

INTENTIONS OF TRANSPORT SECTOR EMPLOYEES TO LEAVE THE JOB: IS WORKPLACE MOBBING TRULY A CATALYST?

Jolita VVEINHARDT ¹, Simona DOMARKAITĖ ², Mykolas DEIKUS ³

¹*Vytautas Kavolis Interdisciplinary Research Institute, Vytautas Magnus University, Kaunas, Lithuania*

²*Faculty of Economics and Management, Vytautas Magnus University, Kaunas, Lithuania*

³*Faculty of Catholic Theology, Vytautas Magnus University, Kaunas, Lithuania*


Article History:

- received 9 May 2024
- accepted 24 June 2024

Abstract. Although previous studies have focused on workplace mobbing in transport companies, there is still a lack of research showing which variables have the greatest impact on employees' intentions to leave their jobs. To address this gap, this paper aims to explore the workplace mobbing variables that strongly impact employees' intentions to leave their workplaces in Lithuanian transport companies. Using the questionnaire "Mobbing and single cases of harassment in employees' relations – MSCH", 440 employees of transport companies were surveyed. The performed analysis provided regression models aimed at reducing employees' intentions to leave the workplace, eliminating regressors with the greatest negative influence, and at the same time, increasing the regressor with the most positive impact, i.e., prevention. The study revealed that abuse in assigning work tasks, poor self-feeling of employees, and experienced damage and prevention measures explained almost 45% of the dispersion in the intentions of transport sector employees to leave the job. In this context, the intervention measures used by the companies were not significant. The study shows that employees' intentions to leave the job are most influenced by employees' self-feeling, while prevention of workplace mobbing should be seen in a broader context, focusing on the ethics of managers' relationships with employees. It also highlights the importance of creating a safe and trustworthy organisational environment and suggests that prevention strategies should address broader contexts, including abuse in task assignments, employees' self-feeling, and the power dynamics of perpetrators.

Keywords: employees, intentions to leave the job, workplace mobbing, transport companies.

JEL Classification: M12, M15, M19.

 Corresponding author. E-mail: jolita.vveinhardt@vdu.lt

1. Introduction

Research has shown that workplace mobbing is a common phenomenon in the transport sector (Glasø et al., 2011; Gonçalves et al., 2020) and is related to significant damage to the psychological and physical health of employees, causing stress and burnout, leading to quitting the job and a high rate of employee turnover (Desrumaux et al., 2020). The serious consequences of this phenomenon are related to its specificity since workplace mobbing differs from other types of interpersonal conflicts in that it is a long-term, escalating conflict with frequent attacks that are systematically directed at the target person (Zapf, 1999; da Silva João & Saldanha Portelada, 2019; Mujtaba & Senathip, 2020). This is one of the most intractable problems arising in the workplace (Bayin Donar & Yesilaydin, 2022; Matsson & Jordan, 2022; Tekşen & Cemaloğlu, 2023).

Research shows that mobbing has a negative impact on employee relationships and cooperation in the workplace in general (Hogh et al., 2011), reduces organisational commitment (Yuksel & Tunçsiper, 2011), has a particularly negative effect on organisational culture, weakens job satisfaction, and creates a tense atmosphere between employees (Petrescu & Manghiuc, 2020). In addition, mobbing is completely independent of the organisation's size (Jarosz & Gozdecki, 2021); i.e., it can occur in both small and large organisations, causing the same amount of damage. Workplace mobbing causes problems not only for the individuals experiencing it but also for the organisation itself (Gulin, 2019). Organisations that do not fight this phenomenon end up losing their best employees (Branch et al., 2013; Krishna et al., 2023); however, improving organizational efficiency can be achieved by boosting employee motivation (Alper Ay, 2024).

Transport companies, whose importance is increasing with the acceleration of globalisation processes, encounter a number of challenges in retaining the best employees. Challenges are also related to the specificity of the activity characterised by high workload and stress (Andrejić et al., 2020; Nguyen et al., 2023), the dynamics of negative relationships manifested by aggression and pressure from managers (Nobili et al., 2023), psychological violence (Pritchard et al., 2023), and a lack of respect and appreciation (Nguyen et al., 2023; Pritchard et al., 2023). Andrejić et al. (2020) believe that one way to cope with stress is to solve problems in teams, but in the case of mobbing, colleagues cause the most stress (Zapf, 1999).

Emotional exhaustion of employees triggers their intention to leave the job (Alper Ay & Türkdoğan, 2018). Organisations should notice dangerous situations promptly and take appropriate actions to protect employees from psychological strain, negative emotions and emotional exhaustion (Rai & Agarwal, 2018). Transport companies and trade unions are therefore encouraged to seek preventive actions mainly directed at persons in managerial positions and informative and instrumental actions aimed at helping employees recognise real workplace bullying situations (Gonçalves et al., 2020). However, despite various efforts, the phenomenon is becoming increasingly recognised (Batsi & Karamanis, 2019), and a number of employees still do not realise that the situation they have fallen into is workplace mobbing (Tekşen & Cemaloğlu, 2023).

Thus, effective prevention requires knowledge of the specificity of the phenomenon (Krishna et al., 2023), especially how it manifests itself in a specific sector. According to Vie et al. (2011), who studied the impact of victims' self-stigmatisation on health, the transport sector is distinguished by its unique organisational culture. That is, interpersonal relationships, experiences, and reactions may differ from those experienced by workers in other sectors. However, few studies have investigated the relationship between workplace mobbing and transport sector workers' intentions to leave their jobs. For example, Norwegian postal and transport employees' intentions to leave the job were found to be influenced by perceived injustice (Reknes et al., 2021), and a study conducted by Glasø et al. (2011) showed that bullying experienced by Australian bus drivers from colleagues, passengers, and managers was negatively related to job engagement and job satisfaction and positively related to intentions to change the workplace. Although ensuring justice and creating conditions that promote job satisfaction are undoubtedly significant tasks, in this context, there is a lack of knowledge about coworker actions by which mobbing manifests itself in transport companies and about the types of damage associated with the intentions to quit the job. Therefore, this study aims to determine how different workplace mobbing variables influence transport sector employees' intentions to leave their jobs.

