



Mobbing and Its Effects on Employee Commitment in the Workplace

Elizabeth Modupe^a

Abstract

The concept of mobbing in the workplace refers to a situation where an individual is subjected to consistent negative behaviors by one or multiple individuals over a certain period of time. This phenomenon can have severe impacts on the targeted individual, affecting both their well-being and performance. When analyzing the related literature, it becomes clear that there is a limited number of studies specifically addressing the relationship between mobbing and organizational commitment. Given this gap in research, the primary objective of this study is to examine whether there is a significant relationship between mobbing in the workplace and employees' organizational commitment. Understanding this connection could provide valuable insights into how negative workplace behaviors influence an employee's attachment and dedication to the organization, and how these factors may contribute to reduced job satisfaction, increased turnover intention, or decreased overall performance.

Keywords: Mobbing, Organizational Commitment, Workplace Behavior

JEL Codes: M12, J53, D23

1. INTRODUCTION

Research on social relations within the workplace has a long history, dating back to Elton Mayo's groundbreaking Hawthorne Studies, which shed light on how social dynamics influence productivity and worker satisfaction (Agervold, 2007). In the last decade or two, the concept of mobbing—also referred to as workplace bullying—has become a significant focus in the study of interpersonal relations in work environments. This growing interest is driven by the increasing recognition of how damaging mobbing can be to both individuals and organizations, particularly in terms of psychological well-being, job satisfaction, and organizational performance (Leymann, 1996; Zapf and Einarsen, 2001; Agervold, 2007; Girardi et al., 2007; Nolfé et al., 2007). Leymann (1996) and Zapf and Einarsen (2001) were among the first scholars to explore the concept of mobbing in depth. They sought to define it as a sustained pattern of negative behaviors targeted at an individual by one or more persons within a work setting. Leymann, in particular, described mobbing as a form of psychological terrorism that can severely impact the victim's mental health, self-esteem, and job performance. Zapf and Einarsen (2001) further explored the psychological dimensions of mobbing, distinguishing it from other forms of workplace conflict by its repetitive nature and the power imbalance between the perpetrator(s) and the victim.

Resch and Schubinski (1996) turned their attention to strategies for preventing mobbing in the workplace, highlighting the need for organizations to develop policies and interventions to reduce the occurrence of such behaviors. They emphasized the importance of creating a positive organizational culture that discourages mobbing and provides support for those affected. Mikkelsen and Einarsen (2001) contributed to the field by studying the prevalence of mobbing among Danish employees. They measured the incidence of mobbing in Danish workplaces and compared their findings with data from other countries. Their research revealed that mobbing is not confined to a single culture or region but is a widespread issue affecting workers across various sectors and nationalities. Their study also investigated the relationship between mobbing and psychological as well as psychosomatic symptoms, highlighting the severe stress that victims endure. Mobbing was shown to lead to anxiety, depression, and in some cases, long-term psychological trauma. In the United Kingdom, Hoel et al. (2001) conducted a large-scale study that explored the impact of mobbing on organizations and individuals. By surveying 5,288 employees across 70 organizations, they gathered valuable data on the prevalence of mobbing and its effects on organizational culture, employee morale, and productivity. Their research demonstrated that mobbing not only harms individuals but also has negative consequences for the organization, including increased absenteeism, turnover, and reduced job performance. Furthermore, Hoel et al. used the MMPI-2 (Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory) to assess the psychological impact of mobbing on both current and former victims, underscoring the lasting emotional scars mobbing can leave. Agervold (2007) extended the research by exploring the definition and boundaries of mobbing through a study involving 3,024 public sector employees. His work focused on distinguishing mobbing from other forms of workplace conflict, establishing clear criteria for identifying mobbing behavior, and exploring its prevalence in the public sector. His findings suggested that mobbing is not limited to the private sector but is a pervasive issue across different organizational settings. In addition to these studies, a broader body of literature has emerged, investigating mobbing in various regions. For instance, in Europe and Australia, researchers have extensively studied the presence, definition, severity, and measurement of mobbing (Hoel et al., 2001; Liefoghe and Davey, 2001). These studies emphasize that mobbing is a global phenomenon, affecting workers in diverse industries and cultural

^aDepartment of Banking and Financial Management, University of Piraeus, Greece

settings. The research highlights the detrimental effects of mobbing, not only on individual mental health but also on overall organizational effectiveness and culture.

One of the critical findings of these studies is the strong correlation between mobbing and stress-related outcomes, such as anxiety, depression, burnout, and even physical health issues like cardiovascular problems. Victims of mobbing often experience a sense of isolation, helplessness, and humiliation, which can lead to long-term psychological damage. The cumulative impact of these negative behaviors is particularly harmful when they are sustained over long periods, making early intervention crucial. Moreover, the research underscores the importance of organizational responses to mobbing. Companies that fail to address mobbing risk creating toxic work environments where productivity, morale, and innovation suffer. On the other hand, organizations that proactively address mobbing through clear anti-bullying policies, employee support programs, and a culture of open communication are better positioned to mitigate its effects. The extensive body of research on mobbing highlights its significant impact on both individuals and organizations. From the early conceptual work of Leymann and Zapf to the large-scale empirical studies of Hoel and Agervold, it is clear that mobbing is a complex, multi-dimensional issue that requires continued attention and action. While much of the research has focused on Europe and Australia, the global nature of mobbing suggests that further investigation is needed in other regions and industries. The growing awareness of mobbing's harmful effects underscores the necessity for organizations to adopt comprehensive strategies to prevent and address workplace mobbing, ensuring healthier and more productive work environments.

