THE POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCES OF TEACHERS' TYPES OF FORGIVENESS ON SCHOOL ORGANISATION

Berrin Burgaz
Hacettepe University
burgaz@hacettepe.edu.tr

Sibel Bakan
Hacettepe University
sibel_bakan@hotmail.com

Biodata

Berrin Burgaz is an associate professor of Educational Sciences in the Faculty of Education, at University of Hacettepe in Ankara, Turkey. Her research interest includes the issues of organizational behaviour,teacher education and development, educational supervision, educational policy and Bologna Process.

Sibel Bakan is a doctoral student in Graduate Institute of Educational Sciences at University of Hacettepe in Ankara, Turkey. She is also a teacher of English. Her research interest includes the issues oforganizational behaviour.

THE POSSIBLE CONSEQUENCES OF TEACHERS' TYPES OF FORGIVENESS ON SCHOOL ORGANISATION

Berrin Burgaz
burgaz@hacettepe.edu.tr

Sibel Bakan
sibel_bakan@hotmail.com

Abstract

The aim of this research is to find out primary school teachers' types of forgiveness and to discuss organisational reflections of these types. The research is based on a qualitative study. The selection of participants is based on the criterion sampling method which is categorized under purposive sampling. The data for this research was obtained through interviews with five teachers working in the same school. The data from these interviews was categorised into 20 case studies. Data is analysed by descriptive analysis. The results show that teachers totally forgive students, parents and other teachers whereas they do not forgive school managers.

Keywords: Organisational forgiveness, types of forgiveness, school, teacher.

1.Introduction

Forgiveness is accepted as one the universal human virtues and it is being discussed for centuries with regard to its affective, cognitive, behavioural, moral and cultural features and from a theological, philosophical and personal aspect (Kerns, 2009; Peterson & Seligman, 2000). At first, the concept of forgiveness was seen by Hegel and Kant as a concept that damag*es* justice and as an "unethical human reaction" encouraging wrong-doing or the guilty (Aquino, Grover, Goldman & Folger, 2003). Later on, it was discussed on an **individual level** by psychologists. Psychologists argue that forgiving is a cognitive process based on understanding, sympathy and affective reactions that decreases a person's negative judgement about a guilty person despite any negative feelings (Goodstein & Aquino, 2010). Bright (2005) defines forgiving the disappearance of rage, anger, revenge, negative feelings and ideas despite negative experiences. Worthington (1998) defines forgiveness as a 131ehaviour of insisting on retaliation against a person who displayed anger, revenge and offending behaviours, and staying away from or avoiding the person who hurts. In other words, forgiveness is the act of decreasing the negative feelings and disposition against the person who hurts or is guilty. As it can be understood in definitions, forgiveness happens at an individual and intrapersonal level.

From an **interpersonal level,** forgiveness is forgiving a person who hurts or harms. When the party who is harmed forgives, then the person who harmed receives undeserved apology. Thus, both of parties or one of the parties move from a negative situation to a positive one and the relationship is characterized by reconciliation (Paul, 2009). Aquino and others (2003) define intrapersonal forgiveness as a relational process during which the person who is damaged copes with the negative feelings of rage, anger and hostility against the guilty person, starts to show understanding towards the guilty and avoids hurting the guilty. In other

words, such a change in feelings, behaviours and opinions has an intrapersonal characteristic and is formed not suddenly but it rather extends over a period of time. This process does not only involve the change of behaviour, opinion and feeling at an individual level of a person who is hurt but also includes a shift to a positive situation in which both parties reconcile and reconstruct their relation or a shift to a neutral situation in their relation. In this context, forgiveness is assessed as an interpersonal and social process due to its interactional nature, and efforts of forming a balance, reconciliation and creating a neutral situation (Kelley & Waldron, 2006).

Forgiveness may emerge in different forms depending on whether it materializes at an intrapersonal or interpersonal level (Kelley & Waldron, 2006; Zechmeister & Romero, 2002). The types of forgiveness may vary depending on how people feel, think and what they do do when they face hurting behaviours. If a person who is hurt is not a forgiver either at an intrapersonal level or in interpersonal relations, this is called *no forgiveness*. If the person is a forgiver both at an intrapersonal level and interpersonal relations, it is a *total forgiveness* situation. When the person is a forgiver at an intrapersonal level but not a forgiver in interpersonal relations, it is a *silent forgiveness* situation. Finally, if the person is a forgiver interpersonal relations but not a forgiver at intrapersonal level, then it is a *hollow forgiveness* (Baumeister, Exline & Sommer, 1998). In cases of **no forgiveness,** the person who is hurt does not forgive the person who harms at the intrapersonal level, does not forget the incident and shows to the other party that he did not forgive. **Total forgiveness** brings reconciliation with the hurting person. In this type, the person who is hurt puts an end to his sadness and rage against the guilty person and makes the person who hurt him feel this or shows him this by the behaviours. In such a case, relationship may go back to the situation it was in the beginning or even if the relationship does not go back to normal, the person who hurt gives up feeling guilty as he will be aware of the good intention of the person who is hurt. In **silent forgiveness,** the person ends the feelings of rage and hostility against the person who harmed him but he does not explicitly express this. Not showing through verbal means and body language that one has forgiven would not create an effect on the person who harmed, and therefore there is only a small possibility that the behaviours of the person who harmed will change. Another point that needs to be emphasized is that in such a situation, there is not a tendency for compromising between parties at an interpersonal level. **Hollow forgiveness** describes the situation in which interpersonal forgiving occurs regardless of the intrapersonal forgiving attitude. In this case, the person who is hurt does not forgive but the person who hurt thinks that he has been forgiven and therefore, it makes it possible for the relationship to continue.

