"Questionnaire verification of prevention of mobbing/bullying as a psychosocial stressor when implementing CSR"

| AUTHORS | Jolita Vveinhardt ⓘ https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6231-9402 |
| | Regina Andriukaitienė ⓘ https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0691-7333 |

NUMBER OF REFERENCES	NUMBER OF FIGURES	NUMBER OF TABLES
0	0	0

Jolita Vveinhardt (Lithuania), Regina Andriukaitiene (Lithuania)

Questionnaire verification of prevention of mobbing/bullying as a psychosocial stressor when implementing CSR

Abstract

The employer is obligated to deal with the psychological safety issues of the employees by legal acts that define them. Also, the organizations themselves must take responsibilities in order to ensure the psychological safety of the employees in the organization. The psychological safety of the employees includes such areas as bullying, various forms of psychological terror suffered from co-workers as well as leaders and clients, the prevention and intervention of stress and health changes. In order to timely diagnose such phenomena in early stages, special instruments are necessary. This article presents a questionnaire customized by the authors for prevention of mobbing /bullying as a psychosocial stressor while implementing corporate social responsibility. The questionnaire was developed based on theoretical assumptions, as well as adapting previous questionnaires made by the authors of the article. The validated questionnaire "Diagnostics of mobbing/bullying as psychosocial stressor" is provided as the main result of the survey.

Keywords: mobbing, bullying, psychosocial stressors, prevention, corporate social responsibility, questionnaire.
JEL Classification: M12, M14, M19.

Introduction

Research relevance. The research performed in various countries shows that many employees suffer from workplace bullying. 27 percent of Americans have suffered abusive conduct at work and 72 percent are aware that workplace bullying happens (Namie, 2014). According to Appelbaum et al. (2012), it is estimated that 1.7 million Americans and 11 percent of British workers experienced bullying at work in the last six months. Another research has shown that psychological abuse was experienced by 29.7 percent Swedish, 27.1 percent German, 24.6 percent Lithuanian and 21.9 percent Portuguese residents (Macassa et al., 2013). According to The State Labour Inspectorate (2012) data, the stress is the second biggest problem according to prevalence that causes issues of health disorders which are suffered by more than one-fourth of the employees in all Member States of the European Union. Markevičienė and Blažys (2000) define violence as a cause of physical and emotional suffering by using force in order to abuse physically or psychologically or by restricting freedom. In the research made in Lithuania, the problem of psychological violence is emphasized in various professional groups (Žukauskas, Vveinhardt, 2008; Kulvinskienė, Banzienė, 2008; Pruskus, 2009; Pacevičius, Janulytė, 2009; Vveinhardt, 2009, 2011; etc.), but there is a lack of research in which such type of violence would be examined in the context of corporate social responsibility (hereafter CSR). Although, as stated by Kirkauskienė and Karazijienė (2009), the improvement of psychological climate at work is one of the spheres of corporate social responsibility, the focus of the research is more often dedicated to study the social and economic concept development (Čepinskis, Sakalauskaitė, 2009; Kovaliov et al., 2011a, 2011b; etc.), values, ethics (Česynienė et al., 2011; Augustinienė et al., 2012; etc.), the nature of social initiative costs (Čiegis, Norkutė, 2012; Korsakienė, Marcinkevičius, 2013; etc.); accountability (Žičkienė et al., 2011), relationships with interested subjects (Bakanauskas, Vanagienė, 2012) and other problems. Jain et al. (2012) pay attention to the protection of factors causing physical and psychological damage, adaptation of work environment for physical and psychological needs of the employees. Because, as stated by Zwetsloot et al. (2008), Jain et al. (2011) the management of the risk of psychological factors is still a barely explored problem. The accumulated experience in the employees' security sphere is not being used in the implementation of corporate social responsibility initiatives, even when it is related to safety and health of the employees (Zwetsloot, 2010). However, it is the responsibility and the duty of managers to protect the employees' health and eliminate psychological violence in the workplace, which is identified as a silent epidemic that ruins lives and careers of millions of people (Namie, Namie, 2009; Namie, Namie, 2011). The employees are one of the concerned subject groups whose human rights, psychosocial welfare, favorable psychological climate assurance goals, when discussed in the concept of corporate social responsibility, coincide with the aims of management science and practice.

Research problem is formulated as a question, what situation of employees' psychological safety in Lithuanian organizations exists and how the principles of CSR are realized in the practice of management of Lithuanian organizations when solving psychological violence against employees and issues of psychosocial welfare. A proper instrument to diagnose such a problem was not found, so there is a need to form such an instrument.

Problem research level. There is a lack of research on ensuring psychological safety and favorable psychological climate in the corporate social responsibility aspect not only in Lithuania but also in other foreign countries. Newport and Sham (2014) discussed a threefold responsibility problem in the article: the desire to be responsible, accountability as duty and control. When making use of the rights, there is generally no wish to accept responsibility. It was found that transformational and ethical leadership are both very effective tools for managers to counter workplace bullying and that the instauration of an ethical climate in the workplace appears to be the most effective in avoiding workplace bullying from forming (Appelbaum et al., 2012).

The carried out research examined the links between job satisfaction, greater commitment, pride in work and organization (Cheruiyot, Maru, 2014), influence of employees' moral behavior (Potocan et al., 2013), individual reaction to the perception of corporate social responsibility, emphasizing that the effect of understanding is a much more complicated process than previously thought (Rupp et al., 2013; Vlachos et al., 2013). Michailides and Lipsett (2013) analyzed the employees' approach to corporate social responsibility, i.e. how the comprehension of work environment climate, education and age variables can directly affect social responsiblity perspectives at work. Mueller et al. (2012) carried out an inter-cultural research which analyzed the ratio between corporate social responsibility and the employees' emotional commitment to the organization. Granerud (2011) carried out a research in small Danish enterprises and came to the conclusion that corporate social responsibility initiatives are mostly related to ethical argumentation to create attractive jobs, to retain employees, however, initiatives aimed to the solution of the employees' health and psychosocial problems, in many cases, are not the object of company's strategy. Jain et al. (2011) carried out a research on the EU employers', the World Health Organization, the European Commission and the representatives of other interested organizations and stated that there is a need to create a psychosocial risk management system for the implementation of corporate social responsibility.

Research aim: to carry out the verification of a newly made questionnaire presenting methodological quality characteristics of its dimensions, structure and the final result – questionnaire "Diagnostics of Mobbing/Bullying as a Psychosocial Stressor".

Research methods. The basis of the research consists of publications by Lithuanian and foreign scientists in the areas of employees' psychological safety, employers' commitments and corporate social responsibility. The research was carried out on the basis of analysis of various social sciences literature, summary, insights of the authors, synthesis of the carried out theoretical and empirical research. The empirical research was carried out by using a questionnaire adapted by the authors.