The article consists of four parts. First, a literature review is presented, which sheds light on workplace mobbing and the main reasons for employees' intentions to

quit their jobs. Second, the methodological parameters of the empirical study and the ethical principles of the research are detailed. The third section presents the research results, which show the factors influencing employees' intentions to leave the job and their effects. Finally, the results of this study, which demonstrate how the specificity of workplace mobbing in transport companies influences employees' intentions to quit their jobs, are discussed. This study contributes to the literature examining the consequences of workplace mobbing by providing new knowledge about the causes of transport workers' intentions to leave their jobs. It explains how they are influenced by managers' abuse in assigning tasks, self-feeling of mobbing targets, and the power possessed by perpetrators. It also highlights the areas that managers of transport companies should focus on.

2. Literature review

Workplace mobbing. Mobbing is understood as an offensive, deliberate and frequent attempt to shame, humiliate and belittle the individual, worsen his or her working conditions, and threaten personal and professional integrity (Rissi et al., 2016). It is performed by one or more coworkers, is usually directed at one person (Leymann, 1990), and involves persistent harassment or intimidation intending to push the victim out of the workplace (Harper, 2020; Leymann, 1990; Maxcy & Nguyen, 2022). It is believed that for workplace misconduct to fall within the classical definition of the phenomenon, it must have lasted for at least six months and manifested itself at least once a week (Deikus & Vveinhardt, 2023; Desrumaux et al., 2020; Leymann, 1990; Vveinhardt & Deikus, 2023a, 2023b). However, some authors do not tend to strictly define duration and frequency (Branch et al., 2013; Rüzgar, 2023).

Often, researchers do not distinguish between "mobbing" and "bullying" when describing phenomena (Harper, 2020). For example, Vie et al. (2011) refer to Leymann (1996) when describing the process of workplace bullying. That is, both terms are considered synonymous, although Harper (2020) believes that, unlike in bullying cases, the goal of mobbing is to damage the target, and abuse itself is a strategy to achieve this goal. On the other hand, it is acknowledged that identifying the intentions of perpetrators is difficult and that they can be ambiguous or unconscious (Keashly & Jagatic, 2011).

Leymann (1996) distinguished five groups of harm-causing actions in workplace mobbing: (1) attacks on self-expression and communication, which limit the target's ability to communicate effectively; (2) social isolation, restricting the ability to maintain meaningful relationships; (3) attacks on reputation, damaging the individual's personal image; (4) attacks on professional status and tasks, which undermine work performance and duties; and (5) physical and psychological intimidation, which affects both physical and mental well-being and can create a sense of terror in the work environment. Summarising various research results (Einarsen et al., 2020), the following

features of negative behaviour are distinguished: work-related rather than person-related actions (unreasonable deadlines and workload, meaningless assignments, hiding information, etc.); passive and active actions (social isolation, insults and threats); more psychological than physical impact; and one or several types of actions (in different cases, there may be one type of attack or combination of different actions). The latter classification essentially includes mobbing actions identified by Leymann.

Employees' intentions to leave the job. There are two types of employee turnover: voluntary (when the employee voluntarily leaves the workplace) and forced (when the employee is dismissed for some reason) (Lyons & Bandura, 2020; Lin & Huang, 2021). Lyons and Bandura (2020) note that the greatest concern is employees who voluntarily leave their jobs, especially if they are talented and add significant value to the company. It is argued that employees' intention to leave the workplace should not be equated with the actual act of leaving the job, but the intention to leave can be a very significant factor and a signal to the employer that this particular person is a potential candidate to leave the workplace (Memon et al., 2014).

Employees' turnover is a problem encountered by every organisation, but in some areas, such as transport, turnover rates are much higher than in others (Živković et al., 2021). The high turnover of employees in transport companies often results from hiring employees based on their skills rather than their existing attitudes (Eckler, 2010). One of the most common reasons why employees leave the workplace in many (not only transport) organisations is low satisfaction with their current job (Guzeller & Celiker, 2020; Pratama et al., 2022). Job dissatisfaction is fuelled by inflexible working hours, overtime, irregular holidays, low salaries, demanding customers and managers, repetitive, monotonous tasks, long shifts, and ineffective training, which subsequently increase employee turnover in companies (Brien et al., 2015; Stamolampros et al., 2019). In addition, a greater impact on employee turnover is made by low commitment (Johns, 2002) or the fact that the current job does not bring pleasure (Andrejić et al., 2020). According to Guzeller and Celiker (2020), people tend to change jobs even though frequent job changes may hinder gaining more experience in a particular company.

When employees find it difficult to adapt to the changing work environment, new requirements, or even new coworkers, they inevitably begin to show poorer performance and start thinking about changing jobs (Lin & Huang, 2021). Si et al. (2008) state that another reason for increased employee turnover is contractual violations by the employer. That is, noncompliance with a contract makes many employees think it is not worth maintaining a relationship with the employer since it is unreliable, reducing employee loyalty and increasing the desire to withdraw from work.

It has been found that employees' intentions to change their workplace are often caused by punitive management and abuse of positions in the field of work (Husain et al., 2020; Zafar et al., 2022) or other situations that

cause negative emotions in the workplace (Adigüzel & Küçükoğlu, 2021). It has been observed that harassment, scolding, gossip, violence and bullying, i.e., any effort to limit other people's social relations, can also force people to leave the workplace (Minárová et al., 2020). Experiencing psychological violence in the work environment increases intentions to leave the workplace and seek new career opportunities elsewhere (Adigüzel & Küçükoğlu, 2021; Saeidipour et al., 2021). In this context, workplace mobbing acts exert enormous pressure on individuals, making them feel extremely vulnerable and unwanted in the organisation (Zafar et al., 2022). For example, the results of a study conducted in Turkey showed that employees avoided speaking out loud about workplace mobbing because they were afraid of losing their position or even the workplace itself (Görgülü et al., 2014).

Early studies on workplace mobbing have shown that this phenomenon is particularly damaging due to the loss of employees (Ertürk & Cemaloğlu, 2014). Recruiting, integrating, and training a new employee costs the organisation a significant amount of time and money (Berber & Yildiz, 2020), damages reputation, and can cause problems in attracting new employees (Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2016; Mujtaba & Senathip, 2020). When the employee leaves, the organisation loses not only his or her knowledge, skills, and experience but also, at the same time, gives all this away to competitors (Sishuwa & Phiri, 2020). Furthermore, high turnover rates hinder remaining employees from demonstrating any commitment to the organisation (Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2016).

