



ASPECT OF MOBBING BEHAVIORS INCURRED ON THE STAFF WORKING AT THE DIRECTORATES OF YOUTH CENTERS

Serkan Hacıcaferoğlu¹

¹Recep Tayyip Erdoğan University Faculty of Education Physical Education and Sports, Rize, Turkey

ABSTRACT

This study was carried out having the purpose of determining the aspect of the mobbing behaviors incurred on the staff working at the youth center directorates of the in Turkey Youth Services and Sports, the Province Directorates. The sample of the study, which was conducted by using a scanning model, was consisted of 253 employees working at the directorate of the youth centers in different regions, who were selected by a random method. The study data were collected by the "Negative Behaviors Questionnaire (NAQ)". Arithmetic mean, crosstab, t-test, one-way analysis of variance and Tukey's test were used in the survey. As the result of the survey, it was found out that 44.7% of the staff in the sample was exposed to mobbing behaviors at a lower medium level during the past six months. Additionally, it was also identified that the contractual civil servants of the staff were exposed to mobbing behaviors at a total ratio of 57.5%. It has been identified that the mobbing actions have been incurred downward upon the contractual civil servants by the branch managers (21.5%) and the managers of the youth centers (18.5%), upon the permanent staff by the branch managers (42.9%), and upon the managers of the youth centers by the provincial directors (66.7%).

Keywords: Psychological violence, Mobbing, Personnel, Youth center, The Turkish sport organizations, Province directorate of youth services sports.

Received: 22 December 2015/ **Revised:** 2 February 2015/ **Accepted:** 13 February 2015/ **Published:** 23 February 2016

1. INTRODUCTION

When the working environment where the individuals spent the important part of their lives is a place away from stress and where there aren't psychological and physical pressures, there the productivity and the commitment to the organization is increasing. The concept of mobbing emerges in front of us as a factor that can disrupt the working environment within the organization and the labor peace among the employees (Köse and Uysal, 2010).

Many types of conflict, sometimes open, sometimes closed, are seen in the organizations. These conflicts cause the employees experience stress and anxiety. This type of conflict and

spiritual harassment seen in the recent years particularly in the developed countries, is called mobbing (Çobanoğlu, 2005). Leymann defines mobbing as a "psychological violence" or a "psychological terror", emerging systematically through hostile and unethical practices by one or more persons upon the other persons (Davenport *et al.*, 2003). Whereas Mikkelsen and Einarsen (2002), define mobbing as behaviors such as any type of maltreatment, threats, violence, and humiliation systematically applied by the employees' superiors, subordinates or by those of equal levels.

Besides mobbing is a personal problem within the organization, actually it is an organizational problem in the invisible part of the iceberg which seriously threatens the organization, deteriorating its stability (Davenport *et al.*, 2003). And in a case of interrogating the mobbing spiral, usually an emphasis is being made on the victim's incompatible personality as being responsible for all the events, the bully or his supporters assume an attitude of accusing the victim and try to get over the responsibility of the stance of events (Yaman, 2010). In addition, the organizational climate where mobbing is being experienced in any organization, is a closed organizational climate. In other words, in any atmosphere where the cult of fear is being intensely experienced from the viewpoint of the employees working in the organization, we can mention of the opacity and colourlessness of the relations, the continuous tension and stress, a closed, not open, communication system, a busy gossiping mechanism, anti-democratic attitudes and behaviors, an organization climate where especially gestures and facial expressions are being expertly-used as a psychological demoralizing weapons (Yaman, 2010). The victim's job satisfaction decreases in the mobbing spiral. It is seen boredom against the work, reluctance, poor performance, continuously taken days off and the health reports increase (Tinaz, 2006). While the mobbing continues, some kinds of psychological and its extension, the physical ailments occur in the victim (Dökmen, 2008).

Mobbing actions follow a certain direction from an employee holding a status toward an employee who has another status. Vandekerckhove and Commers (2003), have divided the mobbing according to the direction which an action takes turn as "downward mobbing", "horizontal mobbing" and "upwards mobbing". Downwards mobbing are negative behaviors actions which an employee applies against another employee working under him/her. Horizontal mobbing are negative behaviors occurring among employees who hold the same status. And upwards mobbing are the negative behaviors applied by employees holding lower status to employees of higher status (Cemaloglu and Erturk, 2008). In this context, mobbing includes the meaning that it is not only an action applied by employees holding a higher status to employees holding a lower status, but it is an action applicable both equally and even in adverse direction as well (Çobanoğlu, 2005; Tinaz, 2006; Cemaloglu and Erturk, 2008).

