

Social responsibility as a key indicator of the social and economic change

Prof. Dr. Tatiana A. Medvedeva,
Siberian State University of Transport, Novosibirsk, Russia
tmedvedeva@mail.ru

Prof. Emer. Dr., Dr., Matjaž Mulej,
University of Maribor,
Maribor, Slovenia,
And IRDO Institute for the Development of Social Responsibility
matjaz.mulej@um.si

Abstract

No nations can live isolated any longer nor can they be competitive, if their human capacities remain underused, as a consequence of the outdated, but surviving authoritarian, repressive style of management. The empirical data about Russia, e.g., are showing critical differences between organizations with the heritage of the tsarist and soviet culture, and the younger ones, such as informatics, in which social responsibility is more practiced. The next step should be a socially responsible society. A look at the press on currently visible global practice is hiding the socially responsible practices more than the bad ones, making such a society seem to be a utopia. But many utopias became innovations and prevailing practices, including the prevailing social orders, in history.

Key words: social responsibility, social and economic change, socially responsible society, social order, utopia, Russia

Družbena odgovornost kot kazalec družbenega in ekonomskega spreminjanja

Povzetek

Nobeni narodi ne morejo več živeti izolirano in ne morejo biti konkurenčni, če so njihove človeške zmogljivosti še vedno premalo izkoriščene, kot posledica zastarelega, a še živega avtoritarnega, represivnega načina upravljanja. Empirični podatki o Rusiji, na primer, kažejo bistvene razlike med organizacijami, ki imajo dediščino carske in sovjetske kulture, in mlajše, kot je informatika,



v kateri se bolj uveljavlja družbena odgovornost. Naslednji korak mora biti družbeno odgovorna družba. Pogled na tisk o trenutno vidni svetovni praksi skriva družbeno odgovorne prakse bolj kot slabe, zaradi česar je videti družbeno odgovorna družba utopija. Toda številne utopije so postale inovacije in prevladujoče prakse, vključno s prevladujočimi družbenimi ureditvami, v zgodovini.

Ključne besede: družbena odgovornost, družbene in gospodarske spremembe, družbeno odgovorna družba, družbeni red, utopija, Rusija

General context of the problem

Globalization processes, such as computerization of economy, the growing importance of knowledge and modern democratic values, deepening and growth of comprehensive economic interdependence of countries and regions, are increasing the degree of economic uncertainty due to the new phenomena in social and economic relations. These include: strengthening the diversity of forms of employment, new labor market architecture, individualization of labor relations and precarious employment, the increasing complexity of organization of social and labor relations, the formation of global and local professional networks, formation of specific models of labor relations in multinational companies and network of horizontal organizations and enterprises, the emergence of supranational trade unions, the increasing trend of self-organization of workers, the development of a network of partnership on the principles of collaboration, convergence of countries' positions in the international standardization of labor laws, and others (Kolosova, Razumowa, Ludanik, 2008; Medvedeva, 2016; Sadovaya, 2010; Sankova, 2014).

Analysis shows that the globalization of the economy leads to deeply contradictory processes and parameters of the state of social and economic relations. (Medvedeva, 2016; Šarotar Žižek and Mulej, ed., 2019) At the same time:

- There are a growing number of opportunities for highly skilled workers and worsened position of other categories of workers, which is expressed in short supply of high-quality jobs and rising unemployment, particularly among young people.
- There is a reduction of social security of workers, opportunities for them to represent their interests, on the one hand, but on the other hand, the formation of workers' organizations at the supranational level, in cyberspace on the basis of self-organization.
- Computerization of the economy creates opportunities to improve working conditions and enhance performance. However, these opportunities are not always used. Some managers are interested in possibilities for lower production costs. They focus on higher short-term profits rather than also improving the labor force and consider their own long-term interests.
- There is a growing interdependence of employee and employer. Dependence of the employers on their employees increases because new technologies need autonomous and well-educated workers in coordinated teamwork for cooperative social and labor relations. Without this the new technologies cannot realize their full potential.



- Traditional formats of social and labor relations are changing. There is a gradual transition from fulltime to part-time employment and from clearly defined professional positions and responsibilities to unclear, blurred content of professional positions; the concept of “a career” and ways to promote it are now less certain.
- The terms “workforce” and “labor for wage” are now ineffective because they do not reflect the current realities. Relationships of complicity, co-working, and participation are being developed.
- Precarious employment is growing (direct hiring on temporary labor contracts; hiring through employment agencies and labor brokers; transfer contracts with other companies; individual employment contracts as covers of the really self-employed workers; abusive duration of probation; employment contract, disguised as training; employment on call / daily employment or "rolling" employee; illegal or part time enforcement; work at home; etc.).

Some researches extended this term to the level of society (Bobkov Veredyuk, Kolosova, Razumova, 2014, etc.)

