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Summary

In the article the problems related to recommending the employer by employees are presented. It is described as the example of employees’ prosumption activity. Transmitting their opinions about the organization as the employer they become the co-creators its image which is one of the key non-material marketing values. The article has theoretical-empirical character. In the theoretical part the essence of prosumption is presented. The special attention is paid to fact that in the literature this appearance is linked with consumption products not with personnel activity. In the empirical part the results of the field researches on recommending employer and its relation determinants are presented. The statistical analysis in the form of correspondence analysis method has been used to these results. It allows to estimate the dependences between analysed variables, to define the power of identified dependences, to show their character, to sort the relation determinants of recommending in the hierarchical system etc. All of the analysed dependences are significant in the statistically meaning. The stronger dependence exists in the case of vertical relation variable in the comparison to the dependence between recommending employer and horizontal relation variable. Of course each of type of organizational relations should be supported by employer because it influences on employees' identifying with the organization which is the key determinant of the column variable.
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Introduction

What is emphasized in modern marketing concepts is the necessity to increase the scope of buyers' market activity. One of the ways to achieve this goal is getting the recipients involved in the process of preparing marketing offer\(^1\) by inspiring their activity and/or using spontaneous readiness of the buyers to contribute to the creation of the offer. Regardless of whether co-creating the offer is inspired, or spontaneous, it constitutes a symptom of buyers' prosumer activity, who in practice cease to be just the recipients of the marketing offers, but also become its co-creators as prosumers\(^2\). The subject scope of such cooperation with the offerors may be varied, from creating material elements of the offer, including products\(^3\), to co-creating its non-material components, including, the image of the offer and the offeror himself.

It is worth pointing out here that one of the basic effects of prosumer activity of the buyers is that their expectations associated with the characteristics of an offer can be satisfied comparably better thanks to the fact that the offer was prepared together with the offeror. What is no less important in this process is satisfying the need to be noticed\(^4\), useful and appreciated etc. Quite often the very awareness that the ideas created by a particular person are used by the offeror contribute to raising the self-esteem of the person, becoming, if not the most important, one of the main reasons for sharing opinions and thoughts\(^5\), additionally, it encourages the person to pursue further active marketing cooperation with other market participants. Prosumer cooperation can take place not only between buyers and offerors, but also between buyers themselves. Even though in the second case offerors don't participate in cooperation directly, its effects are definitely noticeable also for them.

A good example of such a situation is when buyers share their opinions about a particular offeror and/or his marketing offer with other people, which results in a particular image of a given entity and the values it creates. What's more, the image created by buyers on the basis of their opinions is characterized by much greater credibility than the image constructed by the offeror. For this reason every offeror should consistently strive to make buyers spontaneously share positive opinions about the offeror with other recipients. The transformation of a buyer into a
prosumer\textsuperscript{6} is much more likely, when he is at least satisfied with the characteristics of the offer addressed to him and with the way it is provided. Comparably higher level of matching the characteristics of an offer with the expectations of buyers can be achieved if buyers co-create the offer together with the provider, which is an additional argument in favour of the need of offerors to activate the buyers.

It is worth pointing out here that in literature on the subject the issues of prosumption are discussed mainly with regard to offering consumer goods\textsuperscript{7} and services\textsuperscript{8}, and hardly ever with regard to the sphere of personal activity. Naturally, prosumer approach can and should be applied also in course of personal actions. Employers should not only strive to satisfy the expectations of employees to a possibly highest extent by creating personal products satisfying these expectations, but they should include them in the process of preparing the mentioned products. Thanks to this they will be characterized by greater compliance with the expectations of employees, who will be more eager to recommend a particular organization as an attractive employer.

