

CYBER BULLING ON ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE IN MAKURDI, BENUE STATE

Owoicho Michael¹,
Johnson Grace Mubo PhD²
& Emmanuel Oryiman
Nyagba³

¹Department of Business Management,
Benue State University,
Makurdi.

Benue State. Nigeria

²Kogi State University,
Anyigba. Nigeria.

³Department of Business Management,
Benue State University,
Makurdi.

Benue State. Nigeria.

Pages 130 - 139

ABSTRACT

This study examined the effect of workplace cyber bullying on organizational Performance in Makurdi, Benue State. The researcher used mainly primary data from a sample of two hundred and ten (210) of selected business organizations that served as respondents for this study. Regression was used for data analysis and test of formulated hypotheses and the results are presented in model summary, analysis of variance and regression coefficient. The hypotheses of the study were analyzed using the probability value of the regression estimates. The result of the regression analysis indicates workplace cyber bullying (WPCB) has negative effect on organizational performance in Makurdi, Benue State, Nigeria and the effect is statistically significant (0.537). The hypothesis of the study shows that workplace cyber bullying has a significant negative effect on organizational Performance in Makurdi, Benue State Nigeria. It was concluded that the behavioural characteristics of people such as cyber bullying of people can lead to poor organizational performance. It was recommended that management of business organizations in Makurdi, Benue State, Nigeria should put strict rules regarding workplace cyber bullying as it has been shown to affect organizational performance.

Keywords: *Cyber bullying, Employees Organizational Performance, Workplace, Nigeria*

1.1 Introduction

The potential success of a business depends on its organizational performance, which means its ability to effectively implement strategies to achieve institutional objectives (Randeree & Al Youha, 2009). Several variables constitute organizational performance, such as operational effectiveness, organizational effectiveness and financial performance (indicators) are interrelated" (Richter, Schmidt, Ladwig & Wulhorst 2017, 110). The performance of any organization depends in large part on the level of skill its leaders possess when it comes to implementing strategies (Almatrooshi, Kumar & Farouk, 2017). Silva (2014) described the essence of leadership as a conditional relationship that exists between a manager and his or her followers. Given that there are always hurdles to achieving organizational goals, it is important that the techniques that leaders use be flexible enough to accommodate change. The performance of an organization also depends on its employees, who are a key part of the organization and form the team that works toward achieving the organization's goals.

Neely (2002) believes that performance should consider quantifying the efficiency and effectiveness of actions. This quantification can be expressed both qualitatively and quantitatively. According to the definition of Neely and other authors, performance is closely related to efficiency and effectiveness. Kane (1996) argues that the performance is "something that a person leaves behind and which exists outside the said purpose". According to Kane, performance is defined at the level of each individual within the organization or at organization level. It is perceived as an understanding of the achieved results. The author emphasizes the particular nature of the definition and the impossibility of outlining a general definition. Therefore, we can speak of an accuracy of the definition

at particular level and an ambiguity of it at general level. Rolstadas (1998) believes that the performance of an organizational system is a complex relationship involving seven performance criteria that must be followed: effectiveness, efficiency, and quality, and productivity, quality of work, innovation and profitability. Performance is closely related to the achievement of the criteria listed above, which can be regarded as performance objectives. According to Rolstadas, it cannot be established a precise definition of performance because it is dependent on the seven criteria of performance, that cannot be clearly defined

