

Full Length Research Paper

# Teachers' perceptions regarding mobbing at schools

Murat Gürkan Gülcan

Gazi University, Gazi Faculty of Education, Ankara – Turkey.

Received 19 March, 2015; Accepted 15 April, 2015

The aim of the study is to determine whether there are mobbing applications at schools and if so, at which level and between whom. The Mobbing Perception Scale is applied, based on Leymann's (1993), *Mobbing Typology*, and developed by Yavuz (2007), to 154 teachers at 5 selected schools in Ankara for the purpose of the study. According to the teachers' perceptions obtained from the questionnaire, the findings indicate that there is mobbing at the schools at a high level, that mobbing is mostly made by the administrative personnel, and that mobbing is additionally created by parents against teachers. An additional important finding is that the male teachers are subjected to mobbing as much as the female teachers. Also, the working conditions and working environment are found to be the source of mobbing. Suggestions are made to the applicants and researchers in the light of the data obtained in the research.

**Key words:** Mobbing, bullying, school, workplace bullying, mobbing against teachers.

## INTRODUCTION

Mobbing is a process that includes negative behaviour, for example, the employee being denigrated, degraded, prevented from accessing the necessary information, the spreading of rumours about him/her systematically and continuously at the workplace of the employee by one or more persons and thus results in he/she being disturbed physically, mentally and socially leading to withdrawal of employment (Tengilimoğlu and Akdemir, 2009). The word "mob" was derived from the short expression of the words "mobile vulgus" in Latin – fickle crowd – by the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. In English it means a fickle or insubordinate crowd of people, illegal violence by a gang or crowd (Webster's College Dictionary, 1997:174). The term mobbing was first used in the 1960s by the Austrian scientist Konrad Lorenz, who had researched the behaviour used by animals to spoil a foreign animal or a

hunting rival (Davenport et al., 2003:3). Lorenz gave a meaning to it as the attack of small animals together on a single or large animal in order to spoil it (Leymann, 1996:4).

According to Leymann (1993, 1996), mobbing is (psychological violence) a psychological terror applied by one or more persons towards a person by using systematically hostile and unpleasant communication. The person puts in such position is pushed into a corner and is subjected to continuous mobbing (psychological violence) behaviours without defending themselves. This duration is generally accepted to be once a week and lasting more than 6 months. Mobbing (psychological violence) is to exclude a person from the social environment by treating the person at the workplace in a harassing, bullying and hostile manner and to degrade

E-mail: [muratggulcan@hotmail.com](mailto:muratggulcan@hotmail.com). Tel: 90.312.2028500-12.

Authors agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

him/her by assigning him duties below his/her position, capacity at the workplace.

Salin (2001) brings to attention that the targeted person faces difficulties when defending himself/herself with respect to the behaviour and that this is different from a "conflict" in this context (Zapf, 1999). Field (1999), who defined mobbing (psychological violence) as a continuous and merciless attack on self confidence and own-respect of the victims (1999), expresses the underlying reasons for mobbing (psychological violence) as; the aim to establish supremacy, to take one under one's command and to eliminate one. He says briefly that it might be defined as "the aim to terminate the ego of the victim."

Mobbing within the workplace is a sensual attack. It starts with the person being targeted with impudent and harmful behaviour. It is the accumulation of persons with consent or without consent around a person by him/her against another person to force him/her to quit his/her employment by creating a hostile environment by means of continuous malicious intended behaviours, implications, mocking and degrading of the social reputation of the opponent (Davenport et al., 2003:15). Also, Arpacioğlu (2005) defines mobbing as; "systematic and long term torture applied against an employee who constitutes a threat for some persons due to his/her success, knowledge and positive behaviours at the workplace by a person or a group of persons by constituting a mob". Mobbing is possibly applied in two ways within the organizational structure, being vertical or horizontal. Vertical "mobbing" is not only the mobbing directed from the upper management towards the lower levels. It can be bidirectional, meaning that mobbing can occur from top to bottom and from bottom to top within an organization.

