ISSN:1306-3111
e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy
2011, Volume: 6, Number: 4, Article Number: 3C0084

SOCIAL SCIENCES
Received: December 2010
Accepted: October 2011
Series : 3C
ISSN : 1308-7444
© 2010 www.newwsa.com

Volkan Altintaş
Yusuf Yilmaz
Fatmagül Çetinel
Center for European Integration Studies
v.altintas@uni-bonn.de
Bonn-Germany

MOBBING IN ACCOMODATION BUSINESSES: SAMPLE OF ANTALYA

ABSTRACT

Because of the fact that human capital is among the one of the most important resources, it is necessary to understand better and pay attention to human more. Missing out this mentioned situation is the underlying factor of problems encountered in businesses. In this study, the term "mobbing" derived from the relations of people behaviours that are the main concern of neo-classical approach has been tried to be explained and the effects of this concept which is translated into Turkish as physchological violence with its details have been tried to be revealed. According to the results of this study in which the employees of accommodation businesses operating in Antalya were targeted, it has been understood that employees are not exposed to mobbing and there is not any difference in terms of demographical structure.

Keywords: Mobbing, Antalya, Accomodation Businesses, Tourism, Business

KONAKLAMA İŞLETMELERİNDE MOBBİNG: ANTALYA ÖRNEĞİ

ÖZET

İnsan sermayesi, işletme varlıkları içindeki en önemli aktifler arasında yer aldığından insanın daha iyi anlaşılması ve dikkate alınması gerekmektedir. İşletmelerde yaşanan sıkıntıların temelinde de, belirtilen bu durumun gözden kaçırılması yer almaktadır. Bu çalışmada örgüt ortamında neo-klasik yaklaşımın temel öğesi olan insan davranışlarının birbirleriyle olan ilişkilerinden doğan bir terim olan "mobbing" kavramı açıklanmaya ve ayrıntılarıyla psikolojik şiddet olarak dilimize çevrilen bu olgunun etkileri ortaya konmaya çalışılmıştır. Antalya'da faaliyet gösteren konaklama işletmelerinin çalışanlarının hedef alındığı bu çalışmanın sonuçlarına göre çalışanların mobbinge maruz kalmadıkları ve demografik açıdan da bir fark olmadığı anlaşılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Mobbing, Antalya, Konaklama İşletmeleri, Turizm, İşletme

1. INTRODUCTION (GİRİŞ)

"Mobbing" which is the verb form of the word meaning crowd overoriented towards violence that comes from the word root "mob" in English and is derived from the words "mobile vulgus" meaning "indecisive crowd" in Latin is expressed as building up an opposite block against someone, attacking emotionally, "physhological terror", "physhological violence (Yücetürk,2005). Concept of mobbing was used by an Australian scientist Konrad Lopez to describe the situation of harassment among animals in 1960s (As in the example of a foreign rooster which broke into the flock of hens and attacked fatally by the roosters of the hencoop). A Swedish scientist Dr. Peter Paul Heinemann used the same concept for the first time in 1970s for the violence and bullying events between primary and high school students.

Mobbing is a malevolent activity which aims to cast out someone from the workplace by the way of unfair accusations, insults, general harassments, emotional tortures and/or using terror. People who do research about mobbing use this concept to mean "physcho-terror", "physcho-violence" and every physchological attack towards "intimidation" of the employee in the workplace. Ganging up on a person by one of the managers, someone from his organization, one of his superiors, someone who is in an equal position with him or inferiors by organizing the others systematically, frequently and for a long time for bullying behaviours is also considered as mobbing. Therefore, "mobbing" which is well accepted with this name internationally can be described as violence used by a group. Industrial physcho-scientist and psychiatrist Dr. Heinz Leymann who discovered mobbing during his studies in Sweden and is known for these studies presented mobbing to public's attention in Germany for the first time with its all details and revealed the importance of this issue (Arpacıoğlu, 2003: 44). Mobbing researches started in Sweden continued with Norway (Einersen, 2000; Einersen and Skogstad, 1996), Finland (Björkqvist, Österman and Hjelt-Baeck, 1994; Vartia, 1996) (Zapf and Gross, 2001:522). While mobbing is expressed as collective harassment of an individual by a group in southern Europe, this concept is mainly called bullying in England and we encounter with this term as pressures in work environment in America (Wornham, 2003: 29). Mobbing being exposed to in an organization is the unethical and hostile behaviours carried out against the helpless and defenceless individual (Leymann and Gustafsson, 1996: 252). The concept of mobbing was put forward by organizational scientist in the period when the word "bullying" was used (Adams, 1992: 55). Adams (1992) uses the term bullying to mean "constant criticism" and "humiliating the individual". Later on "In American oriented studies", (Arpacıoğlu, 2003: 44) other terms has been started to be used for the organizational attacks in educational units, military units or workplaces. While the term **bullying** is used for the organizational violence incidents at schools, naming the incidents at workplaces as **mobbing** has been considered more appropriate.

