2017

Influence of Personal Experience on Workplace Bullying Behavior

Sandra Trott
Walden University

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Sandra Trott

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Brian Zamboni, Committee Chairperson, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Mitchell Hicks, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Tracy Marsh, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2017

Abstract

Influence of Personal Experience on Workplace Bullying Behavior

by

Sandra Trott

MS, Walden University, 2010

BS, Regis University, 2007

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Counseling Psychology

Walden University

August 2017

Abstract

Workplace bullying has detrimental effects on victims and organizations. Research from the bully's perspective is lacking resulting in unknown causes for the aggressive behavior. Research indicates some child bullies have histories of maltreatment and that bullying may persist throughout adulthood. The purpose of this non-experimental quantitative study was to examine associations between workplace bullying and childhood abuse/neglect, actual or perceived current victimization, attachment style, and the desire to gain social dominance. An examination of the possible influence of social dominance on the relationship between abuse and workplace bullying was also included. Social dominance theory and attachment theory provided the framework for the study. The sample consisted of 126 adult men and women. The survey instrument included the Bullying Behavior Scale, Social Dominance Q-Scale, Social Dominance Orientation Scale, Childhood Trauma Questionnaire, Coercion and Conflict Scale, and Adult Attachment Scale. Data analysis included ANOVA, Pearson correlation, and linear regression. ANOVA results indicated significant associations between low- to mid-range incomes and certain industries and workplace bullying. There was a negative correlation between the relationship workplace bullying and childhood abuse/neglect. Results for domestic violence, social dominance need, and attachment style were not significant. There were no moderating effects of social dominance on the occurrence of workplace bullying and childhood abuse/neglect. Improvements to workplace environments and coping programs for bullies might result from this study's outcome.

Influence of Personal Experience on Workplace Bullying Behavior

by

Sandra Trott

MS, Walden University, 2010

BS, Regis University, 2007

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Counseling Psychology

Walden University

August 2017

Table of Contents

iii

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

A number of fatal incidents across the United States within the past two decades have highlighted the phenomenon of workplace bullying. The number of individuals bullied daily within the United States is one in six according to Namie and Namie (2009). Smith (2014) suggested that 27% of U.S. workers have experienced workplace bullying and 21% have reported witnessing bullying on the job. Zabrodska and Kveton (2013) found 28.8% of their participants witnessed bullying on the job. Traditionally viewed as a phenomenon between children on a playground, bullying is one of the most common situations among adult workers (Namie & Namie, 2009). The behaviors typically include tactics such as humiliation, mocking, ridicule, physical altercations, and sabotage (Einarsen, Hoel, & Notelaers, 2009; Johnson & Trad, 2014; Namie & Namie, 2009; Trad & Johnson, 2014). The tactics used by bullies tend to consist of small incidents rather than severe behaviors (Tehrani, 2004). In most cases, targets of workplace bullying leave their jobs to avoid the constant harassment and stress. In a few cases however, the emotional instability of the victim may result in a fatal reaction such as suicide or revenge (Djurkovic, McCormack, & Casimir, 2008; Srabstein, 2013). For instance, investigators and coworkers believed workplace bullying was the motivating factor behind the shootings of U. S. postal workers during the early 1990s (Deneberg & Denenberg, 1996). Workplace bullying affects not only the target's physical, psychological, and emotional health, but also affects his or her external environment. This might include areas such as family relationships and work performance (Bibi, Karim, & ud Din, 2013; Celep & Konakli, 2013; Djurkovic et al., 2006; Ekici, & Beder,

2014; Misawa & Rowland, 2015; Namie & Namie, 2009; Oladapo & Banks, 2013; Sansone, Leung, & Wiederman, 2013; Trad, & Johnson, 2014; Tuckey & Neall, 2014). The phenomenon of workplace bullying can be one of the most damaging situations to the well-being of the victim, the company, and possibly the bully. Employers who investigate and find bullying accusations to be true may terminate the perpetrator. Furthermore, bullies may fail to develop healthy interpersonal relationships (Courtney & Wann, 2010) such as friendships, which may result in isolation and loneliness.

Most studies conducted on workplace bullying have focused on the impact to victims and the financial costs to organizations (Bano & Malik, 2013; Einarsen et al., 2009; Namie & Namie, 2009; Porath & Pearson, 2013). Physical and psychological health problems tend to be the most common repercussions for targets of workplace bullying. It is common for victims of workplace bullying to report low self-esteem, anxiety, depression, poor concentration, chronic fatigue, insomnia, stomach problems, headaches, anger, self-hatred, and suicidal ideation (Constantinescu, 2014; Gemzøe Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2002; Giorgi, Ando, Arenas, Shoss, & Leon-Perez, 2013; Oladapo & Banks, 2013; Taylor, 2013; Trépanier, Fernet, & Austin, 2013, 2015; Zirkel, 2014). Yuanyi, Ferris, Ho Kwong, Ming, Mingjian, and Ying (2013) found that exposure to workplace bullying inhibits the desire for self-enhancement and to seek well-being. Roland (2013) indicated that victims of workplace bullying, especially young adults might experience a sense of loss and hopelessness that will continue to plague them for the rest of their lives.