According to Human Development Report (2014) economic inequalities grow not only within countries, but also at the global level. Despite the fact that the global economy has the potential to eradicate poverty and ensure a decent standard of living for working people, at present, this potential is not realized and the problems of unemployment, underemployment, inequalities and social injustice are becoming acute. Nearly half the world's workers are in vulnerable employment that is outside the jurisdiction of labor legislation and social protection. Informal employment in developing countries is 40%. At the same time the international scientific community believes that individualizing labor relations cannot serve as an alternative to collective defense.

Therefore, leading researchers in the field of labor relations note that the main challenge for the modern generation of scientists, as well as their direct responsibility, is the need to update ideas, policies, institutions, and practices of social and labor relations in order to increase labor efficiency, equity and social justice, both in the workplace and in the economy, and society (Osterman, Kochan, Locke, Piore, 2001).

Unfortunately, at present, at the state level, strategic goals for the development of social and economic life are not formulated, therefore, there is a contradiction between the goals of building an innovative economy stated at the level of e.g. the Russian Government and the lag in the development of labor relations corresponding to this type of economy. In this regard, the problems arising in social and labor relations will be a serious obstacle to the formation of a new type of economy and its worthy inclusion in the global economy.

We may conclude that a new model of global production and management is characterized by economies of bad jobs, growing unemployment, individualization of labor relations, feminization of labor, precarious labor, the working poor, growing inequality and injustice, lower level of social protection of workers, as well as reduced opportunities for representation and protection of their interests. (Castells, 2000; Hrast, Mulej, Bergant, ed., 2017; Mulej, Merhar, Žakelj, ed., 2019; Klein, 2018; Sedlaček, 2015;)



As a result, conflicts in the field of social and labor relations are growing.

Sociocultural context of the problem: Russia as an example

In Russia, there is a strong tradition of authoritarianism, of vertical organizations. An authoritarian, repressive style of management is the result of the social and economic history of Russia and the established traditions in social and labor relations. The last three hundred years of Russian history have been years of many reforms and social experiments “from above” in order to organize “lagging” people into a new system of social and labor relations. Both the tzars and later the Soviet regime needed a well-prepared and disciplined work force that would accept very long work days to produce large quantities of goods, while the rational use of these goods for the needs of the people was repeatedly delayed by circumstances. However, during the Soviet Union times one used the most advanced technology, techniques and modes of production and, therefore, needed to combine individual initiative and responsibility with the old-fashioned labor discipline. The organizational methods of the Soviet system combined very old and very new forms of organization. Such a complex socio-economic history was not conducive to the rapid development of modern network structures of society and economy in Russia. (Auzan, 2015; Medvedeva, 1999; Medvedeva, Umpleby, 2015)

Researcher of a modern network economy Chekmarev, in particular, writes that the “brick” of the hierarchical structure is the institution, but for a network structure – it is personality. (Chekmarev, 2002, p. 42) While an institution is based on centralization, vertical subordination, staffing and setting formal goals, a network organization is based on the relative autonomy of parts, outsourcing and risk allocation. Online communities in modern economy are formed by individuals who formulate their own goals, creating their projects in temporary virtual organizations. If the idea has extended the call, it influenced people to gather in a kind of clusters. Even if one cluster network is destroyed, others can continue to operate.

In Russia the traditional use of an authoritarian style of management led to the suppression of the individual, the employees were not encouraged to participate in managerial processes, or it happened in the conditions imposed by management. Workers’ self-organization was discouraged.

On the other hand, currently the most organizationally advanced industrial sector in Russia is the information technology one, which in Soviet times simply did not exist. This sector has no problems with the so-called “soviet mentality”. Until recently, Russia had the world's highest annual rate of growth of the Information Technologies sector. But it is necessary to note that simply increasing the amount of computer equipment will not increase the efficiency of the production process; furthermore, it can contribute to randomization. And the reason for this lag is business thinking, business models, and the organization of social and labor relations for the new technologies. An information society is different from an industrial society not just in technology, but also in social innovations (economic, organizational, administrative and legal). It also includes innovations in social and labor relations: how the production roles of employees are changed in organizations; what kind of organizational environment arises as a result of these changes; whether workers really cooperate in the new organizational environment and develop their creativity and initiative; how the new type of management - management cooperation - develops the new type of



social and labor relations. The technical and technological innovations are insufficient without innovations in strategies, processes and business models (Štrukelj, 2015).

