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ABSTRACT

The main objective of this study was to investigate the relationships between a number of previously identified predictors of targets and perpetrators of workplace bullying. A total of 760 employees from diverse occupations in two unionized public organizations completed a series of questionnaires, including the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised (Einarsen, Hoel, & Notelaers, 2009). Thirty-eight percent of the sample were targets and seven percent were perpetrators of workplace bullying on a regular basis over the past year. Hierarchical multiple regression analyses showed that individual characteristics, job characteristics, leadership, organizational culture, and being a perpetrator each significantly predicted the criterion of targets’ experiences of workplace bullying explaining 57% of the variance in the dependent variable. The same variables were examined (with the exception of replacing perpetrator with being a target) in relation to the criterion of perpetrators’ experiences of workplace bullying. Results were significant for all groupings of variables and accounted for a total variance of 32%. Distinct significant predictors for each model are also reported. This study not only provides empirical support that this phenomenon is prevalent in Canada, but also presents parsimonious models for explaining workplace bullying from the perspectives of targets and perpetrators. Contributions, limitations, and future directions are discussed.

Keywords: workplace bullying, psychological harassment, harassment, predictors, risk factors, targets, perpetrators, hierarchical multiple regressions.
DEDICATION

To Mikaël & Alexis

L’éducation, sous toutes ses facettes, est la clé de la réussite.
PREFACE

For the past two decades, I have been intrigued by human behaviour, especially in the workplace context. Having had at least one source of income since the age of fifteen, I have experienced numerous jobs in both the private and public sectors. In this time, I have experienced, witnessed, and listened to situations that were rather disrespectful, counterproductive, and sometimes, downright malicious. In reflecting upon these experiences, I often question people’s motives for their lack of interpersonal “kindness”, when being cordial and respectful to others tends to result in more positive outcomes. Better understanding the nature of negative workplace conduct has become my vocation; on the one hand, helping those in need of support, and on the other, trying to create more civil workplaces. It is with dedication and passion that I continue helping people in creating healthier and more respectful workplaces, one conversation at a time.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

1.1 Introduction

One of the most negative and harmful aspects of harassment is its psychological form often referred to as workplace bullying (Hershcovis & Barling, 2008). As a relatively new topic in industrial and organizational psychology research\(^1\), workplace bullying has been identified as the most common type of workplace harassment (Di Martino, Hoel, & Cooper, 2003; Employment and Social Development Canada, 2017). Prevalence rates are typically higher in North America (i.e., 27% - 59%; Carroll & Hoel, 2007; Carroll & Lauzier, 2014; Carroll & Mendelson, 2017; Keashly & Jagatic, 2000; Out, 2005; Soares, 2002) than in Europe (i.e., 3–15%; Zapf, Escartin, Einarsen, Hoel, & Vartia, 2011). Numerous studies in the literature have demonstrated that workplace bullying is prevalent and often has devastating consequences for individuals and organizations (see Einarsen, 2005; Nielsen & Einarsen, 2012). What seems less evident are the risk factors\(^2\) associated with the occurrence of workplace bullying (Branch, Ramsay, & Barker, 2013; Einarsen, 2005; Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2007; Lutgen-Sandvik, Namie, & Namie, 2009). More specifically, many studies to date have tended

---

\(^1\) Industrial and organizational (I/O) psychology is the psychology applied to the world of work; it is the scientific study of human behaviour within their work context. The framework of this research stems from I/O psychology and is interdisciplinary in nature by combining the disciplines of I/O psychology, organizational behaviour, and human resources.

\(^2\) Despite that the term antecedent seems to be the most frequently term used in the literature when referring to contributing factors of workplace bullying, it was decided that risk factor and predictor are best suited in order to avoid any confusion that could imply causality; given the objectives and types of analyses utilized in this research. Both terms are thus used interchangeably.
to focus more on the consequences of workplace bullying and less on the predictors of
this counterproductive workplace behaviour (Neall & Tuckey, 2014).

Studies examining the predictors of workplace bullying can be classified into the
following two main perspectives (Baillien, Rodriguez-Muñoz, Van den Broeck, & De
Witte, 2011; Skogstad, Torsheim, Einarsen, & Hauge, 2011a): 1) individual
characteristics of the target (Coyne, Seigne, & Randall, 2000) and of the perpetrator
(Glasø, Matthiesen, Nielsen, & Einarsen, 2007), and 2) organizational characteristics
(Hauge et al., 2007; Leymann, 1996; Vartia-Väänänen, 2003; Zapf, 1999). Often
referred to as the work environment hypothesis in the literature, job and organizational
factors seem to have more research support as predictors of workplace bullying as
opposed to individual factors (e.g., traits) of either targets, and those especially of
perpetrators (Skogstad et al., 2011). In fact, studies examining perpetrators’
characteristics are very limited (e.g., Baillien, Rodriguez-Muñoz, et al., 2011; De
Cuyper, Baillien, & De Witte, 2009; Samnani & Singh, 2012).

Many authors suggested that workplace bullying is likely a multi-causal
phenomenon (Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2011; Vartia, 1996; Zapf, 1999); yet
studies have typically focused on either the individual or the organizational
characteristics (Salin & Hoel, 2011; Zapf & Einarsen, 2011); and only a few have
investigated these two perspectives simultaneously (Balducci, Fracaroli, & Schaufeli,
2011; Giorgi, Ando, Arenas, Shoss, & Leon-Perez, 2013). Further, a relatively new
dimension in the literature that has been explored by just a few studies (Brotheridge,
consists of examining the situational variable of being a target or a perpetrator as a
predictor of workplace bullying. Ultimately, no known published studies specifically on workplace bullying have investigated numerous predicting factors from both perspectives simultaneously in the same study in addition to integrating the situational variable of being a target or a perpetrator. Furthermore, Hauge et al. (2007) highlighted that only a handful of studies have examined some organizational characteristics as predictors of bullying, and that most used correlational analyses rather than multivariate regression analyses; thus not allowing determination of the relative strength of these various factors.

The main purpose of the current study is to solidify and enhance our knowledge base to better answer the question, “Why workplace bullying occurs?” Further, by simultaneously assessing multiple variables from multiple perspectives, the current work aims to identify the factors that best predict targets and perpetrators of bullying. Through hierarchical multiple regression analyses (HMR) that specify the relative strength of the various predictive factors, this study simultaneously investigates the predictive value of numerous variables of individual, organizational, and situational characteristics in two contexts: 1) targets, and 2) perpetrators of workplace bullying. This exploratory research essentially examines two models of workplace bullying predictors based on extant literature in order to propose empirical and parsimonious models. As such, these frameworks may help researchers and practitioners to focus their efforts in order to better manage and, ideally, prevent workplace bullying since it is considered to have more destructive consequences than all other work related stressors put together (Hauge et al., 2010). After all, a better understanding of the risk factors of workplace bullying should not only contribute to the literature on this important
element, but could help human resource practitioners, managers, business leaders, and organizations establish more effective prevention and intervention measures.

1.2 Workplace Bullying: A Topic of Interest

According to Hoel and Cooper (2000), no organization or person is “bully-proof” as bullying is said to be present in all work sectors and men and women of all ages and in various levels of the hierarchy are potential targets. Workplace bullying can have detrimental consequences for targets and bystanders as well as for organizations. For targets, this type of workplace harassment has been regarded as a severe social stressor at work (Niedl, 1996; Zapf et al., 1996), as a critical life event (Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2002a), and as a contributing factor to lower job satisfaction and lower well-being (Vartia-Väänänen, 2003). Targets of workplace bullying also reported more psychological health complaints, more psychosomatic complaints, an elevated level of negative affectivity (Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2002b), and in the worst cases, symptoms analogous to Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (Leymann & Gustafsson, 1996; Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2002a). Vartia (2001) found that both targets and bystanders of bullying reported high general stress and mental stress reactions in addition to feelings of low self-confidence. Organizations can be faced with increased absenteeism (Hoel & Cooper, 2000; Hoel, Sheehan, Cooper, & Einarsen, 2011), increased turnover rates, and decreased levels of performance and productivity (Hoel & Cooper, 2000; Hoel et al., 2011; Keashly & Jagatic, 2000; Salin & Hoel, 2011). Hoel et al. (2011) estimated that approximately 18 million working days per year are lost in the United Kingdom because of workplace bullying. By adding costs associated with absenteeism, replacement as a result of turnover, and formal investigation, Hoel, Einarsen, and Cooper (2003) claimed
that one case of workplace bullying has an approximate economic impact of US$50,000 (equivalent to CAN$82,000 and after adjusting for inflation). In all, Hauge et al. (2010) affirmed that workplace bullying could have more destructive consequences than all other work related stressors put together.

1.2.1 Defining the concept of workplace bullying.

An organization may expect that its climate and productivity can be impeded by unresolved conflict and negative behaviours in the workplace. When some of those negative behaviours become recurrent, researchers and practitioners refer to this phenomenon as workplace bullying. This type of workplace harassment is generally differentiated from everyday conflict in that these negative acts occur repeatedly over a period of time rather than being one-off incidents (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2011; Leymann, 1996). Zapf and Gross (2001) described it as an unresolved social conflict that has reached a high level of escalation accompanied by an increased power imbalance between the parties involved.

Workplace bullying has been described in various terms including being labelled as psychological harassment at work (Carroll, 2006; Soares, 2002), mobbing (Leymann, 1996; Zapf & Einarsen, 2001), emotional abuse (Lutgen-Sandvik, 2003), workplace aggression (Baron & Neuman, 1996), and moral harassment (Hirigoyen, 1998). According to Neall and Tuckey (2014), workplace bullying is the most frequent and common term utilized. It can be noted that in Canada, the term psychological harassment at work (i.e., harcèlement psychologique au travail in French) is also common as it is the term coined by the Quebec legislation adopted in 2004 – the first in North America. As various terms have been used to identify more or less the same
phenomenon, it is no surprise that multiple definitions can be found in the literature. In fact, academics and practitioners are still facing the issue of an agreed-upon operational definition of workplace bullying, and of the different criteria used to classify a situation as one of bullying (Agervold, 2007; Cowie, Naylor, Rivers, Smith, & Pereira, 2002) (see Appendix A for a list of definitions).

Regardless of what label is used, there is consensus in the literature that workplace bullying involves a repeated pattern of inappropriate, aggressive, or hostile behaviour that is targeted at a particular person or group of people, and which can be perpetrated by one or more individuals (see Einarsen et al., 2011). Workplace bullying is about persistent exposure to negative and aggressive behaviours of a primarily psychological nature (Leymann, 1996). Leymann (1996) argued that workplace bullying should be viewed as an exaggerated conflict. It evolves from conflict over a period of time, sometimes quickly, sometimes after weeks or months. Leymann (1996) maintained that the distinction between conflict and workplace bullying does not focus on “what is done” or “how it is done” but on the frequency and duration of “what is done.”

One of the most cited definitions of workplace bullying is the one suggested by Einarsen et al. (2011) that is based on the work of Einarsen and Skogstad (1996), of Leymann (1996), and of Zapf (1999).

“Bullying at work means harassing, offending, or socially excluding someone or negatively affecting someone’s work. In order for the label bullying (or mobbing) to be applied to a particular activity, interaction, or process, the bullying behaviour has to occur repeatedly and regularly (e.g., weekly) and over
a period of time (e.g., six months). Bullying is an escalating process in the course of which the person confronted ends up in an inferior position and becomes the target of systematic negative social acts. A conflict cannot be called bullying if the incident is an isolated event or if two parties of approximately equal strength are in conflict.” (p. 22)

1.2.2 Important characteristics of workplace bullying.

Workplace bullying includes a number of defining characteristics (Einarsen et al., 2011). It represents (1) negative act(s) that are (2) persistent (i.e., frequency and duration) and that have (3) an adverse impact on the target and seem to occur in the presence of (4) an imbalance of power between the target and the perpetrator. Then, the notion of (5) intent is still subject to debate since some authors believe that the intent of the perpetrator must be present (Keashly & Jagatic, 2000), whereas others argue that it is difficult to measure intentions and that we should instead focus on measuring the destructive effects on the target (Einarsen, 2000).

1) Negative acts. Workplace bullying manifests in many ways. Overt and covert behaviours have been reported by targets of bullying acts (Einarsen, 2000; Einarsen & Hoel, 2001). Overt behaviours can include persistent insults, offending remarks, persistent criticism, and in a few cases, even physical abuse; meanwhile covert behaviours can imply silent treatment, social isolation, and job isolation. Einarsen (2000) claimed that both these types of negative behaviours are used by perpetrators with the aim (or at least the effect) of persistently humiliating, intimidating, frightening, or punishing the target. One of the most validated measures of workplace bullying is the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised © (Einarsen & Hoel, 2001; Einarsen et al., 2009)
for which Carroll and Hoel (2007) identified five dimensions: (1) overt physical intimidation and aggression (e.g., “being shouted at”), (2) excess of supervision (e.g., “excessive monitoring of your work”), (3) social isolation (e.g., “being humiliated or ridiculed in connection with your work”), (4) impossible job demand (e.g., “being exposed to an unmanageable workload”), and (5) job isolation (e.g., “someone withholding information which affects your performance”).

It can be noted that some researchers excluded the concept of physical violence from their analysis of bullying behaviours (Keashly, Trott, & MacLean, 1994), thus limiting it to psychological harassment only. Furthermore, some may regard sexual harassment either as a manifestation of bullying or as a separate problem (Vartia-Väänenänen, 2003). In contrast to the persistent and long-term nature of most negative behaviours of bullying, a single negative act of sexual or physical nature is generally considered as an actual case of sexual or physical harassment.

2) Persistence. Researchers generally agree that bullying involves negative or hostile behaviours occurring regularly, repeatedly, and over time (Brodsky, 1976; Einarsen et al., 2011; Leymann, 1996; Nielsen, Glasø, & Einarsen, 2017). A one-time incident is not typically considered workplace bullying as it actually distinguishes the severe and negative impact that bullying can have on targets, from less severe consequences associated with mundane workplace conflict or workplace incivilities. Often referred to as the pioneer researcher on the topic, Leymann (1990) specified that in order for the situation to be classified as a case of bullying, the negative behaviour(s) must occur over a minimum period of six months and at a frequency of at least once a week. Since then, this specific criterion has been the topic of much debate (Saunders,
Huynh, & Goodman-Delahunty, 2007). Although researchers generally agree that the factors of frequency and duration are secondary characteristics, it could be argued that it is quite difficult to recognize a case of bullying according to such specific criteria.

3) **Adverse impact on the target.** For a situation to be considered as workplace bullying, the target must feel that he or she has been subjected to negative behaviour(s) making him or her feel bullied, and which have led to the development of certain negative effects on the target (Randall, 1997; Rayner & Hoel, 1997). This belief corresponds with Leymann’s argument that incidents of bullying are present when the negative act(s) clearly engenders a negative effect, more likely of a psychological nature (Leymann, 1996).

4) **Imbalance of power.** Another defining element is the presence of an imbalance of power (Salin, 2003a). This characteristic implies the difficulty that the target faces in defending against negative acts (Vartia-Väänenänen, 2003). It can be viewed as a systematic abuse of power by a person or a group who tries to control or undermine a given target (Vartia-Väänenänen, 2003). It could be due to a formal imbalance of power (e.g., the hierarchical difference between an employee and a supervisor), or it may be an indirect consequence of a bullying incident itself or a previous interpersonal conflict situation (Einarsen, 1999; Einarsen, Mikkelsen, & Matthiesen, 2003). Also, it may be due to a perceived imbalance of power as a result of differences in physical traits (e.g., muscular vs. petite), gender, and seniority amongst others. It has been argued that individuals only will be victimized if they believe they cannot defend themselves or are unable to escape a given situation (Niedl, 1996).
Therefore, according to this view, bullying will not occur if the parties perceive equal
levels of power and status.

5) Perpetrator’s intent. Arguably, one of the most debated elements in the
literature are the perpetrators’ intentions (Einarsen et al., 2011; Hoel et al., 1999).
Keashly and Jagatic (2011) suggested that a perpetrator’s intent to harm is an important
feature when defining workplace bullying. From a workplace aggression perspective,
the behaviours must be intended to cause harm, thus distinguishing them from
behaviours that may cause harm but were not intended to do so (Neuman & Baron,
1997). Accordingly, there is no bullying when there is no intention to cause harm
(Einarsen et al., 2011). Still, Einarsen et al. (2011) highlighted that intent is not
considered as an essential element in the European workplace bullying literature. In fact,
the element of persistency described earlier has led some researchers to speculate that
perpetrators are aware of the inappropriateness of their behaviour, and that their actions
are intended to harm their targets (Zapf & Einarsen, 2004). Agervold (2007) looked at
definitions and delimitations of workplace bullying and determined that intent is a
central element of the subjective experience of being bullied but does not form part of
the objective definition of bullying behaviours. All things considered, it seems that the
lack of intent to harm does not change the situation for the target (Einarsen et al., 2011);
therefore, perhaps the premise “ignorance is not a defence” should prevail.

1.2.3 Origins of workplace bullying research.

Carroll Brodsky, an American psychiatrist, seems to have been the first to
publish on the concept of workplace harassment in his book The Harassed Worker
(Brodsky, 1976). In this qualitative examination, Brodsky (1976) described a number of
situations in which workers claimed to be suffering from severe stress reactions and ill health, without having been exposed to any injuries or any obvious physical damage. These employees had been the target of repeated and prolonged mistreatment by their supervisors or colleagues. Mistreatment behaviours were rather subtle and discreet yet, still caused severe and traumatic effects on the targets (Brodsky, 1976). Moreover, Brodsky (1976) claimed that harassment is manifested under different forms and that sexual harassment is only one of five types of harassment at work. Indeed, name-calling, scapegoating, physical abuse, and the use of work pressures were claimed to be as frequent and as severe as sexual harassment (Brodsky, 1976). Nevertheless, at the time, Brodsky’s pioneering examination of workplace harassment at work did not attract much attention.

In the 1980s, Heinz Leymann, a German-Swedish psychologist conducted pioneering research on workplace bullying. Leymann (1996) labelled this type of harassment as mobbing and psychological terror to describe any intense collective aggression toward a targeted worker by managers and/or colleagues. Leymann (1996) deliberately chose not to use the term bullying, used by English and Australian researchers at the time, because of its physical connotation. In contrast, Leymann (1996) reported that physical violence is rarely manifested in mobbing, as it is characterized by more sophisticated behaviours such as socially isolating the target.

1.2.4 Workplace bullying in Canada.

Studies investigating workplace bullying in the Canadian context are relatively limited. Nevertheless, the few studies conducted within Canada reported rates significantly higher than those in studies with European samples. For example, Out
(2005) found that 47.2% of her sample had reported at least one negative behaviour on a weekly basis. In a study by Soares (2002), 39% of the sample reported experiencing various forms of workplace bullying. In another study, Carroll and Hoel (2007) found that 27% of their Canadian sample had been the target of one or more negative behaviours from a daily to weekly basis. Another example of the prevalence of workplace bullying in Canadian workplaces can be drawn from the *Public Service Employee Survey*, which is administered every three years to all employees working in the federal public service. In the 2014 survey, 19% of respondents claimed to have been a victim of harassment on the job over the past two years (Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, 2014). More recently, a shorter version of the PSES (i.e., *Public Service Employee Annual Survey*) was conducted in 2017 and found that 22% of respondents reported being a victim of harassment on the job (Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat, 2017). As reported in several studies, the self-labelling measure of workplace bullying, as used in the federal public service, typically engenders lower rates than the behavioural experience method (i.e., a predefined list of bullying behaviours); and that, by a ratio of at least 1:2 (see Carroll, 2006; Out, 2005; Salin, 2005). Hence, it seems that workplace bullying is an unfortunate reality of many workplaces in Canada.

Although there is an escalating level of research activity investigating this critical research topic in the last few years, a relative dearth of studies exist in comparison to other workplace phenomena. Einarsen (2000) suggested that the recent surge in researchers and practitioners’ interests in workplace bullying mirrors the development of government legislation. In Canada, workplace bullying seems to be

---

3 A total of 182 165 employees responded to the 2014 survey.
receiving an increased level of attention given legislation adopted in several provinces, most notably in Quebec (Gouvernement du Québec, 2004), Saskatchewan (Government of Saskatchewan, 2007), Ontario (Government of Ontario, 2010), Manitoba (Government of Manitoba, 2011), and British Columbia (Government of British Columbia, 2012). Consequently, it is reasonable to make a connection between the implementation of legislation on workplace bullying and the coverage of this topic by media, practitioners, and researchers.

Some speculations can be put forth regarding the typically higher rates found in Canadian samples in comparison with European samples. For instance, European countries have had their legislation in place for longer than Canada, which also seems to have triggered more research interest as discussed previously. In fact, European research on this topic started in the early 1990s. Also, it may be possible that as their legislation is more advanced, organizations and employees are better equipped for dealing, managing, and likely preventing workplace-bullying situations. It is also plausible that these dissimilarities are attributable to cultural differences along with methodological (e.g., measures utilized) and sampling methods (convenience vs. representative). In all, more research seems needed to ensure fair comparisons between different cultural contexts.

1.3 Predictors of Workplace Bullying

Why does workplace bullying occur? In one of the most comprehensive research-based books on workplace bullying, Zapf and Einarsen (2011) reviewed a number of individual characteristics of the target and the perpetrator whereas Salin and Hoel (2011) reviewed characteristics of the organizational environment as predictors of
workplace bullying. These separate examinations essentially constitute the main
groupings of workplace bullying predictors in the literature, as found in a few
central models of workplace bullying (Carroll, Foucher, & Gosselin, 2012; Samnani
the rather newly explored dimension of the situational characteristic of being a target or
a perpetrator as a contributing factor to bullying would most likely provide a more
comprehensive view. As a number of authors have argued, it is likely that no single
explanation is sufficient on its own to accurately explain why bullying occurs in
workplaces; it would thus require an assessment of multiple perspectives as they are
possibly complex and intertwined (Baillien, De Cuyper, & De Witte, 2011; Hauge et al.,
2007; Zapf, 1999). In the following section, some empirical findings and conceptual
explanations as to why workplace bullying occurs are discussed.

1.3.1 Individual characteristics of targets and perpetrators.

Individual characteristics of targets. Some studies have provided insights into
personality characteristics (e.g., Five Factor Model) differentiating targets of bullying
from non-targets (Coyne et al., 2000; Glasø et al., 2007). Other studies have examined
other personality traits (e.g., self-esteem) and aptitudes (e.g., social competence) as
predictors of workplace bullying (see Carroll et al., 2012; Samnani & Singh, 2012; Zapf
& Einarsen, 2011). The following section provides a review of the main individual
characteristics of workplace bullying targets.

Personality traits: As Einarsen (2005) discussed, a controversial issue in the
workplace bullying literature is the role of the target’s personality in the bullying
process. Some researchers have explored the possibility that possessing certain
personality characteristics may create a predisposition to be a target, either in specific workplace-bullying situations or as a source of provocation for potential perpetrators (e.g., Coyne et al., 2000). Others have researched the possible presence of a more general personality profile that may identify a target (Glasø et al., 2007).

In terms of specific personality traits, Coyne et al. (2000) found that targets tended to be less independent and stable, and more conscientious and introverted, than non-targets of a control group. In another study, Lind, Glasø, Pallesen, and Einarsen (2009) reported that targets scored higher on a measure of neuroticism and lower on agreeableness. In another study, Vartia (1996) also reported that targets scored higher on neuroticism. However, when work environment factors were controlled, the importance of this relationship was reduced. Vartia (1996) suggested that targets might be chosen for victimization because of their personality traits; in other words, the perpetrator may see the target as having certain weaknesses such as a lack of social skills, a tendency to avoid conflict (Zapf, 1999), or an inability to cope (Einarsen, 1999). Furthermore, some studies found that certain targets reported being rather conscientious, creative, and open to experience (Glasø et al., 2007; Zapf, 1999).

Conversely, a number of authors have concluded that there is no such thing as a general personality profile of a bullying target (Glasø et al., 2007; Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2001; Zapf, 1999). For example, Glasø et al. (2007) found in their cluster analysis that targets could be divided into two personality groups. One cluster, which comprised 64% of the target sample, did not differ from other target-victims in terms of personality (Glasø et al., 2007). The other cluster of targets, however, tended to be less extraverted, less agreeable, less conscientious, and less open to experience than targets
in the other cluster and the control group (Glasø et al., 2007). However, these researchers noted that both clusters of targets scored higher than non-targets on emotional instability.

**Other traits and aptitudes.** Zapf and Einarsen (2011) claimed that the most common view of targets characteristics is that certain individuals are more vulnerable than others. This belief is based on the assumption that some people are perceived as natural targets since they seem to be less assertive, unable to defend themselves, and unable to manage the inevitable conflicts constructively (Zapf & Einarsen, 2011). Self-esteem and social skills have been examined as predictors of workplace bullying in various studies. Self-esteem can be defined as the individual’s positive or negative attitude toward the self as a totality (Rosenberg, Schooler, Schoenbach, & Rosenberg, 1995), whereas social skills can be described as the knowledge of both what to do and when to display certain behaviours (Meichenbaum, Butler, & Gruson, 1981).

In one study, targets of bullying reported low self-esteem and high levels of social anxiety (Einarsen, Raknes, & Matthiesen, 1994). In other studies, targets of workplace bullying were characterized by a lack of coping resources, and self-efficacy (Zapf & Einarsen, 2003), low self-esteem, and low social skills (Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2007). Further, Einarsen et al. (1994) reported that victims felt their lack of coping and conflict management skills, as well as shyness, contributed to being bullied. Vartia (1996) found a relationship between workplace bullying, neuroticism, and self-esteem. More specifically, targets of bullying reported being more neurotic and having a lower self-esteem than the non-bullied group (Vartia, 1996). However, this correlation disappeared when the work environment and climate factors were kept constant (Vartia,
1996). Then, Zapf (1999) found in his study that targets scored higher on unassertiveness and avoidance. Targets of this sample also reported lower social skills than the control sample (Zapf, 1999).

Zapf and Einarsen (2011) proposed that individuals with low self-esteem, low self-assertion, and low social competence but high in anxiety and depression (i.e., high negative affect) can potentially be targets as they are not only defenseless but also because of their own behaviour. In fact, Einarsen et al. (1994) claimed that a distressed target may have violated expectations, annoyed others, performed less competently and even infringed on social norms describing polite interactions; and consequently, they may have provoked hostile behaviour in others. Zapf and Einarsen (2011) added that being socially incompetent and unassertive may cause a rejection on behalf of colleagues and superiors; thus explaining why some individuals may easily become targets of workplace bullying.

