

# **EURASIAN JOURNAL OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT**

**www.eurasianpublications.com**

---

## **THE IMPACT OF MOBBING ON LABOR PRODUCTIVITY IN TERMS OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AND LAW: AN APPLICATION IN ACADEMIC WORLD**

**Seden Durustkan**

Corresponding Author: Istanbul Maltepe University, Turkey  
Email: sedendurustkan@maltepe.edu.tr

**Sibel Aybar**

Istanbul Gelisim University, Turkey  
Email: saybar@gelisim.edu.tr

**Seyda Sanli**

Istanbul Gelisim University, Turkey  
Email: ssanli@gelisim.edu.tr

Received: August 20, 2019

Accepted: December 10, 2019

---

### **Abstract**

This study researches mobbing in labor relations. Even though mobbing could have encountered in all sectors, the education sector needs to be considered separately as it relates to the welfare level of society. It should be aimed at universities and academicians, who are one of the determinants of the development levels of their countries, study without any pressure on the quality of education. The analysis is based on a unique survey conducted with 418 academicians in every position in Istanbul universities in November 2016 to March 2017. The findings of the research revealed that productivity was strongly correlated with mobbing. Besides that, it was connected with academic freedom, self-confidence, the freedom to decide and practice and freedom of expression. For the above reason, our study aims to determine how the academicians of foundation universities in Istanbul-Turkey are affected by mobbing they exposed to in their organizations and also to understand the perspective of the Turkish judiciary on the academic mobbing events by analyzing Supreme Court decisions.

**Keywords:** Mobbing, Administration Management, Law, Academician, Productivity

---

### **1. Introduction**

Increasing competition with globalization has forced enterprises to change management structures; at the same time, employees are forced to apply psychological harassment to their colleagues to secure their place in business life. Due to the increased competition in trade, competition has increased not only among competitors but also among employees of the

company itself. Therefore, the psychological harassment applied to dispel the recruited competing labors from the workplace causes the working life to become unhealthy from the point of psychological view. The mobbing term derived from the mob word, which in English means organizational pressure, can be defined as the attacks made between in same status employees or superior-subordinates in the organization, to cause psychological damage, caused by different reasons.

Mobbing, in another saying, psychological harassment, emerged as a concept of conflict between employees and employers, confrontation in the daily life of the individuals and manifest in the environment where conflicts of interest arise, especially unveiled with the ever-developing business world. Mobbing is one of the rare notions that the administration can cooperate with the law with regards to cause and effect. Due to the complexity of organizational structures in today's business world, decision-makers may exhibit aggressive attitudes towards reducing the employee's social and individual reputation to individual interests or not to hinder business activity. There are many opinions suggested about a notion called mobbing by doctrine. Mobbing is a concept that affects the future of enterprise and it requires legal assessment because of its aggressive nature.

Mobbing is experienced in almost all countries and organizations. The concept of mobbing has been examined in detail as an academic subject for the last decades. As the studies continue, it is getting clear that this is a matter of labor force. Studies revealed that one of the most important reasons for reducing productivity at work is mobbing. However, to find a way to prevent this, the sources and elements must be examined in detail. This study aims to demonstrate whether there is a significant relationship between productivity and the academicians exposed to mobbing and also to understand the perspective of the Turkish judiciary on the academic mobbing events by analyzing Supreme Court decisions. For this reason, the hypothesis is based on academicians, who are the victims of mobbing, have reduced the productivity of the universities and the quality of the education assumption.

The organization of this paper is as follows. Section 2 discusses the mobbing and its appearance in universities with sharing views in terms of doctrine. Following, mobbing events in Turkey which are subject to Supreme Court decision and the point of view of Turkish jurisdiction is described in Section 3. Section 4 confers productivity and how it affects foundations. Section 5 includes the objective of the study. Section 6 presents samples and methodology. Data and findings are exhibits in Section 7 and finally, Section 8 concludes the paper.

## **2. Importance of mobbing and appearance in universities**

Mobbing is a concept that first appeared in the late 16th century, long before the industrial revolution. The word "mob" is the abbreviated form of the word "mobiles musvulgus - moving crowd" in Latin and constitutes the roots of mobbing (Ozkul and Carikci, 2010). In English, this word meaning has changed without being too different from the Latin and has come to mean like an irregular or revolting group of people, a gang or a crowd of unlawful violence (Costello, 1997; Ozkul and Carikci, 2010). Some other words are used in doctrine instead of mobbing (Einarsen, 1999; Davenport *et al.* 2005; Nolfé *et al.* 2007; Eser, n.d; Ozkul and Carikci, 2010; Keim and McDermott, 2010), such as: bullying, stalking, psycho-terror at workplace, emotional abuse, workplace syndrome, and psychological abuse.

