

PSYCHOSOCIAL RISK FACTORS IN EMPLOYEES AS PREDICTORS OF MOBBING

Assoc. Prof. Didem AYHAN (Ph.D.)*

Assoc. Prof. Arkun TATAR (Ph.D.)**

ABSTRACT

Mobbing in the workplace is a complex and worldwide phenomenon that reflects a subjective interpretation of this event. The aim of this study is to determine the relationship between mobbing and basic socio-demographic variables and some personality traits (extraversion, agreeableness, responsibility, emotional stability, intelligence/imagination, emotional intelligence, self-esteem, empathy, emotional self-awareness, personal well-being) of employees. In the cross-sectional design, data were collected from 553 employees selected from various occupations through convenience sampling. Employees filled out an anonymous form containing job-related tests. Data collection tools were the standard scales i.e., A Psychological Mobbing Scale-30, The Big Five-50 Personality Test, Schutte Emotional Intelligence Test, The Emotional Self-Awareness Scale, Personal Well-Being Index, Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory and Baron Empathy Scale (short form). Results from multiple logistic regression analysis showed that there were statistically significant relationships between mobbing and age, industry, self-esteem and empathy. The results obtained are evaluated and discussed in terms of variable interaction and future research.

Keywords: Empathy, Industry, Mobbing in The Workplace, Self-Esteem,

JEL Codes: M12, L20, L29

1. INTRODUCTION

The International Labor Organization (ILO) specifies mobbing among the high-risk mobbing elements observed in the workplace (ILO, 2020). In research on mobbing, it is seen that subject choices are aimed at determining the effect of the phenomenon on employees and organizations, while the psychology point of view generally looks at the phenomenon in terms of its causes, consequences and effects (Rajalakshmi & Naresh, 2018). On the other hand, although the definition of mobbing made both by the ILO and in academic studies is very clear and there are many studies on the subject (Einarsen et al, 2020; Keashly et al, 2020; Maran et al, 2018; Stahl-Gugger & Hämmig, 2022), it is still seen that

* Bandırma Onyedi Eylül University Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Nursing, Bandırma/Turkey, E-mail: kose.didem@gmail.com

** Manisa Celal Bayar University Faculty of Science and Letters, Department of Psychology, Manisa/Turkey, E-mail: arkuntatar@yahoo.com

Makale Geçmişi/Article History

Başvuru Tarihi / Date of Application : 15 Eylül / September 2023

133

Düzelme Tarihi / Revision Date : 25 Kasım / November 2023

Kabul Tarihi / Acceptance Date : 11 Aralık/ December 2023

Araştırma Makalesi/Research Article

there is confusion about mobbing and its terminology in the workplace (Rajalakshmi & Naresh, 2018). Mobbing in the workplace, which is defined as Type-III, is expressed with many concepts, including psychological terror, psychological violence, harassment, bullying, emotional abuse, co-worker conflict, scapegoat and rudeness, while petty tyranny or “de facto disintegration of the employee's core self”. ”is also presented in the form of leadership that puts health at risk (Kovacic et al, 2017; Lipscomet al, 2015). Those who are targeted (Namie & Namie, 2009) are generally perceived as threatening organizational stability (Sloan et al, 2010). In this context, it is seen that the most common characteristics of those targeted are refusal to submit and be controlled, to have superior competence and skills, to have social skills such as being liked and positive attitude, to show ethical and honest behaviors (Namie & Namie, 2009).

There is uncertainty about the observed rates of mobbing in employees, and this uncertainty largely depends on how the frequency of mobbing is measured as the measurement method used is influenced by the general understanding of what is or is accepted as mobbing (Zapf et al, 2020). Considering this detail, the measured rate of mobbing among USA adult workers is 50% (Namie & Namie, 2009; Samnani & Singh, 2012). The prevalence of mobbing in Europe is estimated to be between 5% and 30%, depending on the functionalization of the concept and the research method (Lipscomb et al, 2015). On the other hand, mobbing is one of the important psycho-social stressors in organizations (Vveinhardt & Sroka, 2020) and it has both individual and organizational level consequences (Norton et al, 2017; Skurdeniene & Prakapiene, 2021). The presence of mobbing in the workplace leads to long-term health and financial costs such as occupational health and safety problems, increased health expenditures, poor performance in victims, intention to leave, physical and psychological problems (Adeoye et al, 2019; Rajalakshmi & Naresh, 2018; Spector et al, 2015). Specifically, those who are exposed to mobbing have worse physical and psychological health than those who do not (Hoel et al, 2004; Nielsen & Einarsen, 2012; Seun-Fadipe et al, 2019). Many victims of mobbing may experience post-traumatic stress disorder similar to that experienced by tortured soldiers or rape victims, or people who have experienced major disasters such as war, earthquake and flood. In fact, absenteeism, resignation, early retirement, work accident, depression or other illnesses, or suicide attempts are observed in employees (Davenport et al, 2014; Kovacic et al, 2017; Mikkelsen et al, 2020; Nielsen & Einarsen, 2012).

