

"İŞ, GÜÇ" ENDÜSTRİ İLİŞKİLERİ VE İNSAN KAYNAKLARI DERGİSİ

"IS, GUC" INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS AND HUMAN RESOURCES JOURNAL

2017 Cilt/Vol: 19/Num:4 Sayfa/Page: 37-60

Editörler Kurulu / Executive Editorial Group

Aşkın Keser (Uludağ University)
K. Ahmet Sevimli (Uludağ University)
Şenol Baştürk (Uludağ University)

Editör / Editor in Chief

Şenol Baştürk (Uludağ University)

Yayın Kurulu / Editorial Board

Doç. Dr. Erdem Cam (ÇAŞGEM)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Zerrin Fırat (Uludağ University)
Prof. Dr. Aşkın Keser (Uludağ University)
Prof. Dr. Ahmet Selamoğlu (Kocaeli University)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ahmet Sevimli (Uludağ University)
Prof. Dr. Abdulkadir Şenkal (Kocaeli University)
Doç. Dr. Gözde Yılmaz (Marmara University)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Memet Zencirkıran (Uludağ University)

Uluslararası Danışma Kurulu / International Advisory Board

Prof. Dr. Ronald Burke (York University-Kanada)
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Glenn Dawes (James Cook University-Avustralya)
Prof. Dr. Jan Dul (Erasmus University-Hollanda)
Prof. Dr. Alev Efendioğlu (University of San Francisco-ABD)
Prof. Dr. Adrian Furnham (University College London-İngiltere)
Prof. Dr. Alan Geare (University of Otago- Yeni Zelanda)
Prof. Dr. Ricky Griffin (TAMU-Texas A&M University-ABD)
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Diana Lipinskiene (Kaunos University-Litvanya)
Prof. Dr. George Manning (Northern Kentucky University-ABD)
Prof. Dr. William (L.) Murray (University of San Francisco-ABD)
Prof. Dr. Mustafa Özbilgin (Brunel University-UK)
Assoc. Prof. Owen Stanley (James Cook University-Avustralya)
Prof. Dr. Işık Urla Zeytinoğlu (McMaster University-Kanada)

Ulusal Danışma Kurulu / National Advisory Board

Prof. Dr. Yusuf Alper (Uludağ University)
Prof. Dr. Veysel Bozkurt (İstanbul University)
Prof. Dr. Toker Dereli (Işık University)
Prof. Dr. Nihat Erdoğan (İstanbul Şehir University)
Prof. Dr. Ahmet Makal (Ankara University)
Prof. Dr. Ahmet Selamoğlu (Kocaeli University)
Prof. Dr. Nadir Suğur (Anadolu University)
Prof. Dr. Nursel Telman (Maltepe University)
Prof. Dr. Cavide Uyargil (İstanbul University)
Prof. Dr. Engin Yıldırım (Anayasa Mahkemesi)
Prof. Dr. Arzu Wasti (Sabancı University)

İş, Güç, Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi, yılda dört kez yayınlanan hakemli, bilimsel elektronik dergidir. Çalışma hayatına ilişkin makalelere yer verilen derginin temel amacı, belirlenen alanda akademik gelişime ve paylaşım katkısında bulunmaktadır. "İş, Güç," Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi, 'Türkçe' ve 'İngilizce' olarak iki dilde makale yayınlanmaktadır.

"Is, Güc" The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources is peer-reviewed, quarterly and electronic open sources journal. "Is, Güc" covers all aspects of working life and aims sharing new developments in industrial relations and human resources also adding values on related disciplines. "Is, Güc" The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources is published Turkish or English language.

TARANDIĞIMIZ INDEXLER



Dergide yayınlanan yazılardaki görüşler ve bu konudaki sorumluluk yazarlarına aittir.
Yayınlanan eserlerde yer alan tüm içerik kaynak gösterilmeden kullanılamaz.

All the opinions written in articles are under responsibilities of the authors.
The published contents in the articles cannot be used without being cited

“İş, Güç” Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi - © 2000- 2017

“Is, Güc” The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources - © 2000- 2017

İÇİNDEKİLER

YIL: 2017 / CİLT: 19 SAYI: 4

SIRA	MAKALE BAŞLIĞI	SAYFA
1	Doç. Dr. Erdem CAM – Sosyal Taraflar Perspektifinden İşyerinde Sosyal Diyalog	5
2	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Sevgi ÇOBAN - A Literature Review of Mobbing Research in Different Sectors	41
3	Dr. Emirali KARADOĞAN – Sendikalar Arası Rekabetin Türkiye’de Sendikacılık Hareketinin Krizine Katkısı: TCDD Van Gölü Feribot İşletme Müdürlüğü Örneği	65
4	Prof. Dr. İsmail EFİL, Murat ÇUBUKÇU – Örgütlerde Strateji -Yapı Uyumu ve Uygulamadan Örnekler	105
5	Dr. Başak KICIR – Evden Çalışanlarda İş-Yaşam Dengesi: Çevirmenler Üzerinde Bir Araştırma	133

A LITERATURE REVIEW OF MOBBING RESEARCH IN DIFFERENT SECTORS

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Sevgi ÇOBAN
Hacettepe Üniversitesi – Edebiyat Fakültesi – Sosyoloji Bölümü
coban.sevgi@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study is a review of research conducted on workplace mobbing in education, higher education and health sectors between 2000 and 2016. In all sectors, prevalence and types of mobbing, sex, age, level of education, seniority, work experience and coping strategies of victims are investigated.

Results revealed that mobbing victimization rates are high in Turkey, and the highest rates were found in health institutions. Types of mobbing behaviors are attacks against occupational status in more homogenous groups of professional workers in education sector. On the other hand, attacks against victims' communication and personal status are involved as well as occupational status in heterogeneous groups such as health employees. As a result of hierarchical organizational structure and power distance in Turkish workplace, studies indicate that people experience mobbing at relatively younger ages -at their 30's- in Turkey and with nearly 5 years of work experience. In connection to this, in all three sectors, people at the lowest levels of job hierarchy experience higher rates of mobbing. Gender and marital status do not have a significant effect on victimization; however, gender affects perceptions of mobbing and coping strategies as a result of traditional gender roles. Finally, in higher education, direct coping mechanisms are adopted while in education and health, indirect and informal ways are put to use.

Key words: *Workplace mobbing, mobbing by sectors, mobbing victimization*

ÖZET

Bu çalışma 2000 ile 2016 yılları arasında eğitim, yüksek öğretim ve sağlık sektörlerinde işyerinde mobbing üzerine yapılan çalışmaların derlenmesidir. Tüm bu sektörlerde mobbingin yaygınlığı ve türleri, kurbanların cinsiyeti, yaşı, öğrenim düzeyi, kıdemliliği, çalışma deneyimi ve başa çıkma stratejileri ile ilgili bilgiler incelenmiştir.

Sonuçlar Türkiye’de mobbinge maruz kalma oranlarının yüksek olduğunu göstermektedir; en yüksek olduğu sektör ise sağlıktır. Mobbing davranışlarının türleri ile ilgili olarak eğitim alanındaki daha profesyonel çalışanlardan oluşan homojen gruplarda mesleki statüye yönelik saldırılar yüksektir. Diğer yandan, sağlık çalışanları gibi daha heterojen gruplarda saldırıların mesleki statüye saldırıların yanı sıra iletişim olanakları ve kişisel statüye yönelik saldırıların da söz konusu olduğu görülmektedir. Türkiye’deki işyerlerinde hiyerarşik örgütlenme ve yüksek güç mesafesinin bir sonucu olarak araştırmalar insanların mobbing ile görece daha erken yaşlarda -30’larının başlarında- ve görece deneyimsiz oldukları bir dönemde –yaklaşık 5 yıllık deneyim sahibi olduklarında- tanıştıklarını göstermektedir. Bununla bağlantılı olarak, her üç sektörde de iş hiyerarşisinin en alt basamağında yer alanlar daha yüksek düzeyde mobbinge maruz kalmaktadırlar. Sonuçlar, cinsiyet ve medeni durumun mobbing kurbanı olmada önemli bir etken olduğunu göstermemektedir; ancak, cinsiyet mobbing algısını etkilemekte ve mobbinge başa çıkma stratejileri geleneksel cinsiyet rollerinden etkilenmektedir. Son olarak, yüksek öğretimde doğrudan mücadele stratejileri tercih edilirken eğitim ve sağlık alanlarında dolaylı ve informal stratejilerin daha çok kullanıldığı görülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İşyerinde mobbing, sektörlere göre mobbing, mobbing kurbanı olma

INTRODUCTION

Mobbing in the workplace is a complex phenomenon. It has also been referred as harassment, scapegoating, psychological terror, health-endangering leadership, petty tyranny, workplace aggression, workplace incivility, and bullying (Einarsen, 2000: 382; Keashley and Jagatic, 2011). Although discontent caused by work relations is quite common and visible, having a conclusion on what is mobbing is rather difficult due to context-dependent nature of the incidents. Although definitions vary, they usually emphasize “repeated negative acts” (Einarsen, 2000: 383). Leymann (1990: 120) defines psychological terror or mobbing as hostile and unethical communication that is directed in a systematical way by one or more persons mainly towards one targeted individual.