The definition of mobbing generally accepted by the doctrine belongs to Leymann (1990): a kind of psychological terrorism applied by one or more people to another person, systematically using hostile and immoral communication. As can be seen, there are negative notions such as violence, bullying, harassment and terror in this concept (Leymann and Gustafsson, 1996; Ozkul and Carikci, 2010). This concept is a communication process that will take place in the form of formation, humiliation, an accusation of the target person uncomfortably, isolate and abuse and malicious behavior, ideal sand exclusive attitudes in business life and daily life as we will give examples below (Kose, 2006; Ozkul and Carikci, 2010). In addition to daily life, mobbing could create a process, which is unethical, unfriendly and individual vulnerable and helpless, aiming at harming the position of the employees themselves and their organization (Hoel *et al.* 2002; Ozkul and Carikci, 2010), in business life

(Leymann and Gustafsson, 1996; Ozkul and Carikci, 2010). In this communication process, as in every type of communication, not only words but also body language are used (Kose, 2006; Ozkul and Carikci, 2010). Mobbing is not always enforced by a single person (Asunakutlu and Safran, 2006; Ozkul and Carikci, 2010). In terms of operation, there may also be mobbing between employees – employers and employees - employees. According to Einarsen (1999), mobbing can be called repetitive, knowingly or unknowingly movements that are embarrassing, humiliating and psychologically painful, interfering with productivity or causing a negative working environment (Einarsen, 1999) or occupational burnout (Eurofound, 2009; Arnejcic, 2016; Goralewska-Slonska, 2019). Mobbing is an attitude that is often conscious and systematic (Demirel, 2009; Ozkul and Carikci, 2010). There are enough time and options for mobbing in the workplace where most of the day is spent (Browne and Smith, 2008; Ozkul and Carikci, 2010).

Whether it is between the university (employer in terms of labor law) and the lecturer, or by the lecturer to the lecturer, relationships in academic life are places psychological harassment finds application in terms of labor law. From the point of law, there is no differentiation between the State University and the Foundation University for mobbing. Foundation universities are similar to privately owned enterprises; however, they differ from privately owned enterprises in terms of their operations due to their public service activities. Some examples for mobbing in academic life (Westhues, 2006; Faria *et al.* 2012; Druzhilov, 2012) are as below;

- Academician's study is hindered in later processes if s/he does not support the government, and not give them new tasks in the distribution of tasks but the previous missions is also taken from his/her hands.
- Prevention of requested activities such as permission for conferences, professional visits, research projects.
- Not giving support for events such as congress or panel they want to organize.
- Physical working conditions are made difficult. The study rooms, the laboratories, the operating room, etc. are taken from their hands.
- Even masters and doctoral studies are blocked.
- Sometimes students are also provoked against the lecturer exposed to mobbing and confidential information about the lecturer's private experience is shared with the students.
- Suppressing them for changing the university.
- Elimination of justice and expertise principles in course Schedule
- The prevention of the rights and success of the person being exposed to mobbing during the research files and publications for examination and promotion of lecturer. And also during the associate professorship examination, publication evaluation constitutes the first and oral examination constitutes the second stage, lecturers are threatened by the assigned jury members.

### **3. Mobbing in terms of Turkish law**

Mobbing emerges as a concept that is taken into consideration and imposes sanctions in Turkish law, especially in business relations. Mobbing is, in essence, a breach of a person's interest in obligation to be treated equally in terms of labor law. For this reason, when we deal with the equitable treatment of psychological harassment, an important point is drawn. The obligation to be treated equally has been violated in an action against psychological harassment of workers by the employer whereas it is directly attributed to the actual implementation of an employer. If an employee makes psychological harassment to another employee, there will not found any behaviors that are contrary to the employer's liability to treat equally. Besides, an employer, who condones to psychological harassment between employees, with the motive of discrimination is also acting contrary to the treat equally. In mobbing, the employer makes discrimination between equal employees, violates their rights, isolates one employee from others, restricts that employee's working life and often makes their work unbearable; so this act

is contrary to the principle of equal treatment (Tinaz *et al.* 2008; Iskin, 2010; Savas, 2007; Sen, 2009). Besides, it is not right to say that any kind of psychological harassment is contrary to the principle of equality (Guzel and Ertan, 2008). In cases where the reason for psychological harassment is a prohibition of discrimination; equality may be referred to as irregularity (Limoncuoglu, 2010).

The fact that this type of harassment cannot reveal in concrete in the dispute force judges in terms of evidence law. Although certain criteria cannot be laid down for mobbing demonstration in the legal system, the Turkish judiciary wanted to determine a common point of view. It is necessary to examine the Supreme Court and the Council of State's decisions to see the change in the point of view of the Turkish judiciary with mobbing in academic life. Although different judges have different opinions due to increasing mobbing cases in recent years, this process has been gathered under a common roof by the Supreme Court Assembly of Civil Chambers.

If we make the decisions of the Supreme Court of Appeals and the Council of State separately, we will see that the Council of State has a more established consensus of mobbing cases in the academy. If we start with Council of State decision, according to the dispute in front of Council of State for the 8<sup>th</sup> circuit (2012) (F.N. 2008/10606, D.N. 2012/1736.), while the claimant was working at the A. University Faculty of Medicine as a member of the Department of Neurosurgery since 17.9.2001, had been given three separate disciplinary punishments to himself and then the claimant had canceled the disciplinary punishments by appealing to the judiciary, in addition to this, he was taken aforementioned office by court decision. The claimant stated that he had been exposed to mobbing actions and operations annoyance and intimidation which were continuously carried out against him and therefore, he claimed 50,000.00TL in respect of non-pecuniary damage.

