

## The Evaluation of the Mobbing Behaviors Faced by Teachers in Secondary Schools

Nursel Yardibi<sup>1</sup>, Tugba Kucuktamer<sup>2</sup> and Zehra Ozcinar<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Near East University, Ataturk Faculty of Education, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Nicosia-North Cyprus, Mersin 10-Turkey

<sup>3</sup>Ataturk Teacher Training Academy, Nicosia, North Cyprus

E-mail: <sup>1</sup><dryardibi@gmail.com>, <sup>2</sup><tkcktmr@gmail.com>, <sup>3</sup><zehra.ozcinar@aoa.edu.tr>

**KEYWORDS** Bullying. Mobbing. Mobbing in Schools. Victims of Mobbing. Teachers

**ABSTRACT** This research aims to find out what are the mobbing behaviors that teachers of secondary schools are exposed to (MBTSS) and how they range according to different variables. In the research, quantitative methods have been used to evaluate the survey of 479 teachers working at secondary schools in Ankara in November 2013. In order to analyze the data gathered by the researchers through surveys, arithmetic average, standard deviation, independent t-test and variance analyses have been used, while a scale developed by researchers was made use of as well. According to the findings of the research, it is concluded that the most mobbing behaviors that secondary school teachers are exposed to occur in relation to the personalities. But, there are secondary factors that make the topic significant for academic inquiry.

### INTRODUCTION

Organizations need individuals competent in cooperation through communication so as to provide social needs and have effective performance in accordance with their aims. No matter how much this competence foresees the behaviors beyond the aspects of individuality, the human nature with complex needs usually plays an important role in the quality of this communication. Being intimidated by this relationship may sometimes cause sensually injurious results. In this paper, the focal point of the definitions made to explain the situation using the words "mobbing" and "bullying" is that intimidation is practiced by at least one person and it has such reflections on the addressee as psychological violence, verbal or sensual abuse, attack, disturbance (Davenport et al. 2008; Hussein 2011). In accordance with this notion, which was examined on the animals in 1960s and then in the following years on the students' relations between each other, some serious evidences have been presented for the organization to restructure the regulation totally or in parts (Leymann 1996).

The notion of "mobbing" or illicitly "intimidating action" is defined as the oppression towards the workers, as psychological and sensible attacks and for preventing situations (Ibicioglu et al. 2009: 25). This situation is observed clearly in a variety of workplaces ranging from

universities to high schools, elementary schools, from health institutions to military services has been defined as bullying. According to Duffy and Sperry (2012: 3), mobbing is much more complex than killing a person and unfortunately it is legitimate in most of the countries.

The notion "mobbing" rising in 1960s, was first used by Konrad Lorenz, the Australian scientist. Lorenz defined the animals' abusing the other animals or apart from society as mobbing (Davenport et al. 2008: 3). 12 years after that definition, in 1972, the Swedish scientist Paul Heinemann defined the bullying, violence, and peer pressure among the school children as mobbing in his book *Mobbing: Group Violence Among Children* and gave a message that some agonizing events and perhaps suicides might happen unless precautionary measures were taken especially for the children who were exposed to mobbing (Tinaz 2006: 23; Alimoradi and Fatehi 2013). With the most basic definition today, mobbing is stated as the psychological pressure, abuse or terror attempted against the individuals working in organizations. Likewise, Swedish scientist Dr. Heinz Leymann defined mobbing as the psychological pressure in business life. When talking about the problem, Leymann mostly uses the words "mobbing" or "psychological terror". According to Leymann, mobbing or psychological terror is the behavior that occurs generally in business and is performed by a few people to one person and emerges as a

result of an unfriendly communication, and this leads the addressee to despair, helplessness and an indefensible situation. On the part of the addressee's feeling of the pressure, the behavior is repeated at least once a week and for six months. This expresses enough time and recurrence for the addressee to be affected psychologically (Leymann 1996:168; Dereceli et al. 2013). According to Browne and Smith (2008:132), this systematic and long-termed attempt may cause psychological and physiological impacts on an individual. Mobbing is also explained as creating the occasion of tension, establishing a pretext for the person to be fired from work (Alparslan and Tunc 2010: 146). According to Cemaloglu (2007: 22), three elements become prominent among the definitions of mobbing, that is, the effects that the individuals are exposed to as the result of mobbing, the damages of these effects and the proceeding of the behavior systematically.

