

# *Leadership and approaches to the management of workplace bullying*

Article

Accepted Version

Woodrow, C. and Guest, D. E. (2017) Leadership and approaches to the management of workplace bullying. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26 (2). pp. 221-233. ISSN 1464-0643 doi: 10.1080/1359432X.2016.1243529 Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/67459/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2016.1243529>

Publisher: Taylor & Francis

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

[www.reading.ac.uk/centaur](http://www.reading.ac.uk/centaur)

**CentAUR**

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

# **Leadership and Approaches to the Management of Workplace Bullying**

Dr Chris Woodrow <sup>1\*</sup>

Professor David E Guest <sup>2</sup>

European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology

<sup>1</sup> Henley Business School, University of Reading, Whiteknights, Reading, RG6 6UD, United Kingdom, email [c.woodrow@henley.ac.uk](mailto:c.woodrow@henley.ac.uk)

<sup>2</sup> Department of Management, King's College London, Franklin-Wilkins Building, 150 Stamford Street, London, SE1 9NH, United Kingdom, email [david.guest@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:david.guest@kcl.ac.uk)

\* Corresponding author

Acknowledgements: This article presents independent research commissioned by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views expressed in this article are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, NIHR or the Department of Health.

Funding for the research was provided by the NIHR

## **Leadership and Approaches to the Management of Workplace Bullying**

### **Abstract**

Leadership behaviour has been identified as an important antecedent of workplace bullying, since managers may prevent, permit or engage in the mistreatment of others. However, the issue of how managers respond when bullying occurs has received limited attention. With this in mind, the aim of this study was to explore how managers behave when bullying occurs in their work group, and to elucidate the contextual issues that underlie this behaviour. This was achieved through analysis of in-depth interviews with individuals involved in cases of bullying. The findings revealed a typology of four types of management behaviour in cases of bullying, each underpinned by contextual factors at the individual, group and organizational level. The study shows that the role of leadership in workplace bullying is more complex than previously thought, and suggests several ways in which managers and organizations could deal with bullying behaviour.

## **Introduction**

A large and growing body of research has shown that workplace bullying is prevalent across a variety of settings (Zapf, Escartin, Einarsen, Hoel, & Vartia, 2010), representing a serious social stressor that impacts upon the well-being of victims (Nielsen & Einarsen, 2012).

Consequently, the total annual cost of workplace bullying to the UK economy alone has been estimated to be approximately £13.75 billion (Giga, Hoel & Lewis, 2008). In an effort to identify methods to reduce the significant costs associated with bullying, researchers have sought to identify its underlying causes. Here, the behaviour of local managers has emerged as an important antecedent of bullying, particularly since certain leadership styles appear to either facilitate or directly cause it (e.g. Hoel, Glasø, Hetland, Cooper and Einarsen, 2010), whilst others may help to prevent or reduce bullying (e.g. Ertureten, Cemalcilar and Aycan, 2013). However, large gaps remain in our knowledge of the ways in which managers may influence bullying behaviour. In particular, studies have largely failed to address the issue of how specific instances of bullying are dealt with by managers at a local level, or the contextual factors that affect the extent to which managers are able to resolve them.

Consequently, it is unclear how managers might be better equipped to deal with bullying behaviour. With this in mind, the purpose of this theory-building study is to explore the role of local managers in cases of workplace bullying, and to do so using an in-depth qualitative approach. The paper begins below with a brief overview of the existing literature regarding workplace bullying, with a particular emphasis on current research examining the role of local managers in bullying, before moving on to describe our own distinctive approach to this issue.

### Current approaches to the study of workplace bullying

Research interest in workplace bullying has grown considerably over the last two decades. Several related lines of research have examined the issue of conflict at work, both between

co-workers and between managers and subordinates, with terms such as “mobbing” “abusive supervision” and “emotional abuse” used in the literature to describe often overlapping sets of behaviours. This paper focuses on perceived “workplace bullying”, an accepted term in the UK (where the research was undertaken) for the behaviour of “harassing, offending, socially excluding someone or negatively affecting someone’s work tasks” which occurs “repeatedly and regularly” (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf & Cooper, 2003, p.15). In terms of content, Rayner and Hoel (1998) developed a much-cited typography of five types of bullying behaviour that are commonly found in the research literature: threats to professional status; threats to personal standing; isolation; overwork; destabilization. Studies have shown that bullying tends to be relatively common, with up to 20 percent of individuals identifying themselves as bullied in research samples, that women are more often victims, and that men and those with management responsibility are more often perpetrators (see Zapf, Escartin, Einarsen, Hoel & Vartia, 2010, for a detailed review). Research has also revealed substantial effects of bullying on victims, who report impaired levels of various indicators of well-being including anxiety, depression and intention to leave the organization (e.g. Hansen et al., 2006; Nielsen & Einarsen, 2012). In terms of the causes of bullying, the dominant approach has focussed on the role of work environment factors. Bullying is hypothesised to be most prevalent in organizations characterised by a negative work environment and weak management control (Salin, 2003), and various major survey studies have demonstrated that bullying is associated with these issues (e.g. Balducci, Cecchin and Fraccaroli, 2012).

### The role of local managers in workplace bullying

Local managers would intuitively be expected to play a central role in the development of bullying, and several lines of theory and research have examined this issue, with managers viewed as either perpetrating, facilitating or preventing the behaviour. First, research into the role of managers in bullying has used established theory from the leadership literature. Here,

studies have tended to use survey methods to examine how different perceived leadership styles correlate with reported levels of bullying. The two most commonly studied forms of leadership are “destructive” leadership styles, which may themselves be viewed as a form of bullying, and “weak” leadership styles, which effectively permit bullying behaviour. For example, Hoel, Glasø, Hetland, Cooper and Einarsen (2010) found that laissez-faire leadership and more particularly non-contingent reward leadership were strongly associated with self-reported bullying, while autocratic leadership was associated with observed bullying. Hauge, Skogstad, and Einarsen (2007) also found that lower constructive leadership and greater laissez-faire leadership were positively related to reported bullying behaviour. Conversely, some leadership styles may help to deter bullying behaviour. For example, Astrauskaite, Notelaers, Medisauskaite and Kern (2015) found that transformational leadership is related to decreased levels of harassment, because it provides greater autonomy, independence and power in followers. Likewise, Ertureten, Cemalcilar and Aycan, (2013) found that transactional leadership, where leaders are engaged with their work group and focus on performance and stability, is also related to decreased reported bullying behaviour. In sum, the existing literature has shown that bullying is associated with leadership that is either too weak or too firm, whereas constructive or transformational leadership may help to protect employees from the behaviour.

At a more micro level, managers have been implicated in the bullying process through the management (or otherwise) of bullying or of conflicts that have the potential to escalate into bullying. It is important to note here that conflict and bullying are not generally viewed as identical constructs. Rather, bullying is often viewed as a special case of conflict, representing “long lasting and badly managed conflicts’ (Zapf and Gross, 2001, p.499). Keashley and Nowell (2010) state that the key differences between conflict and bullying are that bullying is a longer term process, does not involve reciprocal behaviour and involves a

power imbalance between parties, such that one party is unable to defend themselves.

Conflicts may occur between co-workers or between managers and their co-workers, with the latter situation expected to develop more easily into bullying given the pre-existing power imbalance. Bullying is widely considered to be an escalating process that may begin with a simple conflict (e.g. Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf & Cooper, 2003) and may, therefore, be amenable to amelioration via conflict management techniques (e.g. Leon-Perez, Medina, Arenas and Munduate, 2015; Baillien, Bollen, Euwema and De Witte, 2013).

