International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 2014, 6 (3), 570-580

iojes
www.iojes.net

International Online Journal of Educational Sciences

ISSN: 1309-2707

Examining Relationships between School Administrators' Humor Behaviors and Teachers' Mobbing Experiences According to Teacher Perceptions

Necati Cemaloğlu[1], Ergün Recepoğlu[2], Fatih Şahin[1] and Elif Daşcı[3]

[1]Division of Educational Administration, Inspection, Planning, and Economy, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey; [2] Division of Educational Administration, Inspection, Planning, and Economy, Kastamonu University, Kastamonu, Turkey; [3] Division of Educational Administration, Inspection, Planning, and Economy, Aksaray University, Aksaray, Turkey.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received 18.01.2014
Received in revised form 22.01.2014
Accepted 22.06.2014
Available online 02.12.2014

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to identify school administrators' humor behaviors as perceived by teachers and to determine the relationships between the school administrators' perceived humor behavior and mobbing experienced by teachers. Data was obtained from 459 teachers chosen by systematic sampling. Results indicated that teachers described negative attitudes mostly encountered as "refusal to take their ideas and opinions into consideration," "hiding information that would affect their performance from them", and "humiliation suffered as a result of being assigned to works below the level of their competence." Teachers believed that school administrators generally had "Appreciative humor" and "productive-social humor" attitudes. While there was a negative and significant relationship between positive humor behaviors and mobbing, there were also positive and significant relationships between negative humor behaviors and mobbing. Sarcastic humor and rejective humor were the significant predictors of mobbing.

© 2014 IOJES. All rights reserved

Keywords:
humor behaviors; mobbing; school administrator; teacher

Introduction

Mobbing is a hostile and unethical way of communication that is systematically (almost every day and at least for six months) applied by one or more persons to usually one person (Cemaloğlu, 2011; Leymann, 1990). Research conducted in educational organizations indicated that an overwhelming majority of teachers were exposed to at least one type of mobbing behavior and that 99.6 % of them were exposed to mobbing behaviors during their career (Aksu and Balcı, 2009; Blase and Blase, 2002; Cemaloğlu, 2007a; Cemaloğlu, 2007b; Hubert and Veldhoven, 2001; Riley, Duncan and Edwards, 2009).

Research focusing on the direction of mobbing in educational organizations mirrored that mobbing behavior was mostly exhibited by education professionals with an administrative role (Dick and Wagner, 2001; Gökçe, 20121; Ocak, 2008; Riley, Duncan and Edwards, 2009). The results of research conducted on the field, however, indicated that teachers and administrators were significantly exposed to mobbing behaviors exhibited by their own colleagues (Dick and Wagner, 2001; Gündüz and Yılmaz, 2008; Ocak, 2008; Riley, Duncan and Edwards, 2009; Sağlam, 2008).

Corresponding author's address: Kastamonu University Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Division of Educational Administration, Inspection, Planning, and Economy, Kastamonu University, Kastamonu/Turkey
Telephone: + 90 505 767 35 76
Fax: + 90 366 212 33 53
e-mail: erecepoglu@kastamonu.edu.tr
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.15345/iojes.2014.03.006

© 2014 International Online Journal of Educational Sciences (IOJES) is a publication of Educational Researches and Publications Association (ERPA)

Related literature on mobbing of teachers demonstrate that frequent interruption of their speech, inclination to overlook or downplay their achievements, being ostracized, assignment of tasks beneath their knowledge and skills, frequent control of their work, rejective of their decisions and suggestions after coming under criticism, persistent search for errors in their work, humiliation in presence of others, and hearing insulting remarks about them are different forms of mobbing they are exposed to (Cemaloğlu and Kılınç, 2012; Ertürk, 2011; Gökçe, 2012; Çelik and Peker, 2010; Gündüz and Yılmaz, 2008; Sağlam, 2008).

It was concluded that teachers who were the victims of mobbing in educational organizations suffered from chronic fear and anxiety (Blase and Blase, 2002; Blase and Blase, 2007), showed some physical symptoms of fatigue, headache, and stomach ache (Dick and Wagner, 2001), wanted to be transferred to other organizations (Cabrera, 2012), were frequently absent from work (Cabrera, 2012) their organizational loyalty dwindled (Okçu, 2011), experienced stress and occupational exhaustion accompanied by declining satisfaction with their work and life (Dick and Wagner, 2001; Karakuş and Çankaya, 2012), and they had a low level of perception of self-sufficiency (Celep and Eminoğlu, 2012). Teachers maltreated by the school administrator find it difficult to adapt themselves to their institutions, feel lonely, and experience problems in their relationships within the school (Blase and Blase, 2004). According to Riley, Duncan, and Edwards (2009), more than 50% of education professionals said that mobbing behavior had a negative effect on their health.