The impact to companies and corporations where workplace bullying occurs is primarily financial. Production may be lost due to absenteeism by the victims (Bano & Malik, 2013; Oladapo & Banks, 2013). Porath and Pearson (2013) found that as many as 48% of their 800 participants decreased their work effort and 47% reduced their time at work due to workplace bullying. When victims of workplace bullying choose to leave their jobs due to the situation, the cost for recruiting and training new employees can affect a company's bottom line (McCulloch, 2010). Olender-Russo (2009) suggested that employers who are aware of the bullying within their companies, but refuse to acknowledge its existence or take action are just as guilty as the bullies are in causing emotional and psychological damage to the victims. Pryor, Odom, and Toombs (2014) suggested that workplace bullying is a contributing factor to the eventual failure of many organizations.

Although it is helpful to understand the impact on the victims and companies factors behind the adverse behavior of bullies is unknown. The main reason for the sparse research from the bully's perspective is due to the difficulty in obtaining a sample of bullies (Carbo, 2009). One way to understand adult bullying is to examine and apply the information learned from studying bullying in children and adolescents. Several studies indicated that exposure to domestic violence, abuse, and neglect during childhood affects academic study in school (Morrow, Hubbard, & Swift, 2014). In many cases exposure to violence, abuse, and neglect encourages the use of bullying strategies to avoid further victimization well into adulthood (Baldry, 2003, 2005; Bauer et al., 2006; Bowes et al.,

2009; Dussich & Maekoya, 2007; Shields & Cicchetti, 2001; Shujja, Atta, & Shujja,

2014; Vaillancourt & McDougall, 2013).

Background of the Problem

Workplace bullying has become such a problem across Europe that many

countries have enacted laws to protect victims (Kaplan, 2010). For instance, Belgium,

France, Poland, and Sweden have passed laws that hold both bullies and organizations

accountable for workplace bullying (Kaplan, 2010). The United Nations found that

workplace bullying had reached epidemic levels as of 2006 after surveying 15 European

Union states (International Labour Organization, 2006). The research on workplace

bullying in the United States and some other countries has been slow to emerge due to the

denial of its existence by executives, managers, and human resource personnel (Leo,

Reid, Geldenhuys, & Gobind, 2014; Parkins, Fishbein, & Ritchey, 2006). Carbo (2009)

and McCulloch (2010) blame workplace bullying on organizations and suggested that

companies promote bullying by ignoring the needs of their employees, encouraging

competition, and creating a stressful environment by focusing too much on profits.

Stalcup (2013) indicated that workplace bullying does not occur in a vacuum; incidents

tend to occur only when company personnel ignore the behavior.

Most of the research on workplace bullying across Europe and the United States

has focused on the impact to the victims. Tehrani (2004) found that 44% of the bullied

participants were experiencing symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). For

instance, some participants reported nightmares, sleeping problems, and anxiety (Tehrani,

2004). Blase and Blase (2006) also found PTSD symptoms among participants as well as

physical manifestations of stress such as headaches, ulcers, sleeping disorders, and high blood pressure. The psychological and emotional harm that can befall the victims may include depression, anxiety, low self-esteem, distrust, and poor concentration (Blase & Blase, 2006; Constantinescu, 2014; Pomeroy, 2013; Taylor, 2013; Trad & Johnson, 2014; Trépanier, et al., 2013, 2015). Due to the psychological, emotional, and physiological damage that victims of workplace bullying experience, it is necessary to understand the phenomenon of adult bullying from all aspects. So far, there is no research on the potential relationship between childhood abuse or neglect and workplace bullying.

The research on childhood bullying became the subject of intense study when two boys in Colorado committed mass murder at their high school during the late 1990s. Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold killed 12 students; and 1 teacher; and injured 21 others when they stormed Columbine High School with a variety of guns and bombs (Cook, 2004). Bullying appeared to be prevalent among the student body at Columbine High School (Cook, 2004). Students reported that athletes frequently harassed Harris and Klebold, which seemed to be the main reason behind the devastating incident at Columbine High School.

