ETHICAL CLIMATE, JOB SATISFACTION AND MOBBING

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to analyze the relationship among ethical climate, job satisfaction and workplace mobbing and to explore how they affect each other. First, the theoretical background of ethics, job satisfaction, mobbing, and the relationships among them are explained by an extensive literature review and along with survey data collected from 158 employees from 81 irrigation unions’ employees in Turkey. The study showed, employees’ perceptions of a positive ethical climate and culture are positively associated with their job satisfaction; and their perception of a positive job satisfaction is negatively associated with their perception of mobbing.
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INTRODUCTION

Organisational ethics, job satisfaction, and mobbing have become important research topics in industrial and organisational psychology. They are considered to have an effect on the productivity, working life, and perception of employees of their job, wage, supervisors, co-workers, job itself and opportunities for promotion.
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Recently, some empirical studies have found relationships among organisational ethics, ethical climate of an organisation and job satisfaction as well as between job satisfaction and mobbing. Since there are a few antecedents that lead to job satisfaction, this study focuses especially on the ethical climate type and how it affects job satisfaction and the impact of general job satisfaction on mobbing. Organisational ethics and ethical climate of the organisation are important factors not only for organisations but also for international business due to its effect on the ethical behavior of employees (Sinclair, 1993) and job satisfaction (Deshpande, 1996).

Viswesvaran et al. (1998) found a positive and high correlation between sensed top management support for ethical behaviour and job satisfaction with the aspect of satisfaction from supervisors. Latest results corroborate the findings of Joseph and Deshpande (1997) that there is a relationship between ethical climate except type egoism, and job satisfaction. Moreover, the association between ethical behaviour and career success is importantly related to job satisfaction (Viswesvaran and Deshpande, 1996).

This study aims to analyze and measure the relational level and direction between the sub-variables of ethical culture (top management support for ethical behaviour, organisation’s ethical climate, and the relation between ethical behaviour and career success) and general job satisfaction, and how they influence mobbing variables.

Analysis and the research model, shown in Figure 1, are used in this study. It is divided into four sections. The first section is the theoretical background and the hypotheses, involves literature review on the relationship among sub-variables of organisational ethical culture, different aspects of job satisfaction, and different aspects of mobbing. The second section describes researching method and the third section includes results and findings.

Finally, the fourth section presents a conclusion for the study, a discussion, and research suggestions for the future.

Theoretical Background And Hypotheses

Ethical Culture

Ethical organisational culture has increasingly gained interest in business ethics research. It is known that in addition to ‘getting the job done’, it is also important how it is performed and that valuing ethical practices can be an important asset to the organisation. It is important to note that even good employees can make unethical decisions if their environment does not draw attention to ethical values and forces them to achieve short-term financial goals at any cost (Huhtala et al., 2012:1).

Ethical culture stems in organisations from people's values, policies and activities. When organisations create an environment that makes their employees behave or act in accord with their ethical values and policies, those organisations are considered to have institutionalized their ethics (Koonmee et al., 2009: 2-3). Previous studies have pointed out the importance and influence of the ethical culture of organisations. A relationship between (un)ethical behaviour and ethical culture was evidenced: the stronger the ethical culture of an organisation is, the less unethical behaviour was observed (Trevino et al., 1998; Ethics Resource Center 2010; Huhtala et al., 2011: 232-233). Moreover, several empirical studies have indicated that the ethical culture of an organisation increases the positive behaviours and prosperity of its members (e.g. Trevino et al., 1998; Kaptein, 2010; Huhtala et al., 2011; Riivari
In a recent study, Koh and Boo (2001) found that three measures of organisational ethics (namely, top management support for ethical behaviour, the organisation’s ethical climate, and the relationship between ethical behaviour and career success) are related to job satisfaction (Koh and Boo, 2004: 677-678). Brown and Trevino (2006) argued that stronger ethical culture encourages ethical conduct and provides the improvement and maintenance of ethical leadership in organisations (Huhtala et al., 2011:232-233). Also some studies point out that ethical conduct should be higher in organisations where leaders and norms encourage ethical conduct, and where ethical conduct is rewarded and unethical conduct is punished than those without such traits (Trevino et al., 1985; Zhang et al., 2009: 631). Koh and Boo (2004) studied the link between the structure of ethics culture and job satisfaction and organisational commitment (Soleimani and NiaAzari, 2011: 504).

In a recent research, ethical culture was observed to have a positive effect on nearly all aspects of employees’ view of their organisation. Employees in strong ethical cultures are almost twice as likely to intend to continue working with their organisation compared to those in weak ethical cultures (Kenexa Research Institute, 2010). Ethical culture plays an important role in directing organisational behaviour (Trevino et al., 1998), and may influence employees’ self-set goals within the job environment (i.e. personal work goals) as suggested in this present study (Huhtala, 2012: 1).

**Top Management Support for Ethical Behaviour**

In most organisations, top management is considered as the sole legitimate authority for decision-making while individuals are supposed to achieve each order in accordance with their boss’ instructions, including those conflicting with their professional ethics (Koh and Boo, 2001; Trevino, 1986; cited in Ahmed et al., 2012: 2968).

As pointed out by many authors, if ethics is totally absent in top management levels, the objective of reaching an ethical workforce may not work as employees are convinced that ethics, in reality, is not very important in the organisation. Top management’s role in terms of ethics is defined to be vital in affecting the level of ethics among employees (Ruiz et al., 2011: 4756).

Okpara and Wynn’s (2008: 946) found that organisational ethics is one of the means for corporate leaders to create favourable attitudes/behaviours and organisational outcomes. A survey (Wimbush et al., 1997: 75) has found that identification and predictability of ethical environment affect the manager in developing policies.

Koh and Boo’s (2001) survey of 237 MBA students and managers in Singapore showed that organizational ethical climate types were associated with job satisfaction. In their study on 230 employees in Pakistan banking industry, Ahmed et al. (2012: 2970) studied the positive connection between top management support for ethical behaviour and job satisfaction. In addition, another study on employees of private and public banks, Mumtaz et al. (2011) showed that top management’s attempt to support ethical behaviour in the organisation positively influence employees’ ethical behaviour and it will increase the job satisfaction. Vitell and Davis (1990) found a 2001:313). Traditionally, Koh and Boo (2001) showed a relationship between top management’s ethical behaviour and job satisfaction (Ahmed et al., 2012: 2968).
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Viswesvaran et al., (1998: 366) stated that the important implementations of some research findings (exp. Iaffaldano and Muchinsky, 1985; Hackett and Guion, 1985; Muchinsky, 1977) included a positive correlation between perceived top management support for ethical behaviours and job satisfaction. Given that meta-analytic cumulation shows a positive correlation between job satisfaction and job performance as well as meta-analytic reviews quantifying a negative correlation between absenteeism and job satisfaction and a finding that top management’s perceived support for ethical behaviour is positively related with job satisfaction, top management support for ethical behaviour may present organisational value (e.g., increased job satisfaction, lowered absenteeism, increased organisational commitment, increased job performance), which ethics researchers have not emphasised forcefully in the past. Whereas many authors found out a strong need in top management’s support for ethical behaviour which eventually leads to job satisfaction e.g.; Vitell and Davis (1990), the study by Viswesvaran, Deshpande, and Joseph (1998) on Indian managers, however, found that the correlation was not so important (Daveninderak, 2009:13).

This study focuses on the job satisfaction of irrigation union employees in Turkey, which is one aspect of ethical climate. The relation of job satisfaction of irrigation union employees with perceived ethical behaviour of top management is analysed. It is expected that perceived top management support for ethical behaviour has positive correlation with job satisfaction of employee’s which is resulted from justice theory and also from cognitive dissonance theory. Compatible with the cognitive dissonance theory (as discussed above), such a conflict ordinance could be an important source of stress leading to lower job satisfaction. From the view of justice theory, top management that increases ethical behaviour is perceived to be fair to employees: (Koh and Boo, 2001: 313). This will result in a higher level of job satisfaction among employess. If individuals regard themselves as treated fairly, they are much more likely to adapt to the changes introduced to them (Cordery et al., 1993; Kirkman et al., 1996; Konovsky and Cropanzano, 1991; Daveninderak, 2009:13).

