check for updates

PREVALENCE OF WORKPLACE BULLYING IN UNIVERSITY

Check for updates

iD **Md. Mostafizur Rahman¹⁺**
iD **Md. Rayhanul Islam²**
iD **Md. Zahangir Kabir³**

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Faculty of Business Studies, Hajee Mohammad Danesh Science and Technology University, Dinajpur, Bangladesh.
Email: mostafiz@hstu.ac.bd Tel: +8801717714767
²Senior Lecturer, Department of Real State, Faculty of Business & Entrepreneurship, Daffodil International University, Dhaka, Bangladesh.
Email: rayhanul.bba@diu.edu.bd Tel: +8801729703657
³Professor, Department of Management, Faculty of Business Studies, Hajee Mohammad Danesh Science and Technology University, Dinajpur, Bangladesh.
Email: zahangirhstu@yahoo.com Tel: +8801713163351

(+ Corresponding author)

ABSTRACT

Workplace bulling is a ubiquitous phenomenon with negative consequences for the mental and physical health of targets and the output of organizations. The aim of this study was to assess the prevalence of workplace bullying among the academic and non-academic staffs of two sampled universities. Primary data were collected through a well-structured self-administered questionnaire. Data were analyzed using SPSS (Version: 24) software. The study found that some incidence of bullying are addressed in both institutions in the mode of withholding valuable information, ordered to do unpleasant tasks, overburdened by goals, excessive monitoring, try to finds faults, ignored in workplace, indication for leaving job, hostility in workstation, unwelcomed message or phone calls, being shouted, and fill threatened. The types of bullying presence are from 3% to 30% and DIU has more occurrences of bullying in comparison to HSTU. The present study revealed that some respondents are not conscious about bullying even they are not concern on such issues. They are reluctant to report the incidents happened on them or others. The study suggests that the universities and decision makers must be aware to address the modes of different bullying to resolve negative acts in workplace.

Contribution/ Originality: The paper's primary contribution is finding that there is a prevalence of bullying in higher education. This study will contribute to the existing literature for academic, policy holders, and government to address the problems.

1. INTRODUCTION

Tertiary education in Bangladesh includes two types of organizations are degree awarding universities and affiliated colleges to national university. The degree awarding is categorized into public and private universities. There are 40 public and 101 private universities in Bangladesh (University Grants Commission of Bangladesh (UGCa), 2019). A great number of human resources are employed there as academia, and academic & non-academic staffs. Undoubtedly, it can be concluded that a plenty of employment opportunities are created in higher education sector of Bangladesh. Human resources are one of the influential resources in any types of organizational settings. In the knowledge world, we cannot ignore the importance of human resources. Present world is highly focused on

jobs, organizations, and industries in which skills, knowledge, and capabilities of people are important rather than capabilities of machines and technologies (Lengnick-Hall and Lengnick-Hall, 2003). As a knowledge creating sector the universities are entitled to concentrate on knowledge friendly culture so that they can share the knowledge for the development of the country as a whole. Naachimuthu (2007) believe that sharing, control and reprocess of knowledge should become a part of structural culture to tap its combined wisdom. To ensure a better culture organization need to develop a congenial working environment for human resources.

In the contemporary context, every organization wants to foster and gain distinctive advantages and human recourse of any organization plays a vital role in achieving it. It is evident that, workplace bullying, for the reason that of its severe individual and organizational effects, weakens from the development and care of vital, varied and highly productive workplaces (Branch et al., 2013). The meaning of bullying at work is the irritating, felonious, or socially excluding someone or harmfully affecting someone's job. In order for the naming bullying to be applied to a particular setting, interaction, or system, the bullying action has to happen regularly and repeatedly (e.g., daily or weekly) and over a period of time (e.g., about 6 months). Bullying is an intensifying process in the course of which the person opposed ends up in a low-grade position and becomes the goal of systematic negative societal acts. A disagreement cannot be named bullying if the occurrences is isolated event or if two parties of almost equal strength are in disagreement (Olweus, 1987;1991;1994; Einarsen and Skogstad, 1996; Leymann, 1996; Zapf, 1999). A very small amount of study on bullying had been conducted in Bangladesh. In a M. Phil thesis of Mahmood (2016) found that there is a presence of bullying in school level teachers and students in Dhaka city result psychological state like hopelessness, anger, anxiety, depression and sometimes suicide.

The objectives of the study is to find out the prevalence of the workplace bullying in HSTU and DIU of Bangladesh among the university teachers, officers and employees to address the problems and to find some solutions in both public and private sector. Most of the competent tertiary graduate is produced from the aforementioned 141 universities those are considered as population. Later on, this project guide some measures based on the prevalence of bullying among university teachers and staffs that could be a guideline for the university authorities and the policy makers. Additionally, this project also provides some comparative investigation in both sample universities.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURES

2.1. Workplace Bullying: Antecedents and Consequences

A variety of studies on bullying at work have been found in present studies especially in the context of Europe. Some popular books had been published in European context are Niedl (1995); Einarsen et al. (1994); Leymann (1993); Ege (1996); Field (1996); Rayner et al. (2002) and many mores. Bullying concept is expanded in different tags such as 'mobbing' (Leymann, 1996; Zapf et al., 1996) 'bullying' (Einarsen and Skogstad, 1996; Rayner, 1997) 'harassment' (Björkqvist et al., 1994) 'psychological terror' (Leymann, 1990) and 'victimization' (Einarsen and Raknes, 1997). However, they all look to explain the same impression, namely the systematic maltreatment of a subordinate, a peer, or a superior, which, if continued, may create severe social, emotional and psychological troubles in the victim. Experience to such treatment has been appealed to be a more disturbing and crippling problem for employees than all other types of work-related stress put together, and is seen by many results and targets alike as an excessive type of social stress at work (Zapf et al., 1996). Many researchers require that emotional, psychological or physiological harm be inflicted on a target before bullying is said to have happened. This standpoint is captured in the description provided by Einarsen (1999) exposed above, in which negative actions must clearly cause dishonor, offence and distress.

