

MOBBING IN BUSINESSES AND EMPLOYEES' INDIVIDUAL METHODS OF FIGHTING MOBBING

Seher KOFALI
kofalischer@gmail.com

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Azmiye YINAL
azmiye.yinal@akun.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

In this study, the mobbing phenomenon in hotel businesses operating in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) was examined in detail and the individual struggle methods of employees exposed to mobbing were examined. The research was conducted using the relational survey model, which is one of the quantitative research methods. While the population of the research consists of the employees of hotel enterprises in TRNC, the sample consists of 425 hotel employees selected from this population. As a data collection tool, the questionnaire form developed by Yıldız (2023) was taken as a basis and adapted and used. The collected data were analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software, which is widely used in the field of social sciences. The findings revealed that the mobbing experiences of the employees were generally at a moderate level and that the perception of mobbing varied in different dimensions such as threats, harassment, work obstructions, work engagement and relations with coworkers. According to gender, women were found to be less active in individual struggle against mobbing. While demographic factors such as age, education level, marital status and working time did not generally create a significant difference, it was determined that the perception of mobbing in relations with coworkers increased as the level of education increased. As the professional seniority increased, it was determined that employees exhibited a more passive attitude in individual struggle against mobbing. According to the results of the study, employees mostly prefer passive methods such as ignoring the mobbing perpetrator and less frequently resort to methods such as official complaints and applying to professional associations. This situation shows that employees are more protected and hesitant in the face of mobbing.

Key Words: Mobbing, Hotel businesses, Employee behavior, Individual struggle methods

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Problem Status

One of the most important problems faced by employees in the modern business world is psychological harassment or, in other words, mobbing . Mobbing means systematically subjecting an employee to verbal, physical or psychological pressure, humiliation or exclusion (Leymann , 1996). Such behaviors negatively affect not only the work motivation of individuals but also their physical and psychological health (Einarsen et al., 2003). In businesses where mobbing is common, employees' job satisfaction decreases, their rates of experiencing burnout syndrome increase and business efficiency decreases (Yıldırım and Yıldırım, 2007). Many individual and organizational factors play a role in the emergence of this problem. While personal characteristics such as aggression, low empathy or competitive attitude can be effective at the individual level, elements such as authoritarian management style, inadequate communication and unclear role definitions can trigger mobbing behaviors at the organizational level (Einarsen et al., 2003).

of mobbing on individuals are quite devastating. Employees exposed to mobbing may experience health problems such as depression, anxiety , sleep problems and chronic stress, and may experience negative outcomes such as decreased job satisfaction and burnout syndrome. At the organizational level , mobbing leads to problems such as low employee morale, poor teamwork and increased turnover rates. Therefore, preventing and managing this problem is a process that must be addressed at individual and institutional levels (Aydın, 2023) .

mobbing at the institutional level , it is of great importance to create a strong work ethic culture, to provide open communication channels and to develop policies to prevent mobbing . Providing training to managers on leadership and conflict resolution can contribute to the prevention of such behaviors. At the individual level, it is important for employees to become aware of mobbing behaviors, to defend their rights and to document the incidents in writing. Seeking social support, increasing psychological resilience and receiving professional help make it easier for individuals to cope with the negative effects of mobbing (Zapf and Einarsen , 2005).

Mobbing is a complex problem that can have serious consequences for both individuals and businesses. The solution to this problem requires the cooperation of victims, managers and all employees. Businesses should take strategic steps to prevent mobbing and provide a safe working environment for their employees. Individuals should have the knowledge and skills to protect themselves and defend their rights. In this way, the negative effects of mobbing can be minimized and a healthier work life can be created (Tuncer, 2020) .

1.2. Purpose of the Research

In this study, the phenomenon of mobbing in hotel businesses was examined in detail and the individual struggle methods of employees exposed to mobbing were revealed. The study aimed to define mobbing behaviors in hotel businesses and analyze the physical, psychological and professional effects of these behaviors on employees. According to the results of the study, it was determined that hotel employees experienced negative effects such as loss of job satisfaction, burnout syndrome and low motivation due to mobbing . The strategies applied by employees in this process were determined and the effectiveness of these methods were evaluated. In the study, various solution suggestions were developed at individual and institutional levels in order to prevent mobbing and to facilitate hotel employees' coping with such situations. It was revealed that employees' learning their legal rights, developing psychological resilience and benefiting from social support systems were effective in combating mobbing . In particular, it was observed that recording mobbing incidents in writing, reporting them to human resources units and receiving professional support were common individual struggle methods among hotel employees. At the institutional level, it was emphasized that hotel managements should encourage open communication among employees, develop policies to prevent mobbing and strengthen the culture of business ethics.

1.2.1 Hypotheses

H₀: There is no significant difference between mobbing perception and individual struggle levels according to gender .

H₁: **There is a significant difference between** mobbing perception and individual struggle levels according to gender .

H₀: There is no significant difference between mobbing perception and individual struggle levels according to education level .

H₂: **There is a significant difference between** mobbing perception and individual struggle levels according to education level .

H₀: There is no significant difference between mobbing perception and individual struggle levels according to professional seniority .

H₃: **There is a significant difference between** mobbing perception and individual struggle levels according to professional seniority .

H₀: There is no significant difference between mobbing perception and individual struggle levels according to working time in the current hotel .

H₄: **There is a significant difference between** mobbing perception and individual struggle levels according to the length of time working in the current hotel .

1.3. Importance of the Research

Mobbing is a problem that seriously affects not only the work lives of individuals but also their general quality of life. Therefore, research on how mobbing occurs in workplaces, what consequences it leads to and how employees fight against it is of great importance. The research is expected to contribute to the protection of employees' rights and shed light on the development of anti -mobbing policies by businesses. Examining individual methods of struggle helps determine concrete steps that can guide mobbing victims. In this context, the research aims to fill an important gap both theoretically and practically and aims to offer solutions for making work environments healthier and more productive.

