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Workplace mobbing occurs in libraries but is usually unrecognized and unchecked because the phenomenon has not been described and given a name. This discussion provides the library profession with an overview but also with specific background details to assist with recognizing mobbing and preventing severe harm to employees and organizations.

Libraries, for the most part, are enlightened and civil workplaces fulfilling a noble role in society, reflecting the enlightened and civil people who staff them and their idealistic aspiration to bring information, learning, and understanding to others. Librarians' idealism is tempered by very practical and often demanding, detailed, and complex work. Yet even in these temples of wisdom, as workplaces, disagreements and conflicts will arise, and in the artificially hierarchical and departmentalized work environment with its inevitable cliques, allegiances, and politics, conflicts will at times escalate to detonation or will burn slowly but very heatedly like ignited charcoal. Conflicts which are not handled in a timely and effective manner may cause huge and avoidable costs to libraries in the form of lost productivity and commitment to the organization, and in human suffering. A particularly devastating form of workplace conflict, in which a group in solidarity intentionally creates a hostile work environment for an individual who has been ostracized, is called "mobbing."

An English Language Treatment of Workplace Mobbing is Called For in the Library Literature

Mobbing, as an area of scientific study and as an employment equity issue, originated with Heinz Leymann, a German labor psychologist and later psychiatrist who performed clinical work and research in Sweden. After seeing the same destructive workplace pattern repeated in reports from many of his patients, he described the syndrome he called mobbing in a number of books and research articles. Others, mainly German and Swedish researchers, have expanded and furthered his research, but Leymann's original writings still form the deep and extensive authoritative foundation. Unfortunately for English speakers, the bulk of Leymann's work is untranslated and can only be read in German. A very useful popularized treatment has appeared in English as Mobbing: Emotional

"A particularly devastating form of workplace conflict, in which a group in solidarity intentionally creates a hostile work environment for an individual who has been ostracized, is called ‘mobbing.’"
Abuse in the American Workplace, by Noa Davenport and others. In the library literature specifically we find “Mobbing kak eticheskaiia Problema” (“Mobbing as an ethical Problem,” translation by Azhar Swanson) published in Russian in Bibliotekovedenie, an article treating mobbing in Russian libraries, and an article on a related but not identical phenomenon, “Bullying at Work” in the British journal Library Management. Based on Heinz Leymann’s original research published in German in the 1990s, this article will bring mobbing to the attention of English-speaking librarians as an important employment equity issue. If English-speaking librarians are aware of and can recognize the mobbing phenomenon, this peculiar and harmful form of conflict may be addressed and neutralized or assuaged. Also, individual targets in mobbing situations may find affirming catharsis in knowing that their experience is a frequent but usually unrecognized workplace tribulation.

"Mobbing, however, begins with a triggering, unresolved conflict and then develops an enduring, remorseless course which professionally, emotionally, and often physically harms the target..."

A DEFINITION AND AN EXAMPLE OF MOBBING

Mobbing at the outset should be clearly differentiated from garden variety workplace conflicts. Every workplace is characterized by conflicts, significant and insignificant, which usually are resolved in a fashion more or less satisfactory to the parties involved. Mobbing, however, begins with a triggering, unresolved conflict and then develops an enduring, remorseless course which professionally, emotionally, and often physically harms the target, that is, the person who is the object of mobbing. Mobbing begins with an unresolved conflict and then spins wildly out of control to the detriment of an individual at the mercy of a group. The German Trade Union Federation headquartered in Berlin defines mobbing:

Mobbing is a conflict-laden communication in the workplace among colleagues or between supervisors and subordinates, by which the target is overwhelmed and abused by another person or by several other persons. The target is systematically and over a long period of time directly or indirectly abused with the goal and/or the effect that the abused person is forced out of the workplace and experiences this as discrimination. (author’s translation)