The dentition depends on the perspective and the situation in which the bullying happens. Different findings define bullying as a long-lasting, recurrent, direct or indirect aggressive act which is focused on the victims (Olweus, 1993; Monks et al., 2009). Bullying can be verbal or bodily, but it is always a methodical and spontaneous

way of action. Further, there is a sign of negative consequences on the bully's well-being (Monks *et al.*, 2009). Sociological outcomes have been precarious of these definitions, uttering that they oversee situational factors and socio-cultural proportions, such as social class, race, gender, or sexual orientations (Ringrose and Renold, 2010). Brank *et al.* (2012) specified that bullying results are fearful, weak, and nervous. Skapinakis *et al.* (2011) found that victims were more likely to report desperate conclusions than were bullies. Bullying is less frequent in higher education than at other levels of studies. Conversely, this may be partly explained by the absence of study on the subject in this setting (Coleyshaw, 2010).

2.2. Workplace Bullying in Diverse Context

Since the wider workplace bullying works, the projected prevalence of bullying varies depending on the nature of the sample size, the operationalization of the theory, the time for bullying experiences, and the region in which the research was conducted (for an outstanding review of prevalence rates through work settings, Zapf *et al.* (2011). The degrees of bullying range from 18% to almost 68% and it seems relatively high when likened to those noted in the overall population, in which rate is up to 5% in Scandinavian states, up to 20% in the UK and up to 14% in the US (Rayner and Cooper, 2006; Keashly and Jagatic, 2011). The degrees of people beholding bullying range from 22% to 75% by bulls and witnesses; bullying looks to be an unfortunately familiar feature of academic settings. The study of Twale and Luca (2008) has been found that an accusation that bullying is on the rise in academia

2.3. Bullying in Academic Settings

In recent times there are an increasing attention has been drawn to the wunderkind of 'bullying' in schools and workplaces. There is a rising body of investigation on this issue, in several countries (Simpson and Cohen, 2004; Salmivalli *et al.*, 2005; Kunttu and Huttunen, 2009; Coleyshaw, 2010; Keashly and Neuman, 2010). Conversely, there seems to be a scarcity of study concerning bullying at university. Awareness of bullying among students, and the way in which it experienced, is rather need more concentration. Universities have not been much interested in cheering exploration in this arena (Coleyshaw, 2010). Though, as bullying is recognized to exist in colleges, educational institutes and workplaces, it is rational to assume that universities cannot be exempt from it. Research findings' provide signal that being the target of bullying influences an individual's safety, and escalations the risk of psychic and social problems. Roles which relate to the bully or the victim can follow individuals through their lives, from college up until working life (e.g. (Hawker and Boulton, 2000; Woods and Wolke, 2004; Ledley *et al.*, 2006; Monks *et al.*, 2009; Meland *et al.*, 2010)). The dentition of bullying is not unequivocal.

The study of Mahmood (2016) in the context of Bangladesh found that the children in Mirpur region in Dhaka city are showed experience of bullying in a broad range and that represents different classes of the urban society. So, the evidence of this study about bullying in high school should be the concerning issue. Hossain (2010) observed that Bullying is a serious offence at the workplace, and a sadly ignored agenda in most of the organizations in Bangladesh. Presently, eve-teasing and sexual harassment is mostly discussed topic in Bangladesh. The government of Bangladesh set some laws regarding eve-teasing and sexual harassment. But a few researchers addressed such issues very closely. This study will certainly fill this gap and it will be a great initiative for the first time in Bangladesh.

2.4. Limitation of the Study

Most of the respondents of the study were shy and unwilling to share the information regarding bullying specially about sexual harassment. Sometimes they try to hide the occurrences of bullying and initiatives taken by him during the time of bullied with him or his/her colleagues. They have an erroneous believe that nothing could be happened positive but their information will share with others. In most cases the respondent share that bullied complain are not addressed properly through administration that's why they have a fear of not sharing information

which make troublesome in data collection suitably. DIU respondents were more shy or reluctant to response and most of the respondents from DIU were not wish to answer especially about the experiences of bullying and victimization with himself/herself and about others which he/she observed. They believe that if they share their information to the researchers the authority may take some actions against them.

3. METHODS AND MATERIALS

The study has been conducted on the basis of primary and secondary data sources. Hajee Mohammad Danesh Science and Technology University (HSTU) and Daffodil International University (DIU) were taken as sample institution. During the time of sampling determination the number of respondent were conducted by probability sampling techniques. The sample size were determined as per the population of HSTU and DIU with a confidence level = 95% and confidence interval = 5 as in the Table 1. Data regarding the population were collected from the establishment department of HSTU and DIU as on the end of June, 2018. For analyzing the collected data the cross tabulation and SPSS were used.

Table-1. Determination of sampling.

