MOBING AND SEXISM IN THE ACADEMIA: THE CASE OF ÇUKUROVA UNIVERSITY

Cansu DAĞLIOĞLU[*] & Deniz ÜNAL[**]

Abstract

This study was carried out to examine the mobbing perceptions of employees at Çukurova University (ÇU) and whether this perception differs depending on gender, title or marital status. Although mobbing is a very old concept, people's awareness of the issue is very low, especially in our country. This is clearly demonstrated by the survey. Although s/he gave a positive answer to the detailed questions on the Likert-type scale about the existence of psychological pressures s/he was exposed to, there were quite a lot of data stating that s/he was not subject to mobbing. Unconscious responses, emotions hidden for promotion and the presence of incorrect answers due to fear were frequently encountered in individual interviews. With this three-part questionnaire study, 146 women and 162 men were interviewed, consisting of 33 professors, 15 associate professors, 23 assistant professors, 14 lecturers, 52 research assistants, 9 instructers, 162 administrative staff. However, although there is no significant difference between exposure to mobbing and gender in statistical analysis, the results incidate that female academicians are more disadvantaged than men in many aspects. In terms of the gender perspective, because it is one of the occupations considered suitable for women, the number of women academics in Turkey is above the world average (YÖK, 2020). In the findings of the research at ÇU, which is one of the universities that increased this average, it is also surprising that women are seen to be disadvantaged.

Keywords: Academia, Gender Inequality, Mobbing.

AKADEMİDE MOBİNG VE CİNSİYETÇİLİK: ÇUKUROVA ÜNİVERSİTESİ ÖRNEĞİ

Öz

Bu çalışma, Çukurova Üniversitesi'ndeki çalışanların mobbing mağduriyet algılarının cinsiyetlere göre değişimini görmek amacıyla yapılmıştır. Mobbing çok eski bir kavram olmasına rağmen özellikle ülkemizde insanların konuya ilişkin farkındalıkları oldukça düşüktür. Bunu ise yapılan anket açıklıkla gözler önüne sermektedir. Zira likert tipi sorularda maruz kaldığı psikolojik baskıların varlığına

---

[*] Aydın Adnan Menderes University, Faculty of Economics, Department of Econometrics, cdaglioglu@adu.edu.tr, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0966-6875

[**] Assoc. Prof. Dr. Çukurova Universtiy, Faculty of Arts and Science, Department of Statistics, dunal@cu.edu.tr, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4095-3039

Note: [3]Ethics committee approval for the study was given by Çukurova University with the number 07.11.2016-E143168.

ilişkin yanıtları işaretlemiş olmasına rağmen, mobbinge uğramadığını ifade eden oldukça fazla sayıda kişiye rastlanmıştır. Bilinçsiz verilen yanıtlar, yükselme için saklanan duygular ya da korku nedeniyle verilen doğru olmayan yanıtların varlığına da bireysel görüşmelerde rastlanmıştır. Üç bölümden oluşan bu anket çalışmasında 33 profesör, 15 doçent, 23 yardımcı doçent, 14 öğretim görevlisi, 52 araştırma görevlisi, 9 okutman, 162 idari personelden oluşan 308 kişi ile görüşülmüştür. 146 kadın,162 erkekten oluşan bu örneklemde analizler tanımlayıcı istatistikler ve ki-kare testlerinden oluşmaktadır. İstatistiksel analizlerde mobbinge maruz kalma durumu ile cinsiyet arasında anlamlı bir farklılık olmamasına rağmen yine de kadın akademisyenlerin erkeklere oranla daha dezavantajlı oldukları da verilere yansımıştır. Türkiye'de akademisyenliğin kadın için 'uygun' meslek olarak görülmesi nedeniyle, Türkiye'de kadın akademisyen sayısı dünya ortalamasının üzerindedir (YÖK, 2020). Bu ortalamayı yükselten üniversitelerden bir tanesi olan Çukurova Üniversitesi'nde gerçekleştirilen bu araştırmanın bulgularında bile kadınların dezavantajlı olduğunun görülmesi ise ayrıca şaşırtıcıdır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Akademi, Cinsiyet Eşitsizliği, Mobbing.*

Introduction

Systematic humiliation (or underrating, scolding, given inappropriate duties, being exposed to unfair distribution of duties, being exposed to threats and attacks on their personality, preventing them from accessing information about their job) of a person by their managers, inferiors or co-workers is called mobbing.

Although gender inequality differs depending on the economic and social structure, we call gender inequality where women are more disadvantaged than men. Gender inequality is sometimes brought up by the difficulties of girls' education, sometimes with low pay for equal work, and sometimes, face more difficulties at work than men.

Perhaps there is no workplace without mobbing problems, and a similar judgment can be made on the gender issue. Therefore, it is very important to deal with the issue of mobbing in terms of gender. The separation of colors according to the suitability of men and women, prejudices about whether the professions are suitable according to gender, division of housework into male / female jobs, the inclusion of concepts such as bride price, render payment for seeing the bride's face or virginity in our lives are all a result of the perception of gender. Similarly, each of the judgments that men should take some important relationship steps, such as marriage / partnership proposal, is a result of sexist thinking.

