Mobbing At Elementary Schools In Turkey [1]

Asiye Toker Gökçe

Assist. Prof. Dr. Kocaeli University, Faculty of Education,
Department of Educational Sciences, asi.gokce@kocaeli.edu.tr

Abstract: This paper introduces the concept of mobbing in education system in Turkey. The aims of the study were; to define negative acts causing mobbing at schools; to assess relationships between mobbing and school type, gender, age, job experience, and teachers' branch; and to investigate reasons for mobbing at schools. A theoretical framework based on the literature was proposed. Afterwards, an exploratory survey was formed to gather essential data for the study. T-test and ANOVA were utilized for analyzing the data. The findings reveal that teachers are subject to mobbing at schools. There are high correlations between mobbing and school type and professional experience at schools. Yet there are slight relationships between mobbing, gender, and age. Both school administrators and colleagues mob teachers. The study contributes significant information and data for further research about mobbing at schools in the national and international level.

Keywords: Mobbing, Elementary schools, Education, teacher, Turkey

1. Introduction

In recent years, there has been an increasing interest amongst researchers on the subject of psychological pressures surpassing stress on the workers in business life. The authors Leymann (1996), Niedl (1996), Zapt (1999), and Einarsen (1999), investigated the expression of these psychological pressures, which can result in physical or psychological violence and victimization. They entitle the psychological violence and victimization process as 'mobbing'. Leymann (1993) identified mobbing as harassing someone by hostile and unethical communication and psychologically terrorizing at work (Schuster, 1996). Over the years, mobbing extended as a term across Europe and beyond. Then mobbing was recognized as a real, measurable kind of harm and a destroyer of health at workplace by specialists in occupational health, managers, union leaders, and the public at large, all across Europe (Davenport, Schwartz and Elliott, 2003).

Mobbing at work occurs when someone acts towards the other in a negative and hostile manner that pushes the receiver into a helpless and defenseless position. It may take the form of open verbal or physical attacks as the form of more subtle acts such as social isolation of the victim in workplace. Mobbing does not involve any physical violation. Instead, it can cause sub-lethal results for victims mentally. Generally, it is carried out politely, and without violence at workplace. Even without blood, the mobbing process is essentially unfriendly, hostile acts toward the target; brutal undermining of the target's self-confidence; solidarity in-group against the target, and the exceeding delight of collective attack, engendering the target to become a victim. Besides, it can be performed by e-mails at workplace (Leymann, 1996; Westhues, 2002; Namie, 2003; Baruch, 2005).

People can be mobbed by colleagues, supervisors or sometimes by subordinates at workplace. While can be stated between the inferiors and superiors mostly, mobbing can be took place amongst the colleagues and staff at the same level at workplace too. Organizational culture, the victim's or the perpetrators' characteristics can trigger mobbing at organizations. Mobbing process contains an imbalanced power relationship between perpetrators and the victim. During the mobbing process, the mobbing victims are driven into a disadvantaged position so that they cannot defend themselves and cope with perpetrators in that situation at workplace. Consequently, it can be stated that mobbing is possibly the "fatal" threat for the most workers who are subjected it (Leymann, 1996; Field, 1996; Einarsen and Skogstad, 1996; Zapf, Knorz and Kulla, 1996; Vartia, 1996; Rayner, 1997; Einarsen, 2000; Zapf and Einarsen, 2001; Westhues, 2002).

---

[1] The manuscript was generated by the author's PhD thesis

There has been increasing recognition that mobbing occurs across the world for all occupations. However, it exhibits changeable attributions according to the cultural features (Cassitto, 2003). Studies has been trying to identify mobbing at workplace especially in Scandinavian countries by Leymann (1996), Einarsen, and Skogstad (1996), and Zapf (1999) found out different aspects of mobbing as a phenomenon. Besides, Leymann (1996), Einarsen and Skogstad (1996), Zapf at al (1999, 2001), and Elinoff, Chafouleas, and Sassu (2004) attempted to figure out mobbing examining its relationship with different aspects such as gender, age, working position, and organizational culture. Consequently, the studies have suggested methods in order to investigate mobbing in different cultures by defining it as a concept. Hubert and Veldhoven (2001) tried to find out sectors that were prone to mobbing. They found out that people who work in education, in industry and in service sectors were more prone to mobbing at work. Meantime, Dick and Wagner (2001) described aggressive behaviors, which school principals have in schools. Afterwards, Waggoner (2003) inquired resources for mobbing among educators. Besides, Hoel, Faragher, and Cooper (2004) described negative acts, which teachers were subjected to at schools. These studies suggested that teachers were mobbed through negative acts such as ignorance, criticizing unfairly, rumors, personal abuse, and being isolated by both school administrators and their colleagues at schools (Dick and Wagner, 2001; Waggoner, 2003; Hoel, Faragher, and Cooper, 2004; O'Conner, 2004).

