Wiesław **ŁUKASIŃSKI** • Piotr **ROMAŃSKI**

SPOŁECZNE I EKOLOGICZNE DZIAŁANIA ORGANIZACJI NA RZECZ TRWAŁEGO I ZRÓWNOWAŻONEGO JEJ ROZWOJU – PERSPEKTYWA PRZEDSTAWICIELI POKOLENIA Z

Wiesław ŁUKASIŃSKI (ORCID: 0000-0002-8757-0190) – Cracow University of Economics
Piotr ROMAŃSKI (ORCID: 0009-0009-0084-0994) – Cracow University of Economics

Correspondence address:
Rakowicka Street 27, 31-510 Krakow, Poland
e-mail: 1002183@student.uek.krakow.pl

ABSTRACT: The aim of the article is to identify Generation Z's preferences regarding organisational engagement in social and environmental initiatives and to assess their perceived importance. An online survey was conducted among 310 Polish students and graduates of economics-related fields, with responses analysed using descriptive statistics and the Mann-Whitney U and Kruskal-Wallis tests. The results show that Generation Z prioritises pro-environmental actions, such as waste reduction, recycling programs, eco-friendly products, and investments in sustainable technologies. Social initiatives, including promoting diversity, volunteering, and collaborating with non-governmental organisations, were rated lower. Significant gender differences were observed, with women consistently attributing greater importance to both ecological and social activities, while professional-educational status had a smaller impact. Given that the study sample consisted of Polish students and graduates of economics-related fields, the findings should be interpreted with caution, as their generalizability to the entire Generation Z population and to other cultural or occupational contexts is limited. The findings suggest that organisations seeking to attract and retain Generation Z should integrate ecological, social, and ethical aspects in an authentic manner.

KEYWORDS: generation Z, sustainable development, corporate social responsibility, environmental initiatives, organisational engagement

Introduction

The effectiveness of an organisation's functioning depends not only on improving existing solutions but also on its ability to implement innovations (Serafin, 2015; Baruk, 2021). Such an approach allows organisations to effectively respond to stakeholder needs while building a sustainable competitive advantage (Jones, 1994; Grudzewski et al., 2010). In the context of growing societal awareness, initiatives aimed at the sustainable and enduring development of organisations are gaining importance (Lozano, 2008; Streimikiene, 2023), which should meet the needs of present generations without limiting the opportunities of future ones. Social and ecological activities of organisations are attracting increasing interest from Generation Z representatives (Bińczynski et al., 2023). As new employees and consumers, they have a significant impact on shaping the directions of organisational development.

Generation Z includes individuals born after 1995 (Grabiwoda, 2019; Messyasz, 2021; Czerwińska & Bojar, 2021; Tomaszuk & Wasiluk, 2023). This generation grew up fully integrated with digital technologies, functioning from an early age in an environment of mobile devices, social media, and online tools. This has resulted in a high level of digital competence, encompassing both the ability to navigate online environments efficiently and to use remote work tools, online communication platforms, and data analysis (Stankiewicz-Mróz, 2020).

In the labour market, Generation Z prefers flexible forms of work and environments that allow for maintaining work-life balance (Muster, 2020). Traditional organisational structures, which emphasise interpersonal skills, emotional management, and teamwork, may pose challenges for them (Ławińska & Korombel, 2023). They expect a work environment that supports autonomy, experimentation, and rapid implementation of innovations (Całek, 2021). They favour leaders who act as mentors, providing both substantive and emotional support, which fosters greater engagement and more effective use of their competencies (Muster, 2020; Moczydłowska, 2023).

Despite the growing significance of this stakeholder group, previous research has primarily focused on general concepts of corporate social responsibility, sustainable development, and organisational innovativeness. There is still a lack of in-depth analyses regarding Generation Z's preferences in terms of perceiving specific social and ecological actions undertaken by organisations, representing a research gap. The aim of this article is to identify Generation Z representatives' preferences regarding social and ecological activities implemented by organisations. The study seeks to verify the following hypotheses:

H1: Pro-environmental actions are more important to Generation Z than social actions.

H2: There is a significant difference in the perception of organisational social and ecological activities between women and men from Generation Z.

H3: There is a significant difference in the perception of organisational social and ecological activities between students and those who are both studying and working.

The study also aims to answer the research question: which organisational actions are most significant for the surveyed Generation Z representatives.

Achieving the aim, answering the research question, and testing the hypotheses was enabled by conducting a literature review, a survey study, and applying selected statistical analysis tools.

An overview of the literature

An organisation is perceived as an open system interacting with its environment, capable of integrating employees' competencies, technology, and management processes (Jones, 1994; Grudzewski et al., 2010; Baruk, 2021; Łukasiński et al., 2021). Its operational effectiveness depends on the ability to adapt, respond flexibly to market changes, and optimally utilise resources. Considerable importance is attached to an organisation's focus on sustainable and enduring development (Lozano, 2008; Broman et al., 2017; Valencia et al., 2019). This is particularly crucial in situations where environmental changes disrupt the civilisation developed on Earth (Armstrong McKay et al., 2022; Richardson et al., 2023). According to the Global Footprint Network, the Earth's natural resources are already being used at approximately 171% of their capacity (Global Footprint Network, 2009; Global Foot-

DOI: 10.34659/eis.2026.98.3.1353

print Network, 2025). Therefore, both resource consumption and the levels of waste and pollution exceed the planet's biological capacity (Fatemi et al., 2021).