According to this, vertical mobbing can also be applied by the employees against the supervisors with whom they are affiliated (Mimaroglu and Özgen, 2009).

According to Tutar (2005), the result of mobbing (psychological violence) is that the victim feels him/herself under threat and belittled by hostile, offensive or derogatory behaviours. The goal of mobbing (psychological violence) is to weaken the self-confidence of the victim and to push him/her into chronic anxiety and to place him/her under intensive stress.

According to Yavuz (2007) can the following conditions searched for mobbing (psychological violence) in the light of these definitions:

1. Happens at the workplace,
2. Is applied by one or more persons,
3. Is applied against one or more persons,
4. Is applied systematically,
5. Is applied with a hostile and amoral approach,
6. Is applied in a continuous frequency,
7. May have various reasons,
8. Is applied with the aim to suppress a person,

9. Expresses the psychological offense against the self-confidence of the person and even physical offensive behaviours.

There are three criteria required for the definition of the term mobbing. These criteria are "frequency", "continuity" and "strength differences" (Tengilimoğlu and Akdemir, 2009).

It is determined in the studies conducted related to the subject that the shortest mobbing duration is 6 months; the common average application duration is 15 months; and the main period, where the permanent severe effects of the process is revealed, is 29-46 months (Tınaz, 2006: 13).

Discussions with regards to the term mobbing are being conducted. Leymann (1996) suggested that in relation to the term mobbing "bullying" should be used in order to express behaviours between children and adolescents. Such interactions frequently include physical violence. In contrast, the term "mobbing" should be used for more systematically and deliberate actions that rarely include physical violence at the workplace but rather attitude instead.

The term is yet not fully accepted in our country. It is possible to adapt "bullying" as "extortion" and "mobbing" as "intimidating" into Turkish. Emotional Abuse, Intimidating, Spiritual Abuse, Psychological Violence, Emotional Offense, Extortion. Three presentations related to Mobbing (psychological violence) were made at the 13<sup>th</sup> National Management and Organization Congress (2005) and the term "Intimidating" was used instead of "Mobbing" throughout these presentations (Yavuz, 2007). Bullying (extortion) differs from violence and hostility. Whilst violence and hostility are not systematic, bullying (extortion) is a situation that happens systematically and repeatedly. There is a power difference between those who behave like this and those who are subjected to this behaviour. "Mobbing (psychological violence)" *at the workplace begins as rather refined violence* and the victim is excluded from the social environment. Whilst bullying (extortion) is applied as rude behaviour and words, mobbing (psychological violence) is faced as any type of offending and insulting attitude or behaviour (Tutar, 2005).

## RELATED RESEARCH

The Swedish Doctor Heinemann researched in the 1970s the behaviours of children against other children (particularly against a singular one), which is in general known as extortion or rowdyism. Doctor Carroll Brodsky wrote her first book in 1976 which defined the mobbing (psychological violence – abused employee) behaviour. The word "abuse" in the title of Brodsky's book refers to repeated and continuous actions in order to wear away at someone, maltreat him/her, prevent him/her or to get a

reaction from him/her, continuously provoking, suppressing, intimidating, extorting him/her, or behaving in such a way as to disturb him/her (Yavuz, 2007).

Professor Heinz Leymann has used the term mobbing (psychological violence) for defining the group violence among the employees at the workplace. He presented the work he started at the beginning in Sweden to the public of Germany. He published his first report related to the subject in 1984. There are many studies conducted by Leymann's stimulations, in England, Ireland, Switzerland, Austria, Hungary, Italy, France, Australia, New Zealand, Japan and South Africa, lead particularly by Norway and Finland. Andrea (Adams, 1992), a journalist, published his book "Bullying At Work: How To Confront And Overcome". After his death in 1995 a foundation was founded in 1997 in order to support bullying victims. Detailed studies are being conducted on mobbing (psychological violence) thanks to the Internet site of the foundation.

