FIND THE HIDDEN CRAB; RESEARCH ON DESTRUCTIVE BEHAVIORS AT THE MANAGERIAL LEVELS OF THE ACCOMMODATION BUSINESS

Nurcan ÇETİNER, PhD, Lecturer Dr.
(*Corresponding Author*)
Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University,
Office Services and Secretary Department
Karaman, Türkiye
E-mail: nurcancetiner@kmu.edu.tr

Ayşe ATAR YILMAZ,
Ph.D., Assist. Prof.
Samsun Ondokuz Mayıs University, Faculty of Tourism
Samsun, Türkiye
E-mail: aysee.atar@gmail.com

Ece KONAKLIOĞLU,
Ph.D., Professor,
Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University
Faculty of Tourism
Ankara, Türkiye
E-mail: ece.konaklioglu@hbv.edu.tr

Melahat ÖNEREN,
Ph.D., Associate Professor,
Retired Associate Professor
E-mail: melahatonerenn@gmail.com

Abstract

Purpose - The human-oriented service approach, which is one of the structural features of the tourism sector, causes destructive behaviors of employees to have more negative effects on work efficiency and effectiveness, so it is of great importance to identify and prevent these behaviors. The main objective of this study is to determine the expression of Crab Barrel Syndrome (CBS) among lower, middle and upper managers of employees in the tourism sector. For this purpose, a scale was developed to measure the behaviors of employees with CBS who tend to engage in unethical behaviors in tourism. In addition to our main objective, the differences in the demographic characteristics of CBS employees will also be identified.
Design/Methodology - Data were collected using a random sample. A questionnaire was sent to 310 tourism employees.
Findings - Analysis of the data revealed that the CBS level (CBSL) of the participants was low, with the CBSL of lower management being the highest and the CBSL of individual employees being the highest. CBSL differed significantly by employee hierarchical levels. In addition, CBSL was not found to differ significantly by gender, educational status, or institution, but CBSL decreased with increasing employee age and hours worked in the sector.
Originality of the research - his study provides a solid foundation for a better understanding of CBS and the relationships between workers. It is crucial to identify the negative employee behaviors in advance and take necessary precautions, especially in service sectors such as tourism where employee behaviors have a great impact on service quality./
Keywords crab mentality; crab basket syndrome; crab-bucket effect; crabs in a bucket; pull sb down; tourism; organizational behavior; scale development

INTRODUCTION

Organizations, to take part in the competitive market in the 21st century, see human resources as assets that are compatible with the business that can act in line with the business needs of the future, and that need to be carefully managed (Schuler & Jackson, 1996). Human, an important and valuable resource of modern organizations, plays an extremely important role in achieving organizational goals and organizational success (Riggio, 2018). Organizational behavior, which is a field of science that examines internal processes and practices to determine the effectiveness of individuals and groups in the working environment (Hellrieger & Slocum, 2011), aims to understand the behavior of people in the organization. Thus, it aimed to find ways to make them more successful and effective.

On the other hand, employees of the organization, who try to respond to the politicized business life, job diversity, and the expectations of the organization in an increasingly competitive environment, may have the desire to be included in a certain group, to have a career, and advancement opportunities, and to shine within the working group. As a result of competition and ambition, conflicts occur among employees, a working environment cannot be created as a team, and stress and pressure increase by breaking off communication (Yeşilada & Yeniceri, 2020). This situation may cause various syndromes that can be examined within the scope of the discipline of organizational behavior in the work-life (not included in a psychological disorder group) due to the reasons arising from both themselves and the organizational functioning of the employees (Gündüz, 2017). Crab Barrel Syndrome (CBS), which is one of the most important syndromes seen in the working environment, can be expressed as a situation that employees encounter within the discipline of organizational behavior and can affect the entire career life of an organizational employee.

People-oriented service concept, which is one of the structural features of the tourism sector, causes the destructive behaviors of employees to have more negative consequences in terms of work efficiency and effectiveness. At this point, the detection and prevention of destructive behaviors are of great importance in this area. The most important requirement of this study is the lack of a relevant scale measuring the behaviors of employees with crab syndrome who tend to engage in unethical behavior in tourism. So it is aimed to develop and validate a crab behavior scale to detect the crabs and to determine the difference between these crabs in terms of demographic characteristics. This study provides a solid foundation for a better understanding of intra-organizational crab syndrome behavior and relationships between employees. It facilitates the determination of the negative

behaviors of the employees in advance and taking the necessary measures, especially for the service sectors such as tourism, where the effect of employee behavior on the quality of service is observed instantly. In addition, one of the reasons for the emergence of this study is that the results of the crab syndrome in this study help in the selection and placement of personnel in the recruitment of human resources personnel. With a recruitment test created with the feedback received from here, personnel with crab syndrome can be distinguished and personnel can be recruited per the corporate culture and not disrupt the order.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

CBS is a situation in which the individual tries to bring down the employees who perform better than himself in the organization, and every time the person who performs well makes progress, he continues to be pulled down by another employee (Sampath, 1997; Soubhari & Kumar, 2014; Spacey, 2015; Bulloch, 2017). The presence of employees with crab syndrome in organizations can negatively affect the peaceful working environment, teamwork, and productivity, and can significantly increase the stress experienced by employees at work (Aydın & Oğuzhan, 2019).

Fishermen who catch crabs in the Philippines close the bucket after throwing the first crab into the bucket, they do not need to close the cover of the bucket after catching the second crab. Because even if the crab is in the act of getting out of the bucket, the crab at the bottom does not allow it to come out and pulls it down. This phenomenon, which emerged from these actions of crabs and is widely used among Filipinos; although it is expressed in different ways in the literature as crab mentality (Abrugar, 2014; Aydın & Oğuzhan, 2019), pulls sb down (Gündüz, 2017), crab basket syndrome, crab-bucket effect (Soubhari & Kumar, 2014) or crabs in a bucket (Miller, 2019), it was first used as crabs in a basket by the author Ninotchka Rosca (Tokdemir Reis, 2018). Explained by the social comparison theory and the conservation of resources theory, CBS manifests itself in behaviors such as the punishment of the successful and the different from the others (Üzüm et al, 2021). As it is known, less successful people with selfish personalities consciously try to bring down successful, unique, and unique-style individuals, and failure with anxiety on their faces precedes individuals who can be considered successful. CBS, which manifests itself in these situations, is a situation that can be encountered at every stage of life (Tokdemir Reis, 2018; Royeca, 2010).

