

BULLYING AT FOREST PRODUCTS INDUSTRY IN TURKEY

Kadri Cemil AKYÜZ¹
Tarık GEDİK²
Yasin BALABAN³
İbrahim YILDIRIM⁴
Ali TEMİZ⁵

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the prevalence of exposure to workplace bullying in the forest products industry in Turkey. A total of 2000 questionnaires are given to the employees in the randomly chosen company. Leymann Inventory of Psychological Terror (LIPT) scale which consists of 45 categories of acts of bullying was used. The results show that 13.2% of employees were bullying victims during the previous six month and suffer from hostile behaviours at workplace and 19.2% of employees were the witnesses of bullying. In the study, the negative communication factor was determined the most important behaviour group for defining of bullying. Bullying becomes very important in business life and many studies are applied about it. However, there are not enough studies about bullying in forest products industry.

Keywords: Workplace Bullying, LIPT, Forest Products Industry

JEL Classification: L73, C83

TÜRKİYE ORMAN ÜRÜNLERİ SANAYİNDE PSİKOLOJİK TACİZ

ÖZ

Bu çalışmada, Türkiye'deki orman ürünleri sanayi iş yerlerinde psikolojik tacize ne kadar sıklıkta maruz kaldığını araştırılmaktadır. 2000 anket rastgele seçilen şirketlerdeki çalışanlara verilmiştir. Psikolojik tacizin 45 kategorisini içeren Leymann Psikolojik Terör Envanteri (LIPT) ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Sonuçlar; çalışanların %13,2'sinin altı ay boyunca psikoloji taciz kurbanı olduğunu ve işyerindeki düşmanca davranışlara maruz kaldığını ve %19,2'sinin psikolojik tacize şahit olduğunu göstermektedir. Çalışmada; olumsuz iletişim faktörü, psikolojik tacizi tanımlamada en önemli davranış grubu olarak belirlenmiştir. Psikolojik taciz, iş hayatında önemli bir yer kaplamaya başlamıştır ve bu konuda birçok çalışma yürütülmektedir. Fakat orman ürünleri sanayinde psikolojik taciz hakkında yeterli çalışma yoktur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İşyeri Psikolojik Tacizi, LIPT, Orman Ürünleri Sanayi

JEL Sınıflandırması: L73, C83

¹ Prof. Dr., Karadeniz Technical University, Faculty of Forestry, akyuz@ktu.edu.tr

² Asst. Prof. Dr., Düzce University, Faculty of Forestry, tgedik37@hotmail.com

³ Arş. Gör., Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, Orman Fakültesi, yasinbalaban@ktu.edu.tr

⁴ Arş. Gör. Dr., Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, Orman Fakültesi, ibrahim@ktu.edu.tr

⁵ Assoc. Prof. Dr., Karadeniz Technical University, Faculty of Forestry, temiz@ktu.edu.tr

1. Introduction

The term of mobbing was firstly used by Konrad Lorenz in 1958 for explaining the behaviours of animals against their enemies and then in 1970's, Dr. Peter-Paul Heinemann used mobbing term for extortion of children. At the beginning of 1980's, Swedish psychologist Heinz Leyman made it popular in the science world. The concepts of the workplace bullying have received increasing attention from researchers, organizations and the worldwide public in the past decade (Cowie et al. 2002; Jennifer et al. 2003; Hoel and Beale 2006; Agervold 2007).

Describing negative behaviours at work has been known a number of different names including bullying, mobbing, incivility, victimization, work-place aggression, emotional abuse, employee abuse, mistreatment, intimidation, emotional harassment, psychological harassment and work mistreatment (World Health Organisation [WHO] 2003; Lewis 2004; Yüçetürk and Öke 2005). The main reason for the different descriptions of bullying is the cultural differences, causing the changes on understanding of bullying and the number of bullying victims. In the some societies, any behaviour which is not accepted in bullying can be accepted an important reason for bullying behaviour by other societies.