SN	Position of respondents	HSTU-Population	HSTU-Sample	Usable Data	DIU-Population	DIU-Sample	Usable Data
1	Professor	54	19	19	119	26	19
2	Associate Prof.	52	18	19	69	15	12
3	Assistant Prof.	85	29	30	138	30	24
4	Lecturer/Tutors	85	29	32	502	109	77
5	Officers	182	63	52	228	50	32
6	Employees	268	93	89	327	71	35
	Total	726	251	241	1383	301	199

A self-administered close ended questionnaire was distributed among the 552 respondents and they are Teachers, Officers and Employees of HSTU, Dinapur and DIU, Dhaka to collect primary data. Out of them 440 respondent filled the questionnaire properly. Overall 80% filled correctly, among them 96% from HSTU and 66% from DIU. The questionnaire was developed on the basis of bullying in higher education (Keashly and Neuman, 2013) scale and Negative behaviors at work (bullying) one of the most popular scale of bullying developed by Hoel and Cooper (2000) followed by a questionnaire developed in Norway by Einarsen and Raknes (1997) named 'The Negative Acts Questionnaire'- NAQ. NAQ was consists of 29 items with the response alternatives: "Never," "Now and then," "Monthly," "Weekly" and "Daily". The study collapsed the latter three categories into "bullied" for statistical analysis. The reliability statistics for NAQ were also measured in Table 2 to see the reliability of data.

Table-2. Reliability statistics.

Category	Cronbach's alpha	Cronbach's alpha based on standardized items	No of items
Work-related Bullying	.743	.733	7
Person-related Bullying	.860	.858	15
Physically-intimidating Bullying	.678	.694	7
Total	.911	.912	29

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study aims to see the prevalence or degree of bullying in university level that is in HSTU and DIU that directly impedes the productivity of human resources. It creates negative impact on employee physical and mental health. It is clear to attain agreement that being bullied or persistently showing to negative behavior at work will have some influence on health (Rayner *et al.*, 2002). Sometimes, the competent employees are tried to leave the organization for bullying. A survey on USA concluded that a much stronger relationship between bullying and

'intention to quit' over between bullying and 'looking for a new job' (Keashly and Jagatic, 2000). This study carried out some scientific reevaluation of bullying in HEIs in the context of Bangladesh.

To quantify the prevalence of workplace bullying there might have some problems on the side of victims and bully. Therefore, the scope of bully needs to extend further than the targets to the bully or bullies and the workplace itself. Sometimes, it is necessary to address the bullying beyond the individual level (e.g., group level, department level, organization level). The concept of bullying did not obtain more popularity in the context of Bangladesh because a major number of the employees of the universities are not cautious about their rights and positions. As a result, they are not even found the necessity of addressing or reporting the occurrences of bullying to the authority. A collective idea that something is wrong would exist, and an awareness that action needs to be taken. Knowing why people do not label themselves may help us to understand some of the myths around bullying at work, for instance, some people may discover it to be a protective measure in order to resist the role of the 'victim' (Einarsen and Hellesøy, 1998). This study was an endeavor to open up the incidents that need to be known or focused. The prevalence of bullying in the workplace is subdivided into three categories by the nature of NAQ items are work related, person related, and physically intimidating bullying.

4.1. Work-Related Bullying

NAQ item number 1, 4, 16, 19, 20, 22, 24, 27, & 28 comprises work-related bullying. There are 8.5% of the employee reported that someone withholding information about their workplace in DIU see Table 3. 3%-4% of the employees are ordered to do the odd tasks which degrade their competencies and their opinion is being ignored. Furthermore, 5%-7% also claimed that they need to carry out more jobs beyond their job description. Surprisingly, 15.6% employees of the DIU discussed that they are overburdened by targets and deadline whereas 6.1% in HSTU claimed the same. HSTU employees (4.5%) claimed that their colleagues are trying to find their faults sometimes that make them unhappy. Almost 9% of DIU and 5% of HSTU employees have appealed that they have excessive monitoring over their tasks.

4.2. Person-Related Bullying

Person-relating bullying consists of NAQ items number 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 21, 23, 25, & 29. Results shows that 8.2% & 9.5% employees from HSTU & DIU respectively reported that they need to do unpleasant tasks rather the key areas of responsibility removed from job duties see Table 3. Approximately, 11% of employees from DIU assertion their bullying by ignore or exclusion and 7% got message to leave the job. Additionally, a few employees reminded for their mistake and actively criticized for errors in the workplace. A major number of workforces more than 30% face hostility when s/he approaches before someone in DIU and 7% in HSTU. The employees of DIU have the experiences of unwelcomed message, phone call, and emails from workplace or colleagues.

4.3. Physically-Intimidating Bullying

It's a very severe types of bullying in an organization to assess that sort of bullying this study provide a list of items in NAQ are 9, 10, 12, 22, 26, 28 & 29. Some (6%) employees of DIU is being shouted at or being the target of spontaneous anger in the workplace whereas almost 11% is being moved or transferred against their will in Table 3. The employees of HSTU (7%) fill threatened to make the life difficult by different unwanted tasks and pressures.

Therefore, from Table 3 it can be concluded that the incidence of bullying is more considering the factors is more severe in DIU. Likewise, in some factors both sample Universities have a little or no complain of bullying. Sometimes a major portion of respondents ignore few items by answering never like item no 2, 12, 21, 23 & 25 see.

Table-3. The respondents show their experience of negative behavior (bullying/harassment) at their workplace based on NAQ. (*In percentage terms*).

