

Workplace Bullying among Faculty Members in the University of Eastern Philippines System: Basis for an Intervention Program

Franz Martin N. Jonson

Faculty, Department of Social Sciences College of Arts and Communication
University of Eastern Philippines Catarman, Northern Samar, Philippines

ABSTRACT

This study determined the awareness of and experiences on workplace bullying of the faculty members in the University of Eastern Philippines system. It involved all the colleges of the University main campus and the satellite campuses of UEP-Laoang and UEP-Catubig.

The data gathered were analyzed and interpreted using appropriate statistical tools. Frequency counts and percentages were used to present the profile of the respondents as well as the level of awareness on workplace bullying, school-based efforts to address bullying, and the extent of workplace bullying experienced by the respondents. Pearson r correlation was used to establish a-priori the relationships among the main variables.

The awareness on workplace bullying among respondents were determined. There were three categories identified, namely: construct of bullying, common factors that trigger bullying, and effects of bullying on teachers.

As to the common factors that trigger bullying, most respondents were much aware that bullies view their victims as a direct threat and bully them in an attempt to prevent their own inadequacies being revealed to other colleagues and supervisors. Bullying is motivated by the insecurities and inadequacies of the bully, so any colleague who, unwittingly, threatens to highlight or expose those failings is a potential target.

Most respondents were aware of the effects of bullying including greater absenteeism and lower quality teaching performance and decreased motivation and morale; victims spend much of their time trying to gain support and defend themselves from the bullying.

In the UEP system, one of the most common bullying forms is verbal bullying. Verbal bullying often includes name calling, spreading rumors, and persistent teasing. Another popular form of bullying is emotional intimidation. In this form, a bully may deliberately exclude one from a group activity such as a party or school outing. Covert bullying or indirect bullying is also practiced to some extent in the university. It is sometimes hard to spot as the person involved is not normally aware of the harassment done.

One example of verbal bullying is spreading rumors or made-up stories to harm others. Other scenario is divulging secrets, mimicking, and damaging ones reputation. Making gestures and faces behind a person back is also a form of indirect bullying.

In a male-dominated college, one faculty cried foul about the bullying activities he experienced. In the interview he said that neophyte faculty is usually the victim of bullying.

As to the extent of bullying experienced by the respondents, most of the faculty-respondents have not encountered serious bullying from other faculty. It means that most of the respondents did not encounter bullying in the three campuses of UEP system.

Responses on school-based efforts to address bullying indicate that job descriptions of the employees are clearly defined. This is one way to prevent misunderstanding about their roles in the organization. Besides, most respondents agree that workplace bullying is not an accepted behavior at the campus. They understand that workplace bullying is an occupational hazard and unacceptable.

Keywords: *Workplace bullying, Faculty Members, Intervention Program*

1. Introduction

The phenomenon of workplace bullying is relatively not a new concept. The concept however of workplace bullying itself is both subjective and of emotional in nature: it boils down to what an individual person experiences or feels. Except for the theoretical issues in defining workplace bullying there are practical aspects in organizational life that just as much complicates the concept of workplace bullying.

In the academe, it is not uncommon for administrators and rank and file employees to not have the same mutual understanding or definition of the concept workplace bullying. In the University of Eastern Philippines (UEP) everyone perceives the concept of workplace bullying differently, and thus it is difficult to make everyone in the organization understand what sort of behavior is accepted and what type of behavior is not. As the researcher has observed, bullying behaviors in the university are more subtle and less easy to discern and document, such as setting inconsistent or unrealistic teaching loads, giving little feedback on teaching performance, and interfering with classroom management. It is from these issues that moved the researcher to prove the topic of workplace bullying in the UEP system. Investigating bullying would certainly open the minds of the faculty and how it affects the students.

It may not be the bullying action itself that makes the victim suffer, but the persistency, regularity, and other situational factor concerning power relations that cause anxiety and suffering for the victims. It can therefore be assumed that this fact makes it even more difficult for an administrator to work strategically with employees to prevent workplace bullying.

Bullying is broadly defined as repeated and intentionally aggressive behavior characterized by an imbalance of power between the perpetrator and victim.[Olweus, D. (2003). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc.] Despite substantial research efforts, anti-bullying legislation, and on-going media attention, school-based bullying continues to be an international, pervasive epidemic due to its widespread impact on teachers' well-being and performance. Are employees today aware for the type of crisis that workplace bullying could infer? Are they aware of the complexity of the phenomenon? It is

therefore interesting to examine the extent employees in the University of Eastern Philippines experience bullying in the workplace.

