



# JOURNAL of SOCIAL and HUMANITIES SCIENCES RESEARCH (JSHSR)

Uluslararası Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Araştırma Dergisi

**Received/Makale Geliş** 21.03.2021  
**Published /Yayınlanma** 19.05.2021  
**Article Type/Makale Türü** Research Article

**Citation/Alıntı:** Türker, M. K. (2021). Mobbing Perception of Teachers and Academicians in Turkey: A Descriptive Analysis at Public Schools and Universities. *Journal of Social and Humanities Sciences Research*, 8(69), 1051-1065. <http://dx.doi.org/10.26450/jshsr.2438>

**Dr. Muhsin Kürşat TÜRKER**  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0271-7078>  
Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı, Kocaeli / TÜRKİYE

## MOBBING PERCEPTION OF TEACHERS AND ACADEMICIANS IN TURKEY: A DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS AT PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES

### ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is about determining the mobbing perceptions of teachers and academicians in Turkey by a survey applied all around the country. The results were acquired from the questionnaire forms that sent teachers and academicians who have been working at public schools and universities in Turkey. The sample consisted of 1477 participants. Viewed from a wide perspective, it was aimed to provide information about exposing types of mobbing, pieces of evidence about differences between genders and occupations by determining mobbing perception of teachers and academicians. Therefore, public and organizational authorities in schools and universities can decide what they must do for preventing mobbing and, how they must generate or form policies and political decisions about preventing mobbing by this information. There was some information acquired through the results of this study. The first information acquired is perception differences of occupations and genders about mobbing in the whole research group. The second one is perception differences for genders about mobbing in same occupational group and finally perception differences of occupations about mobbing in a same-gender group.

**Keywords:** Mobbing, Academician, Teacher, Public School, University

### 1. INTRODUCTION

There is a harmony problem wherever people are. One of the important problems of people and work-life is mobbing today. Because work-life means competition in many times and competition associate with power balance. But if there is a power imbalance, mobbing may occur. The concept of mobbing which means psychological violence at the workplace has been discussed nearly for a half-century and it must be done until human beings can solve this humiliating and shameful situation. If there was an opportunity to research from the beginning of human history about mobbing as a workplace concept, lots of evidence could be found. But especially; while mobbing can't be solved yet, it can be focused on remedies or how to prevent it. Since mobbing is about work-life and people, it is hard to find all the solutions for damaging effects on employees. Because, happening, implementing, and exposing styles are changing continuously, even if all of the solutions and preventing methods can be found which were about up to now. One of the big problems about mobbing for today is that there is not a good way for preventing or resolving it exactly. But, solving ways can be found for some aspects which are investigated or, mobbing can be prevented through some procedural precautions in some circumstances.

As mentioned above, one of the main and maybe the most important issue about mobbing is, preventing it or resolving if it occurred. But, for resolving and preventing it in the right ways, the other emphasis must be acceptance of mobbing truly by authorities or whoever controlling power. Because, from many aspects, mobbing is a phenomenon that is difficult to overcome for the victim. Therefore, constructing a power balance or controlling power in the workplace may be a good solution for problems about mobbing.

Issue/Sayı: 69

Volume/Cilt: 8

jshsr.org

ISSN: 2459-1149

The scope of this study is about focusing on the perception of teachers and academicians about mobbing. Because, according to International Labour Office (1998), one of the occupational groups which exposed to mobbing mostly is teachers. Looking from the perspective of what they do for their job, teachers and academicians can be seen similarly. Because both of their jobs are about teaching. Their workplaces, their job definitions are similar. Both two group are calling their holistic workplace a school. Both are calling their inner workplace a classroom etc. The main difference between both groups is about their work definitions. One of the groups, academicians are working on research more and the other group teachers are working on teaching more. Thus, from the start point to the end, their main work definitions are about researching and teaching.

Exposing types and perceptions of mobbing for academicians may differ from teachers because of their institutional, bureaucratic structure or it can be said vice versa for teachers. Looking from this perspective it is important to understand separately, perceptions of teachers, perceptions of academicians, perceptions of women teachers and academicians, and perceptions of men teachers and academicians.

## **2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

The psychological violence concept mentioned by Brodsky (1976) and Thylefors (1987) in early times for description has become a workplace concept by Leymann (1986) when he said its name mobbing as a business life's word. Because mobbing concept was used by Lorenz (1963) for animals before Leymann's study and it is still used in biological research areas too.

Mobbing means for Leymann (1990) that; circumstances which can be considered together with the actions which get victim helpless, vulnerable and includes unethical, aggressively, regularly communications aimed at one person. It lasts for six months and repeats at least once a week. Matthiesen and Einarsen (2007) added to this definition that; victims must feel as vulnerable and feel the actions they exposed are perceived as mobbing.

The phenomenon, mobbing has been used in different names in many articles and books but most of them mean similar things. As mentioned by Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf and Cooper (2011), most of these are using interchangeably. For deciding to prevent or stopping mobbing actions; the definition of phenomenon can be used in an easier, main word as mobbing. Because mobbing can be understood everywhere where it occurred. Thereby a consensus can be created about calling the phenomenon. On the other side, as mentioned by Zapf (1999), sometimes mobbing can be an interpretation question.

If we look at the mobbing cases, sometimes it can be seen as actions from superiors to subordinates, from subordinates to superiors or, in equivalents (Lutgen-Sandvik, Namie, & Namie, 2009; Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2011; Branch, Ramsay, & Barker, 2013). The most mentioned in literature is about from superiors to subordinates (Vanderkerckhove, 2006). Consequently, mobbing can occur at every level of an organization (Branch, Ramsay, & Barker, 2013).

## **3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

Mobbing is about the perception of people about damaging actions of others on them for destroying their existence or damaging intention on their psychological status. Just like how a person gives affective response to an event, victims may give affective responses to mobbing attacks. Because, it is supposed for Affective Events Theory that (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996), people give affective responses to events with their behaviors, attitudes, and welfare conditions which occurred around them. From the perspective of Affective Events Theory, as mentioned in some studies, mobbing may be considered as one of the affective events (Ghosh, Dierkes, & Falletta, 2011; Glasø, Matthiesen, Nielsen, & Einarsen, 2007; Lee & Brotheridge, 2006; Lim, Cortina, & Magley, 2008; Branch, Ramsay, & Barker, 2013). Because; for Brotheridge and Lee (2010), some specific mobbing actions have specific affective responses and there will be an affective response in every mobbing case.