Mobbing is described the systematic attack of one or more people against someone, the communicational and psychological terror by Leyman (Leymann 1990; Leymann and Gustaffson 1996). These actions can be seen on a frequent basis (at least once a week), systematic, repetitive and over a long period of time (at least six months duration). This maltreatment leads to considerable mental, psychosomatic and social misery on the people due to the high frequency and prolonged cases of hostile behaviour (Carnero et al. 2008; Bulutlar and Öz 2009).

Workplace bullying is defined as "all those repeat actions and practices that are directed to one or more workers, which are unwanted by the victim, which may be done deliberately or unconsciously, but clearly cause humiliation, offense, and distress, and that may interfere with job performance and/or cause an unpleasant working environment" by Einarsen (Einarsen 1999).

Workplace bullying can be studied into two main groups. One focuses on the characteristics of victims and perpetrators and second one focuses on the social context in which the bullying occurs (Jennifer et al. 2003).

Leymann and Gustaffson reported that bullying victims did not show any specific characteristics and everybody can be a bullying victim at work but some researchers suggested that character and psychology of person is important for being a bullying victim. Especially the characters having more fear and worries are bullied more than the others (Leymann and Gustaffson 1996; Aquino and Byron 2002). Studies show that the ones; honest, shy, fair and who can not protect themselves are bullied. In the same time, these people are clever, talented, creative, successful, honest and trust-able people and they do not act politically (Lewis 2004). When the personal characteristics of bullying

actors are investigated, it is shown that they are socially disqualified, trying to take attention, weak, distasteful, narcissist, prejudiced, having emotional problems and coward people (Leymann 1996; Menesini et al. 2003; Davenport et al. 2003).

The reasons of bullying at work can be classified as follow: the uncertainty about the job, the problems on the organization, the lack of a leader, the social problems of victim, the low ethic standards on the work, low job satisfaction, the role disagreement and uncertainty of role at work (Einarsen 1999; Vartia 1996; Lewis 2004; Hauge et al. 2007; Einarsen et al. 2009).

There are many studies carried on work stress, job satisfaction, efficiency, activity, employees work health and psychology in Finland, Norway, Denmark, Spain, Holland, Austria, Germany, England and U.S.A.(Leymann 1990; Leymann and Gustaffson 1996; Vartia 1996; Niedl 1996; Einarsen et al. 1994; Einarsen 1999; Zapf 1999; Hoel and Cooper 2000; Mikkelsen and Einarsen 2001; Hubert and Veldhoven 2001; Richards and Freeman 2002; Aquino and Byron 2002; Menesini et al. 2003; Elvira et al. 2003; Mayhew et al. 2004; Vega and Comer 2005; Agervold 2007; Carnero et al. 2008; Einarsen et al. 2009; Nielsen et al. 2009) but a few studies on bullying at work in Turkey has been carried out (Aytaç et al. 2005; Bilgel et al. 2006; Kök 2006; Yüçetürk and Öke 2005). Recently a lot of studies on bullying have been carried out in Turkey (Kısa 2008; Bas 2011; Cheraghi and Piskin 2011; Çankaya and Tan 2011; Çetin et al. 2011; Mura et al. 2011).

Turkey is the 16th largest economy in the world. Manufacturing industry has an important power on the national economy of Turkey. Forest products industry represents nearly 22.3% of the total manufacturing industry and employee portion is nearly 11.5% of all the employees in Turkey. Forest products industry includes 59.690 firms (State Institute of Statistics [SIS] 2005) and 98.5% of industry is classified as SMEs. Forest product firms are scattered all over the region of Turkey and therefore, these firms have an important role in employment level and social welfare of country (Akyüz 2006). Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) reported that the forest products manufacturing industry is in the list of the most dangerous occupational within its manufacturing division. In addition forest products manufacturing industry employees have higher injury incidence rates than those of other manufacturing industries (Michael et al. 2005).

