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ABSTRACT

The prime objective of this study is to analyze the impact of work place mobbing on performance of employees. Mobbing includes any kind of systematic behaviors, such as threats, humiliation, and violence, committed by an employee against his or her colleagues, subordinates, or managers. Population of the study comprised of all professionals working in listed companies with Karachi Stock Exchange (KSE). Sample of study was 200 respondents from financial sector companies of different industries. Data was collected through structured questionnaires. Purposive Sampling technique, a form of non-probability sampling was used to collect the data.

Findings of the study suggest work place mobbing as most devastating element in organizational structure in terms of employee performance. The organization suffer from so many loses in productivity and performance. This paper provides significant information for researchers, practitioners and clinicians in the bounds of workplace behavior and managerial psychology. It is suggested that the feelings, emotions and perceptions of employees are most important factor to look after because human resource is the most remarkable resource in the progress and effectiveness of any organization and it will be compromised if workplace mobbing is present.
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Introduction:
In this competitive age, organizations are endeavoring for their monetary interest. In the contexts of their monetary interest (profit maximization) and exploiting centrality at the workplace, due to this employees become target of workplace mobbing. Organizations considering it as an event that can occur at any time with certain frequency. The pace and the intensity of workplace mobbing drives researchers to focus on the antecedents, consequences, extents and scope of workplace mobbing in order to have more understanding of the construct. In recent years, reoccurring and consistent mobbing behaviors that result in a power imbalance between harasser and victim are increasing. These unethical behaviors can affect organizational commitment, employee efficiency, motivation, job satisfaction, and burnout. Further workplace mobbing leads to negative and contrary effects on employees regarding their job and health such as; loss of efficiency, increased turnover, accusations, failure to meet organizational goals, decreased self-esteem at workplace, extreme distress, less sleep, loss of focus, depression and panic attacks. The severe effects of workplace mobbing include high managerial costs, increase in turnover rate, performance decline and disturb emotional/physical wellbeing. A startling cost is reported of workplace mobbing for individuals and organizations. Individual cost consists of anxiety, depression, suicide, cardiovascular diseases etc. While organizational cost combined with decreased job satisfaction, higher absenteeism, less outcomes, decreased commitment and escalated turnover rate. It is a severe and persistent problem that epidemics workplaces globally. This virus causes severe harm to the workplace and no one is giving serious attention to remove the root causes of workplace mobbing. To date, many studies have been carried out. But no one has addressed the issue of resolving it with social attention to employee performance at the workplace. Workplace mobbing is considered as a severe and prevalent problem that has devastating effects on the employees. Despite the recognition of its severe and prevalent nature, it is still a rife and there is no clear and suitable remedial path for targets of bullying to follow. Therefore to throw light on this shaded area of organizational management this study was conducted (Becker & Huselid, 2006).