Overall, it seems that personality traits and other individual aptitudes should not be neglected as possible contributing factors in the occurrence of workplace bullying. For instance, it is plausible that persistent bullying behaviours could engender a high score on emotional instability (i.e., neuroticism). Although the direction of this relationship nor causality has yet to be determined, it does suggest that emotional stability and other personality traits may be risk factors for being a target of workplace bullying. Overall, as mixed findings on personality traits and aptitudes of targets have been found, more research ascertaining the relative predictive effects of these factors would contribute to the workplace bullying research.
Individual characteristics of the perpetrator. There seems to be a popular view that bullying behaviours are largely rooted in individual characteristics of the perpetrators; though few studies support this notion (Einarsen, 2005). In fact, empirical evidence on perpetrators of workplace bullying is quite limited, likely as a result of the challenges involved in collecting objective and valid data (Samnani & Singh, 2012; Zapf & Einarsen, 2011). Based on the extant literature including Zapf and Einarsen's (2011) review of individual predictors of workplace bullying perpetrators, the same factors listed for targets of bullying seemed the most pertinent: personality traits including self-esteem and social skills.

Personality traits. Brodsky (1976) was one of the first to examine characteristics of the perpetrator. He identified some key traits of perpetrators as being high on measures of bigotry, power drive, and aggression. Seigne et al. (2007) found perpetrators of bullying to be more aggressive, hostile, extraverted, independent, competitive, and confrontational. Atkinson (2000) reported that perpetrators often target those who are different from them. These differences can stem from personality, race, religion, physical characteristics, weight issues, and sexual orientation.

According to Zapf and Einarsen (2011), one type of harassing behaviour is oriented toward the protection of self-esteem or where harassing behaviours are utilized as defence mechanisms. Baumeister, Heatherton, and Tice (1993, 1994) believed that the protection and enhancement of self-esteem is a fundamental human motive and it appears to influence behaviour in many social situations. They also noted that individuals with high self-esteem are more likely to engage in aggressive behaviours than those with low self-esteem. In their review of evidence on aggression, crime, and
violence, Baumeister, Smart, and Boden (1996) claimed that high self-esteem was related to aggressive behaviour, being commonly a result of a threatened ego. However, it can be noted that this group of research concentrated on physical violence and did not specifically research psychological forms of violence.

In contrast, it is often assumed that people with low self-esteem tend to become aggressive and are more likely to bully others (Zapf & Einarsen, 2011). A possible explanation may be that people with low self-esteem can become aggressive in response to trivial threats to their self-esteem and become defensive to constructive feedback. Parkins, Fishbein, and Ritchey (2006) investigated the hypothesis that self-esteem was negatively related to active workplace bullying but did not find a significant relationship. The role of self-esteem in the perpetration of workplace bullying behaviours remains unclear. Further examination should contribute to the limited literature on this specific aspect.

Social skills. According to Zapf and Einarsen (2011), perpetrators’ lack of social skills may be a key factor. Frey, Hirschstein and Guzzo (2000) asserted that social and emotional competence requires the ability to detect, understand, and respond appropriately to the feelings of others. Hudson and Ward (2000) suggested that people with low social competence, particularly those aspects relevant to close relationships, often engaged in offending or humiliating behaviours against others. Similarly, Matthiesen and Einarsen (2007) supported this notion by contending that there is a link between hostile or aggressive behaviour and a lack of social competence. Zapf and Einarsen (2011) argued that a lack of emotional control and a lack of personal reflection are often demonstrated by perpetrators. For instance, perpetrators may vent their anger
by regularly screaming at others. This negative behaviour of “being shouted at” is often found in instruments (i.e., NAQ) measuring workplace bullying. Matthiesen and Einarsen (2007) reported in their study that this negative behaviour seems to be associated with a general style adopted by the perpetrator in which their aggressive conduct typically comes as a reaction to provocation. Others (e.g., Zapf & Einarsen, 2011) have argued that bullying might be an outcome of a lack of personal reflection and perspective taking or perpetrators playing down their aggressive behaviour and ignoring its effects on others (Jenkins, Winefield and Sarris, 2011). It can be argued that, due to the lack of perspective taking, perpetrators may find it difficult to understand a target’s reaction and may even blame the target for taking things too seriously. Thus, links can be made with emotional intelligence. For example, Hutchinson and Hurley (2013) discussed the relationship between emotional intelligence, leadership, and reductions of bullying among nurses. They highlighted the importance of strengthening leadership capabilities associated with emotional intelligence, as a mean of diminishing experiences of bullying.

Ultimately, it is clear that further examination of perpetrator characteristics has merit in the literature given that, according to Samnani and Singh (2012) “research on the perpetrator is relatively non-existent with only a few studies that serve as exceptions (e.g., Baillien et al., 2011; De Cuyper et al., 2009)…research on the perpetrator remains a work-in-progress and we call for future research on this critical aspect of the literature” (p. 587). It is thus evident that very little is known about the individual characteristics of perpetrators and the literature would benefit from further investigation.
1.3.2 Organizational characteristics.

Although there is evidence that individual characteristics are related to workplace bullying, organizational characteristics have received far greater support as predictive factors (Leymann, 1996; Skogstad et al., 2011; Zapf, 1999). After over two decades of research on workplace bullying, the role of the work environment in explaining its occurrence has been highlighted by a number of authors (e.g., Einarsen, 1999; Skogstad, Torsheim, Einarsen, & Hauge, 2011b; Trépanier et al., 2015; Vartia-Väänänen, 2003; Zapf, 1999). For instance, Leymann (1996) argued that anybody could become a target of workplace bullying under the right circumstances. As such, he emphasized the importance of precipitating environmental factors such as a poor working environment. Zapf (1999) maintained that an unhealthy organizational environment might increase the likelihood of interpersonal conflict, which if unresolved, can result in episodes of bullying. Vartia-Väänänen (2003) asserted that workplace bullying could be seen as a symptom of a dysfunctional organization. Accordingly, it can be argued that the organization itself, through its culture, its practices and its policies can create an environment conducive to the emergence of workplace bullying situations.

Salin and Hoel (2011) claimed that despite the clear support for organizational factors being critical elements contributing to workplace bullying, only recently has research been conducted seeking a clearer understanding of the predictive effects of organizational factors such as culture and leadership. A common finding has been that both targets and observers of workplace bullying report a more negative work environment than those who are not bullied (Salin & Hoel, 2011). Based on Salin and
Hoel's (2011) summary of organizational predictors and other literature (Carroll et al., 2012; Samnani & Singh, 2012, 2016; Trépanier et al., 2015), the core factors are (1) job characteristics, (2) leadership, and (3) organizational culture and climate. The following section details each of these factors in relation to workplace bullying.

(1) Job characteristics. According to Di Martino et al. (2003), work situations characterized by monotonous tasks and a lack of control over the work environment can be linked to workplace bullying. Similarly, Bruursema, Kessler, and Spector (2011) claimed that bullying may be the result of role underload or boredom. Nevertheless, Zapf et al. (1996) found contradictory results as they reported that bullying was not related to a lack of perceived control over work and the monotony of tasks; rather, targets reported having little control over the management of their working time (Zapf et al., 1996). Such findings suggest that time pressure can have an indirect effect on bullying since there are few opportunities to resolve conflict. In another study by Zapf (1999), results showed that there were higher stressors and less job control for the group of bullying targets than there were for those who were not bullied. Further, the strongest effects were for the task and time-related control, uncertainty and organizational problems; interestingly, job complexity was the only variable where there was no difference between these groups (Zapf, 1999). Zapf (1999) argued that this probably reflects the fact that targets of workplace bullying can be at lower and higher levels of the hierarchy in the organization.

---

Salin and Hoel (2011) also included reward systems and organizational changes in their review. As these two factors are referenced as motivating or triggering factors (moderators or mediators) as per Salin (2003a), they were not included in the study; given its current aim to identify, measure, and assess the relative strengths of predictors of workplace bullying.
Einarsen (2005) noted that role ambiguity, increased job demands, and conflicting expectations about the roles, tasks, and responsibilities can create a high level of frustration and conflict within a workgroup; particularly concerning the rights, obligations, privileges, and positions. In the same vein, Vartia (1996) claimed that workplace bullying seems predominantly present when workers perceive their work situation and work objectives as vague and unpredictable. Di Martino et al. (2003) asserted that role conflict seems to be linked to bullying, which is consistent with other studies. For instance, in a Norwegian study of union members, both the targets and observers of workplace bullying reported higher levels of role conflict than non-targets (Einarsen et al., 1994). Additionally, role ambiguity appeared to be associated with higher levels of harassment (Di Martino et al., 2003).

In a longitudinal study, Baillien, De Cuyper et al. (2011) found that job demands (i.e., workload, role conflict, and job insecurity) at Time 1 (T1) related positively to targets’ reports of bullying at Time 2 (T2). Further, it was found that job resources (i.e., task autonomy, social support, and skill utilization) at T1 related negatively to reports of bullying by targets at T2. However, they found no significant cross-lagged effect of T1 job demands and resources on T2 perpetrators’ reports of bullying. Despite the fact that no causal evidence was found, it is still one of the very few studies investigating possible antecedents of workplace bullying as per perpetrators’ experiences.

In all, examining characteristics of the job should contribute to the literature given that the findings to date are mixed.

(2) Leadership. Being in positions of power, managers are often identified as perpetrators (Salin & Hoel, 2011). Nevertheless, Carroll and Hoel (2007) found that
workers in managerial positions reported being targets of workplace bullying more often compared to other groups (e.g., front line and professionals). Hoel and Salin (2003) argued that leadership behaviours may instigate bullying behaviours. More specifically, the authoritarian and the laissez-faire leadership styles are two that have been consistently linked to higher levels of workplace bullying. O’Moore, Seigne, Mcguire, and Smith (1998) found a significantly higher number of targets of bullying as compared to non-targets among those working in organizations that utilized an authoritarian management style. In addition, Vartia (1996) found that an authoritarian style used to resolve differences of opinion, promoted harassment. As argued by Desrumaux-Zagrodnicki, Lemoine, and Mahon (2004), a directive management style that focuses on results rather than on relationships is likely to generate a vertical type of harassment.

In addition to authoritative leadership, Di Martino et al. (2003) and Einarsen (2005) argued that the laissez-faire style itself could contribute to situations of bullying between peers and colleagues, given managerial ignorance and failure to intervene in a bullying situation that indirectly contributes to its development. Ignoring this behaviour is equivalent to its complicit acceptance. Hauge et al. (2007) studied the laissez-faire style of leadership in relation to workplace bullying and found that laissez-faire leadership is associated with bullying in several facets. Specifically, they argued that laissez-faire leadership stimulates role conflict, role ambiguity, and interpersonal conflicts amongst employees (Hauge et al., 2007). Ravisy (2000) put forth his concerns of the rather high presence of incompetent managers, who do not have the proper skills in effectively managing a unit or an organization. One can then argue that the laissez-
faire leadership style may be an important sign of incompetence. Preferably, positive behaviours and attitudes should be reinforced while negative influence from managers should be lessened. Thus, both autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles would be expected to be predictive of a number of counterproductive workplace behaviours including bullying. For example, Frooman, Mendelson, and Murphy (2012) found that passive avoidant leadership increased illegitimate absenteeism and was negatively associated with legitimate absenteeism. In other words, employees with passive avoidant leaders tend to come to work when ill (presenters), but stay away from work when well (illegitimate absenteeism) (Frooman et al., 2012).

Further investigating the relationship of leadership and workplace bullying could be beneficial in improving our understanding of precipitators of bullying behaviour. As discussed, the focus has been primarily on the laissez-faire and authoritarian styles of leadership; styles that have been associated with increasing the propensity of bullying situations. Conversely, exploring whether other specific types of leadership (i.e., transformational leadership) can have a positive influence (i.e., decrease the propensity) on workplace bullying has received little research attention. Transformational leaders motivate followers to achieve performance beyond expectations by transforming followers’ attitudes, beliefs, and values as opposed to simply gaining compliance (Bass, 1985). Thus, it can be expected that leaders who support their employees are considerate of their needs, and recognize their efforts will most likely engender positive relationships and outcomes (e.g., job satisfaction, employee commitment, and job performance to name a few) with their employees. One study by Nielsen (2013) examined the transformational leadership style amongst others (i.e., laissez-faire and
authentic) and found that transformational leadership and authentic leadership were related to decreased risk of exposure to bullying behaviour. It seems that the literature could benefit in knowing more about transformational leadership and its relation to bullying at work. Managers who bully are a current reality of our workplaces (Ferris, Zinko, Brouer, Buckley, & Harvey, 2007); hence, the more we know about the various leadership styles, the better it contributes to our understanding of the predictors of workplace bullying.

(3) Organizational culture and climate. First, there seems to be an ongoing debate in the literature on the differences between organizational culture and climate (Thumin & Thumin, 2011). Denison (1996) defined organizational culture as “the deep structure of organizations, that is rooted in the values, beliefs, and assumptions held by organizational members” (p. 624). He explained that it is engrained in history, collectively held, and sufficiently complex to resist many attempts at direct manipulation. Denison (1996) then described that the organizational climate refers to a situation and its link to thoughts, feelings, and behaviours of employees of the organization. It is temporal, subjective and often the result of a direct manipulation by people with power and influence (Denison, 1996). Still, other researchers such as Schneider (2000) believe that climate causes culture but that culture also causes climate. Accordingly, the distinction between the two concepts is still not clear; most likely the reason why workplace bullying literature has made little to no distinction between the two, often using the terms interchangeably (see Salin & Hoel, 2011).

It can be expected that organizational culture may shape employees’ behaviours by affecting their values and attitudes. When considering organizational predictors of
bullying, the organizational culture has been seen to play a decisive role (Einarsen, 1999). In fact, Einarsen (1999) affirmed that through the socialization process, new members are expected to change their values and behaviours to fit the organization’s culture. It can be added that such norms can have a domino effect to the extent that bullying is tolerated, even normalized or rationalized (Hoel & Beale, 2006). As a normalization example, competitive workplaces allowing certain aggressiveness in social interactions are environments conducive to the emergence of bullying (Einarsen, 2005).

As Brodsky (1976) claimed, for harassment to take place, there needs to be a culture that allows and rewards it. Accordingly, Einarsen (1999) suggested that bullying incidents seem to be prevalent in organizations where employees and managers feel that they have the support or at the least, the blessing of the organization to carry out such behaviours. Providing some empirical data to support this view, Neyens, Baillien, De Witte and Notelaers (2007; as cited in Salin & Hoel, 2011) found that workplace bullying was more prevalent in organizations with no anti-bullying policies. Moreover, in the same way that other types of organizational behaviour can be strongly affected by organizational culture (e.g., safety behaviour, dress code, procedures, etc.); one may expect similar effects of culture on bullying behaviours.

Generally, recent empirical evidence investigating various organizational characteristics in relation to workplace bullying is fairly limited. In order to further support many authors’ views (see Leymann, 1996; Vartia-Väänänen, 2003), additional
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5 Second level reference was used as Neyens et al. (2007) was not available in English.
research on the work environment hypothesis in relation to bullying would contribute to a better understanding of this counterproductive workplace behaviour.

1.3.3 **Situational characteristic.**

Links between the aforementioned predictors of workplace bullying and key theories explaining behaviour can be made. In social psychology, behaviour is often explained by individual factors, environmental factors or by the result of their interaction (e.g., Bandura, 1986; Baron & Kenny, 1986; Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010). The individual factor perspective explains behaviour due to a person’s characteristics whereas the situational factors perspective explains behaviour due to environmental factors. Then, when applying these perspectives to the literature on predictors of workplace bullying, the individual perspective is aligned with the individual characteristics perspective of both the target and perpetrator; whereas the situational perspective is supported by the organizational characteristics perspective. In further expanding the situational perspective, it would be logical to examine whether the situation of being a target of workplace bullying also contributes to being a perpetrator and vice versa. Accordingly, the following question may be put forth “Is being a target of workplace bullying predictive of being a perpetrator?” Reversing the scenario would then give the following question, “Is being a perpetrator of workplace bullying predictive of being a target?” These questions constitute a relatively new dimension in the literature that has been explored in just a handful of studies (Brotheridge et al., 2012; Hauge et al., 2009; Lee & Brotheridge, 2006). For example, Hauge, Skogstad, and Einarsen (2009) found that being a target of bullying, regardless of the frequency, predicted involvement in bullying of others. Thus, it seems plausible to suggest that
being targeted might motivate the target to reciprocate or trigger other defence mechanisms, such as the commonly known fight, flight or freeze responses to stress (see Skinner, Edge, Altman, & Sherwood, 2003). Hence, it seems valid to add the situational characteristic to these other discussed dimensions to better understand how the situational characteristic contributes to the occurrence of workplace bullying.

### 1.3.4 Summary

There does not appear to be a definite characteristic that categorizes targets of workplace bullying. On the one hand, some early work negatively stereotyped targets as “literal-minded, ... somewhat unsophisticated ... overachievers” (Brodsky, 1976, p. 89) who may lack social and communication skills and report low levels of self-esteem (Coyne et al., 2000). On the other hand, research also identifies individuals who are particularly skilled and conscientious as people likely to be targeted (Coyne, Smith-Lee Chong, Seigne, Randall, & Chong, 2003). Furthermore, Leymann (1996) strongly opposed the idea that an individual’s personality is a predisposition to become a target of workplace bullying. Leymann (1996) argued that individuals’ particular characteristics should be interpreted as part of a normal response to an abnormal situation. He explained his position by saying that, in the early stages of workplace bullying, there is most often a sign before a task-related conflict becomes an interpersonal conflict. In fact, he believed that an employer has the obligation to stop the conflict when it has become personal. Once a conflict has escalated to this stage, it is meaningless to blame someone’s personality for it, even if future research should reveal personality characteristics as predictors of victimization. If a conflict has developed into a bullying situation, then the responsibility lies first within management, either due to
deficient conflict management abilities or due to a lack of organizational policies about handling conflict situations (Leymann, 1993 as cited in Leymann, 1996). Nonetheless, it is important to continue to investigate various individual characteristics in order for a clearer understanding of possible risk factors.

The lack of workplace bullying research investigating perpetrators represents a current challenge in the literature (Baillien, De Cuyper, et al., 2011). It is no secret that there are methodological limitations in investigating characteristics of perpetrators. Generally, perpetrators would be reluctant to admit bullying someone else and self-reported bullies may only represent a small part of the population of perpetrators. Indeed, Seigne et al. (2007) investigated personalities of perpetrators in order to better identify their characteristics; however, the sample was small. Relying on targets’ response may negatively bias the findings but investigating self-reported bullies may also produce biased results in that the group would be self-selected. In any case, Brodsky (1976) had already concluded that even if perpetrators show common personal characteristics, they can only perform the bullying behaviours in an environment in which the organizational culture allows such behaviours to take place or rewards them. Additionally, it seems pertinent to mention that bullying per se does not start from the target, but from the perpetrator, the same way as torture starts from the torturer, and rape from the rapist. In other words, without a bully, there is no bullying.

It seems clear that prevention and intervention measures cannot be effective without considering organizational predictors of workplace bullying (Flaherty & Moss, 2007). As previously mentioned, workplace bullying happens because it is allowed to happen, thus implying the crucial role of organizational environment factors.
To conclude, workplace bullying is undoubtedly a complex workplace phenomenon. As Zapf (1999) argued, there is insufficient research undertaken to adequately explain why bullying occurs in workplaces. At present, the available data on this critical issue is still limited as studies have been mainly focused on only one of the perspectives (see Salin & Hoel, 2011; Zapf & Einarsen, 2011). More specifically, although a number of studies have identified individual or small groups of workplace bullying predictors as discussed in this section, research has not sought to investigate multiple categories of predictors simultaneously. It seems clear that a comprehensive model explaining the occurrence of workplace bullying must incorporate the individual characteristics of both targets and perpetrators along with organizational environment and situational factors. As put forth by Zapf (1999), bullying at work hardly can be explained by a single factor since it consists of multiple causes. Vartia-Väänänen (2003) also supported this notion by claiming that bullying can be described as a multifaceted interactive process in which the work environment, the organization, personality traits of targets and perpetrators, the general characteristics of human interaction in the organization, and characteristics of other unit members each contribute to its occurrence.

In the end, who is culpable (see Schmidt, 2009)? Are the perpetrators who torment others to blame, or are the targets who let the behaviour continue most at fault? Perhaps it is the supervisor who is aware of the situation, but chooses not to intervene? Or finally, is it the organizational factors and the prevailing culture that are most responsible? The likely answer to all these questions is that the occurrence of workplace bullying can be explained as a shared direct and/or indirect responsibility of all parties involved.
1.4 Proposed Models of the Predictors of Workplace Bullying

This section presents the framework of the present study by proposing two conceptual models of workplace bullying predictors, building upon the extant literature presented previously. As the current study assesses predictors of workplace bullying from both the target and the perpetrator perspectives, it engenders two separate prediction models according to these two criteria (i.e., dependent variables). More precisely, with the exception of the situational variable, the same set of independent variables are used to predict the status of two criteria: 1) the experience of being a target of workplace bullying, and 2) of perpetration of workplace bullying to identify the relevant individual, organizational, and situational characteristics that best explains variance in these two dependent variables.

Figure 1.1 and Figure 1.2 detail the seventeen predictors that are grouped into the main categories of (1) individual, (2) organizational, and (3) situational characteristics as they relate to either the criteria of workplace bullying as per targets, or workplace bullying as per perpetrators. The predictors composing the models are based on existing literature, including theoretical models presented in a few studies (Carroll et al., 2012; Samnani & Singh, 2012, 2016; Trépanier et al., 2016), and modified and expanded to include new elements to meet the objectives of the present study. Moreover, consideration was given in variable selection to present an inclusive model of these various predictors. The conceptual and inclusive models served as a basis for the empirical investigation of predictors of workplace bullying in the current study.

It should be noted that the conceptual models presented are exclusively focusing on the direct predictors of bullying in order to reflect the research objectives. It is
recognized that a comprehensive model of bullying would encompass several dimensions often found in applied social psychology, i.e. (1) predictors (2) moderators and mediators, and (3) outcomes. Given that the focus of the study is to better understand the predictors of workplace bullying, the current model representation by no means proposes to provide a complete analysis of the concept of workplace bullying as a whole. The proposed models of focus in the current study encompass an exhaustive number of contributing factors; thus providing a comprehensive view of one dimension of the concept workplace bullying: its occurrence.

1.5 Problem Statement

Research clearly demonstrates that workplace bullying is omnipresent in Canadian workplaces. In order to strategically address this counterproductive workplace behaviour and hopefully minimize its impact, it is critical that we have a better understanding of why it occurs. As discussed previously, a number of researchers have suggested that workplace bullying is precipitated by a multitude of factors (Hauge et al., 2007; Salin & Hoel, 2011; Vartia, 1996; Zapf & Einarsen, 2011). However, no known published studies have assessed the three groupings of predictors (i.e., individual characteristics of the target and perpetrator, organizational environment, and situational characteristics) simultaneously. Theoretical models proposed in past studies have not always made clear distinctions between the various factors (i.e., job characteristics, leadership, organizational environment) constituting work environment characteristics (see Samnani & Singh, 2012); thus limiting our understanding of their distinct contributions. The few studies investigating predictors reflecting the work environment used correlational analyses rather than multivariate regressions; thus prohibiting
descriptions of the relative strength of these various factors within a system as they relate to bullying (Hauge et al., 2007). Addressing this gap in the literature will provide an informed response to addressing workplace bullying and the development of strategies to deal with workplace bullying. Contributing to the research community’s understanding of the diverse elements contributing to workplace bullying can provide valuable insights to practitioners and organizational leaders in developing better mitigating proactive and responsive human resource strategies to reduce negative individual and organizational outcomes.

1.6 Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study is to solidify and enhance our knowledge base to better answer the following question, “Why does workplace bullying occur?” This current quantitative research attempts to enrich our understanding of the occurrence of bullying in the workplace from the experiences of both targets and perpetrators. Using hierarchical multiple regression analyses (HMR), this study investigates the predictive value of a number of variables identified in prior research as predictors of workplace bullying. The variables fall into three main categories: individual characteristics of targets and perpetrators, organizational environment, and situational characteristics. This study examined the relative contribution of each variable simultaneously in the same study. Specifically, independent variables from all three categories of workplace bullying variable sets (i.e., seven individual characteristics, nine organizational characteristics, and one situational characteristic) are investigated in relation to the prediction of workplace bullying from two dependent variable perspectives: 1) targets’ perspectives, and 2) perpetrators’ perspectives.
Figure 1.1. Modelling the predictors of workplace bullying as per the targets’ experiences.
Figure 1.2. Modelling the predictors of workplace bullying as per the perpetrators’ experiences.
1.7 Research Main Objectives

The overall research objectives consist of determining the combined and distinct predictive influence of numerous risk factors of workplace bullying in two perspectives: 1) from the targets’, and 2) perpetrators’ self-reported experiences. These two objectives thus serve as the foundation for the following specific research questions that are further elaborated in the Results section.

1.7.1 Context I: Modelling predictors of workplace bullying from the targets’ experiences.

Research question 1. After controlling for demographics, do individual, organizational, and situational variables collectively explain a significant proportion of the variance in targets’ experiences of workplace bullying?

Research question 2. After controlling for demographics, which sets (blocks) of predictors individually account for a statistically significant proportion of the variance for the criterion of targets’ experiences of workplace bullying?

Research question 3. After controlling for demographics, which of the distinct variables within each predictor set (block) are most strongly associated with targets’ experiences of workplace bullying?

---

6 Demographics include: age, gender, level of education, and minority group.
7 Group 1: individual characteristics (i.e., extraversion, agreeableness, conscientious, neuroticism, openness, self-esteem, social skill); Group 2: job characteristics (i.e., feedback, task significance, skills variety, autonomy, task identity); Group 3: leadership (i.e., transformational leadership); Group 4: organizational environment (i.e., pleasant organization, rules orientation, organizational support); and Group 5: situational characteristic (i.e., being a WB perpetrator).
8 Predictors include the following 17 variables: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientious, neuroticism, openness, self-esteem, social skills, feedback, task significance, skills variety, autonomy, task identity, transformational leadership,
1.7.2 Context II: Modelling predictors of workplace bullying from the perpetrators’ experiences.

**Research question 4.** After controlling for demographics\(^9\), how well do individual, organizational, and situational variables collectively account for variance in perpetrators’ experiences of workplace bullying?

**Research question 5.** After controlling for demographics, which sets (blocks)\(^10\) of predictors individually account for a statistically significant proportion of the variance for the criterion in perpetrators’ experiences of workplace bullying?

**Research question 6.** After controlling for demographics, which of the distinct variables\(^11\) within each predictor set (block) are most strongly associated with perpetrators’ experiences of workplace bullying?

This study is exploratory in nature in the sense that it aims to identify variables more robustly predictive of workplace bullying victimization and perpetration in order to present empirical, yet parsimonious models. Ultimately, the viewpoint adopted for this research was more of a deductive approach; start with a large number of variables given the numerous predictors found in extant literature, and then allow future research

---

\(^9\) Demographics include: age, gender, level of education, and minority group.

\(^10\) Group 1: individual characteristics (i.e., extraversion, agreeableness, conscientious, neuroticism, openness, self-esteem, social skill); Group 2: job characteristics (i.e., feedback, task significance, skills variety, autonomy, task identity); Group 3: leadership (i.e., transformational leadership); Group 4: organizational environment (i.e., pleasant organization, rules orientation, organizational support); and Group 5: situational characteristic (i.e., being a WB target).

