DOI: 10.26387/bpa.2024.00016

Witnessing mobbing: Psychological consequences for men and women. A study in Israel

Ilana Eldan[1], Maurizio Tirassa[1], Massimo Zedda[1], Carlo Chiorri[2], Daniela Acquadro Maran[1]

[1] Department of Psychology, University of Turin, Italy
[2] Department of Educational Science, University of Genoa, Italy

daniela.acquadro@unito.it

ABSTRACT. L'obiettivo di questo studio condotto a Eliat (Israele) era quello di analizzare le conseguenze (fisiche ed emotive) e le strategie di coping in uomini e donne testimoni di mobbing. I risultati indicano che le donne sono più propense degli uomini a riferire di aver assistito a comportamenti intrusivi che minano la reputazione di una persona. Le donne inoltre risultano esperire sintomi depressivi più gravi e tendono ad utilizzare, più degli uomini, il supporto emotivo come strategia di coping. Nel complesso questo studio mostra come essere testimoni di mobbing può avere conseguenze psicologiche che influenzano la qualità della vita personale e organizzativa. Per quanto riguarda gli individui, il fenomeno viene percepito in modi e gradi diversi nelle donne e negli uomini.

SUMMARY. The aim of the study presented here was to analyze mobbing from the witnesses' point of view: in particular, to contribute to the understanding of the physical and emotional consequences they may suffer (including malaise with symptoms of depression and anxiety) and their coping strategies. A comparison was made between men and women who have witnessed mobbing. A questionnaire was administered in public administrations, private companies and third sector organizations. The questionnaire was distributed to 262 workers in Eliat (Israel), of whom 78.6% responded to all questions. Findings showed that: women are more likely than men to report witnessing intrusive behavior that undermines a person's reputation; the depressive symptoms were more severe in women than in men; women tended more than men to use coping strategies such as confide in friends, colleagues, and relatives and to seek support when they were affected by the phenomenon. This study shows how witnessing mobbing can have psychological consequences that affect the quality of personal and organizational life. As far as individuals are concerned, this can happen in different ways and to different extents in women and men.

Keywords: *Violence in workplace, Sex differences, Coping strategies, Psychosocial risk, Israel*

INTRODUCTION

In the context of the workplace, Leymann (1996) defined mobbing in terms of "psychological terror" (p. 165) at work. It is characterized by hostile and immoral direct and indirect communication that is systematically and mainly directed against one person by one or more individuals. Situations of this kind that take place almost every day and for a long period of time, namely at least six months, fit into the definition. Because of their nature, frequency and duration, they cause significant psychological, psychosomatic, and social suffering, and push the victim into a defenseless position (Saeidipour, Akbari & Alizadeh, 2021). Einarsen and colleagues (Einarsen, Glaasø & Nielsen, 2011) argue that there are close similarities between several forms of perceived abusive behaviors: "in practice, only minor differences exist between the concepts of bullying, harassment, and mobbing" (Einarsen et al., 2011, p. 5; cit. in Yamada, Duffy & Berry, 2018). Accordingly, they endorse a more or less interchangeable use of the terms in referring to "the systematic exhibition of aggressive behavior at work directed towards a subordinate, a coworker, or even a superior, as well as the perception of being systematically exposed to such mistreatment while at work" (Einarsen et al., 2011, p. 5; cit. in Yamada et al., 2018). What distinguishes mobbing from other conflictual phenomena within a work group is the repetition of harassment and humiliation toward the same person with no effort to hide it. Pasek and colleagues (2020) argue that mobbing initially manifests itself through a simple lack of respect, such as tasteless jokes, to which untruths and manipulations are added. If the social environment does not respond to these behaviors, at a later stage these behaviors transform into overtly perverse conducts, which in most cases affect the mental health of the person against whom they are directed (Aristidou, Mpouzika, Papathanassoglou, Middleton & Karanikola, 2020; Romero, 2022). Leymann (1996) describes these attacks as targeted against communication (e.g., the victim is not left free to express his or her thoughts or is interrupted while speaking), social relationships (e.g., the victim is isolated or ignored), social image (e.g., the victim is ridiculed or gossiped about), professional credit (e.g., the victim is assigned tasks that are below or above his or her skill level), and health (e.g., threats of violence, actual aggressions). As a consequence, the victim can suffer from somatoform disorders, which are diseases caused by the persistence of a stressful situation (Acquadro Maran, Zedda & Varetto, 2021; Duffy & Sperry, 2011; Pheko, 2018).

In a work context there will often be others who see, hear, or understand what is going on, beside the mobber(s) and the victim. Previous research has shown that witnessing abusive behaviors in the workplace has a negative impact on work performance (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf & Cooper, 2020; Einarsen, Raknes & Matthiesen, 1994; Siyal, Saeed, Pahi, Solangi & Xin, 2021). This has been known for a long time and well documented by investigations. For example, in a British survey, 73% of 761 respondents reported having witnessed mobbing; these individuals also reported higher levels of stress. In addition, 44% of participants were concerned about being bullied themselves, while about one in five said they had considered leaving their workplace (Salin & Notelaers, 2020). In another study conducted with British workers, it was found that 32% of the participants who had witnessed incidents of bullying said that this led to a decrease in efficiency in their workplace, while 28% said that it badly affected their motivation to work (Hoel & Cooper, 2000). This is consistent with Vartia's (2001) study of Finnish municipal workers, where witnesses on the average showed more stress reactions than the other workers. Other effects include dissatisfaction with the job and a more frequent intention to turnover (Acquadro Maran et al., 2021); decreased trust in the organisation (Yanginlar & Bal, 2021); decreased commitment to the job and the organisation itself (da Silva João & Saldanha Portelada, 2019; Divincová & Siváková, 2014). In their turn, these effects can lead the organization to lose reputation by weakening its competitive power (Akar, Anafarta & Sarvan, 2011; Haq, Raja, Alam, De Clercq & Saleem, 2022). The combination of these negative effects affects not only workers and organisations, but also society as a whole, causing significant health and legal expenditures (Azemović & Azemović, 2019).

Men and women witness of mobbing

Men and women appear to differ as to the respective psychological relationships with violence, whether inflicted, suffered, or witnessed (Spencer, Stith & Cafferky, 2022). This could depend, at least to some extent, on differences in how the two sexes perceive some of the issues involved, e.g. what violence is, what counts as an actual instance of violence, how to judge the extent and gravity of a violent act, how to assess the role of the context within which the act has occurred, how to judge its underlying motives, the extent to which the loss of

face associated to being a victim may be acceptable, and so on (Einarsen & Mikkelsen, 2002). The researchers themselves are probably unable to provide extremely detailed instructions about these issues to the participants. As a result, a question such as, for example, "Have you inflicted/suffered/witnessed acts of violence at work?" might be interpreted differently by the average male and female respondents. In each specific incident of mobbing, of course, other, non-sex-related issues will also interact in different ways with such variability: e.g. the identity, age, social class, education, personal features and previous experience of each of the three or four types of characters involved (the perpetrator, the victim, the witness and, possibly, the researchers), the individual statuses in the context, other features of the incident like the events immediately surrounding it, the presence of one or more witnesses etc. It is correspondingly difficult to achieve a general, abstract understanding of the variables involved. However, there is a good deal of relevant research on the topic. Salin (2021) argues that the men's ability to recognize psychological violence is generally lower than that of women. A possible interpretation is that men might be less aware or more tolerant than women of this form of violence when they are the victims, and therefore might notice it less than women or judge it to be less serious also when witnessing it. Men might also perceive physical violence and threats as less severe when inflicted by a woman than when inflicted by another man (see for example Misawa, Andrews & Jenkins, 2019). There might also exist a sex difference in the very perception of violence. Women appear to be more inclined to label negative incidents as mobbing and to classify them as serious; they also appear to feel more affected by them (Alfano, Ramaci, Landolfi, Lo Presti & Barattucci, 2021; Escartín, Zapf, Arrieta & Rodríguez-Carballeira, 2011). Women and men also appear to interpret and respond to mobbing differently. Acquadro Maran and colleagues (2021) studied a sample of 249 witnesses of mobbing (134 women), finding that, overall, women were more likely than men to self-report health-related psychological problems and work-related stress as consequences of such experience.

Witnesses of abusive behaviors may suffer from depression (Borg, Rabinak & Marusak, 2021) and anxiety (Ng, Niven & Notelaers, 2022) in the aftermath of the experience. In previous investigation (see Nonnis, Cuccu & Porcu, 2020), trait anxiety has also been cited as a possible antecedent for self-classification as a mobbing victim or aggressor. Moreover, and it has been hypothesised that the more severe the trait anxiety, the more likely the person is to also experience an increase in anxiety in stressful situations (Milne, Lomax & Freeston, 2019). People with high levels of trait anxiety seem to interpret a broader range of situations as dangerous or threatening (Guil, Gómez-Molinero, Merchan-Clavellino, Gil-Olarte & Zayas, 2019). People with higher trait anxiety are also more likely to suffer a greater increase of state anxiety in situations that involve interpersonal relationships or may threaten self-esteem (Galletta, Confuorto, Improta & Marcelli, 2019; Molero Jurado et al., 2021). On the other hand, Miner-Rubino and Cortina (2007) found that both men and women responded with lower psychological well-being, poorer physical health, and lower job satisfaction after witnessing incivility at work. Sex also appears to differ in their coping strategies. For example, men tend to seek less emotional support than women, who do so from family, friends, and colleagues (Acquadro Maran, Varetto, Butt & Civilotti, 2019; Lewis & Orford, 2005).

Coping strategies in mobbing

Coping is defined as the cognitive, emotional, and behavioural efforts made to tolerate, reduce, or control conflicts between internal and external demands (Folkman, & Lazarus, 1980; Nielsen, Mikkelsen, Persson & Einarsen, 2020). If the strategies chosen are functional, the stress experienced is significantly reduced. According to Lazarus and Folkman (1984, see also Vukelić, Ćizmic & Petrović, 2019), after being exposed to violence, employees first make a primary assessment of the danger and threat of the situation and then proceed with a secondary assessment of resources to counter the event and avoid threats and losses until they choose a response that they implement. If the chosen resources are not sufficient, the subject experiences a strong tension that generates negative emotions and psychological discomfort.

Vukelić et al. (2019) in their study in Serbia, in which 329 employees (69% women) participated, highlighted that experiencing mobbing leads to facing subsequent stressful events with poorly functioning coping strategies, and that this also affects the level of anxiety of the victims themselves. Previously, Reknes et al. (2016) conducted a longitudinal study to investigate whether nurses who were victims of mobbing exhibited more maladpative coping strategies (e.g., avoiding the bully, taking sick leave; see Acquadro Maran

et al. 2019, 2021) in the face of stressful events than non-victims and to determine whether coping style moderates the relationship between mobbing and anxiety. Data was collected from 1582 Norwegian nurses. The results indeed showed that victims tended to cope more negatively with stressful events than non-victims and that coping strategies influenced the victims' next level of anxiety. Grzesiuk and colleagues (Grzesiuk, Szymańska, Jastrzębska & Rutkowska, 2022) examined the relationships between mobbing symptoms, reactions and coping strategies of victims in a sample of 781 Polish employees (66% women, 34% men). The results show that victims exhibit behaviours that are described in the literature as both maladaptive and adaptive (trying to talk to the bully; see Acquadro Maran et al., 2019, 2021), with the latter being used less frequently. The same result can also be observed among witnesses of bullying. Sims and Sun's (2012) study of 150 employees in China found that witnessing workplace bullying was associated with the use of maladaptive strategies, such as the intention to leave the workplace. In general, compared to men, women report using most coping strategies more frequently and focusing more on their feelings (Finstad et al., 2019). In the meta-analysis by Tamres and colleagues (Tamres, Janicki & Helgeson, 2002), women were found to use adaptive coping strategies, especially emotional support, significantly more often than men.

Current study

The Israeli Ministry of Economy and Industry published a study entitled "Harassment and abuse in the workplace" (Fefferman & Bar-Tsuri, 2016) which provided the first official data on the extent of mobbing and its characteristics in the country. The research was based on a representative sample of 1120 workers who answered to telephone interviews conducted over the course of two months in 2012. Fefferman and Bar-Tsuri (2016) inferred from the results that about half of the employees in Israel (1,464 million) had been affected by mobbing in the workplace during 2011. 50.8% of the respondents confirmed that mobbing compromised their motivation to work (51.6%), and that this had negative consequences on the quality of their life (48.2%). In addition, 43.9% of participants agreed with the statement that mobbing is a serious problem in the organization of work.

The purpose of the study we present here was to analyze mobbing from the witnesses' viewpoint: specifically, to contribute to the understanding of the physical and emotional consequences that they may suffer (including malaise, with symptoms of depression and anxiety) and of their coping strategies. A comparison between men and women was made. Based on the literature reviewed, the hypotheses were as follows:

1) women who have witnessed certain negative behaviors tend to classify them as mobbing more frequently and/or more strongly than men;
2) women who have witnessed mobbing tend to experience more severe physical and emotional consequences than men. We hypothesize that this difference is reflected in a greater perception of symptoms of anxiety and malaise;
3) women who have witnessed mobbing tend to seek more emotional support and, more generally, to use more adaptive coping strategies than men.

METHOD

Participants

The sample included 206 respondents, of whom 63.1% were women and 36.9% men. The age of the respondents ranged from 20 to 67 years, with an average of 40.49 (SD = 13.11). The majority of respondents, 51%, were in a relationship, 34% were single, 12.6% were separated/divorced, and 2.4% were widowed or widowers. The majority of respondents had a college degree (49.5%), 44.7% had a high-school diploma, and 5.8% had a primary school degree (5.8%). 38.8% of respondents were public sector employees, 31.1% were private sector employees, and 30.1% were third sector employees. Most respondents worked in organizations with more than 200 employees (82%), while other company sizes were less represented: companies with less than 15 employees made up 4.4% of the sample, organizations with 16 to 50 employees made up 1%, and those with 51 to 100 employees made up 5.3%. Work experience ranged from 6 months to 54 years (M = 19.19 years, SD = 12.31). The majority of the sample had a permanent contract (78.6%), while 15% had an open-ended contract. The remaining portion of the sample reported a project contract. 37.4% had an operational role, 29.6% had a managerial role, 27.7% had a coordinating role, and 5.3% had a technical role within the work organization.

Measures

Participants were asked to anonymously answer a self-administered questionnaire. The first part of it described its purpose and included the instructions for filling it out (with the contact information of the authors of this paper for any doubts or problems), as well as the informed consent form and the statement of anonymity and privacy. The second part contained three scales to evaluate the participant's perception of mobbing in the organization where they worked and their self-perceived mental health and work-related stress. A Hebrew translation of the Val.Mob. scale (Aiello, Deitinger, Nardella & Bonafede, 2008) was used to assess the risk of mobbing in an organization. The scale was originally developed for an Italian audience and comprises 48 items rated on a Likert-type, agreement scale (response options ranged from 1 = totally disagree to 5 = totally agree). The scale contains four subscales:

- Relationship: assesses the level of verbal violence as well as the relationships between the workers and between them and the supervisor(s) (for example, "Impression of one or more colleagues are rejected by gestures or unfriendly attitudes") (in this study, Cronbach's alpha = .95).
- Intrusiveness: assesses the level of interference in private life, excessive control, and physical and/or psychological violence (e.g., "Sometimes one or more colleagues are ridiculed because of their appearance") (Cronbach's alpha = .79).
- Disqualification: evaluates the prevalence of cases of isolation (including exclusion and/or marginalization), transfer, and dequalification (e.g., "Frequently, one or more colleagues are assigned to tasks for which they are over- or underqualified") (Cronbach's alpha = .90).
- Commitment: assesses the level of commitment, involvement in work, and emotional climate (including recognition of results, professional growth, affectivity, and motivation) (e.g., "I would not trade this job for anything else") (Cronbach's alpha = .78).

