Do Ostracised Teachers Exhibit Deviant Behaviours? Examining the Relationship Between Organizational Ostracism and Organizational Deviance*

Bünyamin Ağalday, Assist. Prof. Dr., Mardin Artuklu University, bunyaminagalday@artuklu.edu.tr
ⓘD 0000-0003-0128-5055

Abstract

This research aimed to examine the relationship between organizational ostracism and organizational deviance according to teachers' perceptions. The research employed a correlational design. The study sample consisted of 261 primary school teachers working in Turkish schools. The data were analyzed via multiple linear regression analysis. The findings showed that teachers experienced a low level of organizational ostracism and organizational deviance at schools. In addition, organizational ostracism predicted organizational deviance in individual, organizational and ethical dimensions, but the level of this prediction was low. The study discussed some implications for researchers and practitioners, emphasizing the role of ostracism in teachers' displaying organizational deviance behaviours. For instance, to prevent organizational deviance behaviours in schools, ostracism should be stopped, or its negative effects should be reduced. Also, importance should be given to developing cooperation and relationship networks among teachers, and communication channels should be kept open.

To cite this article: Ağalday, B. (2022). Do ostracised teachers exhibit deviant behaviours? Examining the relationship between organizational ostracism and organizational deviance. *Psycho-Educational Research Reviews, 11*(2), 339-353. doi: 10.52963/PERR_Biruni_V11.N2.21

---

* This study was presented as an oral presentation at the II. International Congress on the Study of Linguistics, Thought and Religion, held between 24-26 September 2020, in Mardin.

INTRODUCTION

Humankind is a social being. Hence, they seek solid social bonds with other people. Establishing social ties encourages people to belong to a group. The need for belonging is a basic need, and people have a widespread motivation to develop and maintain a minimal amount of lasting, positive, and essential interpersonal relationships (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). In an organizational environment, relationships between people can be damaged over time due to various reasons. This situation may lead to negative consequences such as being ignored or neglected by some organization members. In organizations, this negative situation, expressed as ostracism (Williams, 1997), is a common phenomenon (Fox & Stallworth, 2005).

As educational organizations, there is also ostracism in schools. In the study conducted by Eickholt and Goodboy (2017), it was found that approximately one-third of teachers were exposed to various levels of ostracism in schools. Another study (Husrevsahi, 2021) revealed that teachers were excluded for various reasons. Ostracised individuals in the organizational environment may experience psychological consequences such as sadness and pain (Ferris et al., 2008). Ostracism in the workplace can also harm organizational effectiveness because it can reduce employees' citizenship behaviour (Ferris et al., 2015), workplace commitment (Hitlan et al., 2006), and job satisfaction (Ferris et al., 2008) can benefit the organization. In addition to its personal effects, ostracism may negatively affect the organization's dynamics and performance (Jones et al., 2009). Teachers' perceptions of ostracism can lead to some negative consequences that may disrupt the educational processes in schools. In the research of Erdemli and Kurum (2019), it was concluded that ostracism harms the organizational atmosphere in schools, causes teachers to decrease their sense of belonging, and even leads to conflicts within the school. In addition, research findings show that ostracised teachers may experience burnout (Naz et al., 2017; Sulea et al., 2012), low job satisfaction (Eickholt & Goodboy, 2017), and low performance (Fatima et al., 2019). Considering the harmful effects of ostracism, which is accepted as a form of workplace bullying (Einarsen et al., 2009), on teachers and schools, teachers' reactions to ostracism have gained importance.

Employees who experience a perception of ostracism may think negatively about those who ostracise them by experiencing negative emotions (Williams, 2007) and exhibit some undesirable behaviours such as aggression and harm to the organization (Robinson et al., 2013). Consequently, ostracised employees may exhibit organizational deviance behaviours (Ferris et al., 2008). Contrary to organizational norms, deviant behaviours are initiated by employees and have significant adverse effects at individual and organizational levels (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Also, ostracism harms employees. From this point of view, teachers who are ostracised in schools may exhibit organizational deviance behaviour. This situation can harm all school stakeholders because organizational deviance behaviour threatens the existence of an organization and its members (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Therefore, it is important to prevent or reduce the display of organizational deviance behaviours in schools. In this context, examining the factors that may cause teachers to exhibit organizational deviance reinforces this study's importance. Indeed, some research findings (Ferris et al., 2008; Jahanzeb & Fatima, 2017) show that deviant behaviours are related to ostracised experiences of employees. However, these studies were conducted in non-educational organizations. It remains unclear whether teachers perceive ostracism in educational institutions causes them to exhibit organizational deviance behaviours. In this context, this research is essential in terms of filling the gap in the literature. In addition, it has been observed that studies examining ostracism in educational organizations mainly focus on students (Ogurlu, 2015; Çeliköz & Türkan, 2017). There are also studies focusing on the ostracism of teachers. However, the studies focus on organizational ostracism's effects (Eickholt & Goodboy, 2017; Erdemli & Kurum, 2019; Husrevsahi, 2021; Yılmaz & Akgün, 2019) is limited. Considering the serious adverse effects of organizational ostracism on teachers, more systematic studies are needed on the impact of organizational ostracism in schools. For all that, no study has been

conducted between organizational ostracism and organizational deviance based on teacher perceptions in the literature. The current study also aims to fill this gap in the literature. Therefore, this study examined the relationship between organizational ostracism and organizational deviance based on teachers' perceptions. For this purpose, the research questions were:

RQ1. What is the level of teachers' organizational ostracism perceptions?

RQ2. What is the level of teachers' organizational deviance perceptions?

RQ3. Are teachers' perceptions of organizational ostracism a significant predictor of their perceptions of organizational deviance?