\(^11\) Predictors include the following 17 variables: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientious, neuroticism, openness, self-esteem, social skills, feedback, task significance, skills variety, autonomy, task identity, transformational leadership, pleasant organization, rules orientation, organizational support, and being a WB target.
to be more specific in narrowing down nuances within the models, such as determining possible mediating or moderating effect. This thus constitutes the rationale behind research questions vs. hypotheses. In addition, the deductive approach was utilized in the presentation order of the aforementioned research questions.

1.8 Significance of the Study

1.8.1 Contribution to literature.

By simultaneously investigating a multitude of workplace bullying predictors from all main perspectives via HMR analyses, a stronger basis is provided for making conclusions regarding what factors may contribute to the occurrence of this type of harassment. Overall, findings from this study should add valuable knowledge to the research field of workplace bullying by proposing parsimonious models of workplace bullying predictors.

1.8.2 Advances in practice.

The primary aim of investigating the predictors of workplace bullying and determining their contribution to the onset of such situation is foremost of practical and applied interest, but it is also for advancing theory as discussed previously. After all, workplace bullying can be quite difficult to prevent or respond to, without a thorough understanding of its most critical predictors. Therefore, the purpose of the current research is to provide a greater understanding of this ubiquitous phenomenon and perhaps, lead to better mitigating proactive and responsive human resources strategies to reduce its negative individual and organizational outcomes. Bullying at work seems to be an important organizational reality, thus deserves special attention from researchers, human resource managers, employers, governments, and other policy makers. Proposing
empirical and parsimonious models of workplace bullying predictors could help the stakeholders in focusing their efforts and investments in their prevention strategies. The results of this research may further the cause of creating positive organizational change by claiming more respectful workplaces.
CHAPTER II

Method

In the current study, individual and organizational predictors of workplace bullying, largely identified by previous research, were incorporated into exploratory models (see Figures 1 and 2), allowing for an assessment of which predictors seem to explain the most variance in workplace bullying experiences of both targets and perpetrators. This chapter describes the research design and rationale along with the methodology used to conduct the study.

2.1 Research Design and Rationale

The main objective of this study was to provide a comprehensive answer to the following question, “What are the factors most predictive of workplace bullying?” As presented in the proposed models in Chapter I, individual, organizational, and situational characteristics identified as risk factors in prior research are included in the present study. This was done with the aim of assessing simultaneously the relative strength of the relationships between each variable and workplace bullying in two contexts: targets’ and perpetrators’ experiences.

With the scope of issues to be examined in the current study, it was decided that the best method for collecting data was with the use of an online survey. The survey questionnaire technique is known for its practicality for collecting a large amount of data in a reasonable time frame and seems to be the preferred methodology in workplace bullying research (see Barling, Dupré, & Kelloway, 2009). Online surveys in comparison to paper surveys are typically more economical, practical (e.g., responses are received instantly), and more accurate (e.g., likelihood of human errors in doing
monotonous tasks such as data entry). The fact that a cross-sectional survey allows for a large number of participants to be assessed in a short time span, suggests fewer resource needs compared to individual interviews, for example. This technique is also less time consuming for the respondent, a factor that encourages participation.

2.2 Methodology

This section describes the methodology used to conduct the study, more specifically a description of the participants, measures, and procedures.

2.2.1 Participants.

Employees from two public organizations located in a province in Atlantic Canada were invited to participate in this study on a voluntary basis. Approximately 2606 employees received an email invitation (see Appendix C) and had access to the invitation posted on their electronic weekly newsletter. A total of 1119 people opened the survey from which 760 completed it; representing a response rate of 29% with a completion rate of 68%. Fifty-six percent of the sample was female, 34% male (10% unreported), with an age range between 20 and 76 years ($M = 44.27$ years; $SD = 9.97$). Seven percent reported having a high school diploma, 29% a college diploma, 35% an undergraduate degree, 18% a graduate degree, and 2% reported “other” (in which a majority are currently enrolled in an undergraduate program). Fifty-four percent of respondents considered themselves part of a minority group (i.e., 10% = age; 5% =

---

12 This is an approximation based of the total number of employees per organization provided by Senior HR. This number likely represents a conservative number as it is probable that some employees were on various types of leave (i.e., sick leave, maternity/parental leave amongst others).

13 Response rate = Number of completed surveys / Number of emails sent.

14 Participation rate = Number of completed surveys / Number of respondents who entered the survey.
ethnic origin; 18% = gender; 10% = language; 11% = other\(^{15}\). The sample consisted of workers employed primarily on a full-time basis (87%) in a permanent/indeterminate position (78%). Participants reported working in different industries (i.e., corrections, policing and safety [47%], educational services [22%], professional, scientific and technical services [6%]) and occupying various positions (i.e., trained professionals [34%], administrative staff [20%], supervisor/manager/director [16%]). Tenure was measured by the number of years working in the current organization (\(M = 12.12\) years; \(SD = 8.98\)) and in the current position (\(M = 7.01\) years; \(SD = 6.93\)). Respondents in the management category (121 respondents) reported a range of 0 to 200 of direct reports (\(M = 9.16; SD = 20.35\)) and a range of 0 to 600 of indirect reports (\(M = 27.65; SD = 74.47\)).

2.2.2 Measures.

The survey used was a 179-item online questionnaire package presented in twelve parts: (1) demographics, (2) work attitudes and perceptions, (3) work environment, (4) current supervisor, (5) current job, (6) negative behaviours in the workplace, (7) workplace bullying, (8) witness of workplace bullying and legislation, (9) personal characteristics, (10) other workplace behaviours, (11) workplace bullying attitudes and, (12) sick days. All items in the package were based on a self-report approach (see Appendix D for the complete survey). The piping feature of Qualtrics was used in order to have two versions of the same questionnaire: version A started with the demographics section and version B started with the section entitled “Negative behaviours in the workplace” (i.e., NAQ-R). This added feature allowed for determining

\(^{15}\) Minority group categories are based on the Canadian Human Right Act that proscribes discrimination.
whether there was any order effect and if the two available versions influenced the completion of the questionnaire package.

The following section presents the measures employed to assess all variables of the integrated models: workplace bullying and the various tested predictors of this behaviour.

(1) Workplace bullying as per the targets’ experiences. There are mainly two strategies that have been utilized in measuring workplace-bullying targets: 1) the objective method of the behavioural experience technique which measures the exposure to predefined negative bullying-related acts, and 2) the subjective method of the self-labelling technique which asks respondents to determine if they have been a target or not of workplace bullying as per a given definition (Einarsen, Hoel, & Notelaers, 2009).

Behavioural experience technique. This method consists of presenting respondents with a list of items measuring exposure to specific types of negative acts (Notelaers, Einarsen, De Witte, & Vermunt, 2006). It stems from the work of Leymann (1990), who presented respondents with a set of items measuring exposure to specific kinds of bullying behaviours. According to Einarsen, Hoel, and Notelaers (2009), the most common instruments to measure workplace bullying are the Leymann Inventory of Psychological Terror (LIPT; Leymann, 1990) and the currently widely used revised Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ-R) (Einarsen & Hoel, 2001; Einarsen et al., 2009). Other tools have been developed but are mostly used only in one or a few studies (Einarsen et al., 2009) and typically contain more items, such as the Workplace Aggression Research Questionnaire (Keashly & Neuman, 2004) with 60 items and the
Inventory of Workplace Harassment (Mario, Villar, Caputo, Elizabeth, & Coria, 2012) with 72 items.

For the current study, the NAQ-R was the chosen instrument for the objective measure of workplace bullying. Notelaers et al. (2006) claimed that the NAQ-R is “more ‘objective’ as it does not require the respondents to label their experience as bullying and the decision as whether someone is bullied or not resides with the researcher” (p. 291). Furthermore, this approach to the data collection on workplace bullying is important, as the usage of the term bullying from the outset may lead to either priming or range restriction effects because respondents are not requested to consider the negative behaviours as bullying (Hoel & Cooper, 2000).

Einarsen and Raknes developed the NAQ in 1997. In 2001, Einarsen and Hoel developed a revised version (NAQ-R). All 22 items are formulated in behavioural terms with no reference to the word “bullying”. On a five-point Likert scale ranging from one (1; never) to five (5; daily), respondents are asked to answer the following question: “In the last twelve months, how often have you been exposed to the following negative behaviours at work?” Sample items are “Spreading gossip and rumours about you” and “Excessive monitoring of your work”.

In their review of psychometric properties of the NAQ-R with a sample of 5288 employees, Einarsen et al. (2009) claimed that the NAQ-R is a valid, comprehensive yet short scale capturing workplace-bullying incidents representing three underlying factors: personal bullying, work-related bullying, and physically intimidating forms of bullying. The NAQ-R demonstrates high criterion validity as the total scale score significantly correlates with the three individual factors (Einarsen et al., 2009). Einarsen et al. (2009)
also highlighted that the NAQ-R correlated as expected with measures of mental health, psychosocial work environment and leadership, indicating good construct validity. They also reported that correlations between total NAQ-R and GHQ-12 \((r = .43, p < .001)\) and psychosomatic complaints \((r = .41, p < .001)\) were statistically significant and moderately strong. Correlations between exposure to bullying and self-rated work performance, sick leave, and intention to leave were also significant, yet moderate to weak, and in the expected direction (Einarsen et al., 2009).

In another study, Mikkelsen and Einarsen (2002b) reported that exposure to bullying, as measured by the NAQ, was robustly and positively related to psychological health complaints \((r = .52, p < .01)\) and moderately correlated with psychosomatic complaints \((r = .32, p < .01)\). Moreover, Skogstad et al. (2007) found that the NAQ had a moderately strong correlation with laissez-faire leadership \((r = .48, p < .01)\) and a negative correlation with constructive leadership \((r = -.29, p < .01)\).

The first version of the NAQ had some face validity issues when translated into English as the items were constructed with samples from Nordic countries (Einarsen et al., 2009). Those issues were corrected with the revised version of the instrument. Studies that have utilized the NAQ-R reported high internal consistency with Cronbach’s alpha ranging from .84 to .93 (Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2001; Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2002b). Specific to a Canadian sample, Carroll (2006) and Out (2005) used this tool and reported Cronbach’s \(\alpha\) of .89 and .88 respectively. The Cronbach’s \(\alpha\) found in the current study was .93.

Self-labelling technique. The second method of measuring workplace bullying is based on the self-labelling technique by which respondents are presented with a
definition of workplace bullying prior to being asked to indicate whether or not they perceive themselves as targets of such bullying. This approach uses the subjective perception of respondents and is thus known as the “subjective method” in the workplace bullying literature (Zapf & Einarsen, 2011). It was first introduced in 1991 by Einarsen and Raknes, and was based on school bullying research (Einarsen et al., 2009).

The current study used the Quebec Commission des normes du travail (Quebec, 2004) definition: “a vexatious behaviour in the form of repeated conduct, verbal comments, actions or gestures that are hostile or unwanted, that affect the employee’s dignity or psychological or physical integrity that make the work environment harmful” (Section 81.18, Labour Standards). This definition is the first one to be introduced in the Canadian legislation context, as Quebec was the first Canadian province to enact legislation against workplace bullying in 2004.

A clear advantage of using the self-labelling technique is that it is a short measure and is fairly simple to administer and score. Nielsen, Notelaers, and Einarsen (2011) claimed that the face validity of the self-labelling technique is convincing and it may have high construct validity if respondents are presented with a clear and precise definition. Nonetheless, this subjective method could vary according to one’s interpretation of key words and sensitivity or personal threshold of the negative acts (e.g., “repeated conduct”; repeated could be twice for someone, or weekly for six months for someone else). Some respondents may be reluctant to label themselves as such or, conversely, others could label themselves even though they do not meet the definition. Furthermore, this technique does not provide information of the negative behaviours that targets might be experiencing.
Combining both techniques. Using the NAQ-R in combination with a self-labelling measure is the suggested approach by some researchers in the area of sexual harassment (e.g., Arvey & Cavanaugh, 1995). More precisely, they argue for separating the two methods in the questionnaire and allowing participants to respond to the NAQ-R before presenting the self-labelling technique. Thus, as already noted, one strength of the NAQ-R is that it allows one to determine the prevalence of workplace bullying without imposing respondents to label themselves as targets. The use of both techniques allows for the opportunity to compare these commonly used methods. Salin (2003) maintained that using lists with predefined acts seems to somewhat overestimate the prevalence of bullying, at least, in comparison to the self-labelling technique. In addition to this view, Vartia (2001) suggested that it might be possible that some of the acts, although being perceived as negative and undesirable, may still be seen by many respondents as natural aspects of working life that simply have to be accepted rather than be characterized as actual bullying. Nevertheless, the two strategies should be able to provide a better picture of the people experiencing a wide range of negative behaviours and of those perceiving themselves as targets.

(2) Workplace bullying as per perpetrators’ experiences. Most data available on perpetrators come from self-reports of targets’ perspectives of their perpetrators (Zapf & Einarsen, 2011). There are, however, a few exceptions. Hauge, Skogstad, and Einarsen (2009) used the self-labelling technique to identify perpetrators of workplace bullying. Next, Lee and Brotheridge (2006) measured self-reports of being a perpetrator with a scale they developed consisting 43 behavioural items, all drawn from existing scales.
with the exception of one item (i.e., Cortina et al., 2001; Keashly et al., 1994; Quine, 1999; Rayner, 1997).

More specific to the Negative Act Questionnaire (Revised) used in the current study, three studies used the Short-Negative Acts Questionnaire (S-NAQ; Notelaers & Einarsen, 2008) to assess workplace-bullying perpetrators. In one study, Baillien, De Cuyper et al. (2011) used seven items similar to the S-NAQ items. In two other studies, both De Cuyper et al. (2009) and Balducci, Cecchin, and Fraccaroli (2012) measured perpetrators’ reports of workplace bullying with nine items of the S-NAQ. All three studies have adapted the items from a passive (e.g. “being withheld information”) to an active (e.g. “withholding information”) formulation. They reported a Cronbach’s α of .63 (Time 1) and .55 (Time 2) and .68 (Time 1) and .66 (Time 2) respectively.

Using the same method as these studies, the current study included all 22 items of the NAQ-R in adapting them from a passive to an active formulation. More precisely, in order to gather information from both targets and perpetrators of workplace bullying, the NAQ-R was utilized twice in the questionnaire. The first NAQ-R questionnaire presented in the survey consisted of the original instrument (being a target of negative acts). After a few survey sections, the NAQ-R was reintroduced with some modifications to determine perpetrators of negative acts. This section entitled “Other workplace behaviours” in the questionnaire had the following instructions: “The following statements may be seen as examples of behaviours in the workplace. For each item, refer to the scale below and select the frequency that you believe best describes your experience at work over the past twelve months.” Adaptation to the formulation of
some items was required to obtain the perpetrator’s perspective. The following are examples of reformulated items:

Item 1 (NAQ-R): “Being ignored, excluded or avoided by others.”

Item 1 adapted: “Have you ignored, excluded or avoided someone?”

Item 2: “Spreading of gossip and rumours about you.”

Item 2 adapted: “Have you spread gossip or rumours about someone?”

After searches of multiple databases, no studies were found that used this specific approach with the 22 items of NAQ-R. Consequently, further analyses were completed to verify some of the psychometric properties of the adapted version (see Appendix E for more information). A principal component analysis (PCA) with Varimax rotation was conducted with the 22 items and revealed the presence of six components with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining the variance at 11.95%, 9.49%, 9.02%, 8.30%, 8.04%, and 6.03% respectively, for a total variance of 52.83%. The KMO value was .82 and the BTS value was significant thus confirming the sampling adequacy for the analysis. Next, the scree plot diagram indicated the presence of six factors with the first three being the most discernable. The rotated component matrix (RCM) illustrated six factors, namely overt intimidation (items 2, 7, 8, 9, 20, 22), social isolation (items 1, 5, 6, 14), intense micromanagement (items 3, 4, 11, 13, 15, 18), impossible job demands (items 16 and 21), overt isolation (items 12 and 17), and abuse of authority (items 10 and 19).

In terms of internal consistency, the Cronbach’s alpha for the 22-item NAQ-R perpetrator’s perspective version measure was .79 in the current sample. The inter-item correlation values among its items were ranging from .01 to .46 (M = .20), respecting
the benchmarks set by Clark and Watson (1995) and all Corrected item-total correlations were above .3 with the exception of items 3, 15, 16, 17, 19, and 21. As their values were arguably close to .30 (level suggested by Field 2013) and would not increase the alpha value if deleted, they were kept for analyses.

The NAQ-R from the perpetrator’s perspective with its 22 items represents a unique contribution to the literature as it provides for consistency between assessing bullying targets and perpetrators with only slightly modified items. Furthermore, the modified version of the NAQ-R has a higher reliability ($\alpha = .79$) than other shorter versions of the NAQ. This issue will be addressed further in the Discussion section.

(3) Individual characteristics. Based on the proposed integrated models presented in Chapter I, the following variables were included in the questionnaire: (1) personality traits (Five Factor Model), (2) social skills, and (3) self-esteem.

Personality traits as per the Five-Factor Model. The Five-Factor Model (FFM), also known as the Big-Five, seems to be a widely utilized and an extensively researched model of personality (see Goldberg, 1999). Moreover, it seems that most workplace bullying research has assessed personality using various instruments based on the Big-Five framework (see Coyne et al., 2000; Glasø et al., 2007; Lind et al., 2009). It was thus deemed sensible to employ a tool based on the Big-Five that would allow making comparisons with existing literature. The selected measure to assess some personality characteristics is a scale developed by Carroll (2006) that is based on the abridged version of the Big-Five domains by Gosling, Rentfrow, and Swann (2003). As personality is one component of many of the integrated model, a short version was used in order to enhance survey completion rates. The Ten Item Personality Inventory
(Gosling et al., 2003) introduces adjectival items based on a review of the existing Big Five instruments. Although somewhat inferior to standard multi-item instruments, the instruments reached adequate levels in terms of: (a) convergence with widely used Big-Five measures in self, observer, and peer reports, (b) test–retest reliability, (c) patterns of predicted external correlates, and (d) convergence between self and observer ratings (Gosling et al., 2003). Gosling et al.’s (2003) measure consists of 10 items; each item containing two arguably related descriptors (e.g., extraverted and enthusiastic). However, to avoid any semantic problems in later interpretations and to help improve its psychometric quality (i.e., number of items per scale), Carroll (2006) separated each pair of descriptors resulting in four items for each of the five personality traits; giving a 20-item measure, instead of ten items. The measure consists of four items per each subscale of the Big Five: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism (emotional stability), and openness (intellect). Extraversion assesses traits related to sociability and talkativeness. Agreeableness examines the extent that an individual is understanding and diplomatic. Conscientiousness refers to the degree to which an individual tends to be organized and dependable. Emotional stability (neuroticism) evaluates the degree to which an individual is inclined to be relaxed and emotionally stable. Openness is about being original and creative. Using a Likert-type scale from 1 to 7, respondents are asked to indicate the extent one of the two descriptors applies the most (e.g., introverted vs. extraverted). Studies using this version have found good psychometrics properties overall, with Cronbach’s alphas ranging from .60 to .89 (Carroll, 2006; Demers, 2015; Dion, 2015; Lévesque, 2006; Martel, 2010; Tivendell et al., 2013) and a factor analysis indicating the presence of five distinct factors explaining...
64% of the variance with all items saturating on the expected factor (Martel, 2010). The present study found Cronbach’s α of .87 for extraversion, .81 for neuroticism, .73 for agreeableness, .76 for conscientiousness, and .57 for openness to experience.

Self-esteem. Rosenberg’s (1965) Self-Esteem Scale (RSES) was chosen to assess participants’ self-esteem. The RSES is the most common and widely used measure of self-esteem (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991; Huang & Dong, 2012). Schmitt and Allik (2005) completed a simultaneous administration of the RSES in 53 different countries. They found a substantial mean reliability across all nations with a Cronbach’s alpha of .81. Discriminant validity in their Canadian sample with an openness was statistically significant \( r = .19, p < .001 \); along with convergent validity with an extraversion \( r = .40, p < .001 \) and a neuroticism \( r = -.47, p < .001 \). The RSES requires respondents to rate five positively worded and five negatively worded items on a Likert scale. The RSES was originally designed to provide a one-dimensional self-report inventory to measure global self-esteem in adolescents. The selected version of the RSES is the one utilized in Rosenberg, Schooler, Schoenbach, and Rosenberg (1995) that contains six of the RSES’s ten items presented on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The following is an example of one item: “I take a positive attitude toward myself”. Rosenberg et al. (1995) found that their measure of global self-esteem is statistically significant and positively related to measures of psychological well-being, such as life satisfaction \( r = .32, p < .001 \), happiness \( r = .50, p < .001 \) and negatively correlated with depression \( r = -.43, p < .001 \), anomie \( r = -.41, p < .001 \), resentment \( r = -.35, p < .001 \), irritability \( r = -.35, p < .001 \). The present study found a Cronbach’s alpha of .76
Social skills. The selected scale to assess social skills is a measure developed by Ferris, Witt, and Hochwarter (2001). This social skills inventory consists of seven items presented on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) (sample item: “In social situations, it is always clear to me exactly what to say and do”). Witt and Ferris (2003) used this measure in some of their studies and found good to excellent Cronbach’s alphas (i.e., $\alpha = .77$ to .89). Hochwarter, Witt, Treadway, and Ferris (2006) have also used this scale and found Cronbach’s alphas of .89 and .90 in their samples. The internal consistency of this measure ($\alpha = .77$) was in line with prior research.

Although Riggio (1986) argued that social skills are distinct from, and not simply subsumed by, cognitive ability and personality, he did suggest that social skills should show modest correlations with the more interpersonal-oriented personality characteristics. Accordingly, Ferris, Witt, and Hochwarter (2001) reported suitable construct validity, as their measure of social skills had statistically significant and fairly modest associations with most of the following personality traits: agreeableness ($r = .22$, $p < .01$), conscientiousness ($r = .21$, $p < .05$), emotional stability ($r = .27$, $p < .01$), extraversion ($r = .44$, $p < .01$), and openness to new experiences ($r = .18$, $p < .05$).

(4) Organizational characteristics.

---

16 Other widely used scales were considered, such as the Social Skills Inventory (SSI) (Riggio, 1986). This measure assesses six general social skills and each social skill is assessed by the participant’s responses to 15 items. In a review of measures of social skills, Spitzberg (2003) claimed that the SSI is “one of the few assessments with an explicitly theoretical approach” (p. 111) and “has received extensive application and performed very well” (p. 112). No known abridged version of the SSI was found. With its 90 items, it seems that the SSI was not a viable option for this particular study.
Job characteristics. The Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) is one of the most used tools to assess perceived job characteristics (Taber & Taylor, 1990). Hackman and Oldham (1975) suggested that a job should be evaluated in terms of five core dimensions as found in their Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS). These five dimensions are namely skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback. Hackman and Oldham (1975) defined them as per the following.

Skill variety pertains to the degree to which a job requires a variety of different activities in carrying out the work, which involve the use of a number of different skills and talents of the employee (item example: “The job requires me to use a number of complex or high-level skills”).

Task identity is the degree to which the job requires completion of a whole and identifiable piece of work. In other words, it is about doing a job from beginning to end with a visible outcome (item example: “The job is arranged so that I can do an entire piece of work from beginning to end.”).

Task significance is related to the degree to which the job has a substantial impact on the lives or work of other people (item example: “The job itself is very significant and important in the broader scheme of things.”).

Autonomy is the degree to which the job provides freedom, independence, and discretion to the employee in scheduling the work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out (item example: “The job gives me a chance to use my personal initiative and judgment in carrying out the work.”).

Feedback from the job itself is the degree to which carrying out the work activities required by the job results in the employee obtaining direct and clear
information about the effectiveness of his or her performance (item example: “After I finish a job, I know whether I performed well.”).

The selected measure for the current study is Idaszak and Drasgow’s (1987) revision of the JDS; proposing a version that eliminated the artefact found in Hackman and Oldham (1975) and no longer contains reversed-coded items. Items were measured with a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Coefficient alphas for these scales ranged from .70 to .89 (Spector, Jex, & Chen, 1995). In their meta-analysis of psychometrics properties of the JDS, Taber and Taylor (1990) claimed that the five core JDS scales show moderately good discrimination from one another. Another meta-analysis by Fried and Ferris (1987) of external correlates showed that the JDS consistently correlated significantly with overall job satisfaction, growth satisfaction, and internal work motivation. Cronbach’s alphas found in the current study for the five components consisted of .85 for feedback, .78 for task significance, .76 for skill variety, .84 for autonomy, and .77 for task identity.

Leadership. Rafferty and Griffin’s (2004) measure of the four components of transformational leadership was selected for the current study. The four dimensions consist of the following: 1) inspirational communication, 2) intellectual stimulation, 3) supportive leadership, and 4) personal recognition. Rafferty and Griffin’s (2004) taxonomy is similar to most other conceptualizations of transformational leadership, including 1) inspirational motivation, 2) intellectual stimulation, 3) idealized influence, 4) inspirational leadership, and 5) intellectual stimulation.

17 The MLQ seems to be the most widely used instrument to measure transformational leadership. However, due to the considerable cost of this instrument, this measure was not a viable option. Rafferty and Griffin (2004) developed a transformational leadership measure adapted from widely used instruments produced by House (1998) and Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990).
Rafferty and Griffin’s (2004) claimed that their confirmatory factor analyses provided support for their factor structure of the measures selected to assess these sub dimensions. In addition, their analyses provided support for the discriminant validity of the sub-dimensions with each other. Cronbach’s alpha of Rafferty and Griffin’s (2004) adapted scales range from .84 to .96. The scale consists of 12 items on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = strongly agree). The following is an example of an item: “My current supervisor takes into account my personal needs.” After examining the psychometrics properties of the scale (see Appendix E), it was deemed more suitable to treat the scale as a unitary concept; being consistent with other research (e.g., Bass, 1985; Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999). The present study yielded a Cronbach’s alpha of .97 for this scale.

Organizational culture and climate. The instrument chosen for measuring organizational culture and climate was an adapted version of the Business Organization Climate Index (BOCI). The BOCI was developed by Payne and Pheysey (1971) and is based on the Organization Climate Index (OCI) (Stern, 1970). The advantages of using the BOCI are that it is constructed to be completed by all job levels and functions within an organization and is usable across organizations, thus making inter-organizational comparisons possible (Sparrow & Gaston, 1996). Payne and Pheysey (1971) demonstrated that the BOCI reconceptualization of the items of Stern’s OCI has resulted in slightly better psychometric scales. For instance, they explored the construct validity of the BOCI by comparing the culture in three organizations contrasted in terms of their organization structure and concluded that the BOCI has a reasonable degree of construct
validity (Payne & Pheysey, 1971). In addition, Cronbach’s alphas of the BOCI’s 20 scales ranged from .58 to .80 (Payne & Mansfield, 1973).

