



**THE REASONS OF LACK OF POLISH YOUNG
POTENTIAL EMPLOYEES' INTEREST IN UNIVERSITIES
AS EMPLOYERS IN THE CONTEXT OF PERCEPTION
OF PEOPLE WORKING IN THESE ORGANIZATIONS**



Open Access

THE REASONS OF LACK OF POLISH YOUNG POTENTIAL EMPLOYEES' INTEREST IN UNIVERSITIES AS EMPLOYERS IN THE CONTEXT OF PERCEPTION OF PEOPLE WORKING IN THESE ORGANIZATIONS

Professor Agnieszka Izabela Baruk

Lodz University of Technology, Faculty of Management and Production Engineering
Department of Management Systems and Innovations, Institute of Innovation and Marketing
agnieszka.baruk@poczta.onet.pl • ORCID 0000-0003-2864-509X

Anna Goliszek, Ph.D.

University of Life Sciences in Lublin, Department of Management and Marketing
anna.goliszek@up.lublin.pl
DOI: 10.2478/minib-2019-0036



Summary

The article has a theoretical and empirical character. Identifying the internal structure of reasons of lack of Polish young potential employees' interest in universities as employers was the main goal of this paper. To prepare its theoretical part the method of cognitive-critical analysis of world literature on marketing and management was applied. The results of this analysis show that the aspects connected with the mentioned reasons have not been studied yet. The more the opinions about the way of perception of universities' employees in the comparison of other organizations' employees have not been taken into account in the analysis. So one can talk about the existence of a cognitive gap and an empirical gap in this scope. Striving to reduce these gaps the empirical studies were conducted. The research covered representatives of Polish young potential employees. Gathered primary data were statistically analysed applying the following research methods and tests: exploratory factor analysis and Kruskal-Wallis test. The results of these analyses show that the opinions on relative perception of universities' employees decide about differences in the structure of reasons of lack of interest in universities as employers. But the mentioned opinions are the element differentiating in a statistically significant way only one reason.

Keywords: employee, potential employee, employer, university, perceiving, image

JEL kod: M31; M54

Introduction

The basis of any modern marketing concept is assigning a key market role to a buyer (J. Gamble, A. Gilmore, D. McCartan-Quinn, P. Durkan, 2011) who, like any other entity, must be treated ethically (cf. E. Rudawska, 2017). As a recipient of the values addressed to it by the bidder and as a verifier of the compliance of these values with its own expectations, the buyer is the entity determining the possibilities of the bidder's functioning, and even more so the chances for its development. No bidder can function without buyers whose attitudes (favourable or unfavourable to the bidder) and market behaviours (favourable or unfavourable to the bidder) co-create a marketing environment conducive to the development of the organisation or hindering or even preventing its development.

Therefore, an extremely important element of marketing activities undertaken by contemporary bidders operating on the consumer market is the skilful shaping of the attitudes and behaviours of final buyers through building partnership relations with them (cf. M.C. Ratković, N.D. Krasulja, |N. Garaèa, 2013). The starting point in this process should be the adoption of the assumption of the purchaser's equality, which results in treating the purchaser as a valuable business partner. In accordance with modern marketing concepts, the scope of the role played by the final buyer is much larger, which results, among other things, from changes in the scope of marketing itself (cf. M. Ratković, G. Grubić, S. Tasić, 2012). Apart from purchasing behaviours which characterise the so-called passive buyer whose market role is limited only to the role of the customer, the contemporary buyer is more strongly involved in various forms of market activity (C.M. Sashi, 2012). First of all, they more and more often undertake various out-of-purchase behaviours including communication and creative behaviours. Their manifestation makes the buyer an active participant of marketing activities at practically every stage of the marketing process (cf. S. Seran, M. Izvercian, 2014; E. Ziemba, M. Eisenhardt, 2015) by conveying their opinions, including spontaneously, as well as by sharing their creativity, the effect of which is a collection of intangible and/or tangible assets that definitely better meet the growing requirements of the buyers.

This, of course, also applies to the values that make up the personal offer (cf. A. Baruk, 2017) whose perceived quality determines whether a given organisation is considered an attractive employer or not. It should be stressed that the quality assessment of this offer by the purchasers is of paramount importance, not the way it is assessed by the bidder alone. The purchaser's perspective is therefore more important than the bidder's perspective, as it is in the subjective assessment of the purchaser that a specific offer must be sufficiently valuable for the purchaser to be considered as better within a certain period of time than other offers.

