

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/orgdyn

Workplace bullying: Is lack of understanding the reason for inaction?



Sara Branch, Jane Murray

At what point is the line crossed between a series of humorous work pranks and workplace bullying? This question is actually more complex than it looks. Take the very well publicized office complaint case of David Thorne and Simon Dempsey—a story that has taken social media sites and the wider Internet by storm over the last couple of years. Although it has now been revealed that the interactions between Thorne and Dempsey are somewhat fictitious (loosely based on actual interactions between the author and a previous coworker), the behaviors and their ensuing complaints provide a lens from which this question can be considered.

In this case, Dempsey makes ten formal complaints in six months all relating to the behavior of his work colleague Thorne. The complaints allege that Thorne:

1. Opened a package addressed to Dempsey which contained a T-shirt and replaced it with a pair of socks;
2. Stole Dempsey's lunch from the fridge and replaced it with a single pickle;
3. Changed the title of Dempsey's business cards to Horse Whisper;
4. Accessed Dempsey's computer and photo-shopped Justin Bieber's head onto photographs in his personal album;
5. Impersonated Dempsey on the telephone, telling an important customer that he couldn't get a job done because he "needed to take a nap."
6. Painted Dempsey's iPhone white with liquid paper;
7. Moved Dempsey's desk and personal belongings to the kitchen;
8. Accessed his computer in order to change preset hot keys and web pages;
9. Defaced a poster that Dempsey had behind his desk;
10. Sent an e-mail request from another worker's computer, resulting in Dempsey paying for fictitious company-managed swimming lessons.

BUT IS IT WORKPLACE BULLYING?

When viewed in isolation, each of the acts seem fairly innocuous and actually quite humorous, however are these behaviors workplace bullying? When examining the range of comments that have been posted online in response to this case, there seems to be a blurring as to the answer to this question. Some hold Thorne up on a pedestal hailing him as "the world's most brilliantly obnoxious coworker," calling him "heroic" and "legendary." Others however, do not agree and identify Thorne as a "jerk" and a "bully." Dempsey does not fare well either. Comments such as "Simon needs to grow a pair," "I really think he has it coming," "what a whinge bag," and "he deserved every bit of being trolled" demonstrate how many perceive Dempsey as being the problem.

A further topic of discussion that divides Internet commentators in this case is the appropriateness of the behaviors Thorne subjected Dempsey to. Some believe the behaviors are inappropriate, posting comments such as "Eventually the good employee will leave and the company will have to deal with the office bully. The lack of discipline on the bully makes this a hostile work environment"; "poison"; and "David is a bully from what I can see" to those that believe the behaviors simply constitute funny work pranks, noting, "It's amusing to me that people use words like 'bully.' This is piss taking all the way!"

While Thorne and Dempsey's interactions are only loosely based on actual events, many of us may have seen or heard of similar behaviors occurring in our own workplaces. Indeed, the recent and high profile case of bullying in the NFL (National Football League) has also undoubtedly raised questions as to what constitutes workplace bullying? In this case, a young player from the Miami Dolphins football team (Jonathan Martin) was systematically targeted by several other players for over a year. Martin was constantly subjected

to racial and homophobic slurs, called a “bitch” for the entire season by another player, and subjected to sexually graphic language and gestures toward his sister (whom the perpetrators incidentally had never met) and mother. These insults came in the form of verbal and physical abuse as well as text messages sent to his cell phone. By the end of October 2013, Martin could take no more and vowed to leave the club if he was subjected to any further bullying behavior (by this time he had been prescribed antidepressants by a psychiatrist and his mental wellbeing was jeopardized). But the abuse did not stop. On the contrary, Martin continued to be relentlessly mocked. Then on the evening of October 28, after being told he was not welcome to join his teammates for dinner and having his meal tray thrown to the floor when he tried, Martin checked himself into hospital for psychiatric treatment. NFL-appointed investigator Ted Wells later found that three team members had engaged in harassment of their fellow players for more than a year.

What both cases demonstrate is that there is no clear consensus as to where the line is crossed between workplace banter (or team comradery) and workplace bullying. Furthermore, many individuals do not think that workplace bullying is something that could happen in today’s organization, let alone in a football club. Take for example the comments of Marshall Faulk (Pro Football Hall of Famer—Class of 2011; 2000 NFL MVP) on the NFL “GameDay Morning” show (Culture of NFL locker rooms) on the 3rd of November 2013, who stated:

I just didn’t think [an] adult could be bullied by another adult—I just felt like that was a kid thing.

