Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, Issue 47, Spring 2012, 95-112

Bullying toward Teachers: An Example from Turkey

Rüçhan ÖZKILIÇ *

Suggested Citation:
Özkılıç, R. (2012). Bullying toward teachers: An example from Turkey. Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 47, 95-112

Abstract

Problem Statement: The studies investigating bullying behaviours exhibited by students toward teachers are limited in number. Since teachers are perceived as powerful adults compared to the teenagers and are responsible for managing the classroom, it is commonly thought that they cannot be considered the victims of students. Such thoughts may have put limitations on research studies examining this matter. It is known that student-teacher interactions have effects on school climate and are extremely important in terms of carrying out anti-bullying programs. For this reason, it was thought that collecting more detailed data about bullying behaviours exhibited by students toward teachers can provide useful information for prevention efforts.

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research is to determine the existence and characteristics of students' bullying toward teachers in Turkey according to the gender of teachers and to draw the attention of those preparing anti-bullying programs and of teacher trainers to the subject.

Methods: Participants of the study were volunteer teachers (n=540) serving at the Osmangazi district of Bursa city. A questionnaire was used to determine behaviours related to bullying exhibited by students toward teachers according to teacher perceptions. The obtained data were analyzed by using frequencies, percentages, and chi square tests.

Results: The comparisons showed that there were no significant differences among bullied and non-bullied participant teachers in terms of gender. On the other hand, male teachers experienced more physical bullying and female teachers experienced more verbal bullying and gossiping. It was determined that there are significant differences among female and male teachers in terms of the gender of the students and in terms of some locations.

* Assist. Prof. Dr., UludağUniversity Faculty of Education, ruchan@uludag.edu.tr

Conclusions and Recommendations: The findings showed that the gender of the teachers and students are important in terms of bullying behaviours exhibited by students toward teachers. Therefore, it should be taken into consideration if bullying is included in the content of whole school anti-bullying programs, pre-service, and in-service teacher training programs. In this context, it is believed that future research investigating the differences between bullied and non-bullied teachers, the characteristics of bully students, the variables such as school size, class size, and the effects of students' bullying toward teachers on school climate and teacher performance will contribute to the improvement of teacher education programs and anti-bullying programs.

Keywords: Bullying, students, teachers, teacher education, gender

Although it is defined in different ways, bullying is no longer a vague concept; instead it is one of the most frequently identified behaviours. Bullying has been defined by many researchers (Conn, 2004; Greene, 2006; Monks & Smith, 2006; Olweus, 2003; Smith, Cowie, Olafsson & Liefooghe, 2002) as behaviours that are intentionally and repeatedly exhibited by a bully person or a bully group in order to hurt, upset, and produce stress in the victim, who is usually less powerful than the bully.

Bullying is included in the category of aggressiveness and it appears to be a behavior that an individual may encounter at early ages (while playing with others), during adolescence (either while at school or within the peer group), or even during adulthood (while at work). The increase in the incidence of bullying behaviours among students in recent years (Çınkır & Kepenekçi, 2003; Hymel, Rocke-Henderson & Bonanno, 2005; Kartal, 2008; Pekel, 2004; Kepenekçi & Çınkır 2006; Pişkin, 2003) drew the attention of the researchers.

Bullying is not just an event that was observed among the students. While not attracting as much attention as peer bullying, there are studies dealing with bullying behaviours exhibited by teachers toward students (Champell et al., 2004; Twemlow, Fonagey, Sacco & Brethour, 2006), by school administrators or colleagues toward teachers (Cemaloğu, 2007; Conn, 2004; Mullet, 2006), and by students toward teachers (Benefield, 2004; De Wet & Jacobs 2006; De Wet, 2010; James, Lawlor, Courtney, Flynn, Henry & Murphy, 2008; Pervin & Turner, 1998; Terry, 1998). Despite being a long-known problem, student bullying toward teachers is a subject upon which little research has been carried out (De Wet, 2010, Yaman, 2011).

De Wet (2010) named students' bullying behaviours toward teachers as "educator targeted bullying" and defined it as an aggression directed against teachers, who are meant to be sources of learners' social, cognitive, and emotional well-being and safety. The persistent and vigorous abuse of teachers, ignoring teachers, swearing at or mocking teachers, gossiping about teachers, and damaging teachers' belongings can be included in the definition of students bullying toward teachers (Pervin & Turner, 1998). Some researchers also stress the importance of power imbalance between bully (learner) and victim (De Wet, 2010; Benefield, 2004). Since teachers are perceived as adults who are more powerful than the teenagers and are responsible

for managing the classroom, it is commonly thought that they cannot be considered as the victims of students. Nation, Vieno, Perkins, and Santinello (2007) reported that knowledge of the dynamics of power difference is limited. According to the explanation given by the researchers, most of the research focuses on assertion of power by bullies, but a pattern of abdicated power may also contribute to the victimization (Nation et al., 2007). In fact, power is not a stable characteristic; it varies across relationships and situations.