To improve this situation, it is necessary to integrate knowledge from various disciplines, implement innovative technologies, and design environmentally friendly products. This requires a close link between technology and the environment (Feroz et al., 2021; Beier et al., 2020). Technological development must consider the needs of society and the natural environment. Recognising the role of technology, for example, in the creation of the carbon footprint, is indispensable (Papp-Váry et al., 2023; Goel et al., 2024). In practice, sustainable production, although it may be unprofitable in the short term, is clearly beneficial in the long term (Andersson et al., 2022). Limiting adverse climate change and preserving biodiversity are outcomes of sustainable production and consumption (Streimikiene, 2023).

Digital transformation can also play a key role in this process, enabling the development of Industry 4.0 concepts and the integration of advanced technologies (Zervas et al., 2024; Hetmańczyk, 2024). Industry 4.0 technologies, such as the Internet of Things (IoT), Big Data, and artificial intelligence, enable organisations to effectively implement sustainable development strategies through process automation, resource optimisation, and rapid information exchange between systems (Wieczorek, 2018; Iwański, 2017). Implementing such solutions requires investment in technology, development of employees' competencies, and fostering an organisational culture that supports innovation and engagement in change processes (Sang et al., 2024; Moch, 2024).

Social issues are also crucial for the sustainable and enduring development of organisations, including supporting local communities, developing employee volunteering, and promoting diversity and inclusiveness (Streimikiene, 2023; Tran-Thi-Thanh & Nguyen-Thi-Phuong, 2023; Nowakowska, 2023; Mont et al., 2020; Khodayari et al., 2025). Beyond poverty and employment conditions, this dimension of sustainable development emphasises intangible indicators determining human quality of life, such as satisfaction, happiness, and diversity (Talan et al., 2020). Equality, safety, and adherence to eco-principles also become increasingly important (Eizenberg & Jabareen, 2017).

The significance of organisational actions in sustainable and enduring development is particularly evident in the context of Generation Z, which is entering the labour market and making consumer decisions guided by social and environmental values. Research shows that young consumers and employees expect organisations to actively engage in social and ecological initiatives, which influences brand perception, loyalty, and motivation to collaborate (Bińczynski et al., 2023; Streimikiene, 2023). In this context, the role of the circular economy and sharing economy is also important, as they enable organisations to minimise their environmental impact and involve local communities in production and consumption processes (Streimikis et al., 2024; Mont et al., 2020; Khodayari et al., 2025).

Employees and leaders play a key role in implementing social and ecological initiatives. It is particularly important to shape employees' attitudes by developing their knowledge, skills, creativity, social and environmental awareness, and ability to make rational decisions, which in turn enhances the effectiveness of organisational actions in sustainable development (Kopacka, 2015; Marek-Kołodziej et al., 2018; Rembiasz et al., 2021; Nowakowska, 2023). Another important aspect is ensuring appropriate working conditions that integrate workplace equipment, psychosocial well-being, and employee safety (Wickens et al., 1997; Mengoni et al., 2017; Scafà et al., 2019; Chetty et al., 2024).

Research methods

To identify the preferences of Generation Z representatives regarding organisational engagement in social and ecological initiatives, a study was conducted using an online survey. The aim of the study was to determine which forms of organisational activity are perceived as most desirable and how their importance is evaluated depending on respondents' gender and occupational-educational status. The survey was conducted from October to February 2025. The research sample consisted of 310 purposively selected individuals who met the criteria of belonging to Generation Z (born after 1995) and being students or graduates of economics-related programs at higher education institutions in Poland. The selection of this group of respondents was intentional and based on the assumption that individuals studying in the fields of economics, management, and finance possess fundamental

DOI: 10.34659/eis.2026.98.3.1353

knowledge about organisational functioning, corporate social responsibility, and the principles of sustainable development, which enables them to make a more informed and critical assessment of the actions undertaken by organisations. The study included 153 women, 153 men, and 4 individuals who did not declare their gender. In terms of occupational-educational status, 109 respondents (35.2%) were non-working students, while 194 respondents (62.6%) combined studying with employment. Due to the small number of respondents who were exclusively professionally active (7 individuals, i.e., 2.2%), this category was combined with the group of those who were both studying and working.

The sample selection was non-stratified, which limits the possibility of fully generalising the results to the entire Polish Generation Z population. The respondents represented a group of young people who are educated or active in both education and work, and therefore possess the knowledge and competencies that facilitate a critical assessment of organisational activities. At the same time, it should be emphasised that focusing on students and graduates of economics-related fields may constitute a potential source of research bias, as these respondents may exhibit greater sensitivity to ethical issues, social responsibility, and the economic aspects of sustainable development compared to Generation Z individuals studying in other disciplines, such as technical or environmental sciences.

The survey questionnaire consisted of two main parts. In the first part, respondents were asked to indicate their preferred forms of organisational engagement in social and ecological initiatives. In the second part, they assessed the importance of individual actions using a five-point Likert scale, where 1 indicated "low importance" and 5 indicated "crucial importance" for the sustainable functioning of the organisation. The study applied the Mann–Whitney U test and the Kruskal–Wallis test.

Results of the research

The results presented in Table 1 allow us to capture the hierarchy of preferences among the surveyed Generation Z representatives.

