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**7.1. Women as crew members onboard ships**

Literature abounds in concepts describing the "odyssey" of the woman's pathway - leader to top hierarchical positions in contemporary organizations, even in the naval industry. Systematically studying effective gender leadership in modern organizations, Curşeu and Boroş (2008, p. 127) catalogue and enumerate gender-related concepts in leadership such as: glass ceiling (Singh and Vinnicombe, 2004), the glass elevator (glass elevator - Williams, 1992), the glass cliff (Ryan and Haslam, 2005).

The most common such concept is the one that mentions the possibility of women's ascension to leadership positions only up to a certain point.

This concept emerged from the statistical analyses of the "glass ceiling“ - the presence of women in the executive boards of companies highlights an upward trend in female presence from the 1970s to the present, but only for the average positions of the organizational hierarchy(Singh și Vinnicombe, 2004). The explanations of this phenomenon has its roots in the way women are, considering that there are differences between them and men in terms of the final outcome and value attached to work, the competitive spirit (women being less competitive than men) or obstacles to on training (participation in fewer trainings due to family obligations - Kaplan - Leiserson, 2003). The same authors conducted a study among high school l students in the US, showing that 90% of girls think they will only work to support their family while only 10% plan to have a career.

Evidence of career planning is contradictory, with some studies claiming that women do not have a well-established career plan while other studies show that this is just a stereotype without coverage. In the public arena, these arguments regarding the intrinsic differences between men and women have been repeatedly mentioned. Notable is the intervention by Lawrence H. Summers, Harvard University President, who on January 14, 2005, used the argument of clear gender differences in work-related values, as well as a series of skills and personality traits in order to explain the under-representation of women in different managerial positions at the Conference on Diversifying the Science and Engineering Workforce. His arguments, although statistically grounded, were not well received by public opinion, and after a series of public protests, Summers resigned from office, being replaced by Drew Faust, the first woman president in the history of this university.

Other approaches place the barriers that prevent women from climbing up the hierarchical scale at the organizational, cultural or behavioral level. (Singh and Vinnicombe, 2004).

At the organizational level, the barriers relate to informal promotion and public undeclared processes (Alimo - Metcalfe, 1995, Curseu and Boroş, 2008), lack of a clear career development perspective (Ragins et al., 1998, Boroş, 2008) and the remuneration systems that disadvantage women, being less paid than others. (Oakley, 2000, Curceu and Boroş, 2008).

**Cultural barriers** refer to gender stereotypes in leadership where men are perceived as more effective.

**Behavioral barriers** refer to the fact that women seem to be deficient in managing impressions through strategies such as: publicly stating their own ambitions and achievements, building friendly relationships with hierarchical superiors and key people in the organization, ensuring visibility of their own performance and loyalty to the organization (Singh and Vinnicombe, 2004, Curseu and Boroş, 2008).

Women also prefer experiential learning to the formal one, which may be an alternative explanation for lower adherence to formal trainings. Another negative at the behavioral level is the absence of female role models, which causes a vicious circle of non-promotion: there are no women in high positions, so they have no models from which to learn, and this reduces their ability to promote in their career.

However, analysing the profile of the successful woman (who has a training, experience and superior results over male colleagues in the detriment of which she obtained the position of manager - Singh and Vinnicombe, 2004, Curseu and Boroş, 2008), we will notice that access to positions women's leadership is much more difficult and does not depend on their training or inferior abilities, but on gender stereotypes that lead to their discrimination when it comes to promoting them. The arising question is about the cause that leads to the perpetuation of these stereotypes within a community and makes them so resilient to change.

One of the most pertinent explanations refers to the theory of social identity - a psychosocial theory that elaborates on the issue of the development and perpetuation of stereotypes applicable to gender stereotypes in the Leadership. The theory of social identity focuses on the collective action generated by the development and activation of a group identity. The gender stereotypes in leadership and the non-promotion of women in top hierarchical positions are explained in the literature (Singh and Vinnicombe, 2004 apud. Curşeu and Boroş, 2008, p. 129) in the following sequence: members of the management committees of the companies (the majority being men) define their group identity on several dimensions chosen according to their relevance (top leaders / managers, professionals) and their accessibility (gender variable). This generates so-called in-group favouritism and out-of-group discrimination.

The theory of social identity also details the mechanisms by which these stereotypes act with their own logic and thus manage to perpetuate independently of the objective reality. In the case of women's access to higher hierarchical functions, this is done in three ways (Curşeu and Boroş, 2008).

A first way involves a selection of new members so that group identity does not suffer and women are perceived as outsiders threatening the male identity of the group.

A second way refers to the favouritism shown in the group in the sense of over-evaluating their qualities and achievement. This seems to be one of the reasons why women who manage to break through the glass ceiling have some qualities and training superior than their male colleagues. Other manifestations of this favoritism refer to the high demand for women's performance, the acceptance of a smaller number of mistakes on their part and the more demanding testing compared to men in various situations.

Finally, a third way involves creating and perpetuating stereotypes about out-of-group members. In general, the content of the gender stereotype about women is cantered on the fact that they are weaker, more emotional, less prepared, less rational, essentially less able to cope with leading position than men.

Another phenomenon gaining ground in the literature is called “the glass cliff" (by two British researchers Ryan and Haslam, 2005) and seeks explanations about the times and circumstances in which women can still reach in top hierarchical positions. The hypotheses advanced by the authors are that women manage to break the "glass ceiling" only when the management position is precarious, involves risks and poor chances of success in a company in crisis. This phenomenon has been called "glass cliff". Explications of this phenomenon and empirical evidence are often contradictory, suggesting that women could get into these positions because they might prefer them as an opportunity to show what they are capable of, or simply they no dot strive too hard to avoid them.

However, a series of experimental studies have argued that the "glass cliff" is due to a “think crisis - think woman" type of perception, and not to a propensity of women for precarious leadership positions. Explanations can range from hostile sexism (women are called in such positions by misogynist men who want to see them fail) or benevolent (women are given a favour to demonstrate their leadership skills) to favour the in-group by the male leaders who maintain their better positions, giving women the most problematic positions, in order to maintain the status quo of power.

Curseu and Boroş (2008) inventory some illustrative studies regarding gender-based leadership behaviour by Bass and Avolio (1992, 1994), Druskat (1994), Maher (1997) Carles (1998). Bass and Avolio demonstrate that female managers are more focused on establishing and maintaining interpersonal relationships than on achieving actual tasks, and adopt more often a transformative leadership style compared to men, while men tend to adopt a transactional leadership style.

A study that brings important contributions to clarifying the differences identified in the leadership style adopted by women compared to men is the meta-analysis conducted by Eagly and Johnson (1990). This meta-analysis includes 162 studies addressing gender-based leadership and concluded that women adopt a style of leadership that is more geared towards establishing and maintaining interpersonal relationships while men's leadership style is being more geared towards achieving tasks.

Also, the meta-analysis carried out by the two authors highlights the fact that the leadership style adopted by women was assessed as more democratic and participative compared to the male leadership style that was rated as more autocratic and more direct.

On the other hand, empirical studies reveal the development, perpetuation and consolidation of stereotypical representations related to managerial skills or managerial efficiency, namely: "the characteristics associated with successful managers are more akin to the characteristics associated with the general portrait of a man than those associated with the portrait of a woman. In general, women are assessed as having inferior managerial skills than men and significantly lower efficiency than men in their leadership activities."(Curşeu and Boroş, 2008, p. 144)

These differences identified in the leadership style approached by women compared to those of men were attributed to the differences between the two genres in terms of emotional involvement in the establishment of interpersonal relationships. Thus, women who are more inclined to emotionally engage in interpersonal relationships, offer emotional support, and support the personal development of those in their social network, will be more democratic with their subordinates. (Bass and Avolio, 1992; Druskat, 1994; Eagly and Karau, 2002; Curseu and Boroş (2008).

In the same manner, the literature also reports other concordant results, namely that women in leading positions are much more geared towards the socio-emotional side of the group life while men in leading positions are more oriented towards action and leading the group towards achieving goals. We can say that these results are consistent with the predictions of the expectation theory for social roles. This theory is inspired by the general theories of social roles explaining individual behavior in social situations as a result of socially shared expectations for the role a person has. (for example, from parents there is expected a clear behavioural set in relation to children.) Eagly and Karau (2002) argue that such role expectations are also associated with gender differences as well as with managerial or management positions. In other words, at a social level, there are expectations on how a man or woman behaves in social situations. In general, behavioural expectations shared at the social level relative to the role of "woman" are: affectionate, offering support, empathetic, oriented to interpersonal relationships, sensitive to the needs of others, gentle, compassionate. As far as the category of men is concerned, the defining characteristics are: assertive, active, dominant, strong, self-confident, ambitious, independent, self-centred, aggressive and control-oriented. This explanatory approach advocates that the predominant orientation of women-leaders towards the employees and men-leaders towards the goal is in concordance with the role expectations shared at a social level for men and women. Eagly and Karau, 2002, Curseu and Boroş, 2008, p. 147).