Research that indicates the existence of students bullying toward teachers began to appear at the end of the 1990s. In two studies made in Britain (Pervin & Turner; 1998; Terry, 1998), teachers were asked to evaluate bullying behaviours exhibited by students. In the studies by Pervin and Turner (1998), 91% of the 84 participating teachers and by Terry (1998), 56.4% of the 101 teachers stated that they had been exposed to bullying by their students. According to research carried out in New Zealand (Benefield, 2004), 28% of the 587 teachers and another research in South Africa (De Wet & Jacobs, 2006), 79.7% of the 544 teachers claimed to have been exposed to bullying by their students. More recently in America, bullying toward teachers was examined from the viewpoint of students (James et al., 2008). At the first stage of the research, 28.2% of the 2300 students and at the second stage of the research 16.3% of the 919 students stated that they had bullied their teachers.

Additionally, in a qualitative research, De Wet (2010) concluded that students bullying toward teachers can have effects on teachers' personal lives, the teaching-learning process, and teachers' relationships with other individuals in society. Similarly, in other studies (Benefield, 2004; De Wet & Jacobs, 2006; Pervin & Turner, 1998; Terry, 1998) it is stated that exposure to bullying may affect teachers' morale, performance and learning.

So far this year, few studies conducted in Turkey that directly aim to investigate bullying by students toward teachers are available. The Turkish Education Union (Türk Eğitim-Sen, 2009) conducted a study that aimed to determine the extent of violence in schools throughout Turkey from the teachers' (n= 1010) perspectives. According to the results of this study, 23% of the participated teachers reported having been exposed to violent behaviours exhibited by their students. Additionally, 65.1% of the victimized teachers reported having been exposed to verbal violence, 16.9% reported psychological violence, 14.4% reported physical violence, and 3.6% reported sexual violence. If bullying is considered as a form of violence, it is likely that these results revealed some examples of behaviours included in the definition of bullying but the amount was not clear.

Only one recently conducted qualitative study (Yaman & Kocabaşoğlu, 2011) in Turkey that directly aims to investigate students bullying toward teachers is available. The study was carried out by means of interviews with eleven teachers. The participating teachers stated that an average of 2-3 students per class bullied them, they were subjected mostly to verbal bullying, and both their physical and psychological well-being was adversely affected (Yaman & Kocabaşoğlu, 2011).

It is obvious that neither the victimized teachers nor their colleagues, who are observers, should be expected to perform their duties while being exposed to these

negative experiences at school. Additionally, it is known that student-teacher interactions have effects on school climate and are extremely important in terms of carrying out anti-bullying programs (James et al., 2008; Kartal & Bilgin, 2009; Olweus, 2005; Runions, 2008,). James et al. (2008) and De Wet (2006) stated that findings revealing the presence of students' bullying toward teachers are important in terms of bullying prevention policies and bullying prevention programs must include a section related to students' bullying toward teachers. However, no specific section on students' bullying toward teachers has been encountered within programs developed to prevent bullying in schools (Ayas, 2008; Dölek, 2002; Garrity et al. 2000; Kartal, 2007; Olweus, 2005; Stevens, Bourdeaudhuij & Van Oost, 2000).

To prevent bullying at school, it is not enough just to examine bullying among students and expect teachers to take measures. Greene (2006) asserted that bullying both influences and is influenced by the culture between students, teachers, school administrators, other school personnel and parents. For this reason, it is considered that a collection of more detailed data related to students' bullying toward teachers can contribute to the development of effective strategies which may be used by teachers for combating bullying, to increase the awareness of a need to include students' bullying toward teachers in anti-bullying programs, and to the efforts to prevent bullying in schools in Turkey. In this context, the purpose of this research is to determine the existence and characteristics of students bullying toward teachers in Turkey according to the gender of teachers and to draw the attention of those preparing anti-bullying programs and of teacher trainers to the subject. To carry out this aim, answers were sought to the following research questions:

1. Is there a difference between bullied and non-bullied teachers in terms of their gender?
2. What are the types and places of bullying, the grades and gender of bully students, and the characteristics of the bullied teachers?
3. Is there a difference in the types and places of bullying, the grades, and gender of bully students according to gender of the bullied teachers?

Method

Participants

Participants of the present study were volunteer teachers serving in the 6th, 7th and 8th grades of primary schools and high schools at the Osmangazi district of Bursa city. The researcher thought that the teachers might have refrained from answering questions regarding bullying and the administrators might have felt uncomfortable in aiding research on bullying at schools. The District Directorate for National Education organized some activities for teachers through the cooperation of the Education Faculty of UludağUniversity during the 2007-2008 academic year. In this respect, the participant teachers were reached outside the schools at the time of those activities such as seminars, panels, and conferences. Among the teachers participating in those activities, 540 teachers volunteered for a study on bullying at

schools. Table 1 displays the distribution of volunteer teachers according to gender and the educational level they work.

Table 1

Distribution of the Teachers According to Gender and the Educational Level They Work.

Gender / Educational level	Female n	Male n	Total n
High School	105	171	276
Primary Education (6th , 7th , and 8 grades)	164	100	264
Total	269	271	540

The respondents were essentially volunteers and not a random sample. For this reason, it is difficult to generalize findings to other populations and impossible to establish causality from these data. Consequently, teachers were much more sensitive about the identification of their names and their schools because they were concerned that victimization may diminish their credibility as a teacher. Therefore, it was difficult for the researcher to increase the number of the volunteer teachers.