The original version of the scale was developed to study mobbing from the viewpoint of the victims. Therefore, for this study, the items of the Relationship, Intrusiveness, and Disqualification subscales were reworded in the third person: for example, the item "Sometimes I have to endure mild physical violence" was rephrased as "Sometimes one or more of my colleagues have to endure mild physical violence". In addition, the Val.Mob. allows to assess the degree of stress (low, mild, moderate, or high) in relation to the different subscales.

To assess anxiety, we used the *State-Trait Anxiety Inventory* (*STAI*; Spielberger & Vagg, 1995), which includes a total of 40 items divided into two scales of 20 items each:

1. The *STAI scale – Y1 – State anxiety*. State anxiety is defined as a momentary or situational emotional response to an event (Vîslă, Zinbarg, Hilpert, Allemand & Flückiger, 2021). The scale comprises 20 statements that evaluate the respondent's feelings while completing the inventory. The scale can be used to assess not only how people feel "here and now" but also how they felt at a particular time in the recent past and how they predict they would feel in a particular future situation or in a variety of hypothetical situations. The Y1 scale has been shown to be a sensitive indicator of changes in how people feel about anxiety (Rossi & Pourtois, 2012).
2. The *STAI scale – Y2 – Trait anxiety*. Trait anxiety describes how the respondent normally feels in typical situations in their daily life. More specifically, it evaluates the predisposition to anxiety, i.e., one's tendency to perceive a stressful situation as dangerous or threatening and to respond to it with a temporary increase of the intensity of one's anxiety state. The scale consists of 20 statements assessing the respondent's general state of mind.

Each subinventory includes 20 items that are rated on a Likert-type scale. For the Y1 scale, the response options to statements like "I feel calm; I feel secure" are 1 = not at all; 2 = a little; 3 = sufficiently; 4 = very much; and for the items on the Y2 scale, e.g. "I worry too much over something that really doesn't matter", 1= almost never; 2 = sometimes; 3 = often; 4 = almost always. The possible scores for each scale therefore range from 20 to 80, where higher scores correspond to higher levels of (state or trait) anxiety. The average score of 39-40 represents a threshold for a clinically significant situation (Spielberger & Vagg, 1995). In the original version, internal consistency coefficients for the scale ranged from .86 to .95; test-retest reliability coefficients ranged from .65 to .75 over a 2-month interval (Spielberger, 1983). In this study, Cronbach's alpha was .97 and .93, respectively.

A Hebrew translation of the *Brief COPE* (Carver, 1997) was used to assess the respondent's disposition toward different coping styles and strategies, which may be more or less adaptive, that people typically use to deal with stressful situations. The test comprises 28 items arranged on 14

subscales, each representing a way to cope with stressful situations. The subscales explore the following strategies:

- *active coping*: the propensity to take operational actions and develop strategies to improve the situation (in the original scale by Carver, Cronbach's alpha = .68; in this study, Cronbach's alpha = .64);
- *planning*: the preparedness to look for the most appropriate strategies to resolve the situation (in the original scale by Carver, Cronbach's alpha = .73; in this study, Cronbach's alpha = .66);
- *instrumental support*: the tendency to rely on help or advice from others in difficult situations (in the original scale by Carver, Cronbach's alpha = .64; in this study, Cronbach's alpha = .87);
- *emotional support*: the tendency to seek emotional support from others (in the original scale by Carver, Cronbach's alpha = .71; in this study, Cronbach's alpha = .83);
- *positive reframing*: the ability to reanalyze an event from a more positive perspective (in the original scale by Carver, Cronbach's alpha = .64; in this study, Cronbach's alpha = .70);
- *acceptance*: the ability to accept the situation and live with the difficulties (in the original scale by Carver, Cronbach's alpha = .57; in this study, Cronbach's alpha = .72);
- *denial*: the tendency to deny what happened (in the original scale by Carver, Cronbach's alpha = .54; in this study, Cronbach's alpha = .65);
- *religion*: the tendency to invoke one's religious convictions, e.g. in the form of prayers (in the original scale by Carver, Cronbach's alpha = .82; in this study, Cronbach's alpha = .81);
- *humor*: the attitude of viewing and downplaying a specific event through a humorous lens (in the original scale by Carver, Cronbach's alpha = .73; in this study, Cronbach's alpha = .80);
- *venting*: the ability to externalize one's feelings (in the original scale by Carver, Cronbach's alpha = .50; in this study, Cronbach's alpha = .61);
- *behavioral disengagement*: the tendency to abandon attempts to cope with the situation (in the original scale by Carver, Cronbach's alpha = .65; in this study, Cronbach's alpha = .64);
- *substance use*: the tendency to use alcohol or drugs to mentally escape the situation (in the original scale by Carver, Cronbach's alpha = .90; in this study, Cronbach's alpha = .97);
- *self-blame*: the tendency to blame oneself for a particular event (in the original scale by Carver, Cronbach's alpha = .69; in this study, Cronbach's alpha = .62) (Carver, 1997; Carver, Scheier & Weintraub, 1989).

Each subscale includes 2 items, each rated on a 4-point, Likert-type scale, with response options ranging from 1 = has never happened to me to 4 = has happened to me very often.

The *Beck Depression Inventory* (*BDI*) is a self-administered questionnaire. The BDI-II (Beck, Steer & Brown, 1996) is a version of the original instrument (Beck, Ward, Mendelson, Mock & Erbaugh, 1961) whose items reflect the DSM-IV criteria for major depression. It contains 21 items that aim to capture the characteristics, symptoms, and attitudes that reflect the intensity and severity of each specific symptom, and thus to assess the overall seriousness of depression and the underlying psychological processes. In Beck's theory the "negative cognitive triad", that is the negative beliefs that people may hold about themselves, their present, and their future, has a major impact on the development and severity of depression. The triad also has significant social implications because dissatisfaction with one's social interactions may be expressed and interpreted in its light (Bringmann, Lemmens, Huibers, Borsboom & Tuerlinckx, 2015). Each of the 21 items offers four possible answers, ranging from 0 = no symptom to 3 = severe symptoms. The general scores are arranged on a continuum, where a higher score indicates more severity. The severity of symptoms is interpreted as minimal (0-13), mild (14-19), moderate (20-28), and severe (29-63) (Beck et al., 1996). In the original study, Cronbach's alpha was .91. In this study, Cronbach's alpha was .93.

The third part of the questionnaire collected socio-personal data. In the last part of the questionnaire, mobbing was described using Ege's (2010) definition: "an act (or series of acts) repeated over a long period of time by one or more mobbers to hurt someone systematically and with a specific goal" (see also Cornoiu & Gyorgy, 2013, p. 711). Participants were then asked to indicate whether they had ever witnessed episodes of mobbing in their organization (yes/no response) and whether they considered themselves victims or mobbers (yes/no response). Given the aim of this study, the inclusion criterion was to be a witness. The exclusion criterion was to be a victim or a mobber. Only questionnaires in which the subjects stated that they had witnessed bullying were considered.

Procedure

A letter explaining the aims of the research and providing full details on data protection and anonymity was sent to several Israeli public administration bodies, private companies, and third-sector organizations (for example non-profit or charitable organizations). The criteria for the inclusion of participants were that they were of legal age (18 years and older), witnesses of mobbing and not retired. The exclusion criteria were that they were not employed, victims of mobber, under 18 years of age or retired. A meeting was held with those who agreed to participate to better explain the purpose of the survey and the process. After formal publicity within the organizations, a copy of the questionnaire was distributed to all employees, with additional copies for those who were absent due to illness or vacation. A box was left near the vending machines or in the locker rooms with a request that the questionnaire be returned there within 15 working days. Data were collected between November 2017 and March 2018, i.e. before the pandemic. The survey conformed to the ethical provisions of the 1995 Declaration of Helsinki (revised at the Edinburgh meeting in 2000; World Medical Association, 2001). The research adhered to further ethical standards, including those prescribed by the Israeli Professional Code of Ethics for Psychologists, the Israeli Psychologists Law, which overseees research conducted by psychologists in Israel, the Bioethics Committee of the University of Turin, and the Code of Ethics for Psychologists, which governs the research practices of Italian psychologists. No personally identifying data was gathered. Because there was no medical treatment or other procedures that could cause biological, psychological, or social harm to the participants, no additional ethical approval was required. Participation was voluntary and unrewarded.

The questionnaires were administered in Hebrew. The Brief COPE was translated into Hebrew from the English version, and the Val.Mob. was translated from the Italian version by two translators. The quality of the translation was ensured in two steps. The first was back translation, i.e. a third person reworked the text from the translation to the original version. The second was to test the translation with a control group of fifteen people to evaluate the clarity, cultural appropriateness, and flow of the items. The only problem that emerged was discussed and resolved with the help of this group. Specifically, a change was made in the Val.Mob. value scale: since the answer "neither agree nor disagree" was unclear as a value for the control group, it was decided to translate it in Hebrew as "חוטב אל": an English equivalent is "I am not sure" which the group found to convey a meaning more similar to the Italian version.

The survey was conducted mainly in the greater Eilat area in Israel by distributing questionnaires to government agencies, third sector organisations (e.g. non-profit or charitable organisations) and private companies. The pencil and paper questionnaire was distributed to 262 employees, 78.6% of whom completed all items. Due to the exclusion criterion, 56 people were excluded because they claimed to be victims of bullying. The sample consists of 206 Israeli employees (63.1% women, 36.9% men).

Data analysis strategy

We adopted a dimensional and a categorical approach to data analysis. In the former, we specified a multiple regression model, in which the total score of each scale was regressed on the background variables; in the latter, we specified a logistic regression model, in which the score on each scale was dichotomized according to a cut-off for severity. The cut-offs for the STAI-Y1 and Y2 are the following: from 40 to 50 for mild, 50 to 60 for moderate, and >60 for severe anxiety. The cut-offs for the BDI-II are the following: minimal (scores 0-13), mild (14-19), moderate (20-28), and severe depression (>29). These models allowed us to explore sex differences in the response variables while keeping all other predictors constant. Given the large number of coefficients to be estimated, we controlled the inflation of Type I errors due to multiple tests using the Benjamini-Hochberg method for each group of coefficients. In other words, we controlled for false discovery rate all the regression coefficients of a specific predictor (e.g., sex) across all response variables.

Correlations were calculated to examine the relations between coping strategies and anxiety and depressive symptoms and perception of mobbing in men and women.

RESULTS

The complete results are reported in Appendix A and in Appendix B. For sake of simplicity, we mention here only the significant effects of sex in Cohen's *d* (dimensional approach) or odds ratio (OR) metric (categorical approach).

When taken as absolute values, *d* values indicate a negligible effect when smaller than .20, a small effect between .20 and .50, a moderate effect between .50 and .80, and a large effect when greater than .80 (Cohen, 1988). Using the equations of Borenstein and colleagues (Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins & Rothstein, 2009), we computed the equivalent values for ORs, which were 1.44, 2.48, and 4.27, respectively.

Dimensional approach

The response variables were the scores on the Brief COPE (BC), the STAY-Y1, the STAY-Y2, the BDI, and the Val.Mob. total score and subscale scores (Relationship, Intrusiveness, Disqualification, and Committment). Predictors were age, sex (focal category: female; reference category: male), relationship status (dummy variables for in a relationship and divorced; reference category: other), educational level (focal category: less than college degree; reference category: college degree), type of organization (dummy variables for private and third-sector; reference category: public), total years of working, years of working in the current organization, organizational role (dummy variables for managerial and operational; reference category: other) (see Appendix A).

Women reported significantly higher mean scores than men on several Brief COPE scales (denial: $d = .51$ [.19, .83]; emotional support: $d = .92$ [.58, 1.26]; instrumental support: $d = .89$ [.55, 1.24]; venting: $d = .96$ [.62, 1.31]; positive reframing: $d = .72$ [.39, 1.05]; acceptance: $d = .38$ [.07, .70]; and religion: $d = .57$ [.25, .89]). Women also scored higher on the BDI ($d = .60$ [.28, .93]), while they reported significantly lower scores on the Brief COPE scale substance use ($d = .57$ [.24, .89]).

Categorical approach

The response variables were the scores on the STAY-Y1, the STAY-Y2, the BDI, and the Val.Mob. total score and subscale scores (Relationship, Intrusiveness, Disqualification, and Committment). Predictors were age, sex (focal category: female; reference category: male), relationship status (dummy variables for in a relationship and divorced; reference category: other), educational level (focal category: less than college degree; reference category: college degree), type of organization (dummy variables for private and third-sector; reference category: public), total years of working, years of working in the current organization, organizational role (dummy variables for managerial and operational; reference category: other) (see Appendix B).

Women reported a significantly higher probability than men of scoring above the threshold of the severity cut-off on the BDI (OR = 7.05 [1.90, 26.15]) and on the Val.Mob. Intrusiveness scale (OR = 3.79 [1.52, 9.42]).

Correlation

We computed the correlations of the coping scores with those of Val.Mob. and STAI-Y1 and Y2 scales and BDI and we compared for men and women (see Appendix C and Appendix D). The only differences were found in the correlation of BC_venting with Val.Mob._symptomatology (men $r = -.16$, women $r = .45$, $p = .011$, $d = .62$ [.32, .92]) and BC_acceptance and trait anxiety (men $r = -.17$, women $r = .42$, $p = .015$, $d = .58$ [.29, .88]).

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine how men and women that have witnessed mobbing may differ in their respective perceptions of the event and psychological aftermaths, which are often characterized by malaise, in the form of anxiety and/or depression and more or less effective attempts to cope with the situation. A sample of 206 Israeli workers (63.1% women, 36.9% men) participated in the study. The results showed that women are more likely than men to report witnessing intrusive behavior that undermines a person's reputation. We hypothesized that women who witnessed certain negative behaviors would classify them as bullying more often and/or more strongly than men did, so Hypothesis 1 was only partially supported. However, there is more to the data than just this consideration. An intrusive behavior at work may consist, for example, in an invasion of privacy, excessive control, and physical or psychological violence. The invasion of privacy is the most personal, with consequences that can be more devastating because they affect more aspects of the worker's life than just the professional one. As for overcontrol, in the Job Demand Control Model theory (Karasek, 1979, 1989; Karasek & Theorell, 1990) it brings about higher feelings of stress and, as discussed by Finstad

and colleagues (2019), lead to forms of workplace violence, including mobbing. Overcontrol inhibits a worker's autonomy, i.e., his or her ability to participate in decision-making, while increasing depersonalization and alienation from work (De Vries, 2001; Mastracci & Adams, 2018). Excessive monitoring practices aim to reinforce the notion that the workers are inadequate, giving them the impression that they are at constant risk of failure, which undermines their self-confidence and professional image (Annakis, Lobo & Pillay, 2011; Bugdol & Nagody-Mrozowicz, 2020). Intrusiveness thus is a transversal element in organizational life since not only those who are affected by mobbing, but also those who live in the same context suffer its consequences in different ways, either directly as a victim or indirectly as a witness.