According to Tetik (2010: 81), in the organizations where mobbing occurs, the organizational loyalty diminishes as a natural result and the number of individuals quitting the job increases. Mobbing has been spreading as a grief increasingly everyday like a global epidemic regardless of countries, limits, gender or status. In fact, the mobbing incidents have been increasing even at schools where children who are the guarantees of the future are educated, and especially the teachers as the workers of educations, to make an analogy to workplaces, declare their problems in regard to this phenomenon. In spite of the researches on the mobbing happening in the education sector rising day by day, the necessity for deeper research on that topic is clearly seen in order to identify the source of the phenomenon. From this point of view, this search has been conducted to determine the different dimensions, to contribute to the field and to make some recommendations.

### Objectives

The aim of this research is to evaluate the mobbing behaviors that teachers of secondary schools are exposed to. With this aim in mind, the following objectives are considered:

1. The types of mobbing behaviors that the teachers in secondary schools are exposed to.
2. The MBTSSs in relation to gender.

3. The MBTSSs in relation to the hierarchy of seniority.
4. The MBTSSs in relation to the hierarchy of academic level.

## METHODOLOGY

### Research Model

This research examining the MBTSSs in Turkey is a model of surveying and it aims to describe the existing fact, and the quantitative ways have been used in the research. The reason for using the quantitative methods in this research is to measure objective facts with a focus on the variables. Based on these explanations, the dimensions, frequency and intensity of the MBTSSs are exposed have been tried to be defined. The teachers of the secondary schools in Ankara represent the universe of the research. The research date is February 2014.

### Population and Sample

The sample was determined through simple random sampling with reference to the schools' geographic space, socioeconomic level and differences. From this point of view, the sample of research consists of 491 teachers working in different districts of Ankara, 479 of which (97.6%) participated in the research in November 2013.

### Data Collection

In this research, data has been gathered by means of the questionnaire to be evaluated quantitatively. The survey questions have been answered with a 5-point Likert scale involving "never, seldom, sometimes, often and always". The scheme prepared aftermath the fieldwork has been presented to the opinions of 11 experts. Thus, it has been tried to provide the range of validity of survey in the direction of both, the opinions and the suggestions of experts. The questionnaire has been examined through preliminary interviews with 7 teachers in the district of Cankaya in order to identify any problem with understanding the questions. These interviews have returned no problem in understanding, commenting or replying to the questions.

A pilot study has been conducted to check the validity and reliability of the survey in which both exploratory and confirmatory factor analy-

ses were applied. Before administering the factor analysis, congruence of data to factor analysis has been determined by means of KMO and Bartlett's Sphericity tests, because it is suggested that KMO rate should be at least 0.6 and Bartlett's Sphericity test should be meaningful in order for the factor analysis to be done on the data (Buyukozturk 2012). The rate of KMO test is 0.92 and the rate of Bartlett's Sphericity test is 9619.5 ( $p < .000$ ). Consequently, it has been seen that the factor loads of the items of analysis have been gathered in three factors. Having re-administered the factor analysis, a survey consisting of 40 items and three factor structure has been reached. The items in the first factor can be defined as "mission related mobbing", whereas the items in the second factor can be defined as "personality related mobbing", and the items in the third factor can be defined as "mobbing in social settings". The total variance of these three factors that have explained in accordance with the survey is 0.61554. Besides, it has been seen that the shared variance of three factors that are defined in accordance with the items is between 0.424 and 0.756. Also, the parameter of internal consistency has been calculated for the reliability check of survey. According to this, the reliability parameter (Cronbach Alpha) related to the coherence of survey has been presented as 0.86.