Since the destructive episode at Columbine, similar incidents at high schools around the country have occurred, most of which have been allegedly due to bullying; however research is lacking to support these opinions. Much of the research on childhood bullying has focused on the design and implementation of prevention programs (Baldry, 2003, 2005; Burkhart, Knox, & Brockmyer, 2013; Dominguez, 2013; Franks, Rawana, & Brownlee, 2013; Gage, Prykanowski, & Larson, 2014; Holt, Kaufman Kantor, &

Finkelhor, 2009; Javier, Dillon, DaBreo, & De Mucci, 2013; Pergolizzi et al., 2009).

Other researchers have attempted to understand the causes (Henry, 2004) or physical and

psychological harm (Černi Obrdalj, Zadro, Batić-Mujanović, & Zalihić, 2014; Hunter,

Durkin, Boyle, Booth, & Rasmussen, 2014; Kupferman-Meik, Burris-Warmoth,

Rapaport, Roychoudhury, & Javier, 2013; Lester & Cross, 2014; Ramirez, 2013). Henry

(2004) found a relationship between anger, depression, and inadequate coping strategies.

Externalizing anger and the inability to cope with emotions in stressful situations may

trigger bullying behavior (Henry, 2004). Shalev et al. (2013) found that long-term

exposure to violence; children show deterioration in a portion of their DNA. Fite et al.

(2013) found several different areas where victimization may occur such as sporting

events; however, girls tend to report more victimization at home than do boys. Other

studies have suggested that children who are abused or neglected tend to develop poor

coping skills and may use bullying strategies against others in an effort to avoid being

victimized by classmates (Coid et al., 2001; Mustanoja et al., 2011; Wolfe, Crooks,

Chiodo, & Jaffe, 2009). Inadequate coping skills, fear, anger, and distrust are factors that

when carried into adulthood may manifest through aggressive behaviors toward

coworkers.

Statement of the Problem

The phenomenon of workplace bullying can be damaging to the well-being of all

involved. Organizations lose money in decreased production and attrition (Bano & Malik,

2013; LaVan & Martin, 2008; Porath & Pearson, 2013), victims experience

psychological, emotional, and physiological problems (Blase & Blase, 2006), and bullies

may experience a false sense of power resulting in social isolation (Seeds, Harkness, & Quilty, 2010). Although it has been necessary to understand workplace bullying from the perspective of the victims and organizations, information from the bully's perspective is lacking. Several researchers have conducted studies on workplace and childhood bullying in an attempt to understand and prevent bullying behavior. Research on childhood bullying has focused on prevention (e.g. Baldry, 2003, 2005; Dominguez, 2013; Holt et al., 2009; Pergolizzi et al., 2009). Research on workplace bullying has focused on victims and organizations (Bano & Malik, 2013; Einarsen et al., 2009; Namie & Namie, 2009). To fully understand and prevent workplace bullying, it is vital to understand the factors that may provoke an individual to bully his or her coworkers.

There may be many reasons why an adult bullies a coworker; prevention programs designed to target similar factors among bullies might be more effective if identified. Experiences during childhood may influence how an individual views his or her environment, interpersonal relationships, and stressful situations as an adult. Abused or neglected children live in a world of fear and turmoil (Wolfe et al., 2009). A child in this environment learns to withhold any expression of emotion as he or she may not know what will provoke an abusive reaction from their caregiver (Wolfe et al., 2009). This state of anxiety tends to inhibit normal psychosocial development causing an individual to grow up mistrusting the motives of others preventing the formation of healthy relationships (Espinoza, Gonzales, & Fuligni, 2013; Low & Van Ryzin, 2014; Wolfe et al., 2009). Espinoza et al. (2013) and Jong-Hyo (2013) reported that adolescents found it difficult to adapt to situations at school when exposed to bullying over a long time.

Bullying tended to have an adverse effect on their ability to make friends and on their academic performance (Espinoza et al., 2013; Jong-Hyo, 2013; Weijun et al., 2014).

Due to the challenges of sampling a population of bullies, the causes of workplace bullying have been difficult to identify. Some researchers have blamed the victims suggesting the victims' personality or actions instigate bullying from coworkers (Baillien, Neyens, De Witte, & De Cuyper, 2009; Glasø, Nielsen, & Einarsen, 2007; Hutchinson, & Hurley, 2013; Scott, Restubog, & Zagenczyk, 2013; Sliter, Withrow, & Jex, 2014; Taylor & Pattie, 2014; Zou, NiveditaGanguli, & Shahnawaz, 2014). Other researchers blamed the organizations suggesting that the focus on the bottom line and encouraging competition promote an environment that is perfect for workplace bullying to develop (Blase & Blase, 2006; Duffy, 2009). Although these studies have provided crucial information regarding workplace bullying, research on the relationship between workplace bullying and childhood abuse/neglect is nonexistent.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine a potential link between four factors and the use of aggression toward a coworker. Specifically, I investigated the relationship between workplace bullying and mistreatment by a caregiver during childhood, factual or perceived current victimization, attachment style, and the desire to gain social dominance. I also examined the possible influence of social dominance on the relationship between abuse and workplace bullying.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

I examined workplace bullying with a focus on abuse/neglect experienced during childhood, factual or perceived current victimization, attachment style, and the need for social dominance. The following research questions and hypotheses were addressed in the study.