CONTEXT OF THE RESEARCH: EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM IN TURKEY

Before clarifying the theoretical framework in this study, we present contextual information about the education system in Turkey. This study was conducted in Turkey, a central education system (Erdem et al., 2011). All regulations regarding the education system are made by the Ministry of National Education (MoNE). This situation creates a hierarchical relationship between the MoNE and the local education actors. This type of relationship causes problems in the effective implementation of education policies and makes it difficult to quickly solve the problems encountered at the local level. A similar hierarchical structure is also reflected in schools. This structure in question may also be related to the high power distance in Turkey, which has a rich culture. Power distance is related to how power-based inequality in societies is acceptable (Hofstede, 2001). Therefore, this situation shows that the power in schools is not equally distributed between school administrators and teachers. The hierarchical structure in organizations causes employees to experience exclusion (Robinson et al., 2013). This situation negatively affects the stakeholders of the school. The most important of these stakeholders is undoubtedly the teachers. In addition to the problems they experience due to the hierarchical structure, teachers are passive implementers of the education program prepared by the MoNE. In this sense, teachers are deprived of their professional autonomy. Teachers' autonomy-based education policies can support teachers' goal orientations together (Ertem et al., 2021). Existing negativities may pave the way for an environment where teachers can feel worthless and excluded. It is important to examine the perceived ostracism of teachers in countries such as Turkey, where education is centralized and hierarchical. However, it is also essential to explore the adverse effects of ostracism on teachers. However, these effects will be examined in Turkey, a collectivist culture, carrying the study to a different point. On the one hand, the risk of ostracism of teachers in schools with a large power distance and hierarchical structure; on the other hand, teachers with a collectivist understanding tend to belong to the group. Considering the way the education system is managed and the cultural characteristics of Turkey, this study examines whether the perception of ostracism of teachers is effective in displaying deviant behavior.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This section will first elaborate on the theoretical foundations of organizational ostracism and organizational deviance. We then examine the relationships among the variables.

ORGANIZATIONAL OSTRACISM

Organizational ostracism is defined in this study as "the extent of one's perception of being ignored or ostracized by others in a workplace" (Ferris et al., 2008, p.1348). Although there are different terms for ostracism in the literature, such as *social exclusion*, *ostracism*, and *social rejection*, it is claimed that they point to the same phenomenon (Ferris et al., 2008) and are often used interchangeably by researchers (Williams, 2007). In this study, we will not distinguish between the stated concepts, but the idea of ostracism will be used because it is considered more inclusive. The Sociometer Theory constitutes a vital basis when the theoretical background of organizational ostracism is examined. The basic principle of the theory is that "the self-esteem system monitors the quality of an individual's actual and potential relationships the sense that other people regard their

relationships with the individual as valuable, important, and close" (Leary & Baumeister, 2000, p.11). The theory argues that self-esteem is an aspect affected by our social connections and explains the changes caused by the threat of ostracism in the context of the need for belonging (Leary et al., 1995). Therefore, belonging is the most important theoretical basis for the current research. In addition to the Sociometer Theory, *cognitive deconstruction and self-regulation impairment,* and *ostracism models are the theories underpinning* the study. In the model of cognitive deconstruction and self-regulation impairment (Baumeister et al., 2005), it is stated that one of the reasons for the existence of self-regulation is establishing social relationships and maintaining these relationships. Ostracism will lead to self-regulation impairment in the individual. The model of ostracism (Williams, 1997), on the other hand, proposes a comprehensive model regarding *the cause and types of ostracism, threatened needs, and responses to ostracism*. The section on responses to ostracism in the relevant model was considered in the current study.

Organizational ostracism has been discussed in different dimensions in the literature (Abaslı & Özdemir, 2019; Ferris et al., 2008; Hitlan & Noel, 2009). As the current study focuses on ostracism in educational organizations, the dimensions addressed by Abaslı and Özdemir (2019), used in this research, will be explained. In the mentioned study, organizational ostracism consists of *slight* and *isolate* dimensions. While *slight* is seen as ignoring teachers by their colleagues, contacting them only in case of necessity, and neglecting them, *isolate* refers to teachers being left alone at school by avoiding them.

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVIANCE

The theoretical background of organizational deviance can be based on three approaches. First, according to the *Misbehaviours Approach in Organizations* (Vardi & Wiener, 1996, p.153), misbehaviour in the organization has been defined as "any intentional action by members of organizations that defies and violets shared organizational norms and expectations and/or core societal values, norms and standards of proper conduct." The misbehaviours in question are classified as *behaviours that benefit themselves, benefit the organization, and intend to damage and be destructive*. Second, in the *Counterproductive Work Behaviours Approach* (Gruys & Sackett, 2003, p.30), counterproductive work behaviours are explained as "any intentional behaviour on the part of an organization member viewed by the organization as contrary to its legitimate interests." Counterproductive work behaviours are "*theft and related behavior, destruction of property, misuse of information, misuse of time and resources, unsafe behavior, poor attendance, poor quality work, alcohol use, drug use, inappropriate verbal actions, and inappropriate physical actions"* (p.30). The last approach, *Deviant Workplace Behaviors* (Robinson & Bennett, 1995, p.556), defines organizational deviance, definition we adopted in the current study, as "voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms and in so doing threatens the well-being of an organization, its members, or both" (Robinson & Bennett, 1995, p.556).

This research conceptualized organizational deviance around three main factors (Girgin Köse & Aksu, 2013; Robinson & Bennett, 1995). The first factor, *individual* or *interpersonal deviance* is related to behaviours that directly harm other individuals in the organization. The second one, *organizational deviance* defines deviant behaviours as directly harming the organization. In the last factor, behaviours that violate organizational norms and laws are considered *unethical deviance*.