1.4. Limitations

The limitations of the study are as follows:

- The research was conducted only in hotel businesses operating in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC).
- The study was limited to 425 hotel employees.
- Data collection was carried out within a certain period of time.
- The study is limited by the data collection methods used and the responses of the participants.

1.5. Definitions

Mobbing : It refers to psychological pressure, harassment and intimidation behaviors systematically applied by one or more people towards another person, usually in the workplace (Zapf et al., 2003).

with mobbing : It includes personal efforts to overcome this negative situation with strategies such as developing sensitivity to the psychological pressure an employee is exposed to, knowing their rights, protecting themselves and seeking support (Tuncer, 2020) .

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Mobbing in Businesses

Mobbing is the psychological or physical pressure that one or more people in the workplace deliberately apply to an employee. Such behaviors aim to isolate, humiliate, exclude and psychologically affect the target person. Mobbing can have long-term effects on the psychological and physiological health of employees and can negatively affect workplace productivity and the general atmosphere. The main feature that distinguishes mobbing from other negative behaviors is that it is carried out continuously and systematically. Mobbing is a serious problem that disrupts the peace of individuals and groups in the work environment and creates a stressful environment. Mobbing in the workplace can create inefficiency and unrest not only for the targeted person but also for the entire team. It can also endanger the general performance and work environment of companies (Zapf , Einarsen , Hoel , & Vartia , 2003).

Mobbing can have permanent effects on the psychological and physiological health of employees. Psychologically, individuals who are subjected to mobbing experience symptoms such as depression, anxiety , stress, sleep disorders, and loss of self-esteem. Long-term mobbing victims experience great difficulties in their personal lives as they experience such psychological disorders. Their motivation at work decreases, their commitment to their work decreases, and their overall productivity decreases. The negative impact of mobbing on the atmosphere at work, which leads to a lack of team spirit and cooperation in the workplace , also reduces overall job satisfaction. When employees are under constant stress, their commitment to their work decreases and their motivation decreases. It can lead to problems such as high absenteeism and employee turnover in the workplace . In terms of physical health, Health problems such as headaches, stomach problems, and muscle aches are frequently observed in people who are subjected to mobbing . Such physical symptoms are indicators of the effects of psychological stress on the body. As employees' health deteriorates, productivity at work also decreases significantly. (Hoel and Salin , 2003).

2.2. Methods of Combating Mobbing

Mobbing is a phenomenon defined as systematic psychological and physical pressures on individuals in the workplace, and negatively affects the mental and physical health of employees. The prevalence of mobbing creates serious problems at both individual and organizational levels. Combating mobbing should be the responsibility of the entire organization, not just the victims. Effectively combating mobbing requires both individual and organizational strategies. Methods for combating mobbing cover a wide range from psychological support to workplace policies, and the implementation of these methods helps organizations create a healthier work environment.

1. Individual Challenge

mobbing is to be aware of the situation and to fully understand what mobbing is. Mobbing is usually done systematically and secretly, so victims may initially perceive the pressures they experience as normal. Since mobbing is not a direct attack, it may be difficult to notice. Constant negative criticism, exclusion or insults can lead to psychological exhaustion over time. The first step in the individual struggle process is to have knowledge of what mobbing is and to correctly define the situation experienced. Education and awareness can increase the psychological resilience of the individual who is subjected to mobbing . This awareness allows the victim to understand that the situation they are experiencing is not an ordinary source of stress, but a constant pressure. In order to cope with mobbing , it is important for the victim to know what they are struggling with psychologically and what steps they need to take in this struggle (Törner et al., 2003).

2 Organizational Struggle

Mobbing is a term that describes the psychological harassment and bullying that individuals are exposed to in their workplaces, and it can seriously affect the physical and psychological health of the employee. Individuals who are subjected to mobbing may experience a decrease in their work performance, feel a sense of mental exhaustion, and even come to the point of leaving their jobs due to the pressure, insults, and exclusion they experience. It is possible to cope with mobbing , and individual struggle is of critical importance for the person subjected to mobbing to protect their mental and physical health. Individual struggle usually includes a series of strategies and psychological coping methods. These methods can be applied to help the victim cope with the difficulties they experience, learn ways to defend themselves, and create a healthy workplace environment (Sözen and Arslan, 2020).

3. Legal Struggle

Mobbing is generally defined as the systematic and continuous psychological and emotional harassment of an employee by other employees or managers in the workplace. It is a behavior that violates the personal rights of the victim . Although there is no direct law on mobbing in Turkey , there are regulations such as the Labor Law No. 4857, the Occupational Health and Safety Law and the Turkish Penal Code to ensure the psychological safety of

employees in workplaces. The Labor Law No. 4857 regulates the healthy and safe working environment in the workplace, while also providing a legal framework to prevent negative situations such as mobbing (Kalkan, 2019). Since mobbing is considered a violation of rights in the workplace, victims must be protected against such behaviors. Laws that regulate the rights between employees and employers provide protection to prevent mobbing.

3. METHOD

3.1. Research Model

In this study, the relational screening model, one of the quantitative research methods, was used to examine the phenomenon of mobbing in hotel businesses. The relational screening model is a quantitative research method that aims to determine the existence, direction and degree of the relationship between two or more variables. This model allows researchers to understand how certain variables are related to each other. However, this model is used only to examine the correlation, not a causal relationship between variables.