Instrument

A questionnaire was used to determine behaviours related to bullying exhibited by students toward teachers according to teacher perceptions. The questionnaire was developed in light of a literature review on bullying. The questions were proofread by five teachers from different schools and by two academicians from education faculty. It was composed of two parts. The first part included instructions for filling the questionnaire, definitions, and some examples of bullying and questions about variables such as gender and education level in which teachers work. The second part included questions about students' bullying toward teachers. The Kuder-Richardson-20 reliability coefficient was found as .74 for the second part of the instrument. The questionnaire consisted of multiple-choice and yes/no type questions. The multiple-choice questions were designed so that participants were able to mark more than one answer. Because bullying is secretive by nature (Crothers & Levinson, 2004; Debarbieux, 2003; Frey, 2005; Runions, 2008), is affected by cultural differences (Boulton, Bucci & Hawker, 1999; Smith, Cowie, Olafsson & Liefooghe, 2002), and is better to support by qualitative data (Mishna, 2004), an 'other' alternative coupled with a blank space was included for each question so that teachers could write in their own choices or thoughts. Although it is the most

commonly used method for assessing bullying (Sawyer, Bradshaw & O'Brennan, 2008), the reliance on a self-report measure is a limitation of the present study.

Procedure and Analyses

Prior to the administration of the questionnaire, an explanation was made by the researcher about the subject of the study, the aim of it, and the confidentiality of the data. Afterwards, the definition and examples of the bullying at the questionnaire were read loudly to the participants by the researcher. A quite general definition of bullying was used. However, it would have been thought to affect the responses of teachers, "power imbalance" was not specified but "repetition and intentionality" were specified in the definition of bullying. No time limitation was put to answer the questionnaire, and no personal information such as names, surnames, school names, etc. was asked from the participants. The obtained data were analyzed by using frequencies, percentages, and chi square tests.

Results

The first question in the second part of the questionnaire was to "Have you come across any bullying behaviours exhibited by your students toward you while serving as a teacher?" The distribution of the bullied and non-bullied participant teachers are summarized in Table 2. Among the 540 teachers participated to this study, 221 teachers (40.9%) stated that they had been exposed to bullying by their students. Of these teachers, 20.2% were female and 20.7% were male teachers. Chi square analysis showed that there were no significant differences among bullied and non-bullied participant teachers in terms of gender.

Table 2

The Distribution of the Bullied and Non-Bullied Teachers According to Gender

Gender	Female		Male		Total		Gender comparisons
	f	%	f	%	f	%	χ^2
Bullied	109	20.2	112	20.7	221	40.9	.41
Non-bullied	160	29.7	159	29.4	319	59.1	.03

P >.05

The second question included in the questionnaire was related to the types of bullying behaviours exhibited by students toward teachers. The teachers' answers to this question are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

The Types of Bullying Behaviours toward Teachers

Bullied teachers	Total n=221		Female n=109		Male n=112		Gender comparisons
Types of bullying	f	%	f	%	f	%	χ^2
Verbal bullying	86	38.9	66	76.7	20	23.3	42.357**
Ignoring existence of teacher	73	33	43	58.9	30	41.1	4.005*
Gossiping about teacher	55	24.9	36	65.5	19	34.5	7.625*
Physical bullying	39	17.6	9	23.1	30	76.9	13.050**
Harm to belongings, closet etc.	24	10.9	10	41.7	14	58.3	.631
Other	17	7.7	7	52.9	10	47.1	.489

* P < .05, ** P < .01.

Of the teachers that reported bullying, verbal bullying by students was the most frequently reported behavior (38.9%, f = 86). This was followed, in order of frequency, by: ignoring the existence of the teacher (33%, f = 73); gossiping about the teacher with others (24.9%, f = 55); physical violence (17.6%, f = 39); and doing harm to the teacher's belongings, closets, clothes, etc. (10.9%, f = 24). The comparison of female and male teachers showed that there were significant differences in terms of some types of bullying such as verbal bullying, ignoring the existence of teacher, gossiping about teacher, and physical bullying. In addition, some teachers (7.7%, f = 17) marked the 'other' alternative: five reported that their automobiles had been damaged, five reported having received written warnings or threats, two reported having been threatened with a weapon, two reported that the anger directed at him/her had been exhibited by hitting or breaking school equipment, two reported having been frightened by students' cornering them, and one reported having come across all types of bullying specified in the choices.

Table 4

The Gender of the Bully Students

Bullied teachers	Total n=221		Female n=109		Male n=112		Gender comparisons
	f	%	f	%	f	%	χ^2
A boy student	101	45.7	37	36.6	64	63.4	11.979**
Mixed gender group	89	40.3	49	55.1	40	44.9	1.961
A girl student	43	19.5	30	69.8	13	11.6	8.929*
Boys as a group	14	6.3	4	28.6	10	71.4	2.575
Girls as a group	8	3.6	6	75	2	25	2.190

* P < .05, ** P < .01.

The participating teachers were asked about the gender of the students and the results are displayed in Table 4. It was determined that these students were mostly boys (45.7, f = 101). It was followed by mixed gender students (40.3%, f = 89). Girl students rarely exhibited these behaviours alone (19.5%, f = 43). There are clear significant differences among female and male teachers in terms of the gender of the bully students. When the students exhibited bullying behavior as a group there were not significant differences among female and male teachers in terms of exposure to bullying.