Table 1. Forms of organisational engagement in social and ecological initiatives

Specification	All respondents (A)	Women (W)	Men (M)	Students (S)	Students and employed (E)
Supporting local communities	59.35%	28.39%	30.00%	20.32%	39.03%
Reducing carbon footprint	40.97%	21.29%	18.39%	13.87%	27.10%
Investing in sustainable technologies	56.45%	27.42%	27.74%	17.10%	39.35%
Promoting diversity and inclusiveness	28.06%	15.48%	12.26%	9.03%	19.03%
Implementing transparent and ethical business practices	40.00%	19.68%	19.68%	10.65%	29.35%
Developing employee volunteering programs	26.77%	12.58%	13.55%	8.06%	18.71%
Transparency in reporting social and ecological activities	40.32%	20.00%	19.68%	13.55%	26.77%
Cooperation with NGOs	30.65%	13.23%	17.42%	10.65%	20.00%
Creating environmentally friendly products	58.06%	32.26%	24.84%	20.97%	37.10%
Reducing waste and implementing recycling programs	53.87%	30.00%	22.90%	17.42%	36.45%
Promoting healthy lifestyles among employees	42.90%	17.74%	24.84%	11.29%	31.61%
Adjusting purchasing policies to sustainable criteria	29.35%	14.19%	14.19%	8.06%	21.29%
Implementing energy-saving programs in offices	35.16%	16.45%	18.06%	9.68%	25.48%
Developing diversity policies in recruitment and employment	22.90%	12.90%	10.00%	6.13%	16.77%

Source: authors' work based on survey data.

The highest support among respondents was given to actions such as supporting local communities (59.35%), creating environmentally friendly products (58.06%), investing in sustainable tech-

DOI: 10.34659/eis.2026.98.3.1353

nologies (56.45%), and reducing waste and implementing recycling programs (53.87%). These results confirm that surveyed Generation Z representatives particularly value initiatives directly related to environmental protection and improving the quality of life of local communities. This can be interpreted as a strong orientation of young people toward practical, visible effects of pro-environmental and social initiatives with both local and global impacts.

Significantly lower importance was assigned to initiatives related to diversity and inclusiveness (28.06%), employee volunteering (26.77%), or diversity policies in recruitment (22.90%). This indicates that although equality values are important for this group, they have a lower priority compared to actions focused on environmental protection and sustainable technological development. This may suggest that Generation Z treats environmental issues as a priority requiring immediate action.

Analysis by gender shows clear differences. Women more frequently than men rated all forms of engagement as important. The largest differences were observed in initiatives such as investing in sustainable technologies (27.42% K vs. 27.74% M) and creating environmentally friendly products (32.26% K vs. 24.84% M). Overall, women exhibit greater sensitivity to environmental and social issues.

The division between students (S) and students combining studies with employment (P) showed that those who work alongside studying are more critical in evaluating organisational initiatives. In all categories, the values were higher among students (e.g., supporting local communities – 20.32% S vs. 39.03% P; investing in technologies – 17.10% S vs. 39.35% P). It should be emphasised, however, that these differences did not reach statistical significance, as confirmed by the Kruskal-Wallis test results ($p > 0.05$). Therefore, the observed higher ratings among respondents combining work and study are purely descriptive and cannot serve as a basis for drawing definitive conclusions about the impact of professional experience on respondents' attitudes. The results rather indicate a trend that warrants further investigation on a larger and more diverse sample.

Next, respondents were asked to rate the importance of various forms of organisational engagement in social and ecological initiatives on a scale from 1 to 5 (Table 2).

Table 2. Assessment of the importance of organisational engagement in social and ecological initiatives from the perspective of Generation Z respondents

Specification	Arithmetic mean					Coefficient of variation (%)				
	All respondents (A)	Women (W)	Men (M)	Students (S)	Students and employed (E)	All respondents (A)	Women (W)	Men (M)	Students (S)	Students and employed (E)
Supporting local communities	3.87	3.93	3.81	3.88	3.87	28.45	27.10	29.91	27.55	29.00
Reducing carbon footprint	3.83	4.07	3.56	3.87	3.80	28.16	22.90	32.34	28.14	28.22
Investing in sustainable technologies	3.99	4.09	3.87	3.98	3.99	23.62	21.23	25.79	22.92	24.04
Promoting diversity and inclusiveness	3.49	3.80	3.17	3.53	3.46	31.61	25.70	35.97	29.74	32.67
Implementing transparent and ethical business practices	3.74	3.96	3.53	3.66	3.79	26.91	24.04	28.90	29.09	25.73
Developing employee volunteering programs	3.46	3.61	3.32	3.37	3.52	30.59	28.83	32.16	32.50	29.56
Transparency in reporting social and ecological activities	3.78	4.01	3.54	3.75	3.80	27.05	23.17	30.0	27.18	27.03
Cooperation with NGOs	3.63	3.75	3.51	3.61	3.63	27.29	24.22	30.33	27.64	27.17
Creating environmentally friendly products	4.08	4.35	3.80	4.10	4.07	25.29	20.15	29.09	26.12	24.88
Reducing waste and implementing recycling programs	4.10	4.33	3.86	4.09	4.10	24.19	20.16	27.23	24.79	23.9

DOI: 10.34659/eis.2026.98.3.1353

Specification	Arithmetic mean					Coefficient of variation (%)				
	All respondents (A)	Women (W)	Men (M)	Students (S)	Students and employed (E)	All respondents (A)	Women (W)	Men (M)	Students (S)	Students and employed (E)
Promoting healthy lifestyles among employees	3.83	4.00	3.69	3.76	3.87	28.68	24.33	32.11	31.73	27.01
Adjusting purchasing policies to sustainable criteria	3.69	3.92	3.44	3.65	3.71	26.03	22.19	28.63	26.71	25.71
Implementing energy-saving programs in offices	3.73	3.93	3.52	3.67	3.77	29.19	26.35	31.58	30.37	28.60
Developing diversity policies in recruitment and employment	3.58	3.82	3.35	3.59	3.57	29.65	25.40	33.11	29.92	29.57

Source: authors' work based on survey data.