1. Research methodology

On the basis of the assumptions mentioned such categories of this questionnaire and their defining characteristics were identified: factors related to the mutual relations among co-workers; factors related to the nature of tasks, the content and evaluation of work; factors related to the organization of work and management; factors related to the physical environment of the work and conditions; the behavior of a socially responsible organization; the behavior of a socially responsible employee. The instrument structure is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. The instrument structure

Parts of the questionnaire	Categories	Sub-categories	N items
Mobbing / bullying as a psychosocial stressor	Factors related to the relations among employees	Communication, isolation, reputation, demography, views, suffered damage, comfort, intentions of employees	63
	Factors related to the nature of tasks, work content and evaluation	The nature of tasks, work content and evaluation	20
	Factors related to the organization of work and management	Work organization, work management	12
	Factors related to physical work environment and conditions	Physical environment of the work, work conditions	14
Corporate social responsibility	The behavior of a socially responsible organization	Services and their quality, information for customers, health and safety, responsibility for environment, responsibility in the relations with the public, responsibility in the relations with the employees	32
	The behavior of a socially responsible employee	Responsibility of the employees against customers, the employees' relations with clients, the employees' approach to the protection of environment.	15

Characteristics of the category *Factors related to the relations among employees* include such actions as employees' communication with each other and employees' communication with managers both verbally and non-verbally, at the same time this dimension includes no communication at all or otherwise – ignoring the employee, isolation. In the context of this category such factors must be affected: creation of the employee's reputation or disruption in the organization, tolerance of the employee's views or vice versa, the employee's comfort in the context of relations with colleagues and managers. It is equally important to distinguish such characteristics as demographic characteristics of an employee which may influence the factors related to mutual relations among employees. As far as the negative aspect of the relations is concerned, this category includes such moments as damage suffered by an employee and employee's intentions. If there is a poor climate in the organization and destructive relations among co-workers, the employee may intend to quit the organization.

Factors related to the nature of tasks, work content and evaluation category characteristics include the actions which discourage the employees' reputation in the eyes of colleagues and management, also, a strong psychological pressure is used to undermine the employee's confidence in their professional and social competences, humiliate a personal dignity. Trusting an employee as a specialist is undermined by modelling the opinion of the surrounding people about the person who became a victim. There are situations created where the victim is forced to appear as lacking competence. Key actions are related to the treacherous tasks and permanent criticism about the work carried out by the victim. A dual field of action is highlighted where the power of leadership and ordinary employees is demonstrated. The spectrum of actions carried out by the management includes giving tasks and incorrect evaluation, criticism of the work and the employee. The ordinary employees who support the attacks of the management or organize offensive attacks themselves focus on continuous criticism or the appropriation of the victim's work results.

Factors related to the organization of work and management, category characteristics reflect the organization of work in a number of interrelated aspects. This is a supply of decent work means timely and in sufficient amounts, consistent work planning and organization of information flows, work-orientated, creative environment, adequate evaluation of the employees' skills and the quality of the performance of tasks. Optimal work organization and management plays a dual role defining the functions

and responsibilities of the employees precisely, setting exact tasks corresponding to the competencies: it ensures a smooth and high quality work performance, allows the allocation of human resources rationally, also, minimizes a possibility of destructive conflicts. Therefore, the characteristics of the latter cattegory implemented in the organization's management practice affect the occurrence and/or elimination of bullying and mobbing.

Factors related to the work physical environment and conditions, category characteristics reflect the perception of the needs and means for doing the job effectively as well as the quality of organization of the physical working environment. The indicators identifying the state of the organization under this category show how comfortable the working environment is, if conditions preserving the employees' health create recreation opportunities. Many of these aspects are foreseen by state-wide legislation or assumed additional commitments signed with employees' representatives in a collective agreement. These category characteristics have an impact on employees' well-being, overall psychosocial climate, and also show how an organization behaves socially responsibly in response to employees as an interested group interests, executing economic, ethical and legal responsibilities.

Behavior of a socially responsible organization, category characteristics reflect the organization's economic responsibility to the owners, responsibility in a market (in the relations with partners, customers, competitors, and consumers), legal liability (law enforcement, corruption in internal relations and relations with external entities). It also shows relationship to physical (environment) and social (employees and their families, community) environmental sustainability, the role of ethical values in a daily life. The socially responsible behavior as a certain feature of organizational culture could be evaluated according to how this category forming characteristics are implemented in a complex, that is, consist of a functional system or are selected individually, implemented episodically.

Behavior of a socially responsible employee, the category characteristics reflect staff values and reactions to a company policy. These are indicators that show how the employees identify their values with the values declared in an organization such as industrial production and quality of services, sustainability issues in the relationships with customers and environment. In addition, these indicators show how effectively (informally) corporate social responsibility policy is implemented, and this allows an organization to assess actually existing problems or strengths which must be identified if an organization seeks to implement corporate social responsibility.

2. Results of the research

Empirical research was carried out in 6 organizations. 301 employees took part in the survey. After the empirical research, the reliability of the methodological and psychometric characteristics of the questionnaire was determined. Table 2 contains characteristics of methodological quality of the eight sub-categories within the questionnaire.

Before presenting the results of the questionnaire verification, we should discuss the values of the coefficients. *Cronbach alpha coefficient*: when Cronbach alpha coefficient value is closer to one, the internal consistency of the questionnaire subcategories is stronger. According to psychologists, this coefficient should not be lower than 0.5, in other social sciences this coefficient is acceptable only if its value is not less than 0.7. However, the Cronbach alpha coefficient value depends on the sub-category number which consists of individual items. The more items are included in the sub-category the stronger the Cronbach alpha coefficient may be affected in an upward direction. In this case, our goal is not to establish how the Cronbach alpha coefficient depends on the number of items, but how these items fit together. Fluctuations of items number can distort coefficient values. Then there might be some confusion, e.g. in one case the scale consists of 8-10 items, in other case there could be 5-6 items and in both cases there is obtained similar Cronbach alpha coefficient value. The questions then arise: in which scale Cronbach alpha coefficient is actually better, i.e. where items are more compatible with each other, where their internal consistency is higher – in the sub-category where the number of items is bigger or smaller. The answer is the following: most likely in the sub-category where there are 8-10 items. There Cronbach alpha coefficient is affected by the number of items and then the number shows not the items internal consistency within the sub-category. Therefore, in order to obtain highly accurate results there is calculated not only the Cronbach alpha coefficient but Spearman-Brown coefficient. *Spearman-Brown coefficient* is calculated by a category semi dividing method. The items are divided into two

parts and internal consistency of items of each group is calculated, and then internal consistency between the two parts is calculated. So, Spearman-Brown coefficient indicates the category internal consistency, internal consistency, reliability, however, it is calculated in different than Cronbach alpha method. The number of items is not valid for Spearman-Brown coefficient (for Cronbach alpha coefficient as well). The e*xplained factor dispersion* must be greater than the allowable lowest 10 percent limit, i.e. if the explained factor dispersion in a sub-category is lower than 10 percent, it shows that there are items reducing the dispersion in the analyzed sub-category. *Minimum factorial weight (L)* cannot be lower than 0.3. If it is lower than 0.3, it indicates that there is an inappropriate item found in the subcategory. *Minimum unit correlation (r/itt) average* should not be less than 0.2. The stated value below 0.2 signals a wrong item in the examined sub-category .

