

Effects of Workplace Harassment and Favouritism on Staff Performance in Nigeria

ARUBAYI, Olusoji Damaro, PhD , ERUVBEDEDE, K.O.

Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria.

Postgraduate Student, Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria.

Abstract

Workplace harassment and favouritism occupy a commonplace in most organizations and broadly practiced in both public and private sector. Regardless of the avalanche of empirical studies in this area, there is dearth of empirical investigations on the effect workplace harassment and favouritism has on employee performance in the Nigerian context. The main purpose of this paper is to investigate the effect of workplace harassment and favouritism on staff performance. The paper proposed two objectives and research hypotheses and survey method was employed via structured questionnaire administered to 100 staff of Benin Electricity Distribution Company (BEDC) Headquarters without recourse to age, gender, rank, and department. The simple linear regression tool was used in validating the research hypotheses of the study. Findings indicated that workplace harassment and favouritism statistically and significantly affect staff performance. The result implies that the act of harassment and favouritism is being practiced among employees and do not mean well for employee performance. It was therefore commended among others that management of BEDC should make strategic efforts and put measures to completely devoid the workplace of all injustices and also set up adequate and fair human resource (HR) systems that work in order to promote staff performance in Nigeria.

Keywords: Workplace bullying; Psychological wellness; Job satisfaction

JEL Classification: M12; M19; M10

Introduction

The performance of staff in any organization calls for concern to the business owner whose main aim is to get profit and expand. The business owner or those at the helm of affairs takes into cognizance all that affects the output of the staff that can stall or delay progress. All around the world, hostile and unhealthy behaviours exist in business enterprises that mar the business growth. These behaviours have been ascribed different terms by different scholars such as: workplace bullying (Einarsen, Hoel & Notalaers, 2009); nepotism and favouritism (Bute, 2011); and workplace harassment (Tangem, 2017); among others. These practices have been criticized to be unprofessional by Bute (2011).

Workplace harassment and favouritism have been noted as being severe in workplace. As defined by Funk (2016), harassment is an act which annoys or bothers someone in a constant or repeated way while workplace harassment is termed as the belittling or threatening behaviour directed to individual worker or group of workers. Harassment in the workplace can result to anxiety, stress, fear and even affect mental and physical health for the staff experiencing it (Funk, 2016). Favouritism also means to act in favour of a person or group of persons than others and to shows personal preferences at those who are especially decision makers (Kwon, as cited in Aydogan, 2012).

These two terms (harassment and favouritism) have attracted much attention in the business world. Recent studies in different countries showed that, these acts enormously negatively affect the workplace and human resource issues (Rokonuzzaman, Ali, Sadique & Haque, 2014; Haq, Ziaud-Din & Rajvi, 2018). As Shelton

(2011) had earlier emphasized, these unhealthy behavior in the workplace results in high employee turnover, low self-confidence among others. Ngale (2018) added that these negative behaviours is associated with lowered psychological wellness, concentration disorder, fatigue, lowered self-esteem, anger, stress level increase and experience of psychosomatic indications. More so, Haq, Ziaud-Din and Rajvi (2018) disclosed that sufferers of these acts can have many psychological symptoms such as anxiety, depression, sleep disorder, which results in low satisfaction at work.

Obviously, workplace harassment and favouritism are behaviours that consequently impacts on staff in organizations. In Nigeria, the issue of workplace harassment and favouritism is not new. While researches have been done against these acts in the workplace globally (treating workplace harassment and favouritism individually), there is very little that has been done empirically on this matter in the Nigerian context. This present study therefore examines the effect of workplace harassment and favouritism on staff performance.

