

support in the relationship between mobbing and organizational identification. However, the findings demonstrate that rather than a moderating variable, perceived organizational support is positively associated with organizational identification. **Implications for Research and Practice:** The results of the current study highlight the effect of organizational support in increasing the organizational identification levels of employees to their organizations. It would be useful for future research to assess the moderating role of other dispositional or situational variables. Moreover, future research might also investigate some other work outcomes such as intention to leave, job satisfaction, and job performance.

Introduction

Mobbing defined as “hostile and unethical communication, which is directed in a systematical way by one or few individuals mainly towards one individual who due to mobbing is pushed into a helpless and a defenseless position and being held there by means of continuing mobbing activities” (Leymann, 1996, p.168). It has gained growing attention during the last decades in both theory and practice. Empirical research provides evidence that mobbing may lead to detrimental outcomes at both individual and organizational levels. Individual consequences of mobbing are concentrated on the increasing rates of victim’s psychological stress such as anxiety, depression, and lack of concentration. Organizational consequences are focused on increasing absenteeism and turnover, losing competent and successful employees, reducing the organizational loyalty and credibility, job alienation and decreased organizational commitment (Dean, Brandes, & Dharwadkar, 1998; Ertüreten, Cemalcılar, & Aycan, 2013; Leymann, 1990; Zapf et al., 1996).

The prevalence of mobbing may vary according to the type of organizations. In this regard, educational institutions rank high for mobbing and bullying complaints (Namie & Namie, 2009). Leymann (1996) indicates that in educational work settings, colleges and universities are over-represented in which mobbing occurs. Likewise, the report of The Grand National Assembly of Turkey (2011) indicates the widespread rate of mobbing in educational organizations in Turkey. Studying mobbing in educational settings is worthy for a number of reasons. First, the quality of interpersonal relations such as collegiality is an important factor in the retention of faculty (Norman, Ambrose, & Huston, 2006). Second, most of the literature on conflict gives a special importance to the structural and interpersonal opportunities for disagreement and hostility in higher educational settings (Keashly & Neuman, 2010). Moreover, when mobbing occurs in an educational organization, regardless of its level, the whole system of learning is interrupted because employees and students struggle for stability (Blasé & Blase, 2003; Hornstein, 2003). Therefore, the prevention and the management of mobbing process are considered as vital for the effectiveness of educational systems.

The aim of the current study is twofold. First, it investigates the relationship between mobbing and organizational identification (OI) as an organizational attitude. OI is defined as “perception of oneness with or belongingness to” the organization (Ashforth and Mael, 1989, p.34). In other words, it refers to the overlap between the self-concept of an employee and the goals of the organization (Van Dick et al., 2004). Although it has attracted scholars’ interest since 1990’s, to authors’ knowledge no research has taken into account the effects of mobbing prevalence on the individuals’ sense of belonging and identity to the organization in educational settings. Universities and colleges are considered as 'holographic organizations' (Albert & Whetten, 1985), that is, one where members share a common organization-wide identity and are thus less likely to experience competing demands from department-level or occupational identities (cited in. Mael & Ashford, 1992, p.104). Therefore, the exploration of the plausible effects of mobbing on the employees’ organizational identification in a higher educational setting warrants research attention.

The second purpose of the study is to explore the moderating effect of perceived organizational support (POS) on the relationship between mobbing and organizational identification. We proposed perceived organizational support, the degree to which employees believe that their organization values their contributions and cares about their well-being and socio-emotional needs, (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986) act as a moderator between mobbing and organizational identification. Perceived organizational support is important because it is thought to be the organization's contribution to a positive reciprocity dynamic with the employees. Also, when the organizational climate is not supportive, mobbing problems could proliferate within the organizations (Kasen, Johnson, Chen, Crawford, & Cohen, 2011). Therefore, perceived organizational support might play an important role in regulating the relationship between mobbing and organizational identification by decreasing the negative effects of mobbing.

In general, this study contributes to the literature in examining how organizational support mechanisms might influence the negative experiences of mobbing victims. Building on Tyler and Lind's (1992) Relational Model of Authority, we believe POS might provide additional insights in leading the exchange relationship between employee and organization, and buffering the effects of mobbing.

The research questions of interest in the study are presented below:

- 1- What is the relationship between mobbing and organizational identification?
- 2- Does perceived organizational support act as a moderator between mobbing and organizational identification?

Mobbing

Mobbing is a complex phenomenon that is often described as hostile, abusive, repeated, undesired, and unreciprocated behaviors that can have detrimental effects on targets (Di Martino, Hoel, & Cooper, 2003). The term mobbing was first used by Leymann (1990) to describe a hostile workplace behavior. To be considered as mobbing, these behaviors must occur on a frequent basis, at least once in a week, and continue over a long period, at least six months (Leymann, 1996). The victims of mobbing are exposed to a broad variety of hostile and abusive behaviors. Those behaviors range from permanent criticism of their work to detrimental comments, gossiping, rumors, attacks on their nationality, ethnical heritage, religious, political attitudes, or threats and acts of mild physical violence (Einarsen, 2000; Leymann, 1996; Zapf, Knorz, & Kulla, 1996). In higher educational settings, the most frequent hostile behaviors are reported as threats to professional status and isolating, undermining employees' professional standing, performance, authority, competence and hindering access to key resources for their work, critiques of their work, prevention of career development, rejection of ideas, accusation of mistakes and errors and demoralizing activities (Keashly & Neuman, 2010; Yelgeçen, Tigrel, & Kokalan, 2009). Supporting those, Ak-Kucukcayir and Akbaba-Altun (2016) indicate that the consequences of

mobbing might have severe and broader implications in educational institutions due to the possibility of physical violence and destruction. Likewise Celep and Konaklı (2013), reported that the victims of mobbing in educational area are affected by physically, psychologically, and economically in which resulting lower levels of job performance and less satisfaction of family life.

