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Mobbing, bullying and harassment in the workplace are problems that workers have experienced and continue too. There is a need in the United States for further study and a greater understanding of this problem. With a process in place to handle these cases, those being mobbed would have a resource to access. This study is a review of previous literature to increase awareness about mobbing, bullying and harassment in the workplace.
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INTRODUCTION

This project is an investigation about mobbing, bullying and harassment in the workplace and to promote further understanding of this silent problem. This type of emotional abuse can be devastating for the individual. The intention is to review the current literature regarding mobbing, bullying and harassment in the workplace in an effort to aid people who have been mobbed in the workplace.

Currently there are books and articles written about mobbing, bullying and harassment. In these the author has relied on self-reports for analyzing the events, leaving out the person or persons who did the mobbing, bullying, or harassment. There is a need for the appropriate methodology to evaluate the events, in such a way that both the victim and the person/s doing the victimizing can be analyzed and assessed.

Statement of the Problem

This project is an investigation into ways to aid victims of mobbing in the workplace, so the individual can continue gainful employment. Mobbing assaults the dignity, integrity, and credibility of the worker. This type of emotional abuse can be devastating for the individual. The intention is to review the current literature regarding mobbing in the workplace in an effort to aid people who have been mobbed in the workplace.

Mobbing, is commonly used to describe all situations where a worker, a supervisor, or a manager, is systematically, repeatedly mistreated, and victimized by fellow workers, subordinates or superiors. It results in high turnover, low morale, increased absenteeism, decreased productivity and loss of key
individuals. By using the term mobbing, harassment at work has been given a
wider implication than those normally presented with sexual harassment. A
hostile work environment, in which insulting or offensive remarks, persistent
criticism, personal or even physical abuse and threats prevail, is a reality for
many employees in both public and private organizations (Adams, 1992a;
Leymann, 1990; Randall, 1992; Wilson, 1991). While some clinical and anecdotal
accounts of such a generic type of harassment at work have been described by
both English and American authors (Adams, 1992a; Bassman, 1992; Wilson,
1991), studies of this phenomenon have so far been restricted to the Northern
European countries with a few exceptions (Baron & Neuman, 1996; Brodsky,
1976; Gandolfo, 1995; Spratlan, 1995). Although it has been advocated that
violence and aggression at work are areas in need of more research (Flannery,
1996; Leather, Cox, & Fransworth, 1990), few studies addressing aggression and
violence among organization members are available. Indeed, violence,
aggression, and negative human interaction are rarely studied within an
organizational context (Appelberg, Romanov, Honlasalo, & Kosenvuo, 1991;
Keashly, Trott, & MacLean, 1994; Kennan & Newton, 1984;) perhaps due to the
rational and harmonious framework dominating the research on organizational
conflicts (Pondy, 1992).

Significance of the Problem

The International Labor Office (ILO), in 1998, categorized mobbing in the
same category as homicide, rape, or robbery (Davenport, 2002). In a study of
7986 Norwegian employees, encompassing a broad array of organizations and professions, some 8.6%, had experienced bullying and harassment at work during the last six months (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996). Even though bullying and mobbing behaviors may seem harmless, the effects for those targeted can be so psychologically devastating that the victims may contemplate suicide.

Harassment at work has been claimed to be more crippling and devastating problem for employees than all other work-related stressors together (Wilson, 1991). Based on clinical examinations, it has been observed that many victims suffer from symptoms under the domain of post-traumatic stress syndrome (Leymann, 1992; Wilson, 1991). On the bases of clinical observations and interviews, victims of mobbing have been noted as symptomatic in multiple ways. Brodsky (1976) identified three patterns of effects on the victims. Some expressed their reaction by developing vague physical symptoms, such as weakness, loss of strength, chronic fatigue, pains and various other aches. Others reacted with depression and symptoms related to depression. There were other psychological symptoms, such as hostility, hypersensitivity, loss of memory, feelings of victimization, nervousness, and avoidance of social contact. For example, depending on the reaction of the victim to episodes of laughter and teasing this will largely be dependent upon the individual intellect and temperament. Therefore, personality traits may be important moderators of the victim’s reactions to victimization (Einarsen, 1996).
Purpose of this Project

The purpose of this project is to examine the various definitions of mobbing and bullying, reveal statistical facts to support the need for more research and provide information about how to assess the company's structure. This will be accomplished by a critical analysis of research that has been conducted involving mobbing and bullying in the workplace. These specific questions will be addressed:

1. What are the definitions of mobbing, bullying and harassment?
2. What empirical support exists that corroborates the incidents of mobbing, bullying and harassment in the workplace?
3. How can a company structure be assessed when looking for the possibility of mobbing, bullying and harassment?