As a result, top management has a strong effect on the individual’s ethical behaviour. Therefore, a hypothesis is suggested to test whether top management support for ethical behaviour influences the general job satisfaction or not.

Hypothesis 1: Top management support for ethical behaviour in an organisation affects employees’ overall satisfaction.

Career success is described as the positive psychological or job-related outcomes or achievements that the individual gathers as a result of working experiences (Seibert et al., 1999; Daveninderak, 2009: 22).

The settling factors of a successful career means a matter of interest for the employee and the organisation. Wayne et al. (1999) mentions the fact that the success in a professional career can be described by both subjective and objective terms. The objective terms allow the description of obvious achievements such as salary raise or promotion. The subjective terms describe only the personal opinions of the employees, which actually do not confirm to the objective reality, thus lacking objectiveness. For instance, the salary and the personal development are subjective terms (Constantinescu and Bumbeneci, 2010: 72).

Daveninderak, (2009: 22) indicated the strong effect of ethical climate of an
organisation on the employees’ behaviour as defined by some authors (exp. Deshpande, Victor and Cullen). Organisations with an understanding of ethics would all agree on the abstractness of the terms ethical behaviour which sounds nice and appears positive on paper; however, it is very difficult to put it into practice (Daveninderak, 2009: 22). In this manner, Luthans and Stajkovic’s (1999) meta-analysis on studies of the reinforcement theory found that individual behaviour is promoted by means of all three kinds of reinforces – money, feedback and social recognition (Koh and Boo, 2001: 314).

In contrast to this, Chonko and Hunt (1985) argue that unethical behaviour helps one’s personal career improvement. Example was shown from sales managers, when they are forced to attain short-term sales goal; it may induce a temporary ethical ‘compromise’ which is believed to be necessary to achieve the goal (Daveninderak, 2009: 22). Empirical evidence has shown that employees are much more satisfied when they perceive a connection between ethical behaviour and career success (Vitell and Davis, 1990; Viswesvaran and Deshpande, 1996; Koh and Boo, 2001: 314).

With a view of the above, if employees perceive a strong connection between ethical behaviour and career success in the organisation, they tend to have a higher level of job satisfaction yet, the converse is also true (Koh and Boo, 2004: 679). Therefore, in an organisation where ethical behaviour is closely associated with career success, employees’ ethical behaviour is expected to improve. This leads to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2: Association between ethical behaviour and career success in an organisation affects employees’ overall job satisfaction.

Ethical climate can be defined as common thoughts on how to deal with ethical issues, to address them and which behaviour is ethically positive (Victor and Cullen, 1990; Ahmed et al., 2012: 2967-2968). In addition, O’Keefe (2006) describes ethical climate as a general and pervasive characteristics of organisations, affecting on a broad range of decisions which set the basis on which people decide whether a decision is right or wrong (Daveninderak, 2009: 18). Schneider (1975) defines ethical climate as the stable, psychologically meaningful perceptions maintained by the members of an organisation concerning ethical procedures and policies in their organisation, and departments (Erben and Guneser, 2008: 458-460), employees demand consistency between their ethical value system and ethical climate of their organisation (Schwepker, 1999; Koh and Boo, 2004: 679-680).

Various studies have concluded that the ethical climate may be considered as a component of overall organisational culture or climate, constructs that have long been recognized affecting individual decision making (Shafer, 2009: 1091-1092). Additionally, climate for ethics significantly influence the way employees evaluate and behave (Valentine et al., 2010; Ahmed et al., 2012: 2967-2968). In a study of managers in a large non-profit organisation, Deshpande (1996) found out that an organisation could affect on job satisfaction of its employees through changing the ethical climate (Daveninderak, 2009: 18). Similar results were reached by Joseph and Deshpande (1997) in a study of nurses’ job satisfaction in a non-profit hospital. Drawing from Pervin’s (1968) person organisational fit theory, Sims and Kroeck (1994) tested a few hypotheses, one of which indicated that employees achieving a match between their current ethical work climate and their expressed preferences were more likely to have positive job satisfaction (Koh and Boo, 2001: 313). The research carried out on ethical
Ethical Climate, Job Satisfaction And Mobbing

climates particularly found out that ethical work climates influenced some organisational outcomes such as job satisfaction, performance and organisational commitment (Cullen et al., 2003; Deshpande, 1996; Weeks et al., 2004; Erben and Guneser, 2008: 958-960). In recent years, Schwepker (1999), Sims and Kroack (1994) and Viswesvaran and Deshpande (1996) have found out that the lack of an ethical fit (i.e., ethical incongruence) between employees and their organisation could result in, among other things, distress and job dissatisfaction (Koh and Boo, 2004: 679-680). For the purpose of this paper, we used the types of ethical climates defined by Victor and Cullen (Victor and Cullen, 1988). In their studies of ethical climates, Victor and Cullen (1988) defined a group of work climates regarding organisational practices with moral results. They established and tested a typology of ethical climates on the basis of Kohlberg’s theory of moral development (Cullen et al., 2003: 129). Cullen, 1988; one dimension is ethical criterion, which is used for the organisation’s decision-making, and condition of analysis, the second dimension, refers to ethical decision-making. The ethical criterion dimension is the one that composes three major classes of ethical theory (Victor and Cullen, 1988) and these are egoism, benevolence, and principle (Venezia et al., 2010: 79-80).

The egoistic climate is described by employee self-interests (Floyd and Yerby 2014:68), benevolence (maximizing joint interest as much as possible) (Mutebi et al., 2012: 34-35) and principle, referring adherence to universal standards and beliefs (Erben and Guneser, 2008:958). Apart from three basic types of ethical climates, Victor and Cullen’s (1988) typology has three loci of analysis to further categorise the types of climates observed in organisations. This dimension referred to whether the central concern of individuals in an ethical decision making within the group is related to self interest (individual), company interest (local), or societal interest (cosmopolitan) (Shacklock et al., 2011: 53).

Deshpande (1996) established that climate types did not significantly affect satisfaction with payment while it influenced employee’s satisfaction with other aspects of the job such as, promotions, supervisors, work, and the overall job. Employees within an organisation with a caring working environment were remarkably more satisfied (Floyd and Yerby 2014: 68-69). Our hypotheses are modeled in Figure 1 and are stated in the following sections. As such, we offer hypotheses to test the influence of ethical climate types on employees’ general job satisfaction.

Egoistic Climates

The egoism criterion is based on increasing ‘self-interest’, defined in a narrow, instrumental and economic sense of instant interest. The loci of analysis determine the particular “self” of which the interests are increased. In the ‘self-interest’ climate type (the individual locus of analysis), the individuals in the organization recognise that they are meant to increase their personal interests (Maesschalck, 2005: 4). The decision-maker generally seeks for the alternative with consequences corresponding most to his/her needs, ignoring the needs or interests of others. Egoism assumes that one should take actions which provide maximum good for oneself (Rosen, 1978). In an egoistic climate, the individual’s selfinterest is a primary source of moral reasoning when a decision is made (Victor and Cullen, 1988). The needs and interests of others (within the same department or organisation) are ignored (Cullen et al., 2003: 130). According to Victor and Cullen (1988), an egoist ethical climate can be observed among real estate brokers where each person’s sales are independent. In such an organisation, an egoistic
climate tends to develop as all sales people aim to behave in a self-interested fashion to accomplish maximum good for him/her.

In an egoistic climate decisions are made to devote to the individual's interest, company, social, or economical interest. Woodbine (2006) and Joseph and Deshpande (1997) have found out that an egoistic work climate is a strong evidence of job dissatisfaction (Floyd and Yerby 2014:68-69). People consider themselves as part of a reified self of which they try to increase the interests. Thus, we offer the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: Egoistic climate for ethics affects employees’ overall job satisfaction.