Personal products constitute a very diversified category, covering both material and non-material products. Among products of a non-material character it is possible to mention, among others, work atmosphere resulting from internal characteristics\textsuperscript{9} (vertical and horizontal) as well as external interpersonal relations. What is exceptionally important is their individual reception by particular employees, who regard them as positive, or negative, assessing their from the perspective of own expectations. The assessment of relations with the superiors and colleagues, as well as the assessment of the possibility of reconciling professional and private life influence the complex assessment of a particular employer\textsuperscript{10}, which an employee can share with other people. If he shares his opinions with others, he contributes to building a particular image of a given organization as an employer, which is beneficial for the organization only if the opinions are positive. Thus, it is worth investigating the issue of the influence of relational factors on recommending an employer.

This article is supposed to achieve the following research goals:

1) Presenting characteristics of the prosumer activity of employees,
2) Identifying and analysing the strength and character of relations between the readiness of employees of recommend an employer and chosen relational variables,

3) Defining the relational hierarchies of the determinants of employees' readiness to recommend their employers.

In order to achieve the above-mentioned goals, the following research hypotheses were verified:

H1 — internal horizontal relations are key determinants of the readiness of employees to recommend their employers,

H2 — internal vertical relations are the key determinants of the readiness of employees to recommend their employers.

**General characteristics of empirical research**

Striving to achieve the above-mentioned goals and thus verify the research hypotheses, empirical research was conducted in 2014. The method of questionnaire survey was used to collect raw data. 500 people representing current employees of scientific organizations (mainly public universities) located in Poland participated in the survey. Later, statistical analysis of the raw data was conducted on the basis of the method of correspondence analysis. Its goal is to identify closer relations between at least two categories of variables represented by the questions answered by the respondents. The key element of correspondence analysis is creating a multidimensional map of initial data (the so-called contingency table), which reflects the frequency of occurrence of the respondents' answers with regard to the analysed categories. Next, contingency tables are analysed by means of the chi-square independence test, where statistics showing the strength of relations between qualitative variables are determined.

The application of the method of correspondence analysis allows the spatial visualization of relations between categories on one — and multidimensional axes. Such a visualization makes it possible to build a model on the basis of relative position of adjacent points, which represent the analysed categories. The analysis of statistics and charts generated by means of this method makes it possible to
make conclusions about the relations existing between categories of two variables. In this analysis it is assumed that the variable (in this article recommending a scientific organization as an employer) which is used as a point of reference for research concerning relations with other characteristics always constitutes a column variable. Statistical analysis of the raw data by means of the method of correspondence analysis was carried out with the Statistica 8.0 package.

Recommending scientific organization as an employer and selected relational variables

One of the forms of employees' prosumer activity is expressing their opinions about their employer. By sharing this opinion with other people, including potential employees, they become co-creators of the image of the organization playing the role of an employer. As the conducted research shows (table 1), even though most respondents were more, or less eager to recommend working for the organization employing them (73.79%), in fact, every fifth respondent recommended his employer enthusiastically, still more than a quarter of the respondents advised against working for their employer. Even though comparably lowest percentage of the respondents expressed a strongly negative opinion about their employer (6.8%), from the point of view of image creation the share was disturbingly big. People forming this group, together with people advising against starting work for a particular organization in a less determined manner create a negative external image of the organization and make it harder, or even impossible for the organization to achieve its long-term marketing goals.

Every employer should strive to take measures expected by the employees, which would make it possible to get positive recognition. One of the basic measures of this kind associated with shaping vertical relations is subjective treatment of subordinates by the superiors. It turns out that most of the respondents, always, or in most situations, were treated by their superiors this way (70.88%). Other respondents declared that their superiors treated them with respect only sometimes, or rarely. At the same time comparably smallest percentage of the respondents perceived superiors' approach to them as subjective at the lowest frequency. No respondent expressed the opinion that his employer never showed him respect (for this reason this option is not included in table 1).
Table 1. The relations between recommending employers by the respondents and the way superiors treat their employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>10,68</td>
<td>3,88</td>
<td>0,97</td>
<td>8,74</td>
<td>24,27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>28,16</td>
<td>0,97</td>
<td>5,83</td>
<td>6,80</td>
<td>41,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>13,59</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>14,56</td>
<td>0,97</td>
<td>29,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>1,94</td>
<td>0,00</td>
<td>2,91</td>
<td>4,85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52,43</td>
<td>6,80</td>
<td>21,36</td>
<td>19,42</td>
<td>100,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where: for column variable concerning the willingness to recommend an employer — a) I’d strongly recommend working for my employer, b) I’d rather recommend working for my employer, c) I’d rather advise against working for my employer, d) I’d definitely advise against working for my employer;
for row variable concerning respectful and subjective treatment from superiors — a) yes, always, b) yes, in most situations, c) yes, but only sometimes, d) no, rarely e) no, never