A report was prepared to research made by the Provincial Human Rights Board of the Governor of Erzurum. The aforesaid report state that, the claimant was exposed to several unfair actions and these were large enough to affect his inwardness. Erzurum 2nd Administrative Court, the first instance court, decided to part acceptance of the case so, Administration, which is Employer University, had to pay 5.000,00-TL to the claimant for compensating the damages of him suffering from sadness and distress due to defendant's illegal actions and procedures and rejected the rest of claims. Then, the claimant professor appealed the decision of the trial court, but the Council of State rejected the appeal by citing the relevant procedural law.

It shows that with this decision, which is one of the first decisions on mobbing, the Council of State and administrative courts recognized the concept of mobbing. However, in our opinion, the necessary assessment of the non-pecuniary damage claim arising from psychological harassment has not been made. Nevertheless, with the decision, the concept of mobbing began to gain validity for academic life and started to set a precedent for Supreme Court decisions.

Although the Council of State does not encounter disputes about the mobbing in academic life as the Supreme Court of Appeals, there are no decisions to create a dilemma in itself. However, when the decisions of the Supreme Court of Appeals are examined, it will be seen that there are differences in the mobbing approaches that arise from a circuit to circuit. In chronological order, if the Supreme Court of Appeals' decisions of the academic mobbing will be examined; first, there is a decision of the Supreme Court of Appeals for the 4<sup>th</sup> circuit (2014) (F.N. 2013/5855, D.N. 2014/2603.). The dispute has arisen between the claimant, professor of Medicine faculty of D. University, and the defendant, dean of the same faculty. According to the claimant's claims, s/he sued a lawsuit in the trial court for non-pecuniary damages due to attacks on personality rights, humiliated him, pushed into loneliness and undergoing psychological abuse after the defendant had started as a dean. However, the trial court decided to reject the dispute because there was not sufficient evidence that the defendant applied psychological harassment to the claimant. Supreme Court of Appeals has reversed the decision of the trial court by stating, it is not compatible to reject the case by not complying with the

procedure and the law when the case had to be rejected because of the absence of hostility (party affiliation).

The Supreme Court either has shown a passive stance against the mobbing that emerged in academic life as it is seen in the decision of the Supreme Court of Appeals for the 9th circuit or decided absence of hostility. Accordingly, in the decision of the Supreme Court of Appeals for the 9th circuit (2016) (F. N. 2015/27635 D.N. 2016/7927.) the dispute has emerged between the claimant lecturer and the defendant university. The claimant has worked as a lecturer in the university between 2007 and 2014 and also has taken charge of many different duties such as vice-principal, faculty member, and program director. However, it was stated that on 4.7.2014 claimant's employment contract was terminated due to the 25/2-d article of labor law; that was unjust termination and the main purpose of the termination was to provide new recruitment to the university by the new director. Also, the claimant has demanded reemployment because the defendant university had been continuously applying mobbing to him for about six months and that he had been forced to resign. The defendant, however, alleges that the claimant's employment contract has been terminated in writing by a notice of termination dated 4.7.2014, the reason for the termination has been stated clearly and precisely. In addition, the claimant's bill of claims statement has taken about termination and also using very impolite language to the lecturer ..., administrative personnel ... and student ... On the grounds of these bills of claims, the investigation was initiated on the claimant, the claimant was inflicted a disciplinary punishment on the date of 3.7.2014 toward the investigation and that the investigation report based on the termination was arranged on 2.7.2014 and that the claimant's employment contract was terminated with just cause on 4.7.2014 with these statements the defendant was requested for dismissal.

The trial court stated that the disciplinary proceeding contained in the defendant's statement was invalid because of not being duly enforced, also it was determined from witness statements that claimant did not behave as alleged in the disciplinary proceeding and termination notice, the defendant's witness statements were not based on the judgment as they are still working in the same university thereby the trial court considered the case. Also, the trial court decided to accept the case and the invalidity of the termination because of the correctness of the claim of withdrawal - recruitment. Therefore, the defendant appealed to the Supreme Court.

As regards, the dispute Supreme Court was decided partial reversal of the judgment because the disciplinary proceeding was considered groundless and termination of the contract were not possible. Therefore, termination was not applicable in this case according to the principle that two different penalties for the same crime cannot be given. But still, surprisingly the decision of trial court about the invalidity of termination was upheld. Neither the trial court nor the Supreme Court of Appeals made any assessment of the mobbing claimed by the claimant in dispute (Supreme Court Of Appeals Of The Republic Of Turkey For The 9<sup>th</sup> circuit Dated 22.3.2010, F.N. 2010/10905, D.N. 2010/751; Supreme Court Assembly Of Civil Chambers Of The Republic Of Turkey Dated 2.11.2011, F.N. 2011/9-590, D.N. 2011/677.). Limoncuoglu (2010, p. 53) has stated "When a small number of psychological harassment decisions so far examined, it is concluded that, in practice, trial courts and the Supreme Court have accepted the employees have unilateral right to terminate the contract of service due to exposing to psychological harassment. However, since the supreme court did not examine judgments in detail, it is not known to which subclasses of article 24/2 of law no. 4857 is based on an employee's right to terminate in the qualitative sense. For example, in a case where the employee paying cut off and instructing other employees for not talking to him, the supreme court has found the decision of claimant employee's termination of the contract of service justified due to being exposed to psychological harassment." However, there is an irregularity in the disciplinary proceeding and the statements of witnesses in favor of the claimant were strengthening the claim of mobbing. Although considering the mobbing does not seem to change the court decision, it was of great importance that the actions taken by the defendant are considered as mobbing by the legal order, which is an important step in the academic world.

