



“Readiness of companies to become socially responsible: social behaviour of an organization and an employee from a demographic viewpoint”

AUTHORS

Jolita Vveinhardt  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6231-9402>
Regina Andriukaitienė  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0691-7333>

ARTICLE INFO

Jolita Vveinhardt and Regina Andriukaitienė (2014). Readiness of companies to become socially responsible: social behaviour of an organization and an employee from a demographic viewpoint. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 12(2-1)

RELEASED ON

Friday, 20 June 2014

JOURNAL

"Problems and Perspectives in Management"

FOUNDER

LLC “Consulting Publishing Company “Business Perspectives”



NUMBER OF REFERENCES

0



NUMBER OF FIGURES

0



NUMBER OF TABLES

0

© The author(s) 2024. This publication is an open access article.

Jolita Vveinhardt (Lithuania), Regina Andriukaitiene (Lithuania)

Readiness of companies to become socially responsible: social behavior of an organization and an employee from a demographic viewpoint

Abstract

The goal of the research is to investigate the readiness of companies to become socially responsible through the prism of social behavior of an organization and an employee from a demographic point of view. In order to achieve the goal, a questionnaire survey was carried out in 2013. The questionnaire "Determining the level of management culture in order to implement the concept of a socially responsible company", formed by the authors, was used. This article presents only the results of the part of social responsibility study without elaborating the determination of the level of management culture which is included into the questionnaire. The research was carried out in two groups of Lithuanian manufacturing companies. The overall approach of the groups of companies to the readiness of the company to become a socially responsible company shows that statistically significant differences between the groups of companies are set on the following subscales: responsibility in relations with employees, uncertainty and lack of information in the workplace, corruption, nepotism, favoritism.

Keywords: social responsibility, corporate social responsibility, social behavior of the organization, employee's social behavior.

JEL Classification: M12, M14.

Introduction

The paradigm of corporate social responsibility (CSR) accumulates a wide range of problematic issues of management, marketing, finance and many other issues analyzed in social sciences. However, as Ferreira and de Oliveira (2014) state, despite the claim that internal corporate social responsibility plays an important role, the understanding of this phenomenon has been neglected. Moreover, ter Hoeven and Verhoeven (2013) wrote that the effects of CSR communication on external stakeholders' perceptions and behaviors have been studied extensively; however, researchers have largely overlooked the effects of CSR communication on internal stakeholders. Thus, the problem is that often the researchers focus on relationships with external stakeholders of the organization, on external CSR initiatives. Firstly, it is fostered by the need of organizations to find the answers on how and in what ways the CSR can be useful in the markets, how much dividends it pays, secondly, the existing differences of opinions (Baron, 2001; Maignan, 2001; Maignan and Ferrell, 2004; Christensen et al., 2013, etc.) indicate that the debate on direct benefit of CSR to companies has not led to the conclusion that satisfies all sides. And thirdly, the results of the research carried out by Moon et al. (2014) indicate that employees' perceptions of CSR positively relate to compassion at work through organizational justice perceptions (i.e. perceptions of distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice), and affective organizational commitment, in a

sequential manner, in addition to their direct effects on compassion at work (Moon et al., 2014). Tuan (2013) and other authors presented similar results, only focusing on the ethical aspects, however, the classic management science offers the answers, how to achieve this both without specially distinguishing the paradigm of social responsibility, and stressing close relationships (Aguilera et al., 2007; Collier and Esteban, 2007; Geva, 2008, etc.); the latter gives prominence to the role of the company employees, both in management, marketing and other aspects, for example, potential opportunities to become a socially responsible company.

In this research we analyze the internal relationships of CSR in companies in order to establish the approach of employees as an internal group of stakeholders to the efforts of the organization. CSR should naturally emerge from internal culture, which is reflected in employees' reaction. The goal of this research is to evaluate and compare the readiness of organizations to become socially responsible in the aspect of employees as a stakeholder.

Object of the research – social behavior of the organization and employee in a democratic aspect.

The goal of the research – to distribute respondents based on demographic characteristics, analyze the opinion of the staff on social behavior, justify the degree of employees' support in the context of social behaviour of the employee, in order to determine the readiness of companies to become socially responsible – help to determine the problem questions and the object of the research.

To achieve the goal the research instrument was created, its verification was performed. The results of verification have shown a high level of validity and reliability of the instrument (Andriukaitienė, 2013). In addition, two organizations, which have similar history of existence and work in the same socio-cultural medium, have the same production-structural profile (manufacture and realization of food products), were selected.

The first part of the article gives an overview of research, and problematic issues are discussed, highlighting the lack of this type of research. The second section presents the research methodology. Finally, on the basis of theoretical and empirical studies, the results of the research are summarized, questions for discussion are raised and considerations on possibility of further research are shared.

1. Literature review

While analyzing scientific literature the following research areas of social responsibility were identified (Crouch, 2006; Garavan and McGuire, 2010; Thompson et al., 2010; Shah, 2011; Orlitzky et al., 2011; Post et al., 2011; Peters et al., 2011; Škudienė, Auruškevičienė, 2012, etc.): some authors focus on the contribution of corporate social responsibility in respect of employees, others give special significance to environmental protection and public relations. In a global society there is almost no such a thing as the world order, there is a big world economy. It is not enough to require the transnational companies to adapt to external conditions, because national policies and social structures are relatively weak. Institutional weakness includes the same markets, and organizational hierarchy is often the only source of management (Crouch, 2006).

However, the significant fact is that internationality of capital has an impact on CSR initiatives. For example, Chapple and Moon (2005) conducted a research in seven Asian countries. They found that the CSR does vary considerably among Asian countries, however, this variation is not explained by development, but by factors in the respective national business systems. It also concludes that multinational companies are more likely to adopt CSR than those operating solely in their home country but that the profile of their CSR tends to reflect the profile of the country of operation rather than the country of origin.