A big percentage of teachers reports experiencing bullying at alarming rates during the school day. For example, in a recent study, 39% of more than 5,000 teachers in elementary schools in Manila were bullied at least once during the last month[Billones, T. N. (2006). *Preparing teachers to manage school bullying: The hidden curriculum*. *The Journal of Educational Thought*, 40(2), 119-129.]. Bullying includes both physical like hitting or pushing and verbal like name-calling or threatening behaviors.[Gulemetoba, R.A. (2013). *Bullying in the workplace in elementary schools in Manila*. Unpublished master's thesis. Eulogio Amang Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology. Manila.] In addition, bullying can be inflicted indirectly via relational bullying such as socially ostracizing others, and spreading rumours electronically.[Diamanduros, T., Downs, E., & Jenkins, S. J. (2008). *The role of school psychologists in the assessment, prevention, and intervention of cyberbullying*. *Psychology in the Schools*, 45(8), 693-704. doi:10.1002/pits.20335] Prior research has indicated that bullying occurs in several locations within the school environment[Bradshaw, C. P., Sawyer, A. L., & O'Brennan, L. M. (2007). *Bullying and peer victimization at school: Perceptual differences between students and school staff*. *School Psychology Review*, 36(3), 361-382.]. Furthermore, women are more likely to be involved in indirect bullying, whereas men are more likely to be involved in verbal and physical bullying.[Wang, J. W., Iannotti, R. J., & Nansel, T. R. (2009). *School bullying among adolescents in the United States: Physical, verbal, relational, and cyber*. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 45, 368-375. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.03.021]

Teachers spend a substantial portion of the school day interacting with students, co-teachers, other employees and are therefore at the forefront of the battle against bullying. School climate research has indicated that by implementing consistent and effective interventions for school-based bullying, school administration can play a critical role in providing a safe and supportive environment that promotes harmonious relationship among the employees.[Varjas, K., Meyers, J., Henrich, C. C., Graybill, E. C., Dew, B. J., Marshall, M. L., ...

Avant, M. (2006). Using a participatory culture-specific intervention model to develop a peer victimization intervention. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 22(2), 35-58. Co-published in: B. K. Nastasi (Ed.), *Multicultural Issues in School Psychology*. New York: The Haworth Press, Inc. doi:10.1300/J370v22n02_03] Without specific training however, school heads have a poor understanding of bullying and how to manage it.[Holt, M., Keyes, M., & Koenig, B. (2011). Teachers' attitudes toward bullying. In D. Espelage & S. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in North American schools* (2nd ed., pp. 119-131). New York, NY: Routledge.] Despite the critical need for administrator preparation on bullying, they frequently report being ill-equipped to combat these behaviors due to lack of training.[Benítez, J. (2009). *Bullying and teacher attitude towards bullying*. Unpublished master's thesis. Northwest Samar State University. Calbayog.]

The first step of successful prevention or reduction of bullying requires educators to be able to accurately recognize these behaviors and possess the requisite knowledge, skills, and dispositions to effectively intervene.[Kokko, T. H. J., & Porhola, M. (2009). Tackling bullying: Victimized by peers as a pupil, an effective intervener as a teacher? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 1000-1008. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2009.04.005] Increased learning opportunities for teachers have been highly encouraged, both at the pre-service and in-service level to provide critical information regarding the types, prevalence, signs and consequences of bullying, as well as to educate administrators about how to intervene and prevent these behavior.[James et al., 2008] Studies have demonstrated that school leaders can significantly reduce the negative effects of bullying if properly prepared; however, teacher professional learning programs specifically targeting the reduction of bullying are scarce.[Orpina, M. (2005). Anti-bullying intervention: Implementation and outcome. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75, 465-487. doi:10.1348/000709905X26011]

Based on the issues discussed, the researcher finds it necessary to examine teachers' awareness on workplace bullying and the school-based efforts to prepare teachers address bullying. This study seeks to address the challenges associated with existing efforts to educate teachers about bullying prevention, as well

as to incorporate essential components of effective anti-bullying strategies into a comprehensive model for educators to use in reducing bullying.

2. Objectives of the Study

Generally, this study investigated teachers' awareness and experiences in workplace bullying. It also determined the school-based efforts to stop or minimize bullying.

Specifically, this study tried to:

1. Determine the profile of the respondents in terms of:
 - A. Sex,
 - B. Age,
 - C. Educational attainment,
 - D. Academic rank,
 - E. Administrative Position;
2. To determine the workplace bullying awareness level of the respondents in terms of the following:
 - A. construct of bullying,
 - B. common factors that trigger bullying,
 - C. effects of bullying on teachers, and
3. Determine the forms of bullying experienced by the respondents;
4. Find out the extent of workplace bullying experienced by the respondents;
5. Determine the school-based efforts to address bullying in the workplace;
6. Design a workplace bullying intervention program for the university system.