When analyzing the category "Factors related to relations among employees" methodological quality characteristics (Table 2), reveal the following highlights: Cronbach alpha coefficient values range from 0.88 (minimum value in this category) to 0.95 (maximum value). These values indicate very strong internal consistency of a category. When discussing the results of explained dissemination, it is seen that the percentage in this category is distributed from 49.66 (minimum value) to 72.02 (maximum value), which indicates that such a percentage of the survey respondents agree about the excluded factors. The category explained dispersion rate is high because the lowest value is almost five times higher than the minimum allowable value. It is obvious that there are no items that reduce the dispersion in the analyzed sub-categories. When analyzing factorial minimum weight (*L*) values of factors related to the relationship in the category, it is seen that the lowest weight, i.e. 0.52, was recorded only in one sub-category. In this category the minimum unit correlation (r/itt) average is distributed from 0.48 to 0.71. So, it is not less than 0.2 which confirms that there are no inappropriate items in the examined sub-categories.

Table 2. Characteristics of methodological quality dimensions of factors related to relations among employees

Sub-categories	N items	Explained dissemination %	Cronbach alpha	Spearman-Brown	Factorial weight (L)			Whole unit correlation (r/itt)		
					mean	min	max	mean	min	max
Communication of employees	8	56.57	0.88	0.79	0.75	0.66	0.83	0.56	0.31	0.91
Isolation of employees	7	63.84	0.90	0.89	0.80	0.69	0.88	0.63	0.42	0.87
Reputation of employees	7	62.89	0.90	0.86	0.79	0.67	0.85	0.62	0.41	0.86
Demography of employees	9	69.73	0.95	0.94	0.83	0.72	0.91	0.69	0.50	0.89
Views of employees	5	72.02	0.90	0.85	0.85	0.76	0.89	0.71	0.48	0.89
Damage suffered by employees	6	67.59	0.90	0.82	0.82	0.69	0.90	0.67	0.33	0.86
Comfort of employees	15	49.66	0.93	0.88	0.70	0.52	0.80	0.48	0.13	0.80
Intentions of employees	6	65.34	0.89	0.87	0.80	0.60	0.89	0.64	0.34	0.88

Factors related to the nature of the tasks, work content and evaluation sub-categories methodological quality characteristics are presented in Table 3. Cronbach alpha coefficient values in the sub-categories of this category are high, i.e., ranging from 0.77 (minimum value) to 0.89 (maximum value). The explained dispersion percentage in the analyzed category includes the following ranges: from 42.31 to 65.17 per cent which indicates a relatively high level of respondents agreeing. In this category the factorial minimum weight ranges from 0.41 to 0.72. However, the lowest factorial weight exceeds the minimum threshold of 0.3. Correlation of entire one confirms that the questionnaire items correlate with the indicated sub-category as r/itt average is from 0.40 to 0.64.

Table 3. Characteristics of methodological quality dimensions of factors related to the nature of tasks, work and evaluation

Sub-categories	N items	Explained dissemination %	Cronbach alpha	Spearman-Brown	Factorial weight (L)			Whole unit correlation (r/itt)		
					mean	min	max	mean	min	max
Nature of the tasks	7	52.10	0.84	0.75	0.71	0.52	0.84	0.50	0.12	0.80
Work content	7	42.31	0.77	0.73	0.64	0.41	0.80	0.40	0.04	0.77
Work evaluation	6	65.17	0.89	0.87	0.81	0.72	0.87	0.64	0.46	0.87

Table 4 presents the factors related to the work organization and management where the methodological quality characteristics of the sub-categories show that Cronbach alpha coefficient values here are particularly high (0.90 and 0.93). The explained dispersion percentage is over 70 percent. Here the factorial minimum weight is 0.79 to 0.80, so it may be stated that the items of sub-categories in this category are very closely related.

Table 4. Characteristics of methodological quality dimensions of factors related to the organization of work and management

Sub-categories	N items	Explained dissemination %	Cronbach alpha	Spearman-Brown	Factorial weight (L)			Whole unit correlation (r/itt)		
					mean	min	max	mean	min	max
Work organization	5	71.94	0.90	0.83	0.85	0.80	0.90	0.72	0.53	0.90
Work management	7	70.55	0.93	0.91	0.84	0.79	0.87	0.70	0.57	0.87

Note: All statements are re-coded.

Factors related to the work physical environment and conditions subcategories methodological quality characteristics are shown in Table 5. The survey results show that respondents' stronger endorsement in this category is captured by the one connected with physical working environment, i.e. the explained dissemination percentage (62.86) and Cronbach alpha (0.90) coefficient values are high. Though the values of working conditions sub-categories are somewhat lower, Cronbach alpha coefficient value is also high – 0.86, while the percentage of explained dispersion in this case is slightly lower (55.21) as compared with these two sub-categories. Minimum factorial weight in this category sub-categories meet the requirements of the questionnaires, its values ranging from 0.52 to 0.68, while the average correlation of whole unit is from 0.53 to 0.62. Thus, it can be said that the discussed indicators in this category satisfy the necessary conditions for the reliability of the questionnaire.

Table 5. Characteristics of methodological quality dimensions of factors related to physical work environment and conditions

Sub-categories	N items	Explained dissemination %	Cronbach alpha	Spearman-Brown	Factorial weight (L)			Whole unit correlation (r/itt)		
					mean	min	max	mean	min	max
Physical work environment	7	62.86	0.90	0.84	0.79	0.68	0.85	0.62	0.38	0.83
Work conditions	7	55.21	0.86	0.86	0.73	0.52	0.88	0.53	0.21	0.85

Note: All statements are re-coded.

Analyzing the categories and sub-categories in the second part of the questionnaire "Corporate Social Responsibility" (Table 6), it is seen that Cronbach alpha coefficient values range from 0.88 to 0.92. The explained dispersion lowest percentage is again quite high, i.e., the lowest estimate of 59.41 – the highest 72.80. The minimum factorial weight in the sub-categories of this category is 0.56 (min) – 0.83 (max). The whole unit correlation in this category indicates that the lowest average is 0.58, the highest – 0.72, which confirms that the items in the questionnaire correlate with isolated sub-categories and the items of these sub-categories in this category are closely related to each other.