The first research related to the mobbing (psychological violence) as a workplace phenomenon was conducted by Leymann and Gustavsson in 1984, Sweden. The term started the ball rolling with regards to the conduct of other studies as a focus of interest in the scientific field. In the following years in Norway; in 1989, Matthiesen et al.; in 1990, Kihle; in 1991, Einarsen and Raknes; in Finland; in 1991, Paanen and Vartia; in 1994, Björkqvist; in Germany; in 1993, Becker; in 1996, Knorz and Zapf; in 1996, again Zapf; in Austria; in 1995, Niedle; in Australia; in 1991, Toohey, and in 1995, McCarthy conducted researches containing similar subjects and terms. Later on similar studies began to arise in the Netherlands, England, France and Italy (Yavuz, 2007).

The first publication in our country related to the subject was in 2003 the book of Noa et al. with the title "Mobbing: Emotional Abuse in the American Workplace" published by Sistem Yayıncılık translated by Osman Cem Önerly with the Turkish title "Mobbing İşyerinde Duygusal Taciz". This is followed in 2005 by the books of Tutar et al.

In the study of Yavuz (2007) with the title 'Factors Influencing the Mobbing (Psychological Violence) Perception of the Employees' it is seen that cases of being subjected to mobbing at workplaces were high with a ratio of 78.7%. A reverse relation is determined between mobbing at workplaces and the commitment to the organization. Organisational commitment decreased as employees were subjected to mobbing. In fact, mobbing (psychological violence) has always existed in our work life, but it is a phenomenon which has not been named until recent times. The common point on which the international research results agree is that the number of mobbing (psychological violence) victims is much higher than that of other violence and abused victims (Yavuz, 2007).

Whilst the number of studies conducted about mobbing (psychological violence), where the individual harming effects are felt in every aspect of professional and social

life is increasing day by day, creating awareness of, and fighting against, mobbing is progressively gaining importance in many countries. Publications that increase the awareness on the harmful effects of mobbing (psychological violence) on employees are frequently discussing similar concepts. Çobanoğlu has tried to bring an explanation to the mobbing (psychological violence) phenomenon in sectoral bases (health, education, service and industry) in Turkey with his own professional life experiences and some interviews in the sixth part of his book "Mobbing, Emotional Offense at the Workplace and Fighting Methods" published by Timaç Yayıncılık. Adnan Nur Baykal has attracted attention to the historical dimension of mobbing (psychological violence) phenomenon in his book "Swallowing Competition" published at Sistem Yayıncılık. He gave samples suggesting that people could have committed suicide 500 years prior to now due to the same reasons, too (Yavuz, 2007).

Although the leadership behaviours of the school principals in the educational institutions generally are accepted to be influential and that the teachers face stress, burn-out and are intimidated, the number of the empirical studies conducted in the field is limited (Cemaloğlu, 2007). Intimidation towards teachers is experienced at "medium" level. This level is rather high. These results are parallel with the research findings of Hubert and Veldhoven (2001), Dick and Vagner (2001), Hoel et al. (2004), O'conner (2004) and Gökçe (2006). At the same time, Hubert and Veldhoven (2001) assert that mobbing is mostly seen at educational, industrial and voluntary organizations (as cited by Cemaloğlu, 2007).

### **Mobbing Behaviour Forms**

Shallcross (2003) attracts the attention that the definition of workplace violence in the reports of the International Labour Organization (ILO) of 2000 is not only limited to physical acts, but is expanded to include passive and psychological acts along with this, too (quotation by Yavuz, 2007) quotation used by Tınaz (2006: 43). Mobbing (psychological violence) is the fastest growing form of workplace violence. In this type of violence the mobbing (psychological violence) occurs when the perpetrating person or group are against the person who might perform his/her work more efficiently so as to apply behaviours that will aggravate his/her working life. Some of the mobbing behaviours according to Tınaz (2006: 42) are indicated below:

1. Bearing a grudge,
2. Merciless and tyrannous behaviour,
3. Intentional sinister behaviour,
4. Humiliating behaviour,
5. Unsettling,
5. Letting work by barking out,
6. Persisting on the correctness of the own known,

7. Refusing to give authority due to distrust,
8. Continuously criticizing others,
9. Disturbing with unnecessary questions.