Benevolent Climates

Benevolence is generally based on concern for others (Victor and Cullen, 1988). In the climates have defined by this criterion, people do not consider themselves as a single individual, reified self of which the interests should be maximised. Instead, they make distinction between the subject and the object of ethical behaviour and regard the consequences of their behaviour for the well-being of others (Maesschalck, 2005: 5). In such an environment, the decision-maker tends to make decisions which bring about maximum collective achievements even at the expense of individual needs (Cullen et al., 2003). Benevolent climates tend to develop, for example, in research labs; there is a higher need for cooperation to achieve the desired success outcomes (Victor and Cullen, 1988). Benevolent settings are consistent with agreed relationships for at least two reasons.

First, benevolent climates require employees to look beyond self-interest in decision-making. Covenantal connections, including self-interest as a motivating force, sometimes requires parties to sacrifice for the lasting long-term relationship. Secondly, benevolent climates focus on the results of actions on others as a primary decision criterion (Barnett and Schubert, 2002: 282). This overlaps the focus of covenantal relationship on a common commitment to benefit of both parties. Therefore, we offer the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 4: Benevolent climate for ethics affects employees’ overall job satisfaction.

Principled Climates

People with the principle criterion possess a deontological consideration of laws, rules and principles when handling with ethical issues (Maesschalck, 2005: 5). Actions are judged in accordance with universal moral principles instead of results – and absolute obedience is required. Principled climates should foster strong organisational values regarding appropriate standards for decisions making. Therefore, these climates tend to promote collective agreement on acceptable attitudes and behaviours (Barnett and Schubert, 2002: 283).

A principled work climate propose that decisions are made in line with the established rules and codes. Deshpande (1996) reveals that in a principled climate law and professional codes lead to a positive general whether the ethical climate type of “principled” has impact on general job satisfaction. Our fourth hypothesis is as follows:

Hypothesis 5: Principled climate for ethics affects employees’ overall job satisfaction.

Overall Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has been delineated in several different ways and a definitive
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designation for the term is not likely to be materialised (Carbrita and Perista, 2007: 4). Therefore, it may be simply put as an approach reflecting to what extent people are content with their job or not (Mayasari, 2008: 212). Job satisfaction has been described as a satisfied emotional state concluding from the evaluation of one’s job; an affective reaction to one’s job (Abdullah et al., 2011: 226). In other words, it is an affective reaction to a job that produces outcomes consistent with those aimed (Kam, 1998). Moreover, it is the degree to which employees are content with their job (McCloskey and McCain, 1987; Dogan, 2009: 424-425).

Job satisfaction is an important issue for management and organisation researchers (Locke and Latham, 2000); many research studies have been carried out about different dimensions of job satisfaction because it is closely related to organisational phenomena such as leadership, morale, motivation, performance etc. The researchers have defined a set of evidences for job satisfaction, including payment, work, promotion, supervision, environment, and co-workers (Sokoya, 2000). In a study carried out by Vitell and Davis (1990), the relationship between ethics and job satisfaction are studied in a few dimensions, including payment and promotion. An important correlation between all facets of one’s job was observed and it was found out that the degree of optimism about ethical behaviour was related to the success (Daveninderak, 2009: 22-24). On the conceptual basis, Lind’s (1992) fairness heuristic argues that perceptions of fairness in an area affect on perceptions of fairness in another area. In the context of Lind’s study, it implies that employees who consider their organisations as ethical are also more likely to regard their organisations as being fair to them. As a result, this concludes in an increase in employees’ job satisfaction. Therefore, organisational ethics and job satisfaction are considered to be positively correlated (Koh and Boo, 2004: 679). Concerning with ethical work climate, it is found that there is a significant and positive relation between ethical work climate and job satisfaction. In other words, individuals who believe that employees are supposed to obey the laws and ethical codes of their profession and company rules and regulations are more satisfied with their jobs (Mayasari, 2008: 212). However, dissatisfaction with some facets of the job may not destroy the employee’s general job satisfaction when there are other facets in the job that can still please him/her (Hawass, 2012:114-115). The various aspects of job summarise, a positive relation between organisational ethics and job satisfaction is observed. Differently, a higher level of ethics is assumed to be related to a higher level of job satisfaction in organisations (Koh and Boo, 2004: 680). Before examining the mobbing, job satisfaction factors are analysed briefly in the following types.

Satisfaction with Payment

Payment is a primary factor of satisfaction for almost any employee in private, public, small, medium and large organisations (Khalid et al., 2012: 128). Payment is the amount of financial payment received and the extent to which it is equitable considered vis-a-vis with that of another organisation. Wages or salary is an amount of financial payment received by the employee, and the rate at which it is regarded as a fair level in the organization (Wongso, 2011).

If employees are not satisfied with the payment, employees are engaged in part time jobs to earn extra money. As a result, employees do not give their 100% commitment to their jobs. Management should be concerned about this area because it affects on the employees’ mood and well-being. The concerned authorities should consider improving satisfaction of
payment through implementing gradual payment structures, informing individuals of their level of responsibility and the degree of skill and level of performance required (Leigh, 2004:167).

**Satisfaction with Supervisor**

A supervisor is described as “a front-line manager who is responsible for the supervision of employees” (Heery and Noon, 2001). Nel et al. (2004) consider the supervisors as employees who organise the activities of lower-level employees. Staudt (1997) has uncovered that respondents are probably to feel satisfied in general with their job if they are satisfied with their supervisors (Rast and Tourani, 2012: 94). Supervision plays a significant role concerning job satisfaction in terms of the ability of supervisor to contribute to emotional support and technical guidance with related tasks (Robbins et al., 2003; Khalid et al., 2012:128). When employees express dissatisfaction regarding supervision, the management should remove barriers that prevent their staff from doing a good job, and adopt an open door policy to promote employees to talk to supervisors to decrease stress and improve trust, to provide feedback on performance, to provide clarity on the nature of tasks and to give employees a chance to join in decision making (Leigh, 2004: 167).

Empirical evidences suggest that promotions are a significant aspect of a worker’s career and life, influencing other facets of the working experience. They comprise an important aspect of workers’ labour mobility (Kosteas, 2011: 2-3).

**Satisfaction with Co-Workers**

Empirical evidences suggest that the relationships between co-workers yield substantial positive results on the job satisfaction (Ting, 1997). A study conducted by Viswesvaran, Deshpande and Joseph (1998), supported previous findings that there is a highly positive correlation between job satisfaction and co-workers.

According to Madison (2000), participants who are not supported by fellow workers tended to be dissatisfied with their job. Another survey found out that positive relationship with fellow workers improved job satisfaction (Berta, 2005; Khalid et al., 2012:128-129). In this regard, it is considered that if employees’ dissatisfaction with their co-employees worsens, the relationships between them will get worse, too.

**Satisfaction with Work (Itself)**

The Work Itself is the extent to which job provides individual with an intriguing task, opportunities for learning and chance to have responsibility. It is also the extent to which an employee regards his/her job as an interesting one, provide opportunities for learning, and opportunities to undertake responsibility (Wongso, 2011). Research studies on organisations and on types of jobs have revealed that when employees are asked to evaluate different aspects of their job such as supervision, pay, promotion opportunities and coworkers, the nature of work itself generally becomes the most important point (Judge and Church, 2000; Jurgensen, 1978; Saari and Judge, 2004: 397).