Despite recognition of mobbing across the world, there has been relatively little research regarding mobbing in Turkey. Ertürk (2005) studied negative acts that can trigger mobbing at primary schools. Then, Aktop (2006) examined opinions and experiences of lecturers who work at Anadolu University concerning mobbing. Aktop (2006) found meaningful relationships between age and mobbing, between titles of lecturers and mobbing at Anadolu University. Finally, Tuncel and Gökçe, (2007) investigated that soccer players were mobbed by their managers and coaches through verbal aggressions in Turkey. Because of inadequate studies, describing mobbing at schools in detail was needed. Thus, firstly, the negative acts causing mobbing at schools were identified in this study. Afterwards, relationship between mobbing and several variables related to schools such as school type, gender, age, and work experience were examined to describe mobbing as a phenomenon at schools in Turkish culture. The results of the study are anticipated to introduce the concept of mobbing as a phenomenon at schools in Turkey. Outcomes of the study are expected to contribute to researchers for further studies in respect to negative acts triggering mobbing and reasons of mobbing at schools. The aim of the present study was to identify mobbing at schools with regard to educators' accounts. Thus, the following research questions were examined:

1. Which negative acts that can trigger mobbing are frequent among teachers, and what are the frequencies of these acts?
2. Is there any difference between mobbing and school type (public or private), between mobbing and gender, between mobbing and age, between mobbing and job experience, and between mobbing and teachers' branch?
3. What are the reasons for mobbing according to victims', and observers' perceptions?

2. Method

2.1 Sample

The study sample consists of 1189 teachers in public and private elementary schools in Turkey. The sample was chosen through multi-phase sampling method. Since the country is composed of seven geographical regions (Mediterranean Region, Black Sea Region, Aegean Region, Marmara Region, Central Anatolian Region, East Anatolian Region, and South East Anatolian Region), population was divided into seven groups. Firstly, all provinces were subdivided into three categories according to their economic conditions such as developed region, developing region, and underdeveloped region in each region. Then, a single province was chosen from each developed and developing regions. Since the numbers of the private schools in underdeveloped groups were less than the other groups, two provinces were chosen from the underdeveloped regions. Therefore, four provinces per each region were selected as sample of the study. Secondly, 1189 questionnaires were sent to the selected public and private schools in the regions. While all questionnaires were gathered, 492 questionnaires were not suitable for any analysis. Therefore 697 teachers As Table 1 shows, the sample was comprised of 61% women, and 39% men. Majority of the educators (87%) were younger than 40, while a small number of them (13%) were older than 40 years old. In addition, more than half of the teachers (63%) had less than 11 years of experience. Finally, half of the educators (50%) were classroom teachers, while the others had different branches.

Table 1: Background Characteristics of the Educators

Variables		N	%
Gender	Woman	424	61
	Man	273	39
	Total	697	100
Age	(1) 21-25 years	127	21
	(2) 26-30 years	170	28
	(3) 31-35 years	125	21
	(4) 36-40 years	102	17
	(5) 41-45 years	35	6
	(6) 46-50 years	33	5
	(7) 51 plus	11	2
	Total	603	100
Job experience	(1) 1-5 years	248	37
	(2) 6-10 years	178	26
	(3) 11-15 years	89	13
	(4) 16-20 years	71	10
	(5) 21-25 years	48	7
	(6) 26 plus	46	7
	Total	680	100
Branch	Class teacher	291	50
	Branch teacher	291	50
	Total	582	100

2.2. Instrument

The author developed the questionnaire in Turkish. The questionnaire consisted of two subscales; the negative acts subscale, and the reasons of mobbing subscale. The author reviewed the literature, and interviewed with nine teachers who had been mobbed, to develop items for the questionnaire. The questionnaire was reviewed according to fluency by experts during the piloting. Finally the mobbing questionnaire with 5-point Likert Scale was developed. The items loaded <.30 were discarded through the factor analyses. The respondents were also asked for personal information (gender, age, job experience, and branch) at the beginning of the questionnaire.

The first form, "negative acts scale" included 59 items (Cronbach's alpha =0.99). This form is prepared using five-point Likert Scale (answering scale: never, seldom, sometimes, often, and always). The second form, "reasons of mobbing scale" included 26 items with five-point Likert Scale (answering scale: never, little, average, great, and highly). The four factors named (1) personal qualifications of victim, (2) personal reasons, (3) communication related, and (4) psychological reasons were utilized in the second scale. The Cronbach's alphas for the each factor were .97 for 1st, .82 for 2nd, .65 for 3rd, and .81 for 4th. Perpetrators were also questioned by an open ended question in the questionnaire.

2.3. Data Collection and Analyses

The data were collected by means of the questionnaire, which was carried by the contribution of the Education Research and Development Association (EARGED) that is under the body of Ministry of National Education in Turkey. The EARGED supported the study by reprinting and carrying out the questionnaires. The data were analyzed using SPSS 13 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). Means and standard deviations were used to analyze the items involved in the questionnaire. T-test was utilized to analyze the mean differences of gender, school type, and branch factors. Besides, variance analysis (ANOVA) was used to analyze the mean differences of age, and professional experience. In addition, mean differences of mobbing reasons in terms of school type were examined by t-test.