2. Aim of Study

Forest products industry is generally labour intensive industry and, has dangerous production environment because of physical tiredness, machines and equipments used for production. The goal of this study is to investigate the bullying on forest products industry and determining the profile of bullying (sex, age, position, etc), describing the bullying at work, and finding the relation of bullying between organization, victim and managers and revealing the results of bullying in Turkey. Understanding and quantifying the process of bullying at work in Turkey is important due to its socio-economic consequences.

3. Method

3.1 Data Collection and Analyze

The research areas are chosen in the different regions of Turkey where forest products industry is intensively active. Firstly, we ask for permission to research from random selected factories and pilot research is performed with the permission. Thereafter, required adjustments are made in questionnaire and the questionnaire is delivered to employees in the research. Researchers collect completed questionnaires from employees. A total of 2000 questionnaires are given to the employees in the randomly chosen firms. These are furniture, wooden panel and lumber firms. There are 137 firms which 112 of them are small-scale and 25 of them are large-scale ones. 1220 of the questionnaires are returned and 1152 of them are used for this research (the response rate is 57.6%). Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS version 11.0.

The reliability of the scale used in this study is determined by calculating Cronbach Alpha coefficient in SPSS statistical programme. Cronbach Alpha coefficient is calculated as 0.893 with SPSS program. This value is over the minimum requirement of standards (over 0.60).

3.2 Measurement instrument

Many different methods are used on the analyses of bullying studies in the world. The first method used in bullying based behaviours was Leymann Inventory of Psychological Terror (LIPT) scale which consists of 45 categories of acts of bullying. Other common scales for bullying are Negative Act Questions (NAQ) and Work Harassment Scale (WHS) (Einarsen and Raknes 1997; Agervold 2007).

In the present study, exposure to bullying behaviours of forest products industry employees' in their previous six months is measured by LIPT scale with 45 questions. Five different question types are used. Questions used in the study contain about blocking to show ability and communication of employees attack to their social relations, their dignity, their life quality of person and the position at work and health of employees.

A pilot scale study is carried out in 8 firms with 170 employees then problems such as cultural, linguistic and expressional differences are cleared up and the final questionnaire is created for the study. Responses are recorded on a five-point Likert-type scale, (1=/never; 2=/once or twice; 3=/two to three times per month; 4=/once a week; 5=/a few times per week).

3.3 Sample

Demographic profiles of employees are shown in Table 1. According to Table 1, age of workers is found between 19 and 61 years old and average of their ages is found 31.75. The rate of the men is 84.7 %. Married employees are 2/3 of total

ones. 34.8% of employees have less than 11 years of education, 34% of employees have between 11 to 13 years of education, 15.2% of employees have between 14 to 17 years of education, and 16% of employees have 18 years of education or more.

According to Table 1, age of workers is found between 19 and 61 years old and average of their ages is found 31.75. Married employees are 2/3 of total ones. 34.8% of employees have less than 11 years of education, 34% of employees have between 11 to 13 years of education, 15.2% of employees have between 14 to 17 years of education, and 16% of employees have 18 years of education or more. These results prove that forest products industry employees have medium level education. 91.3% of employees are working full time while 8.7% of them are working part time. The average of working time is 52 hours per week. The average of employees' working duration on the same job is 3.97 years and the employees change 2.28 different jobs in last decade.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Employees

GENDER	Frequency	Percent
Male	976	84,7
Female	176	15,3
MARITAL STATUS		
Single	360	31,2
Married	760	66,0
Divorced	32	2,8
AGE (Category)		
18-24	136	11,8
25-34	680	59,1
35-44	248	21,5
Over 45	88	7,6
EDUCATION LEVEL		
Primary school	216	18,8
Secondary school	184	16,0
High school	392	34,0
College	176	15,2
Faculty	160	13,9
Master	24	2,1
TIME IN POSITION		
3 years or less	624	54,2
4 - 9 years	424	36,8
10 - 14 years	72	6,2
15 years or more	32	2,8

4. Results and Discussions

The criteria for bullied victim according to Leymann is that one bullying behaviour at least per week during the previous six months should be recorded (Leymann 1996). In the present study, according to Leymann' criteria, 152 of 1152 employees (13.2%) are bullying victims. Mikkelsen and Einarsen (2001) describes the bullying victim that employees should be exposed at least two bullying behaviour per week during the previous six months According to this criteria, 3.9 % of employees (45) are found as bullying victims.