Limitations

The scope of this project is to review the current literature regarding mobbing, bullying and harassment in the workplace. It is not intended to discuss other types of violence that occurs in the workplace.
The word mob means a disorderly crowd engaged in lawless violence. It is derived from the Latin *mobile vulgus* meaning “vacillating crowd.” The verb to mob means “to crowd about, attack or annoy. At present, bullying and workplace harassment is to a great extent “taboo” and rarely studied, at least outside of Scandinavia (Bjorkqvist et al., 1994; Niedl, 1995). The term bullying is used in the United Kingdom and some English-speaking countries to identify many actions that Leymann terms as mobbing behaviors. It appears both terms are being used somewhat interchangeably. Rayner & Hoel (1997) found that adult bullying at work will bring more challenges to the researcher than that of school children. Harassment at work has been claimed to be more crippling and devastating problem for employees than all other work-related stressors together (Wilson, 1991). Based on clinical examinations, it has been observed that many victims suffer from symptoms under the domain of post-traumatic stress syndrome (Leymann, 1992; Wilson, 1991).

The following table describes some terms that are used by researchers in this subject matter:
TABLE 1. Definitions and terms used by researchers

In describing “mobbing” in the workplace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brodsky (1976)</td>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>Repeated and persistent attempts by a person to torment, wear down, frustrate, or get a reaction from another person; it is treatment which persistently provokes, pressures, frightens, intimidates or otherwise cause discomfort in another person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thylefors (1987)</td>
<td>Scapegoating</td>
<td>One or more persons who during a period of time are exposed to repeated, negative actions from one or more other individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthiesen, Raknes &amp; Rrokkum (1989)</td>
<td>Mobbing</td>
<td>One or more person’s repeated and enduring negative reactions and conducts targeted at one or more person of their work group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leymann (1990)</td>
<td>Mobbing/ Psychological terror</td>
<td>Hostile and unethical communication that is directed in a systematic way by one or more persons, mainly towards one targeted individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kile (1990a)</td>
<td>Health endangering leadership</td>
<td>Continuous humiliating and harassing acts of long duration conducted by a superior and expressed overtly or covertly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson (1991)</td>
<td>Workplace</td>
<td>The actual disintegration of an employee’s fundamental self, resulting from an employer’s or supervisor’s perceived or real continual and deliberate malicious treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashforth (1994)</td>
<td>Petty tyranny</td>
<td>A leader who lords his power over others through arbitrariness and self aggrandizement, the belittling of subordinates, showing lack of consideration, using a forcing style of conflict resolution, discoursing initiative and the use of non-contingent punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vartia (1993)</td>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>Situations where a person is exposed repeatedly and over time to negative action on the part of one or more persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bjorkqvist, Osterman (1994)</td>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>Repeated activities, with the aim of bringing mental (but sometimes also physical) pain, and directed towards one or more individual who, for one reason or another, are not able to defend themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams (1992a)</td>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>Persistent criticism and personal abuse in public or private, which humiliates and demeans a person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the present most employees either find another job or simply quit their job. My purpose is to reveal the need for a more efficient way of addressing this problem. Commonly, the terms bulling and mobbing are used more or less synonymously (Namie, 2003). For example, bullying tends to be the commonly used term in England and the United States today, whereas mobbing is the
is the commonly used term in Scandinavia and the rest of the continent (Sperry, 2009).

In other countries it has been acknowledged and systems put in place to aid the person being mobbed. Although Brodsky’s research on the harassed worker in 1976 does indicate that there is abusive workplace behavior. Mobbing and bullying have not yet been widely identified as a workplace issue in the United States. However, it is now gradually being recognized and there is a need for more research in this area.