Moreover, this theory of expectation of role also explains the discrimination of women who want to become leaders. There are also a number of shared features regarding the role of manager or leader. The requirements and constraints associated with the role of leader as a shared social representation are: competitive, self-confident, objective, aggressive, ambitious, capable to lead others. It is therefore obvious that there is an inconsistency between the characteristics that describe a typical woman and the characteristics assigned to the social role of the leader. The human cognitive system is sensitive to these inconsistencies and the decisional behavior is influenced by the principle of consistency between the expectations regarding social roles. Behaviors of discrimination and disadvantage of women compared to men as regards the particular situation of leader function can be explained by these inconsistencies. (Eagly and Karau, 2002, apud. Curceu and Boroş, 2008, p. 147)

In summary, in the approach proposed by Curseu and Boroş (2008) based on meta-analyzes in the literature, as well as on the researches made by the authors on the Romanian population, a review was made on the theories that touch this issue either in the form of gender stereotypes and sexual discrimination, or in the study of gender differences in behavior and leadership styles. Following the predictions of these theories on research by the authors, they described a picture of female managers in society stating that: "The stereotype of the female manager in society is centered on three elements: the relationship with the subordinates, the relationship and the interaction between the profession and family as well as resistance to tension and challenges. These stereotypical contents are more pronounced in the post-1989 period, the content of shared social representations about female managers being strongly influenced during the communist era of egalitarian propaganda. In general, female managers in the society are more oriented than men towards establishing and maintaining positive interpersonal relations at the workplace and less oriented towards contingency management as a result of the fulfilling or not of the work tasks. The effective management of gender diversity in modern organizations should include promoting women's top hierarchical positions not only by virtue of the legislation that prohibits discrimination, but by the real contribution that women can have to organizational development through attributes that characterize their leadership style.

An interesting perspective through its specificity is offered by the psychosocial approach of the small group problem, analogous to the naval crew, as a living system that constantly adapts to the demanding professional activities, to the perception of internal interactions, to the particular and risky conditions of the environment. Being the reference framework in which interpersonal relationships are formed and unfolded, it will only be mentioned a few particularities of the naval crew:

* the term "restricted" does not necessarily refer to the number of members as a small or large group, but to a professional type association in a special place - on board ships - for a certain period of time;
* the interaction between group members is centred and oriented towards the realization of the common goal, subordinated to the functional rules and procedures of the crew.
* the stages of group development on board may be similar to those described by *Tuckman's model* (De Visscher, p. 292): forming, storming, norming, performing - motivationally supported by psychological, social, material needs and professional achievement; not characterized by historicity, there is a greater number of errors in the interpersonal perception mediated by the awarding processes, each member of the forming group having idiosyncrasies, attitudes, behaviours, shaped by personal equations and their own cultural identities;
* there is a well-articulated structure of related statuses and roles, in line with the organization chart and standard procedures defining work tasks through division of labour;

- there is some pressure towards uniformity, unity, facilitated by a mosaic of socio-affective linkages generated by *'face to face*' relationships and the type of leadership practiced;

* the existence of a certain maritime tradition that transcends the culture, the common objectives and the nature of the activities specific to the missions to be fulfilled, those of safety and efficiency;
* there are multi-ethnic, multicultural, multigenerational social micro-groups that learn to develop partner relational grids, to accept the other's alterity and "*dialogue*" with difference, respecting the norms, values, traditions, dominant patterns of the other’s culture without axiological or evaluative connotation;

The training and development stages of the naval crew as a social microgroup may be described by *Tuckman's model* (De Visscher, p.292.): forming, storming, norming, performing.

1. a stage of formation (forming) manifested on the level of relationships, through dependence and critical attitudes and, in the task plane, through orientation activities;

2. a tumultuous stage (storming) which takes the form of interpersonal conflicts and emotional reactions to the demands of task;

3. a norming stage(norming) manifested through the interpersonal cohesion of the group and a free exchange of views on the task;

4. an acting stage (performing) considered as a stage of maturity. It involves the recognition of functional roles on the interpersonal level and it is characterized by the emergence of solutions in the task plane.

Regardless of the membership to a formal work structure, a temporary task group or a virtual team, we need to know that the group is going through different stages of its life cycle. Moreover, depending on the development stage of the group has reached, the leader and members may face different attempts.

**1. Forming**

At this stage of forming, the main concern is the initial entry of group members. At this stage, individuals ask themselves a series of questions as they begin to identify with other members of the group and with the group. Their concerns may include "What can the group give me?", "What could my contribution be or what will I be asked?", "Can my needs be fulfilled while making a contribution to the group?" Members are interested in knowing each other and discovering what is considered acceptable behaviour. At the same time, they seek to determine the real tasks of the group and define objectives and norms. Thus, group members:

- are slightly to moderately motivated;

- have generally positive expectations about the results they will get;

- show some anxiety and concern about the cause they are there for, what they will get, what the goals stated in front of the group mean for them, what will they do, what the leader will do, what they are competent for;

- are dependent on authority;

The activity of the group is characterized by:

- low to moderate of task fulfilling;

- energy is focused on defining the goals, on how to approach them and on the necessary skills/competences;  
With simple and easy to define tasks, the stage of forming will be short and distinct, requiring about 5-10% of the total time. In teams with complex goals and tasks, this stage may range up to 30-60% of the time involved.

**2. Storming**

The storming stage is an emotionally charged and tension-filled period for group members. During this stage hostilities and some struggles may occur, and the group experiences many changes. Coalitions can form as individuals struggle to impose their preferences on their group or to achieve the desired position. Outside requirements, including premature expectations for performance, can create less comfortable pressures. In this process, the expectations of members tend to be clarified and attention is directed to the obstacles that may stand in the way of meeting the group's objectives. Individuals begin to understand their personal styles of work and strive to find ways to achieve the group's goals and meet personal needs at the same time. The conflict at this stage must be managed in such a way that the energy, the engaging and reluctant attitudes are guided in the sense of going forward to achieve the goals.

Group members:

- feel a certain discrepancy between the initial hopes and expectations and the real situation;

- become dissatisfied with dependence on authority;

- often have feelings of frustration or anger in connection with the group's goals and aspirations;

- may have negative reactions to the manager or other members of the group;

- often have feelings of incompetence or confusion;

Group activity:

- can be interrupted by negative feelings;

- reflects a slight progress in achieving the task and in developing skills/competencies.

Some groups may be blocked at this stage, continuing to be both demoralized and relatively unproductive. It may happen that some members leave the group.

**3. Norming**

The normalization stage, sometimes called *initial integration*, is the point where the group really begins to be together as a coordinated unit. It is the stage of forming and increasing the cohesion of the group, the spirit of communion. Clear connection rules are established and positive feelings of responsibility, cooperative behaviours are reinforced. The disorder of the previous stage has removed that precarious balance of forces. With a new sense of harmony, the members of the group will try to maintain the positive balance. Keeping the group together can sometimes become more important than working successfully on the group's tasks. Minority views, deviations from group direction and criticism can be discouraged as group members experience proximity. Some members will mistakenly perceive this stage as one of full maturity. In fact, this is just the beginning for the next higher level of group development.

Group members:

- are less dissatisfied as the modes of cooperation become clearer;

- cancel the differences between the initial expectation and the reality related to the goals, tasks and personal and group skills;

- lessen the animosity towards other members or the manager;

- develop feelings of mutual respect, harmony, trust, etc., which increase the cohesion of the group;

- feel pleasure in accomplishing the task, a pleasure that starts to dominate the previous negative feelings;

- it begins to feel self-esteem about the membership of the group and the realization of the task.

Group activity:

- it is slightly enhanced as skills, competences and understanding develop;

- is stimulated by the positive feelings of members.

This stage may be very short (almost non-existent) or very long.

**4. Performing** (realization, performance)

The achievement stage, also called *total integration*, marks the emergence of a mature, organized and well-functioning group. The group is able to perform complex work tasks and solve internal disagreements in creative ways. The structure of the group is stable and the members are motivated by the objectives of the group. The main challenges are the improvement of the relationship and the performance of the group. Group members must be able to adapt successfully as opportunities and requirements change over time. A group that has reached this level of development will meet maturity criteria.