The second hypothesis concerned the possibly different consequences that witnessing mobbing may have on men and women. Overall, the correlation shows that men are less likely to use venting as a coping strategy than women with increased symptoms in Val.Mob. scale. More in details, the results showed that only the depressive symptoms were more severe in women than in men; thus, the hypothesis was partially supported. Again, this is interesting because the literature (e.g., Acquadro Maran et al., 2021) suggests that female witnesses of bullying are more likely to suffer from sudden anxiety than depression. Since the results of this study suggest a lack of consistency with previous research, it would be interesting to better explore the discourse, perhaps with more targeted scales, with interviews, that is, with qualitative data. Women were also more likely than men to suffer from major depressive symptoms: depression is more common in women than in men in the general population too (see Niedhammer, Coindre, Memmi, Bertrais & Chastang, 2020), and the presence of violent behavior in the workplace increases the risk of depressive symptoms (see Boudrias, Trépanier & Salin, 2021; Mento et al., 2020; Rudkjoebing et al., 2020). In addition, as suggested by Rasool and colleagues (Rasool, Maqbool, Samma, Zhao & Anjum, 2019), a negative work environment can induce or exacerbate depressive symptoms in the presence of stigma or of a perception of discrimination by supervisors and colleagues. Fear of displaying symptoms, and thus the inability to ask for help, can lead to worsening mental health (Burns & Green, 2019; Krakauer, Stelnicki & Carleton, 2020; Shann, Martin, Chester & Ruddock, 2019).

The third hypothesis was that women witnesses of mobbing would be more likely than men to seek emotional support and, in general, to use adaptive coping strategies. The results partially confirmed this hypothesis too. Women actually tended more than men to use coping strategies such as confide in friends, colleagues, and relatives and to seek support when they were affected by the phenomenon. They also used more instrumental support, namely venting, positive reframing, acceptance (as also shown by the results of the correlation analysis), and religion, which are considered adaptive strategies (see Dores, Martins, Reis & Carvalho, 2021; Meyer, 2001). At the same time, however, they also tended to use denial more than men, which, given the importance and complexity of this strategy, is noteworthy. Denial is a type of defence mechanism in which the reality of a situation is ignored to avoid anxiety. It can consist in not acknowledging reality or its consequences (Cramer, 2006), and it often means that the worker is struggling to accept something that would otherwise be stressful or overwhelming. In the short term, denial may grant the worker time to adjust to a sudden change in reality; yet this may become a problem if it keeps the worker from addressing a problem or making a needed change. Sometimes it can even prevent the person from accepting help or getting the care they need. Women witnesses of mobbing also were less likely than men to use a substance use strategy. This should bring attention to men who, in the same circumstances, are at risk of using strategies that are considered maladaptive. Maladaptive coping strategies are not only unhelpful in cases of mobbing, like other phenomena, but can also have direct negative effects on psychological well-being, such as withdrawal and social isolation (Enns, Eldridge, Montgomery & Gonzalez, 2018).

This study confirmed the negative consequences that mobbing can have on witnesses. This provides yet another reason to prevent mobbing, in order to maintain the physical and mental health and well-being of all the workers: the victims, who obviously should not be such, as well as the witnesses and the perpetrators themselves. The literature offers several tools for prevention, such as training, monitoring the quality of life in the organization, implementing measures for stress management, e.g. in Bakker and Demerouti's (2007) job demands and resources model, reducing the demands or increasing the organizational resources available to the worker. Recently, Ervasti and colleagues (2022) devised an intervention strategy that includes online and offline meetings with workers and supervisors. At the organizational level, their proposal aims to improve the prevention of mobbing by initiating reflection on the relevant procedures and

instructions. As regards the relationship with supervisors, the objective is to raise awareness of the phenomenon, provide guidance on how to deal with it, and improve the climate within the team. At the work unit level, the goal is to address the aspects of work that aggravate the likelihood of mobbing, identify potentially difficult and risky situations, and suggest further ways to improve the group climate. This allows to express negative feelings, seek help from colleagues, and eliminate the stigma associated with mental health problems. This strategy is desirable in all organizations to prevent mobbing, which can have a negative impact both on the workers and on the entire organization (e.g., due to the worsening of the internal climate or the damage to the organization's image).

Limitations

This study has several limitations. First, being a cross-sectional research, the results should be taken with caution and not generalized. We examined gender differences, but other socio-demographic variables, such as the participant's role in the organization, were not considered. For example, the level of responsibility in a work groups may affect how a suspected case of bullying is assessed or what coping strategies are more likely to be adopted (Bjorklund et al., 2019). We also did not investigate how the participants responded to the mobbing behavior they witnessed. For example, being a bystander or a whistleblower might lead to different coping strategies with different levels of perceived stress and different psychological consequences. The victim's response may also influence the witnesses' reaction and the possible aftermaths of the event. For example, whether the victim reacts with a request for support from colleagues *vs* a tendency to self-isolate from them may affect not only their further propensity to intervene but also their perception of what has actually happened. Further research could investigate the reaction of witnesses to incidents in which the victim is confronted with different types of mobbing behavior, perhaps using the method of vignette (which has already been used to investigate the phenomenon of bullying at school; see Demol, Verschueren, Jame, Lazard & Colpin, 2021). It might also be useful to study mobbing from several perspectives or dimensions (subjects and groups; the victim, the bully, and the witnesses), as well as in terms of the relations between the abusive behavior and the victim's and the witnesses' reaction. This could help to better understand the phenomenon and its dynamics. Interviews could be used to explore the actual experiences and the possible alternatives that each person involved might have been able to implement in the specific context.

Yet another limitation is related to time. We did not ask how long it had been since the events investigated. The time lapsed and the dynamics of the aftermath could probably partly explain the symptoms, the memories, and the experiences recounted by the participants. In post-traumatic stress disorder, for example, the original event is relived in all its vividness, with flashbacks, intrusive memories, and so on (Aristidou et al., 2020; Zhou, Marchand & Guay, 2017), while in other conditions memories tend to change and fade over time. This could help better understand the symptoms associated with witnessing mobbing. Further research could then include a scale to capture symptoms associated with PTSD and examine the time factor to understand whether the symptoms persist or change over time and whether they have aspects of chronicity.

Another aspect that we did not study is the possible changes occurred during the Covid-19 period. While the survey was carried out before the lockdowns occurred, it might be useful to conduct a longitudinal follow-up to determine whether the prolonged lack of direct contact in several workplaces and the rules applied to the workers have modified the occurrence, nature, features, and aftermaths of violence at work (or at school). Of course, the fact that many activities had been partly or wholly transferred online or had undergone other transformations in their material practices cannot but have had an impact on the manifestations of violence. Furthermore, many workers were affected in specific ways because of their individual health or mental conditions; others because of their personal beliefs about the situation and how to deal with it or of the measures imposed (e.g., social distancing, vaccination, sanctions for the dissidents, etc.). Mobbing at work may have been worsened by social/organisational norms that victims did not adhere to or by higher levels of stress at work and outside the workplace, or it may have been mitigated due to the radical impoverishment of relationships or to the atmosphere of general depression which reigned all over the population, or, even more likely, a mix of factors might have changed the landscape in more complex ways. Analogously, the sort of very ambiguous return to normality that is currently underway, should be investigated as well. Periodic surveys of a working

population could therefore help understand the evolution of the phenomenon. Interviews about this could also be useful.

Finally, this survey contains an unavoidable participation bias. Voluntary participation may have attracted individuals who were sensitive to the issue or who responded for reasons of social desirability (MacCurtain, Murphy, O'Sullivan, MacMahon & Turner, 2018). Future studies could include social desirability scales.

CONCLUSIONS

This study shows how witnessing mobbing can affect the physical and emotional consequences (including malaise with symptoms of depression and anxiety) and coping strategies of women and men in Israel. As far as the individuals are concerned, this may happen in different ways and to different extents in women and men. It is necessary to better understand the dynamics of mobbing by investigating the experiences, behaviors, and strategies of both the victims and the witnesses, and in general of all those who are faced with such situations. We hope that the results of the study and the reflections contained here can contribute to finding tools to analyze the phenomenon from different angles.

Acknowledgments. The Authors wish to thank all participants in this investigation. **Declaration of interest statement**: The authors report there are no competing interests to declare. **Data availability statement**: The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to their containing information that could compromise the privacy of research participants.

References

ACQUADRO MARAN, D., VARETTO, A., BUTT, M.U., & CIVILOTTI, C. (2019). The victim's experience as described in civil court judgments for mobbing: A gender difference. *KOME: An international Journal of Pure Communication Inquiry*, *7* (2), 57-73. doi.org/10.17646/KOME.75672.39

ACQUADRO MARAN, D., ZEDDA, M., & VARETTO, A. (2021). Male and female witnesses of mobbing: Gender difference in experiencing consequences. A cross-sectional study in an Italian sample. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, *36* (1), 8-23. doi.org/10.1080/15555240.2021.1877554

AIELLO, A., DEITINGER, P., NARDELLA, C., & BONAFEDE, M. (2008). Uno strumento valutativo del rischio mobbing nei contesti organizzativi: La scala "Val. Mob.". *Prevenzione Oggi*, *4* (3), 9-26. https://stage.frareg.com/cms/wp-content/uploads/ISPESL_Valmob.pdf

AKAR, N.Y., ANAFARTA, N., & SARVAN, F. (2011). Causes, dimensions and organizational consequences of mobbing: An empirical study. *Ege Academic Review*, *11* (1), 179-191. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/558635

ALFANO, V., RAMACI, T., LANDOLFI, A., LO PRESTI, A., & BARATTUCCI, M. (2021). Gender patterns in mobbing victims: Differences in negative act perceptions, MMPI personality profile, perceived quality of life, and suicide risk. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18* (4), 2192. doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18042192

ANNAKIS, J., LOBO, A., & PILLAY, S. (2011). Exploring monitoring, work environment and flexibility as predictors of job satisfaction within Australian call centres. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *6* (8), 75. https://www.academia.edu/download/74418827/484ce44fce03c74567dd9f3269cb36e9f4da.pdf

ARISTIDOU, L., MPOUZIKA, M., PAPATHANASSOGLOU, E.D., MIDDLETON, N., & KARANIKOLA, M.N. (2020). Association between workplace bullying occurrence and trauma symptoms among healthcare professionals in Cyprus. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 575623. doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.575623

AZEMOVIĆ, N., & AZEMOVIĆ, R. (2019). The problem of employees through the prism of mobbing. *Knowledge-International Journal*, *31* (1), 287-291. https://ikm.mk/ojs/index.php/kij/article/download/1264/1263

BAKKER, A.B., & DEMEROUTI, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *22*, 309-328. doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115

BECK, A.T., STEER, R.A., & BROWN, G. (1996). *Beck Depression Inventory – II (BDI-II)*. APA PsycTests. doi.org/10.1037/t00742-000

BECK, A.T., WARD, C.H., MENDELSON, M., MOCK, J., & ERBAUGH, J. (1961). An inventory for measuring depression. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *4 (6)*, 561-571. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.1961.01710120031004

BJORKLUND, C., HELLMAN, T., JENSEN, I., ÅKERBLOM, C., & BJÖRK BRÄMBERG, E. (2019). Workplace bullying as experienced by managers and how they cope: A qualitative study of Swedish managers. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *16* (23), 4693. doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16234693

BORENSTEIN, M., HEDGES, L.V., HIGGINS, J.P.T., & ROTHSTEIN, H.R. (2009). *Introduction to meta-analysis*. John Wiley & Sons.

BORG, B.A., RABINAK, C.A., & MARUSAK, H.A. (2021). Violence exposure and mental health consequences among urban youth. *Current Psychology*, 1-10. doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-02141-4

BOUDRIAS, V., TRÉPANIER, S.G., & SALIN, D. (2021). A systematic review of research on the longitudinal consequences of workplace bullying and the mechanisms involved. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *56*, 101508. doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2020.101508

BRINGMANN, L.F., LEMMENS, L.H., HUIBERS, M.J., BORSBOOM, D., & TUERLINCKX, F.J.P.M. (2015). Revealing the dynamic network structure of the Beck Depression Inventory – II. *Psychological Medicine*, *45* (4), 747-757. doi.org/10.1017/S0033291714001809

BUGDOL, M., & NAGODY-MROZOWICZ, K. (2020). *Management, organization and fear: Causes, consequences and strategies*. Routledge.

BURNS, E., & GREEN, K.E. (2019). Academic librarians' experiences and perceptions on mental illness stigma and the workplace. *College & Research Libraries*, *80* (5), 638. doi.org/10.5860/crl.80.5.638

CARVER, C.S. (1997). You want to measure coping but your protocol'too long: Consider the brief cope. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *4* (1), 92-100. doi.org/10.1207/s15327558ijbm0401_6

CARVER, C.S., SCHEIER, M.F., & WEINTRAUB, J.K. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: a theoretically based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *56* (2), 267. https://www.medicinanarrativa.eu/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/Carver-Assessing-Coping-Strategies.pdf

COHEN, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.)*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

CORNOIU, T.S., & GYORGY, M. (2013). Mobbing in organizations: Benefits of identifying the phenomenon. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *78*, 708-712. doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.04.380

CRAMER, P. (2006). *Protecting the self: Defense mechanisms in action*. Guilford Press.

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. doi.org/10.1177/088626051666285

DEMOL, K., VERSCHUEREN, K., JAME, M., LAZARD, C., & COLPIN, H. (2021). Student attitudes and perceptions of teacher responses to bullying: An experimental vignette study. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *18* (6), 814-830. doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2021.1896492

DE VRIES, M.F.K. (2001). *Organizational paradoxes: Clinical approaches to management (Vol. 4).* Psychology Press.

DIVINCOVÁ, A., & SIVÁKOVÁ, B. (2014). Mobbing at workplace and its impact on employee performance. *Human Resources Management & Ergonomics*, *8* (2). http://frcatel.fri.uniza.sk/hrme/files/2014/2014_2_02.pdf

DORES, A.R., MARTINS, H., REIS, A.C., & CARVALHO, I.P. (2021). Empathy and coping in allied health sciences: Gender patterns. *Healthcare*, *9* (5), 497. doi.org/10.3390/healthcare9050497

DUFFY, M., & SPERRY, L. (2011). *Mobbing: Causes, consequences, and solutions*. Oxford University Press.

EGE, H. (2010). Different typologies of workplace conflict and their connections with post traumatic embitterment disorder (PTED). *Health*, *2* (3), 234-236. https://file.scirp.org/pdf/vol2%20No.3-02-03-20100329045628.pdf#page=70

EINARSEN, S., GLAASØ, L., & NIELSEN, M.B. (2011). Mobbing i arbeidslivet - ytringsformer, årsaker og tiltak. In *Det gode arbeidsmiljø* (pp. 181-198). Fagbokforlaget.

EINARSEN, S., 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.

EINARSEN, S., & MIKKELSEN, E.G. (2002). Individual effects of exposure to bullying at work. In *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace* (pp. 145-162). CRC Press.

EINARSEN, S., RAKNES, B.R.I., & MATTHIESEN, S.B. (1994). Bullying and harassment at work and their relationships to work environment quality: An exploratory study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *4* (4), 381-401. doi.org/10.1080/13594329408410497

ENNS, A., ELDRIDGE, G.D., MONTGOMERY, C., & GONZALEZ, V.M. (2018). Perceived stress, coping strategies, and emotional

intelligence: A cross-sectional study of university students in helping disciplines. *Nurse Education Today*, *68*, 226-231. doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2018.06.012

ERVASTI, J., SEPPÄLÄ, P., OLIN, N., KALAVAINEN, S., HEIKKILÄ, H., AALTO, V., & KIVIMÄKI, M. (2022). Effectiveness of a workplace intervention to reduce workplace bullying and violence at work: Study protocol for a two-wave quasi-experimental intervention study. *BMJ Open*, *12* (3), e053664. doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-053664

ESCARTÍN, J., ZAPF, D., ARRIETA, C., & RODRÍGUEZ-CARBALLEIRA, A. (2011). Workers' perception of workplace bullying: A cross-cultural study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *20* (2), 178-205. doi.org/10.1080/13594320903395652

FEFFERMAN, B., & BAR-TSURI, R. (2016). *Workplace nagging and mobbing*. https://www.nli.org.il/en/a-topic/987007310413905171.

