

# We are IntechOpen, the world's leading publisher of Open Access books Built by scientists, for scientists

6,900

Open access books available

186,000

International authors and editors

200M

Downloads

Our authors are among the

154

Countries delivered to

TOP 1%

most cited scientists

12.2%

Contributors from top 500 universities



WEB OF SCIENCE™

Selection of our books indexed in the Book Citation Index  
in Web of Science™ Core Collection (BKCI)

Interested in publishing with us?  
Contact [book.department@intechopen.com](mailto:book.department@intechopen.com)

Numbers displayed above are based on latest data collected.  
For more information visit [www.intechopen.com](http://www.intechopen.com)



---

# Sociodemographic Indicators: Employee Attitude

---

Pranas Žukauskas, Jolita Vveinhardt and  
Regina Andriukaitienė

Additional information is available at the end of the chapter

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.70635>

---

## Abstract

By presenting the respondents' sociodemographic data (age, sex, education, etc.) and based on them, multilayer sections of the management culture and corporate social responsibility are carried out. The results of the research show that both social and demographic indicators, as well as respondents' positions in various companies have a significant impact on the evaluations of both the management culture and corporate social responsibility. In addition, the trends of evaluation of the respondents working in different divisions of companies were highlighted, related to the psychological climate and weak feedback in the management policy. This emphasizes especially the wide range of factors, which the companies implementing corporate social responsibility should pay attention to.

**Keywords:** management culture, corporate social responsibility, sociodemographic indicators, groups of companies, divisions of companies, psychological climate

---

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Relevance of the research and the level of problem exploration

Research shows that various sociodemographic characteristics, such as age, education, length of service, etc., have a significant influence on processes within companies. For companies all over the world, it is difficult to avoid the prevailing sociocultural traditions; thus, the diversity in the workplace and its attitudes often occur as a multilayered implicit factor despite equivalency and other principles, which tend to be declared by the modern organizations [1, 2]. Research shows that social and demographic criteria strongly affect both the employees' conflicts and the quality of relationships [3] and job satisfaction [1], as well as they are of service to the research of corporate social responsibility level in caring for the well-being of

---

employees [4], the individual factors that promote involvement in different corporate social responsibility activities [5]. On the other hand, results of the research by Kukanja et al. [6] showed that the main reason for the responsible behavior was related to the age, experience, and level of education of managers. The most obvious conclusion of this research is that all demographic variables included in the research had a statistically significant influence when explaining socially responsible behavior. It shows that the age, education, work experience, status in the organization, etc. may have an influence on employees' perceptions. These and other examples confirm the need to distinguish significant social and demographic variables when investigating a variety of corporate social responsibility factors. Of course, large companies and their groups are characterized by greater diversity of the characteristics of employees, the perceptions of which are quite difficult to analyze, and the more so to derive common denominators; however, the variables we analyze allow us to better understand the state of both the management culture and of corporate social responsibility from different approaches. Finally, the employees in the context of corporate social responsibility are equal stakeholders, whose reactions cannot be ignored to avoid a negative practice, especially when the reasonless focus is on the final consumer of the product.

### **1.2. Problem of the research**

The problem of the research is raised by the question: What influence sociodemographic characteristics of employees have on evaluations of management culture and corporate social responsibility and which criteria are the most significant?

### **1.3. Object of the research**

The object of the research is sociodemographic characteristics of employees.

### **1.4. Purpose of the research**

The purpose of the research is, having determined socio-demographic characteristics of employees of companies' groups under research, to assess their influence on assessments of management culture and corporate social responsibility.

### **1.5. Objectives of the research**

The objectives of the research are (1) to determine sociodemographic characteristics of the objects of research; (2) to evaluate the influence of sociodemographic characteristics of employees on evaluations of the management culture; and (3) to evaluate the influence of sociodemographic characteristics of employees on evaluations of corporate social responsibility.

### **1.6. Methods of the research**

The statistical analysis and interpretation of the quantitative research results has been carried out. The analysis and comparison methods were used.

### 1.7. Sociodemographic indicators

In various research cases, the respondents usually give their sociodemographic data: age, sex, education, etc. On the one hand, it shows the structure of the respondents, but quite often, these data are used as sort of “inertia,” without giving greater importance, though multiple social and demographic sections could be a very significant, even a separate, research object, giving valuable information about factors that affect respondents’ reactions or attitude to the researched object.

Considering the complexity and versatility of social and demographic context and its impact on the management culture and corporate social responsibility, a separate publication could be allocated for that. However, this section distinguishes the criteria that summarize the researched population most in order to be able to assess what impact the respondents’ sociodemographic structure elements have on the research results. In addition, it is necessary to take into account the social/historical factors that influenced the respondents’ views. For example, the older workers’ attitudes (both managers and ordinary employees) and values were affected by the Soviet era as well as the dramatic transformation period, in Lithuania metaphorically identified as “savage capitalism,” the education received at that time, and the formed values, the acquired work/management experience, etc.

The sociodemographic criteria of the respondents making the sample reflect the great diversity of the positions as well as the age, work experience, and other respects. Before carrying out the research analysis with respect to the sociodemographic aspect, it is important to give the sociodemographic characteristics of the respondents who participated in the research. The respondents were classified according to subdivisions of the groups of companies, current positions at work, work experience, age, sex, and education. The results of sociodemographic characteristics of employees of both groups of companies are presented in **Table 1**, both in general and individually by groups of companies.

The analysis of the distribution of respondents by subdivisions shows that the majority of respondents represent the production unit, that is, the majority of survey respondents have the position of ordinary employees. When comparing both groups of companies by employees’ work experience, it was revealed that the largest number of employees includes those respondents who work in the organization from 2 to 5 years, although in the first group of companies it is clearly seen that there are many more long-standing employees. Of course, this is influenced by different time of the organizations’ establishment (the first (1) group of companies was established in 1992, the second (2) group of companies - in 1998). The employees’ characteristics according to their age do not show significant differences neither in one nor in another group of companies, i.e., in both groups of companies the respondents were divided fairly evenly. With respect to sex, there were no significant differences in the first (1) group of companies, that is, the number of males and females is almost equal; in the second (2) group of companies, females dominate, which indicates that the activities of this group of companies are more likely to meet the provisions of traditionally established “more acceptable for women” work. The education level of employees in both analyzed groups is distributed more or less equally. The employees who do not have higher education make the

Characteristics	General		First group		Second group	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Subdivision						
Administration	339	19.7%	275	30.2%	64	7.9%
Production	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%
Lowest level manager	63	3.7%	37	4.1%	26	3.2%
Middle-level manager	66	3.8%	50	5.5%	16	2.0%
Highest level manager	22	1.3%	17	1.9%	5	0.6%
Total	1717	100%	911	53.1%	806	46.9%
Work experience						
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%	–	–
Age (years)						
18–23	258	15.0%	116	12.7%	142	17.6%
24–29	523	30.5%	347	38.1%	176	21.8%
30–39	464	27.0%	274	30.1%	190	23.6%
40–49	320	18.6%	126	13.8%	194	24.1%
50—up to 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%
Sex						
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 of employees						
University	264	15.4%	150	16.5%	114	14.1%
Nonuniversity	261	15.2%	170	18.7%	91	11.3%
Higher (postsecondary)	272	15.8%	138	15.1%	134	16.6%

Characteristics	General		First group		Second group	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
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%

Source: Compiled by the authors.

**Table 1.** Sociodemographic characteristics of employees.

majority in the organizations, which is not always a necessary part of the production work. Later on, the results of the research are presented comparing sociodemographic indicators of the management culture indicators in the analyzed groups of companies.

### 1.8. Management culture with respect to sociodemographic attitude

The research results compare the respondents' sociodemographic characteristics and their opinion with respect to the management culture. Since all the questionnaire statements (both positive and negative) were coded positively, z-estimate minus sign indicates a negative situation in the analyzed question and plus sign indicates positive situation. **Table 2** presents the research results that show the management culture situation with respect to subdivisions of the two groups of companies.

Taking into consideration the level of statistical significance, it is obvious that the results are statistically reliable and significant. Management culture assessment aspects differ depending on the type of organization subdivision where the employees work. The results warn that there is a strong gap between management culture assessments at the levels of different subdivisions. Physical and psychological labor safety, as well as workplace organization, and conduct with employees are the key components aiming for corporate social responsibility. The above-mentioned components indicate the need for changes when the organization quality of the companies' activities can have a strong impact in the process of aiming for corporate social responsibility and the implementation. The more so that organization of managerial processes, machinery provision, management knowledge, and leadership qualities are evaluated with very low scores even by administrative staff themselves.

In both corporate groups (**Table 3**), differences between the way the management culture expression is assessed by the production and administration departments were highlighted, that is, the two groups of employees, one of which is directly related to management activities, such as subordinates, and the second—different levels of management staff and administrative staff are not involved in the production. In the first group of companies, reliable, statistically significant differences in all categories characterizing the management culture were found, while statistical significance is distinguished in *management working conditions culture and documentation system culture* positions. However, absolute assurance that the estimate trends of the

Subscales	Administration	Production	ANOVA	
	N = 339	N = 1378	F	p
Management staff general culture level	0.37	-0.12	23.961	0.000**
Management science knowledge level	0.38	-0.11	22.803	0.000**
Managers' personal and professional characteristics	0.28	-0.08	12.712	0.000**
Level of the ability to manage	0.29	-0.08	14.630	0.000**
Optimal regulation of managerial processes	0.21	-0.08	11.200	0.000**
Rational organization of management work	0.15	-0.08	10.981	0.000**
Modern computerization level of managerial processes	0.02	-0.04	5.817	0.001**
Culture of visitor reception, conducting meetings, phone calls	0.25	-0.08	10.818	0.000**
Working environment level (interior, lighting, temperature, cleanness, etc.)	0.38	-0.11	26.114	0.000**
Workplace organization level	0.26	-0.03	16.939	0.000**
Work and rest regime, relaxation options	0.31	-0.10	16.712	0.000**
Work security, sociopsychological microclimate	0.17	-0.06	8.599	0.000**
Culture of official registration of documentation	0.27	-0.07	11.975	0.000**
Optimal document search and access system	0.29	-0.10	15.873	0.000**
Rational use of modern information technologies	0.42	-0.12	32.153	0.000**
Rational archival documents storage system	0.29	-0.10	14.887	0.000**

Source: Compiled by the authors.