Some socio-demographic variables such as gender, age, educational background, marital status, race/ethnicity, occupation are associated with the risk of being targeted or victimized in mobbing (Chaiwuth et al, 2020; Lampman, 2012; Lampman et al, 2016; Sloan et al, 2010). While gender or sexual orientation is one of the important predictors of mobbing (Lampman et al, 2010) and being a woman is reported to be associated with the risk of being targeted in mobbing (Chaiwuth et al, 2020; Hoel et al, 2004; Lampman, 2012; Namie & Namie, 2009; Sloan et al, 2010), there is little evidence that women as subgroups are at greater risk considering the gender ratios of the participants in the studies (Einarsen

& Skogstad, 1996). Similarly, there are studies reporting that men and women do not differ in terms of the prevalence of being exposed to mobbing (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996; Kovacic et al, 2017). In addition, while male employees in lower-level jobs are exposed to more bullying than females, the reverse situation is observed in upper-level jobs such as management level (Hoel et al, 2001). However, the fact that women in a male-dominated occupational group report a higher risk of victimization is attributed to the fact that women in this group are more visible and more frank about sharing their experiences (Zapf et al, 2020; Zukauskas & Vveinhardt, 2009). The reason is minority groups that are different from the main groups have a higher risk of being the target of exclusion and mobbing (Davenport et al, 2014; Namie & Namie, 2009; Zapf et al, 2020). Similarly, in the nurse sample, where men represent a small minority, male nurses report that they are exposed to mobbing more than twice as much as female nurses (Eriksen & Einarsen, 2004). In terms of labor market discrimination, while women are exposed to mobbing more frequently by other women and men by other men, women are sometimes exposed to mobbing only by men, and men are rarely victims of mobbing only by women due to different power positions of women and men in organizations (Zapf et al, 2020). In addition, due to the fact that the case is seen in both gender groups, the groups are affected similarly, and some studies do not reveal a gender difference (Kovacic et al, 2017).

When mobbing is examined in terms of age, young employee leads to a higher risk of being targeted or victimized compared to old employees (DeSouza, 2010; Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996; Lampman, 2012; Kovacic et al, 2017). Similarly, the probability of being the target of mobbing, which is high at the beginning of a professional career, decreases as the years of work experience increase in parallel with age (Chaiwuth et al, 2020; Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996; Vveinhardt & Štreimikienė, 2017). However, not only young people, but also the pre-retirement age group with them are at a similarly high risk of being targeted (Sloan et al, 2010; Vveinhardt & Štreimikienė, 2017).

There are two main types of mobbing, work-related and personal, which affect both the physical and mental health of victims. As a subject area of work-related mobbing, it examines the work processes in the organization, the evaluation processes, and the workload of employees or victims (Rajalakshmi & Naresh, 2018). Although the research findings do not differ (Hoel, et al, 2004) or vary from country to country (Vveinhardt & Sroka, 2020), public sector employees are considered to be more at risk than private sector employees due to factors such as the relative security of employment in the public sector, low job mobility and tendency to change jobs, low priority given to their education and management skills in the sector, high expectation of personal participation as a general characteristic of industry work, and the impersonal bureaucratic nature of the industry (Leymann, 1996; Zapf et al, 2020). However, significantly more employees report mobbing in private companies than in public companies (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996; Maran et al, 2018). In addition, the level of mobbing differs significantly between organizational sectors (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996; Hubert, & van Veldhoven, 2001). With different classification and method of determining the participant group, a high rate of mobbing was observed in

the field and in the employee group of many fields such as education, health services, social affairs, administrative affairs, trade and retailing sector, industrial field, production services, religious organizations, office workers, industrial workers, hotel and restaurant workers, graphic workers while psychologists and university employees were specified as the groups with low mobbing (Zapf et al, 2020). For example, it has been determined that those working in service sectors such as education and health in the European region are at almost three times more risk of mobbing than the average (Sloan et al, 2010). Similarly, mobbing has a higher prevalence in public administration, religious organizations, social service areas and health sector compared to industry and commerce fields (Leymann & Gustafsson, 1996).

Although the Five Factor Model personality constructs yapıları (Amponsah-Tawiah & Annor, 2017; Glaso et al, 2007; Lind et al, 2009; Nielsen & Knardahl, 2015; Ramaci et al, 2020) and the MMPI (Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory) personality profile (Alfano et al, 2021; Balducci et al, 2009; Girardi et al, 2007) were mostly used in the study of mobbing and personality relationships; structures such as self-esteem, social competence, emotional/social intelligence, empathy, personal well-being, exhaustion, anger, anxiety, stress, psychopathy, narcissism and machiavellianism were discussed as well (Bekiroğlu et al, 2019; Góralewska-Slonska, 2019; Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2007; Plopa et al, 2017; Popp, 2017; Qureshi et al, 2013; Reknes et al, 2021; Salazar & Khandelwal, 2021; Samsudin et al, 2020). Studies on the subject examine whether the personality of the employee and whether acts of mobbing influence the occurrence of mobbing (Lind et al, 2009; Nielsen & Knardahl, 2015; Wilson & Nagy, 2017; Zapf & Einarsen, 2020), which may contribute to conflict formation, such as targets of mobbing displaying vulnerability factors, which may increase the risk of subsequent victimization (Reknes et al, 2021). In addition, studies also examine whether the victims of mobbing are people who perceive themselves as the target of mobbing (Ramaci et al, 2020) due to reasons such as personality disorders (Balducci et al, 2009; Hoel & Cooper, 2001; Tokarev et al, 2017). However, potential factors that may contribute to conflict formation that will result in mobbing are personality traits of both abusers and victims (Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2007; Namie & Namie, 2018; Nielsen et al, 2017). Determining the personality traits that can be regarded as antecedents for both abusers and victims in negative actions and events that have serious effects in the field of work and private life will contribute to the understanding of the variables that affect the possible outcomes (Alfano et al, 2021; Girardi et al, 2007). At the same time, it is emphasized that the personality traits of the victims represent not only the cause but also the consequences of the mobbing (Lahelma et al, 2012; Nielsen & Knardahl, 2015; Ramaci et al, 2020). In this context, while psychosomatic symptoms such as depression and anxiety and some personality traits are seen more frequently in the health outcomes of victims of mobbing, in line with the effects of being a target (Balducci et al, 2009; Hoel et al, 2004; Nielsen & Einarsen, 2012; Seun-Fadipe et al, 2019), no specific personality trait difference has been observed between individuals in terms of being a victim of mobbing or not (Glaso et al, 2007; Matthiesen

&Einarsen, 2001). In addition, although they were victims of mobbing, psychological problems such as depressive symptoms and psychosomatic symptoms indicating personality disorders could not be determined in a group of employees (Alfano et al, 2021).