Research Question 1: Is maltreatment during childhood such as abuse and neglect, related to workplace bullying?

H_{01}: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker do not report a history of abuse/neglect during childhood.

H_{a1}: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker report a history of abuse/neglect during childhood.

Research Question 2: Is current physical, psychological, or emotional abuse related to bullying others in the workplace?

H_{02}: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker do not report experiencing current physical, psychological, or emotional abuse.

H_{a2}: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker report experiencing current physical, psychological, or emotional abuse.

Research Question 3: Is the need for social dominance related to bullying coworkers in adulthood?

H_{03}: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker do not report a need for social dominance as measured by the survey questions.

*H*a3: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker report a need for social dominance as measured by the survey questions.

Research Question 4: Is there a relationship between attachment style and bullying coworkers in adulthood?

*H*04: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker do not score high on anxiety as measured by the survey questions.

*H*a4: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker score high on anxiety as measured by the survey questions.

Research Question 5: Does the need for social dominance influence the relationship between childhood abuse/neglect and the use of bullying tactics toward coworkers in adulthood?

*H*05: A stronger relationship between childhood abuse/neglect and workplace bullying does not result from the moderating effects of social dominance for those participants who score high on the need for social dominance questions.

*H*a5: A stronger relationship between childhood abuse/neglect and workplace bullying does result from the moderating effects of social dominance for those participants who score high on the need for social dominance questions.

Participants responded to survey questions to indicate their level of workplace aggressive behavior toward coworkers. The survey included six scales to measure social dominance, childhood trauma, domestic violence, workplace bullying, and attachment style. The Social Dominance Q-Scale (Teisl, Rogosch, Oshri, & Cicchetti, 2012) measured social dominance orientation with a focus on trait social dominance. The Social

Dominance Orientation Scale (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994) measured the beliefs that some individuals are inherently superior or inferior to others. The Childhood Trauma Questionnaire – Short Form (Bernstein et al., 2003) elicited information regarding histories of maltreatment such as physical and emotional abuse or neglect. Answers on the Coercion and Conflict Scale (Cook & Goodman, 2006) indicated current abuse within intimate partnerships. The Bullying Behaviors Scale (Brotheridge & Lee, 2006) elicited information about bullying behaviors directed at coworkers within the past 6 months. Finally, the Adult Attachment Scale (Collins & Read, 1990) elicited information on various attachment styles that individuals have with others. I removed scale names from the survey to avoid influencing participants' answers. The use of a third-party company to post the survey and gather the data ensured anonymity.

Definition of Terms

Attachment style: The way in which an individual approaches interpersonal relationships. The notion of attachment style comes from attachment theory, which addresses the early relationship a child forms with his or her caregiver (Collins & Read, 1990). If a caregiver is abusive, overemotional, or inconsistent, the child may view all future relationships with mistrust expecting the same type of behavior (Collins & Read, 1990).

Bullying: A set of repetitive aggressive behaviors directed toward an individual that are unwanted and unprovoked with the intention to cause harm through physical, psychological, or emotional means in which the victim is unable to defend him- or herself. Carbo and Hughes (2010) identified a new definition of workplace bullying by

asking participants to write out their version of workplace bullying. The common components among the participant descriptions included repetitiveness, severity, intent, and power differential (Carbo & Hughes, 2010). The new definition based on the common descriptors was "workplace bullying is the unwanted, unwelcome, abuse of any source of power that has the effect of or intent to intimidate, control or otherwise strip a target of their right to esteem, growth, dignity, voice, or other human rights in the workplace" (Carbo & Hughes, 2010, p. 397). There has been debate over the definition of bullying; however, there tends to be certain characteristics that are universal to bullying in both school-age children and adults. For instance, bullying behaviors occur over time, are designed to cause harm to the victim, and involve an actual or perceived imbalance of power (Ertureten, Cemalcilar, & Aycan, 2013; Geller, 2014; Grief & Furlong, 2006; Longton, 2014; Oladapo & Banks, 2013; Sercombe & Donnelly, 2013). Although many human resource personnel agrees that bullying behavior occurs repeatedly and is intended to cause physical or psychological harm, they also include the potential economic harm and the creation of a hostile work environment in their definition (Cowan, 2013).