3. Methodology

This study will employ the descriptive research design using qualitative form of data gathering. However, questionnaires will be used primarily in getting the necessary data to achieve the objectives. This will be followed by interviews or Focus Groups Discussions among the research participants. Respondents' profile, workplace bullying awareness, Forms of bullying, school-based effort to address bullying in the workplace, and extent of workplace bullying experienced will be presented using descriptive statistics.

The respondents of this study consist of 208 faculty members from the UEP system. From the main campus, 159 faculty members will be considered while the satellite campuses of Lao-ang and Catubig will have 30 and 19 faculty members, respectively.

4. Results and Discussion

The profile of the respondents in terms of sex, age, educational attainment, academic rank, and administrative position was determined. Table 2 shows that female sex dominates the respondents with 112 or 63.64 percent. As regards age, the 176 respondents were distributed almost evenly from below 20 years old to 41 and above. These figures suggest varying age of the respondents. The highest educational attainment of the respondents was doctorate with 12 or almost seven percent. There were

61 who graduated from master's degree while 37 have not pursued graduate education. In terms of academic rank, most of the respondents were instructors having 57 or 32.39 percent. This is followed by assistant professors with 49 or almost 28 percent. The list also includes 39 special lecturers. Lastly, almost 80 percent of the respondents do not have administrative position. Lastly, almost 80 percent of the respondents do not have administrative position. It means that 80 percent of the respondents are not holding office other than their job as a faculty.

Table 1 Profile of the Respondents

Sex	Frequency	Percent
Female	112	63.64
Male	64	36.36
Total	176	100.00
Age	Frequency	Percent
25 and below	29	16.48
26 to 30	35	19.89
31 to 35	29	16.48
36 to 40	38	21.59
41 and above	45	25.57
Total	176	100.00
Highest Educational Attainment	Frequency	Percent
Phd/EdD/DPA/DALL	12	6.82
with Phd Units	28	15.91
MA/MALL/MPA	61	34.66
with MA Units	38	21.59
Undergraduate	37	21.02
Total	176	100.00
Academic Rank	Frequency	Percent
Professor	4	2.27
Associate Professor	27	15.34
Assistant Professor	49	27.84
Instructor	57	32.39
Special Lecturer	39	22.16
Total	176	100.00
Administrative Position	Frequency	Percent
Department Chair	18	10.23
College Coordinators	17	9.66
Director	3	1.70
None	138	78.41
Total	176	100.00

Workplace Bullying Awareness

The awareness on workplace bullying among respondents were also determined (Table 2). There were three categories identified, namely: construct of bullying, common factors that trigger bullying, and effects of bullying on teachers. In the first category, most respondents describe bullying to take many forms which may include different behaviors, such as physical violence and attacks, verbal taunts and name-calling. Respondents also described bullying as a conscious, wilful, deliberate, hostile and repeated behavior by one or more people, which is intended to harm others.

As to the common factors that trigger bullying, most respondents were much aware that bullies view their victims as a direct threat and bully them in an attempt to prevent their own inadequacies being revealed to other colleagues and supervisors. Bullying is motivated by the insecurities and inadequacies of the bully, so any colleague who, unwittingly, threatens to highlight or expose those failings is a potential target. In addition, respondents were much aware that most incidents of bullying in school are motivated by the bully's own lack of self-esteem rather than the specific actions, appearance, or personality of the victim.

Finally, most respondents were aware of the effects of bullying including greater absenteeism and turnover, lower quality teaching performance and decreased motivation and morale; victims spend much of their time trying to gain support and defend themselves from the bullying.

During interview some faculty members suggested that bullying happens when a “boss is not harmoniously related to a subordinate, subordinate to a boss and between co-workers. If ever the relationship is not helpful there comes bullying”. Others said that “when bullying is experienced by a subordinate then it seems that the one bullied feels intimidated all the time, no matter how good the performance, it is always being neglected and sarcasms coming from the superior is heard elsewhere.”

It can be inferred from these findings that most faculty members are aware about bullying and how can bullying affect them. However, some of the faculty members understand the construct different from the others. These responses suggest that defining bullying as construct varies among the respondents. Everyone has her/his definition and understanding. Hence, awareness would also be different. However, knowing that bullying occurs in the campus is still a good indication that teachers would know how to deal with bullying. Awareness on bullying will be an advantage in doing their job in the university. It will have significant effect on fulfilling their responsibilities as a teacher.