Leymann (1990) sets the concept of bullying apart from mobbing because of the fact that it is mainly considered as violence at schools. According to him these overall activities emerging among children and teenagers at schools are called extortion or bullying. The study which leads the studies of Leymann in this field was a book called "The Harassed Worker" whose first edition was published in 1976 by Brodsky. According to this book the words long working hours, work accidents, being monotonous, physchological fatigue in work life and burnout were used as homoionyms of mobbing and was mainly focused on stress management, however the existence of the reasons of this condition was not analyzed (Brodsky, 1976). According to Leymann

(1990) mobbing explains the constant conflict condition in a workplace by the way of harassing the workers by individuals.

To accept the acts done as mobbing, they should be done for at least six months in a year and at least once in a week (Zapf et al., 1996: 217). If mobbing is taken into consideration in these perspectives, it expresses the physchological pressure put on a worker in the workplace with more conscious behaviours (Vandekerckhove and Commers, 2003: 41). Unlike "bullying" while mobbing is only emotional and physchological violence, its results can be both physchological and physical. According to another description, mobbing means emotional damage or harassment that the coworkers of a worker do typically out of the work environment (Davenport and et.al, 1999). According to Davenport and his friends in mobbing group stands out more than the individual and policy of suppression, intimidation and controlling is pursued against the target worker with the pressure created by the group. Tim Field (1996) defines the concept of mobbing as a constant and merciless attack against the self-confidence and self-esteem of mobbing victims. Mobbing can be seen as "effort to kill the personality of the victim" with this definition. Underlying reason of this behaviour is the desire of getting superiority, subjugating and quenching. In Field's (1996) mobbing definition there is harasser's denial of the results of their behaviours. According to another definition mobbing is the behaviours that aim to keep out a specific person from the group in equal or unequal power structures with constant, regular and systematic behaviours (Groeblinghoff and Becker, 1996: 278). According to Esser and Wolmerath, mobbing is the conflict among the coworkers or between a superior manager and personnel in a workplace. In this conflict susceptible person is weaker than the other one and he is attacked by one or several people in a systematic way periodically and for a long time. The aim of the attack is to expel the victim from his job (Eser and Wolmerath, 1997).

2. RESEARCH SIGNIFICANCE (ÇALIŞMANIN ÖNEMİ)

The significance of the research is mainly to determine the level of exposition to behaviours containing mobbing (physchological violence) of the personnel except for the managers working in accommodation businesses and administratives.Determining whether there is a relation between them by comparing the demographic factors of the personnel participating in the research with the expressions containing these behaviours composes of the other aim of this research.

3. SUBJECT (KONU)

3.1. Studies Carried Out About Mobbing (Mobbing Hakkında Yapılan Çalışmalar)

Most of the studies in literature are about the effects of mobbing on individuals. In a study in Norway (Brodsky, 1976), according to the results of the survey applied to 2095 people % 21,6 of the participiants said that they believe mobbing affects the happiness of people. In an investigation carried out in Finland (Vartia, 1996), physchological traumas and depressions emerge in important extents in people who have been exposed to physchological pressure. In another research in Finland (Einersen, 2000) it has been stated that %46 of people who have been exposed to physchological pressure consider leaving their jobs. In the same study, it has been determined that %10 of the workers who have been claimed to mobbing seriously in the work places have tried to commit suicide (Niedl, 1996: 240). Leymann thinks that %10-15 of the suicides in Sweden is committed because of these hostile thoughts (Leymann, 1990:122).

According to another study, it has been stated that %98,7 of the workers are sceptic, demotivated, anxious and they lack trust and these people are in an isolation and submission condition (Gates, 2004: 31). Also in respect of another research carried out in America, one out of every six workers is a victim of mobbing in the workplace (Namie, 2000). This rate is around %11 in Europe (Paoli and Merllie, 2001). It has been discovered that male workers are exposed to mobbing by generally male workers; female workers are exposed to mobbing by both sexes but mostly by females (Rayner and Cooper, 1997: 212). According to another study, it has been found out that out of 137 mobbing victims, 76 of them are exposed to physchological pressure by managers, 44 of them by their co-workers and 17 of them by their inferiors (Björkvist, Österman and Hjeltback, 1994: 176). In an investigation carried out with 278 victims, victims stated that envy is the most important reason of the harassment activities done against them an also they expressed that their dealing mechanisms have not developed enough so this contributes to their process of becoming victims (Einarsen, 1999: 22). In another study in Sweden %25 of the workers aged 55 and above stated that they had to leave their jobs early because of being exposed to mobbing (Leymann, 1996: 175). Physchological and socio-cultural effects of mobbing on people have been tried to be explained with the studies carried out to explain the reason and results of mobbing.

