CORRESPONDENCE
Ramazan Yirci

✉ *ryirci@gmail.com*

✉ *Kahramanmaras Sutcuimam University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, 46050, Kahramanmaras, Turkey.*

AUTHOR DETAILS
Additional information about the authors is available at the end of the article.

RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Association between Workplace Incivility and Teachers' Motivation Levels

Ramazan Yirci ⓘ · **Sabri Daso** ⓘ

ABSTRACT

Background/purpose – The main purpose of this study is to examine the association between workplace incivility and teachers' motivation levels.

Materials/methods – The sample comprises 355 teachers working in the 2020-2021 academic year in kindergarten, elementary, middle, and high school types. The research was designed with the relational scanning model, which is one of the quantitative research methods. As data collection tools, the "Workplace Incivility Scale" developed by Cortina et al. (2001) and adapted to Turkish by Polatçı and Özçalık (2013), and the "Teacher motivation scale" developed by Taşpınar (2006) and revised by Polat (2010) were used. The collected data were then analyzed using IBM's SPSS Version 22.0 statistics package program.

Results – The results showed that a moderate negative relationship exists between teachers' perceptions regarding workplace incivility and their level of motivation. Teachers' views on workplace incivility were found to significantly predict their motivation levels. It is expected that working towards decreasing incivility in schools will help to positively contribute to teachers' motivation levels.

Conclusion – Within the study, it was determined that the teachers with the lowest level of motivation, according to their duration of service, were novice teachers. For this reason, it may be especially beneficial to offer a more qualified mentoring program to newly qualified teachers during the early years of their professional service.

Keywords – Incivility, teachers, workplace incivility, teacher motivation.

To link to this article–https://dx.doi.org/10.22521/unibulletin.2021.101.4

1. INTRODUCTION

Kindness is one of the important factors that regulate and direct social relationships and shape people's perceptions of each other. Uncivil and disrespectful behaviors can cause individuals to become restless and nervous. As in all areas of social life, one of the indispensable elements of the work environment is the rules pertaining to courteous behavior. Recently, globalization and technological developments have brought about changes in the structure of organizations, and these changes have also affected the psychological atmosphere of organizations and the organizational climate within the workplace. Working environments and increased competitiveness have also had an increasing effect on the stress levels found in workplaces. In this context, workplace incivility has become one of the key factors in the happiness and motivation of employees at work.

It has been observed that emotional states such as unhappiness, anger, and anxiety increase in the workplaces in line with the changing needs and demands of managers and employees. (Altınkurt & Karaköse, 2009; Karaköse, 2008a; 2008b). Employees and managers exhibit different attitudes and behaviors towards the uncivil behavior they experience. Incivility experienced in the workplaces negatively affects the loyalty of individuals to their job and to their institution, with potential negative effects including quitting their job, health problems, and even negative effects realized within their family lives.

The changes seen in modern-day business life have resulted in institutions focusing more on the human factor. This has been due to an understanding that fighting against the increasing competition, and catching up with change and innovation is only possible through the effective use of human resources. Employees at work and teachers at schools, of course, require high levels of motivation in order to work efficiently. Highly motivated employees value their jobs and institutions, undertake their work with devotion, and act in line with the goals and aspirations of the organization. Because of its clear, direct impact on employee performance, organizations care about the concept of motivation, and allocate generally increasing financial resources to this issue. Within the framework of these cases, the researchers of the current study aimed to determine the effect of teachers' perceptions of workplace incivility on their motivation levels. In this context, workplace incivility and motivation are discussed in the current study according to the conceptual framework. Then, quantitative research results are presented so as to determine the impact of teachers' perceptions of workplace incivility on their motivation levels.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Workplace Incivility

Each and every community formed by human beings is based on some set of rules. These rules may differ from society to society, and with it, the boundaries of the concept of courtesy can differ from one culture to another. Civility is considered as a virtue among individuals in terms of morality and manners (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). The word "civility" in the Turkish language relates back to the word "gentle" in Persian when it was introduced into the Arabic word patterns. Civility is expressed in the dictionary of the Turkish Language Association as "being respectful and graceful towards others, grace, and kindness" (Türk Dil Kurumu, n.d.). In contrast to the word civility, "incivility" can be put forward as an individual's disrespectful, thoughtless and careless behavior in their social relations (Kane & Montgomery, 1998). Civility or incivility is a situation face throughout life. It is therefore also possible to evaluate the behaviors we encounter within family life, whilst driving or

encountering traffic (predominantly road-based, but any form of traffic), shopping, at work, or even within our own home, and all within the concept of civility.

Civility has been defined as an important element of interpersonal relationships throughout human history. It has been seen as the basis for social order and as a precondition for cooperation (Yaylagül, 2005). The technology that has developed in recent years and changes seen in working environments have also affected communication and interaction between individuals, with a move away from accepted rules in working ethics, cultural and social norms in individuals and instances of incivility seen to increase in line with communication deficiencies (Delen, 2010). The rules, norms, and principles required by social relations between people have always been and always will be. In his study, Hartman (1996) explained civility as ways or norms that differ from culture to culture that regulate social relationships between people. In this context, incivility is a low-level violation of the rules in interpersonal relations. In addition, unkindness causes empathy erosion (Kumral, 2017).

Uncivil behaviors can be encountered both within general society and also in business life. Andersson and Pearson (1999) defined the concept of incivility in the workplace as "low-intensity deviant behavior that is unclear in intention but harms the target person" (p. 457), which is caused by the violation of respect rules in the workplace. Workplace incivility was first expressed among anti-productive behaviors in working life. Some researchers associate workplace incivility with concepts such as bullying, psychological terror, violence, aggression, conflict, harassment, and also mobbing in the related literature (Toker Gökçe, 2010).

There are specific characteristics that differentiate incivility from other perceivable behaviors encountered in work environments. First, there is a violation of the norm in incivility. Organizations, institutions, and also social structures each have certain norms. Any behavior deemed uncivil must somehow violate these rules. There are three other important features of incivility, which are frequency, density, and uncertainty. Although rare in general, serious incidents can occur when incivility becomes more frequent (Kumral, 2017).

Uncivil behaviors are mostly low-intensity behaviors that are passive, non-physical, and indirect. However, the low density does not mean that they are insignificant, as they may result in other negative behaviors and can trigger anxiety (Akcakavaklı, 2019). Pearson and Porath (2005) stated in their study on Fortune 1000 businesses that incivility can harm the organizational culture. In a study by Kumral (2017), it was reported that managers spend 7 weeks a year resolving conflicts based on some form of incivility. Another feature of incivility is that its intention is ambiguous. The intention of the harm done to the target person is often unclear. This uncertainty is an important factor that distinguishes incivility from other deviant behaviors encountered within organizations for which the purpose of harm is more obvious, such as aggression, violence, threat, or physical attack (Pearson et al., 2000).

