

www.ijones.net

Examination of Mobbing Exposure of Physical Education and Branch Teachers and Organizational Silence Levels

Sami Adak 
Necmettin Erbakan University, Turkey

Mehtap Yıldız 
Necmettin Erbakan University, Turkey

To cite this article:

Adak, S., & Yildiz, M. (2022). Examination of mobbing exposure of physical education and branch teachers and organizational silence levels. *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences (IJONES)*, 4(4), 634-649. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijones.359>

International Journal on Social and Education Sciences (IJONES) is a peer-reviewed scholarly online journal. This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Authors alone are responsible for the contents of their articles. The journal owns the copyright of the articles. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of the research material. All authors are requested to disclose any actual or potential conflict of interest including any financial, personal or other relationships with other people or organizations regarding the submitted work.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Examination of Mobbing Exposure of Physical Education and Branch Teachers and Organizational Silence Levels

Sami Adak, Mehtap Yıldız

Article Info

Article History

Received:

28 February 2022

Accepted:

13 September 2022

Keywords

Physical education teacher

Branch teacher

Mobbing

Organizational silence

Abstract

In this study, it was aimed to comparatively examine the levels of exposure to mobbing of physical education and branch teachers and organizational silence in terms of some variables. In the study, based on the comparative relational screening method, the levels of physical education and branch teachers' exposure to mobbing and organizational silence were compared according to the variables of gender, age, professional seniority, school level and school type. The sample of the research consists of 212 physical education and branch teachers working in Konya. Organizational Silence Scale and Negative Behaviours Questionnaire were used to collect research data. According to the research findings, physical education and branch teachers' exposure to mobbing and organizational silence levels show significant differences according to branch, gender, age and school type. In addition, there is a significant positive relationship between physical education and branch teachers' mobbing exposure and organizational silence levels. This research aimed to test the effects of mobbing and silence, which affect productivity and performance, on branch teachers, physical education and sports teachers. The fact that the research findings are based on quantitative data is an important limitation of the study.

Introduction

One of the most important social institutions in a society is the educational institution. On the other hand, the most important input of an organization is the human. Although the organization has the structural physical and economic conditions for effectiveness it is not possible to achieve institutional success if the necessary attention is not given to the person responsible for the operation of the system. If the problems and expectations of teachers in schools are not taken into account, it may not be possible for that system to work efficiently (Kara, 2020; Kibici, 2021; Sarikaya, 2021; Sokmen & Kilic, 2019).

Human input becomes more important in educational organizations because in other organizations, the human element is less involved at any stage of the system's input-process-output cycle. In fact, this is sometimes negligible in organizations based on automation. However, there is a human element at every stage of the input-process-output cycle of educational organizations. Its input is student, processor is teacher, output is qualified workforce. In addition, what the student gains is behavioural change. So, the most important thing in educational

organizations is human and behaviour as product. The extent to which teachers' duties are carried out effectively is related to the quality of the working environment. The concept of sense of work environment is discussed under the name of organizational effectiveness, environment, climate, organizational ideology, ecological field and organizational knowledge (Hoy et al., 1991). Depending on the characteristics of the working environment, teachers' sense of working environment can affect their working style. One of the factors that form the basis of teachers' working environment feelings is teachers' interests and attitudes towards objects in the working environment (profession, work, colleagues, student, school). In this sense, it is possible for teachers to show an activity according to the importance they give to these objects and the quality of their relationship with them (Kaleli, 2020; Kasimoglu, 2021; Reichenberg & Lofgren, 2019; Sokmen & Kilic, 2019). So, two of the most important phenomena that negatively affect the employee's interest in the objects in the working environment are mobbing and organizational silence.

The phenomenon of mobbing is considered to be an action or behaviour that refers to an employee or includes continuous and long-term harassment or intimidation of that employee. This phenomenon causes significant negative consequences in the workplace but most important of all are the consequences that are devastating for the victims (Vveinhardt & Sroka, 2020). Mobbing in the workplace refers to situations such as verbal abuse, offensive words, sarcasm, slander or social isolation that repeatedly target a specific person in a specific time period (Einarsen, 2000; Tatar & Yüksel, 2019). Mobbing is systematic aggression towards a person or group and is different from individual, temporary interpersonal conflicts (Rayner et al., 2006). Long-term exposure to persistent negative activities that the individual has difficulty in coping with is a basic feature of mobbing (Tatar & Yüksel, 2019). It can be said that conflicts are practically inevitable in any organization. However, since satisfactory working conditions are key to the psychological health of employees, management has a duty to both resolve them promptly and prevent psychological abuse from occurring in order to prevent it (Soljan et al., 2008). Conflicts that arise in the organization can create conditions for the emergence of mobbing and psychological bullying (Minárová et al., 2020). Therefore, an unhealthy organizational culture and a dysfunctional psychological climate create favourable conditions for mobbing to occur (Sroka & Vveinhardt, 2020).