Studies on mobbing usually focus on these key points: the types of behaviors involved; gender, age and position of the victim; gender, age and position of the perpetrator and coping strategies against mobbing.

Defining a negative act in the workplace as mobbing is quite challenging. Diverse behaviors such as hiding information which an employee needs to complete a work task as well as threats of physical violence can be considered as mobbing within a specific context, while the same acts can be seen as a part of personal competition within another. To specify mobbing behaviors, Leymann (1990: 120) indicates that these acts may be directed towards the victim’s reputation, victim’s possibilities of performing the work tasks, victim’s social circumstances or behaviors included physical coercion or assault or the threat of such. Barlett and Barlett (2011), indicate that workplace bullying behaviors are categorized as work related, personal and physical/threatening. Zapf et al., (2003: 121) mention that ‘organisational measures’ affecting the victims’ tasks and competencies, ‘social isolation’, ‘attacking the private person’, ‘verbal aggression’ and ‘spreading rumours’ are typical categories of bullying while “attacking” and “physical violence” occur occasionally. On the other hand, Tomic (2012: 248) indicates that most of the mobbing activities directs victim’s job performance such as insufficient work recognition, inadequate salary, excessive control, work overload, assigning tasks which are inappropriate to the qualification level, giving worse workspace, assigning tasks that impair health and banning employees from

using paid time off and days off. Zapf (1999: 77) on the other hand, states that at the lower levels of the hierarchy, employees have also lower occupational skills, while at the higher levels, they have higher skills, and professional workers become the target of workplace harassment.

Most common mobbing behaviors are work-related such as being given tasks with impossible targets or deadlines, having one's opinions and views ignored. In social, health, public administration and education sectors, mobbing victimization risk is higher than it is in other sectors (Zapf et al., 2004: 118-121).

There are several techniques of measuring mobbing incidents in the workplace. However, the most commonly used ones are Leymann inventory of psychological terror (LIPT), negative acts questionnaire (NAQ) and bullying inventory developed by Quine in 1999. All three scales predicate mobbing on different frequency and time periods and include different items as mobbing behaviors. As a consequence, research results vary in a wide range between %1 and %25 on prevalence of mobbing victimization in Europe depending on the selected measurement tool.

Review of the European literature reveals that while 10 to 20 percent of employees may occasionally be confronted with negative social behaviors at work; only 8 to 10 experience occasional bullying and 1 to 4 percent of the employeeed can be considered as the victims of serious mobbing (Zapf et al., 2004: 104). In Norway, mobbing rate was found as 8.6% (Einarsen and Skogstad, 1996). In Sweden, it was found as 3.5% (Einarsen and Skogstad, 1996). According to a meta-analysis of Nielsen, Matthiesen, and Einarsen (2010: 967), "at least 1 out of 10, and maybe as many as about 1 out of 5, workers are exposed to bullying in their workplaces".

As for the mobbing victims, it was found that women are slightly more likely to be the victims and men are slightly more likely to be the perpetrators (Zapf et al., 2004: 104). Vartia Vaaananen indicates that in Europe, women reported bullying or harassment slightly more often (4.4%) than men (3.9%). Zapf et al. (2003: 112) point out that in most samples in Europe; the victims are about one-third men and two-thirds women. However, it was stressed that research results vary by sector, gender domination and gender distribution of employees and thus results are controversial on the gender of victims. Tomic (2012: 247) also argues that mobbing victims are not a member of specific sex but are "employees of different sex –a woman in a group of men or a man in a group of women", these results show that gender is not a unvariable factor of victimization.

Although age and positions of the mobbing perpetrators may vary; mobbing perpetrators were found to be more in superior positions. As an exception, in Einarsen and Skogstad's study (1996) older employees reported significantly more bullying than younger ones. The prevalence rate among respondents younger than 45 was 8.2%, whereas the prevalence rate among older respondents varied between 9.3% (61-65 years) and 10.3% (51-60 years).

On job experience, results vary to a large extend. For example, in a review, Tomic (2012: 247) states that "young employees, at the beginning of their careers, and older workers who are about to retire" are at risk. However, Hoel ve Cooper's review (2000) point out that among middle managers, increased competition may cause high prevalence of mobbing among these groups. Similarly, Baş and Oral (2012: 19) drew attention to the fact that mobbing is more prevalent among employees with moderate work experience due to unmet expectations of better treatment as well as unmet career and job status goals at work.

As for the perpetrator, superiors rank first in Europe. However, Wolmerath (2013: 81) indicates that mobbing by the same level colleagues is on the increase by 2000's and almost equal to the incidents

caused by supervisors. According to Zapf et al. (2013: 116), in Scandinavian studies, supervisors are equal to peers as perpetrators and in Britain supervisors are "overwhelmingly majority of cases" while in Europe, results are in between.

The last point the mobbing reseach deal with is the coping strategies against mobbing. Although studies generally indicate subtle forms of coping strategies are widely adopted, Einarsen (2000: 393) draws attention to different ways and constructive problem-solving strategies. Einersen and Mikkelsen (2013) also draw attention to victims' avoidant reactions. They found a general tendency towards victim taking less action than "non-bullied employees claim they would do if they were bullied" and conclude that many victims often fail to put an end to the bullying (Einarsen and Mikkelsen, 2013: 136).

In Turkey, it is reported that violence in workplaces is a major problem (Yıldız, Kaya and Bilir, 2011). Similar to European examples (Vartia Vaananen, 2013: 24), the report reveals that although studies on workplace violence in Turkey are limited, present research proves that all kinds of violence are common in health, education and higher education sectors. Most common types are verbal and psychological violence. Women and younger employees are more likely to be the victims of workplace violence according to the report.

In this study, the main characteristics and nature of the mobbing problem are brought to light by a literature review of the mobbing research on health, education and higher education in Turkey. The aim of the study is to review the results on prevalence and types of mobbing, victims' sex, age, level of education, seniority, work experience and coping strategies and compare the results with the European examples.

The Study

This study is a literature review of quantitative studies which were published in 2000-2016 in national and international journals on mobbing at education, higher education and health sectors in Turkey. Articles which include the words "mobbing", "bullying", "psychological harassment", "violence at work", "emotional harassment" and "psychological violence" in their titles were taken into consideration for the review. In total, 98 articles were selected. Results on prevalence of mobbing, types of behaviors, victims' features such as sex, age, marital status, level of education, seniority and work experience and coping strategies were investigated. The results are discussed below for education, higher education and health sectors.

Education

In this section, research findings on public and private primary and secondary school teachers and school managers are discussed. There is a list of the mobbing studies on this sector in Table 1.

Study	Scale	Institution	Number of Participants
Akpunar, 2016	A 27 items Mobbing Perceptions of Teachers Scale developed by the author	Public high school teachers in Diyarbakır City	128
Mete et al., 2015	NAQ	Public School Teachers in Batman City	132
Yaman and Sarıçam, 2015	23 items Psycho-Violence Scale developed by Yaman in 2009	Public school teachers and intern teachers in Kütahya City	218

Ertürk and Cemaloğlu, 2014	NAQ	Public school teachers and principals from 21 provinces in Turkey	1,316
Karabacak Aşır, and Akın, 2014	A scale developed by the authors based on Workplace Bullying Scale developed by Keashly and Jagatic in 2008	Public primary school teachers in Ankara City	230
Akan, Yıldırım, and Yalçın, 2013	NAQ	Public school principals in Erzurum City	60
Ertürk, 2013	NAQ	Public school teachers and principals from 21 Cities	1316
Şener, 2013	NAQ	Teachers in high school in Mamak District of Ankara	279
Cemaloğlu and Kılınç, 2012	NAQ	Public primary schools in Kastamonu City	2131
Celep ve Eminoğlu, 2012	LIPT	Public primary schools in İstanbul City	412
Çivilidağ, 2012	NAQ	Psychological counselors in primary and secondary schools in Antalya City	91
Çivilidağ and Sargin, 2011	NAQ	Public high school teachers in Antalya City	105
Çomak and Tunç, 2012	Mobbing Scale for Primary School Teachers developed by Ertürk in 2005 drawing from LIPT	Public primary schools in Adana City	382
Karakuş and Çankaya, 2012	LIPT	Public school teachers and principles in 4 districts of Ankara City	347
Kılınç, 2012	NAQ	Public school teachers in Ankara City Center	753
Toker Gökçe, 2012	59 item likert scale developed by the authors	Public and private primary school teachers and principles from 28 cities	1249
Tanhan and Çam, 2011	The Mobbing Scale for Teachers (MOST) developed by the authors	Public school teachers and principles in Van City	451
Uğurlu, Çağlar and Güneş, 2012	59 items Emotionally Harmful Behaviors Scale developed by Toker in 2006	Secondary Public school teachers in Adıyaman and Sivas cities	480
Çelik and Peker, 2010	Mobbing and its effects on the teacher-manager relationship scale developed by Yıldırım in 2008 based on LIPT	Public high school teachers from 4 districts of İstanbul City	400
Aksu and Balcı, 2009	A 48 items Scale adapted from LIPT and Mobbing Behaviors Scale developed by Gökçe in 2008 based on LIPT	Public school teachers from 4 counties of İzmir City	373
Koç and Urasoğlu Bulut, 2009	LIPT	Public secondary school teachers from 6 cities	396
Otrar and Özen, 2009	Mobbing Scale for Primary School Teachers developed by Ertürk in 2005 drawing from LIPT	Public primary school ounselors in İstanbul City	306
Cemaloğlu, 2007	NAQ	Public school teachers in Ankara, Yozgat, Kastamonu, and Van cities	500
Cemaloğlu and Ertürk, 2007	LIPT	Public primary school teachers and principles from 4 districts of Ankara City	347
Palaz et al., 2008	LIPT	Public and private education and health organisations in Balıkesir City	464

