Mobbing and Individual Antecedents in Commercial Banks of North Cyprus

Bahareh Ghanbari Kondori

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of

Master of Science
in
Banking and Finance

Eastern Mediterranean University
January 2015
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

_____
Prof. Dr. Serhan Çiftçioğlu
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Banking and Finance.

_____
Assoc.Prof. Dr. Nesrin Özataç
Chair, Department of Banking and Finance

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Banking and Finance.

_____
Prof. Dr. Salih Katırcıoğlu
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Prof. Dr. Salih Katırcıoğlu   _____

2. Prof. Dr. Sami Fethi   _____

3. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nesrin Özataç   _____

ABSTRACT

This thesis empirically investigates the factors of mobbing in commercial banks in the Case of North Cyprus. First of all, I assumed that there was no significant difference between gender groups based on the factors of mobbing influencing individual performance. Second, there was no significant difference among age groups based on the factors of mobbing influencing individual performance. Third, there was no significant difference among income levels of the groups based on the factors of mobbing influencing individual performance. Fourth, there was no significant difference among job task groups based on the factors of mobbing influencing individual performance. The statistical analysis showed that, there are significant differences among working staffs with different gender, age and income level as well as job task based on the factors of mobbing influencing individual performance.

Keywords: Mobbing, Job Performance, Workplace Bullying, Commercial Banks, North Cyprus.

ÖZ

Bu makale deneysel olarak Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta ticari bankaların Mobing etkenlerini incelemektedir. Her şeyden önce kişisel performansa etkili olan Mobing etkenlerine dayanarak grupların cinsiyeti arasında önemli farkın bulunmasını varsayıyorum.

İkinci kişisel performansa etkili olan Mobing etkenlerine dayanarak yaş grupları arasında her hangi bir önemli fark bulunmamaktadır.Üçüncü kişisel performansa etkili olan Mobing etkenlerine dayanarak gelir düzeyi grupları arasında önemli bir fark göze çarpmamaktadır.Sonuçta kişisel performansa etkili olan Mobing etkenlerine dayanarak mesleki gruplar arasında gözde görülür bir fark görünmemektedir.T testi ve tek yönlü ANOVA yöntemleri sonuçları kişisel performansa etkili olan Mobing etkenlerine dayanarak farklı gelir düzeyi, yaş ve cinsiyet koşullarıyla çalışan elemanlar arasında önemli fark göze çarpmamasını göstermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Mobbing, İş Performansı, İşyeri Zorbalık, Ticari Bankalar, Kuzey Kıbrıs.

To My Dear Parents

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Salih Katırcıoğlu, for giving me valuable advice and guidance while conducting my research and writing the thesis.

My sincere thanks go to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sami Fethi and Assoc. Prof. Nesrin Ozatac, for giving me crucial advice to make this thesis more comprehensive and organized.

I am truly thankful to my beloved family who has always supported me unconditionally throughout my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

In today's world, the nature of work has changed. Efficiency, motivation, job satisfaction and personal relations are important for job performance. In the past, the focus was just on earning money. Nowadays, psychological issues, especially mobbing, are inevitable parts of work, particularly in the countries such as Sweden, Finland, and Norway, where they are concern about social and emotional wellbeing of their employees, besides the physical improvement. Competition between employees is another important issue which can lead to hostile and unethical actions between managers and employees.

The term 'Mobbing' originally used by Konrad Lorenz, Austrian-German founder of ethology, to describe animal group behavior in his book titled "On Aggression in 1966." He identified mobbing among birds and he termed ''the attacks from a group of smaller animals threatening a single larger animal "mobbing". In his view, humans are subject to similar innate impulses but capable of bringing them under rational control.

In the 1970s, the term was applied to the psychology by the Swedish scientist, Peter Paul Heinemann in his book "Mobbing: Group Violence among Children", which was regarding violence committed by students in schools. Then the term was

applied to "ganging up in the workplace" by German-Swedish psychologist, the founder of the international anti-bullying movement, Heinz Leymann who cared most about bullying's impact on the health of individuals in 70's (Gülen, 2008). Andrea Adams applied bullying to adulthood misery in 1992.

Based on Leymann, bullying at school refers to physically aggressive acts, while on the other hand, physical violence is rarely found at work. Mobbing in the workplace is considered by behaviors such as the social isolation of the target. Hence, he reserved the word 'bullying' for actions between youths at school and used the word 'mobbing' for adult behavior in workplaces (Leymann, 1996).

Mobbing refers as ''emotional abuse'' (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996) which one individual is attacked by another (or more) frequently and over long period of time and circumstance for the one under attack will be to feel helpless and defenseless (Leymann, 1996).

Some studies argue that there is a relationship between mobbing and personality. However, mobbing is a consequence of not only individual but also situational factors. Some individual exposed to mobbing as result of their personal characteristics (Mathiesen & Einarsen, 2007; Ballucci, 2009).

Mobbing also arises as a result of conflict between employees which cause social stress (Zapf et al., 1996). Based on Scandinavian research, mobbing creates stress condition at work and it exposes victims to physiological and psychological problems (Leymann, 1990; Vartia, 2001; Tinaz, 2006).

Workplace victimization has only recently become a subject of academic study and there is now high public awareness. It was recognized as an important issue in mid-1980s and it has only recently become a subject of academic study.

Namie (2003) described workplace bullying as "status-blind", which is frequent and deliberate hostility to control other person and can harm that person's health and/or economic status. This kind of behavior can be either verbal or physical and moves to render the target unproductive and unsuccessful –it is the aggressor's desire to control the target that motivates the action.

Workplace bullying is common and destructive phenomenon results in emotional harm and mental distress as results of deliberate negative interactions either verbal abuse or physical treatment toward other co-workers to control them in workplace (Lutgen-Sandvik, 2005).

Carmichael professor of organization and human resources at the University Of Buffalo School of Management argued that human resource managers have recently recognized the importance of controlling aggressive behavior in workplace as result of its productivity cost (Farrell, 2002). Based on survey on 9,000 Canadian federal employees, which is done by Canada Safety Council in 2002, 42% of female and 15% of male employees experienced bullying in 2-years, causing over $180 million in lost time and productivity. Psychologist Michael H. Harrison, Ph.D., of Harrison Psychological Associates, conveys "This kind of harassment has a huge impact on a company's bottom line," he says.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

This study was conducted to investigate mobbing in the commercial bank of North Cyprus. The first objective was to assess prevalence of mobbing. The second objective was to investigate underlying patterns and structure in negative behaviors. The third objective was to determine the reasons and effects of such behaviors and interactions.

1.3 Research Questions

One of the most important parts of each study is the questions which need to be answered. This study used banking sectors in North Cyprus.

The following statements were to be answered:

1. Was there significant mobbing in the commercial banks of North Cyprus?
2. Were there significant relationships between mobbing and individual performances in the commercial banks of North Cyprus?
3. Were there significant relationships between mobbing and individual psychological situations of personnel in the commercial banks of North Cyprus?

The results of this investigation were expected to useful for Cypriot banking management, as well as to policy makers, in order to improve the performances in the banks.

1.4 Thesis Structure

Content of this thesis is divided into 5 sections. The first part is an introduction of the study. The second part is literature review, which focused on the background of the study in North Cyprus. The third part explains the methodology. The fourth part explains the empirical results. The fifth part includes the conclusions.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Background

Broad recognition of the workplace environment which is mostly composed physical, social and psychological factors have effect on employees' physical and mental health as well as organizations' performance and effectiveness. Work environment needs to be safe and sound positive and supportive, which encourages employees to make best use of their skills and enables them to perform more efficiently (Leshabari et al., 2008). In fact, employees' well-being, satisfaction and performance have been found to be influenced by psycho-social environment of work organization (Franco et al., 2000). Based on research conducted by Stallworth and Kleiner (1996) for creating such workplace environment, physical and behavioral components should be considered.

It is generally realized that the physical design and the workplace environmental conditions play a vital role in organization's efficiency. The study conducted by Haynes (2008) illustrated that the development in the physical design increase productivity and performance. According to (Stallworth & Kleiner, 1996) when human needs are considered, employees work more efficiently. It is also argued that safe and healthy workplace condition affects employees' job performance (Strong et al., 1999).

The behavioral environment is a key factor of productivity level which connected to employees' communication, and the impression the workplace environment can have on individual's actions. Haynes (2008) discussed that the behavioral environment represents the two main components namely interaction and distraction. Administrators also have to motivate their employees to have good and productive relationships with fellow (Latham & Yukl, 1975). Thus to carry out work in good conditions; employees need a positive environment including collaboration and mutual relation which is the key of organization's success. Poor collaboration creates negative working atmosphere, and consequently results in workplace victimization.

