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The purpose of this article is to form the original questionnaire to identify intensity of the expression of mobbing in employees’ relationships. Mobbing in the context of the paper is the bullying of an individual by a group at the work place. The article presents only the statistical analysis of psychometric features of the formed questionnaire without elaborating on the results of the empirical research on the intensity of mobbing expression in employees’ relationships in Lithuanian organisations. The advantage of the questionnaire is that it is relatively short; however, it covers all features which are characteristic of the mobbing phenomenon and provides the opportunity to analyse the attack that does not fall under the definition of mobbing. It can be used both for mass and local research at the level of single organisations. Economic losses are also revealed by the questionnaire through the assessment of damage experienced by employees, generated expenses and lost revenues.
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1. Introduction

In the practice of organisational management it is not enough to identify mobbing in employees’ relationships; the complex data disclosing the spectrum and depth of the problem is necessary. The psychological and social aspects of mobbing in employees’ relationships fall into the research range. However, in the practice of organisational management it is also necessary to estimate the aspects of managerial culture, which would disclose systemic mistakes. In order to initiate the changes in organisational management, it is necessary to use a universal, inexpensive and simple instrumental base, which allows the diagnosing of problems, the relation of reasons and outcomes at the levels of individuals and organisations systemically.

The diagnostic instrument is not only aimed to identify mobbing in employees’ relationships, but also to identify the wide spectrum of harassment in the workplace. It allows the individual and managerial problems of an organisation to be indicated without performing additional surveys, thus time and financial resources are saved. It is suitable to use in both separate organisations and single branches of economic activity (industry, transport, agriculture, services, construction) as well as in public and private sectors. The functional electronic version of the questionnaire is designed for distant...
surveys (surveys being conducted via internet platform). Thus, the reliability of the mobbing research instrument as well as analysis of the results has not only scientific, but also practical meaning in developing models of organisational management.

The research problem is formed by the following questions: What instruments are used to diagnose mobbing in employees’ relationships? What is the qualitative reliability of the instrument used to survey mobbing? How does the applied instrument diagnose the intensity of the expression of mobbing in employees’ relationships? Would it be possible to determine the economic losses suffered by the organisation, supplementing the research instrument in the future?

Before starting to form the new questionnaire for diagnosing mobbing in employees’ relationships, the review of questionnaires has been performed. Mobbing in employees’ relationships is diagnosed by using different questionnaires, tests and scales. The Leymann Inventory of Psychological Terrorization (LIPT) (Leymann, 1990) has been analysed. Jenkins, Zyzanski, and Rosenman (1971) use the Personality Type A/B Questionnaire (USA), Tuomi, Ilmarinen, Jahkola, Katajarinne, and Tulikki (1994) refer to the Work Ability Index (Sweden). Björkqvist, Lagerspetz, and Österman (1992), Björkqvist, Österman, and Hjelt-Bäck (1994a), Björkqvist, Österman, and Lagerspetz (1994b) and Björkqvist (2001) have formed several scales, which can also be used in surveying mobbing in several aspects: Direct & Indirect Aggression Scales, Work Atmosphere Scale, Work Harassment Scale, Peer-estimated Shyness, Peer-estimated Conflict Behaviour and the Psychosocial Workplace Inventory (Finland). Knorz and Zapf (1995) used the Inventory of Mobbing Acts According to the Frequency of Repetitions, which has been constructed on the LIPT basis (Germany), Kaukiainen, Björkqvist, Österman, Lagerspetz, and Forsblom (1995) developed the Peer-estimated Empathy, Peer-estimated Social Intelligence instrument (Finland). Einarsen and Raknes (1997) formed the Negative Acts Questionnaire (Norway). Pranjić, Maleš-Bilić, Beganlić, and Mustajbegović (2006) used the Mobbing Questionnaire (Croatia, Bosnia–Herzegovina) for their empirical research.

2. Theoretical substantiation

In general, the topics of mobbing are also touched on in the studies indirectly related to mobbing. Burgi (2014, p. 290) touches on the issue of mobbing when analysing the anomic impacts of labour market restructuring and the erosion of social rights in Europe. The article examines exit solutions, at the individual and collective levels, involving violence against the self (suicide) and others (mobbing, xenophobia, fascism), and concludes that Europe seems to be heading towards a protracted period of danger-laden chronic and acute anomie. Testa’s (2013, p. 126) article proposes a synthetic analysis and contextualisation of the most significant, thought-provoking films made in Italy during the first decade of the twenty-first century which thematise or in other ways convey the circumstances of today’s growing social inequality. Such circumstances entail collective and individual trauma, loss of security and well-being in individuals and families, indeed an increase in family breakdown – in other words, a pervasive social crisis. Alongside the other films the article also analyses the case of mobbing. During the research of appraisal, coping, motivational factors and gender in vocational rehabilitation carried out by Andersson (1996, p. 161), the semi-structured interview (with vocational rehabilitation patients), that concerned various key topics (programme evaluation; causal attribution regarding the problem or disease; life-crises, threats, mobbing and unjust treatment; feelings of control; current situation; the future; how the interview was experienced) was conducted.
The analysis of the scientific literature in respect to mobbing has highlighted some of following focuses. Aspects of communication and isolation in the context of mobbing are usually very closely interconnected. Lutgen-Sandvik’s (2003, p. 472) article synthesises extant research findings with the author’s own managerial experience into a comprehensive gestalt of the European Economic Area (EEA) as a communicative process that evolves, escalates, and moves to new targets when earlier targets exit the organisation. Lutgen-Sandvik and Tracy (2012, p. 3) maintain that organisational communication research is vital for understanding and addressing workplace bullying, a problem that affects nearly half of working adults and has devastating results on employee well-being and organisational productivity. A communication approach illustrates the toxic complexity of workplace bullying as it is conditioned through societal discourses, sustained by receptive workplace cultures, and perpetuated through local interactions. The study researching these (macro-, meso-, and micro-)communicative elements addresses the most pressing questions about workplace bullying, including: how abuse is manifested, how employees respond, why it is so harmful, why resolution is so difficult, and how it might be resolved. Cowan (2012, p. 377) states that one issue that has started to garner more attention in organisations across the globe and among human resource (HR) professionals is the communication phenomenon of workplace bullying. The article notes that for HR professionals, the definition of workplace bullying could be much more complex. As workplace bullying is abuse primarily achieved through negative communication, communication researchers seem well suited to explore how HR professionals make sense of this issue.