In a study published by Andersson and Pearson (1999), parties in cases of incivility within institutions were specified. In cases of incivility, it is stated by Gültaç (2019) that individuals who are uncivil target both other individuals and also witnesses. Of course, these sides are not always that clear. Incivility exhibited within institutions is an interactive process involving the relevant parties. This interaction process has been described as a spiral of incivility by Andersson and Pearson (1999, as cited in Akcakavaklı, 2019). In Hornstein's (2003) study, it was noted that one in five employees was subjected to uncivil behaviors. Not only managers but also colleagues can exhibit uncivil behaviors at work (Delen, 2010). It has

been found that lack of civility damages organizational commitment in institutions, negatively affects job satisfaction, increases dismissal rates, increases job stress, and reduces levels of employee productivity (Küçük & Çakıcı, 2018).

People conducting uncivil behaviors in the work environment, either intentionally or unintentionally, out of ignorance or inattentiveness, are referred to as the provocative (initiating) party. The person being subjected to incivility is referred to as the target, whilst anyone having witnessed such behavior is simply a witness (Pearson et al., 2000). Individuals exhibiting uncivil behaviors have a higher status than the victims (targets). The uncivil behavior of superiors towards their subordinates is often observed. In fact, this situation is generally considered as a requirement of seeking a managerial position (Pearson et al., 2000).

In another study, Lim and Lee (2011) stated that young individuals working within industrial institutions encounter more uncivil behaviors than do their more experienced colleagues. Cultural and administrative differences may be considered as the reason for this difference. In addition, the characteristics of the work can also be an effective factor (Demirkasımoğlu & Arastaman, 2017). The probability of instigators being male within the organization is higher than their being female (70%: male, 30% female). Again, the level of rudeness exhibited by male managers towards their subordinates was found to be higher than that of female managers. It can be said, therefore, that females exhibit more harmonious types of behaviors within the institutional setting (Pearson et al., 2000).

Miner and Eischeid (2012) stated in their research that the way of responding to rude behaviors often differs between males and females. Whilst males can react harshly and show aggression in the face of incivility, it has been observed that females tend more to steer away from such conflict. It was stated that if the protagonists of rude behavior within the organization are male, the spiral of incivility can progress more intensely. It has been stated that females experience more intense emotions when exposed to such behaviors in their colleagues (Akcakavaklı, 2019). In addition, according to the findings of research undertaken by Namie (2003), if the target individual is female, most of the time the provocative party is also female (Kumral, 2017). Although individuals who often witness uncivil behaviors are not the actual target of the incivility, they are often affected by the event, although in different ways. They may experience negative emotions, with anxiety or anger attacks, whilst their job stress levels may increase, and they feel tired. Over time, witnesses can also take on the role of target or instigator (Akcakavaklı, 2019).

Various research in the literature has reported on the effects of incivility in the workplace. Workplace incivility can positively affect employee burnout levels (Polatcı & Özçalık, 2013), or it may cause organizational silence or organizational exclusion (Kumral, 2017), aggressive attitudes (Taştan, 2014), or it may trigger instances of stress (Akcakavaklı, 2019; Erol et al., 2018; Yıldız & Bayrakçı, 2020). It has been stated that workplace incivility has a negative and significant correlation with employee satisfaction (Demirsel & Erat, 2019), and that it can cause social loafing and quitting (Aydın Göktepe & Keleş, 2019; Kanten, 2014). In addition, a positive relationship has been established between workplace incivility and organizational cynicism (Çoban & Deniz, 2018), and that it negatively affects creative employee performance and leader-member interaction (Çiçek & Çiçek, 2020). It can also cause organizational deviation (Gültaç, 2019). Workplace incivility negatively relates to the organizational climate (Üstün & Ersolak, 2020), and can negatively affect the perception of organizational justice (Aykan, 2020). Also, unfavorable outcomes of workplace incivility can

be observed on organizational commitment (Guzel, 2019), subjective wellbeing (Küçük & Çakıcı, 2018), perception of justice (Bozacı & İşcan, 2020), work motivation and emotional fatigue (Jamal & Siddiqui, 2020), psychological climate (Kaplan et al., 2019), and on family life (Ferguson, 2012). In addition, workplace incivility can result in health problems and even suicide (Maclntosh, 2005). Considering the many negative consequences of workplace incivility, this raises the importance and necessity to investigate the topic of incivility within the school environment.

2.2. Motivation

In order for teachers to work efficiently within the school organizational environment, their morale and motivation must be sufficiently high. Bureaucratic precautions should be taken in order to maximize the motivation of individuals, and administrators and other employees should set appropriate examples for each other (Tutum, 1979). Institutions aim to reach a certain productive level in terms of the organizational goals by increasing the performance of their personnel through motivation. The concept of motivation is important both for the individual and also for society as a whole, as individuals with high morale are more likely to undertake their work whilst having some degree of fun or enjoyment, and which benefits both the individual and the organization. In this way, motivation can lead to increases in the efficiency of an organization (Ayık et al., 2015).

As pointed by Vroom (1964), the word "motivation" is of Latin origin movere, which means "to move". Motivation is the influencing and directing of employees in terms of the quantity or quality of their work (Durmaz, 2004), and is also the state of taking action according to people's wishes, desires, or motives in order to reach an intended goal (Genç, 2004). Motivation is a process and purpose-oriented action that stimulates impulses that start with physiological and psychological needs (Ülker, 2001, as cited in Deviren & Okçu, 2020).

Motivation is divided into two types, as intrinsic and extrinsic. Extrinsic motivation refers to the rewards and punishments that can affect an individual from the outside, whilst intrinsic motivation connects with an individual's desires, interests, or curiosity (Solmus, 2004). One characteristic of motivation is that it should be personal. Factors that motivate individuals can vary from individual to individual. Another feature is that motivation manifests itself through behaviors. Therefore, managers should observe and interpret the behavior of their personnel and plan appropriate studies that examine the phenomena (Koçel, 2013).

Many theories have been raised with regards to motivation. Maslow saw motivation as a process to meet a need, and that there are five basic needs; physiological, trust, social, self-expression, and self-actualization. It is predicted that the unmet need will motivate the individual knowingly or unknowingly (Peker & Aytürk, 2000). However, needs are not the same for every individual, and not everyone can reach the higher needs in the hierarchy (Cüceloğlu, 2005). As the lower needs are met, the higher needs tend to be directed. Alderfer (1969) expressed the need for **e**xistence, **r**elatedness, and **g**rowth in what is now known as his "ERG theory." Herzberg's (1966) "Two-factor Theory," McClelland's (1985) "Need for Achievement theory," and also Vroom's "Expectation theory" are among popular motivation theories.

Herzberg (1966) explained that being successful in life can be achieved through two primary motivations, namely the "Two-factor theory" (also known as Herzberg's motivation-

hygiene theory) and also the "Dual-factor theory." The "hygiene factors" include an individual's situations such as salary and work life, whilst the "motivation factors" include real incentives that can motivate the individual internally and through self-actualization. Vroom et al. discussed motivation according to the concepts of business life, effort, success, and reward (Polat, 2010). Institutions need motivation in order to continue and to develop. Increasing the motivation of teachers and improving their commitment to their organization is therefore in the school's interest (Ertürk, 2016; Karakose, 2014; Yirci & Karakose, 2010). The school principal is the party with the greatest responsibility as a source of motivation with the school as an organizational setup (Aydoğar & Yirci, 2020; Karakose, 2005; Kocabas & Karakose, 2005; Karaköse et al., 2009; Özdemir et al., 2014; Yirci & Berk, 2021; Yirci & Demir, 2019; Yirci et al., 2016). Knowing the needs of teachers within educational organizations and conducting studies in this area can result in teaching staff acting more willingly in their jobs. Bishay (1996) stated that high levels of teacher motivation can also positively affect the students that they teach. It may be predicted that the performance of highly motivated teachers may increase the academic achievement goals of the school.