ORGANIZATIONAL OSTRACISM AND ORGANIZATIONAL DEVIANCE

Ostracism threatens the need for self-esteem, control, and meaningful existence (Williams, 1997) as well as the need for belonging. Deviance behaviour may conclude to reclaim psychological conditions, especially when the need for control is threatened (Williams, 2007). Employees exposed to ostracism may resort to deviance behaviour to reduce the negative emotions they will experience. To escape the source of social pain shared by ostracism, employees may choose to slow down their work or reduce their contribution to the organization (Spector & Fox, 2002). On the other hand,

members of the organization may prefer to engage in deviance to regain control due to ostracism (Whitman et al., 2014). It has also been found that ostracism leads to more aggressive reactions in unexpected situations and thus creates a self-esteem threat (Wesselmann et al., 2010) that can be understood as a threat to the person's identity (Thau et al., 2007). To eliminate the threat in question, employees may exhibit deviant behaviours. Considering the context of the current research, teachers exposed to ostracism may exhibit deviant behaviours.

METHOD

RESEARCH DESIGN

A quantitative method-based correlational design was employed in this research to examine the relationship between teachers' perceptions of organizational ostracism and organizational deviance.

SAMPLE

The population of the research consists of 602 teachers in primary schools. The study sample consisted of 261 teachers in 24 primary schools in a southeast Turkey province in 2019-2020. The selected region was determined according to the convenience sampling method (Etikan et al., 2016), while the schools and teachers were determined using the simple random sampling method (Fraenkel et al., 2012). The suitability of the selected region is that it is geographically close. On the other hand, we accessed all teachers' names and then randomly chose them when selecting teachers. 38.69% of the teachers are female, 61.31% are male, 60.15% are married, 39.85% are single, 1.91% are associate degrees, 91.57% are undergraduate, and 6.51% are postgraduate.

INSTRUMENTS

ORGANIZATIONAL OSTRACISM SCALE

In this study, the "Organizational Ostracism Scale (OOS)" developed by Abaslı and Özdemir (2019) was used. The scale's construct validity was evaluated by exploratory (EFA) and confirmatory (CFA) factor analyses. The scale has 14 items and consists of isolate and slight dimensions. Sample items from the scale include "employees in this work do not care about me" for the slight dimension and "employees in this workplace do not greet me" for the isolate dimension. This 5-point Likert-type scale was answered on a rating scale from 1 ("totally disagree") to 5 ("totally agree"). The total variance explained was determined as 70%. In this study, the goodness of fit indices for the first level CFA made for the OOS are as follows: $\chi 2/df$ = 2.93, GFI= .91, CFI= .92, RMSEA= .06. Indices show that the scale's construct validity is high (Schermelleh-Engel et al., 2003). In this study, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficients range between .86 and .97. Accordingly, Cronbach's Alpha coefficients are within acceptable limits (George & Mallery, 2003).

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVIANCE SCALE IN SCHOOLS

In this study, the "Organizational Deviance Scale in Schools (ODSS)" developed by Girgin Köse and Aksu (2013) was used. The scale has 20 items and consists of individual, organizational and ethical dimensions. Sample items from the scale include "school staff act without a plan" for the individual dimension, "school staff violates school rules" for the organizational dimension, and "school staff use drugs" for the ethical dimension. This 5-point Likert-type scale was answered on a rating scale from 1 ("totally disagree") to 5 ("totally agree"). The total variance explained was 65.57%. In this study, the goodness of fit indices for the first level CFA made for the ODSS are as follows: $\chi 2/df$ = 3.71, GFI = .81, CFI = .92, RMSEA = .06. In the study, the Cronbach's Alpha coefficients range between .90 and .95. Therefore, the findings are valid and reliable.

DATA COLLECTION

The research was deemed ethically appropriate by the Ethics Committee of Mardin Artuklu University, Turkey, issued with 2020/01-1. School principals and teachers were informed in the schools where the research would be conducted. Surveys were given to the teachers at the school who volunteered to participate in the study. The teachers' identity was protected at all times, and informed consent was obtained from them. It was ensured that the school principal was not present when they filled out the forms to reflect their views entirely. The researcher collected survey forms. Three hundred and ten teachers agreed to participate in the research. Two hundred sixty-one scale forms were evaluated by removing those filled incorrectly or incompletely from the returned forms.

DATA ANALYSIS

SPSS software was used in the analysis of the data. The study calculated the mean and standard deviation to measure teachers' perceptions of organizational ostracism and organizational deviance. The skewness and kurtosis coefficients of the data set were examined to determine the tests to analyze the data obtained from the scales. The skewness coefficients of the OOS are between 1.70 and 2.88; kurtosis coefficients vary between 1.81 and 2.82. The skewness coefficients of ODSS are between .90 and 1.76; kurtosis coefficients vary between -.18 and 2.14. These values indicate that the data show a distribution close to normal (Kline, 2011). Confirmatory factor analyses regarding the measurement tools used in the study were carried out with AMOS software. Multiple linear regression analyses were applied to determine the predictive power of organizational ostracism on organizational deviance. According to the coefficients of Pearson correlation analysis, the multicollinearity issue was not observed between independent variable dimensions (see Table 1).

RESULTS

Descriptive statistics and correlation coefficients between organizational ostracism and organizational deviance are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. *Results of Pearson Correlation Analysis regarding the Dimensions of Organizational Ostracism and Organizational Deviance*

Variable	Mean	SD	IS	SL	OO	IND	ORG	ETH	OD
IS	1.31	.48	1						
SL	1.33	.55	.77*	1					
OO	1.33	.51	.74*	.78*	1				
IND	1.78	.90	.17*	.20*	.20*	1			
ORG	1.82	.88	.24*	.24*	.25*	.71*	1		
ETH	1.31	.53	.25*	.23*	.25*	.57*	.67*	1	
OD	1.61	.67	.26*	.26*	.26*	.86	.76*	.72*	1

IS: Isolate, SL: Slight, OO: Organizational Ostracism, IND: Individual, ORG: Organizational, ETH: Ethical,
OD: Organizational Deviance, *$p < .01$