Aspects of reputation in the context of mobbing are abundantly analysed by different authors in different countries (D’Cruz & Rayner, 2013; Fox & Stallworth, 2010; Harvey et al., 2007; Hugh-Jones & Zultan, 2013; Katrinli, Atabay, Gunay, & Cangarli, 2010; Lutgen-Sandvik, 2008; Lutgen-Sandvik & Tracy, 2012; O’Donnell, MacIntosh, & Wuest, 2010). The damage of mobbing to health is discussed in scientific articles by the following authors: Duffy and Sperry (2007), Yildirim, Yildirim, and Timucin (2007), Testa (2013), Burgi (2014), Garot (2014), and Schindeler (2014). An essential factor for understanding the damage of mobbing to the physical and psychological health of each employee and the productivity of the organisation is to realise that violence is used at work. Studies of health and welfare in organisations show that tension at work has a significant negative impact, weakens the mental and physical health of the employee, encourages sick leave abuse or inspires employees to seek damages and/or reduces work efficiency (Farrell & Geist-Martin, 2005). In addition, tension in the workplace is related to psychological burnout (Cooper, Dewe, & O’Driscoll, 2001; Tattersall & Farmer, 1995) and to social health, defined as the quality of individual network of personal and work relationships (Farrell & Geist-Martin, 2005; Tracy, Lutgen-Sandvik, & Alberts, 2006), which has a negative impact on the performance of the entire organisation: turnover, a decrease in production, efficiency and creativity, the loss of reputation and the possibility of legal proceedings (Bultena, 2008). The consequences of mobbing to an individual’s health and that of their family were analysed by Duffy and Sperry (2007), who present two clinical case studies of workplace mobbing in academia.

3. Methodological considerations
The questionnaire for Diagnostics of Mobbing as Discrimination in Employees’ Relations in Order to Improve Organizational Climate was constructed based on several studies and pilot surveys conducted (Vveinhardt, 2012; Žukauskas & Vveinhardt, 2011).
The structure of the questionnaire is presented in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2. The developed questionnaire was tested by performing several empirical studies. The suitability of the questionnaire was verified for the diagnostics of mobbing, and particularly high reliability coefficients have been obtained, the expression of mobbing in Lithuanian organisations and the correlation of the phenomenon with organisational climate have been identified. The novelty of the questionnaire is related to the fact that the cultural discriminatory context, which is especially relevant for the environment being surveyed, has been evaluated by means of the specific questions. The original new universal questionnaire integrating harassment and managerial contexts was developed for the diagnostics of mobbing.

The new universal questionnaire *Mobbing and Single Cases of Harassment in Employees’ Relations* (MSCH) presented in this article consists of 21 questions and 47 items (Likert’s scale), which were aimed to identify what type of bullying the mobbing victims had experienced.

The items by Leymann (1990) make the basis of the items distinguished in the questionnaire (Scales 1–3). They are constructed by transforming (in the linguistic sense) the items of Leymann presented in the LIPT inventory and formulating them in the first person. The items (in the original variant of the questionnaire were in Lithuanian) have been adapted for the specific cultural environment.

Ten of the 21 questions are about demographic character in order to form as vivid a portrait of a mobbing victim as possible. The remaining 11 questions were aimed at discovering harassment duration and frequency, the discriminator (a colleague, manager and so on), the reaction of the victim to harassment, the person who has provided help, the means to stop harassment, consequences for the discriminator and so on.

By means of operationalisation of concepts three scales of the instrument have been formed: (1) *Communication interferences in employees’ relations*; (2) *Formation of negative opinion and work character*; and (3) *Employees’ physical state and consequences*.

The first scale consists of subscales of communication and isolation. The second scale comprises subscales of reputation and tasks. The third scale consists of subscales of health and harm. The subscales include 47 items (communication – 11; isolation – 5; reputation – 15; tasks – 8; health – 5; harm – 3).

With the help of the items on the subscale of communication it is possible to identify verbal and non-verbal actions intended to disrupt the communication with the victim of mobbing. The situation of the mobbed person, who experiences partial or complete isolation in respect of colleagues, can be identified by the item of isolation subscale. The level of debasement of the reputation of the person whose actions are revealed on the basis of rumours, hints, etc. is found by the items comprising the subscale of reputation. The situation of the mobbed person in respect of received tasks, i.e. whether the given tasks correspond to the competence of the employee, how humiliating the task is, etc. is evaluated by the items on the subscale of tasks. Deterioration in the health of employees, which is associated with both physical and financial damage, can be determined by the items on the subscale of health. The items on the subscale of harm are intended to identify direct and indirect material losses. The fact that the subscales of health and damage should be complemented by the items that in the future would allow the researcher to specify economic losses, determined by the number of lost working hours, the expenses of organisations and compensation to employees should be noted.

The culture, in which the instrument has been checked, is distinguished in the social-historical experience (determined by the Soviet social engineering relevant for Central and Eastern Europe). Initiatives, perception of public decisions, publicity danger,
reticence, which despite political and social transformations taking place remain important socio-cultural factors that influence different research being performed, are characteristic. In pursuing precision the control questions that aim to evaluate openness of the respondents have been included in the questionnaire.

4. Empirical results

The research sample includes 21 fields of professional activity. The fields of professional activity are grouped according to the Classification of Economic Activities (Statistics Lithuania, 2008).

