The Relationship between the Employees' Organizational Justice Perceptions and Mobbing Behavior

Zeliha SEÇKİN (*
Yavuz DEMİREL (**)

Abstract: *The objective of this study is to clarify the relationship between the employees' organizational justice perception levels and mobbing behavior. In order to test the hypotheses, a questionnaire was administered to 334 employees in two firms from automotive supply and furniture industries in Turkey. Distributive, interactional and, procedural approaches to justice were considered in terms of organizational justice perceptions, while mobbing was handled in terms of dimensions such as preventing the individual from communicating and expressing himself, attacks against the individual's social relationships, reputation, professional and life quality, and financial and physical damage towards the individual. The results revealed that there is a moderate relationship (r: -567) between organizational justice and mobbing. In specific words, the employees' mobbing behavior tends to decline, as their levels of organizational justice perception rise.*

Keywords: *Organizational justice, mobbing, distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice.*

Çalışanların Örgütsel Adalet Algıları ile Psikolojik Yıldırma Davranışı (Mobbing) Arasındaki İlişki

Öz: *Bu çalışmanın temel amacı, çalışanların örgütsel adalet algı düzeyleri ile psikolojik yıldırma davranışı arasındaki ilişkiyi tespit etmektir. Çalışmanın amacına bağlı olarak geliştirilen hipotezleri test etmek amacıyla otomotiv yan sanayi ve mobilyacılık sektöründe faaliyet gösteren iki işletmede toplam 334 çalışana yüz yüze görüşme yöntemiyle anket yapılmıştır. Çalışmada örgütsel adalet; dağıtımsal adalet, etkileşim adalet ve prosedürel adalet boyutları ile ele alınırken, psikolojik yıldırma ise bireyin iletişim kurmasını ve kendisini ifade etmesini engellemek, bireyin sosyal ilişkilerine, itibarına, mesleki ve yaşam kalitesine saldırılar, bireye yönelik mali ve fiziksel zarar gibi alt boyutlarıyla ele alınmıştır. Elde edilen sonuçlara göre, çalışanların örgütsel algı düzeyleri yükseldikçe psikolojik yıldırma davranışlarına maruz kalma durumunun da azaldığı tespit edilmiştir. Diğer bir ifadeyle örgütsel adalet ile psikolojik yıldırma arasında orta düzeyde bir ilişkinin (r:-,567) olduğu görülmüştür.*

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Örgütsel adalet, psikolojik yıldırma (mobbing), dağıtımsal adalet, prosedürel adalet ve etkileşimsel adalet.*

*) Assoc. Prof., Aksaray University, Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences
     (e-posta: zeliha0101@hotmail.com)

**) Assoc. Prof., Aksaray University, Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences.
      (e-posta: ydemirel@aksaray.edu.tr)

Introduction

As it is widely perceived that focusing on financial, structural and similar material dynamics of organizations remains inadequate to achieve organizational goals and to generate surplus value, the appeal of employee-focused management approaches striving for workforce engagement is rising. In this sense, the concept of justice distinguishes as an indispensable value to win the employees of an organization. Every employee is expected to compare the gains with the benefits other employees gain under equal conditions from their organizations. This comparison forms the basis of the employees' perceptions of justice towards their organizations. Employees' perception of justice concerning their organization has a three-dimensional content. Employees attribute different meanings to each of these dimensions, which are labeled as distributive, procedural and interactional justice. In this respect; distributive justice implies the ideal amount of reward that employees must receive for the value they add to the organization. Procedural justice refers to the perception of justice concerning the processes of determining the payment and rewards that employees receive. Interactional justice represents the perception of justice regarding how organizational decisions are or will be explained to the individuals. The employees' perception of justice concerning the organization is determinant in reactions that they give towards the organization.

Perception of organizational justice shapes organizational processes through various ways including the organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intention of the employees. This impact brings about significant consequences in terms of relations among the employees. It is probable that employees might have anomalous tendencies due to conditions that negatively affect the employees' perception of justice and might give reactions parallel to those tendencies. One of these disconcerting behaviors which have become a severe and rampant problem of the organizations is mobbing, of which consequences have a deep impact on employees, leading to quitting work, depression and even in extreme cases suicide attempts of targets. Mobbing, of which destructive effect is not limited to victimized employees, is a universal phenomenon of organizational life to be encountered at any workplace. In order to survive this menace, managers can use organizational justice as an offsetting variable in reversing the employees' inclinations to mobbing behavior. This study is an attempt to verify the importance of justice perception for preventing mobbing behavior in organizations.

I. Mobbing: Conceptual Framework

The concept of "mobbing", which was brought to the literature by Dr. Leymann in the 1980s, is generally considered as psychological terror, mental harassment, psychological intimidation, bullying, and emotional abuse (Güngör, 2008). Mobbing, which expresses an emotional attack more than a physical one, is the act of gathering people against a specific victim, and forcing the target to quit his job by provoking negative intentions, insinuations, mocking and decreasing the person's prestige by stigmatizing him/her (Davenport, Schwartz & Elliot, 2003). Mobbing, which involves hostile and unethical behaviors, represents deliberate and destructive behaviors that are systematically directed

towards the person chosen as the victim (Leymann & Gustafson, 1996). For the behaviors developed against the victim to be regarded as mobbing, they must be repeated pretty frequently and in a long period of time (Baillien, Neyens, De Witte & De Cuyper, 2009). According to Field (1996), mobbing occurs as destructive, continuous and merciless behaviors that are directed towards the self-confidence and self-respect of the chosen person (Cited in Yaman, 2009). Although its beginning is "individual" based, its results are more comprehensive in that they negatively affect the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization. In this respect, it is possible to itemize main points regarding mobbing as follows (Özen Çöl, 2008; Aydın & Özkul, 2007); The behaviors that are fundamental to mobbing involve deliberate, offensive and hostile actions and are perceived to be so by the victim, these actions occur frequently and consistently, they do not occur for once and independently from each other**,** they consist of patterns of direct or indirect emotional assaults, the victim perceives herself/himself to be desperate and vulnerable, there is a clear imbalance of power between the parties.