3. Methods

Participants. The research was conducted between December 2023 and March 2024 by surveying employees of transport companies. The survey was conducted in cooperation with the trade unions operating in Lithuania, and the electronic link of the questionnaire was sent to the members of the unions. The questionnaires were completed, and 440 respondents provided answers. There were no incomplete or rejected questionnaires since the electronic questionnaire was configured, so the incorrectly completed questionnaires could not be submitted.

Measure. The research employed a shortened and revised version of Vveinhardt's questionnaire, "Mobbing and single cases of harassment in employees' relations – MSCH" (Vveinhardt, 2012). Specifically, statements were provided that allowed us to identify attacks in areas such as communication (shouting, insults and silencing), isolation (non-communication and prohibition of communication), reputation (gossiping, slander and violations of privacy), tasks (inadequate, beyond competence and dangerous or absence of tasks), self-feeling (perceived tension, stress and helplessness), and damage (impact on health and material losses). The study also employed interventions (intervening in and resolving conflicts), prevention (employees' education, training and relationship regulation) and intentions (thinking about changing jobs and

Table 1. Structure of the questionnaire and its psychometric characteristics

Scales	Subscales	N items	Dispersion explained %	Cronbach alpha	Spearman-Brown	Factor loading (L)			Item-total correlation (r/itt)		
						mean	min	max	mean	min	max
Workplace mobbing	Communication	11	31.59	0.78	0.78	0.56	0.47	0.63	0.30	0.15	0.61
	Isolation	6	41.77	0.72	0.74	0.64	0.57	0.71	0.40	0.18	0.69
	Reputation	12	29.54	0.78	0.71	0.54	0.44	0.64	0.28	0.08	0.62
	Tasks	7	33.14	0.65	0.63	0.57	0.33	0.63	0.30	0.04	0.61
	Self-feeling	14	36.09	0.86	0.84	0.60	0.55	0.67	0.35	0.19	0.66
	Damage	5	50.73	0.76	0.72	0.71	0.67	0.75	0.49	0.33	0.74
	Intervention	3	47.84	0.72	–	0.69	0.57	0.78	0.45	0.13	0.71
	Prevention	5	43.89	0.67	0.64	0.65	0.46	0.76	0.41	0.11	0.73
Employees' intentions to leave the workplace	5	48.58	0.74	0.73	0.70	0.66	0.76	0.47	0.28	0.75	

searching for new jobs). In addition, the study assessed the frequency of coworkers' attacks (at least once a week and less than once a week) and the strength of the perpetrators' power (based on whether the perpetrator was a manager, a manager and a group of employees, a group of employees and individual employees). A 5-point Likert scale was used, where the statements were evaluated in the range from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". The structure of the questionnaire and its psychometric characteristics are presented in Table 1.

The research data were processed using correlation and regression analysis. The correlation analysis aims to establish a linear relationship between two variables, x and y , their strength, and their reliability. However, the correlation coefficient does not measure causality; i.e., it helps establish the relation but does not identify the law of the relation. Therefore, regression analysis is employed in this study to describe the relationships between variables. The paired regression analysis aims to recognize the magnitude of the influence of the independent variable x on the dependent variable y . The paired regression analysis is performed by selecting a curve that best describes the total number of statistical points and evaluating the adequacy of this curve to the real situation. The paired regression model is written by the equation $y = a + b x + \varepsilon$. Multiple regression analysis is applied when there is one dependent variable y and several independent variables (regressors) x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n influencing it, the effect of which is to be predicted. In this case, a linear relationship was sought between employees' intentions to leave the workplace and the factors determining them.

Research ethics. The purpose of the survey and the guarantees of anonymity and confidentiality were explained to the research participants, the survey implementers were introduced, their contact details were provided, and informed consent was obtained from the participants. The permission of the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Economics and Management of Vytautas Magnus University for conducting the empirical study was obtained (minutes of the meeting No. 2023-11-16, No. 2023-11/2).

4. Results

Based on the analysis of the theoretical literature, twelve variables were selected for the empirical study, one of which is the dependent variable y (employee intentions). Eleven are independent variables: x_4 (tasks), x_5 (self-feeling), x_6 (damage), x_{8_1} (prevention), x_{8_2} (intervention), x_9 (frequency of coworkers' attacks), x_{10} (strength of perpetrators' power), x_{11} (seniority in the organisation), x_{12} (age), x_{13} (education), x_{14} (gender), and x_{17} (knowledge of the mobbing phenomenon). Spearman's correlation coefficient between the dependent variable, i.e., the employee's intentions to leave the job (hereinafter, employees' intentions or intentions), and the independent variables (tasks, self-feeling, damage, prevention, intervention, etc.) was calculated, and the strength of the relationship was determined (Table 2).

The correlation analysis revealed the following results:

- A direct, moderate, statistically significant relationship exists between employees' intentions and task dimensions ($r = 0.5$; $p < 0.001$).
- A direct, weak, statistically reliable relationship was recorded between employees' intentions and dimensions of self-feeling and damage, frequency of coworkers' attacks, and strength of perpetrators' power ($r = 0.4$; $r = 0.3$; $p < 0.001$).
- An inverse, weak, statistically reliable relationship was recorded between employees' intentions and prevention and intervention dimensions ($r = -0.4$; $r = -0.3$; $p < 0.001$).
- No statistically significant relationships were detected between employee intentions and gender, age, education, seniority in the organisation, and knowledge about the mobbing phenomenon ($p > 0.05$).