Kimberly (2005) says "Mobbing (psychological violence) is a fact among persons with higher education, which is hard to be perceived, incisively but widespread" and emphasizes that the academic environment is confronted with the same problem, too. Again in the same way; Lewis (2005) used a sample event method to interview 15 university lecturers and tried to determine the mobbing behaviours in this field. Leymann (1993: 33-34) gathered in a more comprehensive manner 45 different mobbing behaviours under five main headings. The development of the scale for the revealing of the mobbing perception in the study questionnaire is performed by beginning from these forty five behaviours. The commonly faced mobbing behaviours at workplaces according to the results of the research conducted via Internet in 1998 in the USA are as follows:

1. Being held responsible for the mistakes made,
2. Assignment of senseless tasks to the person,
3. Criticizing the skills,
4. Enforcing to obey to rules in conflict with someone,
5. Threats regarding the loss of the job,
6. Humiliation and insult,
7. That the success is shown lesser than it is,
8. Dismissal (supersede),
9. Bark out,
10. Dishonouring. (Çobanoğlu, 2005: 88)

## Purpose

The purpose of this study is to determine whether the mobbing (psychological violence) perceptions of teachers vary in relation to demographic variables. Answers to following questions will be searched in order to reach this goal:

1. What is the mobbing confrontation level at the schools according to the perceptions of the teachers?
2. Between whom and in which direction is mobbing experienced at schools?
3. Do the mobbing perception levels of the teachers vary depending on age?
4. Do the mobbing perception levels of the teachers vary depending on gender?
5. Do the mobbing perception levels of the teachers vary depending on marital status?
6. What is the source of the mobbing applied at schools?

## METHOD

This section will handle the model of the study, describing the sample, the collection of the sample data, data analyses.

This study was conducted in order to determine the mobbing

perceptions of the students at the schools affiliated with the Ministry for National Education. For this the MNE Province Ankara sample was selected and the schools in the central districts of Ankara were randomly determined. The Mobbing Perception Scale developed by Yavuz (2007) based on the Mobbing Typology of Leymann (1993) was applied to the teachers in charge of the schools.

This study is a "description" model in form of "Questionnaire, Survey". It was evaluated based on the mobbing perceptions of the teachers in charge in the schools of the MNE in the central districts of Ankara and how the opinions vary depending on the demographic variables. For this the Mobbing Perception Scale developed by Yavuz (2007) was applied to employees in five schools in Ankara, the attitudes of the teachers according to the respective variables are interpreted and thus an answer is searched for the problem of the study. The mobbing perceptions of the participants, the arithmetic averages of the points achieved in the perception scale, the percentage and standard deviations are calculated and indicated in charts. A "T-test" and a "One Way ANOVA" test were used in order to understand whether the personal differences of the employees were influential or not, which is among the sub-problems of the study subject.

## Universe and sampling

The universe included teachers and other personnel in charge of five schools of the MNE in the central districts of Ankara. The developed perception scale for this study was distributed to 215 employees by taking the profession and gender differences into consideration and 189 of them filled in the questionnaire and participated in the application. 154 of these questionnaires were included in the evaluation.

## Validity and reliability

The structure validity and reliability work regarding the Mobbing Perception Scale developed by Yavuz (2007) based on the Mobbing Typology of Leymann (1993) was applied to the scale study group. With regard to reliability, a Cronbach-alpha internal consistency coefficient was determined to be 0.8588. The Split-half reliability calculation was applied as the second method and the "r" value resulted to be 0.8707. These values indicate that the reliability of the scale is high.

## FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

This section handles the findings and interpretations regarding the problem and sub-problems of the study: The results of the descriptive statistics performed in order to find the answer for the first sub-problem of the study "What is the mobbing confrontation level according to the perceptions of the teachers?" are as follows (Table 1).

When we look at Table 1, it is seen that the lowest value of the points given in the questionnaire by the teachers is 96.00, the highest value is 150.00, and the average of the total points given to 30 questions related to the mobbing applications at the schools is 135.772. When we take the point range into consideration, it appears that the average of the total points is similar to the highest point able to be achieved in the scale. According to this, it can be stated that the mobbing application level at the school pursuant to the perceptions of the teachers is high.

The total points of the highest and lowest three articles

**Table 1.** Total points regarding the mobbing confrontation level at schools according to the perceptions of the teachers.

<b>N</b>	<b>Lowest value</b>	<b>Highest value</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>Std. error</b>	<b>S</b>
154	96,00	150,00	135,772	,829	10,299

**Table 2.** Total points of the articles with the highest and lowest points regarding the mobbing confrontation level at schools according to the perceptions of the teachers.

<b>Question</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>S</b>
1. Are you continuously being interrupted while you are speaking?	154	3,883	,969
10. Has unwanted hard work been assigned to you?	154	3,909	,979
20. Have you ever thought that couldn't get the fruits of your efforts?	154	3,487	1,232
28. Were you subjected to physical violence threats?	154	4,941	,285
29. Were you subjected to slight violence in order to intimidate you?	154	4,980	,138
30. Were you subjected to physical violence or a more severe treat?	154	4,974	,159
Total	154	135,772	10,299

**Table 3.** Frequency and percentage table related to by whom mobbing applications at schools are performed.

<b>Mobbing source</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>%</b>
Your direct supervisors	102	70
Administrative personnel without supervisory duty	26	18
Colleagues/Teachers.	53	35
Parents	67	40
Other	30	20

with regards to the article points are as follows.

When we look at Table 2, it appears that among the three questions with the highest points the question "Were you subjected to slight violence in order to intimidate you?" ranked first with a point average of 4.980, "Were you subjected to physical violence or a more severe treat?" ranked second with a point average of 4.974 and "Were you subjected to physical violence threats?" ranked third with a point average of 4.941 respectively. These point averages are very close to the highest point of 5.00 for the question at "I fully agree" level. The three questions with the lowest point average were "Have you ever thought that couldn't get the fruits of your efforts?" 3.478, "Are you continuously being interrupted while you are speaking?" 3.883 and "Has unwanted hard work been assigned to you?" 3.909, respectively. According to this, it can be seen that the teachers were subjected to physical violence, a more severe treat or subjected to a threat regarding physical violence. It can be stated that the teachers were subjected to "physical violence" threats or applications among the most severe forms of the mobbing application. The findings for the question "Between whom and in which direction is mobbing experienced at schools?" The second problem of the study is as follows.

When we look at Table 3, it is clearly seen that 70% of the teachers think that mobbing occurrences are performed by supervisors. In addition, 40% of the teachers think that mobbing is applied by the parents as well. According to this, it can be stated that the teachers think that they are faced with mobbing at schools by the school supervisors as well as the parents. According to the perceptions of the teachers, it can be stated that they are subjected to mobbing by other teachers and their colleagues.

The findings for the question "Do the mobbing perception levels of the teachers vary depending on the age variable?" The third problem of the study is as follows.