Table 6. Methodological quality characteristics of behavior sub-categories of a socially responsible organization

Sub-categories	N items	Explained dissemination %	Cronbach alpha	Spearman-Brown	Factorial weight (L)			Whole unit correlation (r/itt)		
					mean	min	max	mean	min	max
Services and their quality	6	68.68	0.91	0.84	0.83	0.77	0.89	0.68	0.47	0.89
Information for the customers, health and safety	5	72.80	0.91	0.85	0.85	0.83	0.88	0.72	0.57	0.88
Responsibility on environmental protection	7	68.70	0.92	0.86	0.83	0.69	0.90	0.70	0.39	0.90
Responsibility in relations with the public	7	61.39	0.91	0.89	0.78	0.59	0.85	0.60	0.30	0.83
Responsibility in relations with employees	7	59.41	0.88	0.81	0.77	0.56	0.85	0.58	0.28	0.83

Methodological quality characteristics of behavior sub-categories of a socially responsible employee presented in Table 7 show high results as in previously discussed questionnaire categories. In this case, the lowest Cronbach alpha coefficient value is 0.85 (what is considered to be a very good indicator), and the explained dispersion of 68.58 percent is also almost 7 times higher than the lowest compulsory rate.

Table 7. Methodological quality characteristics of behavior sub-categories of a socially responsible employee

Sub-categories	N items	Explained dissemination %	Cronbach alpha	Spearman-Brown	Factorial weight (L)			Whole unit correlation (r/itt)		
					mean	min	max	mean	min	max
Responsibility of employees for the customers	5	74.23	0.91	0.87	0.86	0.81	0.91	0.74	0.57	0.90
Employees' relations with customers	6	81.46	0.95	0.91	0.90	0.83	0.95	0.81	0.67	0.97
Employees' approach to the environment	4	68.58	0.85	–	0.83	0.80	0.87	0.68	0.51	0.86

Note: All statements of scales 1 and 3 are re-coded.

After checking the methodological quality characteristics of the categories and sub-categories in the questionnaire, their secondary factorization must be done. Primary and secondary factorizations are required only when there is a very large-scale questionnaire. Sub-categories which account for a certain category must be similar in content and logic. During the primary factorization the wholeness of the criteria is deducted, while during the secondary factorization deducted criteria are grouped into categories. The closer the factorial weight is to one, the more in line a single questionnaire item is with the isolated factor. After comparing the results of the categories in two parts of the questionnaire (Table 8), the sub-categories that most of the respondents agreed with were revealed. The highest level of approval (by Principal components method) in the section of the questionnaire 'Mobbing/bullying as a psychosocial stressor' was received by the category *Factors related to work organization and management* – 88.36%, relatively the lowest, i.e. 53.51 – by the category *Factors related to relations among employees*. In the corporate social responsibility part when calculating according to Principal components method the explained dispersion is 73.64% (*Behavior of a socially responsible organization*) and 52.67% (*Behavior of a socially responsible employee*). The results of secondary factorization confirm once again high methodological characteristics of categories and sub-categories in the questionnaire.

Table 8. Results of factorization of both parts of the questionnaire, categories and sub-categories

Categories and sub-categories of the questionnaire	Principal components	Alpha factoring
MOBBING / BULLYING AS A PSYCHOSOCIAL STRESSOR		
Factors related to relations among employees		
Reputation of employees	0.83	0.81
Isolation of employees	0.80	0.78
Comfort of employees	0.78	0.75
Damage suffered by employees	0.73	0.68
Intentions of employees	0.72	0.65
Views of employees	0.67	0.63
The demography of employees	0.66	0.61

Table 8 (cont.). Results of factorization of both parts of the questionnaire, categories and sub-categories

Categories and sub-categories of the questionnaire	Principal components	Alpha factoring
Communication of employees	0.64	0.55
Explained dissemination	53.51%	47.23%
Factors related to the nature of tasks, work content and evaluation		
Work evaluation	0.85	0.77
Nature of the tasks	0.85	0.76
Work content	0.83	0.72
Explained dissemination	70.81%	56.26%
Factors related to the organization of work and management		
Work organization	0.94	0.88
Work management	0.94	0.88
Explained dissemination	88.36%	76.66%
Factors related to work physical environment and conditions		
Work conditions	0.88	0.73
Work physical environment	0.88	0.73
Explained dissemination	76.91%	53.73%
CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY		
Behavior of socially responsible organization		
Responsibility in relations with the public	0.91	0.90
Information for the customers, health and safety	0.87	0.85
Responsibility in environmental protection	0.85	0.81
Responsibility in relations with employees	0.84	0.79
Services and their quality	0.81	0.75
Explained dissemination	73.64%	67.27%
Behavior of socially responsible employee		
Responsibility of employees for customers	0.86	0.90
Employees' approach to the environment	0.81	0.55
Employees' relations with customers	0.44	0.22
Explained dissemination	52.67%	38.73%

Conclusions

After analyzing essential mobbing/bullying, psycho-social stressors, and corporate social responsibility aspects, elastic connections among the components are defined. Both seeking for corporate social responsibility status and already implementing it, a preventive aspect of mobbing is important in order to ensure the employees' safety in organizations.

Appropriateness of the questionnaire is confirmed by study results in order to timely diagnose mobbing/bullying as a psychosocial stressor when implementing corporate social responsibility. After checking and comparing methodological quality characteristics in the parts of the questionnaire, the categories and sub-categories, it was revealed that the content quality in both parts of the questionnaire "Mobbing/bullying as a psychosocial stressor" and "Corporate social responsibility" meets the validity and reliability requirements necessary for question-naires, there were not recorded any substantial differences between the quality indicators of the tested categories and sub-categories. The secondary factorization used through Principal components and Alpha factoring methods showed that the weights of all questionnaire categories and sub-categories are high. This confirms that the instrument is appropriate to measure the selected features set. The respondents' approval of the sub-categories is defined basing on explained dispersion. Even the smallest dispersion of all sub-categories explained factor is much higher than the indicated allowable spread, and it proves that the respondents very strongly support the selected criteria.

The inspection of methodological and psychometric characteristics of the questionnaire confirmed the reliability of the instrument, so it can be reasonably stated that the questionnaire is valid and reliable (Appendix 1).