2.2 Workplace Victimization: Mobbing

Over the past two decades, with the increase in incidence of negative behavior at working environment, studies on workplace victimization have increased significantly around the world. According to Einarsen et al. (2011), who debated that even a 10% prevalence of workplace victimization warrants strong attention, although some other researches argue that almost 95% of employees experienced bullying behaviors in the workplace over a 5-year period (Fox, 2005). Workplace victimization describes systematic aggression and hostility in workplace such as harassment, bullying, mobbing and emotional abuse.

Bullying which identified in 1990s has attracted researchers' attention throughout the world especially in Europe (Duffy & Sperry, 2007). Although several books and surveys debate consequences of workplace mobbing such as mental distress, physical illness, and career damage, yet national and international academic study began only recently (Needham, 2003; Rigby, 2002). Given the prevalence of

workplace mobbing, its negative effect on victims and emphasis of European countries such as Sweden, Norway, and Finland for applying preventive activities against workplace bullying, study on bullying started to be more common in other countries (Mueller, 2006).

Mobbing is a more systematic form of bullying carried out by a mob or group of people. However, bullying is a behavior that can be executed by a single individual. In fact, Westhues (2006) debated that the terms bullying and mobbing have been used interchangeably.

Rigby (2002) noted more studies based upon reliable, credible, and empirical investigations are needed regarding the relationship between health status and involvement in bully-target problems. This study demonstrated a relationship between actions and involvement of bullies, targets, and the environment of the organization when measuring bullying and productivity.

2.3 Definition of Mobbing

Workplace victimization was first introduced by Heinz Leymann and Bo-Göran Gustavsson in 1984 (Leymann, 1996). Beginning with Leymann's findings, the issue started to get considerable scientific and societal attention in Europe, first in Sweden and the Nordic countries than in the rest of Western Europe. The definition given by Leymann is still valid and basic today: mobbing is a hostile, "unethical communication" and behavior of one individual or of a group directed towards one or a small number of individuals who due to the systematic negative acts – at least once a week for at least six months – becomes unable to defend himself. As a result of such behaviors the target may experience serious health and social harms

(Leymann, 1996). There has been general agreement on basic definition of mobbing introduced by leymann among researchers. However, they added new components to standard definition. Einarsen (1999) completed the concept with the perception element: the directed behavior must be perceived by the target as hostile and humiliating. Vartia (2001) proved that not the strictly defined duration and frequency but the systematic nature of negative acts is harmful. Researchers report the following devastating effect of mobbing: psychosomatic symptoms, depression, low self-confidence, deterioration of family relationships, and permanent job loss.

The phenomenon of mobbing refers to "emotional abuse'', was defined by Einarsen (1996) when one individual is attacked by one another (or more) frequently and over long period of time and the one under attack will feel helpless and defenseless (Laymann, 1996). Based on Davenport et al. (2003) mobbing is defined as negative actions in the form of physical violence or verbal abuse which has negative consequence on psychological health and well-being of victim. It affects organization and employees' work productivity. Leymann (1984) described mobbing as hostile and unethical behaviors by one individual toward another individual which occurs frequently and over long period of time.

Bullies are defined as individual who repeatedly use negative actions such as verbal or physical violence against victims (Olweus, 2003). According to Seals and Young (2002), bullying changes from aggressive forms to more passive forms as children get older.

According to Duffy and Sperry (2007), individual exposed to derogatory or exclusionary actions will lose their self-esteem and professional reputation. The

main reason for such behaviors is to remove the victim from organization. Research studies in the area of mobbing behavior show that employees who suffer mobbing behavior experience biological and psychological health problems. Einarsen and Raknes (1997) conducted a study that mentioned that 22 % of employees who exposed to mobbing behavior in the workplace experience emotional harm, mental distress, and physical illness consequently.

2.4 History

The first study of workplace bullying was published just over 20 years ago in 1990 by Heinz Leymann. Leymann (1990) illustrated in his study that the bullying behaviors which he had researched in the playground were similarly apparent in the workplace. Einarsen et al. (1994) subsequently investigated workplace bullying in Norway and found that bullying was indeed a prevalent phenomenon in organizations. Olweus was the first researcher started to study about bullying behavior in Swedish and Norwegians school in 1970 and estimated the incidence of bullying behavior in children (Olweus, 2003).

Andrea Adams, a British broadcaster and journalist, was the first person who documented the consequence of adult bullying in the workplace in the United Kingdom and its destructive effect on people's lives and health. Rayner, Hoel and Cooper (2002) also conducted a study about bullying in the United Kingdom which was the most recent large-scale and comprehensive report of workplace.

2.5 Workplace Mobbing Features

Einarsen, Hoel, zapf and cooper (2011) considered four features including frequency, persistency, power imbalance and hostility to describe workplace bullying.

There is disagreement between researchers on frequency (minimum number of times negative behaviors must be exhibited per week 'one or two') and Persistency (the duration of time the negative behaviors are experienced 'six or twelve months') .Moreover, power imbalance refers to the disparity in perceived power between the target and the perpetrator which may take many forms from open verbal or physical attacks to rather indirect and subtle acts of aggression. Finally, hostility ranges from subtle to overt acts. Although subtle bullying behaviors are more common, violence and aggression are easier to detect by others (Fox & Stallworth, 2005). According to Tepper and Henle (2011), workplace bullying is sufficiently distinct and meaningful to be treated separately.

As mentioned before workplace bullying needs the negative behaviors to occur frequently (once or twice a week) and persistently (duration of six to twelve months). Therefore, bullying is a systematic and persistent phenomenon which causes individual to face psychological problem (Fox & Stallworth, 2010). Cortina (2008) mentioned that workplace victimization has significant consequences not only on individual but also on groups and organization.

Workplace bullying includes abuses that not only occur between co-workers but also from customers to employee (Fox & Stallworth, 2005).

Although workplace bullying has been considered as a phenomenon which has global prevalence, researchers have revealed varied prevalence rates around the world. Lutgen-Sandvik, Tracy and Alberts (2007) reported U.S prevalence rate of nearly 50%, however this rate ranging from 5 to 10% in Europe.

2.6 Types of Mobbing

Three types of mobbing can be considered depending on the power of victims and offenders. They are horizontal, up-down and down-up mobbing.

1. Horizontal Mobbing: When mobbing occurs between co-workers at the same hierarchical level it is called horizontal mobbing.

2. Up-down Mobbing: This type of mobbing occurs when a superior harasses one of her/his subordinates.

3. Down-up Mobbing: Down-up mobbing occurs when a worker or a group or workers harasses his/their superior (Branch, Sheehan, Barker & Ramsay, 2004).

2.7 Mobbing Phases

According to Leymann (1996), there are four critical incident phases causing mobbing behavior to occur:

Phase 1: The Original Critical Incident is characterized by the observed conflict which can be a triggering situation for mobbing to occur. This phase is very short and individual will enter into the next phase as soon as the target's coworkers expose stigmatized actions.

Phase 2: Mobbing and Stigmatizing is characterized by harassment, hostile behavior in addition to psychological attacks which have an harmful consequence on the victim and are used consistently and systematically over a long period of time.

Phase 3: In Personnel Administration phase, individual can be confronted with serious violations of justice. Management can take on the prejudices of the victims. As a consequence of mobbing behavior target employ will become a marked

individual and other workmates assume the problem lies with the victim's personality.

Phase 4: In expulsion phase victim finds themselves socially stigmatized and emotionally distressed. If they get different work in same place the particular stigmatizing gives go up to long-term, moving to degrading work along with psychological treatment.

2.8 Personality and Mobbing

Personality is one of the key factors in workplace bullying which researchers have tended to report conflicting findings. Personality refers to relatively stable and organized set of characteristics within the individual which account for consistent patterns of behavior and has significant impact on his or her behaviors in different situations. According to Ryckman (2000), it can also be considered as a psychological construct including the individual's genetic background and the ways in which genetic factors effect person's reactions to different circumstances. Vartia (2001) believes that there is a significant relationship between personality characteristics and being the target of mobbing. In fact there is a relationship between being a victim by organizational measures and being a neurotic. Therefore, neurotic people are more exposed to such behaviors. In addition it has been found that being a psychotic person and being exposed to verbal violence is positively related to one another. As a result of research conducted by Deniz and Ertosun (2007) who stated that there is a positive relations between mobbing and neurotic personality and fantasy cross ego defense mechanisms were found.