FINSTAD, G.L., ARIZA-MONTES, A., GIORGI, G., LECCA, L.I., ARCANGELI, G., & MUCCI, N. (2019). The JDCS model and blue-collar bullying: Decent working conditions for a healthy environment. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *16* (18), 3411. doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16183411

FOLKMAN, S., & LAZARUS, R.S. (1980). An analysis of coping in a middle-aged community sample. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, *21* (3), 219-239. doi.org/10.2307/2136617

GALLETTA, D., CONFUORTO, M., IMPROTA, G., & MARCELLI, V. (2019). The assessment of mobbing damage: When the psychological pain becomes physical. *Journal of Forensic Science & Criminology*, *7*, 1-4. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Diana-Galletta/publication/331385887_The_Assessment_of_Mobbing_Damage_When_the_Psychological_Pain_Becomes_Physical/links/5ccacdb092851c8d2214642a/The-Assessment-of-Mobbing-Damage-When-the-Psychological-Pain-Becomes-Physical.pdf

GRZESIUK, L., SZYMAŃSKA, A., JASTRZĘBSKA, J., & RUTKOWSKA, M. (2022). The relationship between the manifestations of mobbing and reactions of mobbing victims. *Medycyna Pracy*, *73* (1), 1-12. doi.org/10.13075/mp.5893.01002

GUIL, R., GÓMEZ-MOLINERO, R., MERCHAN-CLAVELLINO, A., GIL-OLARTE, P., & ZAYAS, A. (2019). Facing anxiety, growing up: Trait emotional intelligence as a mediator of the relationship between self-esteem and university anxiety. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*, 567. doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00567

HAQ, I.U., RAJA, U., ALAM, I., DE CLERCQ, D., & SALEEM, S. (2022). Servant leadership and mistreatment at the workplace: mediation of trust and moderation of ethical climate. *Personnel Review*, *51* (3), 1061-1084. doi.org/10.1108/PR-04-2019-0172

HOEL, H., & COOPER, C.L. (2000). *Destructive conflict and bullying at work*. Manchester: Manchester School of Management, UMIST.

KARASEK, R.A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *24*, 285-308. doi.org/10.2307/2392498

KARASEK, R.A. (1989). Control in the workplace and its health-related aspects. In S.L. Sauter, J.J. Hurrell, & C.L. Cooper (Eds.), *Job control and worker health*. Wiley.

KARASEK, R.A., & THEORELL, T. (1990). *Healthy work: Stress, productivity and the reconstruction of working life*. Basic Books.

KRAKAUER, R.L., STELNICKI, A.M., & CARLETON, R.N. (2020). Examining mental health knowledge, stigma, and service use intentions among public safety personnel. *Frontiers in psychology*, *11*, 949. doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00949

LAZARUS, R.S., & FOLKMAN, S. (1984). *Stress, Appraisal, and Coping*. Springer.

LEWIS, S.E., & ORFORD, J. (2005). Women's experiences of workplace bullying: Changes in social relationships. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *15* (1), 29-47. doi.org/10.1002/casp.807

LEYMANN, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *5* (2), 165-184. doi.org/10.1080/13594329608414853

MacCURTAIN, S., MURPHY, C., O'SULLIVAN, M., MacMAHON, J., & TURNER, T. (2018). To stand back or step in? Exploring the responses of employees who observe workplace bullying. *Nursing Inquiry*, *25* (1), e12207. doi.org/10.1111/nin.12207

MASTRACCI, S., & ADAMS, I. (2018). "That's what the money's for": Alienation and emotional labor in public service. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, *40* (4), 304-319. doi.org/10.1080/10841806.2018.1485449

MENTO, C., SILVESTRI, M.C., BRUNO, A., MUSCATELLO, M.R.A., CEDRO, C., PANDOLFO, G., & ZOCCALI, R.A. (2020). Workplace violence against healthcare professionals: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *51*, 101381. doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2020.101381

MEYER, B. (2001). Coping with severe mental illness: Relations of the brief COPE with symptoms, functioning, and well-being. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, *23*, 265-277. doi.org/10.1023/A:1012731520781

MILNE, S., LOMAX, C., & FREESTON, M.H. (2019). A review of the relationship between intolerance of uncertainty and threat appraisal in anxiety. *The Cognitive Behaviour Therapist*, *12*, e38. doi.org/10.1017/S1754470X19000230

MINER-RUBINO, K., & CORTINA, L.M. (2007). Beyond targets: Consequences of vicarious exposure to misogyny at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92* (5), 1254.doi.org/ 10.1037/0021-9010.92.5.1254

MISAWA, M., ANDREWS, J.L., & JENKINS, K.M. (2019). Women's experiences of workplace bullying: A content analysis of peer-reviewed journal articles between 2000 and 2017. *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*, *31* (4), 36-50. doi.org/10.1002/nha3.20263

MOLERO JURADO, M.D.M., MARTOS MARTÍNEZ, Á., BARRAGÁN MARTÍN, A. B., SIMÓN MÁRQUEZ, M.D.M., OROPESA RUIZ, N.F., SISTO, M., ... & GÁZQUEZ LINARES, J.J. (2021). Emotional intelligence profiles and mobbing in nursing: The mediating role of social support and sensitivity to anxiety. *European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education*, *11* (2), 345-357. doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe11020026

NG, K., NIVEN, K., & NOTELAERS, G. (2022). Does bystander behavior make a difference? How passive and active bystanders in the group moderate the effects of bullying exposure. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *27* (1), 119. doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000296

NIEDHAMMER, I., COINDRE, K., MEMMI, S., BERTRAIS, S., & CHASTANG, J.F. (2020). Working conditions and depression in the French national working population: Results from the SUMER study. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, *123*, 178-186. doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2020.01.003

NIELSEN, M.B., MIKKELSEN, E.G., PERSSON, R., & EINARSEN, S. (2020). Coping with bullying at work. In *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 363-384). CRC Press.

NONNIS, M., CUCCU, S., & PORCU, S. (2010). Hostile behaviors in the workplace: Consequences and reactions of the victims. *Boundaryless Careers and Occupational Wellbeing*, 112-120. doi.org/10.1057/9780230281851

PASEK, M., SKRZECZYŃSKA, J., DĘBSKA, G., KADUCAKOVA, H., SUCHOCKA, L., & GOŹDZIALSKA, A. (2020). Mobbing: Violence at work or semantic abuse: The evaluation of the phenomenon by professionally active nurses. *Nursing Problems/ Problemy Pielęgniarstwa*, *28* (2), 80-87. doi.org/10.5114/ppiel.2020.98768

PHEKO, M.M. (2018). Autoethnography and cognitive adaptation: Two powerful buffers against the negative consequences of workplace bullying and academic mobbing. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies On Health and Well-Being*, *13* (1), 1459134. doi.org/10.1080/17482631.2018.1459134

RASOOL, S.F., MAQBOOL, R., SAMMA, M., ZHAO, Y., & ANJUM, A. (2019). Positioning depression as a critical factor in creating a toxic workplace environment for diminishing worker productivity. *Sustainability*, *11* (9), 2589. doi.org/10.3390/su11092589

REKNES, I., EINARSEN, S., PALLESEN, S., BJORVATN, B., MOEN, B.E., & MAGERØY, N. (2016). Exposure to bullying behaviors at work and subsequent symptoms of anxiety: The moderating role of individual coping style. *Industrial Health*, *54* (5), 421-432. doi.org/10.2486/indhealth.2015-0196

ROMERO, G. (2022). Does mobbing impact on witnesses? An observational study in the nursing staff of a hospital in Buenos Aires. *Salud, Ciencia y Tecnología*, *1* (1). https://www.medigraphic.com/cgibin/new/resumenI.cgi?IDARTICULO=106961&idP=9984

ROSSI, V., & POURTOIS, G. (2012). Transient state-dependent fluctuations in anxiety measured using STAI, POMS, PANAS or VAS: A comparative review. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, *25* (6), 603-645. doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2011.582948

RUDKJOEBING, L.A., BUNGUM, A.B., FLACHS, E.M., ELLER, N.H., BORRITZ, M., AUST, B., ... & BONDE, J.P. (2020). Work-related exposure to violence or threats and risk of mental disorders and symptoms: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, *46* (4), 339. doi.org/10.5271/sjweh.3877

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://ijethics.com/article-1-96-fa.html

SALIN, D. (2021). Workplace bullying and gender: An overview of empirical findings. In P. D'Cruz, E. Noronha, C. Caponecchia, J. Escartín, D. Salin, & M.R. Tuckey (Eds.), *Dignity and inclusion at work: Handbooks of workplace bullying, emotional abuse and harassment, vol 3*. Springer. doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-0218-3_12

SALIN, D., & NOTELAERS, G. (2020). The effects of workplace bullying on witnesses: Violation of the psychological contract as an explanatory mechanism? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *31* (18), 2319-2339. doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2018.1443964

SHANN, C., MARTIN, A., CHESTER, A., & RUDDOCK, S. (2019). Effectiveness and application of an online leadership intervention to promote mental health and reduce depression-related stigma in organizations. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *24* (1), 20. doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000110

SIMS, R.L., & SUN, P. (2012). Witnessing workplace bullying and the Chinese manufacturing employee. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *27* (1), 9-26. doi.org/10.1108/02683941211193839

SIYAL, S., SAEED, M., PAHI, M.H., SOLANGI, R., & XIN, C. (2021). They can't treat you well under abusive supervision: Investigating the impact of job satisfaction and extrinsic motivation on healthcare employees. *Rationality and Society*, *33* (4), 401-423. doi.org/10.1177/10434631211033

SPENCER, C.M., STITH, S.M., & CAFFERKY, B. (2022). What puts individuals at risk for physical intimate partner violence perpetration? A meta-analysis examining risk markers for men and women. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *23* (1), 36-51. doi.org/10.1177/1524838020925776

SPIELBERGER, C.D. (1983). *State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for adults*. Mind Garden.

SPIELBERGER, C.D., & VAGG, P.R. (Eds.). (1995). *Test anxiety: Theory, assessment, and treatment*. Taylor & Francis.

TAMRES, L.K., JANICKI, D., & HELGESON, V.S. (2002). Sex differences in coping behavior: A meta-analytic review and an examination of relative coping. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *6* (1), 2-30. doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0601

VARTIA, M.A. (2001). Consequences of workplace bullying with respect to the well-being of its targets and the observers of bullying. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 63-69. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40967116

VÎSLĂ, A., ZINBARG, R., HILPERT, P., ALLEMAND, M., & FLÜCKIGER, C. (2021). Worry and positive episodes in the daily lives of individuals with generalized anxiety disorder: An ecological momentary assessment study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 722881. doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.722881

VUKELIĆ, M., ČIZMIĆ, S., & PETROVIĆ, I.B. (2019). Acceptance of workplace bullying behaviors and job satisfaction: Moderated mediation analysis with coping self-efficacy and exposure to bullying. *Psychological Reports*, *122* (5), 1883-1906. doi.org/10.1177/00332941187939

WORLD MEDICAL ASSOCIATION (2001). World medical association declaration of Helsinki: Ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, *79* (4), 373. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2566407/

YAMADA, D.C., DUFFY, M., & BERRY, P.A. (2018). Workplace bullying and mobbing: Definitions, terms, and when they matter. *Workplace Bullying and Mobbing in the United States. Vol. 2*.

YANGINLAR, G., & BAL, N. (2021). The effect of occupational commitment and mobbing on the intention to leave in road transportation during the COVID-19 pandemic period. *Business & Management Studies: An International Journal*, *9* (3), 835-850. doi.org/10.15295/bmij.v9i3.1829

ZHOU, B., MARCHAND, A., & GUAY, S. (2017). I see so I feel: Coping with workplace violence among victims and witnesses. *Work*, *57* (1), 125-135. doi.org/10.3233/WOR-172538

APPENDIX A

Details of the results of the multiple regression models for metric response variables ("dimensional approach")

In these models, the response variables were the scores on the Brief COPE (BC), the STAY-Y1, the STAY-Y2, the BDI, and the Val.Mob. total score and subscale scores (Relationship, Intrusiveness, Disqualification, and Commitment). Predictors were age, sex (focal category: female; reference category: male), relationship status (dummy variables for in a relationship and divorced; reference category: other), educational level (focal category: less than college degree; reference category: college degree), type of organization (dummy variables for private and third-sector; reference category: public), total years of working, years of working in the current organization, organizational role (dummy variables for managerial and operational; reference category: other). Table A reports the complete results of the multiple regression analysis.

Table A – Results of the multiple regression analyses

Response variable	Predictor	Estimate	SE	*t*(160)	*p*	adj-*p*	*d*
BC–Self–distraction	(Intercept)	7.086	1.074	6.597	<.001	<.001	1.04 [.71, 1.37]
	Age	–.093	.047	–1.981	.049	.249	–.31 [–.62, .00]
	Female	.284	.328	.865	.388	.518	.14 [–.17, .45]
	In a relationship	–.207	.376	–.550	.583	.862	–.09 [–.40, .22]
	Divorced	–.274	.497	–.551	.582	.813	–.09 [–.40, .22]
	No college degree	.684	.352	1.944	.054	.147	.31 [.00, .62]
	Private organization	–.946	.415	–2.279	.024	.086	–.36 [–.67, –.05]
	Third–sector organization	–.069	.443	–.156	.876	.918	–.02 [–.33, .29]
	Total years of working	.120	.048	2.495	.014	.100	.39 [.08, .71]
	Years of working in the current organization	–.029	.024	–1.232	.220	.690	–.19 [–.51, .12]
	Managerial role	–.323	.386	–.836	.404	.556	–.13 [–.44, .18]
	Operational role	.631	.347	1.820	.071	.194	.29 [–.02, .60]
BC–Active coping	(Intercept)	7.769	.711	10.923	<.001	<.001	1.73 [1.36, 2.09]
	Age	–.010	.031	–.315	.753	.789	–.05 [–.36, .26]
	Female	–.245	.217	–1.129	.261	.410	–.18 [–.49, .13]
	In a relationship	.208	.249	.833	.406	.862	.13 [–.18, .44]
	Divorced	.385	.329	1.170	.244	.761	.18 [–.13, .50]

continued on next page

continued

Response variable	Predictor	Estimate	SE	*t*(160)	*p*	adj-*p*	*d*
	No college degree	−.344	.233	−1.477	.142	.241	−.23 [−.54, .08]
	Private organization	−.376	.275	−1.370	.173	.265	−.22 [−.53, .09]
	Third−sector organization	.098	.293	.336	.737	.918	.05 [−.26, .36]
	Total years of working	.006	.032	.177	.860	.946	.03 [−.28, .34]
	Years of working in the current organization	−.001	.016	−.094	.926	.998	−.01 [−.32, .30]
	Managerial role	.234	.256	.915	.362	.556	.14 [−.17, .45]
	Operational role	−.568	.229	−2.473	.014	.079	−.39 [−.70, −.08]
BC−Denial	(Intercept)	3.440	1.016	3.386	.001	.001	.54 [.22, .85]
	Age	−.036	.045	−.811	.418	.708	−.13 [−.44, .18]
	Female	**1.007**	**.310**	**3.250**	**.001**	**.004**	**.51 [.19, .83]**
	In a relationship	.122	.356	.343	.732	.862	.05 [−.26, .36]
	Divorced	.310	.470	.659	.511	.813	.10 [−.21, .41]
	No college degree	**1.254**	**.333**	**3.769**	**<.001**	**.005**	**.60 [.28, .91]**
	Private organization	−.543	.392	−1.383	.169	.265	−.22 [−.53, .09]
	Third−sector organization	−.213	.419	−.510	.611	.918	−.08 [−.39, .23]
	Total years of working	.041	.046	.895	.372	.568	.14 [−.17, .45]
	Years of working in the current organization	.001	.022	.059	.953	.998	.01 [−.30, .32]
	Managerial role	−.253	.366	−.693	.489	.633	−.11 [−.42, .20]
	Operational role	−.197	.328	−.600	.550	.636	−.09 [−.40, .22]
BC−Substance use	(Intercept)	3.182	.614	5.183	<.001	<.001	.82 [.50, 1.14]
	Age	−.034	.027	−1.264	.208	.509	−.20 [−.51, .11]
	Female	**−.671**	**.187**	**−3.580**	**<.001**	**.001**	**−.57 [−.89, −.24]**
	In a relationship	−.055	.215	−.255	.799	.862	−.04 [−.35, .27]
	Divorced	−.030	.284	−.107	.915	.996	−.02 [−.33, .29]
	No college degree	.169	.201	.842	.401	.509	.13 [−.18, .44]