1. Literature Review

Workplace harassment can be regarded as ‘mobbing’, ‘workplace bullying’, ‘workplace mistreatment’, ‘workplace aggression’, ‘workplace molestation’ and ‘workplace abuse’. Workplace harassment cut across discrimination and violation across different groups and individual. It include verbal and physical discrimination, unlawful and hassling acts that makes a person or group feel uncomfortable and at some measure of risk in working organization (Funk, 2016; Doyle, 2011; Shelton, 2011; Einarsen, Hoel & Notelaers, 2009). Workplace harassment can be grouped loosely as emotional and physical abuse targeted at various groups, including men, women, and people with disabilities, immigrants, racial minorities and homosexuals.

Workplace harassment is usually associated with sexual harassment as a misconception of the context. According to the United States Department of Labour (2015), workplace harassment entail more than sexual harassment. According to them, it may be ‘quid pro quo’ harassment, in cases where employment decisions are justified on submission to or rejection of unwelcome conduct, basically on sexual nature or offensive conduct targeted at protected groups stated above possible of creating a hostile work environment (United States Department of Labour, 2015).

According to the works of Kulik, Cregan, Metz and Brown (2009) and Cowan and Fox (2015), workplace harassment can be tagged one of the “toxins” human resource personnel (HRP) are expected to manage and resolve. Successfully addressing bullying complaints is essential both to resolve the instant situation and to diminish the likelihood of future cases. However, many HRP find managing a complaint of workplace bullying to be one of the most demanding aspects of their role (Harrington, Rayner & Warren, 2012). With exceptions (for instance, Cowan, 2012; Fox & Cowan, 2015; Harrington, Warren & Rayner, 2015), there is little research investigating the role and experiences of HRP when managing a complaint of workplace bullying. As Harrington et al., (2015) noted little is known about how HRP respond to an actual complaint of workplace bullying.

Workplace harassment has several consequences as depicted by Hershcovis, Reich and Niven (2015). It not only has an impact on staff but destroys organization and society as well. Hershcovis, *et al.*, (2015) divided it into three categories – human cost, organizational cost and spillover/crossover cost. Human cost include psychological distress a victim face, including emotional disorder, sleeping disorders and symptoms that are similar to posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Second category is the organizational cost. Bullied victims are faced with low job satisfaction, absenteeism and low job productivity and performance. Third approach is the spillover/crossover category (Haq, Ziaud-Din & Rajvi, 2018; Ngale, 2018). Haq, *et al.*, (2018); and Ngale (2018) referred to it as “trickle-down” effect, resulting in transfers of aggression to subordinates by bullied employees. Those subordinates are more likely transfer that aggression and anger to their juniors, so on and so forth. This chain not only ends at working place but transfer to individual’s homes, creating an unhealthy society(Hershcovis, Reich & Niven, 2015; Horsfall, 2020; Weziak-Białowolska, Białowski & McNeely, 2020; Mohamed, Abed & Hassan, 2022).

Favoritism means a person, being bestowed a privilege, not because of being the best in his/her profession, but because of some other irrelevant qualification (Employee Favoritism, 2006). Favouritism has three

perspectives; nepotism, cronyism and patronage. Nepotism bestows privileges on relatives at every level for every position; cronyism bestows privileges on friends while patronage occurs when political party leaders assuming power positions relatives and friends at high level management positions (Aydogan, 2012). Favoritism in a workplace can result in increasing packages & incentives unfairly or by promoting faster than other employees (Raja, Zaman, Hashmi, Marri & Khan, 2013). It is one of the most important sources of stress. Another main source of favoritism is the personal preference of decision makers to the particular employee. It is also cause of loss motivation & productivity. In most studies, it is observed that root of favoritism is management's personal preference to a particular employee. Another main point to be discussed is favoritism generates the value for the supervisors or principals (Raja *et al.*, 2013).