This applies to both material and non-material features of the personnel offer, since their combined perception determines the specific image of a given organisation as an employer. The image is formed not only on the basis of one's own experience (general nature and experience related to a particular organization), but also the experience of other people whose opinions are often no less important for a specific buyer than their own judgment. This is particularly visible in the case of people who enjoy authority (the so-called authority effect — cf. K. White, B. Simpson, J. J. Argo, 2014), admired people who want to imitate (the so-called echo effect — cf. K. White, B. Simpson, J. J. Argo, 2014), or people close to whom they trust the most. The collection of opinions of other entities leads to the formation of a specific general perception of a given brand, institution, industry or people working in a specific type of organization. Therefore, it is of key importance to skillfully shape formal marketing communication activities (cf. M. Išoraite, 2016) and to constantly ensure that the content of the marketing message fully corresponds to the activities undertaken by the employer in practice.

In the case of employer-employee relations, this is an extremely important element for any employer, but it is particularly important in relation to universities. They must compete for employees not only with other universities (J. Chluska, W. Szczepaniak, 2016), but also with entities representing other industries. Taking into account the nature of the university, effective competition for the best employees is extremely important, even crucial, for the development of these institutions. However, it is significantly hindered for two basic reasons: legal and formal conditions under which Polish universities, especially state ones, operate; historical and mental conditions.

The conditions in the latter group are particularly important for the subject matter of this article. In the past, universities in Poland did not assign much importance to undertaking comprehensive activities in the field of personnel policy, focusing primarily on activities leading to the attraction of candidates for students. Unfortunately, this approach is still visible, although each university plays different market roles, which means that it should strive to achieve different goals (cf. N. Hsieh, 2015) corresponding to the specificity of particular roles. The university is not only a provider of educational, scientific or research values, but also an employer. Therefore, it should have a well thought-out long-term policy of attracting the best candidates for employees, as well as keeping them.

In other words, like any business process, personal activity should be appropriately shaped by using the assumptions of modern management concepts (cf. P. K. Singh, 2012) in accordance with the marketing approach. This requires undertaking actions expected by potential and current employees, which would be flexibly adjusted to changes occurring in their requirements, e.g. by co-creating these actions together with employees. Only then can the effect of perceiving scientists as an attractive employer be achieved. Its presentation is necessary in order to effectively encourage young participants of the labour market to choose universities as places of employment. Admittedly, more and more universities in Poland obtain the 'HR Excellence in Research' certificate (cf. S. Jarosławska-Sobór, 2017), but in practice such actions do not influence the perception of young potential university employees as employers. They do not belong to the values that they expect from future employers.

Unfortunately, still within the framework of both theoretical considerations and empirical research, not to mention practical actions taken by Polish universities, there is a clear lack of recognition of the fact that they are also employers. There is still no research on issues related to shaping employer-employee relations in the case of universities, including research on building their image as employers. These issues are still analysed primarily in relation to manufacturing or service enterprises (e.g. banks), mainly in the context of building their brand as employers. For example, values that attract employees and/or are conducive to their maintenance were analysed by S.D.S. Tikson, N. Hamid and R. Mardiana

(2018); G. Davies (2008); H. Gilani and L. Gilani. Cunningham (2017); E. Alniacik and U. Alniacik (2012); B. J. Arachchige and A. Robertson (2011); I. Alniacik and U. Arachchige (2011). Bakanauskiene, R. Bendaravièiene and L. Barkauske (2017); G. Van Hoyer, T. Bas, S. Cromheecke and F. Lievens (2013); M. K. Biswas and D. Suar (2016); L. Eger, M. Micik, M. Gangur and P. Øehoø (2019); or N. K. Biswas and D. Gangur (2013). Kashive and V. T. Khanna (2017). However, all these surveys were conducted only for employers who are companies. In the literature devoted to the role of employer one can only indicate single items in which the university is analyzed in this role (K. Wojtaszczyk, 2008). However, the research presented in them does not concern the reasons of lack of interest in working at a university and its perception as an employer. The lack of interest in Poland in issues related to the perception of employer at the university is also evidenced by the scope of research conducted among students by various institutions related to the labour market. For example, in the report "Starting on the labour market 2016" (Report "Starting on the Labour Market 2016"), in the case of a question about student career plans among the multiple-choice answers there was no opportunity to work at a university or other research and / or scientific organization.