In the light of these results, the necessary legal permissions have been taken for the survey to be applied and the data has been gathered in the second term of the 2011-2012 academic year. In order to detect what MBTSSs are, who are doing them and when they do, arithmetic average, standard deviation, t-test, variance analysis and Scheffe test have been used. The score intervals 1-1.79 (never), 1.80-2.59 (seldom), 2.60-3.39 (sometimes), 3.40-4.19 (often) and 4.20-5.00 (always) have been used in order for the gathered data to be commented upon as well as convenient to five-level rating scale used in the survey. From that research, the data obtained through the survey has firstly been described systematically and clearly, then these descriptive explanations have been commented by tak-

ing account of the survey questions, and finally there has been effort to reach some results.

## RESULTS

In this part, the results of data analysis related to the problems studied are presented. In this context, the findings related to MBTSSs have been examined and explained one by one. The results for the first problem, "What are the MBTSSs?" are shown in Table 1.

In Table 1, it is observed that "personality related mobbing" has the highest proportion of the MBTSSs. Therefore, it can be said that the mobbing behaviors are directed at the individuality.

The MBTSSs are presented in Table 2. According to this, in the dimension of the mission related mobbing aiming at the teachers, some items are often met such as "Seeking deficiencies in my work" (3.78), "enacting the legal process easily when compared to other teachers," (3.71), "having heavy criticisms to my work" (3.60), and "preventing from contributing to the decisions about my duty" (3.42). On the other hand, thirty percent of items are sometimes met and twenty-five percent of them are seldom met among the other mission related mobbing behaviors.

When the findings for the personality related MBTSSs in Table 3 are examined, it appears to be very challenging to see that the forty percent of items are often met and fifty percent of items are always met. The items that have higher proportion are as follows, "Encountering verbal abuse of colleagues towards my personality" with 3.79, "Mocking my actions in order to make a fool of myself" with 3.53, "Being exposed to rude phrases" with 3.52 and "Making pressure because of my political opinion" with 3.44. These items are also the ones, which are over the dimension mentioned in general.

Table 4 presents the MBTSSs related to the teachers' situation and interaction in the group. Accordingly, it is seen that the items, "Being exposed to humiliating behaviors in presence of my colleagues" and "Scolding me loudly among

**Table 1: The dimensions of the MBTSSs**

<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>N</i>	$\bar{X}$	<i>Sd</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
Mission related mobbing	477	2.66	.45	Sometimes
Personality related mobbing	474	3.13	.35	Sometimes
Social settings - related mobbing	480	2.60	.26	Sometimes

**Table 2: The mission related MBTSSs**

<i>Mission related mobbing behaviors</i>	$\bar{X}$	<i>Sd</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
Seeking for deficiencies in my works	3.78	.94	Often
Preventing my leadership in my works	2.58	1.23	Seldom
Giving duties apart from my work	1.76	1.03	Never
Preventing my active work at school	3.14	1.14	Sometimes
Giving responsibilities out of my work	1.41	.81	Never
Enacting the legal process more easily, when compared to other teachers,	3.71	1.05	Often
Having heavy criticisms to my work	3.60	1.12	Often
Preventing meeting school management	2.22	1.19	Seldom
Giving me duties the others don't want	3.28	1.04	Sometimes
Preventing me from joining the career development activities	1.88	1.09	Seldom
Changing my duties without any reason	2.43	1.07	Seldom
Inspecting my works more frequently when compared to other teachers	2.87	1.23	Sometimes
Changing my duties without informing me	3.25	1.02	Sometimes
Giving more duties at a time	1.68	.97	Never
Not rewarding despite my efforts	3.17	1.15	Sometimes
Demanding to finish my duties in a very short time	1.67	1.01	Never
Giving duties I won't be able to overcome	3.37	1.05	Sometimes
Preventing from contributing to the decisions about my duty	3.42	1.02	Often
Forcing me to do duties that would make a mockery of myself	2.19	1.20	Seldom
Learning about my performance from the other teachers	1.73	1.03	Never