Item no	The experiences of bullying of teachers, employees and staffs of universities	HSTU (N=241)			DIU (N=199)		
		Never	Now & Then	MWD*	Never	Now & Then	MWD*
1.	Someone withholding information which affects your performance	59.0	38.9	0.8	53.8	37.7	8.5
2.	Unwanted sexual attention	86.9	11.9	0.0	67.3	30.7	2.0
3.	Being humiliated or ridiculed in connection with your work	59.8	37.7	1.2	84.4	11.6	4.0
4.	Being order to do the work below your level of competence	56.1	38.5	4.1	68.8	28.1	3.0
5.	Having key areas of responsibility removed or replaced with more trivial or unpleasant tasks	47.1	43.4	8.2	36.2	54.3	9.5
6.	Spreading of gossip and rumors about you	58.2	38.9	1.6	85.9	14.1	0.0
7.	Being ignored, excluded or being 'Sent to Coventry'	52.5	45.1	1.2	70.9	18.1	11.1
8.	Having insulting or offensive remarks made about your person (i,e. habits and background), your attitude or private life	66.8	29.9	2.0	50.8	47.7	1.5
9.	Being shouted at or being the target of spontaneous anger	64.3	30.3	4.1	47.2	46.7	6.0
10.	Intimidating behavior such as finger pointing, invasion of personal space, showing, blocking/barring the way	76.2	19.3	3.3	78.4	18.1	3.5
11.	Hints and Signal from others that you should quit the job	87.7	9.0	2.0	62.8	30.7	6.5
12.	Threats of violence or physical abuse	88.1	10.2	0.4	100.0	0.0	0.0
13.	Repeated reminders of your errors and mistakes	64.8	29.9	4.1	51.3	44.2	4.5
14.	Being ignored or facing hostility when you approach	50.4	41.4	7.0	38.7	31.2	30.2
15.	Persistent criticism of work and effort	52.5	39.8	6.6	83.4	12.6	4.0
16.	Having your opinions and views ignored	49.2	45.1	4.5	50.3	47.2	2.5
17.	Insulting messages, phone calls, or emails	84.4	13.5	0.8	37.7	54.8	7.5
18.	Practical jokes carried out by people you don't get on with	66.4	28.3	4.1	87.4	7.0	5.5
19.	Systematically being required to carry out tasks which clearly fall outside your job descriptions, e.g. private errands	52.5	38.9	7.4	39.7	54.8	5.5
20.	Being given tasks with unreasonable or impossible targets or deadlines	64.3	28.3	6.1	36.2	48.2	15.6
21.	Having allegations made against you	63.9	32.0	2.9	93.5	6.5	0.0
22.	Excessive monitoring of your works	57.4	36.5	4.9	28.6	62.3	9.0
23.	Offensive remarks or behavior with reference to your race or ethicality	82.4	15.2	1.2	93.5	6.5	0.0
24.	Pressure not to claim something which by you are not entitled to (e.g. sick leave, travel expenses)	78.3	18.9	1.6	74.9	24.1	1.0
25.	Being the subject of excessive teasing and sarcasm	86.9	11.1	0.8	93.5	4.0	2.5
26.	Threats of making your life difficult, (e.g overtime, night work, unpopular tasks)	76.6	15.2	7.0	69.3	29.6	1.0
27.	Attempts to find fault with your work	61.1	33.2	4.5	84.9	15.1	0.0
28.	Being exposed to an unmanageable workloads	68.9	26.2	3.7	53.3	44.7	2.0
29.	Being moved or transfer against your will	73.0	23.4	2.5	71.4	17.6	11.1

Note: *Response categories "monthly", "weekly" and "daily" have been thrown together to make one category "MWD".

4.4. Prevalence of Bullying Considering Gender and Level of Workforce

Sometimes bullying victims and offenders might very base on the gender, age, experience, and position etc. Though the present study finds that a major number of employees are male (67%). Overall 11% of the female from HSTU have the experience of bullying whereas 9% male have the experience of bullying see Table 4. The lower level female staff evident more experience. In DIU, total 37% male and 15% female have the experience of bullying in at least on one item and out of them female professors, male lecturers and female lecturers have more experience of bullying 12%, 17% and 9% respectively. Evidence from Einarsen and Skogstad (1996) presented no or little differences in the occurrence of bullying considering gender from a survey data of Norwegian employees. On the contrary, more male employees were reported as offenders. Additionally, men were typically bullied by men,

whereas women were bullied by both men and women. These findings are also identical to results by Leymann (1996) who finds that the last may be a result of a gender-segregated employment. The finding of the current study Table 4 shows that nearly 5%-7% assistant professor, lecturer, officers, and employees have the experience of bullying. The results on the bullies also parallel to a large degree with data regarding school children (Olweus, 1991). Einarsen and Skogstad (1996) also originate that older employees stated more disclosure to harassment from bullying than younger employees. Conversely, younger employees have been found to knowledge more direct attacks and negative treatment at workplace (Leymann, 1996; Einarsen and Raknes, 1997). Moreover, younger adult employees are more prospective to be both attackers and targets of violence (Felson, 1992). Generally the workers grow older, they may anticipate to be treated with more respect and dignity, later dropping their threshold for what they consider it as tolerable treatment (Einarsen and Skogstad, 1996).

Table-4. Number of bullying who have bullied once daily, weekly, & monthly*.

Category	HSTU (N=241)				DIU (N=199)				Total (N=440)			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
Total no.	170	9%	71	11%	124	37%	75	19%	294	21%	146	15%
Professor	15	1%	4	0%	16	0%	3	12%	31	1%	7	6%
Associate Prof.	10	1%	9	1%	8	2%	4	4%	18	2%	13	3%
Assistant Prof.	23	2%	7	1%	14	8%	10	5%	37	5%	17	3%
Lecturer	23	2%	9	1%	44	17%	33	9%	67	8%	42	5%
Officers	31	2%	21	3%	22	9%	10	0%	53	5%	31	1%
Employees	68	5%	21	11%	20	3%	15	1%	88	4%	36	6%

Note: *Percentage shows maximum bullied in at least one item.

