

The Role of Leaders in Creating Psychologically Healthy Workplaces



Dr. C. Loughlin

Associate Dean, Research

Sobey School of Business

Halifax, N.S.

(catherine.loughlin@smu.ca)

The Role of Leaders in Creating Psychologically Healthy Workplaces

How I became interested in this topic...
(My Canada Research Chair, SSHRC & Consult. In LD)

Some Clarification before we proceed...

Today we will not focus on all forms of ‘Workplace mistreatment’. For example:

Incivility is “Low-intensity deviant behavior, with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for respect” (Andersson & Pearson, 1999); **Interpersonal conflict** is “Minor disagreements between coworkers to physical assaults on others. Overt or covert” (Spector & Jex, 1998); **Verbal aggression** - “Overt, hostile verbal ... behaviors, such as yelling” (Grandey, 2007)

Discrimination - “When persons in a ‘social category’ ... are put at a disadvantage in the workplace” (Dipboye & Halverson, 2004); **Ostracism** - “The extent to which an individual perceives that he or she is ignored or excluded by others.” (Ferris et al, 2008); **Physical aggression** - “Any aggressive physical contact, statements indicating intention to harm or threatening by virtue of overt behavior” (Winstanley & Whittington, 2002)

All can be quite serious (e.g., McCabe et al.) just not our focus today...

Getting Warmer...

We will focus on **Harassment** - “Negative workplace interactions that affect the terms, conditions, or employment decisions related to an individual’s job, or create a hostile, intimidating, or offensive environment” (Rospenda et al., 2005).

One sub category: Bullying is particularly relevant – “Repeated and enduring aggressive behaviors that are intended to be hostile and/or perceived as hostile” (Einarsen, 1999).

[Sometimes also referred to as **Abusive supervision** - “Subordinates’ perceptions of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical contact.” (Tepper, 2000)].

Much of what I will discuss could be called harassment or bullying but (for the sake of our sanity) unless I am referring to a particular study that specifically looked at one of these areas I will tend to refer to “**Toxic Workplace Behaviour**” in general.

What is Toxic Behaviour?

As we just saw from definitions in the literature, toxic behaviour is referred to in many ways (Table 1 in our Bullying Chpt. summarizes these terms – Loughlin & Bryson, 2014 – citation to follow).

These types of behaviours are basically ‘modifiable risk factors’ in the workplace (stressors in NIOSH terms).

The Role of Leaders in Creating Psychologically Healthy Workplaces

Let me give you some specific e.g.'s of what White et al. (from the WWDPI) would call *modifiable risk factors* in a toxic environment...

However, since I obviously can't quote people I have encountered in my own applied work, I will quote heavily today from a book published in 2009 by Kusy & Holloway that poignantly describes toxic behaviour and bullying at work – (pg. #'s for text in red font refer to this book)

Here's how they would describe it:

Book: Toxic Workplace! (Kusy & Holloway, 2009)

“Call them what you will: control freaks, narcissists, manipulators, bullies, poisonous individuals, or humiliators..... What these people do is: poison, corrupt, pollute, and contaminate” (p. 3)

These interactions pervade our thoughts and sap our energies so much that they have the potential to undermine our sense of well-being:

In a variety of ways, they get under our skins, infiltrate our professional and personal space, demoralize us, demotivate teams, and ultimately can even make us doubt our own competence and productivity. They are toxic in every sense of the term” (p. 4).

Hell is other people?! (In person I usually ask...)

How many of you have worked with a “toxic” person?

Dealing with toxic workplace behavior:

Today we will briefly discuss...

- 1) Some Costs of Toxic Behaviour at Work
- 2) Particular types of Toxic Behaviours to watch for
- 3) 4 myths about Toxic Behaviour at work and
- 4) 5 steps Org. Leaders can take to keep these behaviours in check!

But 1st I want to touch on some important research studies in this area over the past decade and one particular context:

Workplace Harassment From the Victim's Perspective: A Theoretical Model and Meta-Analysis (Bowling & Beehr, 2006)

What are the antecedents and consequences of workplace harassment?

This study introduced an attribution/reciprocity-based model that explains the link between harassment and its potential causes and consequences.