The empirical study was conducted in Lithuania on 11–23 April 2014. The number of respondents was $N = 1231$. The survey was conducted at the respondents’ homes. The multi-stage random sampling approach was applied. The research error was 3.1%. Of 1231 respondents 867 indicated that they had experienced mobbing. The remaining 364 participants experienced bullying and harassment. This article presents only the results of the employees who had experienced mobbing.

4.1. Methodological characteristics of quality of questionnaire dimensions

The parameters of harassment and bullying actions within the organisation were represented by 45 primary indications (test questions – steps), which were generalised into six subscales (dimensions). Thus, the method of factorial analysis was chosen and as the result the following subscales of harassment and bullying actions within the organisation were distinguished: communication, isolation, reputation, assignments, health and damage (see Tables 1–6). Having applied the method of secondary factorial analysis, three scales defining harassment and bullying actions within the organisation were distinguished: communication interferences in employees’ relationships, formation of negative opinion and the nature of work as well as employees’ physical state and consequences.

It is known from research and practices of psychometrics that the test (diagnostic construct) can be successfully applied only when it has certain qualities: first of all, reliability and validity. These characteristics are detected after having performed special research and psychometric calculations. The mentioned psychometric characteristics can be quite high (see Table 1).

First of all, in order to identify what percentage of the total is explained by the surveyed object, the descriptive power or dispersion of the factor has been calculated and presented. The factor should be interpreted if it explains not less than 10% of the dispersion. If the explained dispersion of the factor is less than 10%, it would be necessary to search for the single test question, which decreases the dispersion of this generalised factor. The data of Table 1 shows that the explained dispersions of both distinguished factors noticeably exceed this lowest limit. In the communication subscale the explained dispersion is 36.12%, and in the isolation subscale the dispersion is 59.17%.

The internal consistence reliability of the factor has been estimated after having calculated the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. The testing theory indicates the acceptable interval of the coefficient change $0.5 < a < 1$; the large internal consistence of the test is shown by the high meanings of the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient approaching 1. In order to estimate the internal reliability of the subscales of communication interference in the employees’ communication within the organisation ($N = 799$, $N$ items = 15), the
Table 1. Characteristics of the methodological quality of the dimensions of communication interferences in employees’ relationships.

| Test subscales | N items | Explained dispersion % | Cronbach’s alpha | Spearman-Brown | Factorial weight (L) | Item-total correlation (v/itt) |
|----------------|---------|-------------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
|                |         |                         |                  |                | Mean | Min | Max | Mean | Min | Max | Mean | Min | Max |
| Communication  | 11      | 36.12                   | 0.85             | 0.79           | 0.59 | 0.41 | 0.78 | 0.34 | 0.06 | 0.86 |
| Isolation      | 5       | 59.17                   | 0.89             | 0.88           | 0.77 | 0.67 | 0.81 | 0.58 | 0.25 | 0.82 |

Source: Authors’ calculations.
calculated Cronbach’s alpha fluctuates from 0.85 to 0.89. The obtained rather high Cronbach’s alpha meanings allows us to state that the items of the subscales included in the instrument are resiliently related and are appropriate to diagnose communication interference in employees’ relationships. However, the size of the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient depends on the length of the scale – the more single questions which make the scale, the larger it can be. Thus, when the scale involves more than five single test steps, it is difficult to identify the real value and the additional measure of the internal reliability of the scale, which would be more sensitive for measurements, if necessary. So the meanings of the Spearman-Brown coefficient – which are more frequently less than the meanings of the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient as it is accepted in the test theory – are more often presented alongside the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. In this particular case they fluctuate from 0.79 to 0.88.

The resolution (differential power of the test steps [tasks]) or the correlation coefficient of the total item r/itt is the indicator of methodological quality of the test. The tests, which are based not on the solution of cognitive or logical problems, but on the expression of opinions, require that the coefficient of the resolution would not drop below the 0.20 limit. The appropriate estimations of the indicators of the communication interference scale in the presented test fluctuate from 0.34 on the communication subscale to 0.58 on the isolation subscale. The minimal requirements are significantly exceeded.

Referring to the model of the factorial analysis of the main components, the factorial weight of the test step L shows the cohesion of the variable statistical relationship. It is expressed by the correlation coefficient between the variable and extracted factor. The literature indicates that factorial weights are considered to be high in case their estimation does drop below 0.6. The appropriate mean estimations of the indicators of the communication interference scale in the analysed test fluctuate from 0.59 to 0.77. It is evident that this condition has been met as well.

As the qualitative characteristics of both the obtained subscales of the test of communication interference in employees’ relations are quite high, it is necessary to perform the secondary factorial analysis. The secondary factorisation has been performed by two different methods: the method of Principal Components and the method of Alfa Factoring in order to check the test dimensionality. During both factorisations the indicators of the methodological quality have been high (see Table 2).

By means of both methods of the factorial analysis one factor with the obtained factorial weights of the subscales, which exceeds 0.8, has been distinguished from both subscales, and the explained dispersion of the factor is much more than 70%. This shows that it is possible to speak about communication interferences in the employees’ relations as an integral (one-dimensional) dimension.

| Test subscales     | Principal components (model of Factor 1) F1 | Alpha factoring F1 |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Isolation         | 0.94                                        | 0.87              |
| Communication     | 0.94                                        | 0.87              |
| **Explained dispersion** | **87.74%**                               | **75.41%**        |

Source: Authors’ calculations.
It is necessary to discuss the characteristics of two scales (dimensions) Negative Opinion Formation and Work Character and Employees’ Physical State and Consequences, distinguished in the diagnostic test of harassment and bullying actions in an organisation (see Table 3).

As the data presented in Table 3 shows, the characteristics of the methodological quality in the scale of the negative opinion formation and work character are high enough and do not drop much beyond the relative measures identified in the above-discussed scale. In this scale quite high factorial weights of the test steps (on the average the factorial weights fluctuate from 0.60 in the reputation subscale to 0.68 in the tasks subscale) dominate as well. The resolution of the test steps also exceeds the minimal limit – it fluctuates from 0.35 in the reputation subscale to 0.45 in the tasks subscale. The meaning of the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of the intrinsic consistency measure also fluctuates around 0.9, and the Spearman-Brown around 0.8.

