ISSN 1392-0340 (Print)
ISSN 2029-0551 (Online)
https://doi.org/10.15823/p.2026.161.12

Pedagogika / Pedagogy
2026, t. 161, Nr. 1, p. 229–250 / Vol. 161 No. 1, pp. 229–250, 2026

VYTAUTO DIDŽIOJO UNIVERSITETO ŠVIETIMO AKADEMIJA

Teacher Victimisation: How Violence is Experienced in the School Setting

Asta Railienė[1], Daiva Penkauskienė[2], Valdonė Indrašienė[3], Aiste Dirzyte[4], Rugilė Bitinaitė-Motiejūnienė[5]

[1] Mykolas Romeris University, Institute of Educational Sciences and Social Work, 20 Ateities St., LT-08303 Vilnius, Lithuania, asta.railiene@mruni.eu
[2] Mykolas Romeris University, Institute of Educational Sciences and Social Work, 20 Ateities St., LT-08303 Vilnius, Lithuania, daiva.penkauskiene@mruni.eu
[3] Mykolas Romeris University, Institute of Educational Sciences and Social Work, 20 Ateities St., LT-08303 Vilnius, Lithuania, v.indrasiene@mruni.eu
[4] Mykolas Romeris University, Institute of Psychology, 20 Ateities St., LT-08303 Vilnius, Lithuania, aiste.dirzyte@mruni.eu
[5] Mykolas Romeris University, Institute of Psychology, 20 Ateities St., LT-08303 Vilnius, Lithuania, rug.bitinaite@gmail.com

Annotation. A phenomenographical study was used to examine how teachers experience violence directed at them in school. The findings identify four ways in which they experience violence, as specified through three interacting dimensional variations: the source, the form and the addressee of impact (the teacher as a professional role, as a person or both). This extends educational research on teacher victimisation by conceptualising the phenomenon through power relations and harm to the professional and/or personal identity of teachers.

Keywords: *teacher-experienced violence, teacher victimisation, manifestations of violence, workplace violence, phenomenography.*

Introduction

Teacher victimisation is a relatively new field of research that has recently attracted considerable scholarly attention. Victimisation is generally understood as a process in which an individual or a group suffers harm as a result of another person's or other

Copyright © 2026. Asta Railienė, Daiva Penkauskienė, Valdonė Indrašienė, Aiste Dirzyte, Rugilė Bitinaitė-Motiejūnienė. Published by Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

people's actions – most often criminal or aggressive behaviour. The harm may be physical, psychological, social or economic (Gušauskienė et al., 2025). Victimisation therefore encompasses not only the moment of an actual event (a violent act) but also the entire process of lived experiences, consequences and social recognition (or lack of recognition). From a psychological perspective, subjective experience is crucial: how an individual interprets an event; what meaning they attribute to it; how it affects one's identity, self-esteem, relationships and agency (Chacón-Cuberos et al., 2018). Importantly, victimisation research highlights the role of power: victimisation occurs where there is a real or perceived power asymmetry, in which one party holds a greater amount of formalised or informal power than the other (Noret et al., 2018). In the case of teachers, this may manifest as parental pressure through complaints, administrative control, students' display of "collective power," or excessive demands stemming from the education system that increase the vulnerability of teachers. Accordingly, teacher victimisation is defined as a process in which teachers experience physical, psychological, sexual, or other forms of harm that are directly related to their professional role and work environment (Zhao, 2024).

Empirical studies emphasise direct links between teacher victimisation and professional burnout, manifested in emotional exhaustion, depressive symptoms and reduced occupational productivity (Moon & McCluskey, 2020; Moon et al., 2023; Berkowitz, 2025; Yang et al., 2024; Stilwell et al., 2025). The more severe the victimisation – particularly workplace bullying among staff and verbal victimisation perpetrated by students – the lower the level of life satisfaction experienced by teachers (Dirzyte et al., 2024). Teacher victimisation has not only individual but also systemic consequences: it adversely affects the educational process, weakens interactions between students and teachers as well as among colleagues, and thereby contributes to the formation of a negative school microclimate (Stilwell et al., 2025).

Recent research further indicates that teachers' perceptions of violence and their interpretations of these experiences may influence their well-being and responses to victimisation. Findings suggest that subjective meaning-making processes play a decisive role in how victimisation is experienced and internalised (Bitinaite et al., 2025) and that effective prevention of violence against teachers, as well as support for victimised teachers, should align with teachers' own understanding of what constitutes unacceptable behaviour and harm (Erskine et al., 2023; Sigad, 2024; Lang et al., 2025). Accordingly, teacher victimisation should be examined as a specific form of workplace violence (in a school context) that encompasses objective violent acts, subjective experiences and the meanings teachers attribute to these acts. In this article, teacher victimisation is used as an umbrella concept to describe harmful behaviours and actions experienced by teachers within the school ecosystem and the meanings attributed to these experiences. The term 'violence' against 'teachers' or 'teacher-experienced

violence' is used to denote the teacher victimisation experiences identified in the study, which are analysed as different ways of experiencing violence in a school context.

To summarise the points made above, research on teacher victimisation is relatively new and existing studies primarily focus on frequencies, predictors and outcomes of teacher victimisation. Relatively little attention has been paid to the qualitative meanings teachers assign to experiences of violence and to the different ways such experiences are constituted. So, although teacher victimisation has been widely examined in relation to these aspects, little is known about the qualitatively different ways in which teachers experience violence directed at them in school settings. It was used to focus on violence experienced by students, while teachers have been forgotten about. However, this issue is becoming increasingly relevant among educators as well. This study fills this gap by helping to reveal the qualitatively different ways in which Lithuania's teachers experience violence directed at them in a school setting. This study sheds light on lived experiences, which in turn helps to better understand the concept of victimisation itself. The guiding research question is: 'How do teachers experience violence directed at them within the school context?'

Research methodology

To reveal how teachers experience violence in schools, a phenomenographical approach was employed. This approach was chosen because it aligns with the research objective and the central question – how violence against teachers manifests in the school context and what variations characterise these manifestations. Phenomenography aims to identify qualitatively different ways of conceptualising and experiencing a phenomenon, to describe variations of experience and to establish relationships among them (Marton, 1994). Conceptualisation differences are explained by the fact that people's relationships with the world and their lived experiences also differ (Lepp & Ringsberg, 2002). Accordingly, our study focused on identifying qualitatively distinct experiences of violence against teachers in a school setting. We collected and analysed the data, organised it into categories, described the results and developed the outcome that represented the full spectrum of experiences identified within the dataset.