The Russian Federation, at the national and community levels, as well as in the scientific community, is aware of the depth and severity of problems in social and labor relations and has taken some measures to address them. However, their effectiveness is not sufficient. Russian experts believe that market institutions and legislation in the field of economic relations, created as a result of the reforms, have not yet become the basis for an effective socially oriented economy. The situation of workers has deteriorated due to the peculiarities of the formation and functioning of the Russian system of regulating the economic relations. This fact is all the more important now, given the task of entering the world economy, particularly through the construction of an innovative economy, which implies a profound socio-cultural transformation -- the creation of institutions necessary in a modern developed economy. This means the need to improve both the system and the quality of social and economic relations (their humanization, flexibility, and a better balance of the interests of the participants); therefore, one needs an "intellectual breakthrough", both in theory and in practice of economic relations. (Kolosova, Bobkov, 2013; Kolosova, Medvedeva, 2015; Medvedeva, 2016).

Transformation means social learning based on changing values (Medvedeva, 1999). Countries, where the elite does not work with socially responsible cultural values, have less chances to attain sustainable development (examples include Argentina, Greece). The ways to work with values are the following:

- (1) **Avant-garde:** to change values revolutionarily, to destroy old traditions and create a new, modern civilization, which would be compatible with the world economy;
- (2) **Archaic:** to keep the tradition, originality, even if it is not compatible with the comprehensive modernization;
- (3) **Modernity:** building on existing informal institutions, to create a comfortable environment of productive existence evolutionarily (Auzan, Arkhangelsky, Lungin, Naishul, 2011).

Policy of sociocultural modernity comes from the fact that the government should create conditions for the transmission and reproduction of values. In this context we consider the notion "social responsibility" as a contemporary innovation process, aimed at a rather rapid evolutionary modernization of the society and reaching beyond the current global neoliberalism and charity (Mulej, Dyck, ed., 2014) in order for people to generate a livable future (Mulej et al., 2016) in a socially responsible society, not corporations only (Mulej et al., 2019).

Social Responsibility (SR) as a non-technological Innovation Process

Social responsibility is the decisive criterion for the formation of a qualitatively new system of social and economic relations. Its role is coordinating in the system of multidimensional relations established between the actors of social and economic change. Social responsibility determines the limits of the permissible activities of individuals, groups, organizations and the state in society. It generates certain requirements for the actors of social and economic relations, which are



expressed through a system of requirements, norms of a legal, political, economic, and moral nature. In other words, social responsibility is also an indicator of the quality of interaction between the actors of social and economic relations' outcomes of any human activity (Mulej et al., 2013). Social responsibility means one's responsibility for one's influences on society (ISO 26000 by ISO, 2010; EC/EU, 2011;) and it leads humankind out of its current global socio-economic crisis (e.g. Mulej et al., 2019). The three essential concepts of SR namely are:

1. Responsibility for one's influences over society (rather than irresponsibility of bosses as the untouchable ones, and of subordinates as the uninfluential ones);
2. Interdependence of all crucial aspects and contents of life (rather than independence that can only be a legal precondition preventing abuse, but it cannot exist for biological and economic specialization);
3. Holistic approach (actually: requisitely holistic (RH), because (3.1.) a real, i.e. total holism reaches beyond the human capacities, even in a good team work, and (3.2.) a so called holism that is limited to a single profession and/or viewpoint is fictitious and leaves many essential existing features aside).

These three essential concepts form a synergy of SR behavior with support from the seven principles of social responsibility: accountability, transparency, ethical behavior, respect for stakeholders, for the rule of law, for international norms, and for human rights. All of them are human attributes, supported by law and reaching beyond law in the area of the 'soft law', i.e. SR human values, related habits and behavior, because it pays, at least in a longer run (EU, 2011; Collins and Porras, 1997; Collins, 2001; Collins, 2005; Lebe et al., 2013; Mulej et al., 2014; Mulej et al, 2015; Nedelko and Potočan, 2019; Šarotar Žižek et al., 2018a, b;).

We use SR also to deal with the non-technological innovation, found necessary (also) in case of Russia, and we see a practical connecting point of RH and SR in the daily experience in VCEN (i.e. human values, culture, ethics and norms – in circular interdependence of formation and influence). The briefed VCEN need innovation toward RH meaning: less selfishness for selfish reasons (Mulej et al., 2013).

Namely: a narrow selfishness does not protect bosses and riches from e.g. envy and protests all way to terrorism on part of those who feel that the decision makers do not apply SR, but a narrow and short-term, if any, responsibility i.e. a fictitious one, such as bureaucrats, autocrats etc. The current daily press reports on many cases from around the world with empirical data.

SR does not ask whether or not there are e.g. entrepreneurs and more or less high and even questionable awards for political and economic bosses, but it asks about criteria that should be felt among people as, at the same time:

- Requisitely honest and based on real achievements, hence acceptable without envy, i.e. as ethically correct;
- Achievements enabling economic and social advancement including a RH quality of life of a requisitely big majority; and



- Attained by methods/products that do not ruin natural conditions for life of humans and other living beings without which humans cannot live, such as bees etc.