In the eighties, Leymann (1984) used the term mobbing when he discovered similar group violence among adults in the workplace. He researched this behavior first in Sweden and then brought it to public awareness in Germany. He investigated what he was told were “difficult” people in the workplace and determined that many of these people were not “difficult” to begin with. He found that the root of their behavior was not a character flaw that made them inherently difficult. What he found was a work structure and culture that created the circumstances that marked these people as difficult. Once identified as difficult, the company created further reasons for terminating them.

When Leymann first defined mobbing at the workplace in Sweden in 1984, he wrote that “mobbing was psychological terror involving “hostile and unethical communication directed in a systematic way by one or few individuals mainly toward one individual (p 22). Leymann, found that the person who is mobbed is pushed into helpless and defenseless position. These actions occur on a very
frequent basis and over long period of time (1996). Both Brodsky and Leymann stress the frequency and duration of what is done.

In 1984, Leymann published his first report regarding these findings. Since then, he published more than 60 research articles and books, such as *Mobbing: Psychoterror at the Workplace and How You Can Defend Yourself* (1990); *The New Mobbing Report: Experiences and Initiatives, Ways Out and Helpful Advice*. Leymann’s article *Mobbing and Psychological Terror* was published in the American journal *Violence and Victims in 1990*.

Leymann (1990) divided the actions involved in bullying and psychological terror at work into five different forms which include the manipulation of:

- The victim’s reputation
- His or her possibilities of performing the work tasks
- The victim’s possibilities of communicating with co-workers
- His or her social circumstances
- Cluster of behaviors included physical coercion or assaults, or the threat of such

Following Leymann’s, (1990) impetus, a great deal of research has been accomplished or is now in progress, particularly in Norway and Finland as well as in the UK, Ireland, Switzerland, Austria, Hungary, Italy, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and South Africa. The following is not an all inclusive account of research that has been done in more recent years. I attempted to focus more on research done in the United States.
In the United States, as early as 1976, Brodsky, a psychiatrist and anthropologist, wrote *The Harassed Worker*. Brodsky wrote his book based on claims filed with the California Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board and the Nevada Industrial Commission. These claims stated that the workers were “ill and unable to work because of ill-treatment by employers, co-workers, or consumers, or because of excessive demands for work output (p.xi).”

In 1991 Wilson pointed out the cost in billions of dollars that U.S. businesses are losing caused by real or perceived abuse of employees. Wilson, a psychologist who specializes in workplace trauma, which is a condition caused by employee abuse. It is emerging as a more crippling and devastating problem for employees and employers than all the other work stress combined.

Spratlen, wrote an article on “Interpersonal Conflict Which Includes Mistreatment in a University Workplace. Spratlen defines workplace mistreatment as a behavior or situations without sexual or racial connotations which the person perceives to be unwelcome, unwanted, unreasonable, inappropriate, excessive, or a violation of human rights (1995). Keashly, uses the term emotional abuse in the workplace. She analyzes and summarizes North American research mostly published in the eighties and nineties dealing with what she defines as hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors that are not linked to sexual or racial context yet are directed at gaining compliance from others (1998).

Based on empirical data from university employees, Bjorkqvist (1992) identified three phases in a typical harassment case. The first phase was characterized by
conduits that were difficult to pinpoint, by being very indirect and discrete. In the second phase, more direct aggressive acts appeared. The victims were isolated, humiliated in public by being the laughing stock of the department etc. In the third phase, both physical and psychological means of violence were used. Victims of long lasting harassment are also attacked more frequently than victims with a shorter history as victims. In early phases of conflict, the victim seems to be attacked only now and then. As the conflict escalates, the frequency of the attacks comes with increased frequency and more harsh, and after some time, the victims are attacked on a weekly or even daily basis (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996).

Subjective Harassment is important not only as a perception of a very real pain suffered by the target. It is also an expression of how the victims perceives his or her interaction with significant others in the workplace. If one were to consider the subjective measurement of exposure to bullying vs. objective harassment (Einarsen 2000). Brodsky (1976) uses the term *harassment* as a behavior that “involves repeated and persistent attempts by one person to torment, wear down, frustrate, or get a reaction from another. It is behavior that persistently provokes pressures, frightens, intimidates, or otherwise discomforts another person.” Brodsky (1976) pointed out how crippling and pervasive the effects of harassment on mental health, physical health, and worker productivity were and expressed the belief that these claims were “only the tip of an iceberg in relation to the actual incidences (p. 2). “Mobbing has been known to occur in a
range of workplace environments. Some characteristic of an environment conducive to this behavior, according to Davenport, et al., (2002), are the following: Management generally ignores or misinterprets this type of problem; the workplace does not distinguish mobbing from other forms of harassment; and after seemingly endless mobbing, victims have no recourse except to give up. Further, these characteristics are part of a complex interaction among environmental, situational, and personal factors that influence the perpetrators and victims, and can lead to workplace violence (Di Martino, 2000).

