



# Education Quarterly Reviews

---

**Karatepe, R., Aygar, B. B., & Gündüz, S. (2022). The Relationship Between Mobbing Behaviors Experienced by Teachers and Their Feeling of Relative Deprivation. *Education Quarterly Reviews*, 5(1), 261-272.**

ISSN 2621-5799

DOI: 10.31014/aior.1993.05.01.437

The online version of this article can be found at:  
<https://www.asianinstituteofresearch.org/>

---

Published by:  
The Asian Institute of Research

The *Education Quarterly Reviews* is an Open Access publication. It may be read, copied, and distributed free of charge according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license.

The Asian Institute of Research *Education Quarterly Reviews* is a peer-reviewed International Journal. The journal covers scholarly articles in the fields of education, linguistics, literature, educational theory, research, and methodologies, curriculum, elementary and secondary education, higher education, foreign language education, teaching and learning, teacher education, education of special groups, and other fields of study related to education. As the journal is Open Access, it ensures high visibility and the increase of citations for all research articles published. The *Education Quarterly Reviews* aims to facilitate scholarly work on recent theoretical and practical aspects of education.



ASIAN INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH  
Connecting Scholars Worldwide



# The Relationship Between Mobbing Behaviors Experienced by Teachers and Their Feeling of Relative Deprivation

Ramazan Karatepe<sup>1</sup>, Bilge Bakır Aygar<sup>2</sup>, Sinem Gündüz<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Curriculum Development and Instruction, Faculty of Education, University of Mersin, Turkey

<sup>2</sup> Department of Guidance and Physiological Counselling, Faculty of Education, University of Mersin, Turkey

<sup>3</sup> Turkey Ministry of Education

Correspondence: Ramazan Karatepe: Mersin University Faculty of Education Çiftlikköy Campus, 33343, Yenişehir / Mersin/Turkey. E-mail: rkaratepe@gmail.com

## Abstract

Mobbing is generally a situation where victims are directly and indirectly affected, and has an increasingly negative impact on victims, harming their psychosocial and physical health and causing power imbalance. Relative deprivation is defined not only as a perception but also as a sense of deprivation felt meaning anger. Relative deprivation has two dimensions as cognitive and emotional. This study aimed to determine the relationship between the level of mobbing perceived or experienced by teachers and their feeling of relative deprivation. The data were collected from 319 public school teachers in Turkey through online environments. The research data were collected using the Relative Deprivation Scale for Teachers and Mobbing Scale. According to the results of the research, there are significant differences in both scales according to gender, seniority and school level. A positive relationship was found between Relative Deprivation Scale and the Mobbing Scale. In addition, mobbing behaviors experienced by teachers are a significant predictor of Administrative Deprivation and Personal Deprivation dimensions.

**Keywords:** Mobbing, Relative Deprivation, Teachers

## 1. Introduction

From past to present, it seems that organizations have subjected their employees to many positive and negative attitudes and behaviors. Along with the rapid modernization, reasons such as increased competition in working life, intense work pressure, and personal benefits are causing negativities among employees. These negative attitudes and behaviors turn into a problem in working environments, harming the development and continuity of organizations. In this respect, the concept of mobbing emerges in work environments (Gökçe, 2008).

The concept of mobbing first appeared in human relations when Peter-Paul Heinemann defined the aggressive behaviors of children towards their weak and lonely peers as mobbing (Tınaz, Bayram & Ergin, 2008). Heinz Leymann, who enabled the utilization of this concept in terms of organizations and formed the basis for research on mobbing, stated that the concept of mobbing includes psychological violence and intimidation rather than

physical attack (Yaman, 2009). Mooyed et al. (2006) considered mobbing as a concept perpetrated by at least one person on one or more than one person and by individuals who resolve existing conflicts in a hostile way, causing health problems in individuals exposed to, and negatively affecting their motivation. Browne and Smith (2008) defined the concept of mobbing as a situation that has systematic and direct effects on employees, causing them to experience physiological and psychological problems. In this context, mobbing is generally a situation where victims are directly and indirectly affected, and has an increasingly negative impact on victims, harming their psychosocial and physical health and causing power imbalance (Güldalı, 2012).

Mobbing is a complex concept, which may not occur in work environments for only one single reason and may not have a specific reason. Tutar (2004) argues that organizational conflicts such as differences between the personal goals of employees and the organization goals, conflicts between different groups in the organization, disagreements between managers and employees, and disagreements among employees are the primary causes of mobbing. Davenport, Elliott, and Schwartz (2014) divided the causes of mobbing into organizational causes such as organizational culture and structure, stressful work environments, unethical behaviors, downsizing, restructuring, and personal causes such as seeking pleasure to discharge boredom, prejudice, sense of egocentrism, and narcissistic personality traits. However, Zapf argues that when the situations causing mobbing are viewed from a different perspective, those situations may be the consequence of mobbing (As cited in Dinçer, 2017).