Participants. The study was conducted in Lithuania and included teachers working in Lithuanian general education schools. This national educational context is important for interpreting the findings, as teachers' experiences of victimisation are embedded in the specific institutional and cultural conditions of Lithuanian schools. The study involved 27 teachers selected through purposive sampling. The main inclusion criterion was having personally experienced workplace violence. Participants represented different school levels (from primary to upper-secondary school), subject areas (humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, technologies, and arts), professional qualification

categories and diverse locations (urban and regional settings). Their ages ranged from 26 to 59 years, and their teaching experience ranged from 1 to 38 years. Both male and female teachers participated. This diversity enabled us to capture a broad range of experiences and multiple aspects of the phenomenon under investigation (Trigwell, 2000; Larson & Holmstrom, 2007). Data collection was discontinued once it became evident that the data were sufficient to answer the research questions and to adequately highlight the phenomenon.

Data collection. Semi-structured interviews were conducted remotely via MS Teams (duration: 45–75 minutes). The audio of the interviews was recorded and transcribed using automated transcription, after which the transcripts were checked by the researchers.

Data analysis. The analysis followed a phenomenographical second-order perspective (Marton, 1994), focusing not on violence itself, but on the qualitatively different ways teachers experienced and understood violence. Categories of description were developed inductively through iterative comparison of meaning units. The final outcome space was constructed by identifying structural relationships among categories and dimensions of variation. Data analysis followed the stages proposed by Larson and Holmstrom (2007): repeated reading, identification of meaning units, initial descriptions, grouping into categories, establishing relationships among categories and dimensions of variation, and constructing the outcome space.

Ethical considerations. The study adhered to key ethical principles, including confidentiality, voluntary participation, and validation of the data through member checking. The study received ethical approval from the Scientific Committee of the Lifelong Learning Laboratory at Mykolas Romeris University (Protocol No. 10-79 2.25 E-403) on February 25, 2025, ensuring compliance with ethical research standards.

Results

Data analysis revealed that teachers experience violence in the following forms: (A) belittlement/humiliation; (B) blame; (C) pressure; (D) non-transparent decision-making; (E) threats; (F) aggression; (G) verbal abuse/insults; (H) being ignored; (I) exclusion from the community; (J) emotional outbursts; (K) property damage. The first seven experiences (A–G) were mentioned most frequently and were therefore assigned to the dominant categories of meaning, whereas the remaining four (H–K) were classified as non-dominant since they were only reflected in single experiences.

Dominant categories

Violence experienced as belittlement/humiliation (A) is one of the categories with the most extensive breadth of meaning. It encompasses the devaluation of professionalism,

authority and achievements, as well as the belittling/humiliation of the person. Devaluation of achievements and authority (in verbal form) is experienced as coming from school leadership, whereas devaluation of professionalism and the person, as well as humiliation, is reported as originating from leadership, colleagues, and students.

Devaluing professionalism (A1) is expressed through the ongoing control by the school administration, negative evaluations of observed lessons, restriction of duties due to alleged "incompetence," or a general devaluation of one's work: *"Those lessons were graded with zeros <...> we laughed that we were completely incompetent, unqualified. <...> In other words, we are all "unqualified", and it's unclear what we are even doing in that job. Well, in short, they belittle us in every possible way <...> as unqualified, incapable <...>"* [TDA5]. Teachers do not consider a classroom visit by the school principal to be harmful when it has been discussed and agreed upon in advance. However, the presence of the principal in a lesson without there being any clear reason – especially when they engage in unrelated activities – is experienced as harmful: *"<...> [the school principal] sits in the lesson and plays on the phone the entire time and probably doesn't even really see what is happening in the class. I feel foolish <...> students ask me why he came – he was playing on his phone the whole lesson."* [TDB2]. Teachers also report that a school principal can enter the classroom at any time, "*listen at the door,"* or, without giving warning to the teacher, observe one teacher's lessons throughout the year *"from September to June"* [TDD8]. Devaluation of professionalism is also evident in the unjustified public disparagement of a teacher's work – for example, when a principal publicly states that *"it would be better if [the experts observing lessons] didn't come to you <...>, better they go to you [another teacher] instead"* [TDD8]. Such evaluations are not supported by arguments: it is decided *a priori* who among the teachers is a good employee and who is not. Teachers describe professionalism as being devalued by parents as constant monitoring, like being *"in a field of continuous surveillance"* [TDD7] where parents repeatedly track *"what you teach, how you teach, why you teach like that"* [TDA1] and even instruct teachers on "*how to communicate, how to approach their child"* [TDB1]. This creates ongoing tension and stress. Such instances are treated as devaluing teachers' professionalism because they involve open doubt and leave teachers feeling that they must continually justify the decisions that they have made.

Devaluing authority (A2) is always experienced publicly. It takes the form of public accusations made by the school principal in front of colleagues or students that the teacher is failing to fulfil his/her duties: *"While I was in one classroom assigning work, the students in the other classroom were supposed to do the task that had been given to them earlier, and the principal walking in the corridor saw that the students in that room, where I wasn't present, were not working, <...> making noise. She came to me <...> and in front of my students, her tone was raised, and it was all about what a mess this is, how can you not manage it now? <…> I also felt that unfair accusation – I wasn't the one who made those schedule changes, I couldn't be in two places at the same*

time." [TDD3]. Teachers' authority is also undermined through public criticism about unfinished tasks when it is done by *"thanking some <…> and subtly reminding others"* [TDA2] about incomplete work, thereby indirectly highlighting who the "bad ones" are. Even when teachers acknowledge limits in their knowledge or lack of experience, they still experience authority devaluation as violence because they do not take it as a personal comment but as public humiliation; regaining authority is perceived as an extremely difficult, if not impossible, task.

Devaluing achievements (A3) involves downplaying – or even appropriating – teachers' work and accomplishments. For example, when the school receives strong external evaluation results, instead of being thanked, teachers receive a warning that they will be monitored even more closely *"so that the bar doesn't drop"* [TDD8]. Teachers seeking a higher qualification category are described as having *"sticks put in their wheels"* [TDA8]: the start of the certification process is delayed, and part of the completed work is appropriated, with the school principal saying, *"this is my work"* [TDA8].

Belittling/humiliation of the person (A4) is expressed through disparagement based on personal characteristics, such as traits relating to character, appearance, or age. It is experienced both from the administration and from colleagues, for instance via biting remarks referring to a young teacher's age: *"probably the children don't listen to you because you're so young"* [TDD4]. References to a particular physical feature are experienced as hurtful and absurd, creating an unpleasant work environment in which one *"doesn't want to work"* [TDD3]. Although such personally humiliating incidents are not frequent, they are evaluated as especially unpleasant because the focus is not on professional qualities but on the teacher's personal attributes. Teachers who experience this report that, in a sense, they feel dehumanised.

Experiencing violence as blame (B) is expressed through parents' complaints about a teacher's work with a child (how the teacher teaches and assesses the student) (B1) and through reproaching teachers for insufficient knowledge (B2).

