

8th International Strategic Management Conference

Impact of demographic factors on employee's perception of mobbing: A case study from a logistics company

Hakan Yıldırım^a, Beste Uysalolu^b, a*

^aMarmara University, İstanbul, Turkey

^bMarmara University, İstanbul, Turkey

Abstract

Mobbing is one of the obstacles of collaborative and effective organization that challenges motivation and peace in work place. Perceptions of employees on mobbing have critical effects on employee motivation, hence on job stress and job performance that directly affect productivity and organizational effectiveness. On the other hand, analyzing socio-demographic factors and identifying the group based differences in mobbing perceptions of employees is important for identifying the high risk groups. Differences enable policy makers to better design preventive actions in accordance with particular characteristics and needs of these groups. In this context, the purpose of this study is to explore the perceived mobbing level and impact of demographic factors and type of jobs on employees' perceptions of mobbing by using the findings of a case study in a logistics company in Turkey. For this purpose, from the theoretical background, we used a questionnaire that included basic factors that determine level of mobbing in a work place. Responses to survey were analyzed for finding out the significance of differences in terms of the demographics of participants. Therefore, understanding the impact of demographic factors and type of job on mobbing perceptions can enable human resources managers to develop relevant, specific policies that consider the characteristics of employees and jobs.

© 2012 Published by Elsevier Ltd. Selection and/or peer-review under responsibility of the 8th International Strategic Management Conference

INTERNATIONAL STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

Keywords: Mobbing, demographic factors, logistics industry, employee perceptions,

1. Introduction

As enablers of strategic success, collaboration of employees within an organization is among major corporate competencies and is as important as collaboration with other organizations. Mobbing is one of

* Corresponding author. Mob.Tel. + 90-532-658 25 47

Email address: hakan.yildirim@mmu.edu.tr ; beste@mmu.edu.tr

the obstacles of collaborative and effective organization that challenges motivation and peace in work place. Many scholars stated that mobbing is caused by corporate culture, high stress and organizational problems due to uncertainties in job design, lack of leadership, insufficient moral values of colleagues, unsolved conflicts. Perceptions of employees on mobbing have critical effects on employee motivation, hence on job stress and job performance that directly affect productivity and organizational effectiveness. In this context, the purpose of the present study is to explore the perceived mobbing level and impact of demographic factors on employees' perceptions of mobbing by using the findings of a case study in a logistics company in Turkey. For this purpose, from the theoretical background, we identified basic factors that determine level of mobbing in a work place. A questionnaire that is drawn up about relevant socio-demographic and work aspects based on these factors was employed in the studied company to determine the perceptions of employees on mobbing. Responses to survey were analyzed for finding out the significance of differences in terms of the demographics of participants. Therefore, understanding the demographic factors impact on mobbing perceptions can enable human resources managers to develop relevant, specific policies that consider the characteristics of employees.

Study outline is as follows: First, we briefly review the literature regarding the concept, brief history, causes, characteristics and participants of mobbing process, mobbing attitudes in workplace. Based on this theoretical background, we developed hypotheses concerning the impacts of demographic characteristics like age, education level, profession, gender, marital status, job titles, length of service, work experience on the perceptions of employees about mobbing. Next, we tested our hypotheses using data provided from a survey collected from 100 employees in a logistics company in Turkey. We explain in detail the data collection method and analytical procedures. Finally, we present the research findings and conclusions together with the discussion on main implications on strategic human resources management strategies and practices.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Definitions of Mobbing

International Labor Organization (ILO) reported that work-related psychological problems, such as violence, mobbing and burnout experienced at work, are increasing globally (Chappell and DiMartino, 2006). The concept of mobbing in workplace was defined for the first time by the German Labor Psychologist Heinz Leymann (1996) "as the systematic subjection, by one or more individuals (rarely exceeding four), of an individual (or, in rare cases, several individuals) to emotionally disturbing behavior". Mobbing in working life involves hostile and unethical communication, which is directed in a systematic way, by one or a few individuals mainly towards one individual who, due to mobbing is pushed into a helpless or defenseless position, being held there by means of continuing mobbing activities (That occur on a very frequent basis (statistical definition: at least once a week) and over a long period of time (statistical definition: at least 6 months of duration) (Leyman, 1996).