On the basis of the results of the cognitive-critical analysis of the world literature on this subject, we can thus talk about the existence of a cognitive and research gap in this area. Reducing the identified gaps by determining the internal structure of the reasons for the lack of interest in universities as jobs among young potential employees was the main objective of this paper. In addition, the article also aims to achieve the following research objectives:

- C1 — to identify opinions of young people on the perception of university employees in Poland in comparison with the perception of employees employed in other institutions;
- C2 — to determine the internal structure of reasons for young people's lack of interest in taking up employment at a university, depending on their opinion on the perception of university staff in comparison with the perception of persons employed in other institutions;

- C3 — to compare the internal structure of reasons for the lack of interest of young people in taking up employment at universities, who believe that university employees are better perceived in Poland than those working in other institutions, with the internal structure of reasons for the lack of interest of young people in taking up employment at universities, who believe that university employees are perceived in Poland in the same way;
- C4 — to identify the occurrence of statistically significant differences in the reasons for young people's lack of interest in taking up employment at universities depending on their opinion on the perception of university staff in comparison with the perception of persons employed in other institutions.

Two following research hypotheses have been verified in the process of achieving the above mentioned objectives:

- H1 — the internal structure of reasons for the lack of interest of young people in taking up employment at universities, who believe that university employees are better perceived in Poland than those working in other institutions, is different than the internal structure of reasons for the lack of interest of young people in taking up employment at universities, who believe that university employees are perceived in the same way in Poland;
- H2 — opinions on the perception of university staff as compared to the perception of persons employed in other institutions constitute a feature differentiating the reasons for young people's lack of interest in taking up employment in universities.

General characteristics of empirical studies

In order to achieve the objectives of this article and to verify the formulated research hypotheses, empirical research¹, was conducted using the survey method to collect primary data. So far, 3 editions of these surveys have been carried out. During the first edition of the research, 150

students completing their studies at the 1st or 2nd degree of full-time studies as potential employees were covered, while in the 2nd and 3rd edition of the research sample size was 250 people each, representing the aforementioned segment of the labour market².

The research was of a direct nature, requiring personal contact between the researcher and the examined subjects. The first edition of the research was conducted in the first half of 2016, the second edition in the first quarter of 2018 and the third one in the first quarter of 2019. All questionnaires of the survey were qualified for quantitative analysis, which was possible thanks to the use of face-to-face contact with respondents. The collected primary data were subjected to quantitative analysis, using the method of comparative analysis, exploratory factor analysis and Kruskal-Wallis independence test.

During each edition of the survey respondents were presented with a set of the same 12 statements reflecting the reasons for the lack of interest in the university as a workplace. They were distinguished on the basis of the results of cognitive-critical analysis of the literature on the subject and the results of unstructured interviews preceding the first edition of the research. Each of these statements was to be assessed by the respondents in a five-stage Likert scale, in which the assessment of 5 meant definitely yes, 4 — yes, 3 — neither yes nor no, 2 — rather no, while 1 — definitely not. The use of such a scale is a necessary condition for the use of the factorial analysis method. In order to expand and deepen the analysis, in the third edition of the survey respondents were asked about their opinions on the perception of persons working at universities in Poland in comparison with the perception of persons working in other institutions. Answers given to this question during the statistical analysis were used to check the variety of reasons for the lack of interest in the university as an employer.

Factor analysis allowed for an in-depth analysis of the collected primary data. It is used to reduce the number of variables constituting primary data obtained from surveys and to detect structures in the relationships between these variables, in other words, to classify them (H. Abdi, L. J. Williams, 2010; M. Sztemberg-Lewandowska, 2008). This analysis was therefore used to reduce the number of variables affecting the category under study, i.e. the reasons for the lack of interest in the university as an employer and to detect internal interdependencies in the relationships between these variables.

The main components method was used to isolate the factors, but it was important to determine their number. In order to determine the number of common factors (the so-called main components), the Kaiser's criterion technique was applied, which consists in leaving only those factors that have their own values greater than 1. Each such factor explains a certain level of general variability of the considered system, determined by the percentage of variance, which can be interpreted as a measure of the explanation of the phenomenon. The factors were rotated using the standardized varimax method. Within the framework of particular factors, variables with the highest factor loads in relation to a given factor were distinguished (the value ≥ 0.7 was assumed).

Factor analysis identifies hidden factors, which include features responsible for perception through their prism of the problem described in the question. Factor analysis, however, does not allow to find an answer whether the differentiation in terms of separating particular groups (e.g. perception of people working at a university) is statistically significant enough to be able to say that the opinion of respondents determined by the analysed answer is significantly different. This question is answered by the Kruskal-Wallis test (KW), which is an unparametric equivalent of ANOVA.