Blame in the form of parents' complaints about a teacher's work with a child (B1) appears in the form of a reproach that the teacher is investing too little effort and attention in the student. These reproaches are voiced in direct communication with the teacher (*"I'm unable to motivate the child"* [TDD2]) and through complaints to school administration (*"in contemporary pedagogy this is unacceptable <...> the teacher does not respect the child"* [TDD2]). Such blame often takes the form of recurring reproaches and attacks and may develop into a long-term conflict that creates sustained tension for the teacher: *"I had one very ugly conflict with a mother who simply could not understand that the child really had very serious problems. <...> There were all kinds of talk and complaints, and it didn't matter that in the end everything became clear, <...> but still our relationship never developed to a normal level <...> it was truly a very unpleasant experience. It lasted three years."* [TDD2]. Teachers interpret parents' accusations as unfounded and as failing to reflect the actual situation or the efforts invested by the

teacher. Blame also takes the form of personal or public complaints about what parents perceive as being an inappropriate evaluation of the child's achievements: *"A student's parents come and say: <...> the grade is too low, you taught our daughter, and she barely had a four with you, but now she goes to a vocational school and gets a nine. So, you are undervaluing her. And now our son – you're undervaluing him as well."* [TDD7]. When students receive low grades, parents may accuse teachers of incompetence and "nasty comments are written in the gradebook" about how they do their job "*improperly*" [TDB2]. Across cases, parents' blame is experienced as a personal or public, verbal or written act directed against the teacher, accusing them of not providing adequate attention, not offering support, undervaluing the student, and failing to assess the student appropriately. Parents' accusations regarding a teacher's work with their child are experienced as a continually recurring harmful experience and are regarded not only as unfounded but also as devaluing teachers' efforts, harming their dignity and undermining their professionalism.

In all cases, verbal blame in the form of reproaches for not knowing (B2) is experienced as coming from the school administration. Teachers are blamed for asking questions too often and are reproached for not knowing, for a lack of interest, for not participating in the life of the school community and for "creating problems": *"And being told not to create problems out of nothing, when I come to a school completely new and I don't know <...> I simply don't know the system and for me to become part of the community that's a basic thing. <...> Then there are statements like, when someone asks something, they are attacked: if something doesn't suit you, then we'll talk in documents."* [TDD5]. This type of blame can be seen in the experiences of both novice and experienced teachers: teachers report that they feel guilty without being at fault, that they feel worn down and rejected and that they find it difficult to imagine continuing to work at the school.

Experiencing violence as pressure (C). In this category, pressure is experienced as attempts to: (1) push the teacher to accept an unfavourable decision; (2) make the teacher perform duties that are not part of their role; (3) require compliance with imperatively prescribed behaviour; (4) alter students' assessment results. In all of these cases, pressure is experienced as coming from the school administration and takes the form of a direct demand and imperative.

Pressure to accept an unfavourable decision for oneself as a teacher (C1) involves being pushed to voluntarily give up a previously planned share of one's workload or to take on a heavier workload, with appeals to the teacher's professional dedication – attempting to *"play on your conscience, so that I give up that workload, because there are children and you have to help us, since you are now part of all of this"* [TDD3]. It is also expressed as emotional and psychological pressure to resign from a position: *"when we joined the union, there was simply this pressure from the school principal. Half an hour [they talked], <...> about how bad we are, what a negative impact we will have on*

the school, how the school will not receive certain additional grants or funding because of it, in short, that we are harming everyone, although in reality we are not harming anyone – we wanted to defend our rights" [TDB9]), to take up work at another school, or to take unpaid leave. Such pressure is exerted for the benefit of other individuals – often connected through kinship or friendship ties – or to eliminate "inconvenient" teachers who, in the leader's view, do not fit in or who oppose the leader's opinions or decisions. It is commonly justified by invoking a lack of financial resources ("*there isn't enough money"* [TDD7]) or by accusing the teacher of low engagement in community activities ("*you do nothing"* [TDD8]).

Pressure to perform tasks outside one's role (C2) refers to being compelled to carry out duties that are not directly related to teaching – managing school administration documentation, translating texts into other languages, drafting official documents, or editing their language and style. A school principal may decide to summon a teacher during vacation ("*the principal calls in the middle of summer <...> I'm cutting your vacation short, because I do what I want, I am the boss of the school and you will come in – I need you to translate a text and check the style"* [TDA8]), disregard the approaching exam period and the time the teacher needs to prepare and consult students ("*I don't care that they have an exam. I gave you a methodologist [qualification level]. And you will edit [the text] for me here"* [TDA8]) or force the teacher to work overtime ("*I never left [work] normally <...> you just work overtime and don't even try to refuse. So, I give you money, I give you lessons – don't even try to refuse. And I also gave you a methodologist."* [TDA8]).

Pressure to comply with imperatively prescribed behaviour (C3) involves school principals dictating how teachers should communicate with them and with students – in other words, how to speak and what to do. Teachers describe this pressure as grounded in a principal's narrative of *"only I know what is right"* [TDB9], delivered in a raised voice and a commanding tone: *"the school principal instructed me that now you will have to do this and that and tell your students this and that. And I said – no. <...> And then I was indeed spoken to in a raised voice. <...> I felt like a five-year-old child being shouted at because it didn't work to persuade me in some other way"* [TDA2]. Teachers interpret such interactions as a lack of professional culture, in which the teacher is positioned like an immature, unreasonable child being scolded by adults.

Pressure to adjust students' assessments/grades (C4) refers to complying with a principal's order to raise grades for students who do not merit them. Teachers interpret such insistence as unfair to all students ("*others lose motivation when they see that assessment is unfair"* [TDB8]) and as damaging to the teacher's self-respect ("*as a teacher you crush yourself – by assessing you unfairly simply humiliate yourself"* [TDB8]). At times, adequate assessment based on clear criteria is framed by school administration as "*harming students <...> then they try to press you – why did you write that, why can't they correct it <...> as if, erase the comments"* [TDA5]. Teachers experience pressure to

construct a false picture of learning progress and achievement, which distorts reality and demotivates both learners and those who teach them.

Across all cases, pressure is experienced as a demonstration of a principal's superiority and as behaviour that crosses the boundaries of professional ethics and culture. Teachers classify these experiences as harmful not only because of unfair or unlawful actions by the administration but also because they establish a school communications culture that is grounded in subservience, adaptation and exploitation. This, in turn, negatively affects not only teachers but the wider school community.

Experiencing violence as non-transparent decision-making (D) is described as originating from school administration and is expressed through (1) changes in workload and (2) the creation of unequal working conditions. This category differs from category C in that it brings together experiences of non-transparency and procedural injustice aimed at individually selected teachers rather than explicit imperatives.