Finally, the decision dated 11.11.2015 of the Supreme Court Assembly of Civil Chambers has assembled decisions of the different circuits under the same roof to prevent

incompatible decisions due to the different approaches of the mobbing which emerged in the academic life, has been decided on a common basis. In the decision of the Supreme Court Assembly of Civil Chambers (2015) (F.N. 2014/4-110, D.N. 2015/2600.), the claimant stated that he had served as the ...University of Head of the Department of Science of Basic Education and that the defendant, who is the dean of the faculty, applied the attitudes and behaviors of the faculty and the psychological pressure and intimidation policies and the claimant had not received any results despite complaining these attitudes to the university administration. On the contrary, he was punished with disciplinary punishment because of this claims and other instructors were warned about him in the way like "watch out to Mr. K..., do not contact him, stay away, ... etc." The claimant was claimed non-pecuniary damages due to the policy of exclusion and isolation against him. Although he had been paying attention to the work hours, a disciplinary proceeding was started in the matter if he did not come to the office at a previous date. Moreover, some words that he did not say were conveyed to the rector like he was told, he has exposed to some formal letters and unnecessary warnings, pecuniary loss and intangible damages cause of the defendant's mobbing. The defendant argued that the claimant's case must be rejected by the reason of unjustified and legally groundless. The ... 2<sup>nd</sup> Civil Court of First Instance decided that the claimant's claims should be paid partially.

Discussion ways for all the personal failure or service failure were closed for the Supreme Court of Appeals with this decision. In any case, mobbing has been accepted as a personal failure and a sanction was imposed if it was proven.

As a result, the perspective of mobbing in academic life in Turkish law has just begun to mature. Although the Court of Cassation can reach a common point for mobbing in employee-employer relations other than universities, the same will be the case for the academic life after the decision of the Supreme Court Assembly of Civil Chambers.

#### **4. Importance of productivity and efficiency in operations**

Efficiency is a concept, which is equivalent to the word "productivity", to measure of how well resources are used and effectively used, and it is the input rate of an outcome. In the classical sense, the productivity rate is calculated as  $\text{Output} / \text{Input}$ . According to this relation, productivity is the ratio obtained by proportioning the production sources (inputs) used to realize this production with the products and services (outcomes) produced at the end of a certain period of a production or service process. Productivity ratios are tools that evaluate activities occurring after a process and show the extent of how and what they are produced. The increase in productivity determines the quality of operation. Also, it means more production and more profit at a low cost.

The increase in productivity is the biggest gain from the point of the organization. Administrators are the biggest, even the most important, factor in increasing productivity in business. Therefore, it is the direct responsibility of the administrators to increase productivity in the operations (Ozdemir, 1991). Consequently, most of the administrators' business is to ensure the use for production purposes of all the time of operation, employees and pecuniary resources and to keep the productivity susceptibility alive. The attitude of the administrators, who are trying to do the business most efficiently, may not only increase the performance of their employees but also dramatically increase the outcomes of the organization by maximizing the human resource without increasing costs.

Productivity is expressed as the total productivity of all factors of production. Today, productivity is used unremarkable in the sense of "labor productivity" without any particular distinction. According to this, labor productivity is calculated by dividing the total outcome of the labor force used in production (Ekin, 1997). The labor force term is defined by a mental or physical effort spent over a certain period. In other words, the intellectual capital, which is the primary element of the learning organization, is explained by the term. (Atay, 1988). In the circumstances, the most primary element that can define human productivity comes from the focal point being in the same direction.

It is extremely difficult to calculate labor productivity, especially in labor operations. The reason is that, the labor force cannot be the full monty identified and that the business is

affected by many variable factors. Factors affecting productivity are related to; demographic, economic and social conditions, qualifications of administrators and employees. (Ekin, 1997). As a result, labor productivity varies from person to person as it is related to human factors. Human factors are also related to varying from mental, spiritual, moral, and cultural qualities and abilities of the individual. Also, job satisfaction is another factor in which job productivity is affected in the first order (Cerci and Dumludag, 2019; Nahar *et al.* 2013). Job satisfaction means "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (Locke, 1976, p. 1300).