Cyberspace has been revolutionized in the past couple of decades and now there are more people using internet services and mobile devices than ever before. But with all the advantages brought about by cyberspace and all the good that the online world provides to users, there are also some downsides. This alternative medium of communication has also enabled bullies to harass people through the means and methods of cyberbullying, a form of online bullying (Mamajanyan, 2021). Smith, Mahdavi, Carvalho and Tippett, (2008) categorize the concept of cyberbullying into 7 sub-categories that are (Text message bullying, Images/video clips bullying, Cell phone call bullying, Email bullying, Bullying through websites, Instant messaging bullying). Other studies statistical analyses reported that most common tools used in cyberbullying that is majority using texting (99.6%), through e-mail (98.4%), Facebook (86.5%), YouTube (75.1%), Instagram (70.9%) and twitter (69.4%), at which texting is dominant and frequently used in cyberbullying (Whittaker & Kowalski, 2014). Workplace cyberbullying refers to repeated, unreasonable actions of individuals, or a group of workers, directed towards an employee or groups, which are purposely intended to intimidate, degrade, humiliate, and undermine others, or creates a

risk to the health and safety of the employees including their physical, emotional, and psychological safety (Branch, Ramsay, & Barker, 2013; Rayner & Cooper, 2006, p. 47-90). The Workplace Bullying Institute (WBI) (n.d.) defines workplace cyberbullying as an aggressive action that is repeated, health-harming with the mistreatment of one or more persons. Workplace cyberbullying increases the negative effects that persist over time, and the victim is at the risk of experiencing severe stress, anxiety, and poor physical and mental health (Farley, Coyne, Sprigg, & Axtell, 2015). The victims may become excluded from their regular working life due to ill health, stigmatization, victimization, or reputational damages due to workplace cyberbullying.

Workplace cyberbullying impacts the victims in the form of anonymous, fraudulent, aggressive, unwanted messages, or by spreading rumours. In the case of workplace cyberbullying, the perpetrators hack the email accounts of victims to threaten them. The perpetrators if undetected will move on to intimidate the victim through unwanted phone calls, and by using malicious or abusive messages during the working and non-working hours, and this is termed as workplace cyberbullying (Ramsay & Troth, 2011).

Cyber Bullying Effects on Organization Performance

The uncontrolled, undetected, or unreported cases of bullying by the perpetrator increase the occurrence by way of repeated efforts directly or indirectly attempted by the victim employee. The bully may inflict pain on the victimized employees with negative words, misdeeds and actions, which curtails the motivation and productivity of the employee as well as the organization. This perpetrating effect by the bully increases the emotional distress in the employees that creates

absenteeism across the organization (Cooper et al., 2014). At the individual level, targets of offline workplace bullying experience a wide variety of psychological, psychosomatic and physiological effects of being bullied at work (see Coyne, 2011). Negative impacts of bullying on the organization include reduced individual and team performance (Coyne, Craig, & Smith-Lee Chong, 2004), low job satisfaction and commitment (Bowling & Beehr 2006).

The negative domino effect on the employees is caused by the impact of workplace cyberbullying (Tuckey, 2016). This effect happens as a negative impact of the workplace cyberbullying that induces high stress on the body and mind of the workers. The impact then cascades into a negative effect on organizational workers, including managers. When it cascades to the higher level of the organization, even managers are psychologically affected, which pulls down their self-confidence and ability to take accurate decisions on work-related matters. They may poorly respond to the emotional reactions of their fellow employees and may inappropriately respond to organizational situations with innate weakness within their mind and body. This impact may perpetuate trickle down to works across levels in an organization. Hence, the triggering effect of negativity may keep many of the employees away from work, which increases absenteeism, and in the sequel indirectly brings down employees' productivity (Harold & Holtz, 2014). This effect of workplace cyberbullying may also damage the top of the organizational hierarchy. The damages may extend to the boardroom, and in the sequel can break down the productivity of the entire organization (Van Laer, 2014).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Victims who experience cyber bullying perceive that electronic communication is unable to trace so there is no need to report (Hendricks, Lumadue & Waller, 2012)

Based on the above arguments it is appear that cyberbullying is the major cause of psychological distress and have direct impact on employee's performance. Cyberbullying explore as new phenomena of bullying for past few years and have lot of room in research domain. However, in Pakistani context cyber bullying cases occur in thousands of numbers and have greater impact on society and nation as a whole. Cyber bullying menace needs to tackled otherwise it will become workable tools for blackmailers and kidnapers.