Leymann identified 45 different typical mobbing behaviors and grouped them under five titles (Leymann, 1996; Einarsen, 1999; Gül, 2009; İbicioğlu, Çiftçi &Derya, 2009); preventing the individual from expressing self, isolating the individual, attacking the esteem of the victim, attacking the life quality and occupation of the victim, directly attacking the health of the victim. Faced with these deliberate and premeditated actions, the individual experiences loss of self-confidence becomes alienated from his social environment (Sperry & Duffy, 2009), directs his feelings of guilt towards self, experiences loss of performance, and at the end of this process, the victim may submit his resignation and even be inclined to suicide (Hoel, Cooper &Zapf, 2002; Einarsen, 1999). There is a remarkable variety in the literature regarding classifications of mobbing. However, it is possible to categorize mobbing in terms of reasons leading to it (Çobanoğlu, 2005; Davenport et al., 2003; Yaman, 2009); reasons arising from the personality of the victim, reasons arising from the personality of the perpetrator, reasons arising from organizational structure and working atmosphere, reasons arising from organizational culture. The set of behaviors regarding mobbing behavior occur due to an intentional process and its possible effects on the victim can be quite destructive. There may be disease symptoms, major depression due to stress can be observed, the victim can describe his role as back role, he can experience cognitive inefficiency and family problems (Tınaz, 2008; Vega & Comer, 2005; Yaman, 2009).

There are three aspects to mobbing behavior. The victim of mobbing behavior feels desperate and trapped with the beginning of this process and cannot develop a healthy understanding of what is happening. The perpetrators may become more relentless when they understand that the victim has lost self-confidence and has become desperate. Although there isn't any exact characteristic of the victim's personality, it is a quite strong possibility that lonely, strange, successful, quiet, and sensitive workers might be victims (Baillien, 2009; Tınaz, 2008). The perpetrator, on the other hand, is the person who manipulates the relative balance of power in the process in his/her own favor. (Thirlwall & Haar, 2010; Matthiesen, 2006). These people generally prefer the more hostile behavior between two

behaviors. They make an effort to continue the conflicts in their environment and they have no feeling of guilt (Tınaz, 2008). Although the observers may seem outside this process, they contribute to the seriousness of the process. They are included in the process the moment they have a grasp of the mobbing behavior. Whereas some of them are passive, the others take part in the process actively. When they are worried that they may be the next victim, their attitudes and behaviors become more clear (Güngör, 2008; Tınaz, 2008).

Mobbing behavior is formed by three different levels and has consequences associated with these levels. Mobbing may occur in top to bottom level, bottom to top level and between equal levels. When mobbing is performed top to bottom, the offender is in a superior status compared to the victim. According to the hierarchical status, the offender can be a department manager, a chief or an older person. If the perpetrator and the victim are people who have similar status who perform similar duties, it means there is mobbing behavior between equal levels. If the perpetrator is in an inferior status compared to the victim, it means there is mobbing behavior performed in bottom to top level (Tınaz, 2008).

II. Organizational Justice: The Concept, Content and Significance

The interest in organizational justice in the literature is based on Blau's (1964) Social Exchange Theory and Adams' (1965) Equity Theory (Wittmer, Martin & Tekleab, 2010). According to Adams, employees develop general comparative perceptions in their workplace environment concerning professional success and satisfaction levels. They compare the gains they receive in return for the information, skills and abilities. They think they add to the organization with the gains that similar employees in other organizations receive. They develop an attitude towards their organization, manager and job (Özdevecioğlu, 2004). This process forms the employees' perception of justice about their organization. The relative value that employees attribute to justice also shapes the direction and content of the reaction they give to the organization. Thus, in general sense, organizational justice is the perception of the employee regarding the practices in the organization (Greenberg, 1996). In this respect, employees base their perceptions of justice, which is also the focus of organizational justice studies, on the financial benefits and the procedures through which they receive the benefits. This assessment, at first sight, determines the limits of the employees' perception of organizational justice, on the other hand, it demonstrates the direction and degree of the positive/negative reactions they will give to the organization. As it is quoted from Konovsky and Pugh (1994), the sense of trust that employees have for the organization is affected greatly by their perception of justice (Arslantaş & Pekdemir, 2007). In other words, the perception of justice has an important structure that affects the reactions and behaviors of the employees within the organization (Cole, Bertnerth, Walter & Hold, 2010).

The earlier studies in the literature handled organizational justice in two respects: distributive and procedural justice. Distributive justice is related to the criteria through which the organization makes decisions and the consequences of those decisions, whereas procedural justice focuses more on the procedures and how procedures are fomed (Fischer, 2004). In the later studies, (intrapersonal) interactional justice was

added to organizational justice. This dimension is concerned with whether employees are treated with respect and sensitiveness in the organization and to what degree they are taken into consideration in the decision making process. The interactional dimension was considered as the interpretation of procedural justice, and then it was regarded as involving the informative justice which is seen as the fourth dimension of organizational justice (Tutar, 2007). According to those who consider informative justice as the fourth dimension of organizational justice, this justice is used in a broad sense such as being informed about their social and personal rights, protecting their benefits and respect for the right to information (Tutar, 2007) besides their judgments of the adequacy, accuracy, timeliness, and honesty of the information they receive from the managers (Cole et al., 2010). Often the three dimensions of organizational justice are emphasized in the literature. Those are distributive, procedural and interactional justice (Young, 2010; Inoue et al., 2009; Greenberg, 2004; Giderler Atalay, 2010).

Distributive justice: The inputs that the organization uses for the desired outputs require the employees to organize their knowledge, skills and abilities for this purpose. Distributive justice is concerned with the gains that employees get as a result of their contributions to the organization and the results that employees get form the focus of their perceptions of justice (Özdevecioğlu, 2004). According to the definition quoted from Folger and Cropanzano (1998), distributive justice is about the perceived fairness of the shares or results obtained by an individual (Chan, 2000). As it is pointed out in the definition, the employee develops a perception depending on whether he receives the expected return for the value he adds to the organization and develops certain attitudes and behaviors depending on this perception. From the perspective of making a return, distributive justice is formed by factors such as equal payment for equal job, improvement in workplace conditions and processes and equal distribution of rewards. In this respect, distributive justice refers to the consequences of organizational decisions (Campbell & Finch, 2004) and points to the degree of justice perceived by employees regarding the distribution of the gains from the organization such as income, bonus, promotion and social rights (Çınar Altıntaş, 2006). The content of this statement overlaps with Meyer's (2001) regarding organizational justice in terms of the distribution of resources and the reactions towards the distribution style. When the employees take into consideration the moral and ethical values in their perceptions of distribution of organizational resources, it may prompt them to develop emotional reactions regarding distributive justice, as it may involve a subjectivity threat. Thus, it may damage the employees' perceptions of justice (Yıldırım, 2007).