Revealing occupational mobbing and stress has an important preventive role in ensuring health and safety in the workplace. Teaching is a highly prominent profession in terms of mental and emotional workload. Work-related mobbing in the education sector and the resulting stress are increasing day by day due to higher job requirements and personal demands (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2018). There are many negative features associated with the teaching profession (Čecho et al., 2019). Teachers' mental health is affected by mobbing, daily conflicts, life-changing events, daily challenges and cumulative factors at the macro level. Therefore, teacher boredom, professional silence and overload trigger a higher risk of burnout (Rentzou, 2015). The mobbing that teachers are exposed to and the resulting organizational silence can negatively affect the interaction between teachers at school, teacher-student communication, the quality of work and teachers' perception of their profession. Being exposed to excessive mobbing can cause teachers to drop out of school with low achievement and is among the problems that can affect school efficiency. Teachers who are exposed to mobbing may cause the school to deviate from its teaching purpose by showing passive behaviour in the working environment. Such negative situations may result in the teacher directing his students to develop behaviours outside the purpose of education and school in the

classroom environment. It may not be possible to control or realize these attitudes that trigger each other, because it is not easy to evaluate the product objectively in education, and it is not possible to immediately observe the mobbing caused by negative attitudes and behaviours towards the teacher since the education process takes a long time.

Prolonged mobbing in the profession causes many potential problems such as indifference to work, absenteeism, silence and loss of performance, as well as a number of health problems (Novak et al., 2013). Teaching is a helping profession that includes mental abilities, communication skills and social interaction (Järvelin-Pasanen et al., 2018). However, mobbing against teachers causes communication conflicts to increase and teachers to take professional silence (Skaalvik & Skaalvik, 2016).

Organizational silence is the term used to refer to the collective-level phenomenon of saying or doing little in response to significant problems facing an organization or industry (Henriksen & Dayton, 2006; Morrison & Milliken, 2000). The consequence of silence, both inside and outside the education sector, is a heavy price (Millenson, 2003; Perlow & Williams, 2003). The flow of information within an organization is one of the most critical factors of the organization's success. However, hiding information is common too. Employees of any organization will likely form their own opinions in business processes and gather information about the organization's core work. Employees are often faced with the choice between voicing these ideas and observations or keeping quiet and hiding this potentially valuable information (Bagheri et al., 2012). An employee's voice can be defined as attempts to express ideas, concerns, information or opinions to people inside or outside an organization. The absence of sound is considered silence, although the motivation behind silence is the most meaningful message to analyse when considering organizational silence (Brinsfield, 2013). Through the use of purposeful silence, employees collectively withhold information that can undermine corporate growth and success (Bagheri et al., 2012). Therefore, organizational silence can be considered as a situation in which employees have seemingly valuable information, views, concerns or ideas and choose to keep this information (Christian, 2020).

Employee silence refers to situations where employees intentionally or unintentionally withhold information that may be useful to the organization of which they are a part. As a matter of fact, when there is a problem in the workplace, employees have two options: to keep quiet or to raise their voice. However, many employees prefer to remain silent because they do not want to share information that could be interpreted as negative or threatening (Milliken & Morrison, 2003). Employees often remain silent about conflicts with co-workers, disagreements over corporate decisions, potential weaknesses in business processes, illegal or dangerous behaviour, and personal complaints (Panteli & Fineman, 2005). Employee silence can often occur in organizations where communication is problematic. Employee silence is highly damaging when employees, managers, and supervisors do not meet regularly (Vakola & Bouradas, 2005). There are many different reasons for employee silence to begin in an organization. According to Colquitt and Greenberg (2005), "culture of injustice, mobbing and communication conflicts in organizations can lead to employee silence." In other words, "in an unjust environment characterized by the organizational norm, intense supervisory control, suppression of conflict, unclear reporting structures and poorly executed performance reviews, employees choose not to be heard."

The fact that teachers, who are among the most important determinants of the quality of education services, do not experience mobbing and organizational silence means increasing the quality of education. The results of this research will provide clues about what kind of attitudes and behaviours education decision centers should display in such situations. In summary, this research is important in terms of revealing the effects of mobbing and organizational silence that affect productivity and performance on branch teachers, physical education and sports teachers.

Method

The research was carried out by using the comparative relational screening method in order to reveal whether the levels of being exposed to mobbing and silence levels of physical education and other branch teachers differ according to their demographic and job qualifications. In this context, the participants' exposure to mobbing and organizational silence levels were examined with a relational and comparative approach according to demographic variables such as gender, age and branch, and job variables such as professional seniority, working time, type of job and working time at school.

Participant

The participants consisted of 212 teachers working at secondary and high school levels in public and private schools in the city center of Konya (see Table 1). Field research was carried out between November and December 2021.

Table 1. Distribution of Teachers by Demographic Characteristics

		N	%
Branch	Physical Education	102	48.11
	Others	110	51.88
Gender	Male	129	60.8
	Female	83	39.2
Age	21-30	72	34.0
	31-40	87	41.0
	41-50	43	20.3
	+51	10	4.7
Marital Status	Married	169	79.7
	Single	39	18.4
	Divorced	4	1.9
Year Experience at Work	1-10 Year	146	68.9
	11-20 Year	33	15.6
	+21 Year	32	15.1
Working Status	Permanent Teacher	185	87.3
	Contract Teacher	20	9.4
	Other	7	3.3
School Type	State School	108	50.9
	Private School	104	49.1
	Total	212	

According to Table 1, 102 (48.11%) of the participants were physical education teachers; 110 (51.88%) of them work as branch teachers. In terms of gender, 129 (60.8%) of the participants are male; 83 of them (39.2%) are women. 72 (34.0%) of the teachers in the sample are 21-30 years old; 87 (40.00%) 31-40 years old; 43 (20.3%) 41-50 years old; 10 (4.7%) are 51 and above. Of the participants, 169 (79.7%) are married, 39 (18.4%) are single, and 4 (1.9%) are divorced. When the sample is examined in terms of working time in the profession, 146 (68.9%) of the participants are 1-10 Years; 33 (15.6%) 11-20 years; 32 (15.1%) are found to have 21 years or more of professional seniority. 108 (50.9%) of the participants are in public schools; 104 (49.1%) work in private schools.