Table 5

The Locations of Bullying Behaviours toward Teachers

Bullied teachers	Total n=221		Female n=109		Male n=112		Gender comparisons
Locations	F	%	f	%	f	%	χ^2
School corridors	79	35.7	41	51.9	38	48.1	.327
Classrooms	74	33.5	49	66.2	25	33.8	12.705**
School gardens	73	33	35	47.9	38	52.1	.083
At places outside the school	71	32.1	46	62.2	28	37.8	7.339*
On the routes to school and home	45	20.4	29	64.4	16	35.6	5.170 *
School cafeteria / canteen	17	7.7	9	52.9	8	47.1	.097
Other	14	6.4	8	57.1	6	42.9	.366

* P < .05, ** P < .01.

In the following question, the teachers were asked about the locations where the students exhibited bullying behaviours toward them and the answers are summarized in Table 5. As seen in the table, the rates of bullying behaviours toward

teachers were higher in school corridors (35.7%, f = 79), classrooms (33.5%, f = 74), school gardens (33%, f = 73), and places outside the school (32.1%, f = 71) when compared to other places. Additionally, several teachers marked the 'other' (6.4%, f = 14) choice and they wrote that they had been exposed to bullying behaviours at restrooms (f = 5), on the internet (f = 6), and via mobile (f = 3) phone. Also, there are significant differences among female and male teachers in terms of some locations such as classrooms, places outside the school and on the routes to school and home. There were not significant differences among female and male teachers in terms of other locations.

When the teachers were asked if these behaviours were limited to a specific grade, 48% (f = 106) answered "yes" and 52% of them (f = 115) answered "no". Those answering "yes" were asked about the grades of the students exhibiting bullying behaviours toward them and the answers are summarized in Table 6. It was found that the students who exhibited bullying behaviours toward their teachers were mostly eighth graders (33.6%, f = 47). In the "other" choice, more than half of the participants (55.2%, f = 122) stated that these behaviours cannot be limited to a specific grade.

Table 6

The Grades of the Bully Students

Grades (n = 106)	f	%
8th grade	47	33.6
7th grade	23	16.4
11th grade	23	16.4
9th grade	21	15
10th grade	13	9.3
6th grade	13	9.3

The participating teachers also addressed the question, "In your opinion, which teachers are exposed to these kinds of behaviours more frequently?" Approximately 40% of the teachers (f = 88) thought that inexperienced teachers might encounter these kinds of behaviours more frequently, while 30% (f = 67) thought that almost every teacher might encounter such behaviours, and 20% (f = 45) believed that even experienced teachers might encounter such behaviours when starting at a new school. The percentage of teachers who thought that teachers who enforced strict discipline policies usually encountered such behaviours was 8% (f = 18). When the answers provided by the teachers marking the 'other' choice (11.3%, f = 25) were examined, it appeared that five teachers thought that these behaviours were exhibited more frequently toward female teachers. Four teachers thought that these behaviours were exhibited more frequently toward debonair and soft-tempered

teachers, and three teachers thought that extremely serious teachers were exposed to these kinds of behaviours more frequently. Moreover, some participants also stated that those giving low marks, those who were close with students, and those who did not use strict disciplinary rules to control students were more likely to be exposed to bullying.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study is one of the first research efforts to draw attention to the existence of students' bullying toward teachers in Turkey. Within the limits of the present study, the findings indicated that the number of teachers who have been bullied by students is rather high. The participant teachers stated that verbal bullying occurred most frequently. This was followed by ignoring the existence of teachers, gossiping, physical violence, and harming the teacher's possessions. These results showed consistency with the studies conducted by Benefield (2004), De Wet (2010), De Wet and Jacobs (2006), Pervin and Turner (1998), and Yaman (2011). When the results were taken into consideration, it was thought that first and foremost teachers need support in terms of strategies to prevent and protect themselves from verbal bullying.

Research on gender differences has uncovered consistent patterns that male students bully other students more frequently than the female students (Bosworth, Espelage & Simon, 1999; Kartal, 2008; Pişkin, 2006; Yang, Kim, Kim, Shin & Yoon, 2006). Parallel to these patterns, the participant teachers reported that they have been bullied mostly by male students, then mixed gender groups, and finally and rarely by female students. As consistent with this finding, James et al. (2008) reported that boys bullied teachers more frequently than girls did. Furthermore, the findings of the present study showed that there is no significant difference between male and female teachers in terms of exposure to bullying by students. However, the gender comparisons of teachers showed that male teachers are exposed to more physical bullying than female teachers and female teachers are exposed more verbal bullying, ignoring their existence, and gossiping than male teachers. Additionally, it was significant that male teachers are exposed more to bullying by boys and female teachers are exposed more to bullying by girls when the students exhibited bullying without the support of the other students. These two findings complement each other and are in line with the studies on peer bullying. For example; boys are found to be exposed to more physical bullying than girls and girls are found to be exposed to more verbal and indirect bullying such as gossiping (Baldry & Farrington 1999; Kartal & Bilgin, 2008; Wolke, Woods & Stanford, 2001). Moreover, such a comparison could not be found among the previously conducted research related to students bullying toward teachers (Benefield, 2004; De Wet & Jacobs 2006; De Wet, 2010; James et. al., 2008; Pervin & Turner, 1998; Terry, 1998; Yaman, 2011). The results of the present study show that teachers are mostly exposed to bullying by students of their own gender, while research related to peer bullying suggests that bullying is mostly carried out by boys without the gender discrimination among victims. These findings are considered as evidence to an important distinction between students' bullying toward teachers and peer bullying.