Some small-scale studies (in Lithuania) ($N = 274$) found a correlation of internal and external CSR activities with the motivation of employees, noting that the correlation with external activities is weaker. The weakest relationship was found

between the motivation of internal employees and business partners, related with the activities of CSR (Škudienė and Auruškevičienė, 2012). Other results suggest that employees' awareness of CSR activities is positively related to job satisfaction, engagement in helping and voice behavior, and personal initiative, and CSR awareness is negatively related to emotional exhaustion (Raub and Blunschi, 2013). The results of the interview conducted with managers of the leading organization (India) show that the company, in an effort to be helpful to the local community and meet the standards of conduct of business, have taken various initiatives: in the areas of education, health and hygiene, women empowerment, natural disasters, in the production of environmentally friendly products (in order to preserve the natural environment). However, not all of them were successfully implemented (Shah, 2011). A review of the scientific literature shows that there is a lack of broader empirical studies, systematic approach to the development of social responsibility in organizations; traditionally only some aspects are addressed. That is, CSR is not a frequent object of research in respect of detailed socio-demographic criteria of the company employees. The attention is more often directed to individual, narrower social and demographic aspects, or it is analyzed in a wide context of HRM, how social responsibility affects employees. Schmeltz (2012) researched young people's attitudes to CSR in Denmark and found that the value system guiding CSR evaluation and perception is not based on moral aspects and social, society-centred values. On the contrary, consumers' focus tends to be on competence and personal, self-centred values, which has implications for the challenge of communicating CSR. Results indicate that perceived corporate citizenship had a greater impact on job applicant attraction for those individuals who received prior education regarding CSR and for those who were higher in other-regarding value orientation. Furthermore, perceived corporate citizenship had a positive impact on the extent to which participants defined CSR as a personal work role responsibility. The authors also discuss the practical implications of these results for job applicant attraction and employee socialization (Evans et al., 2011; Evans and Davis, 2011).

Costas and Kärreman (2013) pointed out that CSR works as a form of aspirational control that ties employees' aspirational identities and ethical conscience to the organization. Moreover, the analysis shows that organization-level socially responsible human resource management is an indirect predictor of individual task performance

and extra-role helping behavior through the mediation of individual-level organizational identification. In addition, the mediation model is moderated by employee-level perceived organizational support and the relationship between organizational identification and extra-role helping behavior is moderated by organization-level cooperative norms (Shen and Benson, 2014).

Young and Thyl (2009) have found that the position of labor as a stakeholder is problematic, with a divergence between espoused statements on CSR and how they are operationalized throughout the organization. The emphasis seems to be on environmental and financial sustainability with lesser importance placed on dimensions of workplace management and accompanying employee relations approaches.

Studies show that it is important to analyze the theoretical approaches to corporate social responsibility, which can be defined as voluntary CSR actions in order to improve the competitiveness of the company and improve its reputation. The final result of such activities must be the improvement of financial and economic activity (Orlitzky et al., 2011). In real cases of leading organizations the lack of efforts directed towards public welfare and environmental protection is revealed (Shah, 2011). Empirical studies, the results of which show that there are gaps of social responsibility in an effort to

balance the needs of the organization and stakeholders, have been found (Thompson et al., 2010). Sustainability as one of components of social responsibility should be integrated into the processes of activities of the organization. However, the issues that relate social responsibility and sustainable development, had still not been resolved, as these studies are too fragmentary or focused only on the analysis of the organizational level, ignoring individuals or groups (Orlitzky et al., 2011). In order to extend this scientific discussion, the *problem question of the research* is formulated – what is the attitude of the staff of groups of companies towards preparation to become socially responsible in the demographic aspect and how is it reflected while analyzing social behavior of the organization and employees.

2. Research methodology

This article provides only the results of the part of social responsibility, without elaboration of the establishment of the level of management culture, which is included in the questionnaire, therefore, introducing the structure of the questionnaire only the subscales of social behavior of the organization and the employee will be described in detail. Table 1 presents the subscales that comprise the scales and the sources analyzed by authors from which the questions of the questionnaire intended for certain scales were formulated.

Table 1. The structure of the questionnaire: scales and subscales

Scales	Subscales	Authors, sources
Social behavior of the organization	Responsibility in the market	Crouch (2006), Peters et al. (2011), etc.
	Environmental responsibility	Shah (2011), Orlitzky et al. (2011), Post et al. (2011), etc.
	Responsibility in relations with employees	Škudienė and Auruškevičienė (2012), etc.
	Responsibility in public relations	Garavan and McGuire (2010), Thompson et al. (2010), etc.
Social behavior of the employee	Intention to leave the job	Francis-Felsen et al. (1996), Young, Corsun (2010), Vveinhardt (2010), Li et al. (2010), Kuusio, et al. (2013) etc.
	Uncertainty and lack of information at work	<i>Uncertainty</i> : Gresov et al. (1989), Stalker (2003), Feldman (2004), Roderick (2006), White (2009), Roth (2009), Kallehauge (2010), Vveinhardt (2012), etc.
		<i>Lack of information</i> : Choo et al. (2006), Kelly and Shin (2009), Flett (2011), etc.
	Physical and psychological well-being	Russell (2008), Brown et al. (2009), Žukauskas and Vveinhardt (2010), Juniper et al. (2012), Kelloway et al. (2013), etc.
	Employees' opinions about the organization	Vveinhardt (2010), Žukauskas and Vveinhardt (2010), Vveinhardt (2012), etc.
	Corruption, nepotism, favoritism	<i>Corruption</i> : Round et al. (2008), Kingshott and Dincer (2008), etc.
		<i>Nepotism</i> : Kragh (2012), Jaskiewicz et al. (2013), Vveinhardt and Petrauskaitė (2013a), etc.
		<i>Favouritism</i> : Hippel (2006), Zogmaister et al. (2008), Vveinhardt and Petrauskaitė (2013b), etc.
	Criticism of social responsibility	Shah (2011), Idemudia (2011), etc.

After the formation of the questionnaire its verification was carried out. The initial verification of the questionnaire was conducted during the pilot research, by means of only a small sample of respondents. After

introduction of certain corrections following the pilot research, one more survey presented in this article was carried out. The results of verification of the subscales of the adjusted questionnaire are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Methodological quality characteristics of the questionnaire subscales

Subscales	Number of statements in subscale	Explained dispersion, pct.	Cronbach's alpha	Spearman-Brown	Factorial weight (L)			Correlation of unit entity (r/itt)		
					Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max
Social behavior of the organization										
Responsibility in the market (services and their quality)	6	51.20	0.81	0.78	0.71	0.65	0.79	0.50	0.30	0.78
Responsibility in the market (informing consumers, health and safety)	5	50.26	0.75	0.67	0.71	0.66	0.76	0.49	0.29	0.76
Environmental responsibility	7	44.40	0.79	0.72	0.66	0.59	0.72	0.43	0.19	0.71
Responsibility in relations with employees	7	44.57	0.79	0.74	0.66	0.55	0.73	0.43	0.23	0.73
Responsibility in public relations	6	43.36	0.74	0.64	0.66	0.55	0.75	0.41	0.18	0.73
Social behavior of employees										
Intention to leave the job	6	59.59	0.86	0.84	0.77	0.70	0.80	0.59	0.42	0.80
Uncertainty and lack of information at work	6	49.26	0.79	0.72	0.70	0.64	0.75	0.48	0.30	0.74
Physical and psychological state of the employee	5	58.03	0.82	0.77	0.76	0.68	0.80	0.57	0.32	0.79
My opinion about the organization	4	43.55	0.62	–	0.65	0.38	0.86	0.52	0.22	0.77
Corruption, nepotism, favoritism	10	36.61	0.80	0.74	0.59	0.36	0.72	0.34	0.05	0.70
Criticism of social responsibility: the attitude of the staff	10	43.27	0.85	0.79	0.66	0.57	0.72	0.42	0.23	0.71