There is no doubt in it that staff are the building blocks of an organization. This point to the fact therefore that well performing staff contribute to the efficiency and success of the organization (Hameed & Waheed, 2011). As such, performance is crucial for the organizations and making strategies to improve performance and measuring it from time to time are a basic step that is to be taken (Merik & Erdem, 2013). Without desired performance, it is of no use continuing to invest in a firm (Okoro, 2014; Okoro & Ekwueme, 2021; Hoch & Seyberth, 2021; Oboreh, Egberi & Egberi, 2022). To properly define staff performance then is to state it as "the set of staff behavior, results, and outcomes that come after completing the job tasks using certain competencies and that are measured through different metrics constitute staff performance" (Kanyutu, 2021; Nguyen, Nguyen, Nguyen & Truong, 2021; Imran & Tanveer, 2015; Erdem, Ceylan & Saylan, 2013).

Researchers like Graves, Sarkis and Zhu (2013); Ayobami (2013); Iis, Yunus, Adam and Sofyan (2018); Megaravalli and Sampagnaro (2018); Bashir, Arshad, Asif and Khalid (2020); Soare, Dettleux and Deschacht (2021) identified eight staff performance indicators. These are: (1) Quantity of work, that is, the amount of work performed by a staff within a specified period of time; (2). Quality of work, which is the quality of the outcome of a perfect activity, carrying out an activity with an idea in accordance with the intended purpose; (3) Creativeness, which is the authenticity of the ideas raised by staff and actions to resolve the emerging issues; (4) Cooperation, which is the willingness of staff to cooperate with other members of the organization; (5) Dependability, i.e. awareness, and trustworthiness by staff in terms of attendance and completion of work; (6) Initiatives, which is the spirit of initiative by staff to carry out new tasks and in enlarging their responsibilities; (7) Job knowledge, which is the breadth of knowledge about work and skills; (8) Personal qualities, i.e. concerning personality, leadership, hospitality and personal integrity.

This study is hinged on the Affective Events Theory (AET) posited by Howard M. Weiss and Russell Cropanzano in 1996. This theory describes how staff's internal influences: personality, emotions, cognition influences their reactions to work incidents that affect their job performance and job satisfaction. The theory proposes that the mood and emotions portrayed by a staff affective work behaviours, while cognitive-based behaviours are used as predictors of effective job performance and job satisfaction (Wegge, van Dick, Fisher, West & Dawson, 2006; Baker & Palmieri, 2021; Yu, Klongthong, Thavorn & Ngamkroekjoti, 2021).

According to the theory, positive-inducing (such as uplifts) and negative-inducing (such as hassles) emotional incidents at work is distinguishable and plays significant role in psychological impact of employee's job satisfaction. As such, this theory is suitable for this study as it helps to best explain the effect of work harassment and favoritism on the performance of staff in organizations. Prior studies have shown that some fundamental dynamics affects staff performance. For instance, Robert (2018) investigated the impact of workplace bullying on job performance and job stress using a total of 250 staff in Lahore, Pakistan. The results showed a significant link between workplace bullying and job stress while the link between workplace bullying and job performance is low. More so, the results indicated that workplace bullying does not have a significant impact on Job performance and revealed that failure to perform at job could have many different reasons which may include low job satisfaction, inadequate remuneration, lack of ability etc.

Ombanda (2018) surveyed nepotism and job performance using a sample of 357 respondents in Kenya. The hypothesis was tested using Correlations and Regression analyses. Findings showed that nepotism significantly and negatively affects employee job performance. The influence of kinship/friendship or tribal culture was found to be statistically significant in making decision to recruit an employee and that was found to reduce employee performance. The findings also revealed that employee's competence or qualification did not matter when nepotism is practiced and that poor performance is not punished where nepotism was applied.

Rokonuzzaman, Ali, Sadique and Haque (2014) studied the effects of workplace harassment on employees' performance. Data for this work was collated from extant literature on workplace harassment obtained through semi-structured interviews and visited site. Assumptions supposed in this research were tested with programmable MATLAB software. The study revealed that, workplaces harassment is associated with emotions, discriminating treatments and socio-demographic variables. It also causes mental depression and quashing which alters employees mental health; thereby reducing job performance. Conclusively, the study stated that, poor concentration to this issue roots the ill-mental health of the workers and employees.