Bilgel, Aytaç and Bayram, 2006	A 20-item inventory of bullying developed by Quine	25 primary health care units, a public hospital, nine schools (two kindergartens, four primary schools, three high schools) and 13 police stations	944
--------------------------------	--	--	-----

Findings on mobbing victimization rates in educational institutions vary. A major part of the studies revealed that educators are exposed to mobbing on a low level (Ertürk and Cemaloğlu, 2014; Şener, 2013; Uğurlu, Çağlar and Güneş, 2012; Aksu and Balcı, 2009). On the other hand; in a study conducted by Kılınç (2012), 11.2% of teachers were found to have been exposed to mobbing. Mete et al. (2015) proved that 22% of teachers "seldomly", 12% "occasionally", 2.7 "frequently" and 1% "always" exposed to mobbing. Akan, Yıldırım, and Yalçın's research conducted among school principals (2013) revealed similar results: Of principals 21.4% "seldomly", 5.8% "occasionally", 1.9% "frequently" and 1.7% "always" subjected to mobbing activities. Ertürk (2013) showed that 4.1% of teachers confront with one kind of mobbing behaviors every day. Bilgel, Aytaç and Bayram's study (2006) on employees working in various sectors including educational institutions indicated that 55% of the employees experienced one or more types of bullying in the previous year and 47% had witnessed bullying of other employees.

Despite research in education sector indicate slightly varying results on the prevalence, almost all of the studies which employed NAQ indicate that mobbing victimization is remarkably common (Mete et al., 2015; Akan, Yıldırım, and Yalçın, 2013; Ertürk, 2013; Kılınç, 2012; Cemaloğlu, 2007). In Tanhan and Çam's study (2011) which a mobbing scale for teachers was employed, rates are considerably higher than those studies: More than half of the teachers reported victimization.

The most frequently encountered acts are interrupting, ignoring one's suggestions and opinions, over-monitoring and over criticizing one's tasks (Şener, 2013; Cemaloğlu and Kılınç, 2012; Toker Gökçe, 2012; Uğurlu, Çağlar, and Güneş, 2012; Çelik and Peker, 2010; Aksu and Balcı, 2009). In Mete et al.'s study (2015), behaviors of hiding information affects employees most. While results indicate that the most common behaviors are attacks against victim's occupational status; Ertürk's wide-range study (2013) unfolded that it is the attacks against personal reputations such as gossiping.

There is not a strong variation by sex according to a large part of the studies (Akan, Yıldırım, and Yalçın, 2013; Şener, 2013; Çivilidağ, 2012; Çomak and Tunç, 2012; Aksu and Balcı, 2009). Nonetheless, there is also a body of research that indicate man experience such acts more than women do (Mete et al. 2015; Ertürk, 2013; Celep and Emiroğlu, 2012; Çelik and Peker, 2010; Koç and Urasoğlu Bulut, 2009; Cemaloğlu and Ertürk, 2007). Only the study of Karabacak Aşır and Akın (2014) revealed that female teachers are represented more among victims in primary schools.

How mobbing is experienced and perceived also varies. For example, according to Cemaloğlu and Ertürk (2007), male teachers and managers are exposed to mobbing by their colleagues at the same level more than females do. According to a more recent study of them (Ertürk and Cemaloğlu, 2014), females are exposed to mobbing due to organizational structure and due to perpetrators' characteristics and males are exposed to mobbing due to victim's characteristics. Akpunar (2016) also underlines that male teachers cope with mobbing behaviors more effectively. In relation to this, as an interesting result, Ertürk revealed that two-third of man and one-third of women perceive mobbing as "ordinary, normal behaviors that can occur" at a workplace. These results indicate that male educators may perceive

mobbing and cope with it on a more institutional/structural level; and on the opposite, women perceive it on a more personal level and resort to more implicit strategies.

As for the victim's marital status, not a significant difference could be detected in most of the studies (Metem et al., 2015; Uğurlu, Çağlar, and Güneş, 2012; Otrar and Özen, 2009). However, Palaz et al. (2008), have shown that mobbing victimization is statistically higher among married education staff than it is among the singles. In Karabacak Aşır and Akın's study (2014) the rate is higher for married female teachers than not only for married or single males but also for single female teachers. This condition gives rise to the thought that female teachers get under pressure to manage and balance between their career and family life after getting married.

Most of the studies which LIPT or NAQ were selected as data gathering technique concluded that level of education does not make a difference on victimization (Metem et al., 2015; Akan, Yıldırım, and Yalçın, 2013; Şener, 2013; Çelik and Peker, 2010; Aksu and Balcı, 2009). On the other hand, some studies show that the higher the mobbing victimization rates are higher among employees with higher educational levels (Akpunar, 2016; Ertürk and Cemaloğlu, 2014; Palaz et al., 2008). In addition to this, Ertürk and Cemaloğlu (2014) demonstrated that teachers with graduate degree are more likely to experience mobbing due to structural reasons.

Research indicate that teachers at their 30's, become targets of mobbing more frequently than other age groups do (Metem et al., 2015; Ertürk and Cemaloğlu, 2014; Celep and Eminoğlu, 2012; Çelik and Peker, 2010). Palaz et al. (2008) similarly found out that victimization is higher among teachers at the age of 35 and above than the younger ones.

Results regarding work experience generally conclude that educators who have 10 to 20 years of work experience are exposed to mobbing more frequently (Ertürk and Cemaloğlu, 2014; Çivilidağ and Sargın, 2011; Çelik and Peker, 2010). On the other hand, studies that were conducted in primary school teachers who have relatively less experience were found to be a larger group among victims (Aşır and Akın, 2014; Çomak and Tunç, 2012). The variation of organizational structures and work relationships between different educational institutions may explain this controversy.

Results indicate that indirect coping strategies are commonly used. The usual responses to mobbing are "ignoring the offenders, acting as if they are not there" (Toker Gökçe, 2012), "not paying attention and ignoring them" (Uğurlu, Çağlar ve Güneş, 2012), "not giving in by mobbing behaviors" and "responding in an aware and appropriate way" (Aksu and Balcı, 2009), "trying not to be criticized by working harder and in a more planned way" (Palaz et al., 2008). It can be understood from these results that victims generally avoid talking about the problem openly and officially reporting it. When these results are considered altogether with the conclusion that mobbing is perceived as an ordinary act (Ertürk, 2013), these results may be pointing to a problem on victims' awareness on the issue.

Higher Education: In this section studies conducted among academicians were analysed. Studies conducted among academicians can be seen from Table 2.

Study	Scale	Institution	Number of Participants
Şahbudak and Öztürk, 2015	Psychological Harassment at Workplace scale developed by Tınaz et al.	Academicians of Cumhuriyet University in Sivas City	312
Şenerkal and Çorbacıoğlu, 2015	Mobbing and its effects on the relationship scale developed by Yıldırım in 2010 based on LIPT	Randomly choosen academicians from Turkey	108

Şalvarcı Türel and Dolmacı, 2013	A questionnaire developed by the authors	Academics and administrative officers of Süleyman Demirel University in Isparta City	278
Ayan and Şahbudak, 2012	22 items Organizational Mobbing Scale developed by Deniz in 2007	Research assistants from three public universities in Ankara, Kocaeli and Sivas cities	188
Geçikli and Geçikli, 2012	NAQ	Female academics from a public university	92
Özyer and Orhan, 2012	An adaptation of LIPT	Academics of Mustafa Kemal University in Hatay City	229
Aksu and Güneri, 2011	NAQ	Academics of Akdeniz University in Antalya City	346
Şahin and Türk, 2010	A scale developed by authors	Female academics of Niğde University in Niğde City	61
Yıldırım and Yıldırım, 2010	33 items Psychological Harassment Scale Behaviors scale developed by the authors	Randomly chosen academics 80% working on medicine from various Turkish universities	880
Tüzel, 2009	An adaptation of NAQ	Research assistants of Gazi University in Ankara City	115

Studies indicate different results about prevalence of the problem among academic staff. On a nation-wide study of Şenerkal and Çorbacıoğlu (2015), all of the participants reported victimization of mobbing behaviors by their supervisors. Of the participants, 4.7% victimized by behaviors of only their superiors while 26.9% victimized both by their superiors' and peers' behaviors (Şenerkal ve Çorbacıoğlu, 2015: 124). Yıldırım and Yıldırım's national study (2010) revealed even high rates: 90% of the staff experience psychological violence and 17% think that these are intentional acts, not random incidences. Results of other studies which are limited to employees in one city or one university indicate lower rates (Şahbudak and Öztürk, 2015; Kalay, Uğrak, and Nişancı, 2014; Aksu and Güneri, 2011; Şahin and Türk, 2010).