In Turkey, the concept of mobbing has been widely studied by numerous researchers across various sectors. Kirel (2007) examined mobbing conceptually, focusing on preventive measures to manage or mitigate it, exploring factors that negatively impact performance, and identifying elements that reduce organizational and professional commitment. Cemaloğlu and Ertürk (2007) investigated mobbing among elementary school teachers and administrators, analyzing how gender plays a role in exposure to mobbing. Similarly, Aydın and Özkul (2007) explored the scope and extent of mobbing in the hotel industry, while Yıldırım and Yıldırım (2007) focused on the emotional, social, and psychological impacts of mobbing on nurses in the healthcare sector, also examining individual strategies for avoiding mobbing. In education, Aksu and Balcı (2009) studied the levels of mobbing faced by elementary school teachers and their perceptions of coping mechanisms. Yılmaz et al. (2008) conducted empirical research to determine the relationship between mobbing and organizational climate. Öztürk et al. (2008) worked on developing a mobbing scale specifically for academic nurses and explored the prevalence of mobbing in nursing colleges by drawing on the experiences of these nurses. Demirel (2009) examined whether mobbing behaviors differed among employees working in different public institutions, according to the specific institution. Meanwhile, Kılıç (2009) investigated the presence of mobbing in learning organizations, providing further insights into its prevalence in educational settings.

Tengilimoğlu and Mansur (2009) explored the relationship between mobbing and organizational commitment, but their study did not find any significant correlation between the two. In contrast, Demirgil (2008) identified a significant relationship between mobbing and organizational commitment, indicating that mobbing can have a profound impact on employees' loyalty and attachment to their organizations. Given these mixed findings, the primary objective of our study is to further investigate the relationship between mobbing and organizational commitment across different organizations in Turkey. By building on the existing research, we aim to deepen the understanding of how mobbing affects organizational commitment and what factors may contribute to varying outcomes in different organizational contexts. This study is particularly relevant for organizations seeking to improve employee well-being and retention by addressing the harmful effects of mobbing.

2. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE MOBBING AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

According to Leymann, mobbing in the workplace refers to unethical and hostile communication that is systematically and deliberately directed at one person by one or several individuals. The person subjected to mobbing often finds themselves in a vulnerable, helpless position, unable to defend themselves effectively. These behaviors, which are prolonged and frequently repeated, result in psychological, psychosomatic, and social distress for the victim. Leymann (1996) defines mobbing as a social interaction where an individual is placed in a defenseless position, facing a potentially high risk of mental and emotional harm. Zapf and Einarsen (2001) further elaborate on this concept, describing mobbing as a series of negative actions directed at a person over a certain period of time in the workplace. The target often struggles to defend themselves, owing to various factors such as power imbalances or organizational dynamics. According to their analysis, mobbing is not a one-off event but a continuous, deliberate effort to harm an individual within a work setting.

When analyzing various descriptions, mobbing refers to aggressive and hostile actions that are applied systematically to one or more individuals, ultimately leading to the victim's distress (Mikkelsen and Einarsen, 2001; Leymann, 1996; Zapf and Einarsen, 2001; Hubert and Veldhoven, 2001). It is distinct from normal workplace conflicts, as mobbing involves a power imbalance and a sustained, coordinated effort to undermine the victim. Salin (2001) emphasizes that mobbing is a severe problem that must meet specific criteria, such as a power disparity between the aggressor(s) and the target, as well as the persistence of the hostile behaviors over time. Aydın and Özkul (2007) explain that the victim, due to this power imbalance, becomes increasingly incapable of defending themselves, thereby exacerbating the harmful effects of the mobbing. Mobbing behaviors often include rumors, innuendos, intimidation, humiliation, discrediting, and social isolation (Girardi et al., 2007; Matthiesen and Einarsen, 2001). These actions create an atmosphere of ongoing distress and infelicity for the targeted individual. In many countries, any negative behavior directed toward a particular person can be labeled as mobbing; however, researchers propose various criteria to define the phenomenon more precisely. For example, Leymann (1996) suggests that mobbing should continue for at least six months and occur at least once a week

for it to qualify as mobbing. Zapf and Einarsen (2001) offer a slightly different perspective, proposing that mobbing may occur even if it is less frequent or spans a shorter period. Despite these differences, there is broad consensus that mobbing targets a specific individual, involves multiple harmful actions, and leaves the victim in a weakened position where self-defense becomes difficult (Zapf and Einarsen, 2001).