Having identified the methodological characteristics of the quality in the subscales of the negative opinion and work character, their secondary factorisation has been performed by applying two different methods: Principal Components Method and Alpha Factoring Method (Table 4).

The dispersion obtained during the secondary factorisation of the scale Formation of negative opinion and work character in the test on the harassment and bullying actions in the organisation is slightly lower than the one of the above-presented scale and it fluctuates from 63.44% (by using the Alpha factoring method) to 81.77% (by using the Principal Components method). The factorial weights of the subscales reach quite high estimations: 0.80–0.90 (see Table 5). Even though the indicators of the subscale of Harm are pretty high, it is supposed that in the future this subscale should be extended to include the items regarding the economic losses suffered by the organisation that do not prevent mobbing on time or allow competent employees to quit their job.

The data presented in Table 5 shows that the characteristics of the methodological quality of the employees’ physical state and consequences scale are also quite high. High enough factorial weights of the test steps, which fluctuate from 0.65 to 0.77, dominate. As previously mentioned, the factorial weights are considered high in case their value does not drop lower than 0.6. It is evident that this condition is met and exceeded. The distinctive power of the test steps (tasks), the average meaning of which should be not less than 0.2, is a very important indicator of the methodological quality of the test. The appropriate values of the indicators of the employees’ physical state and consequences scale in the presented test ranges from 0.44 to 0.58 and visibly show that the minimal requirements are exceeded (see Table 6). Involvement of economic losses in the questionnaire, relating them to the damage to health would help diagnose the losses related to the employee’s deteriorated health.

During the secondary factorial analysis the factorial weights of the components residual on the scale Employees’ Physical State and Outcomes in the test of the harassment and bullying actions in the organisation do not drop below 0.7 of the value. And the explained dispersion is slightly less (i.e. around 55% to 78%); however, it discloses quite fairly the strength of the respondents’ approval for this criterion.

Considering the obtained high enough characteristics of the methodological quality of the subscales and having performed the secondary factorial analysis by applying two different methods, it has been identified that in the further analysis of the results it is possible to speak about the model of one factor as well (see Table 7).
Table 3. The characteristics of methodological quality in dimensions of negative opinion formation and task character.

| Test subscales | N items | Explained dispersion | Cronbach’s alpha | Factorial weight (L) | Item-total correlation (r/itt) | Mean | Min | Max |
|----------------|---------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|------|-----|-----|
| Reputation     | 15      | 37.36                 | 0.89             | 0.86                 | 0.36                         | 0.60 | 0.36 | 0.76 |
| Tasks          | 8       | 46.05                 | 0.88             | 0.88                 | 0.58                         | 0.68 | 0.58 | 0.79 |

Source: Authors’ calculations.
organisation do not drop below 0.5 of the value, and the explained dispersion is slightly lower (i.e. around 54% to 61%); however, it discloses the fair strength of the respondents’ approval for this criterion.

From a psychometric viewpoint all presented arguments show that the created diagnostic instrument (see the Appendix) of nagging and sneering actions in the organisation is distinguished by high enough methodological quality. Of course, in future the

| Test subscales | Principal components (model of Factor 1) F1 | Alpha factoring F1 |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Tasks          | 0.90                                        | 0.80               |
| Reputation     | 0.90                                        | 0.80               |
| **Explained dispersion** | **81.77%** | **63.44%** |

Source: Authors’ calculations.

| Test subscales | N items | Explained dispersion % | Cronbach’s alpha | Spearman-Brown (L) | Factorial weight | Item-total correlation (r/itt) |
|----------------|---------|-------------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|
| Health         | 5       | 44.90                   | 0.83             | 0.65               | 0.41             | 0.09 0.79                     |
| Harm           | 3       | 60.54                   | 0.85             | 0.77               | 0.58             | 0.32 0.86                     |

Source: Authors’ calculations.

| Test subscales | Principal components (model of Factor 1) F1 | Alpha factoring F1 |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Harm           | 0.88                                        | 0.74               |
| Health         | 0.88                                        | 0.74               |
| **Explained dispersion** | **77.56%** | **55.03%** |

Source: Authors’ calculations.

| Test subscales | Principal components (model of Factor 1) F1 | Alpha factoring F1 |
|----------------|---------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Reputation     | 0.88                                        | 0.87               |
| Communication  | 0.85                                        | 0.79               |
| Isolation      | 0.80                                        | 0.74               |
| Health         | 0.77                                        | 0.73               |
| Tasks          | 0.75                                        | 0.70               |
| Harm           | 0.60                                        | 0.52               |
| **Explained dispersion** | **60.94%** | **53.66%** |

Source: Authors’ calculations.

Table 4. The results of the secondary factorial analysis on the scale of negative opinion formation and work character.

Table 5. The characteristics of methodological quality in the dimensions of the employees’ physical state and consequences.

Table 6. The results of the secondary factorial analysis of employees’ physical state and consequences scale.

Table 7. The results of the scale’s secondary factorial analysis of nagging and sneering actions within the organisation.
reliability and validity of this test should be checked by means of other methods, e.g. the method of re-test (repeated measurements).

