

Perspective of Bullying problem at workplace in Nigeria: The experience of workers

Prof. Oghojafor, B. E. A.,

Department of Business Administration
University of Lagos, Akoka, Yaba, Lagos

Muo, F.I., and

Department of Business Administration
University of Lagos, Akoka, Yaba, Lagos

Olufayo, T. O.

Department of Business Administration
University of Lagos, Akoka, Yaba, Lagos
oluthaddeusojo@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study empirically examines bullying in workplace in Nigeria, because the incidence of bullying is seen to be increasing and empirical study is sparse. The study was inspired by the similar work done by Chartered Management Institute London (2005) titled "Bullying at work: the experience of managers." As a result of this the study adopted descriptive research design by using questionnaire to collect information from employees in the government establishments as well as private institution across the country. The findings of the study suggested that the scope of bullying is adjudged to be low but there is considerable incidence of bullying and that bullying incidence is increasing in the workplace in Nigeria. This is against the case in England where bullying incidence is said to be steadily increasing. There are no policies put in place in many organisations to check the incidence, hence it is feared that the case of bullying may go out of hands. Leadership styles contribute to bullying; hence bureaucracy and authoritarian leadership styles top the list of leadership styles to encourage bullying. Among the types of bullying in the work place are unfair treatments, verbal insults, misuse of power or position and blocking promotion or training opportunities. Among the bullying experienced by respondents include bullying by managers of their subordinates, bullying by directors, bullying by external customers or clients, bullying between peers and bullying of managers by subordinates.

Keywords: *Bullying, management style, organisation, Management*

Introduction

All organisations are concerned about how to improve employees performance. They do this by providing what will motivate the employees or by putting up policies that will remove those things that can distract them from achieving organisational goals and objectives. Bullying is one of those things that can distract employees and thereby prevent them from achieving organisational goals and objectives.

Owoyemi & Oyelere[2010:61] assert that theirs is the first on workplace bullying in Nigeria. While we have been able to identify another study[Adenuga, 2009:153], it is safe to assert that there are not been many 'homegrown' works in this field in Nigeria and even the two referred to are theoretical in nature. We have therefore decided to undertake an empirical study of this organizational challenge so as to provide evidences relevant to Nigeria.

The cost and consequences of bullying - tangible and intangible - are astronomical. It impacts negatively on the victim and the witnesses at the psychological, social and physical level. It may lead to suicide tendency, loss of self respect and self image [Djukorvik et al, 2004:470]; high stress, post-traumatic stress disorder, phobias, sleep disturbances and increased depression[Department of labour & Industry, 2008]. They are also usually unhappy, anxious, withdrawn and unduly cautious all of which affect their performance [Nnaike:2012:44]. For the organization, it adversely impacts on employee commitment, motivation, absenteeism and turnover. There are also costs associated with replacement of staff who left due to bullying, work efforts being displaced and bullying-related investigations and legal services. A 2002 survey of 9,000 Canadian federal employees indicated that 42% of female and 15% of male employees reported being bullied in a 2-year period, resulting in more than \$180 million in lost time and productivity (Canada Safety Council, 2002). According to Namie and Namie (2003:134), 82% of employees who had been bullied left their workplace: 38% for health reasons and 44% because they were victims of a low performance appraisal manipulated by a bullying supervisor to show them as incompetent. High turnover of employees are costly for organizations and it is calculated that the cost of losing and replacing a worker ranges from 25% to 200% of annual compensation. [Fisher-Blando 2008] Leyman [1996:120] and Hoel *et al* [2001:450, both in Owoyemi & Oyelere, [2010:61] estimate that an organization loses \$30000-\$100000 for each bullying incident while UK lost 2bn pounds annually on workplace bullying. That is why organizations should pay very urgent attention

Objectives

1. To establish why organisations should be concerned about bullying
2. To find out the nature and scope/pervasiveness of bullying in Nigeria
3. To ascertain the existence and structure of bullying policies in Nigeria
4. To find out bullying management practices in Nigeria.
5. To establish managers perception about bullying in Nigeria
6. To compare the findings in this study with that of the study of 2005 of the Chartered Institute of Management (CIM) London

Literature Review

The Nature & Scope of Bullying

Bullying is common in human settlements right from the beginning of times as exemplified in the story of Cain & Abel [Genesis, 4:8] or even Joseph and his brothers which occurred much later and which included evidences of verbal, mental and ultimately, physical bullying [Genesis, 37;1-25]. Recent interests in the study of bullying is traceable to the efforts of Leymann [1996:165] who worked on a sample of 2400 Swedish employees and defines it as a social interaction in which someone is attacked by another or others at least once a week for 6 months, causing the victim,

psychological, psychosomatic and social misery. It is a long standing aggression, physical or psychological by an individual or a group directed against someone who is unable to defend himself with the intent to intimidate and create risk to his health and safety [Department of Labour & Industries, 2008]. It involves repeated incidents or patterns of behavior intended to intimidate, offend, degrade or humiliate [Adenuga, 2009:153] and persistent use of aggressive and unreasonable tactics against co-workers [Hanson, 2011:6]. Olewu (1993); quoted in Ayodele and Bello, [2008:146] argues that beyond being aggressive, the behavior must be intended to cause harm or distress, occur repeatedly over time and occur in a relationship in which there is an imbalance of power or strength. The bullying behaviour is also usually unjustified and regarded as oppressive by the victim and enjoyable by the perpetrator [Gropper & Froschl, 2000:48].