In order to find an answer to the question whether the differentiation in terms of separating particular groups (e.g. separated by opinions on the perception of people working at a university) is statistically significant enough to be able to say that the respondents' opinions determined by the analysed answer are significantly different, the Kruskal-Wallis test (KW) was applied.

From the point of view of statistical criteria, in the case of the KW test, the data do not have to meet many requirements. The only requirements are (<http://www.statystyka.az.pl/test-anova-kruskala-wallisa.php>; http://www.statystycy.pl/t4997_1_test_rangowy_kruskala-wallisa.php):

- the dependent variable should be measured on at least an ordinal scale (it can also be measured on a quantitative scale),
- observations in the analysed groups should be independent of each other, which means that a person in one group should not be in another compared group at the same time (this requirement is met by dichotomous questions allowing to divide respondents into two separate groups and single -choice questions).

The Kruskal-Wallis test as a non-parametric equivalent of one-way variance analysis is therefore used when the data does not meet the requirements for similar parametric tests and can be ordered according to specific criteria. It consists of verifying whether the number of independent results from the group comes from the same population or from a population with the same median. Individual samples do not have to be of the same size. Input data is a n -elementary statistical sample divided into 'k' separate survey groups of n_1 to n_k .

An interpretation of the test may consist only in comparing the 'p' value with the assumed materiality level (usually 0.05) or in analysing the values of test statistics in case it is necessary to assess the 'power/ escalation' of differences between groups. The high values of the test statistics indicate that there are differences in individual groups (i.e. against the hypothesis of equality in individual groups), and the higher the values, the greater the difference.

Statistical analysis of the collected primary data was performed with the use of IBM SPSS Statistics Ver. 22.

Results of empirical studies

In the first stage of the analysis of the collected primary data, the aim was to determine the specificity of the internal structure of the reasons for the lack of interest in the university as an employer taking into account the criterion of respondents' opinions on the perception of people working at the university in Poland. For this purpose, the exploratory factor analysis method was applied to the identified causes using it separately for each of the following 3 groups of persons: the total number of respondents; persons who believe that university employees are perceived in Poland in the same way as employees of other organisations; persons who believe that university employees are perceived in Poland better than employees of other organisations. Admittedly, the majority of respondents were of the opinion that persons working at universities are better perceived in Poland than employees of other institutions, but this percentage only slightly exceeded half, amounting to 53.2%. Slightly less than half of the

respondents (46.1%) believed that people working in universities are perceived in the same way as employees of other institutions, and only 0.7% of the respondents expressed the opinion that the perception of university employees is worse than that of employees of other employers. Due to the fact that the percentage of respondents expressing opinions about the worse perception was very small, for the needs of the analysis these answers were merged with the answers about the same way of perceiving university employees as employees of other institutions.

For each of the 3 analysed groups of respondents, this factor includes 3 variables whose factor loads are at least 0.7, while for all respondents (Table 2) and for those who believe that university employees are better perceived than employees of other organisations (Table 4), it is formed by identical variables, reflecting an unfavourable image of the university based on their own experiences. However, in the case of persons who believe that university employees are perceived in the same way as employees of other organisations (Table 6), the first factor includes 3 completely different variables, reflecting insecurity in the non-material and material dimension. The variables constituting the first factor for all respondents and for those who believe that university staff are better perceived are part of the second factor distinguished for those who express an opinion on the identical perception of university staff. In the case of both other groups of respondents, the second factor consists of, respectively, 2 or 1 variable related to insecurity, although it concerns only the non-material aspect of security.

Table 1. Hierarchy of factors due to their own values determined on the basis of Kaiser's criterion
(for all respondents)

Factor	Own value	Accumulated own value	% of total own value (variant)	Accumulated % of own value
1	2.380	2.380	19.835	19.835
2	2.200	4.580	18.335	38.170
3	1.930	6.510	16.087	54.257
4	1.196	7.706	9.965	64.222

Source: Own calculations based on research results.

The third factor for all respondents and for those who believe that university staff are perceived better includes 1 variable reflecting less leisure time, and for those who believe that university staff are perceived in the same way it includes 2 variables reflecting a failure to meet social and psychological needs that leads to an unfavourable perception of a person taking up a job in the university. It is worth noting that for all the respondents in the fourth factor structure there was no variable with a factor load of at least 0.7. However, one of the variables within this factor had a factor load with a high negative value. On the other hand, for those who believe that people working at a university in Poland are perceived in the same way, the fourth factor includes only a variable reflecting a smaller amount of free time. It should be stressed, however, that the fourth factor explained the smallest part of the total variability of the analysed phenomenon than the other factors, both for all the respondents and for those who believe that university employees are perceived in the same way as those employed in other places.