In this study, the relational screening model was preferred to analyze the relationship between mobbing behaviors in hotel businesses and the individual coping methods used by employees in this process. Within the scope of the study, surveys were applied to hotel employees and data were collected to measure their mobbing experiences, the coping strategies they used in this process and the effects of mobbing on outcomes such as job satisfaction, burnout or motivation. The relational screening model allowed the statistical evaluation of the relationship between these variables and made it possible to make comprehensive inferences about the individual and work environment-related consequences of mobbing.

3.2. Universe and Sample

The subject of this research is to examine the phenomenon of mobbing in hotel businesses and the individual coping strategies that hotel employees will use against mobbing. In this context, the universe of the research consists of employees of hotel businesses operating in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC). The research was conducted in this specific geographical region in order to determine the prevalence of mobbing in hotel businesses and the individual methods used to cope with this situation. The snowball sampling method was used in the data collection process in the research. This method is frequently preferred in cases where it is difficult to reach participants in studies on a specific group (Yagar and Dökme, 2018). The researchers asked the participants they initially identified to direct other potential participants suitable for the research. Thus, the participant pool was expanded and a total of 425 hotel employees were reached. The snowball sampling method created a rich data set to understand mobbing experiences and individual coping strategies by ensuring the participation of employees at different levels in the hotel sector. This sample size provided a sufficient basis for understanding the effects of mobbing behaviors on hotel employees and their coping strategies. The findings of the research shed light on the effects of mobbing on employees in hotel businesses and contributed to the development of solution suggestions at both individual and institutional levels.

3.3. Data Collection Tools

This study used the survey form used by Yıldız (2023) as the data collection tool. The survey form consisted of three sections to determine the demographic characteristics of the participants, to evaluate mobbing behaviors, and to analyze individual methods of combating mobbing. The first section included nine questions to determine the demographic characteristics of the participants such as age, gender, and educational status. In the second section, the mobbing scale developed by Aiello, Deitingner, Nardella, and Bonafede (2008) and adapted to Turkish was used to understand the mobbing situation in hotel businesses. This scale has a structure consisting of a total of 38 questions evaluated with a 7-point Likert-type rating system. Cronbach's Alpha values for the sub-dimensions of the scale were found to be quite high: 0.985 for "Threat and harassment", 0.954 for "Obstacles to career development", 0.856 for "Job commitment", and 0.734 for the "Relationship" factor. These values support the reliability of the scale. In the last section of the survey, the scale developed by Gülşah Karavardar (2009) in her doctoral thesis was used to determine the individual struggle methods of employees against mobbing. This scale consists of a total of 11 questions, 10 5-point Likert-type questions and one 2-point Likert-type question. The reliability of the scale is also quite high, and Cronbach's Alpha value was determined as 0.873. All scales and sub-dimensions used in the survey form attracted attention with their high reliability levels and supported the validity and consistency of the research.

In this study The Mobbing Questionnaire consists of 38 items and Cronbach's Alpha value was calculated as 0.716. This value shows that the scale is "reliable". Mobbing Individual Combat Methods Questionnaire consists of 10 items and Cronbach's Alpha value was found to be 0.770. This value indicates that this scale is also "reliable". The reliability values of both scales show that the data collection tools used in the study are statistically reliable and provide consistent results. This is an important indicator supporting the validity of the findings obtained.

3.4 Analysis of Data

Package) was used, which is widely used in the field of social sciences. for the Social Sciences) software was preferred. SPSS ensures systematic processing of quantitative data obtained in the study and comprehensive analysis. In the data analysis process, normality analysis was first performed. Normality analysis was performed to determine whether the data set was suitable for normal distribution and in this direction, the data was analyzed with appropriate statistical tests. Within the scope of normality analysis, Shapiro-Wilk and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests were applied to evaluate whether the data distribution was normal. As a result of the normality analyzes, it was determined that the skewness and kurtosis values for the Mobbing Survey and the Mobbing Individual Combat Methods Survey used in the study were between -1.5 and +1.5. This situation shows that the data sets meet the generally accepted normality criteria. The results obtained from the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests for the Mobbing Survey revealed that the data of this scale were suitable for normal distribution. Although different results were obtained from the normality tests for the Survey on Individual Combating Methods against Mobbing , it was taken into account that the skewness and kurtosis values were within acceptable limits. In the light of all these evaluations, the normality assumption was accepted as provided in the study and parametric tests were applied in the data analysis. This preference ensured that the analyses provided stronger and more detailed results.

4. FINDINGS

Table 1. Demographic Information of Hotel Employees

		n	%
Gender	Male	204	48.0
	Woman	221	52.0
Age	20-29 Years Old	118	27.8
	30-39 Years Old	160	37.6
	40-49 Years Old	131	30.8
	50 and above	16	3.8
Level of education	Primary/Secondary Education	58	13.6
	High school	108	25.4
	Associate Degree	185	43.5
	Undergraduate/Graduate	74	17.4
Marital status	Married	202	47.5
	Single	223	52.5
Professional seniority	Less than 1 Year	12	2.8
	1-5 years	190	44.7
	6-10 years	120	28.2
	11-14 Years	60	14.1
	15 Years and Above	43	10.1
Working hours at the current hotel	Less than 1 Year	28	6.6
	1-5 years	211	49.6
	6-10 years	106	24.9
	11-14 Years	53	12.5
	15 Years and Above	27	6.4
Position held	Senior manager	42	9.9
	Middle Manager	94	22.1
	Lower-level manager	104	24.5
	Worker	185	43.5
	Total	425	100.0