Results show that 19.5% of employees are witness of bullying at work. Regarding the gender, only 19 bullied victims are women due to low rate of women power in the forest products industry.

When the effect of working conditions on bullying at work is investigated, it is found that especially the employees who are working at the weekend, temporarily employed and whose working hours per week is over than 40 hours are bullied more than the others. Besides, 64% of victims are married. 45 age and older ones are in the first place in terms of being bullied with 39.5%. Only 7.6% of the employees in the research are in group of age over 45 but also the highest level of being bullied in this group. These results are similar to Leymann and Gustaffson's study (Leymann and Gustaffson 1996). The proportion is 29.6% in the group of age 35-44 and 24.4% in the group of age 25-35. 43.4% of bullying victims graduate of secondary school with respect to education level. Furthermore, employees working 3 years or less are subjected to bullying (46%) more than the others. Employees are hired by the firms have a lot of knowledge, and it is seen as a threat by formers. They, also are afraid of losing their job.

The relation between organization structure and the quality of job on bullying at work and the importance of negative and positive organization factors are studied. Only 1.64% of employees are bullied because of positive organization factors while 45.1% of employees are bullied because of negative organization factors. 89.5% of these bullying actors are men and 10.5% are women. About the status of bullying actors in the firm; 10.6% of them are owners of the firm or shareholder, 63.2% of them are manager, 15.8% of them are working in the same position and 10.4% of them are working at different parts of the firm.

4.1 Factor Analysis

One of the important stages in the studies is to determine the most appropriate model and number of descriptive factors. An ideal model should contain accuracy, parsimony and generalizability but finding all in the same model is very rarely. Defining fewer factors can be parsimonious but not be generalized. Increasing the number of factors helps to generalize but it causes to less parsimonious. Therefore, factor analysis method is generally used for defining the most appropriate number of factors and helps to solve the problem, but once data is in hand factor structure can be assessed using latent root (eigenvalue), scree test and percentage of variance explained (Mount and Bartlett 2002).

Factor analysis in the present study is used for defining the factor structure of used bullying scale. Data are checked with Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) for if the data is suitable for factor analysis or not. The value of Barlett sphericity test checks the correlation between factors. If KMO' value is more than 0.60 and Barlett test is meaningful, it means that data are appropriate for the factor analysis (Sharma 1996; Büyüköztürk 2002).

Bartlett's test of sphericity is 2763.8; ($p < 0.001$) and the value of Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin statistics is 0.653 in our study and these results indicate that our data seem suitable for factor analysis.

The data used for bullying scale is subjected to exploratory factor analysis. Factor structure obtained by principal components analysis and varimax rotation method is showed in Table 2.

Table 2: Factor Loading of Variables After Varimax Rotation

Items	Factor Loading	Eigen value	% of Variance Explained	Mean	P
Negative Communication					
Does anyone interrupt when you are talking?	.842	7.299	22.806	4.614	.0001
When you are talking, your talk was not mind.	.724				
Were you disturbed with phone?	.603				
Do you get verbal threat?	.872				
Do you threaten with notes?	.829				
Does your relations with others been refused by sign and looking?	.877				
Is your personal relations refused by implications?	.808				
Were you subjected to sexual or verbal abuse?	.816				
Physical violence and Threats					
Have you ever been thought being acted like mental patient?	.768	5.312	16.601	4.862	.0001
Does anyone push you to get in psychological evaluation?	.893				
Have you been ordered to do work below your level of competence?	.621				
Was your home or office damaged?	.820				
Did you get physical violence treats?	.726				
Were you subjected to physical violence?	.706				
Social isolation					
Have you been ignored by people around you?	.734	4.216	13.177	4.277	.0001
Have the other employees been forbidden to talk with you?	.725				
Have you been thought that people talk behind your back?	.852				
Have you ever been thought spreading of gossips about you?	.763				
Have you been sexually harassed?	.794				

