

Volume 25, Special Issue**Print ISSN: 1099-9264****Online ISSN: 1939-4675**

BULLYING BEHAVIOR IN THE WORKPLACE AND ITS INFLUENTIAL FACTORS: EXPLORATORY STUDY IN NUMBER OF IRAQI UNIVERSITIES

Salaheddine Hussein Saleh, Al-Turath University College**Hiba Yasser Taha, Al-Turath University College**

ABSTRACT

The research aims to determine the level of perceived bullying among workers in a number of governmental and private colleges in the city of Baghdad and to know the level of differences between the responses of the members of the research sample. To achieve the objectives of the research, a questionnaire was developed and distributed to a sample of (130) individuals. It was subjected to statistical analysis (122), which is (94%). Several methods have been used in statistical analysis including (Mean, Correlation, ANOVA,). The research reached several results and conclusions, the most important of which is that the sample is aware of and well aware of the contents of "bullying behaviors at work", and that there are significant differences between the faculties discussed. The research recommended that the researched organizations should pay attention to maintaining a positive cultural environment in which the values of respect and dignity prevail for workers. This would prevent bullying cases from occurring in the work, and the necessity of adopting codes of ethical behavior.

Keywords: Bullying, Baghdad, Work Place Behaviour, Stastical Analysis

INTRODUCTION

"Bullying" originated a long time ago, but its tally is now higher than ever. The beginnings of interest in it in the modern era were due to the school environment, and now it has become a big problem in the working environment, so talking about bullying in the workplace in the second millennium is not something new, not an unknown newborn.

Bullying in the workplace is a phenomenon widely studied in different nations, and literature suggests that the perception of "bullying in the workplace" varies across countries due to differences in industrial, social and cultural relationship frameworks.

The search for bullying in the workplace has become global, with 95 per cent of employees reporting bullying behaviour in the workplace over a five-year period. According to studies on this subject, bullying behavior is widespread but to varying degrees, with 46.8% in the United States of America, 44%, Turkey 40%, Italy 16%, Scandinavia and other parts of Europe 3.5-10%.

We do not really survive if we say that "bullying in the workplace" is a general phenomenon in all societies but varies in severity depending on different environments and diversity of factors of impact. Our institutions today (public and private) are not immune from this, including academic institutions.

Research Problem

The problem crystallizes in the following questions:

- What is the level of awareness of the state of bullying in the workplace by the sample researched?
- What level of importance is given to bullying practices in the workplace by the sample researched?
- Are there statistical differences between the sample categories researched towards the perception of bullying practices?

Search Objectives

- Determining the level of importance of bullying practices according to the responses of the sample researched.
- Detecting statistical differences between the trends of the exterminators towards the phenomenon of bullying.

The Importance of Research

The importance of research is reflected in the following data:

- Lack of the Arab Library of Field Studies on bullying in the workplace.
- The scarcity of research on the subject of bullying in the workplace by Iraqi researchers and scholars.
- The lack of a local study on bullying behaviors in the Iraqi university environment.
- The increasing importance of the impact of the phenomenon of bullying and its negative repercussions on the health of the workplace, the performance of workers and their level of association with the organization.

Research Approach

The analytical descriptive approach represents the appropriate approach to this research, as it focuses on the accurate description of the phenomenon or problem to be studied by looking at previous studies and research related to the subject.

Search Limits

Spatial boundaries: represented by a number of public and civil colleges.

- Time limits: Extended for the period of time from 1/10/2019 - 31/1/2020.
- Human boundaries: employees working in a number of public and civil colleges.

Community and Sample Research

A number of public and civil colleges were selected as a research community, including (Faculty of Management and Economics at the Iraqi University/Technical Administrative College at the Central Technical University/Faculty of Heritage University/College of Al-Maamoun University), and the table (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970) was used to determine the sample size of 130 individuals. The number of questionnaires recovered (128) was 128, and was subjected to statistical analysis (122) questionnaires and 94 percent. From the sample, (6) questionnaires were excluded because they were not suitable for analysis.

Research Hypotheses

- a. There is a statistically significant correlation between bullying behaviors and other related areas such as (perception of bullying, the role of management and the culture of the institution, the qualities of bullies), in researched colleges.
- b. There are statistically significant differences in bullying behaviors and other related areas such as (bullying perception, bullying practices, management role and institution culture, the qualities of bullies) among researched colleges
- c. There are statistically significant differences between average research dimensions due to personal variables (gender, age, scientific qualification, number of years of service).

Search Tool

The main data collection tool was developed with the benefit of studies (Golparvar et al., 2018; Manners & Cates, 2016; Zoubi & Mahidat, 2014). The questionnaire consisted of two sections, the first (general information), and the second (bullying behaviors) which included dimensions (awareness of bullying, bullying practices, management and the culture of the institution, the qualities of bullies).

LITERATURE REVIEW

The intellectual development of the concept of "workplace bullying": The first start was when a book was published in the United States of America in 1976 entitled "Harassing workers", but the actual spread of the concept of bullying at work was by psychiatrist Lehman, who conducted the first research studies on school bullying in Scandinavia in 1990 and was the basis for subsequent research on the subject, where he initially studied aggressive behavior in schoolchildren when hostile cases were selected and diagnosed in groups of children. He later shifted his research focus from school yards to seeking similar behavior in the workplace, particularly bullying in adults. Interest and research into work place bullying has expanded throughout the nine-year period of the last century.

