

## The Mobbing Behavior In Secondary Schools And Differences By Province

**Abbas Ertürk**

*Faculty of Education, Muğla University, Turkey  
abbaserturk@mu.edu.tr*

**Sultan Bilge Keskinliç Kara**

*Faculty of Education, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University, Turkey  
bilge.kara@izu.edu.tr*

### ABSTRACT

The aim of present study is to investigate whether or not mobbing experienced in secondary education institutions in different regions of Turkey differ from each other. This study employed a survey research model. The sample of the study consists of 415 teachers. “Negative Acts Questionnaire” (NAQ) was used as a data collection tool. This scale was developed by Einarsen and Raknes (1997) and adapted to Turkish by Aydın and Öcel (2009). As a result, mobbing that teachers experience in secondary education schools in the city of Adana is the highest compared to other cities. Teachers working in schools in Balıkesir and Kütahya experience mobbing the least. The most common type of mobbing was found to be “Hiding from you the information that can improve your performance” and the least common type of mobbing was found to be “Implying that you need to leave your job”. There is no statistically significant difference between age groups and gender.

**Keywords:** Mobbing, school management, secondary schools

### INTRODUCTION

Mobbing is a type of negative behavior that take place between individuals and that affect individuals negatively. Deriding someone on and on, interrupting someone, implying that someone is a liar, and spreading rumors about someone are some of the examples of this type of behavior (Davenport, Schwartz ve Elliott 2003). Leymann (1984, cited in Davenport et al, 2003: pp.4-5) defines mobbing as “psychological terror” or “psycho-terror” that takes place as a result of systematic hostile and unethical treatment of others by someone or some people. The victim of mobbing is influenced by being appalled and isolated (Leymann & Gustafsson, 1996). As a result of mobbing to which he or she was exposed to, the victim loses his or her self confidence. Generally, the ultimate aim here is to cause the victim to leave his or her workplace (Duffy ve Sperry, 2007).

Early research on the issue carried out in Europe and the United States showed that such behavior is an important bloodletting for institutions. Early studies carried out by Leymann (1996: 169) in Sweden found that 3,5% of the working population were exposed to mobbing. In addition to this, it was estimated that the possibility for any employee to be exposed to mobbing in his or her lifetime is 25% (Leymann, 1990: 125). On the other hand, studies carried out in the United States showed that 82% of the employees who were exposed to mobbing either had to leave their jobs or lost their jobs. Of this, 34% left their jobs due to some health problems that they experienced as a result of mobbing, and 44% left their jobs either on their own initiative or on the decision of the administrative boards after the performance assessment reports of the institutions.

Research on mobbing has shown that those who are exposed to mobbing experience some biological and psychological health problems. According to Einarsen and Raknes (1997), 23% of the employees who are exposed to mobbing in workplaces experience psychological disorders. According to Davenport et al. (2003: 70), if the experienced mobbing affects the victim severely, this may cause the victim to develop some health problems such as depression and heart attack, and this may even drive the victim to commit suicide.

Research has shown that mobbing can also be seen in educational institutions. Ertürk (2013) carried out a study in the schools of primary education in Turkey and found that 4.1% of the teachers and administrators are exposed to mobbing on a daily basis. O’Conner (2004:2-3) carried out a study in educational institutions and found that teachers are exposed to the mobbing of their school administrators, inspectors, their colleagues, their students and the parents of students. In the UK, Dick and Wagner (2001:255) carried out a study on job stress and mobbing that teachers experience. They found that feeling pain from fatigue and especially from physical symptoms that arise from mobbing causes more teacher absenteeism. Yazıcı (2009: 41) carried out a study with teachers in Turkey and he obtained similar findings. This study found that teachers who are exposed to mobbing develop stress and burnout syndrome.