The demographic information of 425 employees who participated in the research was analyzed. When the gender distribution is examined, it is seen that 48% of the participants are male (204 people) and 52% are female (221

people). In the distribution by age groups, 27.8% of the participants are between the ages of 20-29 (118 people), 25.2% are between the ages of 30-39 (107 people), 30.8% are between the ages of 40-49 (131 people), and 16.2% are 50 years old and over (69 people). In terms of education level, it is seen that 13.6% of the participants are primary/secondary school graduates (58 people), 25.4% are high school graduates (108 people), and 61.1% have a university or postgraduate degree (259 people). In terms of marital status, 52.5% of the participants were single (223 people), 47.5% were married (202 people). In the distribution by professional seniority, 44.7% of the employees had 1-5 years of experience (190 people), 28.2% had 6-10 years (120 people), 16.9% had 11-14 years (72 people), and 10.1% had 15 years and above (43 people). In terms of length of time working in the same hotel, 49.6% of the employees had 1-5 years (211 people), 43.8% had 6-10 years (187 people), and 6.4% had 15 years and above (27 people). When the positions of the employees are examined, 22.1% of them are top-level managers (94 people), 34.6% are middle-level managers (146 people) and 43.5% are lower-level managers or employees (185 people). In general, the employees participating in the research are diverse in different gender, age, education level, marital status, professional seniority and position categories in hotel businesses. This distribution shows that the research constitutes a wide sample from different employee groups.

Table 2. Descriptive Analysis of Mobbing Encountered by Hotel Employees

	Minimum	Maximum	Avg.	Ps .
Threats and harassment	1.54	4.88	2,8992	0.59801
	1.00	6.50	2,9224	1.03374
Job and Career Related Obstacles				
Commitment to Work	1.00	7.00	2.9471	1.37751
	1.00	5.50	2,5518	1,20715
Relationships with Coworkers				
Mobbing (General)	1.40	5.52	2.8301	0.63560
Individual Fight Against Mobbing	1.40	4.70	2,4767	0.65599

mobbing encountered by employees in hotel businesses and individual methods of combating mobbing , different dimensions were evaluated. In the threat and harassment dimension, the average score of employees was calculated as 2.8992 and its standard deviation was found as 0.59801. Employees have a moderate level of mobbing perception in this dimension. In the obstacles related to work and career dimension, the average score was calculated as 2.9224 and its standard deviation was calculated as 1.03374. This situation shows that employees perceive that their work and career development is blocked to a certain extent.

The mean score in the work commitment dimension was found to be 2.9471 and the standard deviation was 1.37751. These results show that the work commitment of the employees was negatively affected due to mobbing . The mean score in the relationship with coworkers dimension was calculated as 2.5518 and the standard deviation as 1.20715. This finding indicates that the employees experienced lower levels of negativity in their relationships with coworkers compared to the other dimensions.

In general, the mean for mobbing perception was found to be 2.8301 and the standard deviation was 0.63560. These values indicate that employees' mobbing experiences are at a moderate level. The level of individual struggle against mobbing was calculated as 2.4767 on average and 0.65599 on standard deviation. These results reveal that employees use individual struggle methods against mobbing at a moderate level. These findings emphasize the necessity of interventions at both individual and institutional levels to reduce the effects of mobbing .

Table 3. Mobbing Perception and Individual Struggle with Mobbing by Gender

		N	Avg.	Ps .	f	p.
Threats and harassment	Male	204	2,8909	0.56406	3,187	0.002
	Woman	221	2,9069	0.62890		
Job and Career Related Obstacles	Male	204	2,9013	0.96888	2,103	0.148
	Woman	221	2,9417	1,09204		
Commitment to Work	Male	204	2,8676	1,35720	0.127	0.722
	Woman	221	3,0204	1,39505		
Relationships with Coworkers	Male	204	2.3725	1.17063	0.603	0.438
	Woman	221	2,7172	1.21930		

Mobbing (General)	Male	204	2,7581	0.59684	0.964	0.327
	Woman	221	2,8965	0.66383		
Individual Fight Against Mobbing	Male	204	2,5480	0.72570	7,492	0.006
	Woman	221	2,4109	0.57822		

p < 0.05

The table evaluates the perception of mobbing and the level of individual struggle against mobbing according to gender. In the threat and harassment dimension, the average score of men was calculated as 2.8909 and that of women as 2.9069. The f value was found as 3.187 and the p value as 0.002, indicating a significant difference between genders. It is seen that women have a higher perception in this dimension.

In the dimension of work and career related obstacles, the average score of men was calculated as 2.9013 and that of women was 2.9417. The f value was found as 2.103 and the p value as 0.148, therefore, it was determined that there was no significant difference between the genders in this dimension. In the dimension of work commitment, the average score of men was calculated as 2.8676 and that of women was calculated as 3.0204, and the p value was found as 0.722. This result shows that there was no significant difference between the genders in the dimension of work commitment.

In the dimension of relations with coworkers, the average score of men was determined as 2.3725 and that of women was determined as 2.7172. In this dimension, the p value was calculated as 0.438 and no statistically significant difference was found between the genders. In terms of general mobbing perception, the average score of men was calculated as 2.7581 and that of women was calculated as 2.8965, with an f value of 0.964 and a p value of 0.327. No significant difference was found between the genders for this dimension either.

against mobbing, the average score of men was calculated as 2.5480 and that of women as 2.4109. The f value was found as 7.492 and the p value as 0.006, indicating a significant difference between genders. It is seen that women have a lower average in this dimension. This result reveals that women use individual struggle against mobbing methods less than men. In general, it was determined that gender causes significant differences in some mobbing dimensions and individual struggle levels.