The main problem sentence of the research is "Do teachers' perceptions of workplace incivility affect their motivation levels?" In this context, the current study aimed to determine the effect of teachers' perceptions of workplace incivility on their motivation. In the literature, it has been seen that the concepts of workplace incivility and motivation have been studied according to different concepts; however, the number of studies published regarding the effect of workplace incivility on motivation has been very limited. Jamal and Siddiqui (2020) studied the mediating role of motivation in the relationship between workplace incivility and job satisfaction. In the study of Hur et al. (2016), the mediating role of motivation in the effect of workplace incivility on creativity was studied. The current study is consequently expected to be seen as important in terms of the scarcity of studies on this topic, as no similar study has been found in the published literature based on teachers as the sample.

The current study aims to examine the relationship between teachers' perceptions of workplace incivility and their motivation levels, with answers sought to the following questions.

- What is the level of teachers' views on workplace incivility?
- What is the level of teachers' views on their motivation?
- Do teachers' views on workplace incivility and motivations differ by;
    a) type of school,
    b) gender,
    c) age,
    d) marital status,
    e) educational status,
    f) branch,
    g) seniority, or
    h) teaching union membership.
- According to the teachers' opinions, does workplace incivility influence teacher motivation?

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Model

The current study examined the effect of teachers' perceptions of workplace incivility on their motivation levels based on a relational survey within the quantitative research model. This research model is used to describe a phenomenon that is either in the past or the present. The relational survey model is a type of research that tries to determine the relationship, change, and level of change of two or more variables (Karasar, 2005). In the relational model, a certain level of results can be obtained related to the cause-and-effect relationship.

3.2 Universe and Sample of Research

The universe of the research was 16,603 teachers working in public schools in the Kahramanmaraş province of Turkey during the 2020-2021 academic year. A simple non-selective sampling method, one of the probability-based sampling methods, was used in the sample's selection. A simple method of selective sampling is to take participants from the universe without any purposeful selection criteria being applied (Büyüköztürk et al., 2017). The sample of the research comprises 355 teachers working in four different school levels. The data were analyzed using IBM's SPSS Version 22.0 statistics package program.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Variables	Category	ƒ	%
School level	Kindergarten	39	11.0
	Primary School	102	28.7
	Secondary School	112	31.5
	High School	102	28.7
Gender	Female	174	49.0
	Male	181	51.0
Age	20-30 years	110	31.0
	31-40 years	173	48.7
	41-50 years	67	18.9
	51 years or more	5	1.4
Marital Status	Married	268	75.5
	Single	87	24.5
Education Level	Graduate	281	79.2
	Postgraduate	74	20.8
Branch	Kindergarten	38	10.7
	Class teacher	82	23.2
	Branch teacher	168	47.5
	School counselor/Guidance teacher	66	18.6
Seniority	1-5 years	75	21.1
	6-10 years	125	35.2
	11-15 years	66	18.6
	16-20 years	51	14.4
	21 years or more	38	10.7
Union Membership	Yes	250	70.4
	No	105	29.6

Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of the study's participants' according to their school type, gender, age, marital status, education level, branch, length of teaching service, and union membership variables. When Table 1 is examined, it can be seen that the ratio of male and female teachers that participated in the research is close. The number of teachers in the 31-40 year old age range is higher than the other groups (*n* = 173). One of the prominent features seen in Table 1 relates to the participants' level of education, with approximately one-fifth having completed a postgraduate level of education (*n* = 74). Most of the teachers participating in the current study are branch teachers (*n* = 168), the majority of the participants were teachers with 6-10 years of service (*n* = 125), and most of the teachers hold membership of some teachers' union (*n* = 250). It was also determined that the majority of the participant teachers were married (*n* = 268).

3.3. Data Collection Tools

The data collection process in this study was conducted using two separate scales. The first being the "Workplace incivility scale," which was developed by Cortina et al. (2001) and later adapted to the Turkish context by Polatçı and Özçalık (2013). It is a unidimensional scale consisting of seven items. The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of the scale is .81. As a result of the reliability analysis conducted within the current study, the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was determined as .89. This 5-point, Likert-type instrument is a scale evaluated according to 1 = *never*, 2 = *once or twice*, 3 = *sometimes*, 4 = *often*, and 5 = *often*.

The second data collection tool employed in the study was the "Teacher motivation scale," developed by Taşpınar (2006) and later revised by Polat (2010). The scale consists of two dimensions, extrinsic motivation and intrinsic motivation, and 24 items. This 5-point, Likert-type scale is evaluated from 1 = *never* through to 5 = *always*. The Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of the scale is α = .92, and the reliability coefficients of the sub-dimensions are between .87 and .77. As a result of the reliability analysis conducted within the current study, it was determined that Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was .87, and the reliability coefficients of the sub-dimensions were between .82 and .77.

A "personal information form" was developed by the researchers in order to capture the participants' demographic data related to their school level, gender, age, marital status, education level, branch, length of teaching service, and union membership. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the scales were created using Google Forms and delivered to the participants online.

3.4. Data Analysis

The data collected from the 355 participant teachers were analyzed using IBM's SPSS Version 22.0 statistics package program. Descriptive analysis was conducted so as to determine the participant teachers' workplace incivility and motivation levels. The normality of the distribution and homogeneity in terms of various variables were examined with Levene's test. Independent groups *t*-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were conducted in order to determine whether the teachers' workplace incivility and motivation levels differed in terms of related variables. The results of the analyses are presented in tabular format in the following section, and attempted to be interpreted appropriately. Pearson correlation method was applied to determine the relationship between teachers' workplace incivility and motivation levels, and simple regression analysis was performed to determine the predictive power of the relationships between the variables.

4. FINDINGS

In this part of the study, the findings of the research are presented and explained. First, the arithmetic means and standard deviations of each scale were calculated within the research problems regarding the level of teachers' views on workplace incivility and motivation. The results of the findings are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Teachers' Workplace Incivility and Motivation Levels

	Variable	X̄	SS
1	Workplace Incivility	1.92	0.87
2	Motivation	3.96	0.57

The teachers' Workplace Incivility Scale mean score was 1.92, whilst the Teacher Motivation Scale mean score was found to be 3.96. As can be concluded from the data presented in Table 2, the teachers' perceptions regarding workplace incivility are at a low level. From this perspective, it may be said that individuals working in the school environment act within the framework of respect and courtesy rules.

Normality assumption was attempted to be explained according to skewness coefficients. The skewness coefficient of the Workplace Incivility Scale was 1.38; whilst for the Teacher Motivation Scale it was -0.57. Skewness coefficients of the variables between +2.0 and -2.0 (George & Mallery, 2010) are accepted as having normal distribution, hence parametric tests could be used in the data analysis. In order to determine the differentiation of teachers' opinions on workplace incivility according to demographic variables, independent groups t-test was applied, with the results presented in Table 3.