Non-transparent decisions regarding changes in teachers' workload (D1) are made without justification and without consultation with staff: *"While I was ill, changes happened. The end of the first semester was approaching, and they immediately took several English groups away from me – three. I had agreed about one, but not about two. And they provide no clear basis. They say there are many complaints. What complaints? No one says; they didn't show what the complaints were about – neither in writing nor anything <...> at any time they can take lessons away from us, take groups away. It's unclear why <…>. From me, they simply took those groups. <...> To make some changes while someone is sick –no one told you anything, didn't call, didn't inform you, didn't consult. There was no communication at all."* [TDA5]. Non-transparency is also evident in the disorganised calculation of working hours. Teachers have to discover errors themselves, point them out and struggle to receive the pay they have earned: *"I analysed it myself and found that in my contract the hours were calculated in a messy way <...>. I struggled because I didn't receive that remuneration; it still feels like something else was wrong. Well, you don't understand, for example, what you are paid for and what you are not paid for."* [TDA5]. When teachers raise questions or express dissatisfaction, they are told that they are *"not a very convenient person in an established community"* [TDA2]. Teachers interpret such behaviour as an attempt to discipline them, compel acceptance of the "rules of the game," or as a potential push-out from the school.

Non-transparent decision-making also appears in teachers' experiences of unequal working conditions (D2) - some being granted more favourable conditions than others: *"I arrive the earliest and leave the latest"* [TDA8]. Teachers interpret such decisions either as punishment for non-compliance *("look, you somehow <...> didn't please [them], <...> you didn't fit into some frame, so look – others are resting now and you are now imitating work"* [TDA2]) or as a way for school administration to benefit, so that during "free periods" teachers "*do work that is useful to the administration*" [TDA8].

Overall, non-transparent decisions are consistently linked to administrative manipulation, such as making decisions without consulting on them and without honouring prior agreements. Because of the lack of openness and transparent communication, teachers feel unsafe and vulnerable and experience indirect, "hidden" harm that constrains their professional activity.

Experiencing violence as threats (E) is expressed through (1) threats of retaliation and (2) threats of punishment. During analysis, category E included only cases in which the teacher experienced an explicitly stated or implied promise of future harm or sanction. This is the key distinction between the meaning of this category and category B (blame).

Threats of retaliation (E1) are experienced both verbally and in writing, most often from parents. They are typically used to influence the assessment of their child's achievement, to secure preferential attention for their child, or to pressure teachers to testify in favour of one parent. Parents' threats related to grading are delivered in a raised voice and *"even with swear words*" [TDD7], asserting that the teacher is not doing his/her job properly and that this will not only be publicised but also lead to the teacher being removed *"that you won't work here"* [TDD9]. Threats aimed at securing exceptional attention for one's child involve demands that the child be singled out and treated as requiring special protection: *"they say, if anyone at school hurts my girl, <...>, I will take you to court. And then a report arrives from the police that they complained that something allegedly happened. Although they messaged us as if it was 'for the future.' But it is registered by the police as an incident, and all of this is investigated. Teachers go for questioning."* [TDD7]. Threats may also be indirect, functioning as intimidation with an implication of possible retaliation: *"They write you a letter and <...> the sentence that they are threatening you with doesn't appear in the letter, but next to it you see that the recipients are me, [the child's] father and a lawyer – dear, look, you are being watched. <...> and she would come to meetings not alone, but with a lawyer. And taking a teacher to court is very easy <...>."* [TDA1]. Teachers also experience threats of retaliation through pressure to testify in favour of one parent and against the other in legal disputes. In one case, teachers were summoned to court to testify against the mother in a divorce case. The mother pressured the teachers to ignore the court summons and threatened that they would *"regret it if they went to court"* [TDA1]. Whether expressed literally or figuratively – through concrete actions or by threatening to carry out such actions – parents' threats of retaliation are experienced as violent, affecting not only an individual teacher but also the life of the teaching community more broadly. Such threats shape everyday work and impact teachers' emotional, psychological and even physical well-being.

Threats to punish (E2) are experienced in verbal and written form from school administration and are fundamentally tied to everyday teaching work that administration considers to be performed "improperly." They include: threats to remove a

teacher's qualification category ("*if the indicators are bad <...> if you teach a lesson badly, I will take away your senior teacher category*" [TDD8]); threats of more classroom observations after a teacher asks administration for support in managing a large class ("*you can't handle the class, go to others, see how others do it. If not – we will soon come to observe your lessons*" [TDD8]); removal of a designated classroom after a teacher, while ill, refuses to come to work *("what are you doing, go to work <...> when I came back, my classroom was taken away. So that's the retaliation. My things were scattered around the whole school. The classroom was taken away. <...> It's revenge because you didn't come to work."* [TDA8]).

Overall, threats of punishment are linked to the administration's view of a teacher's work, but this view is not grounded in concrete facts or evidence demonstrating the teacher's ability to fulfil their duties. Instead, the threat is expressed *a priori*, as a pre-existing stance. These threats also signal a view of the teacher as a person who is not worthy of support or empathy, but rather someone to be controlled and kept compliant.

Experiencing violence as aggression (F) is expressed through students' verbal and physical acts. Physical aggression (F1) involves a student's concrete physical action, such as pushing the teacher ("*while going up the stairs, [the student] pretended to fall and hit me with a backpack"* [TDB.6]); deliberately targeting the teacher with an object ("*when you are writing, they throw some objects at the board"* [TDB7]); ("*they threw a paper ball at me*" [TDA5]); damaging classroom property ("*they flip tables, smash things*" [TDA3]); or an openly displayed intention to physically attack the teacher.

Physical aggression is consistently experienced as a sudden, unexpected event: *"He [the student] stood up, took my textbook – and tore it up. I have no idea where he got so much strength. <...> And I didn't have time to react in any way, and he picked up a chair above his head – our chairs are very typical school chairs, heavy, with metal. He lifted it above his head. And he stands by my desk with that chair, and I look at him. I can't move. The children are sitting there, watching. I froze so much that <...> I couldn't do anything* – neither *say nor do anything, really. He stood like that for a few minutes; there was a crazy look in his eyes. <...> then he put the chair down and started crying."* [TDD6]. Teachers report that the emotional range in such moments shifts from fear to pity for the student who expressed physical aggression. Even so, the experience is described as emotionally (persistent fear), psychologically (loss of self-confidence), and physically (health disturbances) harmful. Even when they know the students and recognise that physical outbursts could occur at any time, teachers state that they are *"genuinely afraid"* [TDA3] both for themselves and for other students: *"Another student with special educational needs came up to him [the student] and just put a dot on the board. And the first one, who was drawing, got very upset. That dot triggered such an outburst of anger that he simply grabbed that child and started choking him <...> both I and the assistant tried to separate them. And that separation – I won't lie – lasted at least a minute of intense effort, maybe even closer to two. <...> we were shouting and*

using force trying to pull them apart." [TDD3]. This experience reveals that teachers feel powerless and unable to protect themselves while the student displays aggression, and other students who are observing may even become involved in the incident.