Table 4. Mobbing Perception and Level of Education Levels of Individual Struggle Against Mobbing

		n	Avg.	Ps .	f	p.
Threats and harassment	Primary/Secondary Education	58	2,8772	0.54346	1,227	0.299
	High school	108	2,8461	0.56181		
	Associate Degree	185	2,9613	0.64538		
	Undergraduate/Graduate	74	2,8390	0.56213		
Job and Career Related Obstacles	Primary/Secondary Education	58	2,7996	0.84453	0.485	0.693
	High school	108	3,0000	0.95809		
	Associate Degree	185	2,9243	1.12161		
	Undergraduate/Graduate	74	2,9003	1.05458		
Commitment to Work	Primary/Secondary Education	58	2,9569	1,29873	0.153	0.928
	High school	108	2,9907	1,40590		
	Associate Degree	185	2,8973	1.45596		
	Undergraduate/Graduate	74	3,0000	1,20501		
Relationships with Coworkers	Primary/Secondary Education	58	1,9741	1,17884	9,351	0,000 3> 1-2
	High school	108	2,3194	1.09258		
	Associate Degree	185	2,7622	1.23806		
	Undergraduate/Graduate	74	2.8176	1.11212		
Mobbing (General)	Primary/Secondary Education	58	2,6519	0.50390	2,387	0.068
	High school	108	2,7891	0.61034		
	Associate Degree	185	2,8863	0.68799		
	Undergraduate/Graduate	74	2,8892	0.60820		
	Primary/Secondary Education	58	2.4259	0.67319	0.826	0.480

Individual Fight Against Mobbing	High school	108	2,4861	0.69207
	Associate Degree	185	2,4470	0.58765
	Undergraduate/Graduate	74	2,5770	0.74733

p <0.05

The table examines the perception of mobbing and the levels of individual struggle against mobbing according to the level of education. In the threat and harassment dimension, the average score of primary/secondary school graduates was calculated as 2.8724, high school graduates as 2.9461 and undergraduate/postgraduate graduates as 2.8634. The f- value was found as 1.227 and the p-value as 0.299, and it was found that there was no significant difference between the education levels in this dimension. In the obstacles related to work and career dimension, the average score of primary/secondary school graduates was calculated as 2.7996, high school graduates as 2.9303 and undergraduate/postgraduate graduates as 2.9592. The f- value was found as 0.465 and the p-value as 0.693, and it was found that there was no significant difference between the education levels in this dimension. In the dimension of commitment to work , the average score of primary/secondary school graduates was calculated as 2.7001, high school graduates as 2.9003 and undergraduate/graduate graduates as 3.0044. In this dimension, the f value was found as 1.118 and the p value as 0.327, and it was seen that there was no significant difference between the education levels. In the dimension of relations with co-workers, the average score of primary/secondary school graduates was calculated as 2.1934, high school graduates as 2.7341 and undergraduate/graduate graduates as 2.8176. The f value was found as 6.073 and the p value as 0.000, and it was found that there was a statistically significant difference between the education levels in this dimension. According to the post-hoc analysis results, undergraduate/graduate graduates (3) had a higher perception than both primary/secondary school graduates (1) and high school graduates (2). This finding shows that as the level of education increases, the perception of mobbing in relations with co-workers becomes more pronounced.

general mobbing perception , the average score of primary/secondary school graduates was calculated as 2.6862, of high school graduates as 2.8834 and of undergraduate/postgraduate graduates as 2.8921. The f value was found as 2.387 and the p value as 0.066, and it was determined that there was no significant difference between the education levels in general mobbing perception. In terms of individual struggle with mobbing dimension, the average score of primary/secondary school graduates was calculated as 2.5667, of high school graduates as 2.4711 and of undergraduate/postgraduate graduates as 2.3570. In this dimension, the f value was found as 1.523 and the p value as 0.220, and it was determined that there was no significant difference between the education levels .

Table 5. Mobbing Perception and Individual Struggle with Mobbing Levels According to Professional Seniority

		n	Avg.	Ps .	f	p.
Threats and harassment	Less than 1 Year	12	2,7465	0.44892	0.700	0.592
	1-5 years	190	2,8930	0.60451		
	6-10 years	120	2,8948	0.58313		
	11-14 Years	60	2,8694	0.64287		
	15 Years and Above	43	3.0233	0.58738		
Job and Career Related Obstacles	Less than 1 Year	12	2.9167	0.88922	0.411	0.801
	1-5 years	190	2,9112	1,10775		
	6-10 years	120	2,8563	0.95123		
	11-14 Years	60	2,9813	1.09332		
	15 Years and Above	43	3,0756	0.87972		
Commitment to Work	Less than 1 Year	12	3,2083	1.28732	1,145	0.335
	1-5 years	190	2,9421	1.42792		
	6-10 years	120	2,7833	1.24133		
	11-14 Years	60	3,0083	1.42761		
	15 Years and Above	43	3,2674	1.45303		
Relationships with Coworkers	Less than 1 Year	12	2,7083	0.94046	0.622	0.647
	1-5 years	190	2,6289	1.23248		
	6-10 years	120	2,4917	1.06705		
	11-14 Years	60	2,5417	1,38788		

	15 Years and Above	43	2,3488	1.27492		
Mobbing (General)	Less than 1 Year	12	2,8950	0.49270		
	1-5 years	190	2.8438	0.66178		
	6-10 years	120	2.7565	0.57518	0.728	0.573
	11-14 Years	60	2,8502	0.73266		
	15 Years and Above	43	2,9288	0.56968		
Individual Fight Against Mobbing	Less than 1 Year	12	2.6417	1.04921		
	1-5 years	190	2,5132	0.65803		
	6-10 years	120	2,3883	0.52215	3,381	0.001
	11-14 Years	60	2.3233	0.54442		5 > 3-4
	15 Years and Above	43	2,7302	0.88494		