Arithmetic means indicate that the most important actions were environmentally oriented, such as reducing waste and implementing recycling programs (M = 4.10), creating environmentally friendly products (M = 4.08), and investing in sustainable technologies (M = 3.99). These results demonstrate that the younger generation attaches particular importance to ecological issues, recognising them as a priority in organisational activities. This aligns with the global trend of increasing climate awareness and the belief that businesses have a tangible impact on improving the natural environment.

The lowest-rated initiatives were employee volunteering (M = 3.46), promoting diversity and inclusiveness (M = 3.49), and developing diversity policies in recruitment and employment (M = 3.58). Although these values still indicate a relatively positive assessment (close to a mean of 3.5), they clearly lag behind pro-environmental initiatives. This result can be interpreted as a shift in priorities toward environmental actions, perceived as more important and requiring greater organisational commitment. It may also suggest that while diversity and inclusiveness are valued by Generation Z in principle, they are not considered crucial in this context.

Table 3. Assessment of differences in attitudes toward sustainable initiatives

Specification	Mann–Whitney U test p<0.05 (Women vs. Men)	Kruskal–Wallis test (Students vs. Students and employ-ed)
Supporting local communities	0.439	0.408
Reducing carbon footprint	< 0.001	0.753
Investing in sustainable technologies	0.062	0.612
Promoting diversity and inclusiveness	< 0.001	0.775
Implementing transparent and ethical business practices	< 0.001	0.533
Developing employee volunteering programs	0.018	0.300
Transparency in reporting social and ecological activities	< 0.001	0.640
Cooperation with NGOs	0.052	0.744
Creating environmentally friendly products	< 0.001	0.477
Reducing waste and implementing recycling programs	< 0.001	0.922
Promoting healthy lifestyles among employees	0.028	0.801
Adjusting purchasing policies to sustainable criteria	< 0.001	0.176
Implementing energy-saving programs in offices	< 0.001	0.644
Developing diversity policies in recruitment and employment	< 0.001	0.744

Source: authors' work based on survey data.

DOI: 10.34659/eis.2026.98.3.1353

The analysis of the coefficients of variation indicates a moderate level of diversity in the assessment of different forms of organisational engagement. The lowest coefficients of variation were recorded for pro-environmental actions, such as investing in sustainable technologies, creating environmentally friendly products, and reducing waste through recycling programs (below 25%), which reflects a relatively high consensus among respondents regarding their importance. Higher coefficients of variation (above 30%) were observed for social initiatives, such as promoting diversity and inclusivity or developing employee volunteering programs, indicating greater variability in how these actions are perceived by the surveyed Generation Z participants. This may suggest a lack of clear consensus regarding the role and priority of social initiatives compared to ecological ones.

Next, an attempt was made to verify Hypotheses 2 and 3 using the Mann–Whitney U test and the Kruskal–Wallis test. The results are presented in Table 3.

The Mann–Whitney U test revealed statistically significant differences between women and men for most forms of engagement ($p < 0.05$). Women consistently rated both ecological and social actions higher, confirming the greater environmental and social sensitivity of this group. Differences were particularly pronounced in categories such as reducing the carbon footprint (K: M = 4.07; M: M = 3.56), promoting diversity and inclusiveness (K: M = 3.80; M: M = 3.17), and implementing transparent business practices (K: M = 3.96; M: M = 3.53).

Regarding the division between students and those combining studies with employment, the Kruskal–Wallis test did not show statistically significant differences ($p > 0.05$). This indicates that professional experience does not significantly differentiate the evaluation of individual forms of engagement. However, it can be observed that employed respondents, more frequently than students, appreciate practical and measurable actions, such as recycling or transparency in reporting, likely due to their greater exposure to business practice.

Discusion/Limitation and future research

According to the obtained results, surveyed Generation Z representatives attach great importance to organisational activities related to environmental protection and sustainable development. The highest mean scores were observed for reducing waste and implementing recycling programs (4.10), creating environmentally friendly products (4.08), and investing in sustainable technologies (3.99). These findings correspond with observations that Generation Z demonstrates growing awareness of the importance of sustainable development and acceptance of technological and economic solutions that facilitate its achievement (Kuzior et al., 2022). It is encouraging that the interconnections between the environment, the economy, and society are increasingly recognised (Dacko & Płonka, 2017). Initiatives aimed at promoting active solutions to environmental problems are gaining importance (Broman & Robèrt, 2025). Organisations should adhere to the principles of the circular economy (Tran-Thi-Thanh & Nguyen-Thi-Phuong., 2023; Streimikis et al., 2024; Streimikiene, 2024), implement recycling, and be capable of sharing resources, such as material assets (Mont et al., 2020; Khodayari et al., 2025).