Whereby, victims reciprocate with reactions directed toward the harassment perpetrator or toward the organization (if they attribute the cause of the harassment to it).

Workplace Harassment From the Victim's Perspective: A Theoretical Model and Meta-Analysis (Bowling & Beehr, 2006)

- Meta-Analysis demonstrated that Stressors, such as role conflict (.44), role ambiguity (.30), role overload (.28), and work constraints (.53), were all associated with workplace harassment. Autonomy (-.25) was negatively associated with harassment.
- Harassment was also positively associated with generic strains (.35), anxiety (.31), depression (.34), burnout (.39), frustration (.40), negative emotions at work (.46), physical symptoms (.31), CPB's (.37) and Turnover Intentions (.35).
- And negatively associated with positive emotions at work (-.25), self-esteem (-.21), life satisfaction (-.21), job satisfaction (-.39), organizational commitment (-.36), and perceptions of Organizational Justice (-.35).

Predicting Workplace Aggression: A Meta-Analysis (Herschcovis et al, 2007)

What best predicts whether people will engage in interpersonal vs. organizational aggression?

Trait anger and interpersonal conflict were the strongest predictors of *interpersonal aggression* (corrected correlations of .43 and .50, respectively).

In contrast, the strongest predictors of *organizational aggression* were interpersonal conflict, situational constraints, and job dissatisfaction (corrected correlations of .41, .36, and .37, respectively).

Perceptions of poor leadership and interpersonal injustice were the strongest predictors of supervisor-targeted aggression with corrected correlations of .52 and .51.

**Towards a multi-foci approach to workplace aggression:
A meta-analytic review of outcomes from different perpetrators
(Hershcovis & Barling, 2010)**

Does it matter who the perpetrator is?

This study compared **3** attitudinal outcomes (*job satisfaction, affective commitment, and turnover intent*), **3** behavioral outcomes (*interpersonal deviance, organizational deviance, and work performance*), and **4** health-related outcomes (*general health, depression, emotional exhaustion, and physical well being*) of workplace aggression from 3 different sources: **supervisors**, **co-workers**, and **outsiders** across the literature.

Towards a multi-foci approach to workplace aggression: A meta-analytic review of outcomes from different perpetrators (Herscovis & Barling, 2010)

Findings: Supervisor, co-worker, and outsider aggression, respectively, are significantly related to job satisfaction ($r=.38, .25, \text{ and } .14$), affective commitment ($r=.28, .20, \text{ and } .08$), turnover intentions ($r=.30, .23, \text{ and } .17$), general health, ($r=.28, .21, \text{ and } .22$), emotional exhaustion ($r=.35, .31, \text{ and } .36$), depression ($r=.26, .24, \text{ and } .36$), physical well being ($r=.20, .24, \text{ and } .19$), interpersonal deviance ($r=.34, .47, \text{ and } .28$), organizational deviance ($r=.39, .29, \text{ and } .20$), and performance ($r=.17, .09, \text{ NA}$). The relationship between supervisor aggression and interpersonal deviance targeted at the supervisor was $.62$.

Results also show that supervisor aggression has stronger adverse relationships than co-worker aggression with job satisfaction ($t=12.29$), affective commitment ($t=6.03$), turnover intent ($t=6.05$), general health ($t=4.21$), organizational deviance ($t=6.53$), and performance ($t=5.26$) [*all significant at .001*].

Outcomes of Exposure to Workplace Bullying: A meta-analytic review (Nielsen & Einersen, 2012)

OK, so what about 'just' witnessing it?

STUDY 1 (cross-sectional) – Exposure to workplace bullying was positively associated with symptoms of mental health problems in general ($r=.34$), as well as its sub-dimensions anxiety ($r=.27$) and depression ($r=.34$). Positive associations were also established with regard to symptoms of post-traumatic stress ($r= .37$), general strain ($r=.31$) somatization ($r=.28$), burnout ($r=.27$), and physical health problems ($r=.23$).

Significant relationships between workplace bullying and job-related outcomes were: intent to leave ($r=.28$), job satisfaction ($r=.22$), organizational commitment ($r=.19$), and absenteeism ($r=.11$).

STUDY 2 (longitudinal) - The findings also show that baseline exposure to workplace bullying is significantly related to both absenteeism ($r=.12$) and mental health problems ($r=.20$) at follow-up.

