

Małgorzata Dobrowolska

Uniwersytet Śląski

Peripheral staff loyalty

Key words: *Loyalty, flexible forms of employment, peripheral crew*

Introduction. A few words on the loyalty

Loyalty in dictionaries and encyclopaedias is defined as accuracy and fairness in the relationship with something or someone, fidelity in meeting obligations, compliance with rules of honour and righteousness, and is related to sacrifice for the sake of objects or ideas. A loyal person is firm, reliable, honourable, faithful, committed, consistent in his/her relations with others [Borkowski, Dyrda, Kanarski, Rokicki, 2000].

In the times of feudalism loyalty was linked with serfdom and sovereignty. The first Oxford definitions imply that loyalty is "dedication and fidelity to duties, love and obligations; obsequiousness, commitment to a rightful sovereign, to the government of one's country" [Hill, 2003: 26 -27].

Rosmus (2012) carried out synthesis of approaches to loyalty, highlighting three perspectives of research in loyalty: analysis of a market and characteristics of its functioning, such as factors enhancing loyalty to brand of products or services, possibility to use loyalty mechanisms with respect to consumers' decisions or political choices; analysis of behaviour in organizations, with an emphasis on themes, styles of loyalty behaviour, behaviour related to power, functioning of groups; analysis of the meaning of

loyalty in interpersonal relationships, attachment and its forms, giving support, behaviour in difficult situations or crisis situations. On the one hand, loyalty is understood as fidelity, trust, dedication and putting needs of other people on the same level as one's own needs or even putting them first, on the other, loyalty is related to numerous influences that are not related to ethics, morality or nobleness. Negative effects of loyalty are, for instance, loyal submission to principles, people, organizations and ideas that violate universally applicable moral principles. Such situations can be found in marketing influences aiming at benefits of business, religious or military character military. Loyalty is linked to a measurable profit of a organization and gains a particular significance in long-term relationships, making decisions on a change of membership impossible. Loyalty may contribute to betrayal of ideals in crisis situations, especially in the context of a potential overcoming of the said situations. Loyalty promotes altruistic behaviour, deferred acceptance, perseverance and engagement in acknowledged good that requires protection or sacrifice. Loyalty in business relations is a tactics of increasing profits, thus investing in inducing loyalty and adherence to loyalty principles [after: Rosmus, 2012: 106-107].

Employee loyalty models were modified, in accordance with the evolving forms of employment. The original, traditional model of loyalty was based on a stable long-term relationship and evolved toward a transcendent, labile, variable and temporary one. It stands to reason to ask a question concerning loyalty, because the meaning of this construct for flexibility of employment is exactly the same as in the case of the traditional formulas - for each form of employment is about the effect of identification with an organisation and its successes, co-creation and co-attendance, building a mutual trust and forming bonds. Short-term employment raises competition in continuing employment in juxtaposition with uncertainty of employment and does not contribute to building a relationship, which is a significant risk for experiencing loyalty to employers.

Rosmus claims [Rosmus, 2012: 107-109] that the main source of loyalty is a interpersonal relation based on social bonds, a sustainable social system, which allows one to have an influence on behaviour, in terms of acceptance of aims and values cherished by these communities (Aube, Rousseau, 2005). Commitment and loyalty assume particular importance in crisis situations, requiring increased activities in order to support a system, make changes or modify a system [Hirschman, 1995]. Loyalty is about making decisions that do not conform with aims and needs of a person, activities requiring dedication and self-discipline, validating a concept or an object of loyalty as more valuable as one's own needs and benefits. Category of loyalty behaviour is based on freedom of choice, and is a situation in which a subject of behaviour may proceed differently, and for some specific reasons it behaves in a loyal way. This does not apply, of course, to integration behaviour aiming at use others. Hirschman (ibid) defines loyalty as postponing a moment of breaking bonds, in spite of discontent, due to emerging bad conscience. A loyal behaviour is a behaviour against one's own will, awareness of alternative solutions, internalisation of beliefs, which contribute to bad conscience when the beliefs are shaken. Van Vugt, Hart (2004) provide us with a slightly different definition of loyalty, which is made up of emotions, cognition and behaviour. They emphasize its three aspects: behavioural, cognitive and emotional one. Loyalty allows to experience strong, positive emotions in relation to an object - joy, satisfaction, empathy, and a sense of emotional connection to the object, and the experience of trust and optimism in assessment of the effectiveness of the object, care for welfare of the object - be it a group or a community. Summing up, loyalty is a behaviour resulting from the process of socialisation [according to Hirschman, 1970] and an attitude toward an object (Van Vugt, Hart, 2004). Loyalty is also an aspect of attachment, and like the latter, it takes many forms and has different sources. Ainsworth lists three styles of attachment (1983): secure, ambivalent/resistant and avoidant one. As far as their disclosure is concerned, early childhood experience with objects of