As may be understood from Table 1, teachers' perceptions of organizational ostracism and organizational deviance are low (*slight* ($M = 1.31$; $SD = .48$), *isolate* ($M = 1.33$; $SD = .55$), *individual* ($M = 1.78$; $SD = .90$), *organizational* ($M = 1.82$; $SD = .88$), *ethical* ($M = 1.31$; $SD = .53$)). Negative and low-level relationships were revealed between the dimensions of organizational ostracism and the dimensions of organizational deviance. Accordingly, as teachers' perceptions of organizational ostracism increase, their perceptions of organizational deviance might also increase. Multiple linear regression analysis was performed to determine the predictive power of the *individual*, *organizational* and *ethical* dimensions of organizational deviance by dimensions of organizational ostracism. Dimensions of organizational ostracism are considered independent variables, and each dimension of organizational

ostracism is regarded as a dependent variable. The multiple linear regression analysis results regarding the prediction of individual deviance dimension by organizational ostracism dimensions are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. *Results of the Multiple Linear Regression Analysis regarding the Prediction of Individual Deviance Dimension by Organizational Ostracism*

(Dependent variable = Individual deviance)					
Variable	*B*	*SE*	*β*	*t*	*p*
Constant	1.34	.15		8.45	.00*
Isolate	.01	.23	.01	.01	.99
Slight	.33	.20	.20	1.61	.10

R = .20; R^2 = .03; *F* = 5.55; *p* = .00; **p < .01*

Given in Table 2, it was observed that organizational ostracism displayed a significant relationship (*R* = .20; R^2 = .03) with the individual deviance dimension (*F* = 5.55; *p* < .01). Ostracism dimensions explain 3% of the change in teachers' perceptions of individual deviance. The order of importance of predictor variables on teachers' perceptions of individual deviance is slight (*β* = .20) and isolate (*β* = .01). However, when these variables are considered separately, they are not a significant predictor of individual deviance (*p* > .01). The analysis results related to the prediction of organizational deviance dimension by organizational ostracism dimensions are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. *Results of the Multiple Linear Regression Analysis regarding the Prediction of Organizational Deviance Dimension by Organizational Ostracism*

(Dependent variable = Organizational deviance)					
Variable	*B*	*SE*	*β*	*t*	*p*
Constant	1.21	.15		7.96	.00*
Isolate	.25	.22	.14	1.12	.26
Slight	.20	.20	.12	1.00	.31

R = .25; R^2 = .05; *F* = 9.07; *p* = .00; **p < .01*

As may be understood from Table 3, analysis results showed that organizational ostracism displayed a significant relationship (*R* = .25; R^2 = .05) with organizational deviance dimension (*F* = 9.07; *p* < .01). Dimensions of ostracism explain 5% of the change in teachers' perceptions of organizational deviance. The order of importance of predictor variables on teachers' perceptions of individual deviance is isolate (*β* = .14) and slight (*β* = .12). These variables are not a significant predictor of organizational deviance (*p* > .01). The analysis results regarding the prediction of the dimension of ethical deviance by the dimensions of organizational ostracism are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. *Results of the Multiple Linear Regression Analysis regarding the Prediction of Ethical Deviance Dimension by Organizational Ostracism*

(Dependent variable = Ethical deviance)					
Variable	*B*	*SE*	*β*	*t*	*p*
Constant	.94	.09		10.09	.00*
Isolate	.21	.13	.19	1.54	.12
Slight	.06	.12	.06	.54	.58

R = .25; R^2 = .05; *F* = 9.01; *p* = .00; **p < .01*

As seen in Table 4, organizational ostracism had a significant relationship (R = .25; R^2 = .05) with teachers' ethical deviance (F = 5.55; p < .01). Together, the two variables explain 5% of the change in teachers' perceptions of ethical deviance. The order of importance of predictor variables on teachers' perceptions of individual deviance is isolate (β = .19) and slight (β = .06). However, isolate, and slight are not significant predictors of ethical deviance (p > .01).

DISCUSSION

This research deals with the relationship between organizational ostracism and organizational deviance. After interpreting the study's key findings in light of the relevant literature, some limitations have to be explained. According to the results obtained from the first research question, teachers' perceptions of organizational ostracism are low. Based on these findings, teachers' perceived ostracism by their colleagues is low. This implies that teachers are slightly ignored or neglected by their colleagues. The present result seems to be consistent with the findings of other quantitative studies (Eickholt & Goodboy, 2017; Fatima et al., 2019; Halis & Demirel, 2018; Kandemir & Nartgün, 2022; Yılmaz & Akgün, 2019) regarding teachers' perception of ostracism. In the mentioned studies, it was observed that the perception levels of teachers regarding organizational ostracism were low. However, in a qualitative study conducted by Erdemli and Kurum (2019), it was concluded that there might be ostracism among employees at schools and that teachers are either ostracised by each other or ostracised by the school administrators. The research conducted by Uslukaya and Demirtaş (2020) with the qualitative method has also shown that teachers experience a perception of exclusion in schools. The related study reported that school exclusion occurs in ignoring, ignoring ideas, not being included in the group, and not communicating. Reaching different results about ostracism in schools can be explained by using different methods in studies. Experiencing different levels of ostracism in schools is an expected finding because there are employees with varying characteristics in many respects in schools. A study reported that school administrators display discriminatory behaviours based on teachers' gender, age, religion, political opinion, relations with administration, race and ethnic origin, performance, and personality traits (Polat & Hicyilmaz, 2017). Besides, the study conducted by Akcan et al. (2017) indicated that unions are an essential trigger of discriminatory behavior in schools. These discriminatory behaviours can also be seen as ostracism. This ostracism may occur based on the differences in unions, ideologies, and personal characteristics (Erdemli & Kurum, 2019). The low perception of exclusion in this study can be explained because exclusion may occur unintentionally. Because although exclusion is harmful, it can happen without any malicious intent (Williams, 1997). Hence, teachers may not have felt that they were ostracised.