Domestic violence: Abusive behavior by one adult partner toward his or her adult partner. These behaviors include physical and emotional abuse (Lobbestael, Arntz, Harkema-Schouten, & Bernstein, 2009; Von Korff et al., 2009). Domestic violence may also consist of threats of losing children, isolation from friends and family, forced to perform humiliating or degrading acts, and being forced to have sex (Shepard & Campbell, 1992).

Emotional neglect: A lack of love or warmth from a caregiver (Lobbestael et al., 2009). This type of neglect may also include a child having to care for him- or herself and/or care for the parents due to drug or alcohol addiction (Lobbestael et al., 2009).

Physical abuse: Any act against a person's body that leaves marks and/or bruises. This may include being beaten, choked, cut, burned, knocked down, dragged, punched, or kicked (Lobbestael, et al., 2009). Von Korff et al. (2009) also described physical abuse as slapping, grabbing, or throwing something at a child.

Physical neglect: Includes having too little food to eat and wearing dirty or torn clothing (Lobbestael et al., 2009). Von Korff et al. (2009) added leaving a child too young alone for long periods. Physical neglect may also include forcing a child to perform chores that are dangerous or above his or her age (Von Korff et al., 2009).

Psychological/emotional abuse: Attacking or damaging a person's self-esteem or character. This may include name-calling, belittlement, threats of physical violence, destruction of personal property, and prevention of expressing emotions (Lobbestael et al., 2009).

Relational bullying: A type of aggression used to harm an individual's reputation. Bullying usually begins as physical aggression during childhood and transforms into relational bullying in adolescence and adulthood (Turkel, 2007). Relational bullying includes behaviors such as incivility, spreading rumors, social rejection, and gossiping (Bunk & Magley, 2013; Drabek, & Merecz, 2013; Turkel, 2007). This form of aggression tends to be the most harmful as its intent is to damage an individual's social status, relationships, and self-esteem (Drabek, & Merecz, 2013; Turkel, 2007).

Social dominance: The need to be the leader or to obtain the highest status within a group. Although typically viewed as a deficit within the perpetrator, bullying may occur in a social context where the bully aims to be group leader (Guerra, Williams, & Sadek, 2011). An individual may use group membership to bolster his or her self-esteem (Guerra et al., 2011). Bullies may attempt to influence or set group boundaries as a way to define their identity (Guerra et al., 2011; Turner, Reynolds, Lee, Subasic, & Bromhead, 2014). Allen (2013) suggested that adolescents understand and react to bullying through context and the way they identify themselves within that context.

Theoretical Base

Attachment Theory

Two theories provided the foundation for this study: attachment theory and social dominance theory. According to Chestnut (2008), an individual forms his or her expectations of others based on experiences with parents and siblings in childhood. If a child's initial experience with his or her caregiver is abusive, the child will view future relationships as potentially abusive (Steinberg, 2010). Juni (2009) indicated that the earlier in childhood a developmental abuse occurs, the less likely an individual will learn healthy social skills. Furthermore, abuse by caregivers may increase the risk of developing psychopathy in adulthood for children who are predisposed (Juni, 2009). Traumatic experiences during childhood may cause fear and anger to internalize, which eventually manifests through aggression toward others (Cassidy, 1998; Habashy Hussein, 2013; Joaquim, 2014; Juni, 2009; Steinberg, 2010). Zosky (1999) suggested that unmet needs that occur during childhood continue to be needs on a primitive level in adulthood.

As a result, rage may develop internally that inhibits the ability to self-soothe during stressful situations and to regulate emotional responses to external stimuli (Zosky, 1999).

The notion of attachment theory is that parental influence on children is powerful; children form templates based on experiences with caregivers, and the loss of or separation from a caregiver helps to activate these models (Cassidy, 1998). This theory consists of a child's relationship with his or her caregiver from infancy. The formation of an attachment occurs when a caregiver provides an infant with his or her basic needs such as food, warmth, and protection (Shaver, Mikulincer, & Feeney, 2009). A secure attachment forms as the child builds trust that the caregiver will meet his or her needs when signaled (Shaver et al., 2009). As trust forms, the child feels safe to explore the external world (Shaver et al., 2009). Children use the interaction with their caregivers to learn emotional self-regulation and social skills (Shaver et al., 2009). Attachment theory may explain how dysfunctional relationships in childhood can inhibit healthy development of self-regulating abilities that may promote aggressive behavior in adulthood (Bretherton, 1992). When the responsiveness of the caregiver is inconsistent, overly emotional, or exaggerated, the child may overreact to internal cues of distress (Cloitre, Stovall-McClough, Zorbas, & Charuvastra, 2008). Insecure attachment promotes a sense of unworthiness. For instance, if a caregiver is consistently aggressive or abusive when a young child cries for closeness, the child may feel he or she is unworthy of love and will expect future relationships to be filled with abuse and rejection (Cloitre et al., 2008).