This topic has received considerable attention from researchers and practitioners in many European countries such as Norway, Sweden and Finland, where many research projects have begun to study the prevalence of this phenomenon as well as to study enabling factors and negative consequences for staff and organizations. Meanwhile, Andrea Adams, a freelance journalist from the UK, in collaboration with psychologist Neil Crawford, introduced the phenomenon of bullying to the public through radio broadcasts in 1992.

WHAT IS BULLYING

Given the difference in the perception of bullying in the workplace, among researchers, various definitions of bullying have been used. Many researchers have agreed that "bullying" "means harassment, abuse, social exclusion or negatively affecting someone's work tasks. This process, must occur over and over again (for example, weekly) and over a period of time (for example, about six months). Sees workplace bullying as a form of abuse between people that goes beyond mere lack of manners, involves degrading and repeated acts towards individuals and creates repressive work environments. In the workplace," the Institute of Workplace Bullying (WBI U.S.) defined bullying as "repeated and health-damaging abuse of one or more persons (victims) by one or more (perpetrators), it is abusive behavior that threatens, insults, intimidates, interferes with work or causes sabotage (preventing work from being finished).

The Behavior of "Authoritarian" Bullying

(Workplace bullying) has been widely used to identify any form of negative behavior in the workplace, however, researchers warn that all negative social behavior in the workplace cannot be described as bullying. There has been growing interest from researchers in a variety of negative workplace phenomena such as workplace bullying, workplace aggression, workplace disability, workplace harassment, workplace delinquency, social undermining, emotional abuse and arbitrary supervision. While the intention of harm and negative actions directed at the target is a common phenomenon of bullying and other negative phenomena in the workplace, there are key characteristic features of bullying behavior, as seen in:

- Fortitude (the rising nature of the phenomenon), the continuation of inappropriate behaviors in terms of repetition (once or twice a week), duration (at least for 6 months) and (for a variety of behaviors involved) are one of the most prominent features of bullying.
- There must be a difference in authority, as the individual has difficulty protecting himself or herself from these acts as bullying occurs with two unequal persons and is characterized by the illegal use of authority derived from the organization's official organizational structure to violate the limits of appropriate conduct in the workplace.
- The intention of negative acts manifested through the deliberate nature of such behaviours is an essential feature of bullying in the workplace.
- The types of behaviors that can shape the phenomenon of "bullying" include, but are not limited to
- Repeated and unjustified public criticism, which targets individuals, not performing work, insults or intimidation and threats of punishment without justification, humiliating a person through criticism, ridicule and/or insults, especially in front of other employees or clients, social or physical isolation and exclusion of a particular person from social events in the workplace, fatigue (e.g. impossible deadlines, creating unjustified disturbances), destabilizing and undermining behaviour (e.g., lack of confidence, assigning tasks to meaningless individuals). Reminding individuals of their mistakes, withholding responsibility for no reason, spreading false or malicious rumors, gossip and gossip on a particular person, assigning duties that are not conducive to the abilities of the individual and overloading a particular person with a lot of work. Continuous unjustified scrutiny of the employee, deliberate withholding of the information necessary to perform the work as required or preventing access to the necessary information. Denial of training, promotion and appropriate jobs, sabotage of a particular person's work.

Some researchers, including, attributed there a series of reasons for bullying in the workplace to one or a number of reasons such as (change in the nature of work, how work is organized, institutional culture, leadership), that the personality traits of the bully are perhaps one of the most important reasons for bullying as he feels insecure, weak self-confidence, the need to control and exercise power over others, and even a sense of envy towards the other and his abilities and fear of doing his job better than him. Added other causes such as depression, personality disorder, speed of anger, addiction to aggressive behaviors, misunderstanding of others, anxiety and sometimes imitation. Most previous studies have focused on the changing factors of the working environment in the authoritarian workplace.

Thus, bullying in the workplace does not occur in a social vacuum. Instead, it occurs in the context of a regulatory environment that may exacerbate or reduce its occurrence. One of the most predictive factors for studying bullying in the workplace is situational or contextual factors that may affect violations in any organization. "Circumstantial restrictions" were diagnosed as one of the strongest workplace assault predictions.

Stressful work environments seem to represent conditions that make it likely that there will be bullying in the workplace. For example, researchers found that unsafe function and role pressures such as low job autonomy and high workload similarly indicate the results of the

analysis Until roles are opposed, roles are blurred, independence is reduced, labor restrictions are high and boredom is higher between goals compared to non-aggressive goals in the workplace.

ELECTRONIC BULLYING

Communications have created new ways of bullying in the workplace, as a result of over-reliance - often in person - using electronic methods and social communications as management often relies on technology as the primary means of communication, and employees and managers use e-mail, text messages and various social media forms to run businesses from the workplace. Cyber bullying can occur through channels such as mobile phones, text messages, instant messages, email and other social media sources, as a person who hides behind a computer and attacks the recipient through some kind of electronic device.