This concept defines various kinds of psychosocial problems related to work relations occurring in a work place (Kudelka and Kern, 2004) and it presents the process of systematic and repeated aggression by a person or group towards a coworker, subordinate, or superior (Fidalgo & Piñuel, 2004; Topa, Depolo, & Morales, 2007). Mobbing can produce negative consequences not only for the "victim" employees affected (Einarsen & Mikkelsen, 2003; Leymann & Gustafsson, 1996; Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2001, 2004; Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2002a, 2002b), but also for the work organization itself (Einarsen & Hauge, 2006) by causing low performance (Barling et al., 2001; Budd et al., 1996), job dissatisfaction, negative attitudes and behavior towards the workplace (Budd et al., 1996). Mobbing activities can be classified under 45 types of behavior (Leymann, 1996; Leymann and Gustafsson, 1996). These activities cover unhealthy communication, attacks on social relations, reputation, quality of life and work and activities that directly affect health (Fox and Stalworth, 2004). The act is systematic and repetitive

(Leymann and Gustaffson, 1996; Mikkelsen and Einarsen, 2001; Rayner and Hoel, 1997), and it is intended to be hostile and/or perceived to be hostile by the recipient (Einarsen, 1999; Einarsen and Skogstad, 1996).

2.2. Mobbing in Turkey

In Turkey, mobbing has recently been legally recognized by the Act, therefore there is only little research on mobbing in the workplace (Aytaç, 2008). Dikmetas et al. (2011) explored mobbing and burnout in health sector. Studies conducted on mobbing in Turkey have shown that employees in health sector (Dikmetas et al. 2011), sales, banking and insurance industries and technical jobs face with high rates of mobbing activities (Bilgel et al., 2006 ; Ercetin et al., 2008; Yıldırım and Yıldırım, 2007).

Although bullying and mobbing are often used interchangeably, some differences have been identified between these concepts and their applications (Hoel and Beale, 2006). Zapf and Einarsen (2005) related bullying to supervisor's behavior towards a subordinate, and mobbing to unwanted behavior between equals. Some writers identified bullying as a more direct form of aggression of individuals. They related mobbing with milder forms performed by a group (Leymann, 1996; Zapf, 1999). However, as Einarsen (1999) indicated though there are some differences, mobbing and bullying refer to the same concept (Bulutlar and Oz, 2008).

2.3. Demographic Factors and Mobbing

Among socio-demographic variables, gender appears to be the most widely studied variable, however, results from empirical studies on gender and bullying are inconsistent. (Marino-Jimenez, et al., 2009).

Gender: Some research showed that (Grunau, 2007; Dikmetas et al., 2011; Hoel & Cooper 2000; Vartia 1996; Kivimäkia et al., 2000) mobbing does not differ significantly according to gender. However, Trijueque and Gomez (2010) found significantly higher percentages in women. Besides As Moreno-Jiménez et al (2009) reported, differences based on gender vary by industry e.g. women report higher mobbing in male-dominated fields (Björkqvist et al. 1994; Salin 2001), whereas men face mobbing in female-dominated child care sector (Lindroth & Leymann 1992).

Age: There exists some research that found significantly higher percentages in workers aged between 31 and 50 years and in union members (Trijueque and Gomez, 2010). Hoel and Cooper (2000) found that younger people experienced more bullying than older employees. Rayner (1997), for example, reported that victims of bullying were usually less than 25 years of age. In contrast, in Einarsen and Skogstad's (1996) sample, older employees reported the highest incidence of bullying. Some studies in Scandinavian countries showed that older employees have more faced hostile acts (Einarsen et al. 1994; Piirainen et al. 2000; Vartia 2003).