As researchers, we are not surprised at this. In our own research, we have found that many individuals do not understand what workplace bullying is—especially when they have never been subjected to bullying. Importantly, they also do not know what it is not. In this article we attempt to provide some clarity on this topic for managers and workers in the hope that it will raise awareness and spur action to prevent more cases such as Dempsey and Martins’ from occurring.

WORKPLACE BULLYING AND ITS EFFECTS

Research released in 2014 estimates that approximately 27 percent of the U.S. workforce has been (20 percent) or are being (7 percent) subjected to workplace bullying. A further 21 percent of workers report they have witnessed it. When combined, these figures suggest that almost half the U.S. workforce has had some experience with bullying in the workplace. Whatever term you use—bullying, mobbing, emotional abuse, workplace incivility, employee abuse, general harassment—being subjected to this type of behavior can have a devastating effect on those who are targeted, not to mention the flow-on effect for bystanders (affected in many cases as much as the target) and the work environment in general.

INDIVIDUAL EFFECTS

Over 20 years of research has consistently demonstrated the severe, long-term negative effects of workplace bullying on these three groups. For Dempsey and Martin the short-term

effects could have included increased anxiety and panic attacks, and a reduction in self-esteem, attendance at work, productivity and overall wellbeing. Long-term effects comprise stress related symptoms similar to post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), depression, and in more extreme cases suicide. Indeed, Martin was affected so badly that he was prescribed anti-depressants, required psychiatric assistance, and twice contemplated suicide. Negative outcomes for bystanders (witnesses) include fear of being the next target (would you want to be the next Dempsey or Martin?), guilt and shame for not wanting to get involved in the conflict, or more generally they are affected because they have to work in what can become a very toxic environment.

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTS

Naturally, these negative effects also lead to substantial organizational costs. Absenteeism from work due to stress and anxiety and poor productivity is not uncommon. Reduced job satisfaction and higher intention to leave are well-documented consequences. Furthermore, there is the cost of relocating or retraining when individuals transfer to another team or leave the organization all together (commonly targets leave). Indeed, estimates from around the world repeatedly find that the financial costs of bullying to business are substantial (up to \$100,000 per annum for each bullied individual). Workplace bullying therefore deserves our understanding, attention and action.

WORKPLACE BULLYING—WHAT IT IS AND WHAT IT IS NOT

Still the question remains—what is workplace bullying? Can the interaction between Thorne and Dempsey be classed as workplace bullying? Was there a point where the taunts that Martin was subjected to turned from locker-room antics to bullying? Take some time to think about what you would consider to be bullying in the workplace and if YOU perceive what happened to Dempsey and Martin was bullying?

From an academic perspective, workplace bullying occurs when an individual experiences a number of negative behaviors repeatedly over a period of time (a pattern of similar or different behaviors over a period of about six months). Commonly, a single episode of negative behavior is not considered to be bullying unless that singular action results in continuing ramifications or ongoing threat for the target.

Also important when defining workplace bullying is the presence of a power imbalance, that is, one party is at a disadvantage or unable to protect or shield themselves from the bullying. However, when two (or more) individuals are experiencing an ongoing conflict and all parties feel they have an equal power base in the conflict—then this is not bullying. It is important to note that a power imbalance can develop over time and be a direct reaction to the persistent inappropriate behavior of the alleged perpetrator. The case of Martin is a clear example of this.

To illustrate this point, we use the analogy of an empty backpack. Imagine that you are wearing an empty pack on your back. It’s very light and easily carried for a very long time. Now imagine a little bit of weight (an insult, a practical joke, or criticism of your work) is added to your pack—still not a real

issue, is it? You could probably continue to carry that pack for a long time. But now imagine that when you went to work weight continued to be added now and then (through say exclusion, intimidation, and/or focusing on your inadequacies). Soon you would start to feel the extra weight and inevitably over time, there would come a point where you would not be able to manage—something would have to give.

In addition to this, the behaviors tend to escalate both in terms of frequency and the nature of the behaviors. Often it begins with occasional, covert behaviors that gradually increase in frequency and in doing so, become more overt (progressively heavier weights are placed more often into your backpack).

What this analogy demonstrates is that while a power imbalance may not exist at the beginning of the conflict (Martin most likely thought he could handle the insults and banter or thought it was all good fun, at the beginning) they can develop over time. These can be directly attributed to the bullying behavior (things became so bad for Martin, he quit).