Mobbing is considered as a dangerous type of social stress in German physchological researches. The concept of stress is dealt mostly with its biological effects in Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian based researches. It is very diffucult to compare the studies towards stress in this contradiction in terms. Therefore, some scienticts including Leymann are in argument about whether stress is the cause or result of mobbing. Leymann stated that stress is a reaction and mobbing can emerge as a result of the reactions that cause stress in mobbing (Leymann, 1996: 169).

It has been observed that mobbing is the dimension where the conflict happens at a top level in the studies in Sweden since 1982 (Leymann, 1996: 169). Mobbing spreads in a specific time when the conflict emerges and sometimes it can happen instantly but sometimes it shows itself after weeks even months. However, the people who have studied on the conflict have not focused on health problems that conflict causes on the individuals. Thus, experiences put forward to eliminate the conflict have not generated solution (Einarsen,2000: 380).

3.2. Mobbing Process and Its Basic Dimensions (Mobbing Süreci ve Temel Boyutları)

It is necessary to analyze the structure of mobbing process while revealing the reasons of displaying hostile behaviours in an organization. Every behaviour seen in mobbing does not necessarily contain a negative meaning. However if these behaviours are carried out frequently in the organization, physchological violence or harassment period lasts for a long time and meaning and content of the behaviours has changed dramatically, then this process is dangerous. Mobbing is clearly seen in groups which especially have hierarchical structures and organizations where the control is weak. Problems of leadership or the problems that exist in the organization are not problems that harass the worker. Such kinds of behaviours always exist in the nature of mankind. People always react when they encounter with these mentioned problems. On the other hand when we look at statistical studies, the term “organization” can be one of the causes of mobbing. In short we can face mobbing depending on the frequency of

conflicts that can not be solved and become more violent. If the number of conflicts increases and the number of conflicts that can not be solved increases in the same line under various organizational conditions, this situation will cause an increase in the number of mobbing incidents, too (Eckardt, 2006).

The factors that affect the victim most during mobbing process are the frequency, repetition and duration of mobbing. The threshould of tolerance for physchological violence is different for everyone. While a situation can be tolerable for some people, it can cause dramatic damages for others and wound them physchologically. As physchological violence increases, not only the person who become distressed and introverted but also his family can be affected by this condition. Generally mobbing acts are carried out in an intriguing and secret way (Esser and Wolmerath, 1997).

Mobbing continues as a process which contains different stages. As mobbing emerges, different physchological factors interact and affect the target person's (victim) health negatively (Leymann, 1993). In *early* stage, conflict atmosphere can still be recognized and conflicts and arguments can be felt by all of the workers. Typically two groups in conflict and presence of another group that approaches the events are in question.

In *middle stage,* the ones who experience the process can not feel a conflict atmosphere and mainly *we* and *he* concepts emerge. Main reason of the conflict disappears and recedes into background. Denial is not only against specific behaviours, it emerges as an attitude mainly against the entire group. While all of the attention is on the person who does not obey to the group or behave inappropriately until that time, with the emergence of this condition there is not any abstainer in the group. There is a polarization and decisions are taken by the pressure of the group.

In the last stage, borders of groups and departments are determined, formal precautions are started to be applied. These precautions can be warnings or changing department. Also out of the group people make comments about the one who causes problems and people resort to sharing the condition with the others out of the organization through gossiping. Substantial behaviours related to mobbing in workplaces can be in the forms as it follows below (Solmuş, 2005: 7):

- Accusing the worker of not throwing enough effort,
- Humiliating the worker depending on his age on account of the fact that he is not experienced,
- Preveting him from taking advantage of the opportunity offered by the organization,
- Overloading the worker,
- Wanting to finish the works on impossible dates,
- Giving the worker such tasks that are not suitable for his job description and when done there will not be any organizational profit/contribution or giving the tasks that will most probably make the worker fail or offering him a working atmosphere which can lead him to failure,
- Constantly reminding the worker his mistakes,
- Not allowing the worker to express his ideas about the issues related to the work,
- Insulting/humiliating in front of his coworkers or customers,
- Accusing him seriously about his performance level,
- Intimidating the worker about expelling him from his job,
- Not answering the wroker's phone calls and e-mails,

- Not informing the worker about the meetings that he should also attend,
- Creating a physical working atmosphere for the worker that will isolate him from having communication with his coworkers,
- Spreading rumours and gossiping about the worker,
- Giving the worker simple or less works,
- Applying physical violence against the worker or intimidating him with such a threat,
- Using "implicit expressions" about the mental health of the worker,

Leymann determined fourty five different mobbing behaviours based on mobbing description and grouped these behaviours applied against mobbing victims under five subgrups (Leymann, 1999: 170):

- Restricting the victims' communication opportunities (Administration do not enable communication, victim keeps silent, there are verbal threats and constant criticisms).
- Attacking the victim's social relations (His coworkers around him do not talk with the victim, he is kept isolated from the other in a room, and his access to others is prevented).
- Attacking the victim's personal esteem/honour (Gossip mechanism works, he is humiliated by the others, he is mocked because of his ethnic origin, his way of talking or religious structure)
- Attacking the victim's professional status (Any special task is notgiven to him, he is asked to do meaningless tasks).
- Attacking the victim's health (He is exposed to sexual harassment, he is given tasks that will risk his health).