\*Level of statistical significance  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

\*\*Level of statistical significance  $\alpha = 0.01$ .

**Table 2.** Management culture with respect to subdivisions.

respondents from the administration cannot be made and production departments coincide in both groups of companies. In this case, the estimates of *management organization culture* stand out: the negative z-estimate in the first group of companies was established among the production department staff and the positive among administration, whereas in the second group of companies, we see the opposite results. Here, the negative z-estimate was found among administrative staff and the positive among production staff. The z-estimates provided by the production unit are negative according to the rest of the categories. In other words, although the negative z-estimate is not significant, the results show the critical position of the management staff of the second group of companies with regard to the organization of managerial processes. A more detailed distribution of estimates, showing problem areas, could be seen having divided the staff of companies into much smaller groups according to their functions (**Table 5**).

Detailed assessment of management culture decomposed according to the ranks of employees is presented in **Table 4**.

Scales and subscales Groups of companies	First group		T test results	Second group		T test results
Subdivisions	Administration	Production		Administration	Production	
Sample	N = 275	N = 636		N = 64	N = 742	
<b>Management staff culture</b>						
Management staff general culture level	0.45	0.01	<b>t = 6.325</b> <b>P = 0.000</b>	0.12	-0.19	<b>t = 2.382</b> <b>p = 0.017</b>
Management science knowledge level						
Managers' personal and professional characteristics						
The level of the ability to manage						
<b>Managerial processes organization culture</b>						
Optimal regulation of managerial processes	0.25	-0.17	<b>t = 4.830</b> <b>p = 0.000</b>	-0.14	0.06	<b>t = -2.296</b> <b>p = 0.022</b>
Rational organization of management work						
Modern computerization level of managerial processes						
Culture of visitor reception, conducting meetings, phone calls						
<b>Management working conditions culture</b>						
Working environment level (interior, lighting, temperature, cleanness, etc.)	0.31	0.00	<b>t = 4.203</b> <b>p = 0.000</b>	0.61	-0.17	<b>t = 6.334</b> <b>p = 0.000</b>
Workplace organization level						
Work and rest regime, relaxation options						
Work security, sociopsychological microclimate						
<b>Documentation system culture</b>						
Culture of official registration of documentation	0.40	0.07	<b>t = 4.163</b> <b>p = 0.000</b>	0.27	-0.23	<b>t = 4.539</b> <b>p = 0.000</b>
Optimal document search and access system						
Rational use of modern information technologies						
Rational archival documents storage system						
<i>Source: Compiled by the authors.</i>						

**Table 3.** Management culture with respect to subdivisions: results of different groups of companies.

Subscales	Ordinary employee	Administration employee	Lowest level manager	Middle- level manager	Top level manager	ANOVA	
	N = 1268	N = 298	N = 63	N = 66	N = 22	F	p
Management staff general culture level	-0.11	0.36	0.23	0.19	0.27	15.792	0.000**
Management science knowledge level	-0.11	0.32	0.09	0.38	0.32	14.933	0.000**
Managers' personal and professional characteristics	-0.09	0.22	0.38	0.28	0.22	10.137	0.000**
The level of the ability to manage	-0.08	0.20	0.14	0.27	0.49	8.007	0.000**
Optimal regulation of managerial processes	-0.07	0.18	0.26	0.23	0.05	5.804	0.0001**
Rational organization of management work	-0.07	0.13	0.39	0.37	0.20	7.884	0.000**
Modern computerization level of managerial processes	0.00	-0.05	0.11	0.15	-0.23	1.048	0.381
Culture of visitor reception, conducting meetings, phone calls	-0.08	0.23	0.32	0.23	-0.07	8.503	0.000**
Working environment level (interior, lighting, temperature, cleanness, etc.)	-0.14	0.45	0.19	0.36	0.12	24.715	0.000**
Workplace organization level	-0.11	0.38	0.19	0.24	0.19	17.315	0.000**
Work and rest regime, relaxation options	-0.07	0.14	0.21	0.33	0.42	6.371	0.000**
Work security, sociopsychological microclimate	-0.03	0.04	0.14	0.22	0.01	1.489	0.203
Culture of official registration of documentation	-0.08	0.23	0.25	0.18	0.03	7.429	0.000**
Optimal document search and access system	-0.08	0.21	0.31	0.20	0.26	8.142	0.000**
Rational use of modern information technologies	-0.14	0.45	0.29	0.44	-0.05	28.017	0.000**
Rational archival documents storage system	-0.10	0.27	0.25	0.32	0.20	11.542	0.000**

Source: Compiled by the authors.

\*Level of statistical significance  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

\*\*Level of statistical significance  $\alpha = 0.01$ .

**Table 4.** Management culture with respect to position.

Scales and subscales Groups of companies	First group					ANOVA verification results	Second group					ANOVA verification results
Position	Ordinary employee	Administration employee	Lowest level manager	Middle level manager	Top level manager		Ordinary employee	Administration employee	Lowest level manager	Middle level manager	Top level manager	
Sample	N = 621	N = 186	N = 37	N = 50	N = 17		N = 647	N = 112	N = 26	N = 16	N = 5	
<b>Management staff culture</b>												
Management staff general culture level	0.01	0.49	0.48	0.38	-0.14	<b>F = 11.323 p = 0.000</b>	-0.23	0.06	-0.05	0.18	2.14	<b>F = 9.803 p = 0.000</b>
Management science knowledge level												
Managers' personal and professional characteristics												
The level of the ability to manage												
<b>Managerial processes organization culture</b>												
Optimal regulation of managerial processes	-0.18	0.22	0.39	0.38	-0.24	<b>F = 7.063 p = 0.000</b>	0.05	-0.01	0.19	-0.02	0.78	<b>F = 1.992 p = 0.094</b>
Rational organization of management work												
Modern computerization level of managerial processes												
Culture of visitor reception, conducting meetings, phone calls												
<b>Management working conditions culture</b>												

Scales and subscales Groups of companies	First group					ANOVA verification results	Second group					ANOVA verification results
Position	Ordinary employee	Administration employee	Lowest level manager	Middle level manager	Top level manager		Ordinary employee	Administration employee	Lowest level manager	Middle level manager	Top level manager	
Sample	N = 621	N = 186	N = 37	N = 50	N = 17		N = 647	N = 112	N = 26	N = 16	N = 5	
Working environment level (interior, lighting, temperature, cleanness, etc.)	0.00	0.34	0.33	0.28	-0.19	<b>F = 5.409</b> <b>p = 0,0003</b>	-0.22	0.32	0.10	0.64	1.73	<b>F = 15.866</b> <b>p = 0.000</b>
Workplace organization level												
Work and rest regime, relaxation options												
Work security, sociopsychological microclimate												
<b>Documentation system culture</b>												
Culture of official registration of documentation	0.07	0.45	0.53	0.23	-0.36	<b>F = 6.582</b> <b>p = 0.000</b>	-0.30	0.16	0.03	0.66	1.77	<b>F = 20.106</b> <b>p = 0.000</b>
Optimal document search and access system												
Rational use of modern information technologies												
Rational archival documents storage system												
<i>Source: Compiled by the authors.</i>												

**Table 5.** Management culture with respect to position: results of different groups of companies.

According to Tukey's HSD test, statistically significant differences were found among ordinary workers and other position employees' z-estimates. The differences in relation to position were not found in two subscales: modern computerization level of managerial processes and work security and sociopsychological microclimate. Estimates of management culture aspects in most cases differ depending on the employees' position. Almost in all subscales, ordinary production employees evaluated management culture negatively. The answer estimates of administrative staff and managers of all ranks are positive. Although the differences between the subscales z-estimates are not always significant, they are meaningful in several aspects. Routine administrative staff and the lowest level managers evaluated management culture in a similar way. Top-level managers evaluate the factors representing the management culture in a critical way, and computerization of managerial processes, use of information technologies, the culture of visitor reception, conducting meetings, and phone calls were evaluated negatively, which is close to ordinary employees' answers estimates. The results are fairly controversial: first, they show that top-level managers raise high demands on the organization's managerial processes; second, top-level managers are responsible for this policy strategic decisions and their implementation. This demonstrates the need to find deep reasons of the situation, especially considering the tendency that people working in production are opposed to the current managerial situation, and the estimates of their answers are statistically significant. This means that the organization's management state is in a difficult situation, does not satisfy the subordinates, and is critically evaluated by the managerial staff themselves; besides, employees with different ranking have unfair working conditions.

The employees under the current position and the nature of work are divided into five groups: two groups of ordinary employees and three groups of managerial staff. For laconic reasons (**Table 5**), *ordinary employees* are those working directly in the production, and *administrative staff* are those who do not have managerial duties and are not directly connected to production. In the first group of companies there are determined statistically significant differences in assessment of answers to the statements in all management culture categories, and in the second group - only in three categories out of four. Z-estimates also distributed significantly, both positive and negative.

In the first group, negative z-estimates among the top positions as managers range from -0.14 (*culture of management staff*) to -0.36 (*documentation system culture*). Negative estimates include those areas where top managers are directly responsible for the regulation of the situation but, at the same time, depend on the decisions of shareholders in the group of companies. In other managerial staff chains, exclusively positive z-estimates received were distributed from 0.23 to 0.38 among middle-level managers and among the lowest level managers—from 0.33 to 0.53. The latter group of managerial staff stands out from others by relatively higher ratings. The lowest estimates, although in many cases positive (-0.18 management processes organization culture), are among ordinary employees working in production. The estimates of this group are relatively closest to top-level managers.

Significantly, higher variance of z-estimates (both positive and negative) is observed in the second group of companies where the same and clear trends are less. Unlike the first group of companies, the z-estimates of top-level managers' responses are distributed between 0.78 and

2.14. Significantly, lower z-estimates are between the lowest- (from  $-0.05$  to  $0.19$ ) and middle-level managers ( $-0.02$  to  $0.66$ ). The lowest estimates (from  $-0.30$  to  $0.05$ ) are among ordinary employees working in production. The biggest differences of z-estimates while comparing the first and second groups of companies were revealed in the categories of *management staff* and *organization of managerial processes* culture (first group) and the *management working conditions* and *documentation system* culture categories (second group).