Table 2 Workplace Bullying Awareness

Construct of bullying	WM	Interpretation
Bullying takes many forms, and can include many different behaviors, such as physical violence and attacks, verbal taunts, and name-calling	4.49	Very much aware
Bullying is a conscious, willful, deliberate, hostile and repeated behavior by one or more people, which is intended to harm others	4.36	Very much aware
Bullying is a broader social problem that could happen in schools and on the street	4.36	Very much aware
Bullying is the assertion of power through aggression.	4.16	Much aware
Threats and intimidation, extortion or stealing of money and possessions, and exclusion from the peer group are form of bullying	4.15	Much aware
Bullying is not normal” or socially acceptable behavior. We give bullies power by our acceptance of this behavior.	4.14	Much aware
Bullying is not a conflict to be resolved, it’s about contempt –a powerful feeling of dislike toward someone considered to be worthless, inferior or undeserving of respect	4.07	Much aware
Bullying is a school problem, the administrators should handle it	4.05	Much aware
Research shows that bullying will stop when adults in authority and peers get involved	4.04	Much aware
Bullying forms change with age	4.04	Much aware
Bullying is not about anger	3.92	Much aware
Bullying is just, stage, a normal part in any organization	3.56	Much aware
Mean	4.11	Much aware
Common factors that trigger bullying	WM	Interpretation
Bullies view their victims as direct threats and bully them in an attempt to prevent their own inadequacies being revealed to other colleagues and supervisors	4.05	Much aware
Bullying is motivated by the insecurities and inadequacies of the bully, so any	4.04	Much aware

colleague who, unwittingly, threatens to highlight or expose those failings is a potential target.		
Most incidents of bullying in the workplace are motivated by the bully's own lack of self-esteem rather than the specific actions, appearance, or personality of the victim	3.97	Much aware
Bullies operate to hide their own incompetence	3.91	Much aware
Most bully feel threatened by a highly competent colleague or a colleague who receives praise from a manager.	3.84	Much aware
Being popular with colleagues, perhaps because of a vivacious personality and a good sense of humor will most likely attract a bully	3.78	Much aware
Some victims of bullying are those who are unwilling to gossip or engage in malicious discussion about the incompetence of others	3.75	Much aware
Being recognized (by praise or promotion) for professional competence can attract a bully	3.70	Much aware
Mean	3.88	Much aware
Effects of bullying on teachers	WM	Interpretation
Effects of bullying on workplace productivity include greater absenteeism and turnover, lower quality teaching performance and decreased motivation and morale.	3.92	Much aware
Victims spend much of their time trying to gain support and defend themselves from the bullying	3.86	Much aware
Workplace bullying has effects on those who witness it as well as those who experience it, affecting the overall health of an organization	3.82	Much aware
Bullied faculty members experience a wide range of physical effects.	3.64	Much aware
Workplace bullying symptoms include high blood pressure, migraine headaches, pains in the back and chest, physical numbness, irritable bowel syndrome, thyroid problems, skin irritations and ulcers	3.64	Much aware
Bullying also causes anxiety and a lowered resistance to such things as colds, coughs, flue and fever	3.58	Much aware
Much of campus stress and chronic fatigue syndrome are caused by bullying	3.48	Much aware
Mean	3.71	Much aware
Grand Mean	3.93	Much aware

Forms of Bullying Experienced

In the UEP system, one of the most common forms is verbal bullying (Table 3). This often includes name calling, spreading rumors, and persistent teaching. Another popular form of bullying is emotional intimidation. In this form, a bully may deliberately exclude one from a group activity such as a party or school outing. Covert bullying or indirect bullying is also practiced to some extent in the university. It is sometimes hard to spot as the person involved is not normally aware of the harassment done. One example will be spreading rumors or made-up stories to harm others. Other scenarios will be divulging secrets, mimicking, and damaging ones reputation. Making gestures and faces behind a person back is also a form of indirect bullying. This finding confirms the findings of Hornstein who concluded that most forms of bullying behaviors are more subtle and less easy to discern and document, such as setting inconsistent or unrealistic work targets, giving little feedback on performance, interfering with work activities, reducing responsibility, limiting communication, pulling the target out of his or her area of expertise, among others. With technological progress, researchers have identified that some bullying actions are conducted through high-tech means, such as E-mail.[Hornstein, Harvey. 1996. *Brutal Bosses and Their Prey: How to Identify and Overcome Abuse in the Workplace*. New York: Riverhead Books. pp. 83-100.]

In many cases, it is such covert behaviors that make bullying difficult to identify and address. In fact, many of these subtle behaviors may seem fairly common in the campus and may not be drastically different from

punitive management tactics. Yet, if they occur on a regular and frequent basis at the workplace, they become harmful and are considered office bullying. In one of the interviews, one faculty indicated that some faculty members think of him as not capable of teaching because he has no license to teach. The victim considered the bullying serious that he cannot go around the campus and cannot focus on his job.

