

Organizational Bullying, Professional Jealousies, Power Play, and Gossiping in the Work Place: Basis for Institutional Transformation

ROME B. MORALISTA, Ph.D. GABRIEL C. DELARIARTE, Ed.D.

jerlynagustar@yahoo.com

West Visayas State University-Calinog, Iloilo
PHILIPPINES

Abstract – *This study determined the Bullying practices observed, the Professional Jealousies experienced, the Power Play Practices experienced and the gossiping activities as observed by the respondents. Descriptive –type of research was utilized in the study. Results showed that keeping on watching and tracking the lives of industrious and progressive people and being not happy in the promotion of others are most often observed. It is also most often practiced that people will do anything just to be promoted on get ahead of others. Gossiping and power play have significant relationship while bullying has no significant relationship with professional jealousies, power play and gossiping.*

Keywords – Bullying, Professional jealousies, power play

I. INTRODUCTION

Education is a major instrument for economic and social development. Investment in education is considered as investment in human capital and this increase labour productivity furthers technological innovation and produces rate of return markedly higher than that of physical capital (Khatoun, Azeem, and Hayat Akhtar, 2011). Bullying in organizations will continue to be an important consideration in the management of global organizations (Einarsen and Raknes, 1997), as it has detrimental effects on productivity (Keelan, 2000), financial bottom-line (Field, 2003), and employee morale (Olafsson and Johannsdottir, 2004). Yet, bullying is often a misunderstood, misdiagnosed, and a mismanaged behavior in work environments. Many victims of bullying suffer from a form of social stress that is similar in nature to post-traumatic stress syndrome that can have a debilitating impact on the individual (Leymann and Gustafsson, 1996; Wilson, 1991). Thus, the bullied individual can have social, psychological, and psychosomatic dimensions, which can manifest itself in a negative impact on the individual's self-efficacy, and ability to perform his/her job (Einarsen, 1999; Einarsen and Raknes, 1997).

Andersen, Eloy, Guerrero & Spitzberg, (1995), have noted the demonstrated connections with relational satisfaction (Bradbury & Fincham, 1990; Vangelisti, 1992). But, jealousy also has the potential to affect a romantic relationship detrimentally (Bevan, 2008). Many authors note that the experience of jealousy is present because individuals perceive the potential for

relational loss (Harmon-Jones, Peterson & Harris, 2009; Pines, 1992). Furthermore, Orvis, Kelley & Butler (1976) found outside relationship activities to cause the highest frequency of attributional conflict.

In power play, supervision that is primarily authoritarian or power coercive will create disempowerment for child and youth care worker (Brown and Bourne, 1996). Kadushin (1968) referred to a number of games that supervisors play as a way to cope with this imbalance power.

Bauman (1972) refers to games played in the supervisory relationship as a form of resistance that results from feeling disempowered. An extensive account of the different views of gossip is presented by (De Backer, 2005), (Shermer, 2004), (Westacott, 2000), (Michelson and Mouly, 2004), among others. Gossip is sometimes described as a casual or idle talk, often between friends. The term is frequently used with negative connotations, referring to spreading of malicious information, unreliably sourced and unchecked anecdotes and misinformation. The other negative views of gossip are its being trivial, invasive, and commonly harmful. Several authors however suggest neutralizing and generalizing the concept of gossip to refer to any talk about other people (Westacott, 2000), (Collins 1994), (De Backer, 2005). Even (Kurland and Pelled, 2000) define gossip as an informal and evaluative talk about a person who is not present, which also offers a neutral definition and suggests the common nature of gossip.

Discussing rumors and gossip in organizations (Houmanfar and Johnson, 2004) notice that employees

gossip in order to gain information, influence others, and socialize in the organization. Both gossip and rumor increase in situations of environmental ambiguity (Rosnow, 2001) where employees have a low impact on decision making, and when policies and information may not be clear. However, (Michelson and Mouly, 2004) see gossip as a tool of information exchange which helps people to socialize, strengthen social bonds, foster intimacy and preserve group solidarity. Even (Collins, 1994) suggests re-evaluation of the received view of gossip in order to balance the image of gossip as entirely malicious, pointless, trivial and inappropriate activity.

II. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aimed to find out the organizational bullying, professional jealousies, power play, and gossiping in the work place as basis for institutional transformation. Specifically, it determined the Bullying practices observed, the Professional Jealousies experienced, the Power Play Practices experienced and the gossiping activities as observed by the respondent; to test the relationship between organizational bullying, professional jealousies, power play, and gossiping in the work place of the respondents; and to formulate policies on the basis of the findings.

III. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The survey-correlational method of research was employed in this investigation. According to Fraenkel & Wallen (2003), the major purpose of survey research is to describe the characteristics of a population. In Essence, information is collected from a group of people in order to describe some aspects or characteristics (such as abilities, opinion, attitudes, beliefs, and or knowledge) of the population of which the group is part. In correlation research, sometimes called associative research, the relationships among two or more variables are studied without any attempt to influence them. In their simplest form, correlational studies investigate the possibility of relationships among the two variables, although in investigations of more than two variables are common. Since the study describes the organizational bullying, professional jealousies, power play, and gossiping in the work place and the findings are the basis for institutional transformation through institutional policies can be formulated for improving the present West Visayas State University-Calinog Campus making it more effective and efficient. The respondents were the 25 randomly selected faculty of West Visayas State University-Calinog Campus. The simple random

sampling method was used in the selection of the respondents. Four (4) researcher made questionnaires were utilized to obtain data for the organizational bullying, professional jealousies, power play, and gossiping in the work place. These data gathering instruments were dully validated by panel of experts. The responses on the data collected were tallied, tabulated and interpreted using the numeric values assigned to the qualitative description used in questionnaires. Means and standard deviations were employed as descriptive statistics; while the Pearson's *r* was employed as inferential statistics. The means were used to determine the organizational bullying, professional jealousies, power play, and gossiping practices observed by the respondents in the work place; Standard deviations were used to determine the homogeneity of the respondent practices observed on the organizational bullying, professional jealousies, power play, and gossiping in the work place; and the Pearson's *r* was used to determine the significance of the relationships between organizational bullying, professional jealousies, power play, and gossiping in the work place of the respondents. The .05 alpha level was used as the criterion for the acceptance or rejection of the null hypotheses.

IV. INSTITUTIONAL POLICY FORMULATION

This is a presentation of the institutional policy formulation based on the findings of the study:

A. Title of the Intervention:

3 DAYS SEMINAR WORKSHOP ON POLICY MAKING

B. Rationale:

- a.) To identify the degree of organizational bullying, professional jealousies, power play, and gossiping in the work place among the respondents.
- b.) To recommend interventions necessary in order to improve the system.

C. General Objectives

The main objectives of this study is to develop policies based on the findings of study and needs of the college faculty, school administrator, school directors, college dean, and students for the betterment of school system and harmonious relationship among the constitution of the school community.

D. Participants

- a.) School Administrator
- b.) Dean of Instruction
- c.) School Directors
- d.) College Faculty
- e.) Non-Teaching Personnel
- f.) Students

E. Key Results

The expected output of the seminar-workshop is set of formulation policies based on the identified need of the college faculty of West Visayas State University-Calinog, Campus, Calinog, Iloilo.

V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. The Bullying Practices Observed by the Respondents

Category	M	VI	SD
a. Are insensitive to my feeling.	4.64	MOP	.489
b. Berate me	4.64	MOP	.489
c. Underestimate me	4.52	MOP	.714
d. Bad mouth me	4.36	MOP	.637
e. Plot against me	4.20	MOP	.763
f. Insult me among school activities.	4.24	MOP	.597
g. Enjoy in my downfall.	4.28	MOP	.541
h. Insult me in the social media.	4.16	OP	.624
i. Treat me as if I have no dignity.	4.84	MOP	.374

Most Often Practiced (MOP): 4.21-5.00; Often Practiced (OP): 3.41-4.20; Practiced (P): 2.61-3.40; Seldom Practiced (SP): 1.81-2.60; Not Practiced (NP): 1.00-1.80

Result show that the top three bullying practices observed by the respondents in descending order of rank (1) Treat me as if I have no dignity (M=4.84); followed by (2) Are insensitive to my feeling (M=4.64); (3) Berate me (M=4.64) and for the least three, they are (8) Insult me among school activities (M=4.24); (9) Plot against me (M=4.20), and (10) Insult me in the social media (M=4.16). These are shown in table 1.