An important area of respondents' expectations also concerns activities related to supporting local communities (3.87) and promoting a healthy lifestyle among employees (3.83). This indicates that for Generation Z, organisational development is important not only in ecological terms but also socially. Similar conclusions are drawn by Thang et al. (2023), emphasising that members of this generation are interested in corporate social responsibility. Noteworthy are also the results regarding transparency in reporting social and ecological activities (3.78) and the implementation of transparent and ethical business practices (3.74). The relatively high importance assigned to these categories is reflected in the literature (Bińczycki et al., 2023; Loring & Wang, 2022; Satpathy et al., 2019), which indicates that Generation Z expects organisations to treat employees fairly, embrace diversity, and create a supportive work environment.

The lowest mean values in the study were recorded for activities such as developing employee volunteering programs (3.46) and developing diversity policies in recruitment and employment (3.58). Although these values are not low, they may suggest that respondents value actions directly related to ecology and business ethics more than those of an indirect or institutional nature. This result can be interpreted in the context of Bhore and Tapas (2023) and Chala et al. (2022), who

DOI: 10.34659/eis.2026.98.3.1353

emphasise that Generation Z attaches great importance to the work environment and interpersonal relationships, yet when prioritising organisational initiatives, environmental aspects of sustainable development are most often placed first.

The observed gender differences may result from socio-cultural factors, including socialisation processes, which more often shape empathetic, pro-social attitudes in women, as well as greater sensitivity to environmental issues. The literature frequently points out that women more often internalise values related to concern for the common good, social responsibility, and environmental protection, which translates into higher evaluations of ecological and ethical actions undertaken by organisations. Previous studies confirm that women – regardless of cultural context – exhibit a higher level of ecological awareness and stronger support for initiatives related to sustainable development and corporate social responsibility than men (Rzemieniak & Wawer, 2021; Pandita & Khatwani, 2022). Moreover, based on research conducted in Vietnam, it can be stated that Generation Z also values workplace ethics and a focus on corporate social responsibility (Thang et al., 2023). Therefore, these differences are unlikely to be random and are embedded in a broader system of values and social norms that influence perceptions of the role of organisations in addressing environmental and social issues.

The obtained results indicate that organisations aiming to attract Generation Z should focus on pro-environmental, transparent, and ethical initiatives, while social actions can play a complementary role, enhancing the organisation's credibility (Kuzior et al., 2022; Pandita & Khatwani, 2022; Bińczycki et al., 2023).

Conclusions

The study made it possible to identify the preferences of Generation Z regarding the forms of organisational engagement in social and environmental initiatives and to assess their importance from the perspective of young employees and consumers. The results indicate that pro-environmental actions are particularly significant, such as reducing waste and implementing recycling programs, creating environmentally friendly products, and investing in sustainable technologies. Social initiatives, including promoting diversity and inclusivity, collaborating with non-governmental organisations, or developing employee volunteering programs, were rated lower. Although important, these activities were considered less of a priority.

The findings show that Generation Z places special emphasis on pro-environmental actions. The highest mean scores were awarded to initiatives related to waste reduction and recycling programs (M = 4.10), creating environmentally friendly products (M = 4.08), and investing in sustainable technologies (M = 3.99). At the same time, social initiatives, such as supporting local communities (M = 3.87) or promoting a healthy lifestyle among employees (M = 3.83), also received relatively high scores but did not reach the priority level attributed to ecological initiatives. Activities such as employee volunteering (M = 3.46), development of diversity policies (M = 3.58), and promoting inclusivity (M = 3.49) were rated lower, confirming the hypothesis that ecological aspects carry greater importance in the perception of Generation Z.

The analysis of demographic differences confirmed that the assessment of the significance of individual actions varies depending on respondents' gender and professional-educational status. Women consistently rated all forms of engagement higher than men, particularly in ecological areas and those related to transparency (e.g., carbon footprint reduction: F = 4.07 vs. M = 3.56; promoting diversity: F = 3.80 vs. M = 3.17). Regarding the distinction between students and those who study while working, although the Kruskal-Wallis test did not show statistically significant differences, a trend was observed in which working respondents more often appreciated practical and measurable organisational actions.

Based on these findings, it can be concluded that organisations seeking to attract and retain Generation Z representatives should implement strategies that integrate ecological, social, and ethical aspects while ensuring the authenticity of the actions undertaken. The study also showed that for the younger generation, environmental responsibility of the organisation is of key importance, whereas social issues (e.g., diversity, inclusivity, volunteering) play a supplementary role, enhancing the overall perception of organisational credibility and ethics.

DOI: 10.34659/eis.2026.98.3.1353

It should be emphasised, however, that the obtained results pertain to a specific group of respondents – students and graduates of economics-related fields in Poland – which limits the possibility of directly generalising them to other groups of Generation Z functioning in different cultural, educational, or professional contexts.

The results should be interpreted in light of these limitations. The sample was purposive and included individuals with a similar educational profile, which may have influenced their perception of issues related to sustainable development. Therefore, it is advisable to conduct further research involving Generation Z representatives from other countries, sectors, and educational levels, which would allow for the identification of cultural and professional differences in the perception of organisations' social and environmental activities.

The contribution of the authors

Conceptualisation, W.Ł.; literature review, W.Ł. and P.R.; methodology and investigation, P.R.; formal analysis, W.Ł. and P.R.; writing, W.Ł. and P.R.; conclusions and discussion, W.Ł. and P.R.