Looking from this perspective, it is important to understand the responses of academicians and teachers about mobbing in terms of their occupations and their genders. Because there are different law regulations for academicians and teachers in their occupational places in Turkey in terms of their institutional law systems. It can be supposed that different places and different vocational work environments can change emotional conditions. So mobbing attacks, their emotional effects and results

may differ for every occupation and every gender. If the conceptual framework is shaped by Affective Events Theory, this research must be considered by this framework too. Thus, both occupation and gender must be investigated by their own status and conditions.

Institutional status and conditions affected by law regulations may change the perception about behaviours, attitudes, and approaches. There may be more flexible conditions for universities than schools in Turkey. Bureaucratic decisions for universities may be easier than schools because of their law regulations. These regulations give universities more free area and flexibility about their working conditions and opportunity for deciding faster. Because, it can be said that, research studies need more autonomy for thinking and working freely on science. On the other hand, it can be seen either there is more opportunity for helpful and beneficial conditions or, more opportunity for harmful and counter-productive decisions. For national educational schools, there are not similar free areas and decision mechanisms as universities. Because law and policy systems are regulated for every detail in the working area and employee. These differences create two working environments, two different work conditions, and so different perceptions. It can be supposed that schools have more institutional structure than universities because of bureaucracy, different laws and policies, and lesser free areas. In this case, it can be supposed that more laws and policies force people to adapt to them and so more problems may occur. On the other hand, lesser laws and policies can give people more opportunity for mobbing attacks on others easily. As mentioned by Bjørkelo (2010) from the perspective of Social Exchange Theory, circumstances can result from people's current situations and people can affect circumstances depends on their conditions. Looking from this aspect it can be suggested that, a bureaucratic or institutional structure may be important about exposing mobbing more or about exposing types. One of our former studies suggested that there is a negative relationship between organizational procedural justices and mobbing perceptions (Ergün & Ördek, 2016). Thus, it may be supposed that if there is more institutional and bureaucratic structure, in other words, if there is a more and strict procedural justice system, there will be lesser mobbing cases. From the justice perspective, it is considered that procedural justice means that there is a strict implemented law and policy system.

Viewpoints for universities and schools may differ because of their law and policy implementing forms. It depends on practitioners and the people who implemented them. If there are more flexible areas about working conditions and one or more perpetrators are in there, it is supposed that the law and policy system is dependent on initiatives more. Therefore, it can be thought that more mobbing cases may occur. On the other side, if there is the perpetrator who controls power, but the law and policy system is strict, the perpetrator can use laws and policies for the benefit of his/her own. In every circumstance, mobbing may occur in both workplaces depends on the intention of people. Because, it is suggested that, mobbing may be applied everywhere and every time if it is intended.

The other perspective about working conditions may be about the need for autonomy. It can be said that there are different working conditions about decision constructs for the autonomy of these two different occupational groups. If we look from the window of the school, we can say that there is lesser autonomy about teachers because of law and bureaucratic system than academicians. Because the law system of school is found on laws, policies, and principles more. Usually, teachers cannot decide what they can do about their jobs and work conditions. Nearly all steps are ready for their implementations on lesson applications and work conditions. If they are not ready, at that time directives, policies or protocols will be ready. Teachers must adapt to these rules and circumstances. They cannot decide about their working conditions or their job definitions in a circumstance like this.

On the other side, there is more autonomy for academicians for their work conditions and job definitions. Because nearly no one can step in about academicians' jobs for what they do at lessons and what they want to research. There isn't any definition of how an academician must lecture, and the true one may be so. Because academicians are, specialists about what they lecture and maybe an intervention may affect negatively that lesson or topic. Because the lessons or topics that academicians lectured are specific on themselves. In schools, it can be found a teacher easier for lecturing about a subject or lesson. Because topics or subjects are general. However, this may not be possible for a specific lesson or subject which is specialized by an academician.

As mentioned before, academicians work on research more than teachers do. Thus, academicians can decide what they want to do about either their lessons or research studies. However, there is not the

same opportunity for work conditions of teachers or what teachers want to do about their job. From the perspective of mobbing, it can be thought that more autonomy may reason for exposing mobbing more because of the autonomy of the perpetrator. Because there is autonomy for academicians, but the same autonomy is for perpetrators too. If the law system constructed for universities cannot be enough for preventing mobbing, at that time autonomy can be a reason of mobbing by itself.

After all these discussions, the research hypothesis suggested is below.

*H1: There is a significant difference between the mobbing perception of teachers and academicians.*

*H1a: There is a significant difference between the mobbing perception of women teachers and women academicians.*

*H1b: There is a significant difference between the mobbing perception of men teachers and men academicians.*

*H2: There is a significant difference in mobbing perceptions in terms of the gender of teachers and academicians.*

*H2a: There is a significant difference between the mobbing perception of women teachers and men teachers.*

*H2b: There is a significant difference between the mobbing perception of women academicians and men academicians.*

#### **4. METHODOLOGY**

An exploratory and descriptive research design was used in this study. For testing research hypotheses, the data was collected from academicians and teachers who have been working at public schools and public universities in Turkey. For collecting data, the scale “Psikolojik Şiddet Davranışları (Psychological Violence Behaviours)” was used which was developed by Yıldırım and Yıldırım (2010). The scale has 33 items and is used due to its language. Because the sample consisted of Turkish employees. Additionally, this scale is very popular, used in the literature commonly and well known in the literature as cited by Nielsen, Notelaers and Einarsen (2011).

5-Point Likert Scale was used to collect data. There were five different statements for participants’ responses. The statements included in the scale were never (1), rarely (2), sometimes (3), often (4), and every time (5). For collecting data, an internet application was used. An internet link which is hosting questionnaire form was formed.

