

Agata Chudzicka-Czupała

*SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities<sup>1</sup>*

Damian Grabowski

*SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities<sup>2</sup>*

Agnieszka Wilczyńska

*Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Krakow University<sup>3</sup>*

## Mobbing and discrimination in companies. The importance of prevention

### Streszczenie:

Autorzy tego artykułu poszukiwali odpowiedzi na pytanie o to, jaką rolę odgrywa wewnętrzna polityka firmy i postawa zarządu w zakresie walki z mobbingiem i dyskryminacją.

Zbadano pracowników dwóch przedsiębiorstw – 34,7% załogi dużej zagranicznej firmy produkcyjnej (201 osób) i 54,5% załogi średniej polskiej firmy usługowej (110 osób). W badaniu posłużono się metodą kwestionariuszową. Przeprowadzono też analizę jakościową danych, uzyskanych na podstawie wywiadów z pracownikami i obserwacji.

Wyniki koncentrują się na porównaniu badanych przedsiębiorstw. Odnoszą się one do rodzajów i częstotliwości zachowań o charakterze mobbingu i dyskryminacji oraz do reakcji zarządu obydwu firm na otrzymane raporty.

### Słowa kluczowe:

mobbing, dyskryminacja, prewencja mobbingu, klimat organizacji, kodeks etyczny

### Abstract:

The authors of this paper sought to determine the role of companies' internal policy and of the position of their management boards with regard to the fight against mobbing and discrimination.

Employees at two companies were studied: 34.7% of the staff of a large foreign manufacturing company (201 people) and 54.5% of the staff of a medium-sized Polish service provider company

---

<sup>1</sup> Agata Chudzicka-Czupała, Department of Psychology of Social and Organizational Behavior, Faculty of Psychology, SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, ul. Techników 9, 40-326 Katowice, [achudzicka-czupala@swps.edu.pl](mailto:achudzicka-czupala@swps.edu.pl)

<sup>2</sup> Damian Grabowski, Department of Psychology of Social and Organizational Behavior, Faculty of Psychology, SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, ul. Techników 9, 40-326 Katowice, [dgrabowski@swps.edu.pl](mailto:dgrabowski@swps.edu.pl)

<sup>3</sup> Agnieszka Wilczyńska, Faculty of Psychology and Human Sciences, Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Krakow University, ul. Gustawa Herlinga-Grudzińskiego 1, 30-705 Kraków, [awilczynska@afm.edu.pl](mailto:awilczynska@afm.edu.pl)

(110 people). The research used the questionnaire method. A qualitative analysis was also performed on the data obtained on the basis of interviews with the employees and of observation.

The results focus on a comparison of the two companies in the study. They refer to the types and frequencies of behavior bearing the hallmarks of mobbing and discrimination as well as to the reactions of the two companies' management boards to the reports they received.

**Keywords:**

mobbing, discrimination, mobbing prevention, organizational climate, ethical code

## **Introduction**

Mobbing and discrimination are described as various forms of employee bullying. According to Leymann, a Swedish psychologist who was the first to describe the phenomenon of mobbing, it is "psychological terror in working life, characterized by hostile and unethical behavior repeated systematically by one or more individuals, directed mainly against a single individual who is deprived of any chances for help or defense as a result of mobbing" (as cited in: Blicharz, 2014, p. 25). Discrimination, on the other hand, means unequal treatment of people and unjustified differentiation between people's situations or rights. Discrimination tends to be considered to be a manifestation of mobbing, but it also occurs as incidental behavior, which in that case differs from mobbing (cf. Chudzicka-Czupała, & Dobrowolska, 2016).

Mobbing and discrimination in the workplace entail a series of negative effects, not only in the individual aspect (Hogh, Mikkelsen, & Hansen, 2011; cf. Chudzicka-Czupała, 2013), but also for the whole organization, like the possibility of losing its good image, leading to substantial financial losses (Di Martino, Hoel, & Cooper, 2003), as well as a decline in morale across the company (Dorman, 2000; Hallberg, & Strandmark, 2006).