References

Andersson, S., Svensson, G., Molina-Castillo, F.-J., Otero-Neira, C., Lindgren, J., Karlsson, N. P. E., & Laurell, H. (2022). Sustainable development – Direct and indirect effects between economic, social, and environmental dimensions in business practices. Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 29(5), 1158–1172. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2261

Armstrong McKay, D. I., Staal, A., Abrams, J. F., Winkelmann, R., Sakschewski, B., Loriani, S., Fetzer, I., Cornell, S. E., Rockström, J., & Lenton, T. M. (2022). Exceeding 1.5°C global warming could trigger multiple climate tipping points. Science, 377(6611), eabn7950. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abn7950

Baruk, J. (2021). Wspieranie zarządzania innowacjami rozwiązaniami modelowymi. Marketing i Rynek, 28(3), 14–27. https://doi.org/10.33226/1231-7853.2021.3.2 (in Polish).

Beier, G., Fritzsche, K., Kunkel, S., Matthess, M., Niehoff, S., Reißig, M., & van Zyl-Bulitta, V. (2020). Green digitized economy? Challenges and opportunities for sustainability (IASS Fact Sheet 2020/1). Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies. https://doi.org/10.2312/iass.2020.028

Bhore, M., & Tapas, P. (2023). An exploratory study of factors influencing career decisions of Generation Z women in data science. SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 21, a2168. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v21i0.2168

Bińczycki, B., Łukasiński, W., & Dorocki, S. (2023). Determinants of motivation to work in terms of Industry 4.0 – The Gen Z perspective. Sustainability, 15(15), 12069. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151512069

Broman, G., Robèrt, K.-H., Collins, T. J., Basile, G., Baumgartner, R. J., Larsson, T., & Huisingh, D. (2017). Science in support of systematic leadership toward sustainability. Journal of Cleaner Production, 140(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.09.085

Broman, G. I., & Robèrt, K.-H. (2025). Operative system for strategic sustainable development – Coordinating analysis, planning, action, and use of supports. Sustainable Development, 33(4), 4759–4774. https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.3339

Całek, A. (2021). Pokolenie Z – próba diagnozy. Zeszyty Prasoznawcze, 64(1), 105–108. https://ejournals.eu/czasopismo/zeszyty-prasoznawcze/artykul/pokolenie-z-proba-diagnozy (in Polish).

Chala, N., Poplavska, O., Danylevych, N., Ievseitseva, O., & Sova, R. (2022). Intrinsic motivation of millennials and Generation Z in the new post-pandemic reality. Problems and Perspectives in Management, 20(2), 536–550. https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.20(2).2022.44

Chetty, D. R. V., Boojhawon, R., Bhagwant, S., & Levy, L. (2024). Factors affecting the occupational safety and health of small and medium enterprises in the construction sector of Mauritius. Social Sciences & Humanities Open, 10, 100964. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.100964

Czerwińska, M., & Bojar, E. (2021). Model akceptacji internetowych informacji zdrowotnych przez przedstawicieli pokolenia Z. Wyniki badań pilotażowych. Przegląd Organizacji, 4, 31–40. (in Polish).

Dacko, M., & Płonka, A. (2017). Idea rozwoju zrównoważonego w opiniach i postawach rolników. Roczniki Naukowe Stowarzyszenia Ekonomistów Rolnictwa i Agrobiznesu, 19(3), 38–43. (in Polish).

Eizenberg, E., & Jabareen, Y. (2017). Social sustainability: A new conceptual framework. Sustainability, 9(1), 68. https://doi.org/10.3390/su9010068

Fatemi, M., Rezaei-Moghaddam, K., Karami, E., Hayati, D., Wackernagel, M., & Vasa, L. (2021). An integrated approach of Ecological Footprint and AHP in human ecology. PLoS ONE, 16(4), e0250167. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0250167

DOI: 10.34659/eis.2026.98.3.1353

Feroz, A. K., Zo, H., & Chiravuri, A. (2021). Digital transformation and environmental sustainability: A review and research agenda. Sustainability, 13(3), 1530. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13031530

Global Footprint Network. (2009). *Ecological Footprint Standards 2009.* https://footprintnetwork.org/resources/data/footprint-standards/

Global Footprint Network. (2025). *Footprint Data Platform*. https://data.footprintnetwork.org

Goel, A., Masurkar, S., & Pathade, G. R. (2024). An overview of digital transformation and environmental sustainability. Sustainability, 16(24), 11079. https://doi.org/10.3390/su162411079

Grabiwoda, B. (2019). *E-konsumenci jutra. Pokolenie Z i technologie mobilne*. Wydawnictwo Nieoczywiste. (in Polish).

Griffin, R. W. (2017). *Podstawy zarządzania organizacjami.* Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN. (in Polish).

Grudzewski, W. M., Hejduk, I. K., Sankowska, A., & Wańtuchowicz, M. (2010). *Sustainability w biznesie, czyli przedsiębiorstwo przyszłości – zmiany paradygmatów i koncepcji zarządzania.* Poltext. (in Polish).

Hetmańczyk, P. (2024). Digitalization and its impact on labour market and education. Selected aspects. Education and Information Technologies, 29(9), 11119–11134. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12203-8

Iwański, T. (2017). Przemysł 4.0 i wszystko jasne. Napędy i Sterowanie, 1, 22–23. (in Polish).

Jones, J. W. (1994). *High-speed management: Time-based strategies for managers and organizations*. Jossey-Bass.

Khodayari, M., Akbari, M., & Foroudi, P. (2025). The sharing economy: A systematic literature review and research agenda. International Journal of Consumer Studies, 49(1), e70010. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijcs.70010

Kopacka, P. (2015). Rola lidera w efektywnym zarządzaniu zespołem projektowym. In A. Rogozińska-Pawełczyk (Ed.), *Gospodarowanie kapitałem ludzkim. Wyzwania organizacyjne i prawne* (pp. 129–142). Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego. https://doi.org/10.18778/7969-890-5.11 (in Polish).