##### **4.1. Sample**

The questionnaire form was sent to 53000 e-mail addresses of all Turkish public schools. The same form was sent to the e-mail addresses of all academicians in Turkish universities. Addresses of academicians was acquired from personal the web page of academicians on their universities. A simple random sampling technique was used for collecting data. Participants’ responses were gathered by internet platform which used for questionnaire form too. There were 1477 responses acquired from them and they were analyzed by the SPSS program.

##### **4.2. Demographic Characteristics**

Totally, the number of teacher participants was 1164. For academicians, it was 313. The number of total women who participated was 621 and the number of men who participated was 856. The number of women teachers who participated was 469 and men teachers was 695. The number of women academicians who participated was 152 and men was 161. For the professional position of the sample, 1009 of all participants were teachers or lecturers. 16 of the participants were chiefs or group managers. 408 participants were middle-level managers and 44 of them were top-level managers. The work experience of the participants was so that, 186 of them were working for 6 months -3 years in that workplace. The number of 4-7 years was 284 and 8-15 years was 394. For 15-25 years, 386 participants were working at their workplace. 227 of the participants were working at their workplace for more than 25 years. The age of the youngest group in the sample is between 18-24 years. The oldest groups’ age interval is 45-65. Retiring age is the last 65 for Turkish public organizations and so there is not any 65

upper age-old participants in the sample. The number of bachelor's degree of participants is 943. The number of master's degrees is 301 and the doctorate is 233. This information was shown in Table 1.

**Table 1:** Demographic Characteristics

POSITION		
	Frequency	Percent
Teacer-Lecturer	1009	68,3
Chieff-Group Manager	16	1,1
Middle-Level Manager	408	27,6
Top-Level Manager	44	3,0
AGE		
	Frequency	Percent
18-24 years old	34	2,3
25-29 years old	235	15,9
30-34 years old	324	21,9
35-44 years old	517	35,0
46-65 years old	367	24,8
EXPERIENCE		
	Frequency	Percent
6 Ay-3 Years	186	12,6
4-7 Years	284	19,2
8-15 Years	394	26,7
15-25 Years	386	26,1
25+ Years	227	15,4
GRADUATION		
	Frequency	Percent
Bachelor's	943	63,8
Master	301	20,4
Doctorate	233	15,8

## 5. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Exploratory factor analysis was performed for validity and reliability analysis of the dataset. As mentioned by Hair et al. (2010), factor analysis is a method for verification of the validity of a scale. After passing the validity phase, a reliability test was performed. The reliability test evaluates the internal consistency of a measurement items in a scale (Kerlinger, 1986). It should be above at 0,70 Cronbach Alpha coefficient for being able to say that the reliability is enough (Nunnally & Benstein, 1994). Table 2 below shows the coefficients of validity and reliability analysis. As seen from the table, it can be supposed that the scale is confidential and valid.

**Table 2:** Validity and Reliability Statistics

Number of Item	33
Cronbach Alpha	0,94
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy	0,974
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Significance Value)	0,000*
Total Variance Explained (%)	60,798

\*P< 0,01

Factor weights, means, medians, modes, and standard deviations of every item were shown in Table 3. The scale items were separated into sub-dimensions of the variable on the table. As mentioned by Yıldırım and Yıldırım (2010), there must be four sub-dimensions originally for mobbing scale but there were three sub-dimensions shown up from factor analysis for our scale. Originally separated and different sub-dimensions named attacks to personality and attacks directly were gathered and named together attacks to personality and victims directly.



**Table 3: Factor Weights**

Attacks to Personality or Victim Directly						
Item	Explanation	Factor Weight	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation
MOB27	It is implied that my mental health is not well.	0,764	1,1869	1,0000	1,00	0,62601
MOB29	It is made correspondence/reports about me on unfair grounds.	0,724	1,2437	1,0000	1,00	0,68780
MOB26	It is said unfounded rumors about my special life.	0,723	1,2864	1,0000	1,00	0,72408
MOB33	My colleagues are blocked or banned to speak with me.	0,713	1,2133	1,0000	1,00	0,65942
MOB32	When I come to a place, it is deserted intentionally.	0,706	1,1889	1,0000	1,00	0,57281
MOB28	It is questioned whether I am credible/honest or not.	0,699	1,2857	1,0000	1,00	0,72013
MOB24	It is spoken humiliatingly and derogatory with me in front of other people.	0,641	1,3717	1,0000	1,00	0,78387
MOB25	It has behaved me humiliating using body language in front of other people.	0,627	1,4076	1,0000	1,00	0,79660
MOB23	I am threatened verbally/ Threatening sentences are used.	0,626	1,4685	1,0000	1,00	0,85452
MOB22	It is said unfounded rumors about me.	0,601	1,6567	1,0000	1,00	0,98875
MOB21	I am exposed to exaggerative reactions like hitting the table.	0,581	1,2492	1,0000	1,00	0,65037
MOB9	I am forced to leave my job or change my position.	0,564	1,3615	1,0000	1,00	0,87456
Attacks to Occupational Status or Prestige						
Item	Explanation	Factor Weight	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation
MOB13	I am held responsible for work above my capability.	0,747	1,8829	1,0000	1,00	1,11553
MOB14	I am held responsible for the negative outcomes of joint works.	0,695	1,5545	1,0000	1,00	0,95596
MOB15	I am accused of subjects for which I am not responsible.	0,693	1,5498	1,0000	1,00	0,90975
MOB16	My occupational effectiveness/efficacy is questioned whatever I did.	0,659	1,5437	1,0000	1,00	0,94440
MOB18	Negative considerations are made about my job success continuously.	0,631	1,5105	1,0000	1,00	0,91030
MOB17	My job is considered unimportant and insignificant.	0,608	1,6486	1,0000	1,00	1,03941
MOB12	Faults/problems are found about my job and its outcomes continuously.	0,600	1,6838	1,0000	1,00	0,99434
MOB19	It is controlled me and my job indirectly.	0,580	2,1381	2,0000	1,00	1,16283
MOB20	I am forced to do job Works that makes me feel awkward	0,563	1,3588	1,0000	1,00	0,82714
Social Isolation						
Item	Explanation	Factor Weight	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation
MOB4	I am not given the opportunity to show / prove myself	0,704	1,6324	1,0000	1,00	1,00721
MOB5	I am not informed about social meetings.	0,704	1,6019	1,0000	1,00	0,92097
MOB3	The job what I am responsible for is taken from me and it is given people whose level are lower than me.	0,701	1,4028	1,0000	1,00	0,84476
MOB2	It is not replied to my requests for a meeting or speaking.	0,678	1,5152	1,0000	1,00	0,83816
MOB1	I am ignored, I am treated as if I am not at there.	0,664	1,8050	1,0000	1,00	0,96688
MOB6	My decisions and suggestions are criticized and rejected.	0,629	1,7861	2,0000	1,00	0,95863
MOB8	I am interrupted while I am speaking	0,576	1,7190	1,0000	1,00	0,91376
MOB7	I am checked by other people who are at a lower level than me.	0,572	1,4814	1,0000	1,00	0,95521
MOB11	Information, documents, and materials which are necessary for my work are kept from me.	0,507	1,3615	1,0000	1,00	0,80182