In this context, in the survey within the task definition, the Youth Center Directorates have the task to take the necessary measures in order to prevent abuse and violence against young people and eliminate all sorts of discrimination among young people, to carry out studies to protect young people from bad habits and to bring forward proposals ensuring the youth's active

participation into all areas of social life (Spor Bakanlığı, 2014/a), to determine the direction of the mobbing behaviors incurred at the work environment of the staff and to bring solution suggestions against negative attitudes.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The survey has been carried out with the purpose of identifying the direction of the mobbing behaviors that the staff, working at the Directorate of Youth Centers of the Province Directorates of Youth Services and Sports, is exposed to at their work environment. In this study was used a screening model, which is one of the descriptive screening methods. The screening model, are "screening arrangements made on a universe consisting of numerous elements with the purpose to have a general judgment concerning the population, all of the population or a group, sample or sampling taken from it Karasar (2003).

2.1. Population and Sample

The population of the study was consisted of 1054 personnel working in the directorates and the central and provincial organizations of the youth centers, located within the Youth Services and Sports Provincial Directorates in Turkey (Spor Bakanlığı, 2014/b). And its sampling is consisted of 253 personnel voluntarily participated in the survey, selected by a random method from the central and the provincial administrations of the Directorates of Youth Centers in different regions. Considering that the number in the sample needs to reach a minimum of 20% of the small population in the descriptive studies (Arli and Nazik, 2001), it can be said that the number of the sample represented the population.

2.2. Data Collection Tool

"Negative Behaviors Questionnaire (NAQ)", developed by Einarsen and Raknes (1997), and its Turkish version prepared and adapted by Cemaloğlu (2007), was used to obtain the research data. It was found that the cronbach's alpha coefficient of the scale items was 0.94, and their factor loadings were between 0.59 and 0.87. It was intended to determine the various deterrent behaviors as five-point Likert-type with the scale in the following order as "5-Every Month, 4-Every Week, 3-Every Day, 2-From Time to Time 1-Never". In this research it was determined that the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the said scale was 0.76. Having the Research Cronbach's alpha coefficient above 0.70, shows that the scale is reliable (Arseven, 2001).

2.3. Data Analyses

Descriptive statistics, frequency, percentage, standard deviation, arithmetic mean, crosstab and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were used in the study. Tukey test was applied to reveal between group has the significant difference appeared as the result of one-way analysis of variance. The statistical significance level was accepted as alpha (α), and the error level as $p < 0.05$. The results obtained from the distributions have been tabulated and the needed solution

recommendations have been introduced by interpreting the findings. Score ranges of the items used in determining of the perception levels of the mobbing behaviors which the staff, who was involved in the survey, was exposed to: They have been rated as: 1-Never (1.00 to 1.79), 2-Sometimes (1.80 to 2.59), 3-Every day (2.60 to 3.39), 4-Every week (3.40 to 4.19) and 5- Each month (4.20 to 5.00).

3. FINDINGS

In this section were given the data obtained from the staff working in the directates of the youth centers, who were surveyed and the statistical findings related to these data.

Table-1. Staff's Exposure to Mobbing Behavior For the Last Six Months

Have you been exposed to mobbing behaviors during the last six months?	Your task in the organization								Mean
	Youth Director		Permanent Civil Servant		Contractual Civil Servant		Total		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	N	%	
No, I haven't.	6	4.3	74	52.8	60	42.9	140	55.3	1.73
Yes, but very rarely.	3	8.6	17	48.6	15	42.9	35	13.8	2.17
Yes, sometimes	2	4.5	10	22.7	32	72.7	44	17.4	
Yes, almost every day	1	4.2	10	41.7	13	54.2	24	9.5	
Yes, many times a week	-	-	5	50.0	5	50.0	10	4.0	
Total	12	4.7	116	45.8	125	49.4	253	100	

It was determined that 44.7% of the participants were exposed to lower-medium level mobbing behaviors with 2.17 points in the last six months and 55.3% of them were exposed to 1.73 low-level mobbing behaviors with 1.73 points.