**Table 3: The personality related MBTSSs**

<i>The personality related mobbing behaviors</i>	<i>N</i>	$\bar{X}$	<i>Sd</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
Interrupting me while I'm speaking	479	2.84	.89	Sometimes
Teasing me	479	2.74	.99	Sometimes
Making humiliating jokes	479	3.15	.94	Sometimes
Encountering verbal abuse of colleagues towards my personality	479	3.79	.81	Often
Making pressure because of my political opinion	479	3.44	.83	Often
Exerting pressure on my religious belief	479	2.76	.98	Sometimes
Mocking my actions in order to make a fool of myself	479	3.53	.78	Often
Being exposed to rude phrases	479	3.52	.83	Often
Being exposed to behaviors that will affect my self-confidence negatively	479	3.04	1.01	Sometimes
Threatening related to physical violence	479	2.53	1.04	Seldom

**Table 4: MBTSSs in the context of social settings**

<i>MBTSSs in the context of social settings</i>	<i>N</i>	$\bar{X}$	<i>Sd</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
Being exposed to humiliating behaviors in presence of my colleagues	479	3.66	.61	Often
Scolding me loudly among my colleagues	479	3.74	.57	Often
Making sexual jokes in public	479	1.39	.69	Never
Being reviled to the others in my environment	479	3.39	.75	Sometimes
Being given a nickname	479	1.61	.94	Never
Ending the speech when I enter in	479	3.26	.80	Sometimes
Preventing me from expressing myself comfortably	479	2.06	1.09	Seldom
Preventing people from speaking with me in social settings	479	3.15	.85	Sometimes
Preventing me from interacting with my colleagues	479	2.06	1.04	Seldom
Being omitted from the activities apart from school	479	1.73	.99	Never

my friends" have often met with the highest average.

With regards to "Do the mobbing behaviors the teachers in secondary schools are exposed to vary in regard to gender?" as the second problem of the research, in Table 5 there are the results of t-test for the mobbing behaviors teach-

ers face according to the gender. Within this scope, there has been given place to the personal information of teachers related to their gender, and then a comparison of meaning levels between their gender and the MBTSSs. In the Table 5, more than half of the participants of the research are men (59%), while women com-

**Table 5: The MBTSSs according to their gender**

<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>Variable</i>	<i>N</i>	$\bar{X}$	<i>Sd</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p*</i>
<i>Mission Related Mobbing</i>	Female	198	2.62	.47	1.339	.163
	Male	281	2.68	.44		
<i>Personality Related Mobbing</i>	Female	198	3.07	.32	3.220*	.001
	Male	281	3.18	.37		
<i>Mobbing in the Context of Social Settings</i>	Female	198	2.60	.25	.312	.755
	Male	281	2.61	.27		

prise a mere forty-one percent of the survey. Besides, the average rates show that there has been no specific difference between the genders ( $t=3.220$ ,  $p<.001$ ). The arithmetic average of personality related mobbing behaviors the male teachers are exposed to is 3.18, and it is higher when compared to the female ones (3.07).

The results for the third question, "Do the MBTSSs differ in accordance with the seniority?" are presented in Table 6. The specified spaces connected to the seniority have been created with the key criterion in practice, that is, six years for the expert teachers (1-6), group 1, and additional seven years for the head teacher (7-13), group 2. The third group refers to the ones over 14 years. The grouping allows the comparison between the seniority and mobbing behaviors. Table 6 shows that thirty-six percent of the participating teachers lie between 1-6 years, thirty-five percent of them 7-13 years, and twenty-nine percent 14 years and over, which the groups have close rates. According to the same table, it is possible to conclude that teachers who are exposed to the mission related mobbing behaviors are the ones who have an average of work experience between 1-6 years. On the contrary, the average of the ones who have an experience over 7 years is lower. According to the variance

analysis to check the meaningfulness between teachers' seniority and the mission related mobbing behaviors they are exposed to, there could not be found a meaningful difference between these two variances [ $F(2-477)=1.20$ ,  $p>.05$ ].

It is clearly understood that personality related mobbing behaviors in the second dimension are mostly experienced by the teachers who have 1 to 6 years of experience. On the other hand, the average of teachers having career experiences of 14 years and over is lower. The variance analysis shows there is no meaningful difference between teachers' experience and the personality related mobbing behaviors they are exposed to [ $F(2-477)=.04$ ,  $p>.05$ ].