Importantly, managers have a potentially crucial role in preventing simple conflicts from developing into bullying. Salin (2003) states that potential bullies are deterred from acting in environments where managers are perceived to be prepared to intervene in cases of bullying. Indeed, a number of early bullying studies revealed that low satisfaction with management and supervisory support were positively related to reported bullying behaviour (e.g. Zapf et al., 1996). In terms of the way in which managers intervene, various models of conflict escalation (e.g. Fisher, 1990) and management have been proposed (see Keashley and Nowell, 2010 for a thorough review). These are often contingency-based, such that informal interventions by managers can be effective in preventing low-level conflicts from developing into bullying if used at the correct time. Indeed, the importance of appropriate management in preventing conflict escalation is borne out in the research literature. Interviews with victims of bullying have revealed that a lack of management intervention in bullying is often attributed to factors such as poor training (Lewis, 1999). Moreover, Zapf and Gross (2001) found that conflicts that escalated into bullying were often those where one party either initiated a complaint against a supervisor or attempted to enlist their help at too early a stage, which had the effect of escalating the situation beyond a simple conflict. Various commentators have advocated the use of conflict management techniques to deal with bullying. Fox and Stallworth (2009) review the literature on Integrated Conflict Management



Systems, stating that this approach allows both managers and employees to raise concerns in a safe environment, which should reduce the risk of escalation. Others, particularly in the healthcare sector (e.g. Rocker 2008), have called for early management intervention in the bullying process as a way to prevent the behaviour, and many of the recommendations to healthcare organizations (e.g. Royal College of Nursing, 2005) and more widely (e.g. ACAS, 2014) currently in circulation reflect this perspective, since they emphasise the importance of managers tackling disputes informally before they escalate into bullying. Taken together, the available theory and research suggests that managers may usefully act to break the development of bullying, but often fail to do so.

### Management responses to bullying

Although the current literature clearly indicates that managers are of central importance in the bullying process, very little research has examined how managers react when bullying develops in their work group. In particular, micro-level day-to-day interactions between bullying targets and their managers have received limited attention. This is partly because some of the current approaches to understanding the development of bullying (e.g. Salin, 2003) examine the manager's role as a relatively long-term process. Poor management skills or low levels of support are expected over time to enable staff to bully; destructive or laissez-faire leadership styles are viewed as relatively stable patterns of behaviour which can lead, over time, to the perception of either bullying by the manager, or a situation where rules are no longer respected in the workplace and bullying is tolerated. It is understandable that the role of managers in bullying is typically viewed in process terms, since this falls in line with commonly accepted definitions of bullying (e.g. Einarsen et al., 2003). However, under this conceptualization, the manager's role *in reaction* to specific instances of bullying behaviour has received less attention. This is a particularly important issue because various recommendations for practice (see Rayner and Lewis, 2010, for a review) suggest that staff

who are bullied or who witness bullying should approach their managers, and that managers should attempt to intervene informally to prevent or reduce conflict amongst staff.

Detailed qualitative accounts may provide a fruitful avenue for investigating the issue of management responses to bullying, and recent qualitative work has examined the management of bullying from the perspective of various organizational actors. For example, Saam, (2010) investigated the strategies employed by consultants in cases of workplace bullying, whilst a recent study conducted in Sweden highlights various problems with the implementation of anti-bullying policy relating to the role of trade unions and employers (Hoel and Einarsen, 2010). Harrington, Rayner and Warren (2012) undertook interviews with HR professionals, finding that they often distrusted local managers to deal effectively with conflicts amongst their employees, whilst Salin (2008a, 2008b) has provided accounts of the type of measures used by HR managers to prevent and deal with bullying. Additionally, large-scale projects such as the European Survey of Enterprises on New and Emerging Risks (ESENER; González, Cockburn, Irastorza, Houtman, Bakhuys, Roozeboom, 2010) have examined potential barriers to the management of bullying through the accounts of managers and safety staff. However, there is still little detailed work examining how local managers and supervisors deal with bullying on a day-to-day basis, because typical studies of management behaviour in bullying have utilised large scale surveys examining either general views of management support (e.g. Zapf et al., 1996) or leadership style (e.g. Hauge, Skogstad, and Einarsen, 2007). Moreover, these have tended to examine views from the perspective of only targets of bullying, and have rarely sought input from managers themselves or other witnesses. Additionally, we do not know which contextual factors make it more or less possible or likely for managers to intervene when bullying develops. This information is potentially very valuable, because it could help organizations to better support local managers in dealing with bullying. As Rayner and Lewis (2010) point out, managers are

the “first stop” when bullying occurs, and must therefore be supported through policy to enable them to swiftly resolve the situation. In order to improve our understanding of the management role in addressing bullying and the contextual factors that affect the extent to which they are able to do so effectively, this paper reports a qualitative study that is used to begin to build theory about management behaviour in cases of workplace bullying. It does so by exploring two questions. Firstly, in what ways do managers intervene to manage or prevent bullying? Secondly, what sort of contextual factors influence the way in which managers intervene?

### The current study

This study takes the form of an exploratory investigation of management responses to bullying behaviour. In particular, the research aims to examine management behaviour in specific instances of bullying. We conducted the study in the healthcare sector, because it represents something of an extreme case with regard to the occurrence of bullying behaviour. The published literature has revealed disparities in the prevalence of bullying across sectors, with some, including healthcare, featuring notably high levels (Zapf et al., 2010). Working in this sector can be particularly stressful and emotional, a factor which has been implicated in the high levels of burnout amongst staff (McManus et al., 2002) and may lead to high levels of conflict and possible bullying. Additionally, there is evidence that some healthcare professions such as nursing (e.g. Johnson, 2009) feature particularly hierarchical structures, with bullying by superiors becoming normalised. Bullying takes on additional importance in healthcare because it may contribute to poor patient care (e.g. Paice and Smith, 2009), and all NHS trusts are required to have a bullying policy in place to help combat the issue. However, rates of bullying in national surveys in the UK remain high in many areas (see <http://www.nhsstaffsurveys.com>).

The study aims to add to the current literature in several respects. First, we aim to make a conceptual contribution to the literature by developing an analytical framework of management responses to bullying and the contextual factors that can help to shape these responses. In developing this analytic framework, the study seeks to contribute information about how managers may play a more effective role in reducing developing bullying behaviour. We also aim to make a methodological contribution by examining the bullying phenomenon using an in-depth qualitative methodology that examines specific instances of bullying. There is a good deal of research from the healthcare sector examining the role of leadership styles in workplace bullying (e.g. Laschinger, Wong and Grau, 2012), although this literature is dominated by cross-sectional survey studies. We aim to complement this with the use of detailed qualitative accounts, which are likely to provide the richer data about bullying (Lewis, Sheehan & Davies, 2008).

## **Methods**

### The research context

The research was undertaken in two large hospital Trusts<sup>1</sup> in London, UK, one an acute hospital, the other a mental health Trust. The study formed part of a larger programme of research that aimed to provide information to host organizations about why levels of bullying were relatively high in their workforce. This programme of research was initially conceived in partnership with senior human resources staff at one of the Trusts, with senior staff at the second Trust expressing an interest in the research (and subsequently becoming a host) at a slightly later time.

All healthcare Trusts in the UK are expected to have a bullying and harassment policy in place, with detailed guidance and sample policies available for Trusts to use (see

---

<sup>1</sup> Healthcare services in the UK are managed by a number of “Trusts” that cover particular areas and/or types of care

www.nhsemployers.org). Both Trusts had such a policy in place, although survey research by the Care Quality Commission (www.cqc.org.uk), the independent regulators of healthcare in England, had revealed above average levels of bullying within the workforce at both. The policies of the participating Trusts were virtually identical, and, in line with recommended approaches, state that those who feel bullied should approach either the alleged party or their manager in the first instance. Managers should begin any intervention in cases of suspected bullying informally through conversations with affected parties, although all meetings and other forms of intervention should be documented in writing. Where the target's line manager is the alleged perpetrator of bullying, the line manager's manager should be approached. If informal intervention is ineffective, employees may initiate a formal investigation by making a written complaint to their manager who should then liaise with the Human Resources team.