Table 2. The Professional Jealousies Experiences by Respondents

Category	VM	VI	SI
a. Are not happy in the promotion of others.	4.24	MOP	.43
b. Are sad about the blessings of others.	4.16	OP	.55
c. Feel a sense of loss in their beings when others progress.	4.12	OP	.52
d. Feel bad about the rewards and awards of other.	4.20	MOP	.56
e. Keep on watching/tracking the lives of industrious and progressive people.	4.64	MOP	.568

Most Often Practiced (MOP): 4.21-5.00; Often Practiced (OP): 3.41-4.20; Practiced (P): 2.61-3.40; Seldom Practiced (SP): 1.81-2.60; Not Practiced (NP): 1.00-1.80

As regards to professional jealousies experiences by the respondents, the top three are (1) keep on watching/tracking the lives of industrious and

progressive people (M=4.64); (2) Are not happy in the promotion of others (M=4.24); and Feel bad about the rewards and awards of other (M=4.20). The succeeding table exhibits these.

Table 3. The Power Play Practices Experiences by the Respondents

Category	WM	VI	SD
a. Keep on competing among one another.	4.36	MOP	.489
b. Are serious of their "powers".	4.44	MOP	.506
c. Overlap the duties and responsibilities of others.	4.60	MOP	.500
d. Use the political intervention and higher activities to advance.	4.52	MOP	.509
e. Keep on throwing their weight around.	4.68	MOP	.476
f. Will do anything just to be promoted on get ahead of others.	4.84	MOP	.374

Most Often Practiced (MOP): 4.21-5.00; Often Practiced (OP): 3.41-4.20; Practiced (P): 2.61-3.40; Seldom Practiced (SP): 1.81-2.60; Not Practiced (NP): 1.00-1.80

As regards to the power play practices experiences by the respondents, will do anything just to be promoted on get ahead of others (M=4.84) ranks number (1) followed by keep on throwing their weight around (M=4.68); and third, Overlap the duties and responsibilities of others (M=4.60). The table 3 shows the details of these.

Table 4. The Gossiping Activities as Observed by the Respondent

Category	M	VI	SD
a. Are enjoying baseless talking about lives of others.	4.76	MOP	.435
b. Think that the lives of others are their business.	4.64	MOP	.568
c. Create stories to discredit others.	4.72	MOP	.542
d. Use "word war" against their enemies.	4.56	MOP	.506
e. Use gossiping for their own personal and hidden agenda.	4.48	MOP	.509
f. Are fond of gossips.	4.24	MOP	.435

Most Often Practiced (MOP): 4.21-5.00; Often Practiced (OP): 3.41-4.20; Practiced (P): 2.61-3.40; Seldom Practiced (SP): 1.81-2.60; Not Practiced (NP): 1.00-1.80

The gossiping activities as observed by the respondents are exhibited the following in descending order: are enjoying baseless talking about lives of others (M=4.76) rank first; followed by create stories to discredit others (M=4.72); and third, think that the lives of others are their business (M=4.64). Table 4 exhibits these.

Table 5. The Relationship between Organizational Bullying, Professional Jealousies, Power Play, and Gossiping in the Work Place of the Respondents.

		Bullying	Jealousies	Power Play	Gossiping
Bullying	Pearson Correlation	1	.167	-.220	.133
	Significance(2-tailed)	.	.424	.290	.526
Jealousies	Pearson Correlation	.167	1	.144	.064
	Significance(2-tailed)	.424	.	.492	.760
Power Play	Pearson Correlation	-.220	.144	1	.423(*)
	Significance(2-tailed)	.290	.492	.	.035
Gossiping	Pearson Correlation	.133	.064	.423(*)	1
	Significance(2-tailed)	.526	.760	.035	.

* Correlation at 0.05(2-tailed):...

Table 5 shows that gossiping and power play have significant relationship; Bullying, has no significant relationship with professional jealousies, power play and gossiping. Power play has no significant relationship with bullying and professional jealousies; gossiping has no significant relationship with bullying and professional jealousies.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

On the bullying, the respondents experience that treating them as if they have no dignity top most; In professional jealousies, the respondents experienced most that fellow member keep on watching / tracking the line of industrious and progressive people; In power play, the respondents experienced most that their co-workers will do anything just to be promoted and get ahead of others; In gossiping, the respondents experienced most is that their co-workers are enjoying baseless talking about the lives of others; and an increased or decreased in their gossiping and power play, may have a corresponding increased or decreased on the bullying and professional jealousies. This means that the respondents have observed themselves the practices of bullying, professional jealousies, gossiping and power play in their work place.

It is recommended that have a values orientation seminars and workshop may be intensified in order to limit professional bullying, jealousies, power play and gossiping; An orientation to Civil Service Commission Rules and Regulations may help; Strict monitoring and supervision may limit if not eradicate these non-

productive activities; and Policies may be formulated regarding these for the improvement of the system which may be beneficial to all.