To give a representative example, a person who is targeted may notice an abrupt and significant change in her social work environment. A once socially supportive work environment takes a subtle but remarkable turn and becomes hostile and unsupportive. This does not involve the minor misunderstandings or irksome behaviors that everyone experiences at work day to day, but is something much more powerful and insidious. Some or several of her coworkers, also perhaps including her supervisor, begin to use body language and facial expressions that convey contempt and speak to her with unkind tones and words. People begin to exclude the target, giving her the silent treatment. In formal meetings the target’s input is unwelcome and people talk about her, rather than to her, in her presence. She receives anonymous phone calls and insulting or threatening anonymous notes. Rumors are spread about her and people floor her with put-downs. The target’s work is suddenly called into question and is minutely criticized. She is assigned a burdensome workload and is singled out for tasks clearly below her training and capabilities. The group has crystallized in solidarity against the target and she is being given the very broad, palpable hint that she does not belong. The target’s fundamental humanity is being torn away bit by bit, in subtle but unmistakable ways, by the ostracizing mobbing group. Even as the work environment turns intensely hostile and stressful, the social support normally provided by coworkers and supervisors is withdrawn and these very people instead become deep fountains of stress and rejection. Copious personal support is necessary for people to cope in highly stressful situations. Bewildered family and friends may not be able to help the mobbing target effectively. Greatly increasing stress while withdrawing social support is a back-breaker. The group has decided that the mobbing target’s resignation or reassignment is in order. The mobbing continues unabated month after month, perhaps for a year or several years, with great suffering for the target and with her likely separation from the workplace.

MOBBING TACTICS AND THE FOUR-STAGE COURSE OF MOBBING

In his book Mobbing: Psychoterror am Arbeitsplatz und wie man sich dagegen wehren kann (Mobbing: Psychological Terror in the Workplace and how you can defend yourself, author’s translation), Heinz Leymann lists forty-five tactics used by mobbers. A few of these are highlighted in the example above, but not all of these tactics will be used in all mobbing cases. The crux is that a selection of these tactics are repeated over and over, weekly, and perhaps several times daily, over a period exceeding six months. Leymann states that the average duration of a mobbing incident is fifteen months. Some go on for years because the target cannot or will not separate from the toxic work environment. Targets may be heavily invested emotionally in their jobs, may have academic tenure, may be too old to change jobs, or may have other limitations which lock them in. Of course, only people who see no alternative will suffer themselves to continue to be abused in the hostile work environment typical of mobbing. The forty-five tactics listed by Leymann are subsumed under five major areas of assault on the target, including communication, social relations, personal reputation, quality of work and personal life, and personal health. A complete list of the tactics is available in English on two full pages in Noa Davenport’s book.

In addition to the forty-five mobbing tactics, in numerous case studies with patients in his clinical work as a labor psychologist, Heinz Leymann found that mobbing typically has a four-stage course. In the first stage erupts an unresolved conflict. The target has some sort of falling out with one or more members of the group which develops into the mobbers. The mobbing may be initiated by one influential person but then the group sentiment crystallizes that the target does not and should not be included in the group. In the second stage, ostracism occurs and some of the forty-five tactics are employed persistently to ensure that the target will take the
hint. The target is maneuvered into a defenseless and vulnerable position in which stress, anxiety, and suffering become highly elevated. As one against the many (potential allies usually fall away and become passive enablers if not actively participating in the mobbing) the target has no way of effectively countering the subtle but poignant assaults. In the third stage, the target makes an informal or formal complaint to the personnel administration or to other administrators. Until Leymann had made mobbing a household word in Germany and Sweden, he found that usually the administration failed to recognize or downplayed the mobbing complaint. Leymann found that, to make matters worse, the administration may assume that the target is the problem and not the hostile, harassing, but in most countries not strictly illegal behavior of the mobbing group. The fourth stage involves the exclusion of the target from the workplace, either to another department, another employer, early retirement, unemployment, or long-term disability due to the effects of mobbing. Mobbing results in enormous and avoidable social costs.

**MOBBING AND WORKPLACE BULLYING ARE RELATED BUT ARE NOT IDENTICAL**

Although there is often confusion and imprecision in the application of the terms “mobbing” and “workplace bullying,” they are closely related but distinct phenomena. In his book *Der neue Mobbing-Bericht (The new Mobbing Report, author’s translation)*, Heinz Leymann contends that his use of the term “mobbing” to describe the systematic, indirect assaults by a group of coworkers and perhaps also management serving to ostracize and emotionally wear down an individual target, is original to the scientific literature. The term “mobbing” is not interchangeable with “workplace conflict” or “workplace incivility” but rather describes a distinct syndrome with discrete stages and a stereotypic long-term course and outcome. With indistinct recognition, the mobbing syndrome has been at times called “workplace victimization” or “emotional abuse” in the United States and in other countries where awareness of mobbing research is slight or nonexistent. The term “workplace bullying” originated with British journalist Andrea Adams who in 1988 conducted an investigation of employee mistreatment in a bank. In the United Kingdom, the United States and the rest of the English speaking world, “bullying” has been the emphasis in research and in self-help publications while in Scandinavia, Germany, and other countries of Continental Europe the emphasis has been on “mobbing.” Bookstores and Internet booksellers in the United States will have a large selection of self-help titles on workplace bullying while in Germany the self-help titles cover mobbing. German newscasters will use the term “mobbing” with no explanation or background because the word, borrowed from its use in English to describe how small birds will mob a larger predator, has become a household word familiar to nearly every German.