In contrast, Leymann believes there is no relation between personality of a person and being victim. According to Leymann (1996), changes in victim's personality

are due to workplace mobbing and it is not true to consider individual's personality as consequences of mobbing. Moreover, he argues that whenever conflict occurs between coworkers, the mobbing will start and influence on individual's behavior. Shin (2005) debated also that mobbing will not occur if there is positive organizational climate.

However, according to Rayner (1997), organizational factors are important but can't clarify the whole of the picture without individual factors. In fact, the experiences of mobbing affected by both situational and personality factors. Another researcher reported that neuroticism in victims was higher than non-victims but when there is a controlled and positive work climate the relation was reduced. A personality model based upon three universal traits developed by British psychologist Hans Eysenck:

1) Introversion/Extraversion

2) Neuroticism/Emotional Stability

3) Psychoticism/ hostile

Introversion/Extraversion: Introversion involves directing attention on inner experiences, while extraversion relates to focusing attention outward on other people and the environment. So, a person high in introversion might be quiet and reserved, while an individual high in extraversion might be sociable and outgoing.

Neuroticism/Emotional Stability: Neuroticism refers to an individual's tendency to become upset or emotional, while emotional stability refers to the tendency to remain emotionally constant.

Psychoticism/ hostile: Psychoticism; individuals who are high on this trait tend to have difficulty dealing with reality and may be antisocial, hostile, non-empathetic and manipulative (Cherry, 2012).

Introverted employees who are passive and unlikely to retaliate to undesirable behaviors are more likely to be victims for perpetrators (Goldberg, 1990). Although researchers have found conflicting results about personality traits such as extraversion, conscientiousness and agreeableness, and there is a consistent finding that targets tend to have higher levels of neuroticism. Another reason for the conflicting findings can be related to the two different types of targets: vulnerable and provocative (Aquino & Lamertz, 2004). Researchers reported that extraverts and employees with low agreeableness may fall more often under the provocative type. Several researchers have found that targets often have higher levels of negative affect (Glasø, 2007). Negative affect refers to a tendency to experience emotions that include anxiety, fear, sadness and anger (Watson & Clark, 1984). Employees who experienced such emotions tend to appear more vulnerable to bullying behaviors. Similarly, employees with low levels of self-confidence have also been found to be more likely target. (Aquino & Lamertz, 2004).

2.8.1 The Perpetrator

Researchers have found that males are more likely to engage in bullying behaviors than females (Rayner, 1997). Furthermore, employees with high strain jobs, which entail high workloads and low job autonomy, are more likely to engage in bullying behaviors (Baillien et al., 2011). This suggests that high stress may be a predictor of bullying behaviors (Hoel et al., 1999). Researchers have also found that being a target is correlated with being a perpetrator (Baillien et al., 2011). This supports

(Aquino and Lamertz's, 2004) the assertion that provocative employees, through their own bullying behaviors, may provoke others to engage in similar behaviors towards them as a form of revenge.

In a study examining job security and perceived employability, De Cuyper et al. (2009) found that job insecurity was associated with employees engaging in workplace bullying. Moreover, they found that employees who concurrently perceived themselves as employable at other organizations were also more likely to engage in bullying. While job insecurity suggests that stress may be a possible factor stimulating bullying behaviors, perceived employability may suggest that employees who believe they can be more easily to find a job elsewhere will likely take more risks in their current job.

2.9 Demographic Characteristics and Mobbing

Nowadays mobbing is a fact that occurs in almost all workplaces without discrimination of gender and hierarchy which means risk of being exposed to mobbing is equal for everybody.

Based on recent studies conducted by Tınaz (2011), who believes that some demographic characteristics can be changeable from one culture to another would be effective on being victim.

As for demographics, while some researchers have reported that females are more likely to be bullied than males (Lewis & Gunn, 2007), other researchers have reported no differences across gender. Researchers have also found that in workplace bullying situations, males are typically only targeted by other males, while females tend to be bullied by both males and females, but more often by

females (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996). Olweus (1994) founds males to be more involved in physical bullying. However, females use more covert forms like gossiping and spreading rumors. In relation to age Einarsen and Skogstad (1996) found a higher likelihood of older employees being bullied than younger ones. As with gender, Vartia (1996) reported conflicting findings with respect to age. Fox and Stallworth (2005) argue that Hispanics/Latinos experienced significantly higher rates of bullying than Whites; however, they found no significant differences in the prevalence rates between Blacks and Whites. In contrast, Lewis and Gunn (2007) conducted a study of workplace bullying in the public sector in the UK and interestingly found significant differences between White respondents and ethnic respondents; ethnic minorities were almost four times more likely to experience workplace bullying than White respondents.

According to Gülen (2008), employees whose ages were below 30 was exposed bullying more than older ones, In Contrast, Einarsen & Skogstad (1996) believe risk of exposure to mobbing increase as age become older.

Ethnic minorities were almost fourteen times more likely to be ignored while at work by their line manager, almost seven times more likely to face continued criticism of their work by colleagues of equal rank, and over nine times more likely to be told to quit their job by colleagues of equal rank than white respondents. For the former, researchers have found that bullying has adverse effects on physical and mental health (Cooper et al., 2004), causes depression and stress (Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2002), and sleep problems (Strandmark & Hallberg, 2007).

2.10 Consequences of Mobbing

1. Physical Consequences

2. Social Consequences

3. Social-psychological Consequences

4. Psychological Consequences

5. Psychosomatic and psychiatric Consequences

6. Economic Consequences

2.10.1 Consequences on Individuals

Mobbing can have severe consequences on employees. Recent studies shows psychological consequences like psychosomatic complaints, depression, obsession and compulsive behaviors, sleeping and eating disorders, anxiety disorders, lower self-esteem and mainly post-traumatic stress disorder found to be consequences of mobbing (Zapf, 1999; Vartia, 2001). According to Tınaz (2011), victims face with different problems as results of mobbing: They can't go to work, feels stress due to this psychosomatic symptoms, experiences a heavy depression and think to have suicide, or commit suicide.

A psychological disorder is a psychological pattern which is reflected in behavior. Psychological disorders are generally defined as a disorder of the mind including emotions, thoughts, behaviors which lead to substantial self-distress. Substantial distress can be defined as a situation in which the person is not able to meet her/his personal needs, or are a threat to themselves or others. Recent researches mentioned that there is a relationship between mobbing and psychological disorders. In fact, psychological disorders including Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), depression, somatization panic disorders and panic attacks can occur as

consequences of mobbing (Leymann, 1996). In a study that was conducted by De pedro et al. (2008), it was found that there was also significant and positive relation between workplace mobbing and psychosomatic symptoms. Cleary (2000) believes that peer victimization can result in negative self-evaluation which can lead to depression or suicide.

According to results of a research done at the University of Rochester Medical School, work stress is a substantial risk factor for the development of depression. It is argued that lack of support from colleagues and managers leads to depression in both men and women.

2.10.2 Consequences on Group

It truly is obvious that every employee's performance primarily impacts outcome of team. Hoel and Cooper (2000) debated that employees within the group will be adversely affected by the individual who is bullied. Consequently, Ramsay et al. (2011) debated that employees will have less efficiency and they significantly affect group functionality.

According to Robinson and O'Leary-Kelly (1998), bullying behavior in a group may become a norm in a way that perpetuates such behaviors in the group (Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2007). These bullying behaviors may create norms that we identify group norms, status inconsistency, and certain situational factors as antecedents of workplace bullying.

Coyne, Craig and Chong (2004) found that employees who were identified as both targets and perpetrators simultaneously were more likely to be isolated within the team. Moreover, they found that perceptions about team success were lower in

groups that had instances of bullying. As mentioned earlier, bullying in groups can also produce more bullying (Robinson & O'Leary-Kelly, 1998).

2.10.3 Consequences on Organization

Vega and Comer (2005) suggested that the cumulative effects of bullying at the organization are likely to influence organizational performance. Furthermore, researchers have found that workplace bullying has negative consequences for witnesses. In addition, we believe that bullying can affect organizational culture whereby such behaviors can permeate through multiple departments and divisions within the firm (Salin, 2003). In this way, certain aggressive employees, particularly holding important positions within the organization, may influence aggressiveness within the organizational culture (O'Leary-Kelly, 1996).

2.11 Antecedents of Mobbing

2.11.1 Antecedents of Group

Groups, or employees within groups, who are indirectly impacted by workplace bullying may alter existing group norms as a result (Heames & Harvey, 2006). Indeed, researchers have found that employees are more aggressive when witnessing aggressive colleagues (Glomb & Liao, 2003). Moreover, employees who witness bullying behaviors tend to take sides between the target and the perpetrator, and more often take the perpetrator's side in fear of becoming the next target (D'Cruz & Noronha, 2011). This can be particularly destructive for group norms and cohesion (De Dreu, 2008) and may serve to encourage the perpetrator to continue exhibiting these behaviors.