5. Conclusion and discussion
The diagnostic instrument has been formed by evaluating the contexts of organisational management and the social competence of a victim. In the article the attack together with its expression is generally called harassment, particularly by identifying mobbing’s classical features of expression according to Leymann. The items included in the questionnaire allow measuring the strength of attack features, reactions of the victim and the organisation. The items provide the possibility of identifying the reactions to mobbing (the victim of harassment) after having experienced the attack in employees’ relationships, danger source (sources), actions of colleagues and managers, as well as organisational decisions, i.e. they involve levels of individuals and the organisation. The reactions of the victim towards the experienced attack are identified by individual steps of the test, namely decision-making and declination, the appeal to the attacker, manager, colleagues, family members, specialists of mental and physical health as well as law and quitting the job, etc. Who helped within the organisation and beyond it has been evaluated as has whether the help was efficient. In addition, by means of the questionnaire the possibility for the initiative of the employee who had experienced the attack to search for help, alongside the readiness of the organisation to react. The means to measure this in sections of the actions of the employees and the organisation is also provided. The social competitiveness of the victim during the conflict as well as preventive and intervention efficiency of the organisational system (institutionalisation of the phenomenon in internal acts, collective agreement, managerial decisions and their timeliness) have been measured. It has been estimated whether the anti-mobbing means present in the organisation are functional. That is can mobbing be discussed in internal documents of the organisation (e.g., in codes of ethics, collective agreements)? However, this remains unimplemented in practice. The hypothesis ‘The questionnaire is suitable to diagnose mobbing in employees’ relationships by systemically estimating the organisational context of harassment at the workplace’ has been verified.

The performed calculations show that the diagnostic instrument of attack actions applied to mobbing in employees’ relationships in the psychometric viewpoint is distinguished by rather high methodological quality. The items of the subscales included in the instrument are closely related and are appropriate to diagnose communication interference in employees’ relationships. The appropriate minimal requirements formulated for the estimations of indicators on the scale of the communication interferences in the presented test are significantly exceeded. The condition, which is set for factorial weights, is met. In addition, the characteristics of the methodological quality of the scale of employees’ physical state and consequences are also quite high; the high factorial weights of test steps dominate. The resolution of the test steps, the average value of which should be not less than 0.2, has been exceeded.

It is anticipated that in the future studies the questionnaire will be supplemented by the subscale of the economic damage, which is revealed in aspects of worsening employee health, loss of working hours, compensations and other payouts.
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### Appendix 1. The structure of the questionnaire

| Test scales                                      | Test subscales                                      | Number of items in the scale | Number of items in the subscale | Numeration of items and/or questions in the questionnaire |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| I. Mobbing features, prevention and intervention | 1.1. Identification of mobbing phenomenon           | 5                            | 11                              | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 questions                                    |
|                                                 | 1.2. Measures to diminish mobbing phenomenon        | 6                            |                                 | 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 questions                              |
| II. Communication interferences in employees’ relations | 2.1. Communication                                   | 11                           | 16                              | 12.1–12.11 items                                          |
|                                                 | 2.2. Isolation                                       | 5                            |                                 | 12.12–12.16 items                                          |
| III. Formation of negative opinion and work character | 3.1. Reputation                                       | 15                           | 23                              | 12.17–12.31 items                                          |
|                                                 | 3.2. Tasks                                            | 8                            |                                 | 12.32–12.39 items                                          |
| IV. Employees’ physical state and consequences   | 4.1. Health                                            | 5                            | 8                               | 12.40–12.44 items                                          |
|                                                 | 4.2. Harm                                             | 3                            |                                 | 12.45–12.47 items                                          |
| V. Socio-demographic characteristics             |                                                     | 10                           |                                 | 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 questions            |
## Appendix 2. Questionnaire "Mobbing and Single Cases of Harassment in Employees’ Relations (MSCH)."

### I. Mobbing features, prevention and intervention

#### 1.1. Identification of mobbing phenomenon

| Questions | Specification |
|-----------|---------------|
| 1. Have you experienced harassment, bullying in your work? | This question is aimed to disassociate from the respondents who have not experienced harassment in their work. |
| □ Yes | When the questionnaire is used by filling in its electronic version, this insertion is necessary to be able to identify what distribution of the respondents who have participated in the survey is according to the fields of professional activity. This insertion is aimed to identify how many respondents have searched for the information in the specialised website [www.mobingas.lt](http://www.mobingas.lt) and have opened the questionnaire. |
| □ No | This question is aimed to identify whether in respect of duration the respondent has experienced harassment or mobbing. That is up to six months (referring to the definition of H. Leymann) it would be identified that the employee has experienced harassment; if 6 months and more, it is possible to assume that the employee experiences mobbing (subject to what answer will be to the 3rd question). |

If you answered ‘No’, do not fill in the questionnaire; answer the 1st and 13th questions only.

2. If yes, how long has the harassment (bullying) taken place?

| □ Up to six months | □ Six months and more | Other (please, specify) |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|

The variant of the answer ‘Other’ is aimed for the respondent to write in important additional information at discretion, for example, that the harassment lasted for more than several successive years.

3. How often has harassment (bullying) taken place?

| □ Not less than once a week | □ Less than once a week | Other (please, specify) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|

The frequency of harassment is identified by means of this question. According to the definition of H. Leymann, in case of mobbing, harassment has to reoccur not less than once a week. In exceptional cases the frequency can be not so intensive or vice versa – particularly intensive. Thus, the option of the answer ‘Other’ has been included, so the respondent can indicate, for example, that harassment occurs every day or every other week.

For example, it has become evident that the victim had been intensively attacked; however, according to the classical definition, he/she could not have been named as a person experiencing mobbing because he/she has been working by the rolling schedule, which influenced his/her meetings with the aggressor.