People, times and conditions define differently what is a socially acceptable, i.e. SR behavior. Criteria have always depended on VCEN of the most influential ones, the power holders. Others follow good (or bad) examples.

Influential people can use their influence to define criteria of what is wrong or right, sometimes with a too narrow and short-sighted egoism, which is obsolete in the current knowledge-cum-values and innovation society. The current daily press is full of such cases.

It reports also about the consequences: power holders who do not prove their SR, lose their power, ownership and joy, gradually at least. During the latter process, the SR and legal responsibility tend to work in synergy, but they can differ: the power-holders are influential enough to be able to adapt legal rules to their interests, including narrow, one-sided, biased, and short-term interests. They often do so more easily than accept VCEN with SR based on broader defined and perceived RH. This may bring them, too, in trouble, not only their subordinates. (Klein, 2018)

Thus, the famous Friedman's definition that SR is unacceptable, is wrong for economic reasons: companies must care for their profit and benefit of their owners, but not with narrow and short-sighted criteria only (Sedlaček, 2015). Friedman won his Nobel Prize for economy in 1970 for his theory of conservative neo-liberalism, which now proves to be outdated and detrimental for enterprises and society at large; besides, he has never presented any empirical proves for his idea that competition serves people better than cooperation, neither have the other authors with Nobel prizes from the same school (Felber, 2010 and 2012)).

Neoliberalism does not match the old proverb that 'The first profit does not go in the pocket' – a short-term benefit based on narrow and short-sighted criteria often costs much in a longer term. The current socio-economic crisis is proving this. (Mulej et al., 2019)

Slave-owning and feudal societies, as prototypes of autocracy, clearly enforced narrow and short-term interests, as their opponents said. This practice led both long periods of human history in a life that in criteria of quality of life of today has experienced a poor economic efficiency and quality of life of a big majority of people, and showed extreme differences between the rulers and subordinates, around the world. (compare: Sedlaček, 2015)

The industrial and post-industrial/entrepreneurial society differs from the previous ones by its principle of equal chance of everybody to expose their skills and interests and to contribute to the quality of life of them-selves and others. Practice shows that in terms of book-keeping data the entrepreneurial society seems successful in raising the standard of living, but the differences in quality of life are again very similar to those in feudal times: if only good two hundred richest individuals donated less than five percent of their properties, four million children a year would not die for hunger and illness (Crowther et al., 2004). Similar are other data (cited in Mulej et al, 2019). The data from times before the crisis surfacing in 2008, are bad, but much worse today, as daily press reports.



Private owners enforce their interests, so do governmental ones, although formally legally there are no owners, but managers – bosses anyway. Ownership is no problem, but the short-sighted and narrow definition of interests of the influential ones, who forget about SR's longer-term and broader effects, or of the failure of using the SR concepts. (Žakelj, 2018)

Thus the crucial issue of SR reads: do the influential persons, organizations and bodies abuse/misuse rather than use with RH behavior their chances, hidden behind legal responsibility and protection; abuse/misuse fails to lead to SR and out of the current crisis, but it leads to its opposite, probably even to the 3rd world war and end of humankind. (cited in Mulej et al., 2019)

Some practical consequences as SR criteria

Hence, in our perception of ISO 26000 (ISO, 2010), the essence of SR in practice is the prevention of misuses/abuses of legal, economic, and natural laws, and enforcement of replacement of the narrow and short-sighted criteria of right and wrong for broader or even RH criteria. Actually, this is what A. Smith has been speaking for, although today they ascribe him the opposite opinion: the long-term customers return to their suppliers due to SR of both parties – this is the essence of the invisible hand. (Mulej et al., 2013)

Rare authors say that Adam Smith and Karl Marx have aimed in their research at a way to preserve the village-solidarity of earlier times after transition from the village to the entrepreneurial society. They did not succeed. Nobody did. The same necessity is still around.

People who abuse the label of liberalism to cover the huge modern differences in richness, health, famine, etc. and destruction of the humans' natural environment – preconditions of humankind's survival, fail to see that A. Smith does not favor narrow and short-term interests.

The invisible hand expresses the logic of economic interdependence: you must delight your customer to have him/her return and make you happy as a supplier. The fact is that people enforce under the label of A. Smith's their economic thoughts and interests opposing his ideas, is visible in conditions concerning the human care for natural preconditions of life and survival of the current civilization: this care is worrying even in global official data.

These data express abuse of the law of external economics. This law can often be beneficial, but has been applied to nature with expensive consequences. They will obviously damage generations to come soon – our children and grandchildren already. The influential people act like if hating their off-springs, when they act on a narrow basis and with no SR (See: Mulej et al., editors, 2016; Mulej, Dyck, ed., 2014, and references in these books and guest-edited issues of journals; Mulej et al., ed., 2013, 2014; Lebe, Mulej, ed., 2014).