Employees' work experience provides an opportunity to assess the situation described above in the aspect of the working experience at the organization. Details are given in **Table 6**.

Subscales	Up to 1 year	2–5 years	6–10 years	11–15 years	More than 16 years	ANOVA	
	N = 422	N = 722	N = 403	N = 111	N = 59	F	p
Management staff general culture level	0.01	0.03	$-0.05$	0.04	$-0.10$	0.574	0.681
Management science knowledge level	$-0.16$	0.05	0.06	0.18	$-0.19$	5.041	<b>0.0005**</b>
Managers' personal and professional characteristics	0.02	0.00	$-0.07$	0.20	0.00	1.720	0.143
The level of the ability to manage	$-0.15$	$-0.02$	0.11	0.30	0.05	6.475	<b>0.000**</b>
Optimal regulation of managerial processes	0.06	0.02	$-0.16$	0.16	0.15	4.077	<b>0.003**</b>
Rational organization of management work	0.09	0.00	$-0.15$	0.17	0.05	3.935	<b>0.003**</b>
Modern computerization level of managerial processes	0.09	0.06	$-0.19$	0.01	$-0.11$	5.133	<b>0.0004**</b>
Culture of visitor reception, conducting meetings, phone calls	$-0.03$	0.04	$-0.12$	0.18	0.20	3.284	<b>0.011*</b>
Working environment level (interior, lighting, temperature, cleanness, etc.)	$-0.07$	0.02	0.04	0.09	$-0.21$	1.525	0.192
Workplace organization level	0.02	$-0.02$	0.04	0.01	$-0.14$	0.575	0.681
Work and rest regime, relaxation options	$-0.24$	$-0.03$	0.19	0.33	0.18	14.127	<b>0.000**</b>
Work security, sociopsychological microclimate	$-0.26$	0.03	0.13	0.26	0.07	11.174	<b>0.000**</b>
Culture of official registration of documentation	$-0.13$	0.01	0.09	0.18	$-0.13$	3.765	<b>0.005**</b>
Optimal document search and access system	$-0.16$	0.02	0.08	0.13	0.05	3.939	<b>0.003**</b>

Subscales	Up to 1 year	2–5 years	6–10 years	11–15 years	More than 16 years	ANOVA	
	N = 422	N = 722	N = 403	N = 111	N = 59	F	p
Rational use of modern information technologies	–0.14	0.04	0.08	0.08	–0.20	3.773	0.005**
Rational archival documents storage system	–0.23	0.03	0.16	0.21	–0.10	9.961	0.000**

Source: Compiled by the authors.  
 \*Level of statistical significance  $\alpha = 0.05$ .  
 \*\*Level of statistical significance  $\alpha = 0.01$ .

**Table 6.** Management culture with respect to employees' work experience in the company.

Only four aspects should be mentioned where statistically significant differences were not set: management staff general culture; managers' personal and professional characteristics; work environment; workplace organization. The received estimates show that the most critical are the beginners and employees having the biggest work experience, as well as employees who finished lower level training institutions, mainly representing the production.

Thus, the research distinguished two groups: employees with the least work experience and those with work experience of 16 years and more. Employees having 11–15 years' work experience give the most favorable management culture evaluation, whose answers' z- estimates are positive. Since the evaluation varies depending on the work experience, the adaptation and socialization problems can be seen, experienced at the beginning of work. This could be justified by mobbing and sociopsychological climate research carried out in Lithuanian organizations. The research results showed a hostile working environment experienced by novice employees [7, 8]. However, the speeches expressed by the oldest employees can mark the fact that they by declaring a negative position are guided by great work experience in the organization, although they do not feel safe and happy with working environment. This indicates that management culture in groups of companies is not clearly and adequately communicated, because it takes time to assimilate it.

The results of management culture analysis according to the respondents' work experience in years in the groups of companies (**Table 7**) are statistically significant, although their significance rates are not high and smooth. First of all, attention should be paid to the structure of employees by work experience in years in the groups of companies: most of the first group respondents have work experience from 2 to 10 years, whereas in the second group—from 1 to 5 years. In other words, even though both groups of companies have similar amount of years of existence, most of the first group employees have a longer work experience in years.

Z-estimates, while comparing the two groups, do not show common trends for those groups, although there are certain regularities when considered in isolation. For example, in the first group of companies, exclusively negative z-estimates according to all management culture categories represent the answers of respondents having more than 16 years of work experience

Scales and subscales Groups of companies	First group					ANOVA verification results	Second group					ANOVA verification results
Work experience (in years)	Up to 1 year	2–5 years	6–10 years	11–15 years	More than 16 years		Up to 1 year	2–5 years	6–10 years	11–15 years	More than 16 years	
Sample	N = 89	N = 396	N = 279	N = 90	N = 57		N = 333	N = 326	N = 124	N = 21	N = 2	
Management staff culture												
Management staff general culture level	0.11	0.18	0.14	0.20	–0.12	F = 1.265 p = 0.282	–0.13	–0.19	–0.30	0.28	1.42	F = 3.085 p = 0.016
Management science knowledge level												
Managers’ personal and professional characteristics												
The level of the ability to manage												
Managerial processes organization culture												
Optimal regulation of managerial processes	0.10	0.00	0.06	0.16	–0.24	F = 3.020 p = 0.017	0.05	0.07	–0.04	0.08	0.74	F = 1.139 p = 0.337
Rational organization of management work												
Modern computerization level of managerial processes												
Culture of visitor reception, conducting meetings, phone calls												
Management working conditions culture												
Working environment level (interior, lighting, temperature, cleanness, etc.)	–0.03	0.06	0.20	0.15	–0.07	F = 1.568 p = 0.181	–0.21	–0.08	–0.03	0.50	0.93	F = 3.828 p = 0.004
Workplace organization level												
Work and rest regime, relaxation options												
Work security, sociopsychological microclimate												

Scales and subscales Groups of companies	First group					ANOVA verification results	Second group					ANOVA verification results
Work experience (in years)	Up to 1 year	2–5 years	6–10 years	11–15 years	More than 16 years		Up to 1 year	2–5 years	6–10 years	11–15 years	More than 16 years	
Sample	N = 89	N = 396	N = 279	N = 90	N = 57		N = 333	N = 326	N = 124	N = 21	N = 2	
<b>Documentation system culture</b>												
Culture of official registration of documentation	0.17	0.18	0.23	0.17	–0.14	<b>F = 1.348</b> <b>p = 0.250</b>	–0.29	–0.15	–0.13	0.18	0.62	<b>F = 2.919</b> <b>p = 0.021</b>
Optimal document search and access system												
Rational use of modern information technologies												
Rational archival documents storage system												
<i>Source:</i> Compiled by the authors.												

**Table 7.** Management culture with respect to employees' work experience in the company: results of different companies.

(from  $-0.7$  to  $-0.24$ ), whereas in the second group of companies, negative z-estimates stand out in the group of respondents having 6–10 years of work experience (from  $-0.03$  to  $-0.30$ ). On the other hand, in the latter group of companies in the three employee groups, covering a range from 1 to 10 years, the negative z-estimates denote such management culture categories as *management staff culture*, *management working conditions culture* and *documentation system culture*. These trends could indicate the existence of formed stable organization cultures in groups of companies, the assessments of which little (if we consider an exception of the first group of respondents with more than 16 years of work experience) depend on the type of work experience employees have in those companies.

Management culture absolutely in all aspects varies with respect to the age of employees (Table 8) as well as when comparing the results with respect to subdivisions. According to

Subscales	18–23 years	24–29 years	30–39 years	40–49 years	50 to up to retirement	ANOVA verification results	
	N = 258	N = 523	N = 464	N = 320	N = 149	F	p
Management staff general culture level	−0.16	0.09	0.07	−0.05	−0.15	4.339	0.002**
Management science knowledge level	−0.09	0.11	0.07	−0.09	−0.23	5.320	0.0003**
Managers' personal and professional characteristics	−0.14	0.11	0.04	−0.07	−0.15	4.337	0.002**
The level of the ability to manage	−0.20	0.08	0.08	−0.02	−0.12	4.914	0.001**
Optimal regulation of managerial processes	0.07	−0.15	0.00	0.13	0.13	5.083	0.0005**
Rational organization of management work	0.01	−0.16	0.01	0.17	0.12	6.304	0.000**
Modern computerization level of managerial processes	0.22	−0.12	−0.02	0.08	−0.07	5.797	0.0001**
Culture of visitor reception, conducting meetings, phone calls	−0.04	−0.10	0.04	0.10	0.08	2.529	0.039*
Working environment level (interior, lighting, temperature, cleanness, etc.)	−0.22	0.05	0.05	0.02	0.03	3.924	0.004**
Workplace organization level	−0.33	0.03	0.05	0.05	0.19	8.994	0.000**
Work and rest regime, relaxation options	−0.06	0.09	0.07	−0.10	−0.21	4.152	0.002**
Work security, sociopsychological microclimate	−0.21	0.00	0.11	0.01	0.01	4.209	0.002**

Subscales	18–23 years	24–29 years	30–39 years	40–49 years	50 to up to retirement	ANOVA verification results	
	N = 258	N = 523	N = 464	N = 320	N = 149	F	p
Culture of official registration of documentation	–0.26	0.09	0.05	–0.02	0.02	5.796	0.0001**
Optimal document search and access system	–0.12	0.14	0.03	–0.06	–0.23	5.849	0.0001**
Rational use of modern information technologies	–0.18	0.16	0.03	–0.08	–0.15	6.833	0.000**
Rational archival documents storage system	–0.23	0.18	0.02	–0.05	–0.19	9.258	0.000**

Source: Compiled by the authors.

\*Level of statistical significance  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

\*\*Level of statistical significance  $\alpha = 0.01$ .

**Table 8.** Management culture with respect to employees' age.

the Tukey's HSD test, statistically significant differences were found among the youngest, 18–23 years of age, and among the oldest, 50 years–up to retirement age of employees and the middle age of employees' z-estimates. The results show that the most positive management culture evaluation in the workplace is given by 30–39 years age group representatives, which is one of the largest with regard to the number of respondents who participated in the research. The most critical is the third group of respondents concerning the size: 18–23 years. Discussing of the management culture components assessment by age groups revealed that one of the most favorably evaluated indicators is optimality of managerial processes regulation. There is visible a tendency that the worst management culture assessment is given by the youngest age group, the respondents having the least work experience, and the oldest group representatives. Summarizing this research part, it can be assumed that management culture is the least advantageous to these two groups; besides, it reflects the region's common cultural attitudes that are inclined to discriminate employees based on age, as employers are typical of stereotypical attitudes, as shown, for example, in the research carried out in Lithuania [9].