#### Sampling and participant recruitment

The study aimed to recruit individuals who believed that they had any kind of experience of bullying at work. This included people who had been victims of bullying, had witnessed bullying or had been accused of bullying. A purposive sampling methodology was therefore used to select an appropriate sample, with a number of organizational divisions targeted for the recruitment of study participants. Divisions were selected in consultation with the Human Resource directors at each organization on the basis of their size and reported prevalence of bullying. This resulted in the selection of one large division in the acute Trust and three smaller divisions from the mental health Trust. Individuals were recruited into the study using information leaflets attached to payslips and by emails inviting interested employees to contact the researchers. All employees receiving a payslip were invited to participate, which meant that the pool of potential participants included a broad cross section of different staff groups, both clinical (e.g. nurses, physiotherapists) and non-clinical (e.g. administrators, receptionist) staff. The final sample of participants consisted of 31 individuals, for whom

demographic details are shown in table one. Twenty-one participants reported that they had been victims of bullying (“victims”), four individuals had witnessed bullying (“witnesses”), two reported having been accused of bullying (“accused”) and four reported having been involved in the management of a case of bullying (“managers”).

-----INSERT TABLE 1 HERE-----

### Data collection and analysis

The study adopted an exploratory approach based upon the critical incident technique. The critical incident technique was initially developed in the aviation industry by Flanagan (1954) as a job analysis technique, and has since been used widely in healthcare and organizational research (e.g. Kemppainen, 2000). Broadly, the original critical incident technique involves highly structured participant interviews that focus upon incidents that are of particular salience to the interviewee, within which the interviewer probes various aspects of this incident with the aim of establishing an accurate picture of the event. Flanagan acknowledged that the methodology is a “flexible set of principles which must be modified and adapted to meet the specific situation at hand” (*ibid*, p. 335). Hence, researchers have increasingly modified the method to include more interpretivist approaches, in the healthcare sector (e.g. Eklöf, Törner and Pousette, 2014) and elsewhere. An approach of this type is used here, with data collected on critical incidents via participant interview and then analysed using interpretive content analysis. There are several strengths of the critical incident technique that led to its selection for use in the current study. Primarily, the technique allows the researchers to focus in detail on particular management responses to bullying, rather than more general stories. Additionally, the method is inductive and therefore suitable for use in an exploratory study, and it allows participants (rather than researchers) to decide which events are most salient. All interviews and initial analysis were undertaken by one researcher, which ensured consistency in the data collection process. This individual was an experienced

qualitative researcher with knowledge of data collection and analysis in organizational and healthcare settings.

The interviews were semi-structured, with participants choosing whether they preferred to be interviewed on the telephone or face-to-face. Interviewees were asked if they had any experience of bullying at work, and were then asked to give a general description of their experiences. Participants were not provided with a definition of bullying, since the study aimed to uncover instances of perceived bullying. Likewise, participants were not asked directly about their supervisors or managers; rather, themes concerning these individuals were allowed to emerge if present. Based upon critical incident technique methodology (Flanagan, 1954), participants were asked to describe one salient incident from their experience of bullying. The researcher then probed various aspects of this incident in order to ascertain the perceived causes, consequences, actions taken by the individual, the role of the local manager in the process and any relevant contextual factors that affected the experience. Each interview lasted up to 40 minutes and was audio recorded and then transcribed. The interview schedule is shown in appendix A.

Transcripts were coded for emergent themes using methods based on Miles and Huberman (1994). The NVivo for windows software package was used to code data, with transcripts and interviews stored in password-protected files and locked cabinets, and linked to other participant data only using a code number. We took a broadly constructivist approach to data analysis, acknowledging the subjective natures of the realities constructed by participants. Coding therefore focussed not only on the development of a set of critical incidents, but also on participants' understanding and interpretation of these events and their place within them. This began with the application to the data of a small set of general and pre-defined codes, including the role of the line manager in each instance of bullying. Additional codes were added to these as analysis progressed, resulting in a larger set of lower order themes. These

were later grouped under a small set of higher order pattern codes. A second researcher examined coded transcripts, with disagreements resolved by joint consensus. Data saturation was reached towards the end of the coding process. In order to more closely examine the role of the line manager in each instance of bullying, coding matrices were created to detail the events described by participants on a case-by-case basis. By combining these with the coding frame, a typology of four different management responses to bullying behaviour was developed, where the event described by each of the participants was coded as one of these types of response. The four response types are detailed in the following section. In some cases, each individual account of bullying was coded with more than one of the four management response types. This occurred in the few cases where more than one line manager made a response to the bullying.

## **Findings**

### General characteristics of bullying

Of the 31 individuals in the sample, 20 described situations that involved a simple bully-victim dyad. Eight of these related to horizontal bullying, where the alleged perpetrator was a colleague, whereas 12 related to vertical bullying, where the alleged perpetrator was a manager. A further nine accounts of bullying related to individuals who were bullied by a group, including one case of “upwards” bullying where a manager reported being victimized by her entire team. Additionally, two accounts related to what has been termed “organizational bullying” (Liefoghe & Mackenzie Davey, 2001) where the interviewee felt that the organization as a whole used bullying behaviour as a tactic to remove power from the victim or increase their performance. The actual content of the bullying behaviour described by participants largely fitted into the framework of bullying behaviours proposed by Rayner and Hoel (1998), which describes bullying across five behavioural domains (threats to



professional status; threats to personal standing; isolation; overwork; destabilization). There were no instances of physically violent behaviour in the accounts.

### Management responses to bullying behaviour

Analysis of the data resulted in a novel analytical framework within which to consider management responses to bullying. The framework is comprised of four types of management response, each underpinned by contextual factors at the individual manager, group and organizational level. The four patterns of reported management response to bullying, and the frequency with which they occurred, are shown in table two, and the analytic framework integrating the types of response and the various contextual influences is shown in figure one. The four behaviour patterns can be viewed as falling along a continuum ranging from constructive to destructive behaviour, and are described in full with examples in the following section. For each pattern, the management behaviours that were associated with the relevant response are described, followed by the contextual factors at each level that influenced their occurrence.

-----INSERT TABLE 2 HERE-----

-----INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE-----

#### 1. Constructive management

The first pattern of management response to bullying found in the data is termed *constructive management behaviour*. In terms of management behaviour, this response involved cases where the manager successfully intervened to cease bullying by using either informal or formal methods. Some managers who intervened informally took action to prevent bullying from occurring or nip potential bullying in the bud to ensure that it did not arise. In other cases, a victim of bullying made a direct complaint about an on-going case of bullying to their manager, who then resolved the situation using informal means. An example of such a

situation is illustrated below. Here, a nurse describes how she was bullied by colleagues upon joining a new team, a situation that was left unresolved by the local manager. However, a new manager resolved the issues through a three-way meeting.

*“I did report it; nothing was done about it. Subsequently a new manager came in post, and they did something about it. They figured it out, and then I spoke to them as well and gave specific examples and named certain individuals, and they did something about it. That did work, at least for me; that particular individual backed off.” B5, victim*

In the remaining cases of constructive management, the initial management intervention involved the use of formal HR procedures to resolve issues. These cases represent a behaviour pattern that is not entirely in line with the recommendations given in the bullying policy, since no attempt was first made to intervene informally. Nonetheless, management behaviour was centred upon the well-being of the target, and these cases can therefore be viewed as representing an effective (if less than best practice) approach. In one of these cases, the ability of the immediate manager to intervene in an informal fashion was removed because the victim used the formal grievance procedure to allege that they were being bullied by this manager, automatically triggering a formal bullying investigation. In another two cases, an individual who reported being bullied by a colleague approached their manager. Rather than attempting to act informally as the policy advises, the manager immediately initiated a formal bullying investigation.