It is seen that even proverbs and idioms, which are the most important tools of reflecting thoughts and judgments and transferring them from generation to generation, constantly breed sexism (spare the rod and spoil the child, grow into a man etc.).

From past to present, the worthlessness of women in social life has preserved itself by changing shape. Unfortunately, the same has happened in the world of science. In other words, men have always been a priority in

academic life (Tigrel and Kokalan, 2009; Prevost and Hunt, 201; McKay, Arnold, Fratzl and Thomas, 2008).

Moreover, with the existence of numerous examples related to this, even a concept called the Matilda effect (Rossiter, 1993; Mahbuba and Rousseau, 2011) has emerged in the literature. The concept of the Matilda effect can be recalled as follows: Matilda Joslyn Gage (1870) emphasized that the studies of female scientists was ignored, less importance was given to their work and devalued. With this work, Gage broke new ground in the literature and revealed that "women are being pushed to the second grade in academia as in every subject." Later, the historian of science Rossiter introduced the term "Matilda Effect" to the literature in a study she conducted in 1993 to describe this whole of injustices, up to the attribution of women's work to their male colleagues. Another story of three women named Anne Bronte, Emily Bronte, and Charlotte Bronte is as follows: These three female writers brought literature closer to daily life by taking advantage of emotional memories such as romance, love, passion and choosing characters from ordinary people. Thus, they gave a different breath to literature in a process dominated by the ongoing knight-themed literature. They wrote their first novel in 1846. However, due to the difficulty in publishing their books under their own names, they were able to publish this novel using the male names Acton Bell for Anne Bronte, Ellis Bell for Emily Bronte and Currer Bell for Charlotte Bronte (Hewish, 1969). Marie Cruie, the first woman to win a Nobel, received her primary education with her parents. Warsaw, where Cruie lived as a teenager, was then under Russian's domination. Due to the education system, it was not possible for women to receive education in their own country. Therefore, Curie went to Paris in 1891 to pursue higher education with her sister. She received the Nobel Prize in physics in 1904 with her husband Pierre Curie and scientist Henri Becquerel, who studied spontaneous radioactivity. In this process, a group of scientists from the French Academy of Sciences ignored Marie Curie's name in their letters of recommendation, but they could not prevent her from receiving this award. However, this time, it was deemed appropriate that her husband Pierre Cruie gave the speech at the award ceremony (Sonzamancı, 2013). Examples of the problems faced by women scientists started with the example of Hypatia (370-415) and continued uninterruptedly until today. Today, one of the important goals of countries is to eliminate gender inequality in education and academia, as in all areas of life.

Thanks to the awareness of women's rights, women have achieved things beyond their dreams. Therefore, for example, the number of women academics in Turkey is above the world average, and one of the universities above that average is University of Çukurova (Ç.U). But in many universities in Turkey, female academician ratio is far below the average (YÖK, 2020).

The Adim Universities Consortium (AUC) is a collaboration protocol that brings together the universities established on the same date in the same

region to seek common solutions to the problems occurring in the academy. In a study conducted to reveal the mobbing and mobbing behaviors faced by academics in the AUC (Çögenli and Asunakutlu, 2016). The effect of demographic variables on the exposure of academicians to mobbing and the rate of this effect were found. As a result, it was stated that female academicians were exposed to mobbing more than male academics. 76.5% of the women participating in the study are exposed to mobbing, 14.4% of them being mobbed by women, 38.7% by men, and 46.8% by both men and women. 61.2% of the men participating in the study stated that they were exposed to mobbing. The findings of the European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS) also provide information in line with these results. According to the EWCS research, the risk of being exposed to mobbing is higher for women than men (Çögenli and Asunakutlu, 2016) Again, in another study conducted in Finland, it was stated that women were exposed to mobbing more than men (Salin, 2001). In the research conducted by the World Bullying Institute on 7740 employees in America, the mobbing rate was 37%. In addition, it has been stated that 60% of the participants were exposed to mobbing by men and 57% of the victims were women (Namie, 2007).

Unlike all these studies in the literature, the subject that is especially emphasized in this study is to examine the level of mobbing perception of people on the basis of gender and exposition of mobbing and also analyse the relationship between mobbing and demographic variables. For this reason, in addition to the direct question of whether or not there is mobbing, likert-type questions (Leymann, 1990; Leymann, 1996) that indirectly measure the mobbing situation were also included in the questionnaire. Thus, it was aimed to compare the answers given to the question that directly measures mobbing exposure and the answers given to the Likert-type question. Therefore, the second aim is to examine the relationship between the Likert type scale and the direct question about exposure to mobbing. In addition, one of the goals is to question the relationship between the answers given to the Likert scale and demographic variables.

At the same time, the study also revealed the reactions of individuals when they were exposed to or witnessed mobbing. For this reason, we investigate the answers of the question "What is your reaction when you are exposed to mobbing in your workplace or when you see someone else being exposed?". At this stage, the responses of mobbing victims and non-mobbing victims were also discussed specifically.