continued on next page

continued

Response variable	Predictor	Estimate	SE	*t*(160)	*p*	adj-*p*	*d*
	Private organization	.437	.237	1.840	.068	.149	.29 [−.02, .60]
	Third−sector organization	.438	.253	1.731	.085	.439	.27 [−.04, .58]
	Total years of working	.025	.028	.911	.364	.568	.14 [−.17, .45]
	Years of working in the current organization	.000	.014	−.002	.998	.998	.00 [−.31, .31]
	Managerial role	.008	.221	.037	.970	.970	.01 [−.30, .32]
	Operational role	.541	.198	2.729	.007	.078	.43 [.12, .74]
BC−Emotional support	(Intercept)	5.421	.932	5.816	<.001	<.001	.92 [.59, 1.24]
	Age	−.072	.041	−1.767	.079	.249	−.28 [−.59, .03]
	Female	**1.652**	**.284**	**5.812**	**<.001**	**<.001**	**.92 [.58, 1.26]**
	In a relationship	.909	.327	2.782	.006	.067	.44 [.13, .75]
	Divorced	.932	.431	2.160	.032	.355	.34 [.03, .65]
	No college degree	−.632	.305	−2.071	.040	.146	−.33 [−.64, −.02]
	Private organization	−.880	.360	−2.445	.016	.086	−.39 [−.70, −.07]
	Third-sector organization	.392	.384	1.020	.309	.709	.16 [−.15, .47]
	Total years of working	.035	.042	.831	.407	.568	.13 [−.18, .44]
	Years of working in the current organization	.029	.021	1.420	.158	.656	.22 [−.09, .53]
	Managerial role	−.621	.335	−1.853	.066	.241	−.29 [−.60, .02]
	Operational role	−.342	.301	−1.136	.258	.346	−.18 [−.49, .13]
BC−Instrumental support	(Intercept)	4.857	.980	4.954	<.001	<.001	.78 [.46, 1.10]
	Age	−.023	.043	−.534	.594	.789	−.08 [−.39, .23]
	Female	**1.692**	**.299**	**5.658**	**<.001**	**<.001**	**.89 [.55, 1.24]**
	In a relationship	.981	.343	2.856	.005	.067	.45 [.14, .76]
	Divorced	1.086	.454	2.393	.018	.355	.38 [.07, .69]
	No college degree	−.328	.321	−1.021	.309	.453	−.16 [−.47, .15]

continued on next page

continued

Response variable	Predictor	Estimate	SE	*t*(160)	*p*	adj-*p*	*d*
	Private organization	−.834	.379	−2.203	.029	.086	−.35 [−.66, −.04]
	Third-sector organization	.563	.404	1.394	.165	.520	.22 [−.09, .53]
	Total years of working	−.038	.044	−.871	.385	.568	−.14 [−.45, .17]
	Years of working in the current organization	.056	.022	2.610	.010	.210	.41 [.10, .73]
	Managerial role	−.901	.353	−2.554	.012	.076	−.40 [−.72, −.09]
	Operational role	−.657	.316	−2.077	.039	.142	−.33 [−.64, −.02]
BC−Behavioral disengagement	(Intercept)	2.700	.726	3.720	<.001	<.001	.59 [.27, .90]
	Age	−.030	.032	−.951	.343	.631	−.15 [−.46, .16]
	Female	.389	.221	1.758	.081	.165	.28 [−.03, .59]
	In a relationship	−.159	.254	−.625	.533	.862	−.10 [−.41, .21]
	Divorced	−.379	.336	−1.127	.261	.761	−.18 [−.49, .13]
	No college degree	**.744**	**.238**	**3.130**	**.002**	**.023**	**.49 [.18, .81]**
	Private organization	.451	.280	1.610	.109	.219	.25 [−.06, .57]
	Third-sector organization	.282	.299	.942	.348	.709	.15 [−.16, .46]
	Total years of working	.030	.033	.927	.355	.568	.15 [−.16, .46]
	Years of working in the current organization	.014	.016	.845	.400	.889	.13 [−.18, .44]
	Managerial role	−.398	.261	−1.523	.130	.300	−.24 [−.55, .07]
	Operational role	.390	.234	1.664	.098	.205	.26 [−.05, .57]
BC−Venting	(Intercept)	4.021	.859	4.680	<.001	<.001	.74 [.42, 1.06]
	Age	−.026	.038	−.679	.498	.783	−.11 [−.42, .20]
	Female	**1.596**	**.262**	**6.091**	**<.001**	**<.001**	**.96 [.62, 1.31]**
	In a relationship	.222	.301	.739	.461	.862	.12 [−.19, .43]
	Divorced	.455	.398	1.144	.254	.761	.18 [−.13, .49]
	No college degree	−.229	.281	−.814	.417	.509	−.13 [−.44, .18]

continued on next page

continued

Response variable	Predictor	Estimate	SE	*t*(160)	*p*	adj-*p*	*d*
	Private organization	−.630	.332	−1.897	.060	.146	−.30 [−.61, .01]
	Third-sector organization	.554	.354	1.564	.120	.439	.25 [−.06, .56]
	Total years of working	.031	.039	.812	.418	.568	.13 [−.18, .44]
	Years of working in the current organization	.013	.019	.694	.489	.889	.11 [−.20, .42]
	Managerial role	−.770	.309	−2.491	.014	.076	−.39 [−.71, −.08]
	Operational role	−.323	.277	−1.166	.245	.346	−.18 [−.49, .13]
BC−Positive reframing	(Intercept)	5.387	1.006	5.353	<.001	<.001	.85 [.52, 1.17]
	Age	−.018	.044	−.405	.686	.789	−.06 [−.37, .25]
	Female	**1.399**	**.307**	**4.559**	**<.001**	**<.001**	**.72 [.39, 1.05]**
	In a relationship	.298	.353	.844	.400	.862	.13 [−.18, .44]
	Divorced	.671	.466	1.440	.152	.761	.23 [−.08, .54]
	No college degree	.301	.329	.915	.362	.497	.14 [−.17, .45]
	Private organization	**−1.196**	**.389**	**−3.076**	**.002**	**.027**	**−.49 [−.80, −.17]**
	Third-sector organization	−.670	.415	−1.617	.108	.439	−.26 [−.57, .06]
	Total years of working	.010	.045	.225	.822	.946	.04 [−.27, .35]
	Years of working in the current organization	−.015	.022	−.693	.489	.889	−.11 [−.42, .20]
	Managerial role	.368	.362	1.015	.311	.556	.16 [−.15, .47]
	Operational role	.361	.325	1.113	.267	.346	.18 [−.13, .49]
BC−Planning	(Intercept)	7.458	.715	10.426	<.001	<.001	1.65 [1.29, 2.01]
	Age	−.013	.031	−.415	.679	.789	−.07 [−.38, .24]
	Female	.012	.218	.056	.955	.991	.01 [−.30, .32]
	In a relationship	.060	.251	.241	.810	.862	.04 [−.27, .35]
	Divorced	.005	.331	.016	.987	.996	.00 [−.31, .31]
	No college degree	−.509	.234	−2.175	.031	.137	−.34 [−.66, −.03]

continued on next page

continued

Response variable	Predictor	Estimate	SE	*t*(160)	*p*	adj-*p*	*d*
	Private organization	−.070	.276	−.254	.800	.800	−.04 [−.35, .27]
	Third-sector organization	.475	.295	1.610	.109	.439	.25 [−.06, .57]
	Total years of working	.017	.032	.536	.593	.724	.08 [−.23, .39]
	Years of working in the current organization	.002	.016	.133	.894	.998	.02 [−.29, .33]
	Managerial role	.141	.257	.549	.584	.713	.09 [−.22, .40]
	Operational role	−.542	.231	−2.349	.020	.088	−.37 [−.68, −.06]
BC−Humor	(Intercept)	4.222	.908	4.652	<.001	<.001	.74 [.41, 1.05]
	Age	−.073	.040	−1.824	.070	.249	−.29 [−.60, .02]
	Female	.003	.277	.011	.991	.991	.00 [−.31, .31]
	In a relationship	−.071	.318	−.224	.823	.862	−.04 [−.35, .27]
	Divorced	.191	.420	.456	.649	.840	.07 [−.24, .38]
	No college degree	.438	.297	1.474	.142	.241	.23 [−.08, .54]
	Private organization	.472	.351	1.345	.180	.265	.21 [−.10, .52]
	Third-sector organization	−.190	.374	−.508	.612	.918	−.08 [−.39, .23]
	Total years of working	.047	.041	1.142	.255	.568	.18 [−.13, .49]
	Years of working in the current organization	.009	.020	.429	.669	.998	.07 [−.24, .38]
	Managerial role	.521	.327	1.595	.113	.300	.25 [−.06, .56]
	Operational role	.396	.293	1.351	.179	.302	.21 [−.10, .52]
BC−Acceptance	(Intercept)	7.588	.991	7.657	<.001	<.001	1.21 [.87, 1.55]
	Age	−.081	.043	−1.860	.065	.249	−.29 [−.61, .02]
	Female	**.734**	**.302**	**2.428**	**.016**	**.040**	**.38 [.07, .70]**
	In a relationship	−.406	.347	−1.170	.244	.837	−.19 [−.50, .13]
	Divorced	−.247	.459	−.538	.591	.813	−.09 [−.39, .23]
	No college degree	−.555	.324	−1.709	.089	.179	−.27 [−.58, .04]
	Private organization	−.834	.383	−2.180	.031	.086	−.34 [−.66, −.03]

continued on next page

continued

Response variable	Predictor	Estimate	SE	*t*(160)	*p*	adj-*p*	*d*
	Third-sector organization	.454	.408	1.112	.268	.709	.18 [−.13, .49]
	Total years of working	.092	.044	2.069	.040	.168	.33 [.01, .64]
	Years of working in the current organization	−.006	.022	−.290	.772	.998	−.05 [−.36, .26]
	Managerial role	.022	.357	.063	.950	.970	.01 [−.30, .32]
	Operational role	.645	.320	2.018	.045	.142	.32 [.01, .63]
BC−Religion	(Intercept)	2.415	.998	2.420	.017	.017	.38 [.07, .69]
	Age	.001	.044	.013	.989	.989	.00 [−.31, .31]
	Female	**1.099**	**.304**	**3.609**	**<.001**	**.001**	**.57 [.25, .89]**
	In a relationship	.161	.350	.459	.647	.862	.07 [−.24, .38]
	Divorced	.544	.462	1.177	.241	.761	.19 [−.12, .50]
	No college degree	.782	.327	2.392	.018	.132	.38 [.06, .69]
	Private organization	−.543	.386	−1.408	.161	.265	−.22 [−.53, .09]
	Third-sector organization	−.106	.411	−.258	.797	.918	−.04 [−.35, .27]
	Total years of working	.005	.045	.113	.910	.953	02 [−.29, .33]
	Years of working in the current organization	−.001	.022	−.049	.961	.998	−.01 [−.32, .30]
	Managerial role	−.601	.359	−1.673	.096	.300	−.26 [−.58, .05]
	Operational role	−.091	.322	−.283	.778	.815	−.04 [−.35, .27]
BC−Self−blame	(Intercept)	7.058	.671	10.525	<.001	<.001	1.66 [1.30, 2.02]
	Age	−.075	.029	−2.559	.011	.126	−.40 [−.72, −.09]
	Female	−.141	.205	−.691	.491	.568	−.11 [−.42, .20]
	In a relationship	.242	.235	1.031	.304	.837	.16 [−.15, .47]
	Divorced	.179	.310	.578	.564	.813	.09 [−.22, .40]
	No college degree	.135	.220	.615	.539	.624	.10 [−.21, .41]
	Private organization	−.214	.259	−.826	.410	.429	−.13 [−.44, .18]
	Third-sector organization	.000	.276	−.001	.999	.999	.00 [−.31, .30]

continued on next page

continued

Response variable	Predictor	Estimate	SE	*t*(160)	*p*	adj-*p*	*d*
	Total years of working	**.091**	**.030**	**3.019**	**.003**	**.039**	**.48 [.16, .79]**
	Years of working in the current organization	−.016	.015	−1.063	.290	.796	−.17 [−.48, .14]
	Managerial role	−.221	.241	−.918	.360	.556	−.15 [−.46, .17]
	Operational role	−.355	.216	−1.642	.102	.205	−.26 [−.57, .05]
STAY−Y1	(Intercept)	49.531	2.135	23.198	<.001	<.001	3.67 [3.16, 4.17]
	Age	.097	.094	1.041	.299	.631	.16 [−.15, .47]
	Female	−.304	.651	−.467	.641	.706	−.07 [−.38, .24]
	In a relationship	−.788	.748	−1.053	.294	.837	−.17 [−.48, .14]
	Divorced	−.008	.988	−.008	.994	.996	.00 [−.31, .30]
	No college degree	−1.384	.699	−1.980	.049	.147	−.31 [−.62, .00]
	Private organization	1.958	.825	2.374	.019	.086	.38 [.06, .69]
	Third-sector organization	−.790	.880	−.898	.371	.709	−.14 [−.45, .17]
	Total years of working	−.104	.096	−1.084	.280	.568	−.17 [−.48, .14]
	Years of working in the current organization	.030	.047	.637	.525	.889	.10 [−.21, .41]
	Managerial role	−.678	.768	−.882	.379	.556	−.14 [−.45, .17]
	Operational role	.768	.689	1.115	.266	.346	.18 [−.13, .49]
STAI−Y2	(Intercept)	48.750	2.131	22.878	<.001	<.001	3.62 [3.11, 4.12]
	Age	.198	.093	2.119	.036	.249	.33 [.02, .65]
	Female	−1.121	.650	−1.725	.086	.165	−.27 [−.58, .04]
	In a relationship	−.795	.747	−1.064	.289	.837	−.17 [−.48, .14]
	Divorced	−.799	.986	−.810	.419	.813	−.13 [−.44, .18]
	No college degree	−1.265	.698	−1.813	.072	.158	−.29 [−.60, .03]
	Private organization	.715	.823	.869	.386	.425	.14 [−.17, .45]
	Third-sector organization	.252	.878	.287	.774	.918	.05 [−.26, .36]
	Total years of working	−.193	.096	−2.014	.046	.168	−.32 [−.63, −.01]