**Table 2. Results of factor analysis of the reasons for the lack of interest in the university as a workplace
(for all respondents)**

Variable	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
Negative general impressions from studies	<u>0.869</u>	0.125	0.201	0.043
Negative experiences as a student related to contacts with lecturers	<u>0.857</u>	0.110	0.074	0.058
Willingness to break off any contacts with universities	<u>0.762</u>	-0.124	0.007	0.042
Need to share your valuable knowledge with others	0.419	0.184	0.377	-0.111
Uncertainty of keeping the job and job instability	0.086	<u>0.822</u>	0.182	-0.042
Lack of career prospects	-0.031	<u>0.812</u>	0.034	0.085
Low pay	0.112	0.699	-0.052	0.204
Low social prestige	-0.010	0.477	0.444	0.358
Less free time than in other places	-0.038	-0.037	<u>0.783</u>	-0.228
Shame about the workplace	0.185	-0.006	0.677	0.488
Fast burning of professional and life energy	0.277	0.165	0.653	0.021
Willingness to use the knowledge and skills acquired during the studies to work in a place other than a university	-0.028	-0.208	0.104	-0.841

Source: Own calculations based on research results.

**Table 3. Hierarchy of factors due to their own values determined on the basis of Kaiser's criterion
(for respondents who believe that university employees are better perceived in Poland
than employees of other organisations)**

Factor	Own value	Accumulated own value	% of total own value (variant)	Accumulated % of own value
1	2.566	2.566	21.383	21.383
2	2.352	4.918	19.601	40.984
3	1.722	6.640	14.350	55.334

Źródło: Own calculations based on research results.

Table 4. Results of factorial analysis of the reasons for the lack of interest of respondents in universities as a workplace (for respondents who believe that university employees are better perceived in Poland than employees of other organisations)

Variable	Factor		
	1	2	3
Negative experiences as a student related to contacts with lecturers	0.874	0.064	0.040
Negative general impressions from studies	0.853	0.057	0.242
Willingness to break off any contacts with universities	0.755	–0.114	–0.005
Need to share your valuable knowledge with others	0.509	0.137	0.200
Lack of career prospects	–0.085	0.730	–0.093
Low social prestige	0.153	0.698	0.122
Uncertainty of keeping the job and job instability	0.020	0.663	0.352
Low pay	0.198	0.627	0.051
Willingness to use the knowledge and skills acquired during the studies to work in a place other than a university	0.066	–0.466	–0.003
Less free time than in other places	0.007	–0.120	0.893
Fast burning of professional and life energy	0.255	0.456	0.617
Shame about the workplace	0.326	0.146	0.542

Source: Own calculations based on research results.

Table 5. Hierarchy of factors due to their own values determined on the basis of Kaiser's criterion (for respondents who believe that university employees in Poland are perceived in the same way as employees of other organisations)

Factor	Own value	Accumulated own value	% of total own value (variant)	Accumulated % of own value
1	2.634	2.634	21.950	21.950
2	2.161	4.795	18.009	39.959
3	2.081	6.876	17.344	57.303
4	1.422	8.298	11.854	69.157

Source: Own calculations based on research results.

Table 6. Results of factorial analysis of the reasons for the lack of interest of respondents in universities as a workplace (for respondents who believe that university employees in Poland are equally perceived as employees of other organisations)

Variable	Factor			
	1	2	3	4
Lack of career prospects	0.852	0.043	0.111	0.055
Uncertainty of keeping the job and job instability	0.832	0.131	0.131	-0.078
Low pay	0.795	0.049	-0.122	-0.147
Low social status	0.595	-0.082	0.300	0.519
Negative general impressions from studies	0.167	0.848	0.273	0.028
Willingness to break off any contacts with universities	-0.085	0.798	0.010	0.018
Negative experiences as a student related to contacts with lecturers	0.133	0.798	0.181	0.029
Shame about the workplace	0.187	-0.012	0.808	0.219
Fast burning of professional and life energy	-0.133	0.288	0.763	0.042
Need to share your valuable knowledge with others	0.106	0.205	0.631	-0.027
Less free time than in other places	0.015	0.023	0.287	0.830
Willingness to use the knowledge and skills acquired during the studies to work in a place other than a university	-0.336	0.118	-0.351	0.617

Source: Own calculations based on research results.