Procedural justice: The studies on procedural justice date back to Thibaut and Walker's (1975) research on the operation of legal processes in the court. Thibaut and Walker observed that, if the legal process operated properly, the defendants reacted positively to the conclusion, even if it was a negative conclusion. Based on this, Folger and Greenberg carried procedural justice to organizational subjects (Yazıcıoğlu & Topaloğlu, 2009). Procedural justice, with its meaning accepted in the literature, is the level of justice of the duties and responsibilities and the gains received in return for these duties and responsibilities in organizations (Tutar, 2007). In this context, procedural

justice is also defined as the level of justice of the methods, procedures and policies used for the determination and calculation of wage, promotion, financial benefits, working conditions, performance appraisal, etc (Jahangir, Muzahid & Begum 2006; Cropanzano & Folger, 1991). From another perspective, procedural justice is the social structure of the workplace that offers the employees the opportunity to take part in the decision process, in a way that will include the visible behaviors. (Inoue et al., 2009). Distributive justice focuses on results whereas procedural justice focuses on tools that ensure justice (Sweeney and McFarlin, 1993). Procedural justice is handled in two dimensions in the literature. The first dimension is related to the structural properties of procedures and practices used in the decision making process and it involves issues on formal process. Asking the opinions of employees before making the decision and listening to their ideas and suggestions can be considered as examples for this. The second dimension is related to the implementation of policies and practices fundamental to the decision making process by decision makers (Özdevecioğlu, 2003).

Interactional justice: The interpersonal interactional justice expresses how respectfully, sensitively the employees are treated in an organization and to what extent they are taken into consideration (Cole, et al., 2010). To put it another way, interactional justice reflects the perceptions of employees regarding fairness of the treatment of the managers (Wittmer et al., 2010). In this context, interactional justice involves the process that indicates treating employees respectfully, valuing them and showing social sensitiveness to them. Depending on the projection of this tendency originating from the manager on the perception level of the employee, the employee will develop a positive or negative attitude or behavior in terms of interactional justice. As interactional justice represents a situation related to the quality of interpersonal practices that the individual is exposed to, certain forms of practice may be perceived to be fair, while others may not be perceived to be fair (Yıldırım, 2007). Interactional justice is concerned with the interaction between those who have the authority to make decisions on how the organizational resources will be distributed and the individuals who will be affected by this decision (Özdevecioğlu, 2004). It is a widely accepted fact that limiting the employees' expectations to pecuniary advantages is adequate. Employees expect sympathy, respect, politeness, honesty and fairness on issues that concern themselves. When the studies on employees' justice are handled as a whole, it is understood that organizational practices, procedures and communication bring about consequences depending on whether they are perceived to be fair by the employees and this perception has an effect on not only organizational outcomes but also the attitudes and behaviors that they develop towards the manager.

III. The Relationship between the Organizational Justice Perceptions of Employees and Mobbing Behavior

The employees' perceptions of organizational justice are formed based on many factors. These factors have consequences associated with distributive, procedural and interactional justice and are the basis of the behaviors that employees will develop. Employees shape their prejudices against the organization based on their perceptions of justice (Arslantaş

& Pekdemir, 2007). An important consequence based on the employees' perceptions of organizational justice and mobbing is related with stress. Perception of organizational practices as unjust affects the stress level of employees negatively (Greenberg, 2004). The same situation occurs when an employee is faced with mobbing; he experiences diseases due to stress and isolates himself from his social environment (Sperry & Duffy, 2009). The victim frequently being interrupted during the mobbing process (Einarsen, 1999; Leymann, 1996) and the employees' perceptions when they cannot make effective communication in the process of interactional justice are similar situations. Problems of communication that the employees have among themselves and with the management negatively affect their perceptions of organizational justice. On the other hand, the efficiency of the interpersonal interaction process can be the basis of the employees' avoidance of mobbing behavior. Open communication channels, recognizing the employees during decision-making process and respecting them are important developments not only in terms of personal satisfaction but also organizational outcomes. Besides, employees act quite sensitively on how managers treat them. Employees expect from managers to communicate with them just as they do with others and they do not regard managers who treat certain people respectfully and others disrespectfully as fair. In this context, perceived injustice of interpersonal interaction affects the employees' attitudes and behaviors towards their managers (Cropanzano, Prehar & Chen, 2002). One of the most important elements that affect mobbing behavior is that managers either take part in the process or ignore what is happening and encourage the offender. The manager's arbitrary behavior and seeing himself as superior to others, looking down on his subordinates, always being the first to start the conversations put the victim in a very difficult situation (Şenturan & Mankan, 2009) and reinforces the prejudices against the organization and the managers.

IV. The Methodology of the Study

The methodology of the study, the purpose of the study, the basic suppositions and hypotheses, the contents and limitations, sampling process and data collection method, and results regarding the findings of the study are given below.

A. The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to reveal the relationship between the organizational justice perceptions of employees from various sectors and mobbing behaviors they experience. Accordingly, employees' organizational justice perceptions have been studied with the dimensions of distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice. Mobbing behaviors that the employees experience have been dealt as behaviors intended to affect the individual himself and his communication, to harm the social relations, prestige, life quality, professional status and health of the individual.

B. Basic Suppositions and Hypotheses of the Study

Basic suppositions and hypotheses that the study is based on has been formed as follows:

Table 1: Basic Suppositions and Hypotheses of the Study

Basic suppositions of the study	Basic hypotheses of the study
1. If the employees' perception levels of organizational justice are low, they are faced with mobbing	H_1: There is a relationship between organizational justice and mobbing.
2. Sufficiency of the employees' organizational justice perceptions affects mobbing behavior positively or negatively.	H_1: Employees' organizational justice perceptions affect mobbing behavior.