As can be seen from methodological quality characteristics of subscales of the questionnaire presented in Table 2, the subscales of the scales of social behavior of the organization and social behavior of employees meet all reliability and validity requirements for questionnaires. No substantial and significant differences that can influence diagnostic results have been found among the methodological quality characteristics of these scales.

3. The results of research

In 2013 the research was conducted using the questionnaire “Determination of the level of culture of management aiming at introduction of the concept of a socially responsible company”. The survey was carried out in 2013, its duration was 5 months. Two groups of Lithuanian companies whose main activity is manufacturing were chosen for the research. These groups of companies carry on their activities in Central and Eastern Europe (the branches of the 1st group of companies are located in Lithuania, Latvia, Ukraine, Belarus, Poland, Russia, Romania, the 2nd group – in Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Ukraine, Russia).

In both groups of companies in general during the period of the research there worked 1915

employees. There were 1030 employees in the first group (hereafter: 1st group), 885 employees in the second group (hereafter: 2nd group). The total number of participants is 1717 respondents. This number of respondents reflects the researched population, i.e., in this case the research sample is sufficient in respect of the number of employees of the two groups of companies. Since the heads of the groups of companies objected the names of the companies to be made public, the fact that both groups of companies are more or less similar in the sphere of the activities, size and other indicators should be mentioned. It is also important to note the fact that both groups of companies are preparing to become socially responsible companies, one organization of the first group has already declared to be a part of a network of socially responsible businesses. The 1st group of companies includes 15 companies, 11 of which carry out production activities, the 2nd group of companies includes 6 companies, all of which carry out production and trade activities. It should be noted that only companies carrying out production activities participated in the survey and the results of the research are discussed entirely in respect of the production companies.

The respondents were divided in accordance with gender, education. All results of the demographic the department, position, length of service, age, characteristics of the staff are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. The results of study of demographic characteristics of the staff

Characteristics	General		1st group		2nd group	
	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent	Frequency	Per cent
Division						
Management	339	19.7%	275	30.2%	64	7.9%
Manufacturing	1378	80.3%	636	69.8%	742	92.1%
Total:	1717	100%	911	53.1%	806	46.9%
Position						
Ordinary employee	1268	73.8%	621	68.1%	647	80.3%
Administration employee	298	17.4%	186	20.4%	112	13.9%
Lower level manager	63	3.7%	37	4.1%	26	3.2%
Middle level manager	66	3.8%	50	5.5%	16	2.0%
Top level manager	22	1.3%	17	1.9%	5	0.6%
Total:	1717	100%	911	53.1%	806	46.9%
Length of service						
Up to 1 year	422	24.5%	89	9.8%	333	41.2%
2-5 years	722	42.1%	396	43.4%	326	40.5%
6-10 years	403	23.5%	279	30.6%	124	15.4%
11-15 years	111	6.5%	90	9.9%	23	2.9%
More than 16 years	59	3.4%	57	6.3%	–	–
Total:	1717	100%	911	53.1%	806	46.9%
Age						
18-23 years	258	15.0%	116	12.7%	142	17.6%
24-29 years	523	30.5%	347	38.1%	176	21.8%
30-39 years	464	27.0%	274	30.1%	190	23.6%
40-49 years	320	18.6%	126	13.8%	194	24.1%
50-retirement age	149	8.7%	46	5.0%	103	12.8%
Retirement age	3	0.2%	2	0.3%	1	0.1%
Total:	1717	100%	911	53.1%	806	46.9%
Gender						
Male	723	42.1%	460	50.5%	263	32.6%
Female	994	57.9%	451	49.5%	543	67.4%
Total:	1717	100%	911	53.1%	806	46.9%
Education						
Higher university	264	15.4%	150	16.5%	114	14.1%
Higher non-university	261	15.2%	170	18.7%	91	11.3%
College	272	15.8%	138	15.1%	134	16.6%
Vocational	414	24.1%	205	22.5%	209	25.9%
Secondary	393	22.9%	161	17.7%	232	28.8%
Primary	113	6.6%	87	9.5%	26	3.3%
Total:	1717	100%	911	53.1%	806	46.9%

Table 3 summarizes general results of the research in both groups of companies and individual results in groups. The analysis of distribution of the respondents by departments allows seeing that the majority of respondents represent the manufacturing department, i.e., the majority of the respondents to the survey are ordinary employees. When comparing both groups of companies in relation to the length of service of employees it was found that the largest number of employees are those respondents who have been working in the organization for 2 to 5 years, although in the first group of companies it is

obvious that there is a far greater number of long-serving staff (from 6 to 10 years – 279 employees, from 11 to 15 years – 90 employees, 57 persons have been working for more than 16 years). Of course, it depends on the different dates of founding of the companies (the 1st group of companies was founded in 1992, and the 2nd group was founded in 1998).

Characteristics of employees in accordance with their age in both groups of companies do not show significant differences, i.e. the respondents in both groups were distributed fairly evenly. No significant differences were found in the 1st group, i.e. the

number of men and women is almost equal, the 2nd group of companies is dominated by the female. This shows that the activity of this group of companies is probably more in line with the traditionally established attitudes towards the job “acceptable for women”. The level of education in both of the analyzed groups is distributed more or less evenly. Employees without higher education, which is not necessary in the production work, make the largest part of the organization.

The results of comparison of demographic indicators with indicators of preparing to become

socially responsible companies are presented below. Since all statements (both positive and negative) were encoded positively, the minus sign of the Z-score indicates a negative situation of the issue under consideration; the plus sign indicates a positive situation. The differences are obvious, when the sum of Z-scores among the compared objects is 0.5.