Effect- Consequences-Bullying

Aggressive behaviors, bullying and violence are one of the problems in the workplace today in many countries and communities. These behaviors affect the performance of organizations and the performance of individuals. Bullying behaviors are one of the most common among violence and aggressive behaviors that individuals who are exposed to persistent bullying in the workplace usually produce a severe and persistent emotional condition and reaction that can lead to subsequent psychological disorders, such as anxiety. Depression is that abusive behaviour that represents: threats, insults, intimidation or interference in the work that prevents the worker from doing it or verbal abuse has deeper effects on organizations and managers because the potential cost of bullying may be high, and allowing such behaviour to occur will ultimately result in significant costs to the employer due to low staff morale, increased absenteeism and turnover, and the greatest risk is its impact on overall productivity, not to mention the impact on the mental health and well-being of workers and their impact on stress-related disability or workers' claims. In a study revealed the negative impact of bullying on the performance and satisfaction of workers, the study showed the impact of bullying in the workplace on anxiety, depression, job satisfaction, rotation and in attention. found positive relationship Between bullying and the number of workers, a study on the negative relationship between bullying in the workplace and the satisfaction of workers and their level of commitment, also confirmed the study indicated that the intention of workers to leave due to bullying increases or decreases depending on the level of support they receive from their institution.

The effects of bullying can be summarized in the following points:

- a. Regulatory costs: The cost of bullying in organizations includes direct and indirect costs. There is the cost of absence due to illness, staff turnover, low productivity for bullying victims and their colleagues, as well as the cost of potential litigation.
- b. Absence due to illness: During the early stages of bullying, the target may not realize that what they are exposed to is bullying and in the middle stages, the victim of bullying may feel afraid to do anything for fear of reprisals. Only in the final stages, when the victim is completely morally exhausted and suffers from severe symptoms of stress and trauma, she stops working. Victims of bullying in the UK received on average seven days more sick leave each year than those who had not. Based on the 10 per cent bullying rate, this represents 18 million lost working days.
- c. Turnover: For many victims of bullying, leaving the organization is their chosen way to deal with intimidation. This often happens when the organization is seen not to deal with bad behaviors in the workplace.
- d. Productivity: In research that compared bullying and non-bullying organizations, significant differences were found in the method of communication, social climate, general atmosphere and ways to resolve differences of opinion. Organizations that allow bullying also tend to take an authoritarian approach to

resolving differences and a tense and competitive atmosphere, with frequent bickering and a volatile workforce. The culture of bullying is also linked to resistance to innovation because people feel they have to stick to the current ways of doing things. This climate of fear leads to a reluctance to innovate or take any risks. The real impact of the culture of bullying on the organization is that it becomes unproductive.

- e. Influencing colleagues and clients: There are likely to be some colleagues and clients who are aware of what happens in every bullying incident, so those who are monitored for bullying can be almost as burdensome as being intimidated. Interviews show that the main reason for not acting is the fear of being the victim of bullying. So, they may decide to leave the organization, especially when they don't see the organization dealing with bullying in a firm and appropriate way.
- f. Investigation of bullying allegations: Investigating allegations of bullying can be time-consuming and disturbing, and the investigation process itself is likely to become part of the problem, especially when conducted by an inexperienced or impartial investigator.
- g. Strike: Unions may engage in strike action, especially when there is regulatory bullying and when internal systems and processes to deal with bullying are inadequate or non-transparent.
- h. Physical and psychological impact: Victims of bullying generally report a range of physical symptoms, including anorexia, difficulty sleeping or staying asleep, skin complaints and palpitations, and often suffer from psychological symptoms such as anxiety, depression, fatigue, lack of self-esteem, difficulty concentrating, mood, irritability and suicidal thoughts. Exposure to stress in extreme cases can cause symptoms of post-traumatic stress. If bullying continues, the victim may become less able to cope psychologically.
- i. Social impact: Bullying has no limited impact only on those who participate in it. Relationships with partners and colleagues can also be affected. This leads to the anger of the partner or colleague of the organization for not solving the problem.

THE ROLE OF THE ADMINISTRATION IN THE FACE OF BULLYING

Despite the fact that bullying is on the rise and employees are less integrated than they ever were but The Canadian province of Quebec, followed by other provinces, has addressed this issue through laws prohibiting bullying in the workplace, and Canada has acknowledged that the issue of workplace bullying is linked to the occupational health and safety of workers(Hollis) and at present many countries and organizations have realized that preventing the occurrence of bullying in the workplace is linked to the occupational health and safety of workers (Hollis) Bullying is part of WHO's duty to provide a safe working environment without risks to health and safety (Leon liver more, 2007), and the psychological impact of bullying on an issue that needs to be systematically addressed in a similar way to address other health and safety risks, given mental injuries, which may show low self-esteem, depression, feelings of despair or anxiety

Organizational culture is important when it has a positive impact, and workers will encourage it to embrace behavior and respect other individuals. On the other hand, if employees find themselves in the midst of negative culture, behaviors and inappropriate attitudes to management development, bullying will reflect normal behavior among employees of the organization (Rajalakshmi, 2016), in this regard, can take a proactive approach to bullying as organizations that want to promote dignity in the workplace need to start by creating a workplace where appropriate behaviors are promoted and supported, rather than waiting for bad behaviors to occur. To bring about the desired change in culture, the following four elements stand out:

- Creating an atmosphere in which the Organization and its leaders have a clear vision and a sense of what a culture of dignity and respect will be in practice.
- Create and integrate a continuous evaluation and improvement approach based on the common belief that change does not occur by accident, but is caused.
- Develop monitoring tools that measure qualitative and quantitative improvements in the organization's culture.
- Identify the tools and approaches needed to maintain the momentum of dignity at work.