Meanwhile, Bute (2011) analyzed the effects of nepotism and favoritism on employee behaviors and human resources practices in Turkish Public Banks. The data were collected via survey from the public banks operating in Ankara. Out of a total of 300 questionnaire forms distributed, 243 were used for analyses. The survey method was used for collecting data. The results showed that nepotism and favouritism had significant negative impacts on the intention for employees to quit, job satisfaction, human resource management practices and organizational commitment. Besides, human resource management practices were found to have positive significant effects on job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

It was observed by researcher that a number of researches have been conducted individually on the effect of workplace harassment and workplace favouritism on the performance of staff in organizations both in the local and international contexts. However, there is a noticeable lack of empirical evidence that has been documented on the duo as they affect staff performance whether in the local or international scene. It was also noticed that more of the articles on the subject matter were written by international scholars with very little done by local authors thereby creating a knowledge gap in literature. Hence, this study aims to bridge this gap. The aim of this paper is to investigate the effect of workplace harassment and favouritism on staff performance.

2. Research Hypotheses

In line with the aim of the study, the following research hypotheses were formulated:

Ho₁: Workplace harassment has no statistically significant effect on staff performance.

Ho₂: Workplace favouritism has no statistically significant effect on staff performance.

3. Methods

This study adopted the descriptive survey research design as this study aimed to analyze data from a set of respondents at a specific point in time, and did not intend to manipulate the outcome of the research. To get data from the staff of the sampled company, 100 staff were purposely selected by the researcher from among the staff of Benin Electricity Distribution Company Headquarters along Akpakpava Road, Benin City, Edo State. This choice of staff was irrespective of age, gender, department, rank, etc. Data were elicited from the respondents using a self-structured questionnaire titled "Effect of Work Harassment and Favouritism on Staff Performance Questionnaire" (EWHFSPQ).

The instrument was arranged in four sections: Section I on respondents' bio-data; Section II on items centered on harassment at workplace; Section III on favouritism practices in organizations; while Section IV on staff performance ratings. Items in section II were assessed using a 5-point Likert rating scale with 5point for Strongly Agree (SA) to 1point for Strongly Disagree (SD) while items in section III were scaled on a 5-point rating scale with 5point for Very likely to 1point for Not at all. However, items in section IV were

structured to assess the job performance of the respondents using a 5-point Likert rating scale of 5 point for Very High Extent to 1 point for Very Low Extent.

The data collected from the respondents were analyzed using the descriptive and inferential statistics. Mean, frequencies and simple percentage were used to analyze the data received for the research items. The criterion for acceptance of a particular item is mean ≥ 3.00 . However, the Simple Linear Regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses in order to determine the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable of the study. The regression model is given as:

$$Stperf_i = a_o + \beta_1 wkfav_i + \mu t \quad - \quad eq. 1$$

$$Stperf_i = a_o + \beta_1 wkharas_i + \mu t \quad - \quad eq. 2$$

Where: *stperf*=staff performance; *wkfav*=workplace favouritism; *wrkharas*=workplace harassment; *I*=respondents; μt =error term. Hypothesis was tested at a .05 level of significance. Decision rule is that if the computed α -value is greater than the critical α -value, the null hypothesis is accepted, but is rejected if the computed α -value is lesser than the critical α -value.