To some faculty members, bullying is normal in an organization. They just do not take it seriously as some indicated in the interviews. "I cannot consider myself as a victim of workplace bullying because even if I am aware that it could a bullying or a triggering event for a bullying incident. I don't consider it in my part because it's not that serious. Sometimes here in my workplace with my co-workers whom I'm close with we joked comfortably with bullying because we know that it is not actually serious, we even sometimes joke that friendship without bullying is boring".

In a male-dominated college, one faculty cried foul about the bullying activities he experienced. In the interview he said that neophyte faculty is usually the victim of bullying. "if you belong to the younger or the older one you'll be the center of attraction if you are that sensitive, for me I think this is where we can clearly view bullying". However, when asked further, the same employee said that he just ignored the incident and considered as normal in the organization. Most of the time, this is the usual reaction of employees experiencing bullying.

In another campus, one faculty indicated that she already experienced bullying from her superior. She said that "It's more on abuse of power or sometimes scapegoating, using you, since you are the most silent one or the vulnerable one."

Table 3 Forms of Bullying Experienced

Forms of Bullying	WM	Interpretation
Verbal Bullying - often accompanies physical behavior. This can include name calling, spreading rumors, and persistent teasing.	3.56	High extent
Emotional Intimidation - is closely related to these two types of bullying. A bully may deliberately exclude you from a group activity such as a party or school outing.	3.24	Moderate extent
Covert Bullying – This is also called indirect bullying. It is sometimes hard to spot as the person involved is not normally aware of the harassment done. One example will be spreading rumors or made-up stories to harm you. Other scenarios will be divulging secrets, mimicking, and damaging your reputation. Making gestures and faces behind your back is also a form of indirect abuse.	3.22	Moderate extent
Cyber-bullying - is one or a group of faculty using electronic means via computers and mobile phones (emails, Web sites, chat rooms, instant messaging and texting) to torment, threaten, harass, humiliate, or embarrass you	3.12	Moderate extent
Physical Bullying - most obvious form of intimidation consisting of kicking, hitting, biting, pinching, hair pulling, and making threats. A bully may threaten to punch you if you don't give up your money, your lunch, etc.	2.63	Moderate extent
Sexual Bullying - unwanted physical contact or abusive comments.	2.58	Less extent

Extent of Workplace Bullying Experienced

As to the extent of bullying experienced by the respondents, most of the faculty-respondents have not encountered serious bullying from other faculty (Table 4). This is evidenced on the grand mean of 1.74 interpreted as least extent. It means that most of the respondents did not encounter bullying in the three campuses of UEP system. This finding shows that respondents were being treated favorably in her/his work environment. There were also no complaints heard from the students.

Generally, this finding shows that most of the faculty members in the UEP system have not encountered serious bullying experiences. This is probably a good indication that proper measures against bullying are in place or most faculty are not really aware what it means to be bullied. During the interview however, some faculty said that they did experienced however. They did not elaborate the form of bullying they experienced but considered

it serious that they become deserted. “I become helpless, being humiliated, it affected how I worked but I was able to cope up using a good coping mechanism. I was able to recover somehow my confidence and made sure that I will not be bullied anymore.”

Another faculty said that she did not experienced herself being bullied. It was her friend, another faculty who experienced bullying. “The effect of bullying to my friend was she became aloof and does not give her trust right away to anyone after the incident”.

There are a lot of interpretations that could be made from these findings. However, it would be safe to say that most of the faculty do not take bullying seriously. They just ignore it and consider it part of day to day organizational experiences. Being in the academe, ignoring could be the best way to deal with bullying.