Creating Ethical Infrastructure

Organizations use ethical infrastructure to generate predictable behaviors among individuals that correspond to organizational tasks, objectives and expectations. In an organization with a strong formal ethical system, members of the organization may have knowledge of how to act in the event of bullying in the work environment, because they are familiar with regulatory policies and procedures or because they have been trained to deal with such incidents.

INTERNAL CONSISTENCY TEST

The stability or internal consistency test was conducted through cronbach Alpha, which is used to measure the stability of the measurement tool in terms of internal consistency of the instrument's phrases as it can be explained in table 1, with which the internal consistency of the scale paragraphs at the level of all dimensions has been confirmed after the values of Cronbach Alpha transactions exceeded the acceptable minimum (0.70) and confirm the internal consistency of the scale and therefore its stability required in the event of repeated testing.

Stability of Resolution

Split-Half is used to measure stability, which is to find the correlation factor between individual question scores and marital question scores in resolution, and the link coefficient is corrected by spearman-Brown equation, if the stability factor (0.789) is according to The equation is sufficient for research that adopts the questionnaire as a tool for it, and when applying this method it was found that the correlation coefficient of the questionnaire was (0.857), which means that by its different measures it is good stability and can be adopted at different times and for the individuals themselves and give the same results. As shown in table 2

| Scale | Alpha Kronbach Coefficient | Honesty |
|---|----------------------------|---------|
| Perception of bullying | 0.889 | 0.943 |
| Bullying practices | 0.855 | 0.925 |
| The role of management and the culture of the institution | 0.871 | 0.933 |
| Al-Muthammarin's Attributes | 0.89 | 0.943 |
| Bullying behaviors | 0.816 | 0.903 |
| All paragraphs of the questionnaire | 0.889 | 0.943 |

| | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Cronbach's Alpha | Part 1 | Value | 0.855 |
| | | N of Items | 16 ^a |
| | Part 2 | Value | 0.913 |
| | | N of Items | 15 ^b |
| | Total N of Items | | 31 |
| Correlation Between Forms | | | 0.749 |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-------|
| Spearman-Brown Coefficient | Equal Length | 0.857 |
| | Unequal Length | 0.857 |
| Guttman Split-Half Coefficient | | 0.853 |

THE PRACTICAL ASPECT OF THE RESEARCH

Demographic and Functional Features

Table 3 shows a number of demographic and functional characteristics of the search sample members

| | Categories | Iteration | Ratio |
|----------------------------|--|------------------|--------------|
| College/University | Technical Administrative College | 28 | 23.0 |
| | University Heritage College | 25 | 20.5 |
| | Al, Maamoun University College | 27 | 22.1 |
| | Faculty of Management and Economics/Iraqi University | 42 | 34.4 |
| Total | | 122 | 100.0 |
| Gender | Male | 70 | 57.4 |
| | Female | 52 | 42.6 |
| lifetime | 20-30 | 20 | 16.4 |
| | 31-40 | 59 | 48.4 |
| | 41-50 | 25 | 20.5 |
| | 51-60 | 11 | 9.0 |
| | More than 60 | 7 | 5.7 |
| Scientific qualification | Secondary | 5 | 4.1 |
| | Technical Diploma | 7 | 5.7 |
| | Bachelor | 63 | 51.6 |
| | Master | 25 | 20.5 |
| | Doctor | 22 | 18.0 |
| Number of years of service | Less than 5 years | 25 | 20.5 |
| | 5-10 years | 34 | 27.9 |
| | More than 10 years | 63 | 51.6 |

Descriptive Analysis of Search Dimensions

We seek from this analysis to identify the reality of bullying behaviors in the quality of life of work and will be based on the computational medium and standard deviation of those answers in addition to determining the level of relative importance of each dimension within the single variable based on the factor of difference.

| Weighted average | Answer scale | Answer level |
|------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| 1 to 1.79 | I don't quite agree | Very weak. |
| 1.80 to 2.59 | I don't agree | Weak |
| 2.60 to 3.39 | neutral | Medium |
| 3.40 to 4.19 | I agree | good |
| 4.20 to 5 | I totally agree | Very good |

| Keeping out search variables | Arithmetic medium | Standard deviation | Variation coefficient | Relative importance | Direction of the answer | Answer level |
|---|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| Perception of bullying | 3.425 | 0.592 | 17.274 | 1 | agree | good |
| Bullying practices | 3.405 | 0.784 | 23.012 | 3 | agree | good |
| The role of management and the culture of the institution | 3.459 | 0.915 | 26.457 | 4 | agree | good |
| Al-Muthammarin's Attributes | 3.928 | 0.712 | 18.12 | 2 | agree | good |
| Bullying behaviors | 3.554 | 0.61 | 17.152 | | agree | good |