Attacks to occupational status are more frequent than other types of mobbing behaviors. "Acts against one's fulfillment of tasks" (Geçikli ve Geçikli, 2012; Aksu ve Güneri, 2011), "over monitoring of work and duties" (Şahbudak and Öztürk, 2015), "acting as if one's performance is inadequate even when it is not" among female academics (Eroğlu ve Solmaz, 2004), "compelling one to quit by giving simple and unnecessary tasks that are under her/his qualifications" among research assistants (Ayan and Şahbudak, 2012). In addition, it was found that these behaviors against work and occupational status are mostly committed by superiors; and such behaviors from above constitute a typical form in academy (Şahin and Türk, 2010; Yıldırım and Yıldırım, 2010; Tüzel, 2009). "Baseless rumours" and "derogatory and insulting talk in front of people" (Şenerkal and Çorbacıoğlu, 2015), "attacks against personal communications" (Kalay, Oğrak and Nişancı, 2014), and "peeking out from behind and gossiping" (Ayan and Şahbudak, 2012) are other common types.

Research revealed that factors such as title and seniority make difference on mobbing victimization. Ayan and Şahbudak (2012) found out that research assistants are more likely to become target than academics in upper positions. Similarly, Geçikli and Geçikli (2012) concluded that probability of becoming a target decreases with career advancement. Şahbudak and Öztürk (2015) also revealed that research assistants become victims more frequently than other academic staff does. In addition to this, staff at or under the age of 30 are more likely to be victimized than the ones above 30. Ayan and Şahbudak (2012) on the other hand, indicated that research assistants become victims due to organizational causes than other groups do.

There is not a significant difference in mobbing victimization by sex (Akpınar, 2015; Şahbudak and Öztürk, 2015; Kalay, Oğrak, and Nişancı, 2014; Ayan and Şahbudak, 2012; Yıldırım and Yıldırım, 2010). Similarly, studies indicate that there is not a significant difference by marital status (Ayan and Şahbudak; Şahbudak and Öztürk, 2015; Şalvarcı Türel and Dolmacı, 2013). On the other side, Akpınar (2015) draws attention to a particular difference that single research assistants are subject to attacks against their social relationships more frequently than the married ones.

Evidence which support that victimization varies by age is limited. One of them is Geçikli and Geçikli's study (2012) which manifests that victimization rates are higher among academicians at the ages between 26 and 35 than academicians at or above 41. Likewise, Şahbudak and Öztürk (2015) have shown that academicians at the age of 30 and below experience mobbing more frequently than the ones above 30. According to Özyer and Orhan (2012), academicians under the age of 25 experience mobbing at the highest levels.

Şahbudak and Öztürk (2015) proved that research assistants experience mobbing victimization more frequently than other academic staff does. Akpınar (2015) further found out that there are also differences of mobbing experiences among research assistants: Ones doing their master degree experience "attacks against personal status" and "interference in their private lives" more frequently than ones that doing their doctorate do. These findings together with Ayan and Şahbudak's (2012) findings among research assistants that mobbing victimization does not differ by age lead to the idea that difference of victimization by age in other studies may be a result of career advancement and promotion. This point is supported by Geçikli and Geçikli's study which indicates lesser psychological violence and diminished negative effects on victims with advancement of academicians' titles.

Research indicates more direct coping strategies against mobbing. For example, Yıldırım and Yıldırım (2010) demonstrated that most common strategy is "trying to solve the problem by talking face to face with the offender" and "report the incident to an upper management level". They also have found that

Health: In this category, research on employees in health care such as doctors, nurses, midwives, patient care professionals and medical secretaries is reviewed. Studies are listed in Table 3.

Study	Scale	Institution	Number of Participants
Sezerel, Bostan, and Okan, 2015	Psychological violence at workplace scale developed by Yıldırım and Yıldırım in 2008	Health care staff from various institutions in Trabzon, Rize, and Gümüşhane cities	1187
Bayrak Kök et al., 2014	LIPT	Nurses from a university, a public and a private hospital in Denizli City	270
Demir et al., 2014	Mobbing scale developed by Öztürk, Yılmaz, and Hindistan in 2007	Nurses from a university hospital	126
Karahan and Yılmaz, 2014	NAQ	Kocatepe University Hospital staff, Afyon City	321
Karsavuran, 2014	LIPT	Public hospital managers in Ankara City	244
Aslan and Akarçay, 2013	Work harassment scale developed by Björkqvist et al. in 1992 and adapted by Grunau in 2007	Health care staff of three biggest hospitals in Konya City	237
Çalış and Tokat, 2013	A questionnaire developed by the authors based on NAQ and LIPT	Private hospital staff, Giresun City	540

Özaydın Bülbül et al., 2013	LIPT	Employees of public and private health institutions in six different cities	860
Sönmez et al., 2013	Workplace violence survey developed by WHO	Health care staff of various institutions in Malatya City	588
Ançel, Yuva, and Gökmen Öztuna, 2012	Psychological violence at workplace scale developed by Yıldırım and Yıldırım in 2008	Nurses from a university hospital	210
Dursun, 2012	Workplace violence survey developed by ILO and WHO	Health care staff of a public hospital	161
Güven, Özcan, and Kartal, 2012	Mobbing factors scale developed by Çalışkan in 2005	Nurses and midwives working in public health institutions in Nevşehir City	142
Tutar and Akbolat, 2012	Psychological violence scale developed by Fox and Stallworth in 2005	Staff of public health institutions in Sakarya City	185
Bahçeci Geçici and Sağkal, 2011	A 68-item scale developed by Öztürk, Yılmaz and Hindistan in 2007	Nurses working in a county of İzmir City	128
Çamcı and Kutlu, 2011	A descriptive questionnaire developed by the authors	Health care staff from 12 medical institutions in Kocaeli City	270
Dikmetaş, Top, and Ergin, 2011	LIPT	Assistant medical doctors of Ondokuz Mayıs University in İzmir City	270
Gül and Ağıröz, 2011	LIPT	Nurses of Public Hospital of Karaman City	103
Karakuş, 2011	A questionnaire developed by the authors based on LIPT	Nurses from three public hospitals in Sivas City	329
Şahin and Dündar, 2011	LIPT	Health care staff of one public, one university and two private hospitals in Bolu City	514
Karacıoğlu and Akbaş, 2010	A questionnaire developed by the authors based on LIPT	Health care staff of hospitals in Erzurum City	395
Çarıkçı and Yavuz, 2009	LIPT	Süleman Demirel University Hospital Staff, Isparta City	189
Durdağ and Naktiyok, 2009	A questionnaire based on LIPT	Nurses from public hospitals in Erzurum	205
Yılmaz, Ergun Özler, and Mercan, 2008	A questionnaire developed by the authors based on LIPT and NAQ	Health care staff of two public hospitals in Kütahya City	121

Results show that mobbing is considerably high in this sector in general. In Çamcı and Kutlu's study (2011), victimization rate was found as 24% among health personnel in Kocaeli City. In Yılmaz, Ergun Özler, and Mercan's study in public hospitals in Kütahya City is 29.8%. In "a public hospital" again it was found as 58.5% among personnel of medical institutions in a public hospital (Dursun, 2012) and among health staff in Malatya City it is 60.4% (Sönmez et al., 2013). Lastly, 70.4% of health staff of hospitals in Bolu city reported being exposed to at least one of the possible mobbing acts in last six months (Şahin and Dündar, 2011).

Among nurses, the ratio was found as 11.9% in a university hospital for the whole of their career; 43% for whole of their career and 34.5% currently in a hospital in a county of İzmir City (Bahçeci Geçici and Sağkal, 2011); 12.7% among nurses and midwives working in a public health institution in Nevşehir City (Güven, Özcan, and Kartal, 2012); 45.1% in three public hospitals (Karakuş, 2011) and 63% in a university hospital (Ançel, Yuva, and Gökmen Öztuna, 2012).