(Continued)
### I. Mobbing features, prevention and intervention

#### Questions Specification

| Questions                                                                 | Specification                                                                                                                                 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4. Who was a harasser, bully?                                            | In order to identify the direction of harassment (horizontal, vertical, horizontal and vertical) for positions have been distinguished: horizontal (one employee against another), horizontal (several colleagues against one employee), vertical (the manager against his/her subordinate or the subordinate against the manager), horizontal and vertical (the manager and colleagues together). This question does not aim to identify staffing when subordinates conspire against the female manager. |
| □ A colleague                                                            | The respondent is suggested to name several answers, and if there is no suitable answer – to write his/her own answer. The presented variants of the answers are stereotyped; thus, the reaction of the employee written into the variant ‘Other’ can be very useful in extending (specifying) the competence of the victim to deal with the problem, his/her behaviour model. |
| □ Several colleagues                                                     |                                                                                                                                             |
| □ The manager                                                            |                                                                                                                                             |
| □ Both the manager and colleagues                                       |                                                                                                                                             |
| 5. How have you reacted to harassment (bullying)? Indicate all suitable  |                                                                                                                                             |
| variants:                                                                |                                                                                                                                             |
| □ I haven’t done anything                                                |                                                                                                                                             |
| □ I have asked to stop                                                   |                                                                                                                                             |
| □ I have informed the manager                                           |                                                                                                                                             |
| □ I have addressed a psychologist                                       |                                                                                                                                             |
| □ I have addressed a psychotherapist                                     |                                                                                                                                             |
| □ I have told a colleague (colleagues)                                   |                                                                                                                                             |
| □ I have asked to be moved away from the harasser (harassers)            |                                                                                                                                             |
| □ I have addressed the trade-union                                      |                                                                                                                                             |
| □ I have taken legal advice                                              |                                                                                                                                             |
| □ I have told friends, family members                                    |                                                                                                                                             |
| □ I have handed the written a resignation letter                         |                                                                                                                                             |
| Other (please, specify)                                                  |                                                                                                                                             |

#### 1.2. Measures to diminish mobbing phenomenon

| Questions                                                                 | Specification                                                                                                                                 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 6. Who has provided you with support and help?                           | As the previous question has aimed to identify the acts of the victim when he/she had experienced harassment, this question aims to identify the person who has provided help. The comparison of the 5th and 6th question is particularly significant because it is important to find out whether the victim has got assistance, for example, from the manager if he/she addressed namely the manager, etc. |
| □ The manager                                                            | The manager                                                                                                                               |
| □ Psychologist                                                           | Psychologist                                                                                                                             |
| □ Psychiatrist                                                           | Psychiatrist                                                                                                                             |
| □ Trade-union                                                            | Trade-union                                                                                                                              |
| □ Lawyer (attorney)                                                     | Lawyer (attorney)                                                                                                                         |
| □ Friends, family                                                       | Friends, family                                                                                                                          |
| Other (please, specify)                                                  | Other (please, specify)                                                                                                                  |
### I. Mobbing features, prevention and intervention

#### Questions

| Question | Specification |
|----------|---------------|
| 7. Have any actions been taken to prevent bullying, harassment? | Independent of whether the assistance has been provided (the 6th question), it is necessary to identify whether the victim knows about the actions, which had been taken (or not) to prevent the mobbing phenomenon in the organisation. If the variant of the answer ‘I don’t know’ is chosen, it is identified that the victim has not been informed about the actions taken to prevent workplace mobbing. This shows not only the presence or absence of the feedback, but also notes about communication, policy of publicity, which are relevant to overcome mobbing. If you have answered this question ‘No’, proceed to the 11th question. If the previous question has been answered negatively, the 8th, 9th and 10th questions are not to be answered. So the respondent proceeds to the 11th question. The respondent is given the possibility to choose one or several variants of the answers, subject to the situation he/she had experienced. It is aimed to identify what actions are taken or not against the aggressor. For example, in Lithuania it is atypical to use legal instruments – during the decade only two lawsuits, which mention the attack characteristic to mobbing, got to the court. The answers allow checking whether the respondents have honestly answered the previous questions. The variant of the answer ‘I don’t know’ is related to possible problems in organisational communication, publicity in solving mobbing conflicts. |
| □ Yes | |
| □ No | |
| □ I don’t know | |
| 8. If YES, who has taken the actions? | The respondent is asked to specify who had taken the actions with the purpose to compare with what has been identified previously, i.e. the reaction of the victim to harassment (the 5th question), the rescuer (the 6th question). The list is not final. |
| □ The manager | |
| □ Colleagues | |
| □ Trade-union | |
| □ Law enforcement authorities | |
| Other (please, specify) ............... | |
| 9. If YES, what were the consequences for the harasser (harassers)? | The harasser(s) has made restitution. Administrative action or criminal prosecution was applied against a harasser (harassers) |
| □ No consequences | |
| □ Verbal warning | |
| □ Disciplinary penalty was imposed | |
| □ Institutions of law enforcement have been informed | |
| □ The harasser(s) has made restitution | |
| □ Administrative action or criminal prosecution was applied against a harasser (harassers) | |
| □ I don’t know | |
| Other (please, specify) ............... | |
### I. Mobbing features, prevention and intervention

#### Questions

| Question                                                                 | Specification                                                                 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 10. What action has the manager/organisation made after this event?     | The question is aimed to analyse the intervention and prevention system of the organisation. In addition, it partly notes about the possible problems of management culture, which are related to conflict management and organisational climate. |
| □ The situation was given publicity in the organisation as an intolerable example |                                                                                                                                   |
| □ The manager has publicly demonstrated intolerance of harassment, bullying |                                                                                                                                   |
| □ The situation has been discussed with colleagues                      |                                                                                                                                   |
| □ The professional specialist (consultant) has been invited              |                                                                                                                                   |
| □ The seminar aimed at prevention of harassment at the workplace has been held |                                                                                                                                   |
| □ No actions have been made                                              |                                                                                                                                   |
| Other (please, specify)                                                  |                                                                                                                                   |
| 11. In our organisation:                                                 | Together with the above-presented questions and variants of the answers it is specified how mobbing conflicts are solved at organisational level, strengths and/or problematic fields of the organisation are highlighted. |
| □ You can always address the manager if you have experienced bullying and harassment and get some help |                                                                                                                                   |
| □ Bullying and harassment are discussed in the collective agreement       |                                                                                                                                   |
| □ Bullying and harassment are discussed in the code of ethics, which is followed |                                                                                                                                   |
| □ Bullying and harassment are discussed in the code of ethics; however, it is not followed |                                                                                                                                   |
| □ No attention has been given to mobbing and harassment in the collective agreement |                                                                                                                                   |
| □ During the employment process, psychological tests were applied         |                                                                                                                                   |
| □ It is useless to address the manager if you had experienced bullying and harassment |                                                                                                                                   |
| □ Trainings and seminars, where it is explained how to avoid psychological and physical violence and/or how to behave when a colleague commits acts of violence, are held. |                                                                                                                                   |
| □ Colleagues always render their assistance                              |                                                                                                                                   |
| Colleagues are indifferent or support the harasser                       |                                                                                                                                   |
| □ The specialist who renders psychological and other assistance is available. Other (please, specify) |                                                                                                                                   |