In a theory-driven analysis of group-level factors, Harvey et al. (2006) introduced the concept of status inconsistency and theorized its role as an antecedent of intra-

group-level workplace bullying. Status inconsistency represents a situation wherein an employee is different from other members of a group based on a certain characteristic (status) such as age, race, or gender (Lenski, 1954). The potential for status inconsistency to exist is particularly high in the context of globalization and the increasing diversity within organizations, and thus work groups. Interestingly, Heames et al. (2006) suggested employee experiencing the status inconsistency can become either a perpetrator or a target.

For instance, researchers have found the feeling of uncertainty resulting from status inconsistency can produce aggression in employees (Lenski, 1954). Consequently, this aggression may lead them to engage in bullying behaviors; hence, becoming a perpetrator (Heames & Harvey, 2006). However, an employee experiencing status inconsistency may alternatively be targeted because other group members may perceive a greater power disparity between them and the employee based on the difference in the relevant characteristic (status). Moreover, an earlier study by Vartia (1996), provides some support for this proposition. More specifically, he found that 20% of targets felt that they were bullied because of being different from others. Therefore, status inconsistency represents an antecedent to intra-group-level bullying in the workplace.

Similar to individual factors, situational factors may also help explain the presence of workplace bullying at the group. To illustrate, Ayoko (2007) found that high levels of task conflict predicted greater levels of bullying within groups. In addition, he also found that groups with low communication openness were more likely to have employees subjected to bullying behaviors from other group members. Furthermore, Arthur (2011) found less team autonomy predicted lower levels of

workplace bullying, while self-managed teams were associated with higher levels of bullying. To explain, he suggested self-managed teams are associated with increased pressures and stress associated with peer monitoring and task interdependence, which lead to more opportunities for bullying to represent an exertion of social power and status. Thus, these findings suggest that certain situational factors are more strongly related to workplace bullying.

2.11.2 Antecedents of Organization

There are four major antecedents of workplace bullying at the organizational level which have been theorized and/or empirically supported: 1) leadership and management style, 2) organizational culture and ethical climate, 3) organizational policies and 4) situational factors.

First, leadership and management styles represent an organizational level antecedent of workplace bullying. Einarsen, Raknes and Matthiesen (1994) argued that there is a link between an abuse of power in the organization and workplace bullying. Additionally, they identified abuse of power from leaders, and others have declared that leadership can be too passive, which then stimulates bullying behaviors within the organization. Vartia, (1996) also reported the target's dissatisfaction with organizational leadership.

When there is a high level of conflict, management tends to give up much of their leadership responsibility which, in turn, results in bullying (Ashforth, 1994). Weak leadership causes perpetrators to continue to engage in bullying behaviors because of perceiving a lower risk of being punished for bullying (Strandmark & Hallberg, 2007). Bulutlar and Oz (2009) found in an organization which employee act in their own self-interests, bullying behavior is occurring more. On the other hand, there

will be lower levels of workplace bullying in organization with ethical climate. Salin (2003) asserted some organizations may perceive workplace bullying as an efficient way of inducing performance. Furthermore, some researchers believe bullying behavior can become an accepted part of organizational cultures (Harvey et al., 2009). In fact, there is a direct relationship between organizational culture and individual characteristics.

To illustrate, an organization's culture may influence an individual to be aggressive and engage in bullying, while on the other hand, an aggressive individual may influence an organizational culture to encourage workplace bullying (O'Leary-Kelly et al., 1996). Therefore, while we acknowledge the bi-directional possibility of the relationship, we recognize in both instances organizational culture plays the key role in fostering or stimulating the behavior. Indeed, bullying is found to be most prevalent in organizations where the behaviors are explicitly, or implicitly supported or condoned by senior management (Salin, 2005).

It is important to establish some policies in organization to clear statements relating to actions which are appropriate versus undesirable. (Richards & Daley, 2003). Indeed, such policies help organizations to prevent some level of power imbalances (Salin, 2003).

As mentioned earlier, Bulutlar and Oz (2009) found that a work climate, which is a more explicit component of culture (Cullen et al., 1989), based on rules and policies, had significantly lower rates of bullying. A work climate based on rules and policies strongly differentiates between right and wrong behavior (Bulutlar & Oz, 2009).

Researchers have found that there is a strong relationship between work climate and employee behavior (Wimbush et al., 1997). While clear policies may prevent bullying behaviors to a degree, empirical evidence reveals when these policies embedded within the work climate of the organization there is a significantly lower likelihood of workplace bullying.

To illustrate, organizational change/restructuring can result in job insecurity, which Baillien et al. (2009) found to be associated with higher levels of workplace bullying. Forms of work organization, such as small, repetitive tasks, can create frustration, which researchers have also suggested to be related to workplace bullying (Salin, 2003). Finally, reward structures that provide incentives for employees to compete with one another can stimulate bullying through behaviors that are intended to weaken competition. In addition, less concern about job security amongst employees explains fewer instances of bullying.

2.11.3 Individual Antecedents of Mobbing

Possibility of being a target is usually equivalent for anyone in an organization. There's no definite character which can be state the kind of person will be a target of mobbing. However, some people have more risk to be a victim. In particular; a person who is the only woman in the place of work along with the rest are men; distinctive from other people, prosperous than other people or even a newbie has more risk to become a target (Tınaz, 2006).

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the study is to evaluate mobbing in banking sector of North Cyprus. Questionnaire used as an instrument to measure workplace mobbing experiences which significantly affect job performance and examine how often respondents have been exposed to a range of negative behaviors such as aggressive and hostile actions, humiliation and intimidation during the last six months. (Einarsen et al., 2009). The questionnaire was distributed to 20 banks in North Cyprus and 190 (n=190) employees working in these banks participated to the study.

3.1 Survey Design

The questionnaire was translated into Turkish by back translation into English as suggested by McGorry (2000), Aulakh and Kotabe (1993). All three translators were also fluent in both written and spoken English. Later, an instructors from the Eastern Mediterranean University with quality management and banking backgrounds examined the questionnaire items separately and expressed their opinions about the phrasing and wording of the questionnaire.

Questionnaire which was used in this study consists of three parts: First part covers demographic questions about respondents such as gender, age, marital status, Job task. Second part includes items that measure the dependent variables of the study (mobbing). A 5-scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree = 1" to "Strongly Agree = 5"

was used to measure the 37 items. Third Part contains expectations and perceptions of respondents according to the five dimensions which were reliable and tangible.

3.2 Data Collection

Convenient sampling method has been used to distribute two hundred questionnaires between employees of 20 banks in Famagusta, Kyrenia and Nicosia. Of the 200 surveys, 190 surveys were useable. Of these 190 surveys, 54.7 percent were male and 45.3 percent were female. Majority of respondents were in frontline position, 32.6 percent were in unit manager positions and 12.6 percent were general manager. Generally, 10% of employees refused to participate into study.

3.3 Data Analysis

Statistical analyses of the data were performed by using SPSS software. Initially, frequency distribution was used to displays the distribution of demographic variables.

Mean score analysis is used to analyze satisfaction questions which scored by respondents. The whole satisfaction can be summarized by calculating the mean of all the items in each part. Actually, by converting each score into useful mean, it will be determined that whether people are generally agreed or not, by how high or low the mean is.

Chi-square analyses have been used to see if two variables are dependent or not. Additionally, ANOVA is also used which is normally used to determine if there is a significant difference between the means of two or more groups.

The main application of factor analysis is to categorize variables. Factor analysis is used to reduce the number of variables and detect structure in the relationships between variables. Therefore, factor analysis is applied as a data reduction or structure detection method to give idea for further analyses such as path analysis.

Chapter 4

FINDINGS AND RESULTS

The objective of this chapter is to analyze the data collected by questionnaire. Findings were analyzed through the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) based on the method described in the previous Chapter.

4.1 Demographic Profile

Demographic data was generated from first section of questionnaire including 7 questions. Parameters of the demographic profiles; gender, age, marital status, number of children, job task, monthly income and work experience are presented in table 1.