REFERENCES

- Andersen, P. A., Eloy, S. V., Guerrero, L. K., & Spitzberg, B. H. (1995). Romantic jealousy and relational satisfaction: A look at the impact of jealousy experience and expression. *Communication Reports*, 8, 77 - 85.
- Bevan, J. L. (2008). Experiencing and communicating romantic jealousy: Questioning the investment model. *Southern Communication Journal*, 73, 42-67.
- Bradbury, T. N., & Fincham, F. D. (1990). Attributions in marriage: Review and critique. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 3 - 33.
- Bauman, W.F. (1972). Games counsellors trainees play: dealing with trainee resistance, *Counsellor Education and Supervision*, 11, 251-256.
- Brown, A. & Bourne, I. (1996). *The social Work Supervisor*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Collins, L. (1994), Gossip: A Feminist Defense. In *Good Gossip*/edited by Goodman F and Ben-Ze'ev A. University press of Kansas.
- De Backer, C. (2005), *Like Belgian Chocolate for the Universal Mind. Interpersonal and Media Gossip from an Evolutionary Perspective*, PhD Thesis, Gent University, online at http://www.ethesis.net/gossip/gossip_contence.htm accessed on 07.04.2008.

- Einarsen, S. (1999). 'The Nature and Causes of Bullying at Work', *International Journal of Manpower* 10, 16–27.
- Einarsen, S. and B. Raknes (1997), 'Harassment at Work and the Victimization of Men', *Violence and Victims* 12, 247–263.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2003). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (5th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Field, T. (2003). 'Workplace Bullying', *British Medical Journal* 326, 776–777
- Harmon-Jones, E., Peterson, C.K., & Harris, C.R. (2009). Jealousy: Novel methods and neural correlates. *Emotion*, 9, 113 – 117.
- Houmanfar, R. and Johnson, R. (2004), Organizational Implications of Gossip and Rumor, *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, Volume: 23 Issue: 2/3, online at http://www.obmnetwork.com/resources/articles/tips/Houmanfar_Gossip.htm accessed 07.04.2008.
- Kadushin, A. (1968). Games people play in supervision. *Social Work*, 13(2), 127-136.
- Keelan, E. (2000). 'Bully for You', *Accountancy* 125, 56.
- Khatoon, H., Azeem, F., and Hayat Akhtar, S., (2011). The impact of different factors on teaching competencies at secondary level in Pakistan.
- Kurland, N.B. and Pelled, L.H. (2000), Passing the word: toward a model of gossip and power in the workplace, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 25 No.2, 428-38.
- Leymann, H. and Gustafsson, A. (1996). 'Mobbing at Work and the Development of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorders', *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 5, 251–276.
- Michelson, G. and Mouly, S. (2004), Rumour and gossip in organisations: a conceptual study, *Management Decision*, Vol. 38 No.5, 339-461.
- Orvis, B. R., Kelley, H. H., & Butler, D. (1976). Attributional conflict in young couples. In J. H. Harvey, W.J. Ickes, & R.F. Kidd (Eds.), *New directions in attribution research* (Vol. 1, pp. 353 – 386). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Olafsson, R. F. and Johannsdottir, H.L. (2004). 'Coping with Bullying in the Workplace: The Effect of Gender, Age and Type of Bullying', *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling* 32, 319–333.
- Pines, A.M. (1992). Romantic jealousy: Five perspectives and an integrative approach. *Psychotherapy*, 4, 675 – 683.
- Rosnow, R. L. and Foster, E.K. (2001), Rumor and Gossip Research, *APA Psychological Science* Agenda, online at <http://www.apa.org/science/psa/apr05gossip.html> accessed on 07.04.2008.
- Shermer, M (2004), *The Science of Good & Evil: Why People Cheat, Gossip, Care, Share, and Follow the Golden Rule*, Times Books.
- Vangelisti, A. L. (1992). Communication problems in committed relationships: An attributional analysis. In J. H. Harvey, T. L. Orbuch & A. L. Weber (Eds.), *Attributions, accounts, and close relationships* (pp. 144 – 164). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Westacott, E. (2000), The Ethics of Gossiping, *International Journal of Applied Philosophy* 14:1, 65-90.
- Wilson, C.: 1991, 'US Businesses Suffer from Workplace Trauma', *Personnel Journal* 47–50.