Table 4 Extent of Workplace Bullying Experienced

Extent of workplace bullying experienced	WM	Interpretation
I am being treated less favourably than others in my workplace	2.22	Less extent
My students are actively encouraged to complain about my work	1.94	Less extent
Someone deliberately lied to me about a matter relating to my work	1.88	Less extent
There is a culture of harassment & bullying in my workplace	1.86	Less extent
My complaints are being ignored at work	1.84	Less extent
I am being unfairly targeted for poor performance	1.83	Less extent
I have been provided with inadequate or inaccurate information about your work	1.83	Less extent
I feel isolated from my colleagues in how I am treated at work	1.82	Less extent
I feel that I am constantly struggling to keep up with changes to my work or increasing teaching loads	1.80	Less extent
My sleeping patterns are disturbed by what is happening to me at work	1.78	Least extent
I have been humiliated in front of other staff	1.77	Least extent
I have been unfairly accused of doing or not doing something at work recently	1.73	Least extent
I feel that I am deliberately left out of decision making sometimes	1.73	Least extent
I feel that what I say at work is not believed or given importance	1.72	Least extent
I feel that my judgement is constantly being questioned	1.72	Least extent
There are rumours about me that have been deliberately circulated in the campus	1.71	Least extent
I feel as if I am constantly in damage control mode at work	1.70	Least extent
I am being allocated inappropriate tasks or have resources I have previously had access to in performing my duties been restricted or removed	1.70	Least extent
My work suffering is because of my anxiety about being seen to be incompetent	1.68	Least extent
My work has been undermined or criticised in front of others	1.66	Least extent
I am beginning to doubt my own competence because of what others are doing & saying about me	1.66	Least extent
My personal messages sometimes are not passed on	1.64	Least extent
My opinions & suggestions are hated or underestimated	1.63	Least extent
I feel extremely anxious about going into work	1.62	Least extent
A parent made unsubstantiated allegations or complaints about me	1.62	Least extent
I feel that I am being over supervised or as if I am not trusted to do my work	1.58	Least extent
I have used sick leave as one way of avoiding these problems at work	1.54	Least extent
I have been deliberately embarrassed or humiliated in front of students	1.51	Least extent
I believe that I am being deliberately bullied at work	1.49	Least extent
Mean	1.74	Least extent

School-Based Efforts to Address Bullying

Table 5 shows the school-based efforts to address bullying. Respondents indicate the job descriptions of the employees are clearly defined. This is one way to prevent misunderstanding about their roles in the organization. Besides, most respondents agree that workplace bullying is not an accepted behavior at the campus. They understand that workplace bullying is an occupational hazard and unacceptable. As educators,

faculty members do not hesitate to speak up about health and safety concerns involved in bullying. These findings show that school based efforts are in place to control or prevent bullying. This is probably the reason for the low extent of bullying experienced by the faculty as found in previous part of the paper. Preventive measures against workplace bullying are working and the university has enough resources in order to management it, in case it would occur.

During one of the interviews however, one faculty reported that she experienced verbal bullying from her co-teachers. She reported the incident to her superior but told to settle it on their own. Another faculty said she did not report the incident as it might only add to existing conflicts in the organization.

Several interviewees emphasize the role played by co-workers when they experienced verbal bullying. Instead of calling the attention of their supervisor, they just ignore the bully and talk about the incident among themselves and plan how they can get even with the bully. This is similar to the findings of Lubit who believes that bullying victims can often be empowered if they are supported by their co-workers. If co-workers can join the victims in confronting the bully, the group action is more likely to be effective than doing it single-handedly.

One faculty said a friend in the campus confronted the bully after many months of silence. She did not report the incident to the supervisor. “She decided to settle the issue by confronting the bully”. “My friend is no longer able to compensate with the pressure and depression which led her to confront the concern person.”

Organizations therefore like the UEP system should encourage staff to help each other to fight against bullies. To accomplish this, Daverport’s research suggests that enhancing the awareness of employees about bullying is significant in preventing its occurrence.

Table 5 School-Based Efforts to Address Bullying

School-Based Efforts to Address Bullying	WM	Interpretation
All job descriptions are clearly defined	3.79	Much in place
workplace bullying is not an accepted behavior at the campus	3.77	Much in place
The university has a code of conduct policy developed in consultation with employees	3.72	Much in place
Faculty members understand that workplace bullying is an occupational hazard and unacceptable	3.61	Much in place
Workers are encouraged to speak up about health and safety concerns	3.48	Much in place
Grievance and investigation procedures for incidents involving alleged workplace bullying complaints are in place	3.46	Much in place
The school organisation is undergoing restructuring, redundancy	3.31	In place
The university has hazard reporting procedures in place for reporting workplace bullying and violence	3.29	In place
The administration works preventative measures against workplace bullying	3.29	In place
Administrators are well prepared in handling workplace bullying situations	3.28	In place
School administrators have been trained to recognise and deal with workplace bullying	3.27	In place
the university has formulated policies or guidelines that concerns workplace bullying	3.26	In place
Awareness has been raised amongst faculty and staff about bullying and harassment in the university	3.22	In place
The university has enough resources/information in order to manage workplace bullying, in case it would occur	3.16	In place
the university has identified someone who is educated in questions concerning workplace bullying (for example a safety representative)	3.06	In place
Mean	3.40	In place

5. Conclusions

Bullying is motivated by the insecurities and inadequacies of the bully, so any colleague who, unwittingly, threatens to highlight or expose those failings is a potential target.