This is why an organization's internal policy aimed at prevention seems to be important. According to a review that was made of the existing research, few analyses so far have addressed the issue of prevention, whether in Poland (Durniat, Krupa, & Działa, 2016), or internationally (Salin 2008; Harrington, Rayner, & Warren, 2012). Durniat, Krupa and Działa (2016) emphasize that there are in fact very many organizations in Poland that have not done anything yet with regard to the protection of their employees against mobbing. The authors of this article made the same observations and felt compelled, during research they carried out which was commissioned by two companies, to answer the question about the role of the attitude of the managers in these organizations.

The World Health Organization recommends that preventive schemes include three types of measures, which can be described as primary, secondary and tertiary prevention

(Merecz, Drabek, & Mościcka, 2005). The aim of primary prevention is to eliminate and limit mobbing by creating appropriate working conditions which are supposed to guarantee a high level of safety to the employees (the optimum organizational climate).

Secondary prevention is considered to consist in measures aimed at training and improving employees' competences with regard to coping with situations when aggressive behavior occurs (measures used to mitigate the adverse effects of exposure to difficult situations of this kind, procedures of monitoring and documenting behavior bearing the hallmarks of mobbing, the application of existing legal and organizational procedures whose aim is to effectively protect the victims against bullying).

Tertiary prevention consists in support provided to people who have experienced mobbing and discrimination in the workplace, whose mental and physical condition has deteriorated, making it more difficult for them to function at work or in the family (medical assistance, psychological therapy or legal aid, the drafting of transparent procedures for the reporting of various forms of violence against employees, as well as the determination of methods of handling complaints).

The research whose analysis is presented in this paper was of an exploratory and a practical nature. When carrying out the studies commissioned by the two organizations, we sought to diagnose the occurrence and the intensity of behavior bearing the hallmarks of mobbing and discrimination. We sought to check whether employees in company A and company B were experiencing the same behavior when they were victims and the witnesses, what the behavior was, how frequent it was as well as what percentage of people complained about experiencing it.

We carried out the research independently for each of the two parties commissioning the study. Our ultimate task was to describe the situation in a report, indicating to the management boards of the two companies the possible ways of solving potential problems and of proceeding to potential interventions. These were the goals we indicated to both companies before proceeding to the research, and they were approved by both companies.

Additionally, we were interested in the relationship between the experiencing of mobbing and discrimination and the assessment of the organizational climate, employee satisfaction, mutual trust and the quality of relations between people in the workplace.

Another goal was to compare the two companies in terms of their internal preventive policy, both that which existed earlier and that which was implemented after our study. We were interested in the importance of the position taken by the organization's managers on the fight against mobbing and manifestations of discrimination, as well as in the management board's subsequent reaction in both companies to the reports on the research submitted to them.

## Materials and Methods

### *Participants*

The research was conducted in 2016 in the Polish region of Silesia. It covered employees from two companies: company A, a large foreign manufacturing company operating on the Polish market, and company B, a medium-sized Polish service provider company. Organization A is a manufacturing company (a factory), while organization B is a transport services provider. Information about headcount and the characteristics of the two study samples in terms of social and demographic data are shown in Table 1.

*Table 1. Characteristics of the study subjects*

Variables	Company A	Company B
Total headcount	575	202
Number of study subjects – number of questionnaires returned/ percentage of the staff	201 (34.7% of the staff)	110 (54.5% of the staff)
Age of the study subjects	21–60, M=38 SD = 8.75	24–62, M=46 SD = 10.28
Education:		
primary	2 persons	3 persons
vocational	34 persons	37 persons
secondary	34 persons	47 persons
higher	35 persons	7 persons
Marital status:		
married	119 persons	81 persons
in an unmarried couple	33 persons	9 persons
single	28 persons	5 persons
Length of service	M=18 SD = 9.67	M=27 SD = 11.44
Length of service with the company	M=10 SD = 6.23 (65% have been employed for up to 15 years)	M=17 SD = 12.64 (50% of the staff have been working for less than 15 years)
Managerial positions	13 persons	3 persons
Gender	138 male, 49 female, 13 people didn't reveal their gender	86 male, 12 female