As shown in Table 4 the teachers were examined in three different age groups. In the evaluation conducted with the six groups for the questionnaire, these were combined as three groups because the numeric values of some cells were insufficient. The 1<sup>st</sup> group includes 56 teachers between the ages 20-30 years. It is observed that the mobbing perception total point of the employees in this group is 137.035 and the standard deviation is 9.246. Thus, the total point of the teachers in this age group has a very low difference compared to the other groups. The 2<sup>nd</sup> group includes 44 teachers between the

**Table 4.** Comparison of the mobbing perceptions of the teachers according to the age variable.

Age	N	X	S	St. error
20-30	56	137,035	9,246	1,235
31-40	44	133,636	11,949	1,801
41-over	54	136,203	9,798	1,333
Total	154	135,772	10,299	,829

ages 31-40 years. It is noticed that the mobbing perception total point of the employees in this group is 133.636 and the standard deviation is 11.949. The 3<sup>rd</sup> group includes 54 teachers over the age of 41 years. It is recognized that the mobbing perception total point of the employees in this group is 13.203 and the standard deviation is 9.798

A One Way ANOVA test was used in order to determine whether the mobbing perceptions of the teachers varied depending on their age. The results are explained below.

It is to be seen from Table 5 that the p value according to the ANOVA Test results of the mobbing perception levels of the teachers is .244. According to this the mobbing perception levels of the teachers do not present a meaningful difference at a level of .05.

The findings for the question “Do the mobbing perception levels of the teachers vary depending on the gender variable?” the fourth problem of the study is as follows.

It can be seen from Table 6 that 110 female and 44 male teachers participated in the study and that the average of the mobbing perception points of the teachers are comparable to one other.

Table 7 shows that according to the T-test result of the mobbing perception levels of the teachers there is no meaningful difference at a level of .05 determined between the mobbing perception of the teachers and the gender variable.

The findings for the question “Do the mobbing perception levels of the teachers vary depending on the marital status variable?”, the fifth problem of the study is as follows.

It is shown in Table 8 that 36 single and 44 married teachers have participated in the study and that the average of the mobbing perception points of the teachers are very close to each other.

As can be seen from Table 9 according to the T-test result of the mobbing perception levels of the teachers there is no meaningful difference at .05 level determined between the mobbing perception of the teachers and the marital status variable.

The findings for the question “What is the source of the mobbing applied at schools?” the sixth and last question of the study is as follows.

When we look at Table 10, the most important mobbing source according to the teachers’ opinions regarding the

mobbing applied at schools is assessed to be “the difficulty of the performed work” with the highest point average of 2.987. “Bad conditions of the employees” ranks 2<sup>nd</sup> and “working under intensive stress” ranks 3<sup>rd</sup>. According to the teachers’ opinions are “insufficiency of the communication between the administration and the employees” with the lowest point and “bad management by the supervisors” not deemed to be important mobbing sources. According to this the teachers have not assessed the communication deficits of the supervisors, to whose mobbing they are the most subjected, with themselves and the bad management approaches of them as the most important mobbing source. Instead of this, they have assessed “the difficulty of the performed work and the working environment” as the most important mobbing source.

## RESULT AND SUGGESTIONS

According to the perceptions of the teachers the mobbing experience level at schools is high. The teachers think that they are frequently confronted with mobbing at schools. It is understood that according to the perceptions of the teachers the most frequently experienced mobbing forms are occurrences of the most severe mobbing forms at schools like violence in order to intimidate, being subjected to physical violence or more severe treatment and receiving physical violence threats. Contrary to this, teachers assess the inability to get the fruits of their efforts, the interruption of their speech while they are communicating and the assignment of unwanted difficult tasks to them as mobbing application at a lower level. According to this teachers are subjected to physical violence or more severe treatment and receive physical violence threats.

According to the perceptions of the teachers mobbing is mostly performed by the supervisors. Another group, by whom the teachers are subjected to mobbing, are the parents. This finding also supports the news seen in the media during the recent years. The mobbing application at the schools by the parents in different forms should possibly be deemed as a crucial problem that should be addressed.

According to the perceptions of the teachers, fellow teachers are subjected to mobbing by other teachers and colleagues at a low level. According to the perceptions of the teachers, age is not related to mobbing occurrences. Teachers of any age are subjected to mobbing applications at the same level.