The literature uses the terms ‘workplace psychological harassment’, ‘workplace bullying’ and ‘mobbing’ to describe the hostile behaviors in organizations. The majority of research indicates the positive association between mobbing, workplace bullying and harassment, and unfavorable individual and organizational outcomes (Francis, 2014). Thus, in developing conceptual clarity, the current study uses mobbing (Leymann, 1996) as phenomena in explaining and understanding this complex issue (Branch, Ramsay, & Barker, 2013).

Mobbing might lead to detrimental individual and organizational consequences. Accordingly, those hostile behaviors might take away a victim’s sense of safety, security, and identity and may cause severe physical and psychological effects, such as anxiety, depression, sleeplessness, exhaustion, frustration, aggressiveness, tiredness, stress, lack of concentration and motivation (Akgeyik, Güngör, & Uşen, 2007; Einarsen & Raknes, 1997; Kayaci, 2014; Leymann, 1990; Leymann & Gustafsson, 1996; Yıldırım & Yıldırım, 2007, Yıldız, Tüzüntürk, & Giorgi, 2008). Regarding organizational outcomes, absenteeism, productivity loss, job dissatisfaction and lower levels of trust have been reported as detrimental effects of mobbing (e.g., Akgeyik, Güngör, & Uşen, 2007, Cabaros & Rodrigues, 2006; Gül et al., 2010; Leymann, 1990).

Mobbing and Organizational Identification (OI)

Organizational identification is one of the most important conceptualizations regarding the relationship between the employee and his/her organization. OI has been found to be associated with important organizational variables such as job satisfaction, job involvement, turnover intentions, and in-role and extra-role performance (Riketta, 2005). Although initial researches on OI started with March and Simon’s (1958, p.74) operational definition, interest in the topic has widely increased in the late 1980s (Riketta, 2005) particularly with the application of Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) to work settings.

Ashforth and Mael (1989) defined social identification as the oneness with the group that leads to activities in support to the group (i.e., organization). Accordingly, the value congruence between the individual and the organization determines the quality of identification process. Once organizational identification is formed, employees act toward the welfare of the organization. The main mechanism of this specific relationship depends on the assumption that organization’s successes and failures are felt by employees personally who are identified with their organizations. In other words, employees derive an important part of the proportion of their self-esteem from their membership of their organization.

OI can reveal as a product of a positive relationship between the employee and the organization. However, one might presume that the experience of unpleasant behaviors (i.e., mobbing, workplace bullying, etc.) within the organization might have a detrimental effect on the organizational identification process.

The Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964) will serve as a theoretical background for the association between mobbing and OI. The concept of Social Exchange Theory refers to an unspecified exchange where one party needs to trust the other, and the received benefits are reciprocal. In work settings, employees repay favorable work conditions through good performance and desired attitudes and behaviors without any formal contracts. That is, when employees perceive unfavourable treatments from their organizations, they will suffer the loss of identification. Since mobbing is perceived as unfair by the victims, Social Exchange Theory presents the mechanisms through which mobbing generalized into a negative evaluation of the employment relationship and then leads to lower levels of OI of employees.

Supporting the theory above, the study by Loh, Restubog, and Zagencyk (2010) reports a negative association between workplace bullying and workgroup identification in their cross-national sample including Singaporean and Australian employees. The authors suggest that mobbing would signal to employees that they do not have meaningful relationships in their workplace and then they become less identified with their organizations (Loh et al., 2010). Escartin, Ullrich, Zapf, Schlüter and Van Dick (2013) report that being identified with the workgroup reduces the odds of bullying on their sample of industry, service and educational employees. Similarly, Topa and Moriano (2013) note that group identity and group support have negative effects on horizontal mobbing in a sample of Spanish nurses.

Although studies on the direct effect of mobbing on organizational identification are rare, the relationship between mobbing and organizational commitment is well documented. OI and affective organizational commitment (AOC) are similar albeit different concepts. The meta-analysis of Riketta (2005) notes that the shared variance between affective organizational commitment and OI is 61% (Riketta, 2005). Bowling and Beehr (2006) report a significant negative association between mobbing and organizational commitment in their meta-analysis. Consistent with these findings, Cantisano, Domínguez and Depolo (2008) reveal a moderate correlation between harassment and organizational commitment. Studies conducted in Turkey also confirm the negative effects of mobbing on organizational commitment on the sample of health sector employees (e.g., Özler, Atalay, & Şahin, 2008; Yüksel & Tunçsiper, 2011) and hotel workers (Pelit & Kılıç, 2012). Borrowing from affective organizational commitment literature, we presume that exposure to mobbing will decrease the organizational identification of employees. Thus,

Hypothesis 1: Mobbing will be negatively related to OI.

Moderating Effect of Perceived Organizational Support (POS)

Perceived organizational support is described as “a general perception concerning the extent to which the organization values (employees’) general contributions and cares for their well-being” (Eisenberger, Fasolo & Davis-LaMastro, 1990, p.52). Employees develop general beliefs concerning how much their organization values their contributions and care about their well-being in order to assess the organization’s readiness to reward increased efforts (Rhoades, Eisenberger, & Armeli, 2001).

Perceived organizational support includes supporting attitudes and behaviors from co-workers, supervisor and the organization which indicates that the organization is ready to provide voluntary and consistent support to employees when needed (Eisenberger & Stinglhamber, 2011). The common consequences of POS are commonly reported as high organizational commitment (e.g., Eisenberger et al., 1986; Shore and Tetrick, 1991; Shore and Wayne, 1993), positive emotions about job (e.g., Eisenberger et al., 2001), low level of job stress (e.g., Viswesvaran, Sanchez, & Fisher, 1999), lower disengagement behaviors in form of turnover intentions and absenteeism (e.g., Aquino & Griffeth, 1999; Turunç & Çelik, 2010), higher organizational citizenship behavior (e.g., Shore and Wayne, 1993), higher organizational identification (Turunç & Çelik, 2010).