Forgiveness is an important topic that needs to be focused at **organisational level** by both institutional theorists and managers. **Organisational forgiveness** adopts a positive and forward-looking perspective for the future of organisation and it is a process of materializing a transformation through forgiving and a process of helping individuals implement this transformation (Cameron & Caza, 2002). Forgiveness in organisations provides the individual with the opportunity of reconstructing the relations and coping with the negative emotions and ideas arising from interpersonal damages (Aquino et al., 2003). When people face with an offending behaviour or mistakes in the organisations they work, such acts may bear detrimental consequences for the maintenance of organisational relations. Forgiving provides an important exit in coping with these negative results (Paul, 2009). Forgiveness which is seen as a reaction against interpersonal hurting behaviours in organisation and the reconciliation education following this are perceived as alternatives to revenge or maintaining the anger (Palanski, 2011). In institutions in which a person faces injustice and a mistake, leaders seek different solutions to restore the organisation and to provide and increase

positive energy and efficiency. Forgiving is accepted as an effective mechanism in reaching such conclusions (Cameron, 2014).

Researchers also studied effect of forgiveness on organisational operation. Stanton (2011) prepared a counselling programme about forgiveness for the employees in a medical centre and the program showed to be successful in improving the performances of employees. Law (2013) argues that forgiving help employees work in a more harmonious and fruitful in organisations and it also motivates individuals and positively support their job performances. Lagzian, Kafashpor, Mansourian & Farhadinejad (2013) argues that forgivers in organisations have higher level of physical health, spiritual peace and adaptability. Researchers looking into positive effects of forgiving on different levels of organisation found out that forgiveness lead positive results in issues such as focusing on collaboration at organisational level, development of honour in organisation, respect for human values, flexibility and improving social trust culture.

The concept of forgiving and its relation with organisations is a topic that is not being studied much in in Turkey. There only few studies and these do not look into the topic in education organisations. A study conducted with 290 employees in various public and private organisation (Akın, Özdevecioğlu & Ünlü, 2012) showed that dispositions of forgiving have a positive and meaningful impact on employees' mental health. The study of Yılmaz (2014) in five star hotel managements in Izmir determined that there is a negative relationship between perceptions of victimisation among employees and forgiving dispositions. The study conducted with 436 teachers by Sarıçam, Çardak & Yaman (2014) showed that there is a negative but a meaningful relation between mobbing and forgiveness behaviours. This issue has not been studied within the education organisations in Turkey so far. Therefore, studying this issue together with the concepts of organisational climate, organisational culture, organisational justice and related concepts will scientifically contribute to the knowledge in this field. The forgiving types of employees in school organisations, the level of forgiveness and the person whom they forgive are topics that should be researched.

Teachers try to materialise main aims of school with school managers, students and parents who are the fundamental components of school community. In doing so, teachers may face various problems with these people during. The act of forgiveness may play an important role in overcoming these problems without causing organisational conflicts. Therefore, it is necessary to research how teachers forgive the problems they experience with other people in order to understand the effectiveness of organisational operation. The main aim of this research is to find out teachers' types of forgiveness and to discuss the organisational reflection drawing from the incidents primary school teachers experience at school. Thus, the research seeks to answer two following questions:

1) What type of forgiveness teachers prefer when they experience a hurting incident at school?

2) What sort of consequences can teachers' type of forgiveness bear in operation of schools?

2.Method

In this study qualitative research design is used to find out teachers' types of forgiveness.

2.1. Study Group

The participants of this research are five primary school teachers who were working in the same school in Samsun during 2013-2014 academic year. The negative and hurting incidents teachers experienced with their school managers, students, parents and other teachers during their service were taken into consideration in selection of teachers to be interviewed. In other

words, not experiencing a problem with any of these groups played a role in not selecting teachers into study group. The study group was determined by criterion sampling which is one of the methods of purposive sampling. The selection criterion for this study was that teachers in their relations with four different groups should experience an incident, which harmed them, and which required forgiveness.