3. Findings

The results of the data analysis revealed that, most of the teachers seemed to be exposed to mobbing through aggressive acts during their professional life (See Table 2).

Table 2. Negative Acts Causing Mobbing in Accordance With the School Type

	Negative Acts	Public		Private		t	p
		$\bar{x}$	SS	$\bar{x}$	SS		
1	Prevent you from taking effective responsibility in school events	2.02	1.18	1.74	1.01	2.74	.006
2	There is no permission for joining personal/professional improvement activities	1.81	1.11	1.56	0.99	2.40	.017
3	Interrupt you constantly	2.47	1.20	2.15	1.14	3.21	.001
4	Shout or curse loudly you near others	2.16	1.15	1.88	1.02	2.79	.005
5	Criticize your professional performance unfairly	2.37	1.15	2.13	1.16	2.42	.016
6	Minimize your professional achievements	2.29	1.23	2.03	1.21	2.38	.018
7	Bother with phone unnecessarily	1.43	0.84	1.42	0.83	0.18	.857
8	Threat verbally	1.78	1.02	1.55	0.93	2.45	.015
9	Send written threats	1.60	0.80	1.33	0.72	0.39	.694
10	Refuse to communicate by means of slighting glances	1.93	1.17	1.82	1.10	1.07	.284
11	Not inform about others contact requests to you	1.49	0.95	1.42	0.85	0.88	.379
12	Refuse to talk with you	1.99	1.20	1.76	1.10	2.07	.039
13	Prevent me from meeting the school principle	1.31	0.79	1.37	0.75	-0.77	.444
14	Refuse to sit near you in teachers room	1.42	0.91	1.34	0.78	0.96	.337
15	Restrict from communicating with colleagues	1.45	0.95	1.35	0.74	1.12	.264
16	Insinuate when you enter the occasion	1.86	1.13	1.75	1.07	1.07	.284
17	Exclude you from meetings or social activities	1.57	1.06	1.38	0.80	1.96	.050
18	Ignore you in any situations	1.83	1.19	1.73	1.10	0.85	.393
19	Force you to carry out tasks affecting your self-reliance negatively	1.48	0.93	1.52	0.95	-0.43	.666
20	Accept your efforts as flattery	1.80	1.09	1.82	1.14	-0.14	.886
21	Question your work-related decisions	1.93	1.11	1.93	1.07	0.03	.973
22	Check all stages of your works without trusting you	1.79	1.11	1.64	1.05	1.39	.166
23	Slandering	1.61	1.00	1.52	1.00	0.99	.323
24	Spread rumors	1.81	1.09	1.68	1.11	1.32	.189
25	Imply as you are unreliable	1.53	0.95	1.57	1.09	-0.44	.657
26	Run down behind you	2.07	1.19	1.78	1.16	2.68	.008
27	Regard you as having responsible for the others' mistakes	1.67	1.00	1.72	1.00	-0.58	.562
28	Implicate about your mate's profession	1.46	0.95	1.42	0.91	0.35	.729
29	Mention you by humiliating names	1.40	0.90	1.32	0.88	0.96	.339

30	Tease your private life	1.51	1.00	1.35	0.86	1.84	.066
31	Tease your ethnicity	1.37	0.84	1.31	0.79	0.72	.471
32	Make insulting jokes	1.45	0.87	1.38	0.88	0.87	.383
33	Take the starch out of	1.85	1.80	1.52	0.91	3.49	.001
34	Imply as you are stupid	1.70	1.80	1.43	0.87	2.79	.006
35	Indicate as you are the authority about displeasing rules to the students and parents	1.60	0.98	1.49	0.92	1.16	.247
36	Imply as you are with psychological handicap	1.73	1.14	1.52	0.94	2.10	.036
37	Make you feel as needed psychological treatment	1.43	0.89	1.32	0.75	1.36	.176
38	Charge you with being double minded	1.64	0.96	1.53	0.93	1.16	.248
39	Tease your handicap	1.37	0.86	1.27	0.75	1.29	.199
40	Tease your walking style, or voice	1.59	1.04	1.49	0.95	1.09	.276
41	Tease your religious attitudes	1.56	0.99	1.32	0.82	2.68	.008
42	Imply with your political side	1.73	1.11	1.45	0.90	2.94	.003
43	Imply with sexual	1.32	0.83	1.23	0.67	1.18	.241
44	Proposing sex	1.14	0.57	1.13	0.48	0.29	.775
45	Making sexual jokes	1.23	0.72	1.23	0.65	0.04	.968
46	Treating sexual themes	1.17	0.61	1.16	0.54	0.10	.921
47	Discriminate in rules against you	1.60	1.05	1.34	0.80	2.81	.005
48	Warn you with null reasons	1.92	1.10	1.65	1.02	2.80	.005
49	Force you to carry out tasks that no one want to do	1.77	1.09	1.67	1.11	1.04	.300
50	Give respite for hard works	1.42	0.88	1.49	0.92	-0.77	.441
51	Charge you with failure possibility tasks	1.37	0.83	1.36	0.79	0.07	.943
52	Withdraw tasks of you without informing you	1.54	1.00	1.47	0.85	0.86	.391
53	Burden you with hard tasks	1.65	1.06	1.66	1.06	-0.13	.898
54	Threaten with violence	1.26	0.72	1.27	0.74	-0.18	.857
55	Damage your goods	1.23	0.65	1.18	0.57	0.79	.430
56	Made physical environment inconvenient	1.55	1.06	1.32	0.75	2.45	.015
57	Commit violence slightly to discourage	1.23	0.69	1.15	0.53	1.35	.177
58	Collide intentionally implying it was accidentally	1.26	0.44	1.15	0.51	1.71	.087
59	Damage physically	1.18	0.60	1.21	0.70	-0.46	.647