Position/Job title: Some studies have reported similar proportions of bullying victims for employees, supervisors and managers (Einarsen & Raknes 1997; Hoel, Cooper & Faragher 2001). As Moreno-Jiménez et al (2009) quoted, other authors like Salin (2001) have found out that mobbing is associated with hierarchical status, with employees on lower hierarchical levels reporting more bullying than higher-level employees. In their research, Kivimäkia et al. (2000) concluded that the victims of bullying did not differ from the other employees for sex, age, occupational background or type of job.

3. Methodology

Data were collected through an employee survey that 100 employees of a logistic company in Turkey responded.

Survey questionnaire is composed of two sections.

- In the first section of the questionnaire, socio-demographic and professional information like gender, age, education level, marital status, length of service, job title, and total work experience place are collected.
- Second section of the questionnaire was designed to measure perceived mobbing. Respondents was asked to indicate how often they had been subjected to 37 listed counter-productive acts (Survey Questions) that was drawn up on the basis of previous literature and especially adopted from “Mobbing typology” of Leymann (1996). 5-Lykert scale is used in the survey that ranges between Never (=1), Very Rare (=2), Sometimes (=3), Often (=4) and Always (=5).

The universe of the study includes 400 employees in the studied company. Survey was conducted in March, 2011. Survey questionnaire is delivered to 115 employees in two departments (60 employees in courier department, 55 employees in customer services department) that perform main activities in the value chain of the company, hence that feel highest stress in the organization.

100 employees responded to survey (85% of the total delivered employees, %20 of all employees in the company).

Statistical analyses were carried out using SPSS version 12.5. Frequency analyses were carried out for the prevalence of counter-productive behaviors. Levene’s test is used for testing significance of gender, length of service and marital status differences while ANOVA test is used for age, job title and educational level differences (with the assumption of the fact that data distribution is normal.) A level below .05 was considered statistically significant.

Limitations: Employees in departments that perform supporting activities like finance, accounting, administrative office, information technology, public relations are not included in the research. Results of the present study and this future research on these issues can be compared and discussed for “impact of functional/Departmental attitudes” on the mobbing perception of employees. Besides findings of the research are based on subjective ideas of participants. Also findings cannot be generalized to all employees in logistics industry but can provide useful insights to human resources professionals and researchers about the mobbing perceptions in highly-stressed, time-focused operational jobs like courier and customer services in service industry..

4. Research : Analysis of Entrepreneurial Intentions/Orientations of Public Universities in Turkey

In the light of above explained theoretical background, following hypotheses and results are presented.

Due to the fact that the survey has sharp ends, and that the employees felt pressure on them about expressing their feelings about their workplace, responses to survey is not independent from emotional impacts.

Most common answers to survey questions are Never (=1) and Always (=5).

H1: The level of employees’ perceptions on mobbing is above the acceptable level.

As shown in Table 1 (that is derived from Appendix 1) the average value of responses to survey questions in the chosen 5- Lykert scale is 1.5005 that falls between Never (=1) and Rare=2. However as the average is closer to 2 than 1, we concluded that “negative behavior” takes place in this company rarely. Based on the literature, mobbing is a systematic act and negative behaviors have to take place “systematically” instead of “coincidentally” or “occasionally”. From this point of view it is concluded that mobbing does not take place in this company and H1 is rejected.

Table 1. Evaluation of Employees Perceptions on Mobbing in Workplace based on 37 Survey Questions

	Nr of responses	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Average of all questions	100	1,00	3,18	1,5005	0,54198

H2: There are significant differences in mobbing perceptions of employees in the studied company in relation to their gender.