References

1. Appelbaum, S.H., Semerjian, G. & Mohan, K. (2012). Workplace bullying: consequences, causes and controls (part one), *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 44 (4), pp. 203-210.
2. Augustinienė, A., Abromaitienė, L. & Minkutė-Henrickson, R. (2012). Expression of social responsibility in professional expectations of future social pedagogues, *Socialiniai mokslai. Social Sciences*, 3 (77), pp. 41-51.

3. Bakanauskas, A. & Vanagienė, V. (2012). Įmonių socialinės atsakomybės gairės stiprinant prekės ženklo reputaciją, *Management Theory & Studies for Rural Business & Infrastructure Development*, 32 (3), pp. 15-22.
4. Čepinskis, J. & Sakalauskaitė, E. (2009). Įmonių socialinė atsakomybė ekonominės krizės sąlygomis Lietuvoje, *Taikomoji ekonomika: sisteminiai tyrimai. Applied Economics: Systematic Research*, 3 (1), pp. 143-162.
5. Česynienė, R., Diskienė, D. & Česynaitė, E. (2011). Socialinė atsakomybė darbuotojų atžvilgiu: lyginamoji viešojo ir verslo sektoriaus analizė, *Žmogiškieji ištekliai: raidos tendencijos. Human resouces: development tendencies*, 1 (29), pp. 19-26.
6. Cheruiyot, T.K. & Maru, L.C. (2014). Corporate human rights social responsibility and employee job outcomes in Kenya, *International Journal of Law & Management*, 56 (2), pp. 152-168.
7. Čiegis, R. & Norkutė, R. (2012). Lietuvos bankų socialinė atsakomybė darnaus vystymosi kontekste, *Organizacijų vadyba: sisteminiai tyrimai. Management of Organizations: Systematic Research*, 63, pp. 19-33.
8. Granerud, L. (2011). Social responsibility as an intermediary for health and safety in small firms, *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 4 (2), pp. 109-122.
9. Jain, A., Leka, S. & Zwetsloot, G. (2011). Corporate social responsibility and psychosocial risk management in Europe, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 101 (4), pp. 619-633.
10. Jain, A., Saeed, K., Arnaout, S. & Kortum, E. (2012). The psychosocial environment at work – an assessment of the WHO regional office of the Eastern Mediterranean, *Eastern Mediterranean Health Journal*, 18 (4), pp. 325-331.
11. Kirkauskienė, R. & Karazijienė, Ž. (2009). Išlaidų sveikatos apsaugai naštos verslui ir valstybei vertinimas, *Ekonomika ir vadyba. Economics and management*, 14, pp. 280-288.
12. Korsakienė, R. & Marcinkevičius, S. (2013). Filantropinė įmonės atsakomybė ir veiklos rezultatai: gamybos įmonės atvejis, *Business: Theory & Practice*, 14 (2), pp. 131-139.
13. Kovaliov, R., Simanavičienė, Ž. & Palekienė, O. (2011a). Įmonių socialinės atsakomybės skatinimo politikos Lietuvoje SSGG analizė, *Ekonomika ir vadyba. Economics & Management*, 15, pp. 605-611.
14. Kovaliov, R., Simanavičienė, Ž. & Palekienė, O. (2011b). Lietuvos socialinės politikos modelio įtaka ĮSA plėtrai Lietuvoje, *Ekonomika ir vadyba. Economics & Management*, 16, pp. 551-557.
15. Kulvinskienė, V.R. & Banzienė, A. (2008). Streso darbe ekonominis kontekstas, *Ekonomika. Economics*, 82, pp. 75-90.
16. Macassa, G., Viitasara, E., Sundin, Ö., Barros, H., Gonzales, F.T., Ioannidi-Kapolou, E., Gabriella, M.M., Lindert, J., Stankunas, M. & Soares, J.J.F. (2013). Psychological abuse among older persons in Europe: a cross-sectional study, *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, 5 (1), pp. 16-34.
17. Markevičienė, A. & Blažys, V. (2000). *Fizinis ir psichologinis smurtas*. Phare projektas. Vilnius: LR Sveikatos apsaugos ministerija.
18. Michailides, T.P. & Lipsett, M.G. (2013). Surveying employee attitudes on corporate social responsibility at the frontline level of an energy transportation company, *Corporate Social Responsibility & Environmental Management*, 20 (5), pp. 296-320.
19. Mueller, K., Spiess, S.-O., Hattrup, K. & Lin-Hi, N. (2012). The effects of corporate social responsibility on employees' affective commitment: a cross-cultural investigation, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97 (6), pp. 1186-1200.
20. Namie, G. & Namie, R. (2009). *The Bully At Work: What You Can Do to Stop the Hurt and Reclaim Your Dignity On the Job*. Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks.
21. Namie, G. & Namie, R. (2011). *The Bully-Free Workplace: Stop Jerks, Weasels, and Snakes From Killing Your Organization*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
22. Namie, G. (2014). *WBI U.S. Workplace Bullying Survey*. Available at: http://www.workplacebullying.org/wbiresearch/wbi-2014-us-survey/, accessed at: 11/04/2015.
23. Newport, S. & Sham, R.B. (2014). Strategic semantics: word choice essentials in establishing a high-performance culture, *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 18 (1), pp. 112-128.
24. Pacevičius, J. & Janulytė, E. (2009). Mobingas kaip organizacinio gyvenimo problema: priežasčių, raiškos ir pasekmių įvertinimas ir analizė, *Ekonomika ir vadyba: aktualijos ir perspektyvos. Economics and Management: Current Issues and Perspectives*, I (14), pp. 187-196.
25. Potocan, V., Mulej, M. & Nedelko, Z. (2013). The influence of employees' ethical behavior on enterprises' social responsibility, *Systemic Practice & Action Research*, 26 (6), pp. 497-511.
26. Pruskus, V. (2009). Smurtas prieš mokytojus bendrojo lavinimo mokykloje: atsiradimo priežastys, raiškos formos ir pasekmės, *Santalka. Filologija. Edukologija*, 17 (4), pp. 44-51.
27. Rupp, D.E., Shao, R., Thornton, M.A. & Skarlicki, D.P. (2013). Applicants' and employees' reactions to corporate social responsibility: the moderating effects of first-party justice perceptions and moral identity, *Personnel Psychology*, 66 (4), pp. 895-933.
28. Vlachos, P.A., Epitropaki, O., Panagopoulos, N.G. & Rapp, A.A. (2013). Causal attributions and employee reactions to corporate social responsibility, *Industrial & Organizational Psychology*, 6 (4), pp. 334-337.
29. Vveinhardt, J. (2011). Mobingo pasekmių individui, organizacijai, sociumui daugialypiškumo modeliavimas ir įveikimo prielaidos, *Ekonomika ir vadyba: aktualijos ir perspektyvos. Economics and Management: Current Issues and Perspectives*, 2 (22), pp. 15-24.
30. Vveinhardt, J. (2009). Mobingo kaip diskriminacijos darbuotojų santykiuose poveikis organizacijos klimatui, *Verslas: teorija ir praktika. Business: Theory and Practice*, 10 (4), pp. 285-297.