C. Content and Limitations of the Study

The main population of this study consists of the employees of an enterprise operating in the automotive sector in city A and the employees of an enterprise operating in the service sector in city B. The fact that only employees from two sectors are included in the study and that the content of the study is restricted to two cities constitutes the most important limitation of the study. Nevertheless, it is thought that as the related sectors have been handled comparatively in the study, it will provide significant clues for the related sectors, employees and managers.

D. Sampling Process and Data Collection Method

Convenience sampling was preferred in sampling process of the study. All of the employees of the related enterprise were included in the sample. Questionnaire technique was used for data collection in the study. The questionnaires were applied to the employees by the human resources managers of the enterprises that were included n the study. The questionnaires were designed in three sections. The first section involves the employees' socio-demographic characteristics, the second section involves their perceptions of organizational justice and the third section involves their perceptions of mobbing. The organizational justice scale used in the study was adapted from the work of Villanueva (2006) and the mobbing scale was adapted from the work of Davenport et al. (2003).

E. Findings of the Study

The findings of the study are the socio-demographic characteristics of the participants, the reliability-validity analysis of the scales used in the study, correlation and regression analysis and the t-test results.

The Employees' Socio-Demographic Characteristics: When the distributions regarding the socio-demographic characteristics of the employees included in the study were taken into account, it was determined that 155 (46.4%) of 334 total employees work in industry sector, 179 of them (53.6%) work in service sector, 29% of them are female, 71% of them are male, average age is 34 and average monthly income is 1200 TL. When participants' educational levels are considered, it was confirmed that the educational leve of 23.4% is primary education, 46.7% is high school, 26.1% is two-year degree or bachelor's degree, and 3.9% is master-doctoral degree. It was also observed that their tenures are generally

3-10 years and more than 10 years, average tenure in the same sector is 8-10 years and average tenure in the same enterprise is 8 years.

Reliability-Validity Analysis of the Scales: Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was used in the reliability analysis and factor analysis was used in the validity analysis of the scales used in the study. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of organizational justice is, 953, and the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of mobbing is ,974. The results of the validity analysis of the scales are given in Table 2 and Table 3.

Table 2: Factor Analysis Results Regarding Organizational Justice

Variables	Factors	
	1	2
My work schedule is quite fair	,66	
I think that the wage that I receive regarding my job is fair	,86	
I think my workload is quite fair	,85	
I think the rewards and premiums I receive are quite fair	,83	
I think my job responsibilities are fair	,71	
Professional decisions made by the manager do not raise doubts		,47
The employees are consulted for their ideas and opinions before a decision is made		,53
Professional decisions are made after exact and precise information is collected		,54
Managers give the necessary information to the employees when they demand it		,64
The employees are free to object to or approve of the decisions made by the managers		,58
My manager treats me with understanding when a decision regarding my job is made		,74
My manager treats me with respect and protects my honor when he is making a decision regarding my job		,80
My manager is sensitive about my personal needs when he is making a decision regarding my job		,83
My manager treats me honestly when he is making a decision regarding my job		,82
My manager respects me as an employee about my rights when he is making a decision regarding my job		,76
My manager discusses with me the effect of the decisions to be made when he is making a decision regarding my job		,47
My manager presents his reasons that are acceptable enough when he is making a decision regarding my job		,74
My manager makes reasonable explanations about my job when he is making a decision regarding my job		,71
My manager makes the necessary explanations when a decision regarding my job is made		,706
Cronbach's Alpha	*,89*	*,91*
Explained Variance	*7,97*	*54,92*
Total Explained Variance	*62,88*	
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. (KMO9	*,946*	
*Bartlett's Test of Sphericity- Approx. Chi-Squar*e	*4859,798*	

p<0,05. Factor 1: Distributive justice; Factor 2: Procedural and interactional justice

The results regarding the validity analysis of the scale used to determine the organizational justice perceptions of the employees included in the study are in Table 2. It was determined that organizational justice is explained by two factors with 62.88% total variance. It was also determined that the Cronbach's Alpha coefficients regarding the factors are, 89 and, 91, and the sampling adequacy coefficient is ,94. In this context, in the level of 0,05 when all values regarding the scale are considered, it is understood that the internal consistency or validity level of the scale is high.

Table 3: Factor Analysis Results Regarding Mobbing Behavior

Variables	Factors					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Our superior restricts the opportunities to distinguish myself.	,81					
I am frequently interrupted.	,82					
The people I am working with restrict the opportunities to distinguish myself.	,80					
I am shouted at and scolded loudly.	,56					
The work I do is always criticized.		,44				
I am harassed by phone.		,65				
I receive verbal threats.		,70				
I am sent written threats.		,63				
My relationships are rejected through gestures and looks.		,45				
The people around me do not talk to me.			,62			
I cannot talk to anybody; I am prevented from contacting others.			,70			
I am given a workplace that is isolated from others.			,69			
It is forbidden for emy colleagues to talk to me.			,53			
I am treated as if I were not there.			,46			
My private life is constantly criticized.				,51		
People speak ill of me.				,48		
There are groundless rumors about me.				,63		
I am humiliated.				,74		
I am treated as if I were mentally ill.				,75		
I am pressured to go under psychological assessment/examination.				,70		
I am ridiculed because of a handicap of me.				,61		
The way I walk, my gestures or my voice is imitated to humiliate me.				,57		
My private life is mocked.				,52		
My nationality is mocked.				,53		
I am forced to carry out a work that will affect my self-confidence negatively.				,48		
My efforts are judged in a wrong and humiliating way.				,48		
My decisions are constantly criticized.				,49		