Table-2. One-Way Analysis of Variance Related to Exposure to Mobbing Behaviors According to the Position of the Personnel Exposed to Mobbing Behaviors.

M	Task	N	Mean	Ss	Sd	F	p
M.1	Youth Director	6	3.00	.89	2	1.038	.358
	Permanent Staff	42	2.40	.93	110		
	Contractual Staff	65	2.44	.96	112		
	Total	113	2.46	.95			
M.2	a) Youth Director	6	1.50	.54	2	7.932	.001* b-c
	b) Permanent staff	42	1.71	.74	110		
	c) Contractual staff	65	1.23	.52	112		
	Total	113	1.42	.65			
M.3	Youth Director	6	2.83	1.16	2	.335	.716
	Permanent staff	42	2.64	1.41	110		
	Contractual staff	65	2.47	1.28	112		
	Total	113	2.55	1.32			
M.4	Youth Director	6	2.66	1.50	2	.122	.885
	Permanent staff	42	2.73	1.10	110		
	Contractual staff	65	2.61	1.31	112		
	Total	113	2.66	1.24			
M.5	Youth Director	6	2.66	.81	2	.607	.545
	Permanent staff	42	2.45	.99	110		
	Contractual staff	65	2.69	1.19	112		
	Total	113	2.60	1.10			
M.6	Youth Director	6	3.00	1.54	2	3.196	.045* a-b
	Permanent staff	42	2.35	1.24	110		
	Contractual staff	65	1.95	1.06	112		
	Total	113	2.15	1.18			
M.7	Youth Director	6	2.16	.40	2	.479	.620

	Permanent staff	42	2.45	1.21	110		P>0.05
	Contractual staff	65	2.63	1.44	112		
	Total	113	2.53	1.32			
M.8	a) Youth Director	6	1.66	.51	2	4.268	.016* b-c
	b) Permanent staff	42	1.78	.68	110		
	c) Contractual staff	65	1.44	.53	112		
	Total	113	1.58	.60			
M.9	a) Youth Director	6	2.33	2.06	2	10.210	.000* a-c b-c
	b) Permanent staff	42	1.64	.82	110		
	c) Contractual staff	65	1.16	.41	112		
	Total	113	1.40	.79			
M.10	Youth Director	6	2.16	1.47	2	.893	.412
	Permanent staff	42	2.47	1.31	110		
	Contractual staff	65	2.15	1.16	112		
	Total	113	2.27	1.23			
M.11	Youth Director	6	2.50	1.64	2	.190	.827
	Permanent staff	42	2.19	1.01	110		
	Contractual staff	65	2.21	1.19	112		
	Total	113	2.22	1.14			
M.12	Youth Director	6	2.00	1.26+	2	.733	.483
	Permanent staff	42	2.59	1.36	110		
	Contractual staff	65	2.36	1.26	112		
	Total	113	2.43	1.30			
M.13	Youth Director	6	3.00	1.89	2	1.149	.321
	Permanent staff	42	2.26	1.01	110		
	Contractual staff	65	2.36	1.09	112		
	Total	113	2.36	1.11			
M.14	Youth Director	6	2.33	1.36	2	1.364	.260
	Permanent staff	42	1.83	1.01	110		
	Contractual staff	65	1.72	.73	112		
	Total	113	1.79	.88			
M.15	Youth Director	6	1.50	.54	2	1.538	.219
	Permanent staff	42	2.47	1.46	110		
	Contractual staff	65	2.36	1.18	112		
	Total	113	2.36	1.28			
M.16	Youth Director	6	2.33	1.36	2	.096	.909
	Permanent staff	42	2.28	1.08	110		
	Contractual staff	65	2.20	1.13	112		
	Total	113	2.23	1.12			
M.17	a) Youth Director	6	3.33	.51	2	3.722	.027* a-c
	b) Permanent staff	42	2.47	1.19	110		
	c) Contractual staff	65	2.16	1.02	112		
	Total	113	2.34	1.10			
M.18	Youth Director	6	2.33	1.50	2	.150	.861
	Permanent staff	42	2.28	1.19	110		
	Contractual staff	65	2.41	1.18	112		
	Total	113	2.36	1.19			
M.19	a) Youth Director	6	2.00	.89	2	3.363	.038* b-c
	b) Permanent staff	42	2.02	1.19	110		
	c) Contractual staff	65	1.53	.81	112		
	Total	113	1.74	.99			
M.20	Youth Director	6	1.83	.98	2	2.167	.119
	Permanent staff	42	1.78	.97	110		
	Contractual staff	65	1.44	.79	112		
	Total	113	1.59	.88			
M.21	Youth Director	6	2.33	1.36	2	1.093	.339
	Permanent staff	42	2.76	1.30	110		
	Contractual staff	65	2.40	1.25	112		
	Total	113	2.53	1.28			