Research conducted in different sectors in Turkey show that mobbing is present in all sectors. Demirçivi (2008) in tourism sector; Dilman (2007) and Aytaç, Bayram & Bilgel (2005) in health sector; Cemaloğlu & Ertürk (2007), Cemaloğlu & Ertürk (2008) and Tokel (2005) in education sector; Erbaş (2004) and Işık (2007) in textile sector; Yavuz (2007) and Gökçe & Oğuz (2009) in higher education; Kocaoğlu (2007) and Aytaç et all (2005) in security sector; Iyem (2007) and Cengiz (2009) in professional football clubs; Kocaoğlu (2007) in postal operations; Çakır

(2006) in industrial enterprises; Kök (2006) in public and private banking sector; and Bahçe (2007) in public and private sector are examples of the studies conducted in different sectors.

Mobbing also differs according to the cultures of societies or institutions. For the customs and traditions of the culture of an individual has an important role in the perception of a behavior as mobbing (Rayner, Sheehan & Barker, 1999). Different individuals feel differently in the same situation. Therefore, mobbing to be exercised may differ according to different societies and cultures. This study investigates whether or not mobbing experienced in secondary education institutions in different regions of Turkey differ from each other. To this end, the present study seeks to find answers to the following questions:

1. How frequently do teachers experience mobbing in different cities?
2. Is there a statistically significant difference among the frequencies of mobbing experienced by teachers in different cities?
3. Is there a statistically significant difference between the frequencies of mobbing in terms of the sex of teachers?
4. Is there a statistically significant difference between the frequencies of mobbing in terms of the age of teachers?

### THE STUDY

This study employed a survey research model. Survey research is carried out with a large group, confers on the views and attitudes of the participants, and describes the events in this way (Tanrıöğen, 2011: 59).

The general population of the study consists of the teachers and administrators who are presently working in the secondary education schools in the seven geographical regions of Turkey. This population consists of 2,734 schools and 95,655 teachers and administrators (MEB, 2014: 118). This study employed a sub-population method. In this method, one city was selected randomly from each region. According to Balcı (2001: 95), in this method every member of the population has a chance to be involved in the sample. In the selected schools, a questionnaire was administered to those teachers who volunteered to take part in the study.

In order to determine the sample size, population size and sampling error were taken into consideration. The sample size for populations up to 100,000 is 383 (with a sampling error of 0,05 and a confidence level of  $\alpha=0,05$ ) (Şahin, 2011: 127). Therefore, considering the 95,655 teachers in the general population, a sample of 383 teachers was considered to be enough. Considering the return rate and possible data loss, the sample size was increased by 20%. In this way, the sample size was determined to be 459 (383+76). To collect the data, a total of 460 questionnaires were distributed. Of the 460 questionnaires, 432 returned (93.9%). Of the 432, 415 were found to be suitable for analysis. According to this, the return rate is 90%.

Of the participating teachers, 54% were male and 46% were female. 51% of the teachers were in the below-33 age group, 39% in the 34-45 age group and 10% in the 46-and-above age group. 86% of the teachers have bachelor's degree. In terms of career steps, 5% were teacher candidates, 76% teachers, and 19% senior teachers.

In order to find out about the frequencies of mobbing to which teachers are exposed, the "Negative Acts Questionnaire" (NAQ) was used as a data collection tool. This scale was developed by Einarsen and Raknes (1997), revised by Einarsen and Hoel (2001) (22 items), and adapted to Turkish by Aydın and Öcel (2009). During this adaptation work, the Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be .88 and the test-retest reliability coefficient to be .80. Furthermore, the factor loadings that accumulated under a single factor were found to be between 0,31 and 0,76, and the observed variance was found to be 39% (Aydın & Öcel, 2009: 99).

Factorial analysis showed that the items in the scale were collected in one factor but that two items had high factor loadings. These two items were excluded from the scale. It was also found that the factor loadings of the remaining items were between 0,55 and 0,74; that the KMO value was .69; and that the variance value was 64%. In the reliability analysis of the scale, the Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient was found to be .94.