CBS manifested by behaviors such as punishment of the successful and different by the other, less successful people with selfish personalities consciously try to bring down individuals who are successful, unique, and have a style of their own, and with the anxiety experienced in the face of failure, prevent individuals who can be considered successful. The CBS, which manifests itself in these situations, is a situation that can be encountered at every stage of life (Royeca, 2010; Tokdemir Reis, 2018).

Before moving on to the definition of CBS, it would be appropriate to explain the concept of the "syndrome". According to the Cambridge Dictionary (2022), the syndrome is defined as "a type of negative behavior or mental state unique to a person in a particular condition". According to the general opinion, the crab mentality; is a human habit similar to the behavior of crabs after being placed in the basket (Royeca, 2010). There is no drive when crabs exhibit this behavior. However, people exhibiting the CBS behavior are often motivated by negatively perceived emotions such as jealousy, grudge, and envy (Edama, 2021). In CBS, which is seen as a kind of jealousy or hatred (Spacey, 2015), the person in a certain group is tried to be brought down by other group members because of the stance, his superior performance, he displays (Sampath, 1997; Spacey, 2015; Keuthen, 2006).

Considering the literature review regarding crab syndrome, there are studies on educational performance (Spacey, 2015), discrimination (Aaron & Smith, 1992; Sampath, 1997; Bulloch, 2017; Katherine et al., 2018), management (Miller, 2019), job stress (Soubhari & Kumar, 2014), innovative behavior effect (Özkan et al., 2022), the effect of crab syndrome on dissatisfaction, absenteeism, and motivation (Aydın & Oğuzhan, 2019). However, despite the assumption that workers in labor-intensive businesses operating in the field of tourism, where the human factor plays a fundamental role, may be exposed to crab syndrome, no study could be found as a result of our research on the subject. Undesirable behaviors are seen as an attitude in which tourism sector employees behave humiliatingly towards their colleagues and the workplace, and these negative behaviors can cause employees to exhibit low performance (Kuo et al., 2015), leave the job, and unethical work behaviors (Guo et al., 2022).

As it is known, the success of organizations operating in the tourism sector largely depends on their employees who provide the highest quality service to their customers (Yavas et al., 2013). Determining positive/negative employee attitudes and behaviors is of vital importance in the tourism sector, where service quality depends on its employees. (Castro-Casal et al., 2019; Grobelna, 2021).

In order not to encounter these negative situations regarding the attitudes and behaviors of tourism employees, which are the key elements in the quality of service in the tourism sector, and to take the necessary precautions if encountered, the presence and detection of employees with crab syndrome, in other words, it is important to determine the presence and level of crab syndrome in lower, middle and upper-level workers, and also to determine whether the levels of crab basket syndrome differ according to demographic variables. It should not be forgotten that the most important difficulty in the syndrome is that individuals with this syndrome do not fully accept or define it (Abrugar, 2014; Aydın & Oğuzhan, 2019).

2. METHODOLOGY

In the study, it was tried to determine the CBS levels of the lower, middle, and upper-level managers of the tourism sector employees. "Can the levels of CBS differ according to the hierarchical level (lower, middle, and upper level) of the managers working in the tourism sector?" based on the problem of the research, the research hypotheses were determined as follows:

> H1: There is a significant difference between the levels of CBS according to the level (lower, middle, and upper level), of the tourism sector employees.
> H2: There is a significant difference between the levels of CBS according to the age, of the tourism sector employees.
> H3: There is a significant difference between the levels of CBS according to the length of service, of the tourism sector employees.
> H4: There is a significant difference between the levels of CBS according to the educational status, of the tourism sector employees.
> H5: There is a significant difference between the levels of CBS according to the marital status, of the tourism sector employees.
> H6: There is a significant difference between the levels of CBS according to, the gender, of the tourism sector employees.
> H7: There is a significant difference between the levels of CBS according to the institution they work for (public/ private), of the tourism sector employees.

To test the research hypotheses, it was seen that there was no scale measuring the crab syndrome levels of the tourism sector employees as a result of the literature review. For this reason, the (Study1) crab syndrome scale was developed first.

2.1. Research Population and Sample

The population of the research was determined as 1,138,147 people working in the tourism sector in Turkey, as stated in the May 2022 data of TUIK. Data were collected from 310 people through an online questionnaire created face-to-face and via Google form for the lower, middle, and upper-level managers working in the tourism sector, which was determined by the convenience sampling method.

As the details can be seen in Study1, 114 people working in the tourism sector were first reached for the pilot analysis. Afterward, 119 more people were reached, and the exploratory factor analysis of the scale was performed on the data obtained from a total of 233 people, including the data of 114 people used for the pilot analysis. 77 more people were reached and by adding 233 data, confirmatory factor analysis of the scale was carried out on the data obtained from a total of 310 tourism sector employees, and the scale was finalized. Research hypotheses were tested on the data obtained from these 310 tourism workers reached in Study 2. Although a survey link was sent to approximately 1000 tourism employees in total, the data collected at each stage of the research were added on top of each other, and the study was finalized because the number of responses was limited.

3. STUDY 1

3.1. Data Collection Tool

The research design consisted of three stages to ensure rigorous scale development. As it is known, the first stage of scale development studies is the creation of scale expressions to evaluate the structure under investigation. There are different methods such as induction and deduction in forming the first statements (Hinkin, 1998). In this study, the inductive method was used to create the first items to measure crab behavior.

In the first stage, the first item pool consisting of 31 expressions was created using the deductive method, based on the data obtained as a result of the literature review (Abrugar, 2014; Soubhari & Kumar, 2014; Miller, 2019; Aydın & Oğuzhan, 2019). To evaluate the suitability and applicability of the first item pool, an expert evaluation form including the first item questions was sent to 60 people, who are experts in the fields of organizational behavior, human resources, and psychology, via the Google form on April 29, 2021. 30 experts, including 20 academicians, 2 psychologists, and 8 human resources experts, gave their opinions. Three expert opinions were not taken into consideration due to incomplete coding.

In scale development studies, different methods have been developed in the literature to make the results more reliable, since the expert opinions we refer to ensure the content validity of the scale are subjective (Lawshe, 1975; Davis, 1992; Lindell & Brandt, 1999). The Lawshe method, which is the most known and used method among these methods (Ayre & Sclally, 2014), was used in determining the content validity of the scale in the study.

