Indoor sports incurred by referee mobbing behavior evaluation
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Abstract:
This study was done to determine the level of mobbing faced by the umpires that work for indoor sports federations (basketball, handball and volleyball). 248 umpires do constitute the sampling of the study that use screening model. Research data was collected as, "Scale of mobbing towards indoor sports umpires". In the study, arithmetic mean, t-test, analysis of unidirectional variance was used. In sampling, it was determined that indoor sports umpires do encounter below medium level mobbing in their work environment. In addition, it was determined that women, married individuals, 23-27 year olds and undergraduate and postgraduates do encounter more mobbing than their counterparts. However, no significant difference on mobbing was detected with variables like gender, marital status, age and education.
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Introduction

Mobbing involves hostile and unethical behavior in work life (Leymann, 1996). Considering the historical context of mobbing, it can be observed that it started with Konrad Lorenz in the 1960s. Lorenz (1991) used mobbing, do describe the harassment behavior of animals against each other or foreign out of the herd individual. This term was later used by Heinemann (1972) to describe the disruptive behavior applied by a group of children, to a single child, in the classroom during school hours (Leymann, 1996; Davenport et al., 2003).

Many different definitions of mobbing can be found in many different studies. According to Tutar (2004) mobbing is all kinds of ill-treatment, threats, violence, humiliation applied in a systematic manner to employees by their superiors, subordinates or by colleges. Einarsen (2000) defines mobbing as a process that employees and managers take for granted, which includes rude behavior that evolve over time and mentions that mobbing is often a long term process and that these actions, in the process, are increased in level, and most people are oblivious to that fact. According to Davenport et al (2003) mobbing as an emotional assault, consists of malicious acts, ridicule and social discredit of a person to other people, with or without their consent, with the aim of creating an environment that will force these people to leave their work.

Kaymaz (2007) notes the most widely practiced mobbing behavior in workplaces as follows:
1- To be hold responsible for the mistakes,
2- Giving unreasonable tasks,
3- Criticizing ability,
4- To force to obey conflicting rules,
5- Threats of loosing ones job,
6- Suffering from humiliation and insult,
7- Manifestation of less success than there actually is,
8- To be dismissed (cook someone's goose),
9- Yelling,
10- To dishonor.

Mobbing leads to negative consequences on both individuals and organizations. The research for negative consequences on individuals is usually done by measuring the psychological and psychosomatic symptoms that these actions have on victims (Cemaloglu & Ertürk, 2007). Most researchers and psychologists indicate that if severely experienced, such actions might even drag the victims to commit suicide (Davenport et al., 2003). These behaviors can be made by employees in managerial positions, against people who work under them, have the same status or by lower status employees against their superiors (Cemaloglu & Ertürk, 2007).

The content of the study, indoor sports umpires, have to feel good not just physically but also psychologically to fulfill their duties in an efficient manner. Considered to be a risky profession (Hançerlioglu, 1992) to be an umpire requires the knowledge of the game, versatile features such as the ability to communicate
and assessment features. The umpires should also know what mobbing is, how adversely it affects their work and how to deal with it. In an environment in which masses do expect outcomes on their favor, for umpires to make the right decision, not only should have professional knowledge and experience, they also shouldn’t be affected from negative outside factors. In this context, this study was made to determine the perceptions of active umpires of indoor sports (basketball, handball, volleyball) against mobbing, with some variables considered.

**Method**

The universe of study consists of 907 different umpires who are active in either professional and amateur leagues of Turkey’s indoor as in (Basketball (N= 272), Handball (N= 81) and Volleyball (N= 554) Federations). (Basketball Federation, 2013 ; Handball Federation, 2013; Volleyball Federation, 2013). The sampling consists of 248 indoor sports umpires selected randomly, who have different rankings, working in various leagues actively (Basketball (n= 70), handball (n= 62) and volleyball (n= 116) Federations). Given that in a descriptive study, at least 20% of the universe shall be represented (Arlı & Nazik, 2001) the number in the sampling can be said to represent the whole universe.

The data was obtained using the general screening model. To obtain the data, “Mobbing Scale Towards Indoor Sports Umpires (SSHYMÖ in Turkish)” is used which was developed by Hacıcaferoğlu (2014). It’s been determined that Cronbach’s alpha coefficient scale is 0.82, factor loadings were found to be between 0.48 and 0.76 for this study with 14 articles and stand-alone scale units. In this study however, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient in question was determined to be 0.77. Cronbach's alpha coefficient being 0.70, this research suggests that the study is reliable (Arseven, 2001). Scale was set up to identify several daunting behaviors in five-point Likert-type system. Score ranges for articles rated "Never (1.00-1.79)", "Rarely (1.80-2.59)", "Occasional (2.60-3.39)", "Most of the time (3.40 to 4.19)", and "Every time (4.20 to 5.00)". In the study, frequency, percentage, standard deviation, mean, t-test and simplex analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. The statistical significance level is determined to be alpha (α) and error level is p <0.05.