SPSS v13.0 was used in the processing of the data. Frequency, percentage, t-test and ANOVA were used to analyse the data. The findings were tested at  $p<.05$  level.

## FINDINGS

This part of the study presents the findings and interpretations. Table 1 below shows the distribution of the frequencies of mobbing that the participants experienced in different cities.

Table 1. The distribution of the frequencies of mobbing that the participants experienced in different cities.

Item No	Behaviors	Total		Balıkesir	Kütahya	Adana	Ankara	Samsun	Gaziantep	Bingöl
		$\bar{x}$	S							
1	Hiding from you the information that will improve your performance	$\bar{x}$	1,96	1,72	1,80	1,93	2,08	1,80	2,22	2,19
		S	,99	0,68	0,87	0,95	1,11	0,79	1,23	1,10
2	Overloading you more work than you can manage	$\bar{x}$	1,80	1,74	1,65	2,01	1,89	1,58	1,85	1,80
		S	,87	0,94	0,63	1,09	0,97	0,77	0,84	0,83
3	Assigning you simpler duties that are far below your skills	$\bar{x}$	1,63	1,48	1,44	1,78	1,70	1,50	1,75	1,72
		S	,90	0,79	0,70	1,13	1,01	0,51	1,01	0,90
4	Requiring you to finish illogical, meaningless and impossible jobs with impossible completion dates	$\bar{x}$	1,51	1,30	1,35	1,66	1,58	1,42	1,66	1,58
		S	,80	0,52	0,52	1,10	0,85	0,56	0,92	0,80
5	Ignoring your ideas and views	$\bar{x}$	1,62	1,40	1,41	1,73	1,61	1,66	1,86	1,78
		S	,79	0,55	0,52	0,90	0,93	0,76	0,97	0,79
6	Excessive control over your work	$\bar{x}$	1,49	1,30	1,36	1,61	1,51	1,44	1,63	1,58
		S	,75	0,61	0,55	0,97	0,77	0,65	0,93	0,67
7	Reminding you of your wrongs over and over again	$\bar{x}$	1,33	1,35	1,23	1,36	1,40	1,19	1,46	1,34
		S	,67	0,84	0,48	0,61	0,76	0,47	0,91	0,69
8	Denigrating or ridiculing you regarding your work	$\bar{x}$	1,54	1,36	1,43	1,69	1,53	1,47	1,68	1,58
		S	,72	0,75	0,58	0,88	0,72	0,65	0,79	0,67
9	Spreading rumours about you	$\bar{x}$	1,55	1,30	1,44	1,79	1,56	1,40	1,55	1,68
		S	,76	0,47	0,58	0,99	0,78	0,55	0,82	0,84
10	Speaking insultingly and abusively about you	$\bar{x}$	1,40	1,37	1,27	1,50	1,44	1,31	1,52	1,38
		S	,66	0,63	0,54	0,84	0,66	0,47	0,81	0,60
11	Disregarding or excluding you	$\bar{x}$	1,57	1,55	1,40	1,69	1,50	1,44	1,81	1,72
		S	,77	0,86	0,61	0,88	0,68	0,65	0,83	0,88
12	Implying that you need to leave your job (resign)	$\bar{x}$	1,21	1,20	1,13	1,27	1,16	1,25	1,34	1,22
		S	,56	0,70	0,34	0,71	0,41	0,44	0,80	0,51
13	Being frightened through menacing behaviors	$\bar{x}$	1,35	1,30	1,31	1,48	1,26	1,41	1,40	1,34
		S	,63	0,72	0,51	0,92	0,54	0,50	0,64	0,48
14	Insistent criticism of your work and efforts	$\bar{x}$	1,49	1,30	1,38	1,58	1,53	1,36	1,56	1,70
		S	,79	0,72	0,66	0,90	0,72	0,54	0,81	1,05
15	Ignoring you or treating you in a hostile way when you approach them in a friendly way	$\bar{x}$	1,36	1,30	1,18	1,43	1,41	1,27	1,52	1,46
		S	,73	0,66	0,49	0,90	0,72	0,51	0,86	0,91
16	Making untrue claims about you	$\bar{x}$	1,28	1,20	1,23	1,40	1,27	1,22	1,34	1,25
		S	,57	0,56	0,52	0,76	0,51	0,42	0,69	0,44
17	Becoming an object of excessive derision	$\bar{x}$	1,34	1,30	1,23	1,41	1,35	1,25	1,50	1,34
		S	,64	0,65	0,52	0,76	0,59	0,44	0,89	0,56
18	Shouting at you or becoming the target of anger in cases when you are not to be blamed	$\bar{x}$	1,70	1,56	1,53	1,80	1,63	1,75	1,84	1,90
		S	,87	0,64	0,75	1,00	0,78	0,81	1,02	1,01
19	Pressing you for not demanding something that you deserve	$\bar{x}$	1,42	1,35	1,29	1,58	1,47	1,31	1,50	1,41
		S	,74	0,77	0,60	0,93	0,76	0,47	0,76	0,75
20	Being exposed to practical jokes	$\bar{x}$	1,53	1,56	1,51	1,34	1,50	1,88	1,34	1,82
		S	,78	0,94	0,79	0,53	0,70	1,13	0,52	0,85
Total		$\bar{x}$	1,49	1,35	1,35	1,63	1,50	1,42	1,59	1,55
		S	,52	0,33	0,34	0,73	0,55	0,35	0,60	0,49