Thus, SR enforces own benefits/interests of people, but not merely the narrow and short-term ones, but also or even first of all the long-term and broad ones. People need to reinforce them in the form of national and international legislation and VCEN of their enterprises and other organizations for the human civilization of today to survive. Therefore, the effort called SR is showing up today to help influential people think in longer-terms and broader criteria. No wonder, SR has hard times to become a general VCEN. The short-term and narrow views of decision-makers make obstacles



all the time, and there is neither a globally accepted theory to replace the current economics, although this leads humankind to a blind alley. Though, there are some new efforts (Gostiša, 2017; Žakelj, 2018; Mulej et al., 2013, 2014; Lebe & Mulej, 2014; Mulej et al., 2016; Štrukelj, 2015; Zore, 2016; Zupančič, 2016; Bohinc, 2017; Mulej et al., 2019).

Market – as an institution aimed at reinforcing the invisible hand – needs support. Not all private or governmental owners should be off, but the ones without SR and the monopolistic ones should. They make too much damage to the coming and their own generations.

Let us humans hence be less selfish for selfish reasons. We are not independent, but interdependent parts of nature on the planet Earth. The development of the basis of competitiveness tends to go the same direction.

Four Phases of Development of the Basis of Competitiveness and Phase 5: Social Responsibility

There is an interesting view of economic development phases, in terms of the changing basis of competitiveness. Porter sees four phases:

- (1) the factors phase means that a nation or region lives on natural resources and cheap labor, providing for a rather poor life for millennia;
- (2) the investment phase means that a nation or region lives on foreign investment into its economic development and can hardly compete;
- (3) the innovation phase means that a nation or region lives on its own progress and attains a better and better standard of living;
- (4) the affluence phase means that people have finally become rich, which makes them happy, but also lose ambition to work hard and much.

Thus, the phase 4 is not the highest development phase only, but also the phase of growing problems of employment, supporting everybody etc. (Porter, 1990, quoted in Mulej, 2013).

Phase 5 is necessary: this is a socially responsible society. See the first book ever about it (Mulej, et al., 2019).

Conclusion: humans must attain and keep capacity of requisitely holistic approach in order to enter the innovation phase quickly and remain in it as long as possible, or may return to it from phase 4, probably via phases 1 and 2, like history has already shown e.g. in the case of Roman Empire as well as other societies that have attained affluence and complacency – and failed. What offers a solution?

We can talk about companies (Collins, 2001; Collins, Porras, 1997; Gerber, 2004; etc.), individuals, countries, or regions. Florida (2005) found in his field research about the reasons of differences in economic prosperity between regions of United States two basic causes of them:

- (1) In USA, the creative class is rising from 5 (five) percent a century ago to +30 % in 1999, with 12% in its super creative core, while the working class is dropping from 40% at its peak several decades ago to 25% now.



The largest social group is the service class, but it does not earn much, because it only provides preconditions for the creative class to create most of all (Florida, 2005, pp. 90-99).

(2) In USA, the most prosperous regions have the highest 3T indicator: tolerance for difference between neighbors all way from traditional families to gays etc.; talents that are attracted by tolerance and chances to be creative; technology invested (Florida, 2005, pp. 257-273).

Tolerance is a relation making room for differences between humans to complement each other, thus to help them to avoid oversights and to attain more holism – by responsibility and interdependence and the seven principles of SR.

Talents make the basis for creativity, including innovation, which in turn can best result from co-operation of specialists different from each other.

Investment in technology supports them, and receives support from them: if various and different talents work hand in hand and persistently, results of their creativity have more chance to attain requisite wholeness and therefore to succeed.

Well: how do the briefed findings apply to Russia?

Russia does not differ much from the old market/capitalist societies in the West nor from the southern hemisphere in terms of poor SR and RH of bosses. Otherwise, ISO 26000 would not be necessary as a globally passed model of the way out from the current global socio-economic crisis. The open issue lies in VCEN of the influential persons and their organizations.

Due to the monopolies controlling the global economy (less than 750 organizations control 85% of the global economy, out of 30 million investigated ones (Vitali et al., 2012)) the West has no more of a free market than the rest of world. Companies control governments (Perkins, 2012); they may even sue countries preventing their abuse of nature despite the international law requiring sustainability, as daily press reports. Criteria are too narrow and short-term. The open issue lies in VCEN of the influential persons and their organizations, from this viewpoint, too.

If the world had less autocratic and bureaucratic bosses with one-sided and short-term criteria of benefit, documents on SR would neither be found necessary nor neglected. The process of SR as a non-technological innovation process is only beginning to spread, although cases have already proven SR is beneficial, including the economic criteria (once one uses the opportunity cost calculation), e.g.:

- SR to co-workers is cheaper than strikes;
- SR to business partners is cheaper than searching for new reliable suppliers and customers;
- SR to other nations is cheaper than wars and refugees' issues;
- SR to the population of countries in war is cheaper than millions of children dying of hunger and illness.