$p<.05$

As Table 2 demonstrates, educators seemed to be subjected to various negative acts (59 items) several times in their professional lives. Briefly, they were mostly mobbed by being interrupted, being judged unfairly, and being underestimated at schools. The results showed that the teachers who worked in public schools were seemed to be mobbed more than the others were. The results shows that, most experienced negative acts by the public school teachers can be listed as; being prevented from taking effective responsibility at school events; being given no permission for joining personal and professional improvement activities; being interrupted constantly; being shouted at or cursing loudly in a crowd; being criticized about his/her performance unfairly; being minimized him/her professional achievements; being threatened verbally; being excluded from meetings or social activities; being mocked; being imitated his/her gait or gestures; being suspected with psychological handicap; being teased his/her religious attitudes; being

intimated with his/her political side; being discriminated in rules; and being warned unreasonably at p<.05 level (See Table 2).

The teachers who work at public schools were generally kept from 'taking effective responsibility at school events', and 'joining personal and professional improvement activities' more than the teachers working for private schools. Similarly, public school teachers were interrupted constantly, were criticized about their performance unfairly, and were minimized by their professional achievements more frequently than the private school teachers were. Besides, these teachers were subjected to negative acts such as "being rebuked among others", "being threaten verbally", "being excluded from meetings", "being imitated", "being suspected to be psychologically disturbed", "being made fun of his/her religious attitudes", "being intimated with his/her political side", "being discriminated in rules", "being warned irrationally", and "being put in an inconvenient position or environment " more frequently than private school teachers were (See Table 2).

The second question of the study was the whether any difference between mobbing and school type (public or private), between mobbing and gender, between mobbing and age, between mobbing and job experience, and between mobbing and teachers' branch. The results showed that there is slight difference between gender and mobbing at schools. The results revealed that female educators were mobbed mostly through "being shouted or cursed loudly in a crowd", "being rejected verbally", "being excluded", "being questioned in relation with her work", and "being taken responsible for the others' mistakes", more than the male educators. Finally, women were seem to be mobbed by using their social and professional life oriented behaviors, while men were mobbed by using their personal relations and were subject to violence (See Table 3).

Table 3. Difference Between Mobbing and Gender

Negative Acts		Gender	N	$\overline{X}$	sd	t	p
4	Shout or curse loudly you near others	F	269	2.37	1.14	3,80	.000
		M	163	1.95	1.08		
10	Refuse to communicate by means of slighting glances	F	230	2.2	1.3	3,49	.001
		M	147	1.76	0.97		
12	Refuse to talk with you	F	238	2.25	1.28	4,04	.000
		M	150	1.75	1.05		
18	Ignore you in any situations	F	228	2.17	1.29	4,10	.000
		M	141	1.64	1.03		
27	Regard you as having responsible for the others' mistakes	F	213	1.93	1.08	2,67	.008
		M	141	1.63	0.97		
28	Implicate about your mate's profession	F	191	1.65	1.08	2,10	.037
		M	134	1.41	0.93		
35	Indicate as you are the authority about displeasing rules to the students and parents	F	215	1.75	1.05	2,39	.017
		M	145	1.50	0.91		
36	Imply as you are with psychological handicap	F	230	1.88	1.19	2,29	.023
		M	150	1.61	1.00		
47	Discriminate in rules against you	F	213	1.70	1.10	2,23	.027
		M	142	1.45	0.91		
48	Warn you with null reasons	F	256	2.09	1.17	2,67	.008
		M	161	1.79	1.01		
49	Force you to carry out tasks that no one want to do	F	221	1.96	1.22	2,14	.033
		M	151	1.70	1.01		
52	Withdraw tasks of you without informing you	F	216	1.7	1.07	2,00	.046
		M	142	1.49	0.9		
53	Burden you with hard tasks	F	218	1.87	1.18	2,36	.019
		M	145	1.59	0.98		

p<.05

Besides, the results indicate that there is a slight relationship between age and mobbing at schools. When the age groups were examined, it was seen that, educators who were between 26-45 years old were mobbed by "being prevented from taking effective responsibility in school events" more than the teachers included in 20-25 age group and 46 and elder ones. Besides, when compared to 20-25 and 41-50 age groups, 31-35 and 46-50 age group teachers were seemed to be threatened verbally more. On the other hand, 26-40 year old educators and 51-55year old ones were questioned about their work. In addition, 26-30 years old educators were checked at all stages of their work without being trusted more than 46-50 age group. Finally, 31-35 years old educators were threatened physically more than 20-30 years old colleagues, and also they were damaged physically more than 41-45 and 51-55 age groups (See Table 4).