Generally, in the relevant literature, the consequences of mobbing have been addressed under one single heading (Atmaca, 2014; Karakoç, 2016), individual and organizational (Bayraktar, 2016; Daşçı, 2014), or individual, organizational, and social consequences (Dinçer, 2017). Mobbing causes many harms to the individual, society, and organization. Tınaz (2011) notes that physical illnesses such as depression, inability to focus, sweating and trembling hands, headache and back pain, loss of appetite, and skin diseases may occur. From an organizational perspective, deceleration in productivity in organizations, conflicts between employees and managers, increased absenteeism, reduced organizational commitment, and deterioration of peace in work environments are the main consequences (General Directorate of Labor of the Ministry of Labor and Social Security, 2013). The increased expenditures in the health sector, insurance costs, tax losses, disability retirement, and so forth are considered the social consequences that have an economic cost to the society (Cemaloğlu & Daşçı, 2017; Davenport et al., 2014). In general, when we take into account the concept of mobbing, variables emerging within or outside an organization seem to affect individuals. As such, with the reflection of similar processes in educational organizations, teachers may experience deprivation induced by situations such as believing that there is intimidation and injustice, which prevents the formation of a positive organizational culture. Teachers' sense of deprivation in their organizations will also cause other organization stakeholders to get negatively affected. In this respect, the concept of relative deprivation needs to be explained.

The conceptualization of the relative deprivation theory, developed concerning emotions triggered in humans by awareness and reactions to perceived social inequality through subjective comparisons and interpretations, has been carried out in a three-volume work called "The American Soldier: Adjustment during Army Life (1949)" (Stark & Yitzhaki, 1988). However, the theoretical dimension of the concept was formulated by a research group consisting of Stouffer, Suchman, DeVinney, Star, and Williams (1949) in their famous study on American soldiers (Aydın, 2014). The study showed that even though soldiers serving in the air forces had the opportunity to promote faster compared to soldiers serving in the ground forces, they were unsatisfied with the promotions, and the reason for their dissatisfaction with this situation stemmed from the group they compared their status to. In other words, air force soldiers did not compare themselves to ground force soldiers but to other employees in their group. The promoted soldiers compared themselves to unpromoted soldiers and were relatively satisfied with the situation, but the unpromoted soldiers experienced relative deprivation when they compared themselves with the promoted soldiers. The research findings showed that the deprivation experiences of soldiers emerged as a consequence of subjective evaluations rather than objective comparisons (Tougas & Beaton, 2008). According to the relative deprivation theory, lower-level employees compare themselves with those at higher levels and feel injustice because of this inter-class situation (Cowherd & Levine, 1992; Karademir & Çoban, 2010). In addition, Runciman (1966, as cited in Tripathi & Srivastava, 1981) describes the relative deprivation as follows:

*"If A wants something they have not, A will feel relative deprivation when they compare themselves with B, who has this thing. Similarly, A will also feel relative deprivation if their expectations are*

*higher than B's or if A had a better status than B in the past and now they are in the same circumstances."*

The first formal theory of relative deprivation was developed by Davis (1959) based on Stouffer and colleagues' (1949) study on soldiers. This theory was built on the logic that individuals deprived of a desirable good or opportunity (X) experience a sense of injustice when they perceive that their peers have X. From this perspective, according to Davis (1959), there are three determinants required for an individual not having X to feel deprivation: perceiving that their peers have X, wanting X, and feeling deserved to get X. Following Davis, Runciman (1966) expressed the distinction between relative deprivation resulting from individual comparisons of outcomes and relative deprivation resulting from group-level social comparisons of outcomes. Accordingly, personal/egoistic deprivation refers to deprivation that occurs when individuals compare themselves with their own group, while group/collective relative deprivation refers to deprivation that occurs when individuals compare their group with other groups. Following Runciman, Crosby (1979) introduced the relative deprivation model as 'Egoistic Relative Deprivation' and defined the concept of relative deprivation not only as a perception but also as a sense of deprivation felt meaning anger, which is synonymous with a kind of exasperation and complaint. In this model of Crosby (1976), which focuses on personal relative deprivation, determinants and preconditions precede the deprivation felt, while mediator variables and resulting behaviors follow deprivation. More specifically, Crosby's model indicated that a person deprived of some objects or opportunities (X): 1) perceives that someone has X, 2) wants X; 3) feels deserved to get X, 4) thinks that attaining X is possible, and 5) denies personal responsibilities for existing failure in having X, and these are the prerequisites for relative deprivation.

Relative deprivation has two dimensions as cognitive and emotional. Although there are different conceptualizations of relative deprivation based on various theoretical frameworks (e.g., Crosby, 1976; Davies, 1962; Gurr, 1970; Runciman, 1966), according to all, feeling relative deprivation reflects an emotion as good as it reflects cognition. Crosby (1976) defines the concept of relative deprivation not only as a perception but also as an emotion (p.88). Likewise, Runciman (1966) defines relative deprivation as a sense of jealousy and perception of injustice. In a similar vein, Smith and Ortiz (2002) conceptualize affectivity as an integral part of relative deprivation.