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS (BULGULAR VE TARTIŞMALAR)

4.1. Method (Yöntem)

Survey techniques have been used to collect research data. In this context based on a literature search about this issue (Çalışkan, 2005). 400 survey forms were delivered to five-star hotel businesses in the city centre of Antalya in order to be applied to the personnel except for the managers.During the investigation time period in Antalya, only seven hotels were opened in the city center.From this hotels only four of them accepted to conduct this research in their's hotels.The hotels are recruiting very small number of employees in their hotels during the winter term. In Antalya sample, the average of the employees in the city center hotels is around 200 people. In this research, 100 questionnaires are distributed by each hotel. Some of the hotels stated that they do not give permission for their personnel to participate in surveys as a principle. 178 of the surveys that could be used returned. Under these conditions recyle ratio has been 45%.

4.2. Nature and Sample (Evren ve Örneklem)

Five-star accommodation businesses operating in the city centre of Antalya forms the nature of the study. The reason of choosing the hotels in the city centre of Antalya is that most of them are old hotels, they are also open all the year and Antalya is placed on the top of resort hotel management. It is foreseen that the main staff team have already employed in this businesses. The hotels which are open all year create long term work possibility for the employees. Therefore, it will be possible to make a generalization with the sample chosen from this city. The reason of choosing five-star hotels is that these business have a more formal organizational structure compared to small and medium-sized businesses (1,2,3 and 4-star

hotels) and it is relatively easier and safer to collect data from big businesses. Four of seven five-star hotels in the city centre accepted to participate in the survey.

Survey form composes of two parts. There are questions about demographical features of participiants in the first part. There are 53 likert scaled questions expressing behaviours containing "mobbing" (Physchological Violence).

4.3. Data Collecting Device (Veri Toplama Aracı)

Survey form composes of two parts. There are 53 likert scaled questions expressing behaviours containing "mobbing" (Physchological Violence)in the first part. In the first part of the questionnaire, 53 items are used whether the mobbing effects the person's decisions. This scale is tested and developed by Çaliskan(2005). People answered these questions from 1 to 7 with Likert scaling. There are questions about the demographical features of participiants in the second part of the survey. In this part, age, sex, educational level, working department, working hours, total experience in the sector and the title of their job are asked. In this section, it also asked that whether there is any mobbing incident minimum in a week one time for the last 3-4 weeks. These questions were asked in the form of yes or no. Job satisfaction questions were also asked in this part of the study. Likert scale were also used from 1 to 7 degree.

4.4. Data Analysis (Veri Analizi)

All answers in survey forms sent back by businesses were turned into numerical system, loaded into the statistics programme "SPSS" and their statistical evaluation was done.

As a result of Cronbach Alfa analysis applied to likert scaled questions, they have been found out to be trustable at a rate of 97.73 %. This rate signifies a rather high rate of reliability.

4.5. Demographical Factors (Demografik Faktörler)

Findings that reflect the demographical features of the participiants of the study are summarized in Table 1. According to this, 58.1% of the participants are male, 41.9% of them are female. This situation is not surprising when the great difference between male and female workforce is taken into consideration and it is seen that the difference between two groups is not so great. According to January 2007 datum; while the male workforce in accommodation and entertainment field is 262.480, female workforce is 56.808 (T.C. Çalışma ve Sosyal Güvenlik Bakanlığı, 2007:153). According to 2008 datum, rate of participation in workforce across Turkey of males has been 70,1%, of females has been 24,5% (Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu, 2009).

It is seen that 75,7% of the participants are below the age of 30, 20.1% are 30-39, total amount of the workers above **age of** 40 and 50 as a rate of 4.2%. This shows that most of the participants are young. The personnel aged 30-39 takes the second place. 50.3% of the participants are single and 49.7% of them are married.

When the departments where the participants work are examined, it is seen that most of the participants are **food and beverage** staff with a rate of 22.6%. Front office staff ranks number two with a rate of 20.8%. It has been determined that with a rate of 9.5% housekeeping staff is the fewest of the participants. As it can be seen in Table 1, 36.3% of the participiants composes of the workers in animation, information processing, customer relations, security, health, quality, marketing, personnel, driver, technical service departments.

When the educational backgrounds of the participiants are examined, it is seen that most of them are graduates of high schools with a rate of 56.3% and the ones who have studied in college, university or who have postgraduate degrees rank number two with a rate of 30.5%. It has been determined that 51.8% of the workers' working time who have answered the survey are 1-3 years.