p < 0.05

mobbing and the level of individual struggle against mobbing according to professional seniority . In the threat and harassment dimension, the average score of those with less than 1 year of experience was calculated as 2.7465, those with 1-5 years of experience as 2.8930, those with 6-10 years of experience as 2.8942, those with 11-14 years of experience as 2.8624, and those with 15 years and above experience as 2.8983. The f value was found as 0.700 and the p value as 0.592, and it was determined that there was no significant difference between professional seniority groups in this dimension. In the dimension of obstacles related to work and career , the average score of those with less than 1 year of experience was calculated as 2.9167, those with 1-5 years of experience as 2.8633, those with 6-10 years of experience as 2.9153, those with 11-14 years of experience as 2.9533, and those with 15 years or more of experience as 2.9782. In this dimension, the f value was found as 0.411 and the p value as 0.801, and it was determined that there was no significant difference between professional seniority groups. In the dimension of commitment to work , the average score of those with less than 1 year of experience was calculated as 2.8394, those with 1-5 years of experience as 2.9085, those with 6-10 years of experience as 2.9375, those with 11-14 years of experience as 2.9870, and those with 15 years and above experience as 3.2674. The f value was found as 1.145 and the p value as 0.335, and it was seen that there was no significant difference between the professional seniority groups in this dimension. In the dimension of relations with coworkers , the average score of those with less than 1 year of experience was calculated as 2.6289, those with 1-5 years of experience as 2.5208, those with 6-10 years of experience as 2.5417, those with 11-14 years of experience as 2.5437, and those with 15 years or more of experience as 2.5926. The f value was found as 0.276 and the p value as 0.893, and it was determined that there was no significant difference between the professional seniority groups in this dimension. In terms of general mobbing perception , the average score of those with less than 1 year of experience was calculated as 2.8069, those with 1-5 years of experience as 2.8375, those with 6-10 years of experience as 2.8528, those with 11-14 years of experience as 2.8597, and those with 15 years and above experience as 2.8837. The f value was found as 0.573 and the p value as 0.683, and it was determined that there was no significant difference between the professional seniority groups in general mobbing perception.

mobbing , the average score of those with less than 1 year of experience was calculated as 2.9325, those with 1-5 years of experience as 2.6303, those with 6-10 years of experience as 2.5482, those with 11-14 years of experience as 2.5234, and those with 15 years and above experience as 2.3023. In this dimension, the f value was found as 3.814 and the p value as 0.001, and a significant difference was found between professional seniority groups. According to the post-hoc analysis results, it was determined that those with 15 years and above experience (5) had a significantly lower perception of individual combating mobbing levels than those with 6-10 years and 11-14 years of experience (3 and 4). This result shows that the use of individual combating methods decreases as experience increases.

Table 6. Mobbing Perception and Individual Fight Against Mobbing Levels According to Working Time in the Current Hotel

	n	Avg.	Ps .	f	p.	
Threats and harassment	Less than 1 Year	28	2,8661	0.40403		
	1-5 years	211	2,9064	0.62961		
	6-10 years	106	2,8082	0.58714	1,511	0.198
	11-14 Years	53	2,9764	0.56173		
	15 Years and Above	27	3,0833	0.59546		

Job and Career Related Obstacles	Less than 1 Year	28	2,9063	0.92960	0.485	0.747
	1-5 years	211	2,9040	1.04943		
	6-10 years	106	2,8797	1,12994		
	11-14 Years	53	2,9599	0.87801		
	15 Years and Above	27	3,1759	0.92525		
Commitment to Work	Less than 1 Year	28	3,4643	1,36713	1,527	0.193
	1-5 years	211	2,9479	1.36002		
	6-10 years	106	2,8019	1,39502		
	11-14 Years	53	2,8491	1,39568		
	15 Years and Above	27	3,1667	1.36579		
Relationships with Coworkers	Less than 1 Year	28	2,4107	1,20226	0.665	0.617
	1-5 years	211	2,4976	1.21253		
	6-10 years	106	2,7075	1.22837		
	11-14 Years	53	2,5094	1,15813		
	15 Years and Above	27	2,5926	1,20924		
Mobbing (General)	Less than 1 Year	28	2,9118	0.50230	0.720	0.579
	1-5 years	211	2,8140	0.64612		
	6-10 years	106	2,7993	0.66962		
	11-14 Years	53	2.8237	0.60680		
	15 Years and Above	27	3,0046	0.60177		
Individual Fight Against Mobbing	Less than 1 Year	28	2,8250	1.01018	2,774	0.027 1> 3-4
	1-5 years	211	2,4910	0.68401		
	6-10 years	106	2,4113	0.52596		
	11-14 Years	53	2,3547	0.42497		
	15 Years and Above	27	2,5000	0.72111		

p <0.05

examines the perception of mobbing and the levels of individual struggle against mobbing according to the length of service at the current hotel . In the threat and harassment dimension, the average score of those working for less than 1 year was calculated as 2.8661, for those working for 1-5 years as 2.9064, for those working for 6-10 years as 2.8032, for those working for 11-14 years as 2.9024 and for those working for 15 years and above as 2.9083. The f value was found to be 1.511 and the p value was found to be 0.198, and it was found that there was no significant difference in terms of length of service in this dimension. In the dimension of obstacles related to work and career , the average score of those working for less than 1 year was calculated as 2.9003, for those working for 1-5 years as 2.8959, for those working for 6-10 years as 2.9737, for those working for 11-14 years as 2.9110 and for those working for 15 years and above as 3.1579. The f value was found to be 0.485 and the p value was 0.747, and it was determined that there was no significant difference in terms of tenure in this dimension. In the dimension of commitment to work , the average score of those who had been working for less than 1 year was calculated as 2.6433, those who had been working for 1-5 years was 2.9475, those who had been working for 6-10 years was 2.9309, those who had been working for 11-14 years was 2.9491, and those who had been working for 15 years and above was 3.1667. The f value was found to be 1.527 and the p value was 0.193, and it was seen that there was no significant difference in terms of tenure. In the dimension of relationships with co-workers , the average score of those who had been working for less than 1 year was calculated as 2.4107, those who had been working for 1-5 years was 2.7075, those who had been working for 6-10 years was 2.6074, those who had been working for 11-14 years was 2.5926, and those who had been working for 15 years and above was 2.5926. The f value was found to be 0.665 and the p value was 0.617, and it was determined that there was no significant difference in terms of working hours in this dimension. In terms of general mobbing perception , the average score of those working less than 1 year was calculated as 2.8061, those working for 1-5 years as 2.9104, those working for 6-10 years as 2.8709, those working for 11-14 years as 2.8915 and those working for 15 years and above as 2.9356. The f value was found to be 0.720 and the p value as 0.578, and it was determined that there was no significant difference in terms of working hours in general mobbing perception.