Data Collection Tools

Mobbing Exposure Scale

In this study, the 'Negative Behavior Scale' developed by Einarsen and Raknes (1997) and adapted into Turkish by Cemaloğlu (2007) was used to measure teachers' exposure to mobbing. The scale, which has a 2-dimensional structure (Mobbing in Social Relations-Mobbing at Work) reveals the low and high levels of mobbing exposure perception in total scores. The reliability coefficient calculated in the sub-dimension and total scores of the Negative Behaviour Scale is .97 for the Mobbing in Social Relations sub-dimension; It is determined as .91 for the sub-dimension of Mobbing on the Job.

Organizational Silence Scale

The 5-point Likert-type Organizational Silence Scale developed by Kahveci and Demirtaş (2013) is used to measure teachers' perceptions of organizational silence. The scale consists of School Environment, Emotion, Source of Silence, Administrator and Isolation sub-dimensions. The internal consistency coefficient of the Organizational Silence Scale is 0.89. The internal consistency coefficient of the sub-dimensions of the scale is .74 for School Environment, .81 for Emotion, .80 for Source of Silence, .79 for Administrator, and .83 for Isolation.

Data Analysis Techniques

Parametric statistical techniques are used in the study because the scores obtained from the physical education and other branch teachers' exposure to mobbing and silence scales in the study sample met the skewness and kurtosis values of the normal distribution assumptions (Yurt, 2011). The descriptive analysis of these participant teachers' mobbing exposure and silence levels; arithmetic mean and standard deviation; Unrelated Sample t-Test and One-Way Analysis of Variance Techniques are used to compare dependent variables with respect to other independent variables. In addition, the Multiple Regression Analysis Technique is used in the analysis of the relationship between exposure to mobbing and silence levels of physical education and other branch teachers.

Results

When Table 2 is examined, the mean scores of the participant teachers on the Mobbing Exposure Scale and its

sub-dimensions are respectively 1.63 (± 0.76) in the social relations dimension, 1.64 (± 0.84) in the task dimension and 1.64 (± 0.87) in the total points. According to the participant opinions, it is seen that the teachers' exposure to mobbing is at a very low level. On the other hand, when the averages of the scores obtained from the Organizational Silence Scale are examined, 2.76 (± 0.67) in the dimension of school environment, 3.94 (± 0.87) in the dimension of emotion, 3.35 (± 0.78) in the dimension of the source of silence, 4.07 (± 0.83) in the dimension of the administrator, 3.60 (± 0.94) in the isolation dimension and 3.54 (± 0.64) in the total organizational silence scores are calculated. According to these results, it is seen that the school environment, the source of silence and the organizational silence in general of the participating teachers are at a moderate level. On the other hand, it is determined that they have a high level in the dimensions of emotion and manager-based silence.

Table 2. Descriptive Analysis Results of Research

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.
Social Relation	212	1.00	4.87	1.63	0.76
Work	212	1.00	4.83	1.64	0.84
Total Mobbing	212	1.00	4.85	1.64	0.77
School Environment	212	1.00	4.25	2.76	0.67
Emotion	212	1.00	5.00	3.94	0.87
Silence Source	212	1.40	5.00	3.35	0.78
Administrator	212	1.00	5.00	4.07	0.83
Isolation	212	1.00	5.00	3.60	0.97
Total Organization Silence	212	1.35	4.80	3.54	0.64

When Table 3 is examined, it is understood that the mean scores in the dimension of the source of silence of the Organizational Silence Scale of physical education and branch teachers differ significantly according to the branch ($p < 0.05$). It has been observed that physical education teachers participating in the research have a higher perception of organizational silence in the dimension of the source of silence compared to branch teachers. However, no significant difference is observed in the other dimensions of the Mobbing Exposure Scale and the Organizational Silence Scale according to the branch variable.

When Table 4 is examined, there are significant gender differences in physical education teachers' social relations, job and total mobbing exposure scores according to their gender ($p < 0.05$). It has been observed that male physical education teachers have the perception that they are exposed to mobbing at a higher rate compared to the average scores. No significant difference is found in the mean scores of the other branch teachers' Mobbing Exposure Scale. In terms of organizational silence of physical education teachers, significant differences are found in emotion, source of silence, isolation and total organizational silence scores according to gender. It has been observed that male physical education teachers have a higher level of organizational silence perception in these dimensions and total scores. On the other hand, in terms of organizational silence of branch teachers, a significant difference is found in emotion dimension according to gender variable ($p < 0.05$). In this dimension, female branch teachers have a higher level of emotional perception compared to their male colleagues.

Table 3. Comparison of Mobbing Exposure and Organizational Silence Levels of Physical Education and Branch Teachers

	Branch	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	t	p
Social Relation	Physical Edu.	102	1.65	0.80	.37	.71
	Other Branches	110	1.61	0.73		
Work	Physical Edu.	102	1.65	0.87	.15	.88
	Other Branches	110	1.64	0.82		
Total Mobbing	Physical Edu.	102	1.65	0.82	.26	.79
	Other Branches	110	1.62	0.73		
School Environment	Physical Edu.	102	2.70	0.69	-1.22	.22
	Other Branches	110	2.81	0.65		
Emotion	Physical Edu.	102	3.93	0.90	-.15	.88
	Other Branches	110	3.95	0.84		
Silence Source	Physical Edu.	102	3.51	0.74	2.79	.01*
	Other Branches	110	3.21	0.79		
Administrator	Physical Edu.	102	4.11	0.85	.57	.57
	Other Branches	110	4.04	0.81		
Isolation	Physical Edu.	102	3.59	0.93	-.04	.97
	Other Branches	110	3.60	1.01		
Total Organization Silence	Physical Edu.	102	3.57	0.64	.51	.61
	Other Branches	110	3.52	0.65		