Most respondents were aware of the effects of bullying including greater absenteeism and lower quality teaching performance and decreased motivation and morale; victims spend much of their time trying to gain support and defend themselves from the bullying. It can be inferred from these findings that most faculty members are aware about bullying and how can bullying affect them. However, some of the faculty members understand the construct different from the others. These responses suggest that defining bullying as construct varies among the respondents. Everyone has her/his definition and understanding. Hence, awareness would also be different. However, knowing that bullying occurs in the campus is still a good indication that teachers would know how to deal with bullying. Awareness on bullying will be an advantage in doing their job in the university. It will have significant effect on fulfilling their responsibilities as a teacher.

Most forms of bullying behaviors are subtle and less easy to discern and document, such as setting inconsistent or unrealistic work targets, giving little feedback on performance, interfering with work activities, reducing responsibility, limiting communication, pulling the target out of his or her area of expertise, among others. In many cases, it is such covert behaviors that make bullying difficult to identify and address. In fact, many of these subtle behaviors may seem fairly common in the campus and may not be drastically different from punitive management tactics. Yet, if they occur on a regular and frequent basis at the workplace, they become harmful and are considered office bullying.

Proper measures against bullying are in place or most faculty are not really aware what it means to be bullied. During the interview however, some faculty said that they did experienced however. They did not elaborate the form of bullying they experienced but considered it serious that they become deserted. There are a lot of interpretations that could be made from these findings. However, it would be safe to say that most of the faculty do not take bullying seriously. They just ignore it and consider it part of day to day organizational experiences. Being in the academe, ignoring could be the best way to deal with bullying.

Bullying victims can often be empowered if they are supported by their co-workers. If co-workers can join the victims in confronting the bully, the group action is more likely to be effective than doing it single-handedly. Organizations therefore like the UEP system should encourage staff to help each other to fight against bullies. To accomplish this means enhancing the awareness of employees about bullying is significant.

In conclusion, results from this study offer educators, policy makers, and researchers a first-hand account of the challenges teachers face when confronting school-based bullying. As these individuals are often on the forefront of bullying and responsible for addressing these behaviors, teachers' awareness of and responses to bullying must be considered and incorporated into anti-bullying initiatives. Understanding and eliminating the multifaceted obstacles teachers described in this study is a critical step in enhancing teachers' efforts to reduce, or optimally, prevent school-based bullying.

6. Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are forwarded:

1. Bullying awareness campaign should be conducted among faculty members and non-teaching staff in every campus.
2. Topics about bullying awareness could be integrated in lessons to be discussed in social science subjects.
3. Teacher Education Institution may include bullying as topic in Professional Education subjects.
4. Future research is needed to investigate bullying experiences of students at different year levels.
5. Further, assessing the perspectives of other key stakeholders (e.g., administrators, students, teachers) is another research topic that could be investigated.

7. References

- [1] Ashforth, B. 1994. Petty Tyranny in Organizations. *Human Relations*, no. 47. pp. 755-778.
- [2] Benítez, J. (2009). Bullying and teacher attitude towards bullying. Unpublished master's thesis. Northwest Samar State University. Calbayog.
- [3] Billones, T. N. (2006). Preparing teachers to manage school bullying: The hidden