continued on next page

continued

Response variable	Predictor	Estimate	SE	*t*(160)	*p*	adj-*p*	*d*
	Years of working in the current organization	−.008	.047	−.176	.860	.998	−.03 [−.34, .28]
	Managerial role	**2.234**	**.767**	**2.914**	**.004**	**.045**	**.46 [.15, .77]**
	Operational role	1.024	.688	1.489	.138	.254	.24 [−.08, .55]
BDI	(Intercept)	−.227	5.376	−.042	.966	.966	−.01 [−.32, .30]
	Age	.098	.236	.415	.679	.789	.07 [−.24, .38]
	Female	**6.257**	**1.640**	**3.816**	**<.001**	**.001**	**.60 [.28, .93]**
	In a relationship	1.192	1.884	.633	.528	.862	.10 [−.21, .41]
	Divorced	−2.715	2.488	−1.092	.277	.761	−.17 [−.48, .14]
	No college degree	3.201	1.760	1.819	.071	.158	.29 [−.02, .60]
	Private organization	−1.898	2.077	−.914	.362	.419	−.14 [−.45, .17]
	Third-sector organization	−1.923	2.215	−.868	.387	.709	−.14 [−.45, .17]
	Total years of working	.311	.241	1.287	.200	.568	.20 [−.11, .51]
	Years of working in the current organization	−.182	.118	−1.540	.126	.656	−.24 [−.55, .07]
	Managerial role	−2.894	1.934	−1.496	.137	.300	−.24 [−.55, .07]
	Operational role	1.505	1.735	.868	.387	.473	.14 [−.17, .45]
Val.Mob. Relationship	(Intercept)	57.435	10.242	5.608	<.001	<.001	.89 [.56, 1.21]
	Age	−.263	.449	−.586	.559	.789	−.09 [−.40, .22]
	Female	3.152	3.124	1.009	.315	.461	.16 [−.15, .47]
	In a relationship	−.138	3.589	−.038	.969	.969	−.01 [−.32, .30]
	Divorced	−.688	4.739	−.145	.885	.996	−.02 [−.33, .29]
	No college degree	.749	3.353	.223	.824	.832	.04 [−.27, .35]
	Private organization	−4.683	3.957	−1.183	.238	.312	−.19 [−.50, .12]
	Third-sector organization	7.477	4.220	1.772	.078	.439	.28 [−.03, .59]
	Total years of working	.485	.460	1.054	.293	.568	.17 [−.14, .48]
	Years of working in the current organization	−.330	.226	−1.465	.145	.656	−.23 [−.54, .08]

continued on next page

continued

Response variable	Predictor	Estimate	SE	*t*(160)	*p*	adj-*p*	*d*
	Managerial role	−6.895	3.685	−1.871	.063	.241	−.30 [−.61, .02]
	Operational role	5.439	3.304	1.646	.102	.205	.26 [−.05, .57]
Val.Mob. Intrusiveness	(Intercept)	23.617	2.805	8.421	<.001	<.001	1.33 [.99, 1.67]
	Age	**−.403**	**.123**	**−3.278**	**.001**	**.028**	**−.52 [−.83, −.20]**
	Female	.688	.855	.804	.422	.518	.13 [−.18, .44]
	In a relationship	−1.431	.983	−1.457	.147	.837	−.23 [−.54, .08]
	Divorced	1.313	1.298	1.012	.313	.765	.16 [−.15, .47]
	No college degree	.511	.918	.557	.578	.636	.09 [−.22, .40]
	Private organization	−1.276	1.083	−1.178	.241	.312	−.19 [−.50, .12]
	Third-sector organization	−.465	1.156	−.403	.688	.918	−.06 [−.37, .25]
	Total years of working	**.373**	**.126**	**2.962**	**.004**	**.039**	**.47 [.15, .78]**
	Years of working in the current organization	−.001	.062	−.018	.986	.998	.00 [−.31, .31]
	Managerial role	−1.191	1.009	−1.181	.239	.479	−.19 [−.50, .12]
	Operational role	2.305	.905	2.547	.012	.079	.40 [.09, .72]
Val.Mob. Disqualification	(Intercept)	33.494	5.224	6.412	<.001	<.001	1.01 [.68, 1.34]
	Age	.075	.229	.330	.742	.789	.05 [−.26, .36]
	Female	2.719	1.593	1.707	.090	.165	.27 [−.04, .58]
	In a relationship	.479	1.831	.262	.794	.862	.04 [−.27, .35]
	Divorced	−1.374	2.417	−.569	.570	.813	−.09 [−.40, .22]
	No college degree	.363	1.710	.212	.832	.832	.03 [−.28, .34]
	Private organization	**−7.147**	**2.018**	**−3.542**	**.001**	**.011**	**−.56 [−.88, −.24]**
	Third-sector organization	.444	2.152	.206	.837	.918	.03 [−.28, .34]
	Total years of working	−.006	.234	−.025	.980	.980	.00 [−.31, .31]
	Years of working in the current organization	−.089	.115	−.777	.438	.889	−.12 [−.43, .19]

continued on next page

continued

Response variable	Predictor	Estimate	SE	*t*(160)	*p*	adj-*p*	*d*
	Managerial role	**−6.275**	**1.880**	**−3.339**	**.001**	**.023**	**−.53 [−.84, −.21]**
	Operational role	.008	1.686	.005	.996	.996	.00 [−.31, .31]
Val.Mob. Commitment	(Intercept)	21.742	2.697	8.063	<.001	<.001	1.27 [.93, 1.61]
	Age	.151	.118	1.276	.204	.509	.20 [−.11, .51]
	Female	.659	.823	.801	.424	.518	.13 [−.18, .44]
	In a relationship	1.137	.945	1.203	.231	.837	.19 [−.12, .50]
	Divorced	−.758	1.248	−.607	.545	.813	−.10 [−.41, .21]
	No college degree	−1.081	.883	−1.225	.222	.350	−.19 [−.50, .12]
	Private organization	−2.265	1.042	−2.174	.031	.086	−.34 [−.66, −.03]
	Third-sector organization	−1.777	1.111	−1.600	.112	.439	−.25 [−.56, .06]
	Total years of working	−.094	.121	−.775	.439	.568	−.12 [−.43, .19]
	Years of working in the current organization	.141	.059	2.368	.019	.210	.37 [.06, .69]
	Managerial role	−.192	.970	−.198	.843	.927	−.03 [−.34, .28]
	Operational role	**−3.257**	**.870**	**−3.743**	**<.001**	**.006**	**−.59 [−.91, −.27]**
Val.Mob. Total	(Intercept)	45.782	8.479	5.399	<.001	<.001	.85 [.53, 1.18]
	Age	−.353	.372	−.949	.344	.631	−.15 [−.46, .16]
	Female	3.457	2.586	1.337	.183	.310	.21 [−.10, .52]
	In a relationship	.979	2.971	.330	.742	.862	.05 [−.26, .36]
	Divorced	−.018	3.923	−.004	.996	.996	.00 [−.31, .31]
	No college degree	6.073	2.776	2.188	.030	.137	.35 [.03, .66]
	Private organization	−3.636	3.276	−1.110	.269	.328	−.18 [−.49, .14]
	Third-sector organization	1.292	3.494	.370	.712	.918	.06 [−.25, .37]
	Total years of working	.813	.381	2.135	.034	.168	.34 [.03, .65]
	Years of working in the current organization	−.252	.187	−1.350	.179	.656	−.21 [−.52, .10]

continued on next page

continued

Response variable	Predictor	Estimate	SE	*t*(160)	*p*	adj-*p*	*d*
	Managerial role	−1.219	3.051	−.400	.690	.799	−.06 [−.37, .25]
	Operational role	−1.028	2.736	−.376	.708	.778	−.06 [−.37, .25]

Legenda. SE = standard error of the estimate; *p* = *p*-value; adj-*p* = *p*-value adjusted for false discovery rate (FDR); *d* = Cohen's *d* and its 95% confidence interval; BC = Brief COPE; Val.Mob. = Val.Mob. scale; STAY-Y1 = State Anxiety; STAY-Y2 = Trait Anxiety; BDI = *Beck Depression Inventory.*

Note. Significant effects after correction for FDR are bolded for ease of interpretation.

APPENDIX B

Details of the results of the logistic regression models for dichotomous response variables ("categorical approach")

In these models, the response variables were the scores on the STAY-Y1, the STAY-Y2, the BDI, and the Val.Mob. total score and subscale scores (Re-lationship, Intrusiveness, Disqualification, and Commitment). Predictors were age, sex (focal category: female; reference category: male), relationship status (dummy variables for in a relationship and divorced; reference category: other), educational level (focal category: less than college degree; reference category: college degree), type of organization (dummy variables for private and third-sector; reference category: public), total years of working, years of working in the current organization, organizational role (dummy variables for managerial and operational; reference category: other).

Table B shows the complete results of the logistic regression analysis.

Table B – Results of the logistic regression analyses

Response variable	Predictor	Estimate	SE	*z*	*p*	adj–*p*	OR
STAI-Y1	(Intercept)	−.354	1.540	−.230	.818	.842	
	Age	.096	.070	1.370	.171	.405	1.10 [.96, 1.26]
	Female	−.344	.438	−.785	.432	.576	.71 [.30, 1.67]
	In a relationship	−.537	.483	−1.113	.266	.982	.58 [.23, 1.50]
	Divorced	−.468	.647	−.724	.469	.625	.63 [.18, 2.22]
	No college degree	−1.143	.504	−2.266	.023	.188	.32 [.12, .86]
	Private organization	.859	.576	1.491	.136	.272	2.36 [.76, 7.30]
	Third–sector organization	−.336	.560	−.599	.549	.732	.71 [.24, 2.14]
	Total years of working	−.100	.070	−1.417	.157	.418	.91 [.79, 1.04]
	Years of working in the current organization	.025	.032	.783	.434	.602	1.03 [.96, 1.09]
	Managerial role	−.394	.490	−.805	.421	.561	.67 [.26, 1.76]
	Operational role	.416	.465	.896	.370	.592	1.52 [.61, 3.77]
STAI-Y2	(Intercept)	−.363	1.821	−.199	.842	.842	
	Age	.118	.083	1.416	.157	.405	1.12 [.96, 1.32]
	Female	−.973	.576	−1.690	.091	.182	.38 [.12, 1.17]
	In a relationship	−.102	.571	−.178	.859	.984	.90 [.29, 2.77]
	Divorced	−.825	.717	−1.150	.250	.622	.44 [.11, 1.79]

continued on next page

continued

Response variable	Predictor	Estimate	SE	*z*	*p*	adj–*p*	OR
	No college degree	−.260	.520	−.501	.616	.704	.77 [.28, 2.13]
	Private organization	−.014	.678	−.021	.984	.984	.99 [.26, 3.73]
	Third−sector organization	−.049	.713	−.068	.946	.946	.95 [.24, 3.85]
	Total years of working	−.099	.084	−1.183	.237	.447	.91 [.77, 1.07]
	Years of working in the current organization	−.034	.036	−.946	.344	.602	.97 [.90, 1.04]
	Managerial role	1.025	.630	1.627	.104	.276	2.79 [.81, 9.58]
	Operational role	.209	.486	.431	.666	.865	1.23 [.48, 3.19]
BDI	(Intercept)	−2.873	1.680	−1.711	.087	.349	
	Age	−.005	.074	−.072	.942	.942	.99 [.86, 1.15]
	Female	**1.953**	**.669**	**2.919**	**.004**	**.017**	**7.05 [1.90, 26.15]**
	In a relationship	−.011	.556	−.020	.984	.984	.99 [.33, 2.94]
	Divorced	−.745	.766	−.973	.330	.622	.47 [.11, 2.13]
	No college degree	.643	.543	1.186	.236	.629	1.90 [.66, 5.51]
	Private organization	**−2.005**	**.767**	**−2.615**	**.009**	**.036**	**.13 [.03, .61]**
	Third−sector organization	−1.085	.682	−1.590	.112	.255	.34 [.09, 1.29]
	Total years of working	.077	.074	1.033	.302	.447	1.08 [.93, 1.25]
	Years of working in the current organization	−.065	.040	−1.610	.107	.393	.94 [.87, 1.01]
	Managerial role	−.719	.648	−1.109	.267	.428	.49 [.14, 1.74]
	Operational role	1.149	.550	2.088	.037	.098	3.15 [1.07, 9.27]
Severity Val.Mob. Relationship	(Intercept)	−.383	1.772	−.216	.829	.842	
	Age	−.101	.079	−1.275	.202	.405	.90 [.77, 1.06]
	Female	.790	.530	1.490	.136	.218	2.20 [.78, 6.23]
	In a relationship	−.020	.529	−.038	.970	.984	.98 [.35, 2.76]
	Divorced	−.972	.799	−1.217	.224	.622	.38 [.08, 1.81]
	No college degree	−.394	.525	−.751	.453	.679	.67 [.24, 1.89]

continued on next page

continued

Response variable	Predictor	Estimate	SE	*z*	*p*	adj–*p*	OR
	Private organization	−.181	.732	−.247	.805	.920	.83 [.20, 3.50]
	Third−sector organization	1.080	.709	1.525	.127	.255	2.95 [.73, 11.81]
	Total years of working	.123	.080	1.537	.124	.418	1.13 [.97, 1.32]
	Years of working in the current organization	−.011	.038	−.295	.768	.768	.99 [.92, 1.07]
	Managerial role	−.899	.608	−1.480	.139	.278	.41 [.12, 1.34]
	Operational role	1.265	.545	2.321	.020	.081	3.54 [1.22, 10.31]
Severity Val.Mob. Intrusiveness	(Intercept)	3.180	1.430	2.224	.026	.209	
	Age	−.092	.062	−1.476	.140	.405	.91 [.81, 1.03]
	Female	**1.332**	**.465**	**2.864**	**.004**	**.017**	**3.79 [1.52, 9.42]**
	In a relationship	−1.280	.519	−2.466	.014	.109	.28 [.10, .77]
	Divorced	−1.116	.698	−1.599	.110	.622	.33 [.08, 1.29]
	No college degree	.406	.468	.868	.385	.679	1.50 [.60, 3.76]
	Private organization	**−2.137**	**.625**	**−3.420**	**.001**	**.005**	**.12 [.03, .40]**
	Third−sector organization	−1.514	.618	−2.450	.014	.114	.22 [.07, .74]
	Total years of working	.119	.063	1.881	.060	.418	1.13 [1.00, 1.27]
	Years of working in the current organization	−.022	.032	−.695	.487	.602	.98 [.92, 1.04]
	Managerial role	−.923	.490	−1.885	.059	.238	.40 [.15, 1.04]
	Operational role	.695	.456	1.523	.128	.256	2.00 [.82, 4.90]
Severity Val.Mob. Disqualification	(Intercept)	.687	1.756	.391	.696	.842	
	Age	.033	.079	.423	.672	.896	1.03 [.89, 1.21]
	Female	−.223	.493	−.452	.651	.651	.80 [.30, 2.10]
	In a relationship	.143	.579	.247	.805	.984	1.15 [.37, 3.59]
	Divorced	−.099	.789	−.125	.900	.900	.91 [.19, 4.26]
	No college degree	−.071	.574	−.124	.901	.901	.93 [.30, 2.87]
	Private organization	−.924	.763	−1.211	.226	.361	.40 [.09, 1.77]

continued on next page

continued

Response variable	Predictor	Estimate	SE	*z*	*p*	adj–*p*	OR
	Third–sector organization	−1.182	.760	−1.555	.120	.255	.31 [.07, 1.36]
	Total years of working	.032	.083	.393	.695	.794	1.03 [.88, 1.21]
	Years of working in the current organization	.033	.052	.633	.527	.602	1.03 [.93, 1.15]
	Managerial role	−.317	.628	−.505	.614	.614	.73 [.21, 2.49]
	Operational role	**−1.443**	**.517**	**−2.791**	**.005**	**.042**	**.24 [.09, .65]**
Severity Val.Mob. Commitment	(Intercept)	−2.100	1.501	−1.399	.162	.431	
	Age	−.013	.066	−.199	.843	.942	.99 [.87, 1.12]
	Female	.774	.453	1.711	.087	.182	2.17 [.89, 5.27]
	In a relationship	.244	.484	.504	.614	.984	1.28 [.49, 3.29]
	Divorced	−.356	.667	−.534	.594	.678	.70 [.19, 2.59]
	No college degree	.748	.497	1.507	.132	.527	2.11 [.80, 5.59]
	Private organization	−.409	.584	−.701	.483	.644	.66 [.21, 2.09]
	Third–sector organization	.173	.577	.300	.764	.873	1.19 [.38, 3.68]
	Total years of working	.065	.067	.963	.335	.447	1.07 [.94, 1.22]
	Years of working in the current organization	−.064	.035	−1.837	.066	.393	.94 [.88, 1.00]
	Managerial role	.290	.506	.574	.566	.614	1.34 [.50, 3.60]
	Operational role	.080	.469	.170	.865	.865	1.08 [.43, 2.72]
Severity Val.Mob. Total	(Intercept)	−1.086	1.604	−.677	.499	.842	
	Age	−.032	.071	−.446	.656	.896	.97 [.4, 1.11]
	Female	.373	.587	.636	.525	.599	1.45 [.46, 4.59]
	In a relationship	.545	.606	.900	.368	.982	1.72 [.53, 5.65]
	Divorced	.673	.782	.862	.389	.622	1.96 [.42, 9.08]
	No college degree	.368	.557	.660	.509	.679	1.44 [.48, 4.31]
	Private organization	−1.441	.786	−1.833	.067	.178	.24 [.05, 1.10]

continued on next page

continued

Response variable	Predictor	Estimate	SE	*z*	*p*	adj–*p*	OR
	Third–sector organization	.827	.704	1.174	.240	.385	2.29 [.57, 9.09]
	Total years of working	−.009	.074	−.122	.903	.903	.99 [.86, 1.15]
	Years of working in the current organization	.057	.039	1.448	.148	.393	1.06 [.98, 1.14]
	Managerial role	−1.255	.661	−1.899	.058	.238	.29 [.08, 1.04]
	Operational role	.119	.547	.218	.827	.865	1.13 [.39, 3.29]

Legenda. SE = standard error of the estimate; *z* = *z*-statistic; *p* = *p*-value; adj-*p* = *p*-value adjusted for false discovery rate (FDR); OR = odds ratio and its 95% confidence interval.
Note. Significant effects after correction for FDR are bolded for ease of interpretation.