It is worth reminding that in the case of factor analysis in relation to market attitudes or behaviours, the identified factors may be interpreted as segments of respondents (cf. B. Horn, W. Huang). Representatives of particular segments show homogeneous opinions on the causes of reluctance to take up employment at universities (Table 7). Clear differences are visible, however, between representatives of segments separated according to their opinions on the perception of university staff in comparison with employees of other organisations. The statement contained in the research hypothesis H1 in the case of respondents turned out to be true.

Table 7. Identified segments of respondents due to their opinions
on the perception of university employees in Poland

Segment	Segment characteristics		
	for all respondents	for people who believe that university employees are better perceived in Poland than employees of other organisations	for people who believe that university employees in Poland are perceived in the same way as employees of other organisations
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative general impressions from studies • Negative experiences as a student related to contacts with lecturers • Willingness to break off any contacts with universities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative experiences as a student related to contacts with lecturers • Negative general impressions from studies • Willingness to break off any contacts with universities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of career prospects • Uncertainty about keeping the job and job instability • Low pay
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uncertainty about keeping the job and job instability • Lack of career prospects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of career prospects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative general impressions from studies • Willingness to break off any contacts with universities • Negative experiences as a student related to contacts with lecturers
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less free time than in other places 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less free time than in other places 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shame about the workplace • Fast burning of professional and life energy
4	—	—	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less free time than in other places

Source: Own calculations based on research results.

Based on the results of a comparative analysis of the internal structure of factors identified for each of the three groups of respondents, it can be assumed that opinions on the relative perception of university employees in Poland are a feature differentiating the indicated causes of lack of interest in the university as an employer. Therefore, the question arises whether this differentiation is statistically significant or not. In order to find an

answer to these questions, the Kruskal-Wallis test was carried out (Table 8). However, the statistically significant differences can only be observed in the case of one variable, i.e. 'the willingness to use the knowledge and skills acquired during studies in working in a place other than the university'. Only for this variable is the significance level 'p' lower than the limit value of 0.05. The statement contained in the research hypothesis H2 in the case of respondents is therefore true only for the mentioned variable. It is worth recalling that this variable did not enter into any factor regardless of the analyzed group of respondents.

Table 8. Analysis of the difference significance between the respondents' answers concerning the reasons for the lack of interest in the university as a workplace due to the criterion of their opinions concerning the perception of people working at the university in Poland

Variable	Opinions on perception of persons working in a higher education institution	KW test value	Significance level „p”
Low social status	better than persons working in other institutions	46.44	0.135
	the same as persons working for other institutions	54.56	
Low pay	better than persons working in other institutions	46.68	0.164
	the same as persons working for other institutions	54.32	
Lack of career prospects	better than persons working in other institutions	49.68	0.764
	the same as persons working for other institutions	51.32	
Uncertainty about keeping the job and job instability	better than persons working in other institutions	51.52	0.704
	the same as persons working for other institutions	49.48	
Need to share your valuable knowledge with others	better than persons working in other institutions	46.34	0.141
	the same as persons working for other institutions	54.66	
Shame about the workplace	better than persons working in other institutions	47.92	0.328
	the same as persons working for other institutions	53.08	
Fast burning of professional and life energy	better than persons working in other institutions	52.76	0.421
	the same as persons working for other institutions	48.24	
Less free time than in other places	better than persons working in other institutions	54.02	0.210
	the same as persons working for other institutions	46.98	
Negative general impressions from studies	better than persons working in other institutions	45.46	0.072
	the same as persons working for other institutions	55.54	

Cont table 8

Variable	Opinions on perception of persons working in a higher education institution	KW test value	Significance level „p”
Negative experiences as a student related to contacts with lecturers	better than persons working in other institutions	47.14	0.227
	the same as persons working for other institutions	53.86	
Willingness to break off any contacts with universities	better than persons working in other institutions	46.17	0.121
	the same as persons working for other institutions	54.83	
Willingness to use the knowledge and skills acquired during the studies to work in a place other than a university	better than persons working in other institutions	57.25	0.011
	the same as persons working for other institutions	43.75	

Source: Own calculations based on research results.

Finally, it should be added that in 2019 the university was still not an attractive employer for the majority of respondents (76.6% of people). Therefore, the situation did not change in comparison with the years 2016 and 2018, when more than half of the respondents did not take into account taking up employment at the university.