General total was determined as lower-medium level with 2.17 points.

According to data obtained from the behavior scale of the staff in the sample, it was determined that the overall average score of the mobbing behaviors perceived in the work environments was at lower medium level with 2.17 points. And when we look individually to the items, it was identified that the participants perceived the mobbing behaviors at a medium level in items 4 and 5, in items 1-3-6-7-10-11-12-13-15-16-17 and 21 at a lower medium level; and in items 2-8-9-14-19 and 20, they perceived the mobbing behaviors at a low level.

Table-3. Descriptive Findings Related to the Position of Those Applying Mobbing Behaviors According to the Views of the Staff and the Chi-Square Test.

Duty of Those Incurring Mobbing on you	Your position in the organization							
	Youth Director		Permanent staff		Contractual staff		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	N	%
Provincial Director	4	66.7	8	19	8	12.3	20	17.7
Branch Director	1	16.7	19	45.2	14	21.5	34	30.1
District Director	-	-	1	2.40	4	6.2	5	4.4
Youth Center Director	-	-	4	9.5	12	18.5	16	14.2
Sportive Training Specialist	-	-	-	-	1	1.5	1	0.8
Sports Specialist	-	-	2	4.8	1	1.5	3	2.70
Trainer	-	-	1	2.4	5	7.7	6	5.30
Supervisor	-	-	-	-	1	1.5	1	0.9
Permanent Staff	1	16.7	6	14.3	11	16.9	18	15.9
Contractual Staff	-	-	1	2.4	8	12.3	9	8.0
Total	6	5.3	42	37.2	65	57.5	113	100

$X^2 = 24.656$, $p = .135$

It was determined that there wasn't any significant difference between the positions of those applying mobbing and the tasks of those who were exposed to mobbing ($p > .05$). According to the opinion of the staff, when the distribution of the position of staff applying mobbing behaviors is being examined, it was found out that 57.5% of the contractual staff perceived more mobbing actions compared to the other personnel.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

It was determined that 44.7% of the participants were exposed to lower-medium level mobbing behaviors with 2.17 points in the last six months and 55.3% of them were exposed to 1.73 low-level mobbing behaviors with 1.73 points. This situation can be interpreted that even though at a lower level, the personnel who selected No option with points close to lower medium level, gave No answer to the question "Have you been exposed to mobbing during the last six months?", having the thought that they may encounter trouble with the other personnel or the managers. When looking at the surveys conducted on the subject matter, we see results close to this ratio or above this ratio (Leymann, 1996; Asunakutlu and Safran, 2005; Bahce, 2007; Bulut, 2007; Dilman, 2007; Cengiz, 2008; Güneri, 2010; Hacıcaferoğlu and Gündoğdu, 2014). In that case it can be said that the situation in question is a reality to a great extent with respect to many organizations and employees. However, in the surveys of Alkan (2011) and Tüzel (2009), it is seen that they have pointed out that the cases of participants' exposure to mobbing behaviors were at a low level. According to the data obtained from the behavior scale of the staff in the sample, it was determined that the overall average score of the mobbing behaviors perceived in the work environments was at lower medium level with 2.17 points. And when we look individually to the items, it was identified that the participants perceived the mobbing behaviors at a medium level in items 4 and 5, in items 1-3-6-7-10-11-12-13-15-16-17 and 21 at a lower medium level; and in