So, now that we have given an overview of what workplace bullying is, where does your original definition sit within this classification? It isn't easy. To add to the complexity of this problem regrettably the term "bullying" is now used so regularly that there is understandable confusion as to what bullying is, what it is not and that adults can be bullies. Indeed, we suggest that regular use of the term "workplace bullying" can dilute perceptions of its severity and result in a lack of understanding of central definitional elements. In particular, the repeated and sustained nature of bullying behavior is often not considered. This leads to a blurring of the line between one-off inappropriate acts and unacceptable behaviors that form a pattern of behavior. This is a vital point. It is the repeated and persistent nature of workplace bullying that substantially affects targets, and sets it clearly apart from other forms of aggressive behavior.

These differences in understanding undoubtedly pose a problem for those who are tasked with addressing this issue. If individual perceptions of this phenomenon can vary so considerably, is it any wonder that it is so hard to address in the workplace?

WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT THE CAUSES OF WORKPLACE BULLYING?

Workplace bullying should not be characterized as simply a misuse of authority, or interpersonal conflict—it is considerably more complex than that. Normally it is portrayed as a conflict that occurs between a more powerful individual (often perceived as the manager) and a less powerful counterpart (usually perceived as the subordinate). However, bullying can occur between colleagues and even in an upward direction (subordinates bullying their managers and/or supervisors), suggesting more complicated power dynamics are at play. Workplace bullying is multi-dimensional with individual characteristics of targets, perpetrators and bystanders as well as the work environment itself (stress, organizational change etc.) all contributing, synergistically, to its occurrence and escalation.

Bullying is often portrayed as a conflict between individuals, with the role that the work environment plays commonly not recognized. Recent discussions suggest that our

Capitalist society may inadvertently be encouraging workplace bullying. From this perspective the constant quest for dollars and kudos and "only the toughest will survive" mentality may be flourishing in organizations. Under these conditions, inaction may occur when managers and workers behave inappropriately, as there is a perception that these behaviors may actually assist the organization to more efficiently meet its objectives (although when the human and financial costs of workplace bullying are considered this is not true). Of course, the work environment is not the only reason why workplace bullying occurs. It is, however, often forgotten in favor of viewing the issue as an interpersonal conflict.

WORKPLACE BULLYING AND THE LAW

So where does workplace bullying currently stand from a legal perspective? According to research with targets, 81 percent of U.S. employers are either resisting doing anything, or doing nothing at all about workplace bullying. In addition, 44.8 percent of workers with no experience of workplace bullying report inaction by their organizations when it occurs. This may be attributable to there currently being no U.S. state or Federal laws in force to address this phenomenon. Encouragingly however, 29 states (the first of these being California) and two U.S. territories (Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands) have introduced the "Healthy Workplace" bill, that seeks to create a "civility code" for organizations to follow. With potential fines for employers who are found liable of bullying of \$25,000 (New York State example), there is a growing incentive for organizations to become more proactive in their anti-bullying efforts. Unfortunately however, these proposed laws are yet to be enacted.

Where individuals have successfully sought legal recourse it has generally been because the episode was proved to be related to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Act outlaws discrimination or harassment relating to a person's race, color, disability, age, religion, gender or sexual orientation. Therefore, if a target is unable to demonstrate that the bullying they are experiencing relates to at least one protected category, he or she currently has little legal recourse (so someone like Dempsey would find it difficult to win a case). An example of this occurred in California, where a target's case was only successful (receiving \$340,000) because it was demonstrated they had also been subjected to sexual discrimination.

Some targets have been successful using state law. In these instances, the targets were able to demonstrate exposure to intentional emotional distress or negligence on the part of the employer (receiving substantial six-figure amounts). While there may have only been a handful of cases to date, targets will continue to seek legal recourse. Thus there are increasingly strong incentives for employers and organizations to proactively take action.

WHAT CAN BE DONE TO ADDRESS WORKPLACE BULLYING?

One of the most common approaches organizations use to tackle bullying in the workplace is to have a "dignity at work" policy or similar (used by a number of U.K. based organizations including Coca-Cola, AXA Insurance, British

Table 1 Possible Interventions Based on Formal–Informal; Primary–Secondary–Tertiary Models.