The perceptions of the teachers do not vary depending on the gender variable. The average of the mobbing perception points of the 110 female and 44 male teachers who had participated in the study did not present any difference. According to this male teachers are primarily subjected to mobbing by the supervisors, the parents and their other colleagues as much as the female teachers. According to Gülşen and Kılıç (2013) research results,

**Table 5.** ANOVA test results regarding the comparison of the mobbing perceptions of the teachers according to the age variable.

	Sum of squares	df	Mean of squares	F	p
Intergroup	300,176	2	150,088		
Ingroup	15930,870	151	105,502	1,423	,244
Total	16231,045	153			

**Table 6.** Comparison of the mobbing perceptions of the teachers according to the gender variable.

Gender	N	X	Std. Dev.	Std. error
Famela	110	136,0364	10,60286	1,01094
Male	44	135,1136	9,58491	1,44498
Total	154			

**Table 7.** T-Test results regarding the comparison of the mobbing perceptions of the teachers according to the gender variable.

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Equal variances assumed	,832	,363	,501	152	,617
Equal variances not assumed			,523	87,159	,602

**Table 8.** Comparison of the mobbing perceptions of the teachers according to the marital status variable.

Marital Status	N	X	Std. Dev.	Std. Error
Married	38	135,184	12,284	1,992
Single	116	135,965	9,614	,892
Total	154			

**Table 9.** T-Test results regarding the comparison of the mobbing perceptions of the teachers according to the marital status variable.

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Equal variances assumed	2,209	,139	-,405	152	,686
Equal variances not assumed			-,358	52,655	,722

**Table 10.** Descriptive statistical data regarding the determination of the source of the mobbing applied at schools.

Source of mobbing	N	X	Std error	Std. Dev.	Var.
Bad management of the supervisors	154	2,019	,077	,959	,921
Personality problems of the supervisors	154	2,168	,091	1,136	1,292
That the supervisors don't believe that such behaviours exist	154	2,467	,092	1,149	1,322
The insufficiency of the communication between the supervisors and the employees	154	1,824	,063	,793	,629
Working under intensive stress	154	2,551	,083	1,035	1,072
Bad conditions of the employees	154	2,733	,092	1,149	1,321
Difficulty of the performed work	154	2,987	,101	1,262	1,595
Total	154	16,753	,401	4,980	24,801

male teachers are much more vulnerable to emotional mobbing at workplaces. This result supports that contrary to the general perception that females are more frequently subjected to mobbing, male teachers are also often confronted with mobbing.

The perceptions of the teachers regarding mobbing do not vary depending on the marital status variable. Thirty-six single and 116 married teachers, who participated in the study, think that they are subjected to mobbing at the same level. In this case, not single teachers in particular, but also married teachers experience mobbing at the same level.

According to the opinions of the teachers the most important sources for mobbing are "the difficulty of the performed work", "bad conditions of the employees" and "working under intensive stress". According to the opinions of the teachers "insufficiency of the communication between the administration and the employees" and "bad management by the supervisors" are not significant sources of mobbing.

### Suggestions

Following suggestions are made pursuant to the results obtained based on the findings of the study.

More comprehensive studies related to the frequent applied mobbing at schools should be conducted. New structuring should be implemented in order to prevent such situations. The MNE may obtain the support of the universities to research how to deter mobbing and how to apply sanctions.

The mobbing types experienced at the schools are at a more severe level than thought. These include the most severe mobbing forms at schools including slight violence in order to intimidate, being subjected to physical violence or more severe treatment and receiving physical violence threats. These types of applications are defined as crime by both the administrative and the juridical laws. Primarily guidance and support mechanisms such as denouncing to the respective bodies and claiming rights need to be established in order to preserve the rights of the teachers who are subjected to such maltreatment.