items 2-8-9-14-19 and 20, they perceived the mobbing behaviors at a low level. When looking at the points of the items perceived at a low level, it is seen that the points are close to a lower medium level which is between 1.40 and 1.79 points. This situation can be interpreted that the staff in the sample abstained from answering the scale items having the thought that they could be harmed. Bahce (2007), in his research he has conducted, reached the conclusion that the staff's fears of dismissal and losing their jobs due to the economic crisis, cause those people perceive the harassment as a situation they have to endure. And Ertürk (2005), is stating that the victims exposed to mobbing actions abstain from giving information by fear of exposure to more mobbing due to feeling uncomfortable of explaining the actions incurred on them and their feelings and thoughts. These results are in line with this finding of the research. Also, it was found out that there was a statistically significant difference between the task of the staff in the institution and mobbing behaviors with respect to the items M2 "Humiliating you and making fun of you in connection with your work" [$F(2-110)=7.932, p<.05$], M6 "Ignoring you, excluding you or be excluded from the events" [$F(2-110)=3.196, p<.05$], M8 "To be shout at or to be a target of a momentary anger" [$F(2-110)=4.268, p<.05$], M9 "Be threatened with a finger, to intervene in your personal area, to be shoved" [$F(2-110)=10.210, p<.05$], M17 "Making an accusation against you" [$F(2-110)=3.722, p<.05$], and M19 "Applying pressure to prevent you to claim your legal rights" [$F(2-110)=3.363, p<.05$].

Einarsen and Raknes (1997) and Zapf *et al.* (1996), in the surveys they have conducted in the school environments, state that it is an indication of a potential problem in the school to be exposed to slander or rumors, to ignore one's thoughts or his/her appearance, to be laughed at, to be exposed to outrageous comments and insults. These results are in line with these items of the study. In addition, as the result of Tukey test applied with purpose to determine between which groups was this significant difference with respect to the opinions, it can be said that the permanent staff in M2 compared to the contractual staff, the youth center director in M6 compared to the permanent staff, the permanent staff in M8 compared to the contractual staff, the director of the youth center in M9 compared to the permanent staff, and the permanent staff compared to the contractual staff, the director of the youth center in M17 compared to the contractual staff, and the permanent staff in M19 compared to the contractual staff perceived more mobbing behaviors. In spite of this, M1 "some people hide from you the information that will affect your success/performance" [$F(2-110)=1.038, p>.05$], M3 "Forcing you to carry out tasks below your qualification level" [$F(2-110)=.335, p>.05$], M4 "Taking back the responsibilities that are important for your task and giving you trivial or unpleasant tasks" [$F(2-110)=.122, p>.05$], M5 "Gossiping and rumoring about you" [$F(2-110)=.607, p>.05$], M6 "Ignoring you, excluding you or be excluded from the events" [$F(2-110)=3.196, p>.05$], M7 "Making comments containing insults or humiliations about your personality, attitude or your private life" [$F(2-110)=.479, p>.05$], M10 "Somebody hinting or saying that you must leave your work." [$F(2-110)=.893, p>.05$], M11 "Constantly reminding you of your mistakes or faults" [$F(2-110)=.190, p>.05$].