2.2. Data Collection and Analysis

To determine the types of forgiveness of teachers, teachers were asked if they experienced any unpleasant events with school managers, parents, students or with other teachers that harmed them; only the teachers who experienced such an event separately with each of this group are selected. Only five teachers were identified who had experienced such an incident with all groups. The aim of the study was explained to teachers and they were asked whether they would want to participate in the research. The teachers were asked to tell a case they experienced with these groups. A separate interview was held with each participant and thus "interaction effect" was prevented. The case studies were noted down and additional questions were asked during the interviews to elaborate on case studies if they were not clear enough. The written notes were read to teachers after the interview and their approval was received. Each teacher told about 4 different cases and in total 20 exemplary case studies.

The participants were given following codes and pseudonyms in data analysis: T1, T2, T3, T4 and T5. Then, the noted transcripts were read a few times. This is followed by a categorization of transcripts of each participants as "incidents experienced with students", "incidents experienced with parents", incidents experienced with managers" and "incidents experienced with other teachers." Descriptive analysis was used to analyse of each incident. Table 1 presents **types of forgiveness matrix** to show types of forgiveness of teachers. This matrix is formed by using **two variables** such as ending the resentment and anger at intrapersonal level and expressing that one has forgiven the person who hurt (interpersonal level). The sign of "x" in the table indicates that the person did not show forgiveness behaviour in that level whereas the sign of check stands for the display of forgiveness in the related level.

Table 1. *Types of forgiveness matrix*

Level of forgiveness / Types of Forgiveness	Intrapersonal (individual level)	Interpersonal (dyad or interpersonal level)
No forgiveness	x	x
Total forgiveness	✓	✓
Silent forgiveness	✓	x
Hollow forgiveness	x	✓

The types of forgiveness teachers showed in the incidents are coded based on the attitudes they displayed at the end of the incident. Coding was done separately by the researchers. Researchers calculated the agreement percentage by using Miles and Huberman's reliability formula. The agreement between the coders was calculated as 82%. This percentage shows that the research is reliable.

3.Findings

The research findings were obtained through analysis of incidents teachers experienced with students, school managers, parents and other teachers at school. Analysis helped us identify the forgiveness types. Reflections of these on the way school operates were analysed.

3.1. Teachers' Types of Forgiveness

Below, teachers' different types of forgiveness based on their experiences are presented.

3.1.1. Types of forgiveness in the incidents teachers experienced with *students*

When each case told by teachers was analysed, it could be seen that teachers warned students in case of disobedience to rules and if students did not take this warning into consideration and displayed disobedient behaviours, these behaviours can be argued to hurt teachers.

T1: *During the class one of my students' mobile phone rang, I warned him and asked him to give the phone to me. But he insulted me. His parents came and apologized. For the first time, I forgave him quite reluctantly after the request of the parent. After I forgave him, there were positive changes in students' behaviours and attitudes. When we were saying goodbye to students in the last school day of the academic year, he approached embarrassingly and said: "I have been disrespectful to you, Please forgive me and give your blessings." I really forgave him when he said me this. I do not regret forgiving him. I am happy that I forgave him. I feel myself better.*

T2: *One of my students was using slang words when talking with his friends in school garden, I warned him. A week later, I realized that my car had a flat tire and tires were cut. After I investigated, I found out that he was responsible for damaging my tires. His parent kindly asked me to forgive him and I did so and he did not get any punishment. Then, student apologized yet it was not a sincere one. So, I did not genuinely forgive because I did not see a maturity and an embarrassment in his behaviours. Even if I did not forgive him, there was nothing to do. The school management did not do anything about it and did not want to deal with legal procedures. I forgave reluctantly just to please the parent. Indeed, I did not forgive him and could not get over this incident. It affected me a lot.*

T3: *I was on duty that day. Some students were also expected to be on duty but one of them was not there and I asked that student to join his friends for duty. He attacked me. His friends helped him by holding my arms tightly. After I was beaten up, I forgave neither students nor others. No one apologized anyway. I was psychologically affected, I could not go to school for a while and some other health problems appeared. Nothing happened to student. To be honest, I would like student to be punished but nothing could be done because it was a student with learning difficulties. It was a very bitter experience for me. I never forgave the student. Even now while I am talking about this incident, I go back to those days. It was an incident that put me off from working as a teacher.*

T4: *It was time for class. I warned one of the students to go into class. That student complained about me to his parent at home and accused me of applying physical violence to him. Then, he came and apologized. There was a change in his behaviours after the apology because he was feeling embarrassed and whenever he saw me; he understood that what he did was wrong. He became more interested in my class. I could feel that he was feeling embarrassed even when he was looking into my eyes and he was trying to overcome this embarrassment by actively participating into my class. Therefore, I took this incident easily*

and I did not develop hatred or feel like taking revenge. I forgave. He was like other students for me.