Verbal aggression (F2) is expressed through negative, obscene language directed at the teacher in front of the whole class (*"they tell you to f… off. You tell them to do the task, and they tell you to f… off"* [TDA7]; *"I didn't allow them to get too out of hand, so they very loudly told me to f… off in Russian."* [TDB2]). Such utterances are not only humiliating but also intimidating, because they are provocative and shouted: *"they allow themselves to say whatever they want, however they want; they humiliate you in front of everyone, in front of the whole class <...> that shouting and screaming, when they let their emotions loose. You can't control it, and you get those emotions directed at you and those ugly words. <...> They come first, their emotions, and they forget that this is a teacher."* [TDA3]. It is not always possible to distinguish whether the aggression experienced is intentional or unintentional. Teachers are more likely to associate unintentional aggression with students who have special educational needs, whereas they attribute intentional aggression to any student. Notably, verbal aggression, as violence, is consistently experienced as an aggressive, intimidating verbal attack.

Overall, aggression as a manifestation of violence constitutes one of the most intense experiences, with consequences not only for teachers' emotional and psychological well-being but also for their physical health. Unlike other violent experiences, it is reported exclusively as coming from students and, in many cases, is sudden and unpredictable.

Experiencing violence as insulting (G) is a practice reported exclusively as coming from students and is expressed as (1) gossiping/talking behind the teacher's back and (2) hurtful provocation. Students insult teachers through provocation (G1), testing the boundaries of acceptable behaviour *("They explore the environment. And there have been <...> those who didn't sense boundaries and could say a lot to themselves, allowed themselves to say a lot. That was unpleasant"* [TDB3]). At times, provocation takes the form of trying to *"catch you not knowing something. <...> Of course, you can ignore it, not react. <...> they verbally provoke you, they try in some way"* [TDA5].

Insulting through gossiping (G2) is indirect, occurring covertly – or supposedly covertly – away from the teacher who is being talked about. "Supposedly covertly" means that the teacher can see who is gossiping but does not hear, or only partly hears, what is being said about them. Students do not even try to hide; on the contrary, they seem to want the teacher to see and understand what is happening, but not to hear the exact words. "Covertly" refers to situations in which students believe that the teacher being gossiped about neither hears nor sees anything ("*Students do this, sometimes quite openly. 'The principal is stupid,' 'you're this or that.' You hear it in the corridors; you hear them gossiping. It seems they think you can't hear – students shout something down the corridor, but you hear those things.*" [TDA5]).

Overall, insults are treated as a highly intentional form of violence because they are recurring, deliberate and aimed at wearing the teacher down, both in a personal and professional capacity.

Non-dominant categories

Experiences assigned to non-dominant categories (H-K) were not treated as exceptional cases; rather, they were understood as conceptually distinct experiences that capture less typical yet significant forms of violence, extending beyond the boundaries of dominant categories.

Experiences coded as *violence as ignoring (H)* comprise isolated cases in which a teacher is subjected to demonstrative, individualised ignoring by a school principal without any apparent reason. This is experienced as a negation of the person (*"[the principal] walks down the corridor and simply turns her face away and doesn't even talk <…> I go to school, and I am afraid of running into the principal. As soon as I arrive, I head straight to the classroom, close the door and that's it – nothing else*" [TDA6]).

The category of *violence as exclusion from the community (I)* is represented by a single case revealing the experience of being placed "overboard": "*I just come into the staff room, and everyone falls silent. The ones who were sitting at the table where they like to gossip – they fall silent, and everyone is quiet. I leave, and then they start talking again – this complete non-communication. You're overboard. <…> That kind of communication – pushing others overboard*" [TDA8]. In this experience, ignoring takes on a collective, communal character, which distinguishes it from the experiences assigned to category H. Exclusion manifests through not speaking, withholding information and cutting the person off from shared knowledge. It is treated as a harmful experience because it produces a feeling of being separated from a community to which one belongs and wishes to belong.

A single experience was assigned to the category of *violence as emotional outbursts (J)*, illustrating a school principal's discharge of negative emotions onto teachers, as if onto *"sponges that are supposed to absorb those emotions*" [TDA8]. Such behaviour is described as frequent and recurring, and as something colleagues also experience. The emotional dumping takes the form of an uncontrolled stream of angry words, which may not be directed at any particular teacher but rather at whichever teacher happens to be in the leader's line of sight at the wrong moment.

Violence as property damage (K) is an atypical, singular experience involving the destruction of a teacher's personal material property. A student, retaliating in relation to a poor grade, first issues a threat – *"Do you care about your tyres?*" [TDA8] – and later punctures the tyres of the teacher's car. This experience of physical property damage is interpreted as an intentionally planned act of violent retaliation that harms the teacher's personal property.

Outcome space

The qualitatively distinct experiences of violence (categories) identified are interrelated through four natures of experiencing violence and their dimensions of variation, which help to reveal relationships among the categories and indicate how violence is manifested within the sphere of professional activity (the source of violence, its form and its impact) (see Table 1).

Table 1

Outcome Space

Nature of experiencing violence	Categories of description	Dimensions of Variation		
		Source of violence	Form of violence	Impact: target of violence
Professional – control of pedagogical work	Disparagement of professionalism/ authority/ achievements (A1–A3), reproaches for not knowing (B2), parents' complaints about the teacher's work with the child (B1)	Administration (A1-A3, B2), colleagues (A1); students (A1); parents (B1)	Verbal (spoken and written) (A1–A3, B1-B2)	On a teacher as a professional
Professional – institutional/ organisational control	Pressure to accept an unfavourable decision / perform tasks outside one's duties / comply with imperatives / adjust assessments (C1–C4); non-transparent decisions regarding workload / unequal working conditions (D1–D2)	Administration (C1–C4, D1–D2)	Verbal (spoken)	On a teacher as a professional
Mixed – professional and personal harm	An explicitly stated or implied threat of future harm/sanction (E1–E2), physical and verbal aggression (F1–F2), insulting through provocation and gossiping (G1–G2), being ignored (H), exclusion (I), emotional outbursts (J)	Students (F1-F2, G1-G2); administration (E2, H, J), parents (E1), colleagues (I)	Verbal: spoken (E1–E2, F2, G1–G2, H, I, J); written (E1-E2). Physical (F1)	On a teacher as a professional and on a teacher as a person
Personal – harm to a person	Personal belittlement/humiliation (A4), damage to personal property (K)	Students (K), colleagues (A4)	Verbal (A4); damage to property (K)	On a teacher as a person

The interrelations and links among the categories are expressed through four groups that distinguish the nature of the violence against teachers in school: professional – control of pedagogical work; professional – institutional/administrative control; mixed – professional and personal harm; personal – harm to the person (violation of dignity and/or property). The nature of experiencing violence is differentiated through three dimensions of variation that constitute the structural level of the outcome space. These are: the source of violence (from whom the violence is experienced – administration, colleagues, students, parents); the form of violence (verbal – spoken/written, physical, property damage); impact, defined as the target of violence (on a teacher as a professional, on a teacher as a person, or both).