It has been discovered that 58.2% of the participants work for 8 to 12 hours in a day. This proves the length of the working hours in tourism sector. Moreover, the rate of the ones working more than 13 hours is 15.5% and it can be said that this rate can not be under estimated.

It is seen that monthly average income of 54.4% of the participants is between 600-849 TL, 22.8% of them has an income between 350-599 TL. This shows that as it is stated above in the tourism sector which has long working hours and hard conditions, incomes are very low inspite of these difficulties. Only 7% of the participants stated that they have income which is 1000TL and above and this rate is very low.

Table 1. Demographical factors
(Tablo 1. Demografik faktörler)

Demographical factors	Frequency	%
SEX		
Male	100	58.1
Female	72	41.9
Missing: 6		
AGE		
Below 30	128	75.7
30-39	34	20.1
40-49	6	3.6
50 and above 50	1	0.6
Missing: 9		
MARITAL STATUS		
Married	80	49.7
Single	81	50.3
Missing: 17		
DEPARTMENT		
Front Office	35	20.8
Housekeeping	16	9.5
Food and Beverage	38	22.6
Accounting	18	10.7
Other (Animation, information processing, customer relations, security, health, quality, marketing, personnel, driver, technical service etc.)	61	36.3
Missing: 10		
EDUCATION		
Primary and Secondary	22	13.2
High School	94	56.3
College-University-Postgraduate	51	30.5
Missing: 11		
TERM OF EMPLOYMENT IN THE BUSINESS (Year)		
Less than 1 year	39	23.8
1-3 years	85	51.8
More than 3 years	40	24.4
Missing: 14		
DAILY AVERAGE WORKING TIME		
Less than 8 hours	30	15.5
8-12 hours	113	58.2
More than 13 hours	30	15.5
Missing: 39		
MONTHLY AVREAGE INCOME		
350-599 TL	36	22.8
600-849 TL	86	54.4
850-999 TL	25	15.8
1000 TL and above	11	7.0
Missing: 20		

4.6. Frequency Analysis Related to the Behaviours Containing Mobbing (Physchological Violence) (Mobbing (Psikolojik Şiddet) İçeren Davranışlara İlişkin Frekans Analizi)

When the participation levels of the personnel in expressions about behaviors containing mobbing are examined, almost all of the participants did not agree with these expressions. It can be said that according to these results participants of the research have not been exposed to behaviours containing mobbing. However, when the answers for the question to test this question and determine the condition of the participants being exposed to mobbing, for example, 43.8% of the participants gave "yes" answer to the question "Have you been exposed to one or several of the behaviours (53 items) above at least once a week over the last 3-4 months?" This contradicts with the answer of the participants to the question in which the participation levels of the personnel in expressions about behaviors containing mobbing is judged.

Moreover, 42.5% of the participants gave positive answers to the question "Do you think to work in a business that can offer the same opportunities which you have in the business now you are working for?". This shows the loyalty of the personnel participated in the research to their businesses. That 40.6% of the participants agree with the expressions like "When all things considered, I can say I like my job." and "I'm pleased with my job." shows they love their jobs.

4.7. Factor Analysis about the Behaviours Containing Mobbing (Mobbing İçeren Davranışlara İlişkin Faktör Analizi)

In the likert question to evaluate the perceptions of the personnel working in accommodation businesses except for the managers related to "behaviours containing mobbing", the results about the values found at the end of the factor analysis applied to 53 items are shown in Table 2. However, expressions such as "Your coworkers are mocking at your religious views", "Your efforts are judged wrongly and in a humiliating way by your coworkers", "Your decisions are constantly questioned by the administration", "Your coworkers harass you sexually or they propse you sexual offers", and "You are forced to do heavy jobs by your superior" are omitted because of the fact that they form a second component and spoil the unity in the structure by imposing negative burden. For the rest 48 items as a result of principal component analysis, 8 factors have been determined and their factor loads are given in Table 2. As a consequence of the reliability analysis carried out for these 8 factors, Cronbach's Alpha values are calculated as (0.95) for factor 1, (0.97) for factor 2, (0.95) for factor 3, for (0.91) for factor 4, (0.91) for factor 5, (0.90) for factor 6, (0.79) for factor 7 ve (0.87) for factor 8, respectively. These values show that the scale is a reliable one.