Group members:

- have positive feelings of satisfaction for group membership;

- work well together and accept the nature of their relationship;

- feel autonomous: do not feel dependent on the designated leader;

- recognize, support and come forward to the skills and achievements of others;

- focuses their energy rather on the realization of the task than on dissatisfaction and resistance;

- relate to each other or to the group in terms of complementary tasks and interpersonal support.

Group activity:

- is stimulated by the reward of a well-done job and group cohesion;

- it is easier, more efficient and more rewarding with a continuous development of abilities, knowledge and trust.

This stage continues, with moderate fluctuations in the feelings of satisfaction, to the final stage or until the end of the group's activity.

**5. Dissolution**

A well-integrated group is able to demobilize at a certain time if this is necessary or if the task has been performed. The dissolution stage is especially important for groups that have a temporary existence and are more and more common at work. The members of these groups must gather quickly, do their job within a defined time frame and then dissolve, with the possibility to reunite if necessary. The desire of members to demobilize when the task is over and to be able to work well in the future is an important test for the success of the group.

**7.2. Mentoring Guide. Obstacles of women insertion onboard the ships**

Multiculturalism is a general feature of today's crews and plays an important role. Approximately 70-80% of the world's commercial fleet has multicultural crews. Multicultural crews and a possible lack of common language have generated a growing concern of crew competence. The globalization has also led to major changes to ownership, because the shipping companies are growing internationally. Ideally, this could lead to a more organized training of professionals’ crews of all grades and nationalities.

From a systemic perspective, the term "*optimal health of organizational systems*" is increasingly used, highlighting a number of beneficial factors which fortify it as well as other harmful factors that make it fragile:

- the conditions of the social environment, an environment and a working climate conducive to the achievement of high performance and adequate satisfaction, corroborated with the organizational climate, the role of employee morale, the degree of satisfaction and psychological well-being, plus the influence of organizational culture on behaviours in work environment.

- the impact of phenomena and factors such as stress, discrimination of all kinds (professional, religious, racial), sexual harassment, interpersonal or intragroup conflicts. [Zlate, 2007, p. 626]

A healthy organizational environment is defined by high productivity, a great satisfaction of the employees against the conditions of their work, the existence of securing contexts, a limited number of leaving the workplace, a small number of absences, high yield. [Quick, 1999]

The issues of organizational systems’ health, especially of work systems within them, mainly formed by people, work tasks, conditions and constraints of the environment (physical and social) are being joined with medicine, social psychology, psychopathology. [Zlate, 2007, p. 560]. The same author makes a synthesis of the complex and varied concepts involved, grouping them into two main categories:

* those that revolve around the work – of its conditions and constraints – as possible pathogenic sources, which led to the prefiguration of work psychopathology which presupposes, above all, the awareness of the causal links between work activity and health or mental illness of the individual; *Dejours* (1987, p. 729) finds the phrase “man’s *psychopathology at work*" more appropriate, showing that the term "*psychopathology*" does not refer to mental pathology, namely to mental illness, but to the study of psychic mechanisms put into operation individually and collectively by the workers.
* those that revolve around organizations, factors and conditions of the organizational environment as a source of psycho-behavioural disorders, which contributed to the appearance of organizational pathology/psychopathology.

Summarizing, *Zlate* (2007, p. 564) states that the notion of organizational pathology/psychopathology can be defined in two distinct ways:

* broadly, designates organizational dysfunctions that create, accelerate and accentuate organizational risks; in this case, although organizations continue to act, sometimes even successfully, they contain disruptive elements that may worsen. This sense can be illustrated with phenomena such as: organizational stress, burnout, workaholism, mobbing. Depending on the extension and intent of expression and manifestation, they severely affect the climate and organizational efficiency.
* in a narrow sense, organizational pathology designates neurotic organizational manifestations that derive from the predominant neurotic style of the leader, in the pathological characteristics (neurotic psycho-behavioural dysfunctions) of the dominant group within the organization, in particular of the leadership group that is distributed throughout the organization. Here, relevant phenomena are: discrimination, stereotypes, bias, sexual harassment.

These aspects of organizational pathology are disadaptive phenomena in exercising leadership in maritime organizational environments that influence not only the personal life of crew members but also their socio-professional life. They affect the working capacity of the crew members regardless of their gender, formal or informal relationships between them or subjective well-being, and, above all, affect their labor efficiency. Over time, the organization transforms itself from a healthy and efficient one into a sick, morbid and totally unproductive one.

**7.2.1. Mobbing**

The concept of *mobbing* was launched in work and organizational environments by *Heinz Leymann*, Ph.D. in labor psychology, a professor at the University of Stockholm. Aware of the problems of the professional environment, counsellor and psychotherapist in organizational environments, *Leymann* has noticed the existence and action of phenomena such as injustice, denigration, rights violation, psychological harassment, aggression that affect people at work, facts that generate important personal and also organizational level prejudices ranging from simple injury or isolation in the group to suicide. All of these have been reunited under the term *mobbing*. [Zlate, 2007, p. 627-630]

Through *mobbing*, the author does not understand what *Konrad Lorenz* understood, which used the term for the first time (attacks of a smaller group of animals against a single larger animal) or what *Heineman* understood through this term (aggressive behaviours of a small group of children orientated against one child). *Leymann* is closer to the conception of *Dan Olweus* (1993) who studied the phenomena arising in the context of victimizing school children and which he calls by the term of *bullying*. It refers to repeated and long-term negative actions exercised by one or more persons on one or other persons. Negative actions are those that injure, hurt or intimidate another person (schoolchildren) through physical, verbal, gesture or mimic touch. *Leymann* preserves the term *mobbing* for aggressive psychological actions exerted in organizational environments on people at work.

"*By mobbing we understand a communicative situation that threatens to cause serious physical and mental harm to the individual. Mobbing is a process of destruction; it is constituted by hostile actions which, taken in isolation, may seem anode, but by constant repetition they have dangerous effects.*“ [Leymann, 1990, p. 26-27]

Only hostile, aggressive situations involving confrontations, moral maltreatments, contempt of personality, emotional harassment or mockery fall into the sphere of mobbing, which are systematically and prolonged, becoming painful and even destructive. So, frequency and repetition over time allow such actions to become destructive in psychological, psychosomatical and social level, and are considered to be "*psychic terror at work*" with unprecedentedly large personal and organizational effects. Sometimes, *mobbing* is interpersonal, but most often it locates at group level – not only does an individual terrorizes another person or even a whole group, but also the group can terrorize individuals, taken as a stand-alone entity, and by extension, the entire organization, with all its roots of statutes and roles, of hierarchies.

*Mobbing* is practiced throughout and across the entire organization: descendant, ascendant, horizontal or combined, taking place between colleagues, subordinates, subordinates and their boss, between heads and subordinates, running on an interpersonal level, group and even organizational. [Kovacs, 2008, p. 597]

In order to better understand the essence of *mobbing*, it is necessary to know the behaviours (actions, practices) that the aggressors use in relation to their victims. *Leymann* discovered (during 300 interviews) 45 such behaviours that were classified into five categories:

1. *actions aimed for preventing the victim from expressing himself/herself*: hierarchical superiors refuse victim’s opportunity to express themselves; the victim is constantly interrupted when he/she speaks; colleagues prevent the victim from expressing himself/herself; colleagues scream, offend the victim; the victim's work is criticized; criticizing the victim's private life; the victim is terrorized by phone calls; the victim is verbally threatened; threatening the victim in writing; denial of contact with the victim; ignoring the victim's presence.

2. *actions aimed for victim’s isolation: the victim is never spoken*; the victim is not allowed to address another person; the victim is assigned a job that removes and isolates him/her from colleagues; colleagues are forbidden to speak with the victim; the physical presence of the victim is denied.

3. *actions involving the victim's disregard in front of his/her colleagues*: the victim is spoken of evil or slandered; rumours are being reported to the victim; ridiculing the victim; it is claimed that the victim is mentally ill; constraining the victim to attend a psychiatric examination; a victim's infirmity is invented; the actions, the gestures, the voice of the victim are imitated to make it more ridiculous; the political or religious beliefs of the victim are attacked; jokes about the victim's private life; jokes about victim’s origin or nationality; the victim is obliged to accept humiliating activities; the unfair and unintentional marking of the victim's work; the victim's decisions are questioned or challenged; aggression of the victim in obscene or insulting terms; sexual harassment of the victim through gestures or suggestions.