attachment are of importance, that is behavioural responses in earlier interpersonal relationships. Triple model of commitment to an organization is presented by Allen, Mayer (1996) and Bańka and colleagues (2002). A form of attachments is: affective, based on emotions and identification; permanent, as a result of fear, anxiety to leave the object of attachment; normative, as the result of the process of socialisation. Accordingly it creates affiliate, permanent and normative attachment. These factors may also apply to loyal behaviour. Cohen (1993) distinguishes between: a level of affiliation, identification and moral commitment. Probability of occurrence of loyalty behaviour grows along the level of affiliation, identification and moral commitment. Friedman, Harvey (1986) point at loyalty to relationship; responsibility for the bond; intention of actions, effort in favour of a relationship and faith in the idea of a relationship. Friedman, Harvey (1986) distinguish between two factors: attitude toward a bond, relationship, and an intention of behaviour in favour of this relationship. Loyalty is positive opinions, defence of an image, actions in favour of relationships. Porter, Smith (1970) describing attachment use the following components: attitude as beliefs in fairness of ideas, aims of a relationship; desire of belonging to an object; readiness for sacrifice, effort, spending resources in favour of an object. A loyal person is a person who speaks positively on an object, demonstrates attachment, gets involved in actions in favour of an object and its welfare, continues to be in a relationship in spite of costs related to it.

At this point it is worthwhile to return to the difference between loyalty and devotion. By dedication one understands acceptance of loss of one's own good for higher purpose. Willingness to sacrifice is caused by assimilation of an attitude of fidelity and responsibility as well as a declared system of values. Bigger loyalty is achieved, when an organization has a similar system of values resulting from organizational culture [Urban, Siemieniako, 2008]. Smyczek (2001) believes that loyalty is an attitude towards an employer, due to the bond of a socio-psychological contract,

especially in a situation where competition offers better salary and social conditions. An employee is gaining confidence when he is convinced that intentions of his employer are valid. It is also a process embedded in time. Smyczek (2001) claims that loyalty and trust at work are strongly related.

An important factor of inducing loyalty is commitment and habit, since repeatability of behaviour becomes a habit. There are three types of loyalty: informed, involved and partner one. The first one is about following common sense, there is only trust involved. This type is disclosed most often at the beginning of a cooperation with an employer, when expectations of an employee start to be met. Apart from trust, economic benefits are involved here as the major determinants of building loyalty mechanisms. As the result of a positive commitment and trust another phase of built - commitment loyalty, that is about close relationship and positive emotions, identified with values represented by one's employer, a true co-participation and full participation begin here. Another type - partnership loyalty, apart from trust and a positive commitment includes an element of a habit, a strong identification with a company, the deepest level of loyalty, despite potential cases of disagreement employees are virtually immune to an impact of a competition. There is yet another type of loyalty, namely a routine one. Here a dominant factor is habit, deprived of trust. It is about a neutral attitude to an employer, based mainly on economic benefits. Unacceptable loyalty with its roots in coercion is observed, when an employee exhibits a negative commitment and lack of trust for an employer, and a cooperation with an employer is limited by external reasons, an employee feels forced to behave in a loyal way, sometimes his behaviour is accompanied by apathy and helplessness, an employee is not able to work, and has no prospects for other job due to for example loyalty monopoly, he expresses negative opinions on his employer. Indulgent loyalty is another type of loyalty that characterises persons with negative commitment combined with trust and habit. This is the loyalty that plays a key role; an employee is not interested in other job offers, and he does not utter negative

statements concerning his employer. The last type of loyalty is a conditional loyalty, which is similar to the indulgent one, however a negative commitment causes as the result loss of a job, unless an employee is given an elementary chance to participate [Urban, Siemieniako, 20008, cf. Wojciszke, 2002].