Each scale item consisting of 31 statements created as a result of the literature review was evaluated by field experts according to one of the options "Item measures the targeted structure", "The item is related to the structure, but it should be corrected", "The item does not measure the targeted structure". The content validity rate was specific to each item was calculated with the data obtained after the evaluation. Content Validity Ratio (CVR) according to Lawshe (1975);

CVR=[NG / (N / 2)] -1 is calculated by the formula. NG refers to the number of experts who say that the substance is measuring the targeted structure; N indicates the number of all experts.

After the Content Validity Ratio (CVR) is calculated, it is compared with the criteria and it is decided whether the item will continue to be found in the scale. At this stage, in cases where the Content Validity Ratio (CVR) is 0 and -1, it can be concluded that the item does not measure the intended structure and a decision may be made to exclude it from the scale (Lawshe, 1975, 568).

Since the total number of experts whose opinions were obtained in the study was 28, statements with a content validity ratio of 0.357 and above were accepted (Ayre & Scally, 2014). In addition, the items accepted but requested to be corrected were arranged following expert opinions.

As can be seen in Table 2, it was deemed appropriate to remove the expressions specified in Item.10 (-0,071) and Item.29 (0,071) since the Content Validity Ratio (CVR) is below 0,357. Since Item.17 was a reverse question and Item.19 was a similar question, it was removed within the scope of expert opinions.

The expressions in Item.23 was corrected in line with expert opinions and included in the scale expressions. Thus, 27 of the 31 statements were accepted as scale expressions. Content Validity Index (CVI) was found to be 0.630 by taking the average of the Content Validity Ratio (CVR) of 27 accepted expressions. Eventually, 27 items were used in the subsequent questionnaire survey.

3.2. Instrument Development and Data Collection

The pilot application of the questionnaire consisting of 27 statements prepared as a result of submitting the statements created as a result of the literature review to the expert opinions were carried out on 114 employees between May 12 and May 16, 2021. The candidate participants, which can be reached through the easy sampling method, are above the age of 18, lower level, middle level, and senior-level managers in the tourism sector in Turkey. The data has been collected through an online questionnaire via a Google form. The questionnaire form created over the Google form was sent to the participants via e-mail and WhatsApp application.

The questionnaire was created in two parts. The first part includes items of the Crabs in the Barrel Syndrome Scale, which consists of 27 items. Scale expressions are structured with a five-point Likert scale. The scales rated with a five-point Likert are structured as 1 = Strongly Disagree … 5 = Strongly Agree. Starting from the formula 4/5 = 0,80; 1.00-1.79 Strongly Disagree (fairly low), 1.80-2.59 Disagree (low), 2.60 - 3.39 Neither Agree / Neither Disagree (medium), 3.40-4.19 Agree (high), 4.20-5.00 Strongly Agree (quite high). Participants were asked to choose the expressions appropriate to their opinions from the expressions structured with the five-point Likert scale.

In the second part of the questionnaire, which is the pilot application, in addition to the 27 items obtained as a result of expert opinions, questions were included to collect demographic information such as gender, age, educational status, marital status, and working time.

The normality of the data obtained as a result of the pilot application was first tested. The kurtosis value of the items is 0,504 and the skewness value is 0,601. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), the skewness and kurtosis values between -1.5 and +1.5 are an indication of the normal distribution of the data.

Since the data were distributed normally, the item-total correlations of the items and the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the whole scale were calculated, and the Cronbach's Alpha value was found to be 0,826.

Kim & Mueller, quoted from 1978, Hinkin (1998) stated that any variable with less than .40 correlation can be deleted from the analysis of variables without conducting the correlation analysis between variables before performing factor analysis. The correlations between the statements of the pilot statement and the items were examined and the statements less than .40 were not accepted and they were expressed with 18 statements.

As a result of the reliability analysis of the data obtained as a result of the pilot application and the examination of the correlations between the items, 18 statements were accepted as the CBS scale.

3.3. Reliability and Validity of The Instrument

Exploratory factor analysis was performed on the CBS scale consisting of 18 statements as a result of the pilot application, to explain the correlations between the scale statements by determining or confirming the basic factors explaining these correlations. For this purpose, a questionnaire was applied to 233 (N=233) people working in the lower, middle, and upper levels of the tourism sector.

Demographic characteristics related to the data collected as a result of the questionnaire applied to perform the exploratory factor analysis of the scale are given in Table 1.

Table 1: **Demographic characteristics of the participants (n=233)**

	Frequency	Percentage (%)		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender			**Education**		
Male	118	49,4	High school or lower	28	12,0
Female	115	50,6	Associate degree	33	14,2
Age			Bachelor's degree	130	55,8
< 21	2	,9	Master's degree	39	16,7
22 - 40	139	59,7	PhD	3	1,3
41 – 56	83	35,6	**Marital status**		
57 – 75	9	3,9	Single	100	42,9
> 75	0	0	Married	133	57,1
Working time			**Organization level**		
< 3	36	15,5	Lower level manager	63	27,0
4 – 7	43	18,5	Middle manager	33	14,2
8 – 11	32	13,7	Senior manager	137	58,8
12 – 15	34	14,6			
16 – 19	26	11,2			
> 20	62	26,6			

The normality of the data obtained as a result of the application was first tested. The kurtosis value of the items is 0,380 and the skewness value is 0,664. It is seen that the data are normally distributed.

The data obtained were subjected to exploratory factor analysis with a statistical program to discover the factors underlying the variables showing the CBS (Yang, 2009: 183-184). During the factor analysis, direct oblimin rotation principal components analysis was applied. The maximum likelihood method was used for the factor extraction method. As factor loadings, factors with no significant loading above 0.40 were removed, and items with cross-loading above 0.40 were defined during the exploratory factor analysis. The remaining 12 items were subjected to Exploratory Factor Analysis. As shown in Table 2, the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin sampling adequacy measure is 0.823, Bartlett's test of sphericity is significant (chi-square = 934.245; df = 66 p<.001).