The results of the research showing the situation of social behavior of the organization and employees in respect of distribution into departments in two groups of companies are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Social behavior of the organization and the employees: distribution by departments

Subscales	General		ANOVA test results		1st group			2nd group		
	Management (N = 339)	Production (N = 1378)	F	p	Management (N = 275)	Production (N = 636)	ANOVA test results	Management (N = 64)	Production (N = 742)	ANOVA test results
Social behavior of the organization										
Responsibility in the market (services and their quality)	0.20	-0.03	8.627	0.000**	0.23	-0.10	F = 7.488 p = 0.000**	0.46	-0.03	F = 3.955 p = 0.000**
Responsibility in the market (informing consumers, health and safety)	0.24	-0.06	8.644	0.000**						
Environmental responsibility	0.10	-0.01	2.577	0.050*						
Responsibility in relations with employees	0.30	-0.11	18.000	0.000**						
Responsibility in public relations	0.25	-0.03	13.908	0.000**						
Social behavior of employees										
Intention to leave the job	0.28	-0.07	11.432	0.000**	0.16	-0.24	F = 10.305 p = 0.000**	0.78	0.06	F = 5.730 p = 0.000**
Uncertainty and lack of information at work	0.35	-0.09	17.588	0.000**						
Physical and psychological state of the employee	0.21	-0.03	8.230	0.000**						
My opinion about the organization	0.00	0.01	0.776	0.507						
Corruption, nepotism, favoritism	0.24	-0.08	12.551	0.000**						
Criticism of social responsibility: the attitude of the staff	0.12	-0.01	4.691	0.003**						

Note: * Level of statistical significance $\alpha = 0.05$. ** Level of statistical significance $\alpha = 0.01$.

The index of dispersion (F) (one-factor analysis of variance ANOVA) was used to determine the method employed.

Statistical significance (p), where p results in the tables are shown in bold indicates that the differences between Z-scores are statistically significant, i.e. sufficient to formulate a conclusion.

Social behavior of the organization as well as social behavior of the employees differs depending on the department they work in. These data were verified by one-factor analysis of variance one-way ANOVA. Although the results do not show a statistically significant gap, they show that the attitude of the management to all the issues discussed is positive, in the manufacturing divisions it is opposite – negative, only on the subscale “My

opinion about the organization” the Z-score is positive (Table 3).

The results depending on the positions the employees hold and their support to the highlighted subscales are presented in Table 5 (see Appendix).

According to the data of Tukey’s HSD test, statistically significant differences of Z-scores between ordinary employees and employees of other positions have been found. Z-scores of opinion of ordinary employees are all negative, pointing to the negative attitude when marking the statements on the subscales. The managers’ attitudes towards social responsibility are positive, with the exception of personal opinions about the organization (Table 5).

Table 6 presents the distribution of the opinions of employees based on their length of service in the

organization. According to the Tukey's HSD test, statistically significant differences of Z-scores were found among employees with the longest length of service (more than 16 years) and employees with less experience (Table 6).

Table 7 shows the distribution of the employees' attitudes towards the analyzed question depending on their age. According to data of Tukey's HSD test, statistically significant differences in Z-scores have been found among the youngest employees of 18-23 years and older employees (Table 7).

The results of distribution of employees by education are shown in Table 8. According to the data of Tukey's HSD test, statistically significant differences in Z-scores have been found between the groups with higher university, with higher non-university and with vocational and secondary/primary education (Table 8).

Both social behavior of the organization and social behavior of the employee differ in some aspects depending on gender. Table 9 presents the results tested by Student's test (*t*-test).

Table 9. Social behavior of the organization and the employees: distribution by gender

Subscales	General		t-test results		1st group			2nd group		
	Male (N = 723)	Female (N = 994)	t	p	Male (N = 460)	Female (N = 451)	t-test results	Male (N = 263)	Female (N = 543)	t-test results
Social behavior of the organization										
Responsibility in the market (services and their quality)	-0.05	0.03	-1.601	0.110	-0.01	0.00	t = -0.118 p = 0.906	0.09	-0.03	t = 1.646 p = 0.100
Responsibility in the market (informing consumers, health and safety)	-0.01	0.01	-0.407	0.684						
Environmental responsibility	0.03	-0.02	1.195	0.232						
Responsibility in relations with employees	0.09	-0.06	3.108	0.002**						
Responsibility in public relations	0.03	-0.03	1.220	0.223						
Social behavior of employees										
Intention to leave the job	-0.01	0.01	-0.530	0.596	-0.16	-0.04	t = -1.793 p = 0.073	0.27	0.04	t = 3.185 p = 0.002**
Uncertainty and lack of information at work	0.05	-0.04	1.860	0.063						
Physical and psychological state of the employee	0.06	-0.04	2.152	0.032*						
My opinion about the organization	-0.07	0.05	-2.559	0.011*						
Corruption, nepotism, favoritism	0.01	-0.01	0.282	0.778						
Criticism of social responsibility: the attitude of the staff	-0.07	0.05	-2.370	0.018*						

Note: * Level of statistical significance $\alpha = 0.05$. ** Level of statistical significance $\alpha = 0.01$.

Statistically significant differences by gender were found in the subscales: responsibility in relations with employees (in respect of women this indicator is negative, for men it is positive), physical and psychological state: women in the organization both physically and psychologically feel much worse than men. My opinion about the organization: men respond negatively, women respond positively;

criticism of social responsibility: the attitude of the staff – men's attitude towards social responsibility is critical, negative attitudes prevail in their responses, and it is opposite in women's responses.

The comparison of general data of both groups by the behavior of the organization and the employees is presented in Table 10.

Table 10. General comparison of social behavior of the organization and the employee between two groups of companies

Subscales	1st group (N = 911)	2nd group (N = 806)	t-test results	
			t	p
Social behavior of the organization				
Responsibility in the market (services and their quality)	-0.21	0.23	-9.325	0.000**
Responsibility in the market (informing consumers, health and safety)	-0.10	0.11	-4.412	0.000**
Environmental responsibility	-0.01	0.01	-0.274	0.784

Table 10 (cont.). General comparison of social behavior of the organization and the employee between two groups of companies

Subscales	1st group (N = 911)	2nd group (N = 806)	t-test results	
			t	p
Responsibility in relations with employees	0.29	-0.33	13.494	0.000**
Responsibility in public relations	-0.03	0.03	-1.111	0.267
Social behavior of employees				
Intention to leave the job	-0.07	0.08	-3.033	0.002**
Uncertainty and lack of information at work	0.10	-0.11	4.480	0.000**
Physical and psychological state of the employee	-0.03	0.04	-1.539	0.124
My opinion about the organization	-0.24	0.27	-10.954	0.000**
Corruption, nepotism, favoritism	0.02	-0.02	0.956	0.339
Criticism of social responsibility: the attitude of the staff	-0.24	0.27	-11.077	0.000**

Note: * Level of statistical significance $\alpha = 0.05$. ** Level of statistical significance $\alpha = 0.01$.