Cloitre et al. (2008) found that an insecure attachment diminishes the ability to regulate negative emotions and diminishes expectations of social support from a person's environment. Reder and Duncan (2001) found that a history of maltreatment and failure to form a secure attachment during childhood expresses itself in adulthood in unique ways. For instance, adults with insecure attachments tend to have a fear of abandonment (Reder & Duncan, 2001). Many of these individuals experience conflict between the need to be cared for and caring for someone else, which may result in episodes of domestic violence, child abuse, aggression toward strangers, and a determination to dominate others (Reder & Duncan, 2001).

Social Dominance Theory

Social dominance theory suggests that individuals dominate those who seem to be weaker in an effort to gain access to resources including status among peers (Mouttapa, Valente, Gallaher, Rohrbach, & Unger, 2004). According to Jacobson (2010), several studies have indicated that bullying is related to poor social skills in which the bully and/or the victim is unable to communicate successfully, has a passive demeanor, or is unable to manage aggression properly. However, when a bully manipulates a group of people to target one individual, the lack of social skills may not explain the reason behind bullying behavior (Jacobson, 2010). Social dominance theory may provide insight into how bullies use aggression and hostility to lead others to ensure superiority (Parkins et al., 2006). In a group atmosphere, a bully may give the impression that he or she is popular or holds power among the membership. The other individuals within the group may go along with the bullying behavior to gain favor with the bully or tap into his or her

popularity. Jacobson (2010) explained that the desire behind social dominance might be to protect self-image. For example, the bully may believe that the victim is a threat to his or her preferred image and the only way to protect that image is to create distance (Jacobson, 2010). By manipulating group members to target an individual, the bully creates distance from the victim and ensures that the preferred self-image of the bully stays intact (Jacobson, 2010).

Assumptions and Limitations of the Study

This study included several assumptions and limitations. The first assumption was that workplace bullying occurs more often than typically reported. Namie and Namie (2009) found that one in six individuals experience bullying at their workplace each day. Smith (2014) suggested that bullying affects as many as 65 million workers in some form. Although this number seems high, many researchers believe this to be a low estimate as most victims prefer to resign from their positions rather than risk escalation of the bullying behavior (Djurkovic et al., 2008; Einarsen et al., 2009: Ferris, 2009; Heponiemi, Kouvonen, Virtanen, Vänskä, & Elovainio, 2014). Investigation of workplace bullying has routinely consisted of providing participants with a list of bullying behaviors and/or a specific definition of bullying (Carbo & Hughes, 2010). Both methods require the participants to determine whether they have perpetrated or been victimized based on their interpretation of the information provided. As a result, underreporting of workplace bullying in many studies is possible (Carbo & Hughes, 2010). I removed the term *bullying* from the survey to reduce the risk of misinterpretation.

A second assumption in this study was that participants experienced some abuse or neglect by their caregivers during childhood. Although researchers studying childhood bullying and aggression suggested that bullying continues into adulthood, longitudinal studies are nonexistent. Ireland and Power (2004) suggested that there might be a link between early attachment with caregivers and aggressive perpetration, but participants were prisoners, which limited generalizability. Courtney and Wann (2010) suggested that bullies tend to demonstrate aggression, have low self-control, and believe violence is an acceptable means to solve problems. In their study of childhood bullying and sports fan aggression, Courtney and Wann (2010) found that individuals who bullied others as children tended to carry those aggressive patterns into multiple domains as adults. Their data however were limited to responses by adults in a highly aroused environment found in competitive sports. Courtney and Wann (2010) predicted that bullies would have difficulty in their interpersonal relationships both at home and at work.

The intent of this study was to identify similar attributes among individuals who use bullying tactics toward coworkers. However, the use of self-report measures to gather information was a limitation. As indicated in other studies on workplace bullying, the use of self-report mechanisms may result in skewed data (Hershcovis, & Reich, 2013; Tuckey, Dollard, Hosking, & Winefield, 2009). A participant in the current study who experienced bullying at work may have used this survey to express anger and resentment or to exaggerate the frequency of his or her experiences. Individuals who perpetrated bullying may have underreported their behavior on the survey believing they had experienced victimization, which justified their behavior. Other participants may have

chosen to deny their behavior or experiences. Some participants may have feared reliving the abuse they experienced during childhood, while others may have suppressed the memories of their experiences due to the trauma. Information on the purpose of this study included a cautionary note about the risk of emotional upset due to the content of the questions.