On the other hand, studies conducted in non-educational organizations have shown that employees have a high rate of ostracism in the workplace. Fox and Stallworth (2005) found that 66% of employees were ignored by their colleagues or ostracised from the group. In another study, more than 70% of employees felt ostracised in the workplace (Yan et al., 2014). Different findings that have been obtained in various organizations can be explained by the fact that educational organizations have a different structure than other organizations as an open and social system (Hoy & Miskel, 2010). Schools are a social network with open system characteristics, consisting of input, process, output, feedback, and environmental elements. Closed systems are systems that do not interact with their external environment. In comparison, open systems are in constant interaction with their external environment. Therefore, since schools are open systems, they are dynamic with their environment. In this context, minor ostracism in open systems can be considered an expected situation.

According to the findings obtained from the second research question, teachers' perceptions of organizational deviance are low. It is understood that teachers exhibit organizational deviance behaviours at a very low level, such as making irresponsible decisions, acting unplanned, gossiping about colleagues, and coming to school late without permission. In other words, teachers rarely display behaviours that violate or damage school norms. A possible explanation for this result is that schools

are formal organizations, and therefore, such deviant behaviour will be punished so that it will be less visible. The low level of these organizational deviance behaviours, which can be considered a potential threat to the school's functioning, was deemed important. Because organizational deviance behaviours might have adverse effects on teachers' perceptions. A study conducted by Malisetty (2016) showed that organizational deviance reduces employees' job satisfaction and performance. Therefore, it is crucial for the efficiency of the school that teachers exhibit deviant behaviors at a low level. The present finding coincides with other quantitative studies conducted in schools (Aksu, 2016; Argon & Ekinci, 2016; Erturk & Zıblım, 2020). In the previous studies, teachers' perceptions of organizational deviance are low. However, the findings obtained from the qualitative research conducted by Türkkaş Anasız and Iliman Püsküllüoğlu (2017) showed that teachers exhibit deviant behaviours at individual and organizational levels. Conducting the study with a qualitative method may have revealed the existence of organizational deviance behaviours in schools more clearly. The research method mentioned above can explain the presence of low perception of deviance in the current study. The finding obtained in the second research question cannot be justified because teachers avoid deviant behaviors only because of fear of punishment. Teachers' positive attitudes towards their profession may also have been effective in obtaining the present finding. At this point, the commitment of teachers comes to the fore. Teachers who see teaching only as a profession may show deviant behavior when faced with negativity. However, teachers who adopt teaching as a lifestyle may prefer to avoid deviant behaviors that can harm themselves and the school, regardless of their working conditions. Because such teachers see their commitment as a part of their professional identity and define themselves as dedicated to their profession (Elliot & Crosswell, 2001). In this context, commitment may have motivated teachers and made them less likely to exhibit organizational deviance behaviors.

In the third research question analysis, the isolate and slight dimensions explain 3% of the change in teachers' perception of individual deviance and 5% of the change in organizational and ethical deviance dimensions. The research findings appear to be consistent with the current research. In a study conducted by Jahanzeb and Fatima (2017) with employees in the service sector, it was seen that employees' perceptions of ostracism played an essential role in their deviance. In another study focusing on the outcomes caused by ostracism (Ferris et al., 2008), a moderate relationship was found between ostracism and deviance in the workplace. On the other hand, findings obtained from studies examining the relationship between ostracism and counterproductive work behaviour (Hitlan & Noel, 2009; Yan et al., 2014) also seem to be consistent with the findings obtained from this study. Counterproductive work behaviour is defined as the deliberate actions of a team member, such as organizational deviance, that are a threat and destructive to an organization or its employees (Bennett & Robinson, 2000). Ostracised employees become more prone to destructive behaviour by exhibiting counterproductive work behaviour (Twenge et al., 2001).

Although it is seen that ostracism predicts organizational deviance in studies conducted in non-educational organizations summarized above, it is striking that its predictive power is not as low as in the current study. These results can be explained in different ways. The first possible explanation is that the studies were conducted in institutions with different dynamics than educational institutions. The second possible explanation may be related to the collectivist nature of the country where the research was conducted. Collectivism tends to belong to group identity (Hofstede, 2001). Farh and Cheng (2000) found that eastern people exhibit collectivistic behaviours. Therefore, although teachers experience the perception of ostracism, their tendency to behave in harmony with the group shows that they may exhibit organizational deviance behaviours at a lower level. In addition, teachers who have accepted group norms as organizational norms can display behaviours in harmony with the group. In the study of Fatima et al. (2019), ostracised teachers did not engage in counterproductive work behaviours with the expectation of being included in the group again in the first place due to their collectivistic culture. However, it was found that as ostracism became systematic, teachers

tended to exhibit counterproductive work behaviours such as withdrawal and decrease in performance. Another explanation is that teachers may have a very low level of ostracism and deviance perception. It is understood that low ostracism perceptions have a negligible effect on the change in perception of deviance. However, even a deficient perception of ostracism was sufficient for teachers to exhibit organizational deviance behaviours.

Ostracised teachers are expected to exhibit organizational deviance behaviours as some of their essential needs such as "*belonging*, *self-esteem*, *control*, *meaningful existence"* (Williams, 1997) will be threatened. Because deviance behaviour may result as an attempt to recover psychological needs threatened by ostracism, especially when the need for control is threatened (Williams, 2007). However, other factors can trigger deviance behaviour. For example, Eickholt and Goodboy (2017) research revealed that ostracised teachers' job satisfaction and organizational commitment may decrease. Thus, it shows that even a low level of ostracism can create an unsatisfactory school environment and negative attitude towards school. When belonging is threatened, teachers can exhibit deviant behavior to achieve that need. Teachers whose commitment is low by being ostracised will not see themselves as a part of the school. In addition, it will be difficult for teachers who cannot feel tied to the school to continue their profession effectively. Teachers may even tend to slow down work or avoid educational responsibilities. In the conducted study (Türkkaş Anasız & Iliman Püsküllüoğlu, 2017), it was determined that teachers exhibit organizational deviance behaviour by taking long breaks and excusing absenteeism. These organizational deviance behaviours are more likely to be displayed by teachers with lower levels of commitment. Because, in the conducted study (Argon & Ekinci, 2016), it was seen that teachers with a low level of commitment might exhibit more deviant behaviour. The presence of deviant behaviour will damage all stakeholders of the school, especially the students.