One of the most important steps for factor analysis is decided the number of factors. Kaisers' scale and scree plot method are used although there are many other methods for deciding the number of factors. According to Kaisers' scale, if eigenvalue of factors is equal to 1 or more, the factors are used in analysis (Howard and

Tinsley 1987). In this study, it is found that 5 factors have eigenvalue more than 1.00

Table 2: cont.

Items	Factor Loading	Eigen value	% of Variance Explained	Mean	P
Attacks with organizational measures					
Have you been made fun?	.797	3.794	11.857	4.610	.0001
You are deprived of work task by pretending you didn't make and it is given someone and you don't get a new one.	.827				
Was work place or job always changed?	.646				
Was it happened damages bringing financial burden to you?	.666				
Have you been forced to do harder works than your job required by physical?	.652				
Direct and indirect critique					
Is your work continuously and wrongly criticized?	.801	3.164	9.889	4.576	.0001
Do people make fun about your disablement?	.668				
Are your voice gestures and way of moving imitated to fun about you?	.844				
Were your decisions continuously questioned?	.709				

Another finding of the study is that LIPT scale consists of 45 questions for factor analysis is appropriate for forest products industry and questions can be explained with less variables because Barlett's test value is 2763.8; ($p < 0.001$) and Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin statistical value is 0.653.

According to Table 2, 28 items from the factor analysis can be categorized in five factor grouping and explained 74.33% of the total variance. Most of the factor loadings are greater than 0.70 (ranging from 0.603 to 0.893), indicating a good correlation between the items and the factor grouping. Factor value, being less than the 0.60, is not used in the research. The first factor describes the 22.806% of total explained variance.

Leymann named his scale' factors as "negative communication, humiliating behaviour, isolating behaviour, frequent changes of task to punish someone, and violence or threat of violence" and categorized them into five groups. Some researchers used Leymann's scale in their research but they created different names and groups according to their working topic and analysis results. For example, Niedl used seven groups of factors for 45 questions and named the factors as "attacking a person's integrity isolation, direct and indirect critique, sanction by certain tasks, threats, sexual encroachment, and attacking a person's private sphere" (Niedl 1995). Zapf et al. also identified seven factors as "attacks with organizational measures, social isolation, attacking private life, physical violence, attacking attitudes, verbal aggression, and rumours" (Zapf et al. 1996). The fac-

tors found in this study are Negative Communication, Physical Violence and Threats, Social Isolation, Attacks with Organizational Measures and Direct and Indirect Critique. Five factors determined in this study are similar to the factors mentioned in literature.

4.2 Reasons for Bullying Behaviours

In the present study, it is investigated the reasons of bullying at work and responses of the bullied victims are ordered according to importance in Table 3.

Table 3: Subject Of Bullying

Order of importance	Reasons of being exposed to bullying
1	I am honest, trustable and easy-going
2	I am loyal to my company
3	I am the man whose working principles and worth are strong and tough
4	I am self conscious
5	I am fair and merciful
6	I don't avoid to conflict
7	I am a person who doesn't act political
8	My job relations are positive and I am constructive
9	I am successful at workplace
10	I am independent and creative
11	I don't demand justice and I am an inactive person
12	I have superior characteristic than bullying actor
13	I have bright and impressive education background

As can be seen from Table 3, they are bullied because they are honest, trustable and easy-going people. The other important factors found are their loyalty to their job, principles and non-compromise. Bullying victims accept that they suffer from negative actions because of their superior characteristics, their education and brilliant career background than bullying actors. The proportion of bullying victims is very low.