Tyler and Lind (1992)’s relational model of authority theory provides a theoretical explanation for the moderating effect of POS. The theory provides that individuals tend to value group membership as it offers to employees feelings of self-worth. The main part of this feeling is to the extent an employee believes that s/he is treated fairly and supported by the authority figures of the organization. Thus, it can be assumed that POS might be considered as a signal for an individual indicating that they are valued and being cared. In this sense, the victims of mobbing may also perceive support from their organizations. Thus, we can argue that POS might hamper the negative effects of mobbing, in a way that organizational support, as well as the presence of the effective implementation of workplace policies, help the victims cope with mobbing (Keashly, 2001). Alternatively, together with the Social Exchange Theory, based on the norm of the reciprocity, the victims of mobbing employees who perceive adequate support from their organizations, continue to repay, dedicate themselves and identify to their organizations.

Even though, no study directly investigated the moderating effect of POS on the relationship between mobbing and organizational identification (OI), the literature has documented possible moderating effects of POS on the relationship between mobbing/workplace bullying and several organizational outcomes. These outcome variables include turnover, job satisfaction (Francis, 2014; Quine, 2001; Djurkovic, McCormack, & Casimir, 2008). For instance, Quine (2001) report that POS moderates the effects of mobbing on the relationship between bullying, job satisfaction and propensity to leave in their sample of nurses. Djurkovic, McCormack and Casimir (2008) demonstrate that POS moderates the effects of bullying on intention to leave in school teachers. Consistent with their results, Ciby and Raya (2014) also confirm the

positive role of POS on workplace bullying and turnover intentions. In this sense, one might argue that POS allows an understanding of employees' favorable reactions to positive treatment by their organizations. As reported by Francis (2014), POS, as a moderating variable, lessens the negative effects of workplace bullying on job satisfaction and intention to leave of employees. In other words, the presence of POS helps the employees to personify their organization and make them have benevolent intentions, and thus creates a feeling of identification toward the organization.

The current study hypothesizes that the negative relationship between mobbing and organizational identification will lessen when employees perceive higher organizational support. Thus,

H2: Perceived organizational support acts as a moderator on the relationship between mobbing and organizational identification.

Method

Research Design

The present study used the cross-sectional research design. The research design is quantitative and descriptive/correlational in nature.

Research Sample

The study drew its data from a larger ongoing study focusing on the individual and organizational outcomes of mobbing. The study was conducted in a higher education institution in Ankara, Turkey. A self-report survey was administered to a convenience sample of academic and administrative staff currently employed by the university. Convenient sample method was used to reach out to the participants. Participants were provided with a consent form describing the study's purpose and ensuring confidential nature of the study. A total of 350 questionnaires were distributed, and 152 of them were returned. The response rate (43.4%) is considered as satisfactory for self-report survey research of this type (Babbie, 2001). The final sample consisted of 123 academic and 29 administrative staff. The majority of the participants were women (68.2%), and the average tenure was eight years.

Research Instruments and Procedures

Leymann inventory of psychological terror. Mobbing was assessed by using Leymann Inventory of Psychological Terror (Leymann, 1996). The inventory includes 45 items. The sample items include "oral threats are made" and "your political or religious beliefs are ridiculed." The scale reflects the mobbing behaviors, and the participants responded to the degree they have suffered from such behaviors during the last six months, on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (every day). The Turkish version of the instrument is borrowed from Erenler (2010). Three bilingual researchers reviewed and revised the items of the scale to better measure behaviors in an educational organization. No disagreements were identified among these three judges.

Higher scores indicate the higher prevalence of mobbing. Although the original instrument consists of 5 subscales, the current study used the total score. The Cronbach alpha coefficient was .97 in the current study.

Perceived organizational support. The short version (8-item) of the scale developed by Eisenberger et al. (1986) was used to measure POS of respondents. Participants rated 8-items (e.g., Help is available from the organization when I have a problem) in terms of how applicable each statement was to their current job. Responses ranged from definitely disagree (1) to definitely agree (5) indicating that higher scores are representative of higher POS levels. The Turkish adaptation of the instrument is borrowed from Erenler (2010). The Cronbach alpha reliability score for the instrument in the current study was .86.

Organizational identification scale. Participants' organizational identification was measured by Organizational Identification Scale (Mael, 1988). The scale includes six items. Cronbach alpha for this scale was found .81 (Mael, 1988). The sample items include "when someone criticizes organization it feels like a personal insult". The Turkish translation of organizational identification scale is borrowed from Güteryüz (2004). The Cronbach alpha for Turkish form was found .80 (Güteryüz, 2004). In the current study, the Cronbach alpha coefficient was .91.

Data Analysis

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to determine the factor structure of the Leymann inventory of psychological terror, perceived organizational support scale, and organizational identification scale with the maximum likelihood estimation. Before conducting CFA, skewness & kurtosis, and Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests were performed for assumptions of CFA. Hypotheses 1 and 2 were assessed using moderated regression analyses. The moderated regression analysis was conducted by regressing the mobbing, perceived organizational support and organizational identification on a linear combination of predictors, moderator, and predictors-moderator interactions.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Confirmatory factor analyses (CFA). Before conducting the analysis, the data were screened for assumptions of CFA. Significance tests (skewness & kurtosis, and Kolmogorov-Smirnov) revealed that no variable departed significantly from the normal distribution. In addition, multivariate normality was inspected with Mardia's (1970) coefficient of Kurtosis. No violations for multivariate normality were detected.