4. Results

Table 1: Level of Workplace Harassment

S/N	Statements on Workplace Harassment	Mean	Remark
1	I feel at ease at my workplace	4.11	Accepted
2	I have been subjected to bullying at my workplace	2.37	Rejected
3	I believe my superior discriminates against me when assigning work tasks	3.02	Accepted
4	I have been sexually harassed at my workplace	2.12	Rejected
5	I report every form of harassment to my superior	2.07	Rejected
6	Cases of harassment at my workplace are not treated lightly	1.93	Rejected
7	I think my colleagues sometimes looks at me in a hostile and disrespectful manner	2.98	Rejected
8	My superior delays actions that are important to me	3.00	Accepted
9	I have been yelled at for expressing myself at my workplace	3.08	Accepted
10	My superior and colleagues verbally express their anger towards me.	3.23	Accepted
Aggregate mean		2.79	

Source: Field Data (2021)

*Criterion mean = 3.00, N = 83

Results in Table 1 showed that there is a low level of workplace harassment that existing at the sampled company as the aggregate mean of 2.79 is lesser than the criterion mean of 3.00. Although, the results of some individual statements indicate that there are elements of workplace harassment being practiced in the company.

Table 2: Extent of Favouritism

S/N	Statements on Favouritism at Workplace	Mean	Remark
1	My boss favours one staff over another	2.84	Rejected

2	I am not my boss's favourite	2.78	Rejected
3	My hard work is overlooked because another staff is favoured	2.63	Rejected
4	Promotions are based on who is favoured instead of performance	2.51	Rejected
5	The practice of favouritism at my workplace is high	2.80	Rejected
6	Favoured workers usually experience neglects from colleagues	2.30	Rejected
7	My boss mostly give important work-related information to his favourite	2.81	Rejected
8	My boss assigns desired tasks to certain workers	3.30	Accepted
9	I feel my boss supports certain workers more	2.86	Rejected
10	My boss considers the suggestions of only certain workers	3.83	Accepted
Aggregate mean		2.87	

Source: Field Data (2021)

*Criterion mean = 3.00, N = 83

Results in Table 2 showed that the extent to which favouritism is practiced at the sampled company is low as the aggregate mean of 2.87 is lesser than the criterion mean of 3.00. However, the results of the analysis showed some level of favouritism being practiced at the workplace.

Ho₁: Workplace harassment has no statistically significant effect on staff performance.

Table 3a: Model Summary of the Effect of Workplace Harassment on Staff Performance

Model	R	R Square	Adj. R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.951 ^a	.904	.903	2.48776

Source: Field Data (2021)

Table 3b: ANOVA Summary of the Effect of Workplace Harassment on Staff Performance

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4722.862	1	4722.862	763.110	.000 ^b
	Residual	501.306	81	6.189		
	Total	5224.169	82			

Source: Field Data (2021)

Table 3c Coefficient Summary of the Effect of Workplace Harassment on Staff Performance

Model		Unstandardized Coeff.		Standardized Coeff.	t	Sig.	95% Conf. Int. for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	8.747	.690		12.66	.00	7.373	10.120
	Workplace Harassment	.628	.023	.951	27.62	.00	.582	.673

Source: Field Data (2021)

From Tables 3a-3c, the results of the regression indicated the predictor (workplace harassment) explained 90% of the variance ($R^2 = .904$, $F(1, 81) = 763.110$, $p < 0.05$). Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. It was found that workplace harassment does have a statistically significant effect on staff performance in BEDC

($\beta = -.951$, $p < .000$). With 90% variance, it implies that there is a very high relationship between the variables of interactions. The remaining 10% may mean that there may be other variables other than workplace harassment that may affect the performance of staff in BEDC headquarters, Nigeria. The result of this study showed that workplace harassment has a statistically significant effect on the performance of staff at Benin Electricity Distribution Company Headquarters, Nigeria as a high level of harassment at the workplace may diminish the performance of staff especially of the staff being harassed.

The finding agrees with that of Rokonuzzaman, Ali, Sadique and Haque (2014) who found out that harassment at workplaces leads to serious mental depression and quashing which affect the mental health of employees; which eventually reduces their job performance. Meanwhile, this finding disagrees with that of Robert (2018) who discovered that workplace bullying does not have a significant impact on job performance and further posited that failure to perform at job could have many different reasons which may include low job satisfaction, inadequate remuneration, and lack of ability among others.