After establishing the statistical linkages of the constructs of the theoretical model, it can be stated that there are statistically significant relationships between employees' intentions and separate dimensions of mobbing (tasks, self-feeling, damage, prevention and intervention), as well as between the frequency of coworkers' attacks and the strength of perpetrators' power. However, this does not

Table 2. Results of the correlation analysis between employees' intentions to leave the job and other variables

Correlation between Y and X	Spearman's correlation coefficient	Reliability, p-value	Strength and reliability of the relationship
Intentions and tasks	0.459**	0.000	Direct, moderate and statistically reliable
Intentions and self-feeling	0.443**	0.000	Direct, weak and statistically reliable
Intentions and damage	0.323**	0.000	Direct, weak and statistically reliable
Intentions and prevention	-0.411**	0.000	Inverse, weak and statistically reliable
Intentions and intervention	-0.308**	0.000	Inverse, weak and statistically reliable
Intentions and frequency of coworkers' attacks	0.276**	0.000	Direct, weak and statistically reliable
Intentions and strength of perpetrators' power	0.402**	0.000	Direct, weak and statistically reliable
Intentions and seniority in the organisation	0.033	0.491	Statistically insignificant
Intention and age	0.056	0.242	Statistically insignificant
Intentions and education	0.042	0.382	Statistically insignificant
Intentions and gender	-0.001	0.977	Statistically insignificant
Intentions and knowledge of the mobbing phenomenon	-0.086	0.070	Statistically insignificant

mean that significant causal relationships have been established. All statistically significant relationships are moderate to weak, with the strongest relationship found between employees' intentions and task dimensions.

After determining the existence of the relation between variables, paired regression analysis with factors that had statistically significant correlations with the dependent variable (intentions) was performed (Table 3 and Table 4). The goal of this analysis is to determine what influence each of the factors has on employees' intentions. The influence is analysed in the form of a linear regression model. Since the variables gender, age, education, seniority in the organisation, knowledge about the mobbing phenomenon and employees' intentions are not significantly related, regression models are not created for these variables.

Table 3 shows that in all seven regression models, the p-value of the ANOVA criterion $p = 0.000$ is not only lower than 0.05 but also $p < 0.001$. This indicates that in each model, the dependent variable intentions are related to the existing regressor and depend on it, and regression models are considered appropriate for the data. In the first model, the coefficient of determination (R^2) is 0.259, indicating that tasks account for 25.9% of the intention variation. Similarly, in the second model, R^2 is 0.287, suggesting that self-feelings explain approximately 29% of the intention variation. In the third model, R^2 is 0.208, meaning that

damage accounts for 20.8% of the variation in workers' intentions. In the fourth model, the coefficient of determination (R^2) is 0.235, indicating that prevention accounts for 23.5% of the variation in employees' intentions. In the seventh model, R^2 is 0.217, showing that the strength of perpetrators' power explains 21.7% of the variation in employees' intentions. However, in the fifth and sixth models, only a very small portion of the variation in employees' intentions is explained by intervention and the frequency of coworkers' attacks, with R^2 values of 0.096 and 0.068, respectively, which do not even reach 10% (9.6% and 6.8%). As these R^2 values fall below the minimum threshold ($R^2 > 0.20$), it can be assumed that these models do not fit the data well and may lack meaningful explanatory power.

Based on the results presented in Table 4, the p-values of the Student's t-test for the respective regressors in all regression models are statistically significant ($p < 0.001$). Hence, all regressors in the seven models are statistically significant. Since tasks (as a regressor) are statistically significant because $p = 0.000$ ($p < 0.001$), the following regression equation is constructed: $y = 1.016 + 0.716 \times 4$. The regression equation shows that when dissatisfaction with delegated tasks increases by one unit, employees' intentions to leave the workplace increase by 0.716. Self-feeling as an independent variable is statistically significant, and the constructed regression equation $y = 0.948 + 0.643 \times 5$ shows that an increase of one unit in

Table 3. Correlations, coefficients of determination and results of the dispersion analysis

Model	R	R^2	R^2 revised	F statistics	Reliability, p-value
(1) Intentions and tasks	0.509	0.259	0.257	152.929	0.000
(2) Intentions and self-feeling	0.536	0.287	0.286	176.548	0.000
(3) Intentions and damage	0.456	0.208	0.207	115.093	0.000
(4) Intentions and prevention	0.485	0.235	0.233	138.199	0.000
(5) Intentions and intervention	0.310	0.096	0.094	46.679	0.000
(6) Intentions and frequency of coworkers' attacks	0.260	0.068	0.066	31.830	0.000
(7) Intentions and strength of perpetrators' power	0.466	0.217	0.216	129.420	0.000

Table 4. Coefficients of paired regression models between employees' intentions and regressors (independent variables)

Model		Unstandardised β coefficients	Standardised β coefficients	t statistics	Reliability, p-value
1	Constant	1.016		7.426	0.000
	x ₄ Tasks	0.716	0.509	12.366	0.000
2	Constant	0.948		7.136	0.000
	x ₅ Self-feeling	0.643	0.536	13.287	0.000
3	Constant	1.714		16.537	0.000
	x ₆ Damage	0.576	0.422	9.752	0.000
4	Constant	3.878		24.331	0.000
	x _{8_1} Prevention	-0.404	-0.367	-8.258	0.000
5	Constant	3.791		21.307	0.000
	x _{8_2} Intervention	-0.340	-0.310	-6.832	0.000
6	Constant	2.067		18.849	0.000
	x ₉ Frequency of coworkers' attacks	0.337	0.260	5.642	0.000
7	Constant	1.949		23.025	0.000
	x ₁₀ Strength of perpetrators' power	0.322	0.312	7.456	0.000

the value of self-feeling leads to an increase in the value of employees' intention to leave by 0.643. Damage as a regressor is also statistically significant. Thus, based on the constructed regression equation $y = 1.714 + 0.576 x_6$, it can be concluded that when the value of damage increases by one unit, the intention of employees to leave the job increases by 0.576. Prevention as an independent variable is statistically significant ($p < 0.001$); therefore, the constructed regression equation $y = 3.878 - 0.404 x_{8_1}$ shows that an increase in the effectiveness of prevention measures by one unit results in a decrease in employees' intention to leave the workplace by 0.404. The strength of the perpetrators' power as a regressor is also statistically significant, and the constructed regression equation $y = 1.949 + 0.322 x_{10}$ shows that when the strength of the perpetrators' power increases by one unit, the employees' intention to leave the job increases by 0.322. Intervention as a regressor is also statistically significant; therefore,

the regression equation $y = 3.791 - 0.340 x_{8_2}$ was constructed, which shows that if the application of intervention measures is intensified by one unit, the intention of employees to leave the workplace decreases by 0.340. As an independent variable, the frequency of coworkers' attacks is also statistically significant. Thus, the constructed regression equation $y = 2.067 + 0.337 x_9$ shows that if the frequency of coworkers' attacks increases by one unit, employees' intentions to leave the job increase by 0.337. The performance of the paired regression analysis was followed by the construction of equations, which separately reveal the effect of each regressor on employees' intentions to leave the workplace.