Owoyemi & Oyelere [2010:61] list some of the labels used to define bullying to include mobbing, harassment, non-sexual harassment, victimization, emotional abuse, workplace aggression, and workplace incivility. They also explain how these terms fit into some definitions of bullying [Table 1]

Table 1: Definitions & Explanations of Bullying

	Authors	Definition	Term/Explanation
1	Brodsky[1976:2]	Repeated and persistent attempts by one person to torment, wear down, frustrate or get a reaction from another	This kind of treatment can be referred to as harassment because it persistently provokes, frightens, intimidates or makes others feel uncomfortable
2	Bjorkqvist et al [1994: 174]	Repeated activities with the aim of bringing mental and sometimes physical pain to one or more individuals, who for some reasons cannot defend themselves. They are destructive behaviours that are aggressive and sometimes verbal. They are conducted by an individual or group against others	Emphasis is placed on work harassment as a form of bullying. Here the bullying relies on evidence of persistence and repeated aggressive behaviours which after a time cause the recipient to feel victimized
3	Einarsen [1996:1]	When one or several individuals persistently over a long period of time perceive themselves to be on the receiving end of negative actions from one or several persons and where the target has difficulty defending himself against these actions	They are abusive, offensive, intimidating, malicious or insulting behaviours, abuse of power which make the recipient feel upset, threatened, humiliated or vulnerable and can lead to stress or loss of self confidence
4	Leymann[1996:165]	Severe harassing of people in the organization which effects on the victims can lead to various interpersonal relationships and unhealthy physical/non-physical state of health	The term mobbing is used for bullying when somebody is exposed to these negative acts. These actions occur on a very frequent basis[at least once a week and over a long period of at least 6 months

5	McCarthy <i>et al</i> [1995:12]	Repeated aggressive actions and practices directed at one or more workers which are unwanted by the victims. They may be done deliberately or unconsciously but do cause humiliation, offence and distress. They may interfere with the victims job performance and may cause an unpleasant and poor working environment	This may be in the form of internal conflict between employees. In this case, bullying refers to a set of actions that are offensive, intimidating, humiliating or that degrade, ridicule or insult a person[s] at work
6	Hoel & Cooper [2000:10]	A situation where one or several individuals persistently over a period of time perceive themselves to be on the receiving end of negative actions	This can be from one or several persons and is associated with power imbalance
7	ILO [2002]	Ongoing violent abuse within a generalized notion of workplace violence	Internal or external violence that occurs between workers, managers or supervisors
8	MSF Union [1994:2]	Persistent, offensive, abusive, intimidating or insulting behavior. It is an abuse of power or an unfair penal sanction which makes the recipient feel upset, threatened, humiliated or vulnerable	Bullying undermines the victims self-confidence which may cause him to suffer stress

Source: Owoyemi, O. & Oyelere, M. [2010] Workplace bullying: An undiagnosed social problem in workplaces in Nigeria. *Journal of Management & Organisational Behaviour*, 1[2], 61-73

The USA Department of Labour and Industries [2008] lists behaviours associated with bullying to include unwarranted or invalid criticisms, nit-picking, fault-finding, exclusion, isolation, being singled out and treated differently, being shouted at, humiliated and excessive monitoring. It is also important to note that bullying takes place in the given context of interpersonal interactions [Erikson & Einarson, 2004:480] and within the context of labour processes [Hoel, 2006:1] and should thus not be treated or interpreted independent of these environmental realities

In the workplace, bullying involves persistent verbal and non verbal aggression that includes personal attacks, social ostracism, malicious rumors, withholding of information, offensive jokes, persistence and belittling criticism and other painful messages and hostile interaction. Indeed, similar to the views of Ayodele & Bello [2008:146] and Leyman, 1996:154], there is a general consensus among scholars that there are three preconditions for a behavior to be termed bullying: it is perceived negatively by the victims [Hoel *et al* 2001:445]; it is characterized by certain durations and frequency [Vertia, 2003:10]; and there is usually an element of power imbalance [Salin, 2003:33]. Features of workplace bullying, and indeed most forms of bullying are:

- Repetition [it occurs regularly or repeatedly]
- Duration [it is enduring]
- Escalation [increasing aggression]
- Power disparity [the victim or target lacks power to successfully defend himself or herself]
- Attributed intent [the intention of the bully are not usually know with certainty; they are attributed]

Workplace bullying tendency is on the rise and Garry & Namie, 2007, [quoted in Adenuga, 2009:154] report that in the USA, 13% of the staff are currently being bullied; 24% have been bullied, 12% have witnessed bullying and 49% have been affected by workplace bullying. Fisher-