**Mobbing**

Mobbing is described as a repeated pattern of aggressive behaviour that intensifies over time and causes victimisation in subject who cannot defend himself or herself (Bairy et al., 2007). On the other hand, according to Leymann (1996:168), the scientific definition of the
mobbing is a social interaction which includes forcing person into a helpless position with a potentially high risk of impulsion. According to Zapf and Einarsen, mobbing in work life can be defined as negative actions by one or several other individuals in a workplace within a certain time interval against an individual who experiences difficulties in defending him or herself against these actions due to different reasons (Zapf and Einarsen, 2001:369; Yuksel and Tuncsiper, 2011: 55). Therefore, a single and isolated event cannot be defined as mobbing or mobbing. In other words, behaviours in a repeated and persistent manner and directed to one or more employees are weak (Leymann, 1996:168). Zapf and Einarsen (2001), other researchers argued that if the duration of the mobbing is less than 6 months and it occurs less than once a week, it can still be defined as mobbing. However, there is a common agreement on the phenomenon that mobbing should be pointed against a particular target, that it contains more than a single action and that the target ends up in an inferior position in which it is difficult to defend him/herself (Zapf and Einarsen, 2001:370).

Mobbing in the workplace refers negative job satisfaction and retention (Simons and Mawn, 2010: 305). A study in a wheel manufacturer company pointed out a negative relationship between employees’ (downward and horizontal) workplace mobbing perceptions and job satisfaction. Nearly 16.7% of the variance in employee job satisfaction can be described by the independent variables of downward mobbing and horizontal mobbing (Adjusted R²). Horizontal mobbing, which influenced the employees’ job satisfaction most strongly was followed downward mobbing. As a result, employee job satisfaction may be increased through replacing workplace (Dogan and Dogan, 2009: 265).

Aspects of Mobbing

Mobbing can be described as a process because of its similarity to any disease or virus infecting other people silently and insidiously and it grows like a snowball over the victim during a period of time. Leymann (1996) divided this process into five stages to analyse it in a more detailed way because, as has been stated earlier, mobbing is a very complicated and difficult phenomenon to be understood both by the victim and others in organisation (Tigrel and Kokalan, 2009: 717-718).

1. Influence on self-expression and how communication happens: According to the typology of Leymann (1996), the first dimension of mobbing is giving no opportunity to communicate by the management, being exposed to verbal attacks, threats and attacks aiming to remove the individual from the work compose; ‘effects on the victims’ possibilities to communicate sufficiently’ (Taspinar and Sayli, 2008: 129-130). It is described by any kind of conflict or critical issue. If the organisation has proper conflict solving strategies, this conflict is resolved by negotiating colleagues to meet in any mutual point.

However, when organisation is not successful at conflict resolution, this ‘consciously created’ conflict, such as accusation of the victim for not doing duties or being careless and disturbing, lingers and compounds and becomes an essential issue (Tigrel and Kokalan, 2009: 717-718). Findings of a study, focusing on the key role of relationship quality among colleagues geographically spread. Especially, in face-to-face interaction but also computer mediated communication (Agrifoglio and Metallo, 2010).

If there is no communication and relations among the colleagues, job satisfaction...
will decrease accordingly. Thus, the more communication among employee co-workers and supervisors, the higher level job satisfaction is (Schweiger and DeNisi, 1991; Kim, 2002: 231; Tengilimoglu, 2005: 28). A survey’s finding (SHRM, 2009:18) indicated that communication between employees and senior management was very essential for employee job satisfaction. Another study on 352 staff members from 52 primary schools of six Catholic school systems in New South Wales, Australia, De Nobile and McCormick (2008) found out that job satisfaction factors have strong relationship with communication (such as downward, horizontal, and vertical supportive communication).


2. Attacks on one’s social relations: the second dimension, effects on 'possibilities to continue social contacts', consists of isolation and obstruction of communication by colleagues and/or management (Taspinar and Sayli, 2008: 129-130) aggressive manipulations, assaulant actions and psychological offences with increasing isolation are found on this stage and if it is thought that the victim is exposed to these actions everyday for a period of time, it is easy to predict negative effects on the victim (Tigrel and Kokalan, 2009: 717-718). Morgeson and Humphrey’s (2007) investigation of 540 employees from different jobs such as teachers, doctors, and construction workers, revealed an important positive relationship between social factors and job satisfaction. Social factors were defined as ‘how often job offers interaction with others, and work environment which poses characteristics such as the surroundings or physical demands of job in the questionnaire. Another empirical study was carried out with 70,000 Italian households in 1993, 1995, 1998 and 2000 by Italian Central Statistical Office. The analysis results suggest that volunteer work and frequency of meetings with friends are importantly and positively related with job satisfaction, with church attendance having the biggest influence on job satisfaction (Fiorillo and Nappo, 2011: 23). Even though there are many studies regarding the influence of social relations on job satisfaction (Seers, 1989; Gerstner and Day, 1997; Liden et al., 1997; Keup et al., 2004), there is not enough research focusing on whether it influences job satisfaction on attacks on social relations of an employee or not. Therefore, effect of the general job satisfaction on social relations can be hypothesised as following; mobbing ‘Attacks on one’s social relations’.

3. Attacks on one’s reputation: 'Effects on victims' possibilities to maintain personal reputation', the third dimension, composes ridiculing behaviours like gossip, making fun of physical and personal characteristics of the victim (Taspinar and Sayli, 2008: 129-130). Particularly, if management is more dependent on responsibilities of mobbers rather than the victim’s role in organisation, information about conflict can be in favour of the mobbers (Zapf et al., 2003; Tigrel and Kokalan, 2009: 717-718). In a study on 137 victims of mobbing at work, (Einarsen et al., 1994; Matthiesen, 2006:54; Zapf, 1999) it is provided that insulting remarks and ridicule were the most widespread negative acts against employees.

Another empirical study was done with haphazard sample Norwegian assistant nurses (Einarsen et al., 1998). The result of analyses specifies that exposure to mobbing results in lower job satisfaction. Another study on 396 employees from diverse companies of the agro fruit sector located in the Region of Murcia (south-eastern Spain) (De Pedro et al., 2008: 222) while investigating mobbing behaviours found that participants (27.9%) heard gossips or rumours about them. Therefore, gossip and rumours are regarded as mobbing behaviours (Leymann,
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1990; 1996). Zapf et al. (1996) found out that the higher social support the victim of mobbing from their colleagues receive, the lower s/he is exposed to isolation and ridicule.

Hypothesis 8: Overall job satisfaction in an organisation affects employees’ assumption of facets of mobbing ‘Attacks on one’s reputation’ of the Zapf et al. (1996) found that attacks on private life are powerfully correlated with psychological and mental problems. Furthermore, important relationships were found between victims’ health situation and attacks on their private life. In other words, employees are satisfied with their job if there are fewer call-ins (Zapf et al., 1996; Shelton, 2011).

Hypothesis 9: Overall job satisfaction in an organisation affects employees’ assumption of facets of mobbing ‘Attacks on the quality of one’s professional and life situation’.

4. Attacks on the characteristic of one’s professional and life situation: In this dimension, the victim is blamed for having wrong personality, being a person difficult to work with and even mentally unstable to mislead management. The processes gains more speed in this step and usually conclude with dismiss (Leyman, 1996; Tigrel and Kokalan, 2009: 717-718).

A study on 186 blue-collar employees in a Danish manufacturing company (response rate of 93%) Agervold and Mikkelsen (2004) analyzed important differences in bullied and non-bullied employees’ ratings of psychosocial factors such as job control, satisfaction in an organisation influences aspects of mobbing ‘Attacks on the quality of one’s professional and life’ of the irrigation union employees in Turkey.