Table 4. Comparison of Mobbing Exposure and Organizational Silence Levels of Physical Education and Branch Teachers by Gender

		Physical Edu. Teachers				Branch Teachers			
		Mean	Std. Dev.	t	p	Mean	Std. Dev.	t	p
Social Relation	Male	1.77	0.88	2.581	.011*	1.64	0.73	.394	.694
	Female	1.32	0.38						
Work	Male	1.76	0.96	2.135	.035*	1.66	0.85	.341	.733
	Female	1.35	0.45						
Total Mobbing	Male	1.76	0.90	2.406	.018*	1.65	0.74	.387	.699
	Female	1.33	0.40						
School Environment	Male	2.70	0.68	.057	.955	2.81	0.68	-.054	.957
	Female	2.69	0.73						
Emotion	Male	4.05	0.75	2.319	.022*	3.78	0.93	-2.006	.047*
	Female	3.59	1.16						
Silence Source	Male	3.60	0.70	2.104	.038	3.15	0.84	-.769	.443
	Female	3.25	0.81						
Administrator	Male	4.20	0.85	1.847	.068	3.96	0.75	-1.010	.315
	Female	3.85	0.81						
Isolation	Male	3.72	0.82	2.236	.028*	3.51	0.98	-.956	.341
	Female	3.26	1.13						
Total Organization Silence	Male	3.65	0.56	2.310	.023*	3.44	0.67	-1.258	.211
	Female	3.33	0.77						

When Table 5 is examined, no significant difference is found between physical education teachers mobbing

exposure and organizational silence levels ($p>0.05$).

Table 5. Comparison of Mobbing Exposure and Organizational Silence Levels of Physical Education and Branch Teachers by Age

	Age	Physical Edu. Teachers				Branch Teachers			
		Mean	Std. Dev.	F	p	Mean	Std. Dev.	F	p
Social Relation	21-30	1.57	0.77	1.105	.351	1.59	0.64	.461	.710
	31-40	1.86	0.90			1.68	0.78		
	41-50	1.51	0.60			1.51	0.71		
	+51	1.51	0.92			1.43	0.63		
Work	21-30	1.57	0.79	1.386	.251	1.58	0.49	1.266	.290
	31-40	1.91	1.01			1.78	0.95		
	41-50	1.47	0.75			1.46	0.77		
	+51	1.47	0.95			1.30	0.30		
Total Mobbing	21-30	1.57	0.76	1.309	.276	1.59	0.53	.932	.428
	31-40	1.88	0.93			1.73	0.82		
	41-50	1.49	0.66			1.49	0.72		
	+51	1.49	0.94			1.36	0.45		
School Environment	21-30	2.79	0.66	1.377	.254	2.66	0.61	.891	.448
	31-40	2.51	0.69			2.91	0.67		
	41-50	2.84	0.71			2.75	0.68		
	+51	2.60	0.91			2.80	0.41		
Emotion	21-30	3.86	1.00	.669	.573	3.94	0.76	.798	.498
	31-40	3.98	0.72			4.01	0.93		
	41-50	4.15	0.93			3.93	0.73		
	+51	3.60	0.80			3.40	0.76		
Silence Source	21-30	3.56	0.79	.431	.731	3.25	0.78	1.209	.310
	31-40	3.53	0.62			3.32	0.87		
	41-50	3.39	0.85			2.98	0.61		
	+51	3.24	0.79			3.08	0.59		
Administrator	21-30	4.12	0.82	2.116	.103	4.13	0.59	4.324	.006*
	31-40	4.19	0.76			4.22	0.71		
	41-50	4.19	0.83			3.75	1.01		
	+51	3.20	1.39			3.20	0.77		
Isolation	21-30	3.57	0.98	.711	.548	3.58	1.05	.130	.942
	31-40	3.74	0.77			3.62	1.05		
	41-50	3.52	1.00			3.63	0.99		
	+51	3.13	1.19			3.33	0.78		
Total Organizational Silence	21-30	3.58	0.67	.745	.528	3.51	0.58	1.169	.325
	31-40	3.59	0.47			3.62	0.69		
	41-50	3.62	0.73			3.41	0.63		
	+51	3.15	0.96			3.16	0.58		

While no significant difference could be determined in the sub-dimensions of the level of exposure to mobbing of the branch teachers, a significant difference is found in the organizational silence levels only in the sub-dimension of the manager ($p < 0.05$). The significant difference stemmed from the branch teachers between the ages of 31-40 and 41-50.

When Table 6 is examined, no significant difference is found in the levels of being exposed to mobbing and organizational silence according to the staff status of physical education and branch teachers ($p > 0.05$).