	Primary	Secondary	Tertiary
Formal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies and codes of conduct • Risk audit • Workplace bullying awareness workshops • Training for all staff on how to respond to bullying 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contact support officers • Targets keep a diary • Incident reports • Prompt investigation into incidents • Employee Assistance Program (EPA)—Counseling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grievance policies and procedures • Conferencing or mediation processes • Support for all parties • Re-design aspects of the workplace
Informal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing respectful behaviors in the workplace • Modeling of respectful behavior by management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social support for targets and witnesses • Bystanders stepping in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conscious/unconscious reinforcement of respectful actions e.g., don't engage in gossip

Telecom and The Royal Mail). The effectiveness of such policies however, is unclear. While some research indicates a workplace bullying policy is beneficial for giving individuals a clear understanding of behaviors that will not be tolerated, others have found it makes little difference. We recommend that any policy be accompanied by a comprehensive training and development program including interventions such as awareness training and/or skills' training, and the active development of a positive work environment. While policy alone can only communicate the type of desired behavior and the consequences for behaving otherwise, interventions can be used alongside policy to create long-term behavior and cultural change.

PRIMARY, SECONDARY AND TERTIARY INTERVENTIONS

Workplace bullying interventions are often classed as formal or informal. Further, they are delineated in terms of whether they occur before, during or after a bullying episode (see Table 1 for examples of these classifications). Many suggest there is too much reliance on formal responses. Indeed, in some cases action to address an incident may be delayed as the organization mandates that a formal complaint must be made before any action can be undertaken (is this what happened in the Thorne and Dempsey case?). Unfortunately, to the target this is often seen as “too little, too late,” because by this point the bullying behavior has escalated to a point where everyone loses. Organizations that are serious about “doing the right thing” must undertake a more proactive and informal approach as soon as the threat of workplace bullying is evident. We have found addressing inappropriate behavior early and taking a “no blame” approach can be a very successful way of resolving conflict before it escalates into bullying.

Primary Interventions

With regard to primary or preventative interventions, one example of a formal approach to addressing workplace bullying may be an audit of the workplace that highlights areas where bullying may be occurring or could occur. Informal preventative approaches may involve uncovering practices and day-to-day behaviors that tolerate and accept bullying-type behavior in our workplaces. One such intervention is the Civility, Respect and Engagement in the Workplace (CREW)

initiative, introduced by the Veterans Healthcare Administration (for the Department of Veteran Affairs) and the National Center for Organization Development (NCOD). This program seeks to cultivate a respectful work environment that rejects aggressive and inappropriate behavior. It is not a “bullying program,” but a program that encourages positive behavior within the workplace by reducing the acceptance of inappropriate behaviors and increasing the potential for positive interactions to occur.

Secondary Interventions

Formal secondary interventions (implemented during an incident of inappropriate behavior) can include the target seeking support from an independent contact person either within the organization (e.g., contact officer) or externally through an employee assistance program. Advice to targets can include that they keep a diary, noting the behaviors experienced including dates, times, places, who and what was said or done and if there were any witnesses. Furthermore, formal incident reports can be prepared that result in investigation of the bullying accusation (this is what Dempsey did). Ideally any investigation should be completed promptly with concern for the wellbeing of all, including targets and alleged perpetrators, and natural justice at the forefront.

Alternatively, secondary informal approaches can be through the social support that targets and witnesses (even perpetrators) receive from each other or from others within and external to the organization. Ideally if primary interventions, such as training of positive behaviors and what to do when confronted by bullying behavior, have been implemented effectively, bystanders may feel more equipped to step in and de-escalate incidents. This informal intervention can then be followed up more formally to identify if the behavior is part of a pattern of bullying and if further intervention is necessary to resolve the conflict.

Tertiary Interventions

Finally, when an incident of bullying has been identified, tertiary interventions can include grievance and disciplinary procedures. Conferencing as part of a restorative practices approach or mediation between the parties may also be used. It is worth noting however that, due to the power dynamics that occur within workplace bullying, fierce debate surrounds the suitability of mediation in all cases. Employee assistance

Table 2 Five Most Often Experienced Behaviors by Bullying Classification and Position.