4.5. What Sort of Initiatives Targets Taken in the Face of Workplace Bullying

This study estimates the targets' responses when they face bullying in the workplace records in Table 5. The main focus of this section was to examine the own assessment of bullying. According to Richman et al. (2001a) when targets' replies to bullying are observed, the usefulness of those replies is typically inferred from their association to, and restraint of, indicators of the individual's pressure and stress. If victims do not think it worked or certainly they observe it deteriorated the situation, then the result of bullying will probably be more negative. Additionally, an understanding of usefulness has consequences for a sense of effectiveness in their ability to deal with bullying, as well as their sense of organizational receptivity and effectiveness in coping with these issues. In the study of (Keashly and Neuman, 2008; Keashly and Neuman, 2013) it was found that the extant workplace bullying literature on replying employees who self-identified as being bullied were requested to designate what replies they had strained and whether the response had deteriorated, developed, or had no discernible impact on the bullying. The current study on HSTU and DIU shows that how the targets responded see Table 5. The inventiveness of victim is someway consistent with the directive of Lutgen-Sandvik (2006) and Keashly and Neuman (2013) explanations, targets did not simply "lie down and take it"; rather, they exploited, on regular, eight diverse strategies. The top strategies (50% of the targets) involved talking with coworkers, talking with family and friends, and staying calm, all of which can be considered relatively passive, indirect, and informal strategies yet deliberate and thoughtful responses.

Table-5. The initiatives the respondents were taken whenever they face bullying or harassment in their workplace and what reactions they received from the concerns.

Item number	Responses*	HSTU (N=241)			DIU (N=199)			Total (N=440)		
		% of initiatives	Made Better Situation	Made Worse Situation	% of initiatives	Made Better Situation	Made Worse Situation	% of initiatives	Made Better Situation	Made Worse Situation
1.	Talk to coworkers	90.9	209	10	24.1	42	6	60.7	251	16
2.	Talk with family and friends	83.0	176	24	24.1	42	6	56.4	218	30
3.	Stayed calm	60.2	100	45	24.1	42	6	43.9	142	51
4.	Avoid the bully	46.1	80	31	24.1	42	6	36.1	122	37
5.	Told supervisor/chair/dean	46.5	78	34	23.6	44	3	36.1	122	37
6.	Acted as if don't care	40.2	70	27	24.1	42	6	33.0	112	33
7.	Went along with behavior	38.2	70	22	24.1	42	6	31.8	112	28
8.	Had someone speak to bully	34.4	59	24	23.6	44	3	29.5	103	27
9.	Asked colleagues for help	42.3	83	19	13.6	25	2	29.3	108	21
10.	Behaved extra nice	33.6	68	13	24.1	42	6	29.3	110	19
11.	Asked bully to stop	32.8	62	17	24.1	42	6	28.9	104	23
12.	Ignored it or did nothing	32.4	53	25	24.1	42	6	28.6	95	31
13.	Not take behavior seriously	30.3	58	15	24.1	42	6	27.5	100	21
14.	Told union/ your group	28.6	55	14	24.1	42	6	26.6	97	20
15.	Made formal complaint	28.2	50	18	24.1	42	6	26.4	92	24
16.	Told HR/higher authority	24.9	40	20	24.1	42	6	24.5	82	26
17.	Threatened to tell others	24.5	36	23	24.1	42	6	24.3	78	29
18.	Lowered productivity	24.1	34	24	24.1	42	6	24.1	76	30
19.	Asked for transfer	28.2	47	21	13.6	25	2	21.6	72	23

Note: *The responses were ordered in ascending manner of total % of initiatives of both universities (N=440).

The victims are slightest likely to told higher authority, avoidance of bully, don't care, and go along with behavior. The strategies of targets can change the situation but the study finds that only 30% respondents ask help from colleagues. Victims may be more passive and may use avoidance tactics to seek support, warmth, and assistance from those around them immediately. It is particularly risky to manage these situations by itself or through more formal mechanisms. The study of Richman et al. (2001a;2001b) discloses that such exploit actually does deteriorate the situation. Even a little no of targets tells or complain to higher authority like Vice-chancellor, registrar, dean or chairman about their bullying. Because they believe that it may make the situation more worsen. The evidence is consistent with Cortina and Magley (2003) they think that telling the bully to stop was clearly a problem with the highest percentage of people claiming it made the situation worse. There was a greater likelihood of making the situation worse by giving voice through more formal union, HR and formal complaints. Some other strategies also taken by a few numbers of victims like ask bully to stop, ask for transfer, threat to tell others, and unwilling to work.

4.6. Actions of Witnesses/Passersby

To consider the actions of eyewitness the prospective for bullying circumstances to worsen and involve colleagues in the working unit, and the indication that targets look to colleagues for help, thought of the presence and replies of witnesses becomes significant in some ways.

Table-6. The initiatives respondents were taken whenever their colleagues/coworkers face bullying or harassment in workplace and what reactions they were faced.