Table 2. Distribution of Group statistics of Participants by Gender

Gender	Number of participants	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean
Women	35	1,4981	0,52738	0,06541
Men	65	1,5050	0,57595	0,09735
Total	100			

Table 3. Independent Samples test for Mobbing Perceptions' Significant Differences by Gender

Levenes's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of The Difference		
							Lower	Upper	
Equal variances assumed	0,007	0,935	-,061	98	,952	-,00692	,11421	-,23356	,21971
Equal variances not assumed			-,059	64,632	,953	-,00692	,11729	-,24119	,22734

In Table 2 and Table 3, it is tested whether there is a difference in mobbing perception by gender. Hypothesis 2 is that there is a significant difference. In Table 3, LEvene's test is used for testing two groups of responses. Significance value is over ,05, so the variance of two groups is accepted as equal and H2 is rejected meaning that there is no significant difference between men and women in terms of mobbing perceptions.

H3: There are significant differences in mobbing perceptions of employees in the studied company in relation to their age.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics for Distribution of Participants' Mobbing Perceptions by Age

Gender	Number of participants	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower bound	Upper bound
18-22	55	1,4718	0,49710	0,06703	1,3374	1,6062
23-28	37	1,5676	0,56568	0,09300	1,3790	1,7562
29-34	8	1,3875	0,74666	0,26398	0,7633	2,0117
Total	100	1,5005	0,54198	0,05420	1,3930	1,6080

Table 5. ANOVA Test for Distribution of Group statistics of Participants by Age

	Sum of Squares	dF	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	0,314	2	0,157	0,529	5,91
Within Groups	28,766	97	0,297		
Total	29,080	99			

In Table 4 and Table 5, Hypothesis 3 is tested whether there is a significant difference in mobbing perception by age or not. t test is used for testing three age group of responses (18-22, 23-28, 29-34). Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics for three age groups. In Table 5, ANOVA Test is used for testing the significance of differences in mobbing perceptions of three age groups. Significance value is over 0,05 so the variance of three groups is accepted as equal and H3 is rejected meaning that there is no significant difference between different age groups in terms of mobbing perceptions.

H4: There are significant differences in mobbing perceptions of employees in the studied company in relation to their length of service in the company.

Table 6. Distribution of Participants for Length of Service

Length of service	Number of participants	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean
1-5	76	1,4523	0,47637	0,05501
6-10	24	1,6450	0,69496	0,13899
Total	100			

Table 7. Independent Samples test for Mobbing Perceptions’ Significant Differences by Length of Service

Levenes’s Test for Equality of Variances			t-test for Equality of Means						
F	Sig.		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of The Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	3,537	0,063	-1,550	98	0,124	-0,19267	0,12429	-0,43931	0,05398
Equal variances not assumed			-1,289	31,853	0,207	-0,19267	0,14948	-0,49720	0,11187

In Table 6 and Table 7, it is tested whether there is a difference in mobbing perception by length of service in the company by years. Hypothesis 4 states that there is a significant difference in mobbing perceptions of employees with different length of service in the company. Table 6 shows the descriptive statistics for two groups that are determined by length of service; “1 to 5 years” and “6 to 10 years”. In Table 7, Levene’s test is used for testing two groups of responses. Significance value is over 0, 05 so the variance of two groups is accepted as equal and H4 is rejected, meaning that there is no significant difference between the employees that are employed in the company for 1 to 5 years and the ones that are employed for 6 to 10 years in terms of their mobbing perceptions.

H5: There are significant differences in mobbing perceptions of employees in the studied company in relation to their educational level.

