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Abstract
The main purpose of this study was surveying impact of knowledge management on social responsibility. The population was 800 customers of Social Security organization in East Azarbaijan province. We determined the amount of the sample size with the used of Cochran sampling method which the statistical sample is 260 of these employees which have been selected through the simple random sampling method. To gathering of data, we used questionnaire with 23 items. In order to analyze the data resulted from collected questionnaires deductive and descriptive statistical methods are used. And to test the hypothesis of the research we used Structural equations model. Findings show that appropriateness of the model indices were in good condition. So, research model fit is good.
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1- Introduction
While there is no universal definition of corporate social responsibility, it generally refers to transparent business practices that are based on ethical values, compliance with legal requirements, and respect for people, communities, and the environment. Thus, beyond making profits, companies are responsible for the totality of their impact on people and the planet. “People” constitute the company’s stakeholders: its employees, customers, business partners, investors, suppliers and vendors, the government, and the community. Increasingly, stakeholders expect that companies should be more environmentally and socially responsible in conducting their business. In the business community, CSR is alternatively referred to as “corporate citizenship,” which essentially means that a company should be a “good neighbor” within its host community (Rionda et al, 2002).

1 Correspondence author
Mirvis and Googins, (2006) uses a developmental framework to show change in awareness, strategy, and action over time, and posits stages of CSR from elementary to transforming. Jackson and Nelson (2004) take more of a how-to approach, offering a principle-based framework for mastering what they call the “new rules of the game.” Examples of principles include harnessing innovation for the public good, putting people at the center, and spreading economic opportunity.

Although there is substantial variation in the nature and the extent of the corporate approaches reflected in the literature, interest in the field seems poised to stimulate further research and to provide both researchers and CSR practitioners some valuable direction for action and reflection. Lantos (2001) maintains that in relation to social responsibilities, corporations should fulfill the following responsibilities:

- Ethical CSR (including economic, legal and ethical),
- Altruistic CSR (philanthropic, going beyond ethical, regardless of whether or not this will benefit the business itself), and
- Strategic CSR (i.e., fulfilling those philanthropic responsibilities which benefit the firm through positive publicity and goodwill).

In a comprehensive review of CSR definitions, Dahlsrud (2006) highlights five main dimension; namely, environmental, social, economic, stakeholder, and voluntariness.

There are likely more than three distinct perspectives on KM, and each leads to a different extrapolation and a different definition. Knowledge management is a business activity with two primary aspects: according to Barclay and Murray (1997) Knowledge management is treating the knowledge component of business activities as an explicit concern of business reflected in strategy, policy, and practice at all levels of the organization; and, making a direct connection between an organization’s intellectual assets—both explicit (recorded) and tacit (personal know-how)—and positive business results.

Grey (1996) knowledge management is a collaborative and integrated approach to the creation, capture, organization, access and use of an enterprise’s intellectual assets.

From the cognitive science or knowledge science perspective: Wiig (1993) impressed that knowledge—the insights, understandings, and practical know-how that we all possess—is the fundamental resource that allows us to function intelligently. Over time, considerable knowledge is also transformed to other manifestations—such as books, technology, practices, and traditions—within organizations of all kinds and in society in general. These transformations result in cumulated [sic] expertise and, when used appropriately, increased effectiveness. Knowledge is one, if not THE, principal factor that makes personal, organizational, and societal intelligent behavior possible. (pp. 38–39)

And, from the process/technology perspective: Knowledge management is the concept under which information is turned into actionable knowledge and made available effortlessly in a usable form to the people who can apply it (Dalkir, 2005).

There are two main aspects of knowledge management, namely information management and people management. Viewed from this perspective, knowledge management is about information, on one hand, and people, on the other.

The first aspect of knowledge management is information management. The practice of information management developed and became widely accepted when executives realized that information was an important corporate resource that could and should be managed to improve the company’s competitiveness. As a consequence of the growth in the practice of information management...
management, the concepts of “information analysis” and “information planning” developed, thus providing additional tools for practitioners (Uriarte, 2008).

The second aspect of knowledge management is people management. Basically, this involves the management of tacit knowledge that resides inside the heads of people. In actual practice it entails managing the knowledge that exists alongside organizational processes involving a complex set of dynamic skills, know-how and other knowledge-related capabilities (Uriarte, 2008).

Based on actual experiences of the leading global KM case studies, the components for KM can be broadly categorized into three classes - People, Processes, and Technology. While all three are critical to build a learning organization and get business results from KM, a majority of organizations worldwide implementing KM have found it relatively easier to put technology and processes in place, whereas the "people" component has posed greater challenges (Bhojaraju, 2005)

2- Methodology

The main purpose of this study was surveying impact of knowledge management on social responsibility. The population was 800 customers of Social Security organization in East Azarbaijan province.

We determined the amount of the sample size with the used of Cochran sampling method which the statistical sample is 260 of these employees which have been selected through the simple random sampling method.

To gathering of data, we used questionnaire with 23 items. Questionnaires reliability was estimated by calculating Cronbach’s Alpha that was 0.733.

In order to analyze the data resulted from collected questionnaires deductive and descriptive statistical methods are used. Also, we used Kolmogorov-Smirnov Tests to normality of test data. And to test the hypothesis of the research we used Structural equations model.

3- Results

In this study, we developed a main Hypotheses. The statistical way of analysis of hypotheses is two ways, H₁ is acceptance of hypothesis and H₀ is rejecting of hypothesis. In other words, it means that H₁ has positive meaning and H₀ has negative meaning.

Table 1 shows the results of the research hypothesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>path coefficient</th>
<th>t-statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>social responsibility</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to table 1, the value of t-statistics equals 3.49 and shows the effects of social responsibility on the knowledge management in 95 confident level. A positive social responsibility (0.29) indicates that the social responsibility has a positive impact on knowledge management. So, the null hypothesis is rejected and the sixth research hypothesis is accepted.

Fig.1 show the results of standard values of structural equation modeling
Fig 2 show the obtained T values from the estimated structural equation modeling.
4- Conclusion
This paper dealt with the concept of Knowledge management (Technology Infrastructures, organizational climate and conditions and organizational Structure), social responsibility (moral responsibility and altruistic responsibility). Analysis of the hypotheses has shown that appropriateness of the model indices were in good condition. So, research model fit is good.
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