After examining the assumptions, CFA on mobbing, POS and organizational identification items was conducted. For the mobbing scale, the single-factor model was tested. After removing the non-significant loadings of item 45 ($p=.12$, ns), item 43 ($p=.20$, ns), item 42 ($p=.19$, ns), item 44 ($p=.16$, ns), item 32 ($p=.14$, ns) and item 39

($p=.14$, ns) and adding covariance terms between item 10-11, item 17-18 and item 26-36, the final model approached to adequate fit (χ^2 (df = 699) = 936.7, $p < 0.05$, cmin/df = 1.34, CFI = 0.97, TLI = 0.97, GFI = 0.55, SRMR = .008 and RMSEA = 0.07). We created the mobbing index by averaging the remaining 39 relevant items.

For the POS scale, the one-dimensional factor measurement model afforded a good fit to the data (χ^2 (df = 20) = 40.96, $p < 0.05$, cmin/df = 2.15, CFI = 0.98, TLI = 0.95, GFI = 0.94, SRMR = .037 and RMSEA = 0.08), providing evidence that 8 items were significantly loaded on the respective latent variable of perceived organizational support. Similarly, for the organizational identification, the single factor model fit the data well, (χ^2 (df = 9) = 14.18, $p=.11$, cmin/df = 1.57, CFI = 0.99, TLI = 0.98, GFI = 0.97, SRMR = .027 and RMSEA = 0.04), providing evidence that all the items loaded on one factor.

Descriptive statistics. Table 1 shows the zero order correlations among the study variables as well as the reliability scores of the instruments.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics and intercorrelations about study variables

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Gender	-	.098	-.134*	.065	.136
2. Age		-	-.199*	.017	.079
3. Mobbing			(.97)	-.494**	-.154
4.POS				(.90)	.537**
5.Org. Identification					(.91)
Mean.	--	--	1.47	2.93	3.06
SD	--	--	.58	.82	.93

Note: Reliabilities are presented at the diagonal in bold. Sample size= 152

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, Gender was coded 0=women 1=men

The correlations between the study variables are somewhat in the hypothesized directions; such that, mobbing is negatively correlated with POS ($r = -0.49$, $p < .01$), however it is not significantly correlated with organizational identification ($r = -0.15$, $p > .05$) and POS is significantly and positively correlated with organizational identification ($r = 0.54$, $p < .01$). Those findings partially confirm the hypotheses of the study.

Hypotheses Testing

A moderated regression analysis was conducted with organizational identification as the dependent variable, mobbing as the independent variable and perceived organizational support as the moderator. Consistent with the recommendations of Cohen, Cohen, West and Aiken (2003), the independent variable and the moderator variable were mean centered just before the computation of interaction term in order

to reduce multicollinearity problem. In the first step of the hierarchical regression analysis, the independent variable and the moderator were entered to the regression equation, whereas the interaction term was added to the model in the second step. Table 2 provides the hierarchical regression findings.

Table 2: Hierarchical regression analysis for predicting organizational identification

Predictors	B	R ²	Change in R ²	F
Step 1		.30	-	32,58**
Mobbing	.147			
POS	.609**			
Step 2			.010	22,59**
Mobbing	.058			
POS	.592**			
Mobbing*POS	-.129			

Note: N=152, **p<.01

As it can be seen in Table 2, mobbing and POS accounted 30% variance in organizational identification [F (2,151) = 32.58, p<.01]. Among the direct effects, the standardized regression coefficient for POS ($\beta = .609$, p<.01) was significant; however no significant main effect of mobbing was found. Thus, H1 is not supported. The second step of the regression model was significant [F (3,151) = 22.59, p<.01]. Among the direct effects, POS was found to be significant ($\beta = .59$, p<.01). However, change in R² was not significant. Thus, the interaction term was not found to be significant meaning that the interaction term did not explain significant incremental variance in organizational identification. In congruent with this finding, H2 is not supported as the interaction effect was not significant.

Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations

Discussion

The current study aimed to examine the relationship between mobbing and organizational identification as well as the moderating effect of perceived organizational support on this relationship. The study results showed that mobbing is not significantly associated with organizational identification and POS did not influence the strength of the relationship between the mobbing and organizational identification. Nevertheless, the findings suggest that POS is positively and directly associated with organizational identification consistent with the Eisenberger and Stinglhamber's (2011) findings. Similarly, Lam, Liu and Loi (2016) found the positive effect of POS on organizational identification. Regarding the studies in educational settings, the findings of the study confirmed Sokmen, Ekmekcioglu and Celik (2015) in which a positive relationship was found between POS and organizational identification with a sample of research assistants from different public universities.

The results failed to replicate the direct effect of mobbing on organizational identification of Loh et al. (2010). There might be other factors affecting employees' identification to their educational organizations other than mobbing. In other words, organizational identification might be more related to global beliefs concerning the well-being of employees rather than specific ones, such as mobbing. Literature suggests that prestige and distinctiveness of the organization (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Lee, 1971), opportunities for career advancement, positive interpersonal relationships (Johnston & Hewstone, 1990) and higher perceived access to organizational hierarchy foster organizational identification (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Lee, 1971; Reade, 2001) while workplace ostracism (Wu, Liu & Hui, 2010) diminish the levels of organizational identification.

The absence of a relationship between mobbing and organizational identification could be explained by the fact that individuals are motivated to achieve and maintain positive concepts of themselves. As OI refers to the extent to which employees define themselves by organizational attributes, employees who have favorable work experiences might be more prone to develop OI for their organizations. In this sense, our study results might support this assumption by validating the positive association between POS and organizational identification in congruent with the previous literature (e.g. Edwards, 2009; Edwards, & Peccei, 2010; Fuller, Barnett, Hester, & Relyea, 2003; Riketta, Van Dick, & Rousseau, 2006; Caesens, Marique, & Stinglhamber, 2014). More clearly, it can be argued that when employees perceive support from their organizations (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986), this might increase their sense of self-regard and lead to an increase in their identification levels to their organizations (Edwards & Peccei, 2010).