**Findings and discussion**

In this section, the data obtained from indoor sports referees and statistical findings related to these data are given.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics regarding behaviors in the scale (N=248).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>Behaviors</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Ss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I’ve been assigned to matches that require less knowledge and experience than I already have.</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>During and after the game, my decisions are criticized.</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I wasn’t given any opportunity to show myself regarding umpiring.</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Discrimination is made when applying the rules, I am not evaluated with the same criteria as the other referees</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Because I am constantly recruited, I am accused to have close ties with Central Umpire Association (MHK).</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I am not told of the social activities carried out by the association.</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I sometimes consider quitting, due to negative behavior (psychological pressure)</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Groundless and negative comments about me are done to my colleges by some people.</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I am criticized by vested interests for being pressured by my affiliated association, (MHK).</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am ignored, discounted or freeze off by others.</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I am usually interrupted in umpire meetings.</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I face pressure regarding using my legal rights.</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Due to negative reactions and behaviors, I do not want to participate, so I submit excuses.</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>My honor and reputation are overshadowed by interest groups.</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total score, with a lower than medium scale, is 1.81.

A total of lower than medium mobbing was determined to have been faced by The umpires participating in the study, in their work environments (with 1.81 points). When analyzed, the most common mobbing issue stands out to be 2:38 with an average answering mean which states "I’ve been assigned to matches that require..."
less knowledge and experience than I already have." The least encountered mobbing issue is, with its 1.55 response average, is "My honor and reputation are overshadowed by interest groups".

Table 2: t-analysis test results regarding the sexes of the participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Ss</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>t-</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>-426</td>
<td>.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It’s been determined that gender variable of the umpires and mobbing has no significant relationship between them. (p> .05). I can be said however that female umpires with a score of 1.84 do get slightly more mobbing than their male counterparts with a score of (1.80).

Table 3: t-test analysis results on the marital status of umpires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Ss</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>t-</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.219</td>
<td>.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is not a significant difference in the amount of mobbing faced by umpires, married and unmarried (p> .05). Regarding the score, married umpires have a higher score of (1.84) compared to unmarried umpires, in the amount of mobbing they are exposed to (1.76).

Table 4: Participants' age-related one-way analysis of variance results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Ss</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-22 Years old</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-27 Years old</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-32 Years old</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-37 Years old</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-42 Years old</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-47 Years old</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It’s been determined that there is no significant difference in mobbing behavior in sample group with the age variable (p> .05). Also, the umpires in the age group of 23-27 years, compared to the others, do face more mobbing with (25.2) points.

Table 5: Results of one-way analysis of variance on participants' education levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Ss</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>1.944</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>248</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p&gt;0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It’s been determined that there is no significant difference in the exposure of mobbing regarding the educational status of umpires (p> .05). Postgraduate (2.00) and undergraduates (1.84) mobbing exposure in terms of points is higher than the umpires in other educational levels.

Discussion and resolution

It was understood that the indoor sports umpires participating in the study face below medium level of mobbing in their work environment (1.81). When analyzed, the common reason of mobbing with a 2.38 response average is "I’ve been assigned to matches that require less knowledge and experience than I already have." And the least encountered mobbing reason with 1.55 response average is "My honor and reputation are overshadowed by interest groups." (Table 1). In this case, generally speaking, it can be said that there is an attack on the professional qualifications of the participants. Gürpinar and Güven’s (2011) research results, that concludes as
the most common type of non-sportsmanship behavior faced by umpires as psychological pressure, do support our findings. Haccaferoğlu (2010) states in his study that the rate of exposure to mobbing behavior with a score of 1.82, is below medium level. This result is in line with the findings of the research. However, Alkan (2011) and Tüzel (2009) stress that the research participants exposure to mobbing behavior are in low levels.

It’s been determined that there is no significant difference on mobbing behavior in regard to the gender variable \[t = -4.26, p > .05\]. It can be said that the female umpires do get more mobbing with a score of 1.84 in contrast with male umpires with a score of (1.80) (Table 2). In some research done on the subject; it is claimed that women are exposed to more mobbing than men (Aydın & Özkul, 2007; Bülbül et al., 2013; Haccaferoğlu & Gundogdu, 2014; Işık, 2007; Kök, 2006; Kose & Uysal, 2010) however, some other studies suggest that men actually face more mobbing in contrast with women (Aktop, 2006; Bulut, 2007; Güneri, 2010; Göck ve Oğuz, 2009; Tüzel, 2009). In this regard, it can be said that the surveyed female umpires are fewer than their male counterparts, and in an environment dominated by men, there could be a more aggressive attitude towards the weakness of the females (Leymann, 1993). In addition, some research suggests that there is a significant difference in sex variable and mobbing (Güneri, 2010; Haccaferoğlu & Gundogdu, 2014; Turan, 2006). In some studies however, no significant difference was found (Aktop, 2006; Doğan et al., 2011; Öğretmen, 2013; Tanoğlu, 2006; Yavuz, 2007). This result is in line with this finding of the research.