The third aim of the study is to examine the mobbing exposure of individuals under more general groups using factor analysis. The purpose of factor analysis is to reduce the variables as well as to reduce the relationship between new variables and to define new meaningful factors. In addition to the analysis detailed above, the information obtained from other questions asked to the participants in the survey was also shared in the study.

1. MATERIAL AND METHOD

The study was carried out to see the change of mobbing victimization perceptions of employees at ÇU against gender (Ethics committee approval for the study was given by Çukurova University with the number 07.11.2016-E143168.). It was conducted with a questionnaire study consisting of three parts and 144 women and 162 men were interviewed.

The sampling structure was determined by the stratified sampling method. Thus, 52.6% of the participants are administrative staff. It consists of 16.9% research assistants, 10.7% professors, 4.9% associate professors, 7.5% assistant professors, 4.5% lecturers Dr., and 2.9% instructers.

While the first part of the questionnaire consists of demographic features, the second part, which aims to measure the perception of mobbing, was created with Leymann's Mobing scale consisting of 27 questions. The last part of the questionnaire was formed with the reasons of the employees' perception of mobbing, by whom it was applied, the effects it created on themselves, general questions about legal dimensions and open-ended questions.

In the analysis, descriptive statistics were reported first and normality assumptions of our relevant variables were made. According to the study conducted by Tabachnick, Fidell, and Ullman (2013), it was concluded that the distribution is normal if the skewness and kurtosis measures of the variables are between -1.5 and 1.5.

According to normality results, the relationship between categorical variables was examined by chi-square analysis. In cases where normality is provided, t-test is used for paired comparisons and ANOVA is used for multiple comparisons (Stewens, 1996). The relationship between the mobbing scale total score and gender and marital status was examined by the independent sample t test. The relationship between title and age was examined by one-way ANOVA tests. The analysis of the data was made using the SPSS 23 program.

2. FINDINGS

In this study aiming to measure the perception of mobbing in ÇU, 308 people were interviewed. The survey was conducted with volunteer participants. Ethics committee's approval was obtained from ÇU for this study.

Considering the general structure of the participants, 47.4% of them are women and 52.6% of them are men. Also 40.9% of the participants are 27-36 age; 64.6% are married; 31.8% of the participants are academic staff who are at the beginning of their careers. Likewise, considering the answers given to the question "How long have you been working at the workplace?", it is seen that the rate of employees working less than 10 years is approximately 55%. This is another information about the high young population.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics

Variables	Observation (%)	Variables	Observation (%)
Gender		**Title**	
Female	47,4	Prof. Dr.	10,7
Male	52,6	Assoc. Prof. Dr.	4,9
Age		Asist. Prof. Dr.	7,5
18-26	5,50	Lecturer Dr.	4,5
27-36	40,9	Research assistants	16,9
37-46	28,6	Instructor	2,9
47-56	19,5	Administrative Personnel	52,6
56+	5,2	**Working Duration**	
Marital Status		Less than 1 year	4,2
Not single	64,6	1-5 years	28,2
Single	35,4	6-10 years	22,4
		11-15 years	14,9
		More than 16 years	30,2

The relationship between mobbing and demographic variables has always been questioned in studies (Žukauskas and Vveinhardt, 2009; Yıldırım and Uysaloglu, 2012; Vveinhardt and Štreimikienė, 2017; Ján and Eva, 2008). Studies that examine the relationship between mobbing and gender in different dimensions are also very common in literature (Tomić, 2012; Çögenli et al., 2017; Sevinç, 2011).

In this study, when the relationship between mobbing exposure and demographic characteristics of employees at ÇU was examined, the following results were encountered: The chi-square (cross-table) analysis, which examines the relationships between the categorical variables, was used to answer the questions of whether there is a relationship between the reasons for exposure to mobbing and gender, age, marital status, and title.

Table 2: Exposure to Mobbing

Categorical Variables	Exposure to Mobbing		
	χ	df	p
Gender	1,819	1	0.177
Age	4,041	4	0,400
Marital Status	1,996	1	0,158
Title	9,412	6	0,152

According to the results in the table, there is no statistically significant relationship between exposure to mobbing and gender, age, marital status and title (p> 0.05).

Although there is no significant difference between exposure to mobbing and gender, age, marital status, and title, women are still more disadvantaged: Considering the exposure of female and male employees to workplace mobbing at ÇU, this rate is 67% for females and 59% for males.

Since there was no relationship between the title and exposure to mobbing, this relationship was examined by taking the genders separately. That is, women and men are considered separately and the relationship between titles and exposure to mobbing is also questioned.

It was found appropriate to use parametric methods since the normality condition was provided. And, Chi-square analysis was used to find an answer to the question of whether there is a difference between exposure to mobbing and titles for women and also for men.