Affective Event Theory

Affective event theory broadly uses to describe the emotions and moods at workplace and focused on to explain that workplace events trigger the emotional reactions of employees which influences the employee's performance and satisfaction. Experiencing daily hassles and uplifts leads towards the negative and positive emotional reaction that turn into affective driven behaviors and work attitudes (Glaso, Vie, Holmdal & Einarsen, 2011). Weiss and Cropanzano (1996) argue that workplace events trigger emotional responses which collectively influence on workplace attitude such as job satisfaction, organizational commitment and trust. Glaso, Vie, Holmdal and Einarsen, (2011) Psychological distress as anxiety, anger trigger negative emotions of employees at workplace. It is also investigated that Introduction of emotional experience as a potential mediator between bullying and job satisfaction into intention to leave. Finding fit the predictions suggested in AET (affective event theory), that negative

events that is exposure to bullying will badly affect the work attitudes such as employee performance, job satisfaction and cognitive driven behavior such as intention to leave the organization (Glaso, Vie, Holmdal & Einarsen, 2011). Bullying is the major stressor for employees and influence its performance at the end negative outcomes reveals.

1.3 Objectives of the Study.

This study seeks to investigate

1. Effect of workplace cyber bullying on employees
2. Effect of workplace cyberbullying on organizational performance

1.4 Methodology

The population for this study is 210 which cut across various business organizations and institutions in Benue State. Nigeria. Data is gathered from appropriate sample which represent the characteristics of whole population because it is not possible to study entire population.

Calvete et al., (2010) was composed two different scales for measuring CB, one is for perpetrator perspective and second for victimization perspective. In current study we will use cyberbullying questionnaire for victim subscale include 9 items (latest version). Response format use to assess how each behaviour occurred as CB is follows: 1 (never), 2 (1 or 2 times), 3 (3 or 4 times) or 4 (5 or more times).

Results and Discussion

Regression was used for data analysis and test of formulated hypotheses and the results are presented in model summary, analysis of variance and regression coefficient.

Table 1: Model Summary

R	R Square	Adjusted-R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
.776	.531	.526	.2961	1.807
.791	.537	.532	.9421	1.781

- a. *Predictors: (Constant), Workplace cyber bullying*
- b. *Dependent Variable: Employees, Organizational Performance*

Model 2 in Table 1 shows the effect of workplace cyber bullying on organizational performance. The R Square value of 0.537 implies that 53.7% of the variation in

The result of the Model 1 Summary in Table 1 shows the effect of workplace cyber bullying on employees. The R Square value of 0.531 implies that 53.1% of the variation in employee performance is explained by workplace cyber bullying. The value of $R = .776$ indicates the relationship between the independent variable (workplace cyber bullying) and the dependent variable (employee).

organizational performance is explained by workplace cyber bullying. The value of $R = .791$ explains the relationship between the independent variable (workplace cyber bullying) and the dependent variable (organizational performance).

Table 2: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	6.159	1	6.159	61.674	.000 ^b
Residual	191.955	208	.923		
Total	198.144	209			
Regression	6.697	1	6.697	7.902	.005 ^b
Residual	176.298	208	.848		
Total	182.995	209			

- a. *Dependent Variable: Employee, Organizational performance*
- b. *Predictors: (Constant), Workplace cyber bullying*

The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) in Table 2 demonstrates the effect of workplace cyber bullying on employee. The ANOVA result shows that the model was significant ($F = 61.674$, $p < 0.05$). This indicates that workplace cyber bullying has significant effect on employee. The result of model 2

shows the effect of workplace cyber bullying on organizational performance. The ANOVA result indicates that model 2 was significant ($F = 7.902$, $p < 0.05$). This indicates that workplace cyber bullying has significant effect on organizational performance.