4. *victim's professional discrepancy*: no tasks for the victim to be performed; depriving the victim of any occupation and watching the victim not to find any occupation on his/her own; entrusting unnecessary or absurd tasks; providing activities below the competencies; always assigning new tasks; imposing the execution of humiliating tasks; entrusting tasks that are superior to the victim’s qualifications to discredit him/her.

5. *compromising the victim's health*: entrusting dangerous and harmful tasks to victim’s health; physical violence, without aggravating circumstances, as a warning; physical aggression of the victim, without gravity, as a warning; serious physical aggression without restraint; causing inconvenience at home or at work; sexual assault of the victim. [Zlate, 2007, p. 631-633]

The 45 behaviours of the aggressor have a double meaning:

* they manage to better characterize *mobbing* in its vivid expression of current manifestation;
* they could be converted into a *mobbing* measurement instrument by operationalizing the concept. *Leymann* has built such tool, not yet validated, called LIPT (*Leymann Inventory of Psychological Terrorization*), which stood at the base of epidemiological studies.

In a larger plan, aggressive behaviours suggest the degree of gravity of *mobbing*. If it is caused by one or two of these behaviours, it could be less serious than if it is caused by more of them, possibly associated with each other. Critical criteria for identifying *mobbing* are defined by their frequency and duration of manifestation. *Leymann* has determined that such aggressive actions can only be considered mobbing-specific if they occur more than once a week over a period of more than 6 months as a threshold value.

The paradigm of mobbing, once launched, has come into the field of interest of researchers, under various names: bullying, harassment, workplace persecution, psycho terror, victimization, emotional abuse, psychological violence, moral harassment or interpersonal conflict.

Evolution in time of mobbing was conceived by *Leymann* in 4 phases:

1. The first phase consists of a series of **critical incidents**: opinion divergences, conflicts, struggle for power, some of which are solved by themselves, but others that degenerates into mobbing.
2. The second phase is characterized by the **increased frequency of hostile behaviours**, with the probability of multiplying practices and even the number of aggressors. At this stage there is a gradual installation of mobbing, the psychic balance of the victim begins to shake, the symptoms of stress and anxiety start to appear, the self-confidence decreases.
3. The third phase consist of **management acknowledgment** of the events and then attitudes manifestation ranging from non-involvement to leaving tensions to perpetuate the victim's attitude of condemnation; or the intervention occurs too late when the situation can no longer be controlled. Sometimes, mobbing can become a legal case and the victim's possibilities to defend himself/herself diminish further.
4. The fourth phase is the most traumatic and involves **stigmatization, social isolation** or even the removal of the victim from the workplace, which diminishes his/her chances of joining other organizations in other workplaces. The chances for the victim to be incorrectly diagnosed are high because there is a possibility that his/her story may not be believed or, because of commodity, the triggering social events are not investigated; examples of incorrect diagnosis: paranoia, maniac depression, character disorder. (Leymann, 1996) [Kovacs, 2008, p. 599] Of course, this step may be missing. In most cases, the victim leaves the organization discreetly, the management lacking a genuine feedback and not knowing the true reasons for employee’s leaving, which perpetuates the ignorance regarding harassment and amplifies its negative consequences. [Dinu, 2005]

Two features of this process must be retained:

* this is the typical evolution of *mobbing*, when no one intervenes to defuse explosive situations; on the contrary, harassment and persecution are practiced until the "*liquidation*" of the victim.
* such an evolution is not at all inevitable, on the contrary, it is enough to want it and it could take another turn. [Zlate, p. 635]

Causes that define such a complex phenomenon as *mobbing*:

* the appearance of mobbing is usually preceded by a conflict situation. It is interesting to find out what are the reasons that transform the conflict into a mobbing process. It should be noted that there is a wide range of prejudices that argue that the main cause of mobbing would be a specific type of personality/character of the victim. Numerous medical representatives refuse to admit that reactions or stress symptoms originate in the social structure of the group in which the victim of mobbing evolves.
* a number of researchers have undertaken impressive analyses trying to provide a firm answer to the issue of mobbing causality, but the existence of a certain type of individual prone to become the target of mobbing could not be confirmed in the research on employed persons.
* all cases of mobbing follow a systematic and double stereotyped process: social and psychological. The personality theories that guide the interpretative scenarios of the various social actors involved in the knowledge of mobbing do not have consistency and validity and sometimes they are not even credible. For example, it cannot be explained, by calling on the personality theories, why young employees are more often victims of mobbing, as no serious theory admits the radical transformation of personality with age. On the contrary, personality structures remain constant during life, without reserving surprises that can explain the power of differently affecting mobbing in relation to the two categories (young and elderly). Another argument against theories that involves the personality structure as a factor of mobbing is brought by clinic psychologists who show that post-traumatic stress disorder which frequently occurs in mobbing victims generates a series of major changes in personality. This indicates mobbing as a cause of major mental disorders and changes. [Zlate, p. 636-639]

Therefore, if the personality type of the victim is not intrinsically involved in the determination of mobbing, what would be the relevant explanatory factors? Research has shown that, in essence, the process of social marking and systematic destruction of the victim of mobbing is a **management problem**. Among the subjective factors that lead to the appearance of mobbing can be included the "*psychological labour contract*", which is in fact a subjective addition to the formal employment contract.

Employees and employer feed personal expectations whose disappointment is bitter. Three main factors can be distinguished:

**a. Organization of work**

Validation support has been taken from occupational health research that tracked psychosomatic issues in relation to certain stressors (causes). These causes would be specific to both psychosomatic issues and mobbing, which itself is a psychosomatic problem generator. Significant correlations have been found between well-defined work situations and the occurrence of psychosomatic diseases. Such situations, commonly encountered, are mainly represented by:

* 1. quantitative overloading of the job;
  2. qualitative sub-load;
  3. lack of clear rules and delimitations, interference of attributions.

It can be said that because of stressful situations, all work situations generate potentially conflicts, which in turn, through degeneration, can lead to an increased risks of mobbing.

**b. Design of tasks - source of mobbing**

Excessive operationalization of work has led to its impoverishment, becoming so stressful by its monotony and sub-intellectual character. Labour medicine has also found at this level significant correlations between monotony and certain psychosomatic disorders. In such working conditions, mobbing is most often a **mobbing of boredom/monotony/ subsistence**. The explanation lies in the fact that the aggressor usually chooses a colleague as a target only to occupy his/her spirit/mind to eliminate the unpleasant sensation of mental mood.

**c.** **Coordination and employee control/direction - another cause of mobbing**

There are a number of hierarchical superiors that, though surprisingly, through conscious behaviour, reduce employee performance. How is this possible? The answer sends us to the analysis of some style notes sometimes inappropriate in the manifestation/exercise of the statutory prerogatives of the leader in question. Most of them consider that organization management are immutable, and when the weakness of this organization manifests itself, they prefer to use force to reduce the tensions that have arisen instead of revising the structure and organization of work. The stiffening of style is in an anachronistic report with modern scientific suggestions in managerial literature. It addresses the human dimension of the organization, insisting on the necessity of a permanent, creative dialogue that allows the rapid discovery of problems and especially the design of the right solutions based on the experience of the workgroup. In essence, the manager/leader's inability to manage conflicts (translated through conflict neglect, his biased involvement in conflict, denial of conflict) is a ramp for launching mobbing at a group/organizational level. [Adams, 1992, p. 638]

These three factors (organization, design and coordination of work/activity) will condition the social capacity of the working group. It is necessary to take into account and actively integrate the elements of psychological specificity of the considered group, in order to prevent the emergence of negative behaviours that could degenerate into conflict/mobbing. Social groups differ greatly in terms of their specificity: some find their balance more easily when there is polarization, increased homogeneity of members' attitudes and opinions. However, they become quickly sensitive to attitudinal dispersion tendencies, exerting coercive pressure, which makes the individual in question to conform or to exclude himself/herself, becoming a "scapegoat". Self-exclusion, especially psychologically, is the result of the violation of group rules, especially informal ones. In this sense, mobbing appears most often as a break in the emotional balance of the group and as rebalancing is a managerial attribution, the emergence of mobbing illustrates the existence of deficiencies in the very "cortex" of the organization. The inability to jointly seek a solution to work problems and to consider other points of view is a crack in emphasizing the personalization of the conflict and the development of mobbing.

Considered by nature, the effects of mobbing affect 3 big plans:

**a. Psycho-individual plan**: mobbing directly affects the victim's psychophysical integrity with the following effects:

- anxiety, generalized anxiety with panic attack, obsessive-compulsive symptomatology, phobia;

- post-traumatic stress syndrome (PTSS): intense, cumulative damage with intrusive recurrent ideation;

- behavioural disorders: anorexia, bulimia, alcoholism, drug addiction, hetero-aggressivity;

- loss of motivation for professional activity;

- decreasing satisfaction, performance;

- early retirement;

- impairment of adaptability, socio-emotional balance, self-esteem, disinclination, socio-professional alienation.