Workplace Bullying and Mental Health: A Meta-Analysis on Cross-Sectional and Longitudinal Data (Verkuil et al, 2015)

Workplace bullying may be **task-related** (*unreasonable deadlines, meaningless tasks, or excessive monitoring of work*; Ortega et al, 2009), or **person-related** (*gossiping, verbal hostility, persistent criticism, or social exclusion*).

Consistent with stress theories, workplace bullying recognized as a main source of distress that is associated with decreased well-being, lowered job satisfaction & performance, reduced commitment, and higher levels of sickness & absenteeism.

When asked, 33% of the patients with mood disorders attributed their mental health problems to their work situation, making problems at work the most common self-reported cause of depression (Hansson et al, 2010).

Workplace Bullying and Mental Health: A Meta-Analysis on Cross-Sectional and Longitudinal Data (Verkuil et al, 2015)

- **Cross-sectional:** Positive associations between workplace bullying and symptoms of depression ($r = .28$), anxiety ($r = .34$), and stress-related psychological complaints ($r = .37$). A moderation analysis showed a significant difference between the effect size for workplace bullying and general anxiety ($r = 0.28$) versus PTSD symptoms ($r = 0.46$).
- **Longitudinal:** Workplace bullying was related to mental health complaints over time ($r = 0.21$). Baseline workplace bullying significantly predicted depression ($r = .36$), anxiety ($r = .17$), and stress related psychological complaints ($r = .15$). Additionally, a reversed association between mental health problems at baseline and exposure to workplace bullying at follow-up was detected ($r = .18$).

PTSD as a consequence of bullying at work and at school. A literature review and meta-analysis (Nielsen et al, 2015)

- Estimated prevalence rate of 32% in schools (Solberg & Olweus, 2003) and 15% in workplaces (Nielsen, Matthiesen, & Einarsen, 2010). Bullying health problems resemble the symptomatology which characterizes post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD - avoidance, intrusion, and hyper-arousal) and it has, therefore, been proposed that exposure to bullying may lead to PTSD (Kreiner, Sulyok, & Rothenhausler, 2008; Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2004; Tehrani, 2004).
- A consistent body of evidence shows that persons who bully others at school also are likely to bully as adults, a finding which indicates that there are intergenerational continuities in bullying tendencies (Ttofi, Farrington, & Losel, 2012), and victimization from bullying in school increases the risk of being bullied in adult life (Smith et al., 2003).

PTSD as a consequence of bullying at work and at school. A literature review and meta-analysis (Nielsen et al, 2015)

- **Findings:** Average correlation of .42 was established between exposure to bullying and an overall symptom-score of PTSD. This finding suggests that bullying has an equally strong association with symptoms of post-traumatic stress among children and adults.
- Findings show that an average of 57% of victims of bullying report symptom scores for PTSD above cut-off thresholds. In comparison, the estimated lifetime prevalence of PTSD among adult Americans is 7.8%. This suggests that PTSD symptoms are overrepresented among bullied persons.

Meta-Analysis of Sex and Race Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment (McCord et al, 2018)

Does this affect everyone equally?

This study meta-analyzed the magnitude of sex and race differences in perceptions of workplace mistreatment (e.g., harassment, discrimination, bullying, incivility).

Employees who are mistreated may be more likely to leave the organization than stay as evidenced by meta-analytic examinations of the positive relationship between mistreatment and turnover intentions (Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Hershcovis & Barling, 2010; Nielsen & Einarsen, 2012)...obvious implications re: diversity.

Meta-Analysis of Sex and Race Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment (McCord et al, 2018)

- **Findings:** Women perceived more sex-based mistreatment (68% of women perceive more sex-based mistreatment than the average man); Women and men report comparable perceptions of all other forms of mistreatment; Racial minorities perceive more race-based mistreatment
- Contrary to expectations, sex differences in abusive supervision and interpersonal conflict indicated that men are more likely **to report** these forms of mistreatment than women. White employees were also more likely **to report** interpersonal conflict than racial minorities.

Take Aways re: Literature Review on Toxic Behaviour...