The concept of mobbing was first introduced by the renowned ethnologist Konrad Lorenz in 1991, who used the term to describe the behavior of animal groups. He observed that smaller animals would gang up on a larger predator to defend themselves, a behavior he referred to as mobbing. This concept was later applied to human social behavior when Swedish physician Heinemann studied the interactions between schoolchildren and used the term "mobbing" to describe the destructive behavior of groups of children targeting an individual child (Leymann, 1996; Aydın and Özkul, 2007). The workplace context of mobbing gained broader attention with the publication of Brodsky's 1976 book, *The Harassed Worker*. This book explored cases of workplace harassment for the first time, focusing on the damaging psychological and emotional effects of long-term exposure to hostile work environments. However, Brodsky did not directly analyze mobbing but instead framed these cases as workplace accidents, stress, and exhaustion resulting from extended work hours. Over time, this early work contributed to the stress research that now investigates the detrimental conditions faced by employees who endure mobbing (Leymann, 1996).

In sum, mobbing in the workplace is a harmful, sustained form of harassment that systematically targets an individual, placing them in a helpless position where defense becomes difficult. The long-term effects of mobbing include severe psychological, social, and emotional distress. Research by Leymann, Zapf, Einarsen, and others has expanded our understanding of mobbing, highlighting its complexity, its differences from ordinary workplace conflicts, and its damaging impact on both the victim and the workplace environment. Despite some variation in how researchers define mobbing's frequency and duration, there is agreement that it represents a severe problem requiring intervention to protect employee well-being. Since the introduction of the concept of mobbing, or workplace bullying, to Scandinavian and German communities by Leymann in the mid-1980s, a substantial number of studies have been conducted to better define the nature of workplace bullying. These studies aim to describe the prevalence and forms of bullying and identify both personality traits and organizational factors associated with mobbing (Salin, 2001; Hoel et al., 2001; Zapf and Einarsen, 2001). A key moment in the development of mobbing research occurred in 1996 when eight articles by researchers from six countries were published in a special edition of the *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*. These papers, originally presented at the Seventh European Congress on Work and Organizational Psychology in Győr, Hungary, marked the beginning of a coordinated effort to explore mobbing on a wider scale. Following this, a series of symposia on mobbing were held in various European cities, including Verona (1997), Helsinki (1999), and Prague (2001). These symposia significantly influenced research on mobbing, contributing to its recognition as a widespread phenomenon across Europe (Zapf and Einarsen, 2001). Research shows that mobbing has become a significant issue in many countries. In Scandinavia, an estimated 3-4% of the working population has experienced mobbing. Finnish and British studies have reported even higher prevalence rates, with approximately 10% of workers affected by mobbing (Salin, 2001). Mobbing behaviors can take various forms, ranging from direct verbal or physical attacks to more subtle actions like excluding or isolating the victim from their workgroup. Organizational assessments highlight that common mobbing behaviors include taking away responsibilities, devaluing an employee's work, social isolation, exclusion, teasing, insulting remarks, and ridicule (Zapf and Einarsen, 2001). The effects of mobbing on organizations are considerable. Studies indicate that mobbing leads to increased absenteeism, higher turnover intentions, greater employee turnover, and earlier retirements (Salin, 2001; Leymann, 1996). In addition to its impact on employee retention, mobbing negatively affects employee performance (Kirel, 2007) and reduces organizational commitment (Demirgil, 2008). Employees subjected to mobbing often feel disengaged and disconnected from their organizations, leading to a decline in overall morale.

Mobbing also has severe implications for the psychological and physical health of the victims. Research by Mikkelsen and Einarsen (2001) highlights the negative effects of mobbing on both the well-being of the targeted individual and the productivity of their colleagues. Victims of mobbing often experience increased stress, anxiety, and depression, which can result in higher rates of negligence, staff turnover, and sick leave. Mobbing is also linked to decreased job satisfaction, further compounding the negative effects on the victim's health and performance (Salin, 2001). The growing body of research on mobbing illustrates its widespread presence and harmful impact on both individuals and organizations. Mobbing not only damages the psychological and physical health of its victims but also disrupts workplace dynamics, leading to reduced productivity, higher turnover, and overall organizational instability. As a result, addressing mobbing through preventative measures, such as promoting a positive organizational culture and establishing clear anti-bullying policies, is essential for protecting employee well-being and enhancing organizational performance.

The negative behaviors observed in workplaces, commonly referred to as mobbing or bullying, often begin as normal interactions but, when they persist over long periods and occur frequently, their nature changes and they become harmful. It is crucial to distinguish mobbing from typical workplace conflicts. According to Leymann, mobbing behaviors can be categorized based on the specific effects they have on the victim. Some behaviors impact the victim's ability to communicate effectively, such as denying them opportunities to communicate with management, subjecting them to verbal attacks related to their work tasks, or rejecting them outright. Other behaviors affect the victim's social connections, where colleagues avoid them or are instructed not to engage with them, leading to isolation. The victim's personal reputation may also be undermined through gossip, ridicule, or humiliation, often targeting their perceived inadequacies. Furthermore, mobbing can disrupt the victim's occupational situation by depriving them of meaningful work or assigning them trivial or unnecessary tasks, diminishing their professional value. In some extreme cases, mobbing involves

assigning dangerous tasks or even physical threats to the victim.