### **Questionnaires and interviews**

A questionnaire study was used to collect the data, covering all the employees in the two companies. The tool employed was composed of 25 items, describing behavior bearing the hallmarks of mobbing (20 categories) and discrimination (5 categories). For examples of items, see Tables 2 and 3. Each item was provided with a 4-point Likert scale: 1 – never, 2 – rarely, 3 – often, 4 – very often (the following questions were asked: *How often do you experience this personally?* and *How often do you witness such behavior?* Another question that was asked was *How long has this behavior been occurring?* (for a period shorter than six months, longer than six months). The sum of all the 25 items was used in the calculations, i.e. the indicator of the frequency of experiencing mobbing and discriminatory behavior from the point of view of its victim and witnesses (Cronbach's reliability coefficient  $\alpha = 0.95$  in both cases). The percentage ratio was also calculated, i.e. the percentage of study subjects admitting to have experienced specific behavior from another person at work either often or very often, or to have witnessed such behavior, which had occurred repeatedly for over six months.

The employees were also asked to evaluate the organizational climate (10 items, e.g. *My direct co-workers don't respect others; I like meeting with the people from my team every day*;  $\alpha = 0.88$ ), employee satisfaction (2 items, *Rate your level of job satisfaction*, *Rate the level of satisfaction with your work duties, with their nature and quantity*, with a Likert-type scale of answers from 1 – Not satisfied at all to 5 – Very satisfied;  $\alpha = 0.72$ ) and trust (2 items, *Rate the level of mutual trust between employees at this company*, *Rate the level of trust towards the company's management*, with a Likert-type scale of answers from 1 – the employees don't trust one another to 5 – the employees trust one another;  $\alpha = 0.77$ ). The employees also rated the quality of interpersonal relations in the workplace using a five-point Likert-type scale (from 1 to 5, where 1 meant poor relations and 5 meant good relations).

Subsequently, using the interview method, we conducted interviews with HR staff at company A and trade union members in both companies in order to compare the two organizations in terms of the internal preventive policy pursued, aimed at preventing unethical behavior, mobbing and discrimination. Our study also covered the subsequent reaction on the part of the managers of the two organizations to the report they received from us and to further recommendations constituting the basis for intervention at a later date.

### **Procedure**

In company A, the research was initiated by a trade union representative and subsequently undertaken and formally announced by the management board. The research in com-

pany B was initiated by management board members who had received complaints from the staff about the bad atmosphere in the workplace. In both cases, the research was preceded by a meeting of the authors of the research with employees: in the case of company A, with employees in the HR department and with a trade union representative (the management board had not expressed its will to meet), while in the case of company B, with the management board, trade union representatives and staff.

The research lasted around one month, which allowed time for every employee to be able to participate, including those temporarily away on sick leave. It was anonymous and voluntary. The questionnaire was preceded by questions about consenting to participate in the research and by information that the interviewee may stop completing it at any time. The questionnaire took around 15–30 minutes to fill out. The forms were then put in a box supervised by a trusted representative and monitored by the company's security staff, and the contents of the box were subsequently handed over directly to the people conducting the research, without third parties being allowed to inspect the questionnaires.

Interviews with the employees of the HR department in company A and with trade union representatives of both companies took place 3 to 6 months after we had submitted the reports on the studies to the management boards of companies A and B. The meetings were voluntary and were initiated by both parties. They took place in the companies that had been studied and lasted around 20–30 minutes. Their aim was to determine what had happened in the organizations after the submission of our reports on the manifestations of mobbing and discrimination and how the management boards of the two companies had reacted.

## Results

### *Manifestations of mobbing and discrimination. A comparison of the companies being studied*

The results of the research proved that behavior constituting manifestations of mobbing was happening in both companies. According to a substantial part of the staff (over 20%) in both companies A and B, this behavior happened repeatedly, lasting longer than six months, and therefore could be considered as conduct bearing the hallmarks of mobbing and discrimination. Table 2 shows the forms of behavior the largest number of people complained about being victims of.