Comparison of two groups of companies shows that in the first group of eleven criteria of social responsibility most of them were evaluated negatively. Positive Z-scores are identified only for the criteria of responsibility in relations with employees, uncertainty and lack of information at work (respondents confirmed that there is no shortage of information), and on the subscale of corruption, nepotism and favoritism (the indicator shows that there are no such phenomena in the organization).

The indicators are much better in the second group compared with the first group, which is confirmed by the positive Z-score on the subscales, i.e. only 3 of eleven criteria have a negative evaluation: responsibility in relations with employees, uncertainty and the lack of information at work, corruption, nepotism, favouritism. These criteria in the first group of companies are positive, so the recorded difference is statistically significant (Table 10).

Discussion of the results

According to Garavan et al (2010), a considerable body of research exists on CSR and corporate sustainability. However, there is significantly less on the influence of employees on the adoption of CSR and corporate sustainability initiatives. Given the centrality of employees as stakeholders in CSR/corporate sustainability adoption, it is important to understand how barriers at individual, organizational, and institutional levels of analysis influence the adoption of CSR/corporate sustainability initiatives. An understanding of these barriers will illuminate the potential contribution of human resource development to their removal.

The study has shown that when employees evaluate social responsibility activities negatively, and the management evaluates it positively, the following assumptions are possible: the social programme is implemented formally, there are no feedback

mechanisms. Therefore, there is no effective system for the internal audit of social responsibility.

Summarizing the results of studies conducted in different countries, it is revealed that large companies do not always seek to harmonize their activities with stakeholders, depending on institutional weakness of their structures.

Although CSR is understood as organizational investments in large economic benefits through social interactions and sustainability, because of institutional weakness of social structures there remain unfilled gaps that interfere with effective balance of the relationships with stakeholders, investments in the environment of companies remain insufficient, and the studies are incomplete.

During the study 1717 respondents from two groups of Lithuanian companies which operate on an international scale in Central and Eastern Europe were surveyed. One-factor analysis of variance one-way ANOVA has shown statistically significant differences between the evaluation of social responsibility by the administration and by the employees of manufacturing departments: positive by administration, and negative by production employees.

It emerged that insufficient attention is given to psychological well-being of staff. Unfavorable attitude to social responsibility in environmental protection was evident in almost all groups, depending on length of service, and the relationships with employees were evaluated negatively by the respondents with length of service of up to one year. Physical and psychological state was negatively evaluated in groups with length of service from 2 to 5 years and from 11 to 15 years, and in groups from 18 to 23 years, 24-29 years and over 50 years of age.

Employees with vocational, secondary and primary education are more dissatisfied with physical and

psychological environment. It was found that women evaluate relationships with the employees, the public, the approach to nature protection, physical and psychological conditions more critically, but men are more likely to leave the job and give negative responses about the organization. This distribution could determine the fact that women evaluated the situation openly, and men expressed their opinion in the steps of the test without elaboration of the reviews and criticism of social responsibility.

Conslusions

The conclusions of studies carried out in other countries that the organizations take into account not all aspects of CSR and insufficiently strong institutional power of staff as one of the stakeholders has some influence on that were confirmed.

After evaluation of the results of the study it can be concluded that the management of both groups of companies evaluate CSR activities inadequately, there are no feedback mechanisms, and the management insufficiently care about the relationships with the employees, who are one of the stakeholders, their physical environment and psychological condition. There is no effective system of internal audit of social responsibility,

which should be developed and provide feedback, and the concept of CSR has not become an integral part of the organizational culture. Psychologically insecure environment can influence the fact that men don't want to elaborate the critical approach to CSR activities. Future research should also examine the influence of socio-cultural stereotypes. The differences between the two groups of companies are not very notable, but they exist and show the existing differences in the management culture. The gap in differences between managers' and employees' evaluations could be searched for among declarations of CSR values and reality. Although Christensen et al. (2013) argue that differences between words and action are not necessarily a bad thing and that such discrepancies have the potential to stimulate CSR improvements, it is also necessary to assess the negative effects of the approach, which arise when expectations of the employees remain unsatisfied. It shows how consistency is important for the implementation of CSR, that the employees' opinion about the initiatives of the organization can serve to improve the implementation process itself. According to the authors, in future research in the organizations implementing CSR it is important to take into account the culture of managerial staff, values, management knowledge and practical skills as well.

References

1. Aguilera, R.V., Rupp, D.E., Williams, C.A. and Ganapathi, J. (2007). Putting the S back in corporate social responsibility: A multilevel theory of social change in organizations, *Academy of Management Review*, 32 (3), pp. 836-863.
2. Andriukaitienė, R. (2013). Organizacijos ir darbuotojo socialinė elgsena: klausimyno subskalių patikra, Laisvalaikio tyrimai, Nr. 2 (2) (online) [Social behaviour of organization and employee: check of questionnaire subscales, in *Lithuanian*].
3. Baron, D.P. (2001). Private Politics, Corporate Social Responsibility, and Integrated Strategy, *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, 10, pp. 7-45.
4. Brown, M., Metz, I., Cregan, Ch. and Kulik, C. (2009). Irreconcilable differences? Strategic human resource management and employee well-being, *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 47 (3), pp. 270-294.
5. Chapple, W., Moon, J. (2005). Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in Asia: A Seven-Country Study of CSR Web Site Reporting, *Business & Society*, 44 (4), pp. 415-441.
6. Choo, Ch.W., Furness, C., Paquette, S., van den Berg, H., Detlor, B., Bergeron, P. and Heaton, L. (2006). Working with information: information management and culture in a professional services organization, *Journal of Information Science*, 32 (6), pp. 491-510.
7. Christensen, L.T., Morsing, M. and Thyssen, O. (2013). CSR as aspirational talk, *Organization*, 20 (3), pp. 372-393.
8. Collier, J., Esteban, R. (2007). Corporate social responsibility and employee commitment, *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 16 (1), p. 19-33.
9. Costas, J., Kärreman, D. (2013). Conscience as control – managing employees through CSR, *Organization*, 20 (3), pp. 394-415.
10. Crouch, C. (2006). Modelling the firm in its market and organizational environment: methodologies for studying corporate social responsibility, *Organization Studies*, 27 (10), pp. 1533-1551.
11. Evans, W.R., Davis, W.D. and Frink, D. (2011). An examination of employee reactions to perceived corporate citizenship, *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 41, pp. 938-964.
12. Evans, W.R., Davis, W.D. (2011). An Examination of Perceived Corporate Citizenship, Job Applicant Attraction, and CSR Work Role Definition, *Business & Society*, 50 (3), pp. 456-480.
13. Feldman, S.P. (2004). The Culture of Objectivity: Quantification, Uncertainty, and the Evaluation of Risk at NASA, *Human Relations*, 57 (6), pp. 691-718.
14. Ferreira, P., de Oliveira, E.R. (2014). Does corporate social responsibility impact on employee engagement? *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 26 (3/4).