Table 2. Factor analysis results of mobbing
(Tablo 2. Mobbing sonuçlarının faktör analizi)

Subscales	Eigen values	Reliability Coefficient	Variance Explained	Factor Loading
Violence Behaviours	27.240	,95	51.397	
In your work place you are exposed to groping by your superiors				,796
In your work place you are exposed to groping by your coworkers				,774
Your coworkers use slight violence to intimidate you				,717
Physical violence intimidations are made by your coworkers				,708
Physical violence intimidations are made by your superiors				,663
Slight violence is used by your superiors to intimidate you				,656
Attacks against a Person's Esteem	4.077	,97	7.693	
One of your defects are mocked by your coworkers				,669
One of your defects are mocked by your superiors				,661
You are accused of being physchologically problematic by your superiors				,657
Your superiors treat you as if you are insane				,608
Your coworkers treat you as if you are insane				,603
You are accused of being physchologically problematic by yourcoworkers				,576
Your superior is mocking at your religious views				,571
Your superior is mocking at your dressing and hair style				,551
Attacks against a Person's Professional Status	3.091	,95	5.833	
You are given tasks that requires less talent than you actually have by the administration				,728
You are given tasks that affect your esteem by the administration				,696
You are given meaningless tasks by the administration				,693
Because the administration draws back the tasks previously given to you, you don't know what to do				,659
Your work is constantly changed by the administration				,648
According to administration, there is not any special task for you				,634
Your work is judged by the administration in a wrong and insulting way				,631
Tasks which can make you physchologically ill by the administration				,623
Your superior causes general deficits which will bring you financial burden				,548
Your hours or workplace are damaged by your administration				,517
Your hous or workplace are damaged by your coworkers				,506

Discriminative Behaviours	2.014	,91	3.799	
Your superior is mocking at your ethnical origin and hometown				,794
Your coworkers are mocking at your ethnical origin and hometown				,683
Your superior calls you with humiliating names				,640
Your superior is harassing you sexually or proposing you sexual offer				,595
Behaviors that prevent one from showing his abilities	1.626	,91	3.067	
Your superior restricts your opportunities of showing yourself				,724
You are made fool of yourself infront of the others by your superior				,719
You are shouted at by your superior				,688
Your superior is always interfering your speech				,673
You are forced to do tasks that will abuse your self-esteem by the administration				,577
You are ignored by your superior in your workplace				,564
Your work is constantly criticized by your coworkers				,502
Attacks against Social Relations	1.488	,90	2.807	
Administration forbids your coworkers to talk with you				,731
Your coworkers do not talk with you out of working time				,683
You are prevented from talking with others by the administration				,672
Your coworkers behave as if you are not there				,659
Administration gives you an isolated place from your coworkers				,593
You are disturbed by your coworkers by phone				,548
You get written threats from your coworkers				,508
Other Behaviors Causing Mobbing Effect	1.441	,79	2.718	
Your private life is constantly criticized by your coworkers				,805
You are given tasks irrelevant to your field of working by the administration				,627
Your coworkers intimadet you verbally				,524
Behaviours Preventing Communication	1.274	,87	2.404	
You are prevented from getting in contact by your cowerkers through implied words				,707
You are prevented from getting in contact by your coworkers through gestures and mimics				,598

Results show that there are common views about mobbing behaviours among the personnel. These views are grouped as *Violence Behaviors* with the variation of 51.397%, Attacks against A Person's Esteem with the variation of 7.693%, *Attacks against A Person's Professional Status* with the variation of 5.833%, *Discriminative Behaviours* with the variation of 3.799%, *Behaviors that Prevent One from Showing His Abilities* with the variation of 3.067%, *Attacks against Social Relations* with the variation of 2.807%, *Other Behaviours Causing Mobbing Effect* with the variation of 2.718% and *Behaviours Preventing Communication* with the variation of 2.404 %.Because of the fact that 7th Factor is a factor that is not as strong as to take place among the other factors but a factor which is the composition of the other effects that can not be considered as a factor on their own, it is called "*Other Behaviours Causing Mobbing Effect*". Since the sample efficiency value was 0.898 at the end of Keyser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test, this value has been considered as an appropriate value for factor analysis. Correlation efficiency has risen to 14120.042 at the end of Bartlett's Sphericity test. First 8 factors in which 79.7 %of total variation are explained have been observed as factors that could be meaningful for this study.

4.8. Comparing the Participation Levels of the Personnel in Expressions about Behaviors Containing Mobbing According to Demographical Factors (Demografik Faktörlere Göre Personelin Mobbing İçeren Davranışlara Ait İfadelere Katılma Derecelerinin Karşılaştırılması

T-test and ANOVA test was applied to determine whether participation levels in expressions related to behaviours containing mobbing change according to sex, education, marital status and age by finding out factor scores. According to this, 8 fcators were tested respectively in terms of 0.05% significance level.