This study aimed to determine the relationship between the level of mobbing perceived or experienced by teachers and their feeling of relative deprivation. Therefore, responses were sought to the following questions.

1. What is the level of mobbing behaviors experienced by teachers and their level of feeling relative deprivation?
2. Are there significant differences between mobbing behaviors experienced by teachers and their level of feeling relative deprivation per gender, seniority, and school levels they work?
3. Are there significant relationships between mobbing behaviors experienced by teachers and their level of feeling relative deprivation?
4. Do the mobbing behaviors experienced by teachers predict their level of feeling relative deprivation?

## **2. Method**

### *2.1. Research Model*

The research was carried out using a correlational survey model of quantitative research methods to determine the relationship between the level of mobbing experienced by teachers and their feeling of relative deprivation. In the correlational survey model, the aim is to determine the relationship between two or more variables and their levels (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009).

### *2.2. Study Group*

The data were collected from public school teachers in one of the provinces in Turkey in 2021 through online environments. This way, 319 teachers who were reached out and responded to the scales were included in the study. The demographic distribution of teachers participating in the study is illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic Variables

Variable	N	%
Female	201	63
Male	118	37
0-5 Years	48	15.0
6-10 Years	78	24.5
11-15 Years	70	21.9
16-20 Years	52	16.3
21 Years and more	71	22.3
Preschool	30	9.4
Primary School	75	23.5
Secondary School	113	35.4
High School	101	31.7

### 2.3. Data Collection Tools

The research data were collected using the Relative Deprivation Scale for Teachers and Mobbing Scale.

#### 2.3.1. The Relative Deprivation Scale for Teachers

This scale was developed by Altınlı, Uzun, and İnandı (2021) to determine teachers' perception of relative deprivation. It consisted of 20 5-point Likert type items and three sub-dimensions. The sub-dimensions were Administrative, Personal, and Developmental Deprivation. The internal consistency coefficient computed for the Relative Deprivation was 0.78. However, in this study, the internal consistency coefficient was 0.905.

#### 2.3.2. Mobbing Scale

This scale was developed by Laleoğlu and Özmete (2013) to assess the mobbing status of individuals working in human service organizations. The scale consisted of 38 5-point Likert type items and five sub-dimensions. The sub-dimensions were Relations with Co-workers, Threat and Harassment, Work and Carrier-Related Barriers, Interference with Private Life, and Commitment to Work. The general internal consistency coefficient of the scale was reported 0.948. However, in this study, the internal consistency coefficient was 0.937.

### 2.4. Data Analysis

As a result of the normality tests, the data from the Relative Deprivation Scale for Teachers showed normal distribution, but the data from Mobbing Scale did not. Therefore, of difference tests, t-test and ANOVA were applied to the Relative Deprivation Scale for Teachers, whereas Mann-Whitney U and Kruskal-Wallis tests were applied to the Mobbing Scale. In addition, correlation and regression analyses were performed to determine the relationship between the scales.

## 3. Results

This section presents findings relating to the scores teachers obtained from the Relative Deprivation and Mobbing scales and their sub-dimensions, the presence or absence of significant differences between these scores per gender, seniority, and school level, relationships between sub-dimensions, and the prediction of relative deprivation perceptions by mobbing experiences.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of scores obtained from the scales

Variable	<i>N</i>	$\bar{X}$	<i>SD</i>
Administrative Deprivation	319	2.45	.87
Personal Deprivation	319	3.20	.96
Developmental Deprivation	319	4.32	.74
Relations with Co-Workers	319	1.45	.53
Threat and Harassment	319	1.05	.23
Work and Career-Related Barriers	319	1.45	.59
Interference with Private Life	319	1.26	.48
Commitment to Work	319	2.50	1.15
Relative Deprivation Scale - General	319	3.32	.63
Mobbing Scale - General	319	1.54	.41

As shown in Table 2, teachers obtained a moderate score ( $\bar{x} = 3.32$ ) from the Relative Deprivation Scale. Considering the sub-dimensions, the Administrative Deprivation was low ( $\bar{x} = 2.45$ ), Personal Deprivation moderate ( $\bar{x} = 3.20$ ), and Developmental Deprivation high ( $\bar{x} = 4.32$ ). Contrarily, the scores obtained from the Mobbing Scale were quite low ( $\bar{x} = 1.54$ ). As such, the scale's sub-dimensions were also similar, where the mean score was  $\bar{x} = 1.05$  for Relations with Co-Workers,  $\bar{x} = 1.05$  for Threat and Harassment,  $\bar{x} = 1.45$  for Work and Career-Related Barriers,  $\bar{x} = 1.26$  for Interference with Private Life, and  $\bar{x} = 2.50$  for Commitment to Work.