Source: own materials prepared on the basis of the results of conducted research.

Showing respect to another person in every situation, regardless of the fact whether he plays the role of a subordinate, or superior in an organization, should be a natural thing and as research shows, only 29.13% of people have always had the impression of being treated subjectively. Thus, it is possible to conclude that most answers suggests the existence of a dysfunction in the approach of superiors to their subordinates, which may result in sharing negative opinions on a particular organization. The total share of people recommending their employers was very close to the combined share of respondents perceiving that in at least most situations they were treated subjectively by their superiors. Moreover, the share of respondents advising definitely against starting work for a particular organization was close to the share of people claiming that their superiors rarely showed them respect. This suggests the existence of a relationship between recommending an employer and feelings reflecting vertical relations in an organization.

It turns out that indeed, there is a statistically significant relations between these variables (p = 0,000). The relationship is strong, which is shown by high total value of chi-square amounting to 48.7465. Thus, the H2 hypothesis is correct.

In case of the model generated on the basis of the results of correspondence analysis carried out for this relationship, there is a strong correlation between the areas to the left and to the right of the axis of ordinates, which constitutes 79.32% of inertia (that is, variability) of the
whole structure (picture 1). It is polarized into the segment of people recommending their employer and the segment of people advising against a particular organization as an employer.

On the right there are points reflecting the respondents who recommended a particular organization as an employer more, or less strongly. ("a" and "b" from question 19) and people perceiving respect from their superiors always, or in most situations ("a" and "b" from question 2). They form 2 uniform groups of respondents, where comparably stronger relationship exists in case of the group of respondents who'd rather recommend their employers ("b" from question 19) and people treated subjectively by their superiors in most situations ("b" from question 2). What suggests this is much shorter distance between points belonging to this group. Moreover, this is the shortest distance between points among all groups distinguished in the model presented on picture 1, which shows comparably strongest relationship in its case.

Picture 1. Model "recommending an employer — the manner in which superiors treat their subordinates"

Variables and number of categories:
Row variable: question 2 (4)
Column variable: question 19 (4)
Own values: 0.3754; 0.0976; 0.0003

Chi-square total $= 48.7465$; df $= 9$; $p = 0.000$

Source: Own materials based on the results of conducted research.
In the left part of the analysed set there are points reflecting the respondents advising against starting work for their organizations more, or less strongly ("c" and "d" from question 19) and people who feel that their superiors show them respect no more than rarely ("c" and "d" from question 2). Both groups belonging to the left part of the setting are also uniform in character, however, comparably stronger relations exist in case of the group of people displaying less extreme emotions. At the same time weaker relations exist in case of the group displaying extremely negative emotions and comparably longest distance between points forming the group shows comparably weakest relations in case of this group, compared to all other groups. Thus, it is possible to conclude that it is comparably easier to evoke among the employees the willingness to recommend their employer by applying a subjective approach to them, than to provoke them to share negative opinions by showing them no respect. Obviously, this conclusion shouldn't be interpreted as a permission for treating subordinates like objects, but above all as an important hint confirming the necessity of shaping vertical relations in a manner expected by the employees.

The employees of a particular organization are the participants of not just vertical, but also horizontal relations. What reflects them is, among others, the assessment of relations connecting the respondents with their colleagues. As table 2 shows, even though over a half people highlighted kindness as a feature of these relations, almost every third respondents highlighted indifference and almost 1/5 of the respondents pointed to competing with each other. A much bigger portion of the respondents recommended their employer, in comparison to the share of people regarding the atmosphere in their organization as characterized by kindness. Thus, it is possible to conclude that it was caused by high complexity of the analysed relations.