Table C – Correlation matrix for psychological variables in males (*n* = 66, lower triangle) and females (*n* = 106, upper triangle)

Scale	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
1. BC-Self-distraction		–.17	**.40**	**.22**	.18	.05	**.25**	.16	.13	–.13	.08	.10	**.30**	**.23**	**.23**	**.27**	.01	**–.25**	.17	.03	–.16	.17
2. BC-Active coping	**–.28**		**–.52**	**–.22**	**.39**	**.32**	**–.71**	**.20**	–.09	**.74**	**–.46**	.11	**–.20**	**.29**	.07	–.19	.10	**.42**	.09	**–.46**	.10	–.18
3. BC-Denial	**.36**	**–.38**		.07	–.02	–.01	**.47**	.08	.00	**–.46**	**.22**	–.18	**.43**	.07	**.24**	**.26**	**.24**	**–.43**	**.21**	.17	**–.24**	**.24**
4. BC-Substance use	**.44**	**–.46**	**.26**		**–.20**	–.11	**.26**	–.11	.06	**–.23**	.18	.12	.08	–.05	.09	**.35**	.04	–.19	.04	–.01	–.17	.02
5. BC-Emotional support	.15	.23	.06	**–.31**		**.85**	**–.19**	**.53**	**.24**	**.44**	–.10	.13	**.27**	**.38**	.10	.03	.06	.02	.13	**–.23**	–.09	–.14
6. BC-Instrumental support	.02	**.28**	–.08	**–.40**	**.73**		–.15	**.52**	**.22**	**.41**	.01	.12	**.36**	**.33**	.10	.05	.06	–.05	.10	**–.19**	–.13	**–.20**
7. BC-Behavioral disengagement	.22	**–.76**	**.47**	**.29**	–.13	**–.29**		–.17	.01	**–.60**	**.42**	–.11	**.30**	–.02	–.09	.16	–.04	**–.45**	.05	**.44**	–.15	**.22**
8. BC-Venting	**.24**	–.10	**.39**	–.02	**.58**	**.56**	.14		.09	**.37**	–.10	.14	**.26**	**.27**	**.34**	.15	**.33**	.00	**.45**	–.18	–.09	.17
9. BC-Positive reframing	**.38**	–.07	.11	–.03	**.42**	**.42**	.03	**.43**		.01	**.39**	**.55**	.19	–.06	**–.31**	.07	**–.26**	.02	**–.39**	.13	**.22**	**–.41**
10. BC-Planning	–.23	**.67**	**–.27**	**–.53**	**.29**	**.39**	**–.54**	–.02	–.13		**–.29**	.16	–.18	**.40**	.10	–.04	.09	**.41**	.16	**–.45**	.01	–.16
11. BC-Humor	.11	**–.37**	.09	**.24**	.07	–.03	**.31**	.14	**.45**	**–.41**		.12	.18	–.02	**–.34**	**.25**	**–.31**	**–.43**	**–.35**	**.25**	.09	**–.31**
12. BC-Acceptance	**.26**	–.02	–.15	–.11	**.46**	**.33**	–.06	**.29**	**.60**	.04	**.27**		–.04	–.02	**–.24**	–.01	**–.25**	**.28**	**–.25**	.04	**.42**	**–.29**
13. BC-Religion	**.35**	**–.39**	**.26**	**.29**	.00	.05	**.32**	.14	**.36**	**–.32**	**.25**	.19		.16	.08	**.19**	.03	**–.23**	.12	.12	–.12	.07
14. BC-Self-blame	–.17	.09	.11	**–.28**	.17	**.28**	–.03	**.28**	**–.27**	**.35**	**–.40**	–.14	–.20		.13	.07	.16	.00	**.35**	**–.20**	**–.31**	**.28**
15. Val.Mob.-Relationship	**.32**	.07	.20	**.35**	–.10	–.19	.07	–.11	–.18	.03	**–.34**	–.12	–.06	–.06		**.41**	**.80**	**–.25**	**.74**	**–.29**	**–.29**	**.58**
16. Val.Mob.-Intrusiveness	**.30**	–.08	.19	**.53**	.14	.04	–.06	.19	.04	–.11	.05	.07	.07	–.01	**.46**		**.21**	**–.42**	**.25**	.02	–.36	.12
17. Val.Mob.-Disqualification	**.31**	.04	.21	.22	–.01	.00	–.01	.05	–.07	.08	**–.36**	.05	–.02	.12	**.77**	**.35**		–.11	**.68**	**–.23**	**–.34**	**.58**
18. Val.Mob.-Commitment	**–.29**	**.48**	–.23	**–.51**	.23	**.39**	**–.40**	.05	.13	**.42**	–.17	.17	–.07	.16	**–.30**	**–.36**	.01		–.12	**–.28**	.09	–.03
19. Val.Mob.-Total Score	.05	.03	**.29**	.16	–.17	–.21	.04	–.16	**–.34**	.14	**–.40**	–.21	.02	**.36**	**.49**	.22	**.46**	.00		**–.28**	**–.42**	**.75**
20. STAI-Y1	–.11	**–.42**	–.03	.01	.02	.13	.21	.17	.12	–.19	.16	.10	.02	–.04	**–.26**	–.10	**–.31**	**–.35**	–.22		**.24**	–.01
21. STAI-Y2	**–.27**	.11	–.22	–.14	–.14	–.07	–.13	–.24	–.04	.04	.15	–.17	–.02	**–.36**	**–.33**	–.23	**–.30**	.04	**–.45**	.12		**–.42**
22. BDI	.00	–.08	**.32**	.18	**–.27**	**–.26**	.11	–.05	**–.38**	–.02	**–.42**	**–.29**	–.03	**.37**	**.44**	.18	**.49**	–.06	**.77**	–.14	**–.45**	

Legenda. BC = Brief COPE; Val.Mob. = Val.Mob. scale; STAY-Y1 = State Anxiety; STAY-Y2 = Trait Anxiety; BDI = *Beck Depression Inventory*.
Note. Bolded coefficients are significant at $p<.05$.

APPENDIX D

Table D – Results of the comparisons of correlation coefficients

Variable 1	Variable 2	*r* Males (*n* = 66)	*r* Females (*n* = 166)	*z*	*p*	adj–*p*	*d*
BC-Self-distraction	BC-Active coping	−.28	−.17	−.67	.505	.952	.10 [−.20, .40]
BC-Self-distraction	BC-Denial	.36	.40	−.30	.768	.952	.05 [−.25, .34]
BC-Self-distraction	BC-Substance use	.44	.22	1.59	.113	.684	.24 [−.06, .54]
BC-Self-distraction	BC-Emotional support	.15	.18	−.19	.849	.952	.03 [−.27, .33]
BC-Self-distraction	BC-Instrumental support	.02	.05	−.21	.834	.952	.03 [−.27, .33]
BC-Self-distraction	BC-Behavioral disengagement	.22	.25	−.21	.836	.952	.03 [−.27, .33]
BC-Self-distraction	BC-Venting	.24	.16	.56	.573	.952	.09 [−.21, .38]
BC-Self-distraction	BC-Positive reframing	.38	.13	1.70	.090	.610	.26 [−.04, .56]
BC-Self-distraction	BC-Planning	−.23	−.13	−.65	.513	.952	.10 [−.20, .40]
BC-Self-distraction	BC-Humor	.11	.08	.17	.862	.952	.03 [−.27, .33]
BC-Self-distraction	BC-Acceptance	.26	.10	1.01	.314	.929	.15 [−.15, .45]
BC-Self-distraction	BC-Religion	.35	.30	.35	.728	.952	.05 [−.25, .35]
BC-Self-distraction	BC-Self-blame	−.17	.23	−2.51	.012	.353	.38 [.08, .68]
BC-Self-distraction	Val.Mob.-Relationship	−.11	.03	−.92	.359	.952	.14 [−.16, .44]
BC-Self-distraction	Val.Mob.-Intrusiveness	−.27	−.16	−.75	.456	.952	.11 [−.19, .41]
BC-Self-distraction	Val.Mob.-Disqualification	.32	.23	.56	.574	.952	.09 [−.21, .38]
BC-Self-distraction	Val.Mob.-Commitment	.30	.27	.19	.848	.952	.03 [−.27, .33]
BC-Self-distraction	STAI-Y1	.31	.01	1.93	.054	.482	.29 [−.01, .59]
BC-Self-distraction	STAI-Y2	−.29	−.25	−.31	.758	.952	.05 [−.25, .35]
BC-Self-distraction	Val.Mob.-Total Score	.05	.17	−.75	.453	.952	.11 [−.18, .41]
BC-Self-distraction	BDI	.00	.17	−1.09	.278	.904	.17 [−.13, .46]

continued on next page

continued

Variable 1	Variable 2	*r* Males (n = 66)	*r* Females (n = 166)	*z*	*p*	adj–*p*	*d*
BC-Active coping	BC-Denial	−.38	−.52	1.10	.271	.904	.17 [−.13, .47]
BC-Active coping	BC-Substance use	−.46	−.22	−1.71	.087	.610	.26 [−.04, .56]
BC-Active coping	BC-Emotional support	.23	.39	−1.10	.270	.904	.17 [−.13, .47]
BC-Active coping	BC-Instrumental support	.28	.32	−.30	.761	.952	.05 [−.25, .35]
BC-Active coping	BC-Behavioral disengagement	−.76	−.71	−.74	.460	.952	.11 [−.19, .41]
BC-Active coping	BC-Venting	−.10	.20	−1.93	.054	.482	.29 [.00, .59]
BC-Active coping	BC-Positive reframing	−.07	−.09	.15	.881	.952	.02 [−.28, .32]
BC-Active coping	BC-Planning	.67	.74	−.83	.407	.952	.13 [−.17, .43]
BC-Active coping	BC-Humor	−.37	−.46	.66	.507	.952	.10 [−.20, .40]
BC-Active coping	BC-Acceptance	−.02	.11	−.80	.426	.952	.12 [−.18, .42]
BC-Active coping	BC-Religion	−.39	−.20	−1.31	.190	.788	.20 [−.10, .50]
BC-Active coping	BC-Self-blame	.09	.29	−1.29	.198	.788	.20 [−.10, .50]
BC-Active coping	Val.Mob.-Relationship	−.42	−.46	.37	.713	.952	.06 [−.24, .36]
BC-Active coping	Val.Mob.-Intrusiveness	.11	.10	.08	.936	.974	.01 [−.29, .31]
BC-Active coping	Val.Mob.-Disqualification	.07	.07	.01	.989	.998	.00 [−.30, .30]
BC-Active coping	Val.Mob.-Commitment	−.08	−.19	.71	.478	.952	.11 [−.19, .41]
BC-Active coping	STAI-Y1	.04	.10	−.37	.711	.952	.06 [−.24, .36]
BC-Active coping	STAI-Y2	.48	.42	.40	.687	.952	.06 [−.24, .36]
BC-Active coping	Val.Mob.-Total Score	.03	.09	−.35	.724	.952	.05 [−.24, .35]
BC-Active coping	BDI	−.08	−.18	.62	.536	.952	.09 [−.20, .39]
BC-Denial	BC-Substance use	.26	.07	1.25	.211	.788	.19 [−.11, .49]
BC-Denial	BC-Emotional support	.06	−.02	.52	.601	.952	.08 [−.22, .38]
BC-Denial	BC-Instrumental support	−.08	−.01	−.43	.670	.952	.07 [−.23, .36]

continued on next page

continued

Variable 1	Variable 2	*r* Males (n = 66)	*r* Females (n = 166)	*z*	*p*	adj–*p*	*d*
BC-Emotional support	Val.Mob.-Disqualification	−.10	.10	−1.28	.201	.788	.19 [−.10, . 49]
BC-Emotional support	Val.Mob.-Commitment	.14	.03	.72	.469	.952	.11 [−.19, .41]
BC-Emotional support	STAI-Y1	−.01	.06	−.39	.696	.952	.06 [−.24, .36]
BC-Emotional support	STAI-Y2	.23	.02	1.33	.182	.788	.20 [−.10, .50]
BC-Emotional support	Val.Mob.-Total Score	−.17	.13	−1.95	.051	.482	.30 [.00, .60]
BC-Emotional support	BDI	−.27	−.14	−.85	.394	.952	.13 [−.17, .43]
BC-Instrumental support	BC-Behavioral disengagement	−.29	−.15	−.89	.371	.952	.14 [−.16, .44]
BC-Instrumental support	BC-Venting	.56	.52	.38	.704	.952	.06 [−.24, .36]
BC-Instrumental support	BC-Positive reframing	.42	.22	1.40	.161	.780	.21 [−.09, .51]
BC-Instrumental support	BC-Planning	.39	.41	−.17	.865	.952	.03 [−.27, .32]
BC-Instrumental support	BC-Humor	−.03	.01	−.20	.841	.952	.03 [−.27, .33]
BC-Instrumental support	BC-Acceptance	.33	.12	1.40	.162	.780	.21 [−.09, .51]
BC-Instrumental support	BC-Religion	.05	.36	−2.00	.045	.482	.31 [.01, .60]
BC-Instrumental support	BC-Self-blame	.28	.33	−.29	.774	.952	.04 [−.26, .34]
BC-Instrumental support	Val.Mob.-Relationship	.13	−.19	2.02	.044	.482	.31 [.01, .61]
BC-Instrumental support	Val.Mob.-Intrusiveness	−.07	−.13	.38	.703	.952	.06 [−.24, .36]
BC-Instrumental support	Val.Mob.-Disqualification	−.19	.10	−1.84	.066	.534	.28 [−.02, .58]
BC-Instrumental support	Val.Mob.-Commitment	.04	.05	−.01	.989	.998	.00 [−.30, .30]
BC-Instrumental support	STAI-Y1	.00	.06	−.39	.700	.952	.06 [−.24, .36]
BC-Instrumental support	STAI-Y2	.39	−.05	2.92	.004	.255	.44 [.15, .74]
BC-Instrumental support	Val.Mob.-Total Score	−.21	.10	−1.96	.050	.482	.30 [.00, .60]