Table 3: Results of t-test Applied to the Relative Deprivation Scale per Gender Variable

Dimension	Gender	<i>N</i>	$\bar{X}$	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Administrative Deprivation	Female	201	2.54	.86	2.511	317	.013
	Male	118	2.29	.86			
Personal Deprivation	Female	201	3.37	.91	4.185	317	.000
	Male	118	2.91	.98			
Developmental Deprivation	Female	201	4.42	.60	3.437	317	.001
	Male	118	4.13	.90			
Relative Deprivation General	Female	201	3.44	.58	4.637	317	.000
	Male	118	3.11	.67			

\* $p < 0.05$

According to Table 3, female teachers had higher scores ( $\bar{x} = 2.54$ ) in the Administrative Deprivation dimension than male teachers ( $\bar{x} = 2.29$ ). Female teachers had higher scores ( $\bar{x} = 3.37$ ) in the Personal Deprivation dimension than male teachers ( $\bar{x} = 2.91$ ). Female teachers' scores ( $\bar{x} = 4.42$ ) were higher in the Developmental Deprivation dimension than male teachers ( $\bar{x} = 4.13$ ). In general, female teachers scored higher ( $\bar{x} = 3.44$ ) on the Relative Deprivation Scale than their male counterparts ( $\bar{x} = 3.11$ ). As such, the differences were statistically significant. There were significant gender differences in relative deprivation scores, favoring female teachers. Female teachers experienced more relative deprivation compared to male teachers.

Table 4: Results of Mann Whitney U Test Applied to the Mobbing Scale per Gender Variable

Dimension	Group	<i>n</i>	Mean of Ranks	U	<i>p</i>
Relations with Co-Workers	Female	201	147.44	10337	.062
	Male	118	167.37		
Threat and Harassment	Female	201	157.54	11568	.516
	Male	118	161.45		
Work and Career-Related Barriers	Female	201	162.69	12176	.683
	Male	118	158.42		
Interference with Private Life	Female	201	160.94	11969	.872
	Male	118	159.45		
Commitment to Work	Female	201	155.29	11303	.478
	Male	118	162.77		
Mobbing - General	Female	201	156.06	11393	.558
	Male	118	162.32		

According to the Mann-Whitney U test performed to examine whether teachers' scores from the Mobbing Scale significantly differed per gender variable, there were no significant gender differences in the mobbing scale and its sub-dimensions.

Table 5: Results ANOVA Applied to the Relative Deprivation Scale per Seniority Variable

	Age	<i>N</i>	$\bar{X}$	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	Significant Difference
Administrative Deprivation	0-5 Years	48	2.50	4-314	.864	.486	
	6-10 Years	78	2.51				
	11-15 Years	70	2.47				
	16-20 Years	52	2.50				
	21 Years and more	71	2.28				
Personal Deprivation	0-5 Years	48	3.45	4-314	7.960	.000	Between 21 years and more and all other groups
	6-10 Years	78	3.39				
	11-15 Years	70	3.35				
	16-20 Years	52	3.21				
	21 Years and more	71	2.67				
Developmental Deprivation	0-5 Years	48	4.33	4-314	1.037	.388	
	6-10 Years	78	4.43				
	11-15 Years	70	4.27				
	16-20 Years	52	4.36				
	21 Years and more	71	4.20				
Relative Deprivation Scale - General	0-5 Years	48	3.43	4-314	4.579	.001	Between 21 years and more and all other groups
	6-10 Years	78	3.44				
	11-15 Years	70	3.36				
	16-20 Years	52	3.36				
	21 Years and more	71	3.05				

\**p* < .05

A Kruskal Wallis H test was conducted to measure whether the mobbing behaviors experienced by teachers differed per seniority variable. According to the resultant findings, a significant difference was found only in the Commitment to Work dimension, favoring the group with 21 years or more. Teachers with seniority of 21 years or more had a significantly higher mean rank commitment to work score (190.27) than that of teachers in other groups. By contrast, there were no significant differences in other dimensions and the whole scale per seniority.

Table 7: Results of ANOVA Applied to the Relative Deprivation Scale per School Level Served

	Age	<i>N</i>	$\bar{X}$	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>	Significant Difference
Administrative Deprivation	Preschool	30	2.69	3-315	1.541	.204	
	Primary School	75	2.38				
	Secondary School	113	2.51				
	High School	101	2.35				
Personal Deprivation	Preschool	30	3.44	3-315	2.489	.060	
	Primary School	75	3.21				
	Secondary School	113	3.30				
	High School	101	3.00				
Developmental Deprivation	Preschool	30	4.72	3-315	4.117	.007	Preschool and all other levels
	Primary School	75	4.38				
	Secondary School	113	4.27				
	High School	101	4.20				
Relative Deprivation Scale - General	Preschool	30	3.62	3-315	3.877	.010	Preschool and all other levels
	Primary School	75	3.32				
	Secondary School	113	3.36				
	High School	101	3.19				

\**p* < .05

According to the results of ANOVA conducted to measure whether school levels that teachers worked at yielded significant differences in their relative deprivation scores, the school level yielded no significant difference in the Administrative and Developmental Deprivation sub-dimensions. Teachers working at preschool levels had higher scores ( $\bar{x}$  = 4.72) in the Developmental Deprivation dimension than those working at other levels, with the difference being statistically significant. Similarly, teachers working at preschool levels had higher scores ( $\bar{x}$  = 3.62) throughout the scale than other teachers working at other levels. And the difference was statistically significant. The school level they worked yielded significant differences in the Developmental Deprivation dimension and Relative Deprivation Scale in general.