- curriculum. *The Journal of Educational Thought*, 40(2), 119-129.
- [4] Boulton, M. J. (2008). Teachers' views on bullying: Definitions, attitudes and ability to cope. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77, 223-233. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8279.1997.tb01239.x
- [5] Bradshaw, C. P., Sawyer, A. L., & O'Brennan, L. M. (2007). Bullying and peer victimization at school: Perceptual differences between students and school staff. *School Psychology Review*, 36(3), 361-382.
- [6] Craig, W., Harel-Fisch, Y., Fogel-Grinvald, H., Dostaler, S., Hetland, J., Simons-Morton, B., ... HBSC Bullying Writing Group (2009). A cross-national profile of bullying and victimization among adolescents in 40 countries. *International Journal of Public Health*, 54, S216-224. doi:10.1007/s00038-009-5413-9
- [7] Diamanduros, T., Downs, E., & Jenkins, S. J. (2008). The role of school psychologists in the assessment, prevention, and intervention of cyberbullying. *Psychology in the Schools*, 45(8), 693-704. doi:10.1002/pits.20335
- [8] Durkheim, Émile (1974) [1953]. *Sociology and Philosophy*. Translated by D. F. Pocock; with an introduction by J. G. Peristiany. Toronto: The Free Press. ISBN 0-02-908580-2. LCCN 74-19680.
- [9] Einarsen, S., Raknes, B.I. and Matthiesen, S.M. 1994. Bullying and Harassment at Work and their Relationships to Work Environment Quality—An Exploratory Study, In *European Work and Organizational Psychologist*, vol. 4, pp. 381-401
- [10] Einarsen, Stale, 1999, The Nature and Causes of Bullying at Work, In *International Journal of Manpower*, vol. 20, issue 1/2, pp. 16-25. p. 17.
- [11] Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [12] Gulemetoba, R.A. (2013). *Bullying in the workplace in elementary schools in Manila*. Unpublished master's thesis. Eulogio Amang Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology. Manila.
- [13] HBSC Bullying Writing Group (2009). A cross-national profile of bullying and victimization among adolescents in 40 countries. *International Journal of Public Health*, 54, S216-224. doi:10.1007/s00038-009-5413-9
- [14] Holt, M., Keyes, M., & Koenig, B. (2011). Teachers' attitudes toward bullying. In D. Espelage & S. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in North American schools* (2nd ed., pp. 119-131). New York, NY: Routledge.
- [15] Horn, Sam. 2002. *Take the Bully by the Horns: Stop Unethical, Uncooperative, or Unpleasant People from Running and Ruining Your Life*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin.
- [16] Hornstein, Harvey. 2006. *Brutal Bosses and Their Prey: How to Identify and Overcome Abuse in the Workplace*. New York: Riverhead Books. pp. 83-100.
- [17] Keashly Loreleigh and Laurela Burnazi, 2004, *Persistent Hostility at Work*, *Perspectives on Work*, Winter, pp. 37-39.
- [18] Kokko, T. H. J., & Porhola, M. (2009). Tackling bullying: Victimized by peers as a pupil, an effective intervener as a teacher? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 1000-1008. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2009.04.005
- [19] Leymann H. and Gustafsson A., 2006, *Mobbing at Work and the Development of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorders*, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 5. pp. 251-276.
- [20] Leymann, Heinz, 2006. The Content and Development of Mobbing at Work. In *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5 (2), pp. 166-184. p. 168.
- [21] Loreleigh Keashly, 1998. Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: Conceptual and Empirical Issues, In *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, Vol. 1 (1) pp. 85-117.
- [22] Lubit, Roy. 2004. *Coping with Toxic Managers, Subordinates...and Other Difficult People*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Financial Times Press. p. 117.
- [23] Meriam Webster Dictionary Miller, R. (2011). Knowledge and attitudes about school bullying in trainee teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 72, 105-118.
- [24] Morrin, N. (2002). Students' attitudes and motivation towards midwifery education and

- training. *Midwives Chronicle & Nursing Notes*, July, 193-197
- [25] Namie, Gary, U.S. Hostile Workplace Survey 2000, The Workplace Bullying and Trauma Institute.
- [26] Olweus, D. (2003). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- [27] Orpina, M. (2005). Anti-bullying intervention: Implementation and outcome. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75, 465-487. doi:10.1348/000709905X26011
- [28] Peck, M. Scott. 1998. *People of the Lie: The Hope for Healing Human Evil*. New York: Touchstone. p.119.
- [29] Seigne, E. 1998. Bullying at Work in Ireland. In C. Rayner, M. Sheehan and M. Barker. eds. *Bullying at*
- [30] Srabstein, J., & Piazza, T. (2008) Public health, safety and educational risks associated with bullying behaviors in American adolescents. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health*, 20(2), 223–233. doi:10.1515/IJAMH. 2008.20.2.223
- [31] Tim Field, 1996, *Bully in Sight: How to Predict, Resist, Challenge and Combat Workplace Bullying*, Oxfordshire: Success Unlimited. p. 33.
- [32] Vant, M. (2006). Using a participatory culture-specific intervention model to develop a peer victimization intervention. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 22(2), 35-58. Co-published in: B. K. Nastasi (Ed.), *Multicultural Issues in School Psychology*. New York: The Haworth Press, Inc. doi:10.1300/J370v22n02_03
- [33] Varjas, K., Meyers, J., Henrich, C. C., Graybill, E. C., Dew, B. J., Marshall, M. L., ...
- [34] Wang, J. W., Iannotti, R. J., & Nansel, T. R. (2009). School bullying among adolescents in the United States: Physical, verbal, relational, and cyber. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 45, 368-375. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.03.021
- [35] Work: 1998 Research Update Conference: Proceedings. Stafford: Stafford University.
- [36] Yandrick, Rudy M. 1999. Lurking in the Shadows, *HR Magazine*, Oct, pp. 8-9.
- [37] Zapf, Dieter and Einarsen, Stale. 2003. Individual Antecedents of Bullying: Victims and perpetrators. *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice*. London and New York: Taylor & Francis.pp. 168-172.
- [38] Zapf, Dieter, Stale Einarsen, Helge Hoel and Maarit Vartia. 2003. Empirical Findings on Bullying in the Workplace, In Stale Einarsen, Helge Hoel, Dieter Zapf and Cary Cooper, eds. *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice*. London and New York: Taylor & Francis. pp. 109-110.