It was considered to test the importance of socio-demographic variables and personality traits in terms of exposure to mobbing and to determine whether these cases pose a potential risk in terms of exposure to mobbing. Thus, the aim of this study was to examine the effect of socio-demographic variables, Five Factor Model structures as well as personality traits, emotional intelligence, emotional self-awareness, empathy level, self-esteem, personal well-being and the sector in which they work on the probability of being in a group with a low or high level of mobbing in those who actively work in a job.

2. METHODS

2.1. Participants

In a cross-sectional design, data was collected from employees selected from various professions through convenience sampling. A total of 553 active workers, 220 male (39.8%) and 333 female (60.2%), between the ages of 18-60 ($M = 31.31$, $s = 8.66$) participated.

2.2. Data Collection Tools

In addition to the socio-demographic form, the data collection tools in the study were A Psychological Mobbing Scale-30, The Big Five-50 Personality Test, Schutte Emotional Intelligence Test, The Emotional Self-Awareness Scale, Personal Well-Being Index-Adult Form, Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, Baron Empathy Scale (short form) were used.

2.2.2. A Psychological Mobbing Scale-30

The scale is a 30-item self-report scale with a 5-point Likert-type response option (1 = Not at all, 5 = Very Appropriate). The scale does not have an inverse item. In the development study, the internal consistency reliability coefficient of the scale was reported as 0.96. As the score obtained from the scale increases, it is understood that the person's perception of mobbing is higher (Tatar et al., 2017).

2.2.3. The Big Five-50 Personality Test

The Big Five-50 Personality Test is a 50-item self-report scale with a 5-point Likert-type response (1 = Not at all, 5 = Very Appropriate). In the test, 24 items are scored in reverse. The test is evaluated with a total score of five factors consisting of Extraversion, Agreeableness, Responsibility, Emotional Stability, Intelligence/Imagination. As the score obtained from each of the factors increases, it is understood that the level of the tip related to the factor name in that factor is higher (Tatar, 2017).

2.2.4. Schutte Emotional Intelligence Test

The test developed to evaluate emotional intelligence consists of 33 items with 5 Likert-type answer options (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree) (Schutte, et al., 1998). In the test, 3 items are scored in reverse. In the Turkish translation study of the test, the internal consistency reliability coefficient was stated as 0.86. As the score obtained from the test, which is evaluated as one-dimensional, increases, it is understood that the emotional intelligence of the person is higher (Tatar et al, 2017).

2.2.5. The Emotional Self-Awareness Scale

The scale is a 30-item self-report scale with a 4-point Likert-type (0 = Totally Appropriate, 3 = Not Appropriate) response option. 3 of the scales are scored straight and 8 of them are scored reversely. In the translation study of the scale into Turkish, the internal consistency reliability coefficient was reported as 0.69. The high scores obtained from the scale indicate that the ability to read and notice emotions is high (Cooper & Sawaf, 1997; Tatar et al, 2018).

2.2.6. Personal Well-Being Index-Adult Form -8

The form is an 8-item self-report type measurement tool that includes an 11-point Likert-type (0 = I am not satisfied, 10 = I am completely satisfied) answering option that evaluates subjective well-being over the satisfaction level of eight living areas (International Wellbeing Group, 2006). The internal consistency reliability coefficient of the scale was reported as 0.86 in the translation study of the measurement tool, which does not have a reversed item, into Turkish (Meral, 2014).

2.2.7. Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory

The adult short form of the self-report inventory, scored with the dual response option (4 = Yes, 0 = No), consists of 25 items. Eight of the items are scored straight and 17 are scored in reverse. High scores from the scale indicate high self-esteem (Turan & Tufan, 1987).

2.2.8. Baron Empathy Scale Short Form

Although the Empathy Scale consists of 60 items (Baron-Cohen & Wheelwright, 2004), the long form is evaluated with 40 items and the short form with 22 items (Wakabayashi et al., 2006). The items of the self-report measurement tool are answered with a four-point Likert type (1 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Strongly Disagree) response option, while two low empathic response options are scored 0, one medium empathetic response option is scored 1 and one high empathic response option is scored 2. For the short form of the scale, the internal consistency reliability coefficient was specified as 0.81 in the translation study into Turkish (Bora & Baysan, 2009).

2.3. Application and Ethical Consideration

The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, after obtaining ethical approval from a university the Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee meeting number 2021-6 and dated 01/07/2021. The application of the study was carried out in the province of Istanbul with the participation of active working individuals in a two-year period with the easy sampling method. The study, which was carried out using a printed form and without asking the participants for their names and other identification information by obtaining "voluntary consent", took approximately half an hour for one person.

2.4. Analysis of Data

In the study, the internal consistency reliability coefficients for the measurement tools and the correlation coefficients between the total scores were calculated first. Then, using the total scores obtained from the A Psychological Mobbing Scale-30, two groups were formed as those above and below the median value of the total score (34). Then, gender, educational status, income, marital status, in which sector they work and whether he received professional psychological support in the previous period as categorical independent variables; age, how many years he has worked, how many people work in the workplace, Big Five-50 Personality Test total score of five different factors, Schutte Emotional Intelligence Test total score, Emotional Self-Awareness Scale total score, Personal Well-being Index total score, The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory total score and the Baron Empathy Scale short form total score were also analyzed by multivariate logistic regression analysis to examine whether the level of mobbing, which was formed as quantitative continuous independent variables, differentiated the dependent variable groups. In order to perform the logistic regression analysis, the number and percentage values were determined in order to examine the distribution of the categorical independent variables over the two mobbing level groups.