It turns out that even though there is a statistically significant relation between the readiness to recommend an employer and the atmosphere in an organization ($p = 0.0051$), it is much weaker than the relation between recommending an employer and the way superiors treat their subordinates. The total value of chi-square in this case amounts to just 18.5225, which is almost three times lower than the analogous value for the previous relation. This means that H1 hypothesis is not true.
Table 2. Recommending employers by the respondents and the atmosphere in an organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>30.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>52.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>13.59</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>31.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52.43</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where: for column variable concerning the willingness to recommend an employer — a) I’d strongly recommend working for my employer, b) I’d rather recommend working for my employer, c) I’d rather advise against working for my employer, d) I’d definitely advise against working for my employer;

for row variable concerning the atmosphere in an organization — a) kindness, b) competing with each other, c) indifference

Source: own materials prepared on the basis of the results of conducted research.

Picture 2. Model "recommending an employer — the assessment of atmosphere in an organization"

Variables and number of categories:
Row variable: question 3 (3)
Column variable: question 19 (4)
Own values: 0.1780; 0.0018
Chi-square total = 18.5225; df = 6; p = 0.0051

Source: own materials prepared on the basis of the results of conducted research.
On the model created on the basis of the results of correspondence analysis there is an apparent polarization of the set into two parts, according to recommending an employer, or advising against working for the employer (picture 2). To the right of the axis of ordinates there are points reflecting people more or less strongly recommending their employers to others ("a" and "b" from question 19) and regarding the atmosphere in an organization as characterized by kindness ("a" from question 3). They form one group. At the same time the left part of the set contains 2 groups of respondents, in whose case the group including people inclined to rather advise against working for their employers ("c" from question 19) and people describing the atmosphere in their organizations as indifference("c" from question 3) is characterized by comparably higher strength of relation than the second group including people advising definitely against their employers ("d" from question 19) and people highlighting competition as the dominant feature of the atmosphere of their organizations ("b" from question 3). In case of the latter group the distance between points forming it is much greater.

Thus, it is possible to conclude that it is easier to evoke the readiness to recommend an employer, by creating an atmosphere of kindness, than to provoke employees to share definitely negative opinions about their employers by generating an atmosphere of rivalry. Obviously, this doesn't mean that employers can afford to create an atmosphere based on mutual enmity, as the relation between recommending him and the assessment of organizational atmosphere was still statistically important.

Every employee participates also in particular relations of an external character. Thus, it is possible to assume that for him the possibility to reconcile professional duties with private life should be a precious value. Almost 2/3 of the surveyed more, or less often had problems with reconciling the two spheres of life. Moreover, in case of every fourth person such situations occurred at least often (table 3). Even though nobody concluded that for him this is an everyday problem, this doesn't change the fact that only 36.89% of the respondents managed to reconcile professional life with private life without a problem. It is worth pointing out here that the total percentage of the respondents who recognized this as a problem encountered at least often was close to the percentage of people more or less eager to advise against starting work for a particular organization, which may suggest the existence of a relation between these variables.
Table 3. Recommending employers by the respondents and the ability to reconcile professional and private life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>36.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>19.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>20.39</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>38.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52.43</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where: for column variable concerning the willingness to recommend an employer — a) I’d recommend strongly, b) I’d rather recommend, c) I’d rather advise against working for my employer, d) I’d strongly advise against working for my employer;

for row variable concerning the possibility of reconciling professional and private life — a) I never have any problem with this, b) sometimes it is hard, but such situations happen rarely, c) it is hard and such situations happen often, d) it is very hard and such situations happen very often, e) in practice, for me it is an everyday problem

Source: own materials prepared on the basis of the results of conducted research.