Item number	Responses*	HSTU (N=241)			DIU (N=199)			Total (N=440)		
		% of initiatives	Made Better Situation	Made Worse Situation	% of initiatives	Made Better Situation	Made Worse Situation	% of initiatives	Made Better Situation	Made Worse Situation
1.	Talked to coworkers or other people	85.5	203	3	22.1	37	7	56.8	240	10
2.	Talked to the victim about what I saw happening	70.5	152	18	9.5	19	0	43.0	171	18
3.	Talked to family or friends	46.9	94	19	36.7	68	5	42.3	162	24
4.	Helped the bully and the victim talk to each other	55.6	123	11	9.5	19	0	34.8	142	11
5.	Went with victim when they reported the incident	50.6	114	8	15.1	27	3	34.5	141	11
6.	Told the bully to stop the behaviors	47.3	100	14	9.5	19	0	30.2	119	14
7.	Advised the victim to report the incident	39.4	84	11	18.6	31	6	30.0	115	17
8.	Advised the victim to avoid the bully	32.4	66	12	19.6	37	2	26.6	103	14
9.	Did not know what to do	34.0	61	21	9.5	19	0	23.0	80	21
10.	Reported incident to management or higher-ups	32.8	61	18	9.5	19	0	22.3	80	18
11.	Tried to keep the bully away from the victim	31.5	70	6	9.5	19	0	21.6	89	6
12.	Got other people to denounce the conduct	29.9	56	16	9.5	19	0	20.7	75	16
13.	Did nothing (ignored it)	29.0	42	28	9.5	19	0	20.2	61	28

Note: *The responses were ordered in ascending manner of total % of initiatives of both universities (N=440).

First of all, the prevalence rates for witnessing hostile communications are an indicator of the climate of an organization; that is, that others in the situation are awake of these practices. Later on, data from other situations finds that witnesses outcome negative effects, such as, stress, anxiety, unhappiness, and sleep disorders, parallel to those of targets (Vartia, 2001; Hoel *et al.*, 2003).

Finally, witnesses can play a very useful role in preventing and handling violence and intimidation (Keashly and Neuman, 2007). This study tries to capture the initiatives that were taken by the passerby during the time of bullying to address the matters see Table 6. Table shows that most of the respondent of HSTU and DIU talked about the bullying to coworkers, targets, family & friends and others 57%, 43% and 42% respectively. This point is crucial to address the prevalence of bullying. Lewis (2001) Noted that colleagues can be critical in legitimizing and validating the perceptions of a goal. Further, some witness help the bully and targets to make a solution. As we see that, colleagues (35%) went with victim to inform the authority about the incident whereas 30% try to solve the bullying by direct confrontation with bully that may worsen the situation. A few numbers of people always avoid the situation that holds the victim to avoid bully, on the contrary few suggests informing the authority about the incident. Some people are reluctant to do so and don't know what to do. Sometimes the bully and victim's profile, position in the workplace, experience may affects to take the initiatives by the coworkers, colleagues and even the higher authority. There are 13 items to be addressed the actions of witness; it is observed that in all the cases the employees of HSTU is always take more open up initiatives ahead of DIU by percentages of total respondents.

4.7. Key Findings of the Study

Workplace bullying has grown, developed, and advanced extensively in all over the world but it is all about unknown in the context of Bangladesh. The present study finds that in both sampled universities there have some bullying experiences in academic and non-academic staffs. They were reported that there is an incident of various sorts of bullying from 3% to 30% based on NAQ. The major findings of the present study are combination of some

incidence of bullying are addressed in both institutions in the mode of withholding valuable information (DIU-8.5%), ordered to do unpleasant tasks (8.2 in HSTU and 9.5 in DIU), overburdened by goals (6%-16%), excessive monitoring (5% to 9%), private errands (7.5% in HSTU), target of spontaneous anger (6% in DIU), ignored in workplace (11%-30% in DIU), indication for leaving job (6.5% in DIU), threat to making life difficult (7% in HSTU), hostility in workstation (7% in HSTU, 30% in DIU), moved against the will (11% in DIU), unwelcomed message or phone calls (7.5% in DIU), try to finds faults, being shouted, and fill threatened. Consequently, DIU has more prevalence of bullying in consideration of 29 items of NAQ. Besides, consideration of gender and level of workforce females are more experience of bullying 9% male and 11% female in HSTU whereas in DIU its 37% and 19% respectively. There is some evidence that lower the position of workforce the more the experience of bullying except the professors of DIU. The present studies reflects that the victims are taking some strategies are talking with coworkers, talking with family and friends, and sometimes staying calm, all of which can be considered relatively passive, indirect, and informal strategies. On the contrary, witnesses are initiate some strategies like talked about the bullying to coworkers, targets, family & friends and others, talk bully to make a solution, and they are willing to resolve the problems.

5. CONCLUSION AND FURTHER RESEARCH

Human resource (HR) is essential assets for any organization. The success and failure of any organization depends on the contribution of HR of the organization. Every organization always focuses on the development of performance of human capital results a better performance of the organization. Work is recognized and honored as per the article number 20 of the constitution of People's Republic of Bangladesh. Every person's individual work contributes for national revenue. Every organization either public or private is the small unit of national development. Either a public or a private organization can be developed by the ways of mediating workplace bullying or give some guide for minimizing bullying; ultimately the productivity of that university will rise and contribute to the national development. So it is quite impossible to develop an organization without the development of human capital. The study finds the presence of workplace bullying in two samples universities.

The study demonstrates that bullying isn't a well-known term in Bangladesh, but somewhat that a number of individuals are likely to confront amid their employed lives. At the same time, the generally direct prevalence of bullying recommends that Bangladesh is among those nations in which the chance of being bullied at workstations is moderately developing. The study shows that the strategy with which one measures bullying impacts the predominance levels found. In this study, different work segments did not vary impressively from one another with regard to the occurrences of bullying, although negative behaviors were more often reported in both universities. Successively, the study gives more insight to the idea that introduction to repeated negative behaviors at work may have an inconvenient impact on the target's psychophysical health.