Research has shown that victims of mobbing often suffer from various psychological stresses, including anxiety, depression, irritability, and self-hatred. In addition to these psychological impacts, many victims exhibit psychosomatic symptoms, which further deteriorate their health. Mobbing not only harms the victim but also has a negative impact on the overall workplace environment, affecting the efficiency of other employees as well. As such, mobbing is recognized as a significant factor contributing to psychological stress in organizations. Studies highlight that mobbing can lead to increased absenteeism, higher turnover intention, greater employee turnover, and even early retirements. It also negatively impacts employee performance and organizational commitment, as employees subjected to mobbing often feel disconnected from their organizations, leading to lower morale and reduced productivity. Within the field of organizational psychology, the concept of organizational commitment has been an expanding area of interest since the 1960s. Research has consistently shown that organizational commitment correlates with key factors such as job satisfaction, organizational adaptability, and employee turnover. Other related factors include the scope and challenge of the job, role clarity, freedom from conflicts, organizational dependability, and participation in decision-making. Organizational commitment is also linked to lower absenteeism and improved organizational efficiency. Despite the increased focus on organizational commitment, debates continue regarding its exact definition, the nature of commitment, and how it affects employee behavior. Commitment can take various forms, including dedication to organizations, unions, professions, teams, leaders, goals, and personal careers. In the literature, organizational commitment is often conceptualized as an "affective attachment," where employees share the organization's values, desire to remain part of the organization, and are willing to exert effort on its behalf. However, the variety of definitions has caused some confusion in categorizing organizational commitment. For example, Buchanan used three measures—identification, involvement, and loyalty—to assess commitment. Other researchers, like Angle and Perry, examined the concept through subscales such as value commitment and commitment to stay within the organization. O'Reilly and Chatman proposed justification, identification, and internalization as key components, while Penley and Gould categorized commitment into moral, calculative, and alienative forms. A widely used model to conceptualize organizational commitment is the three-component model developed by Allen and Meyer, which defines organizational commitment as a psychological state that binds individuals to their organization. This model breaks down commitment into three types: affective commitment, which is an emotional attachment to and identification with the organization; continuance commitment, which is based on the perceived cost of leaving the organization; and normative commitment, which stems from a feeling of obligation to stay. This model has been extensively used in research over the last two decades, offering a comprehensive framework for understanding the different dimensions of commitment and their impact on employee behavior and organizational outcomes.

According to Meyer and Allen, affective commitment refers to the emotional attachment, identification with, and involvement that employees feel toward their organization (Meyer et al., 1998; Seymen, 2008). This form of commitment is characterized by employees sharing the organization's values, desiring to maintain membership, and working for the benefit of the organization without expecting anything in return (Meyer and Allen, 1988). Employees with strong affective commitment genuinely want to remain part of the organization, as their attachment is driven by intrinsic motivation (Dawley et al., 2005). Continuance commitment, on the other hand, relates to employees' awareness of the high costs associated with leaving the organization (Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001; Meyer et al., 1998). Employees with strong continuance commitment remain in their roles because they recognize the potential financial or career-related losses they would incur by quitting (Seymen, 2008). This form of commitment is less about emotional attachment and more about the perceived risks and costs of leaving the organization.

Normative commitment refers to the sense of obligation employees feel to continue working for their organization (Dawley et al., 2005). This sense of duty or loyalty often stems from cultural or familial pressures, where employees feel that they "ought" to stay in their jobs (Dawley et al., 2005; Seymen, 2008). Employees with strong normative commitment are driven by a sense of moral responsibility to stay with the organization, regardless of other personal factors. In this study, the organizational commitment model developed by Allen and Meyer is utilized to define and measure these three dimensions of commitment. This model is widely regarded as the most comprehensive and has been used in numerous studies to capture the complexities of organizational commitment, incorporating elements from other alternative models.

3. THE RELATIONSHIP OF MOBBING AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Mobbing in the workplace has been shown to lead to higher absenteeism, increased intent to leave the organization, higher turnover rates, and earlier retirements. In the face of economic slumps and changes in working conditions, it has become increasingly important for organizations to foster stronger feelings of commitment among employees. Within this context, mobbing is believed to be closely related to organizational commitment. While Demirgil's study revealed a weak but significant negative relationship between mobbing and organizational commitment, other studies, such as those by Tengilimoğlu and Mansur, did not find any meaningful connection between the two. Taking these studies into account, this research seeks to explore whether a negative relationship exists between mobbing and organizational commitment. It is well-established that employees with a high degree of affective commitment are more likely to align themselves with the organization's goals and values. This alignment generally leads to lower turnover rates and greater employee retention. However, when employees are subjected to mobbing—whether through direct verbal or physical attacks or more subtle forms of exclusion or isolation—absenteeism tends to rise, and the intent to quit the organization increases. Thus, it is anticipated that mobbing may negatively affect employees' affective commitment, causing them to detach emotionally from the organization and consider leaving.