15. Flett, A. (2011). Information Management Possible? Why is information management so difficult? *Business Information Review*, 28 (2), pp. 92-100.
16. Francis-Felsen, L.C., Coward, R.T., Hogan, T.L., Duncan, R.P., Hilker, M.A., Horne, C. (1996). Factors influencing intentions of nursing personnel to leave employment in long-term care settings, *Journal of Applied Gerontology*, 15 (4), pp. 450-470.
17. Garavan, T.N., Heraty, N., Rock, A. and Dalton, E. (2010). Conceptualizing the Behavioral Barriers to CSR and CS in Organizations: A Typology of HRD Interventions, *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 12 (5), pp. 587-613.
18. Garavan, T.N., McGuire, D. (2010). Human resource development and society: human resource development's role in embedding corporate social responsibility, sustainability, and ethics in organizations, *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 12 (5), pp. 487-507.
19. Geva, A. (2008). Three Models of Corporate Social Responsibility: Interrelationships between Theory, Research, and Practice, *Business and Society Review*, 113 (1), pp. 1-41.
20. Gresov, Ch., Drazin, R., Van de Ven, A.H. (1989). Work-Unit Task Uncertainty, Design and Morale, *Organization Studies*, 10 (1), pp. 45-62.
21. Hippel, C.D. (2006). When People Would Rather Switch Than Fight: Out-Group Favoritism Among Temporary Employees, *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 9 (4), pp. 533-546.
22. Idemudia, U. (2011). Corporate social responsibility and developing countries: moving the critical CSR research agenda in Africa forward, *Progress in Development Studies*, 11 (1), pp. 1-18.
23. Young, Ch.A., Corsun, D.L. (2010). Burned! the Impact of Work Aspects, Injury, and Job Satisfaction on Unionized Cooks' Intentions To Leave the Cooking Occupation, *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 34 (1), pp. 78-102.
24. Young, S., Thyil, V. (2009). Governance, employees and CSR: Integration is the key to unlocking value, *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 47 (2), pp. 167-185.
25. Jaskiewicz, P., Uhlenbruck, K., Balkin, D.B., Reay, T. (2013). Is Nepotism Good or Bad? Types of Nepotism and Implications for Knowledge Management, *Family Business Review*, 26 (2), pp. 121-139.
26. Juniper, B., Bellamy, P., White, N. (2012). Evaluating the well-being of public library workers, *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 44 (2), pp. 108-117.
27. Kallehauge, J. (2010). Stage-driven information seeking process: Value and uncertainty of work tasks from initiation to resolution, *Journal of Information Science*, 36 (2), pp. 242-262.
28. Kelly, K.R., Shin, Y.J. (2009). Relation of Neuroticism and Negative Career Thoughts and Feelings to Lack of Informatikon, *Journal of Career Assessment*, 17 (2), pp. 201-213.
29. Kelloway, E.K., Weigand, H., McKeen, M.C., Das, H. (2013). Positive Leadership and Employee Well-Being, *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 20 (1), pp. 107-117.
30. Kingshott, R.P.J., Dincer, O.C. (2008). Determinants of Public Service Employee Corruption: A Conceptual Model from the Psychological Contract Perspective, *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 50 (1), pp. 69-85.
31. Kragh, S.U. (2012). The anthropology of nepotism: Social distance and reciprocity in organizations in developing countries, *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, 12 (2), pp. 247-265.
32. Kuusio, H., Heponiemi, T., Vänskä, J., Aalto, A.M., Ruskoaho, J., Elovainio, M. (2013). Psychosocial stress factors and intention to leave job: differences between foreign-born and Finnish-born general practitioners, *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 41 (4), pp. 405-411.
33. Li, J., Fu, H., Hu, Y., Shang, L., Wu, Y., Kristensen, T.S., Mueller, B.H., Hasselhorn, H.M. (2010). Psychosocial work environment and intention to leave the nursing profession: Results from the longitudinal Chinese NEXT study, *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 38 (3), pp. 69-80.
34. Maignan, I. (2001). Consumers Perception of Corporate Social Responsibilities: A Cross-Cultural Comparison, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 30 (1), pp. 57-72.
35. Maignan, I., Ferrell, O.C. (2004). Corporate Social Responsibility and Marketing: An Integrative Framework, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 32 (1), p. 3-19..
36. Moon, T.W., Hur, W.M., Ko, S.H., Kim, J.W. and Yoon, S.W. (2014). Bridging corporate social responsibility and compassion at work: Relations to organizational justice and affective organizational commitment, *Career Development International*, 19 (1), pp. 49-72.
37. Orlitzky, M., Siegel, D.S., Waldman, D.A. (2011). Strategic corporate social responsibility and environmental sustainability, *Business & Society*, 50 (1), pp. 6-27.
38. Peters, S., Miller, M., Kusyk, S. (2011). How relevant is corporate governance and corporate social responsibility in emerging markets? *Corporate Governance*, 11 (4), pp. 429-445.
39. Post, C., Rahman, N., Rubow, E. (2011). Green governance: boards of directors' composition and environmental corporate social responsibility, *Business & Society*, 50 (1), pp. 189-223.
40. Raub, S., Blunsch, S. (2013). The Power of Meaningful Work: How Awareness of CSR Initiatives Fosters Task Significance and Positive Work Outcomes in Service Employees, *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly*, 55 (1), pp. 10-18.
41. Roderick, M. (2006). A very precarious profession: Uncertainty in the working lives of professional footballers, *Work, Employment & Society*, 20 (2), pp. 245-265.
42. Roth, W.M. (2009). Radical Uncertainty in Scientific Discovery Work, *Science, Technology & Human Values*, 34 (3), pp. 313-336.