(Continued)
Appendix 2. (Continued)

II. Communication interferences in employees’ relations

2.1. Communication

12. Indicate by what actions you have experienced bullying, harassment:
12.1. The manager does not allow me to express my opinion
12.1. My colleagues do not allow me to express my opinion
12.1. When I speak, somebody constantly interrupts me
12.1. I am shouted at, loudly abused
12.1. Productivity of my work is criticised
12.1. My personal life is criticised
12.1. I am terrorised over the phone
12.1. I was threatened verbally
12.1. I was threatened in writing
12.1. They avoided contact with me by showing disdainful glances or gestures
12.11. They avoided contact with me by doing indirect cues
12.12. Nobody talks to me, communicates with me
12.13. Colleagues do not allow me to communicate with them
12.14. My workplace has been moved to another room, farther from my colleagues
12.15. Colleagues are forbidden to communicate with me
12.16. I am treated as ‘an empty place’

2.2. Isolation

12.17. They disparage me behind my back
12.18. False rumours were disseminated about me
12.19. I am sneered, mocked
12.20. The story goes that I have mental problems
12.21. I hear hints that I should ‘visit a psychiatrist’
12.22. They laugh at my physical limitations
12.23. My walking, gestures, speech are mocked
12.24. I have been attacked due to my political views

III. Formation of negative opinion and work character

3.1. Reputation

12.17. They disparage me behind my back
12.18. False rumours were disseminated about me
12.19. I am sneered, mocked
12.20. The story goes that I have mental problems
12.21. I hear hints that I should ‘visit a psychiatrist’
12.22. They laugh at my physical limitations
12.23. My walking, gestures, speech are mocked
12.24. I have been attacked due to my political views

(Continued)
III. Formation of negative opinion and work character

12.25. I have been attacked due to my religious views
12.26. They mock at my nationality
12.27. They mock at my social origin
12.28. My work is evaluated unfairly, offensively
12.29. My decisions are continuously doubted
12.30. On the neck I hear bad language, offensive phrases, remarks and so on
12.31. I have heard remarks about sexual relations or offers to make love
12.32. I do not get any work tasks
12.33. I do not have the possibility to do anything at my work
12.34. I get meaningless work tasks
12.35. The tasks exceeding my power have been assigned
12.36. I constantly get volatile tasks
12.37. I am forced to perform the tasks humiliating my self-esteem
12.38. I get offensive work tasks
12.39. I have got the work tasks that exceed my qualification in order to “discredit” me

IV. Employees’ physical state and consequences

4.1. Health
12.40. I had to perform the tasks harmful for my health
12.41. I have heard threats to use physical force against me
12.42. Slight physical violence has been used against me because I should have been “taught”
12.43. They behave with me particularly harshly
12.44. I have experienced sexual assault

4.2. Harm
12.45. The direct material harm has been done
12.46. The direct material harm has been done at my home
12.47. The situations, because of which I experience material expenses, are specially created
### V. Socio-demographic characteristics

| Questions |  |
|-----------|--|
| 13. Fields of your professional activity: |  |
| **Fields of professional activity**¹ | **Specification** |
| Agriculture | This section contains the activities related to the use of vegetables, animals and nature resources; they cover crop growing, animal breeding, timber handling as well as the output of other vegetable, animals or their products in farms or nature ranges. |
| Forestry | This section consists of the activity types related to the extraction of mineral resources, which are naturally found in solid (coal and ore), liquid (oil) or gas (natural gas) form. |
| Fishing | |
| Mining and quarrying | This section includes the physical or chemical change of materials, environments or their components with new products. |
| Manufacturing | |
| Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply | This section classifies the activity related to the supply of electric power, natural gas, steam, hot water by using permanent infrastructure (networks) of supply lines, mains and pipelines. The size of the network is not the decisive factor; it also involves the supply of electricity, gas, steam, hot water and the like to industrial districts or residential buildings. Thus this section includes the exploitation of electricity and gas systems, which generate, control and distribute electric power or gas. It also includes the supply of steam and air-conditioning. |
| Water supply, sewerage, waste management and remediation activities | This section includes the activity, which is related to the management of different waste, e.g. solid and non-solid industrial or household waste, as well as of contaminated construction sites (including debris collecting, processing and removal). The products got in the process of water and sewage treatment can be removed or used in other manufacturing processes. The section includes water supply activity because it is often carried out together with the exploitation of sewage purifying device or it is performed by other enterprises engaged in sewerage. |
| Questions                                | V. Socio-demographic characteristics                                                                 |
|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Construction                            | This section includes general construction of buildings and engineering structures and special construction works. This can be new construction, repair, construction or reconstruction of enlargements, mounting of prefabricated buildings or structures in the construction site, as well as the construction of temporary buildings. |
| Wholesale and retail                    | This section deals with wholesale and retail of different goods (i.e. sale without processing) and the provision of the services characteristic for trade. This section also includes maintenance of motor vehicles and motorcycles. |
| Maintenance of motor vehicles and motorcycles | This section includes transportation of passengers and cargo, scheduled or not scheduled; transportation of cargo by railway, road, water, air and pipes as well as the related activity such as the functioning of transport terminals and parking, cargo handling, storage and the like. This section also deals with the rent of transport equipment with driver or operator recruitment. This section also includes the activity of post and couriers. |
| Transportation and storage              | This section deals with short-stay accommodation for visitors and other travellers as well as provision of ready meals and beverages meant for immediate consumption. |
| Food service activities                  | The section deals with production and dissemination of information and culture products; the supply of measures, which allow conveying or spreading these products, as well as data or messages; the activity related to information technologies, data processing and other information services. |
| Accommodation activities                 | This section deals with the activity of financial services that include insurance, reinsurance and pension funding as well as the activity maintaining financial services. Also this section involves the activity of investment (asset) storage, i.e. the activity of holding companies and trusts, funds and similar financial institutions. |
### Appendix 2. (Continued)