T5: *I was invigilating an exam and I saw that one of the students was cheating. I wanted to take his exam paper but he threw the paper and left the class. Then, he apologized. I forgave him when he apologized and there was a change in his behaviours after the apology. It did not happen again. I was relieved that the incident resulted in this way and the student's behaviours improved.*

When these incidents were analysed, it can be seen that three teachers (T1, T4 ve T5) totally forgave the students who apologized after their hurting behaviours. Upon forgiving the students, it can be understood that teachers felt good and relieved and their relations with those students were normalized. It could be argued that in the forgiving behaviours of teachers, the genuine and sincere apology of students and the display of positive changes in their behaviour played an important role. Decrease in teachers' anger in due course can also be said to be effective in these behaviours. Another important point is that when teachers displayed forgiveness behaviour, the situation resulted in favour of both them and students.

Moreover, there are a number of important incidents in schools that teachers did not forgive. For instance, two teachers (T2 and T3) did not forgive the students who applied physical violence irrespective of whether students apologized or not. It can be argued that ignorance of school management about behaviours of violence played a role. It can be said that teachers who did not display forgiveness may still be under the effect or influence of the incident. Kerns (2009) expressed in his research that forgiving has a positive impact on job satisfaction, physical health and happiness and forgiveness eases the psychological recovery by reducing stress. It could be seen that teachers who genuinely forgave feel peaceful and do not experience any negative feelings in the workplace. On the other hand, it can be understood that performance of teachers who were not forgivers were affected by the experienced incidents and they even felt alienated from their profession.

3.1.2. Types of forgiveness in the incidents teachers experienced with *parents*

When incidents teachers experienced with parents were analysed, it could be seen that students mostly reflected the problems they faced in school to their parents and parents usually came to school upon this. The problems faced by parents can be summarized as follows:

T1: *There was a student who was constantly causing a problem in the class. I warned him a few times in the class. He told this situation to his parent differently. The parent came to school with the idea that "the teacher gives a hard time to my kid." We quarrelled with the parent and she was disrespectful to me. I felt very sad. However, after she listened to the situation both from me and from other teachers, she apologized. Then, she started to come to school regularly to see if anything can be done about the student. Then, everything returned back to normal.*

T2: *I had a girl who constantly spoke and giggled in the class. I told her to act like a lady and she told this very differently at home. Upon this, her brother came, he was very angry and he literally challenged me. I felt resented by his words. When he learned the actual story, he apologized to me. Then, the student also felt embarrassed about what she did. I forgave. In the end the brother was also young and uneducated. So, there may have been a misunderstanding.*

T3: *A parent came to warn a student for the rude words the student uttered to her child. Is such a thing possible? We are also responsible for safety of children at school. We quarrelled with the parent. She said she only wanted to talk to that student but I did not allow her to do*

so. Then, she uttered rude words to me. I got disappointed. She was such an inconsiderate person. I asked her to leave since I had to go to class. I did not make a big deal about it and the parent did not apologize. We have serious cultural differences in our parent profile so I could understand her. I am OK with the student but I have always tried to avoid the parent.

T4: *A parent came to school to complain that the projects done in the class were very difficult and the materials used for them were very expensive. Then, the parent nagged and told me that I was inconsiderate. I felt sad. Then, it was understood that the student was doing projects at home for pleasure and then was telling his parent that the projects were asked by the teacher. So, he constantly made the parent buy something. When the parent found out this, she apologized. I did not make a big deal because the parent believed the child's words when he said that the teacher asked for the projects. We did not experience the same thing again.*

T5: *The student had severe behaviour and failure problems and I warned him. Then the parent came and told me that his child did not want to come into my class. He questioned my teachership and uttered rude words to me. Then we talked with the teacher who was responsible for that class. Then, it was understood that student did not come to school many days without his parents' knowledge. When the parent listened to other teachers, he apologized. I was relieved that everything came into light.*

Except for one (T3), all teachers indicated that students reflected and told the incidents at school differently to their parents and once parents understood the truth, they apologized to teachers. Teachers expressed that they totally forgave the parents (total forgiveness) and felt relieved afterwards. This finding shows that teachers display forgiving behaviours if the person who does wrong apologizes and the incident is not repeated again. Thus, teachers feel relieved. On the other hand, T3 justifies the cause of incident with the low educational level of parents. It could be understood that despite the rude and hurting words of the parent and unapologetic attitude, the teacher showed understanding and ended the negative feelings at an intrapersonal level. Moreover, teacher's explanation shows that she did not mention this to the parent, so it could be thought that teacher showed silent forgiveness. It could be seen that the problems teachers face with parents results from the problems they experience with students at schools. These problems were generally solved when parents saw that teacher was right and apologized to them. It could be seen that teachers forgave parents and thus they did not make something out of nothing.