When mobbing behaviors in social settings are considered from the point of seniority, it can be seen that the highest average is of the teachers whose experience is between 1-6 years like the findings mentioned above. The average of the teachers whose experience is between 7 years and over is lower. Seniority and the mobbing behaviors in social settings yield a meaningful difference in the variance analysis [ $F(2-477)=7.80$ ,  $p<.05$ ]. According to the results of t-test made for determining between which groups that difference occurs, in the survey conducted, a difference has been seen between the average

**Table 6: The MBTSSs according to seniority**

<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>Year experience</i>	<i>N</i>	$\bar{X}$	<i>Sd</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>p*</i>	<i>Difference among groups (Scheffe)</i>
<i>Mission Related Mobbing</i>	1-6 years	171	2.70	.47	1.20	.302	None
	7-13 years	168	2.64	.45			
	14-over years	140	2.62	.43			
<i>Personality Related Mobbing</i>	1-6 years	171	3.14	.30	.04	.965	None
	7-13 years	168	3.11	.36			
	14-over years	140	3.09	.39			
<i>Social Settings - Related Mobbing</i>	1-6 years	171	2.67	.25	7.80	.000	1-2
	7-13 years	168	2.56	.26			
	14-over years	140	2.57	.26			



of the ones whose experience is between 1-6 years (2.67) and both the ones whose experience is between 7-13 years (2.56) and 14 years and over (2.57). That difference is higher on the part of the ones whose experience is between 1-6 years. It can therefore be said that the occupational carrier influences the social settings and related mobbing behaviors.

In the scope of the question, "Do the MBTSSs differ in accordance with the academic level?", which is the fourth problem of the research, Table 7 shows how the MBTSSs relate to the academic background. In the groupings according to academic background, 1 is used for the teachers who have graduated from tertiary education, 2 for the teachers with a master's degree and 3 for the doctorate graduates. Within this scope, it has firstly given place to the divisions of teachers' academic background and then their seniority has been compared with the MBTSSs. Table 7 shows that most of the teachers participating to the survey have a bachelor's degree (81%), sixteen percent have a master's degree, and three percent are doctorate graduates. In reference to the report for internal check by the Ministry of Education (2010), it is seen that the grouping and rates are consistent with the data of the Ministry of Education, which mentions bachelor's degree holder teachers as eighty-five percent. Table 7 shows that the teachers who mostly are exposed to the mission related mobbing behaviors are bachelor's degree holders, while this rate is low for the doctorate graduated teachers. The variance analysis of teachers' academic background and the mission MBTSSs gives a significant difference between these two variances [F(2-477)=37.36, p<.05]. According to the Scheffe test results made for determining among which groups this difference is present

in the survey, the difference occurs between the rates of the university graduate teachers (2.73) and both the rates of the postgraduate ones (2.40) and doctorate graduates (2.57). This difference is high for the advantage of the ones who graduated universities. Within this scope, it can be said that being a bachelor or a higher degree holder has an influence on the MBTSSs in social settings.

It is understood that the teachers who are mostly exposed to the personality related mobbing behaviors are also the ones who graduated from tertiary education. On the contrary, the rate for the doctorate graduate ones is lower. According to the variance analysis of teachers' academic background and the personality related MBTSSs, a significant difference has been found between these two variances [F(2-477)=16.49, p<.05]. The Scheffe test to identify the difference between the groups returns that there is a difference between the rates of the university graduate teachers (3.17) and the other two, as the postgraduate ones (2.99) and doctorate graduates (2.80). This difference is high for the part of the bachelor degree holders, which denotes that academic background has an influence on the personality related MBTSSs.

Examining the MBTSSs in social settings from the point of seniority, the highest rate belongs to the bachelor holder teachers same as the findings above, while the rates of the postgraduate teachers are the lowest ones. A meaningful difference does not appear between teachers' academic background and the mobbing behaviors in social settings, according to the variance analysis [F(2-477)=4.98, p>.05]. Therefore, it can be said that the teachers' academic background has influence on the social settings and related mobbing behaviors.