The respondents who participated the research were divided into five groups according to their age, i.e. from the youngest to the oldest employees. Considering the distinguished age groups, the research results show significant differences in evaluation. Comparing to the results discussed above, there emerge certain trends of evaluation dependence on the age of respondents. Z-estimates of all management culture categories of the first group in the cohort of 50 years, and older respondents are negative (from –0.06 to –0.16). In the cohort of 18–23 years, negative z-estimates represent three of four categories of management culture (positive is only management processes organization culture, i.e., 0.16). Similarly in this age group there were divided the estimates of management culture categories in the second group of companies. It is significant that in the latter group of companies essential evaluations' connection with the respondents' age was not found even in two management culture categories which are represented by the negative z-estimates, although the statistical significance differs. These are *management staff culture* (from –0.09 to –0.22) and *documentation system culture* (from –0.11 to –0.40). Therefore,

judging by the highlighted evaluation trends and statistical differences among the estimates, the age factor in assessing management culture can be significant, but cannot be given prominence and absolute not paying attention to other sociodemographic factors. Moreover, as we see in the example of the second group of companies, the differences among generations while assessing separate management culture aspects may be insignificant (**Table 9**).

Estimates of management culture aspects vary depending on the employee's education (**Table 10**). A trend is obvious that in most cases the employees having lower level of education, which is represented by manufacturing, in all cases gave negative assessments. According to the Tukey's HSD test, statistically significant differences were found between the groups' z-estimates (with higher, postsecondary, vocational, and secondary/primary education). Estimates in the subscales of work and rest regime and relaxation options are not statistically significant. When assessing the results, it can be said that the management culture estimates are directly dependent on the level of education of the respondents. Management culture in all subscales was positively assessed by employees with higher (university) education. The worst assessment, i.e. assessment of almost all constituents, is negative between the employees having vocational training. Assessment of all analysed constituents is negative between employees having secondary and primary education.

Analyzing management culture by respondents' education section (see **Table 11**), reliable and statistically significant differences were determined in most cases. In the case of the first group, these differences show up in the aspects of *management staff culture* and *management processes organization culture*. Meanwhile, in the case of the second group, attention should be paid to the opposition between the respondents having higher (z-estimates are from 0.05 to 0.21) and secondary and/or primary education (z-estimates ranging from -0.06 to -0.41). Previously reported results have shown a much more complicated situation of management culture than in the first group, which draws attention to how the reactions are determined by a general corporate policy, and how it is understood by company employees having different education (**Table 11**).

**Tables 12 and 14** present research results that were verified by Student criterion (t test).

Management culture assessment in some respects differs depending on employees' sex (**Table 12**). The analysis of the management culture with respect to employees' sex showed the least statistically significant differences than comparing with other sociodemographic criteria. Here, there are no significant differences even in seven subscales. However, males' and females' attitudes in these subscales (management staff general culture, managers' personal and professional characteristics, working environment, work security and sociopsychological microclimate, optimal document search and access system, and rational use of modern information technologies) are quite different—the females assess all these aspects negatively and the males in an affirmative way. Workplace organization with respect to both sexes is positive. It is clear that females were more critical to human relations, working environment, and internal climate of the organization.

Except the highlighted cases of the organization, *culture of management processes* in the first group of companies and *registration of documents* in the second group, with respect to sexuality,

Scales and subscales Groups of companies	First group					ANOVA verification results	Second group					ANOVA verification results
Employees' age	18–23 years	24–29 years	30–39 years	40–49 years	50 y.-up to retirement age		18–23 years	24–29 years	30–39 years	40–49 years	50 y.-up to retirement age	
Sample	N = 116	N = 347	N = 274	N = 126	N = 48		N = 142	N = 176	N = 190	N = 194	N = 104	
<b>Management staff culture</b>												
Management staff general culture level	–0.01	0.25	0.20	–0.01	–0.13	<b>F = 3.624 p = 0.006</b>	–0.31	–0.15	–0.09	–0.11	–0.22	<b>F = 1.265 p = 0.282</b>
Management science knowledge level												
Managers' personal and professional characteristics												
The level of the ability to manage												
<b>Managerial processes organization culture</b>												
Optimal regulation of managerial processes	0.16	–0.20	–0.02	0.17	–0.06	<b>F = 3.256 p = 0.012</b>	0.01	–0.05	0.05	0.12	0.13	<b>F = 1.995 p = 0.093</b>
Rational organization of management work												
Modern computerization level of managerial processes												
Culture of visitor reception, conducting meetings, phone calls												
<b>Management working conditions culture</b>												
Working environment level (interior, lighting, temperature, cleanness, etc.)	–0.08	0.18	0.16	–0.04	–0.11	<b>F = 2.772 p = 0.026</b>	–0.41	–0.19	–0.01	0.01	0.06	<b>F = 5.812 p = 0.000</b>
Workplace organization level												
Work and rest regime, relaxation options												
Work security, sociopsychological microclimate												

Scales and subscales Groups of companies	First group					ANOVA verification results	Second group					ANOVA verification results
	18–23 years	24–29 years	30–39 years	40–49 years	50 y.-up to retirement age		18–23 years	24–29 years	30–39 years	40–49 years	50 y.-up to retirement age	
Sample	N = 116	N = 347	N = 274	N = 126	N = 48		N = 142	N = 176	N = 190	N = 194	N = 104	
<b>Documentation system culture</b>												
Culture of official registration of documentation	–0.02	0.31	0.20	0.01	–0.16	<b>F = 4.354</b> <b>p = 0.002</b>	–0.40	–0.13	–0.20	–0.11	–0.16	<b>F = 2.920</b> <b>p = 0.020*</b>
Optimal document search and access system												
Rational use of modern information technologies												
Rational archival documents storage system												
<i>Source:</i> Compiled by the authors.												

**Table 9.** Management culture with respect to employees' age: results of different groups of companies.

Subscales	University	Postsecondary (higher)	Vocational	Secondary, primary	ANOVA	
	N = 525	N = 272	N = 414	N = 506	F	p
Management staff general culture level	0.26	0.13	-0.10	-0.26	27.251	<b>0.000**</b>
Management science knowledge level	0.24	0.12	-0.17	-0.18	21.578	<b>0.000**</b>
Managers' personal and professional characteristics	0.20	0.07	-0.14	-0.13	12.700	<b>0.000**</b>
The level of the ability to manage	0.12	0.12	-0.09	-0.12	7.602	<b>0.000**</b>
Optimal regulation of managerial processes	0.18	0.21	-0.07	-0.25	21.655	<b>0.000**</b>
Rational organization of management work	0.18	0.28	-0.08	-0.26	26.287	<b>0.000**</b>
Modern computerization level of managerial processes	0.01	0.29	-0.09	-0.09	10.225	<b>0.000**</b>
Culture of visitor reception, conducting meetings, phone calls	0.22	0.17	-0.11	-0.22	21.571	<b>0.000**</b>
Working environment level (interior, lighting, temperature, cleanness, etc.)	0.33	0.04	-0.13	-0.26	34.144	<b>0.000**</b>
Workplace organization level	0.24	0.08	-0.15	-0.17	20.144	<b>0.000**</b>
Work and rest regime, relaxation options	0.06	-0.06	0.02	-0.04	1.274	0.282
Work security, sociopsychological microclimate	0.05	0.08	-0.10	-0.02	2.399	<b>0.046*</b>
Culture of official registration of documentation	0.14	0.15	-0.03	-0.20	12.268	<b>0.000**</b>
Optimal document search and access system	0.19	0.05	-0.10	-0.13	11.067	<b>0.000**</b>
Rational use of modern information technologies	0.31	0.13	-0.16	-0.26	34.540	<b>0.000**</b>
Rational archival documents storage system	0.16	0.14	-0.16	-0.11	12.233	<b>0.000**</b>

Source: Compiled by the authors.

\*Level of statistical significance  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

\*\*Level of statistical significance  $\alpha = 0.01$ .

**Table 10.** Management culture with respect to employees' education.



Scales and subscales Groups of companies	First group				ANOVA verification results	Second group				ANOVA verification results
	Higher (university)	Postsecondary	Vocational	Secondary/Primary		Higher (university)	Postsecondary	Vocational	Secondary/Primary	
Sample	N = 320	N = 138	N = 205	N = 248		N = 205	N = 134	N = 209	N = 258	
Working environment level (interior, lighting, temperature, cleanness, etc.)	0.23	0.19	-0.12	0.03	<b>F = 5.671 p = 0.001</b>	0.21	-0.11	-0.11	-0.35	<b>F = 13.192 p = 0.000</b>
Workplace organization level										
Work and rest regime, relaxation options										
Work security, sociopsychological microclimate										
<b>Documentation system culture</b>										
Culture of official registration of documentation	0.34	0.33	-0.01	0.01	<b>F = 7.540 p = 0.000</b>	0.06	-0.06	-0.25	-0.41	<b>F = 13.968 p = 0.000</b>
Optimal document search and access system										
Rational use of modern information technologies										
Rational archival documents storage system										
<i>Source:</i> Compiled by the authors.										

**Table 11.** Management culture with respect to employees' education: results of different groups of companies.

Subscales	Male	Female	T test verification results	
	N = 723	N = 994	t	p
Management staff general culture level	0.02	-0.02	0.732	0.464
Management science knowledge level	0.07	-0.05	2.389	<b>0.017*</b>
Managers' personal and professional characteristics	0.03	-0.02	1.163	0.245
The level of the ability to manage	0.07	-0.05	2.381	<b>0.017*</b>
Optimal regulation of managerial processes	-0.08	0.06	-2.962	<b>0.003**</b>
Rational organization of management work	-0.08	0.06	-2.786	<b>0.005**</b>
Modern computerization level of managerial processes	-0.09	0.06	-3.104	<b>0.002**</b>
Culture of visitor reception, conducting meetings, phone calls	-0.06	0.05	-2.293	<b>0.022*</b>
Working environment level (interior, lighting, temperature, cleanness, etc.)	0.04	-0.03	1.264	0.207
Level of organizing working places	0.00	0.00	0.123	0.902
Work and rest regime, relaxation options	0.10	-0.07	3.418	<b>0.001**</b>
Work security, sociopsychological microclimate	0.02	-0.02	0.783	0.434
Culture of official registration of documentation	0.06	-0.05	2.284	<b>0.022*</b>
Optimal document search and access system	0.04	-0.03	1.310	0.190
Rational use of modern information technologies	0.03	-0.02	1.127	0.260
Rational archival documents storage system	0.08	-0.06	2.768	<b>0.006**</b>

Source: Compiled by the authors.