Table 4 shows frequencies of responses and percentages for all participants. As seen from the table the most referred "Never" response (1320 times) is about Mobbing 27 item which is "It is implied that my

psychology is not normal”. Thus, it can be supposed that the least mobbing attack is about implying for psychological health for this sample. The most referred response 5 is at Mobbing 19 item (74 times) which is “you or your work is controlled implicitly or explicitly.” The second referred item was Mobbing-13 (57 times) which is “I am responsible for the works which are above my capacity.”

**Table 4:** Frequencies of Responses and Percentages for All Participants Together

		Response 1(Never)		Response 2(Rarely)		Response 3 (Sometimes)		Response 4(Often)		Response 5 (Every time)	
		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Mobbing Attacks as Social Isolation	Mobbing-1	749	50,7	365	24,7	280	19	68	4,6	15	1
	Mobbing-6	729	49,4	450	30,5	209	14,2	63	4,3	26	1,8
	Mobbing-8	776	52,5	426	28,8	209	14,2	46	3,1	20	1,4
	Mobbing -4	946	64,0	269	18,2	154	10,4	75	5,1	33	2,2
	Mobbing -5	912	61,7	342	23,2	146	9,9	53	3,6	24	1,6
	Mobbing -2	986	66,8	276	18,7	169	11,4	37	2,5	9	0,6
	Mobbing-7	1095	74,1	178	12,1	114	7,7	55	3,7	35	2,4
	Mobbing-3	1129	76,4	183	12,4	103	7,0	42	2,8	20	1,4
	Mobbing-11	1156	78,3	179	12,1	91	6,2	31	2,1	20	1,4
Attacks to Occupational Status or Prestige		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
	Mobbing-19	553	37,4	450	30,5	265	17,9	135	9,1	74	5
	Mobbing-13	749	50,7	361	24,4	215	14,6	95	6,4	57	3,9
	Mobbing-12	857	58,0	371	25,1	147	10,0	63	4,3	39	2,6
	Mobbing-17	940	63,6	278	18,8	143	9,7	70	4,7	46	3,1
	Mobbing-14	996	67,4	263	17,8	132	8,9	52	3,5	34	2,3
	Mobbing-15	961	65,1	321	21,7	125	8,5	39	2,6	31	2,1
	Mobbing-16	1001	67,8	267	18,1	121	8,2	58	3,9	30	2,0
	Mobbing-18	1009	68,3	290	19,6	103	7,0	42	2,8	33	2,2
	Mobbing-20	1174	79,5	160	10,8	83	5,6	36	2,4	24	1,6
Attacks to Personality or Victim Directly		Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
	Mobbing-22	878	59,4	372	25,2	123	8,3	64	4,3	40	2,7
	Mobbing-23	1028	69,6	295	20	88	6	43	2,9	23	1,6
	Mobbing-25	1074	72,7	277	18,8	71	4,8	37	2,5	18	1,2
	Mobbing-24	1118	75,7	241	16,3	65	4,4	34	2,3	19	1,3
	Mobbing-9	1190	80,6	149	10,1	71	4,8	33	2,2	38	2,6
	Mobbing-26	1214	82,2	163	11,0	56	3,8	28	1,9	16	1,1
	Mobbing-28	1211	82,0	168	11,4	58	3,9	22	1,5	18	1,2
	Mobbing-21	1230	83,3	166	11,2	54	3,7	14	0,9	13	0,9
	Mobbing-29	1251	84,7	150	10,2	39	2,6	16	1,1	21	1,4
	Mobbing-33	1290	87,3	112	7,6	38	2,6	21	1,4	16	1,1
	Mobbing-32	1285	87,0	137	9,3	33	2,2	12	0,8	10	0,7
	Mobbing-27	1320	89,4	83	5,6	42	2,8	19	1,3	13	0,9

Table 5 shows the responses of only teachers. The least attacks exposed which teachers referred for to “never” is Mobbing-27 item. The most referred “every time” responses are Mobbing 19 and Mobbing 13 for teachers.