5. Conclusions

The aim of this study is to analyze the bullying on forest products industry and determine the profile of bullied victims (sex, age, position, etc), and investigate the results of bullying on forest products industry in Turkey. The results show that 13.2% of employees are bullying victims during the previous six month and suffer from hostile behaviours at workplace and 19.2% of employees are the witnesses of bullying. Some researchers find that the rate women bullied victims are generally more than men (Hauge et al. 2007; Carnero et al. 2008; Salin 2009). In this study, most of the bullied victims are men. This is due to higher amount of male employees on forest products industry in Turkey. Another finding of the study is that employees who have long working hours and temporarily employed are bullied more than the others.

LIPT analysis used in this study shows that 28 questions with the ratio of 74.33% on forest products industry are significant. The negative communication factor is determined the most important behaviour group for defining of bullying. Common bullying behaviors are as follows; intimidating with non-verbal gesture and glance, blocking the communication with others and the relation with others, written or verbal threats and cutting the speech of individual, especially. These behaviours cause to dissatisfaction and less efficiency, quoting and psychological problems. These types of behaviours are the bullying type of superior employees to the others. Especially the superior employees attack to the others who are seen by them as a threat for the future and these bullying victims use paid or unpaid vacation for escaping the situation and in the future they can quit the job. This type of bullying victims can use drugs for relaxing psychologically and some employees need psychological therapy.

Physical violence and threats are the second important group of bullying factors. The sub factors of this group are; behaving the employees like they have mental problems, need cure as a mental patient. Attacking to home or their job and physically are the other important bullying behaviours.

Another finding of the study is that the social isolation factors such as forcing the individual out of the working environment and co workers are the other important bullying factor. Bullying victim thinks that his colleagues and the other workers in organization talk behind his back abstracts the victim from working environment and it causes that the victim is introversive and wrap himself up in a habit causing psychological problems in the future.

The working environment with full of fear, concern and perturbation causes to victim to feel out of the organization and sometimes even it is not usual but it causes industrial accidents.

Bullying factor which contains some different sub factors known as attacks with organizational measures causes the person uncomfortable and unhappy if given duties take back without reasons, so person feels ashamed then the employee feel uncomfortable and quits the job. In addition, employees do not have the chance of showing themselves. Therefore, the employees' duties are changed. It causes financial losses and finally leaves their job.

Bullied victims force to leave their job by criticizing their personal characteristic and their job. It causes the person under pressure and failure with the time. These types of bullying behaviours are in the group of Direct and Indirect Critique factors which are in the last group of result of our study.

Avoiding of harassment at workplace, educational workshops should be organized in firms with assistance of educators or academicians. As it can be seen in the studies applying in schools, children and teenagers must be educated about mobbing. Finally, it must be punished legally by the courts.

References

AGERVOLD, M (2007), "Bullying at work: A discussion of Definitions and Prevalence, Based on an Empirical Study", *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology* 48:161-172.

AQUINO, K and BYRON, K (2002), "Dominating Interpersonal Behaviour and Perceived Victimization in Groups: Evidence for a Curvilinear Relationship", *Journal of Management* 28(1):69-87.

AKYÜZ, KC AKYÜZ, İ SERİN, H CINDIK H (2006), "The Financing Preferences and Capital Structure of Micro, Small and Medium Sized Firm Owners in Forest Products Industry in Turkey" *Forest Policy and Economics* 8(3):301-311.

AYTAÇ, S BAYRAM, N BILGEL, N (2005), "A New Pressure Instrument in Business Life: Mobbing", 13th National Management and Organization Congress, 12-14 May, İstanbul, Turkey (in Turkish).

BAS E (2011), "A Capital Budgeting Problem for Preventing Workplace Mobbing by Using Analytic Hierarchy Process and Fuzzy 0-1 Bidimensional Knapsack Model", *Expert Systems with Applications* 38: 12415-12422.