Table 4.1. Demographic Profile

	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Female	86	45.3
male	104	54.7
Total	190	100.0
Age		
20-29	42	22.1
30-39	65	34.2
40-49	61	32.1
50-59	21	11.1
5.00	1	.5
Total	190	100.0
Marital Status		
Married	108	56.8
Single	61	32.1
Divorced	21	11.1

		(Continued)
Total	190	100.0
Number Of Children		
0-2	164	86.3
3-5	26	13.7
Total	190	100.0
Job Task		
Frontline	104	54.7
Unit Manager	62	32.6
General Manager	24	12.6
Total	190	100.0
Monthly Income		
0-999$	50	26.3
1000-1999$	91	47.9
2000-2999$	37	19.5
3000$ or more	12	6.3
Total	190	100.0
Work Experience		
0-4	38	20.0
5-9	36	18.9
10-14	57	30.0
15 and more	59	31.1
Total	190	100.0

As shown in table 1, 190 respondents (bank staff) with the age range of 20 to 59 years old participated into the study. However, most of the respondents were between 30-39 and 40-49 with the frequency of 65 (34.2%) and 61(32.1%) respectively. Although the age of respondents was asked directly, it was decided to categorize the age item into 4 ranges in our statistical analysis. Regarding gender, the number of male evidence is 104 (54.7%) and the rest is female, 86 (45.3%). Furthermore, of these 190 respondents, 108 (56.8%) respondents were married, 61 (32.1%) were single and 21(11.1%) were divorced. In terms of monthly income, four categorizes were considered. The categorization division was 0-999, 1000-

1999, 2000-2999 and 3000 or more. Whereas out of these categorization, there are more evidences with the monthly income of 1000-1999 (47.9%) and the least evidences with 3000$ or more (6.3%). Most of the respondents have been working in their current workplace for 10-14 years or 15 and more years with the frequency of 57(30%) and 59(31.1%) respectively. In Job Task item, the number of Front line staff (104-54.7%) is the most frequent one than the Unit Manager (62-32.6%) and General Manager (24-12.6%).

4.2 Meanscore Analysis

This section is intended to explain the result of mean score analysis. The following table shows the basic statistical function of mean and standard deviation.

Table 4.2. Meanscore

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Mobbing(Attack To Personal Development)	3.23	0.62
1. my managers are narrating down my personal development	2.39	0.93
2. I have been precluded every time I speak at work	3.65	0.92
3. Sometimes my colleagues are precludes me for showing my self	3.86	1.25
4. Sometimes they act with loud noise or by yelling	1.81	0.87
5. The work I do are being negative interpreted	3.31	0.92
6. Sometimes I get oral treats	3.55	0.89
7. Sometimes I get written treats	3.85	1.26
8. Sometimes I have to get alone with others	2.89	0.98
9. My efforts are being limited	3.82	0.93
Mobbing(Attack To Social Connection)	3.71	1.02
1. People around me speak to me	4.37	1.38
2. I cannot speak to anyone I have to find other connections	3.95	1.35
3. I have been pushed to do the work that my colleagues give me	4.47	1.18
4. Speaking with colleagues have been banned	2.71	0.97
5. Sometimes they act like I am not at work	3.05	0.96
Attack To Personality	3.57	0.95
1. I hear bad things about my self	2.88	0.94
2. I hear gossips about myself	3.59	0.98
3. They act like that I have psychological problem	3.22	0.96
4. Sometimes they pushed me to take psychological help	3.52	1.12

5.	A small mistake that I do has been mocked	3.66	1.09
6.	Sometimes they understand my behavior like been mocked	2.65	1.33
7.	Sometimes my religion and political views have been mocked	3.40	1.01
8.	Sometimes my private life have been mocked	3.58	0.99
9.	Sometimes I have been pushed for doing bad things that harms my confidence	4.23	1.27
10.	Sometimes my efforts are been treated like humiliating	3.88	1.22
11.	Every decisions that I take has been questioned	3.86	1.23
12.	Sometimes I have been exposed for sexual harassment	4.33	1.44
Attack To Life Quality and career		3.36	0.79
1.	At work I have private authority and duty	4.14	1.24
2.	Sometimes I have been given work under my capacity	4.20	1.22
3.	Always my duty and responsibilities are being changed	3.02	0.80
4.	Sometimes the duties are harming my confidence	3.15	0.97
5.	Sometimes I have been given a work that I do not know anything about and that harms my reputations	3.12	0.94
6.	My private belongings are damaged	3.16	0.97
Attack To Health		3.67	1.08
1.	They have harmed my physic	3.55	1.07
2.	I have been getting physical threats	3.58	1.20
3.	They made me scared to stay silent	3.74	1.16
4.	I have been given work more than my ability	3.80	1.14
Emotional Abuse		3.93	0.60
1.	Come to insanity point at work	3.77	0.91
2.	Been exhausted at work	3.44	1.21
3.	Every morning telling myself that I could not work one day more at this place	4.17	1.00
4.	I feel like that I have to work at this place	4.19	1.08
5.	Have to work, pushed me for standing for others	3.73	1.19
6.	I feel like energize	4.19	0.96
7.	I feel like that I can create good relationship with others	4.25	0.88
8.	In my career I can feel successful	3.43	1.44
9.	I am afraid to have honest personality in my career	4.19	0.91
Loss Of Self Respect		3.82	0.77
1.	I am not accepted at work	4.22	0.88
2.	I know what others are thinking about me	3.49	0.73
3.	Meeting my colleagues after work feels friendly with them	3.84	1.11
4.	I like dealing with peoples' problem because of my duties work	3.79	1.16
5.	People around me put pressure on me while they have problem	3.76	1.19
Personal Success		3.89	0.47
1.	Dealing with people all day is	3.97	1.08
2.	I think I work very hard	4.06	0.88

3.	I think that I have come to the end at work	3.91	1.00
4.	I think when I am working I approach people being calm	3.52	0.71
5.	Every problem appears at work I am solving them being calm	3.55	0.72
6.	I do not make my colleagues feel bad about themselves	4.01	0.87
7.	Since I have started this work I care more about my reactions	3.95	0.90
8.	Sometimes I do not think of people' feeling	4.12	1.05

Table 4.3 summarizes the result of mean score analysis. It indicates that most of the respondents are agreed that they felt their social connection, personality and health care were attacked in the workplace. Moreover, they approved that they have experienced abusive behavior and lost their self-confidence.

Table 4.3. Meanscore Interpretation

Attack To Personal Development	Neutral
Attack To Social Connection	Agree
Attack To Personality	Agree
Attack To Life Quality	Neutral
Attack To Health	Agree
Emotional Abuse	Agree
Loss Of Self Respect	Agree
Personal Success	Agree

4.2 Chi-Square Analysis

The Chi-square used for testing the statistical significant relationship. Chi-square tests whether two variables are dependent or not. If the variables are independent, that means they have no relationship. Therefore the results of the test will be not-significant and null hypothesis will be accepted.

On the other hand, if the variables are dependent, it means there is a relationship between the variables. Hence, the results of the test will be significant and null hypothesis of no dependency will be rejected. Table 4.4 shows that there are some dependency of factors on personal profile of respondents since p-value of them are less than alpha = 0.10 level. This suggests that personal profile of respondents do matter some mobbing factors in the commercial banks of North Cyprus.

Table 4.4 shows the relationship between demographics variables and critical statements. For instance, the relationship between gender and A9 is significant which mean they have relationship and they are dependent. However, there is no relationship between marital status and A9 and they are independent.

Table 4.4. P-value Interpretation

	Gender	Age	Marital Status	Job Task	Monthly Income	Work Experience
A9	Significant	Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Significant
B4	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Not Significant	Significant
C9	Significant	Significant	Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Significant
D6	Significant	Significant	Significant	Not Significant	Significant	Significant
E1	Significant	Significant	Significant	Significant	Not Significant	Significant
F8	Not Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Significant	Not Significant	Significant
G1	Not Significant	Not Significant	Significant	Not Significant	Not Significant	Significant
H3	Significant	Not Significant	Significant	Significant	Not Significant	Significant

4.3 One Way-Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

ANOVA is normally used to determine if there is a significant difference between the means of two or more groups. Moreover, (Pallant, 2005) argued that as this

statistical method compares the variance between groups, it is also called analysis of variance.

İt is vital to know that the one-way ANOVA cannot explain which specific groups were significantly different from each other; it only shows that two groups were completely different. If the probability is less than 0.05 then it means differences between groups are statistically significant (Saunders et al., 2012, p.520). Hence, we should accept alternate hypothesis and reject the null hypothesis (Pallant, 2005).Therefore, in this section ANOVA is used to check the acceptance or rejection of hypotheses of the study. Following table shows the difference between mean of two or more groups of demographic variables such as difference between men and women regarding 'Attack to personal development'.