Even Heinz Leymann, though, was indistinct in separating mobbing from bullying in his writings and most others do the same. People who discuss workplace bullying or mobbing tend to gloss over the differences or may even use the terms interchangeably. One person who makes a clear distinction between bullying and mobbing is Kenneth Westhues, an internationally respected expert on mobbing who has published books and articles on the subspecialty of mobbing in academe. His deliciously satirical book, *Eliminating Professors: A Guide to the Dismissal Process,* is based on his own experience as a mobbing target who ultimately prevailed. *Workplace Mobbing in Academe: Reports from Twenty Universities* is another of his trenchant titles. Westhues draws the distinction between bullying and mobbing:

No matter how often the words “mobbing” and “bullying” are said to be synonyms, they are not. They are alike in denoting aggression. “Mobbing” posits a collective, nonviolent source in a distinct episode. “Bullying” points to a single, physically threatening aggressor, sometimes aided by toadies, over an extended period of time. “Mobbing” implies a mob, a crowd of normal people who have temporarily lost their good sense. “Bullying” implies a bully, an abnormal person who is habitually cruel or overbearing toward weaker people. “Mobbing” highlights situation, the ganging up in a specific circumstance of ordinary people against someone. “Bullying” highlights character, the humiliation of someone by one or more psychologically disordered individuals.

Most all of us have an intuitive understanding of bullying from our childhoods and our school years, and so we can readily apply this to the adult world of the workplace. If we think back and consider, though, we may recall from our youth instances of that for which we now have a name, mobbing. Perhaps we do not recall these instances of group aggression as clearly because “until evil is named, it cannot be addressed” or even recognized. An example from childhood would be that of a large group of unsupervised children on the playground mobbing a Polish-American girl. In a taunting manner, the group of boys and girls sang in Polish the refrain of a Polish folk song over and over again, grouped together with all eyes on the girl and with expressions of contempt. After enduring this treatment to the breaking point, the girl burst into tears and ran home. We might protest that adults are too mature and sophisticated to engage, in a subtler manner, in the sort of mobbing behavior we find on the playground and in the school. However, a realistic assessment of adult behavior as brought to us from the electronic, broadcast, and print media may convince us that groups of adults are not only capable of workplace mobbing but of much, much more. Dehumanization and humiliation of those defined as outsiders by people in solidarity are a fundamental stumbling block of societies large and small- and of work groups in cases of mobbing.

**THE MOST FREQUENT TARGETS OF MOBBING**

If the description of workplace mobbing reveals a dark aspect of human group behavior, depicting the most likely targets of mobbing renders this dark aspect more sinister yet. From a country-wide survey, Heinz Leymann found that 3.5 percent of Swedish workers are being mobbed at any point in time, and estimates that the lifetime risk of being mobbed in Sweden may be as high as 25 percent. About 20 percent of suicides in Sweden were found to be the result of workplace mobbing. Figures for the United States have not been estimated, but since workplace mobbing derives from deep-seated impulses in human nature for social control and group rejection of outsiders, it may be assumed that mobbing is just as prevalent in the United States. Men and women are fairly equally targeted and all age groups are targeted. Leymann debunks the tendency to “blame the victim.” No single personality type can be pinpointed as the defining target personality, and innumerable reasons exist which may cause a conflict to erupt which will
lead to the ostracism of an individual by a group. The homosexual office worker who finds pictures of naked women anonymously left on his desk day after day is mobbed for a different reason than the secretary who is regularly humiliated by her supervisor and coworkers because of a speech impediment. Leymann does, however, offer profiles of people who are more likely to be mobbing targets.