Alternatively, Turkey's standing on power distance (Hofstede, 1983) might be an important reason for the insignificant relationship between mobbing and organizational identification. Moreno-Jiménez et al. (2008) indicate that countries, which are characterized by high power distance, tend to experience higher levels of mobbing. Despite its higher level, mobbing is generally more accepted in high power distance cultures (Loh et al., 2010). In this sense, Lim (2011) has reported significant differences between US and Singaporean employees' workplace bullying experiences. As a high power distance culture, Singaporeans report significantly lower levels of workplace bullying exposure with respect to the frequency. Thus, consistent with the literature, it might be argued that individuals in Turkey as a high power distance culture (Hofstede, 1983) are less likely to be responsive and voice their opinions about mobbing relative to the counterparts from low power distance cultures (Lim, 2011). Consistent with this argument, the fear of power and position were found to be the most important organizational factor that leads to mobbing in Turkey (Akar, Anafarta and Sarvan, 2011). However, as the current study has not measured the cultural value orientations of the participants directly, future studies assessing espoused the cultural value orientations of participants would provide more accurate information of the impact of cultural effects.

Conclusion

The study results highlight the importance of providing organizational support on the organizational identification level of employees to their organizations. That is one might argue that educational institutions would greatly benefit from having employees who perceive high organizational support. Accordingly, enhancing organizational support is one of the most important ways to increase feelings of organizational identification. Valuing employees' contributions, acting in their best interests and showing concern are some ways to enhance their perceptions of organizational support (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Moreover, such perceptions can be enhanced by human resources practices as well as managerial staff such as maintaining open channels of communications, providing ethical and favorable working environments to educational employees (Eisenberger & Stinglhamber, 2011).

Recommendations

The present study is not without its limitations. First, given the cross-sectional research design of the study, no causal relationship between the variables can be inferred. Future studies should be planned on longitudinal design in order to obtain further causality linkages between these variables. Second, as the variables were measured by using the same method source at a single measurement time, the common method error bias might affect the results (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Although several remedies were taken, future research can minimize the bias by using multiple sources and methods. Given these results, it would be useful for future research to assess the moderating role of other dispositional or situational variables such as locus of control, personality type of employees and organizational culture and/or power distance. Moreover, future research might also investigate some other work outcomes such as intention to leave, job satisfaction, and job performance.

References

- Akar, N. Y., Anafarta, N., & Sarvan, F. (2011). Causes, dimensions and organizational consequences of mobbing: An empirical study. *Ege Akademik Bakis*, 11(1), 1467-1479.
- Akgeyik, T., Güngör, M., & Uşen, S. (2007). Individual and organizational consequences of mobbing in the workplace: case of banking sector in Turkey (a survey). *Journal of Academy of Business and Economics*, 7, 150-157.
- Ak-Küçükçayır, G., & Akbaba-Altun, S. (2016). Eğitim örgütlerinde etnik-kültürel yıldırma ve yaşantıları üzerine bir durum çalışması. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 22(2), 137-164.
- Albert, S., & Whetten, D. A. (1985). Organizational identity. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 7, 263-295.

- Aquino, K., & Griffeth, R. W. (1999). An exploration of the antecedents and consequences of perceived organizational support: A longitudinal study. *Unpublished manuscript, University of Delaware, Newark.*
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review, 14*(1), 20-39.
- Babbie, E. (2001). *The practice of social research.* (9th Ed). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2003). The phenomenology of principal mistreatment: Teachers' perspectives. *Journal of Educational Administration, 41*(4), 367-422.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in Social Life.* New York, John Wiley and Sons.
- Bowling, N. A., & Beehr, T. A. (2006). Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: a theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(5), 998.
- Branch, S., Ramsay, S., & Barker, M. (2013). Workplace bullying, mobbing and general harassment: A review. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 15*(3), 280-299.
- Cabaros, M. A., & Rodrigues, P. V. (2006). Psychological Harassment in the Spanish Public University System. *Academy of Health Care Management Journal, 2*, 21-39.
- Caesens, G., Marique, G., & Stinglhamber, F. (2014). The relationship between perceived organizational support and affective commitment: More than reciprocity, it is also a question of organizational identification. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 13*(4), 167.
- Cantisano, G. T., Domínguez, J. F., & Depolo, M. (2008). Perceived sexual harassment at work: meta-analysis and structural model of antecedents and consequences. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology, 11*(01), 207-218.
- Celep, C., & Konakli, T. (2013). Mobbing experiences of instructors: causes, results, and solution suggestions. *Educational sciences: theory and practice, 13*(1), 193-199.
- Cemaloğlu, N., & Kılınc, A. Ç. (2012). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin etik liderlik davranışları ile öğretmenlerin algıladıkları örgütsel güven ve yıldırma arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between school principals' ethical leadership behaviors and teachers' perceived organizational trust and mobbing]. *Education and Science, 37*(165), 137-151.
- Ciby, M., & Raya, R. P. (2014). Exploring Victims' Experiences of Workplace Bullying: a grounded theory approach. *Vikalpa, 39*(2), 69-82.

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple correlation/regression analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3th ed.). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Publishers.

Dean, J. W., Brandes, P., & Dharwadkar, R. (1998). Organizational cynicism. *Academy of Management review*, 23(2), 341-352.

Di Martino, V., Hoel, H., & Cooper, C. L. (2003). *Preventing violence and harassment in the workplace*. Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.

Djurkovic, N., McCormack, D., & Casimir, G. (2008). Workplace bullying and intention to leave: the moderating effect of perceived organizational support. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 18(4), 405-422.

Edwards, M. R. (2009). HR, perceived organisational support and organisational identification: an analysis after organisational formation. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 19(1), 91-115.

Edwards, M. R., & Pececi, R. (2010). 'Perceived organizational support, organizational identification, and employee outcomes testing a simultaneous multifoci model. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 9(1), 17-26.