**Table 5:** Frequencies of Responses and Percentages for Only Teachers

Item	Response 1(Never)		Response 2(Rarely)		Response 3 (Sometimes)		Response 4(Often)		Response 5 (Every time)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Mobbing-6	583	50,1	351	30,2	164	14,1	42	3,6	24	2,1
Mobbing-8	610	52,4	341	29,3	163	14	33	2,8	17	1,5
Mobbing-1	633	54,4	265	22,8	202	17,4	50	4,3	14	1,2
Mobbing -5	736	63,2	257	22,1	116	10	35	3	20	1,7
Mobbing -4	781	67,1	194	16,7	112	9,6	49	4,2	28	2,4
Mobbing -2	795	68,3	210	18	123	10,6	27	2,3	9	0,8
Mobbing-7	878	75,4	130	11,2	85	7,3	42	3,6	29	2,5
Mobbing-3	913	78,4	131	11,3	73	6,3	31	2,7	16	1,4
Mobbing-11	930	79,9	131	11,3	62	5,3	21	1,8	20	1,7

**Table 5:** Frequencies of Responses and Percentages for Only Teachers (*Cont.*)

	Response 1(Never)		Response 2(Rarely)		Response 3 (Sometimes)		Response 4(Often)		Response 5 (Every time)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Mobbing-19	437	37,5	345	29,6	214	18,4	105	9	63	5,4
Mobbing-13	603	51,8	281	24,1	169	14,5	63	5,4	48	4,1
Mobbing-12	686	58,9	284	24,4	117	10,1	47	4	30	2,6
Mobbing-17	755	64,9	210	18	112	9,6	48	4,1	39	3,4
Mobbing-15	766	65,8	252	21,6	95	8,2	25	2,1	26	2,2
Mobbing-14	790	67,9	204	17,5	102	8,8	43	3,7	25	2,1
Mobbing-16	803	69	203	17,4	90	7,7	42	3,6	26	2,2
Mobbing-18	812	69,8	220	18,9	74	6,4	29	2,5	29	2,5
Mobbing-20	942	80,9	118	10,1	58	5	25	2,1	21	1,8
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Mobbing-22	724	62,2	287	24,7	86	7,4	39	3,4	28	2,4
Mobbing-23	833	71,6	222	19,1	65	5,6	24	2,1	20	1,7
Mobbing-25	859	73,8	211	18,1	51	4,4	26	2,2	17	1,5
Mobbing-24	900	77,3	176	15,1	46	4	27	2,3	15	1,3
Mobbing-9	944	81,1	120	10,3	50	4,3	22	1,9	28	2,4
Mobbing-26	972	83,5	122	10,5	36	3,1	20	1,7	14	1,2
Mobbing-21	976	83,8	128	11	40	3,4	9	0,8	11	0,9
Mobbing-28	986	84,7	103	8,8	41	3,5	18	1,5	16	1,4
Mobbing-29	998	85,7	111	9,5	25	2,1	12	1	18	1,5
Mobbing-32	1019	87,5	101	8,7	26	2,2	9	0,8	9	0,8
Mobbing-33	1031	88,6	79	6,8	27	2,3	15	1,3	12	1
Mobbing-27	1040	89,3	63	5,4	32	2,7	16	1,4	13	1,1

Number of Participants: 1164

Table 6 shows to responses of only academicians. The least exposed mobbing attacks and the most referred “never” item is Mobbing 27. These are the same with all participants and other responses. But for response 5 (Every time) academicians referred to Mobbing 22 (12 times) mostly. Mobbing 22 means “It is made unfounded discourses about me”. So it can be said that the most referred mobbing attack for academicians is gossiping.

**Table 6:** Frequencies of Responses and Percentages for Only Academicians

	Response 1(Never)		Response 2(Rarely)		Response 3 (Sometimes)		Response 4(Often)		Response 5 (Every time)	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Mobbing-1	116	37,1	100	31,9	78	24,9	18	5,8	1	0,3
Mobbing-6	146	46,6	99	31,6	45	14,4	21	6,7	2	0,6
Mobbing -4	165	52,7	75	24	42	13,4	26	8,3	5	1,6
Mobbing-8	166	53	85	27,2	46	14,7	13	4,2	3	1
Mobbing -5	176	56,2	85	27,2	30	9,6	18	5,8	4	1,3
Mobbing -2	191	61	66	21,1	46	14,7	10	3,2	0	0
Mobbing-3	216	69	52	16,6	30	9,6	11	3,5	4	1,3
Mobbing-7	217	69,3	48	15,3	29	9,3	13	4,2	6	1,9
Mobbing-11	226	72,2	48	15,3	29	9,3	10	3,2	0	0
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Mobbing-19	116	37,1	105	33,5	51	16,3	30	9,6	11	3,5
Mobbing-13	146	46,6	80	25,6	46	14,7	32	10,2	9	2,9
Mobbing-12	171	54,6	87	27,8	30	9,6	16	5,1	9	2,9
Mobbing-17	185	59,1	68	21,7	31	9,9	22	7	7	2,2
Mobbing-15	195	62,3	69	22	30	9,6	14	4,5	5	1,6
Mobbing-18	197	62,9	70	22,4	29	9,3	13	4,2	4	1,3
Mobbing-16	198	63,3	64	20,4	31	9,9	16	5,1	4	1,3
Mobbing-14	206	65,8	59	18,8	30	9,6	9	2,9	9	2,9
Mobbing-20	232	74,1	42	13,4	25	8	11	3,5	3	1
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Mobbing-22	154	49,2	85	27,2	37	11,8	25	8	12	3,8
Mobbing-23	195	62,3	73	23,3	23	7,3	19	6,1	3	1
Mobbing-25	215	68,7	66	21,1	20	6,4	11	3,5	1	0,3
Mobbing-24	218	69,6	65	20,8	19	6,1	7	2,2	4	1,3
Mobbing-28	225	71,9	65	20,8	17	5,4	4	1,3	2	0,6
Mobbing-26	242	77,3	41	13,1	20	6,4	8	2,6	2	0,6
Mobbing-9	246	78,6	29	9,3	17	5,4	11	3,5	10	3,2
Mobbing-29	253	80,8	39	12,5	14	4,5	4	1,3	3	1
Mobbing-21	254	81,2	38	12,1	14	4,5	5	1,6	2	0,6
Mobbing-33	259	82,7	33	10,5	11	3,5	6	1,9	4	1,3
Mobbing-32	266	85	36	11,5	7	2,2	3	1	1	0,3
Mobbing-27	280	89,5	20	6,4	10	3,2	3	1	0	0



Table 7 shows the group statistics about occupations and mobbing attacks. The highest mean is about attacks to occupational status or prestige and the most exposed group is academicians. The lowest mean is about attacks to personality or victim directly and the least exposed group is teachers.