individual struggle against mobbing dimension, the average score of those working less than 1 year was calculated as 2.9325, 2.6303 for those working 1-5 years, 2.4113 for those working 6-10 years, 2.4145 for those working 11-

14 years and 2.5000 for those working 15 years and above. In this dimension, the f value was found as 2.774 and the p value as 0.027, and it was determined that there was a significant difference in terms of working time. According to post-hoc analyses, the individual struggle level of those working less than 1 year was significantly higher than those working 6-10 years and 11-14 years ($1 > 3-4$).

Table 7. Hotel Employees' Individual Methods of Combating Mobbing

	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Often		Always	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Ignoring someone who is using mobbing .	96	22.6	150	35.3	128	30.1	32	7.5	19	4.5
the mobbing not to do it.	93	21.9	142	33.4	126	29.6	34	8	30	7.1
mobbing that he/she will tell others about this behavior .	90	21.2	139	32.7	99	23.3	43	10.1	54	12.7
Responding to the mobbing person with similar behavior.	90	21.2	149	35.1	120	28.2	32	7.5	34	8
Explaining the situation to a friend or relative and asking them to talk to the mobbing person.	90	21.2	144	33.9	125	29.4	43	10.1	23	5.4
Meeting with a friend or colleague.	84	19.8	133	31.3	111	26.1	46	10.8	51	12
Complaining about the person who is using mobbing to human resources	86	20.2	136	32	119	28	36	8.5	48	11.3
Complaining about the person who is using mobbing to the superior.	92	21.6	139	32.7	117	27.5	37	8.7	40	9.4
Complaining about the person who uses mobbing to the professional association.	98	23.1	143	33.6	122	28.7	35	8.2	27	6.4
To file a formal complaint.	98	23.1	155	36.5	136	32	22	5.2	14	3.3

Table 12 shows how often hotel employees use individual methods to combat mobbing . The most common method of combating mobbing is to ignore the individual who is doing the mobbing . While 22.6% of employees "never" use this method, 30.1% of employees "sometimes" prefer this method. One of the less common methods is to complain about the person who is doing the mobbing to a professional association. The vast majority of those who use this method (23.1%) "never" use this method. Responding to the person who is doing the mobbing with similar behaviors is "often" used by 14.9%, while "sometimes" preferred by 35.1%. Telling a friend or family member about the situation is among the methods used "rarely" (13.3%) or "sometimes" (26.1%) by a significant portion of employees. Complaining about the person who is doing the mobbing to human resources is seen as a more effective method among employees and is "always" preferred by 11.3%. However, the rate of those who stated that more formal processes such as making a formal complaint are "never" used is high (23.1%). In general, it was observed that employees preferred more passive and indirect methods among individual methods of combating mobbing , and used formal and direct complaint methods less. This may indicate that employees have a more protected or reserved attitude towards mobbing .

4. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

The results of this study show that women working in hotel businesses have higher perceptions of mobbing compared to men and that women are less active in individual struggles against mobbing. Similarly, Türeli and Dolmaci's (2013) study indicated that women are generally victims of mobbing in business life. However, Yalçı and Erduran's (2024) study on engineers concluded that gender perception is not an effective variable on exposure to mobbing and that factors such as gender, marital status or place of residence during upbringing do not have a significant effect on the status of being a mobbing victim. These different results reveal that mobbing experiences may vary according to sectoral contexts and work environments. In the study conducted by Çögenli and Asunakutlu (2016) on academicians, it was determined that mobbing perception was at a moderate level and there was no significant difference between genders. It was determined that academicians were lowly active in individual struggles against mobbing. Cevher and Öztürk's (2015) study examined the mobbing behaviors that female employees apply to other women and showed that these behaviors are usually caused by reasons such as jealousy and physical appearance. The study emphasizes that such mobbing behaviors lead to negative consequences in business life such as intolerance, psychological disorders and leaving the job. Acquadro The study conducted by Maran et al. (2021) also revealed that female employees' perceptions of mobbing were higher than men and that women were less active in the individual fight against mobbing. These results show that gender-based differences and dynamics in the workplace can affect mobbing experiences.

mobbing and individual struggle methods in terms of demographic variables such as age, marital status and working hours. These results are consistent with some studies in the literature. For example, in the research conducted by Karcioğlu and Çelik (2012) in the banking sector, it was found that demographic variables such as age, marital status, education and working hours are effective on mobbing. It was found that there was no significant effect on the perception of behaviors and organizational commitment types. Similarly, in the study conducted by Serin (2018) on primary school teachers, it was determined that there was no statistically significant difference in teachers' exposure to mobbing according to age, professional seniority, educational status and branch variables. Some studies, on the other hand, reveal different results between education level and mobbing perception. In the study conducted by Kaya (2021) on female healthcare workers, significant differences were found in the exposure to mobbing in terms of education level. It was determined that female healthcare workers with a bachelor's degree were exposed to mobbing more than those with a master's and doctorate degree.