Methods of interdisciplinary creative cooperation, such as the ones by De Bono can help introduce SR into human VCEN rather quickly – once accepted by bosses, which depends on their VCEN and the legal and economic support to such VCEN (see Mulej et al, 2016).



Instead of conclusions: is a socially responsible society a utopia?

Francesco Para Luna (private letter of 15 March 2019) is suggesting us to think about more gender equality. To us, he addresses a component of a socially responsible society, including the case of Russia where the younger generation without experience of the Soviet (and pre-soviet) times is much closer to a socially responsible behavior. Our impression is that Prof. Para Luna is unsure whether or not one can make SR reality. Thus, he makes us think about a historic triangle composed of innovation, utopia and systemic behavior (via making a socially responsible society).

Utopia is something that one dreams about and it hardly has a chance to become reality. Nothing is created, if it has not been dreamed about first (Dragan Sakan's maxima on New Moment office wall).

Innovation is a novelty that was and is experienced by its users as a new practiced source of a new benefit. It is the final phase of the process including:

- an idea – a new thought that is quite near to a utopia;
- an invention – an idea found a source of potential new benefit, once the utopia might happen to succeed;
- suggestion – an invention that is recorded in order to be difficult to forget;
- potential innovation – a suggestion that is elaborated enough to be available for becoming a new practice, but is not used yet;
- an innovation – a former potential innovation that has become a beneficial new practice of some users (inside or outside the organization of its origin);
- diffused innovation that is actually gradually becoming a usual routine of many, to who this new routine is a precondition of a so called normal way of living and working;
- a refused routine being replaced by a new utopia in a new process of making an innovation.

Empirical researchers of this process claim that no more than one out of three thousand ideas becomes an innovation and even less many enjoy their diffusion, changing the prevailing style of life and work of many or even a society.

The authors, promoters, makers and users of innovation process differ from other persons, organizations, communities and societies, because they practice systemic behavior. This means that they practice interdisciplinary creative cooperation of mutually different and therefore interdependent and mutually completing up persons composing a synergetic team. Members of a synergetic team practice listening to and hearing each other due to their mutual differences rather than despite of differences, be them scientists or practitioners. They practice a systemic behavior to attain the highest possible and necessary level of holism, called 'the requisite holism' twenty years ago by Mulej and Kajzer (see: Mulej et al., 2013). Social responsibility supports it (in ISO 26000 by ISO, 2010).

The three basic attributes of social responsibility briefed in ISO 26000 are:

- responsibility for ones' influences on society, i.e. humans and nature,



- interdependence (and values, culture, ethics and norms of mutual support), as a crucial basis of creative cooperation and of attaining the requisitely
- holistic approach.

These facts matter crucially in all phases of the innovation process, including turning of a utopia in an innovation and then the usual beneficial daily practice and room for new innovation processes.

In terms of the innovation process about making a “socially responsible society”, history can show the following critical phases (compare: Sedlaček, 2015):

- a lack of members of a prehistoric small community makes hunting males steal females from the other communities; the utopia of a big enough community became innovation and then the new routine;
- later on the increasing productivity abolished the habit of killing the captured individuals and introduced making them slaves; the utopia of survival became innovation and then the new routine;
- once the slaves' productivity and motivation had become too poor, the utopia of the end of slavery became innovation and then the new routine, called the feudal society;
- then results of renaissance, e.g. printing, protestant religion, technological innovations, and other attributes of the industrial society made the utopia of the end of feudal society become innovation and then the new routine, called the capitalist society;
- in the 19th century the capitalist society started needing literate, educated and innovative population; a rather general entrance to schools gradually made room for the utopia of educated men and women become innovation and then the new routine, including women's equal rights (recalled on 8th March) over the 20th century;
- the long crisis including two world wars and the great economic crises in 1914-1945 generated the need for educated women as a further necessary non-technological innovation that could no way be off after WWII; the utopia of educated and influential women became innovation and then the new routine, called women's really equal rights.

A “socially responsible society” might be a next utopia, becoming step by step a new non-technological innovation. It might put to both men and women as well as children new open issues and make room for new utopias to become sources of a new society (see: Mulej et al, 2019).

The international children's protest covering the entire world in Spring 2019 is very much in line with our efforts as well as the behavior of new post-communist Russian organizations without the so called “soviet mentality”.