H₀₂: Workplace favouritism has no statistically significant effect on staff performance

Table 4a: Model Summary of the Effect of Workplace Favouritism on Staff Performance

Model	R	R Square	Adj. R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.943 ^a	.890	.888	2.66746

Source: Field Data (2021)

Table 4b: ANOVA Summary of the Effect of Workplace Favouritism on Staff Performance

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	4647.828	1	4647.828	653.214	.000 ^b
	Residual	576.341	81	7.115		
	Total	5224.169	82			

Source: Field Data (2021)

Table 4c Coefficient Summary of the Effect of Workplace Favouritism and Staff Performance

Model		Unstandardized Coeff.		Standardized Coeff.	t	Sig	95% Conf. Int. for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	9.802	.708		13.85	.00	8.394	11.210
	Workplace Favouritism	.575	.022	.943	25.55	.00	.530	.619

Source: Field Data (2021)

From Tables 4a-4c, the results of the regression showed that the predictor (favouritism) explained 89% of the variance ($R^2 = .890$, $F(1, 81) = 653.214$, $p < 0.05$). Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected implying that favouritism has a statistically significant effect on staff performance at BEDC ($\beta = -.943$, $p < .000$). With 89% variance, it implies that there is a very high relationship between the variables of interactions. The remaining 11% may mean that there may be other variables other than favouritism that may influence the performance of staff at BEDC headquarters, Nigeria. The results of the tested hypothesis are shown in Tables 7, 8, and 9. The result of this study revealed that favouritism has a statistically significant effect on the performance of

staff, indicating that the higher the extent to which favouritism is practiced at the workplace, the more the performances of the staff are determined.

5. Discussion

Practically, workplace harassment and favouritism are duos found in corporate organizations in public and private sectors. Again, academic researches on workplace favouritism are commonplace in human resource management (HRM) literature; however, the effect of workplace harassment and favouritism on employees' performance has not been adequately researched, particularly in the Nigerian context. The finding supports that of Bute (2011) whose research revealed that nepotism and favouritism had significant negative effects on a staff's intention to quit, job satisfaction, as well as organizational commitment.

It is also in line with the findings of Ombanda (2018) whose study showed that nepotism significantly affects negatively job performance of employees. Ombanda's findings also revealed that employee's competence or qualification did not matter when nepotism is practiced and that poor performance is not punished where nepotism was applied. The reason for significant impacts of workplace harassment and favouritism on employees' performance could be attributable to the fact that harassment and favouritism is commonly used by top management and most likely affect the way in which the employees behave in the organization. Hence there is the need to determine the mediating effects of management levels in the relationship between workplace harassment and favouritism and employee performance.

Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to assess the effect of workplace harassment and favouritism on employees' performance. Descriptive and inferential statistical techniques were employed and data involving eighty-three employees of a sampled company was used notwithstanding their gender, age, rank or department. The regression results revealed that workplace harassment and favouritism significantly affect employees' performance. The implication of the finding is that notwithstanding the act of harassment and favouritism being practiced by management, top management can better decide how employees are favoured and the extent to which they are harassed in order to carry out their responsibility.

Consequently, management of organizations should set up a 'secret' committee to strictly address, control and tackle all hostile behaviours at the workplace in order to eliminate them completely. Again, top management should make strategic efforts and put measures to wholly make the workplace void of all discrimination as well as the setting up of adequate and fair human resource practices aimed at promoting employees' performance.