Blando [2008] reports that 75% of workers witnessed bullying throughout their career, 47% experienced it during their career while 27% experienced in the previous 12 months. But this may not be an epidemic as school bullying where the evidences are frightening. The key concern of 20000 children who phoned the Childline charity from 2000 and 2002 was bullying [The Community Care, 1999]. A survey conducted by Whitney and Smith in 1993 suggests that bullying in schools may exist at a worryingly high level². In an anonymous self-report questionnaire administered to 2600 pupils from 17 primary schools, and 4100 pupils from seven secondary schools in Sheffield, 27% of the primary-aged children reported being bullied “sometimes”; with 10% of that proportion being bullied “once a week” or more frequently. In secondary schools the number of pupils being bullied “sometimes” were 10%, with 4% of that number being bullied “once a week” or more frequently. In a survey of 2308 pupils from 19 schools the number of 10-14 year olds being bullied ‘two or three times a month’ or more was 12.2% and the number bullying others was 2.9%. [Smith & Shu, 2000:193]. The American Academy of Child Psychologists even paints a more alarming picture as they aver that up to 50% of all children experience some form of bullying at some point in school [Nnaike, 2010:44].

While the victim is relatively in a weaker position and incapable of defending himself, the characteristics of the bully is varied and indeed, bullying behavior stems from some inner weaknesses. Bullies have low self confidence and self esteem and they thus feel unsafe. They are inadequate and unable to fulfill their obligations and use bullying as a façade; as a means of dealing with their own problems. Most of the times, bullies are seething with anger, resentment, bitterness jealousy and envy and adopt bullying as a means of expressing their malicious attitudes. At times, they are also motivated by rejection which they have no way of rejecting. As for their victims, they target people who are popular, competent, and successful and those who are frail and have low propensity to violence.

Types of Bullying

There are many types of bullying in schools by classmates, seniors, colleagues and even officials acting alone or in concert and at times by outsiders. It was recently reported that a high ranking political party official manhandled school officials while the policemen watched in Abuja, Nigeria for seizing his son’s telephones; at home-wife or husband battering, other forms of bullying against members by members. Bullying also occurs in the society at large and in the society at large and in an environment where poverty and lack are the defining characteristics, it occasionally becomes a war of all against all. In the workplace however, there are several variants of bullying and Adenuga [2009:153] lists them as:

Pressure Bullying or Unwilling Bullying- Where the work-induced stress causes an employee’s behavior to deteriorate, and as such the employee becomes short-tempered, irritable and may occasionally shout and swear at others. It is not deliberate and the accidental bully usually makes amend.

Organisational Bullying: This is a combination of pressure bullying and corporate bullying. In corporate bullying, the employer abuses the staff with impunity because jobs are scarce or the laws are very weak to defend the workers. This includes coercing employees to work for exploitatively

long periods of time, spying on them, encouraging staff to fabricate complaints against their colleagues.

Institutional Bullying: Similar to corporate bullying and is a situation when it becomes a part of the corporate culture. Staff are terrorized with all sorts of hostile work practices: increased workloads, changing responsibilities and roles, termination of career paths without consultation

Client Bullying: When workers are bullied by those they serve: lecturers bullied by students or nurses bullied by patients. On 27/1/12, Allison Chukwuebuka, a final year student of United Senior Secondary School, Ijokodo Ibadan beat up his teacher for punishing him and 18 others for indecent dressing. The beating was at the instruction of his father, Mr Emmanuel Alison, a customs officers who came along with other customs officers and also joined in publicly beating up the teacher, Mr Gbemiga Ogunleye [Adesina, 2012:37].

Serial Bullying: Where all the bullying activities are perpetrated by one person

Gang Bullying: Where there is collaborative bullying; bullying by a group on an occasional or regular bases

Vicarious Bullying: Where a bully encourages bullying relationship between two other people or parties without being directly involved

Just as there are many types of bullying, there are also many types of bullies who adopt different bullying styles and strategies to achieve their nefarious objectives. Fisher-Blando [2008] identifies 19 types of bullies which we have tabulated as follows. Some are more subtle and softer than others but all of them are nonetheless harmful to the victims, the witnesses and the organizations

Table2: Types of Bullies & Bullying Strategies

SN	Type of Bully	Definition	Features/strategies
1	Know-it-all	Appears as an expert	Seeks constant attention, often argues with people
2	Sniper		Attacks and criticizes, often indirectly, demonstrating aggression with sarcasm
3	Interrupter		Constantly interrupts everyone speaking
4	Bulldozer		Try to run over everyone to impede progress because he is afraid of change
5	Promotion-seeker		Appears normal and easy going until he/she gets a small promotion or authority, and then becomes power drunk, seeking more power and desperately schemes to move up the ladder
6	The pressurized bully		This is not ordinarily a bullying personality but when he is stressed, he loses control and hits out with verbal missiles or harassments
7	The Constant Critic	Extremely negative, nitpicking, perfectionist complainer, liar and fault finder. Liked by management because he can get people to work hard	Put-downs, name-calling, insults, aggressive eye contacts, reacts negatively to the contributions of others, accuses others of wrongdoing, blames errors on others. Makes unreasonable demand, makes others sit while he hovers, expects perfection, harshly criticizes victims, takes calls while discussing with victims etc
8	Two-headed snake	Aggressive; pretends to be nice while actually dealing with the target. They come in three	Denies victim the tools to do the work, assigns dirty meaningless work, makes derogatory and rude remarks, discloses confidential