Research indicating low ratios of mobbing victimization is rather limited. Some of them are the study of Dikmetaş, Top, Ergin (2011) which has been conducted among assistant doctors in a public hospital; the study of Gül and Ağıröz (2011) which has been conducted among health staff in Public Hospital

of Karaman City; the study of Tutar and Akbolat (2012) which has been conducted in a health institution in Sakarya City and the study of Çarıkçı and Yavuz (2009) which has been conducted among health staff of Süleyman Demirel University Hospital in Isparta City. These studies have in common that their scope is a provincial city like Karaman, Sakarya or Isparta. That is quite likely the reason of lower rates of mobbing victimization in contrast with the major body of research.

In health sector, most of the attacks are the ones that impede victims' communication. The specific behaviors are verbal violence (Dursun, 2012; Çamcı and Kutlu, 2011), interrupting (Özaydın Bülbül et al., 2013; Şahin and Dündar, 2011), attacks against communication among hospital managers (Karsavuran, 2014) and among nurses (Karakuş, 2011).

In addition to attacks against communication, attacks against status and quality of life and working life are also common. Çalış and Tokat's study (2013) which has been conducted among health staff has shown that employees usually are exposed to "not appreciating one's purposes and values", "not receiving new opportunities at work", "being given contrary orders from more than one supervisor" and "having been strictly controlled on how he/she spend time at work". According to the study of Güven, Özcan, and Kartal (2012), most prevalent form was found to be attacks against personal status among nurses and midwives. Tutar and Akbolat (2012) point out that attacks against private life is the most common behavior among health staff. In their study, Bayrak Kök, Bursalı, and Eroğlu (2014) revealed that most frequent attacks among nurses are "attacks against quality of work life and occupational status".

In addition to prevalence of attacks against personal status in health sector; Sezerel, Bostan and Okan (2015: 111) indicated that such "indirect" attacks against one's status affect her/his psychological health negatively due to the central role of "shame" in Turkish culture which is collectivistic in nature.

Findings on victims' sex are controversial. A part of the research support that female health workers are exposed to mobbing more frequently (Karsavuran, 2014; Özaydın Bülbül et al., 2013; Çamcı and Kutlu, 2011) and women are attacked more frequently on showing their abilities and on their communication more than men do (Yılmaz, Ergun Özler, and Mercan, 2008). On the contrary, some studies indicate that male health personnel are victimized more frequently than females do (Tutar and Akbolat, 2012; Karcioğlu and Akbaş, 2010).

Similar to sex, marital status does not make a difference in general (Demir and diğerleri, 2014; Karcioğlu and Akbaş, 2010; Çarıkçı and Yavuz, 2009). However, among hospital managers (Karsavuran, 2014) and health personnel in Kocaeli City (Çamcı ve Kutlu 2011) single employees were found to be the largest group in mobbing victims.

As for age, research shows that mobbing victimization peaks at 30's. Critical age range was found as 31-35 (Sönmez et al., 2013), 29-39 (Karsavuran, 2014) and 35-39 (Güven, Özcan, and Kartal, 2012). According to other studies, victimization starts to decrease after the age of 30's. According to these, the age range is 18-30 (Yılmaz, Ergun Özler, and Mercan, 2008), earlier than 29 (Özaydın Bülbül et al., 2013) or earlier than 25 (Tutar and Akbolat, 2012). Results indicate a negative correlation between victimization and age in general (Ançel, Yuva, and Gökmen Öztuna, 2012; Güven, Özcan, and Kartal, 2012; Çarıkçı and Yavuz, 2009).

Özaydın Bülbül et al. (2013) have found an increase in mobbing victimization with higher work experience. Similarly; Ançel, Yuva, and Gökmen Öztuna (2012) found out that nurses with longer work experience have lower rates of victimization. Karsavuran (2014) concludes a different result for hospital managers: most of the victims were managers who have 0 to 5 years of experience. Yılmaz, Ergun

Özler, and Mercan (2008) also proved that health personnel who have 1 to 5 years of experience are exposed to mobbing more frequently.

A bulk of research indicate that employees with higher educational levels are more likely to experience mobbing than the others are (Bahçeci Geçici, and Sağkal, 2011; Karcioğlu and Akbaş, 2010; Palaz et al., 2008; Yılmaz, Ergun Özler and Mercan, 2008). According to Karsavuran's study on hospital managers on the other hand, employees who have vocational high school or associate degree are the largest group among the victims. This opposite results gives clue about the varying nature of the relationship between mobbing and educational level: It is likely that the relationship of victimization and educational level vary by context: Victims become targets due to their differences from other employees. Furthermore, Çarıkçı and Yavuz's study (2009) manifested that people with higher levels of education have a stronger perception of mobbing victimization.

In contrast with the results discussed above, a part of the research proved no significant relationship of educational level with mobbing victimization (Demir et al., 2014; Güven, Özcan, and Kartal, 2012; Tutar and Akbolat, 2012). However, it can be seen that in all of these studies, the sample were selected from a single health institution. This may explain these different results. In addition, health personnel, especially nurses working in provincial cities are likely to be a rather homogenous group in terms of educational level and this may have affected results.

Research reveals significant relationship between mobbing and organizational structure. Research of Özyaydın Bülbül et al. (2013) shows that mobbing victimization is more common in private health institutions than it is in public health institutions. Çalış and Tokat (2013), on the other hand, concluded that strict bureaucracy leads to an authoritarian structure in private health institutions and this causes mobbing and conflicts in the workplace. Similarly, according to Çalış and Tokat (2013: 116) when organizational structure becomes strict and "mechanical", it encourages mobbing perpetrators and makes employees more vulnerable. As another aspect of the organizational regulations, Bahçeci Geçici and Sağkal (2011) indicate that the longer the working hours are, the more mobbing incidences employees are exposed to in especially private health institutions.

Aslan and Akarçay (2013) revealed that employees who have a high level of psychological violence also have negative feelings and thoughts against their organization but do not reflect this on their behaviors. Similarly, Gül and Ağıröz (2011) indicate that there is a significant and positive relationship between mobbing and emotional cynicism, but there is not such a relationship between mobbing and cognitive and behavioral dimensions of cynicism. Şahin and Dündar (2011) found that perceptions of employees on ethical climate in hospitals do not vary by exposure to mobbing behaviors. According to the results, although victims are emotionally affected, they do not reflect it on attitudinal and behavioral levels. This gives clue on victims' general tendency to adopt passive coping strategies. In accordance, most of the victims "do not do anything" (Demir et al., 2014), "keep in the background; do not express their ideas, feelings and thoughts" (Ançel, Yuva, and Gökmen Öztuna, 2012), "remain silent, turn in on herself/himself" (Bahçeci Geçici and Sağkal, 2011), resort to informal ways and "work harder and in a more planned way" just like in the education sector (Palaz et al., 2008).

Conclusion: Mobbing victimization rates in Turkey indicate an alarming problem when compared to European cases. While studies indicate of rates vary from 3.5% to 10% for European cases (Einarsen, 2010: 967; Einarsen and Skogstad, 1996), mobbing rates are between 30% and 51% in Turkey (Demirci et al., 2010: 26; Einarsen, 2010: 967). This study also proves that mobbing victimization is

very high –above 20%, in all three sectors. Mobbing victimization reaches up to 55% when various sectors are combined (Bilgel, Aytaç and Bayram, 2006).

Although European studies conclude that work related attacks are the most common forms of mobbing, present review gives clue on that there might be specific forms of mobbing in different organizational levels. Mobbing acts are rather directed against occupational status such as over monitoring the work, underestimating one's performance, forcing one to do unqualified and over simple tasks in more professional positions. However, for example in health sector which include workers from various occupational statuses, the most prevalent attacks vary to a large extent from verbal violence to communication possibilities and life quality. These findings can be explained by Zapf's (1999: 77) conclusion that mobbing types vary by lower and higher levels of organizational structure.

It can be concluded that attacks against communication opportunities are quite common in every level of work hierarchy while attacks against occupational status are more common in more professional positions. In compliance with the European cases in general (Vartia Vaananen, 2013: 24), service sector employees in health and education, there are personal attacks such as gossiping; hiding information, interrupting; ignoring one's aims and values and attacks against occupational status. It can be concluded from these results that not only occupational status but also personal status is at the target of mobbing acts in service sector occupations.

Another point is that there is a rather poor relation between mobbing and gender. However, women are slightly more likely to be exposed to mobbing than men do. This point complies with European cases (Vartia Vaananen, 2013; Hoel and Cooper, 2001; Einarsen and Skogstad, 1996; Niedl, 1995). However, exceptions can be found for gender of victims. Especially victimization rates are higher for men at the lower and middle levels of health sector. This may be a result of a combination of gender discrimination and strict work hierarchy (female domination in nursing at the lower level and male domination in medicine at the upper level). In accordance with Tomic's (2012: 247) conclusion that mobbing victims are not a member of specific sex but are "employees of different sex –a woman in a group of men or a man in a group of women", these results show that gender is not a context-dependent factor of victimization.

There are also results that a bigger proportion of men take mobbing behaviors normally than women, men are affected less than women and men cope more effectively with mobbing than women do. These differences may result from traditional gender roles; men's more aggressive and competitive behaviors are approved but women are culturally not expected to act this way. These traditional gender roles may explain women's higher victimization rates and stronger victimization perceptions.