3. FINDINGS

The internal consistency reliability coefficients of the measurement tools used were between 0.61 and 0.89, and the Pearson correlation coefficients between the total scores were between 0.10 and 0.56 (Table 1).

Table 1. Correlation Coefficients between Internal Consistency, Reliability and Total Scores of the Scales Used in the Study

n = 553	Alfa	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Big Five-50 Personality Test										
1. Extraversion		0.80								
2. Compatibility		0.72	0.40***							
3. Responsibility		0.80	0.10*	0.26***						
4. Emotional Stability		0.83	0.36***	0.19***	0.15***					
5. Intelligence / Imagination		0.70	0.44***	0.37***	0.26***	0.15***				
6. Schutte Emotional Intelligence Test		0.89	0.38***	0.46***	0.36***	0.25***	0.41***			
7. Emotional Self-Awareness Scale		0.61	0.29***	0.28***	0.27***	0.34***	0.25***	0.53***		
8. Personal Well-being Index		0.85	0.23***	0.26***	0.29***	0.38***	0.12**	0.40***	0.41***	
9. The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory		0.78	0.35***	0.23***	0.25***	0.50***	0.19***	0.35***	0.42***	0.46***
10. The Baron Empathy Scale - Short Form		0.89	0.31***	0.42***	0.29***	0.19***	0.42***	0.56***	0.43***	0.28***
		0.25***								

*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001

Multivariate logistic regression analysis was performed with the Wald Forward method in order to distinguish mobbing level groups. There is a model-data fit for the logistic regression analysis established according to the Hosmer and Lemeshow test results (χ^2 HL (8) = 6.85; p > 0.05). The model created explains 15.7% of the total variance according to the so-called Nagelkerke R² value. The overall hit rate was 65.9%, an increase of 13.4% from the proportional percentage of chance correct classification (52.5%). The correct prediction rate was determined as 74.1% for the low mobbing group and 56.9% for the high mobbing group. Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory total score (χ^2 Wald (1) = 39.94; p < 0.001), Baron Empathy Scale short form total score (χ^2 Wald (1) = 3.84; p < 0.001) taken as independent variables according to the Wald test result 0.05), age (χ^2 Wald (1) = 6.82; p < 0.01), and the sector of employment (χ^2 Wald (1) = 6.38; p < 0.05) low and high levels of mobbing were found to be statistically significant predictors of being in one of the groups (Table 2). It was determined that other variables taken in the study, gender, education, marital status, income status, working year, how many people work at the workplace, emotional intelligence, emotional self-awareness, personal well-being and whether psychological support was received in a previous period was not a statistically significant predictor of being in one of the groups of low- or high-level mobbing.

Table 2. Logistic Regression Model Examining the Relationship between Personality and Socio-demographic Predictors and Psychological Mobbing

	B	S.E.	Wald df	p	Exp(B)	Confidence Interval of Exp(B) (95%)
Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory	-0.04	0.01	39.94	1	0.000	0.96
Baron Empathy Scale - Short Form	-0.02	0.01	3.84	1	0.050	0.98
Age	-0.03	0.01	6.82	1	0.009	0.97
Working Sector	0.50	0.20	6.38	1	0.012	1.65
Constant	3.88	0.57	45.93	1	0.000	48.16

4. DISCUSSION

Psychosocial risk factors faced by working individuals in the workplace play a critical role on the individual's psychological and physical health. Due to the well-known harms of mobbing, it has a negative impact on the health, behavior, work efficiency of employees and, accordingly, the functioning of organizations. While the low willingness of victims to report abusers and the absence of appropriate organizational rules to punish abusers create favorable conditions for mobbing in the workplace, the subjective nature of the experience that causes the employee to classify a conflict as mobbing makes it difficult to examine the phenomenon (Kovacic et al, 2017). For these reasons, it is necessary to examine mobbing in different cultural structures with different variable sets and different methodological approaches in order to understand all aspects of mobbing. Accordingly, in this study, it was aimed to examine the relationship between some socio-demographic variables and some personality traits and mobbing in individuals working in a job.

In this study, data analysis with multivariate logistic regression analysis was preferred instead of multiple linear regression analysis in order to test socio-demographic variables, some of which are frequently emphasized in the relevant literature, such as gender, educational status, and economic status. As a result of testing such categorical independent variables, the effects of which cannot be seen with multiple linear regression analysis, some groups (and variables) that are seen as risk groups in other studies, especially in terms of mobbing, are evaluated in this study data. According to the result obtained in this direction, some of the results reported for some groups such as being in a low socio-economic group, having a low education level, and being a woman, which are seen as risk groups in terms of mobbing, (Bekiroğlu et al, 2019; Chaiwuth et al, 2020; Hoel et al, 2004; Lampman, 2012; Namie & Namie, 2009; Prevost & Hunt, 2018; Sloan et al, 2010) could not be repeated in this study. However, with the preference of multivariate logistic regression analysis instead of multiple linear regression analysis, working in the private or public sector was evaluated as a categorical variable, and it was seen that being in one of the groups with low and high levels of mobbing was one of the statistically significant predictors. According to the result, working in the private sector increases being in the group with a high level of mobbing by 1.65 times compared to working in the public sector. This finding is also in line with the knowledge of reporting more mobbing in the private sector (Einarsen & Skogstad,

1996; Maran et al, 2018). However, the expectation that emerged in line with what was presented in previous studies that mobbing differs significantly in different sectors and that public-private sector differences may affect the quality and quantity of mobbing should be evaluated as whether the organizational context affects both mobbing levels and target people at the same time (Hoel et al, 2004). It is understood that this point of view should be taken into account methodologically in subsequent similar studies focusing on a sector or inter-sectoral differences.