**Table7: The MBTSSs according to their academic background**

<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>Academic background</i>	<i>N</i>	$\bar{X}$	<i>Sd</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>p*</i>	<i>Difference among groups (Scheffe)</i>
<i>Mission Related Mobbing</i>	Bachelor's Degree	387	2.73	.41	37.36	.000	1-2 1-3
	Master's Degree	77	2.40	.46			
	DoctorateDegree	15	2.02	.34			
<i>Personality Related Mobbing</i>	BachelorDegree	387	3.17	.34	16.49	.000	1-2 1-3
	Master Degree	77	2.99	.29			
	DoctorateDegree	15	2.80	.36			
<i>Social Settings Mobbing</i>	BachelorDegree	387	2.62	.26	4.98	.007	None
	Master Degree	77	2.53	.23			
	DoctorateDegree	15	2.50	.21			

### DISCUSSION

The first problem of research about "what are the MBTSSs?" refers to the dimensions of mobbing behaviors. The survey results reveal that mobbing behaviors mostly aim at the personality of individual, followed by the mission and social settings of related mobbing behaviors. A research on the same topic has shown that the MBTSSs are towards their life qualities (Koc and Urasoglu 2009), but fails to define the concept of life quality, due to which the results are not comparable as far as the proximity of personality and the concept of life quality is concerned. A more recent paper by Erturk (2015) discusses the correlation of organizational citizenship and organizational mobbing behavior, which are found to be inversely proportional. The researcher suggests that mobbing behaviors faced by teachers are significantly important at the level of their organizational citizenship (Erturk 2015: 120). In the light of this research, it can therefore be inferred that the MBTSSs are serious threats to establish organizational citizenship among the teachers, and by extension, to increase quality of their performance.

The researchers' findings about the MBTSSs in the context of social settings are in consistency with the previous research. "Being exposed to humiliating behaviors in presence of my colleagues" and "scolding me loudly among my friends" have the highest average among the MBTSS in social settings. These findings are supported by Husrevsahi (2015). In her research on the correlation between organizational mobbing and silence behavior among teachers, the researchers finds that yelling at or scolding someone in social settings is the most frequent type of mobbing on the part of teachers, which drags the victims to silence based on acquiescence (Husrevsahi 2015: 1185). The researcher argues that this is mostly aimed at preventing the victim to communicate with others in a social setting (Husrevsahi 2015). However, this research has inquired the prevention acts separately and found that "preventing me from interacting with my colleagues" has a much lower rate than "scolding me loudly among my friends". The paper of Husrevsahi (2015), on the other hand, seems not to have a particular inquiry on the prevention issue, but is taken for granted as a natural result of scolding the victim. The logical relation between scolding and silence, and hence

interrupting the victim's communication, is acknowledged. But this research reveals the teachers' perception of scolding as not having the power of preventing self-expression of victims. While many teachers have exposure to scolding, not all of them see it as prevention of their communication with other colleagues.

In regard to the third question of this research, the seniority has been found to be a significant variable in perception of MBTSSs. It is however important to note that the findings contradict the research conducted in Uruguay. Buunk et al.'s (2016) paper of secondary schools and hospitals suggests that mobbing is more significant among the older employees regardless of the gender. Gender indifference is consistent with the current paper, even though it is acknowledged that Cemaloglu (2014) finds that that the male teachers are exposed to mobbing behaviors much more than female teachers following his surveys with 347 teachers and managers in 16 primary schools.

Buunk et al. (2016) presume that this can be related to the fact that the older employees are not taken seriously by their younger colleagues. It can further be argued that the phenomenon can be a result of educational dynamics, in the sense that the younger employees have more up to date knowledge and skills. If so, then it can be argued in the case of the current research that experiential background, or more precisely, seniority is superior to educational dynamics in Turkey. But there is a meaningful conclusion resulting from the data that educational level is a strong variable in receiving mobbing behaviors in the secondary schools studied. As discussed above, the bachelor's degree holders are subject to more mobbing behaviors than master's degree and doctorate graduates. It may be seen as hierarchy dependence rather than up to date knowledge and skills.