There is an opportunity to see the influences of bullying in different operational level of diverse government and non-government organizations to ensure the better workplace management and employee well-being. The universities and the policy makers could use the results to oversee the existence of bullying and there modes in university level. The study suggests that if the university addresses the current outcomes of this study, obviously they could solve some problems regarding the bullying. Though the study is limited to find out the existence of bullying but it is necessary to find out the reasons for such incidence to get more results.

103

REFERENCES

Björkqvist, K., K. Österman and M. Hjelt-Bäck, 1994. Aggression among university employees. Aggressive Behavior, 20(3): 173-184.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-2337(1994)20:3<173::aid-ab2480200304>3.0.co;2-d.

Branch, S., S. Ramsay and M. Barker, 2013. Workplace bullying, mobbing and general harassment: A review. International Journal of Management Reviews, 15(3): 280-299.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2012.00339.x.

Brank, E., L.A. Hoetger and K.P. Hazen, 2012. Bullying. Annual Review of Law and Social Science, 8: 213-230.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-102811-173820.

Coleyshaw, L., 2010. The power of paradigms: A discussion of the absence of bullying research in the context of the university student experience. Research in Post-Compulsory Education, 15(4): 377-386.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/13596748.2010.526799.

Cortina, L.M. and V.J. Magley, 2003. Raising voice, risking retaliation: Events following interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 8(4): 247-265.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.8.4.247.

Ege, H., 1996. Mobbing. What is psychological terror in the workplace. Bologna: Pitagora Editrice.

Einarsen, S., 1999. The nature and causes of bullying at work. International Journal of Manpower, 20(1/2): 16-27.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/01437729910268588.

Einarsen, S. and O.H. Hellesøy, 1998. When collaboration loosens up on health: Health consequences of bullying at work, medical yearbook 1998. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.

Einarsen, S. and B. Raknes, 1997. Harassment in the workplace and the victimization of men. Violence and Victims, 12(3): 247-263.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.12.3.247.

Einarsen, S., B.I. Raknes, S.B. Matthiesen and O.H. Hellesøy, 1994. Bullying and severe personal conflicts. Harmful interaction between the couple (bullying and severe interpersonal conflicts. Unhealthy interaction at work). Soreidgrend: Sigma Forlag.

Einarsen, S. and A. Skogstad, 1996. Prevalence and risk groups of bullying and harassment at work. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5(2): 185-202.

Felson, R.B., 1992. Kick'em when they're down: Explanations of the relationship between stress and interpersonal aggression and violence. Sociological Quarterly, 33(1): 1-16.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1992.tb00360.x.

Field, T., 1996. Bully in sight: How to predict, resist, challenge and combat workplace bullying. Wantage: Wessex Press.

Hawker, D.S. and M.J. Boulton, 2000. Twenty years' research on peer victimization and psychosocial maladjustment: A meta-analytic review of cross-sectional studies. The Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, 41(4): 441-455.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-7610.00629.

Hoel, H. and C.L. Cooper, 2000. Destructive conflict and bullying at work. November 2000, Unpublished Report, University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology, UK.

Hoel, H., S. Einarsen and C.L. Cooper, 2003. Organizational effects of bullying. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in research and practice. London: Taylor & Francis. pp: 145–161.

Hossain, F.N., 2010. Bullying at workplace. The Daily Star. Available from https://www.thedailystar.net/news-detail-156608 [Accessed 10.07.18].

Keashly, L. and K. Jagatic, 2000. The nature, extent and impact of emotional abuse in the workplace: Results of a state-wide survey. Paper Given to the Academy of Management Meeting, Toronto, 4-9 August 2000.

Keashly, L. and K. Jagatic, 2011. North American perspectives on hostile behaviors and bullying at work. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice. 2nd Edn., London: CRC Press. pp: 41-71.

Keashly, L. and J.H. Neuman, 2007. Stepping up: Developing peer strategies for managing bullying at work. In S. Dickmeyer (Chair), Building workplace bullying seminars: Grounding training and development in strong communication scholarship. Symposium Conducted at the Meeting of the National Communications Association, Chicago, IL.

Keashly, L. and J.H. Neuman, 2008. Final report: Workplace behavior (bullying) project survey. Mankato: Minnesota State University.

Keashly, L. and J.H. Neuman, 2010. Faculty experiences with bullying in higher education: Causes, consequences, and management. Administrative Theory & Praxis, 32(1): 48-70.Available at: https://doi.org/10.2753/atp1084-1806320103.

Keashly, L. and J.H. Neuman, 2013. Bullying in higher education: What current research, theorizing, and practice tell us. Workplace bullying in higher education. New York: Routledge.

Kunttu, K. and T. Huttunen, 2009. Student health survey 2008: A national survey among finnish university students. Helsinki: Finnish Student Health Service.

Ledley, D.R., E.A. Storch, M.E. Coles, R.G. Heimberg, J. Moser and E.A. Bravata, 2006. The relationship between childhood teasing and later interpersonal functioning. Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 28(1): 33-40.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10862-006-4539-9.

Lengnick-Hall, M.L. and C.A. Lengnick-Hall, 2003. HR's role in building relationship networks. Academy of Management Perspectives, 17(4): 53-63.

Lewis, D., 2001. Perceptions of bullying in organisations. International Journal of Management and Decision Making, 2(1): 48-64.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1504/ijmdm.2001.001221.