Table 3. Exposure to Mobbing by Titles

Categorical Variables	Exposure to Mobbing by Titles		
	χ^2	df	p
Female	5.582	6	0.472
Male	8.923	6	0.178

According to the results in Table 3, there is no statistically significant relationship between exposure to mobbing and title for women (p = 0.472> 0.05) and for men (p = 0.178> 0.05).

In this study, in addition to the direct question about exposure to mobbing, it was aimed to determine the exposure of people to mobbing with a Likert-type scale (Leymann, 1996). The aim here is to examine the relationship between the Likert-type scale and the direct question about mobbing exposure. In addition, questioning the relationships between the answers given to the Likert scale and demographic variables is one of our goals.

When using Likert type scales, the researcher calculates and reports the Cronbach's alpha value. So internal consistency reliability coefficient is obtained. Internal consistency reliability gives the consistency of the scale items among themselves and consistency with the whole scale. In this study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the likert scale consisting of statements about exposure to mobbing was determined as 0.95 and it was concluded that the scale was reliable (Taber, 2018).

Table 4. Mobbing Exposition

Mobbing Exposition	Mean	Standart deviation	Exposed to Mobbing
1. Being inhibited from showing skills/knowledge	2,57	1,457	S
2. Being interrupted at meetings	2,28	1,314	R
3. Getting scolded and yelled	1,86	1,219	R
4. Getting criticized for no reason	2,27	1,359	R
5.Being terrorized by means of phone calls	1,82	1,261	R
6.Receiving verbal threats	1,67	1,167	R
7.Receiving written threats	1,32	0,850	N
8.My presence is ignored among other people	2,04	1,286	R
9.Hearing bad things about himself/herself	2,36	1,498	R
10.Being ridiculed	1,67	1,120	R
11.Being teased due to political and religious beliefs	1,46	0,989	N
12. Suffering verbal attacks regarding political and religious beliefs	1,49	1,008	N
13. Being forced to do humiliating jobs	1,91	1,284	R
14.Efforts are treated scornfully by others	2,04	1,337	R
15.Behaviors are questioned by others	2,26	1,434	R
16. Being sexually attacked	1,23	0,738	N
17. Never being given any special duty	1,93	1,291	R
18. Being given meaningless work assignments	1,73	1,187	R
19. Being given humiliating work assignments	2,48	1,456	R
20. Struggling with focusing on work	2,02	1,327	R

21.Being given work assignments far below capacity	1,82	1,262	R
22. Being physically threatened	1,22	0,719	N
23. I'm physically forced to do hard work	1,45	0,943	N
24. Receiving verbal threats	1,79	1,207	R
25. Being gossiped about	2,57	1,457	S
Cronbach's alpha	0,950		

Our scale, which consists of expressions about exposure to mobbing, is a 5-point Likert scale, and the standard deviation, average, and agreement with the statement have been made by taking into consideration the interpretation criteria in the study of Palaz and Boz (2008). By using Palaz and Boz's (2008) criteria, the averages are categorized as in Table 4. Between 1.00-1.49 = Never exposed (N) to mobbing, between 1.50-2.49 = Rarely exposed to mobbing (R), between 2.50-3.49 = Sometimes exposed to mobbing (S), between 3.50-4.49 = Often exposed to mobbing (O), and between 4.50-5.00= Very often exposed to mobbing (VO). When participants' answers are classified using this scale, the participants involved in research replied "never" to 6 out of 25 factors. They answered "sometimes" to 2 of them and replied "rarely" to 17 of them. The two categories in which the participants answered 'sometimes' were "Being inhibited from showing skills / knowledge" and "Being gossiped about". According to the averages, there are no expressions that fall into 'very often' and 'often' situations. The level of victimization of mobbing with the highest average and the individuals' participation was "Rarely". It respectively "Never" and "Sometimes" victimization levels followed. The answers given by individuals as "often" and "very often" are among the answers that are not emphasized according to the scale obtained.

In this case, the exposure to mobbing of the participants at Adana ÇU measured with a Likert scale, is compatible with their answers to the direct question "Are you exposed to mobbing?". So, it can be said that the employees of ÇU have a conscious attitude in terms of mobbing perception.

The relationship between the responses to the Likert scale and the demographic variables is also examined in the study. For this reason, the answers are given by the participants were collected by considering the 25 questions in our 5-point Likert scale expressing the exposure to mobbing and a new variable was obtained by summation (Abelson, 2012).