The effects are highly destructive, affecting this plan being sufficient for a socioprofessional disability of the individual.

**b. At the level of the workgroup and organizational group**, mobbing translates into effects such as:

- degradation of professional relationships;

- impairing/degrading the quality of communication;

- lack of genuine mutual engagement and support;

- absenteeism;

- staff fluctuations;

- frequent sick leave;

- destructuring, asynergy.

Of course, all of this, translated into money or profit, is costly for the organization.

**c. At the societal level**, the effects of mobbing could be considered of second order because they are extensions of the previous effects, mediated by the plans corresponding to their manifestation. Therefore, mobbing is not only an individual, professional, organizational but also a social one, as it ultimately affects social equilibrium. On the one hand, the individual's ability to maintain and develop natural relationships with family, social group, social institutions is altered and on the other hand, through its protection institutions, the society has to pay extra for longer or shorter periods of unemployment, for psychosocial rehabilitation programs, to restore its own balance. [Zlate, 2007, pp. 639-640]

There are a number of specific measures to counteract mobbing, but when it comes to selecting appropriate methods/measures, it is necessary to know the actual stage of mobbing, as following:

1. **Prevention**

* one of the most desirable forms that should be practiced, as mobbing once installed is hard to assume that it will not leave psychological damage. In order to protect employees' work capacity, it is necessary to establish rules and procedures to prevent the escalation of conflict into dangerous situations. Sometimes it is almost enough if the employer proclaims that the escalation of any conflict seriously damages organization’s interests and that top management considers prevention as an important rule.
* another measure within the perimeter of prevention actions is the establishment of educational programs addressed to managers/leaders in particular. The training aims the formation of capacities to identify potential conflict-generating sources and, above all, the formation of solving skills when they have emerged. In addition, it is necessary to have clear procedures and rules for intervention when a conflict reaches critical odds.
* the series of preventive actions includes early managerial interventions. In order to intervene promptly, the manager must be able to "*read*" the first signs of development in the mobbing process. Top management must designate one or more individuals within the organization where employees in danger can call for advice. The authority should be delegated to these people so that their intervention is effective.

Preventing mobbing in the organization involves checking company issues, monitoring their dynamics and formulating ethical and behavioural norms.

**b. Reconciliation of parties** through a mediator specialist in this mobbing process. The mediation process is similar, almost symmetrical to that instituted in the context of organizational interpersonal conflicts.

**c. Vocational rehabilitation**. When the mobbing process has been installed, fact which is verified by its frequency and persistence, there are certain pieces of labor law that oblige the management to take notice and to design programs with individual addressability for the protection and psychosocial-professional rehabilitation of the victim's. In essence, it is intended to prevent employee stigmatization, preservation of reputation and previous skills.

**d. Victim legal rehabilitation** – a method used when all the other failed. In this situation, mobbing takes the form of a dispute solved according to the civil law methodology. [Zlate, 2007, p.641-642]

**7.2.2. Prejudice**

Studies on stereotypes, prejudices and discrimination can be framed, scientifically speaking, in the broader sphere of attitudes that, in the form of a well-coagulated set, form the character of the individual, expressing himself outward in the form of character traits. In general, addressing attitudes and, above all, changing attitudes, focuses on reporting the individual to a number of objects, phenomena and social processes (social attitudes) or social subjects considered individual (interpersonal attitudes) or social groups (intergroup attitudes).

In this sense, stereotypes, prejudices and discrimination are *different facets of inter-group attitudes*. The classic distinction between the cognitive, affective, behavioural/native elements of attitudes is found in the reactions of the individual confronted with social groups or individuals belonging to them. Thus, **the stereotype refers to cognitive dimension** or predominantly cognitive reporting to a group or its representative (declarative content of a group scheme), **the prejudice is mostly affective reporting to the affective dimension of a group** (affective engraving attached to the stereotype) and **discrimination refers to the behavioural consequences of stereotypes and prejudices**. (Fiske, 1998; Brewer and Crano, 1994, Nastas, 2003) [D. Nastas, 2003, pp. 256-257]

Origin and evolution/notions of "*stereotype*". The term "*stereotype*" has a considerable history, over 200 years. Initially, in 1798, it was proposed to identify the metallic shapes used to print typographical clichés. Etymologically, it is composed of two Greek words: *stereos* ("*rigid*") and *typos* ("*trace*"). The first to use this term were psychiatrists who used it in a slightly modified form, to describe the frequent and almost mechanical repetition of verbal gestures, posts or expressions. Currently, clinical psychologists and ethologists continue to use this term to refer to routine, rigid and repetitive behaviours. In the *Psychological Abstract* index, this term is presented as "*stereotyped behaviors*" while the social psychologists' vision corresponds to the "*stereotyped attitudes*" category. The first to use the term "*stereotype*" in the sense of social psychology was a famous American journalist, *Walter Lippman*. In 1922 he published the famous *Public Opinion* book, which offers several definitions of the concept, the most spoken of being that stereotypes are "*images in our minds*", being "*maps to guide us in the world*."

**a. Stereotype and prejudice/bias as elements of the group scheme**

As the progress of the cognitive perspective in social psychology has provided a universal language for the integration of various areas of social psychology and even of different disciplines (*Hamilton, Devine and Ostrom*, 1994), it is important to make use of this universal language when it comes to stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination. The concept which is the most conveyed in cognitive social psychology is the *scheme*. There are several categories of cognitive schemes, including *group schemes*. Thus, stereotypes and prejudices are elements of a group scheme: *the stereotype* is the declarative content of a group scheme, while *bias* is the affective engram that is supposed to be attached to the stereotype and which activates together with its cognitive content.

Relationships between the two components of the group scheme are not simple. So far, the data gathered is not enough to fully clarify how these components interact with each other. [D. Nastas, 2003, pp. 256-257]

**b. Prejudices and social stereotypes** are factors that mediate and condition, in certain situations, the formation of our system of representations about persons, groups, situations and social events. Prejudices, due to their a priori character and insufficiently substantiated logically and factually, but strongly affirmatively supported, can introduce significant alterations or deformations in our way of seeing and interpreting objects, persons or social situations with negative effects on an optimal adaptation in the relational, attitudinal and behavioural plane.

From direct experience, stereotypes/prejudices about the differences between the Nordic peoples (Norwegian, Swedish, Finnish) to the southern ones (Italians, Spaniards) are known, the Nordics are thought to be more practical and efficient, while the others are more emotional and romantic; or gender differences, whereby women are more sensitive, more dependent and more affectionate, while men are stronger, more independent and more effective; or those that associate some personality traits according to an actual constant feature (dominant - proud and aggressive, empathic - friendly, efficient, diligent or emotional - sensitive and vulnerable, etc.). [D. Cristea, 2015, p. 136-137].

Following systematic research conducted in the 1990s, *Hogg and Vaughn* identified a number of **characteristics of social stereotypes/prejudices**:

* people tend to easily characterize large human groups in terms of common and relatively crude attributes;
* stereotypes/prejudices can change over time, with a specific dynamics. They are often the simplified expression of an era;
* the modification of stereotypes/prejudices generally occurs in response to social, economic or political changes of a certain magnitude;
* stereotypes/prejudices can be acquired at an early age, most often before the subject in question has some knowledge or experience about groups or situations that are stereotyped/preconceived;
* stereotypes/prejudices become more pronounced and more hostile when tensions or conflicts arise between groups, in which case they are very difficult to modify;
* stereotypes/prejudices are not necessarily imprecise or erroneous; most often they serve to form a sense of interpersonal and intergroup relationships in particular situations. [D. Cristea, 2015, p. 137]

1. **Culture of work, cultural distance, attitudes, values, prejudices**

Onboard a ship, a healthy environment with a team that has the work culture is essential for safety, efficiency and on-board contingency management. Good management and leadership strongly help building a strong team that has the work culture. A crew that has the work culture has a number of features:

* crew members know each is dependent on each other;
* crew members show respect for each other;
* there is a high level of mutual trust as a result of an efficient communication flow;
* resources are identified and used in a planned and efficient manner;
* responsibilities are clearly defined;
* crew members are given the opportunity for personal development;
* all crew members accept the final decision that was taken;
* discipline, trust and loyalty: unruly members of a crew can create resentment for others; trust can be lost through a minor incident and it can hardly be fully regained; loyalty can not be given, it must be won by personal effort.