Table 5 shows the overall computational medium of variable dimensions of bullying behaviors, reaching the highest average of my calculation at the number (characteristics of bullies) (3.928), which is higher than the average value ranging from (2.60 to 3.39) and at a good level with a standard deviation (0.712) and different factors (0.712) and different factors (0.712). 18.120) This dimension came at the second level in terms of relative importance, but the lowest middle of my calculation was at the count (bullying practices) at 3.405), standard deviation (0.784) and different factors (26,457), as this dimension came at the fourth level in terms of relative importance.

Table (6) shows the computational medium, standard deviation, variation factor and relative importance of search resolution paragraphs

| N | Perception of bullying | Arithmetic medium | Standard deviation | Variation coefficient | Relative importance | Direction of the answer |
|---|--|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | There are individuals who take on other employees. | 3.84 | 1.039 | 27.095 | 4 | agree |
| 2 | Some employees are intimidated at work. | 3.49 | 0.998 | 28.578 | 5 | agree |
| 3 | Some employees are considering leaving the job because of intimidation | 3.15 | 1.162 | 36.914 | 8 | neutral |
| 4 | Some employees who were intimidated left the institution because of this treatment | 3.18 | 1.121 | 35.246 | 7 | neutral |
| 5 | Some of the medsinthe n who wereintimidated have received disciplinary action from theothers | 3.19 | 1.086 | 34.055 | 6 | neutral |
| 6 | Employees who feared others for this behavior have been questioned or punished | 2.8 | 1.036 | 37.066 | 9 | neutral |
| 7 | Bullying is a form of harassment involved in the | 3.84 | 0.965 | 25.161 | 3 | agree |

| hostile working environment | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|------|-------|--------|----|---------|
| 8 | Bullying is a form of psychological harassment | 3.77 | 0.907 | 24.059 | 2 | agree |
| 9 | Bullying is illegal behavior under the law | 4.07 | 0.911 | 22.353 | 1 | agree |
| 10 | The Foundation provides training against this type of harassment | 2.93 | 1.214 | 41.488 | 10 | neutral |
| 11 | Some supervisors always mention the mistakes of their employees | 3.68 | 0.998 | 27.119 | 2 | agree |
| 12 | Some supervisors make incorrect accusations against their employees | 3.49 | 1.137 | 32.569 | 9 | agree |
| 13 | Some employees are threatened by their supervisors | 3.16 | 1.06 | 33.6 | 10 | neutral |
| 14 | Some employees are humiliated by their supervisors. | 3.12 | 1.14 | 36.493 | 11 | neutral |
| 15 | The reactions of some supervisors are angry and aggressive | 3.4 | 1.042 | 30.626 | 4 | agree |
| 16 | Some supervisors constantly criticize the efforts of their employees | 3.33 | 1.032 | 31.013 | 6 | agree |
| 17 | Some supervisors neglect the opinions and perspectives of their employees for work | 3.64 | 1.129 | 31.012 | 5 | agree |
| 18 | Some supervisors withhold the information their employees need | 3.52 | 1.123 | 31.923 | 8 | agree |
| 19 | Some supervisors are strictly monitoring the work of their employees | 3.8 | 1.001 | 26.323 | 1 | agree |
| 20 | Some supervisors assign their employees tasks that are unreasonable or impossible to carry out in a short time | 3.46 | 1.122 | 32.434 | 7 | agree |
| 21 | Some supervisors ask their employees to perform boring tasks | 3.51 | 1.038 | 29.602 | 3 | agree |
| 22 | Some supervisors order their employees to lower their level of excellence | 2.75 | 1.116 | 40.511 | 12 | neutral |
| 23 | The concept of individuality prevails in working on the collective concept | 3.52 | 1.123 | 31.923 | 2 | agree |
| 24 | Silence about behaviors that indicate bullying | 3.55 | 1.053 | 29.673 | 1 | agree |
| 25 | Not showing the right appreciation and respect for employees | 3.33 | 1.195 | 35.919 | 5 | neutral |
| 26 | Poor sense of security among workers | 3.48 | 1.151 | 33.131 | 4 | agree |
| 27 | Poor feeling of comfort at work | 3.43 | 1.12 | 32.695 | 3 | agree |
| 28 | They often have positions of strength. etc.) | 3.97 | 0.935 | 23.578 | 2 | agree |
| 29 | They've often been bullied by others in the past | 3.75 | 0.826 | 22.012 | 1 | agree |
| 30 | They're often obsessed with controlling others | 3.98 | 1 | 25.147 | 4 | agree |
| 31 | They often can't distinguish between driving behaviors and bullying behaviors | 4.02 | 1.004 | 24.997 | 3 | agree |

The highest average calculation between paragraphs after (bullying perception) when "bullying is illegal behavior under the law" was (4.07), while the lowest average account when "the institution provides training against this type of harassment" was (2.93).