Table 3: Regression Coefficient

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	3.135	.244		12.829	.000

Work Cyber bullying	.167	.064	.176	2.583	.000
(Constant)	3.171	.234		13.540	.000
Work Cyber bullying	.174	.062	.191	2.811	.005

- a. *Dependent Variable: Employee*
- b. *Dependent Variable: Organizational Performance*

The standardized coefficients show that the effect of workplace cyber bullying on employee performance is significant ($\beta = 0.176$, $t = 2.583$, $p < 0.05$). The result the unstandardized coefficients show that for every unit increase in workplace cyber bullying there is 17.4% change in employee performance holding other variables constant.

The standardized coefficients for model 2 shows the effect of workplace cyber bullying on organizational performance is significant ($\beta = 0.191$, $t = 2.811$, $p < 0.05$). The result the unstandardized coefficients show that for every unit increase in workplace cyber bullying there is 17.4 % change in organizational performance holding other variables constant.

Test of Hypotheses

Hypotheses one (H0₁) states that workplace cyber bullying has no significant effect on employee performance and to test this hypothesis (H0₁) the critical value of t-statistics is ± 1.96 at 95% and the result shows that $\beta = 0.176$, $t = 2.583$, $p < .05$ and the null hypothesis which states that workplace cyber bullying has no significant effect on employee performance is rejected.

Hypotheses one (H0₂) states that workplace cyber bullying has no significant effect on organizational performance and to test this hypothesis (H0₂) the critical value of t-statistics is ± 1.96 at 95% and the result shows that $\beta = 0.191$, $t = 2.811$, $p < .05$ and the null

hypothesis which states that workplace cyber bullying has no significant effect on organizational performance is rejected, hence we concluded that workplace cyber bullying has significant effect on organizational performance.

1.4 Conclusion and Recommendations

a. Conclusion The study concluded that workplace cyber bullying has significant effect on employee performance. The study also revealed that workplace cyber bullying has significant effect on organizational performance.

b Recommendations

The study therefore recommended that organizations should put in place legislations that will safe guide employees from workplace cyber bullying which consequently affects the organizational performance.

REFERENCES

Almatrooshi, B., Kumar, S. & Farouk; S. S. (2017). Determinants of organizational performance: a proposed framework. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 65, 6, 844 – 859.

Amason, A. C. (1996). Distinguishing the effects of functional and dysfunctional conflict on strategic decision making: resolving a paradox for top management

- teams. *Academic Management Journal* 39, 123–148.
- Branch, S., Ramsay, S., & Barker, M. (2013). Workplace bullying, mobbing and general harassment: A review. *International Journal of Management Reviews (Review)*, 15(3), 280–299. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2370.2012.00339.x
- Coyne, I., Craig, J. & Smith-Lee Cong, P. (2004). *Workplace bullying in a group context* *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling* 32(3) DOI: [10.1080/03069880410001723530](https://doi.org/10.1080/03069880410001723530)
- Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective Events Theory: A Theoretical Discussion of the Structure, Cause and Consequences of Affective Experiences at Work
- Farley, S., Coyne, I., Sprigg, C., Axtell, C., & Subramanian, G. (2015). *Exploring the impact of workplace cyberbullying on trainee doctors. Medical Education*, 49(4), 436–443. doi:10.1111/medu.12666 PMID: 25800304
- Glasø, L., Vie, T. L., Holmdal, G. R., & Einarsen, S. (2011). An application of affective events theory to workplace bullying: The role of emotions, trait anxiety, and trait anger. *European Psychologist*, 16(3), 198–208. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a0000>
- Harold, C. M., & Holtz, B. C. (2014). The effects of passive leadership on workplace incivility. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 36(1), 16–38. Advance online publication. doi:10.1002/job.1926
- Hendricks, L., Lumadue, R., & Waller, L. R. (2012). The evolution of bullying to cyber bullying: An overview of the best methods for implementing a cyber bullying preventive program. *In National Forum Journal of Counselling and Addiction*, 12(2), 167-182.
- Kane, J.S. (1996). The Conceptualization and Representation of Total Performance Effectiveness. *Human resource management review*, 6, 123-145.
- Mamajanyan, G. (2021). What is cyberbullying and how does it impact work productivity?
- Neely A., (2002) *Business Performance Measurement: Unifying Theories and Integrating Practice*, Second Edition, Cambridge University Press.
- Ramsay, S., Troth, A., & Branch, S. (2011). Workplace bullying: A group processes framework. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 84(4), 799–816. Do
- Randeree, K. and Al Youha, H. (2009), “Strategic management of performance: an examination of public sector organizations in the United Arab Emirates”, *International Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Change Management*, Vol. 9 No. 4, pp. 123-134
- Rayner, C., & Cooper, C. L. (2006). Workplace bullying. In E. Kelloway, J. Barling, & J. Hurrell Jr., (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace violence* 47–90 Sage. doi:10.4135/9781412976947.n7
- Richter, N. F., Schmidt, R., Ladwig T.J. & Wulhorst, F. (2017). A critical perspective on the measurement of performance in the empirical multinationality and performance literature, *Critical perspectives on international business*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 94-118.
- Rolstadas A., (1998). Enterprise Performance Measurement, *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, vol. 18, no. 9-10,
- Silva, A. (2014), “What do we really know about leadership?” *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 5 No. 4, pp. 1-4.
- Smith, P. K., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S., Russell, S., & Tippett, N. (2008). Cyberbullying: Its nature and impact in secondary school pupils.

Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 49(4), 376-385.

Tuckey, M. R. (2016). Like a cancer of the workplace, bullying is a symptom of dysfunction. Retrieved from <https://theconversation.com/like-a-cancer-of-the-workplace-bullying-is-a-symptom-of-dysfunction-43831>

Van Laer, T. (2014). The means to justify the end: Combating cyber harassment in social media. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 123(1), 85–98. doi:10.1007/10551-013-1806-z

Whittaker, E. & Kowalski, R. M, (2014). *Cyberbullying Via Social Media—Access on 31 December 2021*, doi.org10.1080/15388220.2014.949377

[Back to the CONTENTS](#) [Top of the Article](#)

Regression

Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Workplace cyber bullying ^b	.	Enter

- a. Dependent Variable: Employees
- b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.776 ^a	.531	.526	.2961	1.807

- a. Predictors: (Constant), Workplace cyber bullying
- b. Dependent Variable: Employees

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	6.159	1	6.159	61.674	.000 ^b
	Residual	191.955	208	.923		
	Total	198.114	209			

- a. Dependent Variable: Employees
- b. Predictors: (Constant), Workplace cyber bullying

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.135	.244		12.829	.000
	Workplace cyber bullying	.167	.064	.176	2.583	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Employees

Residuals Statistics^a

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	3.30	3.97	3.74	.172	210
Residual	-2.968	1.532	.000	.958	210
Std. Predicted Value	-2.569	1.312	.000	1.000	210
Std. Residual	-3.090	1.594	.000	.998	210

a. Dependent Variable: Employees

Regression

Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Workplace cyber bullying ^b		Enter

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational performance

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.791 ^a	.537	.532	.9421	1.781

a. Predictors: (Constant), Workplace cyber bullying

b. Dependent Variable: Organizational performance

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	6.697	1	6.697	7.902	.005 ^b
	Residual	176.298	208	.848		
	Total	182.995	209			

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Workplace cyber bullying

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	3.171	.234		13.540	.000
Workplace cyber bullying	.174	.062	.191	2.811	.005

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational performance

Residuals Statistics^a

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	3.34	4.04	3.80	.179	210
Residual	-3.040	1.481	.000	.918	210
Std. Predicted Value	-2.569	1.312	.000	1.000	210
Std. Residual	-3.302	1.609	.000	.998	210

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational performance

[Back to the CONTENTS](#) [Top of the Article](#)