From the items M12 "When you approach somebody, you are ignored, disregarded or met with hostility" [$F(2-110)=.733, p>.05$], M13 "Constant criticism of your work and your efforts" [$F(2-110)=1.149, p>.05$], M14 "Your vision/your ideas and suggestions are being disregarded" [$F(2-110)=1.149, p>.05$], M15 "To be exposed to heavy jokes by people you with whom you do not get along" [$F(2-110)=1.538, p>.05$], M16 "To be asked to perform jobs/tasks which are illogical and impossible to be realized" [$F(2-110)=.096, p>.05$], M18 "To have your work checked in an exaggerated way" [$F(2-110)=.150, p>.05$], M20 "To be exposed to constant teasing and mockery" [$F(2-110)=2.167, p>.05$], M21 "To expose yourself to an excessive workload which you are not able to get over" [$F(2-110)=1.093, p>.05$], it was detected that there wasn't any statistically significant difference between the variable of position they hold and the mobbing behaviors. In Dilman (2007), research on this subject, it was observed that there was a statistically significant difference in general aspect between the participants' task variable and the mobbing behaviors, whereas in some studies it was concluded that there wasn't any statistically significant difference (Turan, 2006; Işık, 2007; Gökçe and Oğuz, 2009). It was identified that there wasn't any significant difference between the positions of those applying mobbing and the positions of those exposed to mobbing ($X^2=24.656, p=.135$). When the distribution of the positions of those applying mobbing behaviors according to the views of the staff is being examined, it was determined that the 57.5% of the contractual staff perceived more mobbing behaviors compared to the other personnel and the mobbing was generally applied (downwards) by the branch managers and the directorates of the youth centers in general. In addition, it was determined that the permanent staff has been exposed to mobbing actions (downward) by the branch managers, and the directors of youth centers by the provincial managers (downward). Cemaloglu and Erturk (2008), in their survey, point out that there wasn't any significant difference between the positions of those applying mobbing and the positions of those exposed to mobbing. These data seem to support this finding of the research. It is also seen that in some studies made in relation with the subject the mobbing direction was applied downwards and the work staff was exposed to mobbing in more proportion compared to the directors or the supervisors (Çalışkan, 2005; Tanoğlu, 2006; Yaman, 2007; Gündüz and Yılmaz, 2008; Eksici, 2009; Hacicaferoğlu and Çoban, 2011). When the studies made with respect to the direction of the mobbing behaviors, it was found out that the rate of the downwards mobbing in Europe was 60% within the total mobbing (Yamada, 2000). Whereas in this study this ration is 44.7%. In a study conducted on 775 people, it was found out that 60% of the people who apply mobbing behaviors held a superior status on their victims, 20% of them held equal status, and the 20% of them held a lower status (Yamada, 2000). These studies conducted indicate the conclusion that the downward mobbing had a high rate in the world. However, mobbing is being systematically applied by employees of superior, subordinate or by equivalent level. In this context, the mobbing behaviors should not be seen as actions applied only by superior employees, but it should be also seen as an action applied in the opposite direction upwards and by employees of equal status against each other's (Çobanoğlu, 2005; Tinaz, 2006; Cemaloglu and Erturk, 2008).

Having the thoughts and feelings negatively higher in individuals or having them giving a way to pessimism, cause these individuals focus on the negative aspects of themselves, the others and of the events that occurred, and to pay greater attention to the potential threats around them and therefore the possibility of perceiving the others' behaviors as mobbing is more likely for them (Mikkelsen and Einarsen, 2002). As a result of this survey conducted with a purpose to determine the direction of the mobbing behaviors incurred on the employees of the youth center directorate at their work environment; so, it was found out that the 44.7% of staff in the sample have been exposed to mobbing behaviors in the past six months at lower medium level with 2.17 points. It was identified that those who were exposed to mobbing behaviors perceived these behaviors in general from the items of attacks on professional competence and esteem. It was also identified that the contractual staff from the personnel were exposed to mobbing behaviors in the rate of 57.5% in the total. Likewise, it was found out that the contractual staff was exposed to downward mobbing actions by the branch directors (21.5%) and by the youth center directors (18.5%), and the permanent staff by the branch directors (42.9%), and the directors of the youth centers by the provincial directors (66.7%) respectively. This case can be interpreted as while the deterrent persons do apply mobbing behaviors, they receive significant power from their status.

5. SUGGESTIONS

It can be said that the mobbing actions within the directorate of the youth centers, where they work for the public benefit in order to have the social and the sporting activities be widespread and be enriched, arrange organizations, take measures which will ensure that young people meet such activities and the continuity of such activities, may decrease productivity within the institution. It can also be said that this negative interaction and communication that will occur within the institution, may cause the occurrence of the risk of an interruption of the organization and the training that the institutions should do. In order to remove this risk to be able to have the employees working in the unit got rid of mobbing behaviours or to avoid their exposure to various mobbing behaviours, we must ask for the necessary help or assistance of a specialist or specialists in this field and to increase the awareness of all the working employees on all types of mobbing behaviors. In addition, we must take care that the persons who will take tasks in the institution administration be chosen from people who have educated themselves, who are just, who have tolerance to differences, who are open to communication and we must ensure that the personnel be always in contact with their unit colleagues and to adhere that the communication is not dependent on the hierarchy.