5. Direct attacks on a person’s health: The fifth, and the final sub-dimension, ‘effects on victims’ physical health includes physical attacks, threat of physical attacks, sexual harassment and delegation of dangerous tasks (Taspinar and Sayli, 2008: 129-130). The process of mobbing ends with the departure of victim, and although victims confirm their truths to everyone in the organisation, they do not prefer to stay in such a negative and harmful working environment. Unfortunately, apart from psychological and physiological damages, the victim suffers from other problems even after leaving or being fired from the organisation. The mobbers continue harassing victims through demolishing their reputation and image in the labour market to justify or legitimate rightness of their decisions (Davenport et al., 1999; Tigrel and Kokalan, 2009: 717-718). Spector’s (1987: 158) survey on 136 clerical employees of the University of South Florida in USA indicated that affective reactions, anxiety and frustration were related to job satisfaction. Moreover, in a study on a group of nurses, Jamal (1990) found that work overload, role ambiguity, conflict, and resource in adequacy were remarkably related to job satisfaction, organisational commitment, psychosomatic health problems, and turnover. Einarsen and Raknes (1997) put that the highest level correlation between similar mobbing factor and a scale on psychological health and wellbeing. In a study on 1037 healthcare staff in England, Quine (2001) found that victim of the mobbing nurses were remarkably less satisfied with their job and had higher levels of anxiety, depression and inclination to leave the job compared to other healthcare staff.

Hypothesis 10: Overall job satisfactions in an organisation have an impact on facets of mobbing ‘Direct attacks on a person’s health’. As stated above, the mobbing is difficult to understand since it is a cumulative group activity. Furthermore, victim cannot understand situation very well because he/she is stressed and in a traumatic occasion (Davenport et al., 1999). This is why many researchers tried to find out the indicators of mobbing at workplace to
Hypothesis 1: Top management support for ethical behaviour in an organisation affects employees’ overall job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 2: Association between ethical behaviour and career success in an organisation affects employees’ overall job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 3: Egoistic climate for ethics affects employees’ overall job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4: Benevolent climate for ethics affects employees’ overall job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 5: Principled climate for ethics affects employees’ overall job satisfaction.


Hypothesis 7: Overall job satisfaction in an organisation affects employees’ assumption of facets of mobbing ‘Attacks on one’s social relations’.

Hypothesis 8: Overall job satisfaction in an organisation affects employees’ assumption of facets of mobbing ‘Attacks on one’s reputation’.

Hypothesis 9: Overall job satisfaction in an organisation affects employees’ assumption of facets of mobbing ‘Attacks on the quality of one’s professional and life situation’.

Hypothesis 10: Overall job satisfaction in an organisation has an impact on employees’ assumption of facets of mobbing ‘Direct attacks on a person’s health’.

Method

Aim of the Study

Mobbing became a popular topic at the beginning of the 2000s in Turkey. Thus, this is a relatively new topic in Turkey, and there are a limited number of research studies on mobbing to which employees are exposed. For this reason, this study was conducted as a cross-sectional and descriptive study to determine the rate and nature of mobbing which (that) is experienced by employees who work in irrigation unions in Turkey and the influence of ethical climate types on various facets of job satisfaction and the impact of job satisfaction on employees’ assumption of mobbing.

Data Collection and Sample

Within this research the data required in the nature of the primary data. Therefore, the questionnaire is preferred as the primary data collection method. The data collection process was carried out by means of e-mail, fax and face to face. Return period was set to one week; one reminder was sent out prior to end of that period. While collecting data, the purpose of the study was explained to the employees, and their verbal consent regarding participation was received. In addition, the participants were told that the data collected data would be kept confidential, that is their names would not be written on the forms.

The research was carried out irrigation unions in Turkey. Subject are primarily members of Irrigation Unions in Turkey. According to data from The Irrigation Union...
Association, there are 364 active irrigation unions (The Irrigation Union Association) with about 3236 permanent employees in Turkey in 2012.

Then 20 questionnaires were sent to each union and a total of 158 in 728 were returned and included in the analyses.

**Instruments**

A four-section questionnaire form was used for collecting data. The first section consisted of the participants' demographic information (composed of 12 items), such as gender, age, education, position and experience. The other variables (87 items) were collected in three sections: ethics, job satisfaction and mobbing.

Ethics (Ethical culture and ethic climate): A set of 23 items were used to provide a self-assessment of each staff's perceived ethic culture and climate level. The eleven dimensions of ethic culture assessed by this tool are: top management support for ethical behaviour (4 items), union between ethical behaviour and career success (7 items). To measure the eleven dimensions of ethical culture a questionnaire developed by Koh and Boo (2001) was used. The Ethical Climate (EC), on the other hand, was measured with 12-item scale developed by Koh and Boo (2001) to assess respondents’ perception of ethical climate in their work group. As mentioned above, the ethical climate questionnaire consists of three sub-scales: Egoistic (4 items), Benevolent (4 items) and Principled (4 items). The response scale was a five-point Likert scale to determine how accurately each of the items describes the ethical climate of the work group, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Job satisfaction: A set of 20 items from the Job satisfaction Inventory (Robbins, 1991) was used to provide a self-assessment of each staff’s perceived job satisfaction level. The five dimensions of job satisfaction assessed by this tool are: pay (4 items), promotion (4items), co-employee (4 items), supervisor (4 items) and work (4 items). All items were measured on a five point Likert-type scale where 1 = strongly disagree and 5= strongly agree is.

Mobbing: The questions covered five major categories of mobbing behaviour: Impact on self-expression and the way communication occurs (11 items), attacks on one’s social relations (5 items), attacks on one’s reputation (15 items), attacks on the quality of one’s professional and life situation (9 items) and direct attacks on a person’s health (4 items) by the standardized abridged form of Leymann Inventory of Psychological Terror (LIPT). To measure the employees' perception of mobbing in the workplace, a 44-item tools developed by Leymann (1996) were used. The items were evaluated on a five point scale where 1 = never and 5= always is.

The data gathered by the questionnaire has been analyzed by the statistical data analysis package programme named as SPSS 17.0. The data regarding the demographic characteristics of the employees were evaluated through frequency and percent values. The correlation analysis has been applied to relations between variables; besides, the linear regression analysis has been performed to determine whether the job satisfaction affects over the mobbing, and to test the hypotheses of the study.

The demographic characteristics of the respondents are summarized as follows: 82,9 % of the respondents were male while 17,1 % were female 45,9 % of the participants are between 25-34 years old and 34,4 % of the participants are between 35-44 years old. Education level of
40.5% is high school and 27.2% is bachelor. 47.5% of the participants have been working between 5-10 years while 25.3% of the participants have been working less than 5 years in their present organisations. The marital status of employees is 79.5% married and 20.5% single. The ratio of participants, working as permanent and temporary is 56.8% and 21% respectively. The 37.9% of respondents are manager. 75.9% of the irrigation union employees’ salary was less than 1.501 TL (1TL=1.5 USD).

The reliability coefficients and number of items in each variable are shown in Table 2. Reliability analyses, conducted for ethical culture (top management support for ethical behaviour and association between ethical behaviour and career success), ethical climate (egoistic, benevolent or principled) and job satisfaction (pay, promotion, co-employees, supervision and work) are summarized in Table 2. Cronbach’s alpha was calculated to ensure the consistency and reliability of the questionnaire. Values below 0.60 are at the threshold of acceptability, values between 0.70 and 0.80 are good and values exceeding 0.80 are very good and those greater than 0.90 are excellent (Field, 2005:640). As shown, the alpha coefficients range from 0.51 to 0.87. In other words, only one out of sixteen variable is less reliable than the typical acceptable benchmark of 0.60 (Field, 2005:640). Therefore, it can be concluded that nearly all variables were measured as reliable.