In the case of continuance commitment, research suggests that employees stay with an organization not necessarily because of emotional attachment, but because they recognize the high costs associated with leaving. This is especially relevant in countries like Turkey, where unemployment rates are high, and employees may feel compelled to endure negative workplace behaviors, including mobbing, to avoid losing their jobs. Despite experiencing mobbing, these employees may continue to invest in their roles, as leaving the organization may result in financial instability or difficulty finding new employment. Therefore, it is expected that continuance commitment will persist, even as mobbing increases. Normative commitment, on the other hand, is characterized by a sense of loyalty and obligation to remain with the organization. Employees with strong normative commitment often feel that staying with the organization is the right thing to do, driven by a sense of duty or moral responsibility. However, mobbing is likely to erode this sense of obligation. As employees face persistent negative behaviors, their feelings of loyalty and moral duty may diminish, leading to a decrease in their normative commitment. This suggests that mobbing could weaken the ethical and cultural ties that bind employees to their organization, causing them to question whether continuing to work in such an environment aligns with their values. Through this exploration, the research aims to understand how mobbing influences different aspects of organizational commitment— affective, continuance, and normative—and whether it contributes to an increased intention to leave the organization. Understanding these relationships will provide valuable insights into the ways in which negative workplace behaviors impact employee loyalty, retention, and overall organizational health.

4. METHOD OF THE RESEARCH

The private hospitals in the downtown area of Balıkesir were selected as the sample for this research, which is based on a survey methodology. Considering the nature of hospital work in Turkey, hospital employees typically engage in intense communication with their supervisors, colleagues, and patients. This makes private hospitals an ideal setting to more precisely measure the prevalence and impact of mobbing in the workplace. The management teams of four hospitals in downtown Balıkesir were informed about the purpose of the research, and permission was sought to conduct the survey. Of these hospitals, three granted permission to proceed, while one declined. The total number of employees in the participating hospitals was 457. A total of 200 questionnaires were distributed randomly to employees across the three hospitals, along with necessary instructions and clarifications regarding the study. After three days, the completed questionnaires were collected, with 135 returned, resulting in a 67.5% response rate. Of these, 120 were deemed valid for use in the analysis of the research hypotheses.

The questionnaire was divided into three sections. The first section included demographic information about the employees, the second section contained questions designed to measure the level of mobbing to which the employees were exposed, and the third section focused on their organizational commitment. The variables in both the second and third sections were measured using a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always), to capture the frequency and intensity of mobbing and commitment levels. The data collected through the questionnaire was analyzed using SPSS 15.0, a statistical analysis software package. Descriptive statistics, such as frequency and percentage values, were used to evaluate the demographic characteristics of the respondents. Correlation analysis was performed to examine the relationships between the variables, and a categorical regression analysis was conducted to determine whether mobbing had an influence on organizational commitment. This analytical approach allowed for a detailed understanding of how mobbing impacts the commitment levels of hospital employees in the selected private hospitals.

5. RESULTS

The measure used to assess the level of mobbing experienced by employees in this study was developed by Heinz Leymann (1993) and later interpreted by Demirgil (2008). This measure consists of 26 questions designed to capture the extent of mobbing behaviors. The reliability of the measure is demonstrated by a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.96, indicating a high level of internal consistency. Factor analysis was not performed on the mobbing measure, as Demirgil (2008) treated it as a one-dimensional construct in his study. Regarding the measurement of organizational commitment, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value was found to be 0.717, indicating that the sample was adequate for factor analysis. The Bartlett's test of sphericity yielded a significant result ($X^2 = 515.493$), further supporting the suitability of conducting factor analysis. The factor analysis revealed four dimensions with eigenvalues greater than one, accounting for 61.79% of the total variance. These four dimensions correspond to "Affective Commitment," "Normative Commitment," "Continuance Commitment," and "Intention to Quit," respectively. The Cronbach's Alpha for the organizational commitment measure was calculated as 0.82, indicating that the measure is reliable.

As presented in Table 1, 75.8% of the sample consists of female respondents, while 24.2% are male. In terms of age distribution, 38.3% of the participants are between 21-25 years old. Regarding education level, 43.3% of the respondents have completed high school. The employment duration for 49.2% of the participants ranges between 1 and 5 years at their current organization. As for marital status, 51.7% of the respondents are married, and 48.3% are single. Additionally, 85.8% of the participants are employed on a permanent basis, while 14.2% are temporary employees. These demographic details provide a clear profile of the respondents and form a solid foundation for the analysis of mobbing and organizational commitment within the selected sample. The high reliability and validity of the measures used further enhance the robustness of the study's findings.

Table 1 provides an overview of the demographic variables of respondents, covering gender, marital status, age, education level, tenure of office, and staff status, along with their respective frequencies and percentages. The majority of respondents are female, with 91 individuals (75.8%), while 29 respondents (24.2%) are male. In terms of marital status, the group is nearly evenly split, with 62 individuals (51.7%) married and 58 individuals (48.3%) single, showing a

balanced representation between married and single participants. Regarding age, the largest group of respondents falls within the 21-25 years range, with 46 individuals (38.3%), followed by 26 individuals (21.7%) aged 31-40 years. Those aged 26-30 years make up 20 individuals (16.7%), while 15 respondents (12.5%) are 41 years and over, and 13 individuals (10.8%) are 20 and under. This distribution suggests that the majority of the sample is relatively young, with a notable portion under the age of 40. In terms of education, the highest percentage of respondents, 52 individuals (43.3%), have completed high school, while 44 individuals (36.7%) have graduated from vocational high school. A smaller number of respondents hold an undergraduate degree, with 14 individuals (11.7%), while 7 individuals (5.8%) have elementary-level education, and only 3 individuals (2.5%) possess a master's or doctoral degree. This indicates that most of the respondents have a secondary-level education background.