Konieczko (2006) carries out a synthesis of a definition of loyalty as: a bond, emotional attachment to an organization (Rudawska, 2005); desire to be a part of an organization and identification with it, a tendency make sacrifices for the sake of improvement of a situation in an organisation, putting interests of an organisation first, commitment to fate of an organisation [Świątek-Barylska, 2005]; fidelity and trust, willingness to sacrifice for the sake of an organization, management and people working in it [Śmid, 2000]; involvement of employees in achieving success in an organization, valuing work in a given organization as one of the most important values [Gill, 2011]. A high level of commitment, as one of the components of loyalty, promotes actions meant to improve functioning of an organization and has an impact on economic results [Bugdol, 2008]. In the process of building loyalty employer's image and his comprehensive conduct plays an important role, including elementary ethical code; recruitment process, knowledge of his competence and decent acceptance is the beginning of confidence-building; management style, as the one that deepens confidence, fair play, open communication; proper information flow in the organization, accuracy of operations, decision-making process; creating conditions against absenteeism and loss of employees, observance of ergonomic standards, observance of the rights and obligations [Narra, 2009, Konieczko, 2006].

Dick, Basu (1994) developed typology of loyalty, although related to consumption and relationship with customers, but the typology itself seems to be more universal. They divided loyalty into the following sub-categories: real one - in which a customer has a positive attitude to market proposals, exhibits a minimal, if any, tendency to look for alternatives,

where customers are prepared to forgive a company minor mistakes; and a hidden one - in which a customer prefers products of a given company, but due to certain factors he buys them rarely; false one - when a customer buys the products of a specific brand, but cannot see any difference between them and alternative ones; and finally - a total lack of loyalty - when a customer cannot see any differences between alternative products at all and often changes brands he is buying. Olivier (1999) divided loyalty into four phases, each with a specific degree of commitment of a customer to a company. The first one is a cognitive loyalty; loyalty, in this phase trust for a brand is acquired, loyalty is still weak, and in case of competitive counteroffers it is easy to change a brand. The second phase, being the result of fascination - a customer's attitude to a company and a degree of satisfaction with contracts so far, at this stage commitment can be observed, another phase is loyalty resulting from a conviction to stay with a company, a customer grows his certainty to stay with a company, he manifests his commitment and dedication. The last type of loyalty is loyalty of action - here one finds motivation from the previous phase and readiness to act, even against obstacles or difficulties emerging while a service is provided. In a sense this loyalty is irrational, as it occurs in spite of better offers of competition.

The issue of loyalty, as shown in the above review of literature, generates many methodological problems. Additional complication, is intuitive understanding of the term. For this reason it was decided to measure the global loyalty rate among persons employed in flexible forms of employment.

Presentation of the author's research

Psychological variable of loyalty is categorised as a subject-and- organizational determinant of behaviour of employees in a situation of a non-traditional employment. This attitude is characterised by observance of law, procedures of a given organisation, support for measures taken by

management and fidelity to managers combined with mutual trust, fairness in interpersonal relations, caring for organisation, accuracy and fairness in relations with an organization [Borkowski, Dyrda, Kanarski, Rokicki, 2000].

This variable has been diagnosed by two questions - statements: = 1. I believe I am a loyal employee, 2. I care about my workplace, and the scale for respondents was from 1 (I do not agree) to 5 (I agree completely). The vast majority of responders agreed with these statements. 89% of the responders considers themselves to be loyal employees, including 63% who expressed this view quite strongly. Moreover, 86% of the responders believes they care for their workplace, including 51% who expressed this view quite strongly.

Research was made on $n=2118$ employees with flexible forms of employment including: teleworking, replacement (substitute) work, temporary work, seasonal work, employment under civil law agreements, commercial contracts for a specified period of time, part-time work, in the social economy, self-employment.

The sum for the first question ("I believe I am a loyal employee") is 9416, the average is 4.45 and the median is 5. Whereas the sum of results for the second question ("I care about my workplace") is 9108, the average is 4.3 and the median is 5. While analysing the responses to the above questions, taking into account their forms of employment, one can see a statistically significant correlation between these variables. Analysis of a correlation using Kramer's V showed a statistically significant correlation between a form of employment and answers to the question "I believe I am a loyal employee". Value of the factor is 0.093 and indicates weak correlation.