There is no significant difference in exposure level to mobbing between married an unmarried participants \[t = -1.219, p > .05\]. In regard to score, married umpires do face more mobbing (1.84) than their unmarried counterparts (1.76) (Table 3). This can be interpreted as the concerns and troubles of livelihood and job-related responsibilities of umpires who are married are more than their unmarried counterparts. In research on the subject; higher rates of exposure to mobbing was determined in married participants than the unmarried ones (Aydın & Özkul, 2007; Haccaferoğlu & Gundogdu, 2014; Kök, 2006; Köse & Uysal, 2010; Tüzel, 2009). These results are comparable with the findings of the research. In contrast, there are also research findings that suggest single umpires do face more mobbing than their married counterparts (Akkar, 2010; Bülbül et al., 2013; Haccaferoğlu et al., 2012). Again, in the literature, survey results that suggest there is no significant difference in mobbing with the marital status variable are also available (Doğan et al., 2011; Gökçe & Oğuz, 2009; Güneri, 2010; Işık, 2007; Tanoğlu, 2006; Turan, 2006; Yavuz, 2007). This results seem to support the findings of the research. However, there also are research results indicating that there is a significant relationship between marital status and mobbing (Alkan, 2011; Bülbül et al., 2013; Haccaferoğlu & Gundogdu, 2014).

It’s been determined that there is no significant difference of mobbing exposure regarding the variable of age of the participants \[F = 1.359, p > .05\]. Also, the umpires in the age group of 23-27, are identified to perceive more mobbing than their counterparts in other age groups with a score of (2.25) (Table 4). In this case, it can be said that the umpires in the age group of 23 to 27, due to lack of experience, can perceive more mobbing behavior, and as they gain experience with the advancement of their age, they will be more in control of the situations that mobbing is involved. In some research done on the subject; in respect to the age variable, it was determined that mobbing exposure can be detected more under 30 years of age (Bahçe, 2007; Bülbül et al., 2013; Dilman, 2007; Güneri, 2010; Haccaferoğlu et al., 2012; Kök, 2006; Kose & Uysal, 2010; Orhan, 2009; Öğüt, 2007). These results are in line with the findings of the research. Despite these results, Cengiz (2008) in his study, has concluded that as age increases the perceived mobbing size increases as well, and Chopra (2005) has found out that the mobbing do happen in between the ages 40 to 55. In addition, Bülbül et al., (2013) has stated that there is a significant relationship between age and mobbing.

It’s been determined that there is no significant difference of mobbing exposure regarding the variable of the education of the participants \[F = 1.944, p > .05\]. Postgraduate (2.00) and undergraduates (1.84) mobbing exposure in terms of points is higher than the umpires in other educational levels (Table 5). People with higher levels of education could also mean that they are qualified to be one step ahead than others. In such a case, such umpires can cause a discomfort in other umpires with lower education levels and mobbing against the higher educated ones could ensue. Bulut (2007), Davenport et al., (2003), Demirci ve (2008), Haccaferoğlu et al., (2012) and Haccaferoğlu (2013) in their research, has mentioned that the sufferers of mobbing are mostly the ones with bachelor's or postgraduate degrees. In addition, some research suggests that there are no significant differences regarding mobbing exposure within education variables (Gökçe & Oğuz, 2009; Haccaferoğlu 2010; Işık, 2007; Turan, 2006). This data is consistent with our findings. However, in some studies, a significant difference is observed of exposure to mobbing in regard to the level of education on ones part. (Bülülb et al., 2013; Dilman, 2007; Haccaferoğlu, 2013; Karavardar, 2009; Köse & Uysal, 2010; Yavuz, 2007).

As a result of this research; with the aim to examine the levels of variables on the exposure of mobbing of indoor sports umpires; it was determined that the sampling group of indoor sports umpires do receive mobbing below medium level with a score of (1.81). Also found out that female umpires are exposed to more mobbing (1.84), than their male counterparts (1.80), as like the married ones (1.84) to singles (1.76), and 23-27 years age group, to other age groups (2.25), also undergraduates and postgraduates (2.00) to other education levels (1.80). In addition, it was determined that there is no significant statistical difference for mobbing exposure within the variables of gender, marital status, age and education (p > .05). With this conclusion, it can
be said that, during their careers, the umpires in the sample group are exposed to below medium level of mobbing in their professional lives. The absence of a higher level exposure might be because the umpires do feel that their professional lives might be affected adversely of this information that they are sharing, so may be they keep most of it to themselves.

Suggestions

In this context, the umpires should withstand to pressures that might come from the managerial positions of Central Umpire Committee. Management decisions shall be just and equal for all umpires, and all the decisions taken by the boards within the objective should be implemented as a whole. In addition, the umpire assignment and classification rules should be more objective. In order to avoid the negative effects of mobbing, management (MHK) should provide training and education on mobbing by experts, in order to track and overcome mobbing actions. Also, the referees should not bow to pressure from various groups and from mobbing and shall apply the rules without bending, equally to everyone. Also in sports, public reviews should be more constructive. The comments should be in a more objective and scientific form, and blamings should be avoided.
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