The highest average calculation was between paragraphs after (bullying practices) when "some supervisors strictly monitor the work of their employees" and was (3.80), while the lowest average account when "some supervisors order their employees to reduce their outstanding level" was (2.75).

The highest average calculation was between paragraphs after (the role of management and the culture of the institution) when "silence about behaviors indicating bullying" was (3.55), while the lowest average account when "not showing the appropriate appreciation and respect of employees" was (3.33).

The highest average calculation was between paragraphs after (the characteristics of bullies) when "they often cannot distinguish between driving behaviors and bullying behaviors" and was (4.02), while the lowest average account when "they were often bullied by others in the past" was (3.75).

TEST SEARCH HYPOTHESES

The Imposition of Association

This part of the analysis deals with testing the correlation between the variable behaviors of bullying and its removal (bullying perception, bullying practices, management role and enterprise culture, the qualities of bullies), as it will use Pearson to discover the strength of the relationship between the dimensions of the variable and its direction, and represents the positive correlation between two variables until the increase in one variable is offset by an increase in the other variable, The negative correlation indicates an increase in one variable offset by a decrease in the other variable (Pallan, 2011:128). The correlation is strongly positive when it is (+0.3 to +0.7). To +0.3, while the correlation is strong negative when it is (-0.3 to -0.7), and negatively weak when it is (-0.3 to 0). And (-1) refers to a complete negative correlation, and (0) indicates that there is no link, as the (first hypothesis) will be tested based on the results shown in table (7).

- A- Testing (a relationship that does not rank between bullying behaviors and the perception of bullying) as the correlation between bullying behaviors and the perception of bullying (0.735**) at the level of significance (0.000) this means a correlation relationship to a good level and moral significance.
- B- Testing (a relationship between bullying behaviors and counting bullying practices) as the correlation factor between bullying behaviors after bullying practices (0.863**) at the level of indication (0.000) means a correlation with a good level and moral significance between bullying behaviors and after bullying practices.
- C- Test (a relationship between the behaviors of bullying and the counting of the role of management and the culture of the institution) where the coefficient between the behaviors of bullying and the counting of the role of management and the culture of the institution (0.576**) at the level of significance (0.000) this means a relationship link to a good level and moral significance between the behaviors of bullying and after the role of management and the culture of the institution.
- D- Testing (a relationship between bullying behaviors and counting the characteristics of bullies) as the correlation between bullying behaviors and the counting of the characteristics of bullies (0.750**) at the level of significance (0.000) means a correlation between a good level and a moral significance between the behaviors of bullying and the counting of the characteristics of bullies.

| Bullying behaviors | Link value and semantic level | Keeping out bullying behaviors |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| 7.35E-01 | Link | Perception of bullying |
| 0 | Itself | |
| 8.68E-01 | Link | Bullying practices |
| 0 | Itself | |
| 8.63E-01 | Link | The role of management and the culture of the institution |
| 0 | Itself | |
| 7.50E-01 | Link | Al-Muthammarin's Attributes |
| 0 | Itself | |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Testing the Differences between Averages

A- Differences between the average dimensions of the research variable(second hypothesis)were tested based on the one way ANOVA one-way test, which examines one type of factor or treatment to see if these factors have morally different effects and are meant here by factors (researched colleges) in addition to test(Z) for two independent samples, the results of the test of differences between the average dimensions of the changer of bullying behaviors (bullying perception, bullying practices, management and enterprise culture) on the basis of the researched colleges did not reveal any moral differences except after (the qualities of bullies) as follows:

| Domain | Research college | Arithmetic medium | Standard deviation | test F | itself F | Statistics Levene | itself Levene |
|-----------------------------|--|-------------------|--------------------|--------|----------|-------------------|---------------|
| Al-Muthammarin's Attributes | Technical Administrative College | 3.8036 | 0.85353 | 3.318 | 0.022 | 0.866 | 0.461 |
| | University Heritage College | 4 | 0.55902 | | | | |
| | Al, Maamoun University College | 4.2593 | 0.70193 | | | | |
| | Faculty of Management and Economics/Iraqi University | 3.756 | 0.63555 | | | | |
| | Total | 3.9283 | 0.71182 | | | | |

Table (8) refers to the computational medium of the sample answers researched for the dimension of "bullies" on the basis of their searched college, where the highest average of my account at (Al-Maamoun University College) in the middle of my calculation was (4.2593) and a standard deviation of (0.70193), the calculated F value (3.318) which is greater than the value of F table The 2.26 at the indicative level (0.022), which is lower than the level of significance (0.05) and accordingly we accept the hypothesis in part, which means (there are differences of moral significance for the variable characteristics of bullies on the basis of the researched college), as the table shows the moral differences between the researched colleges, the statistics (levene) of the value of (0) showed 0.866 at the indication level (0.461) which is higher than the level of indication at (0.05) meaning that the data do not suffer from the problem of homogeneity of the disparity between groups at the level of indication (5%) That is, with a degree of confidence (95%).