Due to the most important production factor in the product of services, "human" is the most valuable asset of the operation, the effect of labors in the product cannot be denied in operations. The common aims of operations are; to be able to produce goods and services superior to their counterparts in the market, to be the sector leader in technology, to accelerate sales potential and profitability, to prevent waste by reducing costs, to increase employees' performance and motivation correspondingly. Organizational aims can be achieved through the efforts of labors; the production and efficiency of an organization depend on the productivity of the employees. The achievement of these objectives can be obtained by making the labor force productivity (Yumusak, 2008).

## **5. The objective of the study**

As in all the foundations, the mobbing actions manifest itself in higher education institutions, as well. The current literature points out that mobbing may direct the employees' productivity. Therefore, it can be discussed that the productivity of academicians in higher education institutions is affected by the intensity of mobbing which is exposing. In addition to our survey, Vveinhardt and Streimikiene (2017) state that 69.9% of the people exposed to mobbing are highly educated. For this reason, it has become common for academics to encounter mobbing.

The productivity of higher education institutions, which are vital to the development of societies, is the most valuable of organizations of productivity. Academic freedom is the *sine qua non* for a country for improving. Academic freedom and university productivity are directly proportional to the productivity of academics (Blaug, 1968). Thus, it is necessary for the academicians to reduce the percentages of the above-mentioned movements mentioned in Supreme Court decisions as well as mobbing examples.

Since academies are locations where individuals are strongly represented, it is expected that they are isolated from the psychological harassment faced by the individual at every moment of life. Strengthening the concept of the individual is a crystal-clear fact that the first step is freedom of expression (Schauer, 1982). In case freedom of expression of academicians is restricted by mobbing, then it is necessary to discuss how to influence productivity.

The self-confidence that lays an active role in being an individual need to be riveted at universities. The individual must live without feeling fearful of society or the fear to be judged, feeling like a whole to be strengthened of self-confidence. Academicians, who are steering societies, should be taken as examples. For this reason, they need to be free within their capabilities and fields of study, without being questioned or constrained. The restriction of these freedoms is also included in the definition of mobbing as mentioned before. Therefore, the questions whether the mobbing does affect productivity or not and if it affects, then how are constituted the basic hypothesis of this study.

*Hypothesis: There is a negative relation between mobbing and productivity.*

## **6. Sample and methodology**

In this study carried out to determine whether the mobbing affects the productivity of academicians or not, survey practice was chosen as a quantitative method. The sample of the research comprises of academic members working in foundation universities in Istanbul in November 2016 to March 2017. The online survey method was preferred for the survey

practice. 418 participants and their survey forms' suitable to be used in the research were obtained within the framework of this scope. The reliability statistics of the survey results from the users are shown in Table 1. The information received via the survey forms was transmitted to the statistics package program "SPSS for Windows 24.0", thus being evaluated with this program.

The online survey is constituted into two parts. The first part contained mobbing questions and the second part contained the productivity question. The letters in the front of the question numbers are showing the species of the question. M indicates Mobbing and also P indicates Productivity. Especially, these questions are chosen because of the reasons explained above in the objective of the study.

**Table 1. Mobbing and Productivity Reliability Statistics**

Mobbing Reliability Statistics		Productivity Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.995	45	0.973	17

**Source:** Compiled by authors

## 7. Research data and findings

The important issue shown in Table 2 is freedom of expression. With this question, the study tries to find answers about whether the academicians are exposed to mobbing, and if it is, how their productivity is affected. The dual correlation of the M1 and P52 questions revealed  $r = -0.499$  result. It is analyzed from the results in Table 2 of column A show that the majority of academicians are exposed to mobbing about freedom of expression, as in the literature (Pheko, 2018), and that the results in Table 2 of column E show that this rarely had a positive effect on their productivity.

The dual correlation in Table 2 shows the analysis of the freedom to decide and practice. Academicians' decisions about their self's and their expertise should not be questioned to restrict academic freedom. The dual correlation of the M29 and P56 questions revealed  $r = -0.532$  results. The decisions, given by the academics, are frequently questioned to the results in Table 2 of column B. Column F of Table 2 has analyzed academicians' participation in the decisions given to increase the positive productivity, which is rare.

Whether the academicians see mobbing in their work areas and how this constraint reflects their productivity was also examined. The dual correlation of the M33 and P51 questions revealed  $r = -0.589$  result. It is analyzed from the results of Table 2 of column C that academicians are exposed to mobbing at their work areas rarely; in results in Table 2 of column G about doing business according to their abilities is also rare.

Lastly, Table 2, is taken into consideration, the study tries to find answers to whether academicians meet any mobbing while presenting a benefit in the field of science in their scientific fields, and how mobbing affects productivity. The dual correlation of the M34 and P50 questions revealed  $r = -0.431$  result. According to the results in Table 2 of column D, the academics were frequently forced to do things they thought were meaningless, and according to the results in Table 2 of column H, the universities rarely had enough staff. When we compare our findings with the existing literature, studies on mobbing support our results. In other words, academicians have incurred mobbing reduces their job satisfaction (Einarsen *et al.* 2003; Bowling and Beehr, 2006; Rodriguez-Munoz *et al.* 2009; Carroll and Lauzier, 2014; Ozturk and Sahbudak, 2017; Cerci and Dumludag, 2019).