Keim & McDermott (2010) found the cost of mobbing is evident in legal fees, settlements, turnovers, health of employees, morale’s, and counseling fees. Universities are encouraged to address the problem to cut cost and reduce liability. More importantly, they should address the problems because it is the right thing to do. Education regarding how employees should treat one another is critical. Faculty members need to know about mobbing and university policy, and to be reminded of it periodically. To maintain a positive workplace the university can emphasize the importance of a healthy work environment and provide training and opportunities to make it so (Keim & McDermott, 2010). A workplace anti-violence policy that includes strict prohibitions against mobbing is also critical to convey a message that mobbing will have consequences if they do not follow them.

In the United States, 38 percent of health care workers reported psychological harassment (Dunn 2003). The figures point to the importance of
studying the phenomena of bullying and mobbing. Hubert and van Veldhoven (2001) compared various workplace sectors and behaviors associated with workplace violence and found that those working in education reported some of the higher rates. Those reporting aggression “sometimes”, “often”, or “always” by colleagues or their bosses were 18.3 percent and 12.8 percent, respectively. Respondents in education reported the second highest rates, 54 percent reports unpleasant situations between colleagues and the highest rate of 41.6 percent reported was with their bosses (Hubert and van Veldhoven 2001). Sadly many victims often because of shame and fear of further negative impact on their careers fail to report their experiences. Most unsettling fact is that the average duration of this harassment is 16.5 months (Dunn, 2003).

Workplace bullying behaviors are a growing problem in the American workplace (Oppermann, 2008). According to the Workplace Bullying Institute (2007), 37 percent of the U.S. work force experienced bullying in 2007. Also, nearly 18 percent of the bullies were coworkers and 24 percent of the victims of bullying had their jobs terminated as a result of workplace bullying. Lastly, 40 percent of the individuals targeted by bullies quit their jobs, accounting for a loss of 21 million U.S. workers to employers who currently face shortages of skilled workers (Workplace Bullying Institute, 2007). In addition expenses related to bullying can be significant. The ILO has estimated costs for interpersonal violence, which includes workplace bullying, in the U.S. ranging from $4.9 to $43.4 billion (Waters, Hyder, Raikotia, Basu, Rehwinkel, & Butchart, 2004). The
societal costs for bullying among coworkers include both direct and indirect costs.

Assessing a company’s organizational dynamics could be beneficial if they were looking to change policies or following an incident of mobbing or bullying. Organizational dynamics refers to the interplay of influences among an organization’s subsystems. Organizational dynamics can provide a useful marker in understanding the likelihood that bullying and mobbing will occur within a given organization. Also being employed in an organization with a strategy, structure, culture, and leadership that are prone to foster mobbing or bullying does not mean that such abusive behavior will occur (Sperry, 2009). An organization can be visualized as a set of five overlapping, concentric circles wherein each circle represents the subsystems of an organization: structure, culture, strategy, leaders, and members within a larger circle representing the organization’s external environment (Sperry, 1996). The potential for fostering or preventing abusive actions of these six subsystems is briefly noted in this section.

Structure

Hierarchical levels within an organization reflect structure. It has been noted that certain types of abusiveness are more likely to occur at given levels of an organization (Sperry, 2009). Brodsky (1976) describes name-calling, physical contact, or overt accusations as common at lower levels, whereas attacks on professional abilities, job transfers, and dismissals are common at middle and upper levels.
When the strategy of an organization emphasizes productivity and competitiveness at the expense of the well-being and job security of employees, research indicates that such a strategy fosters workplace mobbing (Hodson, Roscigno, & Lopez, 2006).

Culture

For abusiveness to occur in an organization, aggressive elements must exist within a culture that permits and rewards it. It may be sufficiently offensive, intimidating, or hostile so that it interferes with the ability of certain workers to perform their jobs effectively (Friedland & Friedland, 1994; Hodson et al., 2006).