Table. 3. T-Test Results of Teachers' Workplace Incivility Levels according to Demographic Variables

Variable	Category	n	X̄	SD	df	t	p
Gender	Male	181	1.97	0.79	353	1.172	.242
	Female	174	1.87	0.94			
Marital Status	Single	87	2.00	0.96	353	1.017	.310
	Married	268	1.89	0.84			
Educational Degree	BA	281	1.86	0.85	353	-2.597	.010
	Master's/ PhD	74	2.15	0.91			
Union Membership	Yes	250	1.94	0.85	353	.667	.505
	No	105	1.87	0.92			

Table 3 presents the results of the independent groups t-test conducted to determine whether or not the Workplace Incivility Scale scores of the teachers differed according to certain variables. As a result of the independent sample t-test, the level of workplace incivility of participant teachers was not found to differ statistically according to the variables of gender ($t = 1.172$), marital status ($t = 1.017$), or union membership ($t = 0.667$) ($p > .05$). The level of workplace incivility shows a statistically significant difference with a low-level effect value ($\eta^2 = .019$) according to the variable of educational status ($t = -2.597$, $p < .05$). The significant difference was in favor of those teachers who had completed their postgraduate education. Based on this finding, it may be said that the expectations and sensitivities of postgraduate teachers with regards to courtesy at school are higher than those with other levels of education.

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine the variation of teachers' workplace incivility levels according to school type, age, branch and length of service. It was seen that the change of teachers' workplace incivility levels according to school type ($F = 0.212$), age ($F = 0.566$), branch ($F = 0.729$), length of service ($F = 0.418$) variables were not statistically significant ($p > .05$).

In order to determine the differentiation of teachers' views on motivation levels according to certain demographic variables, independent groups t-test was applied, with the results presented in Table 4.

Table 4. *T*-Test Results of Teachers' Motivation Levels According to Demographic Variables

Variable	Category	*n*	X̄	*SD*	*df*	*t*	*p*
Gender	Male	181	3.94	0.60	353	-.819	.413
	Female	174	3.99	0.55			
Marital Status	Single	87	3.88	0.63	353	-1.575	.116
	Married	268	3.99	0.56			
Educational Degree	BA	281	3.98	0.56	353	.723	.470
	Master's/ Ph.D.	74	3.92	0.64			
Union Membership	Yes	250	3.96	0.58	353	-.311	.756
	No	105	3.98	0.57			

In Table 4, according to the results of the independent groups *t*-test conducted to test the significance between the groups, the motivation levels of the participant teachers do not show any statistically significant difference based on gender (t = -0.819), marital status (t = -1.575), educational status (t = 0.723), or union membership (t = -0.311). One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied to determine the differentiation of teachers' views on motivation levels according to demographic variables, with the results presented in Table 5.

Table 5. ANOVA Results of Teachers' Motivation Levels by Demographic Variables

Variable	Category	*n*	X̄	*SD*	*F*	*p*	Post-Hoc
School Level	Kindergarten	39	4.20	0.46	8.537	.000	a – c
	Primary School	102	4.10	0.62			a – d
	Secondary School	112	3.94	0.52			b – c
	High School	102	3.77	0.58			b – d
							c – d
Age	20-30 years	110	3.96	0.57	.237	.871	
	31-40 years	173	3.97	0.58			
	41-50 years	67	3.95	0.60			
	51 and over	5	4.18	0.35			
Branch	Preschool teacher	38	4.13	0.57	4.271	.006	a – c
	Classroom teacher	82	4.09	0.60			b – c
	Branch teacher	168	3.86	0.55			
	School Psychological Counselor	66	3.97	0.60			
Seniority	1-5 years	75	3.91	0.54	.826	.509	
	6-10 years	125	3.94	0.60			
	11-15 years	66	4.08	0.54			

Variable	Category	n	X̄	SD	F	p	Post-Hoc
	16-20 years	51	3.96	0.63			
	21 years or more	38	3.95	0.59			

Table 5 shows the ANOVA results regarding the participant teachers' motivation levels according to their school type, their age, teaching branch, and seniority variables. The teachers' motivation levels were found to be statistically significant ($p < .05$) according to the school type variable. When examined by school type, it was seen that the motivation levels of those teachers working in kindergartens were higher than those working in secondary schools and high schools, the motivation levels of teachers working in primary schools were higher than those working in secondary schools and high schools, and that the motivation levels of teachers working in secondary schools were higher than those working in high schools. The motivation levels of the participant teachers did not show any statistically significant change according to the age variable ($p > .05$). According to the branch variable, the change in the motivation levels of the participant teachers was found to be statistically significant ($p < .05$), and that when analyzed, it was seen that the motivation levels of preschool and classroom teachers were higher than those of branch teachers. The change in the motivation levels of the teachers according to the variable of seniority was not found to be statistically significant ($p > .05$).

Pearson correlation analysis was applied to determine the relationship between teachers' workplace incivility levels and motivation levels, and the results are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Relationship between Teachers' Workplace Dishonesty and Motivation

	Intrinsic Motivation	Extrinsic Motivation	Motivation
Workplace Incivility	-.368*	-.263*	-.335*

* $p < .05$

In Table 6, a negative, moderate, and statistically significant relationship can be seen to exist between the participant teachers' workplace incivility levels and motivation levels ($r = -.335$, $p < .05$). Although the relationship between workplace incivility and intrinsic motivation sub-dimension is moderately negative ($r = -.368$, $p < .05$), a negative, low-level significant relationship is seen between workplace incivility and extrinsic motivation ($r = -.263$, $p < .05$).

Linear regression analysis was applied to test the effect of the level of workplace incivility (as the independent variable) on the level of motivation (as the dependent variable), with the results presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Linear Regression Analysis Results

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	B	SH	β	t	R	R^2	F	p
Workplace Incivility	Motivation	105.414	1.688	-.335	62.456	.335[a]	.112	44.661	.000[b]

Table 7 presents the analysis results that predict the relationship between workplace incivility and the motivation levels of the participant teachers. As a result of the analysis, the regression model was found to be statistically significant ($F = 44,661$, $p = .000$); accordingly,

11% of the teachers' motivation levels can be explained by the workplace incivility variable (R^2 = 0.112, p = .000). In light of this finding, it may be concluded that workplace incivility is an important factor for the school climate, and that it significantly impacts upon the psychological atmosphere on the school.

5. CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study, which aimed at determining the effect of teachers' perceived workplace incivility on their motivation levels, was designed according to the relational survey model, one of the quantitative research methods. The sample of the research included 355 teachers from the Kahramanmaraş province of Turkey. The obtained data were analyzed using IBM's SPSS Version 22.0 statistics package program.

The findings indicates that incivility is an occasional phenomena affecting educational institutions. Some studies reported that the phenomenon of incivility is rarely seen in working environments (Aykan, 2020; Çiçek & Çiçek, 2020; Demirkasimoğlu & Arastaman, 2017; Demirsel & Erat, 2019; Erol et al., 2018; Kanten, 2014; Kaplan et al., 2019; Polatcı & Özçalık, 2013; Tortumlu & Taş, 2020; Üstün & Ersolak, 2020; Yıldız & Bayrakçı, 2020). On the other hand, Çoban and Deniz (2018), Lim and Lee (2011), and also Taştan (2014) concluded that incivility in working environments is seen more intensely. It can be thought that this situation is caused both by the diversity of the sector and the dynamics of the institutions that are the subject of research.