Moving on to contextual factors associated with constructive management, a central feature of these accounts in terms of individual manager characteristics was the ability of managers to overcome potential barriers to action. Various barriers to implementing bullying behaviour emerged from the accounts of constructive management, primarily relating to the time associated with dealing with issues and threats to professional standing. However, managers

who displayed constructive behaviour used proactive behaviour to overcome these, as illustrated by the following quote:

*“I got him to e-mail me an account of what happened and then I contacted the person that was doing the bullying... I went over there with trepidation - I am going to get a telling off myself - and I thought “no, I am going to stand my ground and challenge him because it doesn’t sound like his behaviour was reasonable” B7, manager*

A second major contextual feature of accounts of constructive management, this time at the group level, was an atmosphere of open communication between the manager and the group. An example of this is shown below. Here, a hospital consultant describes how she noticed, through an unrelated conversation, that a young doctor within her team was experiencing problems at work. Investigating further, the consultant learnt of a confrontation with another doctor. In order to resolve the situation, the consultant discussed the issue informally with a manager of the other party involved. In this case, the on-going communication within the team led to the identification and subsequent management of bullying behaviour:

*“The victim was part of my training...I picked up on him going: ‘I just feel really crap about myself.’ They were the words he used and I couldn’t let that go. I cannot have people who I’m supervising leaving work thinking that about themselves. It’s not acceptable.” A11, manager*

At the organizational level, participants involved in instances of constructive management frequently alluded to an organizational context that did not fully support anti-bullying policies by taking action against perpetrators. According to one manager, for example, the policy is generally regarded as “*just talk*” (A11). Hence, overall, the accounts of constructive management involved managers who acted proactively to resolve issues, often overcoming

potential barriers including a management structure that did not fully support anti-bullying policy, and using an atmosphere of open communication to do so.

## 2. Incomplete management

The second category of management response to bullying which emerged from the data is termed *incomplete management*. This management response involved behaviour where managers attempted to intervene in some way but were unsuccessful in completing this intervention. Hence, this category involves situations where an incident of bullying was not perceived to have been satisfactorily resolved. There were several scenarios in which this occurred, and in each, the failure to resolve the issue was attributed to the way in which managers chose to intervene. In some cases, managers were perceived not to have spent sufficient time dealing with issues. In others, complaints were made and the bullying was discussed, but no meetings were arranged and effectively nothing was done. In the remaining cases of incomplete management, the relevant manager had organized a meeting between the alleged perpetrator and victim, but no resolution was reached.

Moving on to the contextual factors associated with incomplete management, issues again emerged at the individual, group and organizational levels. The major contextual factor that emerged at the individual manager level was the shared perception amongst interviewees that the relevant manager did not take the issue of bullying seriously, effectively paying the complaint lip service. The following excerpt is an example of such a situation. Here, a nurse recalls a situation in which a colleague was bullied over a period of time. A complaint was made, but the nurse describes how very little action was taken:

*“I was told that an incident was completed in connection with it at one point but, beyond that I didn’t actually see that a lot was done. To me it just looked like it was*

*left to dribble along... I'm not a manager, but from my perspective I would have thought it would have been sensible to nip it in the bud straightaway" C5, witness*

Turning to the group level, a related contextual issue to emerge from the data regarding incomplete management concerns the flow of information from managers involved in dealing with cases of bullying. Here, participants who were victims or witnesses of bullying described how they were never informed, even after making a complaint, of what had been done to manage the situation. As one participant noted, this exacerbated participants' concerns about the commitment of management to dealing with bullying, whilst also failing to send a clear message to others that something was being done. The following excerpt illustrates this view:

*"The nurse involved did actually make a complaint, but I don't know how it gets handled, further up the ladder...I think maybe they just talk to them and try to calm the situation down...and I put an adverse incident [report] about the whole situation as well. But I never heard anything back." A2, witness*

Moving on to the organizational level, the accounts of incomplete management revealed a perceived lack of support at senior management level for bullying policy. Many interviewees were not confident that a formal complaint of bullying would be taken seriously by their organization, and interviewees often felt that an anti-bullying culture was not embedded in the values of either organization or endorsed by senior management. This is illustrated in the following quotation. Here, an employee who had witnessed a colleague being bullied described how the situation was left unresolved after a complaint was made. She went on to explain her belief that issues of staff conflict are under prioritised and left without a resolution:

*“I do find it quite frustrating that it does seem that people high up just don’t seem to have any power over those sorts of things, like at school really. It gets left and pushed under the carpet.” - A2, witness*

### 3. Disengaged management

The third category of management response to bullying to emerge from the data is termed *disengaged* management. In terms of manager behaviour, this pattern occurred when the relevant manager in a situation of bullying did not attempt to intervene for some reason. In two such cases, the relevant manager was unaware that bullying was taking place. But in eleven cases managers refused to intervene in alleged bullying when their help was directly sought. Cases of this type were typified by unsupportive managers, with one even attempting to persuade the complainant not to escalate the issue via formal means:

*“My manager then said to me: ‘look, at the end of the day there’s nothing I can do ...[then he] said: ‘okay there is another way you can go, you can put in a bullying complaint about her, you can make an official complaint’. But then after that he said to me: ‘think very, very carefully if you go down that road’. He personally wouldn’t advise it” B6, victim*

Again, three sets of contextual issues underpinned cases of disengaged management. Several characteristics of disengaged managers emerged from the data. First, many interviewees described managers who appeared unable to deal with bullying because they lacked effective management skills. Participants felt that newer managers were unsupported in coping with bullying by their own supervisors, and that additional supervisory support and training in both conflict resolution and leadership skills could vastly reduce bullying behaviour, since this would encourage managers to intervene in cases of bullying more readily. An example of this situation is illustrated in the excerpt below, where a manager describes being bullied by her entire team after disciplining one member for inappropriate behaviour. Complaining

numerous times and requesting a transfer, the manager believed that the senior members of the Trust simply did not know how to deal with the situation. Eventually she was signed off work with acute stress and never returned to the department.

*“They were out of their depth, they really didn’t know what to do with it. So the most you could ever get from anybody almost right up the head of HR, who I remember sitting there and telling about this. They sit there and they would go “Oh yes, that’s terrible ... we’ve got to put a stop to that”, but then didn’t know what to do.”- D3, victim*

Second, and more worryingly, some managers were perceived to have misunderstood their role as set out in the bullying policy, such that they believed that resolving issues of staff conflict was not their responsibility. In the following excerpt, a victim of bullying describes how they felt when their manager told them that they were not responsible for dealing with the situation:

*“[My manager] is not a supportive person...I know that what he said is nonsense, but in the same time you feel trapped - because who is going to fight my case?” A12, victim*

Third, some managers were perceived to have been prevented or discouraged from becoming involved in a case of bullying as a result of an ongoing personal issue. In the excerpt below, for example, an individual describes telling her manager that she was being bullied by others in her team. However, the manager’s failure to act is attributed to the fact that she was herself preparing to leave the organization:

*“I brought it up in my supervision and she did nothing to be honest, she listened. But that’s all she did. I think at the point when I brought it up, she herself was on the verge of leaving, so there was something up. In fact, she did end up leaving, so perhaps...she didn’t feel that it was her job to do anything about it” B5 victim*

Turning to contextual characteristics at the group level that influenced the occurrence of disengaged management behaviour, several interviewees attributed the manager's disengagement in cases of bullying to their personal relationship with the alleged perpetrators. In the excerpt below, for example, an individual felt bullied by another secretary in her department. However, the alleged perpetrator was a good friend of this manager, with two consequences: the manager appeared not to realize that bullying was happening, and the target was not prepared to make a complaint:

*"I didn't know what to do [about the bullying] because I was thinking: 'if I tell my supervisor she's very good friends with [the perpetrator], so what's the point? If I go a bit further they're all supporting her'. So I assumed they would support her, they're such good friends, they go for drinks and go for a fag together, things like that. So I thought 'oh just forget it then'." A1, victim*

A second contextual issue at the group level that characterised disengaged management behaviour concerned the physical location of the manager. The excerpt below, for example, is from a member of administrative staff who described being bullied by other members of their team. However, since the team manager was based in another physical location, they were unaware of the problem and the victim did not make a complaint. Hence, the bullying continued to cause distress to the victim.