Table 4.5. ANOVA for Statistical Difference

	Gender	Age	Marital Status	Job Task	Monthly Income	Work Experience
Attack To Personal Development	.002	.077	.023	.022	.199	.020
Attack To Social Connection	.000	.021	.000	.000	.251	.005
Attack To Personality	.003	.007	.003	.012	.338	.007
Attack To Life Quality	.003	.003	.000	.009	.343	.010
Attack To Health	.006	.002	.000	.003	.166	.001
Emotional Abuse	.001	.569	.029	.004	.760	.003
Loss Of Self Respect	.042	.492	.090	.357	.703	.307
Personal Success	.043	.258	.000	.001	.148	.063

Note: Figures in this table are One-way P-values

Table 4.5 indicate that the significance level for all groups except emotional abuse and age ,loss of self-respect, marital status and monthly income, and attack to health and monthly income is less than 0.05.Hence, we have to reject the null hypothesis and accept alternate hypothesis which mean there is relationship between those variables.

Table 4.6 prepared to better understand the relationship between the variables. From the ANOVA test as performed above, it is also concluded that

1. There is no significant relationship between age and emotional abuse.

2. There is no significant relationship between marital status and loss of self-respect.

3. There is no significant relationship between monthly income and loss of self-respect.

4. There is no significant relationship between monthly income and attack to health.

Table 4.6. Alternate Hypothesis

Hypothesis 1: There is a significant relationship between	Gender	Age	Marital Status	Job Task	Monthly Income	Work Experience
Attack To Personal Development	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Attack To Social Connection	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Attack To Personality	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Attack To Life Quality	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Attack To Health	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Emotional Abuse	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Loss Of Self Respect	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Personal Success	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

4.4 Factor Analysis

This section is devoted to interpret result of factor analysis. Initially, reliability test was done to determine the overall consistency of the instrument. Based on the result, measure is said to have a high reliability because Cronbach's Alpha was 0.972. Afterward, other test was used to clarify the factor structure and find out which instrument should be eliminated in further analysis. Nunnally (1978) recommends that each item used in the survey need to have reliability at least 0.70 or better. As it is shown in the following table, out of overall instrument one item was slightly diversified. It was below the decision rule and it did not passed factor loading. Therefore, that item should be taken out before doing next analysis.

Table 4.7. Factor analysis

Mobbing(Attack To Personal Development)
- my managers are narrating down my personal development   .819
- I have been precluded every time I speak at work   .856
- Sometimes my colleagues are precludes me for showing my self   .911
- Sometimes they act with loud noise or by yelling   .862
- The work I do are being negative interpreted   .876
- Sometimes I get oral treats   .847
- Sometimes I get written treats   .945
- Sometimes I have to get alone with others   .880
- My efforts are being limited   .836

Mobbing(Attack To Social Connection)
- People around me speak to me   .965
- I cannot speak to anyone I have to find other connections   .790
- I have been pushed to do the work that my colleagues give me   .904
- Speaking with colleagues have been banned   .773
- Sometimes they act like I am not at work   .822

Attack To Personality
- I hear bad things about my self   .826
- I hear gossips about myself   .817
- They act like that I have psychological problem   .937
- Sometimes they pushed me to take psychological help   .829
- A small mistake that I do has been mocked   .885

- Sometimes they understand my behavior like been mocked .941
- Sometimes my religion and political views have been mocked .923
- Sometimes my private life have been mocked .943
- Sometimes I have been pushed for doing bad things that harms my confidence .921
- Sometimes my efforts are been treated like humiliating .923
- Every decisions that I take has been questioned .758
- Sometimes I have been exposed for sexual harassment .956

Attack To Life Quality and career

- At work I have private authority and duty .786
- Sometimes I have been given work under my capacity .775
- Always my duty and responsibilities are being changed .877
- Sometimes the duties are harming my confidence .708
- Sometimes I have been given a work that I do not know anything about and that harms my reputations .821
- My private belongings are damaged .938
- My colleagues are harming me .897

Attack To Health

- They have harmed my physic .943
- I have been getting physical threats .849
- They made me scared to stay silent .906
- I have been given work more than my ability .888

Emotional Abuse

- Come to insanity point at work .783
- Been exhausted at work .843
- Every morning telling myself that I could not work one day more at this place .891
- I feel like that I have to work at this place .748
- Have to work, pushed me for standing for others .749
- I feel like energize .870
- I feel like that I can create good relationship with others .803
- In my career I can feel successful .906
- I am afraid to have honest personality in my career .812

Loss Of Self Respect

- I am not accepted at work .899
- I know what others are thinking about me .771
- Meeting my colleagues after work feels friendly with them .872
- I like dealing with peoples' problem because of my duties work .863
- People around me put pressure on me while they have problem .890

Personal Success

- Dealing with people all day is .784

- I think I work very hard   .817
- I think that I have come to the end at work   .750
- I think when I am working I approach people being calm   .805
- Every problem appears at work I am solving them being calm   .832
- I do not make my colleagues feel bad about themselves   .714
- Since I have started this work I care more about my reactions   .772
- Sometimes I do not think of people' feeling   .683

Chapter 5

CONCLUSION

Workplace mobbing is common in almost all organizations especially in developing countries. The present study indicated that moderate level of mobbing exists between the employees of banking sector in North Cyprus.

It is crucial to recognize mobbing as these behaviors lead to devastating losses for both individual and organizations. Regardless of the form, mobbing negatively affects employees' well-being and performance and need to be discouraged to have organizational effectiveness. In fact, employees who experience low level of mobbing at work are better performers than those who experience high workplace mobbing. Moreover, mobbing negatively affects job satisfaction while satisfied employees are likely to be high performers at work.

Therefore banking sector in North Cyprus must develop policies to control mobbing at work by applying severe sanctions to perpetrators of mobbing while providing adequate support to victims of workplace mobbing. This will decline the negative consequences of mobbing on job performance followed by job satisfaction.

In this study, it is found that negative emotions have a reverse effect on individuals' well-being and performance. Research questions argued in the introduction section of this study have generally been confirmed. Hence there is a need to create positive

and friendly environment for employees to feel better at work. As a matter of fact, when employees have more positive emotions, they are more productive and feel succeed.

Positive social interactions at workplace have large and positive effects on employee mood and health. Employees in positive moods are more willing to help co-workers and to provide better customer service.

It has been shown that friendly and supportive environment causes employees to improve the quality of relationship with co-workers. In doing so, they try to boost peer confidence, productivity levels, as well as their levels of engagement with their job.

REFERENCES

[1] Aquino, K., & Lamertz, K. (2004). A relational model of workplace victimization: social roles and patterns of victimization in dyadic relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(6), 1023.

[2] Arthur, J. B. (2011). Do HR system characteristics affect the frequency of interpersonal deviance in organizations? The role of team autonomy and internal labor market practices. Industrial Relations: *A Journal of Economy and Society*, 50(1), 30-56.

[3] Ashforth, B. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. Human Relations, 47(7), 755-778.

[4] Aulakh, P. S., & Kotabe, M. (1993). An assessment of theoretical and methodological development in international marketing: 1980-1990. Journal of International Marketing, 5-28.

[5] Ayoko, O. B. (2007). Communication openness, conflict events and reactions to conflict in culturally diverse workgroups. Cross Cultural Management: *An International Journal*, 14(2), 105-124.

[6] Baillien, E., De Cuyper, N., & De Witte, H. (2011). Job autonomy and workload as antecedents of workplace bullying: A two‐wave test of Karasek's Job Demand Control Model for targets and perpetrators. *Journal of occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 84(1), 191-208.

[7] Baillien, E., Neyens, I., De Witte, H., & De Cuyper, N. (2009). A qualitative study on the development of workplace bullying: Towards a three way model.*Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 19(1), 1-16.

[8] Branch, S., Sheehan, M., Barker, M., & Ramsay, S. (2004, June). Perceptions of upwards bullying: An interview study. In 4th International Conference on Bullying and Harassment in the Workplace (Vol. 2829).

[9] Bulutlar, F., & Öz, E. Ü. (2009). The effects of ethical climates on bullying behaviour in the workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 86(3), 273-295.

[10] Cherry, J. D. (2012). Epidemic pertussis in 2012—the resurgence of a vaccine-preventable disease. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 367(9), 785-787.

[11] Cleary, S. D. (2000). Adolescent victimization and associated suicidal and violent behaviors. Adolescence.

[12] Cooper, C. L., Hoel, H., & Faragher, B. (2004). Bullying is detrimental to health, but all bullying behaviours are not necessarily equally damaging. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 32(3), 367-387.