\*Level of statistical significance  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

\*\*Level of statistical significance  $\alpha = 0.01$ .

**Table 12.** Management culture with respect to employees' sex.

statistical significance does not differ substantially. However, in the second group, negative z-estimates, regardless of the gender of the respondents, are distinguished by two categories of management culture: *management staff culture* (from -0.09 to -0.20) and *documentation system culture* (from -0.07 to -0.25). This, again, indicates already highlighted trends that are given additional tones, which we understand as unresolved problematic aspects, by male and female respondents' evaluations. The culture of the latter group of companies can be seen as more differentiated and less balanced with respect to sexual aspect (**Table 13**).

Management culture differences comparing both groups of companies (**Table 14**) statistically do not have significant differences in these subscales: optimal regulation of managerial processes; modern computerization of managerial processes; and culture of visitor reception, conducting meetings, and phone calls. However, there were statistically significant differences in the remaining parameters. Based on the results of comparative analysis, it can be said that management culture is not common to companies belonging to the same area of economic activities. Attention should be paid to management science knowledge and the related aspects of management staff general culture and management level.

Scales and subscales	First group		T test results	Second group		T test results
Groups of companies						
Sex	Males	Females		Males	Females	
Sample	N = 460	N = 451		N = 263	N = 543	
<b>Management staff culture</b>						
Management staff general culture level	0.13	0.16	$t = -0.372$ $p = 0.710$	-0.09	-0.20	$t = 1.559$ $p = 0.119$
Management science knowledge level						
Managers' personal and professional characteristics						
The level of the ability to manage						
<b>Managerial processes organization culture</b>						
Optimal managerial processes regulation	-0.18	0.10	$t = -3.565$ $p = 0.0004$	0.07	0.04	$t = 0.659$ $p = 0.510$
Rational organization of management work						
Modern computerization level of managerial processes						
Culture of visitor reception, conducting meetings, phone calls						
<b>Management working conditions culture</b>						
Working environment level (interior, lighting, temperature, cleanness, etc.)	0.08	0.10	$t = -0.314$ $p = 0.754$	0.00	-0.16	$t = 2.080$ $p = 0.038$
Level of organizing working places						
Work and rest regime, relaxation options						
Work security, sociopsychological microclimate						
<b>Documentation system culture</b>						
Culture of official registration of documentation	0.14	0.20	$t = -0.882$ $p = 0.378$	-0.07	-0.25	$t = 2.774$ $p = 0.006$
Optimal document search and access system						
Rational use of modern information technologies						
Rational archival documents storage system						

Source: Compiled by the authors.

**Table 13.** Management culture with respect to employees' sex: results of different groups of companies.

Subscales	First group	Second group	T test verification results	
	N = 911	N = 806	t	p
Management staff general culture level	0.06	-0.07	2.787	0.005**
Management science knowledge level	0.17	-0.19	7.653	0.000**
Managers' personal and professional characteristics	0.10	-0.11	4.374	0.000**
The level of the ability to manage	0.18	-0.20	7.845	0.000**
Optimal managerial processes regulation	-0.02	0.02	-0.666	0.506
Rational organization of management work	-0.11	0.12	-4.835	0.000**
Modern computerization level of managerial processes	-0.03	0.03	-1.258	0.209
Culture of visitor reception, conducting meetings, phone calls	0.01	-0.01	0.540	0.589
Working environment level (interior, lighting, temperature, cleanness, etc.)	-0.02	0.03	-0.990	0.322
Level of organizing working places	-0.13	0.15	-5.875	0.000**
Work and rest regime, relaxation options	0.29	-0.33	13.587	0.000**
Work security, sociopsychological microclimate	0.16	-0.19	7.353	0.000**
Culture of official registration of documentation	0.09	-0.10	3.864	0.0001**
Optimal document search and access system	0.19	-0.21	8.501	0.000**
Rational use of modern information technologies	0.11	-0.12	4.672	0.000**
Rational storage system of archival documents	0.20	-0.23	9.134	0.000**

Source: Compiled by the authors.

\*Level of statistical significance  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

\*\*Level of statistical significance  $\alpha = 0.01$ .

**Table 14.** Common management culture comparison between two groups of companies.

Management culture development is one of the main conditions for the company's aim to become socially responsible and for the success of this process. When successfully managing the preparation to implement social responsibility strategy, the process is carried out in four directions: personal management staff culture, culture of organization of managerial processes, working conditions culture, and documentation system culture. Conclusions of the research carried out in other countries proved that organizations assess not all aspects of corporate social responsibility, and this is influenced by lack of a strong institutional capacity of employees as one part of stakeholders. Having evaluated the results of the research, it can be concluded that the administration of both groups of companies assesses corporate social responsibility activities inadequately, there is no guarantee feedback, lack of concern for the relationship with the employees who are one part of the stakeholders, their physical environment, and psychological condition. There is no effective internal social responsibility audit system which should be developed to ensure feedback, and corporate social responsibility has not become the management culture self. Psychologically insecure environment can affect that males are reluctant to

detailed critical approach to corporate social responsibility activities of groups of companies, but in future research the influence of sociocultural stereotypes should be checked.

The research results of this part summarize and extend the theoretical research and practically emphasize the role of management culture as an integral part of organizational culture. An increased investment in strengthening the management culture expression is one of the key tasks for post-Soviet states organizations. Employee, as one part of stakeholders, is a kind of litmus showing the management culture expression and direction of changes.

### 1.9. Corporate social responsibility with respect to sociodemographic attitude

Even in the groups of companies functioning in the same socio-cultural environment, individual companies are not homogeneous. Finally, individuals' education may vary, as well as experiences of different age groups (generations), values, views, and reactions. This is especially true in our case, since the population consists of two generations in the space of different views (planned and market economies) and formed in their transformation. On the one hand, the analysis of views of separate groups making up companies and individuals' reactions to the ongoing processes permits to deconstruct, to know, and to evaluate these processes. On the other hand, having deconstructed and reflected the processes, preconditions are created for more accurate design of solutions, considering different factors. It is like a mosaic, where if viewed from a different distance, new, unique details are revealed. Therefore, in this section, by using statistical analysis, we will present corporate social responsibility situation in few different sections. First, there are presented summarized results of the research, and further presentation—by dividing and detailing in separate aspects.

Since all the questionnaire statements (both positive and negative) were coded positively, z-estimate minus sign indicates the negative situation of the analyzed issue and a plus sign indicates positive. The differences are evident when the z-estimate indicators sum among compared objects is 0.5. In order to get a clearer picture, the general results of both groups of companies with respect to sociodemographic criteria and separately by groups of companies are presented in the tables of this section. **Table 15** gives the general research results showing the situation of socially responsible organization and socially responsible employee behavior with respect to subdivisions of both groups of companies.

In this case, we distinguish two subdivisions, which are conditionally identified as "production" and "administration." The administration includes the respondents performing managerial and administrative work. The production subdivision consists of ordinary employees performing the direct production work (physical, with equipment, etc.) in the workshops of companies.

By using the dispersion indicator (F) (ANOVA single-factor dispersion analysis), it is determined which method was used. Statistical significance (p) (results are in bold) shows that the differences between the z-estimates are statistically significant, i.e., sufficient to be able to draw conclusions in the analyzed case. Both behavior of a socially responsible organization and a socially responsible employee are different depending on in which relatively isolated company subdivision the employee works in case of this research. In production subdivisions, there is greater disapproval of subscales' statements.

ScalesSubscales	Administration N = 339	Production N = 1378	ANOVA verification results	
			F	p
Behavior of a socially responsible organization				
Market responsibility (Services and their quality)	0.20	−0.03	8.627	0.000**
Market responsibility (Consumer information, health, and safety)	0.24	−0.06	8.644	0.000**
Environment protection responsibility	0.10	−0.01	2.577	0.050*
Responsibility in relations with employees	0.30	−0.11	18.000	0.000**
Responsibility in relations with society	0.25	−0.03	13.908	0.000**
Behavior of a socially responsible employee				
Intentions to leave work	0.28	−0.07	11.432	0.000**
Uncertainty and lack of information at work	0.35	−0.09	17.588	0.000**
General physical and psychological condition of the employee	0.21	−0.03	8.230	0.000**
The employee's opinion about the organization	0.00	0.01	0.776	0.507
Corruption, nepotism, favoritism	0.24	−0.08	12.551	0.000**
Social responsibility criticism: staff attitude	0.12	−0.01	4.691	0.003**

Source: Compiled by the authors.

\*Level of statistical significance  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

\*\*Level of statistical significance  $\alpha = 0.01$ .

**Table 15.** Behavior of socially responsible organization and socially responsible employee with respect to subdivisions: general results.

These data were verified by using single-factor dispersive analysis one-way ANOVA. Though the research results do not show a statistically significant gap, however, they signal that administration's position on all analysed questions is positive. It is contrary in manufacturing subdivisions, i.e. employees' position on analysed questions is negative, except the subscale "My responses about organization," where z-estimate is positive.

Although this method does not cover direct reasons why such differences emerged, however, it draws attention to the problem areas of the companies that should be analyzed in detail, by using different methods and angles.

Then, following the macro aspect, research results received in "administration" and "production" subdivisions by different groups of companies are presented in **Table 16**.