Non-targets		Targets	
Team members (n = 517)	Managers (n = 372)	Team members (n = 78)	Managers (n = 47)
1. Being ignored or excluded (22.4%)	1. Being ignored or excluded (23.4%)	1. Having your opinions ignored (84.6%)	1. Having your opinions ignored (83.0%)
2. Having your opinions ignored (21.9%)	2. Having your opinions ignored (23.4%)	2. <i>Being shouted at (83.3%)</i>	2. Spreading of gossip or rumors about you (78.7%)
3. Being ordered to do work below your level of experience (19.7%)	3. Someone withholding information that affects your performance (21.8%)	3. Being ignored or excluded (78.2%)	3. Being ignored or excluded (74.5%)
4. <i>Being shouted at (17.2%)</i>	4. Being given tasks with unreasonable deadlines (21.2%)	4. Being ignored or facing a hostile reaction when you approach (78.2%)	4. Being humiliated or ridiculed in relation to your work (74.5%)
5. Someone withholding information that affects your performance (16.6%)	5. <i>Being shouted at (20.7%)</i>	5. Being humiliated or ridiculed in connection with your work (76.9%)	5. Repeated Reminders of your errors or mistakes (72.3%)

Note. Percentages were derived from the number of participants from that group who had been subjected to the behavior. Behaviors in bold were experience by all groups, behaviors in italics were experience by three of the groups.

programs can also offer formal support for targets (e.g., counseling) and perpetrators (e.g., coaching). Furthermore, due to the part that an organization's culture can play with regard to supporting the occurrence of bullying, some re-design of the workplace, such as, physical design, job design, or procedures may be warranted. Informally others within the workplace can continue to reinforce and model respectful behaviors.

ARE MANAGERS/MANAGEMENT DOING ENOUGH?

Despite all that is known about workplace bullying we find ourselves asking the same questions again and again—*Why are so many people experiencing such terrible behavior in our workplaces? Why aren't we doing more to address it?* Targets of workplace bullying often report they feel unsupported by their bosses and/or the organization (remember the 81 percent statistic noted earlier?). Some perceive that managers fail to act because they just want to “sweep the issue under the carpet” and make it go away. While this might be true for some, our research has found evidence indicating that something else may be occurring. Our research suggests that until you have experienced workplace bullying yourself, you simply don't know what it is like, and therefore may fail to respond with the urgency it deserves.

The following analogy demonstrates this point more clearly:

There are very few people who would not agree that placing your hand on the racks of a hot oven would be extremely painful—however until you actually experience the searing heat of your skin coming into contact with hot metal, you cannot really comprehend just how much it does actually hurt, or more importantly how long it will take for you to recover.

Our research suggests that this is exactly what is happening with workplace bullying—and it's not just managers who don't seem to comprehend the hurt that it can cause. We have identified that coworkers with no experience of workplace

bullying also seem to have the same blind spot. So is it any wonder, that despite nearly 20 years of research, bullying still frequently occurs? In the remainder of this article we demonstrate through research evidence that it may be this disconnect in understanding that is thwarting efforts to stamp out bullying in our own workplaces.

INVESTIGATING PERCEPTIONS

We explored this notion by conducting research that investigated perceptions of the severity of workplace bullying behaviors. Our sample consisted of 1014 individuals (509 males; 505 females) from a range of industries in the U.S.A. Using a conservative definition of bullying (i.e., targets were classified only if they had experienced two or more inappropriate behaviors at least weekly for a period of six months) we categorized our sample. In total, 112 (12.3 percent) individuals were identified as targets of workplace bullying. Just over one third were managers, and the remainder were team members. The non-target group consisted of 372 managers and 517 team members.

We sought to find out at what rate targets and non-targets experience behaviors that have been shown to be characteristic of workplace bullying. The behaviors experienced most often are presented in Table 2. While there were similarities with the behaviors experienced across the groups (most of which are subtle and could be seen as covert in nature), bullied managers and team members experienced these behaviors almost four times as often as non-bullied individuals. This underscores the repeated nature of workplace bullying. Coincidentally, the behaviors that our bullied team members reported experiencing seem to mirror the behaviors experienced by Martin from the Miami Dolphins.

In addition, we sought to determine whether the behaviors that are experienced the most are also perceived to be the most severe in impact (see Table 3). What is most telling is that while individuals with no experience of bullying view overt and aggressive actions as the most severe, targets report actions that prevent them from performing their work duties effectively as being the most impactful. Interestingly,

Table 3 Five Most Severe Behaviors as Perceived by Bullying Classification, Position, and Experience of the Behavior.