Table 6. Comparison of Mobbing Exposure and Organizational Silence Levels of Physical Education and Branch Teachers by Working Status

	Working Status	Physical Edu. Teachers				Branch Teachers			
		Mean	Std. Dev.	F	p	Mean	Std. Dev.	F	p
Social Relation	Permanent	1.61	0.72	.770	.466	1.59	0.72	.957	.387
	Contract	1.73	1.12			2.10	0.90		
	Other	2.04	0.88			1.67	0.94		
Work	Permanent	1.61	0.82	.607	.547	1.64	0.83	.037	.963
	Contract	1.76	1.16			1.58	0.62		
	Other	2.00	0.59			1.50	0.71		
Total Mobbing	Permanent	1.61	0.75	.712	.493	1.62	0.74	.185	.831
	Contract	1.74	1.14			1.84	0.73		
	Other	2.02	0.68			1.58	0.82		
School Environment	Permanent	2.71	0.70	.648	.525	2.83	0.66	.650	.524
	Contract	2.56	0.67			2.63	0.52		
	Other	2.95	0.76			2.38	0.18		
Emotion	Permanent	3.91	0.88	.239	.788	3.95	0.85	.429	.652
	Contract	3.92	0.92			3.67	0.72		
	Other	4.20	1.19			4.33	0.47		
Silence Source	Permanent	3.46	0.73	.921	.402	3.21	0.79	.018	.982
	Contract	3.74	0.83			3.25	1.06		
	Other	3.44	0.75			3.30	0.14		
Administrator	Permanent	4.07	0.90	.563	.571	4.03	0.83	.271	.763
	Contract	4.31	0.63			4.25	0.32		
	Other	4.00	0.67			4.33	0.00		
Isolation	Permanent	3.56	0.93	.881	.418	3.60	1.02	.292	.747
	Contract	3.85	0.76			3.33	0.98		
	Other	3.33	1.31			4.00	0.00		
Total Organization Silence	Permanent	3.54	0.64	.284	.753	3.52	0.67	.093	.911
	Contract	3.68	0.60			3.43	0.41		
	Other	3.58	0.72			3.67	0.03		

When Table 7 is examined, no significant difference is found in the levels of being exposed to mobbing and organizational silence according to the school level of physical education and branch teachers ($p>0.05$).

Table 7. Comparison of Mobbing Exposure and Organizational Silence Levels of Physical Education and Branch Teachers by School Level

	School Level	Physical Edu. Teachers				Branch Teachers			
		Mean	Std. Dev.	t	p	Mean	Std. Dev.	t	p
Social	Elementary School	1.64	0.80	-.060	.952	1.50	0.51	-1.255	.212
Relation	High School	1.65	0.82			1.68	0.83		
Work	Elementary School	1.66	0.89	.161	.873	1.65	0.83	.112	.911
	High School	1.64	0.85			1.63	0.82		
Total	Elementary School	1.65	0.83	.056	.955	1.57	0.62	-.558	.578
Mobbing	High School	1.64	0.81			1.65	0.80		
School	Elementary School	2.66	0.67	-.834	.406	2.69	0.67	-1.585	.116
	High School	2.78	0.74			2.89	0.63		
Emotion	Elementary School	3.96	0.96	.460	.647	3.91	0.94	-.383	.702
	High School	3.87	0.78			3.97	0.78		
Silence	Elementary School	3.50	0.82	-.133	.895	3.15	0.92	-.659	.511
	High School	3.52	0.60			3.25	0.70		
Administrator	Elementary School	4.09	0.87	-.324	.747	3.95	0.84	-1.003	.318
	High School	4.14	0.82			4.10	0.79		
Isolation	Elementary School	3.68	0.94	1.264	.209	3.63	1.07	.231	.818
	High School	3.44	0.90			3.58	0.98		
Total	Elementary School	3.58	0.70	.196	.845	3.46	0.73	-.749	.456
Organization	High School	3.55	0.52			3.56	0.60		
Silence									

When Table 8 is examined, no significant difference is found in the levels of mobbing exposure and organizational silence according to the type of school (state-private) ($p>0.05$). On the other hand, a significant difference is determined in the social relations sub-dimension and total mobbing score averages of the branch teachers' exposure to mobbing, and in the organizational silence levels in the source of silence sub-dimension score averages. When this difference is examined, it is determined that branch teachers working in private schools have higher levels of mobbing perception and organizational silence compared to their colleagues working in public schools.

When Table 9 is examined, it is understood that the regression model developed to test the effect of teachers' exposure to mobbing on organizational silence scores is found to be statistically significant $R=0.27$; $R^2=0.07$; $p<0.001$. Mobbing exposure of the participants explains about 7% of the total variance in organizational silence scores. When the significance values of the calculated standardized path coefficients are examined, exposure to mobbing as a whole affects teachers' organizational silence positively and significantly.

Table 8. Comparison of Mobbing Exposure and Organizational Silence Levels of Physical Education and Branch Teachers by School Type

	School Type	Physical Edu. Teachers				Branch Teachers			
		Mean	Std. Dev.	t	p	Mean	Std. Dev.	t	p
Social Relation	State	1.62	0.79	1.270	.207	1.59	0.71	-2.436	.017*
	Private	1.99	0.92			3.33			
Work	State	1.62	0.87	1.173	.243	1.63	0.82	-1.062	.291
	Private	2.00	0.84			2.50			
Total Mobbing	State	1.62	0.81	1.250	.214	1.61	0.72	-1.996	.047*
	Private	2.00	0.84			2.92			
School Environment	State	2.69	0.69	-.339	.735	2.81	0.65	.098	.922
	Private	2.78	0.74			2.75			
Emotion	State	3.95	0.86	.859	.392	3.94	0.84	-.861	.391
	Private	3.67	1.32			4.67			
Silence Source	State	3.54	0.73	1.416	.160	3.20	0.78	-1.986	.049*
	Private	3.15	0.85			4.60			
Administrator	State	4.13	0.86	1.097	.275	4.04	0.81	.052	.958
	Private	3.79	0.64			4.00			
Isolation	State	3.63	0.90	1.502	.136	3.60	1.01	.264	.792
	Private	3.13	1.18			3.33			
Total Organization Silence	State	3.59	0.62	1.228	.222	3.52	0.65	-.534	.595
	Private	3.30	0.79			3.87			