Table 8: Results of Kurskal Wallis H Applied to the Mobbing Scale per School Level Served

Dimension	Group	<i>n</i>	Mean Ranks	<i>df</i>	<i>X</i> <sup>2</sup>	<i>p</i>	Significant Difference
Relations with Co-workers	Preschool	30	189.68	3	4.27	.233	
	Primary School	75	155.45				
	Secondary School	113	162.76				
	High School	101	151.48				
Threat and Harassment	Preschool	30	157.08	3	.562	.905	
	Primary School	75	162.49				
	Secondary School	113	157.77				
	High School	101	161.51				
Work and Career-Related Barriers	Preschool	30	159.63	3	6.19	.103	
	Primary School	75	160.89				
	Secondary School	113	174.23				
	High School	101	143.52				
Interference with Private Life	Preschool	30	157.65	3	.315	.957	
	Primary School	75	159.42				
	Secondary School	113	157.83				
	High School	101	163.55				
Commitment to Work	Preschool	30	152.72	3	10.29	.016	Between high school and all other levels
	Primary School	75	149.82				



	Secondary School	113	147.36			
	High School	101	183.86			
	Preschool	30	159.27			
Mobbing Scale - General	Primary School	75	151.99	3	3.15	.369
	Secondary School	113	153.73			
	High School	101	173.18			

Kruskal Wallis H test was performed to measure whether the mobbing behaviors teachers exposed to significantly differ per school levels they work. According to the resultant findings, there was a significant difference in the Commitment to Work dimension, favoring high school teachers. The rank scores (183.86) of high school teachers were significantly higher than those of teachers working at other school levels. However, other sub-dimensions and the general scale yielded no significant differences per school level variable.

Table 9: The Relationship between the Level of Mobbing Experienced by Teachers and Their Relative Deprivation

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	$\bar{X}$	<i>SD</i>
1. Relations with co-workers	1										1.45	.53
2. Threat and harassment	.52**	1									1.05	.23
3. Work and career-related barriers	.62**	.48**	1								1.45	.59
4. Interference with private life	.55**	.48**	.55**	1							1.26	.48
5. Commitment to work	.14**	.07	.11	.17**	1						2.50	1.15
6. Administrative deprivation	.51**	.23**	.46**	.33**	.05	1					2.45	.87
7. Personal deprivation	.34**	.12	.30**	.25**	-.03	.60**	1				3.20	.96
8. Developmental deprivation	.06	-.07	.03	.03	.13	.04	.25**	1			4.32	.74
9. Mobbing Scale - General	.71**	.55**	.70**	.69**	.68**	.40**	.23**	.10	1		1.54	.41
10. Relative Deprivation Scale - General	.42**	.14	.37**	.28**	.06	.77**	.87**	.53**	.33**	1	3.32	.63

A correlation test was conducted to determine the relationship between the mobbing behaviors experienced by teachers and their perceived relative deprivation. According to the results, there were positive relationships between the administrative deprivation and relations with co-workers ( $r = .51$ ), threat and harassment ( $r = .23$ ), work and carrier-related barriers ( $r = .46$ ), and interference with private life ( $r = .33$ ). Similarly, there were positive relationships between the personal deprivation and relations with co-workers ( $r = .34$ ), work and career-related barriers ( $r = .30$ ), and interference with private life ( $r = .25$ ). Contrarily, no relationship existed between developmental deprivation and mobbing. However, there was a positive relationship between the Relative Deprivation and Mobbing scales ( $r = .33$ ).

Table 10: Predicting the Administrative and Personal Deprivation by Mobbing Behaviors Experienced by Teachers

Variable	Administrative Deprivation					Personal Deprivation				
	B	SH	B	T	p	B	SH	B	T	p
Constant	1.377	.202		6.807	.000	2.636	.248		10.609	.000
Relations with co-workers	.654	.107	.401	6.104	.000	.499	.132	.275	3.787	.000
Threat and harassment	-.418	.215	-.114	-1.945	.053	-.528	.264	-.129	-1.996	.047
Work and career-related barriers	.380	.095	.257	3.988	.000	.254	.117	.155	2.172	.031
Interference with private life	.051	.111	.028	.456	.649	.184	.137	.092	1.348	.179
Commitment to work	-.021	.036	-.028	-.576	.565	-.081	.044	-.096	-1.817	.070
	R = .554      R <sup>2</sup> = .307 F = 27.699 p < .05      (.000)					R = .388      R <sup>2</sup> = .151 F = 11.107 p < .05      (.000)				

A regression analysis was conducted to measure whether the mobbing behaviors experienced by teachers predicted their perceptions of relative deprivation. According to the resultant findings, the mobbing behaviors significantly predicted administrative deprivation. Further, 30% of the variance of teachers' administrative deprivation perceptions could be explained by the mobbing they experience ( $R^2 = .307$ ). In a similar vein, 15% of the variance of teachers' personal deprivation could be explained by the mobbing they experience ( $R^2 = .151$ ). According to these findings, exposure to mobbing was a significant predictor of Administrative and Personal Deprivation.