The highest percentage of responders, who consider themselves to be loyal employees were observed in the following groups: the self-employed, employees working part-time and working for a specific period of time. Whereas the lowest percentage of individuals claiming to be loyal employ-

ees is observed in the following groups: working as substitute employees, working on a contract and seasonal workers, which for sure, both in the case of higher and lower results, may be due to characteristics of the employment conditions (favourable v. unfavourable for building loyalty behaviour). Self-employment, a fixed term contract and a part-time employment exhibit to the biggest extent signs of traditional forms of employment and among all nine chosen forms of employment are the longest contracts. Whereas a replacement agreement, orders and seasonal work, are their opposite extreme, and in the case of the two latter, they do not provide social security benefits, or privileges resulting from labour law. Apart from a short period of employment, which makes building strong loyalty ties difficult, their content do not support behaviour based on retaliation, dedication and sacrifice.

Analysis of the answer to the second question concerning loyalty is similar - "I care about my workplace". In this case there is also a statistically significant relationship between a form of employment and the answers provided. Kramer's V was 0.088, therefore the relationship is weak. The highest percentages of responders, who consider themselves to care for their workplace has been observed among the self-employed and those working part-time. Whereas the lowest interest of individuals claiming to be loyal workers have been reported in the following groups: employed under a replacement agreement, temporary workers and seasonal workers. The results obtained for the second statement are an analogy described in the analysis of the results of the first one.

Variable loyalty was diagnosed, as mentioned above, by the two statements, in the case of the first one; "I believe I am a loyal employee ", a significant correlation with gender, age, education and marital status has been demonstrated. There is no relation with the other social-and-demographic variables.

Correlation analysis has shown that there is a relationship between a sense of loyalty ("I believe I am a loyal employee") and gender. Kramer's V

is 0.095; $p < 0.01$. Percentage of the respondents who consider themselves loyal was higher among men (89.8 %) than among women (87.6 %). Also, age significantly differentiates responses concerning loyalty Kramer's $V = 0.116$; $p < 0.01$. Percentage of people who consider themselves loyal employees increases with age. In the age group 18-30 years the percentage is 86.6 %; in the age group 31-40 years = 88.8 %, and in the age group 41-65 years = 91.3 %. Education affects the sense of loyalty, too; Kramer's $V = 0.160$; $p < 0.001$. The higher education, the higher the rate of responders considering themselves loyal. In the group of the respondents with education below secondary school the percentage of individuals claiming to be loyal employees is 83.4 %. In the group of the respondents with secondary education the percentage is 85.8 %, and in group of people with a university degree = 91.6 %. There were also statistically significant differences in the responses to the question on loyalty in terms of the respondents' marital status, Kramer's $V = 0.109$, $p < 0.05$. Married respondents consider themselves loyal more often than singles and the divorced/the widowed. The percentage is as follows: 89.9 % among married people; / 88.2 % in the group of singles and 83.3% in group of the divorced/the widowed.

Loyalty characterises mainly men, it increases with age and the level of education, and is typical for the married.

In the statement: I care about my workplace, relationship with the following variables has been identified: gender, age, education, profession, industry, place of residence, marital status.

Correlation analysis has shown that there is a relationship between a sense of loyalty, caring for one's workplace and gender. Kramer's V is 0.100; $p < 0.01$. Percentage of the respondents who believe they care for their workplace was higher among men (86.4%) than among women (85.5%). Age significantly differentiates responses concerning loyalty as well; Kramer's $V = 0.126$; $p < 0.01$. Percentage of people who believe they care for their workplace grows with age. In the age group 18-30 years the percentage is 82.0%; in the age group 31-40 years = 86.1%, and in the age