References

1. Aydogan, I. (2012). The existence of favoritism in organizations. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(12), 4577-4586. DOI: 10.5897/AJBM11.2692
2. Ayobami, P. (2013). Influence of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employees' performance. *Dept. of Business Administration*, 1-14.
3. Baker, K. & Palmieri, S. (2021). Can women dynasty politicians disrupt social norms of political leadership? A proposed typology of normative change. *International Political Science Review*, 1-15.
4. Bashir, Z., Arshad, M.U., Asif, M. & Khalid, N. (2020). Driving factors of growth evidence in the food and textile sectors of Pakistan. *Finance Internet Quarterly*, 16, 11-19
5. Bute, M. (2011). The effects of nepotism and favoritism on employee behaviors and human resources practices: A research on Turkish Public Banks. *TODAÐE's Review of Public Administration*, 5(1), 185-208.
6. Cowan, R. L. (2012). It's complicated: Defining workplace bullying from the human resource professional's perspective. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 26(3), 377-403.
7. Cowan, R. L., & Fox, S. (2015). Being pushed and pulled: A model of US HR professionals' roles in bullying situations. *Personnel Review*, 44(1), 119-139.
8. Doyle, A. (2011). *How to handle workplace harassment issue*. James Cook University, Retrieved from <http://www.about.com>

9. Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Notelaers, G. (2009). Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure and psychometric properties of the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised. *Work and Stress*, 23(1), 24-44.
10. *Employee Favoritism* (2006). Retrieved from <http://www.anonymousemployee.com/csssite/sidelinks/employeefavoritism.php>.
11. Erdem, B., Ceylan, U., & Saylan, U. (2013). Aile İşletmelerinde Nepotizm ve Organizational Bağlılık ilişkisi: Kutahya'da Faaliyet Gösteren Otell İşletmelerinde Bir Araştırma. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Uludağ Journal of Economy and Society*, 32(2), 171-197.
12. Fox, S., & Cowan, R. L. (2015). Revision of the workplace bullying checklist: the importance of human resource management's role in defining and addressing workplace bullying. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 25(1), 116-130.
13. Funk, C. (2016). *Harassment: Effects on people and organisations*. Retrieved from <https://bookboon.com/blog/2016/02/harassment-and-its-effects/>
14. Graves, L. M., Sarkis, J. & Zhu, Q. (2013). How transformational leadership and employee motivation combine to predict employee pro environmental behaviors in China. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 35, 81-91.
15. Hameed, A., & Waheed, A. (2011). Employee development and its affect on employee performance: A conceptual framework. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(13), 224-229.
16. Haq, M. R., Ziaud-Din, M., & Rajvi, S. (2018). *The impact of workplace bullying on employee cynicism with mediating role of psychological contract*.
17. Harrington, S., Rayner, C., & Warren, S. (2012). Too hot to handle? Trust and human resource practitioners' implementation of anti-bullying policy. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 22(4), 392-408.
18. Harrington, S., Warren, S., & Rayner, C. (2015). Human resource management practitioners' responses to workplace bullying: cycles of symbolic violence. *Organization*, 22(3), 368-389.
19. Hershcovis, M. S., Reich, T. C., & Niven, K. (2015). *Workplace bullying: Causes, consequences, and intervention strategies*.
20. Hoch, F. & Seyberth, L. (2021). How institutions moderate the effect of gender diversity on firm performance, *Diskussionspapier des Instituts für Organisationsökonomik*, No. 11/2021, 1-42
21. Horsfall, H. (2020). Brand equity and brand performance of retail pharmaceutical firms in Rivers State of Nigeria. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Business Innovation*, 3(1), 100-112
22. Iis, E. Y., Yunus, M., Adam, M., & Sofyan, H. (2018). Antecedent model of empowerment and performance of Aceh Government with motivation as the intervening variable. *The Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 2, 743-747. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32861/jssr.spi2.743.747>
23. Imran, M., & Tanveer, A. (2015). Impact of training and development on employees' performance in banks of Pakistan. *European Journal of Training and Development Studies*, 3(1), 22-44.
24. Kanyutu, E. (2021). Effect of board gender diversity on organization performance: A critical literature review. *International Journal of Leadership and Governance*, 1(4), 35-45
25. Kulik, C. T., Cregan, C., Metz, I., & Brown, M. (2009). HR managers as toxin handlers: The buffering effect of formalizing toxin handling responsibilities. *Human Resource Management*, 48(5), 695-716.
26. Megaravalli, A.V. & Sampagnaro, G. (2018). Firm age and liquidity ratio as predictors of firm growth: Evidence from Indian firms. *Applied Economics Letter*, 25, 1373-1375
27. Meric, E., & Erdem, M. (2013). İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan öğretmenlerin algılarına göre okullarındaki kayırmacılık. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 19(3), 467-498.
28. Mohamed, E., Abed, F.A. & Hassan, S. (2022). The relationship between ethical work climate and organizational commitment among staff nurses: a comparative study. *Egyptian Nursing Journal*, 17(2), 96-106
29. Ngale, I. F. (2018). Impacts of workplace bullying on staff psychological wellness in institutions of higher learning. *Journal of Educational System*, 2(2), 1-9.
30. Nguyen, T., Nguyen, A., Nguyen, M., & Truong, T. (2021). Is national governance quality a key moderator of the boardroom gender diversity-firm performance relationship? International evidence from a multi-hierarchical analysis. *International Review of Economics and Finance*, 73, 370-390.
31. Oboreh, J., Egberi, K.A. & Egberi, E.O. (2022). Workforce gender diversity and performance of multinational companies in Nigeria. *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 6(4), 1582-1590