*"Nothing's done [about the bullying]. Our manager is based remotely....they've got away with so much, I suppose they think they're just immune to anything that's going on." B4, victim*

Moving on to the organizational level, two major contextual issues that appeared to precipitate disengaged management emerged. First, this type of management response appeared to be a particular problem where the alleged perpetrator was a senior member of



staff. In these cases, there was a clear perception amongst interviewees that senior management and HR staff were reluctant to implement bullying policy, as illustrated by the following excerpt:

*“I’m not of a senior clinic or managerial post I’ve avoided [confronting the bully] ...you have senior clinical management who, bless them, I know they don’t like dealing with issues like this...I’m not blaming them because I would hate to take on somebody like this. But that’s what they’re there for I think.” D5, witness*

A second and related issue at the organizational level which appeared to precipitate the occurrence of disengaged management was that organizational leadership was not perceived to support a culture in which bullying would be addressed. As the following excerpt illustrates, many participants believed that local managers were effectively operating in a culture that did not take addressing bullying seriously. As a result, many participants felt that managers lacked the credibility to deal with issues, leading to disengagement.

*“You’ll never change to me, honestly, if the top management denies it, or wants to just say “OK, sorry, that’s the staff’s business, I want my work to go first.” ... I’m afraid I’m not very optimistic about that.” A1, victim*

In sum, disengaged management was perceived to have occurred where managers were unable, unprepared or unwilling to get involved in cases of bullying. At the individual level, managers lacked the skills, motivation or understanding to deal with bullying, whilst at the group level they were either physically absent or personally close to the team member responsible for bullying. At the organizational level, managers were perceived to be unsupported from above in their attempts implement policy, especially when the perpetrator was a senior member of staff.

#### 4. Destructive management

Destructive management arose when the direct line manager was the alleged perpetrator of the bullying behaviour. Destructive management was always coded alongside other categories, because where a manager is deemed to be the perpetrator of bullying, the responsibility for dealing with the issue falls upon another line manager. Hence more than one line manager was involved in these cases. Turning to the management behaviour itself, managers were accused of bullying in two types of situation. Some were accused of bullying while enacting a formal performance management procedure with an employee. These managers were sometimes perceived to have conducted the procedure in an insensitive fashion, such that the employee to whom the procedure applied felt that they were being unduly scrutinized. In other cases, however, bullying was deemed to be a function of the manager's general leadership style.

Moving to contextual factors at the individual level, managers of this type were often reported to possess poor people management skills or to have undertaken limited management training. An example of such a scenario is shown below, where a social care professional describes the destructive leadership style of her colleague's manager. Ultimately, this social care professional encouraged her colleague to report the behaviour as bullying:

*"[The perpetrator] had a style where she thought if she just got louder, and continued with a stream of bullshit, that people would either just accept it because she was the manager or wouldn't question it...her particular style of management would be to elevate the people that she thought were strong characters and to bully the people that were weaker."- B1, witness*

Turning to the group level, several other contextual issues emerged which appeared to facilitate bullying by managers. First, some interviewees described employees in the bullying

managers' work group who effectively conformed with destructive management behaviour or failed to report it. The excerpt below is an example of such behaviour. Here, a nurse describes the fear that prevented staff from reporting a tyrannical leader who frequently bullied staff.

*"I just keep quiet. I never answer back... other colleagues gave me the impression that "thank goodness you're here, because [it] takes the pressure off me." ....everybody's afraid of [losing] their jobs, that's why they never did anything about it." A8, victim*

Second, other participants described situations of collusion between staff and managers. The following excerpt is an illustration of this situation. Here, an administrator describes being bullied by a manager. However, she believes that the mistreatment was caused in part by a colleague, who used this situation to her advantage by feeding negative information to the manager.

*"[My colleague] is a kind of personality who quickly runs to the manager secretly and feeds negative information. It's almost like she's trying to build herself up to put me down....almost every single week there was an incident that I felt I was being targeted ...there would be occasions where my immediate colleague would have meetings, not open meetings, secret meetings with my line manager ... the two of them, they would just suddenly gang up on me." A4, victim*

Finally, at the organisational level, various individuals noted that those close to the top of the organization tolerated bullying by managers. As the following excerpt shows, employees believed that senior managers were not interested in whether staff were being bullied, so long as the work was being done:

*"[Managers] just come round, and they expect you to know all the things that's going on with the patients. They come now and again and do their rounds...Put it this way, I don't*

*think they know anything, I don't think they know half what goes on in those individual wards." A8, victim*

Staff also drew attention to the difficulties of bringing bullying managers to account in an environment that was not committed to the policies designed to deal with the behaviour. As one victim of destructive management stated, *"they have got excellent written policies, but they just don't put them into practice"* (D6, victim). Echoing this view, a senior clinical employee who had been involved in managing cases of bullying described the gap between what is written in a bullying policy and how the policy is implemented in practice:

*"There's almost a sense of the elements of tokenism: the policy is written and therefore that's what we believe in. But in fact, when you actually dig below that, when you actually look at the application and when you look at individual instances of harassment, of bullying...they are not addressed, even though the policy may actually be there."- C6, manager*

Overall, cases of destructive management involved managers who were perceived either to possess a bullying leadership style or who had been accused of bullying during performance management. In terms of contextual issues, destructive management involved managers with poor communication skills and inadequate training, team members who colluded with the manager or failed to intervene, and a tolerance of bullying at the top of the organization.

## **Discussion**

The aim of the present study was to develop an analytic framework within which to explore the types of management response to bullying behaviour and the contextual factors that influence this response, an issue that has hitherto been largely neglected in research and theory concerning bullying in the workplace. This was achieved by using the critical incident technique to provide a detailed examination of management behaviour in occurrences of

workplace bullying from the perspective of various organizational actors. Our findings highlight the complex and fluid context in which workplace bullying is played out and illustrate the interaction between leadership behaviour with respect to bullying and the context in which it occurs.

A model of four distinct patterns of management behaviour in cases of workplace bullying emerged from our qualitative data. Each of the four types of behaviour is somewhat reflective of existing leadership styles, although it is important to note that the behaviours uncovered in our research relate to events within a process of bullying rather than a longer-term leadership style. *Constructive management* can be viewed as the “best practice” approach. This is because this response is largely in line with typical bullying policy, where managers are instructed to resolve any issues informally in the first instance before they develop into long-term bullying behaviour, and also because it seems to be effective in tackling bullying. Constructive management is therefore reflective of the constructive leadership style described by Hauge, Skogstad, and Einarsen (2007) amongst others, as well as a good number of recommendations for good practice in the management of bullying (e.g. ACAS, 2014) and models of conflict management (e.g. Fisher, 1990), which describe the importance of early intervention and communication. Beneath this, and of some concern, are three categories that can be viewed as varying degrees of dysfunctional leadership behaviour. In cases of *incomplete management*, managers tried to intervene in some way but did not satisfactorily resolve issues, behaviour which was often attributed to managers being insufficiently committed to reducing bullying. In the case of *disengaged management*, managers did not attempt to help, as they either refused to or were unaware of the issues. These categories of behaviour are broadly reflective of *laissez faire* leadership styles, which are known to lead to bullying behaviour (e.g. Skogstad, Einarsen, Torsheim, Aasland, and Hetland, 2007). The final category of management behaviour was *destructive management*, reflected in cases

where the manager was the alleged perpetrator or facilitator of bullying. This behaviour is somewhat reflective of destructive or tyrannical styles of leadership described by Hoel, Glasø, Hetland, Cooper and Einarsen (2010) and others.