A multiple regression model was created to determine the impact of mobbing dimensions (tasks, self-feeling, damage, and prevention) and the strength of perpetrators' power on employees' intentions to leave the workplace (Table 5). Since the paired regression analysis results

Table 5. Linear regression coefficients: the influence of mobbing dimensions and other variables on employees' intentions to leave the workplace

Independent variables	Dependent variable – Intentions					Diagnostics of multicollinearity	
	R	R ²	R ² revised	F statistics	Reliability, p-value		
	0.669	0.448	0.442	50.509	0.0001		
	Unstandardised β coefficient	Standardised β coefficient	t	Reliability, p-value	Tolerance	VIF	
Constant	1.676		8.630	0.000			
x ₄ Tasks	0.247	0.175	3.543	0.000	0.518	1.930	
x ₅ Self-feeling	0.396	0.330	6.975	0.000	0.567	1.763	
x ₆ Damage	0.067	0.049	1.083	0.280	0.616	1.623	
x _{8_1} Prevention	-0.312	-0.283	-7.673	0.000	0.931	1.074	
x ₁₀ Strength of perpetrators' power	0.208	0.139	3.416	0.001	0.771	1.297	

revealed that the impact of the intervention and the frequency of coworkers' attacks on employees' intention to quit the job was very questionable and unreliable, they were not included in the regression model as independent variables.

The multiple regression correlation coefficient R indicates the relationship between the dependent variable y (intentions) and all selected independent variables x (tasks, self-feeling, damage, prevention and strength of perpetrators' power). Table 5 shows that the correlation coefficient between intentions and all selected factors is 0.669, which means that there is a direct strong relationship between the dependent variable and independent variables; therefore, it is likely that the model can work. The coefficient of determination $R^2 = 0.448$ and the revised $R^2 = 0.442$ mean that the independent variables selected for the study explain almost 45% of the dispersion of intentions. The F -criterion checks whether there is at least one regressor in the predicted model on which intentions as a dependent variable depend. The F value presented in the table 5 is $F = 50.509$, and the p value of reliability is 0.0001 ($p < 0.001$). The table also provides basic information about the coefficients of the regression model. The values of the standardised coefficients show which regressor is more influential in the model, which, in this particular case, signals the influence of self-feeling. The p values in the columns explain the statistical significance of the impact of each independent variable on the dependent variable. The results of the regression analysis showed that the damage dimension ($\beta = 0.049$; $p = 0.280$) as a regressor had little influence and was statistically insignificant for the dependent variable (intentions).

The results in Table 5 demonstrate no multicollinearity problem in the specific regression model, as all VIFs < 4.00 and tolerances greater than 0.25. However, due to statistically insignificant variables, the model needs to be further refined; i.e., the regressor (damage) is removed because its reliability value is $p = 0.280$ ($p > 0.05$), and the regression analysis is repeated. The model was also checked for statistical outliers. The maximum value of Cook's distance

was 0.051 (the threshold was one), and the DFBETA in all the regressors varied from 0.00952 to 0.04085 and did not reach one; therefore, there were no significant outliers in the data. The normality of the data was tested using the Shapiro–Wilk test ($p = 0.110$; $p > 0.05$), and the obtained results did not contradict the normality assumption. Breusch Pagan's test, $p = 0.0679$, shows that the assumption of homoscedasticity of residuals is satisfied because $p > 0.05$. The residual plots also show that the assumptions of normality and homoscedasticity of the model are satisfied. The value of the Durbin–Watson indicator is 1.757 and does not differ much from the two; therefore, it can be stated that there is no autocorrelation.

Based on the results of Table 6, a multiple regression equation was constructed:

$$\text{Intentions} = 1.703 + 0.273 x_4 + 0.409 x_5 - 0.319 x_{8_1} + 0.211 x_{10}.$$

Table 6 shows that the correlation and determination coefficients have almost no change. The results demonstrate that $R = 0.668$, indicating a strong direct relationship between the dependent variable (intentions) and the independent variables (tasks, self-feeling, prevention, and strength of perpetrators' power). The coefficient of determination $R^2 = 0.447$, revised $R^2 = 0.442$, which means that the remaining factors x_4 , x_5 , x_{8_1} and x_{10} explain almost 45% of the dispersion of intentions. Considering the values of the standardised beta coefficients, the most influential and statistically significant of all the regressors is x_5 (self-feeling) ($\beta = 0.341$; $p < 0.001$), and the least influential, but statistically significant, is x_{10} (strength of perpetrator's power) ($\beta = 0.142$; $p < 0.001$). In the regression equation, positive coefficients against regressors x_4 , x_5 and x_{10} and their higher estimates correspond to a higher intention score, while a lower score of the negative coefficient against regressor x_{8_1} corresponds to a higher intention score as well. Higher estimated scores indicate worse self-feeling, receiving insurmountable tasks or harassment from persons demonstrating strength of power in the organisation, and a lower estimated prevention

Table 6. Coefficients of repeated linear regression: the influence of mobbing dimensions and other variables on employees' intentions to leave the workplace

Independent variables	Dependent variable – Intentions					
	R	R ²	R ² revised	F statistics	Reliability, p-value	
	0.668	0.447	0.442	87.808	0.0001	
Independent variables	Unstandardised β coefficient	Standardised β coefficient	t	Reliability, p-value	Diagnostics of multicollinearity	
					Tolerance	VIF
Constant	1.703		8.834	0.000		
x_4 Tasks	0.273	0.194	4.193	0.000	0.592	1.690
x_5 Self-feeling	0.409	0.341	7.386	0.000	0.595	1.680
x_{8_1} Prevention	–0.319	–0.290	–7.930	0.000	0.954	1.048
x_{10} Strength of perpetrators' power	0.211	0.142	3.512	0.000	0.776	1.289

score indicates the application of more limited prevention measures; this means that employees' intentions may shift towards saying goodbye to work in the organisation and leaving it.