Perception of severity by non-targets with no experience of the behavior		Perception of severity by targets with experience of the behavior	
Team Members	Managers	Team Members	Managers
1. Threats of violence or abuse or actual physical abuse (Mean = 1.92, MS)	1. Threats of violence or abuse or actual physical abuse (Mean = 1.91, MS)	1. Someone withholding information which affects your performance (Mean = 2.55, ES)	1. Being exposed to an unmanageable workload (Mean = 2.66, ES)
2. Being shouted at (Mean = 1.90, MS)	2. Having insulting or offensive remarks (Mean = 1.84, MS)	2. Excessive monitoring of your work (Mean = 2.47, ES)	2. Being given tasks with unreasonable deadlines (Mean = 2.66, ES)
3. Being humiliated (Mean = 1.89, MS)	3. Being humiliated (Mean = 1.83, MS)	3. Being shouted at (Mean = 2.46, ES)	3. Having insulting or offensive remarks (Mean = 2.63, ES)
4. Having insulting or offensive remarks (Mean = 1.88, MS)	4. Intimidating behaviors (1.83, MS)	4. Being ignored or excluded (2.46, ES)	4. Being humiliated (Mean = 2.60, ES)
5. Having allegations made against you (Mean = 1.86, MS)	5. Being shouted at (Mean = 1.81, MS)	5. Being humiliated (Mean = 2.42, ES)	5. Being ignored or facing a hostile reaction (Mean = 2.60, ES)

Note. Means are on a 3 point Likert-type scale where 1 = not at all severe and 3 = extremely severe. MS = ranked as moderately severe; ES = ranked as extremely severe.

we found similar results when a parallel study was conducted with 1052 Australian workers.

DOES EXPERIENCE MATTER?

We suggest that these differences may relate to individual experience (or lack) of the behaviors. For instance, an individual with no regular experience of being subjected to behaviors, such as *withholding information* or *being exposed to an unmanageable workload*, may find it difficult to understand how severe the behavior can be for the recipient. On the other hand, for that same non-target *threats of violence* or *actual physical abuse* are easily considered as severe (or in the case of our non-targets moderately severe). Perhaps a reason for this

is because we are taught from a very early age (and constantly reminded in the media) that this type of behavior is unacceptable?

What these results also show is that there is a clear difference in perceptions of the harmfulness of workplace bullying behaviors. Even the worst behavior according to non-targets (*threats of violence* or *actual physical abuse*) is perceived as moderately severe. Furthermore, we found that non-targets rate the impact of this behavior as less severe than any of the other behaviors identified by targets. Even more informative is that non-target managers (managers who have no experience of workplace bullying) rate the harmfulness of workplace bullying behaviors as having less impact than any other group. Table 4 clearly shows this tendency.

Table 4 Mean Severity Perceptions of the Behaviors Perceived as Most Severe by Target-Team Members and Target-Managers with an Experience of the Behavior.

	Non-targets with no experience of the behavior—severity perceptions		Targets with experience of the behavior—severity perceptions	
	Team members	Managers	Team members	Managers
Behaviors perceived as most severe by target-team members				
1. Someone withholding information	Moderate	Moderate	Extreme	Extreme
2. Excessive monitoring of your work	Moderate	Moderate	Extreme	Extreme
3. Being shouted at	Moderate	Moderate	Extreme	Extreme
4. Being ignored or excluded	Moderate	Moderate	Extreme	Extreme
5. Being humiliated	Moderate	Moderate	Extreme	Extreme
Behaviors perceived as most severe by target-managers				
1. Being exposed to an unmanageable workload	Moderate	Moderate	Extreme	Extreme
2. Being given tasks with unreasonable deadlines	Moderate	Moderate	Extreme	Extreme
3. Having insulting or offensive remarks	Moderate	Moderate	Extreme	Extreme
4. Being humiliated	Moderate	Moderate	Extreme	Extreme
5. Being ignored or facing a hostile reaction	Moderate	Moderate	Extreme	Extreme

Note. Light gray shading = lowest severity mean for that behavior; dark gray shading = highest severity mean for that behavior; moderate = perceived as moderately severe; extreme = perceived as extremely severe.

EXPERIENCE MATTERS!

Earlier in the article we reported that 81 percent of workplace bullying targets feel as if little or nothing is done by their bosses to deal with it. Could the results presented in this paper provide a reason as to why this is occurring—that managers without their own personal experiences of workplace bullying just don't realize how much targets are being affected? Our research suggests that even the occasional experience of inappropriate behavior is not enough for someone (teammate or manager) to fully comprehend the harm that workplace bullying does.