In consideration of Xenikou and Furnham’s (1996) model of organizational culture and climate, the following BOCI subscales were chosen for the current research project: task orientation, rules orientation, open-mindedness, readiness to innovate, and altruism; with each item scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

After further analyses using the current sample data (see Appendix E), the following variables were kept for the main analyses: rules orientation (item example: “Formal rules and regulations have a very important place here.”) and pleasant organization (item example: “Personal rivalries are uncommon here.”). Pleasant organization involved a focus on the people where respectful and amicable interactions are at the forefront. A Cronbach’s alpha of .83 was found for this scale in the current sample. Rules orientation characterized an organization whereby rules and procedures are important when doing the tasks. Cronbach’s α for this scale was .63 in the current study.

Organizational support was considered part of the organizational environment. The selected measure to assess organizational support is a shorter version of Eisenberger's measure.

---

18 Xenikou and Furnham (1996) analyzed four well-known measures of organizational culture and organizational climate: the Organizational Culture Inventory (Cooke & Lafferty, 1987), the Culture Gap Survey (Kidman & Saxton, 1983), the Organizational Beliefs Questionnaire (Siskin, 1984) and the Corporate Culture Survey (Glaser, 1983). The findings of Xenikou and Furnham (1996) indicated an overlap between the subscales of the four measures examined; thus proposing a five dimensional model of organizational culture: (1) openness to change in a supportive environment, (2) negativism or resistance to change, (3) human factor in a bureaucratic culture, (4) positive social relationship in the workplace, and (5) task-oriented organizational growth.
et al.’s (1986) Survey of Perceived Organizational Support (SPOS). The SPOS evaluates employees’ perceptions about the extent to which an organization cares about their well-being on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree) (item example: “Help is available from the organization when I have a problem”). Coefficient alpha values found for this measure ranged from .74 to .95 (Eisenberger et al., 1986). In the present study, Cronbach’s alpha was .87.

**Demographics.** Some authors have suggested that the occurrence of workplace bullying may be influenced by a number of individual factors including gender and age (see Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996; Hoel & Cooper, 2000). Accordingly, common items such as gender, highest level of education completed, and respondents’ self-consideration of a minority group were included in the questionnaire and controlled for in the analyses further described. Minority group categories were based on the Canadian Human Right Act that proscribes discrimination (see Appendix D)\(^\text{19}\).

**2.2.3 Procedure**

**Recruitment.** As the objective of this research was to examine the degree of relationship between numerous variables as they related to workplace bullying experiences of targets and perpetrators, there was no specific target population other than workers in Canada. Furthermore, given the sensitivity of the topic studied and to access a fairly large number of participants to have sufficient statistical power given the many predictors involved, it was decided that the current study would include at least two organizations in order to maintain anonymity of participating organizations. In

---

\(^{19}\) Minority group was measured with the following question « Do you consider part of any of the following minority group in your workplace? Select all that apply ». Answer choices were the following: *age, ethnic origin, gender, language, religion, other, none.*
addition, as a condition of being granted access to the participating organizations, no identifying information (e.g., individual organizational sample characteristics, tests of organizational differences between the locations) about the separate organizations was to be provided in order to maintain anonymity and confidentiality. In addition, the introduction section of the online questionnaire indicated that participation to the study was confidential and anonymous as no information regarding participant identity or their organization was requested. In essence, in order to be aligned with the objectives, organizational differences or variations were not accounted for in the design of the study. Future research could address differences at different levels of analysis and across organizations. However, due to the sensitivity of this topic, this is not always possible. Moreover, it is not an uncommon research practice in the field to have more than one organization complete one survey and not test for organizational differences (see Brotheridge, Lee & Power, 2012; Lee and Brotheridge, 2006; Mendelson, Turner, & Barling, 2011). Overall, it seems to depend on the research questions (as listed in Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013, p. 29). Finally, two public sector unionized organizations (with two respective departments each) agreed to participate in this study 20.

**Participation.** Senior management personnel from participating organizations invited their employees to take part in an online survey entitled “Workplace Experiences Survey” via email. A reminder was sent after three weeks. In order to further encourage participation, both organizations posted the invitation on their respective electronic weekly newsletter.

---

20 One department declined the invitation, due to poor timing of the request.
Ethical consideration. It was stated in the introduction section of the online questionnaire that participation to the current study was confidential and anonymous as no information regarding participants’ identity or their organization was requested. Participants were informed that their participation was voluntary and that they could, at any time, put an end to their participation without any repercussion (see Appendix D). It was indicated that the Research Ethics Board of the University of New Brunswick, Saint John campus had approved this project (REB 012-2014). As for consent, participants were to select their agreement or disagreement to participate in the study as per the information provided on the introduction page.

Data collection. All data was collected via an online survey powered by Qualtrics. Participants were also made aware that data collected from this study would be available to the principal researcher and her academic supervisor, and would be secured on a UNB password-protected computer database in a restricted access area.

Language. Considering the study’s research sample, all documents (i.e., presentation letter, introduction letter and questionnaire) were made available in Canada’s official languages: French and English. More specifically, a reverse translation method was used (Vallerand, 1989) and then piloted. That is, a bilingual psychologist first translated the original English version of the scales into French. Then, two bilingual professionals translated these translated scales back into English in order to verify the semantic correspondence between the original items and translated items. Next, a committee composed of four professionals including a translator and three academic researchers in applied psychology meticulously examined and compared each version.
Comments and suggestions were provided and minor modifications were made to the documents based on consensus.

**Pilot study.** A convenient sample consisting of people from the general population \( (N = 31) \) was invited to complete the revised version of the online questionnaire (either French or English) in order to spot any content or procedural problems such as the possible use of misleading sentences or expressions and technological glitches. Technical and formatting problems were highlighted along with the use of some misleading terms. The previously mentioned committee examined the suggestions and changes were made accordingly.

The main concern raised in the pilot study was with the NAQ-R scale as participants had some difficulty categorizing the behaviours according to the frequency options available (i.e., *now and then, monthly, weekly, and daily*). Some respondents reported wondering how many times the behaviours have to occur in order to be categorized into one or the other option. Still, it was deemed important not to make any changes to the scale in order to be consistent with other studies and to enable comparisons. Nevertheless, these concerns should be taken into account when interpreting the results.
CHAPTER III

Results

As detailed in the previous sections, the purpose of the current study was to answer the main research question, “Why does workplace bullying occur?” This research was an attempt to enrich our understanding of the multifaceted predictors of bullying in the workplace, a complex yet omnipresent destructive phenomenon. This chapter describes the results obtained from the various analyses conducted.

First, the steps undertaken to clean and to prepare the large data file are explained. Then, the following preliminary analyses are presented: missing data, homogeneity of the population, descriptive statistics, and verification of assumptions. The last section details the main analyses conducted. The current study examined experiences of both targets and perpetrators of workplace bullying. Accordingly, the main analyses assessed these perspectives independently by looking at the variance explained by (a) the various predictors associated with being a target of workplace bullying and (b) the various predictors associated with being a perpetrator of workplace bullying.

3.1 Data File Preparation

IBM SPSS Statistics (version 22) was the software used for data analyses. No data input was required as the “Export Data” feature from Qualtrics downloads raw responses into a SPSS file.

A number of steps were taken to prepare the data file for analysis. First, an initial clean-up of the raw data file consisting of 1119 participants warranted the deletion of 98 participants.

---

21 Additional results not central to the research questions addressed are presented in Appendix E.
error cases (e.g., spam responses reported by Qualtrics)\textsuperscript{22}; thus giving a total of 1021 participants. Next, 261 participants were removed from subsequent analyses because of their incomplete responses\textsuperscript{23}. As a result, the final data sample included 760 participants.

As described in Pallant (2011), it is crucial to look for errors in the dataset. One clear advantage of having a web-based survey is the automation of data input and handling. As respondents input their answers, it reduces errors in data entry considerably as the data is auto-generated. However, errors in the dataset may still be present if respondents make mistakes (e.g., typing 200 instead of 20 for age) and if there are flaws in the survey design (e.g., allowing only one response to a “Select all that apply” question). In order to detect any errors or out-of-range values, descriptive statistics outputs of each survey item (i.e., minimum and maximum values, means, and standard deviations) were generated. All values were deemed plausible\textsuperscript{24}. Nonetheless, a few errors were found in the SPSS codebook that was automatically generated by Qualtrics\textsuperscript{25}. For instance, one Likert scale ranged from 1 to 8 instead of 1 to 7. All errors were rectified.

\textsuperscript{22} The survey software Qualtrics has a feature that takes into account any participants who visited the introduction page on the web link including spam and respondents with the same I.P. address. Their information is downloaded into the data file. As such, it gave the total number of people who entered the survey. However, these are considered as errors, and were easy to detect in the data file created by Qualtrics.

\textsuperscript{23} As indicated in the first point above, Qualtrics registers information of all participants who visit the survey. As a result, uncompleted surveys resulted in the deletion of 261 cases (e.g., participants who clicked on “next” for the introduction page (page 1) or on “consent to participate” (page 2) only.

\textsuperscript{24} The fact that no error was found in the dataset is likely a result of the thorough pilot study conducted in which steps were undertaken to verify the data for errors.

\textsuperscript{25} Qualtrics automatically imports a codebook into the data file as per the design of the online survey. However, various errors were noted, and thus amended.
3.2 Preliminary Analyses

3.2.1 Missing data

It was essential to inspect the data file for missing data and determine any pattern. According to Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), if missing data represent less than 5% of the total and are missing in a random pattern from a large data set, “almost any procedure for handling missing values yields similar results” (p. 63). Non-random missing values, on the other hand, would be a serious matter that could affect the generalization of the results (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

The SPSS “Missing Values Analysis” was conducted and univariate statistics showed that most variables had 5% or more of missing data. This seemed plausible given the fact that Qualtrics had imported data of approximately 115 participants who had not completed the entire survey. The decision was made to keep those respondents given that they had indicated their agreement to participate. In addition, they would automatically be excluded from the main analyses through listwise deletion. With that said, it was imperative to determine the type of missing data (i.e., Missing Completely at Random “MCAR”, Missing at Random “MAR”, Missing not at Random “MNAR”). The Little’s MCAR chi-square test was calculated, which is the most common test for missing cases being missing completely at random (Garson, 2015). The p-value for Little’s MCAR test was not significant (p = .995), thus implying that the data is MCAR.

As missing data is MCAR in this rather large sample, cases with missing values can be dropped listwise from the analyses without biasing the estimates (Garson, 2015). It is a common practice to simply drop the cases with missing values from the analyses,
for which most statistical programs do by default in the process of listwise deletion for advanced analyses (Garson, 2015).

### 3.2.2 Homogeneity of the sample

Next, it was important to determine if the sample could be treated as homogenous or if the analyses had to account for certain differences (see Demers, 2016; Martel, 2010). For this dataset, obvious binary demographic categories were gender and version of the questionnaire. The homogeneity of the sample was thus verified for the binary variables of gender (i.e., female and male) and versions of the questionnaire (version A and version B) using two independent *t*-tests in relation to the following two criteria variables: the workplace-bullying variable as per the target (NAQ-R) and the respondent’s self-report on social skills. As an example, an independent sample *t*-test was calculated to compare the workplace-bullying score between males and females. Results showed no significant difference in scores for males (*M* = 1.24, *SD* = 2.84) and females (*M* = 1.49, *SD* = 3.02), *t*(677) = -1.06, *p* = .29. The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = .24, 95% *CI*: -.71 to .21) was very small (eta squared = .001). The same procedures were used for the other *t*-tests. In brief (see Table 3.1), no significant differences were found due to gender (women and men) for the workplace bullying measure, *t*(677) = -1.06, *p* = .29, and social skills, *t*(607) = 1.28, *p* = .20. In addition, no significant difference was found for the version of the questionnaire (version A and version B) with the workplace bullying measure, *t*(758) =

---

26 Note that all *t*-tests are two-tailed unless otherwise specified.

27 Eta squared = \( \frac{t^2}{t^2 + (N1 + N2 - 2)} \). Cohen (1988, pp. 284-287) proposed the following guidelines for interpreting this value are: .01 = small effect, .06 = moderate effect, .14 = large effect.
- .32, \( p = .75 \) and with the social skills measure, \( t (616) = .13, p = .9 \). With this said, the sample was treated as homogenous.

Table 3.1 *Sample Homogeneity Criteria (N=760)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D.V.</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Questionnaire version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women (N=423)</td>
<td>Men (N=256)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB target crit.</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skills</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.3 *Descriptive statistics.*

Table 3.2 presents a summary of the descriptive statistics for each of the variables included in the model to be examined.

3.3 *Verification of Assumptions*

As discussed in Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), a number of assumptions needed to be verified before running the main data analysis. This section deals respectively with the underlying principles of the ratio of cases to IVs, outliers, absence of multicollinearity, normality, linearity and homoscedasticity of residuals, and independence of errors.

3.3.1 *Ratio of cases to IVs (sample size)*

According to recommendations provided by Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), this study should have at least 274 participants in order to conduct multiple regression analyses according to the ratio of cases formula \(^{28}\) and at least 300 cases for factor analyses \(^{29}\). Given the sample size (N=760) \(^{30}\), these recommendations were therefore

---

28 As per the following formula: \( N \geq 50 + 8m; m \) is the number of IV” = 50+8x28 = 274.
29 “At least 300 cases are needed with low communalities, a small number of factors, and just three of four indicators for each factors” (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013, p. 618).
30
Table 3.2 *Descriptive Statistics of Variables (N=760)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace bullying:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAQ-R (target)</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAQ-R (perpetrator)</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual characteristics:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.75</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skills</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job characteristics:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS skill variety</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS task identity</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS task significance</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>-.77</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS autonomy</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>-.95</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS feedback</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-.77</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational communication</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive leadership</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>-.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal recognition</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational environment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task orientation</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule orientation</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-minded</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational support</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Skewness S.E. = .10 (range: .09 – .10; average .10); Kurtosis S.E. = .19 (range: .18 – .20; average .19). Actual and potential minimum and maximum values are from 1 to 7 respectively with the exception of NAQ-R (target and perpetrator): minimum is 0 and maximum is 4.

---

30 N=700 (aprx) when doing pairwise for preliminary analyses; N=500 (aprx) when doing listwise for main analyses.
respected. Finally, there are a number of statistical software packages that include a sample size calculator\(^{31}\). According to the sample size calculator from Surveysystem.com, the current study’s sample should be able to support findings with a confidence level of 95% and a confidence interval of 3.55 (50%) or with a confidence level of 99% and a confidence interval of 4.7 (50%).

3.3.2 Outliers

When they are isolated, outliers and extreme cases are fairly easy to spot using histograms (Field, 2013). A visual inspection of the variables’ histograms did not raise any major concern. However, the boxplot outputs were more helpful and highlighted a number of outliers and some extreme values. They were as follows (Table 3.3):

Table 3.3 Outliers and Extreme Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Outliers</th>
<th>Extreme Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task orientation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules orientation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership (inspiring communication)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills variety</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task significance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job feedback</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skills</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAQ-R target</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAQ-R perpetrator</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to determine the implications of these univariate outliers and extreme values, an examination of the difference between the mean and the 5% trimmed mean for all variables was completed. If the trimmed mean and mean values are very different,

---

\(^{31}\) Formula: \(ss = \frac{Z^2 \times p \times (1-p)}{e^2}\)
it would require investigating these data points further (Pallant, 2011); otherwise, cases can be retained. Values found from the examination range from .01 to .09. As described in Pallant (2011), a difference of .09 signifies that the mean and mean values are very similar. Given this guideline, these cases were retained. Multivariate outliers were then examined based on Mahalanobis distance, $X^2$ (16) = 39.25; $p < .001$, and Cook’s distance (Cook coefficient < 1). As a result, none of the participants was excluded from the analyses.

### 3.3.3 Multicollinearity

Multicollinearity is a concept that explores the relationship between the variables by looking at their similarity and can be verified by using Pearson correlations. Multicollinearity is present when the IVs are highly correlated ($r > .90$) indicating that the two variables are measuring the same concept; whereas a low correlation indicates that the measures are relatively independent (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). With the criteria proposed by Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) of $r > .90$, no correlation was found to be higher than .90 as illustrated in Table 3.4, demonstrating no multicollinearity.

Additionally, Tolerance and Variance inflation factor (VIF) values (collinearity statistics) were examined to detect possible multicollinearity. Pallant (2011) suggested that tolerance values less than .10 and VIF values above 10 suggest presence of multicollinearity. Tolerance values ranged from .40 to .99 and VIF values ranged from 1 to 2.51; thus, there was no reason to suspect any multicollinearity amongst all variables.
Table 3.4 Correlations Matrix and Cronbach’s Alphas (N=760)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. NAQ Target</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NAQ Perpetrator</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Extraversion</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Agreeableness</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
<td>-0.31*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Conscientious</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.10*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Neuroticism</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.35*</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Openness</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self-esteem</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>-0.33*</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Social skills</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. JDS feedback</td>
<td>-0.34*</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. JDS task sign.</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. JDS skills var.</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.32*</td>
<td>0.41*</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. JDS autonomy</td>
<td>-0.39*</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. JDS task ident.</td>
<td>-0.29*</td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>-0.17*</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.44*</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Leadership</td>
<td>-0.56*</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
<td>0.09*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-0.20*</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Pleasant org.</td>
<td>-0.55*</td>
<td>-0.32*</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td>0.53*</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Rules orientation</td>
<td>-0.36*</td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.39*</td>
<td>0.49*</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Org. support</td>
<td>-0.59*</td>
<td>-0.32*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.31*</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
<td>.61*</td>
<td>.68*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).
**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).
Listwise N=491.
Cronbach’s alpha coefficients are indicated in italics on the diagonal.
3.3.4 Normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity of residuals

As discussed in Tabachnick and Fidell (2013), normality of the variables is not always required for analysis, but the solution is usually better if the variables are normally distributed. A first quick examination of the normality within the sample was done by looking at $p$ values of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. As expected in large samples, all $p$ values were significant ($p < .05$), thus implying the violation of normality. Consequently, a more detailed evaluation was conducted. The determination of normality in the dataset was assessed using kurtosis and skewness values (see Table 3.2). A value of 0 for measures of skewness and the kurtosis suggests a normal distribution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). As shown in Table 3.2, almost all skewness and kurtosis values are between -1 to +1; thus suggesting a reasonably normal distribution (see Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Only five of the thirty-five variables showed possible problematic values of skewness and kurtosis (univariate normality), namely skill variety (Skewness = -1.08, Kurtosis = 1.49), Conscientious (Skewness = -1.29, Kurtosis = 3.87), self-esteem (Skewness = -.75, Kurtosis = 1.12), NAQ-R for targets (Skewness = 1.77, Kurtosis = 3.77), and NAQ-R for perpetrators (Skewness = 1.75, Kurtosis = 3.72). To give a more specific example, scores reported by the targets for the NAQ-R were positively skewed with the mean of 1.56 ($SD = .60$) being greater than the median 1.37 (skewness = 1.77, kurtosis = 1.81) (see Figure 3.10).

This NAQ-R target mean seemed consistent with results from other studies on workplace bullying. Salin (2003) reported that the NAQ did not follow a normal distribution; indeed, scores tend to be positively skewed. Carroll (2006) also reported positively skewed values for NAQ-R. Needless to say, it was probable that the NAQ-R
as per perpetrators would yield similar results. To some extent, it is to be expected to obtain values on the NAQ-R that are positively skewed given the negative nature of this workplace phenomenon. Having a normal distribution, or at its worse, a negatively skewed distribution would be very troublesome and even more disturbing. Then, one could also argue that some measures, conscientiousness for instance, were subjected to social desirability.

For large samples (i.e., 300 + participants), Kim (2013) suggested using a skewness value of greater than two, and a kurtosis value greater than seven to detect substantial non-normality variables. All 35 variables used in the current study showed reasonably normal distributions. As Field (2013) indicated, one with large samples should not be particularly concerned about the assumption of normality. In addition, a common practice in applied psychology research using self-reported data is to avoid data transformation as much as possible as this data consists of respondents’ perspective, and their perspective is their reality.

### 3.3.5 Independence of error

This assumption was verified with the Durbin-Watson statistic test verifies the independence of residuals with one another. As described in Field (2013), the Durbin-Watson statistic ranges in value from 0 to 4 where a value of 2 indicates that the residuals are uncorrelated, a value close to 0 indicates a positive correlation between adjacent residuals, and a value close 4 indicates a negative autocorrelation. The value of Durbin-Watson test found is 2.07 that thus imply the independence of residuals. Furthermore, the value of Durbin-Watson is reported for each of the main analyses described in the next section.
3.4 Main Analyses

As all data assumptions and requisite data cleaning requirements have been met, the next section describes the main analyses conducted to complete the research’s objective. Tabachnick and Fidell's (2013) decision tree lists the statistical techniques to be used according to five major research questions. The main research objective of this study pertains to the first type shown in the decision tree: assessing the degree of relationship amongst several variables. By following the order of the elements presented in the tree, the suggested technique is sequential multiple R, often labelled hierarchical multiple regression (HMR). Therefore, modelling the predictive variables of workplace bullying was examined using linear regressions; a method which estimates the coefficients of a linear equation, involving one or more independent (predictor) variables that best predict the value of the dependent (criterion) variable (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). In HMR, variables or sets of variables are entered into steps (or blocks) in the analysis; in the order specified by the researcher based on theoretical grounds or logic (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). As such, it assists with determining what each predictive variable adds to explanation of variance in the criterion variable after statistically controlling for variance attributed to other variables in the model (Pallant, 2011).

Investigating the possible predictors of workplace bullying by grouping them into sets concurring with the proposed models made conceptual and practical sense (see research questions #2, #3, #5, and #6). First, the proposed models categorized the

---

32 Five types: (1) degree of relationship among variables, (2) significance of group differences, (3) prediction of group membership, (4) structure, and (5) time course of events.
various predictors according to the findings in the extant literature. More specifically, the predictors were divided into the following logical and chronological categories based on a psychological perspective: individual characteristics, job characteristics, leadership, organizational environment, and situational characteristic (being a target or a perpetrator of bullying). The situational characteristic is a newer element and was thus inserted in the last block of the equation to determine its possible added variance to the model. Moreover, it seemed sensible to separately assess the three components of organizational characteristics (i.e., job characteristics, leadership, organizational environment) in order to determine the amount of variance each one accounts for in the model. Therefore, determining the respective contributions of each set/category can provide a more concise view when discussing practical implications, vs. identifying each distinct contributing factor.

Accordingly, HMR analyses were conducted in order to evaluate the proposed models of workplace bullying predictors in two contexts: 1) from the targets’ perspectives, and 2) from the perpetrators’ perspectives. The predictive variables included in the HMR analyses were the seven individual characteristics (i.e., Big-5, self-esteem, and social skills), the five JDS factors, the transformational leadership component, the three organizational environment variables (i.e., pleasant organization, rules orientation, organizational support), and finally, the situational variable of either workplace bullying (WB) perpetrator or WB target (depending on the criterion) as possible explanation of workplace bullying as the criterion.
3.4.1 Context I: Targets’ experiences - Modelling predictors of workplace bullying

Research question 1. After controlling for demographics, do individual, organizational, and situational variables collectively explain a significant proportion of the variance in targets’ experiences of workplace bullying?

A first HMR analysis was carried out for which the criterion consisted of the workplace-bullying variable as per targets’ experiences and the control variables of age, gender, level of education, and minority group\(^{33}\) were inserted in Block 1. Then, all seventeen predictive variables were inserted in Block 2.

Table 3.5 illustrates results of the HMR analysis. The model explains a total of 57% of the variance. For the first step of the analysis, demographic variables contributed significantly to the criterion, \(F(4, 477) = 8.91, p < .001\), explaining 7% of the variance. When all predictive variables were added (Model 2), they contributed significantly, \(F(21, 460) = 28.44, p < .001\), by explaining an additional 50% of the variance.

As shown in Table 3.5, the following are the significant predictors of targets’ experiences\(^{34}\): neuroticism, \(t(482) = 2.59, p < .01\); openness, \(t(482) = -2.45, p < .01\); task significance, \(t(482) = 2.90, p < .001\), autonomy, \(t(482) = -2.36, p < .05\), transformational leadership, \(t(482) = -5.59, p < .001\), pleasant organization, \(t(482) = -2.70, p < .01\); organizational support, \(t(482) = -3.66, p < .001\); and being a WB perpetrator, \(t(482) = 7.64, p < .001\). Based on the magnitude of the beta weights, being a perpetrator had the

\(^{33}\) As Cohen and Cohen (1983) argued, demographic variables are typically good candidates for initial step entry.

\(^{34}\) Significant demographic variables (control variables): education, \(t(482) = -2.70, p < .01\); minority group, \(t(482) = 5.21 p < .001\).
most impact of all predictors. In Table 3.5, being a perpetrator ($\beta = .27$) and leadership ($\beta = -.24$) made the strongest unique contributions to explaining the criterion variable.

Table 3.5 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting NAQ-R (Targets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.89</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority group</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.08**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>-.97</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skills</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS feedback</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS task sign.</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.11***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS skills var.</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS autonomy</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS task id.</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>-2.24</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.24***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant org.</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules orient.</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. support</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.18***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB perpetrator</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $N = 482$; *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$; ***$p < .001$; Durbin-Watson: 2.06.

**Research question 2.** After controlling for demographics, which sets (blocks) of predictors individually account for a statistically significant proportion of the variance for the criterion of targets’ experiences of workplace bullying?

In further investigating the various predictors composing the proposed model of workplace bullying from the targets’ experiences, another HMR analysis was conducted by grouping the independent variables into the following sets: demographics (Block 1), individual characteristics (Block 2), job characteristics (Block 3), transformational
leadership (Block 4), organizational environment characteristics (Block 5), and the situational variable (Block 6).

Table 3.6 illustrates results of the HMR analysis. For the first step of the analysis, demographic variables contributed significantly to the dependent variable, $F(4, 477) = 8.91, p < .001$, explaining 7% of the variance. When individual characteristics were added (Model 2), they contributed significantly, $F(11, 470) = 9.27, p < .001$, by explaining an additional 10.9% of the variance. In Model 3, job characteristic factors were added and contributed significantly, $F(16, 465) = 14.23, p < .001$, accounting for 15% of the variance. For the next step (Model 4), it was found that the addition of the transformational leadership factor was significant $F(17, 464) = 21.84, p < .001$, accounting for 11.6% of the variance. When organizational environment factors were added (Model 5), they contributed significantly, $F(20, 461) = 23.97, p < .001$, by counting for 6.5% of variance. Finally, the sixth step consisted of adding the situational variable of being a WB perpetrator. It contributed significantly to the model, $F(21, 460) = 28.44, p < .001$, by adding 5.5% to the total variance of 56.5%.

Results of the above analysis provided answers to the second research question. In summary, all sets of variables contributed to the prediction of workplace bullying as experienced by the target by accounting for 5.5% to 15% of variance.