On the other hand, the teacher, whose belonging to the school decreases because of being ostracised, may remain silent against ostracism. Indeed, Fatima et al. (2017) revealed a positive correlation between teachers' perceptions of ostracism and team member silence. Teachers' isolation or slight by their colleagues may cause them to feel worthless (Williams, 2009). This may result in a decrease in the teacher's self-esteem over time. When the need for self-esteem is threatened, it is natural for teachers to exhibit organizational deviance behaviour. The teacher who thinks s/he is not valuable may have thought of staying silent over time. Being silent against ostracism can also be described as behaviour against the norms of the organization because the teacher who remains silent actually exhibits withdrawal behaviour. In Turkey, which is managed by a central system, teachers cannot change the schools they work at whenever they want. To work in another school, they have to work for a certain period at their school. Therefore, the teacher who could not leave the school where he was ostracised may have preferred to remain silent. The teacher may have also liked to avoid the pain of ostracism by withdrawing (Williams, 2007). It is suggested that employees may choose to slow down their work or reduce their contribution to the organization to avoid pain (Spector & Fox, 2002). Therefore, the ostracised teachers may be alienated from the profession over time, decreasing their performance. In another study supporting this argument (Erdemli & Kurum, 2019), teachers who perceived ostracism stated that they were unhappy, alienated from their profession, and lost their motivation.

Teachers' motivation is affected by their psychological relationship with their colleagues (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The research finding (Yakut & Yakut, 2018) indicates a negative correlation between teachers' organizational ostracism and psychological well-being perceptions. A teacher who cannot communicate actively with colleagues because of being ostracised will not feel psychologically well. The conducted research (Spector & Fox, 2002) showed that negative emotions trigger organizational deviance behaviour. Therefore, the teacher who feels bad because of being ostracised may exhibit organizational deviance behaviours. On the other hand, the ostracised teachers can distance themself from their colleagues because they will not feel well. Thus, it may also be the case that s/he hides

information from her colleagues. In the conducted study (Zhao et al., 2016), it was observed that as organizational ostracism increases, employees tend to hide information from each other. In this context, the ostracised teachers' hiding information can be considered behavior against the school's norms.

Apart from the negative psychological consequences of ostracism, there is another negative consequence such as burnout. Research findings showed that there might be an increase in burnout perceptions of ostracised teachers (e.g., Naz et al., 2017; Sulea et al., 2012). Teachers who are ignored or neglected may not receive sufficient social support from their colleagues. Teachers spend most of their time in the classroom. This situation may suggest that teachers will communicate less with their colleagues, and therefore the support they will get from their colleagues will not be important. The stressful nature of teaching (Pillay et al., 2005) and the stressful working environment created by ostracism make the support to teachers important. Fatima et al. (2019) found that organizational ostracism can increase counterproductive work behaviour through stress. Therefore, teachers who experience a perception of ostracism may exhibit more organizational deviance behaviour by experiencing stress. Therefore, reducing stress can make ostracised teachers exhibit less organizational deviance behaviour. In this context, teachers may need support to experience less stress. Research findings also confirm this situation. Halis and Demirel (2016) found a negative correlation between social support and organizational ostracism in their study with teachers. Therefore, teachers who may experience burnout due to ostracism are likely to exhibit organizational deviance behaviours as they are deprived of peer support. According to the finding of a study supporting this explanation (Chen et al., 2016), it was observed that the less supported the employees, the more organizational deviance behaviours they displayed.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This study provided some evidence that teachers, albeit very low, are ostracised by their colleagues in schools and, as a result, exhibit organizational deviance behaviours. Although the obtained results show that organizational ostracism is not an important predictor of organizational deviance, even a low level of ostracism triggers teachers to exhibit organizational deviance behaviours. In this context, some implications have been presented for practitioners. To prevent organizational deviance behaviours in schools, first of all, ostracism should be stopped, or its negative effects should be reduced. School administrations have important responsibilities for this. In countries with a collectivist culture, such as Turkey, employees care about having a family atmosphere in the workplace. School principals should create a supportive and trust-based school culture (Tłuściak-Deliowska et al., 2017). In this direction, the school principals should develop cooperation and relationship networks, and communication channels should be kept open among teachers. Social activities should be emphasized in order to strengthen the communication among teachers. In addition, administrators can approach teachers like a parent to create a family atmosphere in the school and deal with their problems in both their professional and private lives. Thanks to the friendly atmosphere in the school, teachers' perception of ostracism can be prevented. The necessary democratic environment should be created to resolve disputes among teachers by discussing instead of "sweeping them under the carpet." School administrators can significantly prevent ostracism with the implications listed above. However, when ostracism occurs, it must first be determined who is ostracised and why. Administrators should contribute to solving problems by holding a mediatory position among teachers. Teachers who perceive ostracism should be given social support to get rid of the psychological pain they experience. The study is the first to investigate the effect of organizational ostracism on organizational deviance based on teachers' perceptions. In this context, it has been concluded that organizational ostracism has a weak impact on the management of teachers' organizational deviance behaviour, which is a potential threat to the school.

This study also has some limitations. Since organizational ostracism has a low explanatory level on organizational deviance, it is understood that there may be other organizational variables affecting organizational deviance. Researchers can research the relationship between different organizational variables and organizational deviance. In addition, a model can be put forward by structural equation modeling using variables such as "*belonging*, *self-esteem*, *control*, *meaningful existence*, *and social support,"* which have the potential to mediate the effect of organizational ostracism on organizational deviance. The study addressed the relationship between organizational ostracism and organizational deviance, but the reasons for teachers' perception of ostracism were not investigated. For this reason, future studies should conduct a qualitative study focusing on the reasons for teachers' ostracism and in this direction involving both teachers and school administrators. Another limitation of the study is that it was conducted only in primary schools. In this respect, future research may be done with a larger sample group of other education levels. The fourth limitation is that only the perception of ostracism experienced by teachers caused by their colleagues was examined. Therefore, future research may focus on the consequences of ostracism of teachers caused by the school administration. The fifth limitation is related to where the data are collected. Research should be done with a more extensive data set with the participation of other provinces. The study did not include personal variables in teachers' perceptions of ostracism and deviance as a final limitation. Future studies should investigate whether there is a difference between teachers' perceptions of ostracism and deviance according to personal variables such as gender, marital status, and educational status.