**Table 7:** Group Statistics about Sub-dimensions of Mobbing for Occupation

Sort of Mobbing Attacks	Occupation	Mean	Std. Deviation
Attacks to Personality or Victim Directly	Teacher	1,3070	0,58450
	Academician	1,3999	0,57010
Attacks to Occupational Status or Prestige	Teacher	1,6384	0,76417
	Academician	1,7039	0,76422
Social Isolation	Teacher	1,5640	0,68753
	Academician	1,6844	0,67814
Mobbing (General)	Teacher	1,4835	0,61890
	Academician	1,5765	0,59608
Number of Teacher Participated: 1164			
Number of Academician Participated: 313			

Table 8 shows the comparing means for occupations. As seen from the table, there are significant differences between means of teachers and means of academicians for attacks to personality or victims directly, social isolation, and generally mobbing attacks. But there isn't any significant difference for means of teachers and academicians about attacks to occupational status or prestige.

**Table 8:** Comparing Means for Occupation

Sort of Mobbing Attacks	T Test	Sig. (2-tailed)
Attacks to Personality or Victim Directly	-2,509	0,012*
Attacks to Occupational Status or Prestige	-1,347	0,178*
Social Isolation	-2,760	0,006*
Mobbing (General)	-2,377	0,018*
* P< 0,05		

Table 9 shows the group statistics about genders and mobbing attacks. The highest mean is about attacks to occupational status or prestige and the most exposed group is women. The lowest mean is about attacks to personality or victim directly and the least exposed group is men.

**Table 9:** Group Statistics about Sub-dimensions of Mobbing for Gender

Sort of Mobbing Attacks	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation
Attacks to Personality or Victim Directly	Women	1,3870	,64165
	Men	1,2829	,53168
Attacks to Occupational Status or Prestige	Women	1,7322	,81440
	Men	1,5944	,72093
Social Isolation	Women	1,6371	,70240
	Men	1,5549	,67407
Mobbing (General)	Women	1,5656	,65664
	Men	1,4579	,57934
Number of Women Participated: 621			
Number of Men Participated: 856			

Table 10 shows the comparing means for genders. Looking from the table, all means are significantly different for genders from one another.

**Table 10:** Comparing Means for Gender

Sort of Mobbing Attacks	T Test	Sig. (2-tailed)
Attacks to Personality or Victim Directly	3,403	0,001*
Attacks to Occupational Status or Prestige	3,432	0,001*
Social Isolation	2,274	0,023*
Mobbing (General)	3,331	0,001*
* P< 0,05		

Table 11 shows the group statistics about sub-dimensions of mobbing for the gender of teachers. The highest mean is about attacks to occupational status or prestige for women teachers. The lowest mean is about attacks to personality or victims directly and about men teachers.

**Table 11:** Group Statistics about Sub-dimensions of Mobbing for Gender of Teachers

Sort of Mobbing Attacks	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation
Attacks to Personality or Victim Directly	Woman	1,3815	,65595
	Man	1,2567	,52544
Attacks to Occupational Status or Prestige	Woman	1,7233	,81432
	Man	1,5811	,72337
Social Isolation	Woman	1,6264	,71516
	Man	1,5218	,66545
Mobbing (General)	Woman	1,5575	,67046
	Man	1,4336	,57669

Number of Women Teachers Participated: 469

Number of Men Teachers Participated: 695

Table 12 shows the comparing means for genders of teachers. As seen from the table, means are significantly different for the genders of teachers. Therefore, the kinds of attacks are different for genders of teachers.

**Table 12:** Comparing Means for Gender of Teachers

Sort of Mobbing Attacks	T Test	Sig. (2-tailed)
Attacks to Personality or Victim Directly	3,590	0,000*
Attacks to Occupational Status or Prestige	3,125	0,002*
Social Isolation	2,551	0,011*
Mobbing (General)	3,366	0,001*

\* P&lt; 0,05

Table 13 shows the group statistics about sub-dimensions of mobbing for the gender of academicians. The highest mean is about attacks to occupational status or prestige and about women academicians. The lowest mean is about attacks to personality or victim directly and about men academicians.

**Table 13:** Group Statistics about Sub-dimensions of Mobbing for Gender of Academicians

Sort of Mobbing Attacks	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation
Attacks to Personality or Victim Directly	Woman	1,4041	0,59714
	Man	1,3960	0,54518
Attacks to Occupational Status or Prestige	Woman	1,7595	0,81674
	Man	1,6515	0,70967
Social Isolation	Woman	1,6703	0,66266
	Man	1,6977	0,69425
Mobbing (General)	Woman	1,5906	0,61348
	Man	1,5631	0,58078

Number of Women Academicians Participated: 152

Number of Men Academicians Participated: 161

Table 14 shows the comparing means for genders of academicians. As seen from the table, any kinds of mobbing attacks did not differ from one another. There isn't any significant difference between means of genders of academicians.

**Table 14:** Comparing Means for Gender of Academicians

Sort of Mobbing Attacks	T Test	Sig. (2-tailed)
Attacks to Personality or Victim Directly	0,125	0,900*
Attacks to Occupational Status or Prestige	1,251	0,212*
Social Isolation	-0,357	0,721*
Mobbing (General)	0,406	0,685*

\* P&lt; 0,05

Table 15 shows the group statistics about sub-dimensions of mobbing for occupations of women. It can be seen from the table that the highest mean is about attacks to occupational status or prestige and about academicians. The lowest means is about attacks to personality or victims directly and about women teachers.

**Table 15:** Group Statistics about Sub-dimensions of Mobbing for Occupations of Women

Sort of Mobbing Attacks	Occupation	Mean	Std. Deviation
Attacks to Personality or Victim Directly	Teacher	1,3815	0,65595
	Academician	1,4041	0,59714
Attacks to Occupational Status or Prestige	Teacher	1,7233	0,81432
	Academician	1,7595	0,81674
Social Isolation	Teacher	1,6264	0,71516
	Academician	1,6703	0,66266
Mobbing (General)	Teacher	1,5575	0,67046
	Academician	1,5906	0,61348
Number of Women Teachers Participated: 469			
Number of Women Academicians Participated: 152			

Table 16 shows the comparing means for women about their occupations. As seen from the table that there aren't any significant differences between means of occupations of women.