Table 2. Percentage of people complaining about being victims of behavior bearing the hallmarks of mobbing and discrimination

No.	Questionnaire item	A	B
A1	Treating a specific employee much worse than others	27	26
A2	Unjustified criticism of the effects of work of some employees	24	23
A4	Unfair assignment of duties, for instance assigning too many duties to a specific individual compared to other employees	32	26
A8	Unjustified bans or orders	22	19
A10	Clear disrespect towards some employees	27	32
A12	Backbiting an employee, gossiping, destroying someone's good reputation	35	28

Key: A and B – percentage of the people surveyed in companies A and B who declared that they had experienced the specific kind of behavior often and very often for more than six months

Statistical tests, a t-test for two averages (StatSoft, 2012; Hill & Lewicki, 2007) and a U-test of the equality of ratios between the structures of the two populations (Krysicki, Bartos, Dyczka, Królikowska, Wasilewski, 1986) demonstrated that other behavior occurred much more frequently in company A than in company B (cf. Table 3). The frequency of witnessing such behavior was much higher in organization A (A: M = 42.09 SD = 14.97; B: M = 37.24 SD = 13.28; t = 2.84, p < 0.01; α = 0.95).

Table 3. Frequency of behavior bearing the hallmarks of mobbing and discrimination and the percentage of people witnessing it

No.	Questionnaire item	A (M)	B (M)	t-test	A	B	U-test
A1	Treating a specific employee much worse than others	2.15	1.76	3.39***	41	24	3.04**
A2	Unjustified criticism of the effects of work of some employees	2.09	1.79	2.9**	33	24	1.7*
A4	Unfair assignment of duties	1.94	1.7	2.03*	28	24	0.8
A9	Ignoring some people, avoiding contact with them and disrespecting them (treating them as if they didn't exist, not responding to greetings)	1.75	2.05	-2.47**	21	35	-2.69**
A12	Backbiting an employee, gossiping, destroying someone's good reputation	2.29	1.85	3.49***	43	25	3.11***
A13	Publicly mocking some employees, for instance their competences, appearance and behavior, parodying them	2.22	1.53	5.92***	39	12	5.08***
A14	Laughing behind someone's back at matters related to their private lives, for instance family, interests and political opinions	1.9	1.46	3.78***	29	9	4.03***
A15	Unfair suggestions that someone may be mentally ill or disturbed	1.61	1.28	3.37***	16	7	2.27*
A16	Using expressions towards some people supposed to offend and to humiliate them (insults, mockery)	1.95	1.53	3.9***	27	12	3.09**
A17	Humiliating an employee in the presence of others by means of gestures, meaningful smiles, ridicule	1.93	1.49	3.85***	30	12	3.58***

A19	Setting other employees against someone	1.65	1.44	2.06*	18	14	1.07
A22	Treating someone worse due to their age	1.4	1.15	3.31**	10	5	1.68*
A25	Treating someone worse due to their political views	1.11	1.23	-2.10*	1	5	-2.38*

Key:

A(M) and B (M) –average frequency of behavior in organizations A and B (1–4 scale); A and B – percentage of the people surveyed in companies A and B who declared that they had witnessed the specific kind of behavior often and very often for more than six months;

t-test for two averages; U-test – test of the equality of ratios between the two populations’ structure

\*\*\* p<0.001; \*\* p<0.01; \* p<0.05; # p<0.1

The data in Tables 2 and 3 proves that behavior bearing the hallmarks of mobbing and discrimination occurs much more often in company A than in company B, and that a larger percentage of the staff interviewed in company A complained about being the victims and witnesses of such behavior. In company B, only ignoring, avoiding contact and disrespecting certain people occurs significantly more frequently, with a much higher percentage of people claiming that they have witnessed such behavior. Similarly, there is a higher percentage of people in company B who complained about discrimination of individuals based on their political views.