Table 2: **Results of exploratory factor analysis with 12 items (n = 233).**

Faktor / Item	Factor Loading	Eigenvalue	Variance explained (%)
Insensitivity (α = ,643)		4.500	16,686
I don't deal with my co-workers' work-related problems.	1,052		
I don't care if my co-workers fail.	,408		
I don't try to solve problems that are not directly related to me.	,402		
Inability to accept (α = ,758)		1.492	24,586
I want to be the most praised person in the workplace.	1,002		
At work, I like to have all the attention on me at all times.	,681		
I always see my co-workers as my competitors.	,483		
Arrogance / Selfishness (α = ,774)		1.100	8,951

The success of my co-workers makes me aggressive towards them.	,887	
My jealousy towards the success of my co-workers causes me to display negative behaviors towards them.	,626	
I think that the concept of «me» represents more success than the concept of «we» in the workplace.	,512	
If I can't do a job, I would prefer my co-workers not to do it either.	,428	
Not working with others (α = ,640)	950	4,402
In order to achieve my individual goals, I can put the rights of my co-workers on the back burner.	,810	
When my opinion is asked, I prefer to keep my knowledge to myself.	,459	
Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood.		
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.		
a. Rotation converged in 9 iterations.		

Four factors were identified that collectively explained 54.625% of the total variance. Based on the semantic meanings of the component items, the four related factors are Arrogance/Selfishness, Insensitivity, inability to accept, and not working with others labeled (see Table 2).

3.4. Confirmatory factor analyses

After determining the factor structure displayed in Table 2, CFA was applied to the factor structure of the CBS scale, which consists of four factors and 12 statements (n=310).

According to the results of confirmatory factor analysis model fit indices (chi-square = 145.472, df = 48, p < .001; CMIN/DF= 3.031; RMSEA = 0.081; GFI =0.931; NFI = 0.882; IFI = 0.918; TLI = 0.885; CFI = 0.917), the model was found to fit the data relatively well. Modification indices suggested error covariance between the items e1(I don't care if my co-workers fail) and e3 (I don't try to solve problems that are not directly related to me) (MI = 11.472) and items e9 (I think that the concept of "me" represents more success than the concept of "we" in the workplace) and e10 (If I can't do a job, I would prefer my co-workers not to do it either) (MI = 9.006). Confirmatory factor analysis was performed again by combining the error variances of the mentioned items for the values of the goodness of fit in line with the modification indices suggestions. Model fit indices obtained as a result of the analysis (chi-square = 112.248 df =46; p <.001; CMIN/DF= 2.440; RMSEA = 0.068; GFI = 0.945; NFI = 0.909; IFI = 0.944; TLI = 0.919; CFI = 0.943)) values indicate that the four-factor model fits well with the data and is acceptable.

DFA results are shown in Table 3. All items have a load of over 0.500, each being significant at the 0,001 level. The mean variance-extracted (AVE) score for the three factors is slightly lower but very close to 0.500. Considering that the AVE is a conservative indicator and composite reliability is all above 0.700 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981), we conclude that the identified factor structure has sufficient reliability and convergent validity.

Table 3: **Results of confirmatory factor analysis with 12 items (n = 310).**

Faktor / Item	SFL	SMC	CR	AVE
Insensitivity			,733	,479
I don't care if my co-workers fail.	,725	,526		
I don't deal with my co-workers' work-related problems.	,665	,443		
I don't try to solve problems that are not directly related to me.	,684	,468		
Inability to accept			,762	,527
I want to be the most praised person in the workplace.	,855	,730		
At work, I like to have all the attention on me at all times.	,772	,596		
I always see my co-workers as my competitors.	,503	,253		
Arrogance / Selfishness			,795	,495

The success of my co-workers makes me aggressive towards them.	,796	,633		
My jealousy towards the success of my co-workers causes me to display negative behaviors towards them.	,570	,324		
I think that the concept of «me» represents more success than the concept of «we» in the workplace.	,690	,476		
If I can't do a job, I would prefer my co-workers not to do it either.	,739	,546		
Not working with others			**,617**	**,450**
In order to achieve my individual goals, I can put the rights of my colleagues on the back burner.	,752	,566		
When my opinion is asked, I prefer to keep my knowledge to myself.	,579	,336		

Notes: SFL = standardized factor loading; SMC = squared multiple correlation; CR = composite reliability; AVE = average variance explained.

Table 4 shows the correlations of the scale factors. As can be seen in Table 4, the sub-factors of the crab basket syndrome are moderately related. It is expected that these factors are moderately related to each other. CBS arises with the coexistence of these 4 factors. If one of these factors is missing, it will not be possible to fully express the attitude of individuals with CBS.

Table 4: **Inter-construct correlations (n = 310).**

		F1	F2	F3	F4
F1: Insensitivity	Pearson Correlation	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)				
F2: Inability to accept	Pearson Correlation	,301**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000			
F3: Arrogance / Selfishness	Pearson Correlation	,511**	,491**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000		
F4:Not working with others	Pearson Correlation	,456**	,360**	,533**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In summary, based on the quantitative data from the questionnaire, a stable 4-factor CBS scale with 12 measurement items was determined. The first factor of the scale is "**Insensitivity**," which consists of three statements and can be explained as the indifference of employees with crab syndrome to the problems of their colleagues. The second factor is "**Inability to accept**", which consists of three statements and refers to the fact that employees with CBS cannot accept the success of their colleagues, whom they think are more successful than themselves, that they want all the attention to be on them, and that they even attribute the success to themselves (burden). The third factor is "**Arrogance / Selfishness**," which consists of four statements and represents the motto of the crab syndrome, that if I can't do it, you shouldn't either. The fourth factor is "**not working with others**," which we can explain as the Crab syndrome employees are not willing to share information with their peers, and they do not observe the rights of their colleagues to achieve their personal goals. The fourth factor of the scale consists of two statements.

4. STUDY 2

4.1. Analysis of Data

Demographic characteristics of the participants are given in Table 5.

Table 5: **Demographic characteristics of the participants (n=310)**

	Frequency	Percentage (%)		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender			**Education**		
Male	168	54,2	High school or lower	39	12,6
Female	142	45,8	Associate degree	51	16,5
Age			Bachelor's degree	166	53,5
< 21	11	3,5	Master's degree	51	16,5

22 - 40	182	58,7	PhD	3	1,0
41 – 56	105	33,9	**Marital status**		
57 – 75	12	3,9	Single	144	46,5
> 75	0	0	Married	166	53,5
Working time			**Organization level**		
< 3	57	18,4	Lower level manager	110	35,5
4 – 7	57	18,4	Middle manager	48	15,5
8 – 11	42	13,5	Senior manager	152	49,0
12 – 15	40	12,9			
16 – 19	31	10,0			
> 20	83	26,8			

Before the analysis of the research data, the normality tests of the data were made. As can be seen in Table 6, the data are normally distributed.