REFERENCES

Abaslı, K., & Özdemir, M. (2019). Development of organizational ostracism scale: The validity and reliability study. *Trakya University Journal of Social Science*, *1*(1), 265-282. https://doi.org/10.26468/trakyasobed.481620

Akcan, E., Polat, S., & Ölçüm, D. (2017). The effects of union activities on schools according to views of principals and teachers. *Bolu Abant Izzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education*, *17*(3), 1101 1119. https://doi.org/10.17240/aibuefd.2017.17.31178-338811

Aksu, A. (2016). Organizational deviance and multi-factor leadership. *Educational Research and Reviews*, *11*(8), 589-597. https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2016.2671

Tłuściak-Deliowska, A., Dernowska, U., & Gruenert, S. (2017). How school achievements ınterplay with school culture and principal behaviors: a comparative study. *Psycho-Educational Research Reviews, 6*(1), 10-22. https://www.journals.lapub.co.uk/index.php/perr/article/view/156.

Argon, T., & Ekinci, S. (2016). Teachers' views on organizational deviance, psychological ownership and social innovation. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 4*(12), 133-139. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2016.041317

Baumeister, R.F., DeWall, C. N., Ciarocco N. J., & Twenge, J. M. (2005). Social exclusion impairs self-regulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*(4), 589-604. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.4.589

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 497-529. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033 2909.117.3.497

Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85,* 349-360. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.3.349

Chen, L.L., Fah, B.Y., & Jin, T.C. (2016). Perceived organization support and workplace deviance in the voluntary sector. *Procedia Economics and Finance, 35,* 468-745. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(16)00058-7

Çeliköz, N., & Türkan, A. (2017). Examination of secondary school 9th grade students' levels of exclusion. *Ondokuz Mayis University Journal of Education Faculty, 36*(2), 45-58. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article file/395748

Eickholt, M.S., & Goodboy, A.K. (2017) Investment model predictions of workplace ostracism on K-12 teachers' commitment to their schools and the profession of teaching. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, *32*(2), 139-157. https://doi.org/10.1080/15555240.2017.1332483

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Notelaers, G. (2009). Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure and psychometric properties of the negative acts questionnaire-revised. *Work & Stress*, *23*, 24-44. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370902815673

Elliott, B., & Crosswell, L. (2001). *Commitment to teaching: Australian perspectives on the interplays of the professional and the personal in teachers' lives*. The International Symposium on Teacher Commitment At The European Conference On Educational Research, Lille, France.

Erdemli, Ö., & Kurum, G. (2019). Ostracism at school from school administrators' and teachers' point of view: Causes and results. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.16986/HUJE.2019051589

Ertem, H. Y., Arslan, A., & Özenir-Üren, E. (2021). The role of teacher autonomy and school climate on goal orientations for teaching. *Psycho-Educational Research Reviews, 10*(2), 203-212. https://www.journals.lapub.co.uk/index.php/perr/article/view/1764

Erturk, A., & Zıblım, L (2020). Is the perception of organizational deviation affected by the organizational climate? Research in schools. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, *85*, 1-22. https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2020.85.1

Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R.S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, *5*(1), 1-4. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11

Farh, J. L., & Cheng, B. S. (2000). *A cultural analysis of paternalistic leadership in Chinese organizations.* London: Macmillan.

Fatima, T., Bilal, A., & Imran, M. K. (2019). Workplace ostracism and employee reactions among university teachers in Pakistan. *The Qualitative Report*, *24*(11), 2759-2777. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160 3715/2019.4002

Fatima, T., Ilyas, M., Rehman, C. A., & Imran, M. K. (2017). Empirical investigation of relationship between workplace ostracism and employee silence: A test of mediating effects of self-esteem and meaningful existence in context of public sector universities in Punjab. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences*, *10*(1), 111-128. http://ajss.abasyn.edu.pk/admineditor/papers/V10I1-6.pdf

Ferris, D. L., Brown, D. J., Berry, J. W., & Lian, H. (2008). The development and validations of the workplace ostracism scale. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*, 1348-1366. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0012743

Ferris, D. L., Lian, H., Brown, D. J., & Morrison, R. (2015). Ostracism, self-esteem, and job performance: When do we self-verify and when do we self-enhance? *Academy of Management Journal*, *58*, 279-297. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0347

Fox, S. , & Stallworth, L. E. (2005). Racial/ethnic bullying: Exploring links between bullying and racism in the US workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66*, 438-456. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2004.01.002

Fraenkel, W., Wallen, N., & Hyun, E. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education.* McGraw- Hill.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *Reliability and validity assessment*. Sage Thousand Oaks CA.

Girgin Köse, S., & Aksu, A. (2013). Organizational deviation measurement for schools. *E Journal of New World Sciences Academy, 8*(3), 375-389.

Gruys, M. L., & Sackett, P. R. (2003). Investigating the dimensionality of counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 11,* 30-42. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00224

Halis, M., & Demirel, Y. (2016). The impact of social support on organizational ostracism. *Kastamonu University Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, *11*(1), 318-335. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/309391

Hitlan, R.T., Kelly, K. M., Schepman, S., Schneider, K. T., & Zárate, M. A. (2006). Language exclusion and the consequences of perceived ostracism in the workplace. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 10*, 56-70. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.10.1.56

Hitlan, R.T., & Noel, J. (2009). The influence of workplace exclusion and personality on counterproductive work behaviours: An interactionist perspective. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *18*(4), 477-502. https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320903025028

Hofstede, G.H. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across culture*. Sage Publications.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2010). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (*8th edn.*). McGraw-Hill.