An analysis of mobbing targeting teachers indicates that organizational trust directly affects the level of being exposed to mobbing while ethical leadership behavior affects the level of experiencing mobbing through organizational trust (Cemaloğlu and Kılınç, 2012). Mobbing has a direct bearing on the level of stress, feeling of exhaustion, and job satisfaction and the level of satisfaction with life falls through those three variables (Karakuş and Çankaya, 2012).

Research into reasons behind mobbing targeting teachers emphasize that leadership attitude taken by school administrators (Cemaloğlu, 2007a; Cemaloğlu and Kılınç, 2012; Ertürk, 2011; Okçu, 2011) and their personality traits (Gökçe, 20120), professional competence and disciplinary actions (Ertürk, 2011), and supportive attitude (Dick and Wagner, 2001) affect mobbing suffered by teachers.

It is widely known that humor has a significant impact on influencing attitudes within educational organizations. Various researches indicated that humor, when used in a positive manner, enhanced positive sentiments (Samson and Gross, 2012), enabled people to establish good relations (Banas, Dunbar, Rodriguez, and Liu, 20112; Özdemir, Sezgin, Kaya, and Recepoğlu, 2011), boosted employee motivation (Recepoğlu, Kılınç, and Çepni, 2011), lessened organizational tension, alleviated the employee's problems (Malone, 19800), and increased productivity (Avolio, Howell, and Sosik, 1999). If humor is used in a negative fashion, positive sentiments dwindle (Samson and Gross, 2012) while organizational loyalty among employees also fall (Romero and Arendt, 2011). It is also believed that humor also has a significant effect on negative behavior observed in educational organizations. After reviewing related literature on humor and mobbing, it was understood that there is not enough research especially about the relationship between school administrators' humor behaviors and teachers' mobbing experiences.

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationships between the humor behaviors of primary school administrators as perceived by teachers and mobbing experienced by teachers. In this regard, the following questions will be answered:

- What is the level of mobbing experienced by teachers?
- What are the types of humor behaviors used by school administrators?
- Is there a significant relationship between the humor behaviors of school administrators and mobbing experienced by teachers based on teacher perceptions?
- Is the humor behavior of school administrators a significant predictor of mobbing suffered by teachers based on teacher perceptions?

Conceptual Framework

Humor

Humor is a social phenomenon which every individual experiences on various occasions and in different settings on any day. It makes people laugh and amuse them while relaxing them psychologically (Martin, 2007). According to another definition, humor is an effective mechanism used for coping with problems faced in daily life and overcoming difficulties (Thorson and Powell, 1993).

The concept of "humor" is defined in the Merriam-Webster Dictionary as "a funny or amusing quality and the ability to be funny or to be amused by things that are funny" (Merriam-Webster, 2013). People's attitudes that we call "comic," "funny", "humorous," or "jocular" in our daily lives may differ depending on how they are used. A person's mood, situation observed, level of sentiment, and importance attached to that situation lead to differences in terms of how humor is used (Thorson & Powell, 1993, p. 13).

Babad (1974) classifies people into five categories in terms of their humorous characters: non-humorous, passive appreciators, producers, reproducers, and producers-reproducers. Humor is analyzed in five different dimensions in this study. Producer-social humor and appreciative humor reflect positive humor behavior while non-humorous, rejective humor and sarcastic humor reflect negative humor behavior. Humor is produced and shared with others in productive social humor. To produce humor, one needs to filter information received from his or her surroundings or existing in his or her memory through a mental process and to express it by using a humorous language in order to amuse the other person (Martin, 2007). According to Babad (1974), a person would not laugh much, make a joke, or produce humor in case of the non-humorous style. In the appreciative humor style, an individual appreciates humorous remarks and behavior, likes jokes, and reacts by laughing. In the rejective humor style, an individual does not accept humorous behavior, remarks, and actions and rejects them. Sarcastic humor involves making fun of someone, humiliation, exclusion, and offense.

Mobbing

Mobbing is a workplace anomaly the existence and prevalence of which were not known until 1980s (Leymann, 19965). Initially used to describe aggressive behavior in a group of animals, mobbing was later used to describe similar aggressive attitudes exhibited by children (Cemaloğlu, 2011; Leymann, 19967). Leymann observed group behaviors similar to those exhibited by animals and children also in a work environment (1996) and used the concept of mobbing to characterize group behavior involving systematic exclusion in workplaces.