According to the logistic regression analysis results, being in the high mobbing level group was used as independent variables with a one-point increase in the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory total score 0.96 times, a one-point increase in the Baron Empathy Scale Short Form total score 0.98 times, and one year increase in age decreases by 0.97 times in predicting the mobbing level groups (Tablo 2). In other words, provided that these rates are at the same level, the increase in self-esteem, empathy level and age decrease the probability of being in the group with a high level of mobbing. Similarly, it has been reported in other studies that the risk of being a victim of mobbing decreases with the increase in age and years of work experience (Chaiwuth et al, 2020; DeSouza, 2010; Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996; Lampman, 2012; Kovacic et al, 2017; Vveinhardt & Štreimikienė, 2017).

It is stated that self-esteem predicts mobbing (Bekiroğlu et al, 2019), but longitudinal study results are required for definitive evidence, since there is a delayed relationship between personality traits such as self-esteem and mobbing in the workplace (Samsudin et al, 2020). Similarly, it has been emphasized in many studies that longitudinal study results are needed to examine mobbing not only in terms of self-esteem but also in many aspects (Djurkovic et al, 2006; Girardi et al, 2007; Lahelma et al, 2012; Reknes et al, 2021). For this reason, although the relationship between mobbing and self-esteem obtained in this study is important, it is also limited in this aspect as the methodological problem stated in previous studies has not been eliminated.

In this study, a similar evaluation can be made for empathy, which is related to mobbing, and for Five Factor Personality Model structures, which are determined not to be related, as extraversion, agreeableness, responsibility, emotional stability, intelligence/imagination and emotional intelligence, personal well-being level, emotional self-awareness. It has been concluded that these variable structures other than empathy are not target personality traits that can explain mobbing in general. Although the existing literature content cannot reveal the role of personality in predisposing an employee to be a target on the basis of empirical evidence (Alfano et al, 2021); it is understood that different personality structures will continue to be examined and considered as a variable in related studies with different methodological approaches such as longitudinal studies since personality is a critical variable in determining how mobbing is perceived and how it is coped (Zap & Einarsen, 2005).

While social/emotional intelligence and empathy show a normal distribution, it is stated that the abusive people who will apply psychological mobbing are at the lower end of this distribution, and the

targeted victim employees are at the higher end (Popp, 2017). The results are limited to this group because only the targeted victim employees were included in this study as participants through self-report. However, it was determined that as the empathy level of the victim employees increased, the probability of being the target of mobbing decreased. Although the results seem to contain contradictory information to the ones presented in the literature, the results of the logistic regression analysis are intelligible and in the expected direction as they reveal the possibility of being in one of the two groups and the empathy level of the victim employees will also be distributed within the group. On the other hand, although empathy was determined as a statistically significant predictor of being in one of the groups with low and high levels of mobbing in this study, it is understood that the possible reasons for not observing the effect of emotional intelligence can be determined by studies in which the characteristics of the participant group are further detailed and different sector employees are separated. It is thought that these variables should be examined with more sophisticated methods than cross-sectional studies, especially in the social and service sectors, where communication and interaction are prominent, such as health services, rather than sectors such as manufacturing, where human relations are relatively more limited.

Personality structures handled within the framework of the Five Factor Model (Amponsah-Tawiah & Annor, 2017; Glaso et al, 2007; Lind et al, 2009; Nielsen & Knardahl, 2015; Ramaci et al, 2020) have not been able to obtain a result related to mobbing, which shows that they do not reveal a profile that may increase the risk of victimization (Reknes et al, 2021). On the other hand, considering that there are studies that draw attention to emotional balance, it is understood that the victims of the participant group included in this study are not people who "perceive" themselves as the target of psychological intimidation (Ramaci et al, 2020), especially in the context of "emotional balance". However, at this point, since it is known that there are gender differences in some personality traits, it is seen that similar studies should be examined with statistical methods in which the gender factor is controlled.

As a limitation observed in this study, it is striking that "whether or not you belong to a minority group" in terms of political opinion, religion, sect, language, race, sexual preference and so on, which are included in socio-demographic variables, are not included. Since historically marginalized groups such as racial or ethnic minorities constitute risk groups in terms of mobbing due to prejudices and it has been shown that minority group identity is one of the important predictors of mobbing (Lampman, 2012; Sloan et al, 2010), mobbing in terms of being in a minority group other than socio-demographic variables or not in terms of discrimination appears to need to be examined in today's Turkey. In addition, considering Turkey's heterogeneous human profile, it is seen that "being in a minority group" can be examined separately in terms of many variables, in terms of being a target for mobbing. As a result, while it was understood that some socio-demographic variables and some personality traits played a role in being a target of mobbing in this study, due to the complex nature of the subject, many new study

projections are expected in the context of the related variables explained above, and at the same time, the variable relations that have been examined before should be reconsidered with methodological approaches in line with the relevant literature.