It was observed that the motivation levels of the teachers were at the "mostly" level; however, other similar research offered differing results on the subject. While Ayık and Ataş (2014) and also Sucu (2016) found the motivation of teachers was medium or below average, some other studies found motivation levels to be high (Çevik & Köse, 2017; Ertürk, 2016; Gömleksiz & Serhatlıoğlu, 2013; Karakose & Kocabaş, 2006; Yılmaz, 2009).

As a result of the findings obtained in the current research, it was determined that no significant difference was found to exist between the variables of teachers' gender, marital status, school type, age, branch, length of service, union membership, and workplace incivility. In the study conducted by Lim and Lee (2011), young employees were seen to face a greater level of incivility situations than their more experienced colleagues. In the study of Zurbrügg and Miner (2016), it is reported that females are exposed to more instances of incivility than males in the workplace. Again, some studies (Cortina et al., 2001, 2013) found that women are exposed to incivility more than men, and that the age factor has no effect on incivility. It is thought that the different situations that arise are caused by the structure of the work of the organizations that are the subject of the research, the cultural elements and the diversity in management styles.

Within the current research, it was determined that teachers with postgraduate education thought more about uncivil behaviors in the workplace than those with undergraduate education. In a study conducted by Demirkasımoğlu and Arastaman (2017), it was found that teachers' views on incivility did not change according to the variable of educational status. On the other hand, Akcakavaklı (2019) found that the incivility scores of those participants with an associate degree and a bachelor's degree were significantly higher than those whose education finished with their high school education. It may be concluded that as the education level increases, people expect more courtesy in the workplace environment.

The current study also found the motivation levels of the teachers showed a statistically significant difference according to the school type and branch variable. It was seen that teachers working in kindergarten and primary school have higher levels of motivation than those working in secondary schools and high schools, whilst teachers working in secondary schools had higher motivation than those working in high schools. In addition, it was found that the motivation levels of preschool and classroom teachers were higher than branch teachers. The results of the current research can be said to show similarities with studies such as those by Candoğan (2015), Çevik and Köse (2017), Sarıca (2013), and Urhan (2018). In a study entitled "High school teachers' motivation level and the relationship between motivation level and school culture" by Dur (2014), it was determined that the motivation of teachers unsatisfied with their working environment decreased significantly. This may be due high schools mostly being largescale operations, where official relations are considered intense and disciplinary incidents frequent.

Another result of the current research showed that the group with the lowest motivation level according to the seniority variable were those teachers who each had 1-5 years of seniority, as in those teachers having only recently qualified. This may be because newly-appointed teachers are appointed only on a contract basis, that the majority of them are assigned to work in disadvantaged regions of the country, that their service scores are low, and their working conditions deemed inadequate. Karadeniz and Beşir Demir (2010) stated in their study titled "A General Assessment of Contracted Basis Teacher Appointment" that the differences in personal rights between permanent and contracted teachers negatively affect the job satisfaction and motivation of contracted teachers. In similar studies, contracted teachers were not satisfied with their personal rights, stating that permanent teachers had greater privileges in terms of personal rights (Çalışoğlu & Tanışır, 2018; Demirkaya & Unal, 2017; Gündüz, 2008).

As a result of the current research, it was revealed that a statistically significant and moderately negative relationship was found to exist between teachers' workplace incivility and their level of motivation. The results of the current study's analysis are similar to those of studies published by Hur et al. (2016) and also Jamal and Siddiqui (2020). Teachers' views on workplace incivility were found to be a significant predictor of their motivation levels. It can therefore be concluded that undertaking studies to reduce levels of incivility in schools will positively contribute to the motivation levels of serving teachers. Teachers with high levels of motivation will more likely undertake their job with increased satisfaction and willingness to work towards achieving the goals of the institution. For this reason, educational institutions should work to develop and implement institutional courtesy rules as a priority. In addition, the management of incivility throughout the school should be considered among the priorities of serving school administrators.

Based on the findings of the current research, the following suggestions are put forwards:

- As studies on the phenomenon of incivility in schools are deemed insufficient in the current literature, further studies should be encouraged.
- Courses on the subject of courtesy could be developed and added to existing curricula. A nationwide courtesy movement could be initiated in order that awareness may be raised with the participation of all stakeholders.
- Prior to studies on motivation being conducted within educational organizations, the effects of incivility should be considered and the programs planned accordingly.

- Social, academic, and psychological support units could be established in order to increase the motivation of newly-appointed teachers. In addition, a qualified mentoring program could be provided in order to help them resolve problems encountered during their initial years of teaching.
- Institutional standards of courtesy could be established in order to ensure all school staff increase adherence to such a standard.
- The current study examined the effect of workplace incivility on teachers' motivation. Additionally, the relationships between incivility in educational institutions and corporate culture, organizational justice, organizational support, and psychological climate issues could also be investigated. Also, qualitative research in this subject area could help to provide more in-depth findings.

DECLARATIONS

Author Contributions The article was written by two authors, who read and approved the final published version of the article.

Conflicts of Interest The authors declared no conflict of interest.

Ethical Approval All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki Declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

Funding None.

Data Availability Statement The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Acknowledgments None.

REFERENCES

Akcakavaklı, H. (2019). *İşyeri nezaketsizliği ile stres arasındaki ilişkide psikolojik sermayenin rolü [The Role of Psychological Capital in the Relationship between Workplace Incivility and Stress]* [Doctoral dissertation, Marmara University, İstanbul, Turkey]. https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezDetay.jsp?id=QmXbmQsO1SPVr5HEjD3cXg&no=fJW31VOvs9Nop3Af4OzNXw

Alderfer, C. P. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance. 4* (2): 142–75. doi:10.1016/0030-5073(69)90004-X.

Altınkurt, Y., & Karaköse, T. (2009). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin etik liderlik davranışlarına ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 24*, 269-280.

Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review, 24*(3), 452-471. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1999.2202131

Aydın Göktepe, E., & Keleş, D. (2019). İşyeri nezaketsizliği ve işten ayrılma eğilimi ilişkisi: Akademik personel üzerine bir araştırma [The relationship between workplace incivility and turnover tendency: A research on academic staff]. *Sosyal Araştırmalar ve Davranış Bilimleri Dergisi, 5*(12), 262-273.