**Table 2. The ratio of given answers to the question**

Answers	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
	<b>Frequency</b>							
	<b>M1</b>	<b>M29</b>	<b>M33</b>	<b>M34</b>	<b>P52</b>	<b>P56</b>	<b>P51</b>	<b>P50</b>
Never	87	95	181	137	56	61	59	62
Rarely	76	84	37	65	164	155	155	165
Sometimes	63	42	21	33	47	35	52	59
Frequently	164	149	135	139	82	97	95	85
Always	28	48	44	44	68	70	57	47
Total	418							
	<b>Percent</b>							
Never	20.8	22.7	43.3	32.8	13.4	14.6	14.1	14.8
Rarely	18.2	20.1	8.9	15.6	39.2	37.1	37.1	39.5
Sometimes	15.1	10.0	5.0	7.9	11.2	8.4	12.4	14.1
Frequently	39.2	35.6	32.3	33.3	19.6	23.2	22.7	20.3
Always	6.7	11.5	10.5	10.5	16.3	16.7	13.6	11.2
Total	100.0							

**Note:** Mobbing Questions: M1. – My opportunities to express myself are limited. M29. – My decisions are constantly questioned. M33. – My tasks are always restricted, jobs given to me are withdrawn, and I cannot even create a new job to myself. M34. – I'm forced to do meaningless works. Productivity Questions: P52. – The ability to express employees' ideas freely to their administrators is positively related to productivity. P56. – Ensuring to participate in decisions positively affects productivity. P51. – Everyone is doing business according to their abilities. P50. – There are a sufficient number of employee to do every job in the units, there are not many employees.

**Source:** Compiled by authors

## 8. Conclusion

When the current data is analyzed, it can be interpreted as follows: The mobbing has a negative relation with productivity. The ethical fact is the basis for negative relations. The findings obtained thanks to the research data set forth the following for higher education institutions:

- There is a closely associated relationship between mobbing and productivity.
- Mobbing negatively affects productivity.

Mobbing rates show that it is related to productivity negatively as academicians are exposed to mobbing in vital aspects for themselves and also for universities. When the character of mobbing is taken into consideration, it will be a waste of time to expect a positive effect on human nature. However, it is revealed with analyzed results, as in the case of universities; the presence of mobbing, in a strong but also weak part of society, has negatively impacted in terms of productivity.

It is not a hopeful expectation that can be realized under the threat of mobbing by presenting a thesis and antithesis in the scientific fields and bringing forth synthesis with scientific research that the universities are working on. The dual correlation of the survey results is revealed that the most important way to improve the productivity of academics is to extinguish mobbing.

For the reason given in the objective of the study, the mobbing questions were chosen among the vital topics for the academicians, and the productivity questions that will count on these semantically and contextually. When the correlations of these questions are evaluated and interpreted,

About freedom of expression value should be regarded as moderate when considering the range of  $r$ , however, since freedom of expression in universities is one of the cornerstones of the society, it will need to be interpreted as largely negative.

It is clear from the negative value of  $r$  of the freedom to decide and practice that

academicians have been exposed to mobbing in decision making and implementation, and that the efficiency of this constraint has been adversely affected their productivity.

It is also demonstrated about the academicians see mobbing in their work areas by the ratios of  $r$ , while universities must be at the forefront of talent, even if a little bit of exposing mobbing does blunt it.

Finally, academicians meet mobbing while presenting a benefit in the field of science in their scientific fields. The academicians have been forced to work in certain fields outside their desires and fields of study, and as a result, universities have nothing left to be productive. This case could exemplify by the fact that academics are forced to work in the Council of Higher Education Committees that are not related to their field of study.

Examined decisions of the Supreme Court, also support our analysis. When academicians are exposed to mobbing their connection to the profession is weakened and their loyalty to the institution is diminishing. Above, a detailed examination of the concept of productivity is focused on the gold factor, which is labor, in the labor force, and it is indicated one of the key elements of increasing productivity is to increase employee performance and motivation. However, the Supreme Court's decisions also show that it is out of the question as increasing the performance and motivation of the academics who are exposed to mobbing. It should be noted that because of, mobbing is a new concept and there are critical deficiencies in the implementation of Turkish Law, such as there is not any decision about deterrent non-pecuniary damages, so that productivity, cause pressure on the academicians by strengthening the mobbing effect they are exposed to. For this reason, by decreasing their belief in the judiciary, only 3.2% of academicians consult legal advice as a solution (Vveinhardt and Streimikiene, 2017). But still, the best solution would be to get legal advice (Pugnerova, 2019).

As a result, our study shows that one of the reasons is why foundation universities in Istanbul demonstrated productivity of the academicians is exposed to mobbing.