BILGEL, N AYTAÇ, S BAYRAM, N (2006), "Bullying in Turkish White-Collar Workers", *Occupational Medicine* 56:226-231.

BULUTLAR, F and ÖZ, EÜ (2009), "The Effects of Ethical Climates on Bullying Behaviour in the Workplace", *Journal of Business Ethics* 86:273-295.

BÜYÜKÖZTÜRK, Ş (2002), "Data Analysis Handbook for Social Sciences", Pegem A Publishing, Ankara (in Turkish).

CARNERO, MA, MARTINEZ B, SANCHEZ-MANGAS R (2008), "Mobbing and its Determinants: The Case of Spain", *Applied Economics* iFirst:1-11.

CHERAGHI A and PISKIN M (2011), "A Comparison of Peer Bullying Among High School Students in Iran and Turkey", *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 15: 2510-2520.

COWIE H, NAYLOR P, RIVERS I, SMITH PK, PEREIRA B (2002), "Measuring Workplace Bullying", *Aggression and Violent Behaviour* 7:33-51.

ÇETİN B, YAMAN E, PEKER A (2011), "Cyber Victim and Bullying Scale: A Study of Validity and Reliability", *Computers & Education* 57(4): 2261-2271.

ÇANKAYA İ H and TAN Ç (2010), "Effect of Cyber Bullying on the Distrust Levels of Pre-service Teachers: Considering Internet Addiction as a Mediating Variable", *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 9: 1634-1640.

DAVENPORT N, SCHWART RD, ELIOT GP (2003), "Mobbing: Emotional Abuse in the American Workplace", (O. C., Önertoy, Trans.). Sistem Publishing, İstanbul (Original work published: 1999).

EINARSEN S, RAKNES BI, MATTHIESEN SB (1994), "Bullying and Harassment at Work and Their Relationships to Work Environment Quality: An Exploratory Study", *European Work and Organization Psychologist* 4(4):381-391.

EINARSEN S and RAKNES B (1997), "Harassment in the Workplace and the Victimisation of Men", *Violence and Victims* 12:247-263.

EINARSEN S (1999), "The Nature and Causes of Bullying at Work", *International Journal of Manpower* 20(1/2):16-27.

EINARSEN S, HOEL H, NOTELAERS G (2009), "Measuring Exposure to Bullying and Harassment at Work: Validity, Factor Structure and Psychometric Properties of the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised", *Work and Stress* 23(1):24-44.

ELVIRA K, PAVO F, LANA M, MARIJA M, SNJEZANA V (2003), "Mobbing", *Rad i Sigurnost/Work and Safety* 7(1):1-20.

HAUGE LJ, SKOGSTAD A, EINARSEN S (2007), "Relationships Between Stressful Work Environments and Bullying: Results of a Large Representative Study", *Work and Stress* 21(3):220-242.

HOEL H and COOPER C (2000), "Destructive Conflict and Bullying at work", Report Produced by the Manchester School of Management, University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology.

HOEL H and BEALE D (2006) , "Workplace Bullying, Psychological Perspectives and Industrial Relations: Towards a Contextualized and Interdisciplinary Approach", *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 44(2):239-262.

HUBERT AB and VELDHOVEN MV (2001), "Risk Sectors for Undesirable Behaviour and Mobbing", *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 10(4):415-424.

HOWARD EA and TINSLEY D (1987), "Uses of Factor Analysis in Counseling Psychology Research", *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 34(4):414-434.

JENNIFER D, COWIE H, ANANIADOU K (2003), "Perceptions and Experience of Workplace Bullying in Five Different Working Populations", *Aggressive Behaviour* 29:489-496.

KISA S (2008), "Turkish Nurses' Experiences of Verbal Abuse at Work", *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing* 22(4): 200-207.

KÖK SB (2006), "Harassment as a Psycho-Violence Spiralling in Business Life", 14th National Management and Organization Congress, 25-27 May, Erzurum, Turkey (in Turkish).