6. CONTRIBUTION OF RESEARCH TO THE LITERATURE AND ITS IMPORTANCE

No any research about the mobbing behaviors was carried out before regarding the personnel, who have been working with the Youth Center Directorates in Turkey and whose task is to organize social and sporting activities. This research is important with respect to

determining whether the personnel are exposed to mobbing behaviors or not, if they are exposed to such behaviors, by whom they have been subjected to these actions. Furthermore, the research is also important in terms of providing both data and sources to the literature for the researches to be carried out on mobbing in the future.

Funding: This study received no specific financial support.

Competing Interests: The author declares that there are no conflicts of interests regarding the publication of this paper.

REFERENCES

- Alkan, E., 2011. Yıldırma (Mobbing) davranışlarının Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenlerinin tükenmişliği üzerine etkisi. Unpublished Master Thesis, Balıkesir University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Arli, M. and H. Nazik, 2001. Bilimsel araştırmaya giriş. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.
- Arseven, A., 2001. Alan araştırma yöntemi. Ankara: Gündüz Eğitim ve Yayıncılık.
- Asunakutlu, T. and B. Safran, 2005. Örgütlerdeki yıldırma uygulamaları ve çatışma arasındaki ilişki. Selçuk Üniversitesi İİBF Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi, 6(11): 111–129.
- Bahce, Ç., 2007. Mobbing oluşumunda örgüt kültürünün rolü. Unpublished Master Thesis, Gazi University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Bulut, U.H., 2007. Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinde psikolojik şiddet düzeyi (Mobbing). Unpublished Master Thesis, Niğde University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Çalışkan, O., 2005. Turizm işletmelerinde çalışanlara yapılan yıldırma davranışları. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Mersin University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Cemaloğlu, N., 2007. Okul yöneticilerinin liderlik stilleri ile yıldırma arasındaki ilişki. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 33: 77–87. Available from <http://www.efdergi.hacettepe.edu.tr/200733NECAT%C4%B0%20CEMALO%C4%9ELU.pdf> [Accessed 07.02.2015].
- Cemaloglu, N. and A. Erturk, 2008. Öğretmen ve okul müdürlerinin maruz kaldıkları yıldırmanın yönü. Bilig, Türk Dünyası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 46: 67–86. Available from <http://yayinlar.yesevi.edu.tr/files/article/189.pdf> [Accessed 07.02.2015].
- Cengiz, R., 2008. Profesyonel futbol kulübü yöneticilerinin dönüşümsel liderlik stilleri ile kulüplerinin örgüt sağlığı ve futbolcuların yıldırma (Mobbing) yaşamaları arasındaki ilişki. Unpublished Doctorate Thesis, Gazi University Institute of Health Sciences.
- Çobanoğlu, S., 2005. Mobbing işyerinde duygusal saldırı ve mücadele yöntemleri. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.
- Davenport, N., R.D. Schwartz and G.P. Eliot, 2003. Mobbing: İş yerinde duygusal incinme. (Translated by: Osman Cem Ömertoy). İstanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık.
- Dilman, T., 2007. Özel hastanelerde çalışan hemşirelerin duygusal tacize maruz kalma durumlarının belirlenmesi. Unpublished Master Thesis, Marmara University Institute of Health Sciences.
- Dökmen, U., 2008. Yaşama yerleşmek. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Einarsen, S. and B.L. Raknes, 1997. Harrasment in the workplace and the victimization of men. Violence and Victims, 12(3): 247–263.