Also the fact that teachers deem the inability to get the fruits of their efforts, being wantonly interrupted while they are speaking and the assignment of unwanted difficult tasks to them as important mobbing behaviour indicates that the teachers are confronted with more severe mobbing applications. In addition, the fact that the teachers are increasingly subjected to maltreatment is supported by the findings of the study. The mobbing application at the schools by the parents in different forms should possibly be deemed as a problem to be addressed the most. The implementation of more comprehensive measures for this is one of the most paramount issues to be taken into consideration by the MNE. The subjection of the teachers to mobbing mostly by supervisors could be interpreted as the abuse of the supervision authority by the supervisor. It is crucial to

select more horizontal administration forms, convert the education regions and commissions more actively, and to give it a more functional structure by limiting the authority power at the schools.

Considering the fact that teachers of each age group, every gender and any marital status are subjected to mobbing application at the same level, it would be appropriate to provide the teachers comprehensive training on their rights and rights claiming methods without discriminating via written or visual publications and correspondence about mobbing and how to fight against mobbing. The teachers indicate that among the most important sources of mobbing at schools are the difficulty of the performed work, bad conditions of the employees and working under intensive stress, and hard working conditions at schools contribute to many problems. Acknowledging this needs new measures such as improving the physical conditions of the schools, the working intensity of the teachers, reducing the number of students, and adjusting the program and success pressure. Trainings directed towards the teachers regarding these important issues in order to change the attitudes of the teachers and for the increased self-confidence of the teachers are also recommended.

### Conflict of Interests

The author has not declared any conflict of interests.

### REFERENCES

- Adams A (1992). *Bullying at Work. How to Confront And Overcome it*. Virago Press, London,
- Cemaloğlu N (2007). Okul Yöneticilerinin Liderlik Stilleri İle Yıldırma Arasındaki İlişki, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H. U. Journal of Education) 33:77-87
- Çobanoğlu Ş (2005). *Mobbing İşyerinde Duygusal Saldırı ve Mücadele Yöntemleri*, Timaş, İstanbul,
- Davenport N, Swartz RD, Elliot GP (2003). *Mobbing İşyerinde Duygusal Taciz, Sistem Yayıncılık*, İstanbul.
- Field T (1996). *Bully In Sight (How to Predict, Resist, Challenge And Combat Workplace Bullying Overcoming The Silence and Denial by Which Abuse Thrives)*,
- Gülşen C, Kılıç MA (2013) Perception of Pre-school Teacher to Mobbing Terms of Effect on Organizational Behavior, J. Educ. Instructional Studies in the World, 3(2): 16
- Leymann H (1993). *Mobbing And Psychological Terror at Workplaces. Violence And Victims*, 5:(2).
- Leymann H (1996). "The Content And Development Of Mobbing At Work" *European J. Work And Organizational Psychol.* 5(2):165-185,
- Mimaroğlu H, Özgen H (2009) Örgütlerde Güncel Bir Sorun: "Mobbing" Sü İibf Sosyal Ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi, V. 2/1
- Tengilimoğlu D, Akdemir MF (2009) İşletmelerde Uygulanan Mobbingin (Psikolojik Şiddet) Örgütsel Bağlılığa Etkisi, Uluslararası İktisadi Ve İdari İncelemeler Dergisi Year:2 Volume:1 Number:3, Summer,
- Tınaz P (2006). *İşyerinde Psikolojik Taciz (Mobbing)*, Beta, İstanbul.
- Tutar H (2005). *İşyerinde Psikolojik Şiddet*, Barış Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Yavuz H (2007) Çalışanlarda Mobbing (Psikolojik Şiddet) Algısını Etkileyen Faktörler: Sdü Tıp Fakültesi Üzerine Bir Araştırma Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Ana Bilim Dalı.
- Zapf D (1999). "Organizational Work Group Related And Personal Causes Of Mobbing / Bullying At Work" *International J. Manpower*, 20(1/2):70-85,