The sets of variables (blocks) that made the strongest unique contribution in explaining the dependent variable, when the variance explained by all other variables in the model was controlled for, were as follows in order of explained variance: 1) job characteristics (15%), 2) leadership (11.6%), which is a major contributor as it is just one factor, and 3) individual characteristics (1.9%).
**Research question 3.** *After controlling for demographics, which of the distinct variables within each predictor set (block) are most strongly associated with targets’ experiences of workplace bullying?*

As presented in Table 3.6, the following variables were significant predictors of workplace bullying from a target’s perspective\(^{35}\): agreeableness, \(t(482) = -2.93, p < .01\); conscientious, \(t(482) = 2.00, p < .05\); neuroticism, \(t(482) = 4.80, p < .001\); openness, \(t(482) = -2.20, p < .05\); self-esteem, \(t(482) = -2.19, p < .05\); feedback, \(t(482) = -3.14, p < .01\); task significance, \(t(482) = 4.07, p < .001\); autonomy, \(t(482) = -4.21, p < .001\); task identity, \(t(482) = -2.14, p < .05\); transformational leadership, \(t(482) = -9.83, p < .001\); pleasant organization, \(t(482) = -3.47, p < .001\); organizational support, \(t(482) = -3.90, p < .001\); and, WB perpetrator, \(t(482) = 7.64, p < .001\).

In order to answer the third research question, the magnitude of the β values listed in Table 3.6 were examined to identify the top predicting factors. Accordingly, the variables of transformational leadership (β = .40; \(t[482] = -9.83, p < .001\)), WB perpetrator (β = .27; \(t[482] = 7.64, p < .001\)), and neuroticism (β = .24; \(t[482] = 4.80, p < .001\)) made the strongest unique contributions to explaining workplace bullying target experience.

---

\(^{35}\) Significant demographic variables (control variables): education, \(t(482) = -2.70, p < .01\); minority group, \(t(482) = 5.21, p < .001\).
Table 3.6 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting NAQ-R (Targets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.89</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of educ.</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority group</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.11***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>-2.04</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skills</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.15***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS feedback</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS task sign.</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS sk. variety</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS autonomy</td>
<td>-2.42</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS task id.</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.12***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>-3.81</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.40***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.07***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant org.</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.17***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules orient.</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. support</td>
<td>-1.77</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.20***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.06***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB perpetrator</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 482; *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001; Durbin-Watson: 2.06. The \( \Delta R^2 \) listed in the table give a total of 58% because of rounding.
3.4.2 Context II: Perpetrators’ experiences - Modelling predictors of workplace bullying

In order to gain a better understanding of the predictors of workplace bullying from a perpetrator’s perspective, similar HMR analyses to the ones presented so far were conducted. These included the same predictor variables, with the exception of the situation characteristic consisted of being WB target (instead of WB perpetrator).

**Research question 4.** After controlling for demographics, how well do individual, organizational, and situational variables collectively account for variance in perpetrators’ experiences of workplace bullying?

Control variables of age, gender, level of education, and minority group were inserted in Block 1. All seventeen predictive variables were inserted in Block 2. Table 3.7 illustrates results of the HMR analysis as per the two steps described above. For the first step of the analysis (1% of variance explained), control variables did not contribute significantly to the perpetrator reported workplace bullying. However, when all predictive variables were added (Model 2), block 2 contributed significantly, $F(21, 460) = 10.45$, $p < .001$, by explaining 31% of the variance.

As shown in Table 3.7, the following variables were significant predictors of perpetrators’ experiences of workplace bullying: agreeableness, $t(482) = -4.33$, $p < .001$, self-esteem, $t(482) = -2.15$, $p < .05$, task identity, $t(482) = -2.05$, $p < .05$, leadership, $t(482) = 2.21$, $p < .05$, and being a WB target, $t(482) = 7.64$, $p < .001$. Based on the magnitude of the t-statistics, being a WB target had the most impact of all predictors. In addition, by assessing the $\beta$ values listed in Table 3.7, being a WB target ($\beta = .42$) and agreeableness ($\beta = -.19$) made the strongest unique contribution by explaining the
variance in the perpetrator’s view of their workplace bullying behaviour. Finally, all predictors except for two (i.e., transformational leadership and being a WB target) were negatively correlated with this dependent measure.

**Table 3.7 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting NAQ-R (Perpetrators)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority group</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skills</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS feedback</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS task sign.</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS skills var.</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS autonomy</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS task id.</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant org.</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules orient.</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. support</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB target</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 482; *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001; Durbin-Watson: 1.88

**Research question 5.** After controlling for demographics, which sets (blocks) of predictors individually account for a statistically significant proportion of the variance for the criterion in perpetrators’ experiences of workplace bullying?

Table 3.8 illustrates results of the HMR analysis as per the six steps described above. For the first step of the analysis, demographic variables did not contribute significantly to the dependent variable (1% of the variance). When individual
characteristics were then added (Model 2), this block contributed significantly, $F(11, 470) = 7.19, p < .001$, by explaining 13% of additional variance. For Model 3, job characteristic factors were added and contributed significantly, $F(16, 465) = 6.70, p < .001$, by adding 4% to the variance. For the next step (Model 4), the transformational leadership factor was significant, $F(17, 464) = 6.64, p < .001$ (1% of the variance). When the organizational factors were added (Model 5), they contributed significantly, $F(20, 461) = 7.17, p < .001$, by contributing 4% of variance. Finally, the sixth step included in the model was the variable of being a WB perpetrator. It contributed significantly to the model, $F(21, 460) = 10.45, p < .001$, by contributing 9% to the total variance of 32%. Overall, all sets of predictors contributed to the prediction of the criterion by explaining 1% to 13% of the variance. The top sets of contributors are individual characteristics and being a WB target.

**Research question 6.** After controlling for demographics, which of the distinct variables within each predictor set (block) are most strongly associated with perpetrators’ experiences of workplace bullying?

As presented in Table 3.8, the following variables were significant predictors of workplace bullying from a target’s perspective\(^{36}\): agreeableness, $t(482) = -5.35 p < .001$; neuroticism, $t(482) = 2.96 p < .01$; self-esteem, $t(482) = -2.65 p < .01$; task identity, $t(482) = -2.80, p < .01$; transformational leadership, $t(482) = -2.20, p < .05$; pleasant organization, $t(482) = -2.71, p < .01$; and being a WB target, $t(482) = 7.64, p < .001$.

In order to answer the last research question, the magnitude of the $\beta$ values listed in Table 3.8 were examined to identify the top predictors. Accordingly, the variables of

---

\(^{36}\) Significant demographic variable (control variable): education, $t(482) = -2.03, p < .05$. 

being a WB target ($\beta = .42; t[482] = 7.64, p < .001$), agreeableness ($\beta = .26; t[482] = -5.35 p < .001$), and pleasant organization ($\beta = .17; t[482] = -2.71, p < .01$) made the strongest unique contributions in explaining the perpetrator’s view of their workplace bullying behaviours.

Table 3.8 *Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses Predicting NAQ-R (Perpetrators)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$\Delta R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority group</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.26***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.15***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skills</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS feedback</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.04***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS task sign.</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS sk. variety</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS autonomy</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDS task id.</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant org.</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.04***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules orient.</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org. support</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB target</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.09***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: $N = 482$; *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .005$; Durbin-Watson: 1.88*
3.5 Other Pertinent Statistics

In addition to testing the two models proposed, it was deemed important to drill down further into the data in order to gain a better understanding of the sample in relation to the main theme of workplace bullying. To do so, the following section presents frequencies for the self-labelling technique (targets) and for the NAQ-R (targets and perpetrators).

**Self-labelling technique.** In terms of the self-labelling item where respondents based their answer on the definition that was provided to them, a total of 299 participants (44%) labelled themselves as having been a target of workplace bullying. That is, 18% within the last 12 months, 12% 1–3 years ago, 14% 3 years or more ago (see Table 3.9). It should be noted that the choice of answers to the self-labelling question did not provide the opportunity to select more than one answer; thus implying reference to only one workplace-bullying situation. In future studies using the self-labelling measure, it could be useful to reformulate the item to be able to capture the number of workplace-bullying situations, if applicable.

Table 3.9 Occurrences of Workplace Bullying as per the Self-Labelling Technique

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrence</th>
<th># of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, over the past 12 months</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, 1–3 years ago</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, over 3 years ago</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAQ-R: targets.** The majority of respondents (i.e., 89%) reported having been a target of at least one act of workplace bullying listed in the NAQ-R. See Table 3.10 for a summary of frequencies of all items. Consistent with many studies using the NAQ-R, 272 (38%) represent the number of respondents who meet the workplace bullying
frequency criterion, that is respondents who reported having been a target of at least one act on a regular basis (i.e., daily to weekly basis).

Table 3.10 *Summary of the Occurrence of Negative Acts (Targets) (N=712)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th># of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Now and then</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now and then + Monthly + Weekly + Daily</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly + Weekly + Daily</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekly + Daily</strong></td>
<td><strong>272</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.11 provides a summary of frequencies for all items consisting of the NAQ-R. The most prevalent items are “Someone withholding information which affects your performance” (67%), “Having your opinions and views ignored” (60%), and “Being exposed to an unmanageable workload” (53%).

**NAQ-R: perpetrators.** Table 3.12 details the incidence of the negative acts by the perpetrator. Results show that 505 participants (81%) reported having done at least one of the 22 negative behaviours from a “Now and then” to a “Daily” basis. Forty-one participants (7%) declared having engaged in at least one of the 22 behaviours on a daily to weekly basis.
Table 3.11 Summary of the Sample’s Data for the NAQ-R Items (Targets) (N=712)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Someone withholding information which affects your performance.</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Being humiliated or ridiculed in connection with your work.</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Being ordered to do work below your level of competence.</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Having key areas of responsibility removed or replaced with more trivial or unpleasant tasks.</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Spreading of gossip and rumours about you.</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Being ignored, excluded, or avoided by others.</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Having insulting or offensive remarks made about your person (i.e., habits and background, your attitudes or your private life).</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Being shouted at or being the target of spontaneous anger or rage.</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Intimidating behaviour such as finger-pointing, invasion of personal space, shoving, blocking/barring the way.</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Hints or signals from others that you should quit your job.</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Repeated reminders of your errors or mistakes.</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Being ignored or facing a hostile reaction when you approach.</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Persistent criticism of your work and effort.</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Having your opinions and views ignored.</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Practical jokes carried out by people you don’t get on with.</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Being given tasks with unreasonable or impossible targets or deadlines.</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Having allegations made against you.</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Excessive monitoring of your work.</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Pressure not to claim something which by rights, you are entitled to (i.e., sick leave, holiday entitlement, travel expenses).</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Being the subject of excessive teasing and sarcasm.</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Being exposed to an unmanageable workload.</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Threats of violence or physical abuse.</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.12 *Summary of the Occurrence of Negative Acts (Perpetrators) (N=620)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th># of respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Now and then</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now and then + Monthly + Weekly + Daily</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly + Weekly + Daily</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weekly + Daily</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.13 shows frequencies of behaviours reported by perpetrators for all NAQ-R items. The behaviours most frequently engaged in were “Have you ignored, excluded or avoided someone?” (51%), “Did you ignore someone’s opinions and views?” (41%), and “Have you spread gossip and rumours about someone?” (40%).

*NAQ-R: Targets and Perpetrators.* It also seems interesting to report that 33 participants (5% of the total sample) reported being both a target and a perpetrator of workplace bullying on a regular basis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviours</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Now and then</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Have you withheld information from someone that was affecting their performance?</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>507 82</td>
<td>105 16.9</td>
<td>.5 3</td>
<td>.5 1  .2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have you humiliated or ridiculed someone in connection with their work?</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>546 87.9</td>
<td>72 11.7</td>
<td>.5 0</td>
<td>0 0  0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Have you ordered someone to do work below their level of competence?</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>538 86.8</td>
<td>82 13.2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0  0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Have you removed or replaced key areas of responsibility with more trivial or unpleasant tasks for someone?</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>567 91.5</td>
<td>50 8.1</td>
<td>.2 2</td>
<td>.3 0  0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Have you spread gossip and rumours about someone?</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>370 59.7</td>
<td>236 38.1</td>
<td>10 1.6</td>
<td>3 1 .2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Have you ignored, excluded or avoided someone?</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>301 48.5</td>
<td>275 44.4</td>
<td>16 2.6</td>
<td>20 3.2 8 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Have you insulted or made offensive remarks about someone (e.g., habits and background) their attitudes or their private life?</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>450 72.8</td>
<td>157 25.4</td>
<td>7 1.1</td>
<td>4 3 .6 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Have you shouted at someone or targeted them with spontaneous anger (or rage)?</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>551 88.9</td>
<td>64 1.3</td>
<td>4 .6  1 .2 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Did you do some intimidating behaviour to someone such as finger-pointing, invasion of personal space, shoving, blocking way?</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>594 95.5</td>
<td>28 4.5</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0  0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Did you give hints or signals to someone that they should quit their job?</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>579 94.1</td>
<td>35 5.7</td>
<td>1 .2  0 0  0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Have you repeatedly reminded someone of their errors or mistakes?</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>542 87.4</td>
<td>77 12.4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 .2 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Have you ignored someone or made a hostile reaction when they would approach you?</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>508 82.1</td>
<td>103 16.6</td>
<td>.5 1</td>
<td>.2 4 .8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Did you give persistent criticism to someone of their work and effort?</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>576 92.8</td>
<td>43 6.9</td>
<td>1 .2  0 0  1 .2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Did you ignore someone’s opinions and views?</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>365 59</td>
<td>246 39.6</td>
<td>.6 3</td>
<td>.5 1  .2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Have you carried out practical jokes to someone you do not get along with?</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>590 95.5</td>
<td>27 4.4</td>
<td>1 .2  0 0  0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Did you give tasks with unreasonable or impossible targets or deadlines to someone?</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>582 93.9</td>
<td>37 6</td>
<td>1 .2  0 0  0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Did you make allegations against someone?</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>533 85.6</td>
<td>86 13.8</td>
<td>.5 0</td>
<td>0 1 .2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Did you do an excessive monitoring of someone’s work?</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>544 88</td>
<td>69 11.2</td>
<td>.6 1</td>
<td>.2 0  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Did you pressure someone not to claim something that by rights, they are entitled to (e.g., sick leave, holiday entitlement, travel expenses)?</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>611 98.7</td>
<td>8 1.3</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0  0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Have you subjected someone to excessive teasing and sarcasm?</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>585 94.7</td>
<td>31 5</td>
<td>1 .2  1 .2 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Have you exposed someone to an unmanageable workload?</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>570 92.1</td>
<td>45 7.3</td>
<td>1 .2  2 .3 1 .2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Have you given threats of violence or physical abuse (or actual abuse) to someone?</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>615 99</td>
<td>6 1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0  0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

Discussion, Recommendations, and Conclusions

The main objective of this study was to simultaneously investigate a number of previously identified predictors of both targets and perpetrators’ experiences of workplace bullying. HMR analyses were conducted to answer six research questions that allowed determining the contribution of sets of predictors (i.e., individual characteristics, job characteristics, leadership, organizational environment characteristics, and situational characteristic) as presented in the literature, in addition to determining the distinct predictive magnitude for each variable in these sets. Briefly, all five sets of variables made a significant contribution to the prediction of targets’ experiences of workplace bullying, varying from 6% to 15% of explained variance, and collectively accounting for a total variance of 57%. Overall, 13 of the assessed 17 variables contributed significantly to the variability. Next, all five sets of variables made a significant contribution to the perpetrators’ experiences of workplace bullying as well, varying from 1% to 13% each, in explaining a total variance of 32% among this dependent variable. Specifically, 7 of the 17 variables were significant predictors.

This last chapter starts with a summary and discussion of the results to the research questions and moves on to presenting the empirical versions of the exploratory models. Other pertinent findings are briefly discussed to help us better understand workplace bullying as assessed in the current study. Next, scientific and practical implications and contributions are discussed. The limitations of the study and recommendations for future research follow. A general conclusion completes this final chapter.
4.1 Discussion of Findings

This section presents a discussion of the results. It also presents in what ways findings confirm, refute, or extend knowledge on the topic of workplace bullying.

4.1.1 Discussing and modelling the occurrence of workplace bullying

What contributes to the occurrence of workplace bullying? This question constitutes the core of this research. The overarching aim of this study was to provide insights into explaining the occurrence of workplace bullying. Compared to prior research studies, it was the first attempt at simultaneously using HMR to assess numerous predictors from all key perspectives (i.e., individual, organizational, and situational characteristics) in two contexts: 1) targets and 2) perpetrators of workplace bullying. Essentially, two proposed models of workplace bullying predictors based on extant literature were examined in order to then propose two empirical, yet parsimonious models of these two experiences.

Context I: Modelling predictors of workplace bullying from targets’ experiences. The first three research questions pertained to assessing the proposed model of predictors (see Figure 1.1), and determining the statistical contribution of each main set (block) of the variables along with their most predictive factors according to targets’ experiences of workplace bullying.

First, the combined predictors explained 57% of the variance in workplace bullying from targets’ perspectives. All sets of predictors contributed to the prediction of being a target of workplace bullying; that is, individual characteristics (11%), job characteristics (15%), transformational leadership (12%), organizational environment variables (7%), and being a WB perpetrator (6%) (see Figure 4.1). Finally, as shown in
Table 4.1, thirteen of the seventeen predictors included in the model were statistically significant in explaining the criterion. These variables include lower agreeableness, higher conscientiousness, greater neuroticism, lower openness, lower self-esteem (-correlation), less job feedback, greater task significance, less autonomy, lower task identity, lower transformational leadership, lower pleasant organization, lower organizational support, and being a WB perpetrator. Notably, the distinct predictors that explained the most variance were transformational leadership, being a WB perpetrator, and neuroticism. These findings provide mixed support in relation to previous findings in the extant literature and are discussed in turn below.

Individual characteristics. In terms of individual characteristics, the results of the present study are fairly aligned with Coyne, Seigne, and Randall (2000) who found that targets are less stable (similar to neuroticism), and more conscientious and introverted. They also support Lind, Glasø, Pallesen, and Einarsen's (2009) findings: targets in their study reported being more neurotic and less agreeable. Results are also congruent with recent findings by Nielsen et al. (2017) who found that neuroticism emerged as the strongest and most consistent correlate of exposure to harassment. These findings are not surprising as it is likely that an emotionally stable individual will respond to bullying behaviours differently than someone reporting higher levels of neuroticism. Thus, it is plausible to assume that someone on the receiving end of bullying behaviours who is emotionally stable, calm, and even-tempered has a greater facility in dealing and resolving the conflict immediately in comparison with someone who is easily upset, tense, and anxious that would most likely escalate the conflict. After all, as Zapf and Einarsen (2002) highlighted, workplace bullying is often considered as a
conflict that has escalated. However, an alternative explanation could be that individuals who are emotionally unstable may invite others to target them due to their perceived and often overt vulnerability, and arguably, weakness.

In regards to agreeableness, individuals who score low on this personality trait tend to experience more interpersonal conflict, as they will more likely express their disagreement than those with higher scores, and tend to be antagonistic and hostile to others. Furthermore, it may create opportunities for workplace bullying to develop as a result of their typically antagonistic ways of interacting, eliciting negative behaviours from others in response to retaliation. Thus, if the conflict is not resolved nor managed effectively, it will likely escalate and could become a workplace-bullying situation (Zapf & Einarsen, 2002). In contrast, individuals who score higher on conscientiousness may threaten perpetrators’ self-esteem or instigate envy and resentment. Generally, conscientious employees are well perceived by their superiors, being seen as organized, dependable, and self-disciplined. Consequently, the conscientious person may have a greater sense of competence (Spreitzer, 2007), which in turn may represent a perceived threat to the perpetrator’s access to available resources (e.g., pay raises, promotions).

Nielsen et al. (2017) found no support for the openness trait of personality as a predictor; however, in the current study, lower levels of openness was associated with more bullying victimization. It seems reasonable to believe that individuals with lower openness to experience scores may trigger negative reactions from others, frustrated by the rigidity and inflexibility of these individuals. For example, one of the top reported negative behaviours identified by respondents in the current study consisted of “ignoring someone’s views and opinions”. As such, it is likely that people who want to move
things in original ways could ignore their colleagues for whom their opinion/idea/strategy represents the status quo.

Results of the present study also support Zapf and Einarsen's (2011) notion that self-esteem plays a role in workplace bullying victimization, but it argues against the role of social skills as a predictor. People reporting lower levels of self-esteem claimed experiencing greater bullying victimization. Hence, people with lower levels of self-esteem may be more vulnerable to bullying behaviours by others, and are easy targets in the sense that they are likely more sensitive to criticism and feel less prepared to handle or confront conflict in the workplace.

Contrary to expectations, no significant relationship was found between social skills of targets and bullying experiences, disputing the results from other studies (e.g., Einarsen et al., 2011). Arguably, one might expect social skills to be negatively related to workplace bullying as social and communication skills would have a tendency to clearly communicate the negative impact of certain behaviours to the perpetrator and likely deal and manage the conflict instantly and appropriately. As social skills were not observed to be a significant predictor in the current study, it is plausible that social skills may act more like a moderator. For example, Witt and Ferris (2003) found social skills to be a moderator of the conscientiousness and job performance relationship. Specific to the bullying literature, Hutchinson and Hurley (2013) provided theoretical arguments that emotional intelligence capabilities offer real potential to moderate bullying behaviours. Accordingly, it seems appropriate to examine if social skills play a similar role, given its similarities (e.g., self-awareness) with emotional intelligence. Future studies looking at the role of social skills as possible moderators in relation to workplace
bullying could be beneficial, especially given that it has more practical implications. More precisely, social skills are relatively trainable, in comparison with personality characteristics that are more stable and enduring (Witt & Ferris, 2003). In all, the aforementioned findings seem to be challenging Leymann (1996) who strongly opposed the idea that the personality of an individual can predispose him or herself to becoming a target of workplace bullying.

*Organizational characteristics.* Results support Salin and Hoel (2011) who claimed that job design and work organization, organizational culture and climate, and leadership are important predictors of workplace bullying. Specific to job characteristics, it is important to note that this category explained the most variance (i.e., 14%) in targets’ experiences of workplace bullying, with four of the five characteristics having a statistically significant contribution. As core aspects of employees’ daily tasks, these findings suggest the importance of job characteristics in the occurrence and/or prevention of bullying. Moreover, most studies investigating job characteristics as predictors of bullying have mainly focused on job control and workload (see Trépanier et al., 2015). Findings from the current study using the five dimensions of the commonly used JDS are thus adding new elements to the literature. For example, task significance was predictive of bullying in the current study. This finding may be due to the fact that high-status jobs integrally have greater levels of responsibility since they encompass more important and complex decision-making. As such, stakes can be rather high at this level and conflict is expected. In addition, the high-status could be perceived as a threat to perpetrators. Addressing this question in subsequent research would be warranted.
Further, feedback, task autonomy, and task identity all had significant negative correlations with bullying victimization; meaning that employees who reported higher levels of these job characteristic variables reported less bullying. This finding supports Di Martino et al.'s (2003) view that a lack of control (autonomy) over the work environment can be linked to workplace bullying. More specifically, it can be postulated that employees who have more autonomy over their work have less opportunity to be micromanaged (see the negative act “Repeated reminders of your errors or mistakes”). In fact, intense micromanagement was a form of bullying behaviours by perpetrators found in the current study (item example, “Did you do an excessive monitoring of someone’s work?”). In summary, as proposed by Björkqvist, Österman, and Hjelt-Bäck (1994) and Leymann (1996), workplace bullying seems to be occurring in the presence of negative job characteristics and the absence of positive ones.

In the current sample, levels of perceived transformational leadership was associated with a reduced propensity to be bullied at work, explaining 12% of the total variance. In fact, it is by far the biggest contributor, as it constitutes one variable only. Findings are aligned with Nielsen (2013) who reported that transformational leadership and authentic leadership were related to decreased risk of exposure to bullying behaviour. Results are thus contributing to the rather limited literature of leadership styles that may lower the occurrence of bullying. It is reasonable to believe that transformational leaders will foster a climate of trust and positive interpersonal relationships with their subordinates. Accordingly, this climate could create an ambiance where constructive conflict and cooperation will be predominant (vs. destructive conflict and competition) between the leader and his/her subordinates, and also amongst the
work unit. Often, it is assumed that employees expect that their managers will “walk the talk”; that will likely create reciprocated behaviours from the employees. After all, according to Bandura (1971), people learn from their interactions with others in a social context. After observing others’ behaviours, people assimilate and imitate those behaviours, especially if their observational experiences are positive ones or include rewards related to the observed behaviour (Bandura, 1971). Hence, a leader who is considerate of others’ needs, recognizes, and appreciates efforts of others will more likely create similar behaviours with and within their subordinates.

Brodsky (1976) proposed that bullying would only happen when there is an organizational culture that allows and rewards it. Findings of the current study support his view to some extent. Particularly, both concepts of pleasant organization and organizational support were shown to decrease the propensity of workplace bullying. These findings are consistent with the notion that, in a healthy organizational culture that promotes consideration and care for others, bullying behaviours would be reduced. Furthermore, organizations that provide help and support for employees when they have a problem (as per the item from the organizational measure) may promote resolving conflict at the lowest level in a timely fashion. This will diminish the likelihood of allowing the conflict to escalate in a workplace-bullying situation. Social learning theory suggests that behavioural modelling and imitation of workplace bullying can help perpetuate it (Salin, 2003a). Although the current study did not investigate specifically whether the organization was rewarding workplace bullying, it is plausible that a pleasant and supportive culture may be its antithesis.
Situational characteristic: being a perpetrator of workplace bullying. As discussed previously, the relatively new dimension of the situational characteristic was also explored in order to determine if being a perpetrator of workplace bullying would predict being a target. Results provided solid support for this postulation. By taking a closer look at the negative behaviours that could constitute workplace bullying as per the NAQ-R, it could be hypothesized that if someone is on the receiving end of bullying behaviours, then they could very well respond by mirroring similar behaviours, or perhaps, react by doing self-preserving behaviours. For example, if a colleague engages in overt intimidation (e.g., “Have you humiliated or ridiculed someone in connection with their work?”), it could evoke a response from the target such as overt isolation (e.g., “Have you ignored someone or made a hostile reaction when they would approach you?”). Another plausible scenario, for example, would be a manager targeted by “Being given impossible deadlines”. This pressure of being given impossible deadlines could spill over so that he/she, in turn, gives his/her subordinates similarly impossible deadlines; thus creating a trickle down effect. These arguably normal reactions to abnormal situations could make the target become a perpetrator and vice versa. With this said, almost any behaviour taken out of context may very well serve as ammunition to one’s belief or perceptions, being either positive or negative. Subsequent research in other samples and in other cultural contexts needs to be conducted in order to better understands how and why being a target makes one more likely to be a perpetrator.

In the same line, but as an extreme case, the incident of Pierre LeBrun in 1999 merits some attention. LeBrun’s case is an example that workplace bullying may have catastrophic consequences such as homicide and suicide. Briefly, Pierre LeBrun, a
former employee of the OC Transpo, had been taunted and teased about his speech
impediment for a long time to finally lash out by murdering four coworkers to then turn
the gun onto himself (Westhues, 2002). Workplace bullying was almost never discussed
in Canada until there was a coroner’s inquest following this incident in Ottawa
(Westhues, 2002). In this case, LeBrun had been ridiculed persistently by colleagues for
his stutter and then, after he had slapped one of them in retaliation, he had been forced
to apologize to his tormentors. As media reports tentatively concluded, the inquest found
that the worker had indeed been a victim of workplace bullying, which led to his
unfortunate actions (Westhues, 2002).