Table 9. The Results of the Regression Analysis

Independent Variables	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	p
(Constant)	3.176	.102		31.218	.000*
Social Relation	.134	.107	.159	1.249	.213
Work	.091	.097	.119	.941	.348

Discussion

In this study, exposure to mobbing and silence levels of physical education and branch teachers are examined comparatively. According to the results in Table 2, it has been seen that the physical education and branch teachers' exposure to mobbing is very low, on the other hand, organizational silence is moderate and high. In this respect, the most important reason why physical education and branch teachers are exposed to less in-school-based mobbing may be due to the fact that administrators in Turkey are also teachers. However, organizational silence may have an impact on the functioning of the system, the central organization of the ministry and the strict hierarchical structuring at the provincial-district directorates. According to the results in Table 3, no significant difference is found in the levels of physical education and branch teachers' exposure to mobbing. On the other hand, it is observed that physical education teachers have a higher perception of organizational silence in the

dimension of the source of silence compared to branch teachers. There is no distinction between branch and physical education teachers in terms of the functioning of the school. In this respect, both groups are exposed to low and similar levels of mobbing. In organizational silence, teachers' reactions to policy and educational decisions specific to their fields may have been determinative.

According to the results in Table 4, there are significant differences in terms of exposure to mobbing and organizational silence levels of physical education and branch teachers by gender. It has been determined that male physical education teachers have a higher perception of being exposed to mobbing and a higher level of perception of organizational silence. On the other hand, while the level of exposure to mobbing of branch teachers does not differ according to the gender variable, it is determined that female branch teachers have a higher level of emotional silence perception compared to their male colleagues. These findings are similar to the research findings carried out Atman (2012), Careroa et al. (2010), Somunoglu et al. (2013). Although exposure to mobbing is reported in these studies, no significant difference could be found between the genders. On organizational silence, Bastug et al. (2016), Demirtaş & Nacar (2018), Kahveci & Demirtaş (2013), and Near & Miceli (1996) have similar research findings. In these studies, it has been reported that women exhibit higher levels of organizational silence in their workplaces. According to Pinder & Harlos (2001), organizational silence is greatly affected by the identity and characteristics of individuals. In these studies, it is stated that women mostly prefer to remain silent in situations of authoritarian leadership and conflict situations in the workplace.

According to the results in Table 5, no significant difference is determined in the levels of being exposed to mobbing and organizational silence according to the age of physical education teachers. These findings are similar to the research findings of Kaya, Ahi & Tabak (2012), Dikmetaş et al. (2011). On the other hand, there are significant differences in one dimension of the Organizational Silence Scale of branch teachers. Branch teachers aged 40 and under have a higher perception of managerial organizational silence than their peers in the upper age group. These findings are similar to the research findings of Millikenet et al. (2003) and Karacaoğlu & Cingöz (2008). According to Millikenet et al. (2003), employees with low professional seniority experience higher levels of anxiety and fear at the managerial level compared to older employees, which leads them to organizational silence.

According to the results in Table 6 and Table 7, no significant difference is found in the levels of being exposed to mobbing and organizational silence according to the staff status and school level variable of physical education and branch teachers. Teachers in Turkey have predominantly similar powers and responsibilities at all levels. In this respect, school level and staff status may not have caused a significant difference in these two dependent variables. According to the results in Table 8, no significant difference is determined in the levels of mobbing exposure and organizational silence according to the type of school (public-private). On the other hand, it has been observed that branch teachers working in private schools have a higher level of mobbing perception and organizational silence perception compared to their colleagues working in public schools. These findings are similar to the research findings of Gürsel, Sunbul and Sarı (2002), Kara (2020), Kaleli (2021), Kızılkaya (2021) and Kibici (2021), and Sunbul (2003). The fact that teachers working in private schools in Turkey face the risk of losing their jobs due to insufficient social security may be the reasons for their exposure to mobbing and

organizational silence in part. According to the results of the regression analysis in Table 9, exposure to mobbing in both physical education and branch teachers directly affects and increases organizational silence. These findings are same as study findings of Vveinhardt and Streimikiene (2015), Wang et al. (2019), Zahed (2015), Zhou et al. (2020). Zahed (2015) states that mobbing those employees are exposed to by their colleagues or a supervisor in an organization causes employee silence within the organization. Huang et al. (2018), on the other hand, reveals that a negative relationship with an impersonal and rude manager are one of the important causes of employee silence.

Conclusion

With this research, it is aimed to create a general framework regarding the reasons why physical education and branch teachers are exposed to mobbing and remain silent. Conducting the research in different educational institutions and different samples will make it easier to generalize the results to the field of education. In new studies, it is recommended to examine the causes and consequences of mobbing and organizational silence and their relations with other organizational behaviour issues such as school climate, job satisfaction, burnout, leadership and school culture. This research aimed to test the effects of mobbing and silence, which affect productivity and performance, on branch teachers, physical education and sports teachers. The fact that the research findings are based on quantitative data is an important limitation of the study. It is recommended that future research on this subject be supported by qualitative methods.