- There are different definitions and understandings of various forms of 'mistreatment'. Some authors clearly distinguish between for example, bullying and harassment, whereas others believe one term encompasses similar behaviors.
- Different measurement instruments are used to measure different forms of 'mistreatment' (the Negative Acts Questionnaire - Einarsen et al., 2009 - was the most frequently used measurement instrument).
- Heterogeneous measurement instruments, populations, and sampling techniques have been found to affect results.
- General consensus is that workplace 'mistreatment' has detrimental effects on a variety of health factors and negatively affects both work performance and organizational outcomes.

Now I want to shift gears to focus on one type of work environment at particular risk:

Bullying in Project Management Teams

Catherine Loughlin & Lindsay Bryson (2014)

Chapter 17

in Chiochio, F., Kelloway K., & Hobbs, B. (Eds).

The Psychology and Management of Project Teams: An Interdisciplinary Perspective, Oxford University Press.

What this book chapter covers:

- Definition of bullying in organizational psychology literature
- Situational problems in project contexts
- Predictors of bullying
- Process of bullying
- Consequences of bullying
- Identification, disruption, and prevention strategies – (Chapter goes into more detail than we have time for today).

Global Trends & Job Design

- **Delisle's** (2007) recent review of 5 important trends now facing project teams suggests we are unknowingly creating environments primed for bullying behavior.
- Authors in project management literature **often dismiss job design** (Huemann et al, 2007) despite it being a cornerstone of creating healthy workplaces free of bullying, especially in project teams!

Defining Bullying in Project Teams

Negative behaviours directed toward members of an organization that are recurring, persistent, and continuous (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996). Interpersonal aggression or hostility including screaming, threatening; or passive, social isolation, spreading rumours, excessive criticism.

Commonly includes perceived imbalance of power between the perpetrator and target. Bullies are often 'leaders' or senior organizational members and are most commonly found in large, male-dominated organizations.

Challenges?

Two notable challenges in generalizing definitions of bullying in the organizational psychology literature are:

- Bullying is only categorized as such if it is **'recurring'** - *What about 'isolated cases' across teams?*
- Power imbalances can be much **more subtle** in team project contexts.

Phases of Bullying

Both **3-phase** (Bjorkqvist, 2001) and **4-phase** (Leymann, 1996) models have been proposed:

3-phase model: spreading rumours => isolation / humiliation => bullying intensification; **4-phase model:** critical event triggers => bullying & stigmatization => target complains to management => target leaves organization.

Both models suggest hopelessness for the target through inability to change or cope with the situation once the cycle has begun.

Causes of Bullying?

Believed to result from an interaction of **individual** and **situational factors** (Salin, 2003)

Individual Level predictors: previous exposure to bullying, gender, narcissism, negative affectivity, positions of authority (leaders), women / minorities / persons with disabilities (targets).

Organizational Level predictors: stressful & poorly organized work environments, design of task – work load & pace, role ambiguity, interpersonal relationships, organizational expedience, management style (autocratic), decline of professional workplace behavior (casual atmosphere).

Conseq. of Bullying in PMT's

- U.K. study estimated costs of bullying to be **\$21.7 Billion CAD** (Giga et al, 2008); Being bullied increases risk of **physical & mental health** (Bridsky, 1976; Einarsen & Mikkelsen, 2003).
- Bullied employees become stressed, leading to risk of **depression, burnout, job detachment**, (Namie, 2003; Balshem, 1988). Also reported have been sleep disturbances, symptoms resembling **PTSD, drug abuse**, and even **suicide**.
- Bullying affects not only individual employees, but also the organization (**absenteeism, turnover, low-productivity**). Turnover is especially problematic for 'Project Teams' on tight timelines.

Costs of Toxic Behaviour at work...

- 94% of employees say they have worked with someone “toxic” in their career (e.g., someone who humiliates others; bullies; takes potshots at people in public). The impact of toxic people on those around them can be devastating.
- One study after another confirms that verbal abuse increases job dissatisfaction, builds a hostile work setting, and lowers morale. Negative interactions affect employees’ moods five times more than positive ones (Miner et al., 2005)
- “The amount of impact of toxic people is a cost that ripples through the organization...If one could ever show the wide-reaching effects of just ONE toxic person, I think it would help people address this sooner” (Kusy & Holloway, 2009, P. 19).