Table 4. Difference Between Mobbing and Age

Item	Negative Acts	Age	$\overline{X}$	SS	Sd	F	p
1	Prevent you from taking effective responsibility in school events	20-25	1.85	1.03	6.362	2.228	0.040
		26-30	2.00	1.22			
		31-35	2.36	1.21			
		36-40	2.05	1.24			
		41-45	2.52	1.27			
		46-50	1.75	0.97			
		51-55	1.60	0.55			
2	Question your work-related decisions	20-25	1.92	1.08	6.339	2.153	0.047
		26-30	2.22	1.16			
		31-35	2.27	1.12			
		36-40	2.07	1.16			
		41-45	1.69	0.70			
		46-50	1.50	0.83			
		51-55	2.25	0.96			
22	Check all stages of your works without trusting you	20-25	1.62	1.03	6.306	2.498	0.022
		26-30	2.08	1.25			
		31-35	1.91	1.19			
		36-40	1.84	1.11			
		41-45	1.47	0.62			
		46-50	1.26	0.65			
		51-55	1.50	0.58			
54	Threaten with violence	20-25	1.17	0.64	6.287	3.102	0.006
		26-30	1.17	0.68			
		31-35	1.68	1.10			
		36-40	1.32	0.78			
		41-45	1.33	0.72			
		46-50	1.29	0.56			
		51-55	1.20	0.45			
57	Damage physically	20-25	1.21	0.70	6.28	2.358	0.031
		26-30	1.08	0.32			
		31-35	1.47	1.00			
		36-40	1.18	0.72			
		41-45	1.00	0.00			
		46-50	1.21	0.54			
		51-55	1.00	0.00			
8	Threaten verbally	20-25	2.55	1.15	6.393	1.739	0.111
		26-30	2.58	1.29			
		31-35	2.65	1.15			
		36-40	2.21	1.18			
		41-45	2.50	1.10			
		46-50	2.04	1.22			
		51-55	3.33	0.58			

p<.05

Furthermore, according to the results, there was significant relationship between mobbing and the teachers' professional experience. The teachers who had 6-10 years experience were mobbed by 'being taken the starch out of' more than the teachers 26 years, and plus years experienced ones. Similarly, 6-10 years experienced educators were threatened verbally, were rumored. Besides, their works were checked without trust more than the others were. The teachers who had 16-20 years experience were insinuated when they entered the occasion, were threatened physically, received written threats, were implied by their mate's profession, were implied as if they were psychologically handicapped, were discriminated in rules, and were warned with null reasons more than the others were. In addition, 21-25 years experienced teachers were ignored, were forced to carry out tasks affecting self-reliance negatively, were withdrawn of tasks without being informed, were prevented from taking effective responsibility in school events, were given no permission for joining personal and professional improvement activities, were restricted from communicating with colleagues, were excluded from meetings or social activities. In addition, their efforts were accepted flattery, they were run down and accused of being double minded, and were given hard tasks, which cannot be easily performed more than the others were (See Table 5).

Table 5. Difference Between Mobbing and professional experience

Item	Negative Acts	Year	$\overline{X}$	SS	Sd	F	p
1	Being prevented from taking effective responsibility in school events	1-5	1.89	1.09	5.399	2.731	0.019
		6-10	2.29	1.24			
		11-15	2.25	1.35			
		16-20	2.02	1.13			
		21-25	2.46	0.99			
		26 plus	1.79	1.07			
2	Being given no permission for joining personal and professional improvement activities	1-5	1.77	1.12	5.335	3.024	0.011
		6-10	2.10	1.21			
		11-15	1.77	1.11			
		16-20	2.03	1.19			
		21-25	2.35	1.18			
		26 plus	1.36	0.83			
15	Being restricted from communicating with colleagues	1-5	1.42	0.80	5.303	3.644	0.003
		6-10	1.67	1.17			
		11-15	1.81	1.21			
		16-20	1.40	0.91			
		21-25	1.95	1.03			
		26 plus	1.00	0.00			
17	Being excluded you from meetings or social activities	1-5	1.50	1.00	5.309	2.618	0.025
		6-10	1.77	1.22			
		11-15	1.84	1.15			
		16-20	1.54	1.07			
		21-25	2.05	1.03			
		26 plus	1.13	0.34			
38	Being run down and accused of being double minded	1-5	1.75	1.06	5.346	2.253	0.049
		6-10	1.78	0.99			
		11-15	1.71	1.02			
		16-20	1.33	0.83			
		21-25	1.96	1.00			
		26 plus	1.34	0.77			
51	Being given hard tasks, which cannot be easily performed more than the others were	1-5	1.25	0.64	5.315	2.631	0.024
		6-10	1.55	0.87			
		11-15	1.58	1.00			
		16-20	1.60	1.14			
		21-25	1.76	1.22			