32. Okoro, E.G. & Ekwueme, C.M. (2021). Is accounting alchemy still the right medicine for firm's earnings and book value? Evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa. *Revista de Administração Mackenzie*, 22(3), 1–27. doi:10.1590/1678-6971/eRAMF210007
33. Okoro, E.G. (2014). Financial leverage behaviour and firm performance: Evidence from publicly quoted companies in Nigeria. *Acta Universitatis Danubius*, 10(4), 99-106
34. Ombanda, P. O. (2018). Nepotism and job performance in the private and public organizations in Kenya. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 8(5), 474-494.
35. Raja, Y. M., Zaman, H. M. F., Hashmi, Z. I., Marri, M. Y. K., & Khan, A. R. (2013). Impact of organizational politics & favoritism on employees job satisfaction. *Elixir Mgmt. Arts*, 64, 19328-19332.
36. Robert, F. (2018). Impact of workplace bullying on job performance and job stress. *Journal of Management Info*, 5(3), 12-15.
37. Rokonuzzaman, M., Ali, M. B., Sadique, M. Z., & Haque, M. E. (2014). *The effects of workplace harassment on job performance*. 11th Asian Business Research Conference. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.1.2372.0085
38. Shelton, T. L. (2011). *Mobbing, bullying, & harassment: A silent dilemma in the workplace*.
39. Soare, T.M., Detilleux, C. & Deschacht, N. (2021). The impact of the gender composition of company boards on firm performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 1(1), 1-12
40. United States Department of Labour (2015). *What do I need to know about – workplace harassment*. U.S. Federal Government. Retrieved from [https://www.dol.gov/oasam/ programs/crc/2011-workplace-harassment.htm](https://www.dol.gov/oasam/programs/crc/2011-workplace-harassment.htm)
41. Wegge, J., van Dick, R., Fisher, G. K., West, M. A., & Dawson, J. F. (2006). A test of basic assumptions of Affective Events Theory (AET) in Call Centre work. *British Journal of Management*, 17(3), 237-254. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2006.00489.x
42. Weziak-Białowolska, D., Białowolski, P., & McNeely, E. (2020). The impact of workplace harassment and domestic violence on work outcomes in the developing world. *World Development*, 126, 1-11.
43. Yu, Z., Klongthong, W., Thavorn, J. & Ngamkroekjoti, C. (2021). Understanding rural Chinese consumers' behavior: A stimulus–organism–response (SOR) perspective on Huawei's brand loyalty in China. *Cogent Business & Management*, 8(1), 1-18