REFERENCES

- Adeoye, S. O., Egbuta, O. U., & Abolarin, E. O. (2019). Workplace mobbing: The causal factor of neurotic personality and employees' intention to leave of selected private institutions in southwest, Nigeria. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 9(7), 70-80. <https://doi.org/10.30845/ijhss.v9n7p9>
- Alfano, V., Ramaci, T., Landolfi, A., Lo Presti, A., & Barattucci, M. (2021). Gender patterns in mobbing victims: differences in negative act perceptions, MMPI personality profile, perceived quality of life, and suicide risk. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(4), 2192. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18042192>
- Amponsah-Tawiah, K., & Annor, F. (2017). Do personality and organizational politics predict workplace victimization? A study among Ghanaian employees. *Safety and Health at Work*, 8(1), 72-76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shaw.2016.08.003>
- Baldacci, C., Alfano, V., & Fraccaroli, F. (2009). Relationships between mobbing at work and MMPI-2 personality profile, posttraumatic stress symptoms, and suicidal ideation and behavior. *Violence and Victims*, 24(1), 52-67. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.24.1.52>
- Baron-Cohen, S., & Wheelwright, S. (2004). The empathy quotient: an investigation of adults with Asperger syndrome or high functioning autism and normal sex differences. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 34(2), 163-175.
- Bekiroğlu, B., Özdemir, H., & Tatar, A. (2019). Examining the role of self-esteem and body image in explaining the perception of mobbing in work life. *Social, Mentality and Researcher Thinkers Journal*, 5(16), 427-442. <https://doi.org/10.31576/smryj.217>
- Bora, E., & Baysan, L. (2009). Psychometric properties of the Turkish form of the Empathy Scale in university students. *Bulletin of Clinical Psychopharmacology*, 19(1), 39-47.
- Chaiwuth, S., Chanprasit, C., Kaewthummanukul, T., Chareosanti, J., Srisuphan, W., & Stone, T. E. (2020). Prevalence and risk factors of workplace violence among registered nurses in tertiary hospitals. *Pacific Rim International Journal of Nursing Research*, 24(4), 538-552.
- Cooper, R. K., & Sawaf, A. (1997). Executive EQ: emotional intelligence in leadership and organizations. New York: The Berkley Publishing Group.
- Davenport, N., Schwartz, R. D., & Elliot, G. P. (2014). *Mobbing. Emotional abuse in the American workplace*. Civil Society Publishing.

- DeSouza, E. R. (2010). Frequency rates and correlates of contrapower harassment in higher education. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(1), 158-188. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260510362878>
- Djurkovic, N., McCormack, D., & Casimir, G. (2006). Neuroticism and the psychosomatic model of workplace bullying. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(1), 73-88. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940610643224>
- Einarsen, S. V., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (2020). The concept of bullying and harassment at work: The European tradition. In S. V. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & S. C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace* (3rd ed.) (pp. 3-53). CRC Press.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594329608414854>
- Eriksen, W., & Einarsen, S. (2004). Gender minority as a risk factor of exposure to bullying at work: The case of male assistant nurses. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 13(4), 473-492. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320444000173>
- Girardi, P., Monaco, E., Prestigiacomo, C., Talamo, A., Ruberto, A., & Tatarelli, R. (2007). Personality and psychopathological profiles in individuals exposed to mobbing. *Violence and Victims*, 22(2), 172-188. <https://doi.org/10.1891/088667007780477320>
- Glaso, 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. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2007.00554.x>
- Góralewska-Slonska, A. (2019). Experiencing mobbing at workplace facing psychological gender and occupational burnout. *Management*, 23(1), 156-173. <https://doi.org/10.2478/manment-2019-0009>
- Hoel, H., & Cooper, C. (2001). Origins of bullying: Theoretical frameworks for explaining workplace bullying. In N. Tehrani (Ed.), *Building a culture of respect: managing bullying at work* (pp. 3-19). Taylor and Francis.
- Hoel, H., Cooper, C. L. and Faragher, B. (2001). The experience of bullying in Great Britain: The impact of organisational status. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10(4), 443-465. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320143000780>
- Hoel, H., Faragher, B., & Cooper, C. L. (2004). Bullying is detrimental to health, but all bullying behaviours are not necessarily equally damaging. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 32(3), 367-387. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03069880410001723594>

Hubert, A. B., & van Veldhoven, M. (2001). Risk sectors for undesirable behaviour and mobbing. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10(4), 415-424. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320143000799>

International Labour Organization (ILO) (2020) Safe and healthy working environments free from violence and harassment, (Erişim Tarihi 20.06. 2022) Geneva.

International Labour Organization (ILO) (2021). Violence and harassment in the world of work: A guide on convention no. 190 and recommendation no. 206, (Erişim Tarihi 20.06. 2022) Geneva.

International Wellbeing Group (2006). Personal wellbeing index-adult. Melbourne: Australian Centre on Quality of Life, Deakin University.

Keashly, L., Tye-Williams, S., & Jagatic, K. (2020). By any other name: North American perspectives on workplace bullying. In S. V. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & S. C. L. Cooper (Eds.), Bullying and harassment in the workplace (3rd ed.) (pp. 55-102). CRC Press.

Kovacic, A., Podgornik, N., Pristov, Z., & Raspot, A. (2017). Mobbing in a non-profit organisation. Organizacija, 50(2), 178-186.

Lahelma, E., Lallukka, T., Laaksonen, M., Saastamoinen, P., & Rahkonen, O. (2012). Workplace bullying and common mental disorders: a follow-up study. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 66(6), e3. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2010.115212>

Lampman, C. (2012). Women faculty at risk: US professors report on their experiences with student incivility, bullying, aggression, and sexual attention. NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education, 5(2), 184-208.

Lampman, C., Crew, E. C., Lowery, S. D., & Tompkins, K. (2016). Women faculty distressed: Descriptions and consequences of academic contrapower harassment. NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education, 9(2), 169-189. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19407882.2016.1199385>

Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5(2), 165-184. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594329608414853>

Leymann, H., & Gustafsson, A. (1996). Mobbing at work and the development of post-traumatic stress disorders. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5(2), 251-275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594329608414858>

Lind, K., Glaso, L., Pallesen, S., & Einarsen, S. (2009). Personality profiles among targets and nontargets of workplace bullying. European Psychologist, 14(3), 231-237. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040.14.3.231>

Lipscomb, J., London, M., McPhaul, K. M., Ghaziri, M. E., Lydecker, A., Geiger-Brown, J., & Johnson, J. V. (2015). The prevalence of coworker conflict including bullying in a unionized US public

sector workforce. *Violence and Victims*, 30(5), 813-829. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-14-00031>

Maran, D. A., Bernardelli, S., & Varetto, A. (2018). Mobbing (bullying at work) in Italy: characteristics of successful court cases. *Journal of Injury and Violence Research*, 10(1), 17-24.