Ok so what is a manager supposed to do?

Fortunately there are some predictable markers
to watch out for:

What seems to be common to toxic behaviour (Kusy & Holloway, 2009)...

Type 1: Shaming behavior

Humiliation, sarcasm, potshots, and highlighting mistakes

- When displeased with your behavior or performance, person acts like a parent and shames and blames, along with severe emotional swings and temper tantrums.
- Demeaning and derogatory to others; person will purposely embarrass people by asking questions to which they know the person doesn't have the answer...

Type 2: Hostility (Can be Passive)

Distrusts others' opinions, verbal attacks if given negative feedback, clueless of their own toxicity

- Micromanaging and protecting one's territory; guarding one's ego and absolute belief in being right above and beyond all others. Passive/aggressive, condescending, martyrdom behaviors.
- The distrust of this individual towards others' work and opinions undermined productivity

Type 3: Team Sabotage

Teams are supported in their work to showcase
the toxic person, who's ego is insatiable

- Quotes to illustrate - “This person did significant damage to individuals and our team. There was such a degradation of performance in the function he heads and to the business. No amount of accommodation to his whims changed the situation. It remained that “everyone else” was the problem, and he continued his reign of terror” – Study respondent (p. 43)
- “One of the frustrating things is that as a peer of this individual, I am not asked for 360 degree feedback as part of the normal course. So any conversation I have with their supervisor is perceived as going out of my way to bad-mouth the individual” (p. 47).

So why are they around?

Largely due to some faulty assumptions that we often make
in organizations....

Four common myths about toxic behavior:

Myth #1

I would know if there was someone toxic on my team...

No you wouldn't....these people don't survive by being stupid! They do not typically 'kick up'

“This person can be quite charismatic and funny, so it is easy to get sucked in time and time again and give her the benefit of the doubt... I've decided over the years that she is essentially a manipulative, power-hungry, dishonest, unethical game player...she makes it look like she strives for calmness, but in reality seems to get pure enjoyment out of chaos and anxiety-producing situations” – participant (p. 21)

“Remember that toxic people are adept at masking the toxicity when it is to their advantage. They can turn their behaviors on and off depending on the impression they want to make on the boss, a direct report, a peer, or a customer. As a leader, recognizing that you have a toxicity problem in your team or group means understanding that complaints to you may not be consistent with your impression” (p. 22)

Myth #2

I can't get rid of this person - he/she is a good producer!

Support Teams not Narcissists

Yes, you can! (get rid of this person)

- One large-scale study (Barrick et al., 1998) of fifty-one manufacturing teams and another study (Lepine et al., 1997) both revealed that a team member who was rated low on interpersonal traits decreased the entire team's performance significantly. In other words, the team is only as strong as its weakest link.
- “Toxic individuals have a tendency to promote mediocrity in their teams, even though a toxic person may be more productive than the others” (p. 78)

Myth #3

If their behaviour was so bad people wouldn't put up with it....

Peers and Leaders must change what they accept as normal...

Yes they will! (put up with bad behaviour)

- “Working with this toxic individual was one of the worst experiences in my life. It took a long time to recover from her abuse. It was difficult because others witnessed what was happening but were scared they might receive the same abuse so they did not want to get involved” (Study respondent, P. 3).
- This includes peers and leaders...

Role of Peers

- “Peers often survive by picking up on the toxic behaviors and using them on each other! In other situations, they withdraw from the team to protect themselves against the toxic person.” (p. 111)...“an entire system of more than seventy people can devote more than a decade of their lives trying to survive workplace assaults to their dignity” (p. 143).
- “Her coworkers got along because they acquiesced and withdrew rather than confronted...The entire team walked on eggshells in front of her...People choose not to attend meetings when she was present...Her behaviour was so extreme that people were almost immobilized” (p. 49)

Role of Leaders

- “Effective organizations have to know what’s the best for the good of the whole team and can’t put the interests of one individual above that, or else the organization is going to break down over the long term’ (quote from a study respondent, p. 111)
- “we were very surprised with one particular finding in our research study: we did not expect that one person’s toxic behaviors would influence so dramatically the way in which people within the team started to act toward one another”
- There is strong evidence that three outcomes occur when key stakeholders are involved in any change process: greater commitment, a higher sense of ownership, and better results.