Leadership

Abusiveness in the work setting can involve some level of acquiescence by management. Supervisor may look the other way or fail to discipline the perpetrators, or they may participate in or initiate the abusive behavior (Sperry, 1998; Strandmark, Lillemor, & Hallberg, 2007).

Personnel

Personnel function best when leadership style is responsive and supportive of personnel needs and expectations, whereas the lack of match between leadership and personnel can account for conflict, decreased productivity, and workplace abusiveness (Hoden et al., 2006; Uris, 1964).

External Environment

Environmental dynamics refers to those factors outside the organization’s internal dynamics that exert significance influence on the organization’s strategy.
and functioning. Although sexual harassment violates federal statues in the United States, mobbing and bullying do not. In contrast to statutes in Europe and Canada, U.S. employment law provides little protection for workers from mobbing and bullying (Yamada, 2000).

In 1988, Adams, journalist, was the first person to draw attention to the bully phenomenon in the United Kingdom through a BBC series, and in 1992, her book *Bullying at Work: How to Confront and Overcome It* was published. Bullying, in her use of the term was about “persistently finding fault” and “belittling individuals,” often with consenting management.

In 1997, a trust was named after Andrea Adams, it was created to assist victims of bullying. The trust commissioned research on the extent of bullying and abusive emails in the workplace. They found what they called an “explosion” of flame mail, or electronic bullying, sexist and racist abuse, including voice-mail.

Field, another British author has written *Bullying in Sight*. Published in 1996, it is a detailed handbook on how to identify and deal with bullies in the workplace. He defines *bullying* as a “continual relentless attack on other people’s self-confidence and self esteem.” The underlying reasons for this behavior is a desire to dominate, subjugate, and eliminate. Additionally, Field includes the perpetrator’s denial of responsibility for any consequences of his or her actions. In 1998, the ILO published the report, *Violence at Work*, written by Di Martino. In this report, mobbing and bullying behaviors are discussed alongside homicide and other more commonly known violent behaviors.
Also, there have been many stories reported in the media about bullying in the workplace, which point to abusive work behaviors that we would now identify as mobbing. As an example, in November 1998, Oprah Winfrey’s show was dedicated to the “Bully Bosses” and several people told their stories in public. This growing awareness has led to the establishment of workplace help organizations, also on the Internet. One such organization, The Campaign Against Workplace Bullying (CAWB), led by Drs. Ruth and Gary Namie, information about their organization can be found on the internet. Bob Rosner, author and syndicated columnist, gives advice to the dissatisfied worker on the website “Working Wounded.”

Extensive research conducted in Sweden in 1990 exposed that 3.5% of the labor force of 4.4 million people i.e. some 154,000, were mobbing victims at any given time. Leymann also estimated that 15% of the suicides in Sweden are directly attributed to workplace mobbing. Incidence studies show 4-5% of employees being bullied at any one time, the average period being 3 years. The two major studies are Einarsen and Raknes (1991); Leymann (1992b) and both being reported in English in Einarsen and Skogstad (1996) and Einarsen, Raknes and Matthiesen (1994). If we switch these figures to the U.S. workforce, comprising some 127 million people, well over 4 million people yearly are, or may become, victimized by mobbing. Hornstein, (1996) in his book Burtal Bosses and Their Prey, estimated that as many as 20 million Americans face workplace abuse on a daily bais – a near epidemic.
In the United States more mobbing, bullying, and harassment research is needed. Mobbing in the work place is an important problem that needs immediate attention. The research on mobbing in the workplace was started primarily in the European region and this issue needs to be brought to the attention of the American workforce. Mobbing and bullying in the workplace produces negative effects for the individual being mobbed and the company in which the mobbing and bullying is taking place. Mobbing and bullying creates negative outcomes and it would be beneficial to our workforce if it was recognized and dealt with accordingly.

Mobbing is unethical and unjust and therefore should not be tolerated. As discussed above mobbing has negative consequences to the individual being mobbed and to the people around the individual. I believe that every individual should be treated with respect and should not be subjected to the belittlement that others may place upon them. Mobbing and bullying is a cruel way to treat other individuals and should not have to be endured. For the victims of mobbing, there are consequences like depression, feelings of inadequacy and overall can affect their lives and the people in the victim's life, no individual should have to endure such treatment.