When the data in Table 1 are examined closely, one can see that the behavior that has the highest mean is “Hiding from you the information that will improve your performance” ( $\bar{x}=1,96$ ). This behavior was most experienced by

teachers in Gaziantep ( $x=2,22$ ), Bingöl ( $x=2,19$ ) and Ankara ( $x=2,08$ ). The behavior that has the lowest mean is “Implying that you need to leave your job (resign)” ( $x=1,21$ ).

In terms of different cities, the frequencies of mobbing was found to be as follows: Adana ( $x=1,63$ ), Gaziantep ( $x=1,59$ ), Bingöl ( $x=1,55$ ), Ankara ( $x=1,50$ ), Samsun ( $x=1,42$ ), Balıkesir and Kütahya ( $x=1,35$ ).

Table 2. The ANOVA results regarding the frequency of mobbing to which the teachers are exposed in different cities

Province	N	$\bar{x}$	St	df	F	P	difference	
Balıkesir	1	34	1,35	,32	6	2,67	,015	2-3
Kütahya	2	83	1,35	,34	358			
Adana	3	64	1,63	,73				
Ankara	4	59	1,50	,55				
Samsun	5	32	1,42	,35				
Gaziantep	6	45	1,59	,59				
Bingöl	7	48	1,55	,48				
Total		365	1,49	,52				

\* $p>,05$

Table 2 shows that teachers working in the city of Adana are exposed to mobbing the most ( $x=1,63$ ). Teachers working in the cities of Balıkesir and Kütahya are exposed to mobbing the least ( $x=1,35$ ). Analysis results show a statistically significant difference between the frequencies of mobbing that the teachers experience in different cities [ $F_{6-358}=2.67, p<.05$ ]. In other words, the frequency of mobbing that the teachers are exposed to differ significantly depending on the city where they work. A Scheffe test was used in order to find out about the between-groups differences. According to the results of this test, teachers working in Adana are exposed to mobbing ( $x=1,63$ ) more than those working in Kütahya ( $x=1,35$ ).

Table 3. The t-test results of teachers’ exposure to mobbing according to sex.

Gender	N	$\bar{x}$	S	sd	t	p
Male	201	1,46	,46	362	-,837	,403
Female	163	1,51	,59			

\* $p<,05$

Table 3 shows that the mean of male teachers’ exposure to mobbing is  $x=1,46$ , and the mean of female teachers’ exposure to mobbing is  $x=1,51$ . When the t-distribution is examined, one can see that teachers’ exposure to mobbing does not show a statistically significant difference in terms of sex variable. In other words, the sex variable is not a determinant factor for teachers’ exposure to mobbing.