Table 6: **Normality tests of scales**

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov				
	Statistic	**df**	**Sig.**	**Skewness**	**Kurtosis**
Crab Barrel Syndrome	,080		,000	,683	,341
Insensitivity	,140		,000	,897	,860
Inability to Accept	,104	310	,000	,349	-,413
Arrogance / Selfishness	,170		,000	1,150	1,104
Not working with others	,212		,000	1,313	2,104

The Cronbach Alpha coefficient was used to determine the reliability of the scale used in the research. The Cronbach Alpha reliability level of the Crab Barrel Syndrome Scale was .843, insensitivity from the sub-dimensions, .660; inability to accept .738; arrogance/selfishness .763; Not working with others was found to be .605. The reliability level of the scale is high.

4.2. Findings

As can be seen in Table 7, it is seen that the crab basket syndrome levels of the participants are at a low level with an average of 1.9368.

Table 7: **Descriptive Statistics of Scales**

Scale	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	S.S.	Variance
Crab Barrel Syndrome		1,00	3,92	1,9368	,03340	,346
Insensitivity		1,00	4,33	1,7978	,03925	,478
Inability to Accept	310	1,00	5,00	2,5538	,05229	,848
Arrogance / Selfishness		1,00	4,00	1,6637	,03957	,485
Not working with others		1,00	5,00	1,7661	,04451	,614

To analyze whether the crab basket syndrome levels of the employees differ according to the hierarchical levels (lower, middle, and upper level) of the tourism sector employees -because the hierarchical level has three levels as lower, middle, and upper levels- One-Way ANOVA analysis was made.

Table 8: **One-Way Anova Test Result for the Evaluation of the Difference in CBS Levels by Hierarchical Levels of Tourism Sector Employees (Lower, Middle, Upper Level Managers)**

	Group	N	Mean	S.D.	F	P
Crab Barrel Syndrome	**Lower level manager**	152	1,8520	,62289		
	Middle manager	48	1,9271	,57955	4,013	,019
	Senior manager	110	2,0583	,52274		
Total		310	1,9368	,58813		

As can be seen in Table 8, as the sig value (p<0.05) was statistically significant as a result of the analysis, it was found that the levels of CBS showed a significant difference according to the hierarchical levels (lower, middle, and upper levels) of the tourism sector employees. With this result, the H1 hypothesis was supported statistically.

To determine between which groups the difference was, Scheffe's test, one of the Post-Hoc tests, was used because the group variances were homogeneously distributed. As can be seen in Table 9, according to the Scheffe test results, it is seen that the CBS levels of the lower-level managers differ significantly compared to the CBS levels of the upper-level managers. When the CBS averages are examined, it is seen that the lower-level managers have an average of 2,0583, and the upper-level managers have an average of 1,8520. In this case, it is seen that the lower-level managers working in the tourism sector have the highest level of CBS, and the level of CBS experienced will decrease as the organizational hierarchy rises.

Table 9: **Scheffe Test Results on Differences in CBS Levels in Terms of Hierarchical Levels of Tourism Sector Employees**

Level (I)	Level (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	P
Lower level	Middle Manager	-,07511	,09644	,739
	Senior Manager	-,20636*	,07291	,019
Middle Manager	Lower level	,07511	,09644	,739
	Senior Manager	-,13125	,10076	,429
Senior Manager	Lower level	,20636*	,07291	,019
	Middle Manager	,13125	,10076	,429

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

To analyze whether the levels of Crab Basket Syndrome differ according to gender, institution, and marital status of tourism sector employees, an independent sample t-test was conducted since each factor has two levels.

Table 10: **Differentiation in CBS by Gender, Institution of Employment and Marital Status**

			N	Mean	S.E.	t	P
Crab Barrel Syndrome	Gender	Female	142	1,9789	,57960	1,160	,247
		Male	168	1,9013	,59464		
	Institution	Public	280	1,9232	,59044	-1,302	,201
		Private	30	2,0639	,55952		
	Marital Status	Single	166	1,8298	,55493	-3,481	,001
		Married	144	2,0602	,60290		

As can be seen in Table 10, as the sig value (p>0.05) was not statistically significant as a result of the analysis, it was found that the CBS of the participants did not show a significant difference depending on the gender and the institution they worked for. With this result, H_6 and H_7 hypotheses could not be supported statistically.

The sig value (p=.001 and <0.05) was found to be statistically significant according to the results of the independent sample t-test, which was conducted to determine that the levels of CBS did not show a significant difference according to the marital status of the tourism sector employees. With this result, the H_5 hypothesis was accepted and it can be said that single workers have higher levels of CBS.

One-Way ANOVA Analysis was conducted to analyze whether the CBS levels of the employees differ according to the age of the tourism sector employees.

Table 11: **One-Way Anova Test Result for the Evaluation of the Differences in CBS Levels by Ages of Tourism Sector Employees**

	Grup	N	Mean	S.E.	F	P
Crab Barrel Syndrome	<= 21	11	2,1515	,61894		
	22-40	182	2,0343	,58743		
	41-56	105	1,7849	,56185	6,176	,000
	57-75	12	1,5903	,38837		
Total		310	1,9368	,58813		

As can be seen in Table 11, as the sig value (p<0.05) was statistically significant as a result of the analysis, it was found that the CBS levels of the tourism sector employees showed a significant difference according to their age. With this result, the H2 hypothesis was supported statistically.

To determine between which age groups the difference was, Hochberg's GT2 test was used as one of the Post-Hoc tests, since the group variances were homogeneously distributed and there was too much difference between the sample numbers of the groups. As can be seen in Table 12, according to the results of Hochberg's GT2 test, it is seen that the CBS levels of employees aged 20-40 differ significantly from the levels of CBS of employees aged 41-56. When the CBS averages are examined, it is seen that the employees between the ages of 20-40 have an average of 2.0343, while those between the ages of 41-56 have an average of 1.7849. This shows that the level of CBS will decrease as the age of the employees in the tourism sector increases.