Mobbing is widely used to describe aggressive and violent behavior to which one or more individuals are repeatedly and systematically subjected by one person or a group (Einarsen, 2000). Mobbing is also psychological harassment used by a group of colleagues or a group of outsiders for forcing an employee to quit (Duffy and Sperry, 2007). Tınaz (2011, p.19-20) says that psychological harassment may occur in any establishment with a communication pattern and "mobbing" only means psychological harassment at the workplace. Such action aims to intimidate an individual and to force him or her to leave the workplace.

A mobbing victim feels helpless and defenseless in the face of mobbing behavior (Einarsen, 2000). Browne and Smith (2008) suggest that mobbing is a kind of systematic and long-term behavior that directly targets and employee and may cause psychological and physiological damage. Mobbing is believed to stem from a variety of reasons and it aims to force the targeted individual to leave the organization by subjecting him or her to humiliation, abasement, and loss of prestige (Zapf, 1999). Nicknaming, making a scapegoat of someone, unfair workload, sexual harassment, and physical attacks witnessed at workplaces are deliberate acts intended to discredit, embarrass, disappoint, intimidate, terrorizing, and offending the targeted person (Einarsen, 2000).

Method

Model

This study used survey method to examine the relationships between mobbing experienced by teachers and school administrators humor behaviors.

Participants

The population of this research is made up of teachers employed in primary schools in Altındağ, Pursaklar, and Yenimahalle, all townships in the capital of Ankara province. A list of the primary schools in those townships was extracted from the website of the Ministry of Education and schools where the research would be conducted were selected through systematic sampling. Thirty-two out of 36 schools chosen could be reached and data gathered from 459 teachers was processed. Data obtained from respondents who had replied to only a part of the scale or left more than 10% of the scale items empty (21 scales) was not processed.

Almost 71% of the teachers in the study were female (n = 325) and the remaining 29% (n = 132) were male. Approximately 86% of the respondents were married, 12% were single, and 2% were divorced. The average age of the respondents, their average length of service in their schools, and average total length of service were 38, 6, and 17 years, respectively. Almost three fifths of the respondents were specialized in different branches while the remaining two fifths were class teachers.

Instrumentation

Humor Behaviors Scale: This scale developed by Cemaloğlu, Recepoğlu, Şahin, Daşcı, and Köktürk (2013), was used to identify school administrators' humor behaviors. The scale consists of 30 items and divides humor into five different categories. There are 3 items measuring "non-humorous style" (example item (EI): Our school administrator does not make jokes), five items measuring "rejective humor" (EI: Our school administrator believes that humorous people are not trustworthy), five items measuring "appreciative humor" (EI: Our school administrator laughs when somebody cracks a joke), nine items measuring "productive-social humor" (EI: Our administrator likes to make people laugh), and eight items measuring "sarcastic humor" (EI: Our school administrator's sense of humor makes us upset." Items of the scale explained 70.10% of the total variance. Coefficients of internal consistency calculated for each dimension of the scale range from .86 to .94. Reliability coefficient calculated for the whole scale is .85. An exploratory factor analysis revealed that Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value was .94 and Barlett's test of sphericity yielded a significant result (p = .00). It was seen that the items concentrated under five factors as the original scale. Factor loads ranged between .57 and .85. The scale measures 69 % of total variance.

Negative Acts Scale: The Negative Acts Scale, developed by Einarsen and Raknes (1997) and adapted to Turkish by Cemaloğlu (2007) was used for determining the level of mobbing experienced by teachers. Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient which consists of 21 items (EI: Being exposed to a workload that cannot be handled) and measures negative acts in a single dimension was .94. The reliability coefficient calculated in this survey was .95. An exploratory factor analysis revealed that KMO value was .95 and Barlett's test of sphericity yielded a significant result (p=.00). The scale explains 65 % of total variance. Item factor loads ranged from .57 and .80. It was seen that the scale items concentrated in a single dimension.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage, arithmetic average, standard deviation), Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient, and multiple regression analysis techniques were used for analyzing data.

Findings

This section presents the results of multiple regression analysis about mobbing and relationships between mobbing and humor behaviors, descriptive humor behaviors, and descriptive statistics regarding mobbing. Table 1 shows results of descriptive statistics about mobbing.