Separately analyzing the groups of companies, the features characterizing the groups begin to emerge. Research results presented by separate groups of companies show that both socially responsible organizations and socially responsible employee behavior results differ

Scales and subscales	First group		T test results	Second group		T test results
Groups of companies						
Subdivisions	Administration	Production		Administration	Production	
Sample	N = 275	N = 636		N = 64	N = 742	
<b>Behavior of a socially responsible organization</b>						
Market responsibility (services and their quality)	0.23	-0.11	t = 4.586 p = 0.000	0.46	-0.03	t = 3.955 p = 0.000
Market responsibility (consumer information, health, and safety)						
Environment protection responsibility						
Responsibility in relations with employees						
Responsibility in relations with society						
<b>Behavior of a socially responsible employee</b>						
Intentions to leave work	0.16	-0.22	t = 5.357 p = 0.000	0.78	0.06	t = 5.730 p = 0.000
Uncertainty and lack of information at work						
General physical and psychological condition of the employee						
The employee's opinion about the organization						
Corruption, nepotism, favoritism						
Social responsibility criticism: staff attitude						

Source: Compiled by the authors.

\*Statistical significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

\*\*Statistical significance level  $\alpha = 0.01$ .

**Table 16.** Behavior of socially responsible organization and socially responsible employee with respect to subdivisions: results of different groups of companies.

statistically significantly in favor of the administrative staff ( $p < 0.001$ ), i.e., the results of socially responsible behavior of the production employees are significantly worse than those of the administration subdivision staff. This is confirmed by significantly lower z-estimates, in most cases even negative. Z-estimates of the first group of companies respondents employed in the production are negative while comparing according to the scales of *behavior of socially responsible organization*, as well as *behavior of socially responsible employee*, which shows very unfavorable provisions differing significantly from administration assessments. Such gap may indicate that the administration does not assess the situation adequately enough. While on the other hand, low estimates in this group of companies generally signal a bad situation according to both corporate social responsibility scales. It can be assumed that *behavior of a socially responsible organization* according to separate subscales has a negative impact on employees' (both in production and administrative subdivisions) reactions, behavior, and critical attitude to company's policy. When comparing with the second group of companies' z-estimates, it is revealed that in the latter the assessments are significantly more favorable, all the more that z-estimates of respondents employed in production in the scale of *behavior of socially responsible employee* are positive, although low. In this case, in this group of companies when initiating changes in corporate social responsibility area, significantly less resources could be required.

**Table 17** presents the research results according to the employees' position and their approval of components of behavior of a socially responsible organization and a socially responsible employee.

Scales Subscales	Ordinary employee N = 1268	Administration N = 298	Lowest level manager N = 63	Middle- level manager N = 66	Top-level manager N = 22	ANOVA verification results	
						F	p
Behavior of a socially responsible organization							
Market responsibility (services and their quality)	-0.10	0.36	0.16	0.17	0.08	14.638	0.000**
Market responsibility (consumer information, health, and safety)	-0.09	0.28	0.28	0.25	0.09	10.997	0.000**
Environment protection 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 relations with society	-0.08	0.26	0.13	0.34	0.05	9.476	0.000**

Scales Subscales	Ordinary employee N = 1268	Administration N = 298	Lowest level manager N = 63	Middle- level manager N = 66	Top-level manager N = 22	ANOVA verification results	
						F	p
Behavior of a socially responsible employee							
Intentions to leave work	−0.11	0.32	0.29	0.35	0.10	15.466	0.000**
Uncertainty and lack of information at work	−0.11	0.24	0.33	0.51	0.58	16.753	0.000**
General physical and psychological condition of the employee	−0.08	0.19	0.32	0.31	0.29	8.446	0.000**
The employee’s 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**
Social responsibility criticism: staff attitude	−0.08	0.29	0.11	0.03	0.08	8.488	0.000**
Source: Compiled by the authors.							
*Statistical significance level $\alpha = 0.05$ .							
**Statistical significance level $\alpha = 0.01$ .							

**Table 17.** Behavior of a socially responsible organization and a socially responsible employee with respect to position: general results.

Employees who have no possibility to manage are identified as an *ordinary employee*—working in the field of production, and *administrative staff*—an ordinary employee, but not working in production. Managing staff is divided into three groups: *the lowest level manager*, *middle-level manager*, and *top-level manager*, that is, the leaders of groups of companies and their deputies.

According to the Tukey's HSD test, statistically significant differences were found among z-estimates of ordinary employees and other employees. Z-estimates of ordinary employees' opinion are all negative, indicating a negative attitude when marking the statements in the distinguished subscales. Again, the managers' provisions of social responsibility issues are positive, with the exception of the personal comments about the organization.

Looking in more detail, according to how subscales statements were evaluated, negative environment protection responsibility z-estimate was set between ordinary production and administrative employees. It is important that the highest positive estimates were revealed among medium-level managers. These estimates are much higher in other subscales of *behavior of socially responsible organization* scale, while comparing with the lowest- and top-level

managers' responses estimates. It can be assumed that middle-level managers may have less information about the actual situation in companies than ordinary employees and lowest level managers who face it directly. Also, the information available to top-level managers encouraged to assess the results of the survey more critically. Of course, one factor should also be taken into account that top-level managers were prone to assess the situation (which depends on themselves) more favorably, and many factors that could not be affected by ordinary employees, influenced a less favorable assessment. In any case, the results of the survey indicate strong tension between managerial staff and ordinary employees.

Employees of the first and second groups of companies who participated in the research, as well as in **Table 18**, were divided into five conditional groups according to the work they do and their rank. Out of them, the lowest rank employees were split into two groups according to the type of work. Relatively named "Ordinary employees group" consists of employees engaged in production, whereas "Administrative staff" group consists of the lowest rank administration subdivision employees carrying out technical work. Such distribution is selected according to the type of work in order to distinguish between manual and nonmanual work. Managerial staff is divided into three groups: the "lowest level manager," "middle level manager," and "top level manager."

The results presented according to separate groups of companies show that the results of behavior of socially responsible organization, as well as socially responsible employee differ statistically significantly in the first and the second group ( $p < 0.001$ ). Performing the following analysis of the results, one can notice certain trends. First, it is symptomatic that in the second group of companies middle-level and top-level managers and administrative staff distinguish themselves by much better results in socially responsible behavior, whereas the lowest ratings in these areas are given by ordinary employees. Second, it is natural that ordinary employees distinguish themselves by the worst results in the first group of companies. However, attention is drawn to the fact that even lower assessment is given by top-level managers.

Discussing the summarized results above, we pointed out that employees of the first group of companies in general are less satisfied with the situation in the context of corporate social responsibility. Probably, the fact that the respondents represent not only single independent companies but also their groups should be taken into account. Analyzing the qualitative research results, it was identified that the companies' possibilities to pursue an independent policy (let's say in corporate social responsibility area) are limited. Therefore, it can be assumed that z-estimates of the first group of companies (including managerial staff) could be influenced by general policy of companies' group directors (shareholders), which is fairly critically assessed by the top-level managers, and natural reactions are provided by the lowest production level employees feeling a direct impact (z-estimates are negative for both scales). In the case of the second group of companies, z-estimates of ordinary employees employed in production, though negative, are more generous than those in the first group of companies.

**Table 19** presents the staff opinion distribution with respect to work experience in the analyzed groups of companies.

Without distinction of groups of companies, summarized research results in a number of cases show that results of behavior of a socially responsible organization as well as a socially

Scales and subscales Groups of companies	First group					ANOVA verification results	Second group					ANOVA verification results	
	Position	Ordinary employee	Administration	Lowest level manager	Middle level manager		Top level manager	Ordinary employee	Administration	Lowest level manager	Middle level manager		Top level manager
Sample	N = 621	N = 186	N = 37	N = 50	N = 17	N = 647	N = 112	N = 26	N = 16	N = 5			
Behavior of a socially responsible organization													
Market responsibility (services and their quality)	-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**	
Market responsibility (consumer information, health, and safety)													
Environment protection responsibility													
Responsibility in relations with employees													
Responsibility in relations with society													
Behavior of a socially responsible employee													

Scales and subscales Groups of companies	First group					ANOVA verification results	Second group					ANOVA verification results
	Ordinary employee	Administration	Lowest level manager	Middle level manager	Top level manager		Ordinary employee	Administration	Lowest level manager	Middle level manager	Top level manager	
Sample	N = 621	N = 186	N = 37	N = 50	N = 17		N = 647	N = 112	N = 26	N = 16	N = 5	
Intentions to leave work	-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												
General physical and psychological condition of the employee												
The employee's opinion about the organization												
Corruption, nepotism, favoritism												
Social responsibility criticism: staff attitude												

Source: Compiled by the authors.

**Table 18.** Behavior of socially responsible organization and socially responsible employee with respect to position: results of different groups of companies.

ScalesSubscales	Up to 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	ANOVA verification results	
						F	p
Behavior of a socially responsible organization							
Market responsibility (services and their quality)	0.05	0.06	−0.07	−0.10	−0.45	4.885	0.001**
Market responsibility (consumer information, health and safety)	−0.02	0.06	−0.01	−0.05	−0.40	3.186	0.013*
Environment protection 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 relations with society	−0.04	0.02	−0.02	0.19	−0.18	1.746	0.137
Behavior of a socially responsible employee							
Intentions to leave work	−0.01	0.02	0.00	−0.11	0.01	0.462	0.764
Uncertainty and lack of information at work	−0.13	0.03	0.02	0.08	0.29	3.233	0.012*
General physical and psychological condition of the employee	0.01	−0.01	0.00	0.04	−0.08	0.160	0.959
The employee’s 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*
Social responsibility criticism: staff attitude	0.21	0.03	−0.17	−0.29	−0.12	10.482	0.000**

Source: Compiled by the authors.

\*Statistical significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

\*\*Statistical significance level  $\alpha = 0.01$ .

**Table 19.** Behavior of socially responsible organization and socially responsible employee with respect to work experience: general results.

responsible employee differ statistically significant by employee's work experience ( $p < 0.001$ ). Several most significant trends could be distinguished.

According to the Tukey's HSD test, statistically significant differences were found among employees with the most, more than 16 years, work experience, and employees with less work experience z-estimates. Among the respondents with the biggest work experience (the experience of the group's relations with the organization is the highest in comparison with others), negative z-estimates indicate highly critical reactions to corporate social responsibility, with the exception of responsibility in relations with employees (z-estimate is positive).

Also, the approval of subscales summarizing individual steps in the test was highlighted, such as the intentions to leave work, uncertainty and lack of information at work, and so on.