There is not a significant difference of marital status on mobbing victimization in general. Nonetheless, there are few studies which indicate the opposite by showing that single employees in some health institutions are exposed to mobbing more than the married ones. This point does not support that married people would be more likely to be exposed to mobbing due to the pressure of flexible working conditions on the balance between work and family life. On the other hand, this result may also be considered as a result of single employees' majority in this sector, especially compared to those in education. However, further research is needed to support this point.

A large body of research indicates that people usually become target to mobbing at the relatively early ages; 30's to 40's and at the medium level of job experience (5-10 years). These results differ partly from Einarsen and Skogstad's study (1996) which indicates that older employees reported significantly more bullying than younger employees.

Another result of the review regarding job hierarchy is that employees at lower levels of this hierarchy such as research assistants in universities and nurses in health institutions are exposed to mobbing more than employees at the higher levels do. This leads to the idea that there is a significant relationship between structural hierarchy and mobbing. According to Hofstede's power distance index (2001), Turkish culture has a high power distance. This has a significant effect on organizational structure. Research proves that autocratic and authoritarian leadership is related to mobbing (Hoel and Salin, 2013: 213). But these findings do not mean that only employees at the bottom are exposed to mobbing. Yet, findings give rise to the argument that employees at the lower levels are exposed to mobbing from above while employees at the upper levels suffer from mobbing behaviors of their peers just as much as mobbing from above.

There is not a specific investigation on the perpetrators. Nonetheless, in education (Otrar and Özen, 2009) and higher education (Tüzel, 2009), it was found that most of the perpetrators are superiors. According to the studies on psychological violence in health institutions, most of the perpetrators are patients' relatives, it is followed by superiors (Çamcı and Kutlu, 2011; Çarıkçı and Yavuz, 2009). Thus, in Turkey, superiors were still found to be majority in most of the studies just like it is in Britain (Bilgel, Aytaç and Bayram, 2006; Zapf et al., 2013: 116).

In education and health sectors, studies indicate that employees with higher educational level are exposed to mobbing more frequently. A possible reason of this could be a higher awareness of people with higher educational levels. Another possible reason indicated by Salin (2001: 436) is that "the higher the education of an employee, the higher the risk that some of the tasks he or she has to do are below their level of competence" and the hierarchical position and high education of the employees are also assumed to be explaining factors in mobbing".

Results on responses and coping strategies indicate that both in education and health sectors, victims choose avoiding the problem or deal with it through indirect and informal ways instead of using formal procedures and making an official report. Research also indicate that although almost 80% of the victims take actions against mobbing such as talking to colleagues or friends, ignoring the perpetrator or warning the perpetrator not to do this again; 23% of them were not satisfied with the result (Bilgel, Aytaç and Bayram, 2006).

While employees usually refrain from formal actions against mobbing, academicians are an exception. Research reveals that academicians discuss the problem with the perpetrator or report it to management. This could be a result of high awareness on mobbing among academicians. In this particular, further research is needed to understand how and why employees in different sectors cope with mobbing victimization in different ways.

Limitations

This study is a literature review of research articles published in scientific journals in a specific time period. Results of other studies on the issues such as reports and books as well as other articles published before and after this time were excluded. Further, a meta-analysis on the issue would be a more proper and practical analytical tool; however, the nature of the research; studies that have been reviewed include many findings such as frequency and prevalence of the problem, age, sex, position, seniority of victims and perpetrators and coping strategies. In order to take all of these factors into account as much as possible, this study is methodologically limited within the scope of literature review.

REFERENCES

- Akan, D.; Yıldırım, İ.; Yalçın, S. (2013). Mobbing behaviors that applied upward from below to principals, *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 5(3), 646-659.
- Akpınar, E. N. (2016). Öğretmenlerin mobbing algısının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi (An analysis of teachers' mobbing perceptions in terms of certain variables), *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (Electronic Journal of Social Sciences)*, 15(56), 295-308.
- Aksu, A.; Balcı, Y. (2009). İlköğretim okullarında psikolojik yıldırma ve psikolojik yıldırma ile baş etme (Mobbing and coping with mobbing in primary schools), *New World Sciences Academy*, 4(4), 1367-1380.
- Aksu, T.; Güneri, B. (2011). Öğretim elemanlarının maruz kaldıkları yıldırma davranışlarının işe yabancılaşmaları üzerine etkisi (The effect of mobbing (workplace bullying) on work alienation of which academicians are exposed), *E-International Journal of Education Research*, 2(4), 28-43.
- Akyüz, K. C.; Gedik, T.; Balaban, Y.; Yıldırım, İ.; Temiz, A. (2013). Bullying at forest products industry in Turkey, *International Journal of Economic and Administrative Studies*, 6(11), 145-158.
- Ançel, G.; Yuva, E.; Gökmen Öztuna, D. (2012). Eş-bağımlılık ve işyerinde mobbing arasındaki ilişki (The relationship of co-dependency and workplace mobbing), *Anatolian Journal of Psychiatry*, 13, 104-109.
- Aslan, Ş.; Akarçay, D. (2013). Psikolojik şiddetin genel ve örgütsel sinizme etkileri (The effects of mobbing on general and organizational cynicism), *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi (Erciyes University Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences)*, 4(1), 24-44.
- Ayan, S.; Şahbudak, E. (2012). Üniversitelerde asistanlara yönelik psikolojik taciz: Gazi, Kocaeli ve Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi örneği (Mobbing to research assistants at universities: Examples of Gazi, Kocaeli and Cumhuriyet University), *Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Dergisi (Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities)*, 4(1), 297-310.
- Bahçeci Geçici, N.; Sağkal, T. (2011). Ödemiş'te çalışan hemşirelerin mobbinge maruz kalma durumlarının incelenmesi, (A survey about the state of nurses who experienced mobbing), *Maltepe Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Bilim ve Sanatı Dergisi (Maltepe University Journal of Science and Art of Nursing)*, 4(1), 53-62.
- Baş, N.; Oral T. E. (2012). Mobbing davranışı ve kişilik özellikleri ile ilişkisi (Mobbing and its relationship with personality features), *İstanbul Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (Istanbul University Journal of Social Sciences)*, 11(21), 11-24.
- Bayrak Kök, S.; Mohan Bursalı, Y.; Gün Eroğlu, Ş. (2014). Psikolojik şiddetin bireysel ve örgütsel yansıması: Yıldırma (Individual and organizational reflection of psychological violence: Mobbing), *Eurasian Socioeconomic studies*, 1(1), 44-62.
- Bilgel, N., Aytaç, S. and Bayram, N. (2006). Bullying in Turkish white-collar workers. *Occupational Medicine*, 56(4), 226-231.
- Cemaloğlu, N.; Kılınç, A. Ç. (2012). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin etik liderlik davranışları ile öğretmenlerin algıladıkları örgütsel güven ve yıldırma arasındaki ilişki (The relationship between school principals' ethical leadership behaviors and teachers' perceived organizational trust and mobbing), *Eğitim ve Bilim (Education and Science)*, 37(165), 137-151.
- Cemaloğlu, N. (2007). Okul yöneticilerinin liderlik stilleri ile yıldırma arasındaki ilişki (The relationship between school administrators' leadership styles and bullying), *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (Hacettepe University Journal of Faculty of Education)*, 33,77-78.
- Cemaloğlu, N.; Ertürk, A. (2007). Öğretmenlerin maruz kaldıkları yıldırma eylemlerinin cinsiyet yönünden incelenmesi (An examination of mobbing behaviors against teachers), *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi (Turkish Journal of Educational Sciences)*, 5(2), 345-362.