Myth #4

This person can be dealt with individually...

Develop systems around Respectful Behaviour

No they can't! (be dealt with individually)

“The longer the toxic behaviours are tolerated and accommodated, the more widespread the impact” (p. 86)

“We have concluded that one brave person without a system of support cannot solve the problem of toxicity” (p. 50)....“first implement system approaches, and then work with individual approaches” (p. 80)

One Practical Proactive Strategy...

*Involve as many stakeholders as possible in hiring,
and ask relevant questions in interviews....*

- E.g. - Please consider an incident from your present or previous employer when you were candid about an error despite the potential risk. What did you do?”
- “How have you recently motivated a group or an individual to do something he or she was not motivated to do?”
- “How did you provide negative feedback to someone who was receiving it?”

Solutions?

Commit to a 'Systems Approach' to
Toxic Work Behaviour!

***5 'Solutions' to consider
(from our PMT chapter p. 25-34):***

What can be done? 5 Specific Steps:

- 1) Carefully select and support teams – Evidence-based personality measures & careful interviewing.
- 2) Proactive Job Design – Monitor Workloads & Employee Input, clearly outline responsibilities; Term Limits for those in Power.
- 3) Proactively Monitor for Bullying Behavior – Exit interviews; Negative Acts Questionnaire.
- 4) Manage Performance – Accountable to ‘rules of engagement’, consistent & faire evaluations, carefully choose managers.
- 5) Adopt a Systems Based Approach – removing a bully from an environment doesn’t necessarily ‘remedy’ the toxic problem, feedback is critical.

How we do things matters!

“Effective organizations pay close attention to both what gets accomplished and **how** it gets accomplished. In our organization, leaders know that **the way they achieve their results** is as important as the results themselves, and because of that, our **core values** are **consistently reinforced and upheld**. We work hard in the **hiring process** to ensure a potential team member’s fit with our culture. Being open to **different perspectives**, collaborating effectively, and taking **accountability** are all critical in our performance-driven culture, so we want to ensure that the people we hire have those natural abilities and can thrive in that kind of environment” (CEO from Kusy & Hollaway, p. 181)

*Respectful engagement is perhaps
not “natural”
but definitely teachable!*

OHS Background Info.

NIOSH: Stressors in the Workplace

- Workload and Workpace
- Role Stressors
- Career Concerns
- Work Scheduling
- Interpersonal Relations
- Job Content and Control

Canada: Standard for Psychological Health and Safety at Work (CSA-Z1003-13)

- Organizational Culture
- Psychological and Social Support
- Clear Leadership and Expectations
- Civility and Respect
- Psychosocial Demands
- Growth and Development
- Recognition and Reward
- Involvement and Influence
- Workload Management
- Engagement
- Balance
- Psychological Protection and Protection of Physical Safety

Additional Definitions

- Mobbing: “an initial unresolved conflict that is preventing the targeted person from accomplishing his or her job in the most effective way” ... “The targeted person tries with good intent to resolve the situation in a constructive way, never realizing that the people he or she is dealing with have already decided to get rid of him or her, which is revealed in attacks of various sorts: humiliation, ridicule, stigmatization, ostracism, exclusion and isolation” (Kenneth Westhues, 2002 as cited in <http://psychologicalharassment.com/mobbing-office-disease.htm>).

Aggression vs. Violence

- (Wrongly) Tendency to treat workplace aggression and workplace violence as interchangeable (Barling, Dupré & Kelloway, 2009).
- They are distinguishable constructs:
 - By definition:
 - All violence is aggression, but not all aggression is violence

Harassment

- Bullying is often included as a form of harassment (e.g., Ontario Bill 168)
- Harassment – single incident
- Bullying – sustained pattern
- Mobbing – sustained pattern by many

Bullying

- Bullying can be quite subtle and difficult to prove: Slamming the door in someone's face to (more hostile acts) graffiti and acts of sabotage.
- An issue made more complicated by different cross cultural norms (i.e., holding doors open).