43. Round, J., Williams, C.C., Rodgers, P. (2008). Corruption in the post-Soviet workplace: the experiences of recent graduates in contemporary Ukraine, *Work, Employment & Society*, 22 (1), pp. 149-166.
44. Russell, J.E.A. (2008). Promoting Subjective Well-Being at Work, *Journal of Career Assessment*, 16 (1), pp. 117-131.
45. Schmeltz, L. (2012). Consumer-oriented CSR communication: focusing on ability or morality? *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 17 (1), pp. 29-49.
46. Shah, S. (2011). Social and environmental responsibility: case study of Hindustan Unilever Ltd, *Journal of Human Values*, 17 (1), pp. 23-42.
47. Shen, J., Benson, J. (2014). When CSR Is a Social Norm: How Socially Responsible Human Resource Management Affects Employee Work Behavior, *Journal of Management*, 20 (10), pp. 1-24.
48. Stalker, K. (2003). Managing Risk and Uncertainty in Social Work: A Literature Review, *Journal of Social Work*, 3 (2), pp. 211-233.
49. Škudienė, V., Auruškevičienė, V. (2012). The contribution of corporate social responsibility to internal employee motivation, *Baltic Journal of Management*, 7 (1), pp. 49-67.
50. ter Hoeven, C.L., Verhoeven, J.W.M. (2013). "Sharing is caring": Corporate social responsibility awareness explaining the relationship of information flow with affective commitment, *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 18 (2), pp. 264-279.
51. Thompson, D.W., Panwar, R., Hansen, E.N. (2010). Examining social responsibility orientation gaps between society and industry executives, *Management Decision*, 48 (1), pp. 156-171.
52. Tuan, L.T. (2013). Underneath organizational health and knowledge sharing, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 26 (1), pp. 139-168.
53. Vveinhardt, J. (2010). The diagnostics of mobbing as discrimination in employee relations aiming to improve the organizational climate in Lithuanian organizations, *Management Theory and Studies for Rural Business and Infrastructure Development*, 21 (2), pp. 173-184.
54. Vveinhardt, J. (2012). Identification of the reliability of methodological characteristics of quality in the diagnostic instrument for mobbing as discrimination in employee relations on purpose to improve the climate in Lithuanian organisations, *Transformations in Business and Economics*, Vol. 11, No. 2 (26), pp. 218-232.
55. Vveinhardt, J., Petrauskaitė, L. (2013a). Intensity of nepotism expression in organizations of Lithuania, *Organizacijų vadyba: sisteminiai tyrimai-Management of Organizations: Systematic Research*, 66, pp. 129-144.
56. Vveinhardt, J., Petrauskaitė, L. (2013b). Nepotizmo, favoritizmo ir protekcionizmo trianguliacijos koncepcinis modelis, *Organizacijų vadyba: sisteminiai tyrimai-Management of Organizations: Systematic Research*, 65, pp. 137-148.
57. White, S. (2009). Fabled Uncertainty in Social Work: A Coda to Spafford et al, *Journal of Social Work*, 9 (2), pp. 222-235.
58. Zogmaister, C., Arcuri, L., Castelli, L., Smith, E.R. (2008). The Impact of Loyalty and Equality on Implicit Ingroup Favoritism, *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 11 (4), pp. 493-512.
59. Žukauskas, P., Vveinhardt, J. (2010). The Model of Managerial Intervention Decisions of Mobbing as Discrimination in Employees' Relations in Seeking to Improve Organization Climate, *Engineering Economics*, 21 (3), pp. 306-314.

Table 5. Social behavior of the organization and the employees: distribution by positions

Subscales	General					ANOVA test results		1st group						2nd group					
	Ordinary employee (N = 1268)	Administration employee (N = 298)	Lower level manager (N = 63)	Middle level manager (N = 66)	Top level manager (N = 22)	F	p	Ordinary employee (N = 621)	Administration employee (N = 186)	Lower level manager (N = 37)	Middle level manager (N = 50)	Top level manager (N = 17)	ANOVA test results	Ordinary employee (N = 647)	Administration employee (N = 112)	Lower level manager (N = 26)	Middle level manager (N = 16)	Top level manager (N = 5)	ANOVA test results
Social behavior of the organization																			
Responsibility in the market (services and their quality)	-0.10	0.36	0.16	0.17	0.08	14.638	0.000**	-0.11	0.24	0.32	0.25	-0.43	F = 6.816 p = 0.000**	-0.06	0.26	-0.03	0.57	2.21	F = 11.342 p = 0.000**
Responsibility in the market (informing consumers, health and safety)	-0.09	0.28	0.28	0.25	0.09	10.997	0.000**												
Environmental responsibility	-0.02	-0.01	0.03	0.31	0.14	1.832	0.120												
Responsibility in relations with employees	-0.05	0.12	0.11	0.26	0.31	3.781	0.005**												
Responsibility in public relations	-0.08	0.26	0.13	0.34	0.05	9.476	0.000**												
Social behavior of employees																			
Intention to leave the job	-0.11	0.32	0.29	0.35	0.10	15.466	0.000**	-0.23	0.20	0.35	0.11	-0.25	F = 9.851 p = 0.000**	-0.01	0.60	0.25	0.91	2.18	F = 19.382 p = 0.000**
Uncertainty and lack of information at work	-0.11	0.24	0.33	0.51	0,58	16.753	0.000**												
Physical and psychological state of the employee	-0.08	0.19	0.32	0.31	0,29	8.446	0.000**												
My opinion about the organization	-0.05	0.27	0.09	-0.27	-0.27	7.876	0.000**												
Corruption, nepotism, favoritism	-0.08	0.22	0.14	0.31	0.54	9.352	0.000**												
Criticism of social responsibility: the attitude of the staff	-0.08	0.29	0.11	0.03	0.08	8.488	0,000**												

Note: * Level of statistical significance $\alpha = 0.05$; ** Level of statistical significance $\alpha = 0.01$.