Einarsen, S. (2000). Bullying and harassment at work: Unveiling an organizational taboo. *Transcending Boundaries: Integrating People, Processes and Systems*, 7-13.

Einarsen, S., & Raknes, B. I. (1997). Harassment in the workplace and the victimization of men. *Violence and Victims*, 12(3), 247-263.

Eisenberger, R., & Stinglhamber, F. (2011). *Perceived organizational support: Fostering enthusiastic and productive employees*. American Psychological Association.

Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P. D., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. *Journal of applied psychology*, 86(1), 42-51.

Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of applied psychology*, 75(1), 51-59.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R. H., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3). 500-507.

Erenler, E. (2010). *Çalışanlarda sessizlik davranışının bazı kişisel ve örgütsel özelliklerle ilişkisi: Turizm sektöründe bir alan araştırması* [The relationship of employee silence with some personal and organizational features: A field study un tourism industry]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Ertüreten, A., Cemalcılar, Z., & Aycan, Z. (2013). The relationship of downward mobbing with leadership style and organizational attitudes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 116, 205-216.

Escartin, J., Ullrich, J., Zapf, D., Schlüter, E., & Van Dick, R. (2013). Individual-and group-level effects of social identification on workplace bullying. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 22(2), 182-193.

Francis, A.C. (2014, April 3-5). *Workplace bullying and job satisfaction: the moderating effect of perceived organizational support*. Paper presented at the National Conference on Undergraduate Research, Lexington, USA.

Fuller, J. B., Barnett, T., Hester, K., & Relyea, C. (2003). A social identity perspective on the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational commitment. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 143(6), 789-791.

Gül, H., Alçalar, N., Kayı, İ., Özel, S., & Özgülner, N. (2010). Mobbing in working life and its effects on health: a cross sectional study among privately-owned bank workers. *Türkiye Klinikleri Journal of Medical Sciences*, 30(6), 1917-1927.

Güleryüz, E. (2004). *Örgütsel Özdeşim Ölçeği'nin Türkçeye uyarlanması* [Adaptation of the Organizational Identification Scale of Turkish]. Unpublished study, Ankara.

Hofstede, G. (1983). The cultural relativity of organizational practices and theories. *Journal of international business studies*, 14(2), 75-89.

Hornstein, H. A. (2003). Workplace incivility: An unavoidable product of human nature and organizational nurturing. *Ivey Business Journal*, 68(2), 1-7.

Johnston, L., & Hewstone, M. (1990). Intergroup contact: Social identity and social cognition. In D. Abrams & M. Hogg (Eds.), *Social identity theory: Constructive and critical advances*, (pp.185-210). London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Kasen, S., Johnson, J. G., Chen, H., Crawford, T. N., & Cohen, P. (2011). School climate and change in personality disorder symptom trajectories related to bullying: A prospective study. In D. E. Espelage & S. S. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in North American Schools* (2nd ed., pp. 161-181). New York: Routledge.

Keashly, L. (2001). Interpersonal and systemic aspects of emotional abuse at work: The target's perspective. *Violence and Victims, 16*(3), 233-268.

Keashly, L., & Neuman, J. H. (2010). Faculty experiences with bullying in higher education: Causes, consequences, and management. *Administrative Theory & Praxis, 32*(1), 48-70.

Lam, L. W., Liu, Y., & Loi, R. (2016). Looking intra-organizationally for identity cues: Whether perceived organizational support shapes employees' organizational identification. *Human Relations, 69*(2), 345-367.

Lee, S. M. (1971). An empirical analysis of organizational identification. *Academy of Management Journal, 14*(2), 213-226.

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.

Leymann, H., & Gustafsson, A. (1996). Mobbing at work and the development of post-traumatic stress disorders. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5*(2), 251-275.

Lim, J. J. C. (2011). *A cross-cultural comparison and examination of workplace bullying in Singapore and the United States*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, Houston, USA.

Loh, J. M. I., Restubog, S. L. D., & Zagenczyk, T. J. (2010). Consequences of workplace bullying on employee identification and satisfaction among Australians and Singaporeans. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 41*(2), 236-252.

Mael, F. (1988). *Organizational identification: Construct redefinition and a field application with organizational alumni*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, Detroit, USA

Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 13*(2), 103-123.

March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. (1958). *Organizations*. Oxford: Wiley Organizations

Mardia, K. V. (1970). Measures of multivariate skewness and kurtosis with applications. *Biometrika, 57*(3), 519-530.

- Moreno-Jiménez, B., Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., Salin, D., & Morante, M. E. (2008). Workplace bullying in southern Europe: Prevalence, forms and risk groups in a Spanish sample. *International Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 13(2), 95-109.
- Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2009). US Workplace bullying: Some basic considerations and consultation interventions. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 61(3), 202.
- Norman, M., Ambrose, S. A., & Huston, T. A. (2006). Assessing and addressing faculty morale: Cultivating consciousness, empathy, and empowerment. *The Review of Higher Education*, 29(3), 347-379.
- Özler, D. E., Atalay, C. G., & Şahin, M. D. (2008). Mobbingin örgütsel bağlılık üzerine etkisini belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma [A research to determine the impact of mobbing on organizational commitment]. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 22, 37-60.
- Pelit, E., & Kılıç, İ. (2012). Mobbing ile örgütsel bağlılık ilişkisi: şehir ve sayfiye otellerinde bir uygulama [The relationship between mobbing and organizational commitment: An application on city and resort hotels]. *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4(2), 122-140.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of applied psychology*, 88(5), 879-903.
- Quine, L. (2001). Workplace bullying in nurses. *Journal of Health Psychology*, 6(1), 73-84.
- Reade, C. (2001). Dual identification in multinational corporations: Local managers and their psychological attachment to the subsidiary versus the global organization. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(3), 405-424.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698-714.
- Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: the contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 825-836.
- Riketta, M. (2005). Organizational identification: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66(2), 358-384.