Onboard the ship, crew members belong to different cultures, relations with officials from different ports of the world involve people belonging to different cultures. Culture is defined as representing all national purchases, both material and spiritual, specific to an ethnic group. The concept of culture refers, in fact, to the specific customs and behaviours of a group of people, while describing the values ​​and modalities of putting them into action. There are national, regional, professional, organizational, family cultures, but that does not mean that labelling or stereotyping a person solely on the basis of their nationality or culture can be done. In this perspective, it can be invoked a series of factors: geographic, environmental, historic/politic, religious, language or economic that influence:

* **cultural context** (high/low):

- interpersonal (long/short term) relationships;

- emotional-cognitive personal involvement in interpersonal relationships;

- social security and employment at sea;

- high/low communication (implicit/explicit, indirect/direct, need for contextual interpretation, verbal skills);

- cultural patterns (changing availability);

* **time** (short/long term) and **space** (protective/open).

Synthesizing the above, a **three-dimensional cultural model** can be built:

- societal dimension (economic and political, geographic, regulations and laws, language);

- social dimension (patterns of behavior, gender roles, group identity);

mental dimension (values, ideals, attitudes).

**c. The concept of "blame free" and "cultural wheel"** (G.Hofstede)

The Dutch *Geert Hofstede* conducted a study of 116000 IBM employees located in 40 countries. The study looked at work-related values ​​and how they integrate into culture, the latter being defined as the set of values ​​that condition the behaviours and attitudes acceptable or not to members of a society. *Hofstede* discovered four basic dimensions of cultures and later, together with *Michael Bond*, discovered a fifth dimension:

1. **Distance from power** – reflects the extent to which members of society accept an unequal distribution of power. There are cultures with a large difference in power, where inequality is considered normal and superiors are inaccessible (Philippines, Venezuela and Mexico) or cultures with a small difference in power where inequality is minimized, superior are accessible and differences in power are not treated with great importance (Denmark, New Zealand, Israel and Austria).

In the case of naval leadership, the basic assertion is that crew members belonging to different cultures, inherently accept the idea that "*power*" is unevenly distributed, as follows:

- high acceptance: autocratic leaders, no involvement of crew members in planning, decision-making, symbolizing the privileges and status;

- low acceptance: subordinates are not addicted to leaders, laws and rules apply equally to all, unacceptable privileges.

**2. Avoiding uncertainty** – refers to the degree to which people feel uncomfortable in ambiguous and uncertain situations. Cultures with a strong avoidance of uncertainty emphasize rules and regulations, hard work, compliance and safety in a particular context (Japan, Greece, Portugal). Slightly avoidable cultures do not emphasize rules and procedures, do not appreciate hard work but appreciate the risk (Denmark, Sweden). This dimension measures the degree to which crew members feel scared of ambiguous situations. In the case of naval leadership, one can describe:

- high acceptance: follows rules and regulations, makes precise plans for anything and when things go wrong, problems arise.

- low acceptance: fewer plans and greater acceptance of risk, easy adaptation to new risk and uncertainty situations.

**3. Masculinity/femininity** – the degree to which people prefer "*masculine*" dominant values ​​such as certainty, independence, detachment or "*feminine*" dominant values as equality, interdependence, quality of life, kindness. Male cultures clearly differentiate gender roles, support men's domination and appreciate economic performance (Japan, Mexico, Venezuela). Female cultures accept gender equality and emphasize quality of life (Scandinavian countries).

In the case of naval leadership, this dimension measures the priority of "*male*" or "*feminine*" values ​​as follows:

- "*male*" values: visible success, money, possessions, individual purchases;

- "*feminine*" values: care, protection, sharing with others.

**4. Individualism/collectivism** – focusing more on individual needs and development than on the needs and development of the group, the collectivity; the priority of the individual or the team. Individualist societies favor independence, individual initiative and privacy (United States, Australia, UK). Collectivist cultures foster interdependence and loyalty to family or clan (Venezuela, Colombia, Pakistan).

In the case of naval leadership, the basic assertion is that the concept of world and life of multicultural naval crew members is either the individual or family well-being or the well-being of the entire naval crew:

- individualism: need for personal fulfillment, individual effort, competitiveness;

- collectivism: the effort of the group is more important, it valorizes the consultation, the loyalty.

**5. Short/long-term orientation** – long-term oriented cultures emphasize perseverance (China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan). Cultural differences are important because the theories and practices of organizational behavior are not easy to translate from one culture to another.

Bridge Resource Management recommends some effective operationalized attitudes in ways of working in multicultural naval crews:

- respect for all cultures by avoiding prejudices or judgments of subjective and absolute value;

- authentic availability to learn and understand others: values, traditions, habits, customs;

* + communication: explaining their own values with consistency and avoiding confusion, tolerance and a way of treating each other as a distinct individuality, regardless of the culture they come from, without generalizations that they label.

Synthesizing the above and following his research, *Geert Hofstede* pleads for considering the "***cultural wheel***" of knowledge that he expresses as follows:

* RESPECT
* UNDERSTANDING THE INDIVIDUAL
* LEARN PEOPLE MOTIVATION
* INTERPRETER AS LINK BETWEEN CULTURES
* EXPLAIN ACTIONS IN SIMPLE WAY
* PROCEDURES TO AVOID MISUNDERSTANDINGS
* CONSISTENT APRROACH TO AVOID CONFUSION
* CALL THE PERSONS BY NAME.

**7.2.3. Harassment**

**Harassment** is the behaviour by which the victim is determined to offer sexual favors, usually at work through intimidation, threats or coercion, the perpetrator abusing his or her office or power in order to achieve his goals. It can damage dignity or create a hostile, humiliating and offensive environment. From this point of view, the harasser acts as an aggressor and the harassed person as a victim.

Sexual harassment can be extremely stressful because it puts the victim at the corner, the person not having a choice: either he or she is subject to the erotic whims of an emotionally unstable superior or they leave. This is a situation of enormous pressure, of which he/she usually has no choice and either obeys or leaves the job. A perpetuated harassment situation can destroy a woman's career and lead to depression. Exposure to aggression or sexual harassment leads to anxiety, anger, insomnia, going down to depression, requiring psychiatric support to avoid suicide. Most of the time, the harassed person can no longer deal with the job at work and ends up giving up the job and the career he/she has been working for years.

In 2015, it was estimated that at least 35% of women were physically and/or sexually abused globally. Between 40 and 50 percent of women in the European Union were harassed at work. Harassers and rapists do not take account of education, age, gender, social class or citizenship.

Within the US Army, data from the Veterans Affairs Department shows that 30% of the soldier women were raped and 90% were sexually harassed. The US Department of Defense is perfectly aware of the problem and thinks that 90% of the sexual attacks are not even reported.

[*https://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hărțuire\_sexuală*]

**Sexual Harassment and Bullying**

According to the European Directive, “*harassment is a form of discrimination when an unwanted conduct takes place which has the purpose of violating the dignity of a person and of creating an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment. Sexual harassment means unwanted conduct of a sexual nature, or other conduct based on sex affecting the dignity of women and men at work.*” [*EIRR 287, December 1997:13*]

**Sexual Harassment** is defined as "*unwelcome sexual favours or other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature regardless of a person's gender that affects an individual's workplace*."

Sexual assault is "*any type of sexual contact that occurs without consent, whether through the use of force, physical threat or abuse of authority for personal gains of a sexual nature.*" The victim and the perpetrator can be males or females, of the same or opposite sex.

[*https://safety4sea.com/preventing-sexual-assault-in-maritime-sector*]

Sexual harassment is defined as unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when either:

* the conduct is made as a term or condition of an individual's employment, education, living environment or participation in a University community;
* the acceptance or refusal of such conduct is used as the basis or a factor in decisions affecting an individual's employment, education, living environment, or participation in a University community;
* the conduct unreasonably impacts an individual's employment or academic performance or creates an intimidating, hostile or offensive environment for that individual's employment, education, living environment, or participation in a University community.

Sexual harassment is defined by law and includes requests for sexual favors, sexual advances or other sexual conduct when (1) submission is either explicitly or implicitly a condition affecting academic or employment decisions; (2) the behaviour is sufficiently severe or pervasive as to create an intimidating, hostile or repugnant environment; or (3) the behaviour persists despite objection by the person to whom the conduct is directed. The University considers such behaviour, whether physical or verbal, to be a breach of its standards of conduct and will seek to prevent such incidents and take corrective action when sexual harassment occurs (Office of Institutional Equity, University of Michigan).