The mean and standard deviation values of variables are shown in Table 3. According to Table 3, most of the respondents identified the presence of an egoistic climate (mean = 3.56). This was followed by principled climate (mean = 3.51) and benevolent climate (mean=3.40). The respondent’s satisfaction with promotion, pay, supervision, co-employees, and work were also analyzed. Among the various facets of job satisfaction, respondents of this study were mostly satisfied with their supervisor (mean = 3.51). This was followed by satisfaction with co-workers (mean = 3.50), overall job satisfaction (mean = 3.18), satisfaction with work (mean = 3.16), satisfaction with payment (mean = 2.77) and satisfaction with promotion (mean=2.70). Table 3 also indicates the mean levels and standard deviations of mobbing (impact on self-expression and the way communication happens, attacks on one’s social relations, attacks on one’s reputation, attacks on the quality of one’s professional and life (direct attacks on a person’s health) perceptions of participant respondents. It indicates that the mean score of mobbing is lower compared to the mean score of job satisfaction and ethical climate levels. The mean of mobbing score of respondents is 1.21 and may be considered as a low level. On the other hand, the mean job satisfaction and ethical climate score is around 3 and it can be said to be a moderate level. Table 4 summarizes Pearson correlations among the study variables. The top management support for ethical behaviour and association between ethical behaviour and career success (i.e. X7 and X10 in table, respectively) are significantly and positively correlated with the measures of job satisfaction. As shown in Table 4, there is a significant positive relationship between three dimensions of ethical climate (egoistic, benevolent and principled) and job satisfaction. All the measures of job satisfaction (i.e. X6 to X11 in the table) are significantly and positively correlated among themselves. Those respondents who believed that their organisation had caring climate were more satisfied with their supervisors. In addition, there is a significantly negative relationship between overall job satisfaction and mobbing. (No significant relationship was observed between overall job satisfaction and direct attacks on a person’s health with mobbing). This negative correlation indicates that there is an inverse relationship between the dimensions of job satisfaction and the dimensions of mobbing within
Organisations (except Mobbing 5: Direct attacks on a person’s health). Strong job satisfaction is associated with less mobbing.

A total of six regression runs were performed – for overall job satisfaction as well as satisfaction with pay, promotion, co-employees, supervision and work. The multiple regression analysis results are summarized in Table 5. As each regression model yields consistent results, they are discussed only for the model with overall job satisfaction as the dependent variable. As shown in Panel F of Table 5, the regression model is significant (p<0.01) and has an adjusted R-square of 0.537. In other words, 53.7% of the variation in employee overall job satisfaction can be explained by the variation in the ethics variables in organisations.

The Adjusted R-square level is considered adequate as the model aims to assess the direction and strength of the association between organizational ethics and job satisfaction. To test the research hypotheses, the significance of tests for the model coefficients is assessed. As shown, the p-value for ‘top management support for ethical behaviour’ is 0.911, which is less significant. Hence, the hypothesis H1 (that top management support for ethical behaviour in an organisation affects employees’ overall job satisfaction) cannot be accepted. Three dummy variables are included in the regression model to represent ethical climate; namely, ‘egoistic ethical climate’, ‘benevolent ethical climate’ and ‘principled ethical climate’. At a significance level of 0.05, ‘egoistic ethical climate’ is not significant (p-value = 0.955). Thus, the hypothesis H3 (that egoistic climate for ethics affects employees’ overall job satisfaction) cannot be supported. On the other hand, ‘benevolent ethical climate’ (p-value = 0.000) and ‘principled ethical climate’ (p-value = 0.025) are significant. Hence, the hypothesis H4 and H5 (that ethical climate types of benevolent and principled for ethics affect employees’ overall job satisfaction) can be supported. As indicated by the numerical sign of the ‘benevolent ethical climate’ coefficient, the results indicate that a more favorable ethical climate is associated with a higher level of job satisfaction in the organisation. This finding is also consistent with the assumptions. Deshpande (1996) similarly found an association between job satisfaction and the organisation’s ethical climate.

Finally, the p-value for the ‘association between ethical behaviour and career success’ is highly significant at 0.000. Therefore, the hypothesis H2 (that association between ethical behaviour and career success in an organisation affects employees’ overall job satisfaction) can be supported. As expected, the coefficient is positive. In other words, a stronger association is linked to a higher level of job satisfaction, a finding similarly obtained in Viswesvaran and Deshpande (1996). Incidentally, Viswesvaran et al. (1998) suggested that ethics in organisation would enhance satisfaction with all facets of the job, especially job satisfaction with supervision.

This conviction/opinion is indirectly supported in the study by the highest model R-square (standardized R-square=0.519) when the dependent variable is job satisfaction with supervision (as compared to the R-squares for job satisfaction with pay, promotion, co-employees and work).

Moreover, Linear regression analysis indicated that five dimensions of satisfaction with payment, promotion, co-workers, supervisor, work (itself) are indicators (some of the dimensions are not at the statistically significant level) of the dimensions of mobbing. According to the first step in the model, impact on self-expression and the way communication
occurs regarding mobbing was considered as a dependent variable while overall job satisfaction was taken as an independent variable and regression analysis was performed. The results indicated that there was a significant and negative relationship between overall job satisfaction and impact on self-expression and the way communication occurs ($b = -515$, $p < 0.01$). In this instance, Hypothesis 6 (overall job satisfaction in an organisation affects employees’ assumption of facets of mobbing ‘Impact on self-expression and the way communication happens’) was accepted.

A meaningful relation between the overall job satisfaction and attacks on one’s social relations has been observed as seen in Table 6. Negative Beta value expresses the negative relation between them. In other words, the overall job satisfaction influences the attacks on one’s social relations by a ratio of 11.1%. As a result, Hypothesis 7 (overall job satisfaction in an organisation affects on employees’ assumption of facets of mobbing ‘Attacks on one’s social relations’) has been accepted. Therefore, employees perceive less mobbing in their organisations with an increase in the overall job satisfaction. In previous studies (Demirgil, 2008; Tengilimoglu and Mansur, 2009), were observed that there is a significant relationship between mobbing and job satisfaction.

As seen in Table 6, the overall job satisfaction has affected on attacks on one’s reputation with a ratio of 19.8%. The Beta value is negative, which shows a negative relation. Hence, employees’ perceive less attacks on his/her reputation with an increase in the overall job satisfaction. By virtue of results, Hypothesis 8 (overall job satisfaction in an organisation affects on employees’ assumption of facets of mobbing ‘Attacks on one’s reputation’) has been accepted.

The Table 6 reveals that the overall job satisfaction has 16.1% affected on the attacks on the quality of one’s professional and life. Moreover, if the level of overall job satisfaction increases, the perception of employees about attacks on the quality of their professional and life will decrease. Hence, Hypothesis 9 (overall job satisfaction in an organisation affects on employees’ assumption of facets of mobbing ‘Attacks on the quality of one’s professional and life situation’) has been accepted. According to table 6, negative and meaningful relations were found between overall job satisfaction and the types of mobbing (except mobbing 5: Direct attacks on a person’s health).

Nevertheless, no relationship was observed between overall job satisfaction and direct attacks on a person’s health according to results of the analysis. By virtue of results, Hypothesis 10 (Overall job satisfaction in an organisation have an impact on employees’ assumption of facets of mobbing ‘Direct attacks on a person’s health’) has been rejected.

Research limitations

One of the most important limitations of this research was the low response rate of questionnaire forms. 570 of the 728 employees who participated in the research did not completely fill in or wrongly filled in the forms and thus were excluded from the research. One of the reasons for low response rate could be the lengthy of questionnaire. Furthermore, it is normal for some individuals to avoid answering questions about sensitive subjects such as ethical climate and mobbing. The questionnaire was predicted to result in a low participation rate. During data collection for this research, some of the employees expressed their opinions regarding how important the research topic is and that the results need to be shared with...
they themselves and with managers.

Another limitation of this research was that the results might be specific in one sector. Therefore, our results cannot be generalized to the all sectors as a whole. Future studies should replicate this study in other organisations.

**DISCUSSION**

In the literature, it was reported that ethical climate predispose to mobbing. Cobanoglu (2005) noted that a lack of job satisfaction and negative atmosphere within the workplace played an important role in mobbing. Our findings are evidence to this argument.

The result of study indicated that 158 usable questionnaires confirm the existence of three different ethical climate types observed in Irrigation Unions in the present sample context. Regarding the effects of ethical climate types on employee overall job satisfaction, benevolent and principled climate type appears to positively influence overall job satisfaction, whereas egoistic climate type is found to have no impacts. Employees also expressed that the existence of association between ethical behaviour and career success affects on overall job satisfaction.