The relationship between the mobbing scale total score and gender and marital status was examined by the independent sample t-test. One of the assumptions of the Student's t test is that the variances in the two groups are similar. This assumption can be tested with the Levene test. Levene test is used when there are two or more groups (Nordstokke and Zumbo, 2010). According to the Levene test results, it is concluded that the variances are homogeneous for both gender and marital status ($p = 0.305 > 0,05$; $p = 0.380$

>0,05). If the variances are homogeneous, the p value in the homogeneous variance row is used, otherwise the other is used. Thus, the average of gender and marital status, which is the main purpose, is compared. Thus, it is concluded that there is no significant correlation between the total score of the scale consisting of exposure to mobbing and gender (p = 0.510> 0.05) and exposure to mobbing and marital status (p = 0.689> 0.05). The results are in Table 5:

Table 5

Variables	Mobbing Exposure		
	t	df	P
Gender	0.660	306	0.510
Marital Status	0.400	306	0.689

The relationship between title and age was examined by one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests. Since, ANOVA is used to calculate the significance of the difference between three or more independent means in a normally distributed series (Park, 2009). ANOVA alone compares the arithmetic means of three or more groups cumulatively; ANOVA result is found to be significant when at least one of these comparisons is significant. As in the t-test, in ANOVA, the variances of the groups are assumed to be homogeneous i.e. close to each other. As in the T-test, Levene is used here to check the variance homogeneity. If the p value we got from Levene's test is less than 0.05, the equality of variances hypothesis is rejected. In this case, we cannot use the F and p values given in the ANOVA table. The F value obtained using the statistic The Brown - Forsythe (1974) and the associated p value is used instead (De Beuckelaer, 1996).

In this study, when one-way ANOVA results are examined; since the assumption of homogeneity was not provided, Brown-Forsythe statistics results were taken into account. According to the result of Brown-Forsythe F statistic, there is a significant relationship between the total score of the scale consisting of exposure to mobbing and age (p = 0.043 <0.05), but there is no significant relationship between the total score of the scale consisting of exposure to mobbing and title (p=0.071>0.05).
The results are given in Table 6:

Table 6

Variables	Mobbing		
	Brown-Forsythe	Df	p
Age	2.540	4	0.043
Title	2.019	6	0.071

Post hoc tests should be used to question the origin of the significant relationship between age and the total score of the scale consisting of exposure to mobbing. The F value obtained from the ANOVA indicates whether there is a difference between groups because of experimental effects. That is, F value only indicates the existence of a significance difference between groups but it does not provide additional information. Therefore, Post hoc tests are used to understand where the differences between groups occur. The results of Games-Howell Post Hoc multiple comparison test were examined in order to see from which group there was a significance. Because Games-Howell Post Hoc multiple comparison test gives accurate results even when the group element numbers are not equal (Huizingh, 2007). When a comparison was made according to exposure to mobbing, it was seen that over the age of 57 were less exposed to mobbing than individuals aged 37-46 (p = 0.003 <0.05) and individuals aged 47-56 (p = 0.015 <0.05).

It was stated that there was no significant relationship between the title and the total score of the scale consisting of exposure to mobbing. However, in order to see the general situation, the numerical findings obtained are presented below. Considering the exposure to mobbing according to the title;

82% of female professors, 68% of male professors

70% of female associate professors, 40% of male associate professors

65% of female research assistants, 59% of male research assistants,

62% of the female administrative personnel and 51% of the male administrative personnel are exposed to this situation.

It is seen from these results that exposure to mobbing shows an increase in women after assistant professor position. But, in terms of averages, there is no significant relationship between the total score of the scale consisting of exposure to mobbing and the title as said before (p = 0.071> 0.05).

Another aim of the study is to examine the analysis of the answers of the question "What will your reaction be when you are exposed to mobbing at your workplace or when you see someone else exposed?"

The table for the responses given is as follows:

Table 7. Reactions

What is your reaction when you are exposed to mobbing at your workplace or when you see someone else exposed?	Percentages (%)
I have not made any complaints. I accepted the situation.	26.3
I thought those who did the mobbing were right.	1.6
I verbally complained about those who did the mobbing.	28.6
I complained in writing of those who took action.	6.8
I have not been subjected to this kind of bad behavior.	26.9
Other	8.4

The answers given to the question "What is your reaction when you are exposed to mobbing at your workplace or when you see someone else exposed?" can be summarized as follows. 28.6% of the participants stated that they verbally complained about those who did the action, 26.9% did not experience such a behavior, and 26.3% accepted the situation. 1.6% of the participants thought that those who did the action were right. 4 participants did not answer the question.

The correlation of the answers to the questions "What will your reaction be when you are exposed to mobbing at your workplace or when you see someone else exposed?" and "Have you been exposed to mobbing?" were also examined. Here, chi-square analysis is used, which is an analysis that used when the dependent variable is categorical. When the results of chi-square analysis are examined; There is a statistically significant correlation between exposure to mobbing and reaction when exposed to mobbing or when you see that someone else is exposed ($p = 0.00 < 0.05$). The results are given in Table 8.

Table 8. Correlation between Reaction and Exposition of Mobbing

Variables	"What will your reaction be when you are exposed to mobbing at your workplace or when you see someone else exposed?		
"Have you been exposed to mobbing?	χ^2	*df*	*p*
	164.258	5	0.000

The answers are presented in detail in Table 9. While the rate of those who have verbal or written complaints among those who are mobbed is 49%, this rate is 14% for those who do not suffer from mobbing. In other words, it can be said that people who have this problem are more sensitive to the issue. The rate of those who say "I do not have any complaints" despite being mobbed is a surprisingly high rate of 38%.