The major contribution of this research is the provision of a framework within which to analyse management responses to bullying and develop policy guidelines. This comprises four types of behaviours that arise in the presence of three levels of associated contextual factors at the individual manager, group and organizational levels (see figure one). In terms of the characteristics of the individual manager, constructive management involved managers who were proactive and who sometimes took risks in order overcome potential barriers to dealing with bullying. Previous research has found that constructive (Hauge, Skogstad, and Einarsen, 2007), transactional and transformational (Astrauskaite, Notelaers, Medisauskaite and Kern, 2015; Ertureten, Cemalcilar and Aycan, 2013) forms of leadership are associated with reduced bullying behaviour. This study extends upon these findings, since bullying was resolved by leadership behaviour that focused specifically on resolving bullying. Incomplete management involved a lack of commitment to solving problems, and disengaged managers lacked the skills, motivation or understanding to take action. Destructive managers also lacked training or skills and, in some cases, used a management style that was deemed to be a form of bullying. Taken together, these findings highlight the need for management training in dealing with conflict, an issue that has been raised elsewhere (e.g. Lewis, 1999).

Moving up to the group context level, constructive management occurred where managers created an open dialogue with their team, reflecting previous research showing that bullying is negatively associated with perceived supervisory support (e.g. Zapf et al., 1996). At the opposite end of the spectrum, destructive management was often characterised by team members who conformed to or colluded with abusive management behaviour, sometimes through fear, reflecting the traits of “susceptible followers” who may contribute to bullying

behaviour previously identified by Padilla et al. (2007). Incomplete management involved managers who did not take bullying issues seriously, whilst disengaged management involved managers who were often physically absent from or too emotionally close to their teams, inhibiting their ability to pick up on issues of conflict.

Finally, at the organizational level, all four styles were underpinned by an organizational context where bullying policy was neither enforced nor supported by senior management. Organizational support for dealing with bullying has been identified as an important aspect of successful bullying management elsewhere (e.g. Heenan, 2009). In the case of constructive management identified in this study, however, a lack of support was apparently outweighed by the more positive context at the group and individual level, reflected in good communication and managers who were prepared to take risks to overcome barriers. The importance of some of these contextual factors at each level has been highlighted elsewhere (e.g. Lewis, 1999; Zapf et al., 1996; Padilla et al., 2007; Heenan, 2009). Other issues, such as managers being physically absent, overly friendly or failing to create an open dialogue with their team are somewhat newer, and hint at possible intervention strategies. The value of this study lies in drawing together these issues into a framework to show how each can lead to particular types of management behaviour that more or less effectively addresses bullying.

The findings of this study clarify the role of the local manager in the management of bullying behaviour. Poor managers have traditionally been viewed as a weak presence that does not offer a significant deterrent to poor behaviour (e.g. Salin, 2003; Zapf et al., 1996). More recently, studies have theorized that managers either bully or permit bullying as a function of some underlying leadership style (e.g. Hauge, Skogstad, and Einarsen, 2007). Qualitative studies have begun to highlight the role of various organizational actors in the management of bullying (e.g. Salin 2008a, 2008b), but there has been limited research using in depth methods to study the day-to-day interactions between managers and staff that occur in

bullying situations. This study begins to address this gap in the literature and, crucially, highlights the role of context, identifying a complex set of factors behind managers who fail to deal with bullying. Importantly, at the root of each of the styles of management identified here lay a culture within which senior managers tolerated bullying and failed to support local managers to deal with it. Only those managers who were able to overcome this lack of support through open communication with their team and risk taking behaviour were able to achieve positive outcomes for their team members. This study suggests, therefore, that rather than being viewed as a root cause of bullying behaviour, managers may be better placed at the centre of the bullying process as a force that could break the bullying cycle. Crucially, our study indicates that this is likely to be possible only if managers are supported and empowered to do so. Our research supports recent suggestions in the literature that simply having a good bullying policy is far from sufficient to deal with the behaviour (Heenan, 2009). Rather, it is necessary for the policy to be lived through the culture of the organization and supported by those at all levels of the organization, particularly managers (Rayner & McIvor, 2008), who may play a central role in preventing bullying through the early management of conflicts (see Keashley and Nowell, 2010). These findings are of particular importance for the study of bullying in the healthcare sector, where high rates of bullying have been attributed to large organization sizes, stressful or emotional work (Zapf, Escartin, Einarsen, Hoel, & Vartia, 2010) and professional hierarchies (e.g. Johnson, 2009). Our study adds to this by showing that there are a range of contextual issues and management behaviours, largely under the control of local and senior management, that also contribute to the phenomenon. Our research suggests that the particularly high levels of bullying in healthcare may be countered through support for existing managers.

The research described in this paper suggests several practical implications for the management of workplace bullying. First, and perhaps most importantly, there appeared to



be very limited management training in issues of staff conflict, with the inevitable result that managers were unable to deal with problems. However, there is a growing literature examining the role of conflict management techniques in bullying behaviour (e.g. Baillien, Bollen, Euwema and De Witte, 2013). Our findings suggest that conflict management training, as well as awareness training, for managers has the potential to seriously reduce bullying by preventing the escalation of simple conflicts. Second, whilst managers typically take a central role in bullying policies (Rayner and Lewis, 2010), managers in this study appeared unfamiliar with the policy or their role within it, with several rather alarmingly believing that dealing with issues of staff well-being was not their job. Additionally, the overarching relationship between the manager and their team in both physical and emotional terms emerged as important for understanding and addressing bullying. Our research suggests, therefore, that those promoted to management duty must be competent in dealing with such issues and must be made aware, more generally, of what their job actually involves. Managers might also be offered incentives through appraisal and promotion to motivate more interest in addressing the topic. Third, in many cases, managers clearly reported feeling unsupported in implementing policy by their senior management, and many participants felt that the organizations as a whole simply did not give priority to issues of staff well-being or conflict. As others (e.g. Rayner & Lewis, 2010) have recommended, any policy must be vigorously promoted and endorsed by top management if it is to be adopted more generally; our research further emphasises such an approach. Fourth, in a good number of cases, managers were identified as the perpetrator of bullying, and in these cases there was often no resolution to the situation. Typical bullying policies suggest that staff approach their manager's manager in such instances. This seems unrealistic, and indeed appeared to be so in the current research since many perpetrators were scared to do this. One way to deal with this issue might be to make provisions so that local team managers are responsible for dealing

with issues of bullying in other teams as well as their own, rather than this responsibility falling upon upper management.

There are some limitations of the current research. First, our findings were based upon a relatively small number of interviews, although these did provide evidence of a range of scenarios. A second limitation was that the sample was composed mainly of victims of bullying. Analysis revealed that the data obtained from managers, witnesses and those accused of bullying was particularly enlightening, and the study would have been enriched further had more of these individuals been involved, although we were unfortunately unable to target recruitment in any way due to ethical constraints. Although we can make no claims to representativeness, this requirement can be of less concern for theory building. Third, and related, individuals with any experience of bullying were invited to participate, and the sample composition was probably biased towards those with a negative experience of some kind. Whilst this does not affect the validity of the findings more widely, it must be noted that the relatively low occurrence of successful management of bullying is probably not representative of true levels of such behaviour within the host organizations or elsewhere. Finally, our study was conducted in the healthcare sector in what were large organizations. Although our sample contained a mix of occupational groups, healthcare is well known for providing a particularly pressured environment and for having a high level of bullying behaviour (Zapf, Escartin, Einarsen, Hoel, & Vartia, 2010). For these reasons, it may not be typical of many workplaces and care must therefore be taken in seeking to generalise the findings. We nevertheless believe the analytic framework that emerged from this study may have wider utility.