## References

- Arnejcic, B., 2016. Mobbing in company: Levels and typology. *Organizacija*, 49(4), pp. 240-250. <https://doi.org/10.1515/orga-2016-0021>
- Asunakutlu, T. and Safran, B., 2006. Orgutlerde yildirma uygulamalar, (Mobbing) ve catisma arasindaki iliski [The relationship between mobbing and conflict in organizations]. *Selçuk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 11(2), pp. 111-129.
- Atay, İ. D., 1988. *İşletmelerde insangucu verimliligini etkileyen faktörler; verimlilik, çalışma zamanı ve ücret tatmini* [Factors affecting manpower productivity in business; productivity, working time and wage satisfaction]. Ankara: MESS.
- Blaug, M., 1968. Üniversitelerin verimliliği [Efficiency of universities]. Translated from English by İ. Sandıkçioğlu, *Ankara University Journal*, 5(1), pp. 249-260.
- Bowling, N. A., and Beehr, T. A., 2006. Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: A theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(5), pp. 998–1012. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.998>
- Browne N. and Smith M. A., 2008. Mobbing in the workplace: The latest illustration of pervasive individualism in American law. *Employee Rights and Employment Policy Journal*. 12, pp. 131-161.
- Carroll T. L. and Lauzier M., 2014. Workplace bullying and job satisfaction: The buffering effect of social support. *Universal Journal of Psychology*, 2(2), pp. 81-89.
- Cerci P. A. and Dumludag D., 2019. Life satisfaction and job satisfaction among university faculty: The impact of working conditions, academic performance and relative income. *Social Indicators Research*, 144, pp. 785–806. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-018-02059-8>
- Costello R. B., 1997. *Random house Webster's college dictionary*. New York: Random House Reference.

- Council of State of the Republic of Turkey for the 8th circuit dated 16.4.2012, F.N. 2008/10606, D.N. 2012/1736.
- Davenport, N., Schwartz, R. and Elliott, G., 2005. *Mobbing emotional abuse in the American workplace*. Ames, Iowa: Civil Society Pub.
- Demirel Y., 2009. Psikolojik taciz davranisinin kamu kurumlari arasinda karsilastirilmasi uzerine bir arastirma [A research on the comparison of psychological harassment behavior among public institutions]. *TİSK Akademi*, 4, pp. 118-137.
- Druzhilov, S., 2012. The problem of mobbing in a college department. *Russian Education & Society*, 54(4), pp. 69-77. <https://doi.org/10.2753/RES1060-9393540407>
- Einarsen S., Hoel H., and Cooper C., 2003. *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in research and practice*. Florida: Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203278734>
- Einarsen, S., 1999. The nature and causes of bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20(1/2), pp. 16-27. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437729910268588>
- Ekin, N., 1997. *Kuresel bilgi caginda egitim- verimlilik- istihdam [Education - productivity - employment in the global information age]*. İstanbul: İstanbul Ticaret Odası.
- Eser O., n.d. Mobbing kavraminin Turkce Seruveni [Turkish adventure of mobbing]. [pdf] Available at: <[http://turkoloji.cu.edu.tr/YENI%20TURK%20DILI/oktay\\_eser\\_mobbing\\_kavrami.pdf](http://turkoloji.cu.edu.tr/YENI%20TURK%20DILI/oktay_eser_mobbing_kavrami.pdf)> [Accessed on 17 April 2017]
- Eurofound, 2009. *EWCO, 'Finland: Increase in workplace bullying over past ten years'*, [online] 7 December. Available at: <<http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/ewco/2009/10/FI0910019I.htm>> [Accessed on 1 February 2019]
- Faria J. R., Mixon Jr. F. G., and Salter S. P., 2012. An economic model of workplace mobbing in academe. *Economics of Education Review*, 31, pp. 720– 726. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2012.04.004>
- Goralewska-Slonska A., 2019. Experiencing mobbing at workplace facing psychological gender and occupational burnout. *Management: The Journal of University of Zielona Gora*, 23(1), pp. 156-174. <https://doi.org/10.2478/manment-2019-0009>
- Guzel, A. and Ertan, E., 2008. İşyeri sendika temsilcisine yönelik psikolojik taciz ve kötüniyet tazminatı [Workplace harassment to trade union representative and compensation for bad faith damages]. *Calisma ve Toplum*, 16(1), pp. 149-170.
- Hoel, H., Zapf, D. and Cooper C. L., 2002. Workplace bullying and stress. In: P. Perrewe, and D. Ganster, eds. 2002. *Historical and current perspectives on stress and health (Research in occupational stress and well being, Vol. 2)*. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited. pp. 293-333. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1479-3555\(02\)02008-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1479-3555(02)02008-5)
- Kose, H., 2006. Orgut ici iletisimde negatif bir olgu: Psikolojik yildirma ve sistemli bir "otekilestirme" sureci olarak Mobbing [A negative case in internal communication: Psychological mobbing and mobbing as a systematic "othering" process]. *Ulusal Halkla İlişkiler Sempozyumu [National Public Relations Symposium]*. pp. 281-292.
- Iskin, G., 2010. *İşyerinde psikolojik taciz [Psychological harassment in the workplace]*. PhD. İstanbul University.
- Keim, J. and McDermott, J., 2010. Mobbing: Workplace violence in the academy. *The Educational Forum*, 74(2), pp. 167-173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131721003608505>
- Leymann, H. and Gustafsson, A., 1996. Mobbing at work and the development of post-traumatic stress disorders. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), pp. 251-275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594329608414858>
- Leymann, H., 1990. Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces. *Violence and Victims*, 5(2), pp. 119-126. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.5.2.119>
- Limoncuoglu S. A., 2010. İş hukuku kapsaminda psikolojik tacizin degerlendirilmesi ve magdurlarin kullanabilecekleri haklar [Evaluation of psychological harassment within the scope of Labor Law and rights of victims]. *TBB Dergisi*, (105), pp. 51-88.