[*https://sapac.umich.edu/article/63Definition of Sexual Harassment*]

**Examples of Sexual Harassment**

The following descriptions, while not all-inclusive, will help you understand the types of behaviour that are considered “*conduct of a sexual nature*” and that, if unwelcome, may constitute sexual harassment:

* **unwanted sexual statements**: sexual or “dirty” jokes, comments on physical attributes, spreading rumours about or rating others as to sexual activity or performance, talking about one’s sexual activity in front of others and displaying or distributing sexually explicit drawings, pictures and/or written material. Unwanted sexual statements can be made in person, in writing, electronically (email, instant messaging, blogs, web pages, etc.) and otherwise.
* **unwanted personal attention**: letters, telephone calls, visits, pressure for sexual favors, pressure for unnecessary personal interaction and pressure for dates where a sexual/romantic intent appears evident but remains unwanted.
* **unwanted physical or sexual advances**: touching, hugging, kissing, fondling, touching oneself sexually for others to view, sexual assault, intercourse or other sexual activity. (Office of Institutional Equity, University of Michigan)

Sexual harassment can take various forms, from touching and comforting (physical harassment), unwanted comments related to private life (verbal harassment) and threats of job loss or denial of promotion/wage growth in the case of rejection of sexual advances (harassment quid pro quo). It can be direct, through verbal and physical aggressions, or indirectly through behaviours that isolate, discriminate or exclude the person on the grounds of role-play.

[*https://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hărțuire\_sexuală*]

**Examples of harassment**

The following may be found to be examples of harassment, as mentioned by ICS/ITWF:

• displaying or circulating offensive or suggestive material;

• innuendo, mockery, lewd or sexist/racist/homophobic jokes or remarks;

• use of offensive language in describing or making fun of someone with a disability;

• comments about a person’s physical appearance or character which cause embarrassment or distress;

• unwelcome attention such as spying, stalking, pestering, overly familiar behaviour or unwelcome verbal or physical attention;

• making or sending unwanted, sexually suggestive, hostile or personally intrusive telephone calls, text messages, emails, comments on social networks, faxes or letters;

• unwarranted, intrusive or persistent questioning about a person’s age, marital status, personal life, sexual interests or orientation or similar questions about a person’s racial or ethnic origin, including their culture or religion;

• unwelcome sexual advances or repeated requests for dates or threats;

• suggestions that sexual favours may further a person’s career or that not offering them may adversely affect their career;

• leering, rude gestures, touching, grabbing, patting or other unnecessary bodily contact such as brushing up against others;

• spreading malicious rumours or insulting someone (particularly regarding age, race, marriage, civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, sex, disability, sexual orientation, religion or belief and gender re-assignment.

According to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), there are two types of sexual harassment claims: "*quid pro quo*" and "*hostile work environment*“. The EEOC provides guidance on defining sexual harassment and establishing employer liability. *Quid pro quo* means "*this for that*“. In this context, it involves expressed or implied demands for sexual favors in exchange for some benefit (e.g. a promotion, pay increase) or to avoid some detriment (e.g. termination, demotion) in the workplace. Quid pro quo harassment is perpetrated by someone who is in a position of power or authority over another (e.g. manager or supervisor over a subordinate). A clear example of quid pro quo harassment would be a supervisor threatening to fire an employee if he or she does not have sex with the supervisor.

*Hostile work environment harassment* arises when speech or conduct is so severe and pervasive it that creates an intimidating or demeaning environment or situation that negatively affects a person's job performance. Unlike quid pro quo harassment, this type of harassment can be perpetrated by anyone in the work environment, including a peer, supervisor, subordinate, vendor, customer or contractor. Hostile work environment situations are not as easy to recognize, given that an individual comment or occurrence may not be severe, demeaning behaviour may occur that is not based on sex and there may be long periods between offensive incidents. Examples of conduct that might create a hostile work environment include inappropriate touching, sexual jokes or comments, repeated requests for dates and a work environment where offensive pictures are displayed.

The EEOC says sexual harassment can occur in a variety of circumstances, including the following:

* The victim as well as the harasser may be a woman or a man. The victim does not have to be of the opposite sex.
* The harasser can be the victim's supervisor, an agent of the employer, a supervisor in another area, a co-worker or a nonemployee.
* The victim does not have to be the person harassed but could be anyone affected by the offensive conduct.
* Unlawful sexual harassment may occur without economic injury to or discharge of the victim.
* The harasser's conduct must be unwelcomed.

[*https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/tools-and-samples/hr-qa/pages/typesofsexualharassment.aspx*]

**Examples of harassment (include but are not limited to):**

* verbal incl. epithets, derogatory jokes or comments, slurs or unwanted sexual advances, invitations or comments;
* visual incl. derogatory and/or sexually oriented posters, photography, cartoons, drawing or gestures;
* physical incl. unwanted touching, blocking normal movement or interfering with work because of refusal of sexual advances or sexual orientation;
* threats and demands to submit to sexual requests as a condition of continued employment or to avoid discipline.

[*https://safety4sea.com/eliminate-sexual-harassment-onboard*]

**7.2. Coping With Obstacles**

**Action to be taken**

• In case of bullying, mobbing or sexual harassment, the seafarer can inform the Master or Chief Engineer or if necessary, a helpline for support and advice.

• Should this not be possible a second person to be identified to whom a concern can be raised. This person might be the company personnel officer.

• The abusers may be the Master or chief and there has to be an independent person who can be approached.

As explained, people often do not report an incident of sexual harassment, because they do not know how to report it or are unsure of what will happen next.

So, seafarers are advised:

* make sure you know your company's reporting procedures. Companies will often have multiple ways for you to report an incident, to ensure protection;
* understand that your company will make every effort to maintain confidentiality;
* know that there is zero tolerance for retaliation against anyone reporting an incident;
* report any prohibited behaviors to the appropriate person, as soon as it happens;
* familiarize yourself with the information your company requires in a report, such as who, what, when and where.

**Recommendations**

* do not go ashore alone, partner with a shipmate;
* be aware of your surroundings;
* always watch for suspicious behaviour;
* walk quickly and confidently. Have a plan of where you are going and do not appear lost and confused;
* keep valuables concealed; do not openly show large amounts of money;
* stay in well-lit, populated areas;
* take the phone numbers of the ship and ship's agent with you ashore;
* if in a foreign country, take with you the phone number and address of the local embassy;
* know how to call for help in an emergency;
* follow your company's drug and alcohol policy.

**How to eliminate mobbing, bullying or sexual harassment onboard?**

Safety at sea is directly linked to preventing accidents from occurring or maintaining a wellbeing onboard. But, what about the unwelcome behaviour onboard? Lately, we hear that more and more women fear to pursue a career onboard believing that they might have to deal with mobbing or harassment or even abuse while at sea. Indeed, this is still an issue in the maritime industry; the victim and the perpetrator can be males or females, of the same or opposite sex. Thus, what is the industry’s adjustment to this topic? How harassment is reported and handled in the maritime workplace?

Certainly, mobbing or harassment irrespective of what, how and against whom, is against the law. Some types of mobbing or harassment may also be offences under criminal law including indecent exposure, stalking, sexual assault and obscene or threatening communications, such as phone calls, letters, emails, text messages and postings on social networking site. The importance of this issue gives the employers an extra responsibility to effectively prevent and respond to harassment claims.

[*https://safety4sea.com/eliminate-sexual-harassment-onboard*]

**How to respond to the mobbing or** **harassment onboard?**

The following steps may be followed to effectively prevent and respond to harassment claims:

* in case of complain, respond immediately;
* involve outside legal counsel experienced in handling such claims;
* listen attentively to allegations of harassment and treat the victim with respect;
* investigate the complaint;
* let the circumstances guide your judgment;
* promote consistent treatment;
* keep complete and accurate documentation;
* keep the senior management fully informed;
* adopt a “*no dating at work*” policy;
* revaluate your insurance, sexual harassment policy, general harassment policy and complaint procedures to fit your company’s needs.

It is sad that sexism or sexual harassment are still widely unreported in the workplace. Specifically, polling by Opinium Research has revealed that 58% of women who have experienced sexual harassment did not report it to their company. Employees often do not report such incidents because they do not know how to report it or are unsure of what will happen next. When it comes to seafarers the situation is even more complicated considering the different work environment. If any seafarer complains of having been the victim of harassment and/or bullying, complaints must be taken seriously and investigated.

All in all, sexual harassment can never be accepted in a society, and shipping is no exception. It can be costly to both seafarers and employers, not only directly but also through the decreased workplace performance or productivity and the reputational harm. It is important that employers take the appropriate measures to minimize such incidents at sea and maximize workplace safety.