#### 4. Discussion

The study found that female teachers have a higher level of relative deprivation than male teachers. Teachers who have worked for many years felt relatively deprived. In addition, there was a significant positive relationship between mobbing and relative deprivation. Mobbing explained 30% of the administrative deprivation of teachers and 15% of their personal deprivation.

The study found no statistically significant gender difference per mobbing experience. Bayraktar (2016), Öntürk (2015), and Çivilidağ (2011) also found no relationship in their studies. However, some studies in the literature have shown that men are exposed to mobbing more than women (Serin, 2018; Nanto, 2015; Bölükbaşı, 2015; Koçak, 2015; Zorgül, 2014; Eken, 2014; Çam, 2013; Erdoğan, 2012; Ekinci, 2012). However, Gezer (2015), Özçelik (2015), Akın and Aşır (2014), and Yumuşak (2013) found that female teachers were exposed to mobbing more.

Significant differences were observed in the level of mobbing and commitment to work as the years of seniority increased. Studies show differences regarding the years of seniority. According to some studies in the literature, the level of mobbing increases as the seniority year decreases (Bölükbaşı, 2015; Nanto, 2015; Yılmaz, 2017). However, Özçelik (2015) found that teachers with 11-20 years of seniority were exposed to mobbing more. Similarly, Canbaz (2014) found that teachers with 16-20 years of seniority were exposed to mobbing more.

As a result of the research, one could state that teachers experiencing relative deprivation are exposed to mobbing. Although no study has directly examined the concepts of mobbing and relative deprivation in the literature, some studies report that situations such as job satisfaction (Lee & Martin, 1991), organizational citizenship (Feldman & Turnley, 2004), and ineffective work behaviors are affected by the concept of relative deprivation. Teachers exposed to psychological violence, humiliation, and maltreatment in institutions where they work may experience decreased job satisfaction and feel more deprived. Pettigrew and Bialosiewicz (2012) addressed stress, depression, and intimidation as personal deprivation behaviors in their meta-analysis study. Teachers exposed to mobbing in their workplaces may experience more stress and depression and thereby have a higher level of personal

deprivation. Research shows that individuals with high subjective wellbeing (Schmitt et al., 2010), life satisfaction (Osborne & Sibley, 2013), and self-esteem (Walker, 1999) have a low level of relative deprivation. Teachers who feel happy in institutions where they work and have a high job satisfaction may not feel personal deprivation.

The study found that teachers with more seniority years felt more deprived than teachers with low seniority years. In general, the literature suggests that relative deprivation occurs when individuals are deprived of an outcome/opportunity and when they want, feel deserved, and find out that other applicants have received it (Feldman & Turnley, 2004; Folger & Martin, 1986). These studies support the study findings. As the seniority year increases, they may witness others get many opportunities, and when they are over-exposed to such situations, they may feel relatively more deprived over time.

As a result of the research, we could contend that teachers exposed to mobbing may eventually think that they do not get what they deserve and therefore feel deprived. As time passes, not getting what is deserved during the working period and opportunities missed by institution managers using intimidation strategies may cause teachers to feel deprived. As studies on the concept of relative deprivation are very limited in the literature, the concepts in this study could be investigated with their different dimensions. Different studies could be conducted using many other related variables.