References

- Auzan, A.A. (2011) Cultural factors of modernization / A.A. Auzan, A.A. Arkhangelsky, P.S. Lungin, V.A. Naishul. – St. Petersburg: Foundation "STRATEGY 2020". – 2011. – 221 p. (in Russian)
- Auzan, A.A. (2015) *The effect of the gauge. The problem of dependence on the trajectory of the previous development – the evolution of hypotheses* / A.A. Auzan // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 6. Economy. – 2015. – №1. – P. 3 – 17. (in Russian)



- Bobkov, V.N. (2014) Employment and social precarization in Russia: an introduction to analysis: a monograph / V.N. Bobkov, OV Veredyuk., RP Kolosova, T.O. Razumova – M.: TEIS. – 2014. – 96 p. (in Russian)
- Bohinc, R. (2017): *Družbena odgovornost*. Univerza v Ljubljani, Fakulteta za družbene vede, Ljubljana
- Castells M. (2000) *The Information Age: economy, society and culture*. M.: State University – Graduate School of Economics, 2000. (in Russian)
- Chekmarev V. (2002) *Economic space and its network organization*. – Kostroma: Nekrasov Kostroma State University. – 2002. – 118 p. (in Russian)
- Collins in Porras (1994, edition 1997): *Built to Last. Successful Habits of Visionary Companies*. Harper Business, New York
- Collins, J. (2001): *Why Some Companies Make the Leap ... and others don't. Good to Great*. Random House Business Books. Sidney, etc.
- Collins, J. (2005): *Good to Great and the Social Sector: Why Business Thinking Is Not the Answer*. New York: Mohonk.
- Crowther, D., Barry, D. M., Sankar, A., Goh, K. G. and Ortiz Martinez, E. (2004b). *S. R. W. Social Responsibility World of RecordPedia 2004*, Ansted Service Center (Ansted University Asia Regional Service Center), Penang
- EC/EU (2011). *A Renewed EU Strategy 2011–2014 for Corporate Social Responsibility*. Bruxelles: European Commission.
- Felber, Ch. (2012): *Die Gemeinwohl-Ökonomie. Eine demokratische Alternative wächst*. Deuticke im Paul Zsolnay Verlag Wien
- Florida, R. (2005): *Vzpon ustvarjalnega razreda* (In Slovene). IPAK, Velenje
- Florida, R. (2005): *Vzpon ustvarjalnega razreda* (In Slovene). IPAK, Velenje
- Gerber, M. E. (2004). *Mit o podjetniku. Zakaj večina podjetij ne uspe in kako to spremeniti*, Lisac & Lisac and Gea College, Ljubljana
- Gostiša, M. (2017): *Ekonomska demokracija v 21. stoletju*. ŠCID – Študijski center za industrijsko demokracijo, Kranj
- Hrast, A., Slapnik, T., Mulej, M. (2017): *Nacionalna strategija družbene odgovornosti v Sloveniji – idejni osnutek*. In: Mulej, M., in Bergant, Ž., ed. (2017): *Družbena odgovornost in izzivi časa 2017: Dodana vrednost kot poslovna informacija z vidika družbene odgovornosti in trajnostnega razvoja podjetij*. IRDO, www.irdo.si
- .. Human Development Report 2014. *Sustaining Human Progress: Reducing Vulnerabilities and Building Resilience*. P. 68.
- ISO (2010): 26000; See: http://www.iso.org/iso/discovering_iso_26000.pdf.
- Klein, N. (2018): *NE ni dovolj*. Mladinska knjiga, Ljubljana
- Kolosova R. and Medvedeva T. (2015) *Social and Labor relations in a network economy* // Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 6. Economy. – 2015. – № 5. – pp. 89–104. (in Russian)
- Kolosova R., Razumova T., Ludanik M. (2008) *Forms of employment in an Innovative Economy: Textbook*. – M.: MAKS Press, 2008. (in Russian)
- Lebe, S. S. and Mulej, M., guest-editors and authors, with coauthors (2014): *Social responsibility and holism in tourism*. Kybernetes, vol. 43, No. 3-4, pp. 346-666
- Medvedeva T.A. (2016) *An extended system approach to social and labor relations in the conditions of globalizing economy: Monograph*. – Moscow: Economic Faculty MSU, TEIS. (in Russian)
- Medvedeva T.A. and Umpleby S.A. (2015) *A multi-disciplinary view of social and labor relations: changes in management in the U.S. and Russia as examples* // *Cybernetics and Systems: An International Journal*. – 2015. – Vol. 46 – Issue 8 – pp. 681-697.
- Medvedeva, T.A. (1999) *Social and labor relations: theoretical bases and modern practice of regulation: diss. ... cand. econ. sciences: 08.00.05*
- Mulej, M. et al. (2013): (Božičnik, S., Čančer, V., Hrast, A., Jurše, K., Kajzer, Š., Knez-Riedl, J., Jere Lazanski, T., Mlakar, T., Mulej, N., Potočan, V., Risopoulos, F., Rosi, B., Steiner, G., Štrukelj, T., Uršič, D., & Ženko, Z.), *Dialectical Systems Thinking and the Law of Requisite Holism Concerning Innovation*. Litchfield Park: Emergent Publications.
- Mulej, M. and co-editors Merhar, V., Žakelj, V., Hrast, A., Čagran, B. (2016): *Nehajte sovražiti svoje otroke in vnuke*. Trilogy with 48 coauthors. IRDO in Kulturni center, Maribor
- Mulej, M., Hrast, A., & Dyck, R., guest editors and authors (2014 in 2015). *Social responsibility – a new socio-economic order*. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 32(2), pp. 147–214.