Matthiesen, S. B., & Einarsen, S. (2001). MMPI-2 configurations among victims of bullying at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10(4), 467-484. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320143000753>

Matthiesen, S. B., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Perpetrators and targets of bullying at work: role stress and individual differences. *Violence and Victims*, 22(6), 735-753. <https://doi.org/10.1891/088667007782793174>

Meral, B. F. (2014). Psychometric properties of the personal well-being index-adult Turkish form. *The Journal of Happiness and Well-Being*, 2(2), 119-131.

Mikkelsen, E. G., Hansen, Å. M., Persson, R., Byrgesen, M. F., & Hogh, A. (2020). Individual consequences of being exposed to workplace bullying. In S. V. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & S. C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace* (3rd ed.)(pp. 163-208). CRC Press.

Misawa, M. (2015). Cuts and bruises caused by arrows, sticks, and stones in academia: Theorizing three types of racist and homophobic bullying in adult and higher education. *Adult Learning*, 26(1), 6-13.

Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2009). *Bully at work: What you can do to stop the hurt and reclaim your dignity on the job* (2. ed.). Sourcebooks, Inc..

Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2018). Risk factors for becoming a target of workplace bullying and mobbing. In M. Duffy, & D. C. Yamada (Eds.), *Workplace bullying and mobbing in the United States*, (pp. 53-74.). Praeger Press.

Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2012). Outcomes of exposure to workplace bullying: A meta-analytic review. *Work and Stress: An International Journal of Work, Health and Organisations*, 26(4), 309-332. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2012.734709>

Nielsen, M. B., & Knardahl, S. (2015). Is workplace bullying related to the personality traits of victims? A two-year prospective study. *Work and Stress*, 29(2), 128-149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2015.1032383>

Nielsen, M. B., Glaso, L., & Einarsen, S. (2017). Exposure to workplace harassment and the Five Factor Model of personality: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 104, 195-206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.08.015>

- Norton, P., Costa, V., Teixeira, J., Azevedo, A., Roma-Torres, A., Amaro, J., & Cunha, L. (2017). Prevalence and determinants of bullying among health care workers in Portugal. *Workplace Health and Safety*, 65(5), 188-196. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2165079916666545>
- Plopka, M., Plopka, W., & Skuzińska, A. (2017). Bullying at work, personality and subjective well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(1), 19-27. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0040320>
- Popp, J. (2017). Social intelligence and the explanation of workplace abuse. *Sage Open*, 7(2), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017715076>
- Qureshi, M. I., Iftikhar, M., Janjua, S. Y., Zaman, K., Raja, U. M., & Javed, Y. (2013). Empirical investigation of mobbing, stress and employees' behavior at work place: quantitatively refining a qualitative model. *Quality and Quantity*, 49(1), 93-113. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-013-9976-4>
- Rajalakshmi, M., & Naresh, B. (2018). Influence of psychological contract on workplace bullying. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 41, 90-97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.05.001>
- Ramaci, T., Barattucci, M., Vella, F., Senia, P., Cannizzaro, E., Scorciapino, A., Ledda, C., De Giorgio, A., & Rapisarda, V. (2020). Straining at work and its relationship with personality profiles and individual consequences in healthcare workers (HCWs). *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(2), 610. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17020610>
- Reknes, I., Notelaers, G., Iliescu, D., & Einarsen, S. V. (2021). The influence of target personality in the development of workplace bullying. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 26(4), 291-303. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000272>
- Salazar, L. R., & Khandelwal, P. (2021). Compassion and empathy as transformative intervention approaches: The management of cyberbullying issues among working professionals. In L. R. Salazar (Ed.), *Handbook of research on cyberbullying and online harassment in the workplace* (pp. 493-512). IGI Global. <http://doi.10.4018/978-1-7998-4912-4.ch023>
- Samnani, A. K., & Singh, P. (2012). 20 Years of workplace bullying research: A review of the antecedents and consequences of bullying in the workplace. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17(6), 581-589. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.08.004>
- Samnani, A. K., & Singh, P. (2016). Workplace bullying: considering the interaction between individual and work environment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 139, 537-549. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2653-x>
- Samsudin, E. Z., Isahak, M., Rampal, S., Rosnah, I., & Zakaria, M. I. (2020). Individual antecedents of workplace victimisation: The role of negative affect, personality and self-esteem in junior doctors'

exposure to bullying at work. *The International Journal of Health Planning and Management*, 35(5), 1065-1082. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hpm.2985>

Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J., Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and individual differences*, 25(2), 167-177.

Seun-Fadipe, C. T., Akinsulore, A. A., & Oginni, O. A. (2019). Workplace violence and risk for psychiatric morbidity among health workers in a tertiary health care setting in Nigeria: Prevalence and correlates. *Psychiatry Research*, 272, 730-736.

Skurdeniene, N., & Prakapiene, D. (2021). Mobbing in the public sector: the case of the Ministry of National Defence of Lithuania and its institutions. *Public Policy and Administration*, 20(1), 34-44. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5755/j01.ppa.20.1.28862>

Sloan, L. M., Matyok, T., Schmitz, C. L., & Short, G. F. L. (2010). A story to tell: Bullying and mobbing in the workplace. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 1(3), 87-97.

Spector, P. E., Yang, L.-Q., & Zhou, Z. E. (2015). A longitudinal investigation of the role of violence prevention climate in exposure to workplace physical violence and verbal abuse. *Work and Stress*, 29(4), 325-340. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2015.1076537>

Stahl-Gugger, A., & Hämmig, O. (2022). Prevalence and health correlates of workplace violence and discrimination against hospital employees-a cross-sectional study in German-speaking Switzerland. *BMC health services research*, 22(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-022-07602-5>

Tatar A., Özdemir, H., Çelikbaş, B. (2018). Examination of emotional self-awareness levels in women who work and do not work in a job that generates income. *Journal of Behavior at Work*, 3(1), 31-41.