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics for Distribution of Participants’ Mobbing Perceptions by Educational Level

Gender	Nr. of responses	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of The Difference	
					Lower bound	Upper bound
Associate Degree	16	1,4469	0,60772	1,15193	1,1230	1,7707
Undergraduate	74	1,4615	0,50052	0,05818	1,3455	1,5774
Post Graduate	10	1,8750	0,64042	0,20252	1,4169	2,3331
Total	100	1,5005	0,54198	0,05420	1,3930	1,6080

Table 9. ANOVA Test for Distribution of Group Statistics of Participants by Age

	Sum of Squares	dF	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	1,561	2	0,781	2,751	0,069
Within Groups	27,519	97	0,284		
Total	29,080	99			

In Table 8 and Table 9, it is tested whether there is a difference in mobbing perception by educational level. Hypothesis 5 states that there is a significant difference. t test is used for testing the three education levels of respondents (Associate Degree, Undergraduate, Post Graduate). In Table 9, ANOVA Test is used for testing the significance of differences in mobbing perceptions of three education level groups. Significance value is over 0, 05 so the variance of two groups is accepted as equal and H5 is rejected, meaning that there is no significant difference between the mobbing perceptions of employees that have associate degree, undergraduate and graduate degrees.

H6: There are significant differences in mobbing perceptions of employees in the studied company in relation to their job titles/positions.

Table 10. Descriptive Statistics for Distribution of Participants’ Mobbing Perceptions by Positions/Job Groups

Position Type of Job	Number of participants	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower bound	Upper bound
Front office	10	1,4525	0,45848	0,14498	1,1245	1,7805
Support	11	1,3955	0,45632	0,13759	1,0889	1,7020
PDN Advisor	13	1,8231	0,70780	0,19631	1,3954	2,2508
Cash line	14	1,3813	0,45474	0,11369	1,1389	1,6236
Courier	50	1,4875	0,53945	0,07629	1,3342	1,6408
Total	100	1,5005	0,54198	0,05420	1,3930	1,6080

Table 11. ANOVA Test for Distribution of Group statistics of Participants by Positions/Job Titles

	Sum of Squares	dF	Mean Square	F	Significance
Between Groups	1,733	4	0,433	1,505	0,207
Within Groups	27,347	95	0,288		
Total	29,080	99			

In Table 10 and Table 11, it is tested whether there is a difference in mobbing perception by job groups in the company. Hypothesis 6 states that there is a significant difference. t test is used for testing five job groups of respondents (Front Office, Support, PDN Advisor, Cash line and Courier). Table 10 shows the descriptive statistics for five job groups. In Table 11, ANOVA test is used to test the significance of differences in mobbing perceptions between different job groups. Significance value is over 0,05 so the variance of two groups is accepted as equal and H6 is rejected meaning that there is no significant difference between the mobbing perceptions of employees that have different jobs in the company.

5. Conclusion

As presented in the research section, in the studied company where employees do not perceive a continuous mobbing behavior overall, study showed that there has been no significant difference in the mobbing perceptions of employees in terms of gender, age, educational level, length of service or job group/position. Mobbing perception is not differed by any distinct group with certain demographic characteristics and type of jobs. These findings supported some of the findings of some previous large-scale researches in European countries, while contradicting with some of the findings of the same or other studies.

Identifying the group based differences in mobbing perceptions of employees is important for identifying the risk groups (Moreno-Jimenez et al, 2009). By analyzing demographic factors and type of jobs, we may have an idea about the groups with high risk of being mobbed or bullied and hence preventive actions can be better designed in accordance with particular characteristics and needs of these groups. That is why this study and similar studies may significantly contribute to defining the preventive measures against mobbing.

Expanding this research to cover other similar companies in the logistics sector in Turkey will be very useful to see the big picture of mobbing perceptions of employees in logistics industry. Besides, inclusion of ethnical and cultural factors in the survey and testing the significance of the cultural, ethnical differences shall complement the research on factors that may have impact on the mobbing perceptions of employees.