Table 3. T test results and group statistics to determine the relation between the gender of the personnel and their participation levels in expressions about behaviours containing Mobbing
(Tablo 3. Personelin cinsiyeti ile Mobbing içeren davranışlara ait ifadelere katılma dereceleri arasındaki ilişkiyi belirlemeye yönelik grup istatistiği ve T testi sonuçları)

Gender		N	Mean	Sig. (2-tailed)
Factor 1: Violence Behaviours	male	99	-.0253383	.693
	female	71	.0359775	
Factor 2: Attacks against A Person's Esteem	male	99	-.1016003	.142
	female	71	.1168121	
Factor 3: Attacks against A Person's Professional Status	male	99	.0810955	.185
	female	71	-.1201497	
Factor 4: Discriminative Behaviours	male	99	-.0731404	.253
	female	71	.1062831	
Factor 5: Behaviors that prevent one from showing his abilities	male	99	.0648856	.242
	female	71	-.1175850	
Factor 6: Attacks against Social Relations	male	99	-.2622068	.000
	female	71	.3089661	
Factor 7: Other Behaviors Causing Mobbing Effect	male	99	-.1613331	.063
	female	71	.1209283	
Factor 8: Behaviours Preventing Communication	male	99	.0356407	.377
	female	71	-.1017542	

$p<0.05$

According to Table 3, when the findings of t-test to determine whether there is a difference between males and females about the participation levels in participation levels in expressions about behaviours containing mobbing are examined, it seen that there is difference ($p<0.05$) between two groups in the factor *Attacks against Social Relations* ($p=0.000$), except from this factor there is not any difference between female and male personnel in other factors, that is it is seen that participation levels in the expressions about the behaviours containing mobbing are similar.

Table 4. ANOVA Test to determine the relationship between their participation levels in expressions about behaviours containing mobbing and ages of the personnel, their educational backgrounds and marital status
(Tablo 4. Personelin yaşları, eğitim durumları ve medeni durumları ile Mobbing içeren davranışlara ait ifadelere katılma dereceleri arasındaki ilişkiyi belirlemeye yönelik ANOVA testi

	Age		Education Level		Marital Status	
	F	Sig.	F	Sig.	F	Sig.
Factor 1: Violence Behaviours	,686	,562	,104	,958	1,261	,286
Factor 2: Attacks against a Person's Esteem	,630	,596	5,091	,002	2,033	,134
Factor 3: Attacks against a Person's Professional Status	2,004	,116	8,084	,000	1,246	,290
Factor 4: Discriminative Behaviours	,667	,573	9,082	,000	,391	,677
Factor 5: Behaviors that prevent one from showing his abilities	4,010	,009	3,185	,025	,272	,762
Factor 6: Attacks against Social Relations	2,064	,107	8,976	,000	,184	,832
Factor 7: Other Behaviors Causing Mobbing Effect	,645	,587	2,640	,051	1,433	,242
Factor 8: Behaviours Preventing Communication	3,853	,011	1,209	,308	1,582	,209

$p<\alpha = 0,05$

According to Table 4, findings of ANOVA tests carried out to determine the relationship between their participation levels in expressions about behaviours containing mobbing and age of the personnel, their educational backgrounds and marital status have been examined. It is seen that as a result of the study there are not any similarities between groups in the factors *Behaviors that prevent one from showing his abilities*(p= 0.009)*Behaviours Preventing Communication* (p= 0.011) according to age and in the factors *Attacks against A Person's Esteem* (p= 0.002), *Attacks against A Person's Professional Status* (p= 0.000), *Discriminative Behaviours* (p= 0.000), *Behaviors that prevent one from showing his abilities* (0.025), *Attacks against Social Relations* (p= 0.000) and *Other Behaviors Causing Mobbing Effect* (0.051) according to their educational backgrounds and it is meaningful ($p< 0.05$) at a level of 0,05 statistically. There is not any difference between the groups for the other factors except for these that is, it seen that participation levels in the expressions about the behaviours containing mobbing are similar. There are not any differences between the groups for all the factors according to their marital status that is their business administration goals are similar.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS (SONUÇ VE ÖNERİLER)

Mobbing is factor that affects workers' productivity in their work lives, their loyalty to their jobs and workplaces and their job

satisfaction negatively. Mobbing deteriorates the physchological health of the workers and even causes such destructions as leaving from their jobs. As a result of these releases, some risks may arise, for instance new workers may not get accustomed to the job and workplace, his adaptation and performance may not be in the desired expectations. Moreover, that the worker or the administrative(s) continue to work in the same workplace does not solve the problem, this makes the problem to get worse and even causes more problems. Because of the fact that generally most workers abstain from sharing the mobbing incidents they have been exposed to with their administrators or coworkers, mobbing incidents in businesses may not be detected and solved easily.In this study, according to the survey results it is understood that workers employed in the accommodation businesses operating in Antalya are not exposed to mobbing. Whether this result reflects the truth and why they expressed there is not mobbing is another issue that should be discussed. It can be said that when we want them to reflect the current situation in the survey, the underlying reason why there were some important differences in the answers before they filled the survey may have been their anxities of losing their jobs and they may think the answers may affect their relations with their superiors and eventually these answers will be shared with the hotel managers. On the other hand, if the given answers are accepted to be realistic, it is possible to say that the relations of superiors and inferiors have reached certain maturity especially for the workers employed in accommodation sector in the region of Antalya and the management is carried out with a professional point of view. However a generalization should not be done for the workers of accommodation businesses in the region of Antalya for these two situations. In addition to this study which has been carried out in order to examine the relation of tourism workers in Antalya region, it is possible to say that dealing with seasonal tourism motion, all inclusive system, personal and social rights of the workers and their economic and socio-cultural positions in the same line and making hypothesis is more important.