Literature Review:
Mobbing:
The term mobbing was first used by Leymann (1990) to describe abusive workplace behavior. He borrowed the term from the ethnologists Lorenz (1963) whose are of the study was the of animal behavior. In the animal world, mobbing is a behavior in which a group of animals single out another animal and gang up on it to disregard it from the group.
Leymann (1990) defined as “Psychical terror or mobbing in working life means hostile and unethical communication which is directed in a systematic way by one or a number of persons mainly toward one individual. There are also cases where such mobbing is mutual until one of the participants becomes the underdog. These actions take place often (almost every day) and over a long period (at least for six months) and, because of this frequency and duration, result in considerable psychic, psychosomatic and social misery”. This definition eliminates momentary conflicts and focuses on the transition zone where the psychosocial condition starts to end in psychiatric states (Boselie, Dietz & Boon, 2005).
Mobbing is additionally a communal marvel. Truth be expressed, there are continuously two parties included in mobbing. The primary party is mobbers or mobbing aggressors and the people who encourage alternately boost mobbing and mobbers and the second gathering is mobbing victims. Individuals or victims who are mobbed generally feel isolated from society (Salin, 2003).
Mobbing behavior is identified with growing frequency in the organizational world and in the workplace, and is called by different names in different countries. The term psychological terrorism is also used to describe workplace mobbing because, like political terrorism, the victim knows that another wave of terror will come but does not know when or from what angle (Schat & Kelloway, 2005). Although the term mobbing is more commonly used in the United States, It does not capture the particular grievousness of mobbing that refers to a group attack on a worker rather than an outbreak by a single individual which is described as mobbing (Zapf & Einarsen, 2001).
Leymann (1996) classified pesky behaviors in following categories: (a) directing self-esteem and the means of communication (limiting possibilities of communication, preventing contact with others, etc.); (b) attacks on
personal social relations (limiting the possibilities of maintaining contact with others, isolating the person from the others, etc.); (c) attacks on the person’s repute (spreading rumors, making fun of the person or of a inability, etc.); (d) attacks on the person’s professional quality and the life condition (not assigning meaningful tasks, assigning tasks that are below the person’s personal qualification, etc.); and (e) attacks on the person’s well-being (assigning hazardous tasks, physical intimidations, sexual harassment, etc.).

Some types of workplace mobbing are seen as predatory (because of target characteristics), whereas others are the result of conflict arising, in which both the ‘target’ and mobber have behaved inaptnly, becoming embroiled into a struggle for power, making it very difficult to apportion culpability (Becker & Huselid, 2006). Just as there is no single portrait of the target of mobbing, there also seems to be no single portrait of the mobber. (Ferris, et al, 2007).

Leymann (1990) asserts that the factors that encourage workplace mobbing include work overload, irrational work output demands, role or task conflict and perceived injustice. Mobbing is far more likely when organizations and jobs are perceived negatively, when workloads are high and there are insufficient time and resources to complete tasks (Ståle, 2000).

Mobbing results in the disgrace, devaluation, discrediting, degradation, loss of professional reputation and, often the removal of the target from the organization with all the associated financial, career, health, and psychosocial implications that one might expect from an extended traumatizing experience.

**Employee Performance:**

Performance of work, in terms of quantity and quality, expected from each staff member is called the Performance of the Employees. These standards are the basis for performance evaluation. According to job performance theory (Stephan, Motowildo, Borman & Schmit 1997) performance is the behavior or people's activities that have an effect on the objectives of the organization. This behavior can be positive or negative and can be either provided as part of the work or outside the scope of the duties set forth.

According to Hackman & Lyman, (1968) performance can be divided into three types. One is to measure the rates of production and the number of sales during a certain period of time. The second type of performance measurement and evaluation includes evaluation of individuals by someone other than the person who is being considered in the performance. The third type of performance measurement and evaluation is self-evaluation. As a result, the adoptions of self-evaluation and self-assessment techniques were found useful in encouraging staff to play an active role in preparing his own goals.

Factors such as work settings, feedback to managers, emotional intelligence, training and development of staff increase employee performance.

Organizations must ensure that their physical settings must be conducive to the organizational policies, systems, and the needs of all stakeholders (Branch, Ramsay, & Barker, 2008). In the twenty-first century, organizations are playing strategic role by enhancing the level of employee’s efficiency. Motivation and infrastructure of the workplace are the two main concerns of management to maximize the employee performance (Felblinger, 2008).

Productivity includes both objective and subjective interpretations of performances like employee’s output per hour and individuals’ perceptions, attitudes or assessments toward organizational goals (Khaliib & Ngan, 2006). But unfortunately, our organizational leaders do not bother about the devastating effects of workplace mobbing on employees as well as on organizational productivity. (Schat & Kelloway, 2005).