The literature suggests that ethical climate affects on employees’ job satisfaction (Kaczka and Kirk, 1968; Friedlander and Margulies, 1996; Schneider, 1972; Schneider and Snyder, 1975; Pritchard and Karasick, 1973; Downie et al., 1974; Churchill et al., 1976; Ostroff, 1993; Johnson and McIntye, 1998). Based on the previous studies, an organisation with a strong ethical climate and supportive top management for ethical behaviours influences job satisfaction positively. For example, in their study Ahmed, Shad, Mumtaz and Tanveer, (2012:2966) analyzed the effects of the climate types on job satisfaction, and found out that egoistic climate for ethics and job satisfaction are negatively related and that both benevolent climate and top management support for ethical behaviour are positively related with job satisfaction. More than one climate types may coexist in an organisation (Deshpande, 1996; Joseph and Deshpande, 1997; Koh and Boo, 2001). Vitell and Davis’ (1990) study indicates that MIS professionals are more satisfied with the various dimensions of their jobs (i.e., promotions, coworkers, supervisors, work itself) when top management emphasizes on ethical behaviour and when they are optimistic about the relationship between ethics and success within their companies. Additionally Okpara’s (2002) study with IT managers in Nigeria revealed that "climate significantly influenced satisfaction with promotions, supervisors, and work along with overall job satisfaction”. Joseph and Deshpande reached findings similar to Okpara’s study. They analyzed climate types in different branches and revealed that a caring climate significantly influenced overall job satisfaction, and a ruling climate affects payment, promotion, and supervision satisfaction of nurses in a large non-profit hospital. Furthermore, Deshpande (1996); Viswesvaran and Deshpande (1996) displayed similar relationships between job satisfaction and ethics among mid-level managers in India (Daneshfard, Rahimi and Damirchi (2011: 14).

Another research showed that salespeople’s positive perceptions about ethical climate are positively associated with their job satisfaction (Schwepker 2001:41). Similarly Koh and Boo, (2001) and Wu’s (1999) studies indicated that ethical climate types are associated with job satisfaction. Similar to the existing literature, the findings of our study indicates that ethical climate has statistically significant effect on overall job satisfaction.
Mobbing has been associated with many aspects such as absenteeism (Agervold and Mikkelsen, 2004; Hoel et al., 2003; Hoel and Cooper, 2000; Ortega et al., 2009), intention to leave and staff turnover (Djurkovic et al., 2005; Keashly and Jagatic, 2000), concentration problems (O’Moore et al., 1998), lowered job satisfaction (Einarsen and Mikkelsen, 2003; Hoel, Einarsen and Cooper 2003; Farrell and Geist-Martin, 2005; Salin, 2003; Vartia, 2001; Dogan ve Dogan, 2009: 265; Einarsen and Raknes, 1997; Einarsen et al., 1994; Einarsen and Mikkelsen, 2003; Zapf et al., 1996), work efficiency and productivity (Hoel and Cooper, 2000; Keashly and Jagatic, 2000), performance, stress, and motivation (Mikkelsen et al., 2011:85; McCormacket al., 2006:318; Kivimaki et al., 2000; McCarthy and Mayhew, 2004; Sheehan, 2004; Sheehan and Griffiths, 2011:8; D'Cruz and Noronha, 2010:270; Bryant et al., 2009:50; Giorgi, 2009: 35) in the literature. Various empirical studies revealed that mobbing could potentially have relationship with the job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction was linked to positive interpersonal work and organisational relationships (O’Moore and Crowley, 2011: 67). Salary, type of job, physical conditions, relations among colleagues, security, promotion opportunities, empowerment, status, financial and morale awards, training, involvement in decision making, communication, social activities, policy and management of organisations are some of the factors influencing job satisfaction (Tanke, 1990). Additionally, the employees’ job satisfaction could be increased through eliminating workplace mobbing (Dogan ve Dogan, 2009: 265). Tinaz stated a decrease in the level of workplace mobbing when managerial behaviour, morale, motivation, job satisfaction and communication, contribute to good organisational health, is in compliance with expectations (Cemaloglu, 2011:505). However, no research is available in the literature that examines the effect of job satisfaction on mobbing.

The present research argues that there is a negative but meaningful relationship between overall job satisfaction and mobbing types. Regression analyses indicated that overall job satisfactions were significantly related with the four types of mobbing (impact on self-expression and the way communication happens, attacks on one’s social relations, attacks on one’s reputation, attacks on the quality of one’s professional and life situation) despite no significant link to direct attacks on a person’s health (mobbing type 5). In other words, the more feeling of employees with job satisfaction in an organisation is, the less mobbing level is. The dominant force of job satisfaction in an organisation will reduce the negative impact of mobbing.

This means that employees’ perceptions of a positive ethical climate and culture are positively associated with their job satisfaction; and their perception of a positive job satisfaction is negatively associated with their perception of mobbing. Therefore, emphasizing on a required ethical climate and ethical culture dimension for organisations, this study presents an outline of a partial strategy to increase job satisfaction and reduce mobbing behaviour.

The important conclusion is that organisations can increase job satisfaction and decrease mobbing behaviours through influencing an organisation’s ethical climate and culture. Administrators and managers can foster within organisations the climate types of benevolent and principled climate, increasing satisfaction and preventing organisations from developing the type of egoistic climate that decreases it. Therefore, emphasizing on a required ethical climate and ethical culture dimension for organisations, this study presents an outline of a partial strategy to increase job satisfaction and reduce mobbing behaviour.
This study may potentially contribute to the research literature as well as the employee profession through indicating that job satisfaction experienced by employees negatively affects on employees' mobbing perception. If there is mobbing in an organisation, appropriate precautions should be taken to protect people against mobbing, and a safe and comfortable atmosphere should be created in organisation. Setting up a system of support for supervisor and co-employees exposed to mobbing may provide important benefits. Hopefully, practitioners in the field will take these findings into account in order to modify the ethical climate of organisation to increase job satisfaction of employees and decrease mobbing behaviors in the firms.
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**Figure 1** Research model

**Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper-level manager</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11,4</td>
<td>Primary Education</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-level manager</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21,5</td>
<td>High school</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-level manager</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office servant</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26,6</td>
<td>Bachelor (Faculty)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver/Operatör</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12,7</td>
<td>Master degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22,8</td>
<td>PhD.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Officer</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7,6</td>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12,7</td>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>47,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Employee</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>56,8</td>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal Employee</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21,0</td>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplier firm’s employee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,9</td>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>79,5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>82,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20,5</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Groups</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
<td>Wage/Salary</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Monthly)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3,8</td>
<td>500-1.000 TL</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>45,9</td>
<td>1.001-1.500 TL</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>41,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>34,4</td>
<td>1.501-2.000 TL</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15,3</td>
<td>2.001-2.500 TL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>,6</td>
<td>2.501-3.000 TL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 2. Reliability Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Questions</th>
<th>Alpha coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top management support for ethical behaviour.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical climate type: Egoistic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical climate type: Benevolent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical climate type: Principled</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association between ethical behaviour and career success</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with pay</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with promotion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with co-employees</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with supervisor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with work(itself)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobbing 1: Impact on self-expression and the way communication happens</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobbing 2: Attacks on one’s social relations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobbing 3: Attacks on one’s reputation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobbing 4: Attacks on the quality of one’s professional and life</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobbing 5: Direct attacks on a person’s health</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 3 Descriptive Statistics (Mean and Standard deviations)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top management support for ethical behaviour.</td>
<td>3.39*</td>
<td>1.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical climate type: Egoistic</td>
<td>3.56*</td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical climate type: Benevolent</td>
<td>3.40*</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical climate type: Principled</td>
<td>3.51*</td>
<td>1.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association between ethical behaviour and career success</td>
<td>3.36*</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with pay</td>
<td>2.77**</td>
<td>1.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with promotion</td>
<td>2.70**</td>
<td>1.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with co-employees</td>
<td>3.50**</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with supervisor</td>
<td>3.51**</td>
<td>.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with work(itself)</td>
<td>3.16**</td>
<td>.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>3.18**</td>
<td>.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobbing 1: Impact on self-expression and the way communicationhappens</td>
<td>1.46***</td>
<td>.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobbing 2: Attacks on one’s social relations</td>
<td>1.18***</td>
<td>.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobbing 3: Attacks on one’s reputation</td>
<td>1.17***</td>
<td>.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobbing 4: Attacks on the quality of one’s professional and life</td>
<td>1.20***</td>
<td>.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobbing 5: Direct attacks on a person’s health</td>
<td>1.04***</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Scale of ethic: 1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neither agree nor disagree, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly agree