Thus, the outcome space shows that teachers' experiences of violence at school involve not only the form of violent actions (how), but also who perpetrates him/her and which dimension of the teacher's identity (professional, personal, or both) is experienced as violated and negatively affected. The source (who), the form (how), and the impact (the target – professional, personal, or both) are not separate types of violent experiences, but they are interacting, mutually complementing and distinguishing "components" of experiences of violence that together constitute practices of experiencing violence. This highlights the interactions and the forms in which any violence against teachers manifests in the school setting.

The professional nature of experiencing violence – control of pedagogical work (A1–A3, B1–B2) encompasses experiences in which teachers' professional status is demeaned through the undermining of their authority – by reproaching them and filing complaints. In essence, control of pedagogical work is manifested at the classroom level, where the teacher's professional competence is questioned. In this case, the source of verbal (spoken and written) violence against the teacher is the administration (A1–A3, B2), colleagues and students (A1) and students' parents (B1).

The professional nature of experiencing violence – institutional/organisational control (C1–C4, D1–D2) defines the experience of verbal violence as hierarchical pressure (always experienced only from the administration), in which decisions are imposed on teachers, tasks outside their duties are assigned, and workload or working conditions are adjusted – thereby controlling teachers' professional functioning. Although such experiences are often emotionally painful, they primarily operate as a devaluation of teachers' efforts and professionalism.

The mixed nature of experiencing violence – professional and personal harm includes experiences in which negative impact is directed not only at the teacher as a professional but also at the teacher as a person. In these experiences, violence manifests as communication that affects personal dignity and safety (insulting, verbal aggression) (F2), physical acts (F1), threats in which a future harm or sanction is explicitly stated or implied (E1–E2), as well as ignoring (H), exclusion (I), or emotional pressure/outbursts (J). This means that verbal insulting, verbal aggression, and

physical aggression affect teachers in a dual way: they feel violated and worn down both personally and professionally. While the most frequent source of such violence is students (F1–F2, G1–G2), threats are also experienced from the administration (E2) and from parents (E1), and exclusion is experienced from colleagues (I).

The final nature of experiencing violence – harm to a person (violation of dignity and/or property) manifests at the level of personal identity and affects the teacher as a person (A4, K). This context also includes a singular form of violent experience, such as damage to personal property (K).

In summary, the outcome space shows that teacher victimisation is a constellation of qualitatively different violence experiences – characterised by source, form and impact –revealing the vulnerability of teachers' professional and personal identity.

Discussion and Conclusions

A phenomenographical study makes it possible to conceptualise teachers' experiences of violence at school not as a collection of isolated violent or harmful incidents, but as a structured set of qualitatively different experiences. The differences can be explained by three critical aspects that are the source of the violence, the mode through which it is expressed and the target of its impact (professional role, person, or both). The study's outcome space reveals three critical variation features in these experiences: the source of violence as a form of power asymmetry; the expression of violence as a form of power enactment; the target of impact as a plane of identity violation.

Accordingly, violence against teachers in schools is not limited to physical attacks or overt insults; some experiences take the form of institutional control, procedural pressure, and reputational undermining. Consistent with the terminology established in the introduction, the findings can be interpreted through research on workplace violence and workplace psychological mistreatment. This enables us to relate part of the results to the concept of workplace bullying, which emphasises not only the type of act but also the use of power that violates dignity and creates a harmful and hostile work environment (Einarsen et al., 2020).

The analysis further shows that teachers construe the source of violence as a power relationship that shapes both how violence is enacted and what is experienced as its core harm. When violence is associated with school administration, teachers' accounts most often reflect a vertical, institutional relationship: the experience is described as pressure or control in decision-making, unclear procedures/rules, and communication that compels compliance. In these experiences, teachers stress not only the importance of the decision itself but also how decisions are made and implemented – process transparency, clarity of justification and respectful interaction. These dimensions are commonly examined in the literature through the lens of organisational justice

(Neall & Tuckey, 2021). When the source of violence is parents, students, or colleagues, the relationship more often relies on reputational (Rajbhandari & Rana, 2023), social (Uslukaya, 2025; Li et al., 2021), and normative power (Fisher & Refael Fanyo, 2022) (e.g., complaints, public challenges to authority, exclusion, and ignoring). In such cases, violence more frequently undermines teachers' authority and sense of safety through public questioning, devaluation of authority and reputation and social exclusion. Research highlights that reputational and normative power may operate as symbolic violence, which is publicly invisible yet damaging to teachers' status and dignity (Yldiz et al., 2021). In teachers' experiences, violence from parents most commonly appears as reputational and normative pressure directed at teachers' professional authority. These findings align with studies showing that parent-to-teacher violence increases when the school ecosystem lacks clear institutional support for teachers (McMahon et al., 2023; Berkowitz, 2025; Chobphon, 2025).

The findings also indicate that the mode of expression functions as a "channel" through which power is enacted. In teachers' accounts, verbal violence takes the form of communicative acts that question professional competence (derogatory remarks, reproaches, complaints, formalised criticism) or impose normative pressure (demands, ultimatums). Social power (ignoring, exclusion, gossip) operates through the withdrawal of belonging resources: teachers are ignored by colleagues and pushed out of the community. These patterns can be interpreted in the context of workplace bullying research, particularly where recurring negative acts and power imbalance affect social status and organisational support (Einarsen et al., 2020; Khairallah et al., 2023). By contrast, physical violence and property damage in the findings emerge as experiences that exceed the boundaries of the professional role. In such situations, teachers emphasise not only the act itself but also its impact on their basic sense of safety and bodily inviolability (therefore, the violence is experienced as directed at the person). This supports an analysis of these results through the concept of workplace violence as a phenomenon encompassing the safety/threat dimension, where violence is understood as a continuum from threats and other psychological forms to physical attacks (Magnavita et al., 2024). The literature also indicates that the impact of workplace violence is meaningfully associated with employees' work quality and health (McMahon et al., 2024; Dirzyte et al., 2024).

A third analytic finding concerns the target of violence as a plane of identity violation. In the context of this study, it is treated as a key element in the puzzle of variations, helping explain why teachers' violent experiences differ so markedly. It allows us to distinguish experiences primarily directed at the professional role (competence, the right to decide, authority) from those directed at the person (dignity, safety, property). Between these two poles, mixed experiences emerge in which professional and personal vulnerability overlap. When violence targets the teacher's professional role, it operates through undermining authority and reducing professional autonomy; when violence

is mixed, it moves beyond the professional domain and disrupts the integrity of the teacher as both a person and a professional; when violence targets the person, the central meaning of the experience becomes a violation of dignity and/or safety. These results resonate with research undertaken into teachers' professional identity, which emphasises that identity is dynamic and sensitive to contextual signals (recognition, status, relationships, and emotional contexts) (Beijaard et al., 2004; Day & Kington, 2008; Suarez & McGrath, 2022).