Table 4. The ANOVA results of teachers’ exposure to mobbing in terms of age.

Age	N	$\bar{x}$	St	df	F	P
33 and above	185	1,51	,53883	2	,495	,610
34 – 45	141	1,46	,51059	361		
46 and above	38	1,56	,50459			
Total	364	1,4915	,52385			

\* $p>,05$

Table 4 shows that teachers who are 46 years old and above are exposed to mobbing the most ( $x=1,63$ ), and teachers in the 34-45 age group are exposed to mobbing the least ( $x=1,46$ ). Analysis results show that there is not a statistically significant difference between the frequencies of mobbing in terms of age. In other words, the age variable is not a factor that accounts for mobbing that teachers are exposed to.

## CONCLUSIONS

Research findings indicate that mobbing that teachers experience in secondary education schools in the city of Adana is the highest compared to other cities. Teachers working in schools in Balıkesir and Kütahya experience mobbing the least. That there is a statistically significant difference between the frequencies of mobbing in different cities leads us to think that mobbing is affected by cultural variables.

The most common type of mobbing was found to be “Hiding from you the information that can improve your performance” and the least common type of mobbing was found to be “Implying that you need to leave your job (resign)” A study by Mete (2013) found the most common type of mobbing to be “exclusion and discrediting.” The reason why the findings of the present study and those of Mete’s are not parallel may be that the two studies were carried out in different institutions.

In terms of the sex of teachers, there is no statistically significant difference in the frequency of exposure to mobbing. The findings of many studies on the topic confirm these findings. For example, studies by Cemaloğlu (2007), Koç and Urasoğlu-Bulut (2009), Acar and Dündar (2008), Yeşiltaş and Demirçivi (2010), Deniz and Ünsal (2010) Hansen et al (2006), and Vertia (1996) showed that there is no difference in mobbing in terms of sex variable. However, there are also studies that found that there is a statistically significant difference between mobbing and sex variable (Karcıoğlu and Çelik, 2012; Namie, 2003). This difference may be accounted for by cultural variables as well as by the characteristics of the institutions in which the studies were carried out.

As for the age of the teachers, there is no statistically significant difference between age groups. Zapf’s explanation supports this finding. Zapf (1999: 75) states that the age factor is not a significant factor in individuals’ exposure to mobbing. However, a study by Urasoğlu found that the age variable is an important and statistically significant variable in mobbing. Urasoğlu (2007: 85) conducted a study in secondary education institutions in 25 cities and found that teachers under 25 years of age are exposed to mobbing more than other age groups.

The finding that the types of mobbing in secondary education institutions differ according to cities is an indication that mobbing is affected by culture. With more comprehensive studies both in educational sector and other sectors, it is possible to obtain a clearer picture of this finding. Therefore, more studies are needed on the issue.