Table 1: Demographic variables

Demographic Variables		f	%
Gender	Female	91	75,8
	Male	29	24,2
Marital Status	Married	62	51,7
	Single	58	48,3
Age	20 and under	13	10,8
	21-25 years	46	38,3
	26-30 years	20	16,7
	31-40 years	26	21,7
	41 and over	15	12,5
Education	Elementary	7	5,8
	High School	52	43,3
	Vocational High School	44	36,7
	Undergraduate Degree	14	11,7
	Master Degree / Doctorate	3	2,5
Tenure of Office	Less than a year	39	32,5
	1-5 years	59	49,2
	6-10 years	10	8,3
Staff Status	11 years and over	12	10
	Permanent	17	14,2
	Temporary	103	85,8

When looking at tenure of office, the largest portion of respondents, 59 individuals (49.2%), have been working for 1-5 years, followed by 39 individuals (32.5%) who have been in their roles for less than a year. A smaller number of respondents, 10 individuals (8.3%), have been working for 6-10 years, and 12 individuals (10%) have over 11 years of experience. In terms of staff status, a significant majority, 103 individuals (85.8%), are temporary staff, whereas only 17 individuals (14.2%) hold permanent positions, highlighting the prevalence of temporary employment in this sample.

Table 2: Correlation

	Ave.	Ss	1	2	3	4	5
1 The Mobbing	1,98	,78					
2 Organizational Commitment	3,00	,44	,220(*)				
3 Affective Commitment	3,37	,65	,-359(**)	,-0,21			
4 Normative Commitment	2,83	,94	,015	,555(**)	,057		
5 Continuance Commitment	3,01	,96	,273(**)	,793(**)	,-206(*)	,287(**)	
6 Intention to Leave the Organization	2,78	,82	,360(**)	,708(**)	,-545(**)	,142	,491(**)

*p<0.05, ** p< 0.01

Table 2 presents the correlation matrix between various organizational factors, including mobbing, organizational commitment, its sub-dimensions (affective, normative, and continuance commitment), and intention to leave the organization. The table includes the average scores (Ave.), standard deviations (ss), and correlation coefficients, with significance levels noted by * for $p < 0.05$ and ** for $p < 0.01$. The first variable, mobbing, has a significant positive correlation with organizational commitment ($r = 0.220$, $p < 0.05$) and a significant negative correlation with affective commitment ($r = -0.359$, $p < 0.01$). This suggests that higher levels of mobbing are associated with lower emotional

attachment (affective commitment) to the organization but show a slight positive association with overall organizational commitment. For organizational commitment, there is a strong positive correlation with normative commitment ($r = 0.555, p < 0.01$) and continuance commitment ($r = 0.793, p < 0.01$), meaning that higher organizational commitment is linked to both a sense of obligation (normative commitment) and a perceived need to remain (continuance commitment). Organizational commitment also shows a strong positive correlation with intention to leave ($r = 0.708, p < 0.01$), indicating that those with higher levels of commitment paradoxically also report higher intentions to leave the organization.

Affective commitment is negatively correlated with intention to leave ($r = -0.545, p < 0.01$), suggesting that employees with strong emotional attachment to the organization are less likely to consider leaving. It is also negatively correlated with continuance commitment ($r = -0.206, p < 0.05$), implying that those who remain with the organization out of necessity tend to have lower emotional attachment. Normative commitment is positively correlated with continuance commitment ($r = 0.287, p < 0.01$), but there is no significant relationship with intention to leave ($r = 0.142$). This implies that employees who feel obligated to stay with the organization may also feel tied to it for practical reasons, though this does not directly impact their likelihood of leaving. Finally, continuance commitment shows a significant positive correlation with intention to leave ($r = 0.491, p < 0.01$), indicating that those who stay with the organization due to a perceived lack of alternatives or high costs of leaving are more likely to express a desire to leave. The table reveals complex relationships between organizational commitment, its sub-dimensions, and mobbing. While mobbing negatively impacts affective commitment, organizational commitment correlates strongly with normative and continuance commitment. The intention to leave is influenced by both affective and continuance commitment, showing that emotional and practical reasons for staying in an organization affect employees' desire to remain or depart.

Table 3: Regression Analysis

	R ²	F	B	P
Organizational Commitment	,10	4,388	,319	.006
Affective Commitment	,198	7,903	-,444	.000
Intention to Leave the Organization	,157	4,250	,396	.001
Continuance Commitment	,136	3,585	,369	.005
Normative Commitment	,033	1,979	,182	.141