Aydoğar, N., & Yirci, R. (2020). Devlet ve özel okul yöneticilerinin yenilik yönetimi becerilerinin karşılaştırılması: nicel bir araştırma [Comparison of innovation

management skills of public and private school administrators: a quantitative research]. *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 19*(39), 1286-1308. https://doi.org/10.46928/iticusbe.804129

Ayık, A., Akdemir, Ö. A., & Seçer, İ. (2015). Öğretme motivasyonu ölçeğinin Türkçeye uyarlanması: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması [Adaptation of the motivation to teach scale into turkish: the validity and reliability study]. *Current Research in Education, 1*(1), 33-45. https://toad.halileksi.net/sites/default/files/pdf/ogretme-motivasyonu-olcegi-toad_1.pdf

Ayık, A., & Ataş, Ö. (2014). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik mesleğine yönelik tutumları ile öğretme motivasyonları arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between pre-service teachers' attitudes towards the teaching profession and their motivation to teach]. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi, 4*(1), 25-43. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/ebader/issue/44675/554958

Aykan, E. (2020). Çalışma yaşamında örgütsel adaletsizlik algısının yöneticilerin işten ayrılma niyeti, yaşam tatmini, geri çekilme ve nezaketsizlik davranışları üzerindeki etkisinin tespitine yönelik bir araştırma [A study on the determination of the effect of managers' perceptions of organizational injustice on intention to quit, life satisfaction, withdrawal and incivility behaviors in working life]. *Journal of Life Economics, 7*(2), 201-216. http://dx.doi.org/10.15637/jlecon.7.014

Bishay, A. (1996). Teacher motivation and job satisfaction: a study employing the experience sampling method. *Journal of Undergraduate Sciences, 3*(3), 147-154. http://www.hcs.harvard.edu/~jus/0303/bishay.pdf

Bozacı, İ., & İşcan, R. V. (2020). Sağlık kurumlarında algılanan hekim nezaketsizliğinin, algılanan adalet ve hizmetten kaçınmaya etkisi: Kırıkkale'de bir araştırma [Research on the effect of perceived physician incivility on justice perception and service avoidance of patients in health care institutions in Kırıkkale province]. *Tüketici ve Tüketim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 12*(1), 35-59. http://betadergi.com/ttad/yonetim/icerik/makaleler/260-published.pdf

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2017). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri [Scientific research methods]*. Pegem Akademi.

Candoğan, R. (2015). *Öğretmenlerin okul yöneticilerinden beklediği motivasyon yaklaşımları [The approaches of school principals to motivate teachers]* [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Uşak Üniversitesi, Uşak, Turkey.

Cortina, L. M., Kabat Farr, D., Leskınen, E. A., Huerta, M., & Magley, V. J. (2013). Selective incivility as modern discrimination in organizations evidence and impact. *Journal of Management, 39*(6), 1579-1605. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0149206311418835

Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6*(1), 64-80. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/1076-8998.6.1.64

Cüceloğlu, D. (2005). *İnsan ve davranışı - Psikolojinin temel kavramları [Human and behavior- basic concepts of psychology]*. Remzi Kitabevi.

Çalışoğlu, M., & Tanışır, S. N. (2018). Sözleşmeli öğretmenlik uygulamalarının sözleşmeli öğretmenlerin görüşleri çerçevesinde değerlendirilmesi [The evaluation of contracted teaching applications according to contracted teachers' ideas]. *Ağrı İbrahim Çeçen Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 4*(1), 105-132. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/aicusbed/issue/36806/409696

Çevik, A., & Köse, A. (2017). Öğretmenlerin okul kültürü algıları ile motivasyonları arasındaki ilişkinin incelemesi [An investigation about the relationship between teachers' perception on school cultures and their motivations]. *Itobiad: Journal of the Human & Social Science Researches, 6*(2), 996-1014. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/309891

Çiçek, B., & Çiçek, A. (2020). İşyeri nezaketsizliğinin yaratıcı çalışan performansı üzerindeki etkisi: Lider-üye etkileşiminin aracılık rolü [The effect of workplace incivility on employee creative performance: the mediator role of leader-member exchange]. *İş ve İnsan Dergisi, 7*(2), 267-282. https://doi.org/10.18394/iid.644694

Çoban, R,. & Deniz, M. (2018, November 2-3). *Çalışanların işyeri nezaketsizliği ve örgütsel sinizm algıları arasındaki ilişkileri belirlemeye yönelik imalat sektörü üzerinde bir araştırma [A research on the manufacturing sector to determine the relationships between employees' perceptions of workplace incivility and organizational cynicism.]* [Conference presentation]. Örgütsel Davranış Kongresi, Isparta, Turkey.

Delen, M. G. (2010). Çalışma hayatında işyeri kabalığı olgusu [The Phenomenon of Workplace Incivility]. *Maliye Araştırma Merkezi Konferansları,* (53), 43-58. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/iumamk/issue/742/8014

Demirkasımoğlu, N., & Arastaman, G. (2017). Öğretmenlerin okulda nezaketsizlik olgusuna ilişkin görüşleri [Teachers' Opinions Regarding Incivility At Schools]. *Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 15*(1), 167-188. https://doi.org/10.18026/cbayarsos.297886

Demirkaya, H., & Unal, O. (2017). Sosyal bilgiler öğretmen adaylarının sözleşmeli öğretmenlik uygulamasına yönelik görüşlerinin incelenmesi [An investigation of social sciences student teachers' reflections on contracted teacher practice]. *International Journal of Social Science Research, 6*(1), 24-37. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/ijssresearch/issue/33399/371647

Demirsel, M. T., & Erat, L. (2019). Algılanan İşyeri Nezaketsizliğinin Çalışan Memnuniyeti Üzerindeki Etkisi [The Effect of Perceived Workplace Incivility on Employee Satisfaction]. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, Prof. Dr. Fuat Sezgin Özel Sayısı*, 209-221.http://dergisosyalbil.selcuk.edu.tr/susbed/article/view/1738/1270

Deviren, İ., & Okçu, V. (2020). İlkokul müdürlerinin kullandıkları örgütsel güç kaynakları ile öğretmenlerin örgütsel sessizlik ve motivasyon düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi [Investigation of the relationship between organizational power resources primary school managers use and teachers' organizational silence and motivation levels]. *Journal of Social and Humanities Sciences Research, 7*(52), 915-932. http://dx.doi.org/10.26450/jshsr.1841

Dur, B. (2014). *Lise öğretmenlerinin motivasyon düzeyi ve motivasyon düzeyi ile okul kültürü arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between high school teachers' motivation level and motivation level and school culture]* [Doctoral dissertation, İstanbul Aydın University, İstanbul, Turkey]. http://acikarsiv.aydin.edu.tr/handle/11547/1854

Durmaz, M. (2004). *Kişilerarası iletişim ve motivasyon [Interpersonal communication and motivation].* Ege Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi.

Erol, Y., Karakoç, G. A., & Aydin, N. C. (2018, November 9-11). *İş yeri zorbalığı ve iş yeri nezaketsizliğinin algılanan stres üzerine etkisi: sağlık kurumlarında bir araştırma [The effect of workplace bullying and workplace incivility on perceived stress: A study in*

health institutions.] [Conference presentation]. International EMI Entrepreneurship & Social Sciences Congress, Nevşehir, Turkey.

Ertürk, R. (2016). Öğretmenlerin iş motivasyonları [Work motivation of teachers]. *Eğitim Kuram ve Uygulama Araştırmaları Dergisi, 2*(3), 1-15. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/ekuad/issue/28248/300307

Ferguson, M. (2012). You cannot leave it at the office: spillover and crossover of coworker incivility. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 33*(4), 571-588. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.774

Genç, N. (2004). *Yönetim ve organizasyon: Çağdaş sistemler ve yaklaşımlar [Management and organization: Contemporary systems and approaches]*. Seçkin.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2010). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference 9.0 update*. Pearson.