		varieties: the back-stabber snake, the Jekyll & Hyde snake and the no- problem, don't bother snake	information about the victim, has personal file for storing damaging facts about victim, steals credit for work done by victim and others
9	The backstabber snake	This will say something before the victim and say a different thing behind	This bully kisses the boss above and attacks the victim below; tells the victim that he/she is wonderful and tells the boss that the victim is grossly incompetent
10	The Jekyll & Hyde Snake	This snake is vicious and sweet alternatively	Sweet at this moment, bitter at the next and while others see only the sweet side, the victim sees both sides so that people do not appreciate the targets complaints
11	No Problem, don't bother Snake	This is the one that says no problem when there are problems aplenty!	When he says no problem, it means that there are problems everywhere; that he has violated the rules and wants to cover it up. He/she is unethical and wants others to partake in his/her unethical agenda
12	The Screaming Mimi	Controls and terrorizes others through fear and intimidation while he/she is emotionally in charge. He wants to instill fear and is over bearing, insensitive and self centered	Popular strategies including yelling, cursing, tantrums, intimidating through aggressive gestures and crowding the personal pace of the victim, creating anxiety, threatening the victim with job loss
13	The controller	This lives, breaths and eats to control others	Generates fear and chaos; has a compulsive need to control and have his way always; verbal aggressiveness
14	Gate-keeper	This is a control freak; feels compelled to give orders and control resources. His tactics are most obvious but often ignored	Silent treatment, fast-forwarding the clock ahead and punishing victim for lateness; cutting off from the communication loop, deny the victim corporate rights and even making up new rules
15	Accidental bully	This is truly unaware of the affect of the affect of her actions on people; works as if the world does not exist and harms people unintentionally	Believes that others will have to change, harasses others at work and out of work. They will demean, belittle and humiliate, view kindness as weakness and see
16	Chronic bully	This becomes a bully through personality disorder, childhood learned behavior or mental disorder	
17	Opportunistic Bullies	Self centered and very common in the work place	These apply bullying to obtain advantages; as survival instincts
18	Serial Bully	One who has bullied in the past, who is bullying now and will bully in the future	Usually high in the administrative ladder and use that to apply their bullying behaviours
19	Narcissists	These are characterized by acute love for self. They are insecure and wish to relate with others in positions of authority	
20	Cyber-Bully	Bullies online	Sends harmful and hurtful e-messages to victims: pictures, words, graphics
21	Substance abusing bully	These are substance-induced bullies. They are dangerous	Uses other bullying methods

		because they are not in control of themselves. Most of the times, the bullying is to hide the real problems	
--	--	---	--

Adapted from Fisher-Blando, J.L[2008] Workplace bullying: aggressive behavior and its effect on job satisfaction and productivity. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Phoenix, January, pp32-42

Coping strategies include firmly telling the bully that his/her behavior is not acceptable and must be stopped; keeping record of all bullying activities and reporting the harassment to a supervisor. The victim should not retaliate so as to avoid being perceived as the perpetrator. The management should be committed to minimizing and managing workplace bullying and a precise written policy is the starting point [Adenuga, 2009:157]. Organization-wide efforts such as empowerment of workers through peer support programmes, establishment of anti-bullying committees by staff and training in conflict resolution and peer mediation are also relevant [Okubanjo, 2007:34; Ayodele, 2003; Peterson & Righby, 1999:481 & Ayodele & Bello, 2008:146]

Managing Bullying: The CAPE Framework

Introduced by Hanson [2011:6] this involves:

- **Confront** - Confront the bully and catch him/her off guard. Once it is addressed, it is on its way to being solved but if not confronted, colleagues may align with bullies and facilitate bullying behaviours. This impromptu meeting of ‘bully stakeholders’-suspected bully, the victim, the enablers- makes it easier for the manager to gather evidence of bullying
 - **Analyse** - the meeting provides an opportunity to discuss and analyse bullying. If the suspected bully responds positively, changes behavior or even apologises, then he may just be a suspected bully and nothing more. But if he/she responds negatively, the other steps become necessary
 - **Present**: showcase specific and concrete evidence of bullying behaviours
 - **Expose**: expose the bully and his/her enablers. Since they use fear of consequence as their main instrument, try and conduct an audit to see if he is using bullying to cover up financial illegalities
- An empirical study by Ayodele & Belo [2008:146], though based in a school environment finds that managerial behavior, organizational climate and management/staff collaboration in the war against bullying [participatory behavior] are critical factors in any meaningful effort to contain bullying at workplaces. Specifically and following from the study, they recommend that:
- CEOs should realize that their behavior reflects the organizational climate and influence the behaviours of others in the organization. They should thus adopt participatory paradigm have genuine concern for staff welfare and empower the staff through peer-support services
 - Empower and get all categories of staff involved in team building activities and organization of organizational events
 - Create an environment that encourages hard work, friendly attitudes and vigilance for signs of bullying which should be reported
 - Create organization-based bullying prevention and management processes that are regularly updated and adhered to[2008:150]

McCarthy *et al* [2003:11] also conclude that management has the responsibility for creating positive work environment which in turn helps to contain bullying behaviours. The ‘whole school approach’ which is adopted from school bullying management is also a usable strategy. This type of intervention has three distinct stages to deal with the manifestations and causes of bullying behaviour [Carney & Merrell, 2001:364]. The first stage is a reactive one, crisis management. This can include approaches such as punishments, reasoning with the bullies, talking to the bully in a non-threatening manner and investigating incidents using a standardized procedure. The second stage is composed of intervention strategies. These are focused primarily on times and places where the potential victims are vulnerable. This may be particular areas identified as “bullying hotspots”. The third stage is Prevention, a proactive component.