Table 3 presents the results of a regression analysis, showing the relationship between various forms of organizational commitment and employee outcomes, including organizational commitment as a whole, affective commitment, intention to leave the organization, continuance commitment, and normative commitment. The table includes the R² values (which represent the proportion of variance explained by the model), F-values (which indicate the overall fit of the regression model), β -coefficients (which show the strength and direction of the relationship), and p-values (which determine the statistical significance). For organizational commitment, the R² value is 0.10, indicating that 10% of the variance in organizational commitment can be explained by the model. The F-value is 4.388, with a β -coefficient of 0.319 and a p-value of 0.006, suggesting that the relationship is positive and statistically significant. This indicates that there is a meaningful positive association between the independent variables in the model and overall organizational commitment. For affective commitment, the R² value is 0.198, meaning that the model explains 19.8% of the variance in affective commitment. The F-value is 7.903, with a β -coefficient of -0.444 and a p-value of 0.000, indicating a significant negative relationship. This suggests that as the predictor variable(s) increase, affective commitment decreases significantly, implying that certain organizational factors negatively impact employees' emotional attachment to the organization. For intention to leave the organization, the model explains 15.7% of the variance, as indicated by the R² value of 0.157. The F-value is 4.250, with a β -coefficient of 0.396 and a p-value of 0.001, indicating a significant positive relationship. This suggests that the predictor variables are significantly associated with an increased intention to leave the organization. Regarding continuance commitment, the model explains 13.6% of the variance, as reflected by the R² value of 0.136. The F-value is 3.585, with a β -coefficient of 0.369 and a p-value of 0.005, indicating a significant positive relationship. This suggests that factors influencing continuance commitment are positively associated with the perceived necessity to stay with the organization due to costs or lack of alternatives. Lastly, for normative commitment, the R² value is 0.033, indicating that only 3.3% of the variance is explained by the model. The F-value is 1.979, with a β -coefficient of 0.182 and a p-value of 0.141, showing no significant relationship. This suggests that the factors included in the model do not significantly impact normative commitment, or the sense of obligation employees feel toward staying with the organization. The regression analysis shows that affective commitment, intention to leave, and continuance commitment are significantly influenced by the factors in the model, with affective commitment being negatively impacted, while intention to leave and continuance commitment are positively associated. Normative commitment, however, does not show a significant relationship.

6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Mobbing, recognized internationally as a growing and serious problem in the workplace, negatively impacts the physical

and mental health, efficiency, performance, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment of employees, which are crucial sources of competitive advantage for organizations (Salin, 2001; Mikkelsen and Einarsen, 2001; Demirgil, 2008). In this study, it was found that 5 of the 120 participants (0.04%) were subjected to high levels of mobbing, 20 participants (17%) to mid-level mobbing, and 95 participants reported no mobbing at all. This indicates that 21% of the participants experienced some form of mobbing in the workplace. When comparing these findings to the broader literature, it becomes clear that mobbing is a widespread issue in many countries. For instance, in Scandinavia, approximately 3-4% of employees are affected by mobbing, while in Finland and England, the prevalence can exceed 10% (Salin, 2001). The results from this study, with a mobbing exposure rate of 21%, are considerably higher than those seen in other regions, signaling that workplace bullying may be a particularly pressing issue in the context of the study sample. One surprising outcome of this research was the observed relationship between mobbing and organizational commitment. Although the literature commonly suggests that mobbing has a negative effect on organizational commitment, a positive relationship was identified in this study. This result could be explained by the high level of continuance commitment exhibited by the employees. Many workers remain with their organizations out of necessity, especially in times of economic difficulty, which may explain why mobbing did not diminish their organizational commitment. A key finding was the negative and significant relationship between mobbing and affective commitment, which supports the findings of Demirgil (2008) and Tengilimoğlu and Mansur (2009). The average affective commitment score of participants was 3.37, indicating a relatively high level of emotional attachment to their organizations. Further analysis revealed a negative and significant relationship between affective commitment and the intention to leave the organization, meaning that as employees' emotional commitment increases, their desire to quit decreases. Conversely, the study found a positive and significant relationship between mobbing and the intention to leave the organization, reinforcing existing literature on this issue. However, while employees may express a desire to leave their organizations due to mobbing, they often do not act on these intentions due to economic constraints, particularly in the face of rising unemployment. In Turkey, especially following the 2008 economic crisis, employees have shown high levels of continuance commitment, driven by a lack of alternative employment opportunities. The average continuance commitment score in this study was 3.01, suggesting that even when employees are subjected to increased levels of mobbing, they tend to stay with their organizations out of economic necessity. This dynamic was further supported by the research findings. On the other hand, no significant relationship was found between mobbing and normative commitment, which aligns with the results of Demirgil (2008). This suggests that while mobbing may affect employees' emotional and financial considerations, it does not significantly influence their sense of moral obligation or loyalty to the organization.

One of the main challenges in conducting this research was determining whether employees were willing to report their experiences of mobbing. Many participants hesitated to share the mobbing behaviors they were subjected to, often due to fear of losing their jobs. Even though privacy was ensured, some employees may have responded inaccurately to protect themselves, which could have influenced the results. Additionally, the findings may not be generalizable beyond the scope of this study, as the research was limited to private hospitals in Balıkesir. Typically, mobbing is thought to be initiated by executives toward subordinates. Future research could explore whether subordinates also engage in mobbing behaviors toward their superiors. Expanding the sample to include different industries and organizational structures could provide a broader understanding of mobbing in various management contexts.