Gömleksiz, M. N., & Serhatlıoğlu, B. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının akademik motivasyon düzeylerine ilişkin görüşleri [Prospective teachers' perceptions of academic motivation levels]. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 173*, 99-128. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/tsadergisi/issue/21486/230306

Gültaç, A. S. (2019). *Örgütsel Sapma Ve Nezaketsizlik Davranışları İlişkisinde İşyerinde Dışlanmanın Aracı Rolü: Sağlık Kurumlarında Bir Araştırma [The mediator role of exclusion at work in the relationship between organizational deviation and unkind behaviors: a study in healthcare institutions].* [Master's thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey]. http://www.openaccess.hacettepe.edu.tr:8080/xmlui/handle/11655/7909

Gündüz, H. B. (2008). Öğretmenlerin sözleşmeli istihdamı ve durumlarına ilişkin sözleşmeli öğretmenlerin görüşleri [Contracted teachers' views on contract employment and status of teachers]. *Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,* (16), 40-60. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/sakaefd/issue/11212/133898

Güzel, C. (2019). *The mediating effect of organizational commitment and job satisfaction in the relationship between workplace incivility and turnover intention* [Doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey]. https://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12624268/index.pdf

Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. Cleveland, OH: World Publishing Company.

Hartman, E. (1996). *Organizational ethics*. Oxford University.

Hornstein, H. A. (2003). Workplace incivility: An unavoidable product of human nature and organizational nurturing. *Ivey Business Journal, 68*(2). https://iveybusinessjournal.com/publication/workplace-incivility-an-unavoidable-product-of-human-nature-and-organizational-nurturing/

Hur, W.-M., Moon, T., & Jun, J.-K. (2016). The effect of workplace incivility on service employee creativity: the mediating role of emotional exhaustion and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Services Marketing, 30*(3), 302-315. https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/JSM-10-2014-0342/full/html

Jamal, R., & Siddiqui, D. A. (2020). The effects of workplace incivility on job satisfaction: mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, emotional exhaustion. intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, emotional exhaustion. *SSRN*. https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3683146

Kane, K., & Montgomery, K. (1998). A framework for understanding disempowerment in organizations. *Human Resource Management, 37*(3-4), 263-275.

https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-050X(199823/24)37:3/4%3C263::AID-HRM8%3E3.0.CO;2-U

Kanten, P. (2014). İşyeri nezaketsizliğinin sosyal kaytarma davranışı ve işten ayrılma niyeti üzerindeki etkisinde duygusal tükenmenin aracılık rolü [The mediating role of emotional exhaustion in the effect of workplace incivility on social loafing behavior and intention to leave]. *Aksaray Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 6*(1), 11-26. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/aksarayiibd/issue/22548/240977

Kaplan, M., Tüm Kılıç, Y., & Karagöz, A. (2019). İşyeri nezaketsizliğinin psikolojik iklim üzerindeki etkisi [The effect of workplace incivility on the psychological climate]. In H. Karadal, A. T. Erdem, & M. S. Karadal (Eds.), *International EMI Entrepreneurship and Social Sciences Congress Proceedings Book* (pp. 884-893). Nişantaşı University.

Karadeniz, Y., & Beşir Demir, S. (2010). Sözleşmeli Öğretmenlik Uygulamasının Değerlendirilmesi [A general assessment of contract teacher application]. *Ondokuz Mayıs University Journal of Education, 29*(2), 55-77. https://www.ogretmenlersitesi.com/files/misc/1136-5142-1-pb_makale.pdf

Karaköse, T. (2005). Öğretmen gereksinimleri ve motivasyon. *Bilim ve Aklın Aydınlığında Eğitim, 69*, 31-34.

Karaköse, T. (2008a). An Evaluation on Principals' Managerial Behaviors: The Profile of Principal from the Teachers' Point of View. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 3*(1), 67-72.

Karaköse, T (2008b). Okul müdürlerini itibarlı kılan değerlerin belirlenmesine yönelik nitel bir çalışma. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi, 6* (16), 113-129.

Karakose, T. (2014). The empirical study of organizational justice and job satisfaction for high school teachers in Turkey. *Pakistan Journal of Statistics, 30*(6), 1243-1250.

Karaköse, T., & Kocabaş, İ. (2006). The effect of teachers' expectations on job satisfaction and motivation in private and public schools. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education, 2*(1), 3-14.

Karaköse, T., Altınkurt, Y., & Yılmaz, K. (2009). Örgütsel adaletin öğretmenlerin iş doyumu üzerine etkileri. 1-3 Ekim. Uluslararası V. Balkan Eğitim ve Bilim Kongresi. Trakya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi, Edirne.

Karasar, N. (2005). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi [Scientific research methods]*. Nobel.

Kocabaş, I., & Karaköse, T. (2005). Principals' behavior and attitudes' effect on the motivation of teachers. *Journal of Turkish Educational Science, 3*(1), 79-93.

Koçel, T. (2013). *İşletme yöneticiliği [Business administration]*. Beta Basım.

Kumral, T. (2017). *İşyeri nezaketsizliği ve örgütsel sessizlik ilişkisinde örgütsel dışlanmanın aracı rolü [The mediating role of organizational exclusion in the relationship between workplace incivility and organizational silence]* [Master's thesis, Marmara University, İstanbul, Turkey]. http://hdl.handle.net/11424/36144

Küçük, Ö., & Çakıcı, A. (2018). İşyeri kabalığının öznel iyi oluş haline etkisi [The effect of workplace incivility on subjective wellbeing]. *İş ve İnsan Dergisi, 5*(1), 75-87. https://doi.org/10.18394/iid.368835

Lim, S., & Lee, A. (2011). Work and nonwork outcomes of workplace incivility: Does family support help? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 16*(1), 95-111. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/a0021726

MacIntosh, J. (2005). Experiences of workplace bullying in a rural area. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 26*(9), 893-910. https://doi.org/10.1080/01612840500248189

McClelland, D. C. (1985). *Human motivation.* Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman

Miner, K. N., & Eischeid, A. (2012). Observing incivility toward coworkers and negative emotions: Do gender of the target and observer matter? *Sex Roles, 66*(7-8), 492-505. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-011-0108-0

Namie, G. (2003). Workplace bullying: Escalated incivility. *Ivey Business Journal, 68*(2), 2-6. http://www.workplacebullying.org/multi/pdf/N-N-2003A.pdf

Özdemir, T. Y., Kartal, S. E., & Yirci, R. (2014). Okul müdürlerinin öğretmenleri motive etme yaklaşımları [School principals' approaches to motivate teachers]. *Turkish Journal of Educational Studies, 1*(2), 190-215. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/turkjes/issue/34151/377635

Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Porath, C. L. (2000). Assessing and attacking workplace incivility. *Organizational Dynamics, 29*(2), 123-137. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0090-2616(00)00019-X

Pearson, C. M., & Porath, C. L. (2005). On the nature, consequences and remedies of workplace incivility: No time for "nice"? Think again. *Academy of Management Executive, 19*(1), 7-18. https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.2005.15841946

Peker, O., & Aytürk, N. (2000). *Yönetim becerileri [Management skills]*. Yargı.