School corridors rank first and classrooms rank second among the places where students exhibit bullying behaviours toward teachers. As a general practice in Turkish schools, every school administration assigns teachers for maintaining order at corridors and gardens during break times. In other words, the assigned teachers are the only adults at those places because other teachers usually spend their time in the teachers' room. Espelage, Bosworth, and Simon (2000) reported that bullying behaviours generally occurred in areas where sufficient adult supervision is lacking. Looking at the frequency of these two places, it can be stated that students do not avoid other students when exhibiting bullying behaviours, yet they prefer the places where teachers and other adults are few in number. As a matter of fact, the the frequency of teacher bullying is low in places where the possibility of existence of other adults (e.g., the school cafeteria/canteen) is high. In order of frequency, school gardens, places outside the school, and the routes to school and home are the other locations where teachers are bullied.

In relation to locations, the results revealed that some significant differences were found between male and female teachers. For example; female teachers exposed more bullying at classrooms, places outside the school and on the routes to school/home than their male counterparts. In support of this finding, in Yaman and Ayar's research (2009) related to school security, it is stated that especially female teachers more frequently encounter misbehaviours from students at school entrances and exits. It is clear that the efforts to make schools safer are just not enough for the prevention of bullying. It should be accepted and enhanced through the whole community.

In the studies of Bradshaw, Sawyer, and O'Brennan (2007), and Olweus (2003), it was reported that bullying increases in late elementary school, peaks during secondary school, and declines in high school. Although the research findings do not indicate an increase or decrease in the incidence of bullying according to grade, the teachers stated that the eighth graders exhibited bullying behaviours toward them most frequently. Eighth graders are 13-14 year-old students entering adolescence, therefore it was thought that they object to or rise against teachers whom they regard as authority figures. As inconsistent with this finding, Chen and Astor (2009) and Yaman (2011) reported that bullying toward teachers exhibited mostly by tenth graders and it decreased as the grades of students increased.

When the answers to questions about the characteristics of teachers exposed to bullying are examined, it is revealed that being inexperienced in the profession is a disadvantage. These findings are consistent with studies which indicate that inexperienced teachers are at a greater risk (Terry, 1998) and inexperienced teachers are subjected to a higher average incidence of students' bullying (Benefield, 2006) when they were compared to other teachers. Furthermore, Royer (2003) stated that young teachers graduate without the skills that are necessary to stop aggressive behavior and this situation leads to an increase in their stress levels at the beginning of their professional lives. Also, the substantial proportions of teachers stated that all teachers may encounter students' bullying, even if he/she is experienced. These findings point out the importance of bullying issues for teacher training programs. According to Royer (2003), there is a gap in the instruction on teacher training

programs between theory and practice concerning aggressiveness. Similarly, teachers participating in Yaman's (2011) study stated that one of the reasons for their exposure to bullying by their students is the content of the "classroom management" courses in pre-service teacher training which did not correspond to real school life.

In conclusion, the findings presented in this study draw attention to the existence of students bullying toward teachers at elementary and high schools in Turkey and to the importance of teachers' and students' gender in terms of students bullying toward teachers. In this case, The Ministry of National Education and teacher training institutions, and those preparing and applying anti-bullying programs to be able to produce solutions and to put actions directed toward intervention and prevention into practice in-depth knowledge and multi-directional studies are needed. In the light of this discussion, the following recommendations are presented:

1. A section that includes strategies for teachers aimed to prevent students' bullying toward teachers should be added to anti-bullying programs. Besides, matters related to students' bullying toward teachers should be included in classroom management courses of teachers' pre-service and in-service training programs.

2. School administrators and parents should be informed about students' bullying toward teachers in order to contribute to bullying prevention and protection efforts.

3. Studies investigating the differences of bullied and non-bullied teachers, the characteristics of bully students, the variables such as school size, class size, and the effects of students' bullying toward teachers on school climate, and teacher performance should be conducted to contribute to the development of whole school anti-bullying programs and the solution of the problem. Even the investigations related to characteristics of teachers who have never been subjected to students bullying may lead to a better understanding of the problem.

References

Ayas, T. (2008). Zorbalığı önlemede tüm okul yaklaşımına dayalı programın etkililiği [Effectiveness of the program based on whole school approach at prevention of bullying]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Baldry, A.C., & Farrington, D.P. (1999). Types of bullying among Italian school children. Journal of Adolescence, 22, 423-426.

Benefield, J. (2004). Teachers — the new targets of schoolyard bullies? Retrieved May 05 2010 from http://www.ppta.org.nz/cms/imaginelibrary/100894.pdf.

Bosworth, K., Espelage, D.L., & Simon, T.R. (1999). Factors associated with bullying behaviours in middle school students. Journal of Early Adolescence, 19 (3), 341-362.

Boulton, M.J., Bucci, E., & Hawker, D. (1999). Swedish and English secondary school

pupils' attitudes towards, and conceptions of bullying: Concurrent links with bully / victims involvement. Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 40, 277-284.

Bradshaw, C.P., Sawyer, A.L., & O'Brennan, L.M. (2007). Bullying and peer victimization at

school: Perceptual differences between students and school staff. School Psychological Review, 36, 361-382.