**Context II: Modelling predictors of workplace bullying from perpetrators’
experiences.** The subsequent three research questions assessed the proposed model of
predictors, and determining the statistical contribution of the main sets (blocks) along
with their most predictive factors according to perpetrators’ experiences.

As presented in Chapter III, although some of the patterns were similar as found
for targets’ experiences, there are a number of notable differences in the findings. For
the perpetrators’ experiences of workplace bullying, results showing a total variance
explained of 32% and seven statistically significant predictors are a fair beginning. Each
set of predictors contributed to the prediction of the perpetrators’ experiences of
workplace bullying; that is, individual characteristics (13%), job characteristics (4%),
transformational leadership (1%), organizational environment variables (4%), and being
a WB perpetrator (9%). Finally, as shown in Table 4.1, seven of the seventeen predictors
were statistically significant in explaining the criterion, namely, lower agreeableness,
greater neuroticism, lower self-esteem, lower task identity (- correlation), lower transformational leadership, lower pleasant organization, and being a WB target.

The distinct predictors that explained the most variance in perpetrators’ experiences of workplace bullying were being a WB target, level of agreeableness, and perceptions of a pleasant organization. These findings provide mixed support with the existing literature as discussed in the following section. In addition, given the similarities of the context of being a target and a perpetrator, some of the speculations provided in the targets’ experiences still seem applicable in the context of perpetrators. In order to avoid being redundant, and because the literature on this is very limited, the following discussion is shorter and more tentative than that of the targets’ perspective.

**Individual characteristics.** There is a popular view that bullying behaviours are largely rooted in individual characteristics of the perpetrators; though few studies support this notion (Einarsen, 2005). The current study found that agreeableness, neuroticism, and self-esteem significantly contributed 13% in predicting workplace-bullying perpetration. It did not find support for the roles of extraversion, conscientious, openness, and social skills. However, these findings are different than those reported in the few studies that have researched this question. For example, Seigne et al. (2007) found that perpetrators are more likely to be extraverted and Zapf and Einarsen (2011) proposed that the lack of social skills is a predictor of being a perpetrator. The relation between agreeableness and workplace-bullying perpetration can be explicated by the idea that people who tend to disagree (less agreeable) inevitably create more conflict, which may then lead to doing more bullying behaviours. Also, results showed that higher scores on neuroticism were associated with more bullying perpetration. One
could argue that emotionally unstable individuals would be more inclined to engage in aggressive bullying behaviours when emotionally frustrated or when having difficulty regulating emotions to perceived triggers. This notion has been supported in the literature (Seigne et al., 2007) and it is consistent with items associated with this variable (e.g., “shouted at someone or targeted them with spontaneous anger or rage”).

As it was found for bullying targets, self-esteem was found to have a negative correlation with bullying perpetrators; having more self-esteem is predictive of less perpetration of bullying. This finding supports the common assumption that people with low self-esteem tend to become aggressive and are more likely to bully others (Zapf & Einarsen, 2011). A possible explanation may be that people with low self-esteem may become hostile or passive-aggressive in response to trivial threats to their self-esteem. It is also interesting to note that the perpetrators’ individual characteristics had a slightly higher contribution to the overall variance of the WB perpetrator model (13%) than for the WB target model (11%). In addition, only three individual characteristics (i.e., agreeableness, neuroticism, and self-esteem) of perpetrators as compared to five characteristics (i.e., agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, openness, and self-esteem) of targets significantly predicted being victimized. This would suggest that overall, individual characteristics of perpetrators are slightly more predictive (i.e., total variance explained) of workplace bullying than individual characteristics of targets. Certainly, further investigation is warranted.

Organizational characteristics. In their research findings summary, Salin and Hoel (2011) claimed that despite the clear support for organizational factors being critical elements contributing to workplace bullying, it is only until recently that
research has been carried out. Findings of this study thus provided support for the work environment hypothesis, specific to the occurrence of perpetrators’ experiences of workplace bullying.

For job characteristics, only task identity contributed significantly by predicting 5% to the model of perpetrators’ experiences of workplace bullying. This finding constitutes another distinctive contribution, which has yet to be examined in any known studies as of date as a predictor of workplace bullying perpetration. Accordingly, comparisons cannot be made with the broader research. However, it is likely that doing a job from beginning to end with a visible outcome creates clear expectations vis-à-vis the tasks to be completed. In contrast, in situations where the expectations are not clear, one may think that a given task is their colleague’s responsibility, while that colleague may believe that it belongs to the other person. This situation will inevitably create conflict. Conflict often takes place when a task-related conflict is not resolved and becomes personal (see Leymann, 1996; Zapf & Gross, 2001). Again, when the situation deteriorates, it risks developing into bullying (Zapf & Gross, 2001). In all, if the person in charge has a clear idea of the beginning and ending point of the task, results propose that it will decrease the tendency of engaging in workplace-bullying behaviours.

The leadership component had a statistically significant contribution of workplace-bullying perpetration, but explained only one percent of the variability in this perspective. Results suggest that respondents who reported observing more transformational leadership behaviours from their supervisors reported engaging in less bullying behaviours. The speculations discussed in the previous section seem to be pertinent here as well. Transformational leaders will foster a climate of trust and positive
interpersonal relationships within their subordinates. Accordingly, it is likely that it will create positive work relationships and work environments, where disagreements will be ironed out and respected (Nielsen, 2013), before they escalate into bullying (see Zapf & Gross, 2001). It also seems reasonable that employees who have transformational leaders will observe many positive behaviours and according to Bandura (1971), will assimilate and imitate such behaviours; consequently, engaged in less workplace bullying behaviours.

Results feature the important contribution of transformational leadership in decreasing the occurrence of workplace bullying for both models. As asserted by Nielsen (2013), these findings highlight the importance of recruiting, developing, and training leaders who promote both positive psychological capacities and positive perceptions among their subordinates. Thus, it would be in the best interest of organizations to promote and support this type of leadership in order to decrease, and arguably, to prevent workplace bullying. Clearly, more research needs to be conducted in order to better understand the differential effects of leadership on being a perpetrator as opposed to being a target.

The organizational culture characteristic of a pleasant organization contributed significantly by adding four percent to the perpetrators’ model. This finding is consistent with Vartia (1996) who found that bullying working milieus were characterized by competitive cultures, while non-bullying milieus had easy-going and pleasant organizational cultures. It should not be surprising that organizational environments in which cooperation and mutual aid are promoted will tend to engender positive discussions and interactions. For example, in organizations with a healthy culture of
collaboration and trust (reflected in the scale item, “if something happens to go wrong, people do not go around seeking whom to blame”), one may expect less negative behaviours, including bullying (see Vartia, 1996). Moreover, it seems consistent with the literature on healthy organizations that shows positive effects for employee management and other interpersonal work relations and reduced counterproductive workplace behaviours (Kelloway & Day, 2005). Further, given the items composing the pleasant organization variable, the current study is relatively aligned with the three types of culture connected with different forms of abuse identified by Wright and Smye (1996): blaming, win/lose, and sacrificing. After all, in certain cultures, bullying acts may be considered natural and or even an effective way in achieving goals (Salin, 2005).

Ultimately, the current findings support Leymann’s (1996) assertion that bullying is deeply rooted in the psychosocial work environment, including leadership practises. Accordingly, similarly to the discussion on transformational leadership, an organization ought to invest in adopting or keeping characteristics that make the organization pleasant, and that will not only create positive outcomes, but also prevent negative outcomes such as workplace bullying. More research is evidently needed to better understand various aspects of organizational characteristics on being a perpetrator of workplace bullying.

Situational characteristic: Being a target of workplace bullying. Being a target of workplace bullying clearly augmented the propensity of becoming a perpetrator (9% variability). As discussed in the section of targets’ experiences, there are many plausible scenarios that could lead to a target also being a perpetrator. Nonetheless, as maintained
by Leymann (1996), perpetrators can only bully others in a culture that permits this behaviour without proper consequences.

Comparing both models of workplace bullying predictors

The following figure (Figure 4.1) compares results of HMR analyses conducted with the sets of variables (blocks) for both workplace bullying targets and perpetrators’ experiences.

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 4.1. HMR analyses: Variance explained (ΔR 2) by each set of predictors for the criteria.*

Table 4.1 provides a summary of all predictors in order to compare the two models for workplace bullying targets and perpetrators.
Table 4.14 *Summary of All Predicting Variables for both Criteria (N=482)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Target of workplace bullying</th>
<th>Perpetrator of workplace bullying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Extraversion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agreeableness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conscientious</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Neuroticism</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Openness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-esteem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Social skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. JDS feedback</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. JDS task sign.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. JDS skills var.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. JDS autonomy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. JDS task id.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Trans. leader.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Pleasant org.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Rules orient.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Org. support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. WB target</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. WB perpetrator</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Negative signs indicate a negative correlation (e.g., agreeableness is negatively correlated with targets’ experiences of workplace bullying). Positive signs signify a positive correlation (e.g., conscientious is positively correlated with targets’ experiences of workplace bullying). Empty cells signify that the variable is not significant.*

**Empirical models of workplace bullying predictors.** The overall aim of the study was to assess the proposed comprehensive, yet exploratory models of workplace bullying predictors in order to elucidate statistically significant risk factors. Numerous factors found in the literature were assessed to determine whether they contributed to workplace bullying according to targets and perpetrators’ perspectives. HMR results allowed for the identification of specific predictors of the criteria. Accordingly, the following figures (Figure 4.2 and Figure 4.3) present parsimonious versions of the models based on the empirical evidence of the current study, as detailed in the previous section. The fundamental goal of understanding the risks factors and protective factors for workplace bullying is to contribute to its prevention and constructive management.
The empirical models are providing a framework to determine the best strategies to prevent and manage workplace bullying. Hence, this should help focus researchers and practitioners’ efforts and attention.

Given that the sample consisted of more targets than perpetrators as per assessed by the NAQ-R, having the two respondent perspectives as dependent variables has inevitably created less power for the perpetrators’ model. Future research needs to ensure that sample sizes for perpetrators are greater in order to minimize Type II errors (i.e., failing to detect an effect that is present due to lower power).
Figure 4.2. Empirical model: Predictors of workplace bullying as per the targets’ experiences.
Figure 4.3. Empirical model: Predictors of workplace bullying as per the perpetrators’ experiences.
4.1.2 other pertinent findings

*Measuring the prevalence of workplace bullying.* In addition to addressing the results of the exploratory models proposed in the current study, other pertinent findings are highlighted below. First, the results of this study add to the growing body of research showing that workplace bullying is omnipresent in Canadian workplaces. As indicated in Figure 4.4, 90% percent of the sample reported being on the receiving end of workplace bullying behaviours over the past year, of which 38% would meet the regular basis criterion found in most definitions of workplace bullying. Further, a startling 81% of the sample reported being an instigator of bullying, and 7% of these reported doing so on a regular basis (i.e., daily or weekly). These statistics paint a disturbing portrait of the state of organizational health in this sample, and point to the necessity of better understanding what factors best predict this damaging workplace behaviour in order to mitigate them.

*Figure 4.4. Prevalence of workplace bullying: Both targets and perpetrators.*

![Figure 4.4](image-url)
Despite differences in measuring (e.g., self-labelling vs. objective list of acts) and reporting (e.g., frequency) workplace bullying as per the targets’ experiences, prevalence rates found in the current study are relatively consistent with similar studies using relatively comparable samples (e.g., Carroll & Hoel, 2007; Keashly & Jagatic, 2000; Out, 2005; Soares, 2002). Further, in their examination of both targets and perpetrators, Lee and Brotheridge (2006) found that 40% of the sample reported they had experienced one or more acts of bullying, and 24% reported that they themselves had engaged in one or more forms of bullying. Although they measured workplace bullying via a different scale from the current study, they found a moderately higher percentage of perpetrators of workplace bullying in their sample. This difference suggests that more studies are needed to better understand incidences of workplace bullying as per the perpetrator’s experience.

Bullying rates found in the present study are aligned with other European research using the NAQ for the “at any given frequency” basis. In fact, research in Europe found that as many as 70-90% of all respondents claimed to have been exposed to at least the occasional negative act over the last six months (Einarsen et al., 2009; Einarsen & Raknes, 1997). As discussed previously, different results are obtained when the repeated criterion (frequency of at least weekly) is applied: Canadian rates are considerably higher (i.e., Canadian rates are between 27% - 47% vs. European rates are 3–15%). One plausible explanation could be that, based on occasional negative acts, Canadians and Europeans are displaying relatively similar negative behaviours. A key cultural difference may be that Europeans are still engaging in some negative acts;
however, the situation is dealt with in a timely fashion or viewed as unacceptable, thus resolving conflict before it escalates into bullying (see Zapf & Gross, 2001).

**Measures of workplace bullying.** As reported earlier, two methods were utilized to measure the occurrence of workplace bullying: 1) the objective method of the behavioural experience technique consisting of the exposure to predefined negative acts as per the NAQ-R, and 2) the subjective method of the self-labelling technique asking respondents to determine if they have been a target or not of workplace bullying as per a given definition. Despite the fact that the objective method was the privileged tool used as the criterion for the various analyses, the comparison of both measures can still provide some interesting insights.

First, for the objective method, a total of 38% of respondents claimed to be a target of negative behaviours on a regular basis (i.e., daily to a weekly basis), and for the subjective method, 17.4% of respondents claimed to be a target based on a definition (that included the term “repeated”). The relatively high difference in occurrence seems to be congruent with other research. For instance, Carroll (2006) found prevalence rates of 27% as per the NAQ-R and 5.6% as per the self-labelling technique. Salin (2005) claimed that using lists with predefined acts in comparison to subjective methods seems to somewhat overestimate the prevalence of bullying. This assertion seems to be challenging the idea that objective measures are often more accurate than subjective ones. Additionally, the reality of the context of this study could rather constitute serious concerns: people do not consider that experiencing negative behaviours at work is problematic nor do they consider bullying as an abnormal phenomenon. In other words, it could be that negative acts found in the NAQ-R are not necessarily perceived as
bullying by the respondents; they are rather natural aspects of working life that simply have to be accepted (Salin, 2005).

Second, it is also interesting to highlight that the self-labelling technique generated a rate significantly higher (i.e., 17.4% versus 5.6%) than others such as Carroll (2006). One plausible explanation for this discrepancy is the increased awareness of workplace bullying in the last decade, partly due to the adoption of anti-bullying legislation in many provinces. Future research is needed in order to answer this question more definitively.

**Negative behaviours.**

**Negative behaviours experienced by targets.** As shown in Appendix E, a total of four categories of workplace bullying behaviours: (1) *person-related bullying* (e.g., “Spreading of gossip and rumours about you”), (2) *work-related bullying* (e.g., “Excessive monitoring of your work”), (3) *overt physical intimidation* (e.g., “Being shouted at or being the target of spontaneous anger”) and (4) *impossible job demands* (e.g., “Being given tasks with unreasonable or impossible targets or deadlines”) were identified. This taxonomy is similar to those found in other research. For instance, Hoel and Cooper (2000) identified the following categories: (1) *work-related harassment* (e.g., persistent criticism of work and effort, attempts to find fault) (2) *personal harassment* (e.g., insulting or offensive remarks, spreading of gossip and rumours) (3) *organizational harassment* (e.g., having key areas of responsibility removed or replaced with more trivial or unpleasant tasks, being given tasks below one’s competence), and (4) *intimidation* (e.g., threats of violence or physical abuse, intimidating behaviour such as finger-pointing, exposure to shouting or spontaneous anger). The categories can not
only help in generating greater understanding of the various forms of bullying but future research could also aim in investigating their specific relation with other variables (e.g., predictors and outcomes) of bullying, as evidenced for example by Harlos and Axelrod (2005) in their study of workplace mistreatment.

Negative behaviours instigated by perpetrators. In regards to the perpetrator’s perspective, six factors were identified from the analysis, namely (1) overt intimidation (e.g., “Have you humiliated or ridiculed someone in connection with their work?”), (2) covert isolation (e.g., “Have you withheld information from someone that was affecting their performance?”), (3) intense micromanagement (e.g., “Did you do an excessive monitoring of someone’s work?”), (4) impossible job demands (e.g., “Did you give tasks with unreasonable or impossible targets or deadlines to someone?”), (5) overt isolation (e.g., “Have you ignored someone or made a hostile reaction when they would approach you?”), and (6) abuse of authority (e.g., “Did you give hints or signals to someone that they should quit their job?”). In their study, Lee and Brotheridge (2006) identified three different forms of workplace bullying according to perpetrators: created fall guy/gal (e.g., “Set you up to fail”), undermined others’ work (e.g., “Set impossible deadlines”), and emotional abuse (e.g., “Made jokes at your expense”). Although Lee and Brotheridge (2006) did not utilize the NAQ-R, similarities can still be observed such as their third factor named “emotional abuse” with this study’s “overt intimidation”. Overall, the various forms of bullying adopted by perpetrators merit further examination, as research using the behavioural approach for identifying bullying perpetrators is scarce.
**Frequent negative acts.** The top three negative workplace bullying related acts reported by targets were as follows: “Someone withholding information which affects your performance”, “Having your opinions and views ignored”, and “Being exposed to an unmanageable workload”. The top three negative acts reported by perpetrators were the following: “Have you ignored, excluded or avoided someone?”, “Did you ignore someone’s opinions and views?”, and “Have you spread gossip and rumours about someone?” It is interesting to note that one item (i.e., “Having your opinions and views ignored”) is one of the top acts for both perspectives. This finding seems to be suggesting some level of congruency in the negative behaviours. In addition, these top reported behaviours by either the targets or perpetrators provide evidence of acts in the workplace that could be considered as clear indicators of workplace bullying. Thus, it would be a responsibility of all to think of our own behaviours and be mindful not to engage in any of these. Yet, if someone does any these negative acts, then it should be clarified and/or addressed right away as per appropriate means in order to put a stop to it and avoid further escalation of this counterproductive behaviour (see Zapf & Gross, 2001).

### 4.2 Scientific Contributions and Practical Implications

#### 4.2.1 Scientific contributions

The results of the present study suggest that a multitude of factors contribute to the experience of workplace bullying. The predictors explained a total of 57% of the variability for targets’ experiences of workplace bullying and the predictors explained a total of 32% of the variability for perpetrators’ experiences of workplace bullying. As the perpetrator’s model is unique, it suggests that further studies are needed to establish
a comprehensive model unique to that perspective; yet the current study represents a solid attempt at representing key risk factors of relevance.

The current study included an exhaustive number of predictor variables assessed in two contexts, allowing for a simultaneous assessment of all previously identified factors predictive of bullying. First, no known studies have investigated all the factors simultaneously in the same study, by looking at both the experiences of targets and perpetrators. Second, by using HMR, the factors could be classified according to their significant contribution; not only distinguishing the significant predictors, but also the predictive value as per the main categories identified in the literature. Third, specific factors found to be statistically significant such as task identity, transformational leadership, and organizational support had received little to no previous research attention. Fourth, the current study is amongst the very few in including the situational characteristic of being a target and being a perpetrator as predictors. Fifth, the adaptation from a passive to an active form of the widely used NAQ-R (22 items) seems to be amongst the first attempts. Sixth, the present study used the objective method of the behavioural list technique that permitted validation of a model of workplace bullying perpetrators to a fair extent, that is, in terms of the variance explained and the number of predictors. Moreover, studies in which perpetrators’ self-report collected with objective measures are rare indeed.

Overall, the findings of the current study clearly support Zapf (1999) who asserted that bullying is hardly ever explained by one factor alone, but it is rather a multi-causal phenomenon. Ultimately, explanatory models being the most
comprehensive should incorporate individual, organizational, and situational characteristics.

4.2.2 Practical implications and contributions

There are a number of practical implications and contributions of the current study. First, the empirical versions of the predictors models may be used as frameworks in order to a) assess the current organizational situation vis-à-vis the risk and protective factors identified, b) determine where to invest organizational resources, including financial and human resources, and c) establish prevention and/intervention strategies.

Organizational characteristics. Contributing factors of the organizational characteristics category can form the basis for establishing prevention strategies that may substantially reduce the prevalence of workplace bullying. Then, organizational factors whose influence has been reported in the current study can serve as a basis for establishing an analytical framework for determining organizational risk factors of workplace bullying, and perhaps other counterproductive workplace behaviours.

In order to tackle workplace bullying, organizational leaders should take responsibility to raise awareness, identifying the extent of the problem (e.g., job characteristics, leadership styles, and organizational culture/environment), and putting in place mechanisms necessary to address it. With that said, many organizations seem to be adopting a “bully-free or harassment-free workplace policy”. This is a good start but in the Canadian context, it seems thus far like a failed objective given the consistently high prevalence rates found. Perhaps, “zero tolerance for workplace-bullying policy” would be more realistic.
Nonetheless, just having a policy to counter bullying is insufficient. In fact, many policies seem not to be properly implemented as in many cases, despite good intentions from employers, some policies seem to be doing more harm than good. To be more explicit, as one might expect, rates found in surveys are typically higher in comparison with the number of harassment complaints (see RCMP, 2018; Employment and Social Development Canada, 2017). This discrepancy should be a concern for organizational leaders. One dilemma is that employees who are targets of workplace bullying are not reporting for various, often valid reasons and another dilemma is that the harassment complaints are often not meeting the criteria of the definition, thus not being investigated (see RCMP, 2018; Employment and Social Development Canada, 2017). This may signify for instance that the policy needs revision, the people making the decisions are influenced to have a low number of investigated complaints (due to relatively high financial costs associated with investigations), or that employees need more education. More education and training may be required to prevent and reduce workplace-bullying situations by increasing awareness of this problem, providing clear personal and organizational consequences for engaging in this behaviour and helping all organizational members to properly address this behaviour when it occurs. In fact, many definitions make the distinction that workplace conflict and normal exercise of management’s right to manage does not constitute harassment (see Treasury Board of Canada, 2018). Perhaps a more complete definition and description of what workplace bullying is, its effects and its consequences for all organizational members would be warranted.
Further, organizations should aim to receive more credible than frivolous workplace-bullying complaints. As mentioned, educating employees about these negative behaviours and consequences for engaging in them could result in lower rates as is evidenced in most European samples (see Einarsen et al. 2011). As such, when a negative behaviour occurs and is dealt with at the lowest level in a timely fashion, it increases the likelihood that it does to escalate into a workplace-bullying situation (see Zapf & Gross, 2001).

**Individual characteristics.** First, assessing and selecting future employees based on personality characteristics have been the topic of much debate in I/O psychology and organizational behaviour (Goffin & Woods, 1995; Morgeson, Campion, Dipboye, & Hollenbeck, 2007). Especially in unionized public organizations, using specific personality profiles for personnel decisions could be subject to a grievance. As such, it would seem reasonable to determine bullying risk groups to provide more assistance and support to both the individual and the supervisor. For example, an employee with personality characteristics identified as predictive of victimization (e.g., low self-esteem, high neuroticism) could be provided with coping mechanisms and other supports (e.g., employee assistance programs and conflict resolution services). In the end, not all possible predictors of bullying at work may be easily altered. In this respect, conflict management and resolution skills for all employees, at all levels should be the primary focus of allocated resources. This would likely result in preventing employees from becoming targets and perpetrators.

It also seems pertinent to highlight that Carroll, Foucher, and Gosselin (2012) suggested a number of arguments limiting the role of the target’s personality hypothesis.
First, knowledge of personality characteristics of the targets has a limited scope in terms of intervention. Second, it is difficult to reach a stable profile (Lind et al., 2009). Third, it is possible that some results, particularly low self-esteem, are linked to the post-traumatic stress syndrome. In favour of this hypothesis, Di Martino, Hoel, and Cooper (2003) questioned whether the traits of the targets are real causes or natural post-bullying reactions. Meanwhile, Zapf (1999) made an interesting point when he argued that “anxious, depressive and obsessive behaviour of the target” may both be an effect of the bullying, but also may be seen as the cause for it at first. Little research has been done on whether these individual characteristics are a cause or an effect. Fourth, Leymann’s perspective (1996) that an individual’s personality is not a predisposition to become a target of workplace bullying has some merit. In fact, when a situation is not only conflictual but has become a bullying situation, there are other important factors to consider than the target’s characteristics, as supported by findings of the current study. One could argue that a respectful and healthy environment is a shared responsibility of all concerned parties. Fifth, several researchers (Einarsen, 1999; Leymann, 1996; Vartia, 1996) rejected the rather simplistic explanation of workplace bullying by only considering the target’s individual characteristics.

4.3 Limitations and Strengths of the Study

The current research contains a number of limitations. In their review paper of workplace aggression and violence, Barling, Dupré, and Kelloway (2009) indicated that studies in this field have relied almost exclusively on self-reports (including self-reports of aggression and victimization) and convenience samples as part of a cross-sectional
survey. The methodology used in the current study involved some of the above-mentioned limitations and a few others as discussed in the following section.

First, no causal conclusions can be drawn from this study due to its cross-sectional nature. However, Spector (1994) argued that cross-sectional research provides important insights on how people perceive their attitudes and work experiences. The findings of the current study have indeed provided support for the relationship between a number of variables and two criteria (i.e., targets’ or perpetrators’ experiences); this study is a solid first step. Future research should utilize longitudinal designs in order to make causal inferences. As Barling, Dupré, and Kelloway (2009) suggested, research conducive to causal inferences is clearly needed on the topic of workplace aggression and violence.

Second, the data is based exclusively on self-reports. This study essentially relied upon respondents’ perspective and experience of the predictors and the criterion of bullying behaviour. This common method is present in most other studies on workplace bullying, and as indicated in Bowling et al. (2016) is omnipresent within psychological research. Bowling et al. (2016) noted that self-report measures are used to assess a variety of constructs, such as attitudes, behaviours, and personality traits for which it is assumed that participants are able and willing to provide accurate self-reports.

A number of elements were incorporated into the study in order to increase the reliability and validity of the data collected. First, longer surveys can create biases related to response fatigue. To ameliorate this risk, careful attention was paid to design of the survey in order to increase response and completion rates (e.g., radio buttons,
drop-down menus) as well as using short forms of measures whenever available (such as
the personality, self-esteem, and organizational culture measures). The analytics
collected by the survey software indicated that the few questions that were dropped out
were all less than 3% and no pattern was present. In all, a relatively high percentage of
respondents completed the survey (i.e., 68%) and no response biases were found.

Further, the online survey, entitled “Workplace Experiences Survey”, made no reference
to workplace bullying, ensuring that participants’ responses were not biased. Moreover,
two versions (i.e., version A started with demographics and version B started with the
NAQ-R) ensured controls for any order effects, of which none were found. Finally,
participation was voluntary. All these considerations ensured a healthy response rate and
a more representative sample.