Though not high but positive *z*-estimates in *socially responsible organization behaviour* scale were recorded in the group of respondents having work experience of 2-5 years. Negative *z*-estimates (except for the aforementioned group of employees) were highlighted in the remaining groups of respondents in the subscale of *market responsibility*, which includes consumer information, health, and safety, as well as in the subscales of intentions to leave work. The dynamics of estimates shows that work experience could encourage more critical approach to company's actions. On the other hand, the results are significantly different, while comparing the survey results of the first and second groups of companies.

The research results presented according to separate groups of companies (**Table 20**) show that the differences are statistically significant in the first and second groups, i.e., they differ ( $p < 0.001$ ) in the behavior of socially responsible organization scale. Both positive and negative *z*-estimates of the first group had impact on the general results discussed above. In this group of companies, negative *z*-estimates (in behavior of socially responsible organization scale) emerged between the employees with the shortest and the longest work experience (with the exception of behavior of socially responsible employee scale, where in the group of employees having up to 1 year work experience, *z*-estimate is positive). It should be emphasized that *z*-estimates in the two group of companies (based on results of behavior of socially responsible employee scale) are positive. So, in spite of the work experience in this group of companies, employees' assessments are more consistent. Comparing the two scales *z*-estimates according to different length of service both in the first as well as in the second groups of companies some consistency could be seen. In addition, some kind of dependence of the results is revealed with respect to employees' age (see below).

**Table 21** shows the distribution of employees' opinions on the analyzed issue according to their age.

According to the Tukey's HSD test, statistically significant differences were found among *z*-estimates of the youngest employees, 18–23 years of age, and older employees. Both in the subscales of behavior of a socially responsible organization and a socially responsible employee, the survey results of the employees of this age group are significantly worse than of other age groups. In addition, positive estimates are given in the behavior of socially responsible employee scale in the group of the respondents of 40–49 years old. According to separate subscales, services and their quality assessment improves depending on the age of respondents, when, for example, in the subscale of consumer information, health, and safety, as well as responsibility in relations with employees subscale trends of more favorable assessment are noticed in the groups of 24–29 and 30–39 years of age. More notable assessment trends that could help make broader generalizations by age groups were not revealed. However, significant differences in terms of age groups allow the description of the first and second group of companies characteristically.

The results of both behavior of a socially responsible organization and a socially responsible employee differ statistically significant in the first and second groups ( $p < 0.001$ ). The results

Scales and subscales Groups of companies	First group					ANOVA verification results	Second group					ANOVA verification results
Work experience (in years)	Up to 1 year	2–5 years	6–10 years	11–15 years	More than 16 years		Up to 1 year	2–5 years	6–10 years	11–15 years	More than 16 years	
Sample	N = 89	N = 396	N = 279	N = 90	N = 57		N = 333	N = 326	N = 124	N = 21	N = 2	
<b>Behavior of a socially responsible organization</b>												
Market responsibility (services and their quality)	–0.16	0.05	0.03	–0.05	–0.33	F = 2.350 p = 0.050*	–0.04	0.05	–0.08	0.63	0.93	F = 3.299 p = 0.011*
Market responsibility (consumer information, health, and safety)												
Environment protection responsibility												
Responsibility in relations with employees												
Responsibility in relations with society												
<b>Behavior of a socially responsible employee</b>												
Intentions to leave work	0.09	–0.09	–0.15	–0.25	–0.05	F = 1.563 p = 0.182	0.06	0.14	0.09	0.56	1.26	F = 2.115 p = 0.077
Uncertainty and lack of information at work												
General physical and psychological condition of the employee												
The employee's opinion about the organization												
Corruption, nepotism, favoritism												
Social responsibility criticism: staff attitude												
<i>Source:</i> Compiled by the authors.												

**Table 20.** Behavior of socially responsible organization and socially responsible employee with respect to work experience: results of different groups of companies.

ScalesSubscales	18–23 years N = 258	24–29 years N = 523	30–39 years N = 464	40–49 years N = 320	50 years to up to retirement age N = 149	ANOVA verification results	
						F	p
<b>Behavior of a socially responsible organization</b>							
Market responsibility (services and their quality)	–0.25	0.05	0.00	0.07	0.10	5.194	<b>0.000**</b>
Market responsibility (consumer information, health, and safety)	–0.27	0.08	0.07	–0.02	0.01	6.210	<b>0.000**</b>
Environment protection 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	<b>0.000**</b>
Responsibility in relations with society	–0.14	–0.02	0.06	0.01	0.09	2.019	0.089
<b>Behavior of a socially responsible employee</b>							
Intentions to leave work	–0.30	–0.05	0.07	0.17	0.11	9.469	<b>0.000**</b>
Uncertainty and lack of information at work	–0.23	–0.06	0.09	0.15	0.00	6.934	<b>0.000**</b>
General physical and psychological condition of the employee	–0.21	–0.08	0.08	0.19	–0.02	7.285	<b>0.000**</b>
The employee's opinion about the organization	–0.12	0.01	–0.02	0.01	0.21	2.539	<b>0.038*</b>
Corruption, nepotism, favoritism	0.00	–0.09	0.03	0.09	–0.01	1.812	0.124
Social responsibility criticism: staff attitude	–0.02	–0.08	0.00	0.08	0.14	2.117	0.076
<i>Source:</i> Compiled by the authors.							
*Statistical significance level $\alpha = 0.05$ .							
**Statistical significance level $\alpha = 0.01$ .							

**Table 21.** Behavior of socially responsible organization and socially responsible employee with respect to employees' age: general results.

show that respondent's age according to this sociodemographic aspect has significant influence. Among the youngest respondents (18–23 years old), z-estimates are negative in the first and second group of companies. This part of population consists of respondents who recently completed education (the level of education will be detailed below) and naturally have the minimum work experience. One could assume that this is influenced by the formed provisions clash with practice during the learning period, but statistically significant and reliable differences identified between groups of companies mean different environments with

Scales and subscales Groups of companies	First group					ANOVA verification results	Second group					ANOVA verification results
Employees' age	18–23 years	24–29 years	30–39 years	40–49 years	50 y.-up to retirement age		18–23 years	24–29 years	30–39 years	40–49 years	50 y.-up to retirement age	
Sample	N = 116	N = 347	N = 274	N = 126	N = 48		N = 142	N = 176	N = 190	N = 194	N = 104	
Behavior of a socially responsible organization												
Market responsibility (services and their quality)	−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**
Market responsibility (consumer information, health and safety)												
Environment protection responsibility												
Responsibility in relations with employees												
Responsibility in relations with society												
Behavior of a socially responsible employee												
Intentions to leave work	−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												
General physical and psychological condition of the employee												
The employees' opinion about the organization												
Corruption, nepotism, favoritism												
Social responsibility criticism: staff attitude												
Source: Compiled by the authors.												

**Table 22.** Behavior of socially responsible organization and socially responsible employee with respect to employees' age: results of different groups of companies.

different corporate social responsibility policies where the employees work. Interestingly, z-estimates in the first group of companies among older employees (from 40 years old) are exceptionally negative on the scale of behavior of socially responsible organization, and the positive ones are revealed only on the scale of behavior of socially responsible employee. In other words, the youngest and older respondents were critical of the activities of companies in which they work in the context of social responsibility; the age affects the “adaptation” to the current situation. In addition, some may also be affected by the company’s management attitude to different ages of employees, which is reflected in their assessments.

A different situation is highlighted in the second group of companies where z-estimates, though not high but positive, are found among employees who have reached the age of 30 years and more. This suggests that employees of different ages treat the expression of corporate social responsibility in practice rather alike.

**Table 23**, including both groups of companies, shows the results of estimates distribution by education.

According to the Tukey’s HSD test, statistically significant differences ( $p < 0.001$ ) are identified among the groups (with university, postsecondary (higher), vocational, and secondary/primary education) z-estimates. Though not high, but positive z-estimates are distinguished among university and postsecondary (higher) education. In many cases according to the subscales of behavior of socially responsible organization and socially responsible employee scales, the highest positive z-estimates are among the employees with university education; these estimates are becoming worse when “the education becomes lower.” The most significant negative z-estimates are seen among employees with secondary and primary education. In other words, among the employees whose education determines the lowest rank in the organizations. These results are partly related to the negative z-estimates between the employees employed in production and the youngest by age. Since education has an impact on the employee’s position in companies, these factors together may show the signs of different behavior with different rank employees. This is a sensitive area of corporate social responsibility, occurring in relations with employees as stakeholders, and generally having an impact on their attitude to the workplace.

Trends, showing a different situation in the area of corporate social responsibility, remain when comparing the first and second group of companies according to the respondents’ education. Reliable, statistically significant differences are identified between the two groups of companies. Z-estimates values, both positive and negative, differ significantly depending on the employees’ education. For example, in both groups of companies between university-educated respondents z-estimates are positive in both scales, but in the second group of companies their expression is higher. On the other hand, in the first group of companies, negative z-estimates are revealed among employees with vocational, secondary and primary education, and the biggest negative z-estimates in the second group of companies are among the employees with only secondary and primary education. However, even the negative expressions of z-estimates in the second group of companies are more favorable than in the first group of respondents having the same education. For example, according to the scale of behavior of a socially responsible employee, z-estimate is  $-0.46$ , which is the worst. Attention

Scales Subscales	University N = 525	Postsecondary (higher)N = 272	Vocational N = 414	Secondary/primary N = 506	ANOVA verification results	
					F	p
Behavior of a socially responsible organization						
Market responsibility (services and their quality)	0.19	0.11	-0.11	-0.17	14.497	0.000**
Market responsibility (consumer information, health and safety)	0.17	0.15	-0.02	-0.24	17.763	0.000**
Environment protection 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 relations with society	0.17	0.08	-0.10	-0.14	10.610	0.000**
Behavior of a socially responsible employee						
Intentions to leave work	0.22	0.18	-0.09	-0.25	23.606	0.000**
Uncertainty and lack of information at work	0.21	0.10	-0.01	-0.26	21.180	0.000**
General physical and psychological condition of the employee	0.14	0.21	-0.01	-0.26	19.255	0.000**
The employee's 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**
Social responsibility criticism: staff attitude	0.23	0.07	-0.08	-0.21	18.095	0.000**
Source: Compiled by the authors.						
*Statistical significance level $\alpha = 0.05$ .						
**Statistical significance level $\alpha = 0.01$ .						