Cemaloğu, N. (2007). The relationship between organizational health and bullying that teachers experience in primary schools in Turkey. Educational Research Quarterly, 31 (2), 3-29.

Champell, M., Casey, D., De la Cruz, C., Ferrel, J., Forman, J., Lipkin, R., and et. al. (2004). Bullying in college by students and teachers. Adolescence, 39 (153), 53-64.

Chen, J. K. & Astor, R.A. (2009). Students' reports of violence against teachers in Taiwanese Schools. Journal of School Violence, 8 (1), 2-17.

Conn, K. (2004). Bullying and Harassment: A legal guide for educators. Alexsandria, VA, USA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development, p. 104-203.Retrieved

October 19 2008 from http: / / site.ebrary.com / libuludag / Doc?id=10065774&ppg=115

Crothers, L.M., & Levinson, E.M. (2004). Assessment of bullying: A review of methods and instruments. Journal of Counseling and Development, 82 (4), 496-503.

Çınkır, Ş. & Kepenekçi, Y. (2003). Öğrenciler arası zorbalık [Bullying among students]. Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi. 34, 236-253.

Debarbieux, E. (2003). School violence and globalization. Journal of Educational Administration, 41 (6), 582-602.

De Wet, C. (2010). Victims of educator-targeted bullying: A qualitative study. South African Journal of Education, 30, 189-201.

De Wet, N. C & Jacobs, L. (2006). Educator-targeted bullying: Fact or fallacy? Acta

Criminological, 19, 53-73.

Dölek, N. (2002). Öğrencilerde zorbaca davranışların araştırılması ve önleyici bir program

modeli [The investigation of students bullying behaviours and a model for prevention program]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Marmara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Espelage, D.L., Bosworth, K., & Simon, T.R. (2000). Examining the social context of bullying behaviours in early adolescents. Journal of Counseling Development, 78 (3), 326-333.

Frey, K.S. (2005). Gathering and communicating information about school bullying.

Health Education, 105 (6), 409-413.

Garrity, C., Jens, K., Porter, W., Sager, N. & Short-Camilli, C. et al. (2000). Bully-Proofing

Your Elementary School, (2d ed.) . Longmont, Colorado: Sopris West.

Greene, M.B. (2006). Bullying in schools: A plea for measure of human rights. Journal of Social Issues, 62 (1), 63-79.

Hymel, S., Rocke-Henderson, R. N., & Bonanno, R.A. (2005). Moral disengagement: A framework for understanding bullying among adolescents. Journal of Social Science, 8, 1-11.

James, D.J., Lawlor, M., Courtney, P., Flynn, A., Henry, B., & Murphy, N. (2008). Bullying behaviour in secondary schools: What roles do teacher play? Child Abuse Review, 17, 160-173.

Kartal, H. (2008). Bullying prevalence among elementary students. Hacettepe University Journal of Education, 35, 207-217.

Kartal, H., & Bilgin, A. (2008). Öğrenci, veli ve öğretmen gözü ile ilköğretim okullarında yaşanan zorbalık [Bullying in the elementary schools: from the aspects of the students, the teachers and the parents]. İlköğretim Online, 7(2), 485-495.

Kartal, H., & Bilgin, A. (2009). Bullying and school climate from the aspects of students and teachers. Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 36, 209-226.

Kepenekçi, Y.K. & Çınkır, Ş (2006). Bullying among Turkish high school students. Child Abuse & Neglect. 30(2):193-204.

Mishna, F. (2004). A qualitative study of bullying from multiple perspectives. Children & Schools, 26 (4), 234-27.

Monks, C.P., & Smith, P.K. (2006). Definitions of bullying: Age differences in understanding of the term, and the role of experience. British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 24, 801-821.

Mullet, J, H. (2006). The bully within us… as teachers. Academic Exchange Quarterly, September, 22. Retrieved June 16 2009 from http://www.thefreelibrary.com/The+bully+within+us+…+as+teachers-a015556791

Nation, M., Vieno, A., Perkins, D.D., & Santinello, M. (2007). Bullying in school and adolescents sense of empowerment: An analysis of relationships with parents, friends and teachers. Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 18, 211-232.

Olweus, D. (2003). A profile of bullying at school. Educational Leadership, 60 (6), 12-17.

Olweus, D. (2005). Useful evaluation design and effects of the Olweus bullying prevention program. Psychology, Crime & Law, 11 (4), 389-402.

Pekel, N. (2004). Akran zorbalığı grupları arasında sosyometrik statü, yalnızlık ve akademik başarı durumlarının incelenmesi [An investigation on sociometric statüs, loneliness and academic achievement among peer bullying groups]. Unpublished maste thesis. Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Pervin, K., & Turner, A. (1998). A study of bullying of teachers by pupils in an inner London school. Pastoral Care, December, 4-10.

Pişkin, M. (2003). Okullarımızda yaygın bir sorun: okul zorbalığı [A widespread problem in schools: School bullying]. VII. Ulusal Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Kongresi, İnönü Üniversitesi, 11-13 Haziran, Malatya.

Pişkin, M. (2006). Akran zorbalığı olgusunun ilköğretim öğrencileri arasındaki yaygınlığının incelenmesi. [An investigation about prevalence of peer bullying among elementary school students]. I. Şiddet ve Okul: Okul ve Çevresinde Çocuğa Yönelik Şiddet ve Alınabilecek Tedbirler Sempozyumu, 28-31 Mart, İstanbul.

