



UNIVERSITÉ DU
LUXEMBOURG

The Luxembourg Workplace Mobbing Scale: Psychometric properties of a new instrument

Georges Steffgen & Diane Kohl

University of Luxembourg

Contact: Georges Steffgen, University of Luxembourg, INSIDE, Route de Diekirch, L-7220 Walferdange, georges.steffgen@uni.lu



UNIVERSITÉ DU
LUXEMBOURG

Introduction and aims

Workplace mobbing is a serious phenomenon that is costly to organizations and has various negative consequences for those targeted. There are several workplace mobbing instruments available to researchers that want to investigate the issue. The main purpose of the present study was to develop and validate a new short scale of workplace mobbing experience in three languages.

Method

Sample

A representative sample of 1537 employees working in Luxembourg (aged from 22 to 66 years; $M=45,71$; $SD=8,37$; 58.5 % male) participated in this study (Data collection by CATI). Luxembourgish version of the questionnaire: 46.3 % of the participants; French: 41.6 % and German 12.1 %.

Luxembourg Workplace Mobbing Scale (LWMS)

The LWMS is a 5-item self-report inventory assessing the degree of mobbing experienced on a five-point Likert scale.

Quality of Work Scale (QWS)

The QWS is a 16-item self-report questionnaire assessing different aspects of quality of work on a five-point Likert scale on five dimensions: Satisfaction and respect (6 items; $\alpha=.85$), Mental strain at work (3 items; $\alpha=.65$), Communication and feedback (3 items; $\alpha=.56$); Cooperation (2 items; $\alpha=.65$) and Appraisal (2 items; $\alpha=.54$).

Results

Results from exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis approved the one factor solution. Internal reliability was also satisfactory. Correlations with different working condition scales confirmed the construct validity of the new questionnaire.

To further examine the construct validity of the LWMS, a hierarchical regression was calculated. Table 4 shows that there is some variation between the regression results of the subsamples. Only Satisfaction and respect as well as Mental strain at work are significant predictors of mobbing experiences in all three subsamples. Cooperation is a significant predictor for all but the GER sample.

Conclusions

Although the present findings are preliminary in nature, they nevertheless support the reliability and validity of the 5-item scale and its use in psychological research. Future research is needed to improve the different language versions of the LWMS.

Table 1: Factorial loadings and reliability for the (sub-)sample(s)

	Total	LUX	FRA	GER
Criticized by colleagues/superior	.71	.71	.71	.73
Ridiculed by colleagues/superior	.67	.69	.67	.63
Ignored by colleagues/superior	.74	.72	.75	.77
Assigned absurd duties	.70	.67	.70	.80
Conflicts at work	.60	.62	.60	.56
% variance explained	47.3	46.8	47.7	49.6
Cronbach α	.71	.70	.72	.73

Table 3: Correlation between mobbing and quality of work factors

	Correlation				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1. Mobbing					
2. Satisfaction and Respect	-.57**				
3. Mental strain at work	.23**	-.17**			
4. Communication and Feedback	-.24**	.45**	.16**		
5. Cooperation	-.27**	.38**	.00	.25**	
6. Appraisal	-.37**	.58**	-.02	.36**	.31**

Table 4: Results of the hierarchical regression analysis ($p<.01$, * $p<.05$)**

	Total		LUX		FRA		GER	
	b	t	b	t	b	t	b	t
Step 1								
Age	.01	3.41**	.01	3.40**	.00	.62	.02	1.95
Gender	.15	2.84**	.22	2.86**	.06	.72	.18	1.34
Work sector	.00	1.06	.00	.14	.00	.74	.02	1.67
	$R^2 = .01$; $F = 7.23^{**}$		$R^2 = .03$; $F = 6.55^{**}$		$R^2 = .00$; $F = .60$		$R^2 = .05$; $F = 3.08^*$	
Step 2								
Age	.02	2.31*	.02	2.30*	.00	.61	.01	1.33
Gender	.12	2.24*	.19	1.99*	.04	.65	.17	1.15
Work sector	.00	0.06	.00	.13	.00	.54	.01	.98
Satisfaction and respect	.47	16.64**	.52	11.75**	.43	10.25**	.34	4.02**
Mental strain at work	.15	6.78**	.15	4.58**	.16	4.71**	.13	2.01*
Communication and feedback	.01	.51	-.07	-.18	.04	1.25	.18	2.54*
Cooperation	.07	3.29**	.08	2.36*	.10	3.06**	-.09	-1.43
Appraisal	.06	2.48*	.02	.44	.16	3.67**	.12	1.67
	$R^2 = .36$; $F = 162.99^{**}$		$R^2 = .34$; $F = 66.49^{**}$		$R^2 = .41$; $F = 85.80^{**}$		$R^2 = .36$; $F = 16.61^{**}$	

Table 2: Fit indices for the LWMS in a CFA

	χ^2	df	RMSEA	SRMR	AIC
Total	4.35	2	.03	.01	22641.20
LUX	9.75*	3	.06	.02	10988.63
FRA	13.41**	4	.06	.03	10910.58
GER	7.08	4	.06	.04	2579.83