Table 9. Type of Reactions

		Have you been exposed to mobbing in the work?	
		Yes	**No**
What is your reaction when you are exposed to mobbing at your workplace or when you see someone else exposed?	I have not made any complaints. I accepted the situation.	(%38) 72	(%7) 8
	I thought those who did the mobbing were right.	(%2) 3	(%2) 2
	I verbally complained about those who did the mobbing.	(%41) 76	(%8) 9

	I complained in writing of those who took action.	(%8) 15	(%5) 5
	I have not been subjected to this kind of bad behavior.	(%3) 5	(%70) 76
	Other	(%8) 16	(%8) 9
Total		**187**	**109**

The third aim of the study is to examine individuals' mobbing exposure under more general groups by using factor analysis. The purpose of factor analysis is to reduce the variables and also reduce the relationship between new variables and make the new factors meaningful (Kline, 1994; Büyüköztürk, 2004). It can be said that we have a data suitable for factor analysis due to KMO=0.934 (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy) value (Strickland, 2003).

Table 10

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		0.934
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	4961.880
	Df	253
	Sig.	0.000

To examine individuals' mobbing exposure under more general groups in this study, we applied factor analysis. In the first iteration by applying factor analysis, the two items in the scale, "Being given work assignments far below capacity" and "Receiving verbal threats " items, excluded from the analysis because of the high and close factor loading values. Then, the second iteration process was carried out with the remaining 23 items. As a result of this factor analysis carried out, 3 components were created (Table 11) from the 23 mobbing exposure items.

Table 11. Pattern Matrix-Factor Analysis

Pattern Matrix[a]	Component		
	1	2	3
Being inhibited from showing skills/knowledge	0.838		

Being interrupted at meetings	0.827		
Getting scolded and yelled	0.593		
Getting criticized for no reason	0.891		
Being terrorized by means of phone calls	0.499		
Receiving verbal threats	0.454		
Receiving written threats			0.473
My presence is ignored among other people	0.757		
Hearing bad things about himself/herself	0.673		
Being ridiculed	0.461		
Being teased due to political and religious beliefs		0.852	
Suffering verbal attacks regarding political and religious beliefs		0.762	
Being forced to do humiliating jobs	0.724		
Efforts are treated scornfully by others	0.830		
Behaviors are questioned by others	0.846		
Being sexually intimated		0.632	
Never being given any special duty	0.674		
Being given meaningless work assignments	0.735		
Being given humiliating work assignments	0.812		
Struggling with focusing on work	0.712		
Being physically threatened			0.737
I'm physically forced to do hard work			0.816
Being gossiped about	0.540		

These three factors in Table 11 were named as the following and they explain 63.39% of the total variance:

Factor 1: Bullying against self-presentation and social relationships.

Factor 2: Bullying against dignity

Factor 3: Bullying against health and emotions

In this part of the study, the relationships between these three new factors and gender, age, title and marital status were examined. The relationship between these three factors and gender, marital status was

examined by independent sample t-test, and the relationship between title and age was examined by one-way ANOVA test.

Factor 1: Bullying against self-presentation and social relationships.

According to Levene test results, it was concluded that the variances were homogeneous (p = 0.200> 0.05; p = 0.544> 0.05). The answers of women and men do not differ by means of Factor 1 (p = 0.319> 0.05). Similarly, there ise no statistically difference between single and married individuals for Factor 1 (p = 0.625> 0.05).

Table 12

Variables	Factor 1: Bullying against self-presentation and social relationships.		
	t	df	p
Gender	0.998	306	0.319
Marital Status	0.490	306	0.625

When one-way ANOVA results are examined; since the assumption of homogeneity was not provided, Brown-Forsythe statistics results were taken into account. When the results of the test statistics are examined, it was concluded that there is a statistically significant relationship between title and Factor 1 (p = 0.026 <0.05). However, in the post hoc tests conducted to see which groups the difference originated from, it was understood that this result was not significant. But there is a significant relationship between Factor 1 and age (p = 0.042 <0.05). In order to see from which group there was a significance, the Games-Howell results from multiple comparison tests were examined. According to this result, it is understood that individuals aged 57 and over are less exposed to mobbing than individuals aged 37-46 and 47-56 (p = 0.001 <0.05, p = 0.011 <0.05, respectively).

Table 13

Variables	Factor 1: Bullying against self-presentation and social relationships.		
	Brown-Forsythe	df	P
Age	2.540	4	0.042
Title	2.540	6	0.026

Factor 2: Bullying against dignity

According to the Levene test results, it was concluded that the variances were homogeneous (p = 0,694> 0.05; p = 0.527> 0.05). The attitudes of individuals with respect to gender and marital status were not differ significantly for Factor 2 (p = 0.681> 0.05, p = 0.723> 0.05, respectively).