Table 6. Social behavior of the organization and the employees: distribution by the length of service

Subscales	General					ANOVA test results		1st group						2nd group					
	From 1 year (N = 422)	2-5 years (N = 722)	6-10 years (N = 403)	11-15 years (N = 111)	More than 16 years (N = 59)	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	From 1 year (N = 89)	2-5 years (N = 396)	6-10 years (N = 279)	11-15 years (N = 90)	More than 16 years (N = 57)	ANOVA test results	From 1 year (N = 333)	2-5 years (N = 326)	6-10 years (N = 124)	11-15 years (N = 21)	More than 16 years (N = 2)	ANOVA test results
Social behavior of the organization																			
Responsibility in the market (services and their quality)	0.05	0.06	-0.07	-0.10	-0.45	4.885	0.001**	-0.16	0.05	0.03	-0.05	-0.33	<i>F</i> = 2.350 <i>p</i> = 0.050*	-0.04	0.05	-0.08	0.63	0.93	<i>F</i> = 3.299 <i>p</i> = 0.011*
Responsibility in the market (informing consumers, health and safety)	-0.02	0.06	-0.01	-0.05	-0.40	3.186	0.013*												
Environmental responsibility	-0.08	0.01	0.06	0.14	-0.21	2.183	0.049												
Responsibility in relations with employees	-0.17	0.05	0.03	0.15	0.08	4.616	0.001**												
Responsibility in public relations	-0.04	0.02	-0.02	0.19	-0.18	1.746	0.137												
Social behavior of employees																			
Intention to leave the job	-0.01	0.02	0.00	-0.11	0.01	0.462	0.764	0.09	-0.09	-0.15	-0.25	-0.05	<i>F</i> = 1.563 <i>p</i> = 0.182	0.06	0.14	0.09	0.56	1.26	<i>F</i> = 2.115 <i>p</i> = 0.077
Uncertainty and lack of information at work	-0.13	0.03	0.02	0.08	0.29	3.233	0.012*												
Physical and psychological state of the employee	0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.04	-0.08	0.160	0.959												
My opinion about the organization	0.25	-0.04	-0.10	-0.20	-0.26	10.388	0.000**												
Corruption, nepotism, favoritism	0.00	0.05	-0.13	0.05	0.14	2.449	0.044*												
Criticism of social responsibility: the attitude of the staff	0.21	0.03	-0.17	-0.29	-0.12	10.482	0.000**												

Note: * Level of statistical significance $\alpha = 0.05$. ** Level of statistical significance $\alpha = 0.01$.

Table 7. Social behavior of the organization and the employees: distribution by age

Subscales	General					ANOVA test results		1st group						2nd group					
	18-23 years (N = 258)	24-29 years (N = 523)	30-39 years (N = 464)	40-49 years (N = 320)	50 years – to retirement age (N = 152)	F	p	18-23 years (N = 116)	24-29 years (N = 347)	30-39 years (N = 274)	40-49 years (N = 126)	50 years – to retirement age (N = 48)	ANOVA test results	18-23 years (N = 142)	24-29 years (N = 176)	30-39 years (N = 190)	40-49 years (N = 194)	50 years – to retirement age (N = 104)	ANOVA test results
Social behavior of the organization																			
Responsibility in the market (services and their quality)	-0.25	0.05	0.00	0.07	0.10	5.194	0.000**	-0.17	0.11	0.02	-0.15	-0.28	F = 3.430 p = 0.009**	-0.24	-0.05	0.09	0.11	0.11	F = 3.651 p = 0.006**
Responsibility in the market (informing consumers, health and safety)	-0.27	0.08	0.07	-0.02	0.01	6.210	0.000**												
Environmental responsibility	-0.09	-0.05	0.02	0.11	0.06	1.962	0.098												
Responsibility in relations with employees	-0.08	0.16	0.05	-0.12	-0.29	8.512	0.000**												
Responsibility in public relations	-0.14	-0.02	0.06	0.01	0.09	2.019	0.089												
Social behavior of employees																			
Intention to leave the job	-0.30	-0.05	0.07	0.17	0.11	9.469	0.000**	-0.25	-0.20	-0.08	0.13	0.21	F = 4.194 p = 0.002**	-0.19	0.15	0.28	0.19	0.04	F = 5.367 p = 0.000**
Uncertainty and lack of information at work	-0.23	-0.06	0.09	0.15	0.00	6.934	0.000**												
Physical and psychological state of the employee	-0.21	-0.08	0.08	0.19	-0.02	7.285	0.000**												
My opinion about the organization	-0.12	0.01	-0.02	0.01	0.21	2.539	0.038*												
Corruption, nepotism, favoritism	0.00	-0.09	0.03	0.09	-0.01	1.812	0.124												
Criticism of social responsibility: the attitude of the staff	-0.02	-0.08	0.00	0.08	0.14	2.117	0.076												

Note: * Level of statistical significance $\alpha = 0.05$; ** Level of statistical significance $\alpha = 0.01$.

Table 8. Social behavior of the organization and the employees: distribution by education

Subscales	General				ANOVA test results		1st group					2nd group				
	Higher university (N = 525)	Higher non-university (N = 272)	Vocational (N = 414)	Secondary/ Primary (N = 506)	F	p	Higher university (N = 320)	Higher non-university (N = 138)	Vocational (N = 205)	Secondary/ Primary (N = 248)	ANOVA test results	Higher university (N = 205)	Higher non-university (N = 134)	Vocational (N = 209)	Secondary/ Primary (N = 258)	ANOVA test results
Social behavior of the organization																
Responsibility in the market (services and their quality)	0.19	0.11	-0.11	-0.17	14.497	0.000**	0.13	0.17	-0.21	-0.12	F = 7.205 p = 0.000**	0.21	0.10	0.00	-0.19	F = 7.298 p = 0.000**
Responsibility in the market (informing consumers, health and safety)	0.17	0.15	-0.02	-0.24	17.763	0.000**										
Environmental responsibility	0.03	0.15	-0.08	-0.05	3.552	0.014*										
Responsibility in relations with employees	0.09	0.06	-0.09	-0.05	3.220	0.022*										
Responsibility in public relations	0.17	0.08	-0.10	-0.14	10.610	0.000**										
Social behavior of employees																
Intention to leave the job	0.22	0.18	-0.09	-0.25	23.606	0.000**	0.11	0.10	-0.14	-0.46	F = 17.960 p = 0.000**	0.51	0.24	-0.01	-0.16	F = 21.424 p = 0.000**
Uncertainty and lack of information at work	0.21	0.10	-0.01	-0.26	21.180	0.000**										
Physical and psychological state of the employee	0.14	0.21	-0.01	-0.26	19.255	0.000**										
My opinion about the organization	0.17	0.02	-0.08	-0.11	8.172	0.000**										
Corruption, nepotism, favoritism	0.20	0.12	-0.08	-0.21	16.714	0.000**										
Criticism of social responsibility: the attitude of the staff	0.23	0.07	-0.08	-0.21	18.095	0.000**										

Note: * Level of statistical significance $\alpha = 0.05$. ** Level of statistical significance $\alpha = 0.01$.