Peer group initiatives adapted from the school environment are also useful. These are participatory responses to the issue of bullying, whereby relatively senior staff receive training in order to contribute to anti-bullying strategies such as mediation, mentoring, befriending and counseling. The aim is to create a more protective environment in workplace and to increase peer intervention in situations where bullying occurs. Peer involvement in anti-bullying strategies appears logical when it is considered that bullying occurs within a social context. Indeed, Craig and Pepler (1997) observed that peers were present in 85% of bullying episodes that occurred O’Connell & Craig (1999:437).

Methodology

Research Design

This study adopted descriptive research method because the variables under study are mainly non-metric which requires the collection of primary data.

Population and Sample size

The target population for the study consists of senior, middle and junior management of various organisations in Nigeria. From this infinite population, 300 sample size was chosen which was selected using stratified random sampling procedure. The stratification is carried out into three (3) levels of management staff in which 100 managers are obtained from each stratum of senior, middle and junior management level by randomization.

Instrumentation

The primary data which was the basis of findings in this study are collected from sample respondents through the medium of a structured and self-administered close-ended questionnaire. This instrument was used since it has the potential of generating higher response rate compared with open-ended alternative.

Sampling Procedure and Administration of Instrument

The respondents in this study are selected using stratified sampling techniques and the mail questionnaire is self-administered by the researchers. Each copy of the questionnaire was given to the respondents for completion. Many of the respondents completed the instrument and returned immediately while other instrument is accordingly retrieved a few days after administration.

Data Analysis

The results of this study are presented in Tables, showing descriptive statistics of the data collected with mail questionnaire. The frequency distribution of the questionnaire items are presented with the percentages.

Results

Table 1A: Social Characteristics of Respondents

Gender			Status			Work experience			Highest Qualification		
	Freq.	%	Variable	Freq.	%	Variable	Freq.	%	Variable	Freq.	%
Female	40	34.8	Junior staff	13	11.3	Above 20 Years	43	37.4	Professional Qualification	24	20.9
Male	75	65.2	Supervisory staff	11	9.6	16-20 Years	28	24.3	Doctorate degree	3	2.6
			Middle manager	48	41.7	11-15 Years	5	4.3	Masters' degree	49	42.6
			Top Management staff	43	37.4	6-10 Years	15	13.0	Bachelor's degree	36	31.3
						1-5 Years	24	20.9	Below Bachelor's degree	3	2.6
Total	115	100.0		115	100.0		115	100.0		115	100.0

Table 1A presents the demographic characteristics of the respondents. The variables presented include gender, status, educational qualification, and working experience

Table 1B: Working Characteristics of Respondents

Sector			Ownership of your Organisation			Location		
Variable	Freq.	%	Variable	Freq.	%	Variable	Freq.	%
Others	8	7.0	Mixed	14	12.2	Others	40	34.8
Educational	13	11.3	Multinational	6	5.2	Lagos	75	65.2
Government	20	17.4	Foreign	13	11.3			
Service	22	19.1	Fully indigenous	82	71.3			
Banking	43	37.4						
Manufacturing	9	7.8						
Total	115	100.0		115	100.0		115	100.0

Table 1B presents the sector where the respondents are working, ownership of the organisation and where respondents organisations are located within the country.

Research Question 1: To establish why organisations should be concerned about bullying

Table 2: Why should firm be concerned with bullying

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	-----------	---------	--------------------

Impact on staff turnover and absenteeism	19	16.5	16.5
Impact on productivity	53	46.1	62.6
Employee morale	26	22.6	85.2
Employee wellbeing	17	14.8	100.0
Total	115	100.0	

Table 2 shows why organisation should be concerned about bullying. Table 2 shows that impact of bullying on productivity as the highest variable which prompt managers of organisation to be concern about bullying in the work place.

Research Question 3: To ascertain the existence and structure of bullying policies in Nigeria

Table 3: Bullying in the past and Policy

	Experience Bullying before		Organisations have bullying policy	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
No	53	46.1	77	67.0
Yes	62	53.9	38	33.0
Total	115	100.0	115	100.0

Table 3 shows that 53.9% of the respondents have experienced one form of bullying or the others in the past. The Table also indicates that 67% of the respondents claim that their organisations do not have any bullying policy. This is despite the fact that majority in Table 3 claimed that they have been bullied in the past. Majority of the respondents (74.1%) claimed that their organisation does not have any bullying policy in the pipeline. The valid percent was used because this is the percentage of respondents that completed this aspect of the questionnaire item because the answer depends on the previous question. Majority of respondent (73%) in responding to another question had no formal training on how to handle bullying situation.