Table 14

Variables	Factor 2: Bullying against dignity		
	t	*df*	*p*
Gender	0.411	306	0.681
Marital Status	0.355	306	0.723

When one-way ANOVA results are examined; Since the assumption of homogeneity was not provided, Brown-Forsythe statistics results were taken into account. When the results of the test statistics were examined, a significant relationship was found between Factor 2 and age ($p = 0.037 < 0.05$). According to the averages, it was determined that individuals aged 57 and over were less exposed to mobbing than individuals aged 27-36, 37-46 and 47-56 years old ($p = 0.031 < 0.05$; $p = 0.002 < 0.05$; $p = 0.006 < 0.05$, respectively).

There is no statistically significant difference between Factor 2 and title ($p = 0.345 > 0.05$).

Table 15

Variables	Factor 2: Bullying against dignity		
	Brown-Forsythe	*df*	*p*
Age	2.732	4	0.037
Title	1.147	6	0.345

Factor 3: Bullying against health and emotions

The relationship between Factor 3 and variables was also examined however, no relationship was found.

In addition to the analysis detailed above, the information obtained from other questions asked to the participants in the survey are as follows:

When the answers regarding the causes of mobbing exposure are examined, among the reasons for being a mobbing victim, the stressful work environment is in the first place, and the personality problems of the people who practice mobbing are the second. The last place is the mismanagement of the administrators.

When the answers to the question "If you have been exposed to mobbing, or if someone around you was exposed, how would this affect the victim or you?" are examined: "loss of self-confidence" (24,9%) "prevents me from focusing on my work" (23,5%), and "causes a lack of motivation about work" (11,1%). 19 participants did not answer the question.

Answers to the question of who is mobber are as follows: While 4 participants did not answer the question, other participants stated that they

were exposed to mobbing mostly by their superiors and least by their inferiors.

When we asked the participants who stated that they would not complain about mobbing, the reasons for this are as follows: The reason why the remaining participants did not complain was the highest percentage (20.8%) "Because I think this situation will not change or get worse even if I complain" and the lowest percentage (0.6%) "Because I think people will not believe me" and "It was because I was afraid of work environment if this event was heard".

Conclusion

Mobbing is frequently encountered in workplaces with high superior-inferior relationships such as universities. Addressing this issue with the gender dimension is very important in order to be able to deal with it from a gender perspective. The proportion of female students and female academicians in the university is increasing day by day, but this situation is still less than men. When we look at the academicians in universities on the basis of gender, it is seen that the number of female academicians is more disadvantaged than male academicians, regardless of their title.

The proportion of female students and female academicians who attend universities is increasing day by day, but this is still less than men. When we look at the academicians in universities on the basis of gender, it is seen that the number of female academicians is more disadvantaged than male academicians regardless of their title. This study was carried out to examine the mobbing victimization level of employees at ÇU and its relationship with demographic variables. At the same time, the study also revealed the reactions of individuals to exposure to mobbing. In the study, the mobbing perceptions of the employees were discussed in terms of gender. When we look at the results of the survey on employees' perception of mobbing, it is observed that there is not a big difference between men and women. The reason for this may be that ÇU has an advantageous structure for female academics.

Although there is no significant difference between exposure to mobbing and gender, women are still in a disadvantaged position in ÇU. For example, considering the exposure of female and male employees to mobbing in the workplace at ÇU, this rate is 67% for women and 59% for men. Furthermore, there is no statistically significant relationship between exposure to mobbing and title for women. However, when looking at the rates of exposure to mobbing according to gender and title, it can be seen that women have disadvantageous rates. For example, 14% higher exposure to mobbing for female professors than men, for associate professors, this difference was 30%. For women administrative staff, this difference is 11%. According to the title, exposure to mobbing shows an increase in women after being an Assistant Professor. Until a certain stage, this situation may not be disturbing. They may not be aware of it. They may be afraid of being

said because it may prevent them from promoting to upper titles or because they are afraid. When we look at the exposure to mobbing according to marital status, it can be seen that women are again disadvantaged. For example, 63% of married women, 58% of married men, 73% of single women and 62% of single men are exposed. We can attribute this to different reasons.

In this paper, a survey was carried out and the results are analyzed statistically. And the results were interpreted in terms of the risk created by mobbing. Any kind of work to be done in universities to take the necessary measures regarding psychological violence, which is one of the biggest obstacles to productivity in academic life, is valuable. The reduction of academic production quantity and quality leads to many negative effects, from the weakening of social consciousness to scientific progress, to the technologically and economically disadvantaged position of countries.

In future studies, it can be examined in which types of environments mobbing practitioners can have more power. Or with which measures to overcome such problems, multidisciplinary studies can also be very beneficial for correct steps towards a solution.

It should be clearly stated that mobbing incidents in universities should be investigated immediately by authorized units, investigations should be carried out safely and confidentially, and followed objectively. For this purpose, it is of great importance to have mobbing units in universities and to realize the conditions that will enable these units to work actively and freely. In addition, it is also among the measures that should be taken to ensure that the employees of the psychological support units have the necessary equipment for mobbing and their awareness of the issue is high.