Finally, consistent with the chosen use of teacher victimisation as an umbrella concept, the diverse range of harmful or violent experiences undergone by teachers in school can be linked to teacher victimisation research that examines teachers' victim experiences and their consequences, especially when violence crosses the boundary of the professional role, including experienced stress, persistent anxiety, and associated considerations of leaving the profession (Peist et al., 2024; McMahon et al., 2024; Martinsone et al., 2024).

In summary, our study contributes to the field of teacher victimisation by empirically substantiating violence against teachers in school as a complex phenomenon and conceptualising it through qualitatively different natures of violence experience. These natures show how different sources and modes of violence relate to what the violence targets (the professional role, the person, or both). This can serve as a conceptual basis for developing more effective violence prevention and response measures in schools. Future studies should examine how institutional factors shape teachers' experiences of violence across different levels of the school ecosystem. Longitudinal research is also recommended to identify links between the target of violence's impact and changes in teachers' professional identity, psychological well-being, and intentions to leave the profession.

Acknowledgment

The research is funded by the Lithuanian Research Council (LMTLT), contract number: S-MIP-24-108, 2024–2026.

References

Beijaard, D., Meijer, P. C., & Verloop, N. (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20*, 107–128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2003.07.001

Berkowitz, R. (2025). Teacher-to-student victimisation: The role of teachers' victimisation and school social and organisational climates. *Education Sciences, 15*(9), Article 1090. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15091090

Bitinaite, R., Dirzyte, A., Indrasiene, V., Jegeleviciene, V., Merfeldaite, O., Prakapas, R., Railiene, A., Gusauskiene, M., & Serapinas, D. (2025). Teachers' perception of the relationship as a moderator between victimisation and life satisfaction. *Frontiers in Education, 10*, Article 1683234. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1683234

Chacón-Cuberos, R., Castro-Sánchez, M., González-Campos, G., & Zurita-Ortega, F. (2018). Victimisation in the school, digital leisure and irritability: Analysis using structural equations. *RELIEVE, 24*(1), Article 3. https://doi.org/10.7203/relieve.24.1.12614

Chobphon, P. (2025). Perspectives on school violence: Novice teachers' experiences in Thai urban secondary schools. *Frontiers in Education, 10*, Article 1691464. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1691464

Day, C., & Kington, A. (2008). Identity, well-being and effectiveness: The emotional contexts of teaching. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 16*(1), 7–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/14681360701877743

Dirzyte, A., Indrašienė, V., Jegelevičienė, V., Merfeldaitė, O., Prakapas, R., Railienė, A., & Gušauskienė, M. (2024). Teacher victimisation by students, their parents and school staff: Prevalence and links with teachers' life satisfaction in a Lithuanian sample. *Education Sciences, 14*(2), Article 163. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14020163

Einarsen, S. V., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (Eds.). (2020). *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Theory, research and practice* (3rd ed.). CRC Press. https://doi.org/10.1201/9780429462528

Erskine, M., Ferguson, C., & Ayre, K. (2023). "I don't want to come back now": Teacher-directed violence. *Issues in Educational Research, 33*(3), 920–936. https://www.iier.org.au/iier33/erskine.pdf

Fisher, Y., & Refael Fanyo, R. (2022). Parents' perceptions of teachers' authority and parental involvement: The impact of communality. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, Article 908290. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.908290

Gušauskienė, M., Indrašienė, V., Prakapas, R., Railienė, A., & Sadauskas, J. (2025). Teacher victimisation in educational institutions: Analysis of the legal environment. *Pedagogika, 158*(2), 136–157. https://doi.org/10.15823/p.2025.158.7

Khairallah, G. M., Makarem, N. N., Rahme, D. V., El Jaouni, M. A., & Brome, D. (2023). The effect of workplace bullying on fatigue in school teachers: The moderating roles of gender and spirituality. *The Libyan Journal of Medicine, 18*(1), Article 2266239. https://doi.org/10.1080/19932820.2023.2266239

Lang, J. M., Hines, L. A., & Johnson, K. (2025). Teachers' experiences with physical or verbal aggression in the aftermath of COVID-19. *The Qualitative Report, 30*(11), 4592–4610. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2025.6909

Larsson, J., & Holmstrom, I. (2007). Phenomenographical or phenomenological analysis: Does it matter? Examples from a study on anaesthesiologists' work. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-Being, 2*(1), 55–64. https://doi.org/10.1080/17482620601068105

Lepp, M., & Ringsberg, K. C. (2002). Phenomenography: A qualitative research approach. In L. R.-M. Hallberg (Ed.), *Qualitative methods in public health research: Theoretical foundations and practical examples* (pp. 105–135). Studentlitteratur.

Li, M., Xu, X., & Kwan, H. K. (2021). Consequences of workplace ostracism: A meta-analytic review. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, Article 641302. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.641302

Magnavita, N., Larese Filon, F., Giorgi, G., Meraglia, I., & Chirico, F. (2024). Assessing workplace violence: Methodological considerations. *La Medicina del Lavoro, 115*(1), Article e2024003. https://doi.org/10.23749/mdl.v115i1.15186

Martinsone, B., Rutkiene, A., & Žydžiūnaite, V. (2024). Factors associated with teachers' intention to leave their profession: Teacher portraits from two European countries. *Frontiers in Psychology, 15*, Article 1450424. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1450424

Marton, F. (1994). Phenomenography. In T. Husen & T. N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of education* (pp. 4424–4429). Oxford, England: Pergamon.