** Scale of job satisfaction: 1= Strongly disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neither agree nor disagree, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly agree

*** Scale of mobbing: 1= Never, 2= Rarely, 3= Sometimes, 4= Often, 5= Always
### Table 4 Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
<th>X7</th>
<th>X8</th>
<th>X9</th>
<th>X10</th>
<th>X11</th>
<th>X12</th>
<th>X13</th>
<th>X14</th>
<th>X15</th>
<th>X16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>.605**</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>.648**</td>
<td>.609**</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3</td>
<td>.491**</td>
<td>.582**</td>
<td>.547**</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4</td>
<td>.466**</td>
<td>.553**</td>
<td>.521**</td>
<td>.409**</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5</td>
<td>.313**</td>
<td>.389**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6</td>
<td>.398**</td>
<td>.365**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X7</td>
<td>.421**</td>
<td>.413**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X8</td>
<td>.442**</td>
<td>.525**</td>
<td>.618**</td>
<td>S**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X9</td>
<td>.339**</td>
<td>.284**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X10</td>
<td>.507**</td>
<td>.529**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X11</td>
<td>.340**</td>
<td>.174**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X12</td>
<td>.310**</td>
<td>.123**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X13</td>
<td>.152**</td>
<td>.154**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X14</td>
<td>.244**</td>
<td>.138**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X15</td>
<td>.019**</td>
<td>.092**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X16</td>
<td>.096**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation, significant level 0.05 (2-tailed).

### Table 5. Regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Satisfaction with pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Top management support for ethical behaviour</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-3.71</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ethical climate type: Egoistic</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td>0.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ethical climate type: Benevolent</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>1.895</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ethical climate type: Principled</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>1.221</td>
<td>0.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Association between ethical behaviour and career success</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>1.348</td>
<td>0.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Satisfaction with promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Top management support for ethical</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>0.275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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behaviour.

- Ethical climate type: Egoistic
  - 0.059  1.096  0.586
- Ethical climate type: Benevolent
  - 0.135  0.546  0.227
- Ethical climate type: Principled
  - -0.084  1.213  0.369
- Association between ethical behaviour and career success
  - 0.366  -0.902  0.000

Model
  (Standardized R-square = 0.253) (F = 10.414) 0.000

3. Satisfaction with co-employee

- Top management support for ethical behaviour.
  - 0.026  0.280  0.780
- Ethical climate type: Egoistic
  - -0.138  -1.451  0.149
- Ethical climate type: Benevolent
  - 0.402  4.152  0.000
- Ethical climate type: Principled
  - 0.280  3.401  0.001
- Association between ethical behaviour and career success
  - 0.184  2.317  0.022

Model
  (Standardized R-square = 0.392) (F = 20.050) 0.000

4. Satisfaction with supervisor

- Top management support for ethical behaviour
  - -0.109  -1.343  0.182
- Ethical climate type: Egoistic
  - 0.018  0.207  0.836
- Ethical climate type: Benevolent
  - 0.400  4.645  0.000
- Ethical climate type: Principled
  - 0.183  2.497  0.014
- Association between ethical behaviour and
  - 0.373  5.283  0.000
Ethical Climate, Job Satisfaction And Mobbing

career success

Model (Standardized R-square (F=32,957) 0,000

=,519)

5. Satisfaction with work itself

- Top management support for ethical 0,007 0,067 0,946

behaviour

- Ethical climate type: Egoistic -0,85 -0,790 0,431

- Ethical climate type: Benevolent 0,335 3,067 0,003

- Ethical climate type: Principled 0,107 1,157 0,249

- Association between ethical behaviour and 0,218 2,428 0,016
career success

Model (Standardized R-

square(=,224)

(=,537)

6. Overall Job Satisfaction

- Top management support for ethical -0,009 -0,112 0,911

behaviour

- Ethical climate type: Egoistic -0,005 -0,056 0,955

- Ethical climate type: Benevolent 0,402 4,761 0,000

- Ethical climate type: Principled 0,163 2,265 0,025

- Association between ethical behaviour and 0,345 4,969 0,000
career success

Model (Standardized R-square (F=35,308) 0,000

=,537)

Table 6. Regression analysis
### Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobbing 1: Impact on self-expression and the way communication happens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Satisfaction with pay</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-3.19</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Satisfaction with promotion</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>-7.28</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Satisfaction with co-employees</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Satisfaction with supervisor</td>
<td>-0.633</td>
<td>-6.790</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Satisfaction with work(itsely)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>(Standardized R² = 0.400)</td>
<td>(F=19.776)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.0515</td>
<td>-7.424</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Standardized R² = 0.260)</td>
<td>(F=55.119)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobbing 2: Attacks on one’s social relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Satisfaction with pay</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Satisfaction with promotion</td>
<td>-0.054</td>
<td>-5.67</td>
<td>0.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Satisfaction with co-employees</td>
<td>-0.239</td>
<td>-2.185</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Satisfaction with supervisor</td>
<td>-0.283</td>
<td>-2.546</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Satisfaction with work(itsely)</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>0.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>(Standardized R² = 0.161)</td>
<td>(F=6.387)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Ethical Climate, Job Satisfaction And Mobbing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>-342</th>
<th>-4,487</th>
<th>.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Standardized R-square = .111)</td>
<td>(F=20.134)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mobbing 3: Attacks on one’s reputation

- Satisfaction with pay | .011 | .138 | .890 |
- Satisfaction with promotion | -.039 | -.443 | .659 |
- Satisfaction with co-employees | -.102 | -.1,006 | .316 |
- Satisfaction with supervisor | -.487 | -.4,724 | .000 |
- Satisfaction with work(itself) | .037 | .378 | .706 |

#### Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>-.451</th>
<th>-6,233</th>
<th>.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Standardized R-square = .278)</td>
<td>(F=11.774)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mobbing 4: Attacks on the quality of one’s professional and life

- Satisfaction with pay | -.013 | -.153 | .878 |
- Satisfaction with promotion | -.050 | -.535 | .594 |
- Satisfaction with co-employees | -.028 | -.248 | .804 |
- Satisfaction with supervisor | -.411 | -.3,725 | .000 |
- Satisfaction with work(itself) | -.024 | -.238 | .812 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>(Standardized R-square = 0.195)</th>
<th>(F=7,727)</th>
<th>0.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.408</td>
<td>-5.496</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>(Standardized R-square = 0.161)</th>
<th>(F=30,208)</th>
<th>0.000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Mobbing 5: Direct attacks on a person’s health

- Satisfaction with pay                | 0.049                           | 0.508      | 0.612 |
- Satisfaction with promotion           | -0.048                          | -0.475     | 0.636 |
- Satisfaction with co-employees        | 0.050                           | 0.407      | 0.685 |
- Satisfaction with supervisor          | -0.332                          | -2.749     | 0.007 |
- Satisfaction with work(itsel)         | 0.076                           | 0.679      | 0.498 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>(Standardized R-square = 0.039)</th>
<th>(F=2,143)</th>
<th>0.064</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>-1.726</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>(Standardized R-square = 0.013)</th>
<th>(F=2,979)</th>
<th>0.086</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>