31. Žičkienė, S., Potelis, N., Juozaitienė, L. & Potelienė, S. (2011). Corporate social responsibility disclosure in water supply companies, *Socialiniai tyrimai. Social Research*, 4 (25), pp. 43-55.
32. Žukauskas, P. & Vveinhardt, J. (2008). Discrimination as a confusion of relations among the employees: the role of stereotypes and prejudices, *New trends in Management*. International scientific conference. Alexander Dubcek University of Trencin, Faculty of social and economic relations, November 26th–27th 2008, Trenčín, Slovak Republic, pp. 790-799.
33. Zwetsloot, G., Leka, S. & Jain, A. (2008). Corporate social responsibility and psychosocial risk management. In: S. Leka & T. Cox (eds), *The European Framework for Psychosocial Risk Management: PRIMA-EF*. Nottingham: I-WHO Publications.
34. Zwetsloot, G.I.J.M. (2010). Corporate social responsibility and safety and health at work: global perspectives, local practices. *Working on Safety Conference*, 7-10 September 2010, Røros, Norway.

Appendix

QUESTIONNAIRE

PREVENTION OF MOBBING/BULLYING AS A PSYCHOSOCIAL STRESSOR WHEN IMPLEMENTING CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Many organizations declare that they take care of their staff security, well-being, seek to become socially responsible or already are the ones. The safety of employees is not only safe, comfortable job places, but also the assurance of psychological welfare. This study aims to find out how organizations in Lithuania understand their social responsibility and take care of their employees' protection from bullying, harassment, mobbing. This study will help develop recommendations for companies on how to protect employees from psychological violence and create safer working conditions.

It is essential that you answer ALL questions sincerely.

There are no right or wrong answers in the questionnaire. It is just important that you express YOUR opinion. The first evaluation of the question is usually the most correct.

The **aim** of this survey is to identify the expression of mobbing/bullying as a psychosocial stressor in organizations seeking for CSR.

THE SURVEY IS **ANONYMOUS**.

According to scientific ethics, we guarantee that the results will be presented only generally.

Explanation of categories of answers

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Doubt	Agree	Strongly agree
❶	❷	❸	❹	❺

Example of marking the answers

Strongly disagree	Disagree	Doubt	Agree	Strongly agree
①	②	③	④	⑤

Codes	I. Psychosocial stressors (PSS)							
	Dimensions	Criteria	Items	❶	❷	❸	❹	❺
FRRAE	1. Factors related to relations among employees							
1.1. CoE	1.1. Communication of employees							
1 question	Evaluate how co-workers interact with you:							
CoE1	People avoid to communicate with me by demonstrating contemptuous glances or gestures			●	●	●	●	●
CoE2	People avoid to communicate with me by making indirect verbal insinuations towards me			●	●	●	●	●
CoE3	I am openly threatened verbally			●	●	●	●	●
CoE4	I am threatened in writing (email letters, SMS, etc.)			●	●	●	●	●
CoE5	I am being yelled at, loudly scolded			●	●	●	●	●
CoE6	When I speak, someone constantly interrupts me			●	●	●	●	●
CoE7	My procession, gestures and language are mimicked			●	●	●	●	●
CoE8	I am being insulted on social networks (on the Internet)			●	●	●	●	●
1.2. IsE	1.2. Isolation of employees							
2 question	Evaluate your well-being at work in the context of isolation:							
IsE1	I feel that my colleagues shy away from me			●	●	●	●	●
IsE2	I feel isolated from other co-workers			●	●	●	●	●
IsE3	People look at me as if I were "a blank space"			●	●	●	●	●
IsE4	My work place has been specially moved further away from co-workers			●	●	●	●	●

Codes ♀	Dimensions ♂	Criteria ♂	Items ♂	①	②	③	④	⑤
IsE5	I feel that I don't have anyone to talk to at work			●	●	●	●	●
IsE6	At work I often feel completely lonely			●	●	●	●	●
IsE7	I understand that I am deliberately not given all information necessary for work			●	●	●	●	●
1.3. ReE	1.3. Reputation of employees							
3 question	Evaluate your relationships with co-workers in the context of reputation:							
ReE1	People constantly mock and bully me			●	●	●	●	●
ReE2	People say bad things about me behind my back			●	●	●	●	●
ReE3	False rumours are spread about me			●	●	●	●	●
ReE4	My personal life is constantly bothering someone			●	●	●	●	●
ReE5	There are hints that I am not like the others, "abnormal"			●	●	●	●	●
ReE6	My decisions are constantly questioned			●	●	●	●	●
ReE7	All of my proposals on work issues are deliberately ignored.			●	●	●	●	●
FRNTW	2. Factors related to the nature of tasks, work content and evaluation							
2.1. NaT	2.1. Nature of the tasks							
4 question	Evaluate the nature of given tasks:							
NaT1	I constantly have to carry out new tasks			●	●	●	●	●
NaT2	The given tasks exceed my physical capabilities			●	●	●	●	●
NaT3	The given tasks excess my qualification in order to discredit me			●	●	●	●	●
NaT4	I am given tasks that undermine my self-respect			●	●	●	●	●
NaT5	I often have to carry out absolutely pointless tasks			●	●	●	●	●
NaT6	I am purposefully given only monotonic, routine tasks			●	●	●	●	●
NaT7	I must carry out harmful work			●	●	●	●	●
2.2. WoC	2.2. Work content							
5 question	Evaluate your work content:							
WoC1	My job requires excessive physical effort			●	●	●	●	●
WoC2	My job requires excessive mental effort			●	●	●	●	●
WoC3	My work requires too much attention to details			●	●	●	●	●
WoC4	My job is too monotonous			●	●	●	●	●
WoC5	My job doesn't require any creative contribution			●	●	●	●	●
WoC6	My job requires particular psychological preparation (e.g. intensive communication with customers)			●	●	●	●	●
WoC7	My job requires detailed time planning			●	●	●	●	●
2.3. WoE	2.3. Work evaluation							
6 question	Please indicate how your work is appreciated:							
WoE1	At work someone constantly has a problem with my work results			●	●	●	●	●
WoE2	My work is evaluated incorrectly			●	●	●	●	●
WoE3	My efforts put into this work have never been properly evaluated			●	●	●	●	●
WoE4	People notice only my mistakes			●	●	●	●	●
WoE5	My achieved positive results are usually suppressed			●	●	●	●	●
WoE6	My work results are given to someone else			●	●	●	●	●
FRRAE	1. Factors related to relations among employees							
1.4. DeE	1.4. The demography of employees							
7 question	Evaluate how you are treated in the following cases:							
DeE1	People constantly make fun of my nationality			●	●	●	●	●
DeE2	I suffer bullying due to my age			●	●	●	●	●
DeE3	People make fun of my origin			●	●	●	●	●
DeE4	People make fun of my education			●	●	●	●	●
DeE5	Colleagues make fun of my marital status (married, divorced, single, etc.)			●	●	●	●	●
DeE6	My colleagues constantly tease me for my profession (e.g. former)			●	●	●	●	●
DeE7	I am getting bullied due to the fact that I am a man (woman)			●	●	●	●	●
DeE8	People constantly make jeers about my language (dialect)			●	●	●	●	●
DeE9	People make fun of my appearance (body shape features, clothing)			●	●	●	●	●
1.5. ViE	1.5. Views of employees							
8 question	Evaluate how your colleagues react to your views:							
ViE1	People make fun of me because of my religious beliefs			●	●	●	●	●
ViE2	People make fun of my political views			●	●	●	●	●
ViE3	People constantly have a problem with my approach to people (i.e. my humanistic views)			●	●	●	●	●