Another limitation of this study was that individual participants might have viewed or interpreted abuse, bullying, and victimization in different ways. Although the term bullying did not appear in the explanation, instructions, or survey questions, some questions pertaining to various acts against other individuals were open to interpretation by participants. The combined scales that made up the survey were not able to assess all types of abuse or bullying behavior, which may have resulted in inaccurate responses to some questions. Omizo, Omizo, Baxa, and Miyose (2006) found that childhood bullies had different views of their behavior. For instance, some of the bullies felt that they were helping the victims by toughening them up (Omizo et al., 2006). However, the childhood bullies also admitted that their behavior was wrong and knew that they had hurt the victims either physically or emotionally (Omizo et al., 2006). Lam and Liu (2007) pointed out that cultural differences tend to influence the meaning of bullying and victimization. If an individual's family viewed aggression as acceptable behavior, he or she might not have perceived the behaviors described in the survey questions as negative acts. Investigation of cultural differences among participants was not possible in the current study. The survey questions elicited information about behaviors, but did not address participants' perceptions of the behaviors.

One of the weaknesses of this study was depending on a third party service to obtain a sample. Although this method provided anonymity, there was no control over the individuals approached to participate or the type of responses received. The advantage of using a third party service with an online survey was the potential to have a large random sample. Most studies on bullying and aggression included convenience samples such as prisoners (Ireland & Power, 2004) or students from specific schools or areas (Carbo & Hughes, 2010; Omizo et al., 2006; Parkins et al., 2006).

Significance of the Study

Workplace bullying is one of the most damaging trends in organizations today. It has a negative impact on victims, organizations, and bullies. Namie and Namie (2009) and Smith (2014) indicated that millions of workers experience bullying on a daily basis. Leymann (1990) suggested that companies are at risk of losing as much as $100,000 for every incident of workplace bullying. Most of the studies on workplace bullying have concentrated on the damaging effects to victims and organizations. Very little research has focused on workplace bullying from the bully's perspective. It is vital to gain information about the reasons why an individual uses aggressive tactics on a coworker. This study was an attempt to further the knowledge and understanding of workplace bullying.

I applied information from previous research on child and adolescent bullying when investigating adults who use coercive strategies against coworkers. The results added to the field of psychology by providing insights into the causes of workplace bullying. The results may provide mental health professionals with an understanding of

the nature of adult bullying when presented with workplace issues. This study may also help raise public awareness of workplace bullying, which may prompt positive social change among the workforce. Childhood bullying has been a major focus of study due to the increased risk of fatalities when an unstable victim chooses to retaliate. Research on workplace bullying has been slow to emerge. The results from this study may also provide organizations with a starting point to modify training methods, workplace environments, and policies to alleviate some of the conflict that occurs between workers. Finally, results may provide U.S. policy a better understanding of workplace bullying when contemplating policy changes.

Summary

Workplace bullying is one of the most destructive phenomena in organizations. It has a damaging effect on the well-being of all involved. Namie and Namie (2009) estimated approximately one in six workers are bullied each day and Smith (2014) suggested that the number may be as high as 65 million. After several fatal incidents, workplace bullying became the focus of studies around the world, but research in the United States has been limited. Most of the research on workplace bullying has focused on the negative effects to victims and organizations. Few researchers have attempted to gather data from the bullies primarily due to the difficulty in obtaining samples (Carbo, 2009; Misawa & Rowland, 2015). Gaining knowledge and understanding of how workplace bullying affects victims and organizations is crucial. It is equally important to understand the phenomenon from the bully's perspective to design adequate prevention programs within organizations and inform therapeutic practice.

Fatal incidents involving childhood bullying have prompted numerous studies over the past two decades. Most research on childhood bullying has focused on designing and implementing prevention programs with sampling yielding helpful information from the bullies. Several studies indicated that children who experience abuse or neglect have poor coping skills and may bully others to avoid further victimization (Coid et al., 2001; Mustanoja et al., 2011; Wolfe et. al., 2009). Many of the researchers on childhood bullying suggested that aggression and bullying behaviors continue into adulthood. In the current study, I applied the knowledge gained from studies on child and adolescent bullying to examine potential links between workplace bullying and childhood experiences.