Table 12: **Hochberg's GT2 Test Results on the Differences in CBS Levels in terms of Ages of Tourism Industry Employees**

(I) Age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	P
<=21	22-40	,11717	,17819	,986
	41-56	,36659	,18187	,239
	57-75	,56124	,23955	,113
22-40	<=21	-,11717	,17819	,986
	41-56	,24942*	,07033	,003
	57-75	,44406	,17104	,058
41-56	<=21	-,36659	,18187	,239
	22-40	-,24942*	,07033	,003
	57-75	,19464	,17488	,843
57-75	<=21	-,56124	,23955	,113
	22-40	-,44406	,17104	,058
	41-56	-,19464	,17488	,843

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA Analysis was conducted to analyze whether the CBS levels of the employees differ according to their working time in the tourism sector. As can be seen in Table 13, as the sig value (p<0.05) was statistically significant as a result of the analysis, it was found that the CBS levels of the tourism sector employees showed a significant difference according to the working time in the sector. With this result, hypothesis H3 was supported statistically.

Table 13: **One-Way Anova Test Result for the Evaluation of the Differences in the Levels of CBS According to the Working Times of the Tourism Sector Employees in the Tourism Sector**

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Error	F	P
Crab Barrel Syndrome	1-3	57	2,1140	,53560		
	4-7	57	1,9956	,54655		
	8-11	42	2,1448	,63733		
	12-15	40	1,9771	,71983	6,403	,000
	16-19	31	1,9059	,60543		
	>=20	83	1,6616	,44237		
Total		310	1,9368	,58813		

To determine between which study periods the difference was, the Games Howell test, one of the post-hoc tests, was used because the group variances were not homogeneously distributed. As can be seen in Table 14, according to the Games Howell test results, it is seen that the levels of crab basket syndrome of employees of 20 years or more differ significantly compared to the levels of CBS of employees between 1-3 years, 4-7 years and 8-11 years. When the average of the CBS is examined, it is concluded that the level of CBS will decrease as the working time in the tourism sector increases.

Table 14: **Games Howell Test Results on the Differences in CBS Levels in Terms of Working Hours in the Tourism Sector Employees**

(I) Working Time (Year)	(J) Working Time	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
1-3	4-7	,11842	,10136	,851
	8-11	-,03081	,12126	1,000
	12-15	,13695	,13411	,909
	16-19	,20812	,12983	,600
	>=20	,45239*	,08597	,000
4-7	1-3	-,11842	,10136	,851
	8-11	-,14923	,12211	,825
	12-15	,01853	,13489	1,000
	16-19	,08970	,13063	,983
	>=20	,33397*	,08717	,003
8-11	1-3	,03081	,12126	1,000
	4-7	,14923	,12211	,825
	12-15	,16776	,15042	,874
	16-19	,23893	,14661	,582
	>=20	,48319*	,10968	,001
12-15	1-3	-,13695	,13411	,909
	4-7	-,01853	,13489	1,000
	8-11	-,16776	,15042	,874
	16-19	,07117	,15741	,998
	>=20	,31544	,12374	,128
16-19	1-3	-,20812	,12983	,600
	4-7	-,08970	,13063	,983
	8-11	-,23893	,14661	,582
	12-15	-,07117	,15741	,998
	>=20	,24427	,11909	,332
>=20	1-3	-,45239*	,08597	,000
	4-7	-,33397*	,08717	,003
	8-11	-,48319*	,10968	,001
	12-15	-,31544	,12374	,128
	16-19	-,24427	,11909	,332

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

One-Way ANOVA Analysis was conducted to analyze whether the CBS levels of the employees differ according to the educational status of the tourism sector employees.

As can be seen in Table 15, as the sig value (p>0.05) was not statistically significant as a result of the analysis, it was concluded that the levels of CBS did not show a significant difference according to the education level of the tourism sector employees. With this result, the H4 hypothesis could not be supported statistically.

Table 15: **One-Way Anova Test Result for the Evaluation of the Differences in CBS Levels According to the Educational Status of Tourism Sector Employees**

	Group	N	Mean	S. E.	F	P
Crab Barrel Syndrome	High school or lower	39	1,8077	,52710		
	Associate degree	51	1,9297	,55562		
	Bachelor's degree	166	1,9342	,56496	,937	,443
	Master's degree	51	2,0408	,72617		
	PhD	3	2,1111	,52924		
Total		310	1,9368	,58813		

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In the study, which aimed to determine the CBS and its levels in the tourism sector, a four-dimensional CBS scale with sufficient reliability and validity was developed to determine the CBS levels of the employees. The developed and approved CBS scale will enable the examination of the relationships between various behavioral structures of tourism sector employees such as organizational cynicism, organizational silence, job satisfaction, motivation, organizational citizenship, employee performance, mobbing, and its effect on career development. On the other hand, the developed scale will enable tourism practitioners to detect these undesirable behaviors, as well as to understand the behaviors and causes of crabs that they have not been able to identify until now and to take the necessary precautions. Undoubtedly, the effects of the CBS on the service sector will be different from the industrial production factories. Because the behavior of the employee in the tourism sector, which puts people at the center, is of great importance. In other words, employee behaviors have a direct effect on perceived quality in terms of tourists. Perceived quality also points to vital aspects of the business such as tourist purchasing behavior and sustainable competitive advantage. For this reason, with the implementation and dissemination of the scale, it will be easier to identify tourism personnel with CBS by using this scale in the HR processes of tourism enterprises. Especially in the recruitment process, it will be possible to avoid candidates who will exhibit such behaviors. Thus, while preventing performance deficiencies that may occur in the future, it will enable the emergence of effective, harmonious, and productive teams.

According to the findings obtained as a result of the research we conducted on the lower, middle, and upper-level managers working in the tourism sector, it was found that the crab basket syndrome levels of the tourism sector managers were low. CBS levels were significantly different according to their hierarchical levels, and the lower-level managers' CBS levels were the highest. It was concluded that the levels of CBS did not show a significant difference depending on the demographic variables of the participants, such as gender, educational status, and the institution they worked at, and that single workers had higher levels of CBS compared to the marital status variable. In addition, it was concluded that the CBS levels of young workers and those who have just started the sector are high, and the CBS levels will decrease as the age of the employees and the working time in the sector increase.