3.1.3. Types of forgiveness in the incidents teachers experienced with *other teachers*

The problems teachers faced with *other teachers* are not only school related but they also involve personal problems. These problems can be summarized as follows:

T1: *My friend made students imitate me and then he was telling this to our colleague to make fun. He told this in teachers' room as if it was something pleasant. First, I also laughed but then I felt disappointed. I said "Are you dealing with such things in class instead of teaching? It is not pleasant at all. You decrease the respectability of teachers." She apologized once she realized that I did not like it. She told me that I would enjoy it. I could see that she felt really sad. I forgave.*

T2: *In every celebration at school, we, as the branch teachers, are very active but primary school teachers are not doing much. They even don't want to deliver a speech. Our workload is increasing and we don't have much time for other activities. It is very unjust to assign work to the same teachers all the time. This created a problem at school. Upon this, there was a big discussion among teachers. Some teachers uttered rude words to us. No one talked to*

each other for a long while. Then, it was agreed that tasks would be distributed equally to everyone and the problem was solved. Resentments were forgotten. We are ok now.

T3: *I had an excuse and kindly asked one of my colleagues to invigilate in my exam. This friend let students cheat and also provided the answers of some questions. I repeated the exam. I also got mad at her as she fooled me. I also said this to her. She apologized and said that she did so because she felt pity for students. But I had to repeat the exam. It caused me more workload. My anger did not last a lot. We are good now but I can never ask such a thing from her again.*

T4: *There is a committee in our school who is responsible from buying presents to staff on special days. We had a small discussion upon seeing that this committee arbitrarily bought presents and sometimes they did not buy presents for certain people and made excuses for this. We abolished the committee and the problem was solved. One friend from the committee spoke a bit harsh to me so I am not talking with him anymore. I will never speak. He is a primary school teacher and I am a branch teacher, so we don't need to talk each other. He really hurt me.*

T5: *We had a problem with a colleague of mine about allocation of courses. The school managers backed him. This was unfair. I did not discuss about it with my colleague. I did not say anything about it. During the year, he was sarcastic to me a few times. I was angry at him for the entire year. He also became part of this injustice. I am still angry. We are not talking at all.*

The problems between teachers are thought to result from both formal and informal relations. Yet, most teachers (T1, T2 and T3) remarked that they talked about the problems they faced with their friends. Although most of these talks were hurting, the problems were solved. The apology of teachers who hurt or the fair solutions of school managers resulted in teachers' forgiving the people who hurt them (total forgiveness). Apology and fair decisions can be argued to play a meaningful role in ending the resentments among teachers. When the persons who have harmed other individuals do not apologize or when the person who is hurt feels that the school management treats him unfairly then these situations lead teachers who are hurt (T4 and T5) not to forgive their colleagues (no forgiveness). In summary, individuals who forgive within the organisation are more successful in solving the problem and have inner peace whereas individuals who do not display forgiveness can be argued to experience problems in accessing inner peace.

3.1.4. Types of forgiveness in the incidents teachers experienced with *school managers*

The problems teachers experience with school managers involves permission request, course programme, duties and responsibilities. The problems they face with school management can be summarized as follows:

T1: *When there were new regulations about the dress codes, our principal was frequently commenting on what we should wear and what we should not wear. When he was saying all these, as a principal, he was not even wearing a tie. I criticized this situation. I told him that there was freedom about the dress code and he cannot just tell us what to wear. Then we had a discussion and some other friends also involved in it. A year passed and I did not forgive the principal. His attitude was not nice. It did not affect my performance and I was keeping a distance from him. I did not talk to him unless I had to.*

T2: *I was not going to attend annual meeting due to my health problems but the principal started to criticize me without even saying get well soon. He said that I was a new teacher and therefore I needed to attend this meeting. He reluctantly gave permission. I felt sad. I*

seemed as if I was a teacher who was avoiding my duties. I did not talk much with him after this incident.

T3: *The principal was assigning a duty to me in every meeting for years. He was excusing other teachers by saying that they have babies or they could not undertake such a task. When I told him that this was unfair, he got angry and reprimanded me. He said unpleasant words. He is discriminating. I started to feel myself like a dump after a while. I am not talking him to at all unless I have to.*

T4: *I came to my morning duty early in the morning. There was no one at school and we decided to have tea with other colleagues who were on duty. The principal assistant came and talked as if he was reprimanding us. We got disappointed but we did not say a word out of courtesy. After that incident, we did not talk except from exchanging hellos. What he did was quite wrong, I witnessed that he also treated other teachers in the same way. Then I realized that this person was not liked in the school. While he had an authoritarian attitude and approach towards staff the teachers would not obey to what he was saying.*