Polat, S. (2010). *Okul öncesi yöneticilerinin kullandıkları yönetsel güç kaynaklarına ilişkin öğretmen algıları ile öğretmen motivasyonu arasındaki ilişki [The relationship between administrative power sources that preschool administrators use and teacher motivation]* [Master's thesis, Yeditepe University, İstanbul, Turkey]. https://tez.yok.gov.tr/UlusalTezMerkezi/tezDetay.jsp?id=-gqAtbaIIuF6V6xohM_G_A&no=pC3e1zUnPdTW55TSaW1v_g

Polatcı, S., & Özçalık, F. (2013). Yapısal ve psikolojik güçlendirmenin işyeri nezaketsizliği ve tükenmişliğe etkisi [The effects of structural and psychological empowerment on workplace incivility and burnout]. *İşletme Bilimi Dergisi, 1*(1), 17-34. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/213294

Sarıca, Y. (2013). *Eğitim ortamlarının iyileştirilmesinin yönetici ve öğretmen motivasyonuna etkisi [The effect of improving educational environments on administrator and teacher motivation]* [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Yeditepe University, İstanbul, Turkey.

Solmuş, T. (2004). *İş yaşamında duygular ve kişiler arası ilişkiler: Psikoloji penceresinden insan kaynakları yönetimi [Emotions and interpersonal relationships in business life: Human resource management from the perspective of psychology]*. Beta Basım.

Sucu, A. (2016). *Öğretmenlerin motivasyonu ile okul yöneticilerinin öğretimsel liderlik davranışları arasındaki ilişkinin analizi [Analysis of the relationship between teachers' motivation and school administrators' instructional leadership behaviors]* [Master's thesis, İnönü University, Malatya, Turkey]. http://hdl.handle.net/11616/11138

Taşpınar, F. (2006). *Motivasyon araçlarının işgören motivasyonu üzerindeki etkisi: Afyonkarahisar ilindeki termal otel işletmelerinde bir araştırma [The effect of motivation tools on employee motivation: A research in thermal hotel enterprises in Afyonkarahisar province.]* [Master's thesis, Afyon Kocatepe University, Afyonkarahisar, Turkey]. http://hdl.handle.net/11630/2785

Taştan, S. B. (2014). İşyeri Nezaketsizliğini Öngören Örgütsel ve Durumsal Önceller İle Çalışanların Davranışsal Sonuçları Arasındaki İlişkinin ve Sosyo-Psikolojik Kaynakların Rolünün İncelenmesi: Sağlık Kurumlarında Yapılan Bir Araştırma [An investigation of the relationship between organizational and situational antecedents predicting workplace insults and behavioral results of employees and the role of socio-

psychological resources: a study in health institutions]. *ISGUC The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources, 16*(3), 60-75. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/235167

Toker Gökçe, A. (2010). *Mobbing: iş yerinde yıldırma nedenleri ve başa çıkma yöntemleri [Mobbing: causes of mobbing at work and coping methods].* Öğreti Akademi.

Tortumlu, M., & Taş, M. A. (2020). İşyeri kabalığı ve mutluluk ilişkisinde iş yaşamında yalnızlığın düzenleyici etkisi [The moderating effect of loneliness at workplace in the relationship between workplace incivility and happiness]. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Meslek Yüksekokulu Dergisi, 23*(2), 706-719. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/792474

Türk Dil Kurumu. (n.d.). Nezaket. In *Türk Dil Kurumu*. Retrieved March 05, 2021, from http://www.tdk.gov.tr

Tutum, C. (1979). *Personel Yönetimi [Staff Management].* Türkiye ve Orta Doğu Amme İdaresi Enstitüsü (TODAİ).

Urhan, F. (2018). *Öğretmenlerin motivasyon düzeylerine etki eden değişkenlerin analizi [Analysis of variables affecting teachers' motivation levels]* [Master's thesis, Necmettin Erbakan University, Konya, Turkey. https://acikerisim.erbakan.edu.tr/xmlui/bitstream/handle/20.500.12452/3681/feyza%20urhan.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Üstün, F., & Ersolak, Ş. (2020). Örgüt ikliminin işyeri nezaketsizliği üzerine etkisinde makyavelist kişilik özelliklerinin düzenleyici rolü [The moderating role of the makievelist personality in the effect of organizational climate on workplace disability]. *Ataturk University Journal of Economics & Administrative Sciences, 34*(2). https://acikerisim.erbakan.edu.tr/xmlui/bitstream/handle/20.500.12452/3681/feyza%20urhan.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation.* New York: John Wiley.

Yaylagül, Ö. (2005). Eski Türkçede nezaket ifadeleri [The Politeness Expressions in "Old Turkish" language]. *Milli Folklor, 68*, 151-165. https://www.millifolklor.com/PdfViewer.aspx?Sayi=68&Sayfa=147

Yıldız, S., & Bayrakçı, C. (2020). İşyeri nezaketsizliği ile iş stresi arasındaki ilişki: Akademisyenler üzerine bir araştırma [The relationship between workplace incivility and job stress: a research on academicians]. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi,* (40), 515-529. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/pausbed/issue/55392/646525

Yılmaz, F. (2009). *Eğitim örgütlerinde örgüt kültürünün öğretmenlerin iş motivasyonu üzerindeki etkisi [Effects of organizational culture in educational organizations on teachers' job motivation]* [Master's thesis, Selçuk University, Konya, Turkey]. http://acikerisimarsiv.selcuk.edu.tr:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/360/fatih_yilmaz_tez.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

Yirci, R., & Berk, B. (2021). Okul Yöneticilerinin ve Öğretmenlerin Görüşlerine göre Etkili Okul Müdürü: Nitel bir Araştırma [Effective school principal according to the views of school administrators and teachers: a qualitative research]. *Journal of History School, 50*, 570-598. http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/Joh.43166

Yirci, R., & Demir, C. (2019). Öğretmenlerin Okul Müdürlerinin Takım Liderliği Becerilerine İlişkin Algılarının Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi [Analyzing teachers' perceptions regarding school principals' team leadership skills in terms of various

variables]. *Uluslararası Alan Eğitimi Dergisi, 5*(2), 165-184. https://doi.org/10.32570/ijofe.650874

Yirci, R., & Karaköse, T. (2010). Democratic education policy and Turkish education system. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 9*, 1330–1334.

Yirci, R., Karakose, T., Uygun, H., & Ozdemir, T. Y. (2016). Turkish Adaptation of the Mentorship Effectiveness Scale: A validity and Reliability Study. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education, 12*(4), 821-832.

Zurbrugg, L., & Miner, K. N. (2016). Gender, sexual orientation, and workplace incivility: who is most targeted and who is most harmed? *Frontiers in Psychology, 7*(1), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00565

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

Ramazan Yirci is an Associate Professor at KSU Faculty of Education. Before this position, he worked as a teacher at public and private schools for five years. He received his PhD. degree on educational management. His research interests include teacher training, school management and mentoring in education.
E-mail: ryirci@gmail.com
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4696-7420

Sabri Daso is a graduate student in the field of educational administration at KSU Institute of Educational Sciences. He also works as a school principal at a public school. He previously worked as a psychological counselor for 6 years at various educational levels. He is interested in incivility and psychological ownership in education.
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8724-7265