Summary

The results of the survey indicate that more than half of the respondents believed that university employees in Poland are better perceived than those working in other organisations. It should be remembered, however, that over 46% of respondents expressed the opinion that the perception of people working in universities is worse. Taking into account the opinion on this subject in the factor analysis as an element potentially determining the internal structure of the reasons for the lack of interest in the university as an employer allowed to identify clear differences in the structure of these reasons. Among those who express the opinion that university employees are better perceived, the most important

were image reasons related to negative experiences of their own. However, among those who believed that university employees are perceived in Poland in the same way as employees of other organisations, the causes reflecting the lack of material and non-material sense of security attributed to work at the university came to the fore. The statement contained in the research hypothesis H1 in the case of respondents turned out to be true. The aforementioned element, however, was a feature differentiating in a statistically significant way only in the case of one analysed reason, which is 'the willingness to use the knowledge and skills acquired during studies in work in a place other than a university'. Thus, it can be said that the statement contained in the research hypothesis H2 in the case of respondents turned out to be true only for this variable.

The results of the research and the conclusions drawn from it have a cognitive and application value. They are, of course, particularly important for universities, as they indicate the necessity for this group of employers to undertake coherent and comprehensive actions in the field of personnel policy which, according to the assumptions of marketing orientation, should be consistent with the expectations of individual segments of the labour market participants including the segments of young potential employees, which were identified during the research. Analysing the characteristics of persons belonging to particular segments, it is worth noting that the consequences of the HR policy have, among others, also the attitude of university employees towards students. As it can be seen, not only actions taken towards employees have specific personal effects, but also actions taken during the implementation of the didactic process in relation to students. This confirms the extremely high complexity of the phenomenon of fulfilling the role of employer by a university, thus indicating the need for a holistic approach to all activities that may affect the perception of the university as an employer.

Of course, the conducted research has certain limitations. They include the following scope: subjective (only representatives of young potential employees), geographical (only representatives of Polish young potential employees), objective (no in-depth analysis of particular causes). In order to eliminate these limitations, in subsequent stages of the research process concerning the reasons for lack of interest in universities as employers, it is planned to broaden each of the above mentioned areas by including

universities as employers and representatives of young potential employees from other countries. This will make it possible to conduct comparative analysis in terms of entities and geography. So far, three editions of the research have been carried out, gradually extending their scope. It is planned to continue them in the future so that comparative analyses can be conducted also in a time perspective.

References

¹ The first edition of the study was preceded by unstructured interviews conducted among 50 people.

² Each time a random sample selection was used, taking into account the opinion of M. Szreder (2010) that not always random selection is better.

Bibliography

1. Abdi, H., Williams, L. J. (2010), Principal component analysis. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics*, vol. 2, iss. 4, pp. 433–459.
2. Alniacik, E., Alniacik, U. (2012), Identifying Dimensions of Attractiveness in Employer Branding: Effects of Age, Gender, and Current Employment Status. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 58, pp. 1336–1343.
3. Arachchige, B. J., Robertson, A. (2011), Business Student Perceptions of a Preferred Employer: A Study Identifying Determinants of Employer Branding. *The IUP Journal of Brand Management*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 25–46.
4. Bakanauskiene, I., Bendaravičiene, R., Barkauske, L. (2017), Features of Employer Attractiveness on Lithuanian Business Organizations: Employees' Perceptions. *Management of Organizations: Systematic Research*, vol. 77, iss. 1, pp. 7–23.
5. Baruk, A. (2017), Contentment of employees vs their prosumer activity in the scope of recommending an employer. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, vol. 32, iss. 5, pp. 742–751.
6. Biswas, M. K., Suar, D. (2016), Antecedents and Consequences of Employer Branding. *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 136, no. 1, pp. 57–72.
7. Chluska, J., Szczepaniak, W. (2016), Nowe wyzwania zarządzania strategicznego w publicznych uczelniach ekonomicznych. *Studia Ekonomiczne. Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Katowicach*, no. 300, pp. 30–38.
8. Davies, G. (2008), Employer branding and its influence on managers. *European Journal of Marketing*, vol. 42, no. (5/6), pp. 667–681.
9. Eger, L., Micik, M., Gangur, M., Øehoø, P. (2019), Employer branding: exploring attractiveness dimensions in a multicultural context. *Technological and Economic Development of Economy*, vol. 25, iss. 3, pp. 519–541.