Table 1 indicates that "intimidating acts such as being pointed at, aggression to personal space, pushing, and standing on one's way", "other people's acts implying that you should quit", and" offensive and humiliating comments about your personality (e.g. habits and manners), attitude or private life" are among negative behaviors that teachers are least exposed to. Approximately 85% of teachers never encounter such negative behaviors. Teachers describe "tendency to ignore their ideas and opinions," "keeping information that would affect their performance from them", and "being humiliated by being assigned to works beneath their competence" as negative behaviors that they face more frequently than others. Around two percent of teachers face such attitudes almost every day. In other words, teachers are exposed to negative behaviors

mostly related to their profession. Teachers face negative behaviors directed to their personality less frequently. Descriptive statistics related to humor behaviors are presented on Table 2.

Table 1. Frequency of teachers' exposure to negative behaviors (%)

Negative behaviors	*Never*	*Occasionally*	*Once a month*	*Once a week*	*Everyday*	*Empty*	*Average*
1. Somebody keeps information that would affect your performance from you	63.2	28.7	3.5	2.0	2.0	0.7	1.50
2. Being humiliated by being assigned works beneath your competence	77.0	14.7	4.6	1.1	2.0	0.7	1.35
3. You are requested to do work beneath your expertise / proficiency	70.0	20.4	5.3	2.2	1.3	0.9	1.43
4. Your responsibilities in key areas are canceled or replaced by less important and undesired tasks	75.5	16.4	4.4	2.4	0.2	1.1	1.34
5. There are gossip and rumors spread around about you	70.7	20.4	4.8	2.8	1.3	0.0	1.44
6. Being ignored, ostracized, neglected	72.9	19.5	4.2	1.8	1.8	0.9	1.40
7. Offensive and humiliating comments about your personality (e.g. habits and manners), attitude or private life	85.6	9.2	3.1	0.9	0.4	0.9	1.20
8. Being yelled at or being the target of spontaneous anger (or rage)	73.5	19.0	4.6	1.5	0.9	0.4	1.36
9. Intimidating acts such as being pointed at, aggression to personal space, pushing, and standing on one's way	86.4	8.1	3.7	1.1	0.2	0.2	1.20
10. Other people's acts implying that you should quit	84.9	10.1	3.1	1.3	0.4	0.9	1.22
11. Constant reminders / remarks about your mistakes and errors	73.7	18.8	3.9	2.2	0.4	0.9	1.35
12. Your approaches are not taken into consideration or ignored or you face hostile reactions	74.0	18.2	4.4	1.5	1.1	0.9	1.36
13. Unending criticism about your work and efforts	71.3	20.1	4.2	2.4	1.8	0.2	1.43
14. Your ideas and opinions are not taken into consideration	62.1	28.0	5.3	1.3	2.2	1.1	1.52
15. Being exposed to unpleasant jokes made by people you do not get along with (practical jokes)	79.6	14.9	3.3	1.3	0.7	0.2	1.28
16. Being assigned illogical works or works which cannot be completed on time	70.2	22.8	4.2	1.8	0.4	0.7	1.38
17. Facing accusations	81.2	14.0	2.8	0.7	1.1	0.2	1.26
18. Excessive control of your work	70.9	20.1	5.5	1.3	1.3	0.9	1.41
19. Facing pressure not to demand certain things that you are entitled to (e.g. sickness leave, annual leave, travel allowance)	76.4	16.2	4.6	1.8	1.1	0.0	1.35
20. Being the target of excessive mocking and harassment	85.8	10.1	2.8	0.9	0.2	0.2	1.19
21. Being exposed to a workload that you are unable to cope with	77.9	14.7	5.5	1.3	0.7	*0.0*	1.32
22. Have you ever experienced bullying at the workplace?	8.1	81.0	10.9				1.90

Table 2. Descriptive statistics related to humor behaviors

Humor behaviors	$\overline{X}$	S	Most frequent behavior ($\overline{X}$)	Least frequent behavior ($\overline{X}$)
1. Non-humorous style	2.33	1.02	…he is rarely humorous (2.44)	… he does not laugh much (2.23)
2. Rejective humor	1.86	0.89	… he is skeptical about other people's humor (2.09)	… he cautions people who are humorous (1.68)
3. Appreciative humor	3.14	0.85	… he laughs when somebody makes a joke (3.56)	…he appreciates humor (2.93)
4. Productive-social humor	2.71	0.94	… he produces humor (2.93)	…he responds to events by telling anecdotes (2.46)
5. Sarcastic humor	1.64	0.85	…he attempts to humiliate people who are successful in humor (1.46)	…he would not hesitate to tell any funny thing that comes to his mind even if it will offend others (1.73)

As can be seen from Table 2, school administrators mostly exhibit appreciative humor behaviors from teachers' point of view ($\overline{X}$ = 3.14). Sarcastic humor is the humor attitude least exhibited by school administrators ($\overline{X}$ = 1.64). They believe that school administrators exhibit positive humor behaviors more frequently than others. Relationships between humor behaviors and mobbing are shown on Table 3.