LEYMANN H (1990), "Mobbing and Psychological Terror at Workplace", *Violence and Victims* 5(2):119-126.

LEYMANN H (1996), The Content and Development of Mobbing at Work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 5(2):165-184.

LEYMANN H and GUSTAFFSON A (1996), "Mobbing at Work and the Development of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder", *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 5:251-275.

LEWIS D (2004), "Bullying at Work: the Impact of Shame Among University and College Lecturers", *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling* 32(3):281-299.

MAYHEW C, MCCARTHY P, CHAPPELL D, QUINLAN M, BARKER M, SHEEHAN M (2004), "Measuring the Extent of Impact from Occupational Violence and Bullying on Traumatized Workers", *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal* 16(3):117-135.

MENESINI E, SANCHEZ V, FONZI A, ORTEGA R, COSTABILE A, LO FEUDO G (2003), "Moral Emotions and Bullying: A Cross-National Comparison of Differences Between Bullies, Victims and Outsiders", *Aggressive Behaviour* 29:515-530 .

MICHAEL JH, EVANS DD, JANSEN JK, HAIGHT JM (2005), "Management Commitment to Safety as Organizational Support: Relationship with Non-safety Outcomes in Wood Manufacturing Employees", *Journal of Safety Research* 36:171-179.

MIKKELSEN EG and EINARSEN S (2001), "Bullying in Danish Work-life: Prevalence and Health Correlates", *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 10(4):393-413.

MOUNT DJ and BARTLETT ALB (2002), "Development of a Job Satisfaction Factor Model for the Lodging". *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism* 1:17-40.

MURA G, TOPCU Ç, ERDUR-BAKER Ö, DIAMANTINI D (2011), "An International Study of Cyber Bullying Perception and Diffusion Among Adolescents". *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 15: 3805-3809.

NIEDL K (1995), "Mobbing/Bullying am Arbeitsplatz. Eine Empirische Analyse Zum Phanomen Sowie Zu Personal/wirtschaftlich Relevanten Effecten von systematischen Feindseligkeiten, Munchen: Rainer Hampp Verlag.

NIEDL K (1996), "Mobbing and Well-being: Economic and Personal Development Implications", *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 5(2):239-249.

NIELSEN MB, SKOGSTAD A, MATTHIESEN SB, GLASØ L, AASLAND MS, NOTELAERS G, EINARSEN, S (2009), "Prevalence of Workplace Bullying in Norway: Comparisons Across Time and Estimation Methods", *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 18(1):81-101.

RAYNER C and HOEL H (1997), "A Summary of the Literature Relating to Workplace Bullying", *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* 7(3):181-191.

SALIN D (2009), "Organisational Responses to Workplace Harassment: An Exploratory Study", *Personnel Review*, 38(1): 26-44.

SHARMA S (1996), "Applied Multivariate Techniques", John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York.

STATE INSTITUTE OF STATISTICS (2005), "Statistical Yearbook of Turkey", Prime Ministry Republic of Turkey Turkish Statistical Institute, Printing Division, Ankara.

VARTIA M (1996), "The Sources of Bullying-psychological Work Environment and Organizational Climate", *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology* 5(2):203-214.

VEGA G and COMER D (2005), "Sticks and Stones may Break your Bones but Words Can Break Your Spirit: Bullying in the Workplace", *Journal of Business Ethics* 58:101-109.

YÜCETÜRK EE and ÖKE MK (2005), "Mobbing and Bullying: Legal Aspects Related to Workplace Bullying in Turkey", *South-East Europe Review* 2:61-70.

ZAPF D, KNORTZ 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* 5:215-237.

ZAPF D (1999), "Organisational, Work Group Related and Personal Causes of Mobbing/Bullying at Work", *International Journal of Manpower* 20:70-85.

WORLD HEALTH ORGANISATION (2003), "Occupational and Environmental Health Programme, Raising Awareness of Psychological Harassment at Work", *Protecting Workers Health Series*, 4, 12, Genève.