Leymann found that people with disabilities are five times more likely to be mobbed as people without disabilities. For all of the efforts to make the workplace more inclusive, compassionate, and diverse, the American workplace is still highly competitive and production-oriented. Objectified people who may appear less efficient or who do not fit neatly into streamlined, rationalized processes may find themselves unwelcome. Even though many people with disabilities are excellent, reliable employees, indeed on average exhibiting more loyalty to their employer and taking less sick leave than their peers, having a disability may clearly differentiate them and set them apart in the minds of some coworkers. Despite the passage and implementation of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the unemployment of people with disabilities remains higher than the general population. As of 2003, "Only 32 percent of Americans with disabilities of working age are employed full or part time. That number is in contrast to 81 percent of Americans without disabilities, according to the comprehensive N.O.D./Harris Survey of Americans with Disabilities." In his book Workplace Mobbing in Academe, Westhues recounts the experience of a woman who was injured on the job and who returned to work after medical leave and physical therapy. Her job was restructured to accommodate her permanent disability, eliminating any heavy lifting. She was mobbed and finally broke down completely when one of her peers, who was handing out headbands to control perspiration in the factory, passed her by and said "The cripple doesn't need one. She doesn't work hard enough." Any personal factor which may set a person apart from the solidarity of the group may lead to mobbing if an unresolved conflict arises, but disability is a factor Leymann emphasized since his Swedish survey found a pattern of ostracism because of disability.

Women in male-dominated occupations and men in female-dominated occupations are designated by Leymann in his books as particularly broad targets for mobbing. A primary example given by Leymann in his groundbreaking book Mobbing is the case of a female welder in Sweden who was not accepted by her male coworkers and who was emotionally destroyed by their hostility and rejection. In an example from another book, by Trude Ausfelder, a female police officer in Munich, Germany, committed suicide likely because she was mobbed. On the other hand, Leymann describes the considerable difficulties encountered by male kindergarten and elementary school teachers. One would expect this tendency to hold true for male nurses and for male librarians and male library staff. Leymann states that work groups with a more even balance of male and female workers are less prone to mobbing than either those predominantly male or female.

Mobbing takes place in schools, universities, and libraries at twice the rate of workplaces in general. While Leymann hazards no reason for this weighting, one could speculate that teachers, professors, and librarians are intellectually and emotionally invested in their personal positions and in their professions. Thus, conflicts may be taken more personally and may have more dire consequences than in, say, factory production, where workers may not be as invested in their jobs. Also, while the academic life nominally fosters free inquiry and protects orderly communication, group dynamics leading to mobbing may be called into action more often because of intellectual and ethical differences.
think a behavior or policy is very unwise or unethical but would rather stand by their conscience and their principles in the face of ostracism.

**The People Who Comprise the Mob**

Leymann states that, in many cases, coworkers without the knowledge of supervisors, or with the tacit permission of supervisors who are aware of the situation, mob the target. In some cases, coworkers in cahoots with supervisors, perhaps with the encouragement or the instigation of management, mob the target. Far less often, because of the power differential and the risks involved, subordinates will mob a supervisor. Members of the mob can be anyone and everyone who identifies with the group's perceptions and goals and who has integrated to a degree into the group. Focusing on a scapegoat serves the purpose of increasing group solidarity and may foster delicious feelings of safety and inclusion in those who unite to endanger and exclude the mobbing target. Although the term mobbing derives from the observed behavior of small birds which combine to harass and wear down a predator, the mob more closely resembles the wolf pack which will harry and hound its prey until it breaks down in complete exhaustion and offers no further resistance.

Once again, workplace mobbing should be clearly differentiated from workplace bullying. The workplace bully has a personality disorder which causes them to pick on and to humiliate another or others in an effort to control them. Bullies are usually, though not always, supervisors, and although they may have allies or support from the administration, bullying involves an individual in conflict with another individual in a toxic relationship. In workplace mobbing, the members of the mob can be anyone and everyone with any sort of personality and personal characteristics, as long as they agree with and are integrated into the mobbing group. Group think and group dynamics are deeply seated in the extremely social human animal, and the conventional or sociocentric viewpoint has aided human survival throughout the history of the species. Groups working in concert with unquestioning conformity to group perceptions and goals can be very powerful, for better or for worse. In his classic 1919 book *Social Psychology*, Edward Alsworth Ross presents causes for what he calls the “mob mind,” the manic and at times pathological homogenization of thought and sentiment in societies. In his chapter “Prophylactics against Mob Mind,” Ross suggests education to inculcate critical thinking and the cultivation of a moral sense based on proper pride to help people develop a postconventional outlook which will shield them from the sociocentric mob mind. Kenneth Westhues states that, especially in academe, the workplace cannot be a tight ship with unquestioning conformity and action in lockstep. The promotion of critical thinking and ethical inquiry involves a high degree of ambivalence and messiness, which requires at least tolerance if not appreciation if the creative energies of the postconventional personality are to flourish. With a measure of tolerance and appreciation, the stone which the builders rejected because it was not as regular as the others may become the cornerstone.