References

- Atman, Ü. (2012). İşyerinde psikolojik terör. *Sağlıkta Performans ve Kalite Dergisi*, 3, 157-174.
- Bagheri, G., Zarei, R., & Aeen, M. N. (2012). Organizational silence (basic concepts and its development factors). *Ideal Type of Management*, 1(1), 47-58.
- Barnett, D.E. (2018). Online Adjunct Faculty: A quantitative examination of the predictive relationship between leadership and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 4(1), 226-236. DOI:10.21890/ijres.383159
- Bastug, G., Palan, A., Yılmaz, T., & Duyan, M. (2016). Organizational silence sport employees, *Journal of Education and Learning*, 5(4). 126-132. Doi:10.5539/jel.v5n4p126.
- Brinsfield, C.T. (2013). Employees silence motives: Investigation of dimensionality and development of measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(5), 671-697. doi: 10.1002/job.1829
- Carneroa, M. A., Blanca, M., & Rocio S.M. (2010). Mobbing and its determinants: the case of Spain. *Applied Economics*, 42, 3777-3787.
- Čecho, R., Švihrová, V., Čecho, D., Novák, M., & Hudečková, H. (2019). Exposure to mental load and psychosocial risks in kindergarten teachers. *Zdravstveno Varstvo*, 58(3), 120-128.
- Cemaloğlu, N., & Okçu, V. (2012). İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin liderlik stilleri ile öğretmenlerin yıldırma (mobbing) yaşama düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(3).
- Christian, T. (2020). Organizational silence: why employees don't speak up. Indiana University East Publisher. <https://medium.com/@tiani1999/organizational-silence-why-employees-dont-speak-up-a01c7dbc3fb9>


- Colquitt, J.A., & Greenberg, J. (2005). *Handbook of organizational justice*. Hillsdale, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. ISBN 0-8058-4203-9
- Demirtaş, Z., & Nacar, D. (2018). Öğretmenlerin iş doyumunu ve örgütsel sessizlik algıları arasındaki ilişki. *The Journal of Educational Reflections*, 2(1), 13-23.
- Dikmetaş, E., Top, M., & Gülpembe, E. (2011). Asistan hekimlerin tükenmişlik ve mobbing düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *Türk Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 22(3), 137-149.
- Einarsen, S. (2000). Harassment and bullying at work: A review of the Scandinavian approach. *Aggress Violent Behav.*, 5, 379-401.
- Einarsen, S., & Raknes, B. I. (1997). Harassment in the workplace and the victimization of men. *Violence and Victims*, 12, 247-263.
- Gürsel, M., Sunbul, A.M., & Sarı, H. (2002). An analysis of burnout and job satisfaction between Turkish headteachers and teachers: A Quantitative Approach. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, XVII (1), 35-45.
- Henriksen, K., & Dayton, E. (2006). Organizational silence and hidden threats to patient safety. *Health Services Research*, 41(4p2), 1539-1554. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6773.2006.00564.x>
- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Kottkamp, R. B. (1991). *Open schools/healthy schools: measuring organizational climate*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.
- Huang A.H., Yang L., & Guo G.T. (2018). Abusive supervision and employee silence: The mediating effect of perceptions of organizational politics and the moderating effect of LMX. *Int. Interdiscip. Bus.-Econ. Adv.*, J. 3, 19-28.
- Järvelin-Pasanen S., Sinikallio S., & Tarvainen, M. P. (2018). Heart rate variability and occupational stress - systematic review. *Industrial Health.*, 56, 500-511. doi: 10.2486/indhealth.2017-0190.
- Kahveci, G., & Demirtaş, Z. (2013). Öğretmenler için örgütsel sessizlik ölçeği geliştirme çalışması. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 12 (43), 167-182.
- Kahveci, G., & Demirtaş, Z. (2013). Okul yöneticisi ve öğretmenlerin örgütsel sessizlik algıları. *Eğitim ve Bilim Dergisi*, 38(167), 50-64.
- Kaleli, Y. S. (2020). Investigation of the relationship between pre-service music teachers' attitudes towards teaching profession and their self-efficacy beliefs. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 6(4), 580-587.
- Kaleli, Y. S. (2021). Covid 19 sürecinde müzik öğretmenlerinin tükenmişlik düzeylerinin incelenmesi. *International Journal of Eurasia Social Sciences*, 12(44), 262-277.
- Kara, S. (2020). Investigation of job satisfaction and burnout of visual arts teachers. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 6(1), 160-171.
- Karacaoğlu, K., & Cingöz, A. (2008). Örgütsel sessizlik içinde: örgütsel davranışta seçme konular (Mahmut Özdevecioğlu ve Himmet Karadal, Eds.) *Organizasyonların Karanlık Yönleri Ve Verimlilik Azaltıcı Davranışlar*. Gazi Üniversitesi Vakfı, İlke Yayınevi, 155-167.
- Kasimoğlu, M. (2021). Investigations of organizational commitment of healthcare professionals in terms of personal and business factors. *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences*, 3(2), 267-286. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijonses.143>
- Kaya, G., Ahi, B., & Tabak, H. (2012). Primary education teachers' problem: mobbing (Kastamonu Province