Table 3. Relationship between humor behaviors and mobbing

Humor behaviors	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Non-humorous style	-	.58**	-.39**	-.47**	.26**	.30**
2. Rejective humor		-	-.29**	-.26**	.51**	.46**
3. Appreciative humor			-	.68**	-.15**	-.20**
4. Productive - social humor				-	.03	-.10*
5. Sarcastic humor					-	.56**
6. Mobbing						-

** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$

Table 3 demonstrates that there is a positive relationship between appreciative humor and productive-social humor which are among positive humor attitudes. There are also positive and significant relationships between negative humor behaviors. It is also seen that there is a positive and significant relationship between the non-humorous style, rejective humor, and sarcastic humor and mobbing and that there is a negative and significant relationship between appreciative humor and productive-social humor behaviors and mobbing. The highest relationship with mobbing is observed in sarcastic humor ($r = .56$, $p < .01$) and rejective humor ($r = .46$, $p < .01$). In other words, the more school administrators exhibit sarcastic and rejective humor behaviors, the higher is the level of mobbing experienced by teachers. Regression analysis was conducted in order to show to what extent the significant relationship observed between humor behaviors and mobbing can be explained by humor behaviors. Results are shown on Table 4.

Table 4. The results of a multiple regression analysis related to regression of mobbing

Variable	B	SE	β	T	p
Constant	.924	.045		20.753	.000
Non-humorous style	.009	.010	.045	.896	.371
Rejective humor	.208	.054	.199	3.858	.000
Appreciative humor	-.011	.013	-.045	-.859	.391
Productive-social humor	.002	.012	.009	.161	.872
Sarcastic humor	.476	.049	.440	9.743	.000
$R = .60$	$R^2 = .36$				
$F_{(5, 451)} = 51.09$	$p = .00$				

According to data presented on Table 4, there is a moderately significant relationship between humor behaviors and mobbing in total: R = 0.60, R2 =.36, $p < .01$. Humor behaviors explain 36% of total variance pertaining to mobbing. While humor behaviors have a significant relationship with mobbing at all dimensions, it is seen that only sarcastic humor and rejective humor behaviors are significant predictors of mobbing while non-humoristic style, appreciative humor, and productive-social humor behaviors do not have a significant effect on mobbing. Standardized regression coefficients (β) indicate that sarcastic humor is the most significant predictor of ($\beta = .44$). In other words, the extent to which teachers experience mobbing can be explained by sarcastic and rejective humor behaviors.

Conclusion and Discussion

This research concluded that tendency to ignore their ideas and opinions, keeping information that would affect their performance from them, and being humiliated by being assigned to works beneath their competence are negative behaviors that teachers face more frequently than others; school administrators mostly exhibit appreciative humor behaviors in contrast to sarcastic humor behaviors least observed among them; mobbing experienced by teachers increase when school administrators exhibit more sarcastic, non-

humorous, and rejective humor behaviors while mobbing they face decrease when school administrators exhibit more productive-social humor and appreciative humor; and that sarcastic humor and rejective humor behaviors are the significant predictors of mobbing suffered by teachers.

The first sub-problem of the research was "What is the level of mobbing experienced by teachers based on their perceptions?" An examination of findings related to this sub-problem indicates that tendency to ignore their ideas and opinions, keeping information that would affect their performance from them, and being humiliated by being assigned to works beneath their competence are negative behaviors that teachers face more frequently than others. The findings of this study are parallel to those of studies conducted by Cemaloğlu, (2007b), Cemaloğlu and Kılınç (2012), Dick and Wagner (2001), Ertürk (2011), and Sağlam (2008). Mobbing behaviors witnessed in educational institutions are generally directed to teachers' careers and mobbing behaviors that could harm personality and ego have a lower incidence rate, which is consistent with ethical expectations related to educational organizations because they regard ethics from the standpoint of education professionals as an ethical responsibility that they should fulfill in both their professional life at school and personal life (Furman, 2004; cited from Uğurlu, 2012). Refusal to take teachers' ideas and opinions into consideration and their humiliation by assigning them tasks beneath their competence may be interpreted as a sign that administrators do not have a positive perception of their competence. Lower teacher competence may be perceived as an organizational problem. Mobbing used by school administrators for resolving that problem rather than creating a culture of learning organization and resolving teachers' cognitive problems may denote that they use mobbing as a management strategy and that they have a hidden curriculum. Korkmaz and Cemaloğlu (2010) concluded that there was a decline in the level of mobbing at schools which had developed a culture of learning organization and that a learning organization is a significant predictor of mobbing level.