In extremely competitive and politicized work environments, equality, diversity, inclusion in the group and/or work, and the inability to have an equal opportunity, especially in the field of career and advancement, are new challenges for employees. CBS is also a metaphorical representative that can express this problem, which explains the negative feelings and behaviors of employees towards each other, that is, their mentality and behavior. When those who are the target of the CBS gain areas of advancement and success, they are faced with those who deter opportunities they seize, and they may be subjected to maltreatment.

CBS is a socially undesirable phenomenon. When those who are the target of this behavior gain areas of progress and success, they face those who deter opportunities they seize, and they may be subjected to ill-treatment. CBS is included in the dark behaviors in organizations such as the perception of injustice, low job satisfaction, lack of organizational commitment, mobbing, careerism, organizational silence, and cynical behaviors, which have recently increased in working life. It can be seen that CBS causes negative effects on employees such as exclusion and bullying. It is possible that the tourism personnel who are under the influence of the syndrome will have difficulties in communicating with the tourist, and that these problems will hurt tourist satisfaction and business output. As a result, since the employee, who is the most important tool in communication with the tourist, cannot establish effective communication with the tourist, the tourism businesses that are in the middle of the syndrome will also have difficulties in reaching quality service that they aim for.

Struggle against the existing/possible CBS in tourism businesses, the biggest task falls to the leaders and managers. Leaders need to be aware that the success achieved will be again for the employees of the organization and that the success in question will protect the organizational interests. It will also be beneficial to support its employees who are trying to develop and make a difference in their work in the organization and to share opportunities, suggestions, and information with them without expecting anything in return for their progress.

It should not be forgotten that employee who perceives that they are treated in the framework of high fairness will show a more desirable attitude towards employers by displaying higher performance than expected (Anderson & Shinew, 2003).

In addition, it should not be neglected that the employees who are given opportunities to show themselves by the managers are rewarded for the continuation of their behavior due to their achievements.

Managers should focus on hope, existence (hope), optimistic perspective, resilience in the face of difficulties, and employees' self-efficacy as positive organizational behavior variables in coping with the CBS. In addition, to prevent the formation of interpersonal competition and hostility, one should avoid taking sides and not allow workplace incivility. Based on the knowledge that the motivation of those with the high social power to target groups with rudeness stems from agitators seeking social power, they should not be easily influenced by individuals with crab syndrome existing in the organization.

The service sector constitutes more than half of the employment both in the world and in Turkey. Increasing the level of job satisfaction of the employees in this sector will enable them to improve their individual and organizational performances by increasing their work commitment, and organizational commitment with organizational justice practices and even motivating them to show organizational citizenship behavior.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE IMPLICATIONS

This study has limitations in terms of sample coverage because the tourism sector could not operate at full capacity due to the Covid-19 outbreak. According to the general opinion, each factor that makes up the scale should be three items, but the last factor of the scale consists of two statements. In future studies, the deficiencies can be eliminated by applying the scale in different sectors and the scale can be retested on different sample groups.

One of the purposes taken into consideration while developing the scale is participant shyness, which is among the problems that are generally encountered. Considering that even the academics get bored after a certain statement, it is thought that an effective and efficient scale has been developed that will enable the participants to respond objectively in a short time and at the same time measure the syndrome with a limited number of statements. In this sense, researchers who will conduct similar studies can easily use the scale in this study as it will provide data collection in a short time.

In addition, individuals with crab syndrome were examined as individuals with negative behaviors. In future studies, if the subject of crab syndrome is treated with concepts such as organizational justice, mobbing, gaslighting, and nepotism, it may be revealed that the behavior of the crab syndrome that will emerge is a state of self-defense. In this sense, individuals with crab syndrome exhibiting this behavior will be able to display a just structure rather than being negative.

Otherwise, in future studies, it can be investigated whether leadership style, organizational culture, organizational climate, work engagement, etc. variables affect the levels of CBS of tourism sector employees.

REFERENCES

Abrugar, V. Q. (2014). Signs that a Peron has a crab mentality, Retrieved June 13, 2019 from https://faq.ph/10-signs-that-a-person-has-a-crab-mentality/

Anderson, D. M., & Shinew, K. J. (2003). Gender equity in the context of organizational justice: a closer look at a reoccurring issue in the field. *Journal Of Leisure Research*, *35*(2), 228-247. https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2003.11949992

Aydin, G. Z., & Oğuzhan, G. (2019). The "crabs in a bucket" mentality in healthcare personnel: a phenomenological study. *Hitit Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 12*(2), 618-630. https://doi.org/10.17218/hititsosbil.628375

Ayre, C., & Scally A. J. (2014). Critical values for Lawshe's content validity ratio: revisiting the original methods of calculation. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, *47*(1), 79–86. https://doi.org/10.1177/0748175613513808

Bulloch, H. C. M. (2017). Ambivalent moralities of cooperation and corruption: local explanations for (under) development on a Philippine island. *The Australian Journal of Anthropology*, *28*(1), 56–71. https://doi.org/10.1111/taja.12173

Cambridge Dictionary (2022). Syndrome, Retrieved September 12, 2022, from https://dictionary.cambridge.org/tr/s%C3%B6zl%C3%BCk/ingilizce/syndrome

Castro-Casal, C., Vila-Vázquez, G., & Pardo-Gayoso, Á. (2019). Sustaining affective commitment and extra-role service among hospitality employees: Interactive effect of empowerment and service training. *Sustainability, 11*(15), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11154092

Davies-Netzley, S. A. (1998). Women above the glass ceiling: perceptions on corporate mobility and strategies for success' .*Gender & Society*, 12(3), 339–355. https://www.jstor.org/stable/190289

Davis, L. L. (1992). Instrument review: Getting the most from a panel of experts. *Applied Nursing Research*, *5*(4), 194-197. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0897-1897(05)80008-4

Derks, B. (2017). Queen bee syndrome. In Rogelberg, S. G. (Ed.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Derks, B., Ellemers, N., Van Laar, C., & De Groot, K. (2011). Do sexist organizational cultures create the Queen Bee?. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 50*(3), 519–535. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466610X525280

Dreher, G. F. (2003). Breaking the glass ceiling: The effects of sex ratios and work–life programs on female leadership at the top. *Human Relations, 56*(5), 541–562. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726703056005002

Edama, R. (2021). What is crab mentality? the 'crabs in a bucket' analogy explained, Retrieved August 26, 2021, from https://www.roliedema.com/crabs-in-a-bucket.html

Foley, S., Kidder, D. L., & Powell, G. N. (2002). The perceived glass ceiling and justice perceptions: an investigation of Hispanic law associates. *Journal of Management,* 28,(4), 471–496. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630202800401

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research,* 18(1), 39 – 50. https://doi.org/10.2307/3151312

Goodman, J. S., Fields, D. L., & Blum, T. C. (2003). Cracks in the glass ceiling. *Group & Organization Management,* 28(4), 475-501. https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601103251232

Grobelna, A. (2021). Emotional exhaustion and its consequences for hotel service quality: the critical role of workload and supervisor support. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management,* 30(4), 395-418. https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2021.1841704

Gündüz, Ş. (2017). İş Yerinde Yaşanan Sendromlar. İstanbul: Beta Basım.