continued on next page

continued

Variable 1	Variable 2	*r* Males (n = 66)	*r* Females (n = 166)	*z*	*p*	adj–*p*	*d*
BC-Instrumental support	BDI	−.26	−.20	−.37	.714	.952	.06 [−.24, .35]
BC-Behavioral disengagement	BC-Venting	.14	−.17	2.00	.046	.482	.30 [.01, .60]
BC-Behavioral disengagement	BC-Positive reframing	.03	.01	.09	.925	.971	.01 [−.28, .31]
BC-Behavioral disengagement	BC-Planning	−.54	−.60	.51	.612	.952	.08 [−.22, .38]
BC-Behavioral disengagement	BC-Humor	.31	.42	−.76	.447	.952	.12 [−.18, .41]
BC-Behavioral disengagement	BC-Acceptance	−.06	−.11	.26	.793	.952	.04 [−.26, .34]
BC-Behavioral disengagement	BC-Religion	.32	.30	.10	.923	.971	.01 [−.28, .31]
BC-Behavioral disengagement	BC-Self-blame	−.03	−.02	−.05	.956	.978	.01 [−.29, .31]
BC-Behavioral disengagement	Val.Mob.-Relationship	.21	.44	−1.64	.100	.659	.25 [−.05, .55]
BC-Behavioral disengagement	Val.Mob.-Intrusiveness	−.13	−.15	.15	.879	.952	.02 [−.28, .32]
BC-Behavioral disengagement	Val.Mob.-Disqualification	.07	−.09	.99	.322	.942	.15 [−.15, .45]
BC-Behavioral disengagement	Val.Mob.-Commitment	−.06	.16	−1.43	.153	.780	.22 [−.08, .52]
BC-Behavioral disengagement	STAI-Y1	−.01	−.04	.19	.850	.952	.03 [−.27, .33]
BC-Behavioral disengagement	STAI-Y2	−.40	−.45	.37	.715	.952	.06 [−.24, .35]
BC-Behavioral disengagement	Val.Mob.-Total Score	.04	.05	−.09	.928	.971	.01 [−.29, .31]
BC-Behavioral disengagement	BDI	.11	.22	−.67	.502	.952	.10 [−.20, .40]
BC-Venting	BC-Positive reframing	.43	.09	2.34	.019	.396	.36 [.06, .66]
BC-Venting	BC-Planning	−.02	.37	−2.56	.010	.353	.39 [.09, .69]
BC-Venting	BC-Humor	.14	−.10	1.50	.134	.771	.23 [−.07, .53]
BC-Venting	BC-Acceptance	.29	.14	1.02	.306	.927	.16 [−.14, .45]
BC-Venting	BC-Religion	.14	.26	−.82	.415	.952	.12 [−.17, .42]

continued on next page

continued

Variable 1	Variable 2	*r* Males (n = 66)	*r* Females (n = 166)	*z*	*p*	adj–*p*	*d*
BC-Venting	BC-Self-blame	.28	.27	.05	.957	.978	.01 [–.29, .31]
BC-Venting	Val.Mob.-Relationship	.17	–.18	2.21	.027	.450	.34 [.04, .64]
BC-Venting	Val.Mob.-Intrusiveness	–.24	–.09	–.96	.338	.952	.15 [–.15, .44]
BC-Venting	Val.Mob.-Disqualification	–.11	.34	–2.85	.004	.255	.43 [.14, .73]
BC-Venting	Val.Mob.-Commitment	.19	.15	.27	.784	.952	.04 [–.26, .34]
BC-Venting	STAI-Y1	.05	.33	–1.83	.067	.534	.28 [–.02, .58]
BC-Venting	STAI-Y2	.05	.00	.29	.770	.952	.04 [–.25, .34]
BC-Venting	**Val.Mob.-Total Score**	**–.16**	**.45**	**–4.08**	**<.001**	**.011**	**.62 [.32, 92]**
BC-Venting	BDI	–.05	.17	–1.36	.175	.788	.21 [–.09, .51]
BC-Positive reframing	BC-Planning	–.13	.01	–.84	.399	.952	.13 [–.17, .43]
BC-Positive reframing	BC-Humor	.45	.39	.45	.654	.952	.07 [–.23, .37]
BC-Positive reframing	BC-Acceptance	.60	.55	.42	.675	.952	.06 [–.23, .36]
BC-Positive reframing	BC-Religion	.36	.19	1.16	.244	.868	.18 [–.12, .48]
BC-Positive reframing	BC-Self-blame	–.27	–.06	–1.33	.183	.788	.20 [–.10, .50]
BC-Positive reframing	Val.Mob.-Relationship	.12	.13	–.06	.950	.978	.01 [–.29, .31]
BC-Positive reframing	Val.Mob.-Intrusiveness	–.04	.22	–1.62	.106	.660	.25 [–.05, .55]
BC-Positive reframing	Val.Mob.-Disqualification	–.18	–.31	.84	.402	.952	.13 [–.17, .43]
BC-Positive reframing	Val.Mob.-Commitment	.04	.07	–.16	.873	.952	.02 [–.27, .32]
BC-Positive reframing	STAI-Y1	–.07	–.26	1.22	.223	.818	.19 [–.11, .48]
BC-Positive reframing	STAI-Y2	.13	.02	.70	.485	.952	.11 [–.19, .41]
BC-Positive reframing	Val.Mob.-Total Score	–.34	–.39	.43	.669	.952	.07 [–.23, .36]
BC-Positive reframing	BDI	–.38	–.41	.20	.838	.952	.03 [–.27, .33]
BC-Planning	BC-Humor	–.41	–.29	–.88	.380	.952	.13 [–.17, .43]

continued on next page

continued

Variable 1	Variable 2	*r* Males (n = 66)	*r* Females (n = 166)	*z*	*p*	adj–*p*	*d*
BC-Planning	BC-Acceptance	.04	.16	−.81	.416	.952	.12 [−.17, .42]
BC-Planning	BC-Religion	−.32	−.18	−.91	.364	.952	.14 [−.16, .44]
BC-Planning	BC-Self-blame	.35	.40	−.41	.683	.952	.06 [−.24, .36]
BC-Planning	Val.Mob.-Relationship	−.19	−.45	1.85	.064	.534	.28 [−.02, .58]
BC-Planning	Val.Mob.-Intrusiveness	.04	.01	.15	.882	.952	.02 [−.28, .32]
BC-Planning	Val.Mob.-Disqualification	.03	.10	−.44	.662	.952	.07 [−.23, .37]
BC-Planning	Val.Mob.-Commitment	−.11	−.04	−.40	.690	.952	.06 [−.24, .36]
BC-Planning	STAI-Y1	.08	.09	−.09	.929	.971	.01 [−.29, .31]
BC-Planning	STAI-Y2	.42	.41	.10	.922	.971	.01 [−.28, .31]
BC-Planning	Val.Mob.-Total Score	.14	.16	−.17	.869	.952	.03 [−.27, .32]
BC-Planning	BDI	−.02	−.16	.84	.404	.952	.13 [−.17, .43]
BC-Humor	BC-Acceptance	.27	.12	1.03	.304	.927	.16 [−.14, .46]
BC-Humor	BC-Religion	.25	.18	.49	.625	.952	.07 [−.22, .37]
BC-Humor	BC-Self-blame	−.40	−.02	−2.52	.012	.353	.38 [.09, .68]
BC-Humor	Val.Mob.-Relationship	.16	.25	−.60	.549	.952	.09 [−.21, .39]
BC-Humor	Val.Mob.-Intrusiveness	.15	.09	.33	.738	.952	.05 [−.25, .35]
BC-Humor	Val.Mob.-Disqualification	−.34	−.34	.00	.999	.999	.00 [−.30, .30]
BC-Humor	Val.Mob.-Commitment	.05	.25	−1.33	.183	.788	.20 [−.10, .50]
BC-Humor	STAI-Y1	−.36	−.31	−.38	.701	.952	.06 [−.24, .36]
BC-Humor	STAI-Y2	−.17	−.43	1.79	.074	.567	.27 [−.03, .57]
BC-Humor	Val.Mob.-Total Score	−.40	−.35	−.36	.717	.952	.06 [−.24, .35]
BC-Humor	BDI	−.42	−.31	−.84	.403	.952	.13 [−.17, .43]
BC-Acceptance	BC-Religion	.19	−.04	1.47	.140	.780	.22 [−.07, .52]

continued on next page

continued

Variable 1	Variable 2	*r* Males (n = 66)	*r* Females (n = 166)	*z*	*p*	adj–*p*	*d*
BC-Acceptance	BC-Self-blame	−.14	−.02	−.79	.432	.952	.12 [−.18, . 42]
BC-Acceptance	Val.Mob.-Relationship	.10	.04	.35	.723	.952	.05 [−.24, .35]
BC-Acceptance	**Val.Mob.-Intrusiveness**	**−.17**	**.42**	**−3.83**	**<.001**	**.015**	**.58 [.29, .88]**
BC-Acceptance	Val.Mob.-Disqualification	−.12	−.24	.80	.425	.952	.12 [−.18, .42]
BC-Acceptance	Val.Mob.-Commitment	.07	−.01	.53	.596	.952	.08 [−.22, .38]
BC-Acceptance	STAI-Y1	.05	−.25	1.95	.051	.482	.30 [.00, .60]
BC-Acceptance	STAI-Y2	.17	.28	−.73	.468	.952	.11 [−.19, .41]
BC-Acceptance	Val.Mob.-Total Score	−.21	−.25	.29	.775	.952	.04 [−.26, .34]
BC-Acceptance	BDI	−.29	−.29	−.01	.993	.998	.00 [−.30, .30]
BC-Religion	BC-Self-blame	−.20	.16	−2.29	.022	.396	.35 [.05, .65]
BC-Religion	Val.Mob.-Relationship	.02	.12	−.66	.511	.952	.10 [−.20, .40]
BC-Religion	Val.Mob.-Intrusiveness	−.02	−.12	.62	.538	.952	.09 [−.20, .39]
BC-Religion	Val.Mob.-Disqualification	−.06	.08	−.86	.392	.952	.13 [−.17, .43]
BC-Religion	Val.Mob.-Commitment	.07	.19	−.78	.437	.952	.12 [−.18, .42]
BC-Religion	STAI-Y1	−.02	.03	−.25	.801	.952	.04 [−.26, .34]
BC-Religion	STAI-Y2	−.07	−.23	1.03	.304	.927	.16 [−.14, .46]
BC-Religion	Val.Mob.-Total Score	.02	.12	−.63	.532	.952	.10 [−.20, .39]
BC-Religion	BDI	−.03	.07	−.63	.526	.952	.10 [−.20, .40]
BC-Religion	Val.Mob.-Relationship	−.04	−.20	1.06	.291	.927	.16 [−.14, .46]
BC-Self-blame	Val.Mob.-Intrusiveness	−.36	−.31	−.33	.738	.952	.05 [−.25, .35]
BC-Self-blame	Val.Mob.-Disqualification	−.06	.13	−1.25	.211	.788	.19 [−.11, .49]
BC-Self-blame	Val.Mob.-Commitment	−.01	.07	−.50	.617	.952	.08 [−.22, .38]

continued on next page

continued

Variable 1	Variable 2	*r* Males (n = 66)	*r* Females (n = 166)	*z*	*p*	adj–*p*	*d*
BC-Self-blame	STAI-Y1	.12	.16	–.23	.816	.952	.04 [–.26, .33]
BC-Self-blame	STAI-Y2	.16	.00	1.02	.309	.927	.16 [–.14, .45]
BC-Self-blame	Val.Mob.-Total Score	.36	.35	.02	.983	.998	.00 [–.30, .30]
BC-Self-blame	BDI	.37	.28	.64	.522	.952	.10 [–.20, .40]
Val.Mob.-Relationship	Val.Mob._ Intrusiveness	.12	.24	–.76	.450	.952	.12 [–.18, .41]
Val.Mob.-Relationship	Val.Mob.- Disqualification	–.29	–.26	–.18	.859	.952	.03 [–.27, .33]
Val.Mob.-Relationship	Val.Mob.- Commitment	.02	–.10	.80	.425	.952	.12 [–.18, .42]
Val.Mob.-Relationship	STAI-Y1	–.23	–.31	.53	.594	.952	.08 [–.22, .38]
Val.Mob.-Relationship	STAI-Y2	–.28	–.35	.52	.605	.952	.08 [–.22, .38]
Val.Mob.-Relationship	Val.Mob.-Total Score	–.28	–.22	–.39	.693	.952	.06 [–.24, .36]
Val.Mob.-Relationship	BDI	–.14	–.01	–.85	.396	.952	.13 [–.17, .43]
Val.Mob.-Relationship	Val.Mob.- Disqualification	–.29	–.33	.24	.808	.952	.04 [–.26, .34]
Val.Mob.-Relationship	Val.Mob.- Commitment	–.36	–.23	–.88	.376	.952	.13 [–.16, .43]
Val.Mob._Intrusiveness	STAI-Y1	–.34	–.30	–.25	.804	.952	.04 [–.26, .34]
Val.Mob._Intrusiveness	STAI-Y2	.09	.04	.28	.783	.952	.04 [–.26, .34]
Val.Mob._Intrusiveness	Val.Mob.-Total Score	–.42	–.45	.22	.823	.952	.03 [–.26, .33]
Val.Mob._Intrusiveness	BDI	–.45	–.42	–.25	.806	.952	.04 [–.26, .34]
Val.Mob.- Disqualification	Val.Mob.- Commitment	.46	.41	.44	.662	.952	.07 [–.23, .37]
Val.Mob.- Disqualification	STAI-Y1	.77	.80	–.42	.675	.952	.06 [–.23, .36]
Val.Mob.- Disqualification	STAI-Y2	–.30	–.25	–.37	.711	.952	.06 [–.24, .36]
Val.Mob.- Disqualification	Val.Mob.-Total Score	.49	.74	–2.52	.012	.353	.38 [.09, .68]
Val.Mob.- Disqualification	BDI	.44	.58	–1.18	.238	.859	.18 [–.12, .48]

continued on next page

continued

Variable 1	**Variable 2**	***r* Males** (n = 66)	***r* Females** (n = 166)	*z*	*p*	**adj–*p***	*d*
Val.Mob.-Commitment	STAI-Y1	.35	.21	.92	.360	.952	.14 [–.16, .44]
Val.Mob.-Commitment	STAI-Y2	–.36	–.42	.43	.668	.952	.07 [–.23, .36]
Val.Mob.-Commitment	Val.Mob.-Total Score	.22	.25	–.18	.855	.952	.03 [–.27, .33]
Val.Mob.-Commitment	BDI	.18	.12	.40	.691	.952	.06 [–.24, .36]
STAI-Y1	STAI-Y2	.01	–.11	.75	.451	.952	.11 [–.18, .41]
STAI-Y1	Val.Mob.-Total Score	.46	.68	–2.11	.035	.482	.32 [.02, .62]
STAI-Y1	BDI	.49	.58	–.77	.444	.952	.12 [–.18, .42]
STAI-Y2	Val.Mob.-Total Score	.00	–.12	.77	.443	.952	.12 [–.18, .42]
STAI-Y2	BDI	–.06	–.03	–.16	.875	.952	.02 [–.27, .32]
Val.Mob.-Total Score	BDI	.77	.75	.37	.712	.952	.06 [–.24, .36]

Legenda. BC = Brief COPE; Val.Mob. = Val.Mob. scale; STAY-Y1 = State Anxiety; STAY-Y2 = Trait Anxiety; BDI = B*eck Depression Inventory*.
Note. Bolded rows indicate significant comparisons at adjusted p<.05.