Royer, E. (2003). What Galileo knew; school violence, research, effective practices and teacher training. Journal of Educational Administration, 41 (6), 640-649.

Runions, K. (2008). A multi-systemic school-based approach for addressing childhood aggression. Australian Journal of Guidance & Counseling, 18 (2), 106-127.

Sawyer, A.L., Bradshaw, C.P., & O'Brennan, L. M. (2008). Examining ethnic, gender, and developmental differences in the way children report being a victim of bullying on self-report measures. Journal of Adolescence Health, 43, 106-114.

Smith, P.K., Cowie, H., Olafsson, R.F., & Liefooghe A. (2002). Definitions of bullying: A comparison of terms used, and age and gender differences, in a fourteen-country international comparison. Child Development, 73 (4), 1119-1133.

Stevens, V., de Bourdeaudhuij, I, & Van Oost, P. (2000). Bullying in Flemish schools: An evaluation of anti-bullying interventions in primary and secondary schools. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 70:195–210.

Terry, A. (1998). Teachers as targets of bullying by their pupils: A study to investigateincidence. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 68, 255-268.

Türk Eğitim-Sen. (2009). Öğretmenlerin gözüyle okullarda şiddet [Violance at schools through the eyes of teachers]. Retrieved May 25 2009 from http://www.turkegitimsen.org.tr/modules.php?name=News&file=article&sid=1642

Twemlow, S.W., Fonagey, P., Sacco, F., & Brethour, J.R. (2006). Teachers who bully students: a hidden trauma. International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 52, 187-198.

Wolke, D., Woods, S., & Stanford, K. (2001). Bullying and victimization of primary school children in England and Germany: Prevalence and school factors. British Journal of Psychology, 92, 673-696.

Yang, S.J., Kim, J.M., Kim, S.W., Shin, I.S ., & Yoon, J.S. (2006). Bullying and victimization behaviours in boys and girls at South Korean primary schools. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 45 (1), 69-77.

Yaman, E. & Kocabaşoğu, N. (2011). A different approach to bullying: An upright/vertical

Bullying study where students bully their teachers. Elementary Education Online, 10(2), 653-666.

Yaman, E. & Ayar, N. (2009). Okul güvenliğine farklı bir yaklaşım: Okul polisi uygulaması [A different approach to school safety: School police practice]. Sakarya Üniversitesi Fen Edebiyat Dergisi, 11 (2), 147-171. Retrieved June 24 2011 from http://www.fed.sakarya.edu.tr/arsiv/yayinlenmis_dergiler/2009_2/2009_2_S7.pdf

Öğretmenlere Yönelik Zorbalık: Türkiye'den Bir Örnek

(Özet)

Problem Durumu

Zorbalık farklı araştırmacılar tarafından değişik ifadelerle tanımlanmış ancak genel olarak üzerinde fikir birliğine varılmış bir kavramdır. Tanımların ortak özelliğine bakıldığında, zorbalığın, zorba bir kişi ya da grubun kasıtlı ve tekrarlı olarak kendisinden daha güçsüz olan kurbanı inciten, üzen ve kurbanda stres yaratan davranışları olarak ele alındığı söylenebilir. Saldırganlık sınıfı içinde yer alan ve güçlerdeki dengesizlikle belirlenen zorbalık bireyin küçük yaşlarda başkalarıyla oyun oynarken, ergenlikte okulda ya da akran grubu içerisinde veya yetişkinlikte işyerinde karşılaşabileceği bir davranıştır. Son yıllarda öğrenciler arasında gözlenen zorbalık olaylarında gözlenen artış dikkat çekicidir. Ancak zorbalık sadece öğrenciler arasında gözlenen bir durum değildir. Öğretmenlerin öğrencilere yönelik sergilediği zorba davranışları ele alan çalışmaların yanı sıra okul yöneticileri veya meslektaşları tarafından öğretmenlere yönelik zorbalığı ele alan araştırmalara sıklıkla rastlamak mümkündür. Ancak öğrencilerin öğretmenlere karşı sergiledikleri zorba davranışları ele alan çalışmaların sayısı oldukça sınırlıdır. Yetişkin ve güçlü oldukları için öğretmenlerin öğrenciler tarafından zorba davranışlara maruz kalmayacağının düşünülmesi ya da görevi sınıfı yönetmek ve öğrencilere liderlik etmek olan öğretmenin bu tür davranışlara maruz kalmasının beklenen ve arzu edilen bir durum olmaması konunun bu açıdan ele alınmasını sınırlandırmış olabilir. Öğrenci öğretmen arasındaki etkileşimin okulun iklimini etkilediği ve zorbalık karşıtı programların uygulanması açısından son derece önemli olduğu bilinmektedir. Okulda zorbalığı önlemek için sadece öğrenciler arasındaki zorbalığa bakmak ve alınacak önlemleri sadece öğretmenlerden beklemek yeterli olmayacaktır. Bütüncül bakıldığında okulda bulunan tüm tarafların birbirlerine karşı sergiledikleri zorba davranışların

sorgulanması gerektiği açıktır. Bu nedenle öğretmenlere yönelik öğrenci zorbalığı ile ilgili daha detaylı veri toplamanın öğretmenleri hedef alan zorbalığa karşı öğretmenlerin kullanabilecekleri etkili stratejiler geliştirilmesine, zorbalığı önleme programlarında öğretmene yönelik zorbalık konusunun yer alması için gerekli farkındalığın artmasına ve Türkiye'deki okullarda zorbalığı önleme çabalarına katkı sağlayacağı düşünülmüştür.