Cyber-Bullying (Cyber-Aggression)

- Emails, Twitter, Facebook, Texts
- Increasing accusations of ‘mobbing’ happening online (e.g. James Gunn firing by Disney?)

Employer's Responsibility

- In Ontario (Bill 168) for example, employers are required to have a policy about harassment in the workplace but are not required to conduct risk assessments for harassment (unlike workplace violence). Furthermore, harassment does not constitute a grounds for a work refusal under the legislation.

Two Employer Responsibilities

- 1) Obligation to investigate and respond to specific complaints.
- 2) Organizations have made attempts to promote more respectful workplaces.

#1) Policy for the investigation of specific incidents should include:

- 1) provision to individuals to file a complaint
- 2) conduct an investigation by neutral third party ASAP
- 3) consultation with each party involved
- 4) evidence gathering
- 5) communicating the decision to parties involved
- 6) documenting the process and maintaining records

#2) Respectful Workplaces Programs

- Train individuals about what constitutes bullying, harassment and aggression at work.
- The C.R.E.W. (Civility Respect and Engagement) process is one such program.
- An evaluation of the CREW process reported found that incivility can be reduced; also this improvement was sustained over a year later (Osatuke, et al., 2009; Leiter, et al., 2012)

Outcomes of Aggression and Violence

Longer Term Outcomes

- Emotional Well-being (Bowling & Beehr, 2006)
- Physical Health (Bowling & Beehr, 2006)
- Affective Commitment (Rogers & Kelloway, 1997)
- Turnover Intentions (Bowling & Beehr, 2006;)
- Performance (Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Schat & Kelloway, 2000)

Moderators

- Organizational support (Schat & Kelloway, 2003)
- Previous exposure (Schat & Kelloway, 2005)
- Training (Schat & Kelloway, 2000)

The impact of methodological moderators on prevalence rates of workplace bullying. A meta-analysis. (Nielsen et al, 2010)

A note about measurement...

- **Study** Investigated how **heterogeneous measurement methods** and **sampling techniques** contribute to the observed variation in prevalence rates of workplace bullying.
- In terms of operationalization, most approaches have either assessed (a) the respondents' overall perception of being victimized by bullying (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996) or (b) the respondents' perception of being exposed to a range of specific bullying behaviour (Salin, 2001; Zapf et al., 2003)

The impact of methodological moderators on prevalence rates of workplace bullying. A meta-analysis. (Nielsen et al, 2010)

Workplace bullying characterized by four main criteria:

- 1) the target is exposed to direct or indirect, but highly unwanted, **negative acts** of a non-sexual and mainly non-violent nature. These acts may range from subtle, even unconscious, incivilities to blatant, intentional emotional abuse (Fox & Stallworth, 2005).
- 2) the negative acts in question are **repeated regularly**.
- 3) the negative events take place over a **prolonged time period** (Einarsen, Matthiesen, & Hauge, 2008).
- 4) a real or perceived **imbalance of power** between the bully and the target (Leymann, 1996); one feels powerless in the situation compared to the perpetrator.

The impact of methodological moderators on prevalence rates of workplace bullying. A meta-analysis. (Nielsen et al, 2010)

Two methods used to investigate bullying:

Self-labelling Method (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996; 190–191) and the **Behavioural Experience Method** (Einarsen et al., 2009).

Self-labelled victimization from bullying, measures a perceptual construct. Thus, reported prevalence rates will be influenced by individual characteristics of the respondent and, possibly, also by the psychological climate in the organization (Ilies, Hauserman, Schwochau, & Stibal, 2003).

Cursory Glance at WCB's Re: Harassment & Bullying

Province	Address Harassment	Address Bullying	Address Mobbing	Presumption of work caused Psych Injury	Harassment (H) and / or Bullying (B) Compensable
B.C.	✓	✓	✓	✓	(H) ✓ (B) ✓
Alta.	✓	X	X	✓	(H) ✓
Sask.	X	X	X	✓	Interpersonal incidents*
Man.	X	X	X	✓	If -> PTSD*
Ont.	✓	✓	X	X	(H) ✓
N.S.	X*	X	X	X	X
Nunavut	✓	✓	X	X	(H) ✓

Violence policies

Example:

<http://www.smu.ca/policy/documents/6-2001ViolenceWorkplace.pdf>