- Celep, C.; Eminoğlu, E. (2012). Primary school teachers' experience with mobbing and teachers' self-efficacy perceptions, *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 4761-4774.
- Çakıroğlu, E.; Tengilimoğlu, D. (2014). Mobbing (yıldırma) davranışlarının tıbbi sekreterlerin tükenmişliği üzerine etkisi (Effects of mobbing (intimidation/terrorization) behaviors over medical secretaries' burnout syndrome), *Electronic Journal of Vocational Colleges*, 4(3), 167-188.
- Çalış, M.; Tokat, B. (2013). Örgüt yapısı ve mobbing ilişkisinin özel hastanelerde incelenmesi: Giresun ili örneği (An investigation of relationship between organizational structure and mobbing in private hospitals: A Case Study of Province Giresun), *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi (Ankara University Journal of Faculty of Policial Science)*, 68(4), 103-120.
- Çamcı, O.; Kutlu, Y. (2011). Kocaeli'nde sağlık çalışanlarına yönelik işyeri şiddetinin belirlenmesi (Determination of workplace violence toward health workers in Kocaeli), *Psikiyatri Hemşireliği Dergisi (Journal of Psychiatric Nursing)*, 2(1), 9-16.
- Çarıkcı, İ. H.; Yavuz, H. (2009). Çalışanlarda mobbing (psikolojik şiddet) algısı: sağlık sektörü çalışanları üzerine bir araştırma (The mobbing (psychological violence) among employees: A study on health sector), *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi (Süleyman Demirel University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences)*, 2(10), 47-62.
- Çelik, S.; Peker, S. (2010). Mobbing perceptions of high school teachers, *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 1617-1623.
- Çivilidağ, A. (2012). Okul psikolojik danışmanlarının psikolojik taciz ve yaşam doyumu düzeylerinin incelenmesi (An analysis of the mobbing and life satisfaction levels of school counselors), *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences)*, 129-144.
- Çivilidağ, A.; Sargin, N. (2011). Farklı ortaöğretim kurumlarında çalışan öğretmenlerde psikolojik taciz (mobbing): Antalya ili örneği (Mobbing on the high school teachers who work in different schools: A case study in Antalya), *Uluslararası Avrasya Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (International Journal of Eurasia Social Sciences)*, 2(3), 11-22.
- Çomak, E.; Tunç, B. (2012). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin ilköğretim okullarında yaşadıkları yıldırma durumları (Mobbing cases of the primary school teachers at their schools), *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (Mersin University Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences)*, 8(3), 197-208.
- Demir, G.; Bulucu, G. D.; Özcan, A.; Yılmaz, D.; Şen, H. (2014). Hemşirelerin mobbinge uğrama durumlarının belirlenmesi (A survey about the states of nurses who experience mobbing), *Düzce Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi (Düzce University Journal of Institute of Health Sciences)*, 4(1), 1-5.
- Demirci, K. M.; Özler, D. E.; Girgin, B. (2010). Beş faktör kişilik modelinin işyerinde duygusal tacize (mobbing) etkileri: Hastane işletmelerinde bir uygulama (The effects of five-factor personality model on emotional harassment (mobbing): An application on hospital businesses), *Journal of Azerbaijani Studies*, 10, 13-39.
- Dikmetaş, E.; Top, M.; Ergin, G. (2011). Asistan hekimlerin tükenmişlik ve mobbing düzeylerinin incelenmesi (An examination of mobbing and burnout levels of physician associates), *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi (Turkish Journal of Psychiatry)*, 22, 1-15.
- Durdağ, M.; Naktiyok, A. (2009). Psikolojik taciz algısının örgütsel güven üzerindeki rolü (The role of mobbing perception on organizational trust), *Kafkas Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi (Kafkas University Journal of Faculty of Business Administration)*, 1(2), 5-37.
- Dursun, S. (2012). İşyeri şiddetinin çalışanların tükenmişlik düzeyi üzerindeki etkisi: Sağlık sektöründe bir uygulama (The effect of workplace violence on employees' burnout levels: An application in health sector), *Çalışma İlişkileri Dergisi (Journal of Labor Relations)*, 3(1), 105-115.
- Einarsen, S. (2000). Harassment and bullying at work: A review of the Scandinavian approach, *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 5(4), 379-401.
- Einarsen, S. (1999). The nature and causes of bullying at work, *International Journal of Manpower*, 20(1/2), 16-27.
- Einarsen, S.; Mikkelsen, E. G. (2013). Individual effects of exposure to bullying at work, in *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace (Einarsen, Stale; Hoel, Helge; Zapf, Dieter; Cooper, Cary eds.)*, Taylor&Francis: London, pp. 127-144.
- Einarsen, S.; Hoel, H. (2001). The validity and development of the revised Negative Acts Questionnaire. Paper presented at the meeting of the European Congress of Work and Organizational Psychology, Prague, Czech Republic.
- Einarsen, S.; Skogstad, A. (1996). Bullying at work: Epidemiological findings in public and private

- organizations, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), 185-201.
- Eroğlu, E.; Solmaz, B. (2004). Örgütlerde işgörenlere yönelik mobbing (yıpranma) davranışları ve örgütsel iletişime etkileri (Mobbing behaviors towards workers in the organizations and the effect of organizational communication), *Anadolu Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Dergisi (Anadol University Journal of Faculty of Communication)*, 21, 143-154.
- Ertürk, A. (2013). Yıldırma davranışları: Maruz kalanlar ve etkilenenler (Mobbing Behaviors: Victims and ones who are affected), *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri (Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice)*, 13(1), 161-173.
- Ertürk, A.; Cemaloğlu, N. (2014). Causes of Mobbing Behavior, *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 3669-3678.
- Geçikli, F.; Geçikli, M. (2012). Women in the mobbing-oriented atmosphere in workplaces: an empirical study in a public university, *Uluslararası Kadına ve Çocuğa Karşı Şiddet Sempozyumu Bildiri Kitabı (Proceedings Book of International Symposium on Violence Against Women and Children)*, 54-74.
- Gül, H.; Ağröz, A. (2011). Mobbing ve örgütsel sinizm arasındaki ilişkiler: hemşireler üzerinde bir uygulama (Relations between mobbing and organizational cynicism: An application on nurses), *Afyon Kocatepe İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi (Afyon Kocatepe University Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences)*, 13(2), 29-49.
- Güven, Ş. D.; Özcan, A.; Kartal, B. (2012). Nevşehir il merkezinde kamuya bağlı sağlık kuruluşlarında çalışan ebe ve hemşirelerin mobbing'e uğrama durumları (Nurses and midwives who are being mobbed in Nevşehir City Centre Health Organizations of State), *Balıkesir Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi (Balıkesir University Journal of Health Sciences)*, 1(3), 117-123.
- Hoel, H.; Einarsen, S.; Cooper, C. L. (2013). Organizational effects of bullying, in *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace* (Einarsen, Stale; Hoel, Helge; Zapf, Dieter; Cooper, Cary eds.), Taylor&Francis: London, pp. 23-38.
- Hoel, H.e; Cooper, C. L. (2000). *Destructive conflict and bullying at work*, Manchester: Manchester School of Management, UMIST.
- Kalay, F.; Oğrak, A.; Nişancı Z. N. (2014). Mobbing, örgütsel sessizlik ve örgütsel sinizm ilişkisi: Örnek bir uygulama (The relationship between mobbing, organizational silence and organizational cynicism: An empirical study), *Kastamonu Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi (Kastamonu University Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences)*, 4(2), 127-143.
- Karabacak Aşır, S.; Akın, G. (2014). İlköğretim okullarındaki yıldırma (mobbing) toplumsal cinsiyet bağlamında bir bakış (Mobbing in primary schools in the context of gender perspective), *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 11(1), 584-602.
- Karahan, A.; Yılmaz, H. (2014). Mobbing ve örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisine yönelik bir çalışma (Mobbing and its effects on organizational commitment), *Yaşar Üniversitesi Dergisi (Journal of Yaşar University)*, 9(33), 5692-5715.
- Karakuş, H.; Çankaya H. İ. (2012). Öğretmenlerin maruz kaldıkları psikolojik şiddete ilişkin bir model sınanması (Examining a model related to mobbing incurred by teachers), *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (Hacettepe University Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences)*, 42, 225-237.
- Karakuş, H. (2011). Hemşirelerde kurum ve yönetimin etkisine bağlı olarak yaşanan mobbing davranışları (Mobbing behaviors due to organizational and administrative reasons among nurses), *Akademik Araştırmalar ve Çalışmalar Dergisi (Journal of Academic Research and Studies)*, 3(5), 83-102.
- Karicioğlu, F.; Akbaş, S. (2010). İşyerinde psikolojik şiddet ve iş tatmini ilişkisi (The relationship between psychological violence and job satisfaction), *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi (Atatürk University Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences)*, 24(3), 139-161.
- Karsavuran, S. (2014). Sağlık sektöründe mobbing: Hastane yöneticileri üzerinde bir uygulama (Mobbing in healthcare: An application to hospital managers), *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi (Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences)*, 26(11), 271-296.
- Keashly, L., & Jagatic, K. (2011). North American perspectives on hostile behaviors and bullying at work. *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice*, 2, 41-71.
- Kılınç, A. Ç. (2012). Öğretmenlerin denetim odağı puanları ile yıldırma yaşama düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki (The relationship between locus of control points and exposure to mobbing of teachers), *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi (Turkish Journal of Educational Sciences)*, 10(4), 805-835.
- Koç, M.; Urasoğlu Bulut, H. (2009). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinde mobbing: Cinsiyet, yaş ve lise türü değişkenleri açısından incelenmesi (Mobbing in the