Riketta, M., Van Dick, R., & Rousseau, D. M. (2006). Employee attachment in the short and long run: Antecedents and consequences of situated and deep-structure identification. *Zeitschrift für Personalpsychologie*, 5(3), 85-93.

Shore, L. M., & Tetrick, L. E. (1991). A construct validity study of the Survey of Perceived Organizational Support. *Journal of applied psychology*, 76(5), 637-643.

Shore, L. M., & Wayne, S. J. (1993). Commitment and employee behavior: comparison of affective commitment and continuance commitment with perceived organizational support. *Journal of applied psychology*, 78(5), 774-780.

Sokmen, A., Ekmekcioglu, E. B., & Celik, K. (2015). Algılanan örgütsel destek, örgütsel özdeşleşme ve yönetici etik davranışı ilişkisi: Araştırma görevlilerine yönelik araştırma. *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7(1), 125-144.

Tajfel, H. E. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. Oxford: Academic Press.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). *An integrative theory of intergroup conflict*. pp. 33-47 in W. G. Austin, & S. Worchel (eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

The Grand National Assembly of Turkey (2011). *İşyerinde Psikolojik Taciz (Mobbing) ve Çözüm Önerileri Komisyon Raporu [Psychological Harassment (Mobbing) at Work and Resolution Proposal Commission Report]*. Kadın Erkek Fırsat Eşitliği Komisyonu Yayınları No: 6, Ankara.

Topa, G., & Moriano, J. A. (2013). Stress and nurses' horizontal mobbing: Moderating effects of group identity and group support. *Nursing Outlook*, 61(3), 25-31.

Turuç, Ö., & Çelik, M. (2010). Algılanan örgütsel desteğin çalışanların iş-aile, aile-iş çatışması, örgütsel özdeşleşme ve işten ayrılma niyetine etkisi: Savunma sektöründe bir araştırma [The Effect of Perceived Organizational Support on Work-Family Conflict, Family-Work Conflict, Organizational Identification and Turnover Intention: A Research on Defence Sector]. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 14(1), 209-232.

Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 115-191.

Van Dick, R., Christ, O., Stellmacher, J., Wagner, U., Ahlswede, O., Grubba, C., Hauptmeier, M., Höhfeld, C., Moltzen, K., & Tissington, P. A. (2004). Should I stay or should I go? Explaining turnover intentions with organizational identification and job satisfaction. *British Journal of Management*, 15(4), 351-360.

Viswesvaran, C., Sanchez, J. I., & Fisher, J. (1999). The role of social support in the process of work stress: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 54(2), 314-334.

Wu, Z., Liu, J., & Hui, C. (2010). Workplace ostracism and organizational citizenship behavior: The roles of organizational identification and collectivism. *Nankai Business Review*, 13(3), 36-44.

Yelgeçen Tigrel, E., & Kokalan, O. (2009). Academic Mobbing in Turkey. *International Journal of Social and Human Sciences*, 3, 1028-36

Yıldırım, A., & Yıldırım, D. (2007). Mobbing in the workplace by peers and managers: mobbing experienced by nurses working in healthcare facilities in Turkey and its effect on nurses. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 16(8), 1444-1453.

Yıldız, S., Tüzüntürk, S., & Giorgi, G. (2008). Workplace bullying in Turkey: prevalence among private sector employees. *Risorsa Uom*, 14, 157-170.

Yüksel, M., & Tuñçsiper, B. (2011). The relationship between mobbing and organizational commitment in workplace. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 1(3), 54-64.

Zapf, D., Knorz, C., & Kulla, M. (1996). On the relationship between mobbing factors, and job content, social work environment, and health outcomes. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), 215-237.

Yıldırma, Örgütsel Özdeşim ve Algılanan Destek: Bir Yüksek Öğretim Kurumundan Bulgular

Atf:

Coskuner, S., Costur, R., Bayhan-Karapinar, P., Metin-Camgoz, S., Ceylan, S., Demirtas-Zorbaz, S., Aktas, E. F., & Ciffiliz, G. (2018). Mobbing, Organizational Identification, and Perceived Support: Evidence From a Higher Education Institution. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 73, 21-42, DOI: ?

Özet

Problem Durumu: İşyerlerinde önemli stres kaynaklarından biri olarak kabul edilen yıldırma, "bir veya birkaç kişi tarafından en az altı ay süre ile sistematik olarak genelde bir kişiye karşı uygulanan, düşmanca ve ahlak dışı hareketler içeren ve bu kişinin yardımsız ve savunmasız bir duruma düşmesine neden olan davranışlar" olarak tanımlanmaktadır. Bu kapsamda yıldırma, çalışanlara üstleri, aslları veya eşit düzeyde

olanlar tarafından sistematik biçimde uygulanan, en az 6 aydır devam eden, her türlü kötü muamele, tehdit, şiddet ve aşağılama davranışlar olarak değerlendirilmektedir.

Yıldırmanın hedefi olan birey, hem kendisi hem de örgüt için ciddi sonuçlar doğurabilecek fiziksel ve psikolojik sorunlarla yüz yüze gelmektedir. Tekrarlanan olumsuz davranışlarla karşılaşan kişi, kendisini dışlanmış, aşırı çalışmaya zorlanmış ve kişilik hakları, mesleki statüsü ve sağlığı açısından zedelenmiş hissetmektedir. Bu nedenle bireysel ve örgütsel düzeyde olumsuz sonuçlara neden olabilecek yıldırmanın farkına varılması, nedenlerinin belirlenmesi ve çözüm önerilerinin geliştirilmesi büyük önem taşımaktadır. Yıldırma maruz kalma farklı sektör çalışanlarında görülmekle birlikte araştırmalar yıldırmanın en yaygın olduğu ortamlardan birinin akademi olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Mobbing ile Mücadele Derneği'ne göre yıldırma davranışları Türkiye'de en fazla üniversitelerde görülmektedir. Ancak eğitim ve yükseköğretim kurumlarında, yıldırmanın çeşitli bireysel ve örgütsel tutumlarla ilişkisini ele alan kapsamlı çalışmaların sınırlı sayıda olduğu görülmüştür.