10. Gamble, J., Gilmore, A., McCartan-Quinn, D., Durkan, P. (2011), The Marketing concept in the 21st century: A review of how Marketing has been defined since the 1960s. *The Marketing Review*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 227–248.
11. Gilani, H., Cunningham, L. (2017), Employer branding and its influence on employee retention: A literature review. *The Marketing Review*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 239–256.
12. Horn, B., Huang, W., *Comparison of Segmentation Approaches*, <https://www.decisionanalyst.com/whitepapers/comparesegmentation/>, (dostęp: 04.04.2019).
13. Hsieh, N. (2015), The Social Contract Model of Corporate Purpose and Responsibility. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 433–460.
14. http://www.statystycy.pl/t4997_1_test_rangowy_kruskala-wallisa.php, (access: 18.05.2019).
15. <http://www.statystyka.az.pl/test-anova-kruskala-wallisa.php>, (dostęp: 18.05.2019).
16. Išoraite, M. (2016), Marketing Mix — Theoretical Aspects. *International Journal of Research*, vol. 4, iss. 6, pp. 25–37.
17. Jarosławska-Sobór, S. (2017), HR Excellence in Research as an Attribute of Scientific Institutions' Competitiveness. *Marketing of Scientific and Research Organizations*, vol. 23, iss. 1, pp. 1–20.
18. Kashive, N., Khanna, V. T. (2017), Conceptualizing Employer-Based Brand Equity and Employer Brand Pyramid. *European Scientific Journal*, vol. 13, no. 34, pp. 211–229.
19. Raport. *Start na rynku pracy 2016*, raport.start.na.rynkupracy.161005.pdf, (access: 18.05.2019).
20. Ratković, M., Grubić, G., Tasić, S. (2012), Evolution of marketing: from product up to employment. *International Journal of Economics and Law*, no. 5, pp. 72–78.
21. Ratković, M. C., Krasulja, N. D., Garaëa, N. (2013), Customer relationship management strategy as an opportunity for improving the modern marketing concept. *Kultura*, pp. 381–395.
22. Rudawska, E. (2017), Sustainable Marketing Concept — A New Face of Capitalism. *British Journal of Research*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 1–2.
23. Sashi, C. M. (2012), Customer engagement, buyer-seller relationships, and social media. *Management Decision*, vol. 50, pp. 253–272.
24. Seran, S., Izvercian, M. (2014), Prosumer engagement in innovation strategies: The prosumer creativity and focus model. *Management Decision*, vol. 52, no. 10, pp. 1968–1980.
25. Singh, P. K. (2012), Management of business processes can help an organization achieve competitive advantage. *International Management Review*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 19–26.
26. Szreder, M. (2010), Losowe i nielosowe próby w badaniach statystycznych. *Przegląd Statystyczny*, vol. 4, pp. 168–174.
27. Sztemberg-Lewandowska, M. (2008), *Analiza czynnikowa w badaniach marketingowych*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu, Wrocław, p. 29.
28. Tikson, S. D. S., Hamid, N., Mardiana, R. (2018), Employer Branding as a Strategy to Attract Potential Workforce. *International Journal of Administrative Science & Organization*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 115–119.
29. Van Hoyer, G., Bas, T., Cromheecke, S., Lievens, F. (2013), The Instrumental and Symbolic Dimensions of Organisations' Image as an Employer: A Large-scale Field Study on Employer Branding in Turkey. *Applied Psychology*, vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 543–557.

30. White, K., Simpson, B., Argo, J. J. (2014), The Motivating Role of Dissociative Out-Groups in Encouraging Positive Consumer Behaviors. *Journal of Marketing Research*, vol. 51, iss. 4, pp. 433–447.
31. Wojtaszczyk, K. (2008), Employer branding po polsku na przykładzie uczelni wyższych. *E-Mentor*, vol. 25, no. 3, <http://www.e-mentor.edu.pl/arttykul/index/numer/25/id/547> (access: 18.05.2019).
32. Ziemba, E., Eisenhardt, M. (2015), Examining prosumers' participation in business processes. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 219–229.

Professor Agnieszka Izabela Baruk, Łódź University of Technology, Poland — lecturer at Lodz University of Technology, Faculty of Management and Production Engineering, Department of Management Systems and Innovation. Her publications comprise 434 peer-reviewed positions including 14 books about transaction and personal marketing and their mutual interdependencies.

Anna Goliszek, PhD., University of Life Sciences in Lublin, Poland — sociologist, lecturer in the Management Department at the University of Life Sciences in Lublin. Graduate of the Faculty of Social Sciences of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin. He earned his doctoral degree from the Faculty of Philosophy and Sociology of the Maria Curie Skłodowska University in Lublin. His major scientific interests include organisational and management sociology, with a particular focus on the problem of organisational culture, business communication, inventics and social psychology.