- Mulej, M., Hrast, A., & Ženko, Z., guest editors and authors (2013). Social Responsibility – measures and measurement. *Systems Practice and Action Research*, 26(6), pp. 471–588.
- Mulej, M., R. Dyck, editors and coauthors, with coauthors (2014): Social responsibility beyond neoliberalism and charity. 4 volumes. Betham Science, Shirjah, UAE; E-book, 33 chapters, 48 authors from 13 countries
- Mulej, Merhar, Žakelj, ed., (2019): *Uvod v politično ekonomijo družbene odgovorne družbe*. Kulturni center, Maribor
- Nedelko, Z., Potocan, V. (2019): *Personal Values as Drivers of Managerial Innovation*. IGI Global. Hershey, PA
- Nixon, B. (2004): Speaking Plainly – A New Agenda for the 21st Century. In: Crowther, D., & Caliyut, K. T., editors: *Stakeholders and Social Responsibility*. Penang: ANSTED University.
- Osterman P., Th. A. Kochan, R. Locke, M. Piore. (2001) *Working in America: A Blueprint for the Labor Market*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001.
- Perkins, J. (2012). *Izpovedi ekonomskega morilca*. Ljubljana: Založba Sanje d.o.o.
- Sadovaya E.S. (2010) *Modern Mechanisms of Regulation of Social-Labor Relations: Experience of Developed Countries and Russia* / E.S. Sadovaya // *Studies on Russian Economic development*. – 2010. – V. 21. – Issue 5. – pp. 528-537.
- Sankova L.V. (2014) *Precarization of employment in modern economy: systemic risk or "special" form of flexibilisation* / L.V. Sankova // *Living Standard of Population of Russian Regions*. No. 4 (194). – pp. 44-53 (in Russian)
- Šarotar Žižek, S. and Mulej, M., ed., (2019): *Pametna proizvodnja / Smart Production – Pametna proizvodnja – managementski vidik in vidik zaposlenih*, Pearson, UK
- Šarotar Žižek, S., Mulej, M., urednika, s soavtorji Treven, S., Veingerl Čič, Ž., Senčur Peček, D., Rožman, M., Čančer, V., Ženko, Z., Cantarutti, A., Šebjan, U., (2018b): *Družbeno odgovorno ravnanje z deležniki koristi vsem*, (Zbirka Sodobni izzivi managementa človeških virov, knj. 3). Maribor: IRDO - Inštitut za razvoj družbene odgovornosti.
- Šarotar Žižek, S., Mulej, M., urednika, s soavtorji Veingerl Čič, Ž., Bobek, S., Šebjan, U., Tominc, P., Frešer, B., Kapun, S., Sternad Zabukovšek, S., Zabukovšek, U., Krajnc, B., (2018a): *Družbeno odgovorna uporaba IKT*, (Zbirka Sodobni izzivi managementa človeških virov, knj. 4). Maribor: IRDO - Inštitut za razvoj družbene odgovornosti.
- Sedlaček, T. (2017/2015): *Ekonomija dobrega in zla*. Družina, do.o., Ljubljana
- Štrukelj, T. (2015). *Dialektični sistem vidikov za inoviranje upravljanja in vodenja tranzicijskega podjetja: doktorska disertacija*. Maribor: Univerza v Mariboru, Ekonomsko-poslovna fakulteta,
- Vitali, S., Glatfelder, J. B., & Battiston, S. (2011). The network of global corporate control. *PLOS ONE* 6(10), e25995. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0025995. See: <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0025995> (visited 15. 1. 2015).
- Žakelj, V. (2018). *Družbeno odgovorno gospodarjenje*. Ljubljana: VBG d.o.o.
- Zore, M. (2016): *Krepitev inovativnosti podjetij v Sloveniji z razvojem družbene odgovornosti*. Doktorska disertacija. Univerza v Mariboru, Ekonomsko-poslovna fakulteta, Maribor
- Zupančič, M. (2016): *Inovacija upravljanja starejših znanjskih delavcev kot dejavnik inovativnosti in konkurenčnosti trga dela kot podsistema gospodarstva v Sloveniji*. Doktorska disertacija. Univerza v Mariboru, Ekonomsko-poslovna fakulteta, Maribor