Araştırmanın Amacı: Bu doğrultuda çalışmada yükseköğretim kurumlarında çalışan akademik ve idari personelin maruz kaldıkları yıldırma davranışları ile örgütsel özdeşim ve algılanan örgütsel destek değişkenleri arasındaki ilişkiler incelenmiştir. Çalışmanın iki amacı bulunmaktadır. Bunlardan ilki; üniversitede yıldırma ile örgütsel özdeşim arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektir. Örgütsel özdeşim, örgütün ve çalışanın amaçlarının bütünleşmesi veya uyumasıdır. Örgütsel özdeşimin gerçekleştiği durumlarda çalışanlar kurumlarına karşı aidiyet hissetmekte, sadakat göstermekte ve kurum değerlerini benimsemektedirler. Çalışanların yıldırma davranışlarına maruz kalmalarının onların kurumlarına karşı hissettikleri örgütsel özdeşimlerini azaltacağı düşünülmektedir. Çalışmanın ikinci amacı ise yıldırma ve örgütsel özdeşim arasındaki ilişkide algılanan örgütsel desteğin düzenleyici etkisini ortaya koymaktır. Örgütsel destek, örgütün çalışanın katılımına önem vermesi ve iyiliğini önemsemesine ilişkin duygulardır. Çalışanın örgütsel desteğin varlığını algılamasının, yıldırma davranışlarının örgütsel özdeşim üzerindeki olumsuz etkisini azaltabileceği öngörülmektedir. Bu çerçevede test edilecek hipotezler aşağıda yer almaktadır:

H1: Yıldırma ile örgütsel özdeşim arasında negatif yönde bir ilişki vardır.

H2: Yıldırma ile örgütsel özdeşim arasındaki ilişkide örgütsel desteğin düzenleyici rolü vardır. Şöyle ki, örgütsel destek arttıkça, yıldırmanın örgütsel özdeşim üzerindeki etkisi azalmaktadır.

Araştırmanın Yöntemi: Çalışmada veri toplamak amacıyla Leymann (1996) tarafından geliştirilen ve araştırmacılar tarafından üniversite ortamına uygun olarak çevirisi düzenlenen 45 maddelik Psikolojik Terör Envanteri, Eisenberger ve arkadaşları (1986) tarafından geliştirilen ve Türkçe adaptasyonu Erenler (2010) tarafından gerçekleştirilen sekiz maddelik Algılanan Örgütsel Destek Ölçeği ve Türkçe formunun geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması Güleriyüz (2004) tarafından yapılan altı maddelik Örgütsel Özdeşim Ölçeği'nden (Mael, 1988) yararlanılmıştır.

Çalışmaya konu olan veriler, Ankara’da bir devlet üniversitesinde çalışmakta olan akademik ve idari personelden toplanmıştır. Dağıtılan 350 ölçek setinden %43,4 cevaplanma oranıyla 152 personelden geri dönüş alınmıştır. Toplamda çalışmanın örneklemini 123 akademik ve 29 idari personelden oluşmuştur. Katılımcıların, %68,2’si kadın, %31,8’i erkek ve üniversitedeki ortalama hizmet yılı sekiz yıldır. Verilerin analizlerine geçilmeden, ölçüm geçerliliğini test etmek amacı ile kullanılan tüm ölçekler için doğrulayıcı faktör analizleri yapılmıştır. Önerilen hipotezleri test etmek için ise Cohen, Cohen, West ve Aiken’in (2003) yöntemi ile düzenleyici regresyon analizi uygulanmıştır.

Araştırmanın Bulguları: Yapılan analizler sonucunda, yıldırma ve örgütsel desteğin örgütsel özdeşimdeki varyansın %30’unu açıkladığı görülmüştür. Doğrudan etkiler arasında örgütsel desteğin standardize edilmiş regresyon katsayısı ($\beta = .609$, $p < .01$) anlamlıdır ancak yıldırma üzerinde anlamlı etkisi bulunamamıştır. Böylelikle, araştırmanın birinci hipotezi desteklenmemiştir. Örgütsel desteğin düzenleyici rolünün test edildiği ikinci aşamada ise örgütsel desteğin yıldırma ile örgütsel özdeşim arasındaki ilişkide düzenleyici etkisinin anlamlı olmadığı görülmüştür. Böylelikle, araştırmanın ikinci hipotezi de reddedilmiştir. Ancak, çalışma bulguları algılanan örgütsel desteğin örgütsel özdeşim üzerinde doğrudan anlamlı ve olumlu yönde etkisi olduğunu göstermiştir ($\beta = .59$, $p < .01$).

Araştırmanın Sonuç ve Önerileri: Elde edilen sonuçlar, çalışanların kurumlarına olan örgütsel özdeşimlerinin artması ya da azalmasında yıldırma davranışları haricinde algılanan örgütsel destek gibi başka faktörlerin de etkili olabileceğini göstermiştir. Bir diğer ifadeyle, örgütsel özdeşim üzerinde yıldırma davranışlarının yıkıcı etkilerinden çok; çalışanların iş yerlerinde desteklendiği ve yönetimi arkalarında hissettikleri durumların daha çok etkili olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Bu bulgu, çalışanlarının örgütsel özdeşim ve aidiyetlerini artırmak isteyen eğitim kurumları yöneticilerine örgütsel desteğin önemi ve yararları hakkında uygulamaya dönük katkılar sunmaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Yıldırma, örgütsel özdeşim, algılanan örgütsel destek, yüksek öğretim kurumları, üniversite.