The findings of our study present avenues for future research on workplace bullying. The first concerns methodology. The existing (predominantly survey) research in the area has provided invaluable data but has suffered from a number of measurement issues (see Nielsen,

Notelaers & Einarsen, 2010), and has largely failed to examine bullying as a multifaceted process. Intervention has remained a particularly under-researched area (see Vartia and Leka, 2010, for a review). The current study has added to a small body of research (e.g. Miller & Rayner, 2012; Saam, 2010) showing that qualitative methods are particularly useful in uncovering issues of context in the bullying process. Future research using qualitative methods to examine how existing interventions are delivered and received at the local level may provide further useful information for the development of new interventions and the evaluation of existing methods. A second implication of our findings broadly relates to the theoretical focus of future research examining bullying. Managers have been somewhat under-examined in the literature, where the focus is more often on victims or perpetrators of bullying. This study supports a model of four management styles in cases of bullying, and future research might aim to further investigate this model, both for additional emergent categories and for the contextual factors that drive each form of behaviour. Thirdly, our research highlighted the importance of context in bullying, and future research might aim to identify further barriers and facilitators of senior and local management intervention in staff conflict; a particularly important question concerns the reasons why organizations do not support managers to enact policy. Additionally, whilst no such indications emerged from our own data, future research might usefully examine whether characteristics of the conflict itself (or of the individuals engaged therein) affected the degree to which managers were able to intervene. For example, models of conflict resolution suggest that informal resolution may be effective only for relatively minor disputes (Keashley and Nowell, 2010). Fourth, our study revealed that managers often misunderstood their role in the bullying policy, whilst previous research has shown that HR staff lack confidence in local managers to deliver policy (e.g. Harrington, Rayner and Warren, 2012). The issue of how organizations might communicate anti-bullying messages to managers warrants further research investigation. The Human

Resources Management literature has recently highlighted the role of the “strength” of an HR system (e.g. Bowen and Ostroff, 2004), where a strong system is achieved when messages from HR and the senior management team are consistent, distinctive and engender consensus across their target audience. Our study suggests that an empirical investigation of the communication of anti-bullying messages under such a framework may be of use. Finally, as noted above, our findings were based upon accounts of bullying in the healthcare sector, and while the categories of bullying that were identified here did not differ not from those described in other classifications of bullying behaviour (e.g. Rayner and Hoel, 1998), it is possible that in different organizational contexts with lower rates of bullying (and where the demands on local managers may be less severe) different forms of management behaviour may emerge. Hence, additional research should aim to examine whether the findings from this study are also evident in other contexts.

## Conclusion

This study uses detailed qualitative accounts of bullying to develop an analytical framework of management responses to bullying, consisting of four behaviour types. The findings highlight the role of context, uncovering a complex set factors at the individual, team and organizational levels that underpin the four management styles and make it more or less feasible for managers to intervene effectively in cases of bullying. The study adds to the literature by examining the hitherto largely neglected role of managers in addressing cases of bullying, showing that intervention can be effective given supportive features in the individual, group and organizational contexts. In particular, organizations can support local management intervention by providing managers with the skills and confidence to intervene.

## Reference List

- ACAS. (2014). *Bullying and Harassment at Work. A Guide for Employees*. Retrieved from <http://www.acas.org.uk/media/pdf/o/c/Bullying-and-harassment-at-work-a-guide-for-employees.pdf>
- Astrauskaite, M., Notelaers, G., Medisauskaite, A., & Kern, R. (2015). Workplace harassment: Deterring role of transformational leadership and core job characteristics. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 31, 121-135.  
doi:10.1016/j.scaman.2014.06.001
- Baillien, E., Bollen, K., Euwema, M., & De Witte, H. (2014). Conflicts and conflict management styles as precursors of workplace bullying: a two-wave longitudinal study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 23(4), 511-524.
- Balducci, C., Cecchin, M., & Fraccaroli, F. (2012). The impact of role stressors on workplace bullying in both victims and perpetrators, controlling for personal vulnerability factors: A longitudinal analysis. *Work & Stress*, 26, 195-212.  
doi:10.1080/02678373.2012.714543
- Bowen, D., & Ostroff, C. (2004). Understanding HRM–firm performance linkages: The role of the “strength” of the HRM system. *Academy of Management Review*, 29, 203-221.  
doi: 10.5465/AMR.2004.12736076
- Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D. and Cooper, C. (2003). The concept of bullying at work. In S. Einarsen , H. Hoel , D. Zapf and C. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice* (pp. 3-31). London: Taylor & Francis.

- Eklöf, M., Törner, M., & Pousette, A. (2014). Organizational and social-psychological conditions in healthcare and their importance for patient and staff safety. A critical incident study among doctors and nurses. *Safety science*, 70, 211-221. doi: 10.1016/j.ssci.2014.06.007
- Ertureten, A., Cemalcilar, Z., & Aycan, Z. (2013). The relationship of downward mobbing with leadership style and organizational attitudes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 116, 205-216. doi: 10.1007/s10551-012-1468-2
- Fisher, R. J. (1990). Needs theory, social identity and an eclectic model of conflict. In J. Burint (Ed.), *Conflict: Human needs theory* (pp. 89-112). London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Flanagan, J. (1954). The critical incidents technique. *Psychological Bulletin*, 51, 327.
- Fox, S., & Stallworth, L. E. (2009). Building a framework for two internal organizational approaches to resolving and preventing workplace bullying: Alternative dispute resolution and training. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 61, 220. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0016637
- Giga, S., Hoel, H., & Lewis, D. (2008). *The Costs of Workplace Bullying*. London: Unite the Union/Department for Business
- González, R., Cockburn, W., Irastorza, X., Houtman, I., & Bakhuys Roozeboom, M. (2010). *European Survey of Enterprises on New and Emerging Risks Managing safety and health at work (ESENER)*. Retrieved from [https://osha.europa.eu/en/node/6745/file\\_view](https://osha.europa.eu/en/node/6745/file_view)
- Hansen, A. , Hogh, A., Persson, R., Karlson, B., Garde, A. , & Orbaek, P. (2006). Bullying at work, health outcomes, and physiological stress response. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 60, 63-72. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychores.2005.06.078

- 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, 392-408. doi: 10.1111/1748-8583.12004
- Hauge, L., Skogstad, A., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Relationships between stressful work environments and bullying: results of a large representative study. *Work & Stress*, 21, 220-242. doi:10.1080/02678370701705810
- Heenan, R. (2009). How to beat the workplace bully. *The Health Service Journal*, 119, 26.
- Hoel, H., Glasø, L., Hetland, J., Cooper, C., & Einarsen, S. (2010). Leadership style as predictors of self reported and observed workplace bullying. *British Journal of Management*, 21, 453-468. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2009.00664.x
- Hoel, H., & Einarsen, S. (2010). Shortcomings of antibullying regulations: The case of Sweden. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 19, 30-50. doi:10.1080/13594320802643665
- Johnson, S. L. (2009). International perspectives on workplace bullying among nurses: a review. *International nursing review*, 56(1), 34-40. doi: 10.1111/j.1466-7657.2008.00679.x
- Keashly, L. & Nowell, .B. L.. (2010). Workplace bullying, conflict and conflict resolution. In S. Einarsen , H. Hoel , D. Zapf and C. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: developments in theory, research and practice* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition, pp. 75-106). London: Taylor & Francis
- Kemppainen, J. (2000). The critical incident technique and nursing care quality research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 32, 1264-1271. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2648.2000.01597.x