We suggest the difference in perceptions relate directly to a person's understanding of how severe or destructive workplace bullying can be, and that this (unfortunately) can only come from direct and ongoing experience. This lack of understanding may then lead to inaction (by managers and co-workers) because they just don't get what workplace bullying is, how bad it can get, and the need for prompt action! This is especially important when the practical implications for effective responses to incidents of bullying or the implementation of prevention programs are considered. In short, if non-target managers do not fully comprehend what workplace bullying is, how can we expect them to devise and execute appropriate responses and implement successful prevention programs?

A comment by past NFL player and now commentator Michael Irvin (Pro Football Hall of Fame—Class of 2007; five time Pro Bowl selection) on the NFL "GameDay Morning" show (Culture of NFL locker rooms) on the 3rd of November, 2013, emphasizes this point.

As a leader in the locker room if I feel that it's going too far I am going to say something, so I cannot imagine no one in that locker room saying a word and watch this thing go too far. So I don't know where it lies, does it lie on the guys in the locker room, does it lie on Mr Martin and his sensitivity, I don't know where it lies, but it is hard for me as a leader to imagine it.

We would suggest that Michael Irvin is not alone, and that many people within a range of organizations and professions find workplace bullying hard to understand. Correspondence bias or attribution error is one way of explaining the different perceptions of targets and non-targets. Within this view, those who are not directly involved in a situation cannot fully comprehend its impact, leading to invisibility and construal problems. Thus, if those who have not experienced workplace bullying are not able to recognize the situation as bullying (the invisibility problem), how would they be able to understand it as the target sees it (the construal problem) and act accordingly?

THE SOLUTION

So how can we overcome this bias and expect managers (and others) to respond with the urgency that bullying requires? We believe that more needs to be done to assist non-targets to understand the harmful affect workplace bullying creates. Key to this, we believe, comes through highlighting and reinforcing the major definitional element—the enduring and repeated nature of the inappropriate behaviors. The

question is, can primary prevention efforts such as the implementation of a new written policy or a half-day awareness-building seminar achieve permanent change in understanding and perceptions? We suggest NO.

We do propose however, that a comprehensive awareness program is required. Such a program may look something like this: First individuals need to be trained in what bullying is and, importantly, what it is not. In line with our research findings, emphasis should be made that not all bullying behaviors are easy to recognize, and that the behaviors that we might think may cause the most harm are not sometimes the worst for recipients (and vice versa). Participants should also be introduced to the more insidious and subtle nature of bullying, highlighting that behaviors such as someone withholding information from you, excessive monitoring of your work, being exposed to an unmanageable workload or being ignored by others when they occur regularly and in combination with each other can have a crippling effect on targets. Thus, the repeated and cumulative effect of bullying on individuals as well as how this affects targets needs to be reinforced.

In addition, the escalating nature of bullying and the correlating decline in the target's ability to function (remember the backpack analogy?) needs to be highlighted and demonstrated in a range of ways to participants. This means going beyond showing a video of people talking about bullying and rather engaging participants in activities that demonstrate the effect of repeated inappropriate behaviors on an individual (the previously presented backpack activity can be very effective for demonstrating this). We believe this approach will debunk some of the commonly held myths of workplace bullying and reduce the overuse of the term to describe any incident of inappropriate or intimidating behavior in the workplace.

Importantly, a comprehensive training program that seeks to increase participants' understanding of bullying needs to occur within each level of the organization, including those at the very top. But as our study demonstrates, those who are expected to respond and manage cases of bullying or model positive behaviors may not understand the severity of the phenomenon (unless they have previously on the receiving end of such behaviors). Those who are responsible within the organization for responding to an accusation of bullying or for offering support, be they managers or contact officers, must take concerns about bullying seriously.

Indeed, if organizations want to eradicate (as far as possible) workplace bullying, substantial resources and time need to be invested not just into training but also into organizational structures, procedures and policies. In doing this, organizations will make all members of the workforce responsible for addressing workplace bullying as well as other similar inappropriate behaviors. Ideally we suggest organizations move to adopting a primary prevention approach that addresses bullying and the culture that condones it. Programs such as the Civility, Respect and Engagement in the Workplace (CREW) initiative can be very effective. In this program constructive interpersonal interactions are developed rather than concentrating on the reduction of inappropriate behaviors.