Additionally, in both organizations the more frequent experiencing of mobbing and discriminatory behavior correlates negatively with the judgment of the climate as friendly (A:  $r = -0.55$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; B:  $r = -0.26$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), employee satisfaction (A:  $r = -0.50$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; B:  $r = -0.52$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), trust (A:  $r = -0.48$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; B:  $r = -0.48$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and the assessment of the quality of relations between people in the workplace (A:  $r = -0.43$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; B:  $r = -0.47$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). It is worth pointing out that in organization A, the people who experienced behavior bearing the hallmarks of mobbing and discrimination are more likely to judge the organizational climate negatively, while in organization B there is a weaker tendency to do so, which means that despite such negative experiences, not everyone judges the organization in a clearly negative manner.

### ***Results of a supplementary qualitative study***

The behavior described by employees from company A pointed to bad or very bad interpersonal relations in company A (for instance “addressing employees in a vulgar manner, throwing things around, vindictiveness, absence of freedom of expression, introducing an atmosphere of fear, conspiring against someone, picking on people”).

Employees from company A treated the questionnaire as an opportunity to also complain about other things that bothered them, resulting from inappropriate work organization, which was perceived as unfair, or from the abuse of power. They complained about bias in favor of certain people and about the absence of clear rules. The employees also complained about cronyism, about the setting up of cliques, and about superiors having their subordinates do all the work. Violations of occupational health and safety rules and



of the labor code were also mentioned. The highest number of complaints added by the staff appeared in the questionnaires filled out by the same departments in company A in which the highest frequency of manifestations of mobbing and discrimination was also indicated.

In company B, there were much fewer free comments and they mainly concerned the ignoring of employees, as well as the distribution of tasks by superiors, which was perceived as unfair.

***Methods of preventing mobbing and discrimination in the companies that were studied***

Table 4 shows the findings based on interviews with employees concerning the elements of the policy of mobbing prevention in both organizations and the measures undertaken by the two companies' management boards.

*Table 4. Elements of the mobbing prevention policy and measures undertaken in the two companies being studied – a comparison*

Characteristics	Company A	Company B
Party initiating the research	social aspect (the management board consented to the research by way of compromise)	members of the company's management board and a representative of the supervisory board, concerned about comments from the staff and by isolated complaints
Primary preventive policy	lack of care about improving the organizational climate	care demonstrated by the management board about improving the organizational climate
Secondary preventive policy	the HR department implemented appropriate regulations; provisions had been in place at the company concerning an anti-mobbing policy before the research, and an ethical code of conduct had existed	no HR Department no ethical code of conduct in place before the research
Tertiary preventive policy	no preventive measures, the company's management board failed to comply with the recommendations, the results of the report on the research were ignored and made light of (management board members joked among themselves and with lower level managers about the contents of the report, they didn't meet with the staff, the HR department also failed to take action)	the psychologists' recommendations were acted upon: the management board met with the staff and publicly expressed disapproval of behavior bearing the hallmarks of mobbing and discrimination, the drafting of a transparent procedure for the reporting of various forms of violence against employees started, as well as the determination of methods of handling complaints in force at the company, an ethical code of conduct was implemented, certain employees were replaced in some divisions of the company, selected employees were reprimanded

The research and the observations that were made point to differences in the prevention policies and in the management boards' position towards unethical behavior on the part of employees. The reaction of the managers in company B was much more firm and unambiguous. Remedial measures were applied which were aimed at improving the situation, while in company A the report and the psychologists' recommendations were disregarded, and the research results were made light of.

## **Discussion**

The research whose results are described in this paper shows that in company A, the employees who were interviewed have experienced much more behavior bearing the hallmarks of mobbing and discrimination than in company B, that the frequency of such behavior has been much higher in company A, and that a higher percentage of the staff interviewed have complained about being victims and witnesses of such behavior.