Chapter 2 provides a review of studies that addressed workplace bullying and childhood bullying. I include an overview of workplace bullying beginning with the impact to organizations and the damaging effects to victims. I also review the studies conducted on childhood and adolescent bullying to explain some of the identified causes.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter highlights the research on workplace bullying and its possible relationship to childhood maltreatment. European studies provided most of the research on workplace bullying. U.S. research has been slow to emerge. Namie and Namie (2009) estimated that millions of U.S. workers experience bullying on a daily basis. Although there are laws to protect workers from hazardous or unhealthy work environments, sexual harassment, and discrimination, the laws do not address bullying or stress-related illnesses like the laws in European countries do (Kaplan, 2010). Victims frequently report physiological problems like stomach ulcers and sleep disruption (Djurkovic et al., 2006; Gemzøe et al., 2002; Pomeroy, 2013; Trépanier, et al., 2013, 2015). Depression, anger, and suicidal ideation are common psychological and emotional issues among victims of workplace bullying (Djurkovic et al., 2006; Gemzøe et al., 2002; Namie & Namie, 2009; Trépanier, et al., 2013, 2015).

According to Carbo (2009), workplace bullying is a violation of human rights for the victims. Kolstrein and Toledo Jofré (2013) argued that childhood bullying is also a violation of human rights. The closest law in the United States for workplace bullying pertains to protecting individuals from harassment based on a protected status such as race, gender, and disability (Carbo, 2009). Bullies rarely target victims based on race or gender; therefore, discrimination laws do not protect the majority of individuals who experience workplace harassment (Carbo, 2009; Namie & Namie, 2009). Carbo indicated that the legal system is not conducive to the protection of victims from workplace bullying. The few attempts at legal action caused bitter disappointment as many victims

experienced non-action by the courts and in several cases, judges humiliated and degraded the victims further (Carbo, 2009). One of the issues gaining support from the judicial system is the level and severity of the bullying. The small incidents typical of workplace bullying do not fit the criteria of extreme or severe even though they tend to be the most harmful to the victim (Tehrani, 2004). Under the existing Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) laws, victims have little recourse (Carbo, 2009). Legal protection from workplace bullying is lacking for certain industries. Le Mire and Owens (2014) pointed out that bullying has become prevalent within the legal industry possibly due to the competition to obtain clients, the rapid pace, and the expanding complexity of laws and regulations. Although seen as independent practitioners, many attorneys work within a larger practice or firm preventing protection from workplace bullying due to their employment categorization (Le Mire & Owens, 2014).

The stress from workplace bullying also filters into an individual's family life such as difficulty with family relationships or the inability to complete household tasks (Celep & Konakli, 2013; Djurkovic et al., 2006; McCulloch, 2010; Namie & Namie, 2009). Mikkelson and Einarsen (2001) found that over 73% of their participants reported that bullying interfered with interpersonal relationships, leisure time, household responsibilities, and sexual activities. Hoobler and Brass (2006) found that victims of bullying supervisors tend to transfer the aggression experienced at work to the members of their families. Carlson, Ferguson, Perrewé, and Whitten (2011) found that abusive supervision carries over to the family environment by contributing to tension between family members and adversely affecting the victim's family satisfaction.

Experiencing workplace bullying on a continuing basis may push an individual to take drastic actions to alleviate the frustration and stress. These actions may come in the form of resigning from the job, retaliating against the bully, or self-destructive behavior. Most victims of workplace bullying choose to leave their positions rather than take retaliatory or suicidal action. Organizations feel the repercussions when employees leave their jobs to escape workplace bullying. Leymann (1990) suggested that each incident of workplace bullying might cost an organization as much as $100,000 due to lost production, absenteeism, civil law suits, recruitment, and training. Considering it has been almost three decades since Leymann made his assessment, the cost per workplace bullying incident has likely increased. The work environment within an organization may encourage workplace bullying through competition (Blase & Blase, 2006; Duffy, 2009), job function distribution, role conflicts, and job insecurity (Ciby, & Raya, 2014; Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2007).

Workplace bullying can occur between coworkers or between managers/supervisors and their employees. When bullying occurs between coworkers, witnesses to the behavior are rare, making it difficult for the target to prove victimization (Martin & LaVan, 2010; Saunders, Huynh, & Goodman-Delahunty, 2007). Managers who bully their employees are usually making an effort to demonstrate power (Ciby & Raya, 2014; Lewis, Sheehan, & Davies, 2008; Saunders et al., 2007). Several employees who bully one individual demonstrate a form of power and control that acts as a deterrent to other employees. Emdad, Alipour, Hagberg, and Jensen (2013) found that witnessing workplace bullying leads to depression for bystanders. In contrast, Nielsen and Einarsen

(2013) suggested that bystanders who experience depressive symptoms are due to personal bullying victimization. Reich and Hershcovis (2015) found that