I am referred to with humiliating names.				,68		
Sexual implications				,66		
My religious or political views are mocked.				,77		
There is no private duty for me.				,58		
Duties given to me are taken back; you cannot create yourself a new duty.				,61		
I am given meaningless duties to carry out.					,66	
I am given duties that require less skill than I already have.					,63	
My duties are constantly changed.					,74	
I am given duties that will affect my self-confidence.					,71	
Duties that are far from my qualities are given to me in a way that will decrease my prestige.					,65	
Financial burden is caused by the general harm brought onto me by others.						,57
My house or workplace is damaged.						,64
I am forced to perform physically demanding work.						,44
I am threatened to physical violence.						,82
Slight violence is performed against me to discourage me.						,69
Direct sexual harassment.						,85
Physical harm.						,78
Cronbach's Alpha	***,85***	***,84***	***,87***	***,96***	***,92***	***,89***
Explained Variance	***8,09***	***7,06***	***9,86***	***19,8***	***12,6***	***11,4***
Explained Total Variance	***68,823***					
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	***,934***					
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity- Approx. Chi-Square	***13671,794***					

$p < 0,05$. *Factor 1: Preventing the individual from distinguishing himself, Factor 2: Affecting the communication status of the individual, Factor 3: Attacks against the social relations of the individual, Factor 4: Attacks against the prestige of the individual, Factor 5: Attacks against the professional and life quality of the individual and Factor 6: Financial and physical harm against the individual*

Validity analysis results of the mobbing scale is shown in Table 3. Mobbing behavior is explained by six basic factors with 68.82% variance. It was determined that validity coefficients regarding the factors are quite high. On the other hand, it was also found that the load values regarding the factors are generally over 0,50. The sampling adequacy coefficient (KMO) of the scale was calculated as ,93. Briefly, it was found out that the scale has high level of validity overall.

F. Results in Terms of Relationship Between Mobbing and Justice Perceptions

The fact that justice perception is a strong motivator from the perspective of employees affects their attitudes towards their jobs (Yıldırım, 2007). The same case is also important in terms of the mobbing behavior perceptions of the employees. The employees develop attitudes according to the meaning they attribute to the behaviors towards them in the workplace. The fact that organizational justice is a significant necessity in terms of the personal satisfaction of the employees and the effectiveness of the organization (Özmen, Arbak & Özer, 2007) is not independent from the possible consequence that will arise when there is mobbing in the organization. It is commonly accepted that there is a decrease in the personal performance of the employees and that it affects the organizational outcomes negatively when they are faced with mobbing behavior (Standen & Omari, 2009). Besides, negative developments such as increasing role conflicts in the workplace, unhealthy information flow, passivation of the employees in the organizational restructure, authoritarian management style are regarded among the most important causes of mobbing behavior in organizations (Vartia, 2001). These developments are among the basic premises that will negatively affect the organizational justice perceptions of the employees.

When the positive perception of organizational justice is compared with its expected outcomes, it can be assumed that there is a negative relationship between mobbing behavior. In other words, it can be considered that as long as the employees have a positive perception of organizational justice, the probability of their perceive of mobbing behavior will be stronger. In the case where the opposite situation is existent, when the employees' perceptions of organizational justice are negative, then it is a probable consequence that mobbing behavior will become common among the employees. The positive perception of employees regarding organizational justice may decrease the tendency to perform mobbing behavior. The existence of factors such as fair distribution of organizational resources, high interaction level among the employees, the stability of the belief that procedures are carried out fairly may increase the tendency of the employees to organizational goals. The perceptions of the employees which are in accordance with this situation have an influence on organizational outcomes (Currall, Towler, Judge & Kohn, 2005) positively affect the employees' opinions on justice, organizational commitment and performances and prevent their turnover intentions. To put it in other words, while organizational justice perception of the employees provides opportunities to remove both individual and organizational negative consequences, it will also protect the employees from the harmful effects of mobbing behavior at the same time. Table 4 demonstrates the correlation analysis results regarding the determination of the relationship between organizational justices and mobbing behavior.

Correlation analysis results regarding the relationship between employees' organizational justice perceptions and mobbing behavior are given in Table 4.

Table 4: The Relationship between Mobbing and Organizational Justice

Mobbing and Organizational Justice Factors		Distributive Justice	Procedural and Interactional Justice	*Organizational Justice in General*
Preventing the Individual from Distinguishing Himself	r	**-,491****	**-,537****	**-,554****
	p	,001	,001	,001
Affecting the Communication Status of the Individual	r	-,329**	**-,428****	-,406**
	p	,001	,001	,001
Attacks Against the Social Relations of the	r	-,321**	**-,430****	**-,403****
	p	,001	,001	,001
Attacks Against the Prestige of the Individual	r	-,297**	-,397**	-,373**
	p	,001	,001	,001
Attacks Against the Professional and Life Quality of the Individual	r	-,355**	**-,443****	**-,429****
	p	,001	,001	,001
Financial and Physical Attacks Against the Individual	r	-,216**	-,308**	-,280**
	p	,001	,001	,001
Mobbing in General	r	**-,485****	**-,568****	***-,567*****
	p	,001	,001	***,001***

***p<0.05*

The correlation relationship is demonstrated with the general and lower dimensions. It was found out that there is a negative relationship between general mobbing behavior and the distributive justice perceptions of the employees with the prevention of the employers' distinguishing themselves, the prevention of employers' communication, the attacks against the individual's social relations, the attacks against the individual's professional/life quality and financial/physical harm against the individual. Similarly, it was determined that there is a negative relationship between procedural and interactional justice and the lower dimensions of mobbing behaviors. As a consequence, the fact that there is a medium level (r: -, 567) of negative relationship between organizational justice and mobbing verifies the hypothesis "**H₁:** There is a relationship between organizational justice and mobbing behavior." It is clear that many studies on mobbing and organizational justice have been carried out separately. On the other hand, the number of studies regarding the relationship between mobbing and organizational justice appears scarce. According to Cowan (2008: 285), most researches on mobbing have focused on possible victims and offenders. Although a great deal is known about who participate in mobbing, who the victims are, and what the components of mobbing behaviors and the effects of these behaviors are, we know very little about what is the meaning of justice for the victims and what kind of fairness perception is generated in them. As Nielsen and colleagues quote

Adoric and Kvartuc (2007), the justice perception of the person exposed to mobbing behavior withers, and psychological condition of the target gets ruined as well (2012: 42). It is recorded that employees who experience mobbing develop some reactions towards their organizations. The findings of a study on public officials conducted by Atalay (2010: 126) indicated that there is a reverse --and 90% meaningful-- relationship between the employees' perception of exposure to offences against their reputation and their organizational commitment feeling. The employees having such perceptions develop negative attitudes toward the organization they work in and may even tend to damage the properties of the organization as a manifestation of their frustration (Fox, Spector & Miles 2001: 294; Murphy, Ramamoorthy, Flood & McCurtain, 2006: 328).