## References

- Acar, A. B. & Dündar, G. (2008). The research of relationship between frequency of mobbing at work and the demographic factors. *Istanbul University Journal of the School of Business Administration*, 37(2), 111-120
- Aydın, O. & Öcel, H. (2009). İşyeri Zorbalığı Ölçeği: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 12(24), 94-103
- Aytaç, S.; Bayram, N. & Bilgel, N. (2005). Çalışma yaşamında yeni bir baskı aracı: mobbing (Psikolojik Terör). 13. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi (12–14 Mayıs). *Bildiriler Kitabı*, s. 333-337. Marmara Üniversitesi. İstanbul.
- Bahçe, Ç. (2007). Mobbing oluşumunda örgüt kültürünün rolü. *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. İşletme Anabilim Dalı, İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Bilim Dalı, Ankara
- Balcı, A. (2001). Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma. (3. Baskı). Ankara: Pegem A yayınları.
- Cemaloğlu N. (2007). The exposure of primary school teachers to bullying: an analysis of various variables. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 35(6), 789-802
- Cemaloğlu, N. & Ertürk, A. (2007). Öğretmenlerin okullarda maruz kaldıkları yıldırma eylemlerinin cinsiyet yönünden incelenmesi. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*. 5, (2), 345–362.
- Cemaloğlu, N. & Ertürk, A. (2008). The course of mobbing experienced by school teachers and principals. *Bilig*, 46, 67-86.
- Cengiz, R. (2009). Futbolda psikolojik baskı ve şiddet. İstanbul: TFF- FGM. Futbol Eğitim Yayınları –No:11.
- Çakır, B. (2006). İş yerindeki yıldırma eylemlerinin (mobbing) işten ayrılmalara etkisi üzerine bir araştırma. *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Davenport, N.; Schwartz R. D. & Elliott G. P. (2003). *Mobbing: Emotional Abuse in the American Workplace*. (Translation: Osman C. ÖnerToy). İstanbul: Sistem Publishing.
- Demirçivi, B. M. (2008). Otel işletmelerinde yıldırma eylemlerinin iş gören verimliliğine etkisi ve insan kaynakları yönetimi açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara
- Deniz, D. & Ünsal, P. (2010). İşyerinde yıldırma uğramada dışadönük ve nevrotik kişilik yapıları ile cinsiyetin rolü. “İŞ, GÜÇ” *Industrial Relations and Human Resources Journal*, 12(1), 31-45
- Dick, V. & Wagner, U. (2001). Stressandstrain in teaching: A structural equation approach. *British journal of educational psychology*, 71, 243–259.
- Dilman, T. (2007). Özel hastanelerde çalışan hemşirelerin duygusal tacize maruz kalma durumlarının belirlenmesi. *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Marmara Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