## References

- Akın, G., ve Karabacak, A., S. (2014). İlköğretim okullarındaki yıldırma (mobbing) toplumsal cinsiyet bağlamında bir bakış. *International Journal of Human*
- Atmaca, T. (2014). *Okul yöneticilerinin kullandıkları güç türleri ile öğretmenlerin yaşadıkları yıldırma, örgütsel bağlılık ve örgütsel sinizm arasındaki ilişki* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Bayraktar, D. (2016). *İlkokul öğretmenlerinin duygusal taciz yaşama düzeyi ile örgütsel sinizm arasındaki ilişki* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi
- Bayraktar, D. (2016). *İlkokul öğretmenlerinin duygusal taciz yaşama düzeyi ile örgütsel sinizm arasındaki ilişki*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Bölükbaşı, B. (2015). *Ortaöğretim kurumlarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin psikolojik taciz (Mobbing)'e ilişkin algıları (Güngören-İstanbul örneği)*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Çanakkale.
- Browne, M. N., & Smith, M. A. (2008). Mobbing in the workplace: The latest illustration of pervasive individualism in American Law. *Employee Rights and Employment Policy Journal*, 12(1), 131-161. Erişim Adresi: [https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1006&context=econ\\_pub](https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1006&context=econ_pub)
- Canbaz, Ö. (2014). *Öğretmenlerin psikolojik şiddet algılarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi (Fatih ilçesi örneği)*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Okan Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Cowherd, D. M., & Levine, D. (1992). Product quality and pay equity between lower-level employees and top management: An investigation of distributive justice theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37(2), 302–320. Erişim Adresi: [https://www.jstor.org/stable/2393226?seq=1#metadata\\_info\\_tab\\_contents](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2393226?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents).
- Crosby, F. J. (1976). A Model of Egoistical Relative Deprivation. *Psychological Review*, 83, 85-113. Erişim Adresi: <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0033-295X.83.2.85>
- Çalışma ve Sosyal Güvenlik Bakanlığı Çalışma Genel Müdürlüğü (ÇSGB), (2013). *İşyerlerinde Psikolojik Taciz (Mobbing) Bilgilendirme Rehberi*. (Editör: Ebru Öztüm Tümer), Ankara: Özel Matbaası.
- Çam, A. (2013). *Özel ve resmi ilkokul ve ortaokullarda görevli öğretmen ve yöneticilerin psikolojik taciz algısı*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Maltepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Çivildag, A. ve Sargın, N. (2011). Farklı Ortaöğretim Kurumlarında Çalışan Öğretmenlerde Psikolojik Taciz: (Mobbing). *Uluslararası Avrasya Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Sayı:3.
- Daşcı, E. (2014). *İlköğretim kurumu yöneticilerinin liderlik tarzları ile öğretmenlerin yaşadıkları yıldırma (mobbing) ve örgütsel sessizlik davranışları arasındaki ilişki* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Davenport, N. Z., Elliott, G. E. & Schwartz, R. D. (2014). *Mobbing, işyerinde psikolojik taciz*. İstanbul: Ray.
- Davis, J. A. (1959). A formal interpretation of the theory of relative deprivation. *Sociometry*, 22, 280-296. Erişim Adresi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2786046>
- Diñçer, H. (2017). *İş yerinde yıldırma ve örgütsel sessizlik arasındaki ilişki: Enerji sektörü üzerine bir araştırma* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi.
- Eken, M. (2014). *İlkokul ve ortaokul öğretmenlerine yönelik yıldırma davranışlarının incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Kilis 7 Aralık Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kilis.