The second sub-problem of the study was "What are the humor behaviors used by school administrators?" An examination of findings related to this second sub-problem shows that school administrators exhibit appreciative humor behaviors mostly in contrast to sarcastic humor behaviors which they exhibit less than others. In literature, it is generally accepted that appreciative humor is positive and sarcastic humor is negative. The findings of researches conducted by Kent (1993), Koonce (1997), Mertz (2000), Özdemir and Recepoğlu (2010), Özdemir, Sezgin, Kaya, and Recepoğlu, (2011), Phillips (2000), Puderbaugh (2006), Recepoğlu (2011), Recepoğlu, Kılınç, and Çepni, (2011), Romero and Arendt, (2011), Spurgeon (1998), Williams (1994), support the findings of this study. In almost all these researches, the most perceived humor style was appreciator humor style. Considering that schools generally provide serious and disciplined education and are regarded as stressful, dull, and unpleasant places and that teaching is a stressful profession (Hurren, 2006), it can be claimed that school administrators make more use of positive humor behaviors in an attempt to ensure organizational efficiency, to establish good relations with teachers, and to create a healthy climate at school. A meta-analysis study conducted by Mesmer-Magnus, Glew and Viswevaran (2012) about humor indicates that positive humor is good for physical and mental health, reduced the negative effects of stress at workplace, and motivated people to work efficiently. According to Banas, Dunbar, Rodriguez, and Liu's study (2011), positive humor is used at educational organizations for lessening tension, establishing friendly relations, and to strengthen integrity. It can be stated that education professionals use positive humor behaviors as an effective tool for dealing with stress and resolving problems.

The third sub-problem of the study was "Is there a significant relationship between the humor behaviors of school administrators and mobbing experienced by teachers based on teachers' perceptions?" An analysis of findings related to that sub-problem indicates that teachers are exposed to more mobbing if school administrators' perceived sarcastic, non-humorous, and rejective humor behaviors increase whereas teachers experience less mobbing if school administrators exhibit more productive-social humor and appreciative humor behaviors. Findings in related literature support the findings of the study (Recepoğlu, Kılınç, and Çepni (2011). According to the findings of research conducted by Banas, Dunhar, Rodriguez. and Liu (2011) and Thorson and Powell's (1993), humor may help individuals gather and have a nice time or be used for defaming and isolating others. Romero and Arent (2011) concluded that individuals use positive humor behaviors in order to have good relations with their friends and to brag and to humiliate the other person. The use of negative humor attitudes in an education organization will unsurprisingly create negative

effects on some organizational elements such as organizational climate, organizational trust, and communication. Various studies concluded that negative humor behavior used in education organizations reduced organizational trust (Banas, Dunbar, Rodriguez, and Liu, 2011), had a negative effect on communication (Banas, Dunbar, Rodriguez, and Liu, 2011), and reduced the job satisfaction of education professionals (Hurren, 2006). The research conducted by Recepoğlu, Kılınç, and Çepni (2011) showed that the level of motivation among teachers who work with school administrators using negative humor behaviors was lower than that of teachers working with school administrators using positive humor behaviors. If a school administrator uses humorous remarks and behaviors to spread rumors about a teacher or makes fun of and humiliates him or her, then the teacher will be alienated from his or her profession and not want to keep working at that school. Frequent and repeated occurrence of acts causing disturbance causes mobbing (Leymann, 1990).

The fourth sub-problem of the study was "Are the humor behaviors of school administrators a significant predictor of mobbing experienced by teachers based on the latter's perceptions?" An analysis of the findings related to this sub-problem indicates that sarcastic humor and rejective humor attitudes were a significant predictor of the level of mobbing experienced by teachers while positive humor behaviors are not a significant predictors of mobbing. Negative behaviors generally cause mobbing. Thus, sarcastic and rejective humor behaviors are a significant predictor of mobbing in line with expectations. Blase and Blase (2004) concluded that teachers who are maltreated by a school administrator experience difficulties in adapting themselves to the school, feel lonely, and face problems in their relations within the school.