Husrevsahi, S.P. (2021). The reasons for and results of ostracism at schools and recommendations for solutions through teacher experiences. *International Journal of Progressive Education, 17*(3), 202-215. https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2021.346.13

Jahanzeb, S. & Fatima, T. (2017). The role of defensive and prosocial silence between workplace ostracism and emotional exhaustion. *Academy of Management Proceeding, 1*, 17107. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2017.17107abstract

Jones, E. E., Carter-Sowell, A. R., Kelly, J. R., & Williams, K. D. (2009). 'I'm out of the loop': Ostracism through information exclusion. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 12,* 157-174. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430208101054

Kandemir, A., & Nartgün, Ş. S. (2022). The relationship between teachers' perceptions of gender equality, organizational ostracism, and organizational obstruction. *International Journal of Curriculum and*

Instruction, 14(1), 864-893. https://ijci.wcci-international.org/index.php/IJCI/article/view/897/462

Kline, R.B. (2011). *Methodology in the social sciences: Principles and practice of structural equation modeling (3rd ed.).* Guilford Press.

Leary, M. R., & Baumeister, R. F. (2000). The nature and function of self-esteem: Sociometer theory. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, *32*, 1-62. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(00)80003-9

Leary, M. R., Tambor, E. S., Terdal, S. K., & Downs, D. L. (1995). Self-esteem as an interpersonal monitor: The sociometer hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 518-530. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.68.3.518

Malisetty, S. (2016). Genesis and emanations of deviant workplace behaviour: A case study in IT Industry. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, *9*(14), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.17485/ijst/2016/v9i14/87684

Naz, S., Li, C., Khan, S., Salah, H., & Khan, H.S. (2017). Comparative analytical study of teachers' personality type (a and b) to study the consequences of ostracism. *IJSRSET, 3*(5), 488-502.

Ogurlu, U. (2015). Ostracism among gifted adolescents: A preliminary study in Turkey. *Educational Process:*

International Journal, 4(1-2), 18-30. http://dx.doi.org/10.12973/edupij.2015.412.2

Pillay, H., Goddard, R., & Wilss, L. (2005). Well-being, burnout, and competence: Implications for teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *30*, 22-33. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2005v30n2.3

Polat, S., & Hiçyılmaz, G. (2017). Discrimination behaviors that classroom teachers are exposed and the causes of these behaviors. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Education, 5*(2), 47-66. https://doi.org/10.14689/issn.2148-2624.1.5c2s3m

Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal, 38,* 555-572. https://doi.org/10.2307/256693

Robinson, S.L., O'Reilly, J., & Wang, W. (2013). Invisible at work: An integrated model of workplace ostracism. *Journal of Management*, *39*, 203-231. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312466141

Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68-78. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68

Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: Tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online, 8*(2), 23-74.

Spector, P.E., & Fox, S. (2002). An emotion-centered model of voluntary work behaviour some parallels between counterproductive work behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management Review*, *12*, 269-292.

Sulea, C., Filipescu, R., Horga, A., Orţan, C., & Fischmann, G. (2012). Interpersonal mistreatment at work and burnout among teachers. *Cognition, Brain, Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, *16*, 553-570.

Thau, S., Aquino, K., & Poortvliet, P. M. (2007). Self-defeating behaviors in organizations: The relationship between thwarted belonging and interpersonal work behaviors. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 840-847. https://doi.org/cvc767

Türkkaş Anasız, B., & Iliman Püsküllüoğlu, E. (2017). Phenomenological analysis of teachers' organizational deviance experiences in a rural primary school in Turkey. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, *6*(1), 70-79. https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v6i1.2783

Twenge, J. M., Baumeister, R. F., Tice, D. M., & Stucke, T. S. (2001). If you can't join them, beat them: Effects of social exclusion on aggressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*, 1058-1069.

Vardi, Y., & Wiener, Y. (1996) Misbehavior in organizations: A motivational framework. *Organization Science, 7*(2), 151-165. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.7.2.151

Wesselmann, E. D., Butler, F. A., Williams, K. D., & Pickett, C. L. (2010). Adding injury to insult: Unexpected rejection leads to more aggressive responses. *Aggressive Behavior*, *36*(4), 232-237. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20347

Whitman, M. V., Halbesleben, J. R., & Holmes, O. (2014). Abusive supervision and feedback avoidance: The mediating role of emotional exhaustion. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *35*(1), 38-53. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1852

Williams, K. D. (1997). Social ostracism. In R. M. Kowalski (Ed.), *Aversive interpersonal behaviors*, (pp. 133 170). New York: Plenum.

Williams, K. D. (2007). Ostracism. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 425-452. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.58.110405.085641

Williams, K. D. (2009). Ostracism: A temporal need-threat model. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 41*, 275-314. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)00406-1

Yakut, S., & Yakut, İ. (2018). Relationship between psychological well-being in teachers and exclusion from workplace*. Turkish Studies*, *13*(18), 1357-1376. https://doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.13883

Yan, Y., Zhou, E., Long, L., & Ji, Y. (2014). The influence of workplace ostracism on counterproductive work behavior: The mediating effect of state self-control. *Social Behavior and Personality, 42*(6), 881-890. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2014.42.6.881

Yılmaz, Ö., & Akgün, N. (2019). The relationship between primary and secondary school teachers' perceptions of organizational ostracism and organizational fit. *Bolu Abant Izzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education, 19*(3), 1147-1159. https://doi.org/10.17240/aibuefd.2019.19.49440-576144

Uslukaya., & Demirtaş, Z. (2020). Workplace ostracism based on teachers' perceptions: a qualitative research in educational institutions. *Journal of Education and Humanities, 11*(22), 230-256. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/1313640

Zhao, H., Xia, Q., He, P., Sheard, G., & Wan, P. (2016). Workplace ostracism and knowledge hiding in service organizations. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *59*, 84-94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.09.009