Tatar, A. (2017). Translation of the Big Five-50 Personality Test into Turkish and comparison with the short form of the Five Factor Personality Inventory. *Anatolian Journal of Psychiatry*, 18(1), 51-61.

Tatar, A., Namlı, M., Özüdoğru, M. T., Uysal, A. R., Yeşilkanat, G., Bahadır, E., Kalender, B., & Aydin, S. (2017). Developing the A Psychological Mobbing Scale and examining its psychometric properties. *Journal of Behavior at Work*, 2(2), 79-88.

Tatar, A., Tok, S., Bender, M. T. & Saltukoğlu, G. (2017). Translation of the original form of Schutte Emotional Intelligence Test into Turkish and examination of its psychometric properties. *Anatolian Journal of Psychiatry*, 18(2), 139-146.

- Tokarev, A., Phillips, A. R., Hughes, D. J., & Irwing, P. (2017). Leader dark traits, workplace bullying, and employee depression: Exploring mediation and the role of the dark core. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 126(7), 911-920. <https://doi.org/10.1037/abn0000299>
- Turan, N., & Tufan, B. (1987). Validity-reliability study of the Coopersmith self-esteem inventory (SEI). 23. National Congress of Psychiatry and Neurological Sciences, İstanbul-Türkiye.
- Uluslararası Çalışma Örgütü (ILO) (2021). Violence and harassment in the world of work: guidance on convention 190 and recommendation 206 (Access date: 20.06. 2022), Cenevre.
- Vévodová, Š., Vévoda, J., & Grygová, B. (2020). Mobbing, subjective perception, demographic factors, and prevalence of burnout syndrome in nurses. *Central European Journal of Public Health*, 28(Supplement), S57-S64.
- Vveinhardt, J., & Sroka, W. (2020). Workplace mobbing in Polish and Lithuanian organisations with regard to Corporate Social Responsibility. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(8), 2944. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17082944>
- Vveinhardt, J., & Štreimikienė, D. (2017). Demographic, social and organizational characteristics on the levels of mobbing and single cases of harassment: the multicomplex approach. *Economics and Management*, 3, 52-69.
- Wakabayashi, A., Baron-Cohen, S., Wheelwright, S., Goldenfeld, N., Delaney, J., Fine, D., Smith, R., & Weil, L. (2006). Development of short forms of the Empathy Quotient (EQ-Short) and the Systemizing Quotient (SQ-Short). *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41(5), 929-940. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.03.017>
- Wilson, C. J., & Nagy, M. S. (2017). The effects of personality on workplace bullying. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 20(3), 123-147. <https://doi.org/10.1037/mgr0000054>
- Zapf, D., & Einarsen, S. (2005). Mobbing at work: escalated conflicts in organizations. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior: investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 237-270). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10893-010>
- Zapf, D., & Einarsen, S. V. (2020). Individual antecedents of bullying: Personality, motives and competencies of victims and perpetrators. In S. V. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & S. C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace* (3rd ed.) (pp. 269-303). CRC Press.
- Zapf, D., Escartin, J., Scheppa-Lahyani, M., Einarsen, S. V., Hoel, H., & Vartia, M. (2020). Empirical findings on prevalence and risk groups of bullying in the workplace. In S. V. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & S. C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace* (3rd ed.) (pp. 105-162). CRC Press.

Zukauskas, P., & Vveinhardt, J. (2009). Socio-demographic characteristics of mobbing and discrimination in employee relations. Transformations in Business and Economics, 8(3, 18 Supplement A), 128-147.

KATKI ORANI / <i>CONTRIBUTION RATE</i>	AÇIKLAMA / <i>EXPLANATION</i>	KATKIDA BULUNANLAR / <i>CONTRIBUTORS</i>
Fikir veya Kavram / <i>Idea or Notion</i>	Araştırma hipotezini veya fikrini oluşturmak / <i>Form the research hypothesis or idea</i>	Assoc. Prof. Didem AYHAN Assoc. Prof. Arkun TATAR
Tasarım / <i>Design</i>	Yöntemi, ölçüği ve deseni tasarlamak / <i>Designing method, scale and pattern</i>	Assoc. Prof. Didem AYHAN Assoc. Prof. Arkun TATAR
Veri Toplama ve İşleme / <i>Data Collecting and Processing</i>	Verileri toplamak, düzenlemek ve raporlamak / <i>Collecting, organizing and reporting data</i>	Assoc. Prof. Didem AYHAN Assoc. Prof. Arkun TATAR
Tartışma ve Yorum / <i>Discussion and Interpretation</i>	Bulguların değerlendirilmesinde ve sonuçlandırmasında sorumluluk almak / <i>Taking responsibility in evaluating and finalizing the findings</i>	Assoc. Prof. Didem AYHAN Assoc. Prof. Arkun TATAR
Literatür Taraması / <i>Literature Review</i>	Çalışma için gerekli literatürü taramak / <i>Review the literature required for the study</i>	Assoc. Prof. Didem AYHAN Assoc. Prof. Arkun TATAR

Hakem Değerlendirmesi: Dış bağımsız.

Çıkar Çatışması: Yazar çıkar çatışması bildirmemiştir.

Finansal Destek: Yazar bu çalışma için finansal destek almadığını beyan etmiştir.

Teşekkür: -

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Conflict of Interest: The author has no conflict of interest to declare.

Grant Support: The author declared that this study has received no financial support.

Acknowledgement: -