**The Severe Effects of Mobbing on the Target**

Leymann found that the great majority of mobbing occurrences are not resolved to the relief of the mobbing target. In most instances, mobbing targets are separated from the workplace through “voluntary” resignation, through documented problems used as rationales for involuntary separation, such as excessive sick leave taken to cope with mobbing stress or behavioral or performance problems stemming from mobbing, or through long-term disability because of mobbing-related emotional or physical health problems. Traumatized mobbing targets often have difficulty finding another position and suffer professionally, socially, and financially. Heinz Leymann documented the enormous emotional and physical toll that mobbing targets sustain over the typical fifteen-month duration of the ostracism, and applied findings on Post Traumatic Stress Disorder or PTSD to his clinical studies. Because of the intensity and the duration of the typical workplace mobbing occurrence, which destroys the target's social support while simultaneously elevating stress, perhaps a better descriptor of this damage would be Prolonged Duress Stress Disorder, as suggested by Gary and Ruth Namie. Mobbing targets are not traumatized by a single, vicious attack but rather are worn down by insinuating, low-level, not illegal in most countries but unremitting, uncivil, and poignant assaults on their humanity. Leymann states that mobbing targets experience their ostracism as outrageously unjust discrimination against them as persons, and frequently become and remain cynical of human nature.

---

**"Mobbing targets are not traumatized by a single, vicious attack but rather are worn down by insinuating, low-level, not illegal in most countries but unremitting, uncivil, and poignant assaults on their humanity."**

---

**The Claims and Appeals of Targets are Usually Disregarded**

Recalling the four stages in the mobbing process, following the initial conflict and then the emergence of the mobbing situation, which the target may attempt to counter alone with little success, in desperation the target may appeal to the personnel administrator or the employment equity administrator. Although in the United States there is some awareness of workplace victimization, the target's appeals to personnel or employment equity usually are not believed or are downplayed. Administrators will likely be unaware of mobbing, may be in denial that mobbing could occur in their shop, or may wish to sweep the problem under the rug rather than confront it openly. Since laws against mobbing do not exist in the United States, the fear of possible legal action does not act as a goad to provide active relief as it does in situations involving harassment specifically because of sex or race. In Germany, on the other hand, mobbing has become such a household term and concept that it is in danger of being diluted and over-applied in situations which involve conflict but which should not be classified as mobbing occurrences. Leymann regretted that the term “mobbing” may be applied to everyday workplace conflicts, personality differences, or abrasive interactions which do not represent the insidious and prolonged course of true mobbing manifestations.
Coping Mechanisms, Possible Outcomes, and Desirable Resolutions

Once the mobbing target realizes that the ostracism is not going to ease and that personal efforts will not bring relief, and once claims made to personnel or employment equity are dispersed with disillusioning disbelief, misunderstanding, or disingenuousness, the mobbing target has little recourse left. The alternatives are to stay and endure the abuse using whatever coping mechanisms can be found or to separate to another job or to unemployment. Those targets who are somehow locked into their jobs by advancing age, by tenure, by family obligations, or by other circumstances, may rely heavily and perhaps too heavily on the emotional support of family and friends. This reliance burden may cause alienation and exhaustion in family and friends and can damage or destroy the mobbing target’s personal life. Another coping mechanism is “internal resignation,” to “leave but stay.” With this coping mechanism, the target becomes highly alienated from the workplace and withdraws from emotional involvement, becoming detached and aloof in the workplace and instead putting emotional energies into personal goals and efforts. Of course for the employer this results in a highly disengaged employee. This coping mechanism was used by some Germans during World War II who were highly alienated from the policies of Hitler’s government and the actions of their society. In the exchange of letters between Thomas Mann and Hermann Hesse and in The Tin Drum by Günter Grass, “internal emigration” is discussed by those who must remain in Germany but who would rather be elsewhere. Another coping mechanism is medical and psychological intervention for the treatment of Prolonged Duress Stress Disorder with medication and some kind of group or individual therapy. In Germany, self-help groups exist for mobbing targets specifically and mobbing is recognized as a discrete and treatable condition by the medical community. In the United States, awareness of mobbing is minimal and medical and psychological intervention may be rendered by professionals who assume the mobbing target is responsible for the situation. Medical and psychological intervention for mobbing targets in the United States may lead to stigmatization of the target, their designation as being physically or emotionally disordered personally, when in fact the symptoms are the result of a toxic and demoralizing work environment.