Codes	Dimensions	Criteria	Items	❶	❷	❸	❹	❺
ViE4	People make fun of my positive approach to the widely accepted ethical values			●	●	●	●	●
ViE5	People make fun of my fairness at work			●	●	●	●	●
FROWM	3. Factors related to the organization of work and management							
3.1. WoO	3.1. Work organization							
9 question	Evaluate the level of your work organization:							
WoO1	In our organization work is carried out consistently, according to the plan			●	●	●	●	●
WoO2	The organization ensures all means of work			●	●	●	●	●
WoO3	Work means allow to carry out the work quickly and qualitatively			●	●	●	●	●
WoO4	Work is organized by evaluating individual characteristics of the employees			●	●	●	●	●
WoO5	Managers take into account the employees' comments on work organization			●	●	●	●	●
3.2. WoM	3.2. Work management							
10 question	Evaluate the level of managerial work:							
WoM1	In my organization tasks and orders are submitted accurately			●	●	●	●	●
WoM2	Assignments and orders match the employees' competences			●	●	●	●	●
WoM3	Managers provide correct comments related to work			●	●	●	●	●
WoM4	Managers are objective and fair			●	●	●	●	●
WoM5	Managers create hard-working, creative environment			●	●	●	●	●
WoM6	Managers ensure internal communication			●	●	●	●	●
WoM7	Managers ensure timely and complete presentation of information necessary to carry out tasks			●	●	●	●	●
FRPWE	4. Factors related to physical work environment and conditions							
4.1. PhW	4.1. Physical work environment							
11 question	Evaluate your physical work environment:							
PhW1	My organization takes care of interior to meet the needs of the employees			●	●	●	●	●
PhW2	Work environment is clean and tidy			●	●	●	●	●
PhW3	Furniture is ergonomic, tools and means of work – comfortable			●	●	●	●	●
PhW4	Air ventilation is good, there are no extraneous, unpleasant odours			●	●	●	●	●
PhW5	At my work place I do not feel discomfort due to the lighting			●	●	●	●	●
PhW6	My work place in winter is never too cold			●	●	●	●	●
PhW7	My work place in summer is never too hot			●	●	●	●	●
4.2. WrC	4.2. Work conditions							
12 question	Evaluate your working conditions:							
WrC1	Work and leisure conditions are discussed in the collective agreement			●	●	●	●	●
WrC2	The organization ensures everything, for example, good working clothes			●	●	●	●	●
WrC3	The work place has a place for rest			●	●	●	●	●
WrC4	My organization takes care of work safety in reality, and not just formally			●	●	●	●	●
WrC5	My organization takes care of occupational disease prevention			●	●	●	●	●
WrC6	My organization ensures optimal work conditions			●	●	●	●	●
WrC7	I am satisfied with my work place conditions			●	●	●	●	●
FRRAE	1. Factors related to relations among employees							
1.6. DsE	1.6. Damage suffered by employees							
13 question	Evaluate what damage you have experienced:							
DsE1	I purposefully suffered material damage at work			●	●	●	●	●
DsE2	Situations are purposefully created so that I would suffer various material expenditure			●	●	●	●	●
DsE3	Direct damage was made to my personal property			●	●	●	●	●
DsE4	I suffer material damage due to the worsened state of my health at work			●	●	●	●	●
DsE5	I regularly suffer moral damage at work			●	●	●	●	●
DsE6	I was prevented to reach a career			●	●	●	●	●
1.7. CmE	1.7. Comfort of employees							
14 question	Evaluate your well-being at work:							
CmE1	I feel that relationships at work are crushing me psychologically			●	●	●	●	●
CmE 2	I think that I am in a quite desperate situation at this work			●	●	●	●	●
CmE 3	I always feel stress and pressure at work			●	●	●	●	●
CmE 4	I can't relax after working hours			●	●	●	●	●

Codes ↺	Dimensions ↻	Criteria ↻	Items ↻	❶	❷	❸	❹	❺
CmE5	I feel that I have no energy left to do my work with quality			●	●	●	●	●
CmE6	In order to relax, I must use alcohol			●	●	●	●	●
CmE7	I started doubting my professional competence			●	●	●	●	●
CmE8	I do not desire to achieve best results any more			●	●	●	●	●
CmE9	Due to my worsening health, I am forced to visit doctors			●	●	●	●	●
CmE10	Because of oppressive atmosphere at work, I started to be ill more often (take sick-leave documents)			●	●	●	●	●
CmE11	Because of the worsened relations at work, I more often argue with my household			●	●	●	●	●
CmE12	At the end of the day's work I feel very tired			●	●	●	●	●
CmE13	I feel tired even in the morning, before leaving home			●	●	●	●	●
CmE14	I think that this fatigue, stress and tension marathon never goes away			●	●	●	●	●
CmE15	Because of the pressure, sometimes I am forced to simulate sickness			●	●	●	●	●
1.8. InE	1.8. Intentions of employees							
15 question	Describe how you intend to behave:							
InE1	In such conditions, I simply can't work here any more			●	●	●	●	●
InE2	I often think that I should quit this job			●	●	●	●	●
InE3	It is very likely that I will soon be looking for a new job			●	●	●	●	●
InE4	I am constantly searching for a new job, so that after my patience runs out, I don't have to go to the street			●	●	●	●	●
InE5	I will work here, because I have no choice			●	●	●	●	●
InE6	I am not going to work here for a long time			●	●	●	●	●