Leymann, H., 1990. Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces. Violence and Victims, 5(2): 119-126.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.5.2.119.

Leymann, H., 1993. Mobbing - psychoterror in the workplace and how one can defend oneself. Reinbeck: Rowohlt.

Leymann, H., 1996. The content and development of mobbing at work. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5(2): 165-184.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/13594329608414853.

Lutgen-Sandvik, P., 2006. Take this job and: Quitting and other forms of resistance to workplace bullying. Communication Monographs, 73(4): 406-433.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/03637750601024156.

Mahmood, S., 2016. Nature and consequences of bullying at high schools in Dhaka City. M.Phil Thesis, Dhaka University Institutional Repository, University of Dhaka, Dhaka.

Meland, E., J.H. Rydning, S. Lobben, H.-J. Breidablik and T.-J. Ekeland, 2010. Emotional, self-conceptual, and relational characteristics of bullies and the bullied. Scandinavian Journal of Public Health, 38(4): 359-367.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/1403494810364563.

Monks, C.P., P.K. Smith, P. Naylor, C. Barter, J.L. Ireland and I. Coyne, 2009. Bullying in different contexts: Commonalities, differences and the role of theory. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 14(2): 146-156.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2009.01.004.

Naachimuthu, K., 2007. We are from knowledge sharing culture. Management and Labour Studies, 32(3): 369-374.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0258042x0703200308.

Niedl, K., 1995. Bullying / bullying in the workplace. An empirical analysis of the phenomenon and the economically relevant effects of systematic hostilities (bullying at work. An empirical analysis of the phenomenon and of the effects of systematic harassment on human resource management). Munich: Hampp.

Olweus, D., 1987. Bully/victim problems among schoolchildren. In J. P. Myklebust and R. Ommundsen (Eds.), The psychology profession against years 2000. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Olweus, D., 1991. Bully/victim problems among schoolchildren: Basic facts and effects of a school-based intervention program. In D. Pepler and K. Rubin (Eds.), The development and treatment of childhood aggression. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Olweus, D., 1993. Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do. Oxford: Blackwel, 1.

Olweus, D., 1994. Bullying at school: Basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 35(7): 1171-1190.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1994.tb01229.x.

Rayner, C., 1997. The incidence of workplace bullying. Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 7(3): 249–255.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1298(199706)7:3%3C199::AID-CASP418%3E3.0.CO;2-H.

Rayner, C. and C.L. Cooper, 2006. Workplace bullying. In E. K. Kelloway, J., Barling, J., Hurrell, & J. Joseph (Eds.), Handbook of workplace violence. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rayner, C., H. Hoel and C.L. Cooper, 2002. Workplace bullying. What we know, who is to blame, and what can we do? , London: Taylor & Francis.

Richman, J.A., K. Rospenda, J.A. Flaherty and S. Freels, 2001a. Workplace harassment, active coping and alcohol-related outcomes. Journal of Substance Abuse, 13(3): 347–366.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0899-3289(01)00079-7.

Richman, J.A., K.M. Rospenda, S.J. Nawyn, J.A. Flaherty, M. Fendrich, M.L. Drum and T.P. Johnson, 2001b. Sexual harassment and generalized workplace abuse among university employees: Prevalence and mental health correlates. American Journal of Public Health, 89(3): 358–363.Available at: https://dx.doi.org/10.2105%2Fajph.89.3.358.

Ringrose, J. and E. Renold, 2010. Normative cruelties and gender deviants: The performative effects of bully discourses for girls and boys in school. British Educational Research Journal, 36(4): 573-596.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920903018117.

Salmivalli, C., T. Ojanen, J. Haanpää and K. Peets, 2005. I'm ok but you're not and other peer-relational schemas: Explaining individual differences in children's social goals. Developmental Psychology, 41(2): 363-375.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.41.2.363.

Simpson, R. and C. Cohen, 2004. Dangerous work: The gendered nature of bullying in the context of higher education. Gender, Work & Organization, 11(2): 163-186.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2004.00227.x.

Skapinakis, P., S. Bellos, T. Gkatsa, K. Magklara, G. Lewis, R. Araya, S. Stylianidis and V. Mavreas, 2011. The association between bullying and early stages of suicidal ideation in late adolescents in greece. BMC Psychiatry, 11(1): 1-9.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-244x-11-22.

Twale, D.J. and D.B.M. Luca, 2008. Faculty incivility: The rise of the academic bully culture and what to do about it. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

University Grants Commission of Bangladesh (UGCa), 2019. List of universities. Available from http://www.ugc.gov.bd/en/home/university/public/120 [Accessed 10.07.2019].

Vartia, M.A., 2001. Consequences of workplace bullying with respect to the well-being of its targets and the observers of bullying. Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health, 27(1): 63-69.Available at: https://doi.org/10.5271/sjweh.588.

Woods, S. and D. Wolke, 2004. Direct and relational bullying among primary school children and academic achievement. Journal of School Psychology, 42(2): 135–155.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2003.12.002.

Zapf, D., 1999. Organisational, work group related and personal causes of mobbing/bullying at work. International Journal of Manpower, 20(1/2): 70-85.Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/01437729910268669.

Zapf, D., C. Dormann and M. Frese, 1996. Longitudinal studies in organizational stress research. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 1(2): 145-169.

Zapf, D., J. Escartín, S. Einarsen, H. Hoel and M. Vartia, 2011. Empirical fi ndings on prevalence and risk groups of bullying in the workplace. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice. 2nd Edn., London: CRC Press. pp: 75–105.