Third, exclusive reliance on self-reported data poses the threat of common
method bias, potentially inflating the true associations between variables (Podsakoff,
MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). In order to examine this concern, Harman’s one-
factor test was performed. According to Podsakoff and Organ (1986), common method
variance is evidenced by this test when a) a single factor emerges in a factor analysis
comprising all variables and/or b) the amount of variance explained by the first factor
extracted is considerable (i.e., more than 50%). The results of this test indicated that
neither of those scenarios existed in the present study; it revealed a factorial solution
comprising more than one factor and the first factor explained only 22% of the total
variance. In addition to Harman’s test not indicating a concern with common method
bias in this sample, it is worth noting Spector’s (2006) claim that the actual impact of
common method variance on the associations observed in the field are far from obvious
and still under debate. Some researchers suggest collecting more objective data using multiple sources could reduce common method bias (Francioli et al., 2016). For example, although direct observations may not be feasible, it might be possible for coworkers to provide “peer ratings” of whom is victimized in the workplace in order to cross-validate self-reports of experience (Francioli et al., 2016). It is important to be cautious about using other methods when assessing the experience of workplace bullying. For example, assessing bullying based on peer and/or supervisor observations could engender biases as a result of individual perceptions, prior experiences, and organizational context colouring these observations. More precisely, organizational context may be driven by unwritten rules, hidden agendas, and organizational politics. One unwritten rule may consist in having a low number of harassment complaints, and even fewer founded complaints as it draw negative attention, negatively impacting the organization’s reputation. In the end, it might be difficult to get objective data. To conclude, it seems that the perspective and the experience of the participants should be central. After all, perceptions are reality in the sense that if a person believes that she/he is a target of workplace bullying, her/his reactions will reflect this belief.

Fourth, despite the large sample consisting of employees in different positions working in various fields in two public service organizations, generalizations based on current findings cannot be made. This study did not focus on investigating workplace bullying amongst a particular working group. By no means did it cover the diversity of jobs across various industries in Canada. The few studies done in this country have often selected specific groups, such as nurses (Blackstock, Harlos, Macleod, & Hardy, 2015; Out, 2005; Trépanier, Fernet, & Austin, 2012, 2013) and university employees
(Brisebois, 2010; Claybourn, 2007). Carroll and Hoel (2007) conducted one of the few studies that investigated workplace bullying in the Canadian context with a varied, but rather small ($N=249$) sample. The paucity of scientific data in Canada on the topic could certainly benefit from having a more representative sample of the population. Nevertheless, there is no particular reason to suspect that the relationships between the variables would be different as a result of another type of industry based on the congruency in the findings between the current study and prior research.

Fifth, as this exploratory study constitutes an assessment of a multitude of previously identified risk factors, the goal was to test the models using a sample large enough to provide sufficient power to detect these relationships. In addition, given the sensitivity of the topic and in order to gain access to a fairly large number of participants, it was consented to, based on the wishes of the organizations that participated that no specific organization identifiable data would be released, not allowing for a full description of each organization. It is not an uncommon research practice not to test for the variation explained by group membership, even though it is always preferable when possible (Brotheridge et al., 2012; Demers, 2015; Lee & Brotheridge, 2006; McCulloch, 2016; Mendelson, Turner, & Barling, 2011; Tivendell et al., 2013). In all, this aspect is a limit of this study and future research should address differences at various levels of analysis and across organizations.

Sixth, it is recognized that a comprehensive model would encompass several dimensions often found in applied social psychology, i.e. (1) predictors (2) moderators and mediators, and (3) outcomes. As the focus of the current study is to better understand the predictors of workplace bullying, by no means does it propose to provide
a complete investigation of the concept of workplace bullying. Subsequent research needs to further refine and test the models examined in this study.

Despite its limitations, the current study still has several strengths beyond its unique contributions to the literature. First, a large sample was collected and a fairly high response rate was achieved, even with a fairly long survey. Moreover, the research design was carefully articulated, ensuring the selection of reliable and valid measures of the variables assessed. Leading researchers in this area have recommended the strategies used in the current study to measure both the subjective and the objective criteria of workplace bullying as providing a more comprehensive evaluation of the existence of workplace bullying from a target’s perspective (see Zapf & Einarsen, 2011). Finally, by using self-report measures, responses gathered represent participants’ real perceptions of their workplace bullying experiences.

4.4 Recommendations for Future Studies

Studies on workplace bullying in the Canadian context are sparse. Future research investigating this negative workplace phenomenon is greatly needed, especially one that would have a representative sample of Canadian workplaces. Next, as highlighted on a few occasions, studies that would be able to discern cause-effect relationships would contribute greatly to the international literature. Furthermore, the prevalence rates found in Carroll (2006) and this study increased considerably after a decade. Despite the differences of these two samples, the present results show the growing magnitude of workplace bullying in Canada. According to Vartia-Väänänen (2003), working environments are becoming more demanding, while workloads, organizational changes, competition, uncertainty and different kinds of threats in the
workplace have considerably augmented. We can thus expect that the occurrence of workplace bullying to increase.

This study is unique in that it investigated the predictors for both targets’ and perpetrators’ experiences of workplace bullying. One limit, thus avenue for future studies, is that it did not account for whether or not the negative behaviours that respondents engaged in were directed towards their “alleged” perpetrator as a form of retaliation or directed towards others. Research into better understanding the reasons why people engage in this destructive workplace phenomenon would contribute to a better understanding of the reasons behind workplace bullying.

Further, studies exploring mediating and moderating effects of various job attitudes (e.g., organizational changes and job insecurity) would also provide a clearer portrait of the psychological processes intervening and affecting employees’ experiences of workplace bullying. As such, it would contribute in building greater comprehensive models of the predictors of workplace bullying and associated mechanisms. Carroll and Lauzier (2013) is an example of the effect of a moderator variable in better understanding the workplace-bullying phenomenon. In this study, Carroll and Lauzier (2013) found that social support is a moderator for the workplace bullying and job satisfaction relationship. The findings suggested that social support could protect workers from a particular damaging consequence of workplace bullying (i.e., job satisfaction).

Finally, when conducting studies on this topic, it is important to remember the highly sensitive nature of this kind of research. Resistance from HR practitioners and senior managers are common responses. That said, given the serious negative
consequences associated with this type of harassment, an important avenue for further research will be to analyze the prevention and intervention strategies chosen by organizations and the success rates of these different strategies (Salin, 2005).

4.5 Conclusions

Leymann (1996), considered as the first contributor to the workplace bullying literature, argued that anybody could become a target of workplace bullying under the right circumstances. As such, he emphasized the importance of precipitating environmental factors such as a poor working environment. Not only did the current study support his assertion, but it also provided support for other characteristics found in the literature. More precisely, individual characteristics of targets and perpetrators along with job characteristics, leadership, organizational environment factors and situational characteristics were found to be contributing to the occurrence of workplace bullying, and that is, from the experiences of targets and perpetrators.

Nobody should turn a blind eye, nor only point fingers at others when faced with a workplace-bullying situation. Results of the study add further weight to the assertion that we all have a moral (and increasingly in Canada, a legal) obligation to both prevent and to properly address workplace bullying when it occurs. Workplace bullying is everyone’s concern and responsibility to recognize and address.

In conclusion, although the results of the current study support the predictive value of some individual factors (e.g., self-esteem, neuroticism), workplace bullying will not occur simply if it is not allowed to occur. Without the organizational context, processes and culture to support this behaviour, it seems likely that bullying behaviours will not occur on an ongoing basis.
To ensure reductions in bullying, organizations must increase their focus on management and employee training on this health and safety topic, establish and update clearer harassment policies (with clear consequences for breaching this policy) that recognize, assess, and control all workplace-bullying situations. Bullying perpetrators would then need to use other, more prosocial methods, to obtain their objectives.

Finally, who is truly culpable (see Schmidt, 2009)? Are perpetrators who torment others most to blame? Or, are targets most at fault by allowing this behaviour to continue, perhaps due to a lack of healthy coping mechanisms? Perhaps it is the supervisor who is aware of the situation, but chooses not to intervene? Maybe it is the organizational culture which accounts for this counterproductive workplace behaviour? The results of this study suggest that the answer to the first question posed is “All of the above”.
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APPENDIX A: LIST OF DEFINITIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>(Brodsky, 1976)</td>
<td>“Repeated and persistent attempts by one person to torment, wear down, frustrate, or get a reaction from another. It is a treatment that persistently provokes pressures, frightens, intimidates, or otherwise discomforts the victim” (p. 2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological terror or mobbing</td>
<td>(Leymann, 1996)</td>
<td>“Involves hostile and unethical communication which is directed in a systematic manner by one or more individuals, mainly toward one individual, who, due to mobbing, is pushed into a helpless and defenseless position and held there by means of continuing mobbing activities. These actions occur on a very frequent basis (statistical definition: at least once a week) and over a long period of time (statistical definition: at least six months’ duration)” (p. 26).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral harassment</td>
<td>(Hirigoyen, 2001)</td>
<td>“As any abusive conduct (action, word, behaviour, attitude, etc.) that adversely affects, through its repetition or systematization, the psychic or physical dignity or integrity of a person, thereby compromising that individual’s employment or the work environment” (p. 13).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace aggression</td>
<td>(Baron and Neuman, 1996)</td>
<td>“Efforts by individuals to harm others with whom they work, or have worked, or the organizations in which they are currently, or were previously employed. This harm-doing is intentional and includes psychological as well as physical injury” (p. 38).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace bullying</td>
<td>(Namie and Namie, 2000)</td>
<td>“Is the deliberate, hurtful and repeated mistreatment of a target (the recipient) by a bully (the perpetrator) that is driven by the bully’s desire to control the target …encompasses all types of mistreatment at work…as long as the actions have the effect, intended or not, of hurting the target, if felt by the target” (p. 17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional abuses at work</td>
<td>(Keashly, 2001)</td>
<td>“Interactions between organizational members that are characterized by repeated hostile verbal and nonverbal, often non-physical behaviours directed at a person(s) such that the target’s sense of him/herself as a competent worker and person is negatively affected” (p. 212).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>Treasury Board of Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Improper conduct by an individual, that is directed at and offensive to another individual in the workplace, including at any event or any location related to work, and that the individual knew or ought reasonably to have known would cause offence or harm. It comprises objectionable act(s), comment(s) or display(s) that demean, belittle, or cause personal humiliation or embarrassment, and any act of intimidation or threat. It also includes harassment within the meaning of the <em>Canadian Human Rights Act</em> (i.e. based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, marital status, family status, disability and pardoned conviction).</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harassment is normally a series of incidents but can be one severe incident which has a lasting impact on the individual.”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological harassment</th>
<th>Labour standards (Quebec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological harassment “means any vexatious behaviour in the form of repeated and hostile or unwanted conduct, verbal comments, actions or gestures, that affects an employee’s dignity or psychological or physical integrity and that results in a harmful work environment for the employee”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: OTHER PERTINENT JOB ATTITUDES
Other Pertinent Job Attitudes

This section describes some other job-related attitudes included in the questionnaire package that were not part of this study’s main objectives in investigating the predictors of bullying. They could, however, be considered as moderators, mediators, or outcomes in future studies of a comprehensive model of workplace bullying. Specifically, the role of organizational changes and job insecurity in the onset of a workplace-bullying situation is limited. It would thus be valuable to provide some empirical insights to its possible contribution as a moderator or mediator, as suggested in the theoretical framework of Salin (2003). Moreover, job satisfaction, turnover intentions, and job performance could be examined as possible outcomes (Carroll et al., 2012; Carroll & Lauzier, 2014; Nielsen & Einarsen, 2012; Trépanier et al., 2012; Trépanier, Fernet, & Austin, 2013b).

Organizational changes. Organizational changes are often caused by crises leading to restructuring and downsizing that increase the vulnerability of workers; which in turn may create conditions conducive to the development of workplace bullying amongst employees (Foster, Mackie, & Barnett, 2004). As discussed by Vartia (1996), even just the anticipation of organizational change can lead to harassing behaviours. Furthermore, in times of economic uncertainty, organization will often revise their structures and seek efficiency enhancements. Increased efficiency often results in job and position reductions, resulting in scarcer resources, increased intragroup competition, and greater levels of interpersonal stress. This situation may be conducive to workplace bullying behaviours amongst remaining employees as they battle for diminishing resources such as promotions, raises, and job security.
Based on instruments used in other workplace bullying studies (Hoel, 2002), a measure of organizational changes was included in the questionnaire (Appendix D).

**Job insecurity.** Job insecurity is often considered as a stress-related variable (Barling & Kelloway, 1996). As a matter of fact, in Francis and Barling’s (2005) study, people who reported a high degree of insecurity in their work also reported more strain.

Job insecurity was assessed by the measure developed by Francis and Barling (2005). Three items are composing the scale (e.g., “I can be sure of my present job as long as I do good work.”). Possible responses are based on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). This measure was validated in a Canadian sample of public servants where an internal consistency of .81 was found. This measure was also significantly related to job strain ($r = .26, p < .001$), procedural injustice ($r = .22, p < .001$), distributive injustice ($r = .17, p < .001$), and interactional injustice ($r = .16, p < .001$).

**Job satisfaction.** Research on stress at work has shown for years that poor relationships with coworkers and supervisors are associated with lower levels of job satisfaction and well-being amongst employees (Cooper & Marshall, 1976) and that is, before any research on bullying had been carried out (Vartia-Väänänen, 2003). It can thus be put forth that workplace bullying has an adverse impact on job satisfaction. For example, Bowling and Beehr (2006) revealed in their meta-analysis that workplace bullying is negatively associated with job satisfaction ($r = -.32$).

The chosen measure is based on the work of Hart, Griffin, Wearing, and Cooper (1996). It contains three items measuring the extent to which employees feel satisfied with their jobs, the nature of the work that they do and the organization that they work
for (e.g., “Overall, I am satisfied with the kind of work I do.”). The scale for all three items consists of a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Rafferty and Griffin (2006) reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .90 for this scale. This measure of job satisfaction was statistically significant with supportive leadership ($r = .47, p < .001$) and developmental leadership ($r = .50, p < .001$).

**Turnover intentions.** As evidenced by research, workplace bullying is likely to predict some variance of turnover intentions (Bowling and Beehr, 2006).

The selected measure to assess job turnover intention is based on work of Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh (1979). This measure evaluates the employees’ intention in leaving their job. Cammann et al. (1979) found a coefficient alpha of .83. Also, job turnover has been found to negatively correlate with job satisfaction and job involvement (Cammann et al., 1979). The scale used three items (e.g., “I often think about quitting this job”) with responses ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Job performance.** Few studies have looked at the effects of negative workplace behaviours on individual performance (Paradis, 2016). It seems plausible to believe that negative behaviours experienced by someone would negatively impact his or her job performance.

Job performance was evaluated based on Daoust (1996) measure consisting of three items verifying the individual’s perception of his or her performance by comparing this to the quantitative and qualitative of others and then comparing their own current and own past performance (e.g., “In terms of quality, when comparing yourself to other coworkers doing a similar job, would you agree that the quality of your work is better
than theirs?”). In terms of internal reliability, Albert (2002) reported an alpha of .73 for this scale. Vance, MacCallum, Coover, and Hedge (1988) found results that were consistent with Kraiger’s (1985) conclusion that supervisors, peers, and self are equally valid as sources of performance information.

**Other pertinent job attitudes: Psychometric evaluation**

It seemed reasonable to make some basic analyses of the various work attitudes presented earlier to determine if they merited further investigation. Internal consistency was examined with Cronbach’s alpha, inter-item correlations (when suitable), and values of .3 and above for the Corrected item-total correlations (see Field, 2013).

*Job insecurity.* Cronbach’s alpha for this three-item scale was .81. All items have a positive contribution to the reliability of the scale, as all values for Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted were all below the respective alpha value. All Corrected item-total correlations were all above .3. This scale demonstrated good reliability and was consistent with other research such as Francis and Barling (2005) who reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .81.

*Job satisfaction.* The Cronbach’s alpha for this three-item scale was .79. Values in the column Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted were all below the respective alpha value; thus indicating that all items contributed positively to the reliability. All Corrected item-total correlations were above .3. Accordingly, a suitable level of reliability was obtained for this scale, being lower than what was reported in other studies (e.g., \( \alpha \) of .90 by Rafferty & Griffin, 2006).

*Job turnover intentions.* A Cronbach’s alpha of .81 was found for this three-item scale. Values in the column Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted were all below the
respective value with the exception of item 8. Despite the fact that this item would increase the alpha value, variables with two items are to be avoided as much as possible (see Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). As the scale showed good reliability, it was decided to retain item 8. In fact, item 8 clearly measures turnover; the difference lies in the fact the other two items are measuring intentions of turnover but within a specific timeframe, “I will probably look for a new job in the next year”. All Corrected item-total correlations were above .3. Accordingly, this scale confirmed a suitable level of reliability and results are consistent with Cammann et al. (1979) who reported a coefficient alpha of .83.

*Job performance.* A Cronbach’s alpha of .53 was found for this three-item scale. This value was below the recommended level of .7. All values in the column *Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted* were below the respective alpha value with the exception of item 2. Item 20 seemed problematic as it had a value below the recommended .3 for the corrected item-total correlation. The item per se had a time component comparison (i.e., “When comparing your current work...is better now than it was then?”) being different from the other items. Consequently, this item was dropped from further analyses. As concluded by Eisinga, Grotenhuis, and Pelzer (2013), the Spearman-Brown’s coefficient should be reported for two-item measure instead of Cronbach’s alpha or Pearson correlation. For this two-item variable, the Spearman-Brown’s coefficient was .86; which is considered reliable, Demers (2015) and Dion (2015) also dropped the same item in their studies, and reported an $r$ of .63 and .78 respectively.
The following table details descriptive statistics of the other job attitudes.

Table A1: *Descriptive Statistics of Job Attitudes Variables (N=760)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job attitudes:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job insecurity</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job turnover</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job performance</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Skewness S.E. = .10 (range: .09 – .10; average .10); Kurtosis S.E. = .19 (range: .18 – .20; average .19). Actual and potential minimum and maximum values are from 1 to 7 respectively.
APPENDIX C: EMAIL INVITATION
Dear employee;

I am a doctoral candidate in the Interdisciplinary Studies Ph.D. program supervised by Dr. Morrie Mendelson (Faculty of Business) at UNB Saint John. As part of my dissertation, I am conducting a survey on various workplace experiences and interactions between employees. Findings of the study will be published in an academic journal but can also be used to help organizations create better organizational practices and policies.

I am thus inviting you to participate in my study by completing an online questionnaire that takes approximately 25 minutes to complete. This questionnaire does not evaluate your skills or aptitudes; you simply need to give your personal opinions and observations. There are no good or bad answers and all your responses are anonymous and confidential.

The success of this research depends on your participation. As a token of appreciation for your participation, you will have the opportunity at the end of the survey to enter a draw to win one of ten $50 cash prizes.

In order to participate, please click on the following web address:

https://unb.az1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6WHoNjbvP9OsSFL

For my part, I will be giving a public presentation on the overall results of this study at the Saint John campus upon its completion.

Finally, I would like to thank you in advance for your contribution to my research and for your contribution to my goal of creating better workplaces.

Sincerely,

Tammy Carroll, M.Sc.
Ph.D. Candidate - Interdisciplinary studies (Business & Psychology)
Faculty of Business
University of New Brunswick
tammy.carroll@unb.ca
http://www.unb.ca/saintjohn/business/faculty/phd.html
Cher employé, chère employée,

Je suis doctorante au programme de Ph. D. en études interdisciplinaires à la University of New Brunswick (St John). Dans le cadre de ma thèse de doctorat supervisée par Dr Morrie Mendelson (Faculté d’administration), je fais un sondage à propos de diverses expériences et interactions entre les employés au travail. Les résultats de l’étude seront publiés dans une revue académique, mais peuvent également être utilisés afin d’aider les organisations à créer de meilleures pratiques et politiques organisationnelles.

Je vous invite alors à participer à mon étude en remplissant un questionnaire en ligne prenant environ 25 minutes à compléter. Ce questionnaire n’évalue pas vos compétences ou aptitudes; il suffit de donner votre avis et vos observations personnelles. Il n’y a pas de bonnes ou de mauvaises réponses et vos réponses sont anonymes et confidentielles.

Le succès de cette recherche dépend de votre participation. Comme guise de remerciement pour votre participation, vous aurez l’occasion à la fin de l’enquête de participer à un tirage au sort pour gagner l’un des dix prix de 50 $.

Afin de participer, veuillez SVP cliquer sur l’adresse Web suivante :
Pour ma part, je donnerai une présentation publique des résultats globaux de cette recherche sur le campus de Saint John une fois mon étude complétée.

Enfin, je tiens à vous remercier à l’avance pour votre contribution à ma recherche et pour votre contribution à mon objectif de créer de meilleurs milieux de travail.

Sincèrement,

Tammy Carroll, M.Sc.
Candidate au Ph. D. – Études interdisciplinaires (Administration & Psychologie)
Faculté d’administration
University of New Brunswick
tammy.carroll@unb.ca
http://www.unb.ca/saintjohn/business/faculty/phd.html
APPENDIX D: INTRODUCTION LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE
Introduction

WORKPLACE EXPERIENCES SURVEY (2015)

You are invited to participate in a study investigating experiences in the workplace. Your involvement consists of filling out a questionnaire mainly containing questions about you, your work and your work environment that should take approximately 25 minutes to complete. As a token of appreciation for your participation, you will have the opportunity at the end of the survey to enter a draw to win one of ten $50 cash prizes.

Ethical Guidelines
This project has been reviewed by the Research Ethics Board of the University of New Brunswick, Saint John campus, and is on file as REB 012-2014. If you have any questions or concerns regarding your participation in this study, please do not hesitate to contact Dr. Lisa Best, Research Ethics Board Chair, University of New Brunswick Saint John at (506) 648-5908, reb@unb.ca.

- There are no known or anticipated physical, psychological or social risks from participating in this study. Still, you will find at the end of the questionnaire some occupational resources should you wish to receive more information or discuss any issue.
- Your responses will be kept strictly anonymous and confidential. You do not need to identify yourself by name on any materials. All the data will be summarized and no individual would or could be identified from these summarized results.
- The questionnaire is designed to collect responses on the survey items only. It does not contain any information that could identify you as a respondent. Further, if you start completing the questionnaire and then decide that you do not wish to complete it, the information you have provided will not be transmitted to us.
- Your participation in this study is voluntary. Declining to answer or withdrawing from participating will have no impact on you. You are not obliged to answer any questions that you find objectionable or which make you feel uncomfortable.
- The final report will be used by the principal researcher, Tammy Carroll, in completion of her doctoral dissertation at the University of New Brunswick. In addition, we hope to publish the overall results of this study in an academic journal.
- Please note that the data collected from this study will only be available to the principal researcher and her academic supervisor, Dr. Morrie Mendelson, and it will be secured on a UNB password-protected computer database in a restricted access area. The data will be electronically secured for a five-year period and subsequently destroyed once submissions to journals have been completed.

Feedback of results and contact information
If you have any questions related to this study or would like to speak with us further concerning various types of workplace experiences, please do not hesitate to contact either one of us (contact information below):
Also, it is anticipated that the results of this study will be available by early 2016. If you would like to know the overall findings once the data has been analyzed, please send an email with “requesting study summary” as subject line to the principal researcher, Tammy Carroll.

Thank you.

Consent

Consent

Please indicate your agreement or disagreement to participate to this study as per the information provided on the previous page. *Note that if you disagree, you will not be able to complete the questionnaire.*

☐ I agree
☐ I disagree

Part 1 - Demographics

DEMOGRAPHICS

The following items refer to some socio-demographical characteristics. Please select the appropriate response or fill in the box for each.

Sex:

☐ Male
☐ Female

Age:
**Highest level of education completed:**

- [ ] High School diploma or less
- [ ] Post-secondary diploma (e.g., community college, CEGEP, etc.)
- [ ] University undergraduate degree (e.g., BA, BSc, etc.)
- [ ] University graduate degree (e.g., Master’s, Doctorate, etc.)
- [ ] Other (specify):

**Do you consider yourself part of any of the following minority group in your workplace? Select all that apply.**

- [ ] Age
- [ ] Gender
- [ ] Religion
- [ ] None
- [ ] Ethnic origin
- [ ] Language
- [ ] Other (specify):

**In which province/territory do you work?**

- [ ]

**DEMOGRAPHICS (CONTINUE)**

The following items refer to some individual job characteristics. Please select the appropriate response or fill in the box for each.

**Job contract:**

- [ ]

**Employment status:**

- [ ]
Work sector:
- Non-for-profit
- Private sector
- Public sector
- Other (specify):

Work industry:
- Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting
- Corrections, policing and safety
- Educational services
- Finance, insurance and banking
- Health care and social assistance
- Information, culture and recreation
- Manufacturing
- Professional, scientific, and technical services
- Public Administration
- Other (specify):

How long have you been working for your current organization?
0 year(s) 0 month(s)

Type of current position:
- Administrative staff
- Customer service staff
- Skilled labourer
- Supervisor/Manager/Director
- Support staff
- Technical staff
- Trained professional
- Other (specify):

How many employees do you supervise?
0 Direct report(s) 0 Indirect report(s)

How long have you been in your current position?
0 year(s) 0 month(s)
**Part 2: Work attitudes and perceptions**

**WORK ATTITUDES & PERCEPTIONS**

Here are some statements that can more or less describe certain attitudes and perceptions you may have about your work.

*Please indicate the extent to which you disagree or agree with each statement in relation to your current work using the following scale.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the kind of work I do.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid of losing my present job.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is likely that I will look actively for a new job in the next year.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work under a great deal of tension.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the organization in which I work.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not really sure how long my present job will last.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems associated with my job have kept me awake at night.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I often think about quitting this job.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have felt fidgety or nervous as a result of my job.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with my job.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can be sure of my present job as long as I do good work.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So far my employer has done an excellent job of fulfilling its promises to me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I will probably look for a new job in the year to come.
I feel betrayed by my organization.

If I had a different job, my health would probably improve.
I feel that my organization has violated the contract between us.
I often “take my job home with me” in the sense that I think about it when doing other things.

When comparing yourself to other employees doing a similar job, to what extent do you agree that the quantity of your work is greater than theirs (e.g., the number of tasks accomplished in a normal day of work)?
When comparing yourself to other employees doing a similar job, to what extent do you agree that the quality of your work is superior to theirs?
When comparing your current work with what you did when you first started your position, to what extent do you agree that the quantity and the quality of your work is better now than it was then?