5. Conclusions and discussion

This study investigated how different variables of workplace mobbing influence the intention to leave a job among employees of transport companies. It explored how intentions were influenced by specific means of negative impacts on targets, the damage experienced, and intervention and prevention measures. Although researchers in other occupational domains accentuate the importance of intervention (e.g., Bayin Donar & Yesilaydin, 2022; Branch et al., 2013; Matsson & Jordan, 2022), the results of this study show that intervention measures were not significantly related to employees' intentions to stay in the organisation. However, Seppälä et al. (2023) used a different research design but found no intervention effects. The authors compared two groups, where one group received a workshop-based intervention on organisational practices to prevent mobbing and violence, including the manager's support, the manager's justice, social capital in the workplace and psychological safety. One of the possible explanations may be related to the specificity of mobbing itself and the reactions of its targets. This phenomenon may remain unrecognised for a long time (Gonçalves et al., 2020; Tekşen & Cemaloglu, 2023); the process is therefore protracted, which is associated with weaker trust (Krishna et al., 2024) and determines a heightened sense of helplessness, incompetence and leaving the job (Coetzee & Oosthuizen, 2017). In addition, studies examining perceptions of intervention have demonstrated that there is often a lack of confidence and time to fight workplace mobbing and that for victims, intervention is not a linear process, and they may question the legitimacy of their complaint (Blackwood et al., 2018), which can result in unsuccessful interventions.

Thus, although intervention measures are undoubtedly necessary for solving incipient or already ongoing conflicts, a greater effect in seeking to reduce intentions to leave can be expected by developing prevention measures (the results of this study show that when the effectiveness of prevention measures increases by one unit, employees' intentions to leave the workplace decrease by 0.4), i.e., by ensuring such an environment where employees would feel safe and could trust the organisation.

In general, the results of the study suggest that prevention should be considered in a broader context (abuse in assigning tasks, employees' self-feeling, and perpetrators' power) since all these variables explain almost 45% of employees' intentions to change the organisation. In this case, the greatest influence was made by employees' self-feeling ($R^2 = 0.341$), and the least influence was made by perpetrators' power ($R^2 = 0.142$). Although perpetrators' power as a separate factor explains a relatively small

proportion of employee intentions, it must be considered in conjunction with other factors. An earlier study conducted by Glambek et al. (2014) surveyed 1,800 Norwegian offshore workers in the North Sea and found that, in general, negative actions by perpetrators were the primary factor that increased workers' intentions to quit their jobs. The authors did not distinguish a specific way of negative impact used by perpetrators on targets, whereas our study highlighted abuse in assigning tasks, which explained approximately one-fifth of the dispersion.

The right to assign tasks rests with managers, and as demonstrated by several previous studies conducted in other countries, the abuse of positions by managers is likely one of the most important problems in the transport sector in the context of mobbing (Glasø et al., 2011; Gonçalves et al., 2020). Both workplace mobbing prevention policy and whether to intervene in ongoing conflicts depend on managers; therefore, to reduce employee turnover, particular attention should be given to the ethics of management's relationships with subordinates. The results of this study show that both top managers and company owners should be interested in this topic.

The main limitation of this study is related to the fact that the research instrument is based on respondents' introspection, although this problem was solved by providing respondents with a particularly extensive list of negative action options. That is, they only needed to note which action or actions they had experienced. Another limitation pertains to the fact that the content of intervention and prevention and the quality of measures in specific organisations were not investigated, which could also have influenced the outcome. For example, Einarsen et al. (2020) emphasised the role of bystanders, especially their awareness, self-efficacy and behavioural control; therefore, specific prevention and intervention strategies and their relation to employees' intentions should be explored in more detail in other studies. It should also be noted that the beginning of the research coincided with the entry into force of an amendment to the law regulating labour relations in Lithuania, which obliged companies to prevent psychological violence. Therefore, it would make sense to repeat the study to test the effect of new measures, while the results of this study could be useful for comparing changes in the situation. In addition, the results of the study should be applied to other branches of the transport sector with caution due to their specificities, and the cultural context should be taken into account.

Funding

The publication is a part of the project "Strengthening the R&D activities of the Vytautas Kavolis Transdisciplinary Institute for Social Sciences and Humanities (SOC-MTEP)". The project is funded by the Research Council of Lithuania and the Ministry of Education, Science and Sport of the Republic of Lithuania, Contract No S-A-UEI-23-13 (2023-12-27).