**Table 23.** Behavior of socially responsible organization and socially responsible employee with respect to employees' education: general results.

Scales and subscales Groups of Companies	First group				ANOVA verification results	Second group				ANOVA verification results
Employees' education	University	Postsecondary (higher)	Vocational	Secondary/ Primary		University	Postsecondary (higher)	Vocational	Secondary/ Primary	
Sample	N = 320	N = 138	N = 205	N = 248		N = 205	N = 134	N = 209	N = 258	
<b>Behavior of a socially responsible organization</b>										
Market responsibility (services and their quality)	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**
Market responsibility (consumer information, health, and safety)										
Environment protection responsibility										
Responsibility in relations with employees										
Responsibility in relations with society										
<b>Behavior of a socially responsible employee</b>										
Intentions to leave work	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										
General physical and psychological condition of the employee										
The employee's opinion about the organization										
Corruption, nepotism, favoritism										
Social responsibility criticism: staff attitude										
Source: Compiled by the authors.										

**Table 24.** Behavior of a socially responsible organization and a socially responsible employee with respect to employees' education: results of different groups of companies.

should be paid to z-estimates showing the reactions of employees in the second group of companies. Significant differences of estimates among the employees with the highest and lowest education are symptomatic and show a different position of employees in companies.

Behavior of socially responsible organization, as well as socially responsible employee in some respects differs depending on the employees' sex. **Table 25** presents the research results that were verified by the Student's criterion (t test).

With respect to sex, statistically significant differences were found in these subscales: responsibility in relations with employees—this indicator is negative for females, whereas for males it is positive; the employee's physical and psychological general condition—females feel much worse both physically and psychologically than males in the organization. With the help of the statements in the subscale *The employee's opinion about the organization*, it was determined that males have a negative opinion about the organization, whereas the females have positive opinion. The employees' attitude to negative aspects of social responsibility (subscales *Social responsibility criticism*) again stood out in terms of sex: males demonstrate a critical attitude towards social responsibility, in the choices of their answers negativity dominates; females: on the contrary, assess it more positively.

ScalesSubscales	Males N = 723	Females N = 994	T test verification results	
			t	p
<b>Behavior of a socially responsible organization</b>				
Market responsibility (services and their quality)	-0.05	0.03	-1.601	0.110
Market responsibility (consumer information, health, and safety)	-0.01	0.01	-0.407	0.684
Environment protection responsibility	0.03	-0.02	1.195	0.232
Responsibility in relations with employees	0.09	-0.06	3.108	<b>0.002**</b>
Responsibility in relations with society	0.03	-0.03	1.220	0.223
<b>Behavior of a socially responsible employee</b>				
Intentions to leave work	-0.01	0.01	-0.530	0.596
Uncertainty and lack of information at work	0.05	-0.04	1.860	0.063
General physical and psychological condition of the employee	0.06	-0.04	2.152	<b>0.032*</b>
The employee's opinion about the organization	-0.07	0.05	-2.559	<b>0.011*</b>
Corruption, nepotism, favoritism	0.01	-0.01	0.282	0.778
Social responsibility criticism: staff attitude	-0.07	0.05	-2.370	<b>0.018*</b>

Source: Compiled by the authors.

\*Statistical significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

\*\*Statistical significance level  $\alpha = 0.01$ .

**Table 25.** Behavior of a socially responsible organization and a socially responsible employee with respect to employees' sex: general results.

Research results presented according to separate groups of companies (**Table 26**) indicate that statistically significant differences ( $p < 0.001$ ) are only on the scale of behavior of a socially responsible employee. In this case, again, z-estimates of the answers of employees of the first and second groups of companies stand out, which in the case of the first group of companies (both males and females) are purely negative, and in the second group of companies are positive. Assessing in the context of these and previous results, it can be said that social responsibility policy differences of both groups of companies could have higher values than the respondents' sexuality.

Scales and subscales Groups of companies	First group		T test results	Second group		T test results
Sex	Males	Females		Males	Females	
Sample	N = 460	N = 451		N = 263	N = 543	
<b>Behavior of a socially responsible organization</b>						
Market responsibility (services and their quality)	-0.01	0.00	t = -0.118 p = 0.906	0.09	-0.03	t = 1.646 p = 0.100
Market responsibility (consumer information, health, and safety)						
Environment protection responsibility						
Responsibility in relations with employees						
Responsibility in relations with society						
<b>Behavior of a socially responsible employee</b>						
Intentions to leave work	-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						
General physical and psychological condition of the employee						
The employee's opinion about the organization						
Corruption, nepotism, favoritism						
Social responsibility criticism: staff attitude						

Source: Compiled by the authors.  
\*Statistical significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$ .  
\*\*Statistical significance level  $\alpha = 0.01$ .

**Table 26.** Behavior of a socially responsible organization and a socially responsible employee with respect to employees' sex: results of different groups of companies.

**Table 27** presents general comparison of both groups of companies with respect to behavior of organization and employee.

Reliable and statistically significant differences ( $p < 0.001$ ) are set in seven subscales, but the values of z-estimates, either positive or negative, are not significant. Comparing the two groups of companies, it is observed that in the first group of companies according to 11 subscales of social responsibility, 8 z-estimates are negative. The positive z-estimates are determined only in the scales of responsibility in relations with employees, uncertainty and lack of information at work (the respondents confirm that there is no such lack) and the corruption, nepotism, and favoritism. In the second group of companies, while comparing with the first, the indicators are much better, which is confirmed by the number of positive z-estimates in the subscales, i.e., of 11 criteria only 3 are with a minus sign: responsibility in relations with employees, uncertainty and lack of information at work, as well as the corruption, nepotism, and favoritism. It is these criteria in the first group of companies that are positive, although in the case of the latter subscale, the differences are not statistically significant. On the other hand, the subscale such as *social responsibility criticism*, expressing the views of employees' attitude to corporate social responsibility, could be influenced by statistically significant differences found on the scale of *behavior of socially responsible organization*.

Scales Subscales	First group N = 911	Second group N = 806	T test verification results	
			t	p
<b>Behavior of a socially responsible organization</b>				
Market responsibility (services and their quality)	-0.21	0.23	-9.325	<b>0.000**</b>
Market responsibility (consumer information, health and safety)	-0.10	0.11	-4.412	<b>0.000**</b>
Environment protection responsibility	-0.01	0.01	-0.274	0.784
Responsibility in relations with employees	0.29	-0.33	13.494	<b>0.000**</b>
Responsibility in relations with society	-0.03	0.03	-1.111	0.267
<b>Behavior of a socially responsible employee</b>				
Intentions to leave work	-0.07	0.08	-3.033	<b>0.002**</b>
Uncertainty and lack of information at work	0.10	-0.11	4.480	<b>0.000**</b>
General physical and psychological condition of the employee	-0.03	0.04	-1.539	0.124
The employee's opinion about the organization	-0.24	0.27	-10.954	<b>0.000**</b>
Corruption, nepotism, favoritism	0.02	-0.02	0.956	0.339
Social responsibility criticism: staff attitude	-0.24	0.27	-11.077	<b>0.000**</b>

Source: Compiled by the authors.

\*Statistical significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

\*\*Statistical significance level  $\alpha = 0.01$ .

**Table 27.** Comparison of common behavior of a socially responsible organization and a socially responsible employee between two groups of companies.

In conclusion, it could be stated that statistically significant differences between the two groups of companies emerged on a number of sociodemographic criteria. Besides, more detailed analysis indicated that situation of the respondents who are working in manufacturing, are younger and have lower education, is significantly worse, which might have influence on negative assessments as well.

## Author details

Pranas Žukauskas<sup>1</sup>, Jolita Vveinhardt<sup>1\*</sup> and Regina Andriukaitienė<sup>2,3</sup>

\*Address all correspondence to: jolita.vveinhardt@gmail.com

1 Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania

2 Marijampolė College, Lithuania

3 Lithuanian Sports University, Lithuania

## References

- [1] Franěk M, Mohelská H, Zubr V, Bachmann P, Sokolová M. Organizational and sociodemographic determinants of job satisfaction in the Czech Republic. *SAGE Open*. 2014;**4**(3):1-12. DOI: 10.1177/2158244014552426
- [2] Yang J, Matz-Costa C. Age diversity in the workplace: The effect of relational age within supervisor–employee dyads on employees' work engagement. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development*. 2017. DOI: 10.1177/0091415017709798
- [3] Picakciefe M, Acar G, Colak Z, Kilic I. The relationship between sociodemographic characteristics, work conditions, and level of “mobbing” of health workers in primary health care. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 2015;**32**(3):373-398. DOI: 10.1177/0886260515586360
- [4] Metzner RJ, Fischer FM. Fatigue and workability in Brazilian textile companies in different corporate social responsibility score groups. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*. 2010;**40**(10):289-294. DOI: 10.1016/j.ergon.2010.01.008
- [5] Gond J-P, El Akremi A, Swaen V, Babu N. The psychological microfoundations of corporate social responsibility: A person-centric systematic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. 2017;**38**(2):225-246. DOI: 10.1002/job.2170
- [6] Kukanja M, Planinc T, Šuligoj M. Influence of managers' demographic characteristics on CSR practices in the restaurant industry: The case of Slovenia. *Tourism and Hospitality Management*. 2016;**22**(2):151-172. DOI: 10.20867/thm.22.2.2

- [7] Vveinhardt J, ŽP. Mobingas darbuotojų santykiuose individas, organizacija, sociumas. Monografija. [Mobbing in Employee Relations: Individual, Organisation, Society. Monograph]. Kaunas: Vytautas Magnus University; 2012. p. 456 in Lithuanian
- [8] Vveinhardt J, Andriukaitienė R. Prevention of Mobbing as Psycho-Social Stressor in the Application of Corporate Social Responsibility. 1st ed. Lietuvos sporto universitetas: Kaunas; 2016. p. 206. DOI: 978-609-8200-05-8 Mobingo, kaip psichosocialinio stresoriaus, prevencija įgyvendinant įmonių socialinę atsakomybę, in Lithuanian
- [9] Brazienė R, Dorelaitienė A. Transition of youth from education. Socialiniai mokslai. Social Sciences. 2012;3(77):30-40. DOI: 10.5755/j01.ss.77.3.2768