A rarely encountered but ideal situation is that in which a supervisor or an administrator intervenes in the mobbing situation and negotiates a conflict resolution which allows the target to be accepted back into the fold by the work group. Because the target is in a weak and vulnerable position and because the mobbers arrogate the moral high ground to themselves and are blinded by group think, only vigorous and timely intervention by an alert third party can nip the incipient or ongoing ostracism. In Germany, union stewards and company management are now more aware of mobbing and employees are aware of this syndrome at the grass-roots level, so mobbing situations have less opportunity to find foothold in the workplace. In Germany, this evil has a name and is quickly recognized. In the United States, however, not only do most managers have little or no awareness of mobbing but employees themselves who are targets of mobbing do not understand what is happening to them. Targets find themselves abused, bewildered, and completely alone. When Heinz Leymann published his original book, mobbing targets who read it said that it described their situations perfectly and that they experienced a catharsis with this supportive affirmation. If awareness of mobbing in the library profession could be raised, administrators, supervisors, and rank and file employees alike would recognize the signs and symptoms of a group acting in hostile solidarity against a defenseless individual.

Strategies for Supervisory or Administrative Intervention

Mobbing may not be illegal in the United States, but mobbing is certainly unethical and should be vigorously countered with insight, courage, and sensitivity. The first step is to recognize that a mobbing situation is arising or has already arisen. An alert supervisor in close contact with a work group may see the group crystalizing in solidarity and may see the target being marginalized. This is the ideal time to step in and use maturity and character to break up the incipient group dynamics and stop the target’s marginalization. The instigating conflict may be resolved as well as possible. However, a supervisor may not be powerful enough to counter the solidarity of the group, especially if informal leaders in the group use their influence to maintain and increase the mobbing of the target. Supervisors may then need to appeal to upper-level administrators to assist with resolving the situation, educating and convincing administrators as necessary to the reality of workplace mobbing. A strong display of support for the target from upper administration, along with the active discouragement of mobbing behaviors, may then resolve the situation successfully.

In other situations, the target’s immediate supervisor may be ineffective, may be unconcerned by the target’s claims that mobbing is occurring, or may themselves be actively involved in the ostracism. The target may then appeal to personnel or to employment equity for relief. Because mobbing is little known in the United States, targets may be unable to clearly articulate their situation as underdog and scapegoat. Few targets will ask for relief with books on mobbing in hand to help them describe their situation. Thus, administrators must be aware of workplace mobbing to be able to have insight into the target’s situation. For administrators unaware of the severity and the persistent course of mobbing situations, the tendency may be to disbelieve the claims of the target or to downplay the target’s distress. Occasionally, the target may be viewed as the guilty instigator rather than as the overwhelmed casualty. A response such as “It’s time to move on” does not take into account the long-lasting, remorseless course of workplace mobbing, which sets it as an insidious syndrome apart from normal workplace conflicts which may blow over. A response such as pulling out a code of conduct and directing the target to get along better with others will not help. No matter how strong the character of the target may be, a group in solidarity against them will put them in a weak and defenseless position. The target is unable to resolve the situation without assistance. The best response by personnel or employment equity is to educate those in the target’s chain of command on the reality of workplace mobbing, to show strong support for the target, and to vigorously discourage mobbing behaviors against the target. Resolving the initiating conflict may also help break up the mobbing, if the conflict is still significant and the mobbing has not simply taken on a life of its own.

Courteous and respectful treatment of employees despite individual differences is absolutely necessary in the workplace.
Mobbing is an extreme form of unethical and uncivil treatment which should be vigorously countered and eradicated from the workplace. Intervention by alert, insightful, and courageous supervisors and administrators may save their organizations from the immense costs and may spare their employees profound suffering.
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