Kuzior, A., Kettler, K., & Rąb, Ł. (2022). Great Resignation – Ethical, cultural, relational, and personal dimensions of Generation Y and Z employees' engagement. Sustainability, 14(11), 6764. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14116764

Ławińska, O., & Korombel, A. (2023). *Pokolenie Z jako wyzwanie współczesnego zarządzania przedsiębiorstwem. Relacje, media społecznościowe i crowdsourcing.* Politechnika Częstochowska. (in Polish).

Loring, A., & Wang, J. (2022). Engaging Gen Z in professional selling: A systematic literature review. European Journal of Training and Development, 46(5/6), 413–433. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-07-2020-0120

Lozano, R. (2008). Envisioning sustainability three-dimensionally. Journal of Cleaner Production, 16(17), 1838–1846. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2008.02.008

Łukasiński, W., Bińczycki, B., & Dorocki, S. (2021). *Kluczowe kompetencje organizacji XXI wieku*. Oficyna Wydawnicza Arboretum. (in Polish).

Marek-Kołodziej, K., Łapuńka, I., & Jagoda-Sobalak, D. (2018). Model kompetencji kierownika projektu według najnowszych wytycznych IPMA Project Excellence Baseline 4.0. Marketing i Zarządzanie, 51(1), 259–268. https://bazekon.icm.edu.pl/bazekon/element/bwmeta1.element.ekon-element-000171543406 (in Polish).

Mengoni, M., Matteucci, M., & Raponi, D. (2017). A multipath methodology to link ergonomics, safety and efficiency in factories. Procedia Manufacturing, 11, 1311–1318. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.promfg.2017.07.259

Messyasz, K. (2021). Pokolenie Z na rynku pracy – strukturalne uwarunkowania i oczekiwania. Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Sociologica, 76, 97–114. https://czasopisma.uni.lodz.pl/sociologica/article/view/10196 (in Polish).

Moch, E. (2024). The Fourth Industrial Revolution and its impact on production processes and efficiency enhancements through automation and data networking. East African Journal of Business and Economics, 7(1). https://doi.org/10.37284/eajbe.7.1.2109

Moczydłowska, J. M. (2023). *Przemysł 4.0 (?) Ludzie i technologie*. Wydawnictwo Difin. (in Polish).

Mont, O., Palgan, Y. V., Bradley, K., & Zvolska, L. (2020). A decade of the sharing economy: Concepts, users, business and governance perspectives. Journal of Cleaner Production, 269, 122215. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.122215

Muster, R. (2020). Pokolenie „Z" na współczesnym rynku pracy w opiniach pracodawców. Humanizacja Pracy, 1, 131–146. http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12128/13825 (in Polish).

Nowakowska, P. (2023). Zarządzanie zasobami ludzkimi w innowacyjnym przedsiębiorstwie. Zarządzanie Innowacyjne w Gospodarce i Biznesie, 36(1), 49-61. https://doi.org/10.25312/2391-5129.36/2023_03pn (in Polish).

Pandita, D., & Khatwani, R. (2022). Creating sustainable engagement practices for Generation Z: Role of CSR in organizations. Journal of Statistics Applications & Probability, 11(1), 241–254. https://doi.org/10.18576/jsap/110118

Papp-Váry, Á., Pacsi, D., & Szabó, Z. (2023). Sustainable aspects of startups among Generation Z – Motivations and uncertainties among students in higher education. Sustainability, 15(21), 15676. https://doi.org/10.3390/su152115676

Rembiasz, M., Borowiec, A., & Czajkowski, P. (2021). Wpływ kompetencji menedżerów na przewagę konkurencyjną przedsiębiorstw jako przejaw intraprzedsiębiorczości – wyniki badania delfickiego. Zeszyty Naukowe

Politechniki Poznańskiej. Organizacja i Zarządzanie, 83, 155–166. https://doi.org/10.21008/j.0239-9415.2021.083.10 (in Polish).

Richardson, K., Steffen, W., Lucht, W., Bendtsen, J., Cornell, S. E., Donges, J. F., Drüke, M., Fetzer, I., Bala, G., von Bloh, W., Feulner, G., Fiedler, S., Gerten, D., Gleeson, T., Hofmann, M., Huiskamp, W., Kummu, M., Mohan, C., Nogués-Bravo, D., ... Rockström, J. (2023). Earth beyond six of nine planetary boundaries. Science Advances, 9(37), eadh2458. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adh2458

Rzemieniak, M., & Wawer, M. (2021). Employer branding in the context of the company's sustainable development strategy from the perspective of gender diversity of Generation Z. Sustainability, 13(2), 828. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13020828

Sang, Y., Mingjian, X., Xiaolong, B., & Fusen, G. (2024). Does natural resource dependence influence the impact of financial technologies on corporate ESG and digital governance in China's listed enterprises?. Resources Policy, 91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2024.104948

Satpathy, I., Litt, D., Patnaik, B. C. M., & Palai, D. (2019). Challenges related to multi-generational workforce in manufacturing sector. International Journal of Mechanical Engineering and Technology, 10(1), 719–724.