Regression analysis in order to find out the effect of organizational justice on mobbing behavior has been carried out and the results are demonstrated in Table 5.

Table 5: The Effect of Organizational Justice on Mobbing Behavior

Regression	F	p	R	R²	β	T	p
Model	83,814	,001	,580	,332			
Constant Value					2,384	31,18	,001
Distributive Justice					,-,451	-7,08	,001
Procedural and Interactional Justice					-,164	-2,57	,001

p<0,05. Dependent variable: Mobbing and independent variables: Distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice.

The regression analysis results regarding the effect of distributive, procedural and interactional justice on mobbing behavior are demonstrated in Table 5. When we examine the results, it is seen that the model is meaningful as a whole and the rate to which organizational justice explains mobbing behavior is 33%. It is also seen that when distributive justice increases by one digit, mobbing behavior decreases by ,-451 and when procedural and interactional justice increases by one digit, it decreases by ,-164. Thus, as the employees' organizational justice perception levels increase, the probability of them to experience mobbing behavior decreases. In this context, "**H₁:** The employees' organizational justice perceptions affect mobbing behavior." hypothesis is confirmed. As Reichert (2003) suggested, it is of great importance that human rights play a determinant role in the formation the behaviors of the employees working in the organizations. Mobbing occurs as a consequence of the violation of human rights in the organizations. Thus, sociological studies in the organizations can be carried out to prevent mobbing. According to the results of the study of Tekleab et al. (2005), the employees' perceptions of procedural and interactional justice affect their turnover intentions. This phenomenon is parallel with the turnover intentions of the employees faced with mobbing behavior (Çobanoğlu, 2005; Leymann, 1996). LaVan and Martin (2008) emphasize that when

some individuals and groups experience negative discrimination against other individuals
and groups during the distribution of organizational resources, it causes mobbing to
emerge and become common. Thus, if the distribution of the resources is based on certain
principles, mobbing within the organization will decrease in a considerable amount. In a
study carried out by Semmer et al. (2010) as case study 1 (199) and case study 2 (205),
it was found out that there is a negative relationship between organizational justice and
counterproductive behaviors. In this study, it was concluded that as the perception level
of procedural and interactional justice increases, counterproductive behaviors decrease.
In a study carried out by Öcel and Aydın (2010), it was determined that the individual
and world views of the employees have a meaningful effect on the negative behaviors.
The findings of the study suggest that employees whose belief in a just world is low
demonstrate behaviors such as withdrawal, sabotage or office abuse.

Conclusion

Regarding the basic criteria on whether the employees' expectations from the
organization are met, organizational justice is one of the most critical ones affecting all
outcomes of the organization, and also the employees. The employees' perceptions of
organizational justice are an important factor in the organization of their knowledge, skills
and efforts in favor of the organization. In this context, the limits of organizational justice
should not be determined based on the financial benefits provided for the employees.
Although it seems as a critical challenge to study, the relationship between the terms
justice or fairness and mobbing in the workplace still awaits particular attention (Cowan,
2008: 285). The limited number of studies on the issue have so far indicated that the
victims experience psychological destruction remarkably (Glasø and Vie, 2009: 49-51),
their professional and social relations get wrecked (Gül, 2009: 516), they tend to display
counterproductive behaviors, their performance plummets (Einarsen, 1999: 17), and their
commitment toward the organization they work in vanishes (Yüksel & Tunçsiper, 2011:
57-58). Mobbing naturally halts as the target employee quits his job. However, recent
findings have shown that, most victims do not give up and surrender, on the contrary, they
–at least for a while- resist. Thus, justice seems as an area to be studied. In their study on
the victims of mobbing and their colleagues in the USA, Lutgen-Sandvik (2006) found
out that victims resist to mobbing and mobbers in many creative ways. The argument
that victims resisting to mobbing gain a certain feeling of justice consequently sounds
convincing (Cowan, 2008: 285-286).

Factors such as how the decision-making process is performed, whether the
employees contribute to this process, whether communication channels are open and
used effectively, whether the employees are satisfied when they compare the benefit
they receive with other employees are important parameters that shape their perceptions
of justice. The direction of this perception is strong enough to determine the limits of
the behaviors that the employees will develop against each other. The weakness of the
employees' perceptions of organizational justice may shape their reaction against the

organization. A universal reality of the workplace, mobbing may be shaped depending on the employees' perceptions of organizational justice. The employees' positive perception of organizational justice may cause them to avoid mobbing behavior. The findings of the study support this inference. The managers of the organization can use organizational justice as an intervening variable in preventing mobbing behavior. In this context, the managers of the organization can take the following precautions in order to strengthen the employees' perceptions of justice and limit the tendency to mobbing behavior:

✓ To take measures to strengthen the communication among the employees and encourage them to share information,

✓ To enable the contribution of employees to decisions about themselves,

✓ To support the participation of the employees in decision making process,

✓ To form an organizational policy against mobbing,

✓ To prevent a probable organizational culture that encourages mobbing behavior,

✓ To take legal measures to prevent mobbing,

✓ To act decisively so that mobbing will be accepted as a workplace reality and it will be prevented,

✓ To enable manager-employee cooperation against mobbing,

✓ To use organizational justice as an intervening variable to prevent mobbing behavior,

✓ To follow the developments regarding mobbing within the organizations, taking the complaints on this issue seriously,

✓ To define mobbing and recognize it as a universal workplace reality.

According to the findings of the study, the most significant issue that future studies must primarily focus is the implementation of the issue on the employees working in different sectors. In this context, a country-level inference can be made by making a comparison of the organizational justice perceptions of the employees working in mentioned sectors and the mobbing behaviors they experience.