**Actions to be taken in case of mobbing or sexual harassment**

In case of a mobbing or sexual harassment incident onboard, the seafarer can inform the Master or Chief Engineer or/and a helpline for support and advice.  Given that the abusers may be the Master of Chief Engineer, there has to be an independent person who can be approached, for example the company personnel officer. Also, it is important to ensure that companies have a clearly written policy statement on the elimination of harassment including contact information to enable seafarers to report any related incidents.

A 2016 report by ISWAN on crew welfare stressed that bullying, harassment and abuse continue to be key reasons for seafarers seeking help. On the occasion of the International Woman's Day, the Heads of EU agencies and Joint undertakings announced they commit to zero tolerance towards sexual violence and harassment. A recently published guide advises US merchant mariners and shore-based personnel on how to participate in a work environment free of sexual assault, harassment and other prohibited behaviours. ICS, ITF updated the guidelines for all seafarers on how to eliminate workplace harassment and bullying which may aid women seafarers as well. In late January, the India-based Anglo-Eastern Maritime Training Centre, ISWAN, and WISTA International released a new booklet on building and maintaining gender diversity onboard merchant ships.

**Who protects women seafarers?**

The number of female seafarers in the world fleet is steadily increasing. In 2000, the International Maritime Organization (IMO) launched the 10-year "*Women on Board*" program, which has yielded but below expectations. At that time, the share of women in total was only 1-2% and most women were in economically developed countries.

In the European Union, the percentage was 4-5%, in Southeast Asia 0.5%. Philippines, the world's largest marine labor force provider, had only 223 women out of a total of 230000 sailors.

A study published in 2003 by the International Labor Organization shows that in 1997-2001 most women sailed in the following fleets: Denmark - 15.1% of the total, Norway - 10%, the UK - 8.3%, Finland - 5.6%, Belgium - 4.4%, Germany - 4.2% and Italy - 1.2%. At that time, most women were engaged on cruise ships in auxiliary activities (restaurants, hotels, shops, services, casinos). Their share in the total crew was 18%.

**How have things evolved over a decade and a half?**

According to the International Federation of Transporters, the share of women in the maritime labour market is currently estimated at 2%.

"*Seafarers work mainly on cruise ships and ferry boats, often under pavilions of convenience. These are among the least paid and least protected jobs at sea. Female officers are fewer than male colleagues. Their low number shows that women can be subject to discrimination and harassment*.“ - ITF appreciates.

A recent report shows that Brazil, Russia, India and China (BRIC Group countries) have the largest number of women officers in the maritime industry, respectively 26% of the total. They are followed by the G8 countries, with 18%. Despite the increase in the number of women at sea, shipping continues to show misogyny. Women are discriminated against in terms of employment, pay and promotion, too few vessels have distinct sanitary groups for women and abuses and harassment by colleagues and bosses are frequent. The reaction of sailors has not been delayed. Worldwide, there is a tendency to organize them into structures to defend their rights. ITF-affiliated unions have 23000 members among sailors. WOMESA - South African and Western African Maritime Sector Women's Organization counts 50 founding members from 24 countries.

In Romania for example, maritime universities have given thousands of graduates over the past 25 years, but most of them have chosen to remain on shore. The crisis of the practice places for cadets is the main obstacle to a career at sea, especially for women. However, thousands of female Romanians work on cruise ships as auxiliary personnel.

Surprisingly, although they need more social protection than men, Romanian female seafarers prefer to remain outside professional organizations. Only 22 women are part of the Free Trade Union of Navigators, two of whom are officers, and the other auxiliary staff.

"During this year, more than 20 women have reported us a number of incidents: abuse by employers, violations of contractual provisions, sexual harassment. For example, four women who were employed as maids on a cruise ship complained to the master that they were also commissioned to perform work other than those for which they were contractually licensed. He sent them home without paying their salaries and repatriation expenses.

A young woman who was also working on a cruise ship came under control at the on-board hospital, where she learned she was pregnant. Despite the assurance that she will receive her prenatal rights, no money was paid.

In two other cases, women reported to masters that they were victims of abuses and sexual harassment from colleagues. Instead of making justice to them, they were sent home.

None of the women who addressed us was a union member. That is why, in most cases, we could only help with advice, because we could not intervene legally.

By comparison, none of the female sailors who are our trade union members are facing such problems because they are informed, they are in touch with the union and know how to act if problems arise "- said Adrian Mihălcioiu, leader of Free Trade Union of Navigators.

[*https://www.cugetliber.ro/stiri-economie-cine-le-apara-pe-femeile-marinar-262809*]

**Conclusions**

Seafarer women represent a strategic human resource in seafaring that can resolve the problem of world seafarers’ shortage. Diversity is the range of values, attitudes, cultural perspectives, beliefs, ethnic background, sexual orientation, skills, knowledge and life experiences of the individuals making up any given group of people, and the on-shore maritime industry can benefit from the presence of women.

The conclusion can be done that maritime education and training institutions have to explain young people all merits of maritime profession and show possibility for them to find emotional attractiveness and realization of their interests if they choose to pursue a maritime profession.

* **Organizational dysfunctions** and **psycho-behavioural disturbances** that can be found onboard ships refers to *stress, burnout, workaholism, mobbing*, *discrimination, stereotyping, bias* and *sexual harassment*. These aspects influence not only the personal life of crew members but also their socio-professional life.
* Organization of work, conceiving tasks, coordination and controlling employees compose the social capacity of the crew and breaking its emotional balance results in **mobbing**.
* When working with multicultural crews, to prevent prejudice and stereotype onboard ships, leaders can take attitudes derived from the **“*cultural wheel”* concept**.
* Sexual harassment irrespective of what, how and against whom, **is against the law**.
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**ASSESMENT TEST**

1. *Cultural barriers in maritime sector refers mainly to the:*
2. **gender stereotypes where men are perceived as more effective;**
3. women seem to be deficient in managing impressions;
4. bullying and mobbing situations.
5. *Behavioural barriers in maritime sector refers mainly to the fact that the women seem to be deficient in managing impressions through strategies such as:*
6. **building friendly relationships with hierarchical superiors;**
7. bullying their colleagues in the crew;
8. **ensuring visibility of their own performance and loyalty to the organization.**
9. providing the colleagues with confidentiality.

3. The storming stage for a crew functionality refers to:

a. an initial integration period for group members;

**b. an emotionally charged and tension-filled period for group members;**

c. a training phase of the group consolidation.

4. The normalization stage for a crew functionality refers to:

a. is the point where the group starts to cooperate;

**b. is the point where the group really begins to be together as a coordinated unit;**

c. the group initiate the communication.

5. According to *Leymann* in case of mobbing, the next behavioural attitudes could be identified:

a. free expression of the will in the group;

**b. actions aimed for preventing the victim from expressing himself/herself;**

**c. actions aimed for victim’s isolation;**

**d. victim's professional discrepancy;**

e. the continuous praising of the victim performance.

6. The design of tasks, referring to the excessive operationalization of work, could be a source of

**a. mobbing;**

b. bullying;

c. harassment;

d. self confidence.

7. Evolution in time of mobbing is passing usually through 4 phases:

**a. critical incidents;**

b. sexual harassment;

**c. increased frequency of hostile behaviours;**

d. overtasking attitude in relation with the superiors;

**e. management acknowledgment;**

**f. stigmatization, social isolation;**

g. intellectual aggression.

8.………………………………………………………are factors that mediate and condition, in certain situations, the formation of our system of representations about persons, groups, situations and social events

a. mobbing and bullying;

b. social harassment;

**c. prejudices and social stereotypes;**

d. malpractices attitudes.

9. Considering the major characteristics of the social stereotypes/prejudices, check the correct assertions:

**a. people tend to easily characterize large human groups in terms of common and relatively crude attributes;**

b. stereotypes/prejudices cannot be change over time, with a specific dynamic;

**c. the modification of stereotypes/prejudices generally occurs in response to social, economic or political changes of a certain magnitude;**

d. stereotypes/prejudices cannot be acquired at an early age.

10. The next actions/situations could be considered examples of……………………….………………..,as mentioned by ICS/ITWF**:**

a. displaying or circulating offensive or suggestive material;

b. innuendo, mockery, lewd or sexist/racist/homophobic jokes or remarks;

c. use of offensive language in describing or making fun of someone with a disability;

d. comments about a person’s physical appearance or character which cause embarrassment.

11. Unwelcome attention such as spying, stalking, pestering, overly familiar behaviour or unwelcome verbal or physical attention could be considered as:

a. bullying;

b. prejudice;

c. mobbing;

**d. harassment.**