According to Yamada (2009) mobbing is just like a cancer that cannot be cured and resultantry productivity and profits diminish. The existing literature presented three reasons of workplace mobbing, including reducing self-esteem, socially excluding someone, and become the high achiever (Kemppilä & Lönnqvist, 2003). Demographic differentiation may strengthen the mobbing behaviors of an individual at the workplace that can negatively affect the performance level (Salin, 2003). Additionally, the individuals who have lack of confidence and poor managerial skills can be the target of mobbing at workplace. While implementation of anti-mobbing policies and laissez-faire management styles can be the solution for mobbing that decrease the performance of employees (Moore & Casper, 2006).

Finally the toxic work environment of Mobbing not only affect individual performance, but it also has a negative impact on group performance (Hauge, Skogstad & Einarsen, 2007).

On the basis of in depth review of the literature following research framework and hypothesis are formulated.
**Theoretical Frame-work:**

H₁: There is a relationship between workplace mobbing and employee performance.
H₂: Work place mobbing have negative impact on employee performance.

**Methods:**

In this cross sectional study the primary data on independent and dependent variables were collected from professionals working in different financial sector companies in Pakistan, through structured questionnaires. Population of the study comprised of all professionals working in listed companies with Karachi Stock Exchange (KSE) financial sector companies of different industries i.e. Banking, Insurance, Leasing, Investment and Moradabad were taken from the KSE website.

Purposive Sampling technique, a form of non-probability sampling was used to collect the data from 200 respondents. The target groups of employees in different companies were identified. Purposive sampling was applied because the respondents for this study were not common employees; rather they were employees posted at different positions in banking and financial sector.

**Results and Discussions:**

**Descriptive Statistics:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee_performance</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.5283</td>
<td>.07071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee_mobbing</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.6204</td>
<td>.06123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table 1.1 shows that the mean value for employee performance is (3.5283) which suggests that the respondents are agree about the questions of the employee performance standard deviation value is the (0.962) which means that very little variation among the respondents is present. The above table further depicts that the mean value for mobbing is (3.6204) which explains that the respondents are agree about the questions of the employee mobbing. Standard deviation whose value is the (0.86598) which suggests that little variation among the respondents is present.

H₁: There is a relationship between workplacemobbing and employee performance.

The correlational analysis tells the relationship status of the different variables which are included in the research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Employee performance</th>
<th>Employee mobility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.525**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table shows that the corelationship between the employee performance and employee mobbing is present as the coefficient for correlation is significant (-0.525) at (p>0.01).these results suggest that work place mobbing is correlated with employee performance. Thus hypothesis H₁ is accepted.

H₂: Work place mobbing have negative impact on employee performance.
Table 3: Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EP-EM</td>
<td>-0.625</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table 3 shows that the value of the R square is the (0.55) which suggest that the 55% change in the employee performance occurs due to the employee mobbing at work place. it explains that if the organization wants to improve the employee performance then the employee mobbing is the important variable to control. the value of the $\beta$ is (-0.625) at (p<0.01) which depicts the negative change in dependent variable (independent) due to change in independent variable (work place mobbing). Results shows that if the organization wants to increase the performance of the employees then it is necessary to remove the impact of the employee mobbing because the results clearly shows that there is the negative relationship between the employee performance and the employee mobbing.

**Conclusion:**

This research clears that there is still much to learn about the phenomenon of workplace mobbing. It is more than ‘simple’ interpersonal conflict between two people of equal power. The consequences of mobbing may be severe for the target, leading to lasting psychological harm. It is costly for the organization in terms of lost productivity and performance. This paper provides significant information for researchers, practitioners and clinicians in the bounds of workplace behavior and managerial psychology. Further this study provides clear examples of unpleasant workplace behavior and their perilous effects for employees as well as for an organization by presenting a clear picture for the managers that the growth of firm could not be possible without the employees. So they should try to understand their difficulties faced horizontally or vertically at the workplace arising due to mobbing. They should care about the feelings, emotions and perceptions of employees because human resource is the most noteworthy resource playing a significant part in the success of an organization.
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