**Table 16:** Comparing Means for Women about Occupation

Sort of Mobbing Attacks	T Test	Sig. (2-tailed)
Attacks to Personality or Victim Directly	-0,377	0,707*
Attacks to Occupational Status or Prestige	-0,476	0,634*
Social Isolation	-0,670	0,503*
Mobbing (General)	-0,539	0,590*

\* P< 0,05

Table 17 shows the group statistics about the sub-dimension of mobbing for occupations of men. The highest mean is about social isolation of men academicians. The lowest mean is about attacks to personality or victims directly for teachers.

**Table 17:** Group Statistics about Sub-dimensions of Mobbing for Occupations of Men

Sort of Mobbing Attacks	Occupation	Mean	Std. Deviation
Attacks to Personality or Victim Directly	Teacher	1,2567	0,52544
	Academician	1,3960	0,54518
Attacks to Occupational Status or Prestige	Teacher	1,5811	0,72337
	Academician	1,6515	0,70967
Social Isolation	Teacher	1,5218	0,66545
	Academician	1,6977	0,69425
Mobbing (General)	Teacher	1,4336	0,57669
	Academician	1,5631	0,58078
Number of Women Teachers Participated: 695			
Number of Men Teachers Participated: 161			

As seen from Table 18, only attacks to occupational status or prestige haven't got difference about occupations of men. The others mean for men about occupations are significantly different. Thus, attacks on personality or victims directly and social isolation is different from men academicians than men teachers. There is a significant difference about means of teachers and academicians about general mobbing attacks.

**Table 18:** Comparing Means for Men about Occupation

Sort of Mobbing Attacks	T Test	Sig. (2-tailed)
Attacks to Personality or Victim Directly	-3,008	0,003*
Attacks to Occupational Status or Prestige	-1,116	0,265*
Social Isolation	-2,997	0,003*
Mobbing (General)	-2,565	0,010*

\* P< 0,05

## 6. RESULTS OF TESTING HYPOTHESIS

Table 19 shows the results of the testing hypothesis.

**Table 19:** Results of Testing Hypothesis

Research Hypothesis	Results of Analysis
H1: There is a significant difference between mobbing perception of teachers and academicians.	Supported
H1a: There is a significant difference between mobbing perception of women teachers and women academicians.	Not Supported
H1b: There is a significant difference between mobbing perception of men teachers and men academicians.	Supported
H2: There is a significant difference on mobbing perceptions in terms of gender of teachers and academicians.	Supported
H2a: There is a significant difference between mobbing perception of women teachers and men teachers.	Supported
H2b: There is a significant difference between mobbing perception of women academicians and men academicians.	Not Supported

## 7. DISCUSSION

This paper was aimed to analyse the differences of mobbing perceptions of teachers and academicians and their mobbing perceptions in terms of their genders. As mentioned above, teachers and academicians may have differences in exposure to mobbing for some aspects. It can be said that there are some differences in their work conditions, bureaucratic structures, and about their perceptions. If we look from a mobbing perspective, it can be thought that there are differences too. Exposing types of mobbing may differ because of the positions of academicians and teachers or their self-perceptions. It can be supposed looking from the windows of all these tables that, there are some differences about exposing types and sorts of exposed mobbing attacks between teachers and academicians. Additionally, there are some differences in exposing types and levels of mobbing between men and women. If we look closer, it is supposed that there are some differences between mobbing attacks for women academicians from others, men academicians from others, and women teachers from others.

As seen from analyses and results, there is a difference between mobbing perceptions of teachers and academicians. Because their legal structures and regulations may differ. From the view of the procedural and autonomic structure, perceptions of victims and perpetrators may differ for teachers and academicians. It can be said that there is more autonomy for academicians than teachers in Turkey. Therefore, it can be supposed that academicians are exposing to mobbing more than teachers because of this more autonomy. It can be supposed that more autonomy means more opportunity for the perpetrator too. Looking at the results of this study, it can be suggested that these comments are supported by analyses.

One of the results is that there is a difference between the mobbing perception of teachers and academicians generally. Academicians are exposed to mobbing more than teachers about social isolation and attacks to personality or victim directly. It can be supposed due to, there is not any professional level for teachers in Turkey, but for academicians is, as an academic degree. These professional levels may get co-workers more comparable and they may be seen as an opponent or threat the others.

This difference mentioned above about the general sample is not valid for the genders of two occupational groups. Because there isn't any significant difference in mobbing perception of women. Accordingly, in point of results of statistical analyses, there isn't any significant difference between mobbing perception of women teachers and women academicians. It can be suggested from these results that, both women occupational groups think the same about mobbing or they are exposing to mobbing at the same level. One another and important point about exposing the type of women is that women academicians are exposing to attacks to occupational status or prestige mostly. The reason may be the envy from other women academicians.

Attacks for the whole group most exposed are about their occupational status or prestige. These results may emerge because of the occupational status and its structural specifications of these two occupational groups. It can be supposed that being an academician or a teacher is very important and respectable socially in Turkey. Therefore, if anyone wants to harm another by mobbing attacks and if both the victim and perpetrator are in the same occupations as an academician or a teacher, getting harmfulness for

prestige and status may be thought the best way. In this way, the perpetrator can eliminate the risk of competition.

From the perspective of men, there is a significant difference in their general mobbing perceptions in terms of their occupational status. Except for the attacks on occupational status or prestige, the perception about other mobbing attacks is different for men. But the attack on occupational status or prestige is the most one the men exposed. From the perspective of difference, the most exposed attacks are social isolation for men academicians. It can be suggested from the results that, men academicians are getting more victim than men teachers. This result maybe because of the social relations of men and their point of view.

There is another result about mobbing perceptions of academicians. Tables show us and it can be supposed that there isn't any significant difference between mobbing perceptions of women and men academicians. This result may mean that either both these gender groups percept mobbing attacks the same, they think about mobbing closely or they are exposing mobbing at the same levels. The most exposed mobbing attacks are about their occupational status or prestige. Although there isn't any significant difference between their mobbing perceptions for the same sub-dimensions of and general mobbing, looking from the results of mean tables, women academicians are exposing to attacks on their occupational status or their prestige mostly. But men academicians are exposing to social isolation mostly.