| (I) | (J) | Mean Difference (I-J) | It self. |
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------|----------|
| Technical Administrative College | University Heritage College | -0.19643- | 0.305 |
| | Al, Maamoun University College | -0.45569-* | 0.016 |
| | Faculty of Management and Economics/Iraqi University | 0.04762 | 0.778 |
| University Heritage College | Technical Administrative College | 0.19643 | 0.305 |
| | Al, Maamoun University College | -0.25926- | 0.18 |

| | | | |
|--|--|------------|-------|
| | Faculty of Management and Economics/Iraqi University | 0.24405 | 0.165 |
| Al, Maamoun University College | Technical Administrative College | 0.45569* | 0.016 |
| | University Heritage College | 0.25926 | 0.18 |
| | Faculty of Management and Economics/Iraqi University | 0.50331* | 0.004 |
| Faculty of Management and Economics/Iraqi University | Technical Administrative College | -0.04762- | 0.778 |
| | University Heritage College | -0.24405- | 0.165 |
| | Al, Maamoun University College | -0.50331-* | 0.004 |
| *. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level. | | | |

B- The differences between the average variable "bullying behaviors" attributable to the personality traits of the research sample (gender, age, educational attainment, number of years of service) were tested, and the results revealed significant moral differences only on the basis of the variable "gender" and the variable "educational attainment" as follows:

| Z | Significance | The difference between averages | Itself | Z | Standard deviation | Arithmetic medium | Sample |
|------|--------------|---------------------------------|--------|-------|--------------------|-------------------|--------|
| 1.96 | Spiritual | 0.24716 | 0.026 | 2.252 | 0.45717 | 3.6596 | males |
| | | | | | 0.75049 | 3.4124 | Female |

Table: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of XLSTAT 2014

Table 11 shows the computational medium of the sample answers researched on the variable bullying behaviors, reaching the highest average calculation at the researched sample (males) in the middle (3.6596) (with a standard deviation of (0.45717), with the value of Z) calculated as (-2.252) and outside the period (1.960,1.960-) at the level of significance (0.026) which is lower than the level of significance (0.05) and therefore we accept the hypothesis in part and this means (there are morally significant differences about the answers to the change in bullying behaviors based on gender).

| Domain | Education | Arithmetic medium | Standard deviation | test F | itself F | Statistics Levene | itself Levene |
|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------|----------|-------------------|---------------|
| Bullying behaviors | secondary | 3.3342 | 0.49223 | 2.754 | 0.031 | 1.028 | 0.396 |
| | Technical Diploma | 3.0679 | 0.68527 | | | | |
| | Bachelor | 3.4999 | 0.64356 | | | | |
| | Master | 3.6315 | 0.57744 | | | | |
| | Doctor | 3.8269 | 0.41588 | | | | |
| | Total | 3.5542 | 0.60963 | | | | |

1. Table (11) refers to the computational medium of the sample answers researched for the variable of bullying behaviors based on educational attainment, where it reached the highest average of my

calculation at educational attainment (PhD) in the middle of my calculation amounted to (3.8269) and a standard deviation of (0.41588)

2. The calculated F value (2.754) is greater than the scheduled F value of (2.26) at the indicative level (0.031), which is smaller than the level of significance (0.05) and accordingly we accept the hypothesis in part, which means (there are differences of moral significance for the variable behaviors of bullying based on educational attainment), as table (11) shows the moral differences between the levels of education
3. The Levene statistics of 1.028 at the level of indication (0.396) which is higher than the level of indication at (0.05) which means that the data do not suffer from the problem of homogeneity of the disparity between groups.

| (I) Scientific qualification | (J) Scientific qualification | Mean Difference (I-J) | Itself |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|
| Technical Diploma | secondary | -0.26631- | 0.444 |
| | Bachelor | -0.43201- | 0.07 |
| | Master | -0.56364-* | 0.028 |
| | Doctor | -0.75904-* | 0.004 |
| Bachelor | secondary | 0.1657 | 0.549 |
| | Technical Diploma | 0.43201 | 0.07 |
| | Master | -0.13163- | 0.349 |
| | Doctor | -0.32703-* | 0.028 |
| Master | secondary | 0.29733 | 0.308 |
| | Technical Diploma | 0.56364* | 0.028 |
| | Bachelor | 0.13163 | 0.349 |
| | Doctor | -0.19539- | 0.262 |

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

Conclusion

- The results of the sample answers revealed a good level of importance for most of the questionnaire paragraphs, from which it is concluded that the sample researched is well aware of the contents of "bullying behaviors at work", and this is supported by the moral relationships of association between areas of "bullying behaviors".
- The results of the test of differences between averages showed that after the "qualities of bullies" was the most likely to explain the difference between the researched colleges, as the differences tended in favor of the faculties of "al-Maamoun University, Administrative Technology, Management and Economics", it is concluded that the trends of the sample members in the researched colleges agree to determine the "characteristics of bullies" in them but at different levels.
- The "gender" variable was one of the personal variables attributable to the variation in the average dimensions of bullying behaviors at work, indicating a difference in the attitudes of male sample members from females towards bullying behaviors at work. The difference was also noted according to the variable "scientific qualification", especially for the doctoral holders, and concludes that holders of higher degrees are better aware of the dimensions of "bullying behaviors at work" than lower scientific qualifications.