		26 plus	1.30	0.65			
33	Being taken the starch out of	1-5	1.84	1.04	5.368	2.638	0.023
		6-10	2.09	1.10			
		11-15	1.83	1.16			
		16-20	1.83	1.14			
		21-25	2.00	1.19			
		26 plus	1.30	0.79			
8	Being threaten verbally	1-5	1.67	0.99	5.358	2.868	0.015
		6-10	2.06	1.08			
		11-15	2.07	1.23			
		16-20	1.85	1.17			
		21-25	1.76	0.94			
		26 plus	1.41	0.73			
9	Receive written threats	1-5	1.23	0.57	5.302	2.681	0.022
		6-10	1.55	0.97			
		11-15	1.64	1.02			
		16-20	1.50	0.94			
		21-25	1.47	0.87			
		26 plus	1.19	0.69			
22	Works were checked without trust more than the others were	1-5	1.76	1.12	5.34	3.137	0.009
		6-10	2.19	1.18			
		11-15	2.15	1.33			
		16-20	1.63	1.10			
		21-25	1.95	1.18			
		26 plus	1.46	0.84			
16	Being insinuated when you entered the occasion	1-5	1.92	1.17	5.357	4.351	0.001
		6-10	2.05	1.20			
		11-15	2.47	1.31			
		16-20	1.62	0.96			
		21-25	2.35	1.04			
		26 plus	1.41	0.75			
54	Being threaten with violence	1-5	1.15	0.56	5.317	4.144	0.001
		6-10	1.41	0.90			
		11-15	1.73	1.11			
		16-20	1.29	0.79			
		21-25	1.55	1.10			
		26 plus	1.17	0.46			
28	Being implied by mate's profession	1-5	1.49	1.05	5.307	2.577	0.027
		6-10	1.58	0.97			
		11-15	1.98	1.24			
		16-20	1.31	0.72			
		21-25	1.75	1.06			
		26 plus	1.26	0.71			
36	Being implied as if you were psychologically handicapped	1-5	1.64	1.06	5.361	3.754	0.003
		6-10	1.95	1.18			
		11-15	2.13	1.31			
		16-20	1.53	1.06			
		21-25	2.17	1.17			
		26 plus	1.35	0.75			
47	Being discriminated in rules, and were warned with null reasons more than the others were	1-5	1.52	0.94	5.337	2.573	0.027
		6-10	1.67	1.01			
		11-15	2.00	1.30			
		16-20	1.70	1.32			

		21-25	1.62	1.12			
		26 plus	1.15	0.36			
18	Being ignored	1-5	1.96	1.21	5.35	3.400	0.005
		6-10	1.98	1.21			
		11-15	2.28	1.42			
		16-20	1.85	1.20			
		21-25	2.63	1.21			
		26 plus	1.35	0.75			
19	Being forced to carry out tasks affecting self-reliance negatively	1-5	1.50	0.94	5.325	3.912	0.002
		6-10	1.71	1.16			
		11-15	1.72	1.11			
		16-20	1.46	0.80			
		21-25	2.32	1.25			
		26 plus	1.24	0.52			
52	Being withdrawn of tasks without being informed	1-5	1.42	0.83	5.34	3.458	0.005
		6-10	1.70	1.06			
		11-15	1.91	1.29			
		16-20	1.58	0.95			
		21-25	2.15	1.19			
		26 plus	1.50	0.86			
20	Your efforts were accepted flattery	1-5	2.04	1.20	5.356	2.919	0.013
		6-10	2.04	1.16			
		11-15	2.24	1.30			
		16-20	1.67	0.94			
		21-25	2.32	1.25			
		26 plus	1.41	0.82			

The results showed a slight relationship between branch and mobbing. It has effect only on two acts; "being intimated because of his/her political views" [$t_{(308)}$ =2.02, p<.05], and "being threaten physically" [$t_{(271)}$ =2.62, p<.05]. Classroom teachers were seemed to be exposed to these acts more than the others were (See Table 6).

Table 6. Difference Between Mobbing and Branch

Item	Negative Acts	Branch	$\overline{X}$	SS	Sd	t	p
42	Being intimated because of your political view	Class	1.87	1.15	308	2.02	.045
		Branch	1.61	1.05			
54	Being threaten physically	Class	1.45	0.95	271	2.62	.009
		Branch	1.19	0.60			

Finally, the perpetrators' role for mobbing was studied by using an open-ended question. The data revealed that, the school administrators mobbed the teachers mostly both at the public and private schools. The colleagues were seemed to be inferior to the school administrators as perpetrators at schools.