References

- Barling, J., Rogers, A.G. and Kelloway E.K. (2001). Behind closed doors: In-home workers' experience of sexual harassment and workplace violence. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Vol: 6: 225-269.
- Björkqvist, K., Österman, K. And Hjelt-Bäck, M. (1994). 'Aggression among university employees', *Aggressive Behaviour*, 20, 173-184.
- Bilgel, N., Aytac S. and Bayram, N. (2006). Bullying in Turkish White-Collar Workers. *Occupation Medicine*, 56: 226–231.
- Budd, J. W., Arvey R.D. and Lawles, P. (1996). Correlates and consequences of workplace violence. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, Vol. 1: 197-210.
- Bulutlar, F and Oz, E. U. (2008). The Effects of Ethical Climates on Bullying Behaviour in the Workplace, *Journal of Business Ethics* (2009) 86:273–295.
- Chappell D, Di Martino V (2006) *Violence at work* (Third Edition). Geneva, International Labor Organization, p. 17.
- Çobanoğlu, Ş. (2005). *İşyerinde Duygusal Saldırı ve Mücadele Yöntemleri*, Timaş Yayınları.
- Dikmetaş, E., Top, M. and Ergin, G. (2011). An Examination of Mobbing and Burnout of Residents , *Turkish Journal of Psychiatry* 2011

- DiMartino, V. (2003). Relationship between work stress and workplace violence in the health sector. Geneva, ILO/ICN/WHO/PSI, p. 35
- Einarsen, S., and Skogstad, A. (1996). Bullying at work: Epidemiological Findings on Public and Private Organizations, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), 185-201
- Einarsen, S. (1999). 'The Nature and Causes of Bullying at Work', *International Journal of Manpower* 20(1/2), 16–27.
- Einarsen, S. (2000). Harassment and Bullying at Work: A review of the Scandinavian Approach, *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 5(4), 319-401.
- Einarsen, S. and Mikkelsen, E. G. (2003). Individual effects of exposure to bullying at work. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace. International perspectives in research and practice* (pp. 127-144). London: Taylor and Francis.
- Erçetin Ş.Ş., Hamedoğlu M.A. and Çelik, S. (2008). Mobbing in primary schools (A case study for Hendek county, Sakarya). *Work and Safety Journal*, Vol. 3: 945-955.
- Fox S, Stallworth LE (2004) Racial/ethnic bullying: exploring links between bullying and racism in the US workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, Vol. 59: 291-309
- Grunau, G. (2007). *Mobbing and burnout: Are they linked?*, (Ph.D. Thesis). Walden University.
- Hoel, H & Cooper, C. L. (2000). 'Destructive Conflict and Bullying at Work', Manchester School of Management, University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology (UMIST).
- Kivimäki, M., Elovainio, M. and Vahterä, J. (2000). Workplace bullying and sickness absence in hospital staff, *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 57, 656-660.
- Kudielka B.M. and Kern, S. (2004). Cortisol day profiles in victims of mobbing (bullying at the work place): Preliminary results of a first psychobiological field study. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, Vol. 56: 149-150.
- Koç, M. and Urasoğlu, B.H. (2009). Ortaöğretim Öğretmenlerinde Mobbing: Cinsiyet, Yas ve Lise Türü Değişkenleri açısından incelenmesi, *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 1(1), s.64-80.
- Leymann, H. (1996). The Content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5: 165-184.
- Leymann, H. and Gustafsson, A. (1996). Mobbing and the development of posttraumatic stress disorders. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5: 251-275.
- Lindroth, S. and Leymann, H. (1993). Adult Bullying among a Minority Group of Men in Child Care. On Men's Equality in a Female-Dominated Occupation, Stockholm: Swedish National Board of Occupational Safety and Health.
- Matthiesen, S. B., & Einarsen, S. (2001). MMPI-2. configurations among victims of bullying at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10(4), 467-484. Niedl, K. 1996. *Mobbing and Well-being: Economic and Personal Development Implications*,
- Mikkelsen, E. G. and Einarsen, S. (2001). 'Bullying in Danish Work-Life: Prevalence and Health Correlates', *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 10(4), 393–413.
- Moreno-Jiménez, B, Muñoz, A., Salin, D. and Benadero, M. M. (2009). Workplace bullying in southern europe: prevalence, forms and risk groups in a Spanish sample, *International Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, Volume 13(2), 95-109.
- Rayner, C. and Hoel, H. (1997). 'A Summary Review of Literature Relating to Workplace Bullying', *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* 7, 181–191.
- Salin, D. (2003). 'Ways of explaining workplace bullying: enabling, motivating and precipitating structures and processes in the work environment', *Human Relations*, 56, (10), 1213-1232
- Trijuque G. D., Gómez J. L. G. (2010). Workplace bullying: prevalence and descriptive analysis in a multi-occupational sample, *Psychology in Spain*, Vol. 14. No 1, 15-21
- Vartia, M. (1996). 'The sources of bullying - psychological work environment and organizational climate', *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5:2, pp. 203-214.