In conclusion, it was found out that teachers working for primary education schools are exposed to some types of mobbing behaviors and that school administrations generally have a positive humor behavior and use sarcastic and rejective humor as a mobbing tool. Teachers who have been the victims of mobbing are also exposed to attacks through humor and their psychology is affected negatively. Their work performance, motivation, and organizational loyalty decrease while teacher turnover goes up in education organizations which are prevented from developing a strong organizational culture. In addition, organizational climate becomes negative and the teacher's communication with his or her immediate and distant surroundings is affected negatively.

The study indicated that school administrators' negative humor behaviours are an important factor on mobbing. It can be stated that humor behaviours of school administrators is of great significance in shaping teachers' work performance morale, and motivation. The limitations in this study are related to the participants and school level. Participants were from primary schools in Ankara, so this may limit the generalizability of the results. In future researches, these analyses could be repeated with other, more diverse groups of participants and participants may be chosen other cities from different countries. High schools and universities may be analysed.

References

Aksu, A., & Balcı, Y. (2009). Psychological mobbing in primary schools and coping with psychological mobbing. *e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy, 4*(4), 1367-1380.

Avolio, B. J., Howell, J. M., & Sosik, J. J. (1999). A funny thing happened on the way to the bottom line: Humor as a moderator of leadership style effects. *The Academy of Management Journal, 42*(2), 219-227. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/257094

Babad, E. Y. (1974). A multi-method approach to the assessment of humor: A critical look at humor tests. *Journal of Personality, 42*(4), 618-631. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1974.tb00697.x

Banas, J. A., Dunbar, N., Rodriguez, D., & Liu, S. J. (2011). A review of humor in educational settings: Four decades of research. *Communication Education, 60*(1), 115-144. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2010.496867

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2002). The dark side of leadership: Teacher perspectives of principal mistreatment. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(5), 671-727. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013161X02239643

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2004). The dark side of school leadership: Implications for administrator preparation. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 3*(4), 245-273. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15700760490503733

Blase, J., & Blase J. (2007). School principal mistreatment of teachers. *Journal of Emotional Abuse, 4*(3-4), 151-175. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J135v04n03_10

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.

Cabrera, C. M. (2012). *Relationship of teachers' perceptions of organizational health and workplace bullying* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database (UMI No. 351593)

Cemaloğlu, N. (2007a). The relationship between school administrators' leadership styles and bullying. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, *33*, 77–87.

Cemaloğlu, N. (2007b). The exposure of primary school teachers to bullying: An analysis of various variables. *Social Behavior and Personality*, *35*(6), 789-802. http://dx.doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2007.35.6.789

Cemaloğlu, N., & Kılınç, A. Ç. (2012). The relationship between school principals' ethical leadership behaviors and teachers' perceived organizational trust and mobbing. *Education and Science, 37*(165), 137-151.

Cemaloğlu, N. (2011). Primary principals' leadership styles, school organizational health and workplace bullying. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *49*(5), 495-512. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09578231111159511

Celep, C., & Eminoğlu, E. (2012). Primary school teacher's experience with mobbing and teacher's self-efficacy perceptions. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *46*, 4761-4774. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.06.332

Çelik, S., & Peker, S. (2010). Mobbing perceptions of high school teachers. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 9*, 1617-1623. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.12.375

Dick, R., & Wagner, U. (2001). Stress and strain in teaching: A structural equation approach. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *71*, 243-259. http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/000709901158505

Duffy, M. & Sperry, L. (2007). Workplace mobbing: individual and family health consequences. *The Family Journal*, *15*(4), 398-404. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1066480707305069

Einarsen, S. (1999). The nature and causes of bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower,20*(1-2), 57-69.

Einarsen, S., & Raknes, B.I. (1997). Harassment in the workplace and the victimization of men. *Violence & Victims, 12*(3), 247-263.

Ertürk, A. (2011). *Analysis of mobbing behaviors that teachers and managers exposed in primary schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Gazi University: Ankara.

Gökçe, A. T. (2012). Mobbing: A study on public and private school teachers and school administrators. *Dicle University Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 18*, 272-286.

Gündüz, H. B., & Yılmaz, Ö. (2008). The opinions of teachers and administrators on mobbing behaviors in secondary (A sample of Düzce). *Milli Eğitim*, 179, 269-282

Hubert, A. B. & Veldhoven, M. (2001): Risk sectors for undesirable behaviour and mobbing. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10*(4), 415-424. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13594320143000799

Hurren, B. L. (2006). The effects of principals' humor on teachers' job satisfaction. *Educational Studies, 32*(4), 373-385. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03055690600850321

Karakuş, M., & Çankaya, İ. H. (2012). Examining a model related to mobbing incurred by teachers. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education, 42*, 225-233.