Araştırmanın Amacı

Bu araştırmanın amacı Türkiye'de öğretmenlere yönelik öğrenci zorbalığının varlığını ve özelliklerini öğretmen cinsiyetine göre belirleyebilmek ve zorbalığı önlemeye yönelik programları hazırlayanlar ile öğretmen eğitimcilerinin dikkatini konuya çekmektir.

Yöntem

Araştırmanın katılımcılarını Bursa İli Osmangazi İlçesinde yer alan ilköğretim okullarının 6, 7 ve 8. sınıfları ile liselerde görev yapan gönüllü 540 öğretmen oluşturmaktadır. Öğretmenlere Osmangazi İlçe Milli Eğitim Müdürlüğü ve Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi işbirliği ile düzenlenen öğretmenlere yönelik hizmet içi eğitim seminerleri ve konferanslar sırasında ulaşılmıştır. Öğretmenlerin öğrenciler tarafından sergilenen öğretmene yönelik zorba davranışlar ile ilgili algılarını belirlemek üzere araştırmacı tarafından hazırlanan bir anket kullanılmıştır. Hazırlanan anketin Kuder-Richardson-20 güvenirlik katsayısı.74 olarak belirlenmiştir. Anketin ilk kısmında zorbalığa ilişkin bir tanıma ve örneklere yer verilmiştir. Katılımcılar anketi yanıtlamaya başlamadan önce bu bölüm araştırmacı tarafından yüksek sesle okunmuştur. Elde edilen veriler frekans, yüzde ve Ki kare testi kullanılarak analiz edilmiştir

Bulgular

Araştırmaya katılan 540 öğretmenden 221 tanesi öğrencileri tarafından sergilenen zorbalığa maruz kaldıklarını belirtmişlerdir. Zorbalığa uğrayan ve uğramayan öğretmenler arasında cinsiyete göre anlamlı bir fark bulunamamıştır. Zorbalığa uğrayan öğretmenler sırasıyla en çok sözel zorbalık, öğretmeni yok saymak ve başkaları ile öğretmen hakkında dedikodu yapmak gibi zorbalık türlerine maruz kaldıklarını belirtmişlerdir. Bunları fiziksel şiddet ve eşya, dolap, giysi v.b zarar vermek izlemektedir. Öğretmenlerin cinsiyetlerine göre zorbalığa maruz kalma türleri arasında anlamlı farklılıklar bulunmuştur. Öğretmenlerin en çok erkek öğrenciler tarafından sergilenen zorba davranışlara maruz kaldığı belirlenmiştir. Kadın ve erkek öğretmenler arasında zorba davranışları sergileyen öğrencilerin cinsiyetlerine göre anlamlı fark olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Öğretmenler sırası ile en çok okul koridorlarında, sınıflarda ve okulun bahçesinde zorba davranışlarla karşlaştıklarını belirtmişlerdir. Bu yerleri zorbalığa uğrayan kadın ve erkek öğretmenler arasında zorba davranışlarla karşlaştıkları yerler açısından anlamlı farklar bulunmuştur. Öğretmenler en çok sekizinci sınıftaki öğrenciler tarafından kendilerine yönelik zorba davranışların sergilendiğini belirtirken katılımcıların yarısından fazlası bu davranışların bir tek sınıf ile sınırlandırılamayacağını belirtmiştir. Ayrıca katılımcı öğretmenler deneyimsiz öğretmenlerin bu tür davranışlar ile daha sık karşlaşabileceğini belirtmişlerdir.

Sonuç ve Öneriler

Araştırmadan elde edilen sonuçlar öğretmene yönelik öğrenci zorbalığının Türkiye'de ilköğretim ikinci kademe ve liselerde bir sorun olarak varlığına ve öğretmenlerin ve öğrencilerin cinsiyetlerinin öğretmenlere yönelik öğrenci zorbalığı açısından önemine dikkat çekmektedir. Bu yüzden zorbalık karşıtı programlarda, öğretmenlerin hizmet öncesi ve hizmet içi eğitim programlarında öğretmene yönelik öğrenci zorbalığı konu olarak yer aldığında cinsiyet değişkeninin göz önünde bulundurulması gerekir. Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'nın, öğretmen yetiştiren kurumların ve zorbalık karşıtı programları hazırlayan ve uygulayanların öğretmene yönelik öğrenci zorbalığını bir problem olarak ele almaları ve çözüm üretebilmeleri için daha fazla bilgiye ve çok yönlü çalışmaların yapılmasına ihtiyaç vardır. Ayrıca, zorbalık karşıtı programların içerisine öğretmenlerin kendilerine yönelik öğrenci zorbalığını önlemelerine yardımcı olacak stratejilerin yer aldığı bir bölümün eklenmesinin ve öğretmene yönelik öğrenci zorbalığı konusuna hizmet öncesi ve hizmet içi öğretmen eğitimi programlarında yer verilmesinin sorunun çözümüne katkı sağlayacağı düşünülmüştür.

Anahtar sözcükler: Zorbalık, öğrenci, öğretmen, öğretmen eğitimi, cinsiyet