Research Question 2: To find out the nature, scope and pervasiveness of bullying in Nigeria

Table 4: Indicate the type of bullying you have witnessed or experienced (You may tick more than one)

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Unfair treatment	71	17.7	17.7
Verbal insults	64	16.0	33.7
Misuse of power or position	59	14.7	48.4
Blocking promotion/Training opportunities	49	12.2	60.6
Spreading malicious rumours	28	7.0	67.6
Undermining by overloading or criticism	26	6.5	74.1
Exclusion	26	6.5	80.5
Overbearing supervision	25	6.2	86.8
Making threats about job security	25	6.2	93.0
Physical intimidation/violence	16	4.0	97.0
Unwelcome sexual advances	12	3.0	100.0

Total	401	100.0	
--------------	------------	--------------	--

Table 4 presents results of the types of bullying experienced by the respondents in the past. Among the top ones are; unfair treatment, verbal insults, misuse of power or position and blocking promotion/training opportunities.

On the types of bullying relationships witnessed at their places of work, the highest is ‘bullying by a manager of their subordinates’, this is followed by bullying by a director. The least occurrence is bullying of managers by subordinates. The respondents also identified authoritarian management style, lack of management skills, personality of managers or colleagues top the list of contributors to bullying while organisational change is the least contributor to bullying.

Table 5: Rate the level of bullying in your organisation

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very high bullying	1	.9	.9
High bullying	9	7.8	8.7
Average bullying	34	29.6	38.3
Low bullying	50	43.5	81.7
No bullying	21	18.3	100.0
Total	115	100.0	

In Table 5, 43.5% of the respondents rated incidence of bullying low while 29.6% rated it average. Leadership style may be a variable that contributes to incidence of bullying hence, in responding to a question, bureaucratic, innovative and authoritarian leadership styles top the list of leadership style being practiced in the respondents’ organisations.

Table 6: How effective are the approaches to bullying management

Response Variable	Deterring Bullying		Responding to specific incidents	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Very effective	9	7.8	11	9.6
Quite effective	52	45.2	70	60.9
Ineffective	27	23.5	19	16.5
Makes problem worse	27	23.5	15	13.0
Total	115	100.0	115	100.0

Deterring bully as a bullying management approach according to the results in Table 6, is considered to be quite effective by 45.2%, ineffective by 23.5% or make problem worse by 23.5% respondents. Responding to specific incidents as an approach to bullying management according to the results in Table 5, is considered to be quite effective by 60.9%, ineffective by 16.5%, and make problem worse by 13.0% of the respondents.

Table 7: Incidence of and commitment to, tackling bullying in the work place

	Increasing Incidence of Bullying		Commitment to Tackling Bullying Problem	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Strongly agree	31	27.0	39	33.9
Agree	74	64.3	36	31.3
No opinion/Undecided	1	.9	37	32.2
Disagree	9	7.8	3	2.6
Total	115	100.0	115	100.0

Table 7 shows that 64.3% of the respondents agree and 27% strongly agree that incidence of bullying are increasing in the work place in Nigeria. Table 6 indicates that 33.9% of the respondents strongly agree and 31.3% agree that they are committed to tackling bullying in Nigeria despite the fact that majority of the organisation where they work have no bullying policies.

Research question 5: To establish managers' perception about bullying in Nigeria

Table 8: Managers perception about bullying issues

	Employees should have responsibilities for bullying issues			Employees who are persistent bullies should be dismissed		
	Frequency	%	Cumulative %	Frequency	%	Cumulative %
Strongly agree	37	32.2	32.2	39	33.9	33.9
Agree	50	43.5	75.7	23	20.0	53.9
No opinion/Undecided	6	5.2	80.9	14	12.2	66.1
Disagree	18	15.7	96.5	30	26.1	92.2
Strongly disagree	4	3.5	100.0	9	7.8	100.0
Total	115	100.0		115	100.0	

In Table 8, majority of the respondents agree (43.5%) and strongly agree (32.2%) that employees should have responsibilities for bullying issues. Table 7 also indicates that 33.9% of the respondents strongly agree, 20.0% agree while 26.1 disagree that employees who are persistent bullies should be dismissed.

Table 9: My organisation is quite effective in responding to bullying

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	13	11.3	11.3
Agree	52	45.2	56.5
No opinion/Undecided	19	16.5	73.0
Disagree	15	13.0	86.1
Strongly disagree	16	13.9	100.0

Total	115	100.0	
--------------	------------	--------------	--

Table 9 shows that 45.2% agree, 11.3% strongly agree, 13.9% strongly disagree and 13.0% disagree that their organisation is quite effective in responding to bullying even though the majority of the organisations do not have bullying policy.

Table 10: I have behaved in a manner which may have been perceived as bullying others

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Strongly agree	6	5.2	5.2
Agree	24	20.9	26.1
No opinion/Undecided	24	20.9	47.0
Disagree	35	30.4	77.4
Strongly disagree	26	22.6	100.0
Total	115	100.0	

Table 10 indicates that 30.4% and 22.6% disagree and strongly disagree respectively while 20.9% agree that they have behave in a manner which may have been perceived as bullying others.