- -

Codes ↺	II. Corporate social responsibility (CSR)							
	Dimensions ↻	Criteria ↻	Items ↻	❶	❷	❸	❹	❺
FRBOE	5. Factors related to social behavior of an organization and employee							
5.1. BsRO	5.1. Social behavior of an organization							
5.1.1. SQ	5.1.1. Services and their quality							
16 question	Evaluate the service quality of your organization where you work:							
SQ1	My workplace gives great attention to the quality of services (production)			●	●	●	●	●
SQ2	My workplace tries to fulfil the promises given to the clients			●	●	●	●	●
SQ3	The quality of products/services declared by my organization matches the reality			●	●	●	●	●
SQ4	In my workplace there is a product quality control system			●	●	●	●	●
SQ5	Consumers' complaints are investigated, and findings improve quality			●	●	●	●	●
SQ6	My workplace uses not only legislation, but also universally accepted moral principles in relations with the customers			●	●	●	●	●
5.1.2. IC	5.1.2. Information for the costumers, health and safety							
17 question	Evaluate customers' health care and the level of security in your organization:							
IC1	The organization provides comprehensive information about the products			●	●	●	●	●
IC2	I am happy to use (would use) services, production provided by my organization			●	●	●	●	●
IC3	When providing services or products my organization takes care of customers' health			●	●	●	●	●
IC4	There has not been a case that services (production) provided by my organization would have done any harm to the customers' welfare			●	●	●	●	●
IC5	My organization does not manipulate the trust of customers			●	●	●	●	●
5.1.3. RE	5.1.3. Responsibility on environmental protection							
18 question	Evaluate the level of environmental responsibility in the organization where you work:							
RE1	My organization uses technologies that match ecological standards			●	●	●	●	●
RE2	The organization organizes environmental initiatives			●	●	●	●	●
RE3	The organization uses only such tools and technologies that reduce negative impact on the environment			●	●	●	●	●
RE4	My organization takes care of environmental education of the employees			●	●	●	●	●
RE5	My organization takes care that all waste would be recycled			●	●	●	●	●
RE6	At my workplace, we sort waste			●	●	●	●	●
RE7	My workplace financially promotes environmental-friendly ideas			●	●	●	●	●

5.1.4. RRP	5.1.4. Responsibility in relations with the public					
19 question	Evaluate responsibility level of relations with the public in the organization where you work:					
RRP1	My organization fights corruption outside	●	●	●	●	●
RRP2	My organization is in compliance with fair activity principles	●	●	●	●	●
RRP3	My organization invests in research and public education programs	●	●	●	●	●
RRP4	My organization supports cultural and social projects	●	●	●	●	●
RRP5	My organization is in compliance with ethical principles	●	●	●	●	●
RRP6	My organization actively cooperates with governmental and non-governmental organizations, local communities	●	●	●	●	●
RRP7	My organization fights against corruption, patronage, abuse of position inside	●	●	●	●	●
5.1.5. RRE	5.1.5. Responsibility in relations with employees					
20 question	Evaluate responsibility level of relations with employees in the organization where you work:					
RRE1	Legislation to protect workers' rights is not just formal but it is applied in reality	●	●	●	●	●
RRE2	An employee is considered as the biggest asset of organization and success factor	●	●	●	●	●
RRE3	My workplace guarantees a fair pay for work	●	●	●	●	●
RRE4	Trade-union organization is considered an equal partner	●	●	●	●	●
RRE5	Employees have a possibility to appeal management decisions and to prove their position	●	●	●	●	●
RRE6	All employees have equal rights	●	●	●	●	●
RRE7	Social and health guarantees that exceed requirements established by laws, are enshrined in the collective agreement	●	●	●	●	●
5.2. BsRE	5.2. Social behavior of employees					
5.2.1. REC	5.2.1. Responsibility of employees for the consumers					
21 question	Evaluate your level of responsibility for consumers:					
REC1	I do not care about the opinion of our services/products consumers	●	●	●	●	●
REC2	I do not care about what will happen to our services/products consumers	●	●	●	●	●
REC3	I do not worry about the claims of an unhappy customer	●	●	●	●	●
REC4	Not me, but the organization must take care of customers' satisfaction with our services or products	●	●	●	●	●
REC5	It is important for me to receive the payment for work, and the service/product quality is irrelevant to me	●	●	●	●	●
Note: if you do not have a direct contact with customers, omit question 22 and go to question 23:						
5.2.2. ERC	5.2.2. Relations of employees with customers					
22 question	Evaluate level of your relationship with customers:					
ERC1	I behave with all customers as if they were exceptional	●	●	●	●	●
ERC2	I try to solve all customers' problems	●	●	●	●	●
ERC3	When working with the customers, I do more than it is required from me	●	●	●	●	●
ERC4	I try to be pleasant with customers	●	●	●	●	●
ERC5	I serve the customers responsibly	●	●	●	●	●
ERC6	I carefully prepare to service the customers	●	●	●	●	●
5.2.3. EAE	5.2.3. Employees' approach to the environment					
23 question	Evaluate your approach to environmental protection:					
EAE1	It does not matter to me what environmental or non-ecological technologies are used by the organization	●	●	●	●	●
EAE2	I think that environmental initiatives only increase the expenditure	●	●	●	●	●
EAE3	Organization, and not the employees have to worry about environmental protection	●	●	●	●	●
EAE4	Employees' environmental education is just a waste of time	●	●	●	●	●

Information about you and your workplace:

23. Your gender:
☐ Male
☐ Female

24. Your nationality:
☐ Lithuanian
☐ Russian
☐ Pole
☐ Other

25. Your age:
☐ 18-25
☐ 26-30
☐ 31-35
☐ 36-40
☐ 41-45
☐ 46-50
☐ 51-60
☐ 61 and more

26. Your marital status:
☐ Single
☐ Married
☐ Divorced
☐ I live with a partner

27. Your education:
☐ Higher
☐ College
☐ Vocational
☐ Secondary
☐ Primary

28. Your work experience:
☐ Up to 1 year
☐ 1 to 3 years
☐ 4 to 7 years
☐ From 8 to 10 years
☐ From 11 to 15 years
☐ From 16 to 20 years
☐ From 21 years and more

29. You are in:
☐ Top management
☐ Middle managers
☐ The lowest-rank manager
☐ Ordinary worker / employee / specialist

30. Your job specifics:
☐ Provision of services, direct communication with customers, interested parties
☐ I do technical, physical work

31. Number of employees in your organization:
☐ Up to 10 employees
☐ More than 10 but less than 50 employees
☐ From 50 to 250 employees
☐ More than 250 employees

32. Your organization belongs to this sector:
☐ Private sector
☐ Public sector

33. Your company:
☐ Aims to become socially responsible
☐ Is socially responsible (has a certificate)
☐ Does not seek to become socially responsible
☐ I do not know