- Ekinci, Ö. (2012). *Ortaöğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin yıldırma davranışları ile örgütsel adanmışlıkları arasındaki ilişki*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Konya.
- Erdoğan, Ö. (2012). *İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan öğretmen algılarına göre psikolojik şiddet (mobbing) ve örgüt iklimi arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Kastamonu Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kastamonu.
- Fraenkel, Jack R., & Wallen, Norman E. (2009). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (Seventh ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gezer, H., S. (2015). *Öğretmenlere göre mobbing olarak algılanan yönetici davranışları ve bunlarla başa çıkma yolları*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir.
- Gökçe, A. T. (2008). *Mobbing: İşyerinde yıldırma eğitim örneği*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Güldalı, O., 2012. Çalışma yaşamında çalışana psikososyal ve psikosomatik açıdan acı veren travmatik bir deneyim: mobbing (yıldırma). *Toplum ve Sosyal Hizmet*, 23 (2), 125-144.
- Karaçay, G. (2020). Leader-member exchange and in-role performance: Can perceived organizational support be a remedy for employee affective reaction? . *Optimum Ekonomi ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 7(2), 361-372. DOI:10.17541/optimum.66152910
- Karademir, T., & Çoban, B. (2010). Sporun Yönetel Yapısında Örgütsel Adalet Kuramına Bakış. *Niğde Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4(1), 48-62. Erişim Adresi: <https://dergipark.org.tr/pub/bsd/issue/53575/713923>
- Karakoç, B. (2016). *Öğretmenlerin okulda karşılaştıkları yıldırma davranışları ile örgütsel bağlılıklarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi.
- Koçak, N. (2015). *Öğretmenlerin psikolojik şiddet (mobbing) algıları - İstanbul ili Anadolu yakasında bulunan resmi kız keslek kiselerinde bir tarama*. . Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Maltepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Minibaş-Poussard, J. & İdiğ-Çamuroğlu, M. (2009). *Psikolojik taciz iş yerindeki kâbus*. Ankara: Nobel.
- Mooyed, A. F. Daraiseh, N. Shell, R. Salem, S. (2006). Workplace bullying: A systematic review of risk factors and outcomes. *Theoretical Issues In Ergonomics Science*, 7 (3), 311-317. Erişim Adresi: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14639220500090604>.
- Nanto, Z. (2015). *Öğretmenlerin yaşadıkları yıldırma durumlarının çeşitli değişkenlere göre incelenmesi* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Fırat Üniversitesi.
- Nanto, Z. (2015). *Öğretmenlerin yaşadıkları yıldırma durumlarının çeşitli değişkenlere göre incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Fırat Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Elazığ.
- Osborne, D. & Sibley, C. G. (2013). Through rose-colored glasses: System-justifying beliefs dampen the effects of relative deprivation on well-being and political mobilization. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39(8), 991-1004. doi:10.1177/0146167213487997
- Öntürk, Y. (2015). *Beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokullarında görev yapan akademik personelin mobbinge maruz kalma durumlarının incelenmesi*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Muğla.
- Özçelik, S. (2015). *Öğretmenlerin psikolojik şiddet (mobbing) algıları "İstanbul ili anadolu yakasında bulunan resmi ilkokullarda bir tarama"*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Maltepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Özdemir F, Tekeş B, Öner-Özkan B (2019) Birey düzeyinde görel yoksunluk ve öznel esenlik arasındaki dolaylı ilişki. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*. 34(84), 37-49. doi:10.31828/tpd1300443320180811m000009
- Özdemir, F. (2019). Farklı görel yoksunluk seviyelerinde başa çıkma stratejileri ve öznel oluş arasındaki ilişki. *Psikiyatride Güncel Yaklaşımlar*, 11(1) 234-245 doi:10.18863/pgy.616916
- Özkan, Ü. (2018). *Farklı lider üye ve ekip üye etkileşim kalitesi kombinasyonlarının göreceli yoksunluk ve psikolojik sermaye bağlamında iş sonuçlarına etkisi ve bir araştırma* (Doktora Tezi). İstanbul Üniversitesi.
- Pettigrew, S., & Bialosiewicz, P. (2012). Relative deprivation: A theoretical and meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology*, 16 (3), 203-232. Erişim Adresi: <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1088868311430825>
- Runciman, W.G. (1996). *Relative deprivation and social justice*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Schmitt M, Maes J, Widaman K (2010) Longitudinal effects of egoistic and fraternal relative deprivation on well-being and protest. *Int J Psychol*, 45, 122-130. Erişim Adresi: <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1080/00207590903165067>
- Sciences*, 11(1), 584-602.
- Serin, S. (2018). *İlkokul öğretmenlerinin yıldırma (mobbing) davranışlarına maruz kalma düzeyleri*. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kahramanmaraş.
- Stark, O., & Yitzhaki, S. (1988). Labour migration as a response to relative deprivation. *Journal of Population Economics*, 1(1), 57-70. Doi: 10.1007/BF00171510
- Stouffer, S. A. (1949). An Analysis of Conflicting Social Norms. *American Sociological Review* 14(6), 707-717. Erişim Adresi: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2086672.pdf>
- Tınaz, P. (2011). *İşyerinde psikolojik taciz*. İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.

- Tınaz, P., Bayram, F. & Ergin, H. (2008). *Çalışma psikolojisi ve hukuki boyutlarıyla işyerinde psikolojik taciz (mobbing)* 1. Baskı. İstanbul: Beta.
- Toplu, D. (2010). *Örgütsel adaletin yöneticiye güven üzerindeki etkisi ve bir araştırma.* (Yüksek Lisans Tezi). İstanbul Üniversitesi.
- Tougas, F., Beaton, A. (2008). Personal Relative Deprivation: A Look at the Grievous Consequences of Grievance, *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2(4), 1753-1766. Doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00127.x
- Tripathi R.C., Srivastava, R. (1981). Relative deprivation and intergroup attitudes, *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 11 (3), 313-318. Erişim Adresi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420110306>
- Tutar, H. (2004). *İşyerinde psikolojik şiddet.* Ankara: Platin Yayınları 3. Baskı.
- Walker, I. & Mann, L. (1987). Unemployment, relative deprivation, and social protest. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 13, 275-283. doi: 10.1177/0146167287132012.
- Walker, I. (1999). Effects of personal and group relative deprivation on personal and collective self-esteem. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 2(4), 365-380. doi: 10.1177/1368430299024004
- Yaman, E. (2009). *İşyerinde psikoşiddet -mobbing-* 1. Baskı. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık
- Yılmaz, İ. (2017). *Öğretmenlerin maruz kaldıkları psikolojik yıldırma (mobbing) davranışları ile iş doyumunu arasındaki ilişki.* Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Muğla.
- Yılmaz, N. (2019). *Hastanelerde çalışan kurum ev idaresi personelinin görelî yoksunluk duygusunun performans etkisinin incelenmesi* (Doktora Tezi). Hacettepe Üniversitesi.
- Yumuşak, H. (2013). *İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin bezdiri (mobbing) yaşama düzeyi ile örgütsel bağlılıkları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi.* Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Zapf, D. & Gross, C. (2001). Conflict escalation and coping with workplace bullying: a replication and extension. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10(4), 497-522. doi: 10.1080/ 13594320
- Zorgül, G., G. (2014). *İlkokul öğretmenlerinin maruz kaldığı psikolojik yıldırma ile işe yabancılaşma arasındaki ilişki (İstanbul ili Avcılar ilçesi örneği).* Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Bahçeşehir Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.