Table 11: Preferred solution to bullying relationship (You may tick more than one

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Talk to person behaving in bullying manner	83	31.2	31.2
Inform HR department	53	19.9	51.1
Talk to person being bullied	44	16.5	67.7
Talk to senior manager	34	12.8	80.5
Consult a union	29	10.9	91.4
Consult other colleagues	21	7.9	99.2
Turn a blind eye	2	.8	100.0
Total	266	100.0	

From Table 11, a more of the respondents would rather talk to the bullies[31%] followed by those who would inform the HR department[20%]. Only a very few[8%] would turn a blind eye

Research Question 4: To find out bullying management practices in Nigeria.

Table 12: Elements of bullying policy contained in organisation's Staff Manual

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative %
Guidelines on acceptable behaviour	49	24.3	24.3
Formal process e.g. grievance procedure	36	17.8	42.1
Awareness training	22	10.9	53.0
Defined responsibilities for managers	20	9.9	62.9
Informal process e.g. discussion with manager/Human	19	9.4	72.3

Resource			
Contact point for advice	16	7.9	80.2
Internal confidential counselling	15	7.4	87.6
Defined responsibilities of trade union/Employee representatives	14	6.9	94.6
Definition of bullying	7	3.5	98.0
External counselling	2	1.0	99.0
Others (Please specify)	2	1.0	100.0
Total	202	100.0	

From table 12, the most common elements of bullying policy in staff manual are guidelines on acceptable behaviour[24%], formal process[18%] awareness training[11%] and defined responsibilities for managers[10%]

Discussion and Conclusion

Discussion of Results

Bullying has gradually crept into organisations in Nigeria. Subordinates and managers are experiencing bullying from their colleagues and superiors. Incidence of bullying is being witnessed in work place and this should be handled because it is affecting workers morale, employee turnover and absenteeism, employees wellbeing and productivity. In comparison to the UK study by (CIM) London, the incidence of bullying is increasing more than the Nigerian case.

The scope of bullying is adjudged by majority of the respondents to be low but those who claimed that bullying is average is considerable. In another response to the questionnaire item, 91 percent of the respondents agree that bullying incidence is increasing in the workplace in Nigeria. This shows that if proactive policies are not put in place to check the incidence, the case of bullying may go out of hands. From the leadership styles that contribute to bullying, bureaucracy and authoritarian leadership styles top the list. Among the types of bullying in the work place are unfair treatments, verbal insults, misuse of power or position and blocking promotion or training opportunities. Among the bullying experienced by respondents include bullying by managers of their subordinates, bullying by directors, bullying by external customers or clients, bullying between peers and bullying of managers by subordinates.

In this study, many of the organisations where the respondents work do not have a formal bullying policy despite the fact that many claimed that they have been bullied in the past. This is different from the CIM study in the UK where the majority of respondents agreed that their organisations have bullying policies. Despite these, majority of the respondents claimed that these organisations do not have any plan to formulate bullying policies at present. Since there is no bullying policies now or in the pipeline, few of the respondents claimed they have had formal training on how to handle bullying. In the UK too, majority of respondents claimed that they have not had training on how to handle bullying incidence.

Deterring bullying approaches according to majority of the respondents is quite effective while substantial percentage of the respondents believe it is ineffective and sometimes it will make bullying problems to become worse. In managing bullying, responding to specific incidence may be quite effective according to the majority of the respondents. In addition, respondents believe that formal process (such as grievance procedure), awareness training and defining responsibilities for managers are things that could be done to manage bullying. In the report of Chartered Management Institute

Majority of the respondents agree that managers are committed to tackling bullying and that employees should have responsibilities for bullying issues. Employees who are persistent bullies according to majority of the respondents should be dismissed. Majority of the respondents suggested that in order to find solutions to the issue of bullying in the workplace there is need to talk to person behaving in bullying manner, Human Resources Department must be involved and they should be informed. The person being bullied should be involved by talking to him/her. However, turning a blind eye will not help the case.

Conclusion

Bullying takes many forms among the respondents' organisations, hence Owoyemi and Oyelere (2010) assertions about nature and scope of bullying are supported by this study. This study agreed with Fisher-Blando (2008), Garry & Namie (2007) and Adenuga (2009) that the incidence of bullying is on the increase. Some management and leadership styles contribute to the incidence of bullying more than the others. Innovative and democratic management styles will not lead to high incidence of bullying unlike authoritarian and bureaucratic leadership style. Therefore, management of organisations need to examine the type of management style they use if incidence of bullying is very high. There is need for policies and programmes to be developed in order to tackle bullying incidence because the effects on the victim, witnesses and the organisation may not be palatable. This is in line with the study of Djukorvik *et al* (2004), Nnaike (2012), Canada Safety Council (2002), Namie and Namie (2003) and Department of Labour & Industry (2008), where they enumerate the consequences of bullying.