- Duffy, M. & Sperry, L. (2007). Workplace mobbing: Individual and family health consequences. *The Family Journal*, 15(4), 398–404.
- Einarsen, S. & Raknes, B. I. (1997). Harassment in the workplace and the victimization of men. *Violence and Victims*, 12, 247-263.
- Einarsen, S. & Hoel, H. (2001). The Negative Act Questionnaire: Development, validation and revision of a measure of bullying at work. 10th European Congress on Work and Organizational Psychology, Prague.
- Erbaş, E. F. (2004). Yönetmelik yıldırımının çalışan motivasyonuna etkilerinin yönetmelik etik bağlamında incelenmesi. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Kocaeli Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kocaeli
- Ertürk, A. (2013). Mobbing Behaviour: Victims and the Affected. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 13(1), 161-173.
- Gökçe, A. T. ve Oğuz, E. (2009). Yüksek öğretimde Yıldırma. Uluslararası 5. Balkan Eğitim ve Bilim Kongresi (1-3 Ekim). Kongre Kitabı 55-60. Edirne.
- Hansen, A.; Høgh, A.; Persson, R.; Karlson, B.; Garde, A. & Orbaek, P. (2006). Bullying at work, health outcomes, and physiological stress response. *Journal of Psychosom Res* 60(1), 63–72.
- Işık, E. (2007). İşletmelerde mobbing uygulamaları ile iş stresi ilişkisine yönelik bir araştırma. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- İyem, C. (2007). Futbolda Mobbing: Sakaryaspor A.Ş. Örneği. XV. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi (25-27 Mayıs). Sakarya Üniversitesi. Kongre Kitapçığı 920-928.
- Karcıoğlu, F. & Çelik, Ü. H. (2012). Mobbing (Yıldırma) ve Örgütsel Bağlılığa Etkisi. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 26(1), 59-75.
- Kocaoğlu, M. (2007). Mobbing uygulamaları ve motivasyon arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Koç, M. ve Urasoğlu H. B. (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.
- Kök, S. B. (2006, Mayıs). İş yaşamında psiko-şiddet sarmalı olarak yıldırma olgusu ve nedenleri. 14. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi, 16, 433-448. Erzurum
- Leymann, H. (1990). Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces, *Violence and Victims*, 5(2), 119-126.
- Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5 (2), 165-185.
- Leymann, H. & Gustafsson, A. (1996). Mobbing at work and the development of posttraumatic stress disorders. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), 251–275.
- MEB (2014). National Education Statistics- Formal Education 2013-2014. Publications of National Education [http://sgb.meb.gov.tr/istatistik/meb\\_istatistikleri\\_orgun\\_egitim\\_2013\\_2014.pdf](http://sgb.meb.gov.tr/istatistik/meb_istatistikleri_orgun_egitim_2013_2014.pdf)
- Mete, Y. A. (2013). Mobbing in higher education: Practitioners, Victims And Audiences. *International Journal of Social Science*, 6,(2), 977-993,
- Namie G. (2003). Workplace bullying: Escalated in civility. *Ivey Business Journals*, 68(2), 1-6
- O’Conner, H. (2004). Bullying staff in schools. 1-6. Retrieved June 18, 2014, <http://www.caitrin.mtx.net>.
- Rayner, C.; Sheehan, M. & Barker, M. (1999). The theoretical approaches to the study of bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20(1/2), 11-15.
- Şahin, B. (2011). Methodology. (In: Scientific research methods. Editör: Tanrıoğen, Abdurrahman.) 109-130
- Tanrıoğen, A. (2011) Scientific research methods. 2. Press. Anı Publishing. Ankara
- Tokel, A. G. (2005). İş yerinde incinme: Özel ve resmi ilköğretim okulu öğretmen ve yöneticileri üzerinde yapılan bir araştırma. Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Urasoğlu, H. B. (2007). Ortaöğretim öğretmenlerinde psikolojik şiddet düzeyi. yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Niğde Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Niğde.
- Vartia, M. (1996). The sources of bullying –psychological work environment and organizational climate. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), 203-214.
- Yavuz, H. (2007). Çalışanlarda mobbing (psikolojik şiddet) algısını etkileyen faktörler. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İsparta.
- Yazıcı, h. (2009). Öğretmenlik mesleği, motivasyon kaynakları ve temel tutumlar: kuramsal bir bakış. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 17 (1) 33-46
- Yeşiltaş, M. & Demirçivi, B. M. (2010). İş Görenlerin Yıldırma Eylemlerine Maruz Kalma Durumları Üzerine Bir Araştırma: Antalya Örneği. *Anatolia: Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 21, (2), 199-217.
- Zapf, D. (1999). Organizational Work Group Related and Personal Causes of Mobbing / Bullying at Work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20 (1-2), 70-85.

# Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology

*Special Issue for INTE 2015*

*August, 2015*

Prof. Dr. Aytekin İşman  
Editor-in-Chief

Prof. Dr. Jerry WILLIS - ST John Fisher University in Rochester, USA  
Prof. Dr. J. Ana Donaldson - AECT President  
Editors

Assist.Prof.Dr. Fahme DABAJ - Eastern Mediterranean University, TRNC  
Associate Editor

Assoc.Prof.Dr. Eric Zhi - Feng Liu - National Central University, Taiwan  
Assistant Editor





**THE  
TURKISH ONLINE  
JOURNAL  
OF  
EDUCATIONAL  
TECHNOLOGY**

**August, 2015**  
Special Issue for INTE 2015

**Prof. Dr. Aytekin İşman**  
Editor-in-Chief

Editors

**Prof. Dr. Jerry Willis**  
**Prof. Dr. J. Ana Donaldson**

Associate Editor

**Assist. Prof. Dr. Fahme Dabaj**

Assistant Editor

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Eric Zhi - Feng Liu**

**ISSN: 1303 - 6521**

**Indexed by**

**Education Resources Information Center – ERIC**  
**SCOPUS - ELSEVIER**