Yıldırım A. and Yıldırım, D. (2007). Mobbing in the workplace by peers and managers: mobbing experienced by nurses working in healthcare facilities in Turkey and its effect on nurses. *Journal of Clinical Nursery*, 16: 1444-1453.

Appendix 1. Descriptive Statistics on Responses to 37 Survey Questions

Questions	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
S1 I am limited for presenting my knowledge and skills	100	1	5	1,94	,973
S2 My success is ignored and my failures are overstated	100	1	5	2,00	1,128
S3 I am interrupted when I am speaking in the meetings	100	1	4	1,77	,790
S4 My private life is criticized	100	1	3	1,71	,608
S5 I am threatened verbally	100	1	2	1,35	,479
S6 I am subject to disturbing gestures and looks.	100	1	4	1,59	,793
S7 I am threatened by written expressions	100	1	3	1,35	,557
S8 People do not communicate with me	100	1	2	1,36	,482
S9 I am criticized for talking to some colleagues	100	1	4	1,55	,744
S10 I am accused of being someone's mate	100	1	4	1,48	,847
S11 My colleagues are interfered when they talk to me	100	1	4	1,53	,703
S12 I am treated as I am not there	100	1	4	1,54	,797
s13 People gossip about me	100	1	3	1,50	,659
s14 There are unfounded rumours and gossips about me	100	1	4	1,63	,895
s15 They hold me up to ridicule	100	1	3	1,39	,567
s16 They treat me as I am insane	100	1	2	1,25	,435
S17 I am forced to receive psychological treatment	100	1	2	1,25	,435
s18 They make fun of my defects and weaknesses	100	1	3	1,44	,656
S19 They mimic me for making fun of me	100	1	2	1,30	,461
S20 They imitate my body language for making fun of me	100	1	2	1,30	,461
s21 They imitate my noise for making fun of me	100	1	2	1,30	,461
s22 They make fun of my religious or political beliefs	100	1	2	1,35	,479
s23 They make fun of my ethnicity	100	1	2	1,30	,461
s24 I am force to do jobs that negatively affect my self confidence	100	1	5	1,62	1,013
s25 My efforts are considered wrongly and disparagingly	100	1	5	1,67	1,055
s26 My behaviors are questioned	100	1	5	1,76	1,120
S27 They call me with humiliating names	100	1	3	1,34	,555
S28 Special tasks are never assigned to me	100	1	3	1,49	,577
S29 Tasks that are given to me are cancelled	100	1	5	1,57	1,018
s30 They give me meaningless and valueless tasks	100	1	4	1,53	,893
s31 They give me tasks that require less than my skills	100	1	5	1,62	1,013
s32 They give me tasks that are not related to my qualifications, so they undervalue me	100	1	5	1,60	1,015

s33 My workplace or my house is harmed	100	1	2	1,25	,435
s34 I am threatened by physical violence	100	1	2	1,25	,435
s35 I am discouraged by violent attempts	100	1	3	1,29	,537
s36 I get physically hurt and harmed	100	1	2	1,25	,435
S37 I am sexually harrassed	100	1	2	1,27	,446
Average	100	1,00	3,18	1,50	,54198