[13] Cortina, L. M. (2008). Unseen injustice: Incivility as modern discrimination in organizations. Academy of Management Review, 33(1), 55-75.

[14] Coyne, I., Craig, J., & Smith-Lee Chong, P. (2004). Workplace bullying in a group context. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 32(3), 301-317.

[15] Cullen, J. B., Victor, B., & Stephens, C. (1989). An ethical weather report: Assessing the organization's ethical climate. Organizational dynamics, 18(2), 50-62.

[16] Davenport, N., Schwartz, R. D., & Elliot, G. P. (2003). Mobbing: İşyerinde duygusal taciz. Çev. Osman Cem ÖNERTOY), İstanbul: Sistem Yayınları.

[17] D'Cruz, P., & Noronha, E. (2011). The limits to workplace friendship: Managerialist HRM and bystander behaviour in the context of workplace bullying. Employee Relations, 33(3), 269-288.

[18] De Cuyper, N., Baillien, E., & De Witte, H. (2009). Job insecurity, perceived employability and targets' and perpetrators' experiences of workplace bullying.Work & Stress, 23(3), 206-224.

[19] De Dreu, C. K. (2008). The virtue and vice of workplace conflict: Food for (pessimistic) thought. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29(1), 5-18.

[20] De Pedro, M. M., Sánchez, M. I. S., Navarro, M. C. S., & Izquierdo, M. G. (2008). Workplace mobbing and effects on workers' health. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 11(01), 219-227.

[21] Deniz, N., & Ertosun, O. G. (2010). The relationship between personality and being exposed to workplace bullying or mobbing. *Journal of Global Strategic Management*, 7, 129-142.

[22] Duffy, M., & Sperry, L. (2007). Workplace mobbing: Individual and family health consequences. *The Family Journal*, 15(4), 398-404.

[23] Einarsen, S. (1996), Bullying and Harassment at Work: Epidemiological and Psychosocial aspects, University of Bergen, Bergen.

[24] Einarsen, S. (1999). The nature and causes of bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20(1/2), 16-27.

[25] Einarsen, S., & Raknes, B. I. (1997). Harassment in the workplace and the victimization of men. Violence and victims, 12(3), 247-263.

[26] 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.

[27] Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (2011). The concept of bullying and harassment at work: The European tradition. Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice, 3-39.

[28] Einarsen, S., Raknes, B. R. I., & Matthiesen, S. B. (1994). Bullying and harassment at work and their relationships to work environment quality: An exploratory study. *European journal of work and organizational psychology*,4(4), 381-401.

[29] Farrell, L. U. (2002). Workplace bullying's high cost: $180 M in lost time, productivity. *Orlando Business Journal*, 18.

[30] Fisher-Blando, J. L. (2008). Workplace bullying: Aggressive behavior and its effect on job satisfaction and productivity (Doctoral dissertation, University of Phonix).

[31] Fox, R. (2005). Teaching and learning: Lessons from psychology. Blackwell Publishing.

[32] Fox, S., & Stallworth, L. E. (2005). Racial/ethnic bullying: Exploring links between bullying and racism in the US workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 66(3), 438-456.

[33] Fox, S., & Stallworth, L. E. (2010). The battered apple: An application of stressor-emotion-control/support theory to teachers' experience of violence and bullying. Human Relations, 63(7), 927-954.

[34] Franco, L. M., Milburn, L., Qarrain, R., Kanfer, R., Bennett, S., & Stubblebine, P. (2000, November). Tuesday, November 14, 2000-Board 8 Abstract# 11424 Investigating the determinants of health worker motivation in Jordan. In The 128th Annual Meeting of APHA.

[35] Gemzøe Mikkelsen, E., & Einarsen, S. (2002). Relationships between exposure to bullying at work and psychological and psychosomatic health complaints: The

role of state negative affectivity and generalized self–efficacy. Scandinavian *journal of psychology*, 43(5), 397-405.

[36] Glasø, L., Matthiesen, S. B., Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Do targets of workplace bullying portray a general victim personality profile?. *Scandinavian journal of psychology*, 48(4), 313-319.

[37] Glomb, T. M., & Liao, H. (2003). Interpersonal aggression in work groups: *Social influence, reciprocal, and individual effects. Academy of Management Journal*, 46(4), 486-496.

[38] Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative" description of personality": the big-five factor structure. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 59(6), 1216.

[39] Gülen, Ö. (2008). The Relationship between Personality and Being Exposed to Workplace Bullying or Mobbing. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

[40] Harvey, M., Treadway, D., & Heames, J. T. (2006). Bullying in global organizations: A reference point perspective. *Journal of World Business*, 41(2), 190-202.

[41] Harvey, M., Treadway, D., Heames, J. T., & Duke, A. (2009). Bullying in the 21st century global organization: An ethical perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 85(1), 27-40.

[42] Haynes, B. P. (2008). An evaluation of the impact of the office environment on productivity. Facilities, 26(5/6), 178-195.

[43] Haynes, B. P. (2008). The impact of office comfort on productivity. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 6(1), 37-51.

[44] Heames, J. T., Harvey, M. G., & Treadway, D. (2006). Status inconsistency: An antecedent to bullying behaviour in groups. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 17(2), 348-361.

[45] Heames, J., & Harvey, M. (2006). Workplace bullying: A cross-level assessment. Management Decision, 44(9), 1214-1230.

[46] Hoel, H., & Cooper, C. L. (2000). Destructive conflict and bullying at work. Manchester,, UK: Manchester School of Management, UMIST.

[47] Hoel, H., Rayner, C., & Cooper, C. L. (1999). Workplace bullying. John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

[48] Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (2002). Workplace bullying and stress.Research in Occupational Stress and Well-being, 2, 293-333.

[49] Latham, G. P., & Yukl, G. A. (1975). A review of research on the application of goal setting in organizations. *Academy of management journal*, 18(4), 824-845.

[50] Lenski, G. E. (1954). Status crystallization: a non-vertical dimension of social status. American sociological review, 405-413.

[51] Leshabari, M. T., Muhondwa, E. P., Mwangu, M. A., & Mbembati, N. A. (2008). Motivation of health care workers in Tanzania: a case study of Muhimbili National Hospital.

[52] Lewis, D., & Gunn, R. O. D. (2007). Workplace bullying in the public sector: Understanding the racial dimension. Public Administration, 85(3), 641-665.

[53] Leymann, H. (1984). Silencing of a skilled technician. Work. Env. in Sweden, 4, 236238.

[54] Leymann, H. (1990). Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces. Violence and victims, 5(2), 119-126.

[55] Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work.European *journal of work and organizational psychology*, 5(2), 165-184.

[56] Lutgen-Sandvik, P. (2005). Water smoothing stones: Subordinate resistance to workplace bullying (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 2005).Dissertation Abstracts International, 66(04), 1214.

[57] Lutgen-Sandvik, P., Tracy, S. J., & Alberts, J. K. (2007). Burned by Bullying in the American Workplace: Prevalence, Perception, Degree and Impact*. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44(6), 837-862.

[58] McGorry, S. Y. (2000). Measurement in a cross-cultural environment: survey translation issues. Qualitative Market Research: *An International Journal*, 3(2), 74-81.

[59] Mueller, R. (2006). Bullying bosses: A survivor's guide how to transcend the illusion of the interpersonal. Retrieved October 1, 2006, from http://www.bullyingbosses.com

[60] Namie, G. (2003). Workplace bullying: Escalated incivility. *Ivey Business Journal*, 68(2), 1-6.

[61] Needham, A. W. (2003). Workplace Bullying: a costly business secret. Penguin books.

[62] Ng, V. L., Ryckman, F. C., Porta, G., Miura, I. K., de Carvalho, E., Servidoni, M. F., ... & Balistreri, W. F. (2000). Long-term outcome after partial external biliary diversion for intractable pruritus in patients with intrahepatic cholestasis.*Journal of pediatric gastroenterology and nutrition*, 30(2), 152-156.Nunnally, J. (1978). C.(1978). Psychometric theory.

[63] Nunnally, J. (1978). Psychometric methods. New York: McGraw.

[64] O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Griffin, R. W., & Glew, D. J. (1996). Organization-motivated aggression: A research framework. Academy of management review, 21(1), 225-253.

[65] Olweus, D. (1994). Bullying at school (pp. 97-130). Springer US.

[66] Olweus, D. (2003). A profile of bullying at school. Educational leadership, 60(6), 12-17.

[67] Pallant, J. (2005). SPSS survival guide. Open University Press, Maidenhead.