- Sample). *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 838-842.
- Kibici, V. B. (2021). Analysis of music teachers' job satisfaction and covid-19 anxiety levels. *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences*, 3(4), 752-767.
- Millenson, M. (2003). The Silence. *Health Affairs*, 22(2), 103–112.
- Milliken, F.J., Morrison, E.W., & Hewlin, P.F. (2003). An exploratory study of employee silence: issues that employees don't communicate upward and why. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1453-1476.
- Milliken, Fr. J., & Morrison, E.W. (2003). Shades of silence: emerging themes and future directions for research on silence in organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40 (6), 1563–1568.
- Minárová M., Benčíková D., Malá D., & Smutný F. (2020). Mobbing in a workplace and its negative influence on building quality culture; *Proceedings of the SHS Web of Conferences, Globalization and its Socio–Economic Consequences*, Rajecke Teplice, Slovak. 21–22 October, p. 05014.
- Morrison E., & Milliken F. (2000). Organizational silence: a barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), 706–725.
- Near, J. P., & Miceli, M. P. (1996). Whistle-blowing: myth and reality. *Journal of Management*, 22(3), 507-526.
- Novak, T., Sedlar, N., & Šprah, L. (2013). Perceived workplace stress and co-occurrence of health problems and burnout in different occupational groups. *Zdr Varst*, 52, 292–303. doi: 10.2478/sjph-2013-0030.
- Panteli, N., & Fineman, S. (2005). The Sound of silence: the case of virtual team organising. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 24, 347-52.
- Perlow, L., & Williams, S. (2003). Is silence killing your company? *Harvard Business Review*, 81(5), 52–58.
- Pinder, C. C., & Harlos, K. H. (2001). Employee silence: Quiescence and acquiescence as response to perceived injustice. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 20, 331-369.
- Rayner, C., & Cooper, C. L. (2006). Workplace Bullying. In E. K. Kelloway, J. Barling, & J. J. Hurrell, Jr., *Handbook of workplace violence* (pp. 121–145). Sage Publications, Inc.
- Reichenberg, M., & Lofgren, K. (2019). On the relationship between Swedish special educators' work absenteeism, job satisfaction, and self-efficacy for inclusive education. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 5(2), 615-627.
- Rentzou, K. (2015). Prevalence of burnout syndrome of Greek child care workers and kindergarten teachers. *Education*, 43, 249–62. doi: 10.1080/03004279.2013.804853
- Sarikaya, M. (2021). An Investigation of the relationship between COVID-19 anxiety and burnout among music teachers. *International Journal on Social and Education Sciences*, 3(4), 789-806.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2018). Job demands and job resources as predictors of teacher motivation and well-being. *Social Psychology Education*, 21, 1251–75. doi: 10.1007/s11218-018-9464-8.
- Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2016). Teacher stress and teacher self-efficacy as predictors of engagement, emotional exhaustion, and motivation to leave the teaching profession. *Journal Creative Behavior*, 7, 1785–1799. doi: 10.4236/ce.2016.713182.
- Sokmen, Y., & Kilic, D. (2019). The Relationship between primary school teachers' self-efficacy, autonomy, job satisfaction, teacher engagement and burnout: a model development study. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 5(2), 709-721.
- Soljan I., Josipovic-Jelic Z., & Kis A.J. (2008). Workplace mobbing. *Archives of Industrial Hygiene and Toxicology*, 59, 37–42. doi: 10.2478/10004-1254-59-2008-1857.

- Somunoglu, S., Ayçin Gedik, D. E. K., Gökhan, E., Gayeste G., İlhan, Y., & Sağ, Z. (2013). Mobbing in health sector: sample of university hospital. *Journal of Health Management*, 15(2), 169-175.
- Sroka, W., & Vveinhardt, J. (2020). Is a CSR Policy an equally effective vaccine against workplace mobbing and psychosocial stressors? *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(19), 72-92. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17197292>
- Sunbul, A.M. (2003). An analysis of relations among locus of control, burnout and job satisfaction in Turkish high school teachers. *Australian Journal of Education*, 47 (1), 58-72.
- Sunbul, A.M. (2008). The relationship between emotional intelligence and achievement among 1st and 4th grade faculty students. *Scientific Bulletin-Education Sciences Series*, 2, 27-42.
- Tatar, Z. B., & Yüksel, Ş. (2019). Mobbing at workplace -psychological trauma and documentation of psychiatric symptoms. *Noro Psikiyatri Arsivi*, 56(1), 57-62. <https://doi.org/10.29399/npa.22924>
- Vakola, M., & Bouradas, D. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of organisational silence: an empirical investigation. *Employee Relations*, 27, 441-458.
- Vveinhardt J., & Streimikiene D. (2015). The questionnaire for diagnosing mobbing in employees' relationships. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 28, 441-466.
- Vveinhardt, J., & Sroka, W. (2020). Workplace mobbing in Polish and Lithuanian organisations with regard to corporate social responsibility. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(8), 29-44. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17082944>
- Yurt, E. (2011). *Sanal ortam ve somut nesnelere kullanılarak gerçekleştirilen modellemeye dayalı etkinliklerin uzamsal düşünme ve zihinsel çevirme becerilerine etkisi* (The effect of modeling-based activities using virtual environment and concrete objects on spatial thinking and mental translation skills). PhD Thesis, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü
- Wang D., Li X., Zhou M., Maguire P., Zong Z., Hu Y. (2019). Effects of abusive supervision on employees' innovative behavior: The role of job insecurity and locus of control. *Scandinave Journal Psychology*. 60, 152-159. doi: 10.1111/sjop.12510.
- Zahed R.K. (2015). The mediating effect of social undermining on the relationship between organizational justice and organizational silence. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 4, 752-760.
- Zhou, X., Rasool, S. F., & Ma, D. (2020). The relationship between workplace violence and innovative work behavior: the mediating roles of employee wellbeing. *Healthcare*, 8(3), 2-16.

Author Information

Sami Adak

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7670-0837>


Necmettin Erbakan University

Meram/Konya

Turkey

Contact e-mail: samiadak@gmail.com

Mehtap Yıldız

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8553-7154>

Necmettin Erbakan University

Meram/Konya

Turkey