The results of statistical analysis show that there really is a statistically significant relation (p = 0.0002) between recommending an employer and the ability to reconcile professional and private life. The relation is quite strong, as shown by the comparably high total value of chi-square amounting to 31.6100. At the same time, the relation is much stronger than in case of the previously analysed relation between recommending an employer and the assessment of the organizational atmosphere reflecting the specific character of horizontal relations, for which the total value of chi-square was almost twice smaller.

In the model created on the basis of the results of correspondence analysis it is possible to distinguish 4 groups of respondents (picture 3):

1) group of people recommending their employer ("a" from question 19) and encountering no problems with reconciling their professional and private life ("a" from question 10);

2) group of people less eagerly recommending their employer ("b" from question 19) and rarely encountering problems with reconciling professional and private life ("b" from question 10);
3) group of people who’d rather advise against starting work for their employer ("c" from question 19) and who often find it hard to reconcile professional and private life ("c" from question 10);
4) group of people advising strongly against starting work for their employer ("d" from question 19) and who often have a problem with reconciling professional and private life ("d" from question 10).

Variables and the number of categories:
- Row variable: question 10 (4)
- Column variables: question 19 (4)
- Own values: 0.2495; 0.0567; 0.0007
- Chi-square total = 31.6100; df = 9; p = 0.0002

Source: own materials prepared on the basis of the results of conducted research.

All of the distinguished groups are uniform in character, even though relations within them vary in strength, which is shown by varied distances between the points forming them. Comparably strongest relationship exists
in case of the second group including people displaying moderately positive emotions. At the same time, in case of the three other groups the strength of relations is comparable, which is reflected by similar distances between the points forming them.

The specific character of internal and external interpersonal relations is reflected by the degree to which an employee identifies himself with his organization and its goals. Comparably smallest share of the surveyed identified fully with the organization employing them (table 4). This was a percentage similar to the share of people strongly recommending their employer. The share of respondents not identifying themselves with a particular organization was also similar to the total share of people advising against their organization as an employer. This gives rise to the question whether this is just a coincidence, or whether there is a certain relationship between the variables.

### Table 4. Recommending an employer and identifying oneself with the organization and its goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>34.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>50.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>26.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52.43</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>21.36</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

where: for column variable concerning the willingness to recommend the employer — a) I'd strongly recommend, b) I'd rather recommend, c) I'd rather advise against, d) I'd strongly advise against; for row variable concerning identification with the organization — a) I identify myself fully with my organization, b) I partially identify myself with my organization, c) I don't identify myself with my organization at all.

Source: own materials prepared on the basis of the results of conducted research.

The results of analysis confirm the existence of a statistically significant relationship between them \((p = 0.000)\). This is the strongest relationship out of all relationships analysed till now, which is confirmed by the highest total chi-square value \((57.8750)\).

On the model created on the basis of correspondence analysis (picture 4) there is a noticeable polarization of the set with regard to the axis of ordinates. To the left of the axis there are points representing the segment
of respondents recommending their organization as an employer more, or less eagerly ("a" and "b" from question 19) and people identifying themselves completely, or partially with their organization ("a" and "b" from question 27). At the same time, on the right side there are points representing respondents who advise more, or less strongly against working for a particular organization ("c" and "d" from question 19) and who don't identify themselves with their organization at all ("c" from question 27).

Within the left side of the polarized set, considering the intensity of positive emotions, it is possible to distinguish two uniform groups of people. Among them the group displaying extremely positive emotions ("a" from question 19 and "a" from question 27) is characterized by comparably higher strength of internal relationships. At the same time, this is the group...
displaying the greatest strength of relations among all three groups visible in the model. The third group is composed of points located on the right side of the setting and it is characterized by comparably smallest strength of internal relations, as suggested by definitely the longest distances between the points forming it. At the same time, it is the least uniform group.

Similarly, as in case of all relations analysed up till now, it is possible to conclude that it is easier to evoke the willingness to recommend an employer among people displaying positive emotions (in this case people identifying themselves with an organization) than to provoke people displaying negative emotions (in this case people not identifying themselves with an organization) to share negative opinions. In comparison with the previously analysed relations, it is only possible to notice that in case of the relation between recommending an employer and identifying oneself with an organization, the relation is comparably strongest for people displaying extremely positive emotions. This is what distinguishes this relations from the previous ones, in which the segments of respondents displaying moderately positive emotions played the most important role.