The research proves that the two organizations have a different policy with regard to prevention. In company A, which is able to follow foreign models with regard to the prevention of mobbing and discrimination and to the combating of such phenomena, and where there is an HR department employing specialists, the situation is worse than in company B, where no anti-mobbing policy has been implemented so far and where there was no ethical code of conduct or procedures in place in the case of any manifestations of mobbing or discrimination. On the basis of subsequent interviews, one could suppose that in organization B, a smaller company deprived of models of earlier measures of this kind and of support from HR department specialists, the management board's reaction and the unambiguous position taken by the company's management may contribute to a genuine change and consequently to the improvement of relations between people.

According to Kmiecik-Baran and Rybicki (2004), measures related to the prevention of mobbing and discrimination in the workplace which an employer should strive to implement are preventive measures, organizational procedures aimed at counteracting and combating mobbing, and mediation (consultancy). Preventive measures involve information measures, making sure that human resources management processes are correct, as well as revealing and publicly deploring the perpetrators of mobbing (Godlewska-Werner, 2006). In company B, a strong tendency was observed to undertake such measures, while in company A, which is a foreign company, and where mechanisms were developed to prevent violence in the workplace, the existence of appropriate provisions (an ethical code of conduct) did not lead to the desire to do so.

The results of our observations, even though they only concern two organizations, confirm the results of the research carried out by Aquino and Lamertz (2004), who prove

that aspects related to the external context, such as social aspects, mutual trust, organizational climate and the level of tolerance of mobbing in the workplace resulting from the management board's attitude are very strongly linked with the frequency of such behavior. The employees studied by Durniat (2009) considered the most important causes of mobbing to be overall chaos and organizational disorder. It would be interesting to study the role of those aspects. The results shown in this paper may also provide inspiration for a study on the importance of the position taken by the company's management board on mobbing and discrimination, which seems to be key. It would be appropriate to have such research cover a larger number of different organizations, to change the methodology, to develop the right questionnaires and to use tools verified from the psychometric point of view. It would also be worthwhile focusing attention on the organizational climate and on the anti-mobbing policy, studying these variables from the point of view of managers at various levels, HR department employees and subordinates. In further studies, it would be worthwhile to take into account intercultural comparisons and the gender aspect. Hauge, Sgogstad and Einarsen (2009) emphasize that the more male-dominated the working environment, the more likely the occurrence of mobbing. The results of the studies carried out by the said Norwegian researchers suggest that men perpetrate mobbing more often.

Research and practical experience prove that important aspects in the fight against mobbing and in the prevention of the phenomenon include the organization's management board's firm and loudly expressed declaration, addressed to all the employees, and the management's unambiguous and firm position, expressing disapproval and objections to such behavior (cf. Durniat, Krupa, & Działa, 2016). The declarations should be accompanied by a genuine effort to explain and resolve such issues in a fair manner.

If the organization's CSR policy towards its own employees assumes the observance of an ethical code, if ethical conduct is rewarded and those violating the rules are punished, managers at various levels seek to act appropriately, because firstly they understand the importance of such behavior and they have a growing awareness that they also need to set an example to their subordinates in this area, and secondly they no longer feel that they can go unpunished and they therefore seek to control their own behavior. Silence means consenting to immorality (Bugdol, 2007). According to researchers, those who can be blamed for a poor organizational climate may be the superiors, characterized by an autocratic, non-interventionist style of management, who do not treat their subordinates as partners and do not attach adequate importance to the quality of interpersonal relations at work, whose "uninterested leadership and narcissistic management" may have very negative effects (Nerka, 2013, p. 291; cf. Kmiecik-Baran, 2003, Warszevska-Makuch, 2005).

The results of our analysis also confirm the views of Leymann (1996), who emphasizes that in the studies of unethical behavior in organizations, the aspects that play a key role are organizational determinants and problems related to the functioning of the whole community within the company, while personality-related aspects are important, but much less significant. We are convinced that further research into the effective prevention of mobbing and discrimination in organizations should focus on working conditions and on relations between people within the organization, but also on the attitudes of the companies' managers.