| Questions | V. Socio-demographic characteristics |
|-----------|--------------------------------------|
| Real estate activities | This section includes the activity of peoplefunctioning as lessors, agents and (or) brokers in one or more fields presented: sale or purchase of real estate, real estate for rent, the activity of other services related to real estate, e.g. real estate appraisal or the activity of the real estate escrow agent. This section also deals with the construction of buildings by maintaining the property of these buildings or renting them. The section also includes the activity of real estate managers. |
| Professional, scientific and technical activities | This section includes specialised professional, scientific and technical activity. This activity requires high level of readiness; due to it special knowledge and skills become available to consumers. |
| Administrative and service activities | This section includes various activities, which maintain general operations of business. |
| Public administration and defence | This section involves the types of state and self-government activities, which are most frequently performed by public administration institutions. It deals with the adoption of laws and legal acts accompanying them and their legal interpretation, as well as management of the programmes based on them; legislative activities; the management of tax, defence, public order and security, immigration institutions, as well as of foreign affairs and government programmes. This section also contains the activity of compulsory (state) social security. |
| Compulsory social security | |
| Education | This section includes education of any level or of any profession. Education can be organised orally or in written, as well as by radio, television, the Internet or correspondence. This section contains the education implemented by different institutions of regular (traditional) education system at its different levels, as well as adult education, programmes for elimination of illiteracy and so on. Also at respective levels this section involves military schools and academies, prison schools and so on. The section deals with both state and private education. |

(Continued)
Appendix 2. (Continued)

| Questions                                                                 | V. Socio-demographic characteristics                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Human health care and social work                                         | This section includes the activity of human health care and social work. It involves a wide range of activities starting from the health care provided by qualified medical professionals in hospitals or other institutions, over residential care when the activity of social work only partly relates to the activity of health care performed without the involvement of health care professionals. |
| Arts, entertainment and recreational activities                           | This section includes different activities that meet cultural, entertainment and recreational needs of the general public, which include live performances, operation of museums, gambling, sports and recreation activities. |
| Other service activities                                                  | This section (as a residual category) includes the activities of membership organisations, computer maintenance, repair of personal and household goods, as well as a variety of personal service activities not covered elsewhere. |
| Activities of extraterritorial organisations                              | This group includes the activity of international organisations such as the United Nations and the specialised agencies, regional units of this system – International Monetary Fund, World Bank, World Customs Organization, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, the EU, European Free Trade Association etc. This group also contains: activities of diplomatic and consular missions representing countries, if they are registered in the accommodating country. |

14. You work for:  
- [ ] Private sector  
- [ ] Public sector

It is important to evaluate the situation of the organisations referable to the economic activity according to the sectors by orienting to future more specified researches (for example, on culture and climate).
**Appendix 2. (Continued)**

| Questions                                                                 | V. Socio-demographic characteristics                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 15. You are:                                                             | For specification of mobbing and other actions of harassment as well as evaluation of organisational system, subject to the status within the organisation |
| □ The top manager                                                        | The question to specify but not optional                                                              |
| □ The middle-level manager                                               | The previous research have identified that the risk to experience the attack exists in the beginning of one’s career, and victims suffer mobbing not for a year because the culture being surveyed is distinguished by low work mobility, especially for older people and public sector employees |
| □ The lower-level manager                                                |                                                                                                      |
| □ The subordinate                                                        |                                                                                                      |
| 16. Position (desirable):                                                |                                                                                                      |
| 17. Your work experience at the present workplace:                       |                                                                                                      |
| □ Up to 1 year                                                           |                                                                                                      |
| □ 1–3 years                                                              |                                                                                                      |
| □ 4–7 years                                                              |                                                                                                      |
| □ 8–10 years                                                             |                                                                                                      |
| □ 11–15 years                                                            |                                                                                                      |
| □ 16–20 years Other (please, specify)                                    |                                                                                                      |
| 18. The number of employees working at your organisation:                | It is aimed to specify the causal/outcome relationship of mobbing (harassment) expression with the size and management of the organisation |
| □ Up to 10 employees                                                     |                                                                                                      |
| □ More than 10, but less than 50 employees                               |                                                                                                      |
| □ From 50 to 250 employees                                               |                                                                                                      |
| □ More than 250 employees                                                |                                                                                                      |
| 19. Your marital status:                                                 | One of the socio-demographic criteria, for example, related to stigmatisation                           |
| □ Single                                                                 |                                                                                                      |
| □ Married                                                                |                                                                                                      |
| □ Divorced                                                               |                                                                                                      |
| □ Living together without getting married                                |                                                                                                      |
| Other (please, specify)                                                  |                                                                                                      |
### Questions

| V. Socio-demographic characteristics |
|--------------------------------------|

20. Your age:
- [ ] Up to 20 years
- [ ] 21–30
- [ ] 31–40
- [ ] 41–50
- [ ] 51–60
- [ ] More than 60, but not retired

- [ ] The retirement age

21. Your education: Please, specify: ............... Respondents are advised to write in their education because the previous practice has shown that respondents often wish to state that they have several diplomas of higher education, i.e. he/she has acquired not only the Bachelor’s degree, but also Master’s or Doctor’s degree, continues his/her studies, is on academic leave – and a lot of other variants. The answers to this question complement the portrait of a victim. In addition, it can show the coherence of person’s competence and education as well as serve for more explicit future researches related to educational system in evaluating the readiness of both employees and managers in respect of mobbing conflicts.

22. Your gender
- [ ] Female
- [ ] Male

Note: It is advisable to adapt some socio-demographic criteria when carrying out research in different countries.

1Referring to the Classification of Economic Activities of the Republic of Lithuania.