The last aim of the study was finding out the reasons of mobbing according to victims and observers at schools. The results showed that both teacher groups believe that features of victims trigger mobbing at schools mostly. T-test analysis results are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. T-Test Results of Reasons of Mobbing in Accordance to the Teachers

Reasons of Mobbing			Public		Private			
			$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	t	p
1	TEACHERS	Based on victim	21.25	12.10	21.50	11.15	-.251	.152
2		Personal reasons	9.73	4.96	9.78	4.48	-.113	.084
3		Communication related	7.35	3.47	7.57	3.17	-.754	.198
4		Psychological reasons	13.52	5.95	13.27	5.85	.492	.776

As Table 7 demonstrates, most of the educators believed that psychological resources were inferior reason for mobbing at schools. The psychological reasons include high competition, many unsolved problems, lack of job satisfaction, and high stress at schools.

4. Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The most important finding of the study is the introduction of mobbing in education as a phenomenon in Turkey. This paper presents that teachers are mobbed by school managers and by their colleagues at schools. While school type and professional experience have significant effect on mobbing, there is slight relationship between mobbing and gender, between mobbing and age, and between mobbing and branch at schools. Since EARGED of the MONE supported the study by conducting the questionnaires formally, participants might have felt restrained while they were answering questions. This prospect is the main limitation of the study. It is assumed that private school educators hesitated with filling out the questionnaires because of their anxiety of being unemployed; because while public school teachers have tenure, private school teachers do not have tenure in Turkey.

The findings reveal that, female educators are mobbed through their professional and personal features mostly at schools. Besides, perpetrators mostly attack the victim's professional qualifications, and show verbal aggression at schools. Thus, teachers are mobbed through negative acts, which are related to their professional performance. These findings correspond with the literature that Dick and Wagner (2001), Hoel and at al. (2004), and O'Conner (2004) introduced that mobbing at school involves ignoring in any situations, criticizing professional performance unfairly, rumoring, excluding him/her from activities, and personal abuse. Besides, results of the studies undertaken by Einarsen, (1999); Leymann, (1996); Niedl, (1996); Vartia, (1996); and Zapf, Knorz and Kulla, (1996) support these outcomes introducing four styles of mobbing as "organizational measures", "social isolation", "attacking victim's private life", and "physical violence". In addition, "verbal aggression" and "rumors" are claimed the main negative acts by Vartia and Björkqvist (Zapf, Knorz and Kulla, 1996). Criticizing and humiliating are the main points of the results and these are compatible with the literature (Rayner, 1997; Einarsen and Skogstad 1996; Davenport, Schwartz and Elliott, 2003). In addition, because mobbing shows changeable attributions according to the cultural features (Cassitto, 2003), there is no clear cut definition of mobbing lining of age, professional experience and so on. Besides, authors (Leymann, 1996; Einarsen and Skogstad, 1996; Leymann and Gustafsson, 1996; Davenport, Schwartz and Elliot, 2003) claim that mobbing cannot be bounded with clear descriptive features like age.

The findings suggest that, both school administrators and their colleagues at schools mob the teachers. These findings are compatible with the O'Conner (2004), who claims that school administrators, and inspectors at schools mob teachers. He also suggests that school administrators perceive 'mobbing' as a management style. Similarly, some school administrators apply mobbing for management style at schools in Turkey.

It is interesting to see that, victims themselves and psychological features of schools are perceived as the main reasons for triggering mobbing at schools. In fact, resources and reasons of mobbing are debating issues in the literature. While Leymann and Gustafsson (1996) could not find out any evidence that personal features are the main reason of mobbing; some researchers (Vartia, 1996; Rayner, 1997; Crawford, 1997; Zapf, 1999) claim that personality is main reason for mobbing in their cultures. Since mobbing is a new phenomenon, there is not clear evidence revealing reasons for mobbing in literature. Furthermore, discussions around the reasons of mobbing have been progressing. For example,

Leymann (1996), Vartia (1996), Zapf (1999), and Liefooghe and Davey (2001) argue that multiple causes of mobbing have to be taken into consideration. To conclude, mobbing can be caused by more than one factor simultaneously.

Finally, these results point out importance of analyzing mobbing in different parts of education system. While some progress is reported in this article, it is clear that, further empirical researches are needed to deepen our understanding of mobbing, and its implications for educators. Based on the present findings, the study is expected to lead to researchers to study mobbing in education system in other cultures. In addition, this study contributes to other sectors to investigate mobbing at their workplace through further researches.

References

Aktop, N. G. (2006). *The opinions and experiences of lectures at Anadolu University about mobbing*, Unpublished master thesis, Anadolu University, Eskisehir.

Baltaş, A., Baltaş, Z. (2002). Adı yeni konmuş bir olgu: İş yerinde yıldırma. *Activeline News*. No:30.

Baruch, Y. (2005). Bullying on the net: Adverse behavior on e-mail and its impact. *Information & Management*, 42, (361-371).

Cassito, M. G. (2003). *Raising awareness of psychological harassment at work.* Albany, NY, USA: World Health Organization.

CNBC-e. (2005). *İş yerinde cinsel taciz. Haftanın konuğu.* 2005 tarihinde http://www.cnbce.com adresinden alınmıştır.