References

- Adigüzel, Z., & Küçükoğlu, İ. (2021). Examining the effects of mobbing and role uncertainty on the performance of the employees: Research in logistics companies. *Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 18(1), 434–455. <https://doi.org/10.33437/ksusbd.719717>
- Alper Ay, F. (2024). The relationship between work motivation and productivity: Bibliometric analysis of articles from 1953 to 2024. *Human Systems Management*, 43(4), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.3233/HSM-240020>
- Alper Ay, F., & Türkdoğan, N. (2018). The relationship between emotional labor, burnout, turnover intention and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Research*, 3(1), 87–103.
- Andrejić, M., Pajić, V., & Kilibarda, M. (2020). Stress and communication as quality indicators of a working environment in logistics companies: A case study in the logistics sector in Serbia. *International Journal for Traffic & Transport Engineering*, 10(3), 309–322. [https://doi.org/10.7708/ijtte.2020.10\(3\).05](https://doi.org/10.7708/ijtte.2020.10(3).05)
- Batsi, C., & Karamanis, K. (2019). Mobbing at work: Experiences in the Greek public sector. *Management Research & Practice*, 11(4), 23–33.
- Bayin Donar, G., & Yesilaydin, G. (2022). The evaluation of mobbing cases in the healthcare sector based on Supreme Court case law in Turkey. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*, 58(4), 2888–2896. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ppc.13137>
- Berber, U., & Yıldız, B. S. (2020). Mobbing and turnover Intention: a study from employees of the provincial directorate of youth and sports in Turkey. *European Journal of Physical Education and Sport Science*, 6(1), 71–79.
- Blackwood, K., Bentley, T. A., & Catley, B. E. (2018). A victim's search for resolution: Conceptualising workplace bullying and its intervention as a process. *Journal of Safety, Health & Environment*, 34(1), 7–31.
- Branch, S., Ramsay, S., & Barker, M. (2013). Workplace bullying, mobbing and general harassment: A review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 15(3), 280–299. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2012.00339.x>
- Brien, A., Thomas, N., & Hussein, A. S. (2015). Turnover intention and commitment as part of organizational social capital in the hotel industry. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 14(4), 357–381. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2015.1008385>
- Coetzee, M. & Oosthuizen, R. M. (2017). Work-role psychosocial flourishing: Its mediation role on workplace bullying and employee turnover intention. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 27(3), 211–215. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14330237.2017.1321826>
- da Silva João, A. L., & Saldanha Portelada, A. F. (2019). Mobbing and its impact on interpersonal relationships at the workplace. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 34(13), 2797–2812. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516662850>
- Deikus, M., & Vveinhardt, J. (2023, 22–23 November). Victims' specific expectations arising from experiences of workplace mobbing. In *42nd IBIMA Conference*. IBIMA. <https://doi.org/10.5171/2023.4226823>
- Desrumaux, P., Malola, P., Dose, E., & Manzano García G. (2020). Workplace bullying and thwarted needs: Effects of support from colleagues and hierarchy on turnover intentions [Harcèlement moral et frustration des besoins: impacts des soutiens des collègues et de la hiérarchie sur l'intention de quitter]. *Archives des Maladies Professionnelles et de l'Environnement*, 81(6), 811–819. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.admp.2020.02.007>
- Eckler, J. (2010). Why we need to re-invent logistics outsourcing. *Wareh Forum*, 25(11), 1–3.
- Einarsen, K., Nielsen, M. B., Hetland, J., Olsen, O. K., Zahlquist, L., Mikkelsen, E. G., Koløen, J., & Einarsen, S. V. (2020). Outcomes of a proximal workplace intervention against workplace bullying and harassment: A protocol for a cluster randomized controlled trial among Norwegian industrial workers. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, Article 2013. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.02013>
- Einarsen, S. V., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (2020). The concept of bullying and harassment at work: The European tradition. In *Bullying and harassment in the workplace* (pp. 3–53). CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9780429462528-2>
- Ertürk, A., & Cemaloğlu, N. (2014). Causes of mobbing behavior. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 3669–3678. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.821>
- Guzeller, C. O., & Celiker, N. (2020). Examining the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intention via a meta-analysis. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 14(1), 102–120. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCTHR-05-2019-0094>
- Glambek, M., Matthiesen, S. B., Hetland, J., & Einarsen, S. (2014). Workplace bullying as an antecedent to job insecurity and intention to leave: A 6-month prospective study. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 24(3), 255–268. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12035>
- Glasø, L., Bele, E., Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2011). Bus drivers' exposure to bullying at work: An occupation-specific approach. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 52(5), 484–493. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2011.00895.x>
- Gonçalves, J., da Rosa Tolfo, S., Espinosa, L. M. C., & Teixeira K. C. (2020). Workplace bullying: A study on urban collective transportation [Assédio Moral no Trabalho: um Estudo sobre o Transporte Coletivo Urbano]. *Trends in Psychology*, 28(4), 494–510. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43076-020-00039-x>
- Görgülü, N., Beydağ, K. D., Şensoy, F., & Kiyak, M. (2014). The effects of mobbing (bullying) on health employees. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 152, 503–509. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.09.196>
- Gulin, W. B. (2019). Mobbing in the workplace-causes and consequences. *21st Century Pedagogy*, 3(1), 14–19. <https://doi.org/10.2478/ped21-2019-0002>
- Guzeller, C. O., & Celiker, N. (2020). Examining the relationship between organizational commitment and turnover intention via a meta-analysis. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 14(1), 102–120. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCTHR-05-2019-0094>
- Harper, J. (2020). Bullied by the best: Why the bully paradigm is a bad fit for understanding the mob. In *Confronting academic mobbing in higher education: Personal accounts and administrative action* (pp. 29–43). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-9485-7.ch002>
- Hogh, A., Mikkelsen, E. G., & Hansen, A. M. (2011). Individual consequences of workplace bullying/mobbing. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice* (pp. 107–128). CRC Press. <https://doi.org/10.1201/EBK1439804896-7>
- Hussain, K., Abbas, Z., Gulzar, S., Jibril, A. B., & Hussain, A. (2020). Examining the impact of abusive supervision on employees' psychological wellbeing and turnover intention: The mediating role of intrinsic motivation. *Cogent Business & Management*, 7(1), Article 1818998. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1818998>