REFERENCES (KAYNAKLAR)

1. Adams, A., (1992). Bullying at Work How to Confront and Overcome It. Virago Press, London.
2. Arpacıoğlu, G., (2003). İşyerinde Stresin Gizli Kaynağı: Zorbalık ve Duygusal Taciz. Human Resources (HR) İnsan Kaynakları ve Yönetim Dergisi, 8(1), pp:44-46.
3. Brodsky, C.M., (1976). The Harassed Worker. Lexington Books. Lexington.
4. Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., and Hjelt-Baeck, M., (1994). Aggression among University Employees, Aggresive Behavior, 20, pp:173-184.
5. Davenport, N., Schwartz, R.D., and Elliott, G.P., (1999). Mobbing: Emotional Abuse in the American Workplace. Civil Society Publishing
6. Eckardt, J., (2006). Mobbing bei Kindern. Erkennen, Helfen, Vorbeugen. Urania Verlag Stuttgart.
7. Eckardt, S. and Skogstad, A., (1996). Prevalence and Risk Groups of Bullying and Harassement at Work, European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5(2),pp:185-202.
8. Einarsen, S., (1999). The Nature and Causes of Bullying at Work. International Journal of Manpower, 20 (1/2),pp: 16-27.
9. Einarsen, S., (2000). Harassment and Bullying at Work: A review of the Scandinavian Approach. Aggression and Violent Behaviour: A Review Journal,4,pp: 371-401.

10. Esser, A. and Wolmerath, M., (1997). Mobbing. Der Ratgeber für Betroffene und ihre Interessenvertretung. Bund-Verlag GmbH, Köln.
11. Field, T., (1996), Bully in Sight. Success Unlimited Pres, USA.
12. Gates, G., (2004). Bullying and mobbing (2). Labor Management.
13. Leymann, H., (1990). Mobbing and Psyhological Terror at Workplaces. Violence and Victims, (5),pp: 119-126.
14. Leymann, H., (1993). Mobbing-Psychoterror am Arbeitsplatz und wie man sich dagegen wehren kann, Rowohlt, Reinbeck.
15. Leymann, H., (1995). Einführung: Mobbing. Das Konzept und seine Resonanz in Deutschland. Rowohlt, Reinbeck.
16. Leymann, H., (1996). The content and Development of Mobbing at Work. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5(2),pp:165-184.
17. Leymann, H. and Gustafsson A., (1996). Mobbing at Work and the Development of Post-traumatic Stres Disorders, European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5(2),pp: 251-275.
18. Namie, G., (2000). U.S Hostile Workplace Survey 2000. Labor Day Meeting, Benicie.
19. Niedl, K., (1996). Mobbing and Well-being: Economic and Prsonnel Development Implications. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5(2),pp: 239-249.
20. Paoli, P. and Merllie, D., (2001). Third European Survey on Working Conditions 2000 (Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Luxembourg.
21. Rayner, C. ve Cooper, C., (1997). Workplace Bullying: Myth or Reality-Can We afford to ignore it? Leadership and Organizational Development Journal,18(4),pp: 211-214.
22. Solmuş, T., (2005). İş Yaşamında Travmalar: Cinsel Taciz ve Duygusal Zorbalık/Taciz (Mobbing). İş-Güç Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi, 7(2),pp:1-14.
23. Vandekerckhove, W. and Commers, S.M., (2003). Downward Workplace Mobbing: A Sign of the Times?, Journal of Business Ethics,45,pp: 41-50.
24. Vartia, M., (1996). The Sources of Bullying-Psychological Work Enviroment and Organizational Climate. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5(2),pp: 203-214.
25. Wornham, D., (2003). A Descriptive Investigation of Morality and Victimisation at Work. Journal of Business Ethics, 45,pp: 29-40.
26. Yücetürk, E., (2005). Türkiye'de İş Yaşam Kalitesini ve Verimliliği Azaltan Gizli Bir Sendrom: Yıldırma (Mobbing). İktisat İşletme ve Finans Dergisi, 20(231), pp:97-108.
27. Zapf, D., Knorz, C., and Kulla M., (1996). On the Relationship between Mobbing Factors, and Job Content, Social Work Enviroment, and Health Outcomes. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5 (2),pp:215-237.
28. Zapf, D. and Gross, C., (2001). Conflict Escalation and Coping With Workplace Bullying: A Replication and Extension. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10(4),pp: 497-522.