Gündüz, Ş. (2017). Kariyer basamaklarında kadının düşmanı olarak kendisi: süper anne sendromu, görünmez kadın sendromu ve külkedisi sendromu. *Karadeniz Uluslararası Bilimsel Dergi, 35,* 84-94. https://doi.org/10.17498/kdeniz.318192

Guo, G., Cheng, B., Tian, J., Ma, J., & Gong, C. (2022). Effects of negative workplace gossip on unethical work behavior in the hospitality industry: the roles of moral disengagement and self-construal. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management,* 31(3), 290-310. https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2021.1961111

Hellriegel, D., & Slocum, J. W. (2011). Organizational Behavior. 13th ed. South-Western College Pub.

Hinkin, T. R. (1998). A Brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods,* l(1), 104-121. https://doi.org/10.1177/109442819800100106

Keuthen, M. (2006). *Dikkat: Diğer Kadınlar-Kadınlarla Birlikte Çalışmanın Sırları,* TranslatorGül Kızılca Yürür, İstanbul: Optimist Yayınları.

Kim, J. & Mueller, C. W. (1978). Introduction to Factor Analysis: What it is and how to do it. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Kuo, C.-C. , Chang, K., Quinton, S., Lu, C. Y., & Lee, I. (2015). Gossip in the workplace and the implications for HR management: a study of gossip and its relationship to employee cynicism. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 26*(18), 2288-2307. https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2014.985329

Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personnel Psychology, 28*(4), 563-575. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1975.tb01393.x

Lindell, M. K., & Brandt, C. J. (1999). Assessing interrater agreement on the job relevance of a test: A comparison of the CVI, T, rwg(j), and r*wg(j) indexes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*(4), 640–647. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.84.4.640

Linstead, S., Maréchal, G., & Griffin, R. W. (2014). Theorizing and researching the dark side of organization, *Organization Studies*, 35(2), 165-188. https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840613515402

Mackenzie, S., & Kerr, J. (2013). Can't we all just get along? Emotions and the team guiding experience in adventure tourism, *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management,* 2(2), 85-93. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2013.03.003

Miller, C. D. (2019). Exploring the crabs in the barrel syndrome in organizations. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 26(3), 352-371. https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051819849009

Murray-Gibbons, R., & Gibbons, C. (2007). Occupational stress in the chef profession. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management,* 19(1), 32-42. https://doi.org/10.1108/09596110710724143

Özkan, O. S., Üzüm, B., & Gülbahar, Y. (2022). Reflection of crab syndrome on innovative behaviors: mediator role of perceived organizational support and an application in information Technologies enterprises, *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi,* 23(2), 329-343. https://doi.org/10.31671/doujournal.1033247

Rasheed, M. I., Okumus, F., Weng, Q., Hameed, Z., & Nawaz, M. S. (2020). Career adaptability and employee turnover intentions: The role of perceived career opportunities and orientation to happiness in the hospitality industry. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 44*, 98-107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.05.006

Riggio, R. E. (2018). Introduction to industrial/organizational psychology. Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.

Royeca, J. E. (2010). Crab mentality is Universal. Retrieved July 28, 2023 from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/371140264_Crab_Mentality_Is_Universal

Sampath, N. (1997). 'Crabs in a bucket': Reforming male identities in Trinidad. *Gender & Development,* (5)2, 47-54. https://doi.org/10.1080/741922352

Schuler, R. S., & Jackson, S. E. (1996). *Human Resource Management* (6th ed.), New York: West Publishing Company.

Sobczak, A. (2018). The queen bee syndrome. The paradox of women discrimination on the labour market. *Journal of Gender and Power,* 9(1), 51-61. https://doi.org/10.14746/jgp.2018.9.005

Soubhari, T., & Kumar, Y. (2014). The crab- bucket effect and its impact on job stress- an exploratory study with reference to autonomous colleges. *International Journal on Recent and Innovation Trends in Computing and Communication*, 2(10), 3022-3027.

Staines, G., Tavris, C., & Jayaratne, T. (1974). The queen bee syndrome. *Psychology Today,* 7(8), 63-66. https://doi.org/10.1037/e400562009-003

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics*, Boston: Pearson.

Tokdemir Reis, H. (2009). Yengeç zihniyeti, Felsefe Taşı Düşünce Platformu. Retrieved August 26, 2021 from http://www.felsefetasi.org/yengec-zihniyeti/

TÜİK (2022). Ücretli Çalışan İstatistikleri Mayıs 2022. Retrieved June 01, 2022 from https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=Ucretli-Calisan-Istatistikleri-Mayis-2022-45822

Üzüm, B., Özkan, O. S., & Köse, S. (2021, 5-6 November). Yaşam doyumu yengeç sendromunun frenine basabilir mi?. In Avci, U., İzci, Ç., Demirci, U., & Türken, S. (Eds), *8. Örgütsel Davranış Kongresi Bildiri Kitabı*, Muğla.

Vibes, J. G. (2013). ""Crab Mentality" in Human Beings". Retrieved June 13, 2019 from www.intellihub.com/crab-mentality-in-human-beings

Yang, B. (2009). Faktor analysis methods. In R. A. Swanson, & E. F. Holton III (Eds), *Research in organizations foundations and methods of inquiry* (pp. 181-199). San Francisco, California: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Yavas, U., Karatepe, O. M., & Babakus, E. (2013). Correlates of nonwork and work satisfaction among hotel employees: implications for managers. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management,* 22(4). 375-406. https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2012.667596

Yeşilada, T., & Yeniçeri, İ. (2020). Bankalarda çalışan personel arasında yaşanan rekabet algısı, İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi, 21(1), 161-175. https://doi.org/10.24889/ifede.459246