T5: *I was assigned to another school but I was also planning to teach in my school. The school manager distributed the courses to the other teachers at school. I was feeling tired since I was going to another school and I was also teaching very few classes in my school. I was unjustly treated. The school managers were a bit unfair to me both in terms of material and psychological terms. When I voiced this concern, next term they even scheduled a worse teaching programme. This situation affected my performance and psychology a lot. I never forgave them. We are not talking anyway.*

It could be understood from the explanations that all teachers displayed no forgiveness attitude in the problems experienced by school managers. Teachers expressed that they lost their trust in school management and they were seeing the school manager only when they had to. It could be understood that teachers kept a distance from the school managers and they hardly talked with them except when they had to discuss important issues. This situation negatively affects the performance, psychology of employee and organisation climate. It is known that forgiving plays an important role in improving relations and creating a positive interaction between people at the workplace (Struthers, Dupuis & Eaton, 2005). The results of the research that Akın, Özdevecioğlu & Ünlü (2012) carried out in different private and public sectors show that there is a meaningful and positive relation between the forgiving others and mental health. In addition, the study also revealed that there is a meaningful and negative relation between mental health and intentions of revenge. In this case, unlike their relations with other groups, teachers displayed a stricter attitude towards the school managers.

3.2. The Possible Consequences of Teachers' Types of Forgiveness on School Organisation

Mistakes and hurting behaviours in organisations may cause problems that could create difficulties for organisational operation and affect interpersonal relations and lead dismissal. They could even cause national tragedies. These mistakes can affect an individual, a family, an institution or the entire country (Madsen, Gygi, Hammond & Plowman, 2009). In such situations, there could be dispositions such as seeking revenge or not tolerating the mistake as a counter response. These reactions not only make the individual and the others sad but also damage the relations. These behaviours were effective in the case of individuals seeking revenge if the individuals who harmed continued to make a mistake. Replying to these negative reactions by forgiving rather than by acting aggressively or acting in a way that could damage the relations is a much stronger behaviour. Forgiveness does not mean

compromising with the guilty person or with the one who makes the mistake, and overlooking the incident. Forgiveness means reducing and stopping the urge of harming or avoiding mistakes and anger. The person who benefits the most from forgiveness is the forgiver and this reaction positively affects the efficiency in the organisation (Kerns, 2009). In this respect, the act of forgiving within the organisation will positively affect both the individual and the organisation.

According to Bradfield and Aquino (1999), the experienced incident is important in determining whether employee will display forgiveness or revenge as a reaction to organisational injustice. Several researchers indicated that there are some situations which ease the process of forgiving. These situations are related to the individuals' intentions, the level of intimacy with the harmed party, apology or the feeling of regret from the person who hurt, the severity of the mistake, personal characteristics, social conditions, whether the hurt party is still harmed, and the attitudes of other people (Gauché & Mullet, 2005; Kamat, Jones & Row, 2006; Sastre, Vinsonneau, Neto & Mullet, 2003; Molden & Finkel, 2010). The differences in teachers' disposition of forgiveness may result from any of the aforementioned reasons.

When research findings are looked into in terms of forgiveness types (total forgiveness, no forgiveness, silent forgiveness and hollow forgiveness), it could be seen that teachers displayed 10 for total forgiveness, 9 for no forgiveness and 1 for silent forgiveness behaviours (Table 2).

Teachers did not forgive the incident that hurt them at an intrapersonal level yet they did not show hollow forgiveness which means that they did not pretend to have forgiven the persons who harmed them. It can be argued that teachers generally display forgiveness behaviours. This result is important for organisational life. Cameron and Caza (2002) define organisational forgiveness as the capacity of collectively abandoning the rightful pain and resentment and indicate that positive and forward looking effort will form a good foundation to face the possible negative situations in the future with courage.

Table 2. *Teachers' different forgiving behaviours related to various groups*

Teacher Code	Students	Parents	Other teachers	School managers
T1	Total forgiveness	Total forgiveness	Total forgiveness	No forgiveness
T2	No forgiveness	Total forgiveness	Total forgiveness	No forgiveness
T3	No forgiveness	Silent forgiveness	Total forgiveness	No forgiveness
T4	Total forgiveness	Total forgiveness	No forgiveness	No forgiveness
T5	Total forgiveness	Total forgiveness	No forgiveness	No forgiveness

When variables affecting teachers' types of forgiveness are looked into, the behaviour of apology affects the type of forgiveness. When the incidents in which teachers totally forgave (total forgiveness) were analysed, in 9 out of 10 incidents, the person who hurt apologized. In that one incident, despite there was no direct apology due to intervene of school management, the teacher still displayed total forgiveness. In one of the cases in which teacher did not forgive at all, the person who hurt apologized superficially and reluctantly and therefore apology did not seem genuine to the teacher. These results reveal that genuine and sincere apology positively affects teachers' behaviour of forgiveness and teachers prefer total forgiveness in such a case. Enright & Coyle (1998) think that genuine forgiveness is showing mercy to the person who hurt and renouncing the right of retaliation. Apology, in this respect, led teachers to display total forgiveness.