- secondary education teachers: Investigation from the gender age and high school), *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 1(1), 64-80.
- Leymann, H. (1993). Ätiologie und Häufigkeit von Mobbing am Arbeitsplatz: Eine Übersicht über die bisherige Forschung (Etiology and frequency of bullying in the workplace: An overview of current research). *Zeitschrift für Personalforschung*, 7, 271-283.
- Leymann, H. (1990). Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces, *Violence and Victims*, 5(2), 119-126.
- Luthar, H. K.; Luthar, V. K. (2007). A theoretical framework explaining cross-cultural sexual harassment: Integrating Hofstede and Schwartz, *Journal of Labor Research*, 18(1), 169-188.
- Mete, M.; Ünal, Ö. F.; Akyüz, B.; Kılıç, R. (2015). Psikolojik şiddetin işe bağlı tükenmişliğe etkisi: Batman ilinde öğretmenler üzerine bir araştırma (Effect of mobbing on work-related burnout: A survey on teachers in Batman Province of Turkey), *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Vizyoner Dergisi (Vizyoner Journal of Süleyman Demirel University)*, 6(2), 37-61.
- Mikkelsen, E. G.; Einarsen, S. (2001). Bullying in Danish work Life: Prevalence and health correlates, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10, 393-414.
- Nielsen, M. B.; Matthiesen, S. B.; Einarsen, S. (2010). The impact of methodological moderators on prevalence rates of workplace bullying: A meta analysis, *Journal of Occupational and Organizational psychology*, 83, 955-979.
- Otrar, M.; Özen, B. (2009). Rehber öğretmenlerin okul ortamında algıladıkları yıldırma davranışları (The mobbing behaviours perceived by guidance counselors at school context), *İş Ahlakı Dergisi (Journal of Work Ethics)*, 2(3), 97-120.
- Özaydın Bülbül, P.; Ünal, E.; Bozaykut, T.; Korkmaz, M.; Yücel, A. S. (2013). Sağlık çalışanlarında mobbing: Kamu ve özel sağlık kurum çalışanlarının karşılaştırılması Türkiye örneği (Mobbing in healthcare workers: The comparative turkey example of workers in public and private medical institutions), *Uluslararası Hakemli Akademik Spor, Sağlık ve Tıp Bilimleri Dergisi (International Refereed Academic Journal of Sports)*, 7(3), 1-21.
- Özyer, K.; Orhan, U. (2012). Akademisyenlere uygulanan psikolojik tacize yönelik ampirik bir araştırma (An emirical study of the mobbing applied to academicians), *Ege Akademik Bakış (Ege Academic Review)*, 12(4), 511-518.
- Palaz, S.; Özkan, S.; Sarı, N.; Göze, F.; Şahin, N.; Akkurt, Ö. (2008). İş yerinde psikolojik taciz (mobbing) davranışları üzerine bir araştırma: Bandırma örneği (A study on psychological harassment (mobbing) behaviors in workplace: The example of Bandırma District), *İşGüç Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi ("IS, GUC" Industrial Relations and Human Resources Journal)*, 41-58.
- Pryor, J. B.; Fitzgerald, L. F. (2013). By any other name: American perspectives on workplace bullying, *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace (Einarsen, Stale; Hoel, Helge; Zapf, Dieter; Cooper, Cary eds.)*, Taylor&Francis: London, pp. 79-100.
- Quine, L. (1999). Workplace bullying in NHS community trust: Staff questionnaire survey, *British Medical Journal*, 3, 228-232.
- Sezerel, H.; Bostan, S.; Okan, T. (2015). Kişiliğe yönelik yıldırma (mobbing) davranışları ve fizyolojik etkiler arasındaki ilişkide psikolojik etkilerin aracılık rolü (The mediator role of psychological effects between mobbing behaviors towards personality and physiological effects), *İş Güç Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi ("IS, GUC" Industrial Relations and Human Resources Journal)*, 17(3), 93-118.
- Sönmez, M.; Karaoğlu, L.; Egri, M.; Genç, M. F.; Güneş, G.; Pehlivan, E. (2013). Prevalence of workplace violence against health staff in Malatya, *Bitlis Ahi Evren University Journal of Science and Technology*, 3, 26-31.
- Strandmark, M. (2013). Workplace bullying and harassment in Sweden: Mobilizing against bullying, *Workplace bullying and harassment in the EU and Finland*, in *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace (Einarsen, Stale; Hoel, Helge; Zapf, Dieter; Cooper, Cary eds.)*, Taylor&Francis: London, pp. 23-38.
- Şahbudak, E.; Öztürk, M. (2015). İş yerinde psikolojik taciz: Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi'nde çalışan akademisyenler üzerine bir çalışma (Harassment in workplace: A study on academicians of Cumhuriyet University), *Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi (Journal of Academic Social Research)*, 3(15), 146-160.
- Şahin, B.; Dündar, T. (2011). Sağlık sektöründe etik iklim ve yıldırma (mobbing) davranışları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi (Investigation of relationship between ethical climate and mobbing behaviors in health care sector), *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi (Ankara University Journal of Faculty of Political Science)*, 66(1), 129-159.
- Şahin, S.; Türk, M. (2010). Çalışanlarda psikolojik şiddet algılaması ve kadın çalışanlar üzerine bir araştırma (A

- Study on perception of psychological violence among employees and female employees), Çukurova Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi (Çukurova University Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences), 14(2), 1-9.
- Şalvarcı Türeli, N.; Dolmacı, N. (2013). İş yaşamında kadın çalışana yönelik ayrımcı bakış açısı ve mobbing üzerine ampirik bir çalışma (An empirical study on the discriminatory point of view and mobbing against the female employees in the work place), Ekonomi ve Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi (Journal of Economics and Management Research), 2(2), 83-104.
- Şener, O. (2013). Genel kamu liselerinde psikolojik yıldırma ve örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi (The relationship between psychological mobbing and organizational commitment in general public high schools), Karatekin Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi (Karatekin University Journal of Faculty of Literature), 1(1), 47-64.
- Şenerkal, R.; Çorbacıoğlu, S. (2015). Akademik personelin algıladığı psikolojik taciz davranışları ile iş performansı, psikolojik ve fizyolojik sağlık ilişkisi üzerine bir araştırma (A research on the relationship between mobbing behaviors and job performance, psychological health, and psychological health as perceived by academic personnel), Gazi Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi (Gazi University Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences), 17(1), 107-135.
- Tanhan, F.; Çam, Z. (2011). The relation between mobbing behaviors teachers in elementary schools are exposed to and their burnout levels, Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15, 2704-2709.
- Toker Gökçe, A. (2012). Mobbing: İş yerinde yıldırma özel ve resmi ilköğretim okulu öğretmen ve yöneticileri üzerinde yapılan bir araştırma (Mobbing: A study of public and private school teachers and school administrators), Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (Dicle University Journal of Faculty of Literature), 18, 272-286.
- Tomic, M. (2012). Mobbing: The incidence of mobbing activities and differences regarding workplace and gender, Megatrend Review, 9(1), 243-252.
- Tutar, H.; Akbolat, M. (2012). Sağlık çalışanlarının yönetici cinsiyetleri bakımından mobbing algıları (Perceptions of mobbing of health employees in terms of genders of managers), Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi (Selçuk University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences), 28, 19-29.
- Tüzel, E. (2008). Araştırma görevlilerinin maruz kaldıkları yıldırma (mobbing) davranışlarının araştırma görevlilerinin sahip oldukları çeşitli değişkenlere göre incelenmesi (Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Örneği). (An examination of mobbing victimization of research assistants based on various characteristics of the research assistants: The Case of Gazi University Faculty of Education). I. Uluslararası Türkiye Eğitim Araştırmaları'nda sunulan bildiri (The study presented on I. International Turkish Research on Education), Çanakkale.
- Uğurlu, C. T.; Çağlar, Ç.; Güneş, H. (2012). Ortaöğretim okullarında yıldırma (mobbing) davranışlarına ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri (Secondary school teachers' views of mobbing behaviors), Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi (Turkish Journal of Educational Sciences), 10(4), 718-749.
- Vartia Vananen, M. (2013). Workplace bullying and harassment in the EU and Finland, in Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace (Einarsen, Stale; Hoel, Helge; Zapf, Dieter; Cooper, Cary eds.), Taylor&Francis: London, pp. 1-23.
- Wolmerath, M. (2013). Workplace bullying and harassment in Germany, in Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace (Einarsen, Stale; Hoel, Helge; Zapf, Dieter; Cooper, Cary eds.), Taylor&Francis: London, pp. 77-90.
- Yıldırım, D.; Yıldırım, A. (2010). Sağlık alanında çalışan akademisyenlerin karşılaştıkları psikolojik şiddet davranışları ve bu davranışların etkileri (Mobbing behaviors encountered by health science faculties staff and their responses to them), Türkiye Klinikleri (Turkish Clinics), 30(2), 559-570.
- Yılmaz, A.; Ergun Özler, D.; Mercan, N. (2008). Mobbing ve örgüt iklimi ile ilişkisine yönelik ampirik bir araştırma (An empirical study of the relationship between mobbing and organizational climate), Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (E-Journal of Social Sciences), 7(26), 334-357.
- Zapf, D.; Einarsen, S.; Hoel, H.; Vartia, M. (2014). Empirical findings on bullying in the workplace, in Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace (Einarsen, Stale; Hoel, Helge; Zapf, Dieter; Cooper, Cary eds.), Taylor&Francis: London, pp. 103-126.
- Zapf, D. (1992). Organizational, work group related and personal causes of mobbing/bullying at work, Journal of Manpower, 20(1/2), 70-85.