According to results, teachers are exposing to mobbing differently in terms of their gender. Every sort of mobbing attack is different for both gender groups. However, women teachers are exposing to mobbing more than men teachers, the most one women teacher exposed is attacking to occupational status or prestige like women academicians. It can be suggested from the results that, occupational status or prestige is more important for women teachers than men. On the contrary, if the perpetrator is a man, it is supposed that that perpetrator is caring status or prestige and perpetrator sees the victim as an opponent, enemy or he envies the victim.

## **8. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

As a result of this study, it is suggested that women are exposing to mobbing more than men, and academicians are exposing to mobbing more than teachers. The most exposed sort of mobbing attack is about occupational status or prestige for the whole sample group. Therefore, for preventing mobbing, some precautions can be developed. For example, autonomy can be developed only for work conditions but not for decisions of managerial issues. For managerial issues, consensus can be highlighted in the workplace for academicians and teachers. Occupational status may be seen as an opportunity for promotion, but organizational climate and culture can be developed for the improvement of workers and promotion should not be seen as a threat. Prestige issues may not be evaluated as a racing tool but can be seen as a reward in the workplace and work conditions must be prepared for this mindset.

## **9. LIMITATIONS**

This study has limitations about its population. Because it is conducted on only academicians and teachers. If it is conducted on other occupational groups, the results can be evaluated more generally and get generalizable. The other limitation is about scale. The scale has 33 items, but it can be developed for current mobbing issues and sort of current mobbing attacks. Additionally, other mobbing scales which are developed and used in researches commonly can use for analysing the perception of mobbing. The other probable limitation is that measuring mobbing with a reflective scale may not be a good solution for understanding the victim deeply in every mobbing case. Because mobbing is a concept that is continuous, developing and perpetrators can find different ways to bully-victims. In addition, statements of a questionnaire form should not limit mobbing cases because some mobbing attacks cannot describe by only expressions of framed forms.



## REFERENCES

- Bjørkelo, B. E. (2010). Predicting Proactive Behaviour At Work: Exploring The Role Of Personality As An Antecedent Of Whistleblowing Behaviour. *Journal Of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 2(83), 371-394.
- Branch, S., Ramsay, S. & Barker, M. (2013). Workplace Bullying, Mobbing and General Harassment: A Review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, (15), 280-299.
- Brodsky, C. M. (1976). *The Harassed Worker*. DC Heath & Co.
- Brotheridge, C. & Lee, R. (2010). Restless and confused emotional responses to workplace bullying in men and women. *Career Development International*, (15), 687-707.
- Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D. & Cooper, C. L. (2011). The Concept of Bullying and Harassment at Work. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper, *Bullying and Harassment in the Workplace: Developments in Theory, Research, and Practice* (pp. 3-30). Florida, Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- Ergün, E. & Örddek, M. (2016). Mobbingin Örgütsel Adalet Algısına Etkisi. *Avrasya Bilimler Akademisi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, (1), 429-443.
- Ghosh, R., Dierkes, S. & Falletta, S. (2011). Incivility spiral in mentoring relationships: reconceptualizing negative mentoring as deviant workplace behavior. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, (13), 22-39.
- Glasø, L., Matthiesen, S., Nielsen, M. & Einarsen, S. (2007). Do targets of workplace bullying portray a general victim personality profile? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, (48), 313-319.
- Hair, J., Black, W. C., Babin, B. & Anderson, R. (2010). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (7. Baskı ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). *Foundations of behavioral research* (3rd ed.). New York: Holt: Rinehart and Winston.
- Lee, R. & Brotheridge, C. (2006). When prey turns predatory: workplace bullying as a predictor of counteraggression/bullying, coping and well-being. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*(15), 352-377.
- Leymann, H. (1986). Mobbing-Psychological violence at work places. *Lund: Studentlitteratur*.
- Leymann, H. (1990). Mobbing and Psychological Terror at Workplaces. *Violence and Victims*, 5(1), 119-126.
- Lim, S., Cortina, L., & Magley, V. (2008). Personal and workgroup incivility: impact on work and health outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, (93), 95-107.
- Lorenz, K. (1963). *On Aggression*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Lutgen-Sandvik, P., Namie, G. & Namie, R. (2009). Workplace Bullying: Causes, Consequences, and Corrections. In P. Lutgen-Sandvik, & B. Sypher, *Destructive organizational communication: Processes, consequences, and constructive ways of organizing* (p. 42). New York: Routledge Press.
- Matthiesen, S. & Einarsen, S. (2007). Perpetrators and targets of bullying at work: role stress and individual differences. *Violence and Victims*, (22), 735-753.
- Nielsen, M., Notelaers, G. & Einarsen, S. (2011). Measuring exposure to workplace bullying. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. Cooper, *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace. Developments in theory, research and practice*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- Nunnally, J. & Benstein, I. (1994). *Psychometric Theory*. New York: Mc-Graw Hill.
- Thylefors, I. (1987). *Syndabocker. Om utstötning och mobbning i arbetslivet*(Scapegoats. On expulsion and bullying in working life). Stockholm: Natur och Kulture.

- Vanderkerckhove, W. (2006). *Whistleblowing and Organizational Social Responsibility: A Global*. Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- Weiss, H. & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: a theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. In B. Staw, & L. Cummings, *Research in Organizational Behavior* (pp. 1-74). Connecticut, Greenwich: JAI Press.
- Yıldırım, D. & Yıldırım, A. (2010). Sağlık Alanında Çalışan Akademisyenlerin Karşılaştıkları Psikolojik Şiddet Davranışları ve Bu Davranışların Etkileri. *Türkiye Klinikleri Journal of Medical Sciences*, 30(2), 559-570.
- Zapf, D. (1999). Organisational, Work Group Related and Personal Causes of Mobbing/Bullying at Work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 70-85.