Millions of men and women hate going to work because of mobbing. Mobbing is an emotional abuse which is committed mostly indirectly by co-worker(s) against any person. A person who is exposed to mobbing, fall into desperation and has physical illness frequently. So the social and economic risks of the mobbing syndrome become increasingly important. And awareness of mobbing is slowly growing. Thus, statistical studies on this issue not only shed light on the problem, but also increase the awareness of institutions and individuals on the issue.

References

Abelson, R. P. (2012). *Statistics as Principled Argument*. Psychology Press.

Brown, M. B., &Forsythe, A. B. (1974). The Small Sample Behavior of some Statistics which Test the equality of Several Means. Technometrics, 16, 129-132.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2004). *Sosyal Bilimler İçin Veri Analizi El Kitabı*. (4. Baskı). Ankara: Pagem A Yayıncılık.

Çögenli, M. Z., & Asunakutlu, T. (2016). Akademide mobbing: ADIM üniversiteleri örneği. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi,* 9(1), 17-32.

De Beuckelaer, A. (1996). A Closer Examination on Some Parametric Alternatives to the ANOVA F-test. *Statistical Papers,* 37(4), 291-305.

Gage, M. J. (1870). *Women as Inventors. Woman Suffrage Tracts*, No. 1. Fayetteville, NY: FA Darling.

Hewish, J. (1969). *Emily Brontë: A Critical and Biographical Study*. Springer.

Huizingh, E. (2007). *Applied statistics with SPSS*. Sage.

Ján, J., & Eva, L. (2008). Demographic and Organization Factors Analyses in Relation to Mobbing in Companies. *In Proceedings of the Management 2008 conference in Times of Global Change and Uncertainity* (p. 430). FON.

Kline, P. (1994). A general description of factor analysis. *An Easy Guide to Factor Analysis.*

Leymann, H. (1990). *Mobbing and Psychological Terror at Workplaces. Violence and victims*, 5(2), 119-126.

Leymann, H. (1996). The Content and Development of Mobbing at Work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology,* 5(2), 165-184.

Mahbuba, D., & Rousseau, R. (2011). *Matthew, Matilda and the others.* September 20-23, Istanbul Bilgi University, Turkey, 348.

McKay, R., Arnold, D. H., Fratzl, J., & Thomas, R. (2008). Workplace bullying in academia: A Canadian study. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 20(2), 77-100.

Namie, G. (2007). *The Challenge of Workplace bullying. Employment Relations Today*, 34(2), 43.

Nordstokke, D. W., & Zumbo, B. D. (2010). A New Nonparametric Levene test for Equal Variances. *Psicologica*, 31(2), 401-430.

Palaz, S., & Boz, İ. (2008). Üniversite Mezunu Yetişkinlerin Farklı Organizasyonlarda Gönüllü Hizmet Vermesini Etkileyen Faktörler. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi,* 11(19), 95-106.

Park, H. M. (2009). *Comparing group means: t-tests and one-way ANOVA using Stata, SAS, R, and SPSS.*

Prevost, C., & Hunt, E. (2018). Bullying and Mobbing in Academe: A literature. *European Scientific Journal,* 14(8), 15.

Rossiter, M. W. (1993). The Matthew Matilda effect in science. *Social Studies of Science*, 23(2), 325-341.

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(4), 425-441.

Sevinç, E. T. (2011). Mobbing with a gender perspective: how women perceive, experience and are affected from it. *Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Ortadoğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü,* Ankara.

Sonzamacı, E. (2013). *Bilim Dünyasında Alışılmadık Bir Kadın Portresi: Marie Cruie.* Retrieved from http://politikart1.blogspot.com.tr/2013/07/bilim-dunyasinda alisilmadik-bir-kadin.html

Strickland, O. L. (2003). *Using Factor Analysis for Validity Assessment: Practical Considerations.*

Stevens, J. (1996). *Appied Multivariate Statistics For The Social Science* (Third Edition). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tabachnick, B. G., Fidell, L. S., & Ullman, J. B. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (Vol. 5, pp. 481-498). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's Alpha when Developing and Reporting Research Instruments in Science Education. *Research in Science Education*, 48(6), 1273-1296.

Tigrel, E. Y., & Kokalan, O. (2009). Academic Mobbing in Turkey. *International Journal of Behavioral, Cognitive, Educational and Psychological Sciences,* 1(2), 91-99.

Tomić, M. (2012). Mobbing: The incidence of Mobbing Activities and Differences Regarding Workplace and Gender. Megatrend Review, 9(1).

Vveinhardt, J., & Štreimikienė, D. (2017). *Demographic, Social and Organizational Characteristics on the Levels of Mobbing and Single Cases of Harassment: The Multicomplex Approach. Economics and Management.*

Yıldırım, H., & Uysaloglu, B. (2012). Impact of Demographic Factors on Employee's Perception of Mobbing: A Case Study from a Logistics Company. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 58, 634-644.

YÖK. https://istatistik.yok.gov.tr/ . Date of Access: 5 Temmuz 2020.

Žukauskas, P., & Vveinhardt, J. (2009). Socio-demographic Characteristics of Mobbing and Discrimination in Employee Relations. *Transformations in Business & Economics*, 8(3), 18.