- Laschinger, H., Wong, C. & Grau, A. (2012). The influence of authentic leadership on newly graduated nurses' experiences of workplace bullying, burnout and retention outcomes: A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 49, 1266-1276. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2012.05.012
- Leon-Perez, J. M., Medina, F. J., Arenas, A., & Munduate, L. (2015). The relationship between interpersonal conflict and workplace bullying. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30, 250-263. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JMP-01-2013-0034
- Lewis, D. (1999). Workplace bullying-interim findings of a study in further and higher education in Wales. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20, 106-119. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437729910268696
- Lewis, D., Sheehan, M., & Davies, C. (2008). Uncovering workplace bullying. *Journal of Workplace Rights*, 13, 281-301. doi: 10.2190/WR.13.3e
- Liefooghe, A., & Mackenzie-Davey, K. (2001). Accounts of workplace bullying: the role of the organization. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10, 375-392. doi:10.1080/13594320143000762
- McManus, I., Winder, B., & Gordon, D. (2002). The causal links between stress and burnout in a longitudinal study of UK doctors. *The Lancet*, 359, 2089-2090. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(02)08915-8
- Miles, M., & Huberman, A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook*. New York: Sage.
- Miller, H., & Rayner, C. (2012). The form and function of “bullying” behaviors in a strong occupational culture bullying in a UK police service. *Group & Organization Management*, 37, 347-375. doi:10.1177/1059601112449476



- Nielsen, M., & Einarsen, S. (2012). Outcomes of exposure to workplace bullying: A meta-analytic review. *Work & Stress*, 26, 309-332. doi:10.1080/02678373.2012.734709
- Nielsen, M., Notelaers, G., & Einarsen, S. (2010). Measuring exposure to workplace bullying. In S. Einarsen , H. Hoel , D. Zapf and C. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: developments in theory, research and practice* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition, pp. 149-176). London: Taylor & Francis.
- Padilla, A., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2007). The Toxic Triangle: Destructive Leaders, Susceptible Followers, and Conducive Environments. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18(3), 176-194. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.001
- Paice, E., & Smith, D. (2009). Bullying of trainee doctors is a patient safety issue. *The Clinical Teacher*, 6(1), 13-17. doi: 10.1111/j.1743-498X.2008.00251.x
- Rayner, C., & Hoel, H. (1998). A summary review of literature relating to workplace bullying. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 7, 181-191. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1298(199706)7:3<181::AID-CASP416>3.0.CO;2-Y
- Rayner, C. and Lewis, D. (2010). Managing workplace bullying: the role of policies. In S. Einarsen , H. Hoel , D. Zapf and C. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: developments in theory, research and practice* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition, pp. 327-340). London: Taylor & Francis.
- Rayner, C., and McIvor, K. (2008). *Research report on the dignity at work project*. London: Equality Challenge Unit.
- Rocker, C. (2012). Responsibility of a frontline manager regarding staff bullying. *The Online Journal of Issues in Nursing*, 18. doi:10.3912/OJIN.Vol17No03PPT02

- Royal College of Nursing (2005). *Bullying and harassment at work: a good practice guide for RCN negotiators and health care managers*. Retrieved from:  
[https://www2.rcn.org.uk/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0004/193504/000926.pdf](https://www2.rcn.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/193504/000926.pdf)
- Saam, N. (2010). Interventions in workplace bullying: A multilevel approach. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 19, 51-75. doi:  
[10.1080/13594320802651403](https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320802651403)
- 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, 1213-1232. doi:10.1080/13594320802651403
- Salin, D. (2008a). The prevention of workplace bullying as a question of human resource management: Measures adopted and underlying organizational factors. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 24, 221-231. doi:10.1016/j.scaman.2008.04.004
- Salin, D. (2008b). Organisational responses to workplace harassment: An exploratory study. *Personnel Review*, 38, 26-44. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00483480910920697
- Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M., & Hetland, H. (2007). The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12, 80. doi:10.1177/1548051813515302
- Vartia, M., & Leka, S. (2010). Interventions for the prevention and management of bullying at work. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf and C. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: developments in theory, research and practice* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition, pp. 359-380). London: Taylor & Francis.
- Zapf, D., Escartin, J., Einarsen S., Hoel, H., & Vartian, M. (2010). Empirical findings on prevalence and risk groups of bullying in the workplace. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D.

Zapf and C. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: developments in theory, research and practice* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition, pp. 75-106). London: Taylor & Francis

Zapf, D., & Gross, C. (2001). Conflict escalation and coping with workplace bullying: A replication and extension. *European journal of work and organizational psychology*, 10, 497-522. doi:10.1080/13594320143000834

## **Appendix A: Bullying and Harassment Interview schedule**

1. Have you personally experienced any bullying and harassment, from managers or from other staff, in the past year or so?
  - 1.1 If yes, was this an isolated event or did it recur a number of times?  
  
or
  - 1.2 If no, have you observed others being bullied or harassed?
2. Can you please think of a specific example of bullying or harassment and describe to me what happened? In doing so, can you please anonymise it so that individuals cannot be identified by name.
  - 2.1 What kind of people were involved?
  - 2.2 What were the causes?
  - 2.3 What were the consequences?
  - 2.4 What was the impact in terms of attitudes and behaviour on those involved (probe for changes in commitment, motivation, behaviour, morale, OCB, intention to quit)
  - 2.5 What action, if any, was taken to follow it up or make a complaint and if so, what? (If none, probe why not)
  - 2.6 What action, if any, was taken to remedy the situation or prevent it from recurring?  
  
(Probe – Did you or others take any action? If no action taken, probe why not)
  - 2.7 What effect, if any, did this instance of bullying and harassment have on the quality of service provided to patients?
3. What should be done to reduce or prevent cases like this in the future?

4. More generally, what can be done to reduce bullying and harassment by staff?
5. Bullying and harassment is just one of a number of issues that can affect your relationship with the Trust and its management. In general, how would you describe the relationship between the Trust management and staff like you?
6. Finally, to what extent does the Trust management keep you informed about policies and practices that affect the way you are treated as a member of staff or the way you do your job?

Table 1: Sample Demographics

<u>Organization</u>	<u>Division</u>	<u>Participants</u>	<u>Gender</u>	<u>Occupations</u>	<u>Involvement</u>
Acute trust	A	12	11 female 1 male	4 Admin and Clerical 4 Senior Nurses 2 Junior Nurses 1 divisional Manager 1 consultant	8 victims 1 witness 1 accused 2 management
Mental Health Trust	B	7	5 Female 2 Male	2 Admin and Clerical 1 Porter 1 Team Manager 2 Social Care Professionals 1 Administration manager	4 victims 1 witness 1 accused 1 management
Mental Health Trust	C	6	5 Female 1 Male	1 Nurse 1 Social care professional 1 Allied Health Professional 2 Team Managers 1 Secretary	3 victims 2 witnesses 1 management
Mental Health Trust	D	6	5 Female 1 Male	2 Admin and Clerical 1 AHP 1 Administration manager 1 consultant 1 Social Care Professional	6 victims

Table 2: Four Forms of Management Behaviour in Instances of Bullying

<u>Category</u>	<u>Victim</u>	<u>Witness</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. Constructive	6	3	<u>9</u>
2. Incomplete	3	3	<u>6</u>
3. Disengaged	13	0	<u>13</u>
4. Destructive	7	5	<u>12</u>
<u>Totals</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>40</u>

Figure 1: Management Responses to Bullying, Associated Behaviours and Contextual Factors at Three Levels