Scafà, M., Papetti, A., Brunzini, A., & Germani, M. (2019). How to improve worker's well-being and company performance: A method to identify effective corrective actions. Procedia CIRP, 81, 162–167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2019.03.029

Serafin, K. (2015). Zmiany i innowacje w organizacji warunkiem budowania pozycji konkurencyjnej we współczesnym otoczeniu. Acta Universitatis Nicolai Copernici. Zarządzanie, 42(3), 117–136. https://doi.org/10.12775/AUNC_ZARZ.2015.037 (in Polish).

Stankiewicz-Mróz, A. (2020). Percepcja elastyczności pracy studentów jako reprezentantów pokolenia Z oraz pracodawców z sektora MŚP. Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi, 132(1), 49–63. https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0013.8778 (in Polish).

Streimikiene, D. (2023). Use of nudges for promotion of sustainable energy consumption in households. Contemporary Economics, 17(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.5709/ce.1897-9254.495

Streimikiene, D. (2024). Assessment of green growth in the Baltic States. Contemporary Economics, 18(1), 87–100. https://doi.org/10.5709/ce.1897-9254.527%0A

Streimikis, J., Ślusarczyk, B., Siksnelyte-Butkiene, I., & Mura, L. (2024). Development of circular economy in the Visegrad Group of countries. Contemporary Economics, 18(3), 365–375. https://doi.org/10.5709/ce.1897-9254.543%0A

Talan, A., Tyagi, R. D., & Surampalli, R. Y. (2020). *Sustainability: Fundamentals and applications*. John Wiley & Sons.

Tapscott, D. (2008). *Grown up digital: How the net generation is changing your world*. McGraw-Hill.

Thang, N. N., Rowley, C., Mayrhofer, W., & Nguyen, T. T. (2023). Generation Z job seekers in Vietnam: CSR-based employer attractiveness and job pursuit intention. Asia Pacific Business Review, 29(3), 797-815. https://doi.org/10.1080/13602381.2022.2058217

Tomaszuk, A., & Wasiluk, A. (2023). Pokolenie Z – perspektywa zaufania do przełożonych i współpracowników. Przegląd Organizacji, 2, 31–40. https://przegladorganizacji.pl/plik/655672544cac9/po.2023.02.09.pdf (in Polish).

Tran-Thi-Thanh, T., & Nguyen-Thi-Phuong, A. (2023). Exploring the mechanisms underlying firms' intent to adopt circular business models. Contemporary Economics, 17(4), 389–405. https://doi.org/10.5709/ce.1897-9254.518

Valencia, S. C., Simon, D., Croese, S., Nordqvist, J., Oloko, M., Sharma, T., Buck, N. T., & Versace, I. (2019). Adapting the Sustainable Development Goals and the New Urban Agenda to the city level: Initial reflections from a comparative research project. International Journal of Urban Sustainable Development, 11(1), 4–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/19463138.2019.1573172

Wickens, C. D., Gordon, S. E., Liu, Y., & Lee, J. (1997). *An introduction to human factors engineering*. Addison Wesley Longman.

Wieczorek, P. (2018). Czwarta rewolucja przemysłowa – wizja przemysłu nowej generacji – perspektywa dla Polski. Państwo i Społeczeństwo, 18(3), 89–115. https://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta1.element.desklight-81f54f02-3d65-4724-8abe-912eb4113507 (in Polish).

Zervas, I., Stiakakis, E., Athanasiadis, I., & Tsekouropoulos, G. (2024). A holistic approach to define important digital skills for the digital society. Societies, 14(7), 127. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc14070127

Wiesław ŁUKASIŃSKI • Piotr ROMAŃSKI

SPOŁECZNE I EKOLOGICZNE DZIAŁANIA ORGANIZACJI NA RZECZ TRWAŁEGO I ZRÓWNOWAŻONEGO JEJ ROZWOJU – PERSPEKTYWA PRZEDSTAWICIELI POKOLENIA Z

STRESZCZENIE: Celem artykułu jest identyfikacja preferencji pokolenia Z dotyczących zaangażowania organizacji w inicjatywy społeczne i ekologiczne oraz ocena ich postrzeganego znaczenia. Przeprowadzono badanie ankietowe online wśród 310 polskich studentów i absolwentów kierunków ekonomicznych, analizując odpowiedzi przy użyciu statystyki opisowej oraz testów U Manna-Whitneya i Kruskala-Wallisa. Wyniki pokazują, że pokolenie Z priorytetowo traktuje działania proekologiczne, takie jak ograniczanie odpadów, programy recyklingowe, produkty przyjazne środowisku oraz inwestycje w zrównoważone technologie. Inicjatywy społeczne, w tym promowanie różnorodności, wolontariat i współpraca z organizacjami pozarządowymi, zostały ocenione niżej. Istotne były różnice związane z płcią – kobiety konsekwentnie przypisywały większe znaczenie działaniom ekologicznym i społecznym, natomiast status zawodowo-edukacyjny miał mniejszy wpływ. Ze względu na fakt, że próba badawcza obejmowała polskich studentów i absolwentów kierunków ekonomicznych, uzyskane wyniki należy interpretować z ostrożnością, gdyż możliwość ich uogólnienia na całą populację pokolenia Z oraz na inne konteksty kulturowe lub zawodowe jest ograniczona. Wyniki sugerują, że organizacje chcące przyciągnąć i utrzymać pokolenie Z powinny integrować aspekty ekologiczne, społeczne i etyczne w sposób autentyczny.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: pokolenie Z, zrównoważony rozwój, społeczna odpowiedzialność biznesu, inicjatywy ekologiczne, zaangażowanie organizacji

DOI: 10.34659/eis.2026.98.3.1353