Part 3 - Work environment

WORK ENVIRONMENT

Listed below are a number of statements that can more or less describe how you feel about your current work environment.
Please indicate the extent to which you disagree or agree with each statement in relation to your current work environment using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People here can get so absorbed in their work that they often lose sense of time or personal comfort.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people here pay little attention to rules and regulations.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one needs to be afraid of expressing extreme or unpopular viewpoints here.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are conventional ways of doing things here, which are rarely changed.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If something happens to go wrong, people do not go around seeking whom to blame.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People are always very serious and purposeful about their work.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal rules and regulations have a very important place here.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People here tend to be cautious and restrained.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New ideas are always being tried out here.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal rivalries are uncommon here.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People here follow the maxim “business before pleasure”.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is expected that there will be no deviation from established practices, no matter what the circumstances.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People here speak out openly.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unusual or exciting plans are encouraged here.  
Most people here seem to be especially considerate of others.  
The organization really cares about my well-being.  
Help is available from the organization when I have a problem.  
The organization shows very little concern for me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>says things that make employees proud to be a</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 5 - Current job

**CURRENT JOB**

Listed below are a number of statements that can more or less describe your current job.
Please indicate the extent to which you disagree or agree with each statement in relation to your current job using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The job requires me to do many different things at work, using a variety of my skills and talents.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The job is arranged so that I have the chance to do an entire piece of work from the beginning to end.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The results of my work are likely to significantly affect the lives or well-being of other people.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The job permits me to decide on my own how to go about doing the work.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work itself provides me with information about my work performance (i.e., the work itself provides clues about how well I am doing).</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The job requires me to use a number of complex or high-level skills.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The job provides me the chance to completely finish the pieces of work I begin.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This job is one where a lot of people can be affected by how well the work gets done.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just doing the work required by the job provides many chances for me to figure out how well I am doing.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The job is quite simple and repetitive
The job involves doing a whole and identifiable piece of work (i.e., the job is a complete piece of work that has an obvious beginning and end.
The job itself is very significant and important in the broader scheme of things.
The job gives me a chance to use my personal initiative and judgement in carrying out the work.
After I finish a job, I know whether I performed well.

Part 6 - NAQ

NEGATIVE BEHAVIOURS IN THE WORKPLACE

The following statements may be seen as examples of negative behaviours in the workplace.

Over the last 12 months, how often have you been subjected to the following negative acts at work?

Please select the response that best corresponds with your experience over the last 12 months using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Now and then</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Someone withholding information which affects your performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Being humiliated or ridiculed in connection with your work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Being ordered to do work below your level of competence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Having key areas of responsibility removed or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Spreading of gossip and rumours about you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Being ignored, excluded or avoided by others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Having insulting or offensive remarks made about your person (e.g., habits and background), your attitudes or your private life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Being shouted at or being the target of spontaneous anger (or rage).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Intimidating behaviour such as finger-pointing, invasion of personal space, shoving, blocking your way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Hints or signals from others that you should quit your job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Repeated reminders of your errors or mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Being ignored or facing a hostile reaction when you approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Persistent criticism of your work and effort.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Having your opinions and views ignored.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Practical jokes carried out by people you do not get along with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Being given tasks with unreasonable or impossible targets or deadlines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Having allegations made against you.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Excessive monitoring of your work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Pressure not to claim something which by right you are entitled to (e.g., sick leave, holiday entitlement, travel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
expenses).

20. Being the subject of excessive teasing and sarcasm.


22. Threats of violence or physical abuse or actual abuse.

Other Related Questions

Below on the left are the behaviour(s) that you have selected either 'now and then', 'monthly', 'weekly', or 'daily' for any of the 22 previous statements.

Please rank the top three behaviours (if applicable) that had the most negative effect on you by selecting the behaviour (item on the left) and dragging it in the appropriate box on the right (drag and drop).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>#1 behaviour that had the most negative effect on you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Someone withholding information which affects your performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Being humiliated or ridiculed in connection with your work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Being ordered to do work below your level of competence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Having key areas of responsibility removed or replaced with more trivial or unpleasant tasks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Spreading of gossip and rumours about you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Being ignored, excluded or avoided by others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Having insulting or offensive remarks made about your person (e.g., habits and background), your attitudes or your private life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Being shouted at or being the target of spontaneous anger (or rage).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Intimidating behaviour such as finger-pointing, invasion of personal space, shoving, blocking your way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other related question(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Other related question(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other related question(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Other related question(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Other related question(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Other related question(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Other related question(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Other related question(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Other related question(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Other related question(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Other related question(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Other related question(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Other related question(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| #2 behaviour that had the most negative effect on you |  
| #3 behaviour that had the most negative effect on you |  

10. Hints or signals from others that you should quit your job.
11. Repeated reminders of your errors or mistakes.
12. Being ignored or facing a hostile reaction when you approach.
13. Persistent criticism of your work and effort.
14. Having your opinions and views ignored.
15. Practical jokes carried out by people you do not get along with.
16. Being given tasks with unreasonable or impossible targets or deadlines.
17. Having allegations made against you.
18. Excessive monitoring of your work.
19. Pressure not to claim something which by right you are entitled to (e.g., sick leave, holiday entitlement, travel expenses).
20. Being the subject of excessive teasing and sarcasm.
22. Threats of violence or physical abuse or actual abuse.

Please indicate to what extent you disagree or agree with each of the following statement using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The behaviour(s) had a negative impact on your mental health and well-being.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The behaviour(s) had negative impact on your physical health.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The behaviour(s) troubled</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 7 - WB self-labelling

WORKPLACE BULLYING

Workplace bullying can be defined as follows:

“…a vexatious behaviour in the form of repeated conduct, verbal comments, actions or gestures that are hostile or unwanted, that affect the employee’s dignity or psychological or physical integrity that make the work environment harmful”

Using the above definition, answer the following items referring to your experience at work.

Are you or have you been a target of workplace bullying?

- Yes, over the past 12 months
- Yes, between 1-3 years ago
- Yes, over 3 years ago
- No

Approximately how long did the incident(s) last?

- [ ] year(s)
- [ ] month(s)

Approximately how often was/were the negative behaviour(s) occurring?

- Never
- Now and then
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

Generally, the incident(s) was/were initiated by? Select all that apply.

- [ ] Client/customer(s)
- [ ] Direct report(s)/subordinate(s)
How many person(s) carried out the negative behaviours?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of women</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of men</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was there anyone else targeted? Select all that apply.

- Colleague(s)/Co-worker(s)
- Supervisor(s)
- Direct report(s)/subordinate(s)
- Other (specify): ____________

What did you do, if anything? Select all that apply.

- Avoided any interaction with the perpetrator
- Avoided the area where the bullying occurred
- Confronted the perpetrator
- Discussed with colleague
- Discussed with family/friend
- Discussed with superior
- Made an official complaint
- Resigned
- Retaliated
- Spoke to HR personnel
- Spoke to union
- Spoke to lawyer
- Spoke to doctor
- Nothing
- Took time off work
- Went to see doctor
- Went to see lawyer
- Other (specify): ____________

Part 8 - WB witness and law

Have you ever observed or witnessed bullying in your workplace?

Based on your own experience either of being a target and/or a witness of workplace bullying, please choose up to three (3) of the most important factors you believe were the causes.
Is there a provincial law against workplace bullying (in your province or territory of work)?

Yes  No  Do not know

Does your organization have a policy against workplace bullying?

Yes  No  Do not know

Part 9 - Personal characteristics

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Here are some statements that can more or less describe certain characteristics or feelings about you.

Please indicate the extent to which you disagree or agree with each statement using the following scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Boredom
- Competition for tasks or advancement between parties involved
- Competition for the supervisor’s favour and approval
- Conflicting tasks between parties involved
- Enjoyment of mockery (perpetrator)
- High stress
- Illness
- Jealousy
- Job insecurity
- Organizational culture
- Perpetrator can get away with it
- Perpetrator wanted the target out of the organization
- Perpetrator's performance below the average
- Poor management
- Target’s performance above the average
- Target’s performance below the average
- Target is different from others
- Target is part of a minority group
- There is no rule or policy against workplace bullying
- Unresolved conflict between parties involved
- Ineffective leadership of the immediate supervisor
- Ineffective leadership of the organization
- Other (specify):
I find it easy to put myself in the position of others.
I feel I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.
I am keenly aware of how I am perceived by others.
I feel I have a number of good qualities.
In social situations, it is always clear to me exactly what to say and do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am able to do things as well as most other people.
I am particularly good at sensing the motivations and hidden agendas of others.
I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
I am good at making myself visible with influential people in my organization.
I take a positive attitude toward myself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am good at reading others' body language.
Sometimes I think I am no good at all.
I am able to adjust my behaviour and become the type of person dictated by any situation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Select the number (from 1 to 7) that best describes you as per the opposite poles.

I SEE MYSELF AS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introverted</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraverted</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part 10 - NAQ SELF (PERP)

#### OTHER WORKPLACE BEHAVIOURS

The following statements may be seen as examples of behaviours in the workplace.

*For each item, refer to the scale below and select the frequency (Never, Now and then, Monthly, Weekly and Daily) that you believe best describes your experience at work over the past twelve (12) months.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Now and then</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you withheld information from someone that was affecting their performance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you humiliated or ridiculed someone in connection with their work?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ordered someone to do work below their level of competence?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you removed or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Now and then</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you spread gossip and rumours about someone?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ignored, excluded or avoided someone?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you insulted or made offensive remarks about someone (e.g., habits and background), their attitudes or their private life?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you shouted at someone or targeted them with spontaneous anger (or rage)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you do some intimidating behaviour to someone such as finger-pointing, invasion of personal space, shoving, blocking way?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you give hints or signals to someone that they should quit their job?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you repeatedly reminded someone of their errors or mistakes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ignored someone or made a hostile reaction when they would approach you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you give persistent criticism to someone of their work and effort?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you ignore someone’s opinions and views?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you carried out practical jokes to someone you do not get along with?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you give tasks with unreasonable or impossible targets or deadlines to someone?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you make allegations against someone?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you do an excessive monitoring of someone’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
work?

- Did you pressure someone not to claim something that by right, they are entitled to (e.g., sick leave, holiday entitlement, travel expenses)?
  - Never: 0, Now and then: 0, Monthly: 0, Weekly: 0, Daily: 0

- Have you subjected someone to excessive teasing and sarcasm?
  - Never: 0, Now and then: 0, Monthly: 0, Weekly: 0, Daily: 0

- Have you exposed someone to an unmanageable workload.
  - Never: 0, Now and then: 0, Monthly: 0, Weekly: 0, Daily: 0

- Have you given threats of violence or physical abuse (or actual abuse) to someone?
  - Never: 0, Now and then: 0, Monthly: 0, Weekly: 0, Daily: 0

### Part 11 - WB attitudes

Here are some statements that can more or less describe possible attitudes regarding workplace bullying in relation to your current workplace.

**Please indicate the extent to which you disagree or agree with each statement using the following scale.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No action is taken against workplace bullying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This organization condemns workplace bullying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying is accepted in this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel comfortable about filling a complaint in cases of bullying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullies are punished for their actions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My superiors are committed to ensuring a workplace free from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would fear that I might be blamed if I were to admit I was bullied.

I am satisfied with the way in which my work unit responds to matters related to workplace bullying.

If I am faced with a workplace bullying issue in the workplace, I know where I can go for help in resolving the situation.

Part 12 - Sick days

**In the last six (6) months, how many days have you...**

- been unable to carry out your usual work activities because of health problems? 0
- taken a day off work because you were emotionally, physically or mentally fatigued? 0
- taken a day off work because you just did not feel like going to work that day? 0

**Total** 0

Part 13 : WB TEXT BOX

Any comments that could help us better understand the causes of workplace bullying?
APPENDIX E: PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES OF MEASURES
1. Psychometric Evaluation and Properties of Measures

The following section includes an examination of the psychometric properties of the instruments used in the present study. More specifically, reliability and validity analyses of the variables composing the model (i.e., workplace bullying for both the target and the perpetrator, individual characteristics, job characteristics, leadership, and organizational environment) were examined and are reported. It seemed sensible to interpret and judge the data of this specific sample rather than forcing the factors and items according to the literature. From a psychometric perspective, if using empirical factors makes the scale or variable more robust (i.e., valid), it seems logical to modify according to the results of the psychometric analyses of this study. After all, a tool can be valid in a given context, but not useful or bias in another context (American Psychological Association, 2014); thus the rationale of examining the psychometric properties of each scale in a given context. This approach has been used in other industrial and organizational psychology research (see Demers, 2015; Dion, 2015; Martel, 2010; Paradis, 2016).

1.1 Reliability

Several steps were completed in order to assess the reliability of the measures used. To begin with, a principal component analysis (PCA) with Varimax rotation as factor analysis was completed to verify if the subscales in the measures used were aligned with those reported by their developers and found in previous studies. Prior to examining results of the PCA, the suitability of the dataset for factor analysis was first determined. As indicated in Pallant (2011), a value of .6 or above for the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO), a significant value (smaller than .05) for
the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity (BTS), and values of .3 and above in the correlation matrix would support the factorability of the correlation matrix. Next, the PCA results were examined followed by the scree plot diagram to help with deciding on the number of components(s). As highlighted in Pallant (2011), factor analysis is used as a data exploration technique; consequently, the interpretation is subjected to the researcher’s judgment rather than any hard statistical rules. Therefore, three criteria were considered from the PCA outputs: values of .40 or higher, absence of important cross loading factors, and the clarity of identifying the items with the factor.

To evaluate the internal consistency of all measures, Cronbach’s alphas were calculated. Nunnally (1978) is often associated with the assertion that measures used in research should have reliability of .70 or better, a value for which the context needs to be considered. Based on this criterion, Pallant (2011) proposed that a coefficient of .70 is preferable, but it is common in applied psychology to have smaller coefficients (e.g., .50), especially with measures containing fewer than 10 items. When coefficient \( \alpha \) are below the acceptable level, Pallant (2011) proposed that it would be appropriate to report means of inter-item correlations. According to Briggs and Cheek (1986), the inter-item correlation means should ideally be in the range of .20 to .40, whereas Clark and Watson (1995) recommended this value to fall in between .15 to .5. In addition, Field (2013) suggested that a value of .3 (and above) for the Corrected item-total correlation signifies that the item correlates well with the variable.

---

37 Larger sample sizes tend to produce smaller correlations. If no value of .3 is found, the use of factor analysis should be reconsidered (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2013).
**Workplace bullying**

NAQ-R (target). A first principal component analysis (PCA) with Varimax rotation was calculated for the NAQ-R’s 22 items. The KMO measure verified the sampling adequacy for the analysis; the KMO was .94 and the BTS value was significant. An inspection of the correlation matrix revealed the presence of many coefficients of .3 and above. These three criteria thus support the factorability of this dataset.

An exploratory PCA revealed the presence of four components with eigenvalues exceeding one, and in combination explained 62.37% of the variance. More specifically, the items that clustered on the same factor suggested that factor 1 represents *person-related bullying* (items 2, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 20) explaining 25.05% of the variance, factor 2 denotes *work-related bullying* (items, 1, 3, 4, 18) explaining 13.39% of the variance, factor 3 characterizes *overt physical intimidation* (items 8, 9, 22) explaining 13.36% of the variance, and factor 4 describes *impossible job demands* (items 16, 21) explaining 10.53% of the variance. Item 19\(^{38}\) seemed somewhat problematic as it had relatively high loadings on three factors and was not clearly fitting with any of these factors. Given that the NAQ-R is a widely and validated scale and removing that item does not enhance the Cronbach’s alpha, it seemed more prudent to keep the 22 items.

Next, the scree plot diagram clearly indicated the presence of one factor, with the second, third, and fourth not being as plainly discernable; it showed inflections that would justify retaining either one or four components. Furthermore, it can be argued that

\(^{38}\) Item 19: Pressure not to claim something, which by rights, you are entitled to (i.e., sick leave, holiday entitlement, travel expenses).
the two items\textsuperscript{39} composing factor 4 (i.e., \textit{impossible job demands}) could simply be combined with factor 2 (i.e., \textit{work-related bullying}), as they are work-related.

These findings are aligned with the literature, particularly with the study conducted by the NAQ-R authors aimed at testing the psychometrics properties of this tool. Einarsen, Hoel, and Notelaers (2009) concluded that the NAQ-R is a reliable and valid measure of exposure to workplace bullying which can be used as a one-factor scale. The researchers also distinguished three interrelated factors: person-related bullying, work-related bullying, and physically intimidating bullying.

In order to further validate the aforesaid three factors, a confirmatory PCA with Varimax rotation was conducted with the 22 items. The three forced factors explained 58.1\% of the variance, more specifically 27.3\% (person-related bullying), 18.1\% (work-related bullying), and 12.7\% (overt physical intimidation). The KMO value was .93 and the BTS value was significant. Results showed to be consistent with the literature (Einarsen, Hoel, & Notelaers, 2009).

Furthermore, the distinction between the three types of workplace bullying highlighted in Einarsen, Hoel, and Notelaers (2009) as discussed above does not seem to be retained in published studies on the subject. Most published studies using the NAQ-R treated workplace bullying as a unitary construct in their analyses (see Glasø, Matthiesen, Nielsen, & Einarsen, 2007; Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2004). This can be explained by the fact that the correlations between sub-factors of the NAQ are very high (i.e., $r = .96$, see Einarsen & al., 2009; p. 31). As a result, the composite measure of workplace bullying was used for the main analyses.

\textsuperscript{39} i.e., “being exposed to unmanageable workload” and “being given tasks with unreasonable or impossible targets or deadlines”.
Next, coefficient alphas were examined for internal consistency. The Cronbach’s alpha was .93. This high level of internal consistency is congruent with other research. Einarsen, Hoel, and Notelaers (2009) reported a Cronbach’s alpha for the NAQ-R’s 22 items of .90. Studies that have utilized the NAQ-R reported Cronbach’s alpha between .84 to .93 (Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2001; Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2002b). Specific to a Canadian sample, Carroll (2006) and Out (2005) reported a Cronbach’s alpha of .89 and .88 respectively.

In conclusion, the 22 items one-factor measure of the NAQ-R demonstrated solid reliability and results from a confirmatory PCA was consistent with the literature.

Individual characteristics

Carroll’s (2006) adapted version of Ten Item Personality Inventory (TIPI). The 20 items of Carroll’s (2006) adapted version of the TIPI (Gosling et al., 2003) measuring personality characteristics (as per the Big Five) was subjected to a first PCA with Varimax rotation. Results demonstrated the presence of five components with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining a total of 61.45% of the variance, five factors explaining 14.07%, 13.82%, 12.36%, 12.14%, and 9.05% respectively. The KMO value was .80 and the BTS value was significant thus confirming the sampling adequacy for the analysis. Next, the scree plot diagram clearly indicated the presence of five factors and so did the RCM. More specifically, items clustering on the same factor suggested that factor 1 characterizes extraversion (items 1, 6, 11, 16), factor 2 denotes neuroticism (items 4, 19, 14, 19), factor 3 represents agreeableness (items 2, 7, 12, 17), factor 4 describes conscientiousness (items 3, 8, 13, 18), and factor 5 describes openness to
experience (items 5, 10, 15, 20). Items 6 and 10 had cross-loadings on two factors so were thus dropped for further analyses.

A second PCA of the 18 variables gave a total variance explained of 64.49%, with five components explaining 15.05%, 14.24%, 13.50%, 12.49%, and 9.20%. The KMO value is .78 and the BTS value is significant. Next, the scree plot diagram clearly indicated again the presence of five factors and the RCM also illustrated five clear factors (same as described in previous paragraph). All saturation coefficients were deemed acceptable (ranging from .66 to .89, with the exception of item 5 of .58).

The following paragraph describes the scale’s internal consistency. Cronbach’s alphas for the five components were .87 for extraversion ($\alpha = .69$ in Carroll, 2006; $\alpha = .71$ in Demers, 2015; $\alpha = .71$ in Dion, 2015), .81 for neuroticism ($\alpha = .68$ in Carroll, 2006; $\alpha = .70$ in Demers, 2015; $\alpha = .82$ in Dion, 2015), .73 for agreeableness ($\alpha = .54$ in Dion, 2015), .76 for conscientiousness ($\alpha = .70$ in Carroll, 2006; $\alpha = .68$ in Demers, 2015; $\alpha = .68$ in Dion, 2015; $\alpha = .82$ in Lévesque, 2006), and .57 for openness to experience ($\alpha = .60$ in Dion, 2015). Although the alpha coefficient for the fifth factor was below the satisfactory .70 recommended, it was still consistent with findings from other research (see Dion, 2015). Still, inter-item correlation values were ranging between .25 to .35 ($M=.31$) for the fifth factor; thus respecting the benchmarks set by Briggs and Cheek (1986). All values for Corrected item-total correlations were exceeding .3 meaning that each item correlated well with the variable (see Field, 2013).

To conclude, the measure of personality for the sample of this study was reliable with its five factors. However, the fifth factor was carefully interpreted when used in the main analyses.
**Social skills.** The Cronbach’s $\alpha$ was .75 for this seven-item scale. For item 1, the *Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted* value was higher than the scale’s alpha. In addition, item 1 had a value below .3 for the corrected item-total correlation, a value being problematic as per Field (2013). By examining the item per se, it seems clear that it was measuring a different component from the other six items. Therefore, after dropping item 1, the Cronbach’s $\alpha$ was .77. The mean for the inter-item correlations was .36 being within the suggested the criteria of Briggs and Cheek (1986) and all *Corrected item-total correlations* were above .3. This scale had thus suitable reliability.

**Self-esteem.** Cronbach’s alpha was examined to assess the reliability of the scale. A Cronbach’s alpha of .76 was found for this six-item scale. Values in the column “*Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted*” were all below the respective alpha value; thus indicating that all items were contributing positively to the reliability. All *Corrected item-total correlations* were above .3 (see Field, 2013). Accordingly, this scale proved satisfactory reliability.

**Organizational characteristics**

**Job characteristics: Job Diagnostics Survey.** The fifteen items composing the JDS was subjected to a PCA with Varimax rotation. Results demonstrated the presence of five components explaining a total of 74.20% of the variance, five factors explaining 16.85%, 16.01%, 14.31%, 14.25%, and 14.18% respectively. The KMO value was .85 and the BTS value was significant thus confirming the sampling adequacy for the analysis. Next, the scree plot diagram indicated the presence of five factors (with the first four factors being clearer). The RCM also had five components where items clustering on the same factor suggest that factor 1 describes *feedback* (items 5, 10, 15),
factor 2 denotes task significance (items 3, 8, 13), factor 3 represents skills variety (items 1, 6, 11), factor 4 characterizes autonomy (items 4, 9, 14), and factor 5 denotes task identity (items 2, 7, 12). All saturation coefficients were deemed quite acceptable (ranging from .74 to .84, with the exception of item 14 of .53). These results were aligned with the JDS model.

Next, Cronbach’s alphas for the five components consisted of .85 for feedback, .78 for task significance, .76 for skill variety, .84 for autonomy, and .77 for task identity. The values in the column Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted were all below the respective alpha value with the exception of items 12 and 14. Despite the fact that these two items would have increased slightly their respective $\alpha$, variables with two items are to be avoided as much as possible (see Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Accordingly, all items for the five variables were kept. All Corrected item-total correlations are above .3.

To conclude, the reliability results for the five variables of the JDS scale were congruent with the literature (see $\alpha = .70$ to .89 in Spector, Jex, & Chen, 1995) and were utilized for the analyses.

Leadership. The twelve items composing the scale of transformational leadership was subjected to a PCA with Varimax rotation. Results demonstrated the presence of one component with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining a total of 73.11% of the variance. The KMO value is .96 and the BTS value was significant thus confirming the sampling suitability for the analysis. Next, the scree plot diagram clearly identified one factor. As only one factor was extracted, the solution could not be rotated. This one factor model is different from the scale’s original model with its four factors (i.e.,
supportive leadership, inspirational communication, intellectual stimulation, and personal recognition). However, it is consistent with some authors who have opted to use a global measure as opposed to examining the individual subscales (e.g., Bass, 1985; Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999).

Cronbach’s alpha for this 12-item scale was .97. All items have a positive (or neutral, see item 6, $\alpha = .97$) contribution to the reliability of the scale as values for Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted were below the respective alpha value. All Corrected item-total correlations were well above .3 (see Field, 2013). Conclusively, this scale demonstrated excellent reliability.

For comparison purposes, a PCA with a forced four-factor solution was calculated. The four extracted factors explained 86.45% of the variance and items loaded as per the four factors structure. Cronbach’s alphas for the four scales are ranging from .89 to .95. Nonetheless, the one-factor structure as per the observed data was retained for analyses.

*Organizational culture.* The 15 items of the Business Organization Climate Index measuring the organizational culture were subjected to a first PCA. Prior to performing the PCA, the suitability of data for factor analysis was assessed. Inspection of the correlation matrix revealed the presence of many coefficients of .3 and above. The KMO value was .83, exceeding the recommended value of .6 and the BTS was statistically significant, supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix. PCA revealed the presence of four components with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining 26.64%, 13.4%, 11.4% and 7.87% of the variance respectively for a total of 59.19% explained. Next, the scree plot diagram clearly indicated the presence of two factors but
the RCM illustrated four factors. More specifically, items clustering on the same factor in the RCM suggested that factor 1 characterizes a *pleasant organization* (having items from BOCI’s open-minded and altruism); factor 2 describes *rules orientation* (having items from BOCI’s rules and task orientation); factor 3 describes *traditional* (same as BOCI’s innovation). However, the matrix illustrated that factor 3 had only two items, and factor 1 had one item, which is not ideal according to Tabachnick and Fidell (2013). Based on these analyses, it was more suitable to keep the distinctive first two factors with a total of 12 items, namely *pleasant organization* (items 3, 5, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15) and *rules orientation* (items 2, 6, 7, 8, 11).

A second PCA of the 12 variables gave a total variance explained of 51.15%, with two components explaining 33.37% and 17.78%. The KMO value was .84 and the BTS value was significant. Next, the scree plot diagram evidently indicated the presence of two factors and the RCM also illustrated two clear factors as described above. All saturation coefficients were deemed reasonable (ranging from .60 to .80).

Next, Cronbach’s alpha for factor one was .86. All items have a positive contribution to the reliability of the scale, as values for *Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted* were below the respective $\alpha$ value. All *Corrected item-total correlations* were above .3. This variable demonstrated good reliability. The second factor had a Cronbach’s alpha of .63. All items made a positive contribution to the reliability of the scale, as values for *Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted* were below the respective alpha value. All *Corrected item-total correlations* were above .3 (see Field, 2013). This variable demonstrated acceptable reliability.
The results were rather different from BOCI’s original scales, but were similar to other research. For instance, Demers (2015) kept two factors, namely people orientation and artefacts of the five factors composing the organizational culture measure.

**Organizational support.** A Cronbach’s alpha of .87 was found for this three-item scale. Values in the column *Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted* were all below the respective alpha value; thus indicating that all items were contributing positively to the reliability. All *Corrected item-total correlations* were above .3. Accordingly, this scale has a very good level of reliability.

**1.2 Validity**

According to the American Psychological Association, a tool can be valid in a given context, but not useful or bias in another context (American Psychological Association, 2014). It thus seemed important to examine validity elements of the measures used in this study. Based on the factor analyses and inter-correlation coefficients reported previously, the scales seemed to be measuring what they were supposed to measure in the context of this study. More precisely, items grouped together and formed independent factors that corresponded to the theoretical concepts and psychometric analyses reported in the literature. An evaluation of the Pearson correlation coefficient matrix to assess convergent and discriminant validity is presented in Table 3.3. The table contains no values above .90 or below -.90; thus suggesting no issues in terms of discriminant validity. Similarly, the variables showed good convergent validity since they have moderate correlations between the variables of different instruments measuring more or less the same construct. Overall, all measures were acceptable to use for the analyses in the present study.
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