group 41-65 years = 89.9%. Education affects the sense of caring for one's workplace, too; Kramer's $V = 0.157$; $p < 0,001$. The higher education, the higher the rate of responders considering themselves careful for their workplace. In the group of the respondents with education below secondary school the percentage of individuals claiming to be careful for their workplace is 75.6%. In the group of the respondents with secondary education the percentage is 86.1%, and in group of people with a university degree = 87.9%. There was also a statistically important correlation between profession and a sense of caring for a workplace, Kramer's $V = 0.150$; $p < 0.001$. The lowest percentage of people claiming they care for their workplace was in the group workers (79.5 %). In the other groups percentage of such persons is between 85% and 88% (in the group of professionals and freelancers). Also, age significantly differentiates responses concerning carefulness for one's workplace; Kramer's $V = 0.164$; $p < 0.001$. The highest percentage of persons caring for their workplace occurred in other industries (90.2 %), in public administration (87.7 %) and industry (87,3 %). Slightly lower percentage has been obtained in industries such as services (84.8 %) and trade (82.2 %). Place of residence also significantly affects carefulness for one's workplace, Kramer's $V = 0.117$; $p < 0.001$. Rural residents care for their workplaces more often (88.4 %) than city dwellers (85.6% in small towns and 85.7% in large cities). Marital status also significantly affects the responses concerning carefulness for one's workplace; Kramer's $V = 0.128$; $p < 0.001$. Persons who are married care for their workplaces more often than singles (87.6% the former, 83 -84 % the latter).

Summing up, carefulness for one's workplace is declared more often by men, people with a university degree, working on higher posts in the organizational structure and persons employed in administration, living in the country and the married. Carefulness for one's workplace is not influenced by the following variables: industry sector, length of service, number of previous employers, duration of a contract, number of children.

Conclusion

Loyalty behaviour is affected by both demographic data and a form of employment. Changes observable on the market, in particular fixed percentage of flexible forms of employment in modern HR solutions change perspective of looking at loyalty of employees permanently. Moreover, shift of contracts from psychological to formal ones contribute to the fact that loyalty attitudes of employees begin to arise unnecessary fears.

For employee loyalty models, regardless their modifications due to changing forms of employment, tend to have the same descriptions. The original, traditional model of loyalty based on a stable long-term relationship and evolves toward a transcendent, labile, variable and temporary one. Questions concerning loyalty, the importance of this construct for flexibility of employment is exactly the same as in the traditional work formulas. It is about the effect of identification with an organisation, its successes, co-creation and co-participation, confidence and relation-building. Short-term employment combined with with uncertainty of work may be negative for relation-building and become a significant threat for experience of loyalty towards an employer. However, the need of identification with an organisation, experience of a sense of belonging, is independent of short-term and non-standard forms of employment. Loyalty behaviour is to be found in flexible forms of employment in various degrees, depending on their form and, what follows, conditions and characteristics of work.

Summary

This article presents the results of research among persons employed in nine flexible forms of employment: teleworking, replacement work, temporary work, seasonal work, employment under civil law agreements, contracts for a defined period of time, employment on part-time basis, in social economy, self-employment. The psychological variable chosen for the analysis was loyalty. The issue of loyalty, as shown in the review of literature, generates

many methodological problems. Additional setback is intuitive understanding of the term. For this reason it was decided to measure the global loyalty rate among persons employed in flexible forms of employment. The most important results are described in the second part of the article.

References

- [1] Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1983). Patterns of infant – mother attachment as related to maternal care: Their early history and their contribution to continuity. W: D. Magnusson, V. Allen (red.), *Human development: An interactional perspective*, New York, Academic Press.
- [2] Allen, N.J., Meyer, J.P. (1996). Affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization: An examination of construct validity. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 49, 252-276.
- [3] Aube, C., Rousseau, V. (2005). *Team Goal Commitment and Team Effectiveness: The Role of Task Interdependence and Supportive Behaviours*. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 9(3), 189-204.
- [4] Bańka, A. (2002a). *Psychologia pracy*. W: J. Strelau (red.), *Psychologia. Podręcznik akademicki. Tom 3. Jednostka w społeczeństwie i elementy psychologii stosowanej*, (s.283-320). Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.
- [5] Bańka, A. (2002b). *Spółeczna psychologia środowiskowa*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.
- [6] Becker, H.S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66, 32-42.
- [7] Borkowski, J., Dyrda, M., Kanarski, L., Rokicki, B. (2000). *Słownik terminów z zakresu psychologii dowodzenia i zarządzania*. Warszawa: Akademia Obrony Narodowej Instytut Nauk Humanistycznych.
- [8] Bowlby, J. (1978). Uwagi o kontekście historycznym teorii przywiązania. W: R. Zazzo (red.). *Przywiązanie*. Warszawa: PWN.
- [9] Bugdol, M. (2008). Zaangażowanie pracowników a doskonalenie jakości. W: T. Borys, P. Rogala (red.), *Zarządzanie personelem jako kryterium doskonałości. Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu* (nr 31, s. 357). Wrocław.
- [10] Cohen, A. (1993). Work commitment in relation to withdrawal intention and union effectiveness. *Journal of Business Research*, 26, 75-90.