CNBC-e. (2005). *Türkiye'de zorbalık bir çalışma biçimi.* 2005 tarihinde http://www.cnbce.com adresinden alınmıştır.

Crawford, N. (1997). Bullying at work: A psychoanalytic perspective. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 7*, 219-225.

Davenport, N., Schwartz, R. D., Elliot, G. P. (2003). *Mobbing: İş yerinde duygusal taciz.* (Çev. Osman Cem Önertoy) İstanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık A.Ş.

Dick, R., Wagner, U. (2001). Stress and strain in teaching: A structural equation approach. *British Journal of Educational Psychology. 71,* 243- 259.

Einarsen, S. (1999). The nature and causes of bullying at work, *International Journal of Manpower, 20.* 1-2.

Einarsen, S. (2000). Harassment and bullying at work: A revıew of the Scandınavıan approach. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 5, 4,* 379–401.

Einarsen, S. and Skodstad, A. (1996). Bullying at work: Epidemiological findings in public and private organizations. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*. 5, 2. 185-201.

Elinoff, Chafouleas and Sassu (2004). Bullying: Considerations For Defining And Intervening In School Settings. *Psychology in the Schools. 41, 8.*

Espelage, D. Swearer, S. (2003). Research on school bullying and victimization: What have we learned and where do we go from here?. *School Psychologhy Review*. 32, 3.

Ertürk, A. (2005). *Acts of mobbing suffered by teachers and school managers in schools.* Unpublished master thesis, Gazi University, Ankara.

Griesser, M., Ekman, J. (2005). Nepotistic mobbing behavior in the Siberian Jar, perisoreus infaustus. *Animal Behaviour. 69*, 345-352.

Groeblinghoff, D.ve Becker, M. (1996). A case study of mobbing and the clinical treatment of mobbing victims. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5 (2),* 277-294.

Hoel, H., Faragher, B., Cooper, C. (2004). Bullying is detrimental to health, but all bullying behaviours are not necessarily equally damaging. *British Journal of Guidance & Councelling, 32, (3),* 367-387.

Hogh, A and Dofradottir, A. (2001). Coping with bullying in the workplace. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10, (4), 485-495.

Hubert, A. and Veldhoven, M. (2001). Risk sectors for undesirable behaviour and mobbing. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10 (4),* 415-424.

ILO/ICN/WHO/PSI (2002). *Workplace violence in the health sector. Framework guideleness for adressing workplace violence in the helath sector. Geneva.* Retrieved November 22, 2005 from www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention

Leymann, H. (1996). The contend and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5 (2),* 165-184.

Leymann, H. and Gustafsson, (1996). Mobbing at work and the development of post-traumatic stress disorders. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5 (2),* 251-275.

Leymann, H. (1996). *Identification of Mobbing Activities, The mobbing encyclopaedia*, Retrieved November 22, 2005 from http://www.leymann.se/English/frame.html

Liefooghe, A., Davey, M. K. (2001). Accounts of workplace bullying: The role of the organization. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology. 10 (4),* 375-392.

Namie, G. (2003). Workplace bullying: Escalated incivility. *Ivey Business Journal. Nov.-Dec*, 1-6.

Niedl, K. (1996). Mobbing and well-being: Economic and personnel development implications. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5 (2),* 239-249.

O'Conner, H. (2004). *Bullying staff in schools.* Retrieved November 22, 2005 from www.caitrin.mtx.net

Randall, P. (2001). *Bullying in adulthood: Assessing the Bullies and Their Victims.* USA: Brunner - Routledge

Rayner, C. (1997). Bullying at work. After Andrea Adams. *Journal Of Community & Applied Social Psychology. 7,* 177-180.

Resch, M., Schubinski, M. (1996). Mobbing – Prevention and management in organizations. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5(2),* 295-307.

Tuncel, S. D., Gökçe, A. T. (2007). Mobbing in soccer. *International Journal of Physical Education, XLIV(4),* 153-158.

Schuster, B. (1996). Rejection, exclusion, and harassment at work and in schools. *European psychologist, 1(4),* 293-317.

Vartia, M. (1996). The sources of bullying – Psychological work environment and organizational climate. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), 203-214.

Waggoner, C. (2003). When does incivility turn into downright hurtful behavior teachers behaving badly. *American School Board Journal.* 29-31.

Westhues, K. (2002). *At the mercy of the MOB*. Retrieved November 22, 2005 from http://gateway.proquest.com

Zapf, D. (1999). Organizational, work group related and personal causes of mobbing /bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower, 20 (½),* 70-85.

Zapf, D. Knorz, C. and Kulla, M. (1996). On the relationship between mobbing factors, and job content, social work environment, and health outcomes. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5(2),* 215-237.

Zapf, D. and Gross C. (2001). Conflict Escalation and coping with workplace bullying: A replication and extension. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10(4),* 497-522.

Zapf, D., Einarsen, S. (2001). Bullying in the workplace: Recent trends in research and practice – an introduction. *European Journal of Work And Organizational Psychology, 10(4),* 369-373.