**Summary**

The results of the conducted analysis make it possible to arrange the hierarchy of the investigated variables, according to the strength of their influence on the readiness to recommend an organization as an employer by its employees. Among the analysed relational determinants of co-creation of the employers' image the variable reflecting horizontal relations in form of the atmosphere in an organization, played comparably least significant role (table 5). It is because in its case the total chi-square value was the lowest. Thus, hypothesis H1 is not true. The value of chi-square in case of the relation between recommending an employer and the assessment of the atmosphere in an organization was almost three times lower than the value of this parameter referring to the variable associated with vertical relations, that is, the way superiors treat subordinates, which placed second. Thus, hypothesis H2 is true. What played comparably most important role was the respondent's identification with their organization. Only in case of the relation between this variable and recommending an employer the total value of chi-square exceeded 50.
Table 5. Hierarchical arrangement of the analysed determinants of recommending an organization playing the role of an employer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysed row variable</th>
<th>chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The way respondents are treated by their superiors</td>
<td>48.7465</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0000*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmosphere in an organization</td>
<td>18.5225</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0051*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to reconcile professional and private life</td>
<td>31.6100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0002*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying oneself with an organization and its goals</td>
<td>57.8750</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0000*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05

Source: own materials.

However, we shouldn't forget that all analysed relations turned out to be statistically significant. For this reason every organization intending to build a positive image of itself as an employer thanks to prosumer activity of its employees, should shape both vertical and horizontal relations in a thought-out, consistent and complex manner, without forgetting about the necessity to make it possible for employees to easily reconcile their professional and private life. This factor turned out to be an important determinant for recommending and employer, comparably more important than horizontal relations. The necessity to apply an integrated approach to building organizational relations also comes from the fact that their resultant is the level of identification with an organization, which turned out to be the most important determinant behind the respondents' willingness to share their opinions about their employers.
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In literature on the subject it is emphasized that it should be one of the main goals of contemporary offerors (see: M. Izvercian, S.A. Æeran, C.-F. Buciuman, Transforming Usual Consumers into Prosumers with the Help of Intellectual Capital Collaboration for Innovation, International Journal of Information and Education Technology 2013, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 388–392), however, it is also possible to find opinions critical of prosumption (see, among others: A. Humphreys, K. Grayson, The Intersecting Roles of Consumer andProducer: A Critical Perspective on Co-production, Co-creation and Prosumption, Sociology Compass 2008, no. 2, pp. 1–18).


A negative assessment made by an employee can be a reason for leaving an organization (see: M. Judeh, Emotional Intelligence and Retention: The Moderating Role of Job Involvement, International Scholarly and Scientific Research & Innovation 2013, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 255–260) or at least for comparably lower involvement in carrying out its goals. When superiors understand the key significance of the potential of their employees, they display high emotional intelligence, which is discussed by, among others, P.J. Jordan, A. Troth, Emotional intelligence and its determinants of relational character. The scale of answers to these questions are provided in the descriptions of particular tables.

This article is based on a fragment of much broader empirical research conducted by means of a questionnaire including a few dozen questions directed to employees as the recipients of the marketing personal offer. For this reason, only raw data obtained from asking selected questions (questions number 19, 2, 3, 10 and 27) were used in this article. The questions are associated with recommending employer by the employees and its determinants, especially determinants of relational character. The scale of answers to these questions are provided in the descriptions of particular tables.

Purposive-quota sampling.

Also, the assessment of the credibility of identified models was carried out by identifying the boundary critical “p” likelihood in the chi-square test. If it is higher than 0.05, determined diversification of inertia with regard to zero, which served to build models, has no statistical significance. The term of inertia is used in correspondence analysis in a similar way to the term of variance used in statistics.
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