In theory, it is possible if there was more research about mobbing conducted in the United States, we might find that certain systems used in company's framework may promote a higher instance of mobbing that others. Based on the evidence I found, I believe that if a certain work system promotes
mobbing it affects the company’s overall image and production negatively. If there is mobbing in the work place it affects the company’s present employees and their ability to provide their best work. It is not clear what impact it may be for the company’s future employees. For example, as an administrator of rehabilitation facility when employees are happy with their job there is less call-ins. When there is less absenteeism throughout the company it is more productive. Employee job performance can be impacted by bullying and mobbing. Staff may exhibit either a steady decline or a sudden drop in the quality of their work. Low morale and lack of motivation can be key signs that people feel miserable and unhappy at work. Staff who are being bullied or mobbed or observe unchallenged bullying or mobbing may eventually cause staff to leave in large numbers, creating a high turnover and impacting the care being provided to the residents.

Everyone wants to work in a positive environment and mobbing is not part of the equation. If individuals are satisfied with their job, they will tend to work harder and overall morale will be better for the company. Insurance cost could be cut down because employees who are victims of mobbing would not seek medical attention, whether it is for mental health or physical health reasons. Benefit time and medical insurance is another costly factor of mobbing. Workers miss work and someone else performs their duties. The person being mobbed uses their sick time and the company also pays for someone else to do their job.
During mobbing situations the victim will often attempt to wait out the mobbing or try to confront the employer and if the desired goal is not achieved then the employee will usually quit. This is another problem for companies, from my experience replacing someone can be more expensive than if companies were able to keep the employee already hired and trained. So, researching mobbing and bullying in the work place would be beneficial to companies but most importantly it has to be recognized as a problem. Also, if mobbing was researched more we could possibly identify key work systems that could potentially have higher instances of mobbing and replace or adjust them with new work systems which would help better the company’s environment for the employees and the productiveness of the company.

If more research was done about mobbing in the workplace I believe that people will see that mobbing and bullying is no different than sexual harassment. Mobbing is wrong, it is a potential issue when people are working together and it needs to be recognized as a crisis. Once given a name to the problem, something needs to be done about it. If laws were put in place making mobbing and bullying illegal, victims would be afforded due process and restitution made. Slowly in the United States we are seeing such cases of electronic bullying by one person or a group. Email in the office can be use to intimidate and mob employees. Texting and electronic mail is a fast way to degrade or embarrass one or many individuals. Such as a picture being taken of someone in a comprising position and then someone sends it to others or post on the web.
Recently these very situations have been in the news. When charging the perpetrator they have used our current law and was charged with violation of civil rights, stalking, criminal harassment, and a hate crime. If these injustices are going on in our schools by young people, who are we to think that as adults in the workforce that these same actions are not happening there too.

Victims of mobbing in the workplace over time lose support because their friends and family will eventually become inattentive to the situation. These victims of mobbing are suffering in isolation. Some will seek a medical professional such as a doctor for physical pain or a mental health professional for the emotional trauma. Recognizing that mobbing is indeed happening will help everyone in the workplace. At this time there is not a diagnosis in the DSM-IV or 5 for mobbing or bullying. At this time most patients are treated for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. Due to the large amount of stress placed on the individual, one can cope for varied amounts of time, but most leave their job.

I believe for mobbing and bullying to be recognized as a problem, awareness of the offense and more research would help educating the general public about mobbing and bullying. America is a label based society and the lack of education about mobbing is what I believe to be one of the key factors as to why mobbing is tolerated. The research about mobbing and bullying is like the awareness, it is limited. The workplace needs to become aware of mobbing so certain implication can be put into place so victims of mobbing have support. The victims of mobbing need to have resources available to them to aid in their
efforts to resolve the issues. Until there are regulations in the workplace, most businesses will continue business as usual. While there are millions of workers suffering every day. As I mentioned there is organizations with web-based assistance for workers being mobbed. Lastly, there are medical professionals to help with the physical pains and counselors to help with the emotional pain of mobbing. As, Brodsky, (1976) stated mobbing in the workplace is an –epidemic!


Waters, H. (n.d.).
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