McMahon, S. D., Bare, K. M., Cafaro, C. L., Zinter, K. E., Garcia-Murillo, Y., Lynch, G., McMahon, K. M., Espelage, D. L., Reddy, L. A., Anderman, E. M., & Subotnik, R. (2023). Understanding parent aggression directed against teachers: A school climate framework. *Learning Environments Research, 26*(3), 915–931. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-023-09460-2

McMahon, S. D., Swenski, T., Bare, K., Valido, A., Asad, S., Reddy, L. A., Astor, R. A., Espelage, D. L., Anderman, E. M., Martinez, A., Worrell, F. C., & Knapp-Fadani, M. (2024). Teacher-directed violence and anxiety and stress: Predicting intentions to transfer and quit. *School Psychology, 39*(5), 530–544. https://doi.org/10.1037/spq0000595

McMahon, S. D., Worrell, F. C., Reddy, L. A., Martinez, A., Espelage, D. L., Astor, R. A., Anderman, E. M., Valido, A., Swenski, T., Perry, A. H., Dudek, C. M., & Bare, K. (2024). Violence and aggression against educators and school personnel, retention, stress and training needs: National survey results. *American Psychologist, 79*(7), 903–919. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0001348

Moon, B., Kim, J., & McCluskey, J. (2023). Teacher victimisation patterns: Establishing a group-based trajectory approach to assessing predictors of connectedness to school, job satisfaction and depression. *Victims & Offenders, 18*(4), 607–622. https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2021.2014007

Moon, B., & McCluskey, J. (2020). An exploratory study of violence and aggression against teachers in middle and high schools: Prevalence, predictors and negative consequences. *Journal of School Violence, 19*(2), 122–137. https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2018.1540010

Neall, A. M., Li, Y., & Tuckey, M. R. (2021). Organisational justice and workplace bullying: Lessons learned from externally referred complaints and investigations. *Societies, 11*(4), Article 143. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc11040143

Noret, N., Hunter, S. C., & Rasmussen, S. (2018). The relationship between peer victimisation, cognitive appraisals and adjustment: A systematic review. *Journal of School Violence, 17*(4), 451–471. https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2017.1423492

Peist, E., McMahon, S. D., Davis-Wright, J. O., & Keys, C. B. (2024). Understanding teacher-directed violence and related turnover through a school climate framework. *Psychology in the Schools, 61*(1), 220–236. https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.23044

Rajbhandari, J., & Rana, K. (2023). Cyberbullying on social media: An analysis of teachers' unheard voices and coping strategies in Nepal. *International Journal of Bullying Prevention*, *5*, 95–107. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42380-022-00121-1

Sigad, L. I. (2024). "I keep warning the new teachers, you'll have elephant skin": Teachers coping with physical violence perpetrated toward them by their pupils. *Journal of Family Trauma, Child Custody & Child Development, 21*(1), 76–95. https://doi.org/10.1080/26904586.2023.2202204

Stilwell, S. M., Guzmán, P., Varela, J., McMahon, S. D., Bare, K., Heinze, J., & Zimmerman, M. (2025). Protecting educators: A scoping review of interventions that address teacher victimisation. *Behavioral Sciences, 15*(2), Article 214. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15020214

Suarez, V., & McGrath, J. (2022). *Teacher professional identity: How to develop and support it in times of change.* OECD Education Working Papers No. 267. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. https://www.oecd.org/content/dam/oecd/en/publications/reports/2022/02/teacher-professional-identity_1843d4f3/b19f5af7-en.pdf

Trigwell, K. (2000). A phenomenographical interview on phenomenography. In J. Bowden & E. Walsh (Eds.), *Phenomenography* (pp. 63–82). RMIT University Press.

Uslukaya, A. (2025). Can teacher ostracism be prevented? Exploring how empowering leadership can mitigate teacher ostracism through work engagement. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(2), 663–682. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12745

Yang, C., Rho, E., Dong, Q., & Zhang, Y. (2024). *Teacher victimisation, burnout and school climate: Insights from a U.S. study*. PsychArchives. https://doi.org/10.23668/psycharchives.15459

Yildiz, S., Korumaz, M., & Balyer, A. (2021). Symbolic violence teachers experience at schools. *Journal of Economy Culture and Society, 63*, 165–180. https://doi.org/10.26650/JECS2020-0101

Zhao, Y. (2024). Teacher victimisation and teacher burnout in schools: Risk factors and concerns. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences, 42*, 379–387. https://doi.org/10.54097/e19ayw43

Mokytojų viktimizacija: kaip patiriamas smurtas mokyklos aplinkoje

Asta Railienė[1], Daiva Penkauskienė[2], Valdonė Indrašienė[3], Aistė Diržytė[4], Rugilė Bitinaitė-Motiejūnienė[5]

[1] Mykolo Romerio universitetas, Edukologijos ir socialinio darbo institutas, Ateities g. 20, LT-08303 Vilnius, Lietuva, asta.railiene@mruni.eu
[2] Mykolo Romerio universitetas, Edukologijos ir socialinio darbo institutas, Ateities g. 20, LT-08303 Vilnius, Lietuva, daiva.penkauskiene@mruni.eu
[3] Mykolo Romerio universitetas, Edukologijos ir socialinio darbo institutas, Ateities g. 20, LT-08303 Vilnius, Lietuva, v.indrasiene@mruni.eu
[4] Mykolo Romerio universitetas, Psichologijos institutas, Ateities g. 20, LT-08303 Vilnius, Lietuva, aiste.dirzyte@mruni.eu
[5] Mykolo Romerio universitetas, Psichologijos institutas, Ateities g. 20, LT-08303 Vilnius, Lietuva, rug.bitinaite@gmail.com

Santrauka

Straipsnyje pristatomi fenomenografinio tyrimo radiniai, atskleidžiantys mokytojų patiriamo smurto raiškos variacijas mokyklos aplinkoje. Straipsnio tikslas – remiantis mokytojų patirtimi, atskleisti, kaip smurtas reiškiasi mokykloje. Keliamas probleminis klausimas: kaip mokytojai patiria prieš juos nukreiptą smurtą mokyklos aplinkoje? Taikyta fenomenografinė tyrimo prieiga. Tyrime dalyvavo 27 mokytojai. Tyrimo rezultatai identifikuoja keturias smurtui prieš mokytoją mokykloje būdingas skiriamąsias ypatybių grupes (pobūdžius): du profesinius – pedagoginio darbo kontrolę ir institucinę / administracinę kontrolę; mišrų – profesinį ir asmeninį pažeidimą; ir asmeninį – orumo ir / ar nuosavybės pažeidimą, apibrėžtą pagal tris tarpusavyje sąveikaujančius kintamųjų matmenis: šaltinį, formą ir poveikio adresatą (mokytojo profesinį vaidmenį, asmenį arba abu). Tyrimo rezultatai atskleidžia, kad mokytojų viktimizacija yra kokybiškai skirtingų smurto patirčių visuma, kurioje reiškiasi smurto šaltinis, forma, poveikis, atskleidžianti tris kritines smurto patirčių variacijų detales: smurto šaltinį kaip galios asimetriją; smurto raišką kaip galios realizavimo formą ir poveikio adresatą kaip tapatybės pažeidimo plotmę. Tai praplečia mokytojų viktimizacijos švietimo tyrimus, konceptualizuojant šį reiškinį per galios santykius ir žalą mokytojų profesinei ir (arba) asmeninei tapatybei.

Esminiai žodžiai: *mokytojų patiriamas smurtas, mokytojų viktimizacija, smurto apraiškos, smurtas darbo vietoje, fenomenografija.*

Gauta 2026 04 02 / Received 02 04 2026
Priimta 2026 06 03 / Accepted 03 06 2026