Another variable that affects the type of forgiveness that teachers show is the **perception** of the hurt person about the severity level of the harming behaviour. Teachers do not forgive if they think that the incidents involved "fight, insult and violence." For instance, the reason why two teachers (T2 and T3) did not forgive the students was the violent behaviours. Violence causes a broken relationship between two parties (Sells & Hargrave, 1998) and it deeply affects the life of the person who was exposed to violence for a long time (Hammond & Madsen, 2008). Severe offenses may lead to irreversible results both at a personal level and in the work environment. This situation will negatively affect the classroom atmosphere in which teacher meets students and works collaboratively for an aim.

Teachers did not forgive the school managers in all the incidents experienced with them. The reasons for this can be found in the unapologetic behaviour of school managers and teachers' belief that school managers act unjustly in their practices and in solving problems. Aquino, Tripp & Bies (2006) observed an interactional relationship between hierarchal position and procedural justice. According to researchers, when the person who is hurt is in a lower-position than the person who hurt and if the person who is hurt believes that the organisation will punish the person who did harm, then the person who is hurt will most probably show forgiveness. However, in this study, the managers did not get a warning or enforcement for hurting teachers. Teachers expressed that they were still offended although the incident happened long time ago. It could be argued that school managers, who are supposed to display fair and appropriate conflict management behaviour in organisations, have poor behaviours regarding how to work with other people in school environment and how to manage conflict. This situation will obstruct collaborative work of teachers and managers due to long lasting resentments. In addition, it will also prevent establishing a "forgiveness culture" in school organisation.

It is argued that in organisation where there are behaviours of forgiveness are not common, job satisfaction and performance reduces, relations are broken, negative feelings prevail, efficiency decrease and turnover intentions of employees increase (Worthington, Greer, Hook, Davis, Gartner, Jennings, Norton, Tongeren, Greer & Toussain, 2013). Teachers who did not display forgiveness expressed that they feel angry when they remember the incidents where people harmed them and that their performance and psychology was negatively influenced. Some teachers did not even want to see the people whom they did not forgive and did not interact with them unless they had to. Furthermore, teachers who showed forgiveness behaviours feel more peaceful and they do not regret forgiving the people who hurt them. Teachers who forgave students and parents said that they saw positive developments in students' behaviours and parents became more interested in their children. This situation is robust evidence that forgiving has a positive impact on individual and organisation.

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

The main finding of this research is that teachers generally forgive parents, students and colleagues, except for special situations, but they do not forgive school managers whom they hold responsible for solving conflicts at school and maintaining justice. Managers who are responsible for the performance of employees in organisations and efficiency of organisation seem unsuccessful in solving long-lasting resentments. This situation weakens the possibility of future collaboration with teachers and creates a discouraging environment that could prevent the way teachers work. Thus, it could also decrease teachers' motivation, job satisfaction, trust and high efficiency. This environment can be argued to create ethical and legal problems or it could weaken teachers' behaviours supporting education and initiatives. Yet contemporary organisation necessities and prioritizes efforts of development based on competencies and strategies for employers. To achieve this, school managers should work towards establishing a forgiveness culture at schools. In this respect, teachers and managers, being the most fundamental groups of schools, should receive education on "organisational forgiveness" both in pre-service and in-service training; such an education could work as a precautionary measure in terms of organisational health.

References

Akın, M., Özdevecioğlu, M., & Ünlü, O. (2012). Örgütlerde intikam niyeti ve affetme eğiliminin çalışanların ruh sağlıkları ile ilişkisi. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi, 45* (1), 77-97.

Aquino, K., Grover, S. L., Goldman, B., & Folger, R. (2003). When push doesn't come to shove: Interpersonal forgiveness in workplace relationships. *Journal of Management Inquiry, 12,* 209-216.

Aquino, K., Tripp, T. M., & Bies, R. J. (2001). How employees respond to personal offense: The effects of victim and offender status on revenge and reconciliation in the work place. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 52-59.

Baumeister, R. F., Exline, J. J., & Sommer, K. L. (1998). The victim role, grudge theory, and two dimensions of forgiveness. In E. L. Worthington, Jr. (Ed), *Dimensions of forgiveness* (pp. 79-104). Philadelphia: Templeton Foundation Press.

Bradfield, M., & Aquino, K. (1999). The effects of blame attributions and offender likeableness on forgiveness and revenge in the workplace. *Journal of Management, 25*(5), 607- 631.

Bright, D.S. (2005). *Forgiveness and change: begrudging, pragmatic, and transcendent responses to discomfiture ın a unionized trucking company*. Doctoral Thesis. Case Western Reserve Unıversity, Cleveland. Available at: www.proquest.com (accessed 12 October 2013).