- Eksici, S., 2009. Kurum ve kuruluşlarda psikolojik taciz (Mobbing) eylemleri ve çalışanların motivasyonu üzerine etkisi. Unpublished Master Thesis, Selcuk University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Ertürk, A., 2005. Öğretmen ve okul yöneticilerinin okul ortamında maruz kaldıkları yıldırma eylemleri. Unpublished Master Thesis, Gazi University Institute of Education Sciences.
- Gökçe, T.A. and E. Oğuz, 2009. Yükseköğretimde yıldırma. The 5th International Balkan Education and Science Congress. 1-3 September, Trakya University, Edirne.
- Gündüz, H.B. and O. Yılmaz, 2008. Ortaöğretim kurumlarında mobbing (yıldırma) davranışlarına ilişkin öğretmen ve yönetici görüşleri (Düzce ili örneği). Millî Eğitim Dergisi, 179: 269–282. Available from http://dhgm.meb.gov.tr/yayimler/dergiler/Milli_Egitim_Dergisi/179.pdf [Accessed 07.02.2015].
- Güneri, M.B., 2010. Öğretim elemanlarının maruz kaldıkları yıldırma davranışlarının işe yabancılaşmaları üzerine etkisi. Unpublished Master Thesis, Akdeniz University Social Sciences.
- Hacıcaferoğlu, S. and B. Çoban, 2011. Gençlik ve Spor İl Müdürlüğü personelinin çalışma ortamında maruz kaldığı yıldırma davranışlarının incelenmesi. Spor ve Performans Dergisi, 2(2): 38–50.
- Hacıcaferoğlu, S. and C. Gündoğdu, 2014. Surveying the exposure level of intimidation (Mobbing) behaviours of the football referees. Journal of Physical Education and Sport (JPES), 14(1): 120–126.
- Işık, E., 2007. İşletmelerde mobbing uygulamaları ile iş stresi ilişkisine yönelik bir araştırma. Unpublished Master Thesis, Yıldız Technical University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Karasar, N., 2003. Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi. 12. Baskı, Ankara (Turkey): Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Köse, S. and S. Uysal, 2010. Kamu personelinin yıldırma (Mobbing) ve boyutları hakkındaki düşünceleri üzerine yönelik bir çalışma: Manisa tarım il müdürlüğü örneği. Celal Bayar Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 8(1): 261-276.
- Leymann, H., 1996. The content and development of mobbing at work. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5(2): 165–184.
- Mikkelsen, E.G. and S. Einarsen, 2002. Relationships between exposure to bullying at work and psychological and psychosomatic health complaints: The role of state negative affectivity and generalized self-efficacy. Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 43(5): 397–405.
- Spor Bakanlığı, 2014/a. Gençlik ve Spor Bakanlığının teşkilat ve görevleri hakkında kanun hükmünde kararname. Available from <http://Bilgiedinme.Gsb.Gov.Tr/Dokuman/4.5.638.Pdf> [Accessed 26.06.2014].
- Spor Bakanlığı, 2014/b. Verilerle gençlik ve spor. Available from <http://www.gsb.gov.tr/Public/Edit/files/verilerle-genclik-ve-spor.pdf> [Accessed 25.06.2014].
- Tanoğlu, S.C., 2006. İşletmelerde yıldırmanın (Mobbing) değerlendirilmesi ve bir yüksek öğrenim kurumunda uygulama. Unpublished Master Thesis, Selcuk University Institute of Sciences.
- Tinaz, P., 2006. İşyerinde psikolojik taciz: Mobbing. İstanbul: Beta Basım.
- Turan, F., 2006. İşyerlerinde psikolojik yıldırma olgusu ve konuya ilişkin bir araştırma. Unpublished Master Thesis, Istanbul University Institute of Social Sciences.

- Tüzel, E., 2009. Araştırma görevlilerinin maruz kaldıkları yıldırma (Mobbing) davranışlarının araştırma görevlilerinin sahip oldukları çeşitli değişkenlere göre incelenmesi: Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Örneği. Çanakkale: The 1st Turkish International Congress of Educational Research. pp: 212.
- Vandekerckhove, W. and M.S.R. Commers, 2003. Downward workplace mobbing: A sign of the times. Journal of Business Ethics, 45(1): 41-50.
- Yamada, C.D., 2000. The phenomenon of "workplace bullying" and the need for status-blind hostile work environment protection. Georgetown Law Journal, 88(3): 475-536.
- Yaman, E., 2007. Üniversitelerde bir eğitim yönetimi sorunu olarak öğretim elemanlarının maruz kaldığı informal cezalar: Nitel bir araştırma. Unpublished Doctorate Thesis, Marmara University Institute of Education Sciences.
- Yaman, E., 2010. Psikoşiddete (Mobbinge) maruz kalan öğretim elemanlarının örgüt kültürü ve iklimi algıları. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri, 10(1): 547-578.
- Zapf, D., C. Knorz and M. Kulla, 1996. On the relationship between mobbing factors, and job content. Social work environment and health outcomes. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5(2): 215-237.

Views and opinions expressed in this article are the views and opinions of the author(s), Journal of Sports Research shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability etc. caused in relation to/arising out of the use of the content.