## References:

- Aquino, K., & Lamertz, K. (2004). A relational model of workplace victimization: Social roles and patterns of victimization in dyadic relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 1023-1034.
- Blicharz, J. (2014). *Problem mobbingu jako formy wykluczenia społecznego i prawnego*. [The problem of mobbing as a form of social and legal exclusion]. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Bugdol, M. (2007). *Gry i zachowania etyczne w organizacji*. [Games and unethical behavior in the organization]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Difin.
- Chudzicka-Czupała, A. (2013). *Etyczne zachowanie się człowieka w organizacji*. [Ethical behavior of man at work]. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Chudzicka-Czupała, A., & Dobrowolska, M. (2016). Mobbing w doświadczeniach pracowników zatrudnionych w elastycznych formach pracy i w spółdzielniach socjalnych [Mobbing in experiences of employees]. *Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi*, 5, 112, 117-140.
- Dorman, P. (2000). *The Economics of Safety, Health and Well-being at Work: An Overview*. Geneva: International Labour Organization.
- Durniat, K. (2009). Mobbing i jego konsekwencje jako szczególny rodzaj kryzysu zawodowego. [Mobbing and its consequences as a particular type of occupational crisis]. *Przedsiębiorczość i Zarządzanie*, 10(11), 129–148.
- Durniat, K., Krupa, A., & Działa, B., (2016). Organizacyjne mechanizmy prewencji i radzenia sobie z mobbingiem z perspektywy specjalistów HR [Organizational mechanisms of prevention of and coping with mobbing from the point of view of HR specialists]. *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu*, 430, 83-95.

- Godlewska-Werner, D. (2006). Mobbing w polskich przedsiębiorstwach. [Mobbing in Polish companies]. *Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi*, 1, 46, 43-56.
- Hallberg, L. R. M., & Strandmark, M. K. (2006) Health consequences of workplace bullying: Experiences from the perspective of employees in the public service sector. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health & Well-Being*, 1, 109-119.
- Harrington, S., Rayner, C., & Warren, S. (2012). Too hot to handle? Trust and human resource practitioners' implementation of anti-bullying policy. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 22, 4, 392-408.
- Hauge, L. J., Skogstal A., Einarsen, S., (2009). Individual and situational predictors of workplace bullying. Why do perpetrators engage in the bullying of others? *Work and Stress*, 23, 349-358.
- Hill, T., & Lewicki, P. (2007). *Statistics: Methods and Applications*. Tulsa, OK: Stat-Soft.
- Hogh, A., Mikkelsen, E.G., & Hansen, A.M. (2011) *Individual consequences of Workplace bullying/mobbing*. In: Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D. and Cooper, C. (Eds.) *Bullying and Harassment in the Workplace*, London: Taylor and Francis, 107-128.
- Kmieciak-Baran, K., & Rybicki, J. (2004). *Mobbing zagrożenie współczesnego miejsca pracy*. [Mobbing: a threat in today's workplaces]. Gdańsk: Pomorski Instytut Demokratyczny.
- Krysicki, W., Bartos, J., Dyczka, W., Królikowska, K., & Wasilewski, M. (1986). *Rachunek prawdopodobieństwa i statystyka matematyczna w zadaniach*. [The probability calculus and mathematical statistics in problems]. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of bullying at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5, 165-184.
- Merecz, D., Drabek, M., & Mościcka, A. (2005). *Mobbing w środowisku pracy. Charakterystyka zjawiska, jego konsekwencje, aspekty prawne i sposoby przeciwdziałania* [Mobbing in the working environment. Characterization of the phenomenon, its consequences, legal aspects and counteractive methods]. Łódź: Instytut Medycyny Pracy im. Prof. J. Nofera.
- Nerka, A. (2013). Mobbing jako przykład nieetycznych zachowań w miejscu pracy. *Annales*. [Mobbing as an example of unethical behavior in the workplace. Annales]. *Etyka w życiu gospodarczym*, 16, 281-294.

Salin, D. (2008). The prevention of workplace bullying as a question of human resource management: Measures adopted and underlying organizational factors. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 24, 2, 21–231.

Warszewska-Makuch, M. (2005). Mobbing w pracy – przyczyny i konsekwencje. [Mobbing at work—sources and consequences]. *Bezpieczeństwo Pracy*, 404, 3, 5-7