Cameron, K., & Caza, A. (2002). Organizational and leadership virtues and the role of forgiveness. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 9*(1), 33-48.

Cameron, K.. (2014). Leadership through organizational forgiveness. Available at: www.centerforpos.org (accessed 4 August 2014).

Enright, R. D. & Coyle, C. T. (1998). Researching the process model of forgiveness within psychological interventions. In Worthington, E. L. (Ed.), *Dimensions of forgiveness* (pp. 139-161). Pennsylvania: Templeton Foudation Press.

Gauché, M., & Mullet, E. (2005). Do we forgive physical aggression in the same way that we forgive psychological harm? *Aggressive Behavior, 31*(6), 559-570.

Goodstein, J., & Aquino, K. (2010). And restorative justice for all: Redemption, forgiveness, and reintegration in organizations. *Journal of Organizational, 31*, 624–628.

Hammond, S.C., & Madsen, S. R. (2008). Forgiveness as an individual, group, and organizational competency: A literature review and comments. Available at: http://works.bepress.com/susan_madsen/81/ (accessed 12 July 2014).

Kamat, V. I., Jones, W. H., & Row, K. L. (2006). Assessing forgiveness as a dimension of personality. *Individual Differences Research, 4*(5), 322-330.

Kerns, C. (2009). Forgiveness at work: Managing the dynamics and reaping the benefits. *Kravis Leadership Institute, Leadership Review, 9*, 80-90.

Lagzian, M., Kafashpor, A., Mansourian, Y., & Farhadinejad, M. (2013). Spiritual competencies of managers: The study of forgiveness at organization in the light of Islamic teachings. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences, 5* (5): 587-593. Available at: www.irjabs.com (accessed 5 March 2014).

Law, M. (2013). Exploring forgiveness: do benevolence and revenge associate with procedural justice, workplace satisfaction and intention to leave? *International Journal of Management Sciences and Business Research, 2*(12), 167-179.

Madsen, S., Gygi, J., Hammond, S., & Plowman, S. (2009). Forgiveness as a workplace intervention: the literature and a proposed framework. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management, 10*(2), 246-262.

Molden, D. C., & Finkel, E. S. (2010). Motivation for promotion and prevention and the role of trust aand commitment in interpersonal forgiveness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46*(2), 255-268.

Palanski, M. (2011). Forgiveness and Reconciliation in the Workplace: A Multi-Level Perspective and Research Agenda. *Journal of Business Ethics, 109*(3), 275-287.

Paul, D.G. (2009). *Forgiveness at work: Exploring the relationship between justice ideologies and forgiveness in the workplace.* Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Texas, Texas.

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. (2000). *The classification of strenghts and virtues: The VIA manual* (Working paper). University of Pennsylvania.

Sarıçam, H, Çardak, M., & Yaman, E. (2014). Predictive role of forgiveness on mobbing (A Case Study for Teachers), *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences, 9*(2).

Sastre, M. T. M., Vinsonneau, G., Neto, F., Girard, M., & Mullet, E. (2003). Forgiveness and satisfaction with life. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 4*, 323-335.

Sells, J. N., & Hargrave, T. D. (1998). Forgiveness: A review of the theoretical and empirical literature. *Journal of Family Therapy, 20*, 21-33.

Stanton, A. (2011). Hospitals help employees overcome anger, bitterness. Wrangler News. Available at: www.wranglernews.com (accessed 5 March 2014).

Struthers, C. W., Dupuis, R., & Eaton, J. (2005). Promoting forgiveness among co-workers following a workplace transgression: The effects of social motivation training. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 37*(4), 299-308.

Waldron, V. R. & Kelley, D. L. (2005). Forgiving communication as a response to relational transgressions. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 22*(6), 723-742.

Worthington, E. L. (1998). *Dimensions of forgiveness: Psychological research and theological perspectives.* Philadelphia: Templeton Foundation Press.

Worthington, E. L., Greer, C., Hook, J. N., Davis, D. E., Gartner, A. L., Jennigs, D. J., Norton, L., Tongeren, D. R., Greer, T. W., & Toussain, L. (2013). Forgiveness and spirituality in organizational life: Theory, status of research, and new ideas for discovery. Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion, 7(2), 119-134. Available at: www.tandfonline.com (accessed 23 November 2013).

Yılmaz, D. (2014). Algılanan mağduriyetin affetme eğilimi ve intikam niyeti üzerindeki etkisi: konaklama işletmeleri çalışanlarına yönelik bir araştırma. *AKÜ İİBF Dergisi, 16*(1), 87-105.

Zechmeister, J. S., & Romero, C. (2002). Victim and offender accounts of interpersonal conflict; Autobiographical narratives of forgiveness and unforgiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 675-686.