References

Arslantaş, C. ve Pekdemir, I. (2007). "Dönüşümcü Liderlik, Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı ve Örgütsel Adalet Arasındaki İlişkileri Belirlemeye Yönelik Görgül Bir Araştırma". *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 1*, 261-286.

Atalay, İ. (2010). *Mobbing'in Örgütsel Bağlılık Üzerindeki Etkisi: Kamu Sektöründen Bir Örnek*, (Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi), Ankara: Atılım Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Aydın, Ş. ve Özkul, E. (2007). "İş Yerinde Yaşanan Psikolojik Siddetin Yapısı ve Boyutları: 4-5 Yıldızlı Otel Işletmeleri Örneği". *Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 7*, 167-186.

Baillien, E., Neyens, I.,De Witte, H., ve De Cuyper, N. (2009). "A Qualitative Study on the Development of Workplace Bullying: Towards a Three Way Model". *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 19*, 1-16.

Campbell, L. ve Finch, E. (2004). "Customer Satisfaction and Organizational Justice". *Facilities* 22, 178-189. DOI: 10.1108/02632770410547543.

Chan, M. (2000). "Organizational Justice Theories and Landmark Cases". *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 8*, 68-88. DOI: 10.1108/eb028911.

Cole, M. S., Bernerth, J. B., Walter, F. ve Hold, D.T. (2010). "Organizational Justice and Individuals' Withdrawal: Unlocking the Influence of Emational Exhaustion". *Journal of Management Studies, 47*, 367- 390. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2009.00864.x.

Cowan, R. L. (2008). "Rocking the Boat" and "Continuing To Fight":Un/Productive Justice Episodes and the Problem of Workplace Bullying". *Human Communication*. A Publication of the Pacific and Asian Communication Association, *12*(3), 283-302.

Cropanzano, R. ve Folger, R. (1991). *Procedural Justice and Worker Motivation, In Motivation and Work Behavior* (Sth ed.), Eds. R.M. Sreers and L W Porter, New York: NY McGraw Hill.

Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C.A. ve Chen, P. Y. (2002). "Using Social Exchange Theory to Distinguish Procedural from Inteactional Justice". *Group and Organization Management, 27*, 324-351. DOI: 10.1177/1059601102027003002.

Currall, S. C., Towler, A. J., Judge, T. A. ve Kohn, L. (2005). "Pay Satisfaction and Organizational Outcomes". *Personel Psychology, 58*, 613-640. DOI: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00245.x.

Çınar Altıntaş, F. (2006). "Bireysel Değerlerin Örgütsel Adalet ve Sonuçları İlişkisinde Yönlendirici Etkisi: Akademik Personel Üzerinde Bir Analiz". *İşletme fakültesi Dergisi, 7*, 19-40.

Çobanoğlu, Ş. (2005). *Mobbing İşyerinde Duygusal Saldırı ve Mücadele Yöntemler.* İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.

Davenport, N., Schwartz, R. D. ve Elliott, G. P. (2003). *Mobbing İşyerinde Duygusal Taciz.* İstanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık.

Einarsen, S. (1999). "The Nature and Causes of Bullying at Work". *International Journal of Manpower, 20*, 16-27. DOI: 10.1108/01437729910268588.

Fischer, R. (2004). "Rewarding Employee Loyalty". *International Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 8*, 486-503.

Fox, S.; Spector, P. E. ve Miles, D. (2001). "Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB) in Response to Job Stressors and Organizational Justice: Some Mediator and Moderator Tests for Autonomy and Emotions". *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *59*, 291–309. DOI: 10.1006/jvbe.2001.1803.

Giderler Atalay, C. (2010). *Örgütsel adalet, Örgütsel Davranışta Güncel Konular.* (Ed. Derya Ergun Özler). Bursa: Ekin Basım Yayın Dağıtım.

Glasø, L. & Vie, T. L. (2009). "Toxic Emotions at Work". *Scandinavian Journalof Organizational Psychology, 2*(1), 49-54.

Greenberg, J. (1996). *The Quest for Justice on the Job: Essays and Experiments.* Thousand Oaks. CA: Sage Publications.

Greenberg, J. (2004). "Stres Fairness to Fare No Stres: Managing Workplace Stres by Promoting Organizational Justice". *Organizational Dynamics, 33*, 352-365. DOI: 10.1016/j.orgdyn.2004.09.003.

Gül, H. (2009). "İş Sağlığında Önemli Bir Psikososyal Risk: Mobbing-Psikolojik Yıldırma". *TAF Preventive Medicine Bulletin, 8*(6), 515–520.

Güngör, M. (2008). *Çalışma Hayatında Psikolojik Taciz.* İstanbul: Derin Yayınları.

Hoel, H., Cooper, C.L. ve Zapf, D. (2002). "Workplace Bullying and Stress". *Historical and Current Perspectives on Stres and Health, 2*, 293-333.

Inoue, A., Kawakami, N., Ishizaki, M., Shimazu, A., Tsuchiya, M., Tabata, M., Akiyama, M., Kitazume, A. ve Kuroda, M. (2009). "Organizational Justice, Psychological Distress, and Work Engagement in Japanese Workers". *Int Arch Occup Environ Health, 83*, 29-38.

İbicioğlu, H., Çiftçi, M. ve Derya, S. (2009). "Örgütlerde Yıldırma (Mobbing): Kamu Sektöründe Bir İnceleme". *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi, 1*, 25-38.

İnce, M., ve Gül, H. (2005). *Yönetimde Yeni Bir Paradigma: Örgütsel Bağlılık,* Konya: Çizgi Kitabevi.

Jahangir, N., Muzahid, M. A. ve Begum, N. (2006). "The Impact of Social Power Bases, Procedural Justice, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment on Empleyees's Turnover Intention". *South Asian Journal of Management, 13*, 72-88.

LaVan, H. ve Martin, Wm. M. (2008). "Bullying in the U.S. Workplace: Normative and Process-Oriented Ethical Approaches". *Journal of Business Ethics, 83*, 147–165. DOI: 10.1007/s10551-007-9608-9.

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

Leymann, H. ve Gustafson, A. (1996). "Mobbing at Work and the Development of Post-traumatic Stress Disorders". *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5*, 251-275.