- Jarosz, S., & Gozdecki, K. (2021). The phenomenon of mobbing among young employees in relation to the size of the organization in Poland. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government*, 27(5), 160–175.
- Johns, G. (2002). The psychology of lateness, absenteeism, and turnover. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work and organizational psychology*, Vol. 2: *Organizational psychology* (pp. 232–252). Sage Publications, Inc.
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781848608368.n13>
- Keashly, L., & Jagatic, K. (2011). North American perspectives on hostile behaviours and bullying at work. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace* (pp. 41–74). Taylor and Francis.
<https://doi.org/10.1201/EBK1439804896-4>
- Krishna, A., Soumyaja, D., & Joseph, J. (2024). Workplace bullying and employee silence: The role of affect-based trust and climate for conflict management. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 35(5).
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCM-09-2023-0190>
- Krishna, A., Soumyaja, D., & Sowmya, C. S. (2023). Workplace bullying and diffident silence: A moderated mediation model of shame and core self-evaluation. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 34(3).
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCM-04-2022-0075>
- Leymann, H. (1990). Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces. *Violence and Victims*, 5(2), 119–126.
<https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.5.2.119>
- Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), 165–184. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594329608414853>
- Lin, C. Y., & Huang, C. K. (2021). Employee turnover intentions and job performance from a planned change: The effects of an organizational learning culture and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Manpower*, 42(3), 409–423.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-08-2018-0281>
- Lutgen-Sandvik, P., Hood, J. N., & Jacobson, R. P. (2016). The impact of positive organizational phenomena and workplace bullying on individual outcomes. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, XXVIII(1–2), 30–49.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118955567.wbieoc165>
- Lyons, P., & Bandura, R. (2020). Employee turnover: Features and perspectives. *Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal*, 34(1), 1–4.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/DLO-02-2019-0048>
- Matsson, A., & Jordan, T. (2022). Workplace bullying investigations: A complex endeavor for a complex problem. *Organizational Dynamics*, 51(2), Article 100840.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2021.100840>
- Maxcy, B. D., & Nguyễn, T. S. T. (2022). The micropolitics of workplace mobbing: Utilizing precarity and microaggressions in neoliberal reform. In *The Palgrave handbook of educational leadership and management discourse* (pp. 1025–1051). Springer.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-99097-8_87
- Memon, M. A., Salleh, R., Baharom, M. N. R., & Harun, H. (2014). Person-organization fit and turnover intention: The mediating role of employee engagement. *Global Business and Management Research*, 37(3), 285–298.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-07-2017-0232>
- Minárová, M., Benčíková, D., Malá, D., & Smutný, F. (2020). Mobbing in a workplace and its negative influence on building quality culture. In *SHS Web of Conferences* (Vol. 74, Article 05014). EDP Sciences.
<https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20207405014>
- Mujtaba, B. G., & Senathip, T. (2020). Workplace mobbing and the role of human resources management. *Business Ethics and Leadership*, 4(1), 17–34.
[https://doi.org/10.21272/bel.4\(1\).17-34.2020](https://doi.org/10.21272/bel.4(1).17-34.2020)
- Nguyen, M. H., Pojani, D., Nguyen-Phuoc, D. Q., & Thi, B. N. (2023). What if delivery riders quit? Challenges to last-mile logistics during the Covid-19 pandemic. *Research in Transportation Business & Management*, 47, Article 100941.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rtbm.2022.100941>
- Nobili, M., Gonnella, M. T., Mazza, B., Lombardi, M., & Setola, R. (2023). Review of measures to prevent and manage aggression against transport workers. *Safety Science*, 166, Article 106202.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2023.106202>
- Petrescu, C., & Manghiuc, I. (2020). Mobbing at work and the impact of employee performance. *LUMEN Proceedings*, 11, 273–282. <https://doi.org/10.18662/lumproc/gekos2020/28>
- Pratama, E. N., Suwarni, E., & Handayani, M. A. (2022). The effect of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on turnover intention with person organization fit as moderator variable. *Aptisi Transactions on Management (ATM)*, 6(1), 74–82.
<https://doi.org/10.33050/atm.v6i1.1722>
- Pritchard, E., van Vreden, C., Xia, T., Newnam, S., Collie, A., Lubman, D. I., de Almeida Neto, & Iles, R. (2023). Impact of work and coping factors on mental health: Australian truck drivers' perspective. *BMC Public Health*, 23(1), 1–12.
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-15877-4>
- Rai, A., & Agarwal, U. A. (2018). A review of literature on mediators and moderators of workplace bullying: Agenda for future research. *Management Research Review*, 41(7), 822–859.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-05-2016-0111>
- Reknes, I., Glambek, M., & Einarsen, S. V. (2021). Injustice perceptions, workplace bullying and intention to leave. *Employee Relations*, 43(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-10-2019-0406>
- Rissi, V., Monteiro, J. K., Cecconello, W. W., & Moraes, E. G. D. (2016). Psychological interventions against workplace mobbing. *Temas Em Psicologia*, 24(1), 339–352.
<https://doi.org/10.9788/TP2016.1-24>
- Rüzgar, N. (2023). Mobbing perceptions of academic staff. *OPUS Journal of Society Research*, 20(51), 95–109.
<https://doi.org/10.26466/opusjr.1191308>
- Saeidipour, B., Akbari, P., & Alizadeh, Z. (2021). The role of organizational silence & organizational mobbing on the turnover intention. *International Journal of Ethics and Society*, 3(1), 59–69.
<https://doi.org/10.52547/ijethics.3.1.59>
- Seppälä, P., Olin, N., Kalavainen, S., Heikkilä, H. C., Kivimäki, M., Remes, J., & Ervasti, J. (2023). Effectiveness of a workshop-based intervention to reduce bullying and violence at work: A 2-year quasi-experimental intervention study. *Social Science and Medicine*, 338, Article 116318.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2023.116318>
- Si, S. X., Wei, F., & Li, Y. (2008). The effect of organizational psychological contract violation on managers' exit, voice, loyalty and neglect in the Chinese context. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(5), 932–944.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585190801995849>
- Sishuwa, Y., & Phiri, J. (2020). Factors influencing employee retention in the transport and logistics industry. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(6), 145–160.
<https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2020.86013>
- Stamolampros, P., Korfiatis, N., Chalvatzis, K., & Buhalis, D. (2019). Job satisfaction and employee turnover determinants in high contact services: Insights from employees' online reviews. *Tourism Management*, 75, 130–147.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2019.04.030>

- Tekşen, K., & Cemaloğlu, N. (2023). Mobbing and social network analysis. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 39(1), 184–194. <https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v39i1.8214>
- Vie, T. L., Glasø, L., & Einarsen, S. (2011). Health outcomes and self-labeling as a victim of workplace bullying. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 70(1), 37–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2010.06.007>
- Vveinhardt, J. (2012). Identification of the reliability of methodological characteristics of quality in the diagnostic instrument for mobbing as discrimination in employee relations on purpose to improve the climate in Lithuanian organisations. *Transformations in Business and Economics*, 11, 218–232.
- Vveinhardt, J., & Deikus, M. (2023a). Strategies for a nonviolent response to perpetrator actions: What can Christianity offer to targets of workplace mobbing? *Scientia et Fides (SetF)*, 11(2), 175–195. <https://doi.org/10.12775/SetF.2023.021>
- Vveinhardt, J., & Deikus, M. (2023b). The use of religious resources in helping victims of workplace mobbing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, Article 1288354. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1288354>
- Yuksel, M., & Tunçsiper, B. (2011). The relationship between mobbing and organizational commitment in workplace. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 1(3), 54–64.
- Zafar, R., Abid, G., Rehmat, M., Ali, M., Hassan, Q., & Asif, M. F. (2022). So hard to say goodbye: Impact of punitive supervision on turnover intention. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 33(5–6), 614–636. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2021.1882844>
- Zapf, D. (1999). Organisational, work group related and personal causes of mobbing/bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20(1/2), 70–85. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437729910268669>
- Živković, A., Franjković, J., & Dujak, D. (2021). The role of organizational commitment in employee turnover in logistics activities of food supply chain. *LogForum*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.17270/J.LOG.2021.536>