- Locke, E. A., 1976. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In: M. D. Dunnette, ed., 1976. *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally. pp. 1297-1349.
- Nahar, L., Hossain, A., Rahman, A. and Bairagi, A., 2013. The relationship of job satisfaction, job stress, mental health of government and non-government employees of Bangladesh. *Psychology*, 4(06), pp. 520-525. <https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2013.46074>
- Nolfe, G., Petrella, C., Blasi, F., Zontini, G. and Nolfe, G., 2007. Psychopathological dimensions of harassment in the workplace (mobbing). *International Journal of Mental Health*, 36(4), pp. 67-85. <https://doi.org/10.2753/IMH0020-7411360406>
- Ozdemir, M., 1991. Verimlilik uzerine dusunceler ve verimlilik calismalari [Thoughts on productivity and productivity studies]. *Verimlilik Dergisi*, 2(2), pp.169-174.
- Ozkul B. and Carikci I. H., 2010. Mobbing ve Turk hukuku acisindan degerlendirilmesi [Mobbing and evaluation in terms of Turkish Law]. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(1), pp. 481-499.
- Ozturk M. and Sahbudak E., 2017. İşyerinde psikolojik taciz (mobbing) ve is doyumunu: Cumhuriyet Üniversitesindeki araştırma görevlileri uzerine bir calisma [Mobbing and job satisfaction: A study on research assistants at Cumhuriyet University]. *Sosyoloji Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 20(2), pp. 200-228. <https://doi.org/10.18490/sosars.345512>
- Pheko, M., 2018. Rumors and gossip as tools of social undermining and social dominance in workplace bullying and mobbing practices: A closer look at perceived perpetrator motives. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 28(4), pp. 449-465. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2017.1421111>
- Pugnerova, M., 2019. The issue of mobbing in the workplace. 4th International Conference on Political Science, International Relations and Sociology. *The European Proceedings of Social & Behavioural Sciences*, pp. 55-65.
- Rodriguez-Munoz A., Baillien E., Witte H. D., Moreno-Jimenez B., and Pastor J. C., 2009. Cross-lagged relationships between workplace bullying, job satisfaction and engagement: Two longitudinal studies. *Work & Stress*, 23(3), pp. 225-243. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370903227357>
- Savas, F. B., 2007. *İşyerinde manevi taciz [Spiritual harassment in the workplace]*. Istanbul: Beta.
- Schauer, F., 1982. *Ifade özgürlüğü: felsefi bir inceleme [Freedom of expression: A philosophical study]*. Translated from English by M. B. Seçilmişoğlu. Melbourne: Cambridge University.
- Sen, S., 2009. Psikolojik taciz ve is kanunu boyutu [Psychological harassment and Labor Law dimension]. *Çimento İşveren Dergisi*, 5(23), pp. 46-68.
- Supreme Court Assembly of Civil Chambers of the Republic of Turkey dated 2.11.2011, F.N. 2011/9-590, D.N. 2011/677.
- Supreme Court Assembly of Civil Chambers of the Republic of Turkey dated 11.11.2015 F.N. 2014/4-110, D.N. 2015/2600.
- Supreme Court of Appeals of the Republic of Turkey for the 4th circuit dated 18.2.2014, F.N. 2013/5855, D.N. 2014/2603.
- Supreme Court of Appeals of the Republic of Turkey for the 9th circuit dated 31.3.2016, F. N. 2015/27635 D.N. 2016/7927.
- Supreme Court of Appeals of the Republic of Turkey for the 9th circuit dated 22.3.2010, F.N. 2010/10905, D.N. 2010/751.
- Tinaz, P., Bayram, F. and Ergin, H., 2008. *Çalışma psikolojisi ve hukuki boyutlarıyla işyerinde psikolojik taciz (mobbing) [Psychological harassment in the workplace with legal aspects of labor psychology (mobbing)]*. İstanbul: Beta.
- Vveinhardt J., and Streimikiene D., 2017. Demographic, social and organizational characteristics on the levels of mobbing and single cases of harassment: The multicomplex approach. *Economics and Management*, 20(3), pp. 52-69. <https://doi.org/10.15240/tul/001/2017-3-004>
- Westhues, K., 2006. The unkindly art of mobbing. *Academic Matters: The Journal of Higher Education OCUFA*, Fall, pp. 18-19.

- Yumusak, S., 2008. İsgoren verimliliğini etkileyen faktörlerin incelenmesine yönelik bir alan araştırması [A field study on investigating factors affecting employee productivity]. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13(3), pp. 241-251.