Matthiesen, S. B. (2006). *Bullying at Work.* (PhD Thesis). Norway: University of Bergen.

Meyer, C. B. (2001). "Allocation Processes in Mergers and Acquisition: An Organizational Justice Perspective". *British Journal of Management, 12*, 47-66. DOI: 10.1111/1467-8551.00185.

Murphy, C., Ramamoorthy N., Flood, P.C. ve MacCurtain, S. (2006). "Organizational Justice Perceptions and Employee Attitudes among Irish Blue Collar Employees: An Empirical Test of the Main and Moderating Roles of Individualism/Collectivism". *Management Revue, 17*(3), 328-343.

Nielsen, M.B., Hetland, J., Matthiesen, S. B. ve Einarsen, S. (2012). "Longitudinal Relationships Between Workplace Bullying and Psychological Distress". *Scand J Work Environ Health, 38*(1), 38–46. DOI: 10.5271/sjweh.3178.

Öcel, H.ve Aydın, O. (Aralık 2010). "Adil Dünya İnancı ve Cinsiyetin Üretim Karşıtı İş Davranışları Üzerindeki Etkisi". *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 25*, 73-83.

Özdevecioğlu, M. (2003). "Algılanan Örgütsel Adaletin Bireylerarası Saldırgan Davranışlar Üzerindeki Etkilerinin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma". *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, 21*, 77-96.

Özdevecioğlu, M. (2004). "Duygusal Olaylar Teorisi Çerçevesinde Pozitif ve Negatif Duygusallığın Algılanan Örgütsel Adalet Üzerimdeki Etkilerini Belirlemeye Yönelik Bir Araştırma". *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Dergisi, 59*, 181-202.

Özen Çöl, S. (2008). "İşyerinde Psikolojik Şiddet: Hastane Çalışanları Üzerine Bir Araştırma". *Çalışma ve Toplum, 4*, 107-134.

Özmen, Ö. N. T., Arbak, Y. ve Süral Özer, P. (2007). "Adalete Verilen Değerin Adalet Algıları Üzerindeki Etkisinin Sorgulanmasına İlişkin Bir Araştırma". *Ege Akademik Bakış, 7*, 17-33.

Reichert, E. (2003). "Workplace Mobbing: A New Frontier for the Social Work Profession". *Professional Development: The International Journal of Continuing Social Work Education*, 5, 4-12.

Semmer, N. K., Tschan, F., Meier, L. L., Facchin, S. ve Jacobshagen, N. (2010). "Illegitimate Tasks and Counterproductive Work Behavior". *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 59*, 70–96. DOI: 10.1111/j.1464-0597.2009.00416.x.

Shallcross, L. Ramsay, S. ve Barker, M. (2010). "A Proactive Response to the Mobbing Problem: A Guide for HR Managers". *NZJHRM, 10*, 27-37.

Sperry, L. ve Duffy, M. (2009). "Workplace Mobbing: Family Dynamics and Therapeutic Considerations". *The American Journal of Family Teraph, 37*, 433-442. DOI: 10.1080/01926180902945756.

Standen, P. ve Omari, M. (2009). "Psychological Warfare: The Destructive Cycle of Reciprocal Bullying At Work". *NZJHRM, 9*, 4-13.

Sweeney, P. D. ve Mcfarlin, D. B. (1993). "Workers' Evaluations of The 'Ends' and 'Means': An Examination of Four Models of Distrubutive and Procedural Justice". *Organizational behavior and Human Decision Processes, 55*, 23-40. DOI: 10.1006/obhd.1993.1022.

Şenturan, Ş. ve Mankan, E. (2009). "Ücretin İşyerindeki Yıldırma Olgusu Üzerindeki Etkisi. *Bilig,* Yaz, *50*, 253-168.

Thirlwall, A. ve Haar, J. (2010). "Bullying in New Zealand: Comparing NAQ Finding to European and USA Studies". *New Zealand Journal of Human Resource Management, 10*, 99-115.

Tınaz, P. (2008). *İşyerinde Psikolojik Taciz (Mobbing)*. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım.

Tutar, H. (2007). "Erzurum'da Devlet ve Özel Hastanelerde Çalışan Sağlık Personelinin İşlem Adaleti, İş Tatmini ve Duygusal Bağlılık Durumlarının İncelenmesi". *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi, 12*, 97-120.

Vartia, MA-L. (2001). "Consequences of Workplace Bullying with Respect to the Well-Being of Its Targets and the Observers of Bullying". *Scand J Work Environ Health, 27*, 63-69. DOI: 10.5271/sjweh.588.

Vega, G. ve Comer, D. (2005). "Sticks and Stones may Break Your Bones, but Words can Break Your Spirit: Bullying in the Workplace". *Journal of Business Ethics, 58*, 101-109. DOI: 10.1007/s10551-005-1422-7.

Villanueva, Lytida S. (2006). *An Examination of the Role of Self-Control in the Prediction of Counterproductive Work Behaviors: Does Cognition Matter?*, (Ph. D. Thesis), University of Houston.

Wittmer, J. L. S., Martin, J. E. ve Tekleab, A. G. (2010). "Procedural Justice and Work Outcomes in a Unionized Swtting: The Mediating Role of Leader-Member Exchange". *American Journal of Business, 25*, 55-69. DOI: 10.1108/1935 5181201000010.

Yaman, E. (2009). *Yönetim Psikolojisi Açısından İşyerinde Psikoşiddet-Mobbing-*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Yazıcıoğlu, İ. ve Topaloğlu, I. G. (2009). "Örgütsel Adalet ve Bağlılık İlişkisi: Konaklama İşletmelerinde Bir Uygulama". *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi, 1*, 3-16.

Yıldırım, F. (2007). "İş Doyumu ile Örgütsel Adalet İlişkisi", *Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi, 62*, 253-278.

Young, L. D. (2010). "Is Organizational Justice Enough to Promote Citizenship Behavior at Work? A Retest in Korea", *European Journal of Scientific Research, 45*, 637-648.

Yüksel, M. ve Tunçsiper, B. (2011). "The Relationship between Mobbing and Organizational Commitment in Workplace", *International Review of Management and Marketing, 1*(3), 54–64.