As part of such an initiative, staff from all levels of the organization would engage in skills development that enhances their interpersonal competencies. For instance,

as performance management is a potential trigger for accusations of bullying, training could focus not just on how to give constructive feedback but also how to receive performance-related feedback. In this way the focus of preventing workplace bullying is not on just developing individuals' interpersonal skills but also on the processes within the organization.

This is where we hit the biggest "Catch 22." How can there be organizational change if some who can influence change within the organization (non-target management) do not understand how bad workplace bullying can actually be? This is where we hope this article and others like it will

influence understanding of the complexity of workplace bullying as well as the damaging effects it can have on a wide range of people within organizations and their bottom-line. We implore organizations to take on this significant challenge so that targets such as Dempsey and Martin do not have to endure the severe and ongoing impacts that workplace bullying can cause.



To order reprints of this article, please
e-mail reprints@elsevier.com



SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

For a comprehensive review of all aspects of workplace bullying, including what it is, contributing factors and the effects see: S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, and C. Cooper, eds., *Bullying and Harassment in the Workplace: Developments in Theory, Research, and Practice*, 2nd ed. (London: Taylor & Francis Group, 2011); and S. Branch, S. Ramsay, and M. Barker, "Workplace Bullying, Mobbing and General Harassment: A Review", *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 2013, 15(3), 280–299.

For more on the definition of workplace bullying and how lay people also define workplace bullying, see: S. Branch, "You Say Tomatoe and I Say Tomato: Can We Differentiate Between Workplace Bullying and Other Counterproductive Behaviours?" *International Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 2008, 13(2), 4–17; and P. Saunders, A. Huynh, and J. Goodman-Delahunty, "Defining Workplace Bullying Behaviour: Professional Lay Definitions of Workplace Bullying", *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 2007, 30(4–5), 340–354.

Further information relating to the David Thorne and Simon Dempsey story can be found at: <http://www.27bslash6.com/f26a.html>; <http://happyplace.someecards.com/workplace/david-thorne-makes-co-workers-life-a-living-hell/>. In addition, details surrounding the Miami Dolphins NFL case can be found at: <http://www.nytimes.com/>

2014/02/15/sports/football/investigation-finds-pattern-of-harassment-in-dolphins-locker-room.html?_r=0.

Figures of the number of U.S. people bullied were obtained from the results of a 2014 survey conducted by the Workplace Bullying Institute and can be found at: <http://www.workplacebullying.org/wbiresearch/wbi-2014-us-survey/>. Information about the percentage of employers acting to address workplace bullying was drawn from the Workplace Bullying Institute and can be accessed at: <http://www.workplacebullying.org/2012/04/20/effectiveness/>.

For a review of a comprehensive intervention program refer to: S. Branch, J. Murray, and S. Ramsay, "Workplace Bullying: What Can Be Done To Prevent and Manage It?", in: B. Ben-scooter, ed., *The Encyclopaedia of Human Resource Management, Volume III: Critical and Emerging Issues in Human Resource Management* (San Francisco: Pfeiffer/Jossey-Bass, 2012), 181–196). Further details of the Dignity at Work Project and how organizations can incorporate dignity at work policies can be found at <http://www.dignityatwork.org/>. Be Intent (www.beintent.com/bullying) is a company that specializes in providing workplace bullying audits to over 300 organizations.

A comprehensive review of correspondence bias and attribution theory was presented by Daniel T. Gilbert and Patrick S. Malone in "The Correspondence Bias", *Psychological Bulletin*, 1995, 117(1), 21–38.

Sara Branch is a research fellow at the Griffith Criminology Institute, Griffith University, Australia. For over ten years she has researched upwards bullying and the broader topic of workplace bullying with a particular interest in how best to prevent and reduce the harm workplace bullying can do to people and organizations. Her current research interests includes the application of the CREATE model to collaborative prevention (Griffith Criminology Institute, Griffith University, Queensland, Australia. Tel.: +61 07 3735 5666; fax: +61 07 3735 6985; e-mail: s.branch@griffith.edu.au).

Jane P. Murray is an adjunct assistant professor of management at Bond Business School, Bond University, Australia, where she teaches organizational behavior, human resource management and negotiation. Jane's research interests include the training of emotional intelligence within organizations and examining the impacts of workplace bullying. Prior to entering academia, Jane worked as a trainer for one of Australia's largest banks (Faculty of Business, Bond University, Queensland, Australia. Tel.: +61 0423 596992; fax: +61 07 5595 1160; e-mail: jmurray@bond.edu.au).