Kent, S. H. (1993). *An investigation of the relationship between humor style and effectiveness of elementary school principals as perceived by teachers in Georgia.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9416267).

Koonce, W. J. (1997). *The relationship between principals'humor styles and school climate in elementary schools.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9731494)

Korkmaz, M., & Cemaloğlu, N. (2010). Relationship between organizational learning and workplace bullying in learning organizationas. *Educational Research Quarterly, 32*(3), 3-38.

Leymann, H. (1990). Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces. *Violence and Victims, 5*(2), 119-126.

Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *5*(2), 165-184. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13594329608414853

Malone, P. B. (1980). Humor: A double-edged tool for today's managers? *Academy of Management Review*, *5*(3), 357-360. http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1980.4288842

Martin, R. A. (2007). *The psychology of humor: An integrative approach*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic.

Merriam-Webster. (2013). The definition of humor. Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/humor on 21.09.2013.

Mertz, D. J. C. (2000). *Teachers' perceptions of principals' humor style: Its effect on teacher satisfaction and burnout.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9991715)

Mesmer-Magnus, J., Glew, D. J., & Viswesvaran, C. (2012). A meta-analysis of positive humor in the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *27*(2), 155-190. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683941211199554

Ocak, S. (2008). *Teacher's perceptions concerning mobbing* (*The sample of the city Edirne*). Unpublished master's dissertation. Trakya University, Edirne.

Okçu, V. (2011). The relationship between leadership styles of elementary school principals and organizational commitment and degree of mobbing experiences of teachers in Turkish public schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Gazi University, Ankara.

Özdemir, S., & Recepoğlu, E. (2010). *Organizational health and humor.* V. National Educational Administration Congress Proceedings Book, May, 1-2, 2010, Antalya.

Özdemir, S., Sezgin, F., Kaya, Z., & Recepoğlu, E. (2011). The relationship between primary school teachers' coping styles with stress and humor styles. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, *17*(3), 405-428.

Phillips, K. A. (2000). *The use of humor and effective leadership styles by elementary principals in central Florida*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No.9977824)

Puderbaugh, A. (2006). *The relationship between supervisor's humor styles and subordinate job satisfaction. (Doctoral dissertation).* Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3208068)

Recepoğlu, E. (2011). *The relationship between principals' humor styles and both instructional leadership behaviours and organizational health of the school.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Gazi University, Ankara.

Recepoğlu, E., Kılınç, A. Ç., & Çepni, O. (2011). Examining teachers' motivation level according to school principals' humor styles. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *6*(17), 928-934.

Riley, D., Duncan, D. J., & Edwards, J. (2009). Investigation of staff bullying in Australian schools: Executive summary. Retrieved from http://www.schoolbullies.org.au/ at 30.01.2013.

Romero, E. J., & Arendt, L. A. (2011). Variable effects of humor styles on organizational outcomes. *Psychological Reports*, *108*(2), 649-659. http://dx.doi.org/10.2466/07.17.20.21.PR0.108.2.649-659

Sağlam, A. Ç. (2008). Teachers' views about mobbing (Psychological Violence) at elementary schools. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, *32*, 133-142.

Samson, A. C., & Gross, J. J. (2012). Humour as emotion regulation: The differential consequences of negative versus positive humour. *Cognition & Emotion, 26*(2), 375-384. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2011.585069

Spurgeon, K. (1998). *Humor versus burnout: An organizational analysis of principals and teachers.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9831984)

Thorson, J. A., & Powell, F. C. (1993). Development and validation of a multidimensional sense of humor scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 49*(1), 13-23. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679(199301)49:1<13::AID-JCLP2270490103>3.0.CO;2-S

Tınaz, P. (2011). *İşyerinde psikolojik taciz. (Mobbing).* İstanbul: Beta.

Uğurlu, C. T. (2012). The perceptions of primary school teachers regarding administrator Ethic leadership behavior. *Cumhuriyet University Journal of Social Sciences, 36*(2), 203-213.

Williams, R. A. (1994). *The perceived value of administrator humor to school climate* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9429737)

Zapf, D. (1999). Organizational, work group related and personal causes of mobbing/bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, *I*, 70-85. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437729910268669