In regard to the relationship between mobbing and academic level of victims, it is likely that the degrees of mobbing varying according to the academic level are not limited to the secondary schools, as the scope of this research paper, or to the levels of higher education, that is, the bachelor's degree, master's degree, and doctoral degree. But it can be argued in terms of cultural behaviors widespread throughout Turkey. In their research in a company of 242 employees, Deniz and Ertosun (2010) found that the correlation between the degree of mobbing

and the academic background of victims was present. Their findings include that the employees with primary school education are more subject to mobbing than high school and university graduates and the degree of mobbing decreases as the academic level of victims increases. The relativity underlines the workplace specific character of mobbing in the sense that teachers with a bachelor's degree at schools are the counterparts of the employees with the primary education at other workplaces than schools, an argument that implies hierarchy dependence in organizational culture in Turkey, regardless of the academic level as an independent variable.

Mobbing behaviors towards teachers in schools have been studied from a large variety of perspectives. In the context of Turkey, the paper has mainly focused on secondary schools, and a few publications appear in the literature studying mobbing at universities and primary schools. The peculiarity of secondary schools has not been discussed in the study of mobbing behaviors. But Erturk's (2013) research implies some differences between the primary schools and the secondary schools. His findings on the primary school teachers reveal that making rumors and gossip about the victim, ignoring, or excluding her/him, disregarding the victim's opinions and ideas are the most common types of mobbing, which are remarkably different from the findings of this research and others that have appeared in the literature (Erturk 2013: 171). The difference can be seen as a topic of further inquiry that would contribute to the theory by defining a preliminary typology of workplaces in the context of mobbing. The study of mobbing is a need-based field of inquiry and such a typology would help elaborate better remedies to eventually eliminate the problem.

### CONCLUSION

The current study reveals that mobbing in secondary schools is mainly aimed at the personality of the victim. Besides personality related mobbing, mission related mobbing, but the practice of mobbing is more complicated than this statement. This research has been carried out on the variables of gender, academic level and seniority of victims, in addition to defining types of mobbing and mobbing in social settings have also been explored. It should be noted that the potential pressure administered with

the two are to worsen the damage the personality suffers, as the victim would perceive threat with mission related mobbing. The types of mission related mobbing can be limited to the current paper, but their existence would imply a systematic mobbing in regard to mission, no matter how the types change over time or from one victim to another.

Likewise, as may be expected due to the nature of incidence, mobbing in public and in presence of other colleagues are high in secondary schools. According to the research findings, teachers suffer from some serious mobbing behaviors such as humiliation and scolding loudly in public. With the second problem, whether the mobbing behaviors differ in accordance with gender has also been focused. It is also worth to reemphasize that there are no significant differences in reference to gender among the mobbing behaviors, which makes the problem more difficult to define and to cope with.

The seniority as another variable in mobbing strategies has significance with its implications towards organizational culture in Turkey. Using the categories established by the Ministry of Education, it has been observed that personality related mobbing behaviors are mostly experienced by the teachers who have a work history of 1 to 6 years. That is, no matter how good the teachers are at their professional performance, they are not regarded same as the senior teachers. The findings underline aspects of the organizational culture in Turkey that dependence on seniority is superior to the work performance, which should bring about questioning the quality issues.

Academic background of teachers as the last variable in mobbing strategies shows another aspect of hierarchical thinking in the school environment as elsewhere a workplace in Turkey. While the bachelor's degree holders face the highest degree of mobbing, it decreases with the ones holding master's degree and doctorates. When the last two variables are thought of in a combination, the problem becomes more complicated and a deeply rooted preoccupation in secondary schools.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

It can be conferred from the research findings that mobbing is a reality in secondary schools. The level, type, its relation to gender,



age and seniority does not change the reality. As educational workers, teachers suffer from this disorder. To overcome this problem, some serious precautions should be taken. Here are some of suggestions by the researchers:

1. There should be a legal system to monitor the mobbing behaviors in order to determine the phenomenon of crime.
2. Every school must be able to have its own Mobbing Prevention Office to which anyone can apply for help.
3. Schools must be under regular surveillance for mobbing.
4. Periodical training sessions should be considered for all the staff members of secondary schools.