Recommendations

- Based on the extensive review of the literature and studies of "bullying in the workplace" and the findings and conclusions of the data analysis, the following recommendations were reached:
- Organizations should be geared towards maintaining a positive cultural environment in which the values of respect and dignity prevail for workers, which would prevent bullying from emerging at work.
- The importance of organizations and within the awareness and continuing education programs carried out by cultural and training activities that enable workers and officials to deal with cases of bullying when they occur.
- The need for the departments of organizations to monitor and detect any practices that may constitute bullying behaviours and preferably adopt a proactive approach that takes into account the nutrients of bullying, including widely disseminated electronic media.

REFERENCES

- Al-Zoubi, D.M., & Mahidat, R.A. (2014). Bullying behaviors practiced by employees of academic institutions in Jordan and related factors-case study. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 35.
- Al-Sabahi, A.M., & Mohammed, F. (2013). *Behavior of bullying in children and adolescents-its concept, its causes, its treatment*. Center for Studies and Research, Nayef Arab University of Security Sciences.
- Al-Manzel, A.F. (2008.). *Inference statistics and computer applications using SPSS statistical packages*. University library, Sharjah, 1, 91-95.
- Al-Hiti, S.H. (2004). *Statistical methods in administrative sciences applications using SPSS* Wael Publishing House, 1, 341.
- Quality. (2009). *Basic statistical analysis using SPSS*. Wael Publishing House, 12, 295-305.
- Abdel Fattah, E. (2008). *Introduction to descriptive and inference statistics using SPSS*. Dar al-Khwarizmi Printing and Publishing, 541.
- Branch, S., Ramsay, S., & Barker, M. (2013). Workplace bullying, mobbing and general harassment: A review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 15(3), 280-299.
- Branch, S. (2008). You say tomato and I say tomato: Can we differentiate between workplace bullying and other counterproductive behaviors. *International Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(2), 4-17.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S.G., & Aiken, L.S. (2002). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences, (3rd Edition)*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C.L. (2003). *The concept of bullying at work: The European tradition. International Perspectives in Research and Practice*, 3-30. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. (2011). *The concept of bullying and harassment at work: The European tradition, (2nd edition)*, 3-39. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Gullander, M., & Hogh, A. (2014). Exposure to workplace bullying and risk of depression. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 56(12), 1258–1265.
- Hairul Akmal, M.H., Fatimah, W.H., & Rozainee, K. (2018). Does personality influence workplace bullying and lead to depression among nurses? *Journal of Management*, 53, 16.
- Janet, O., Chan-Moka, I., Carlo, C., & Chris, W. (2014). The concept of workplace bullying: Implications from Australian workplace health and safety law. *Australian Catholic University*, 21(3), 442–456.
- Kari, E., Reidar, J., Mykletun, S.V.E., Anders, S., & Denise, S. (2017). Ethical infrastructure and successful handling of workplace bullying. *Nordic journal of working life studies*, 7(1), 37-39.
- Leah, P. (2017). Workplace bullying in the United States and Canada: Organizational accountability required in higher education. *Comparative Civilizations Review*, 76(76).
- Manners & Cates. (2016). Bullying in the workplace: Does it exist in United States Organizations. *International Journal of Business and Public Administration*, 13(2), 99-100.
- Mohsen, G., Sheida, S., & Mohammad, R.M. (2018). Development of supervisor's bullying questionnaire at workplace. *Journal of Research & Health*, 8(2), 95-107.
- Sandy Hershcovis, M., Tara, C., & Reich, K.N. (2015). *Workplace bullying: Causes, consequences, and intervention strategies*. Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Inc., 6-7
- Muhammad, K., Imtiaz, A., Masooma, S., & Syeda Wajiha, K. (2018). Impact of workplace bullying on job performance, intention to leave, OCB and stress. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 33(1), 55-74.
- Noreen, T. (2005). *Bullying at work beyond policies to a culture of respect*. Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.

- Public Services Health & Safety Association (PSHSA). (2010). *Bullying in the workplace: A handbook for the workplace*.
- Raja lakshmi, M. (2016). Relationship between workplace bullying and organizational culture. *Sona Global Management Review*, 10(2).
- Rai, I., & Upasna A.A. (2013). Workplace bullying: A review and future research directions. *South Asian Journal of Management*, 23(29), 28-32.
- Reggie, H., & Sue J. (2014). *Managing workplace bullying and social media policy: Implications for employee engagement*. Tarleton State University.
- Salin, D. (2003). Ways of explaining workplace bullying: A review of enabling, motivating and precipitating structures and processes in the work environment. *Human Relations*, 56(10), 1213-1232.
- Samnani, A.K., & Singh, P. (2012). 20 years of workplace bullying research: A review of the antecedents and consequences of bullying in the workplace. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17(6), 581-589.
- Zapf, D. (2004). Negative social behavior at work and workplace bullying. *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Bullying and Harassment in the Workplace (25)*. Bergen, Norway: University of Bergen.