- [11] Dick, A.S., Basu, K. (1994). Customer loyalty: toward an integrated conceptual framework. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 22, 99-113.
- [12] Friedman, L., Haevey, R. J. (1986). Factors of Union Commitment: The Case for a Lower Dimensionality, *Journey of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86, No. 4, 585-598
- [13] Fullager, C. (1986). A Factor Analytic Study on the Validity of a Union Commitment Scale. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(1), 129-136.
- [14] Gill, R. (2011). Using Storytelling to Maintain Employee Loyalty during Change. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(15), 25.
- [15] Hill, N., Alexander, J. (2003). *Pomiar satysfakcji i lojalności klientów*. Kraków: Oficyna Ekonomiczna.
- [16] Hirschman, A. O. (1995), *Lojalność, krytyka, rozstanie. Reakcja na kryzys państwa, organizacji i przedsiębiorstwa*, Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Znak.
- [17] Konieczko, A. (2006a). Elastyczność zatrudnienia w kontekście kształtowania lojalności pracowniczej. W: J. Skalik (red.), *Zmiana warunkiem sukcesu: dynamika zmian w organizacji – ewolucja czy rewolucja* (s. 265-271). Prace Naukowe Akademii Ekonomicznej im. Oskara Langego we Wrocławiu nr 1141. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej.
- [18] Konieczko, A. (2006b). Lojalność pracownicza w organizacjach międzynarodowych – studium przypadku. W: T. Listwan, S.A. Witkowski (red.), *Sukces w zarządzaniu kadrami, kapitał ludzki w organizacjach międzynarodowych* (s. 119-128). Prace Naukowe Akademii Ekonomicznej im. Oskara Langego we Wrocławiu. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej.
- [19] Li, X. R., Petrick, J.F. (2010). Towards an Integrative Model of Loyalty Formatio: The Role of Quality and Value. *Leisure Sciences*, 32, 201-221.
- [20] Morrow, P.C. (1993). *The theory and measurement of work commitment*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- [21] Narra, V. (2009). Ergonomics: a key differentiator to employee loyalty. *Journal of Management Research*, 8(9), 67-78.
- [22] Olivier, R.L. (1999). *Whence Consumer Loyalty?* *Journal of Marketing*, 63, 33-44.

-
- [23] Olson-Buchaman, J.B., Boswell, W.R. (2002). The role of Employee Loyalty and Formality in Voicing Discontent. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(6), 1167-1174.
- [24] Porter, L.W., Smith, F.J. (1970). The etiology of organizational commitment: A longitudinal study of the initial stages of employee-organizational reaction. Unpublished manuscript, Graduate School of Administration, University of California Testing an Integrative Framework. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131(2), 241-259.
- [25] Rosmus, R. (2012). Lojalność osób przedsiębiorczych. Postawa czy taktyka. W: Z. Ratajczak (red.), *Przedsiębiorczość – źródła i uwarunkowania psychologiczne*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Difin.
- [26] Rudawska, E. (2005). *Lojalność klientów*. Warszawa: PWE.
- [27] Šmid, W. (2000). *Leksykon menedżera*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Profesjonalnej Szkoły Biznesu.
- [28] Soylu S. (2011). Creating a Family or Loyalty-Based Framework: The Effects of Paternalistic Leadership on Workplace Bullying, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 99(1), 217-231
- [29] Urban, W., Siemieniako, D. (2008). *Lojalność klientów. Modele, motywacja i pomiar*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej w Katowicach.
- [30] Valenzuela, L.M., Mulki, J.P., Jaramillo, J.F. (2010). Impact of Customer Orientation, Inducements and Ethics on Loyalty to the Firm: Customers' Perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 93, 277-291.
- [31] Van Vugt, M., Hart, C.M. (2004). Social Identity as Social Glue: The Origins of Group Loyalty. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(4), 585-598.
- [32] Wojciszke, B. (2002). *Człowiek wśród ludzi. Zarys psychologii społecznej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.