### REFERENCES

- Alimoradi A, Fatehi M 2013. Comparison of the Metacognition Beliefs and Thought Control Strategies in Patients with Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder (OCD) and Non-patient Individuals. *Global Journal of Psychology Research*, 1(1). From <<http://www.world-education-center.org/index.php/gjpr/article/view/1684>> (Retrieved on 26 March 2013).
- Alparslan MA, Tunc H 2010. Mobbing Olgusu ve Mobbing Davranisinda Duygusal Zeka Etkisi. From <<http://sdu.edu.tr/edergi>> (Retrieved on 26 March 2013).
- Browne MN, Smith MA 2008. Mobbing in the workplace: The latest illustration of pervasive individualism. *American Law, Employee Rights and Employment. Policy Journal*, 12: 131-161.
- Buunk AP, Franco S, Dijkstra A, Zurriaga R 2016. Mobbing in schools and hospitals in Uruguay: Prevalence and relation to loss of status. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1-12.
- Buyukozturk S 2012. *Sosyal Bilimler Icin Veri Analizi El Kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Cemaloglu N 2007. Orgutlerin kacinilmaz sorunu: Yildirma. *Bilig*, 42: 111-126.
- Cemaloglu N, Recepoglu E, Sahin F, Dasci E 2014. Examining relationships between school administrators' humor behaviors and teachers' mobbing experiences according to teacher perceptions. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 6(3): 570-580.
- Davenport N, Schwartz RD, Elliott GP 2008. *Mobbing- Isyerinde Duygusal Taciz* (Trans. by OC Oneroy). Istanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık.
- Deniz N, Ertosun OG 2010. The relationship between personality and being exposed to workplace bullying or mobbing. *Journal of Global Strategic Management*, 4(1): 129-142.
- Dereceli C, Dorak R, Tekin A 2013. The Effect of Tai-Chi on Internal-External Locus of Control Levels in Primary School Students with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. *Global Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 1(1). From <<http://www.world-education-center.org/index.php/gjgc/article/view/1694>> (Retrieved on 5 July 2013).
- Duffy M, Sperry L 2012. *Mobbing: Causes, Consequences and Solutions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Erturk A 2013. Mobbing behaviour: Victims and the affected. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 13(1): 169-173.
- Erturk A 2015. Organizational citizenship and mobbing behavior of secondary school teachers. *Anthropologist*, 22(1): 113-124.
- Husrevsahi SP 2015. Relationship between organizational mobbing and silence behavior among teachers. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 15(5): 1179-1188.
- Hussein G 2011. The Attitudes of Undergraduate Students Towards Motivation and Technology in a Foreign Language Classroom. *International Journal of Learning and Teaching*, 2(2). From <<http://www.world-education-center.org/index.php/ijlt/article/view/354>> (Retrieved on 17 January 2013).
- Ibicioğlu H, Ciftci C, Derya S 2009. Orgutlerde yildirma (Mobbing): Kamu sektorunde bir inceleme. *Organizasyon Ve Yonetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(1): 14 pages.
- Koc M, Urasoglu BH 2009. Mobbing in the secondary education teachers: Investigation from the gender, age and high school. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 1(1): 64-80.
- Leymann H 1996. The content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 2(5): 165-184.
- Ministry of Education (Milli Egitim Bakanligi) 2010. *Ic Denetim Faaliyet Raporu 2009*. Ankara.
- Tetik S 2010. Mobbing kavrami: Birey ve orgutler acisinden onemi. *KMU Sosyal ve Ekonomik Arastirmalar Dergisi*, 18(12): 81-89.
- Tinaz P 2006. *Isyerinde Psikolojik Taciz (Mobbing)*. Istanbul: Beta Basim Yayim.