[68] Pallant, J. (2005). SPSS survival guide. Open University Press, Maidenhead.

[69] Ramsay, S., Troth, A., & Branch, S. (2011). Work-place bullying: A group processes framework. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*,84(4), 799-816.

[70] Rayner, C. (1997). The incidence of workplace bullying. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 7(3), 199-208.

[71] Richards, J., & Daley, H. (2003). Bullying policy: Development, implementation and monitoring. Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in research and practice, 247-258.

[72] Rigby, K. (2002). New perspectives on bullying. Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

[73] Robinson, S. L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (1998). Monkey see, monkey do: The influence of work groups on the antisocial behavior of employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(6), 658-672.

[74] Salin, D. (2003). Ways of explaining workplace bullying: A review of enabling, motivating and precipitating structures and processes in the work environment.Human relations, 56(10), 1213-1232.

[75] Salin, D. (2003). Workplace bullying among business professionals.Prevalence, Organisational Antecedents and Gender Differences.

[76] Salin, D. (2005). Workplace bullying among business professionals: Prevalence, gender differences and the role of organizational politics.Perspectives interdisciplinaires sur le travail et la santé, (7-3).

[77] Seals, D., & Young, J. (2002). Bullying and victimization: prevalence and relationship to gender, grade level, ethnicity, self-esteem, and depression.Adolescence, 38(152), 735-747.

[78] Shin, H. H. (2005). Institutional safe space and shame management in workplace bullying. Made available in DSpace on 2011-01-04T02: 36: 34Z (GMT). No. of bitstreams: 7 02whole. pdf. jpg: 844 bytes, checksum: c7bf429085f6ff833103eb3856d284fb (MD5) 01front. pdf. jpg: 844 bytes, checksum: c7bf429085f6ff833103eb3856d284fb (MD5) 02whole. pdf. txt: 519860 bytes, checksum: 5c833a96eb3b9ade07464a44dd1760d9 (MD5) 01front. pdf. txt: 22918 bytes, checksum: 8d95442737fa2d5c3f4349b1428a30b2 (MD5) 01front. pdf: 115139 bytes, checksum: c2006905c7042d634cd7cca32c23f39c (MD5) 02whole. pdf: 1234262 bytes, checksum: 344b6feb03ec818b480d81a2d011ab1d (MD5) license. txt: 1972 bytes, checksum: a2b6d8d98c5eda2c183f08967dcb829a (MD5) Previous issue date: 2009-08-11T04: 22: 38Z.

[79] Stallworth Jr, O. E., & Kleiner, B. H. (1996). Recent developments in office design. Facilities, 14(1/2), 34-42.

[80] Strandmark, M., & Hallberg, L. M. (2007). Being rejected and expelled from the workplace: Experiences of bullying in the public service sector. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 4(1-2), 1-14.

[81] Strong, M. H., Jeanneret, P. R., McPhail, S. M., & Blakley, B. R. D egidio, EL (1999). Work context: Taxonomy and measurement of the work environment.An occupational information system for the 21st century: The development of O* NET. Washington: American Psychological Association, 127-145.

[82] Tepper, B. J., & Henle, C. A. (2011). A case for recognizing distinctions among constructs that capture interpersonal mistreatment in work organizations.*Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(3), 487-498.

[83] TINAZ, P. (2006). İşyerinde Psikolojik Taciz (Mobbing). Çalışma ve Toplum,4(11), 13-28.

[84] Tınaz, P. (2011). Isyerinde psikolojik taciz (mobbing).

[85] Vartia, M. (1996). The sources of bullying–psychological work environment and organizational climate. European *Journal of work and organizational psychology*,5(2), 203-214.

[86] Vartia, M. A. (2001). Consequences of workplace bullying with respect to the well-being of its targets and the observers of bullying. *Scandinavian journal of work, environment & health*, 63-69.

[87] Vega, G., & Comer, D. R. (2005). Sticks and stones may break your bones, but words can break your spirit: Bullying in the workplace. *Journal of business ethics*, 58(1-3), 101-109.

[88] Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1984). Negative affectivity: the disposition to experience aversive emotional states. Psychological bulletin, 96(3), 465.

[89] Westhues, K. (2006, June). Ten choices in the study of workplace mobbing or bullying. In Fifth International Conference on Workplace Bullying Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland (pp. 15-17).

[90] Wimbush, J. C., Shepard, J. M., & Markham, S. E. (1997). An empirical examination of the relationship between ethical climate and ethical behavior from multiple levels of analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16(16), 1705-1716.

[91] Zapf, D. (1999). Organisational, work group related and personal causes of mobbing/bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20(1/2), 70-85.

[92] Zapf, D., Knorz, C., & Kulla, M. (1996). On the relationship between mobbing factors, and job content, social work environment, and health outcomes. *European Journal of work and organizational psychology*, 5(2), 215-237.

APPENDIX

PART 1. PERSONAL PROFILE

1. Gender

a. Female
b. Male

2. Age: ....

3. Marital Status

a. Married
b. Single
c. Divorced

4. Number of children: ....

5. Job task: ....

6. Monthly Income: ....

7. Work Experience (years): ....

PART 2. MOBBING

Strongly Disagree   Strongly Agree
                    1   2   3   4   5

A. Attack To Personal Development

1.	Occasionally my managers are narrating down my personal development	1	2	3	4	5
2.	I have been precluded every time I speak at work	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Sometimes my colleagues are precludes me for showing my self	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Sometimes they act with loud noise or by yelling	1	2	3	4	5
5.	The work I do are being negative interpreted	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Sometimes I get oral treats	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Sometimes I get written treats	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Sometimes I have to get alone with others	1	2	3	4	5
9.	My efforts are being limited	1	2	3	4	5

B. Attack To Social Connection

1.	People around me speak to me	1	2	3	4	5
2.	I cannot speak to anyone I have to find other connections	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I have been pushed to do the work that my colleagues give me	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Speaking with colleagues have been banned	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Sometimes they act like I am not at work	1	2	3	4	5

C. Attack to personality

1.	I hear bad things about my self	1	2	3	4	5
2.	I hear gossips about myself	1	2	3	4	5
3.	They act like that I have psychological problem	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Sometimes they pushed me to take psychological help	1	2	3	4	5
5.	A small mistake that I do has been mocked	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Sometimes they understand my behavior like been mocked	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Sometimes my religion and political views have been mocked	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Sometimes my private life have been mocked	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Sometimes I have been pushed for doing bad things that harms my confidence	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Sometimes my efforts are been treated like humiliating	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Every decisions that I take has been questioned	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Sometimes I have been exposed for sexual harassment	1	2	3	4	5

D. Attack to life quality and career

1.	At work I have private authority and duty	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Sometimes I have been given work under my capacity	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Always my duty and responsibilities are being changed	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Sometimes the duties are harming my confidence	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Sometimes I have been given a work that I do not know anything about and that harms my reputations	1	2	3	4	5
6.	My private belongings are damaged	1	2	3	4	5
7.	At work I have private authority and duty	1	2	3	4	5

E. Attack to health

1.	They have harmed my physic	1	2	3	4	5
2.	I have been getting physical threats	1	2	3	4	5
3.	They made me scared to stay silent	1	2	3	4	5
4.	I have been given work more than my ability	1	2	3	4	5

Part 3. Exhaustion

A. Emotional Abuse

1.	Come to insanity point at work	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Been exhausted at work	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Every morning telling myself that I could not work one day more at this place	1	2	3	4	5
4.	I feel like that I have to work at this place	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Have to work, pushed me for standing for others	1	2	3	4	5
6.	I feel like energize	1	2	3	4	5
7.	I feel like that I can create good relationship with others	1	2	3	4	5
8.	In my career I can feel successful	1	2	3	4	5
9.	I am afraid to have honest personality in my career	1	2	3	4	5

B. Loss of Self -Respect

1.	I am not accepted at work	1	2	3	4	5
2.	I know what others are thinking about me	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Meeting my colleagues after work feels friendly with them	1	2	3	4	5
4.	I like dealing with peoples' problem because of my duties work	1	2	3	4	5
5.	People around me put pressure on me while they have problem	1	2	3	4	5

C. Personal Success

1.	Dealing with people all day is	1	2	3	4	5
2.	I think I work very hard	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I think that I have come to the end at work	1	2	3	4	5
4.	I think when I am working I approach people being calm	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Every problem appears at work I am solving them being calm	1	2	3	4	5
6.	I do not make my colleagues feel bad about themselves	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Since I have started this work I care more about my reactions	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Sometimes I do not think of people' feeling	1	2	3	4	5