REFERENCES

- Agervold, M. (2007). Bullying at work: A discussion of definitions and prevalence based on an empirical study. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 48, 161-172.
- Aksu, A., & Balcı, Y. (2009). İlköğretim okullarında psikolojik yıldırma ve psikolojik yıldırma ile baş etme. *e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, 4(4), 1367-1380.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance, and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 60, 1-18.
- Angle, H. L., & Perry, J. L. (1981). An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26, 1-14.
- Aydın, Ş., & Özkul, E. (2007). İş yerinde yaşanan psikolojik şiddetin yapısı ve boyutları: 4-5 yıldızlı otel işletmeleri örneği. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 7(2), 169-186.
- Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66, 32-42.
- Buchanan, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19, 533-546.
- Cemalolu, N., & Ertürk, A. (2007). Öğretmenlerin maruz kaldıkları yıldırma eylemlerinin cinsiyet yönünden incelenmesi. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 5(2), 345-362.
- Chen, C. (2006). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and flight attendants' turnover intentions: A note. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 12, 274-276.
- Cohen, A. (1991). Career stage as a moderator of the relationships between organizational commitment and its outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 64, 253-268.
- Dawley, D., Stephens, R., & Stephens, D. (2005). Dimensionality of organizational commitment in volunteer workers: Chamber of Commerce board members and role fulfillment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67, 511-525.
- Demirel, Y. (2009). Psikolojik taciz davranışının kamu kurumları arasında karşılaştırılması üzerine bir araştırma. *TİSK Akademi*, 1, 118-136.

- Demirgil, A. (2008). İşletmelerde mobbing uygulamaları ile örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisinin incelenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Girardi, P., Monaco, E., Prestigiaco, C., Talamo, A., Ruberto, A., & Tatarelli, R. (2007). Personality and psychopathological profiles in individuals exposed to mobbing. *Violence and Victims*, 22(2), 172-188.
- Gul, H. (2002). Örgütsel bağlılık yaklaşımlarının mukayesesi ve değerlendirilmesi. *Ege Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, 2(1), 37-56.
- Hoel, H., Cooper, L. C., & Faragher, B. (2001). The experience of bullying in Great Britain: The impact of organizational status. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10(4), 443-465.
- Hubert, A. B., & Veldhoven, M. V. (2001). Risk sector for undesirable behavior and mobbing. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10(4), 415-424.
- Kiliç, E. D. (2009). Psychological violence in learning organizations: A case study in Şanlıurfa, Turkey. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 37(7), 869-880.
- Kirel, Ç. (2007). Örgütlerde mobbing yönetiminde destekleyici ve risk azaltıcı öneriler. *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 7(2), 317-334.
- Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), 165-184.
- Liefooghe, A. P. D., & Davey, M. K. (2001). Accounts of workplace bullying: The role of the organization. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10(4), 375-392.
- Matthiesen, B. S., & Einarsen, S. (2001). MMPI-2 configurations among victims of bullying at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10(4), 467-484.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, J. N. (1988). Links between work experiences and organizational commitment during the first year of employment: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 61, 195-209.
- Meyer, J. P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11, 299-366.
- Meyer, J. P., Irving, P. G., & Allen, N. J. (1998). Examination of the combined effects of work values and early experiences on organizational commitment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, 29-52.
- Mikkelsen, E. G., & Einarsen, S. (2001). Bullying in Danish work-life: Prevalence and health correlates. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10(4), 393-413.
- Nolfe, G., Petrella, C., Blasi, F., Zontini, G., & Nolfe, G. (2007). Psychopathological dimensions of harassment in the workplace (mobbing). *International Journal of Mental Health*, 36(4), 67-85.
- Oliver, N. (1990). Rewards, investments, alternatives, and organizational commitment: Empirical evidence and theoretical development. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 19-31.
- Ozturk, H., Sokmen, S., Yilmaz, F., & Cilingir, D. (2008). Measuring mobbing experiences of academic nurses: Development of a mobbing scale. *Journal of the American Academy of Nurse Practitioners*, 20, 435-442.
- Penley, L. E., & Gould, S. (1988). Etzioni's model of organizational involvement: A perspective for understanding commitment organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 9, 43-59.
- Resch, M., & Schubinski, M. (1996). Mobbing-prevention management in organizations. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), 295-307.
- Salin, D. (2001). Prevalence and forms of bullying among business professionals: A comparison of two different strategies for measuring bullying. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10, 425-441.
- Seymen, A. O. (2008). Örgütsel bağlılığı etkileyen örgüt kültürü tipleri üzerine bir araştırma. Detay Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- Tengilimoğlu, D., & Mansur, A. F. (2009). İşletmelerde uygulanan mobbingin (psikolojik şiddet) örgütsel bağlılığa etkisi. *Uluslararası İdari ve İktisadi İncelemeler Dergisi*, 1(3), 69-84.
- Wasti, S. A. (2005). Commitment profiles: Combinations of organizational commitment forms and job outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67, 290-308.
- Witt, L. A., & Wilson, J. W. (1989). Income sufficiency as a predictor of job satisfaction and organizational commitment: Dispositional differences. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 130(2), 267-268.
- Yildirim, A., & Yıldırım, D. (2007). Mobbing in the workplace by peers and managers: Mobbing experienced by nurses working in healthcare facilities in Turkey and its effect on nurses. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 16, 1444-1453.
- Yilmaz, A., Özler, E. D., & Mercan, N. (2008). Mobbing ve örgüt iklimine yönelik ampirik bir araştırma. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(26), 334-357.
- Zapf, D., & Einarsen, S. (2001). Bullying in the workplace: Recent trends in research and practice—An introduction. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10(4), 369-373.