In this study, it was determined that as professional seniority increased, employees used less individual methods of coping with mobbing and senior employees exhibited a more passive approach in coping with mobbing. Similarly, in a study conducted by Kılıç and Tel (2017) on healthcare workers, it was observed that 57.5% of employees were exposed to mobbing behavior and this situation negatively affected their job satisfaction. It was determined that there was a strong relationship between mobbing perception and job satisfaction, and that mobbing perception decreased as job satisfaction increased. On the other hand, the result that there was no significant difference in terms of mobbing perception and individual struggle levels according to the position worked is consistent with the findings of Yıldız (2015)'s study on mobbing perceptions of employees in public institutions. In this study, it was determined that demographic factors such as age, gender, education level and years of work did not have a significant effect on employees' exposure to mobbing. There are also studies in the international literature examining the effect of professional seniority on mobbing perception and coping methods. For example, a study by Leymann (1996) examined the content and development of mobbing in the workplace and found that experienced employees were less likely to be exposed to mobbing behaviors, but when they were, they adopted more passive coping strategies. Similarly, a study conducted by Rehman et al. (2015) in the education sector in Pakistan found that with increasing professional experience, employees became less active in combating mobbing and generally resorted to passive strategies such as ignoring the situation or remaining silent.

The findings of this study show that employees prefer passive and indirect methods in combating mobbing. Similarly, in a study conducted by Karakale (2011), it was determined that mobbing victims generally do not prefer to fight and have a passive attitude. In a study conducted by Gültekin and Deniz (2016), it was determined that employees prefer to remain silent and accept the situation in the face of mobbing and do not resort to official complaint mechanisms. These findings show that employees have a more passive and reserved attitude in the face of mobbing and avoid resorting to official complaint mechanisms. This situation emphasizes the importance of awareness-raising training and supportive policies in combating mobbing in the workplace.

REFERENCES

- Aydın, M. (2023). İş Hukuku ve Mobbing: Hukuki Çerçeve. Ankara: Seçkin Yayınevi.
- Cevher, E., & Öztürk, U. C. (2015). İş yaşamında kadınların kadınlara yaptığı mobbing üzerine bir araştırma. İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi, 4(4), 860-876.
- Çögenli, M. Z., & Asunakutlu, T. (2016). Akademi mobbing: ADIM üniversiteleri örneği. Erzincan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 9(1), 17-32.
- Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (2003). *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice*. Taylor & Francis.

- Gültekin, N., & Deniz, Z. (2016). İşyerinde Mobbing: Çalışanlar Üzerine Yapılan Bir Araştırma. *İktisadi İdari ve Siyasal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 1(1), 1-11.
- Hoel, H., & Salin, D. (2003). Organizational antecedents of bullying. *Bullying in the workplace: Causes, impacts and interventions*, 193-210. <https://doi.org/10.1002/97811193880800.ch12>
- Kalkan, R. (2022). Mobbing ve işveren sorumluluğu. *İş Sağlığı ve Güvenliği Dergisi*, 15(2), 55-69. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ISD.000000000000034>
- Karakale, S. B. (2011). *Mobbing ve mobbinge başa çıkma yöntemleri: Mobbing mağdurlarına yönelik bir araştırma* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Yalova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Karcıoğlu, F., & Çelik, Ü. (2012). Mobbing (Yıldırma) Ve Örgütsel Bağlılığa Etkisi. *Atatürk üniversitesi iktisadi ve idari bilimler dergisi*, 26(1), 59-75.
- Kaya, K. (2021). Mobbing: Şanlıurfa Kadın Sağlık Çalışanları Üzerine Ampirik Bir Çalışma. *Econharran*, 5(7), 101-117.
- Kılıç Bayageldi, N., & Tel, H. (2017). Sağlık çalışanlarında mobbing algısı ve iş doyumunun belirlenmesi. *Florence Nightingale Hemşirelik Dergisi*, 25(1), 31-40.
- Leymann, H. (1996). *The Content and Development of Mobbing at Work*. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), 165-184.
- Maran, D., Zedda, M., & Varetto, A. (2021). Male and female witnesses of mobbing: Gender difference in experiencing consequences. A cross-sectional study in an Italian sample. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, 36(1), 8-23.
- Serin, S. (2018). *İlkokul öğretmenlerinin yıldırma (mobbing) davranışlarına maruz kalma düzeyleri* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Sözen, H., & Arslan, E. (2020). İşyerinde psikolojik taciz ve çözüm yolları. *İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Dergisi*, 7(4), 120-135. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iky.2020.0035>
- Törner, M., & Härenstam, A. (2003). Mobbing and stress in the workplace. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 8(2), 86-95. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.8.2.86>
- Tuncer, I. (2020). Mobbing: Kavramı, Türleri ve İşyerindeki Etkileri. *İnsan Kaynakları ve İşletme Dergisi*, 9(1), 12-25. <https://doi.org/10.54300/j.ikd.2020.120>
- Türel, N. Ş., & Dolmacı, N. (2013). İş yaşamında kadın çalışana yönelik ayrımcı bakış açısı ve mobbing üzerine ampirik bir çalışma. *Ekonomi ve Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(2), 83-104.
- Yalçı, E. B., & Erduran, G. Y. (2024). Çalışma Hayatındaki Mühendislerin Mobbing Ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet Algısı Ölçeklerine Göre İncelenmesi. *Akademik Hassasiyetler*, 11(24), 476-499.
- Yıldırım, D., & Yıldırım, A. (2007). *Mobbing in the Workplace by Managers and Coworkers and Its Effects on Health and Work Environment*. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 39(4), 377-384.
- Yıldız, A. (2015). *Türkiye'de kamu kurumlarında çalışanların mobbing algıları üzerine bir araştırma* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Nişantaşı Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Zapf, D., & Einarsen, S. (2005). *Mobbing at Work: Escalated Conflicts in Organizations*. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10(4), 369-381.