Strategies to cope with and manage bullying in this study include reporting the bullies to superior (this could be HR Department's manager), management showing commitment to curb the act by formulating policies to minimise it (Adenuga, 2009). Training of staff is also a suggestion given in this study (see Okubanjo, 2007; Ayodele, 2003; Peterson & Righby, 1999 and Ayodele & Bello, 2008). It should be noted that managerial style is can encourage bullying (see Ayodele and Belo, 2008), thus management perception on issue of bullying could encourage or discourage the incidence. This study supports the view of Carney and Merrell (2001) that management has the responsibility to deal with bullying. In comparison with the CIM London (2005) study, there are differences in the incidence of bullying and the formulation and implementation of policies to curb the problem. The incidence is high in the UK than in Nigeria while there were policies in place in

UK to handle it than in Nigeria where there is no policy put in place. The effect of bullying on workers morale and wellbeing is similar in the two studies and countries.

Limitations of Study and Suggestion for Further Studies

This study was carried out covering every organisations, the scope is therefore too large. For further study, an organisation or a firm should be used as case study. The study also used questionnaire instrument to collect data, hence further information which the researchers do not know cannot be ascertained. It is suggested that interview should be conducted in addition to the use of questionnaire. The study did not formulate or test any hypothesis, descriptive statistics was used to analyse the data collected. There is need to make propositions/assertions and test them in further studies.

References

- Adenuga, O A[2009] Bullying at workplace: Coping strategies. *African Journal of Research in Personal & Counseling Psychology*, 1[1], 153-158
- Adesins,G[2012] A wayward dullard. *The News*, April 2nd, p37
- Ayodele, K.O[2003] Psycho-sociological Factors as Correlates of Antisocial Behaviour Among Private Secondary Students in Sagamu LGA of Ogun State, Nigeria. M.Ed Dissertation, University of Ibadan
- Ayodele,K.O & Bello, A.A[2008] reduction of Bullying tendencies among secondary school students: A multiple regression analyses. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 1[1] 146-156
- Canada Safety Council. (2002). *Bullying in the workplace*. Retrieved May 6, 2006, from <http://www.safety-council.org/info/OSH/bullies.html>
- Carney, A. G. & Merrell, K. W. (2001) Bullying in schools: perspectives on understanding and preventing an international problem. *School-Psychology-International* 22 (3): 364-382.
- Community Care (14/01/1999) *The Playground Blues*. 14th january
- Department of Labour & Industries[2008] Workplace bullying: What everyone needs to know. Report Number 72-2-2008, April.
- Djurkovic,N; McCormack,D; & Casmir,G[2004] The physical and psychological effects of workplace bullying and their relationship to intension leave: A test of the Psychosomatic and Disability Hypothesis. *International Journal of Organisational Theory & Behaviour*,7[4] 469-497
- Eriksen, W & Einarsen, S[2004] Gender minority as a risk factor of exposure to bullying at work: the case of male assistant nurses. *European Journal of Work & Organisational Psychology*, 13[4], 473-492
- Fisher-Blando, J.L[2008] Workplace bullying: aggressive behavior and its effect on job satisfaction and productivity. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Phoenix, January**
- Grosper,N & Froschl,M[2000] the role of gender in young childrens' teasing and bullying behavior. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 33, 48-56

- Hanson, B.C[2011] How to diagnose and eliminate workplace bullying *HBR Monthly Management Review*, July, p6
- Hoel,H; Cooper,C & Faragher,B [2001] the experience of bullying in Great Britain: The impact of organizational status. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*,10[4]443-465
- Hoel, H[2006] *The limits of regulations: Assessing the effectiveness of Swedish regulations against workplace bullying*. Paper presented at the 5th International Conference on Workplace Bullying.
- Leymann H[1996] The content and development at work. *European Journal of Work & Organisational Psychology*,5[2]165-182
- McCarthy,P;Sheeham,M & Henderson,M[2003] Ethical investment and workplace bullying: Consonances and dissonances. *International Journal of Management & Decision Making*, 4[1]11-23
- Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2003). *The bully at work: What you can do to stop the hurt and reclaim your dignity on the job*. Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks
- Nnaike,U[2010] Bullying as bane of academic success. *Thisday*, October 27th
- O'Connell, P. Pepler, D. & Craig, W. (1999) Peer involvement in bullying: insights and challenges for intervention. Journal of Adolescence 22: 437-452**
- Okubanjo,O.O[2001] A comparison of public and public school teachers strategies in handling classroom disruptive behavior of children. *Ogun Journal of Counseling Studies*,1[1], 34-41
- Olewus,D[1993] *Bullying at school: what we know and what we can do*; New Jersey, Blackwell
- Owoyemi,O & Oyelere,M[2010] Workplace bullying: An undiagnosed social problem in workplaces in Nigeria. *Journal of Management & Organisational Behaviour*, 1[2], 61-73
- Peterson, L & Righby,K[1999] Countering bullying in Australian secondary schools. *Journal of Adolescence*. 22[4]481-492
- Salin,D[2003] The significance of gender in prevalence, forms and perception of workplace bullying. *Nordiske Organisasjonsstudier*, 5[3], 30-50
- Smith, P. K., & Shu, S. (2000) What good schools can do about bullying. Findings from a survey in English schools after a decade of research and action. *Childhood* 7 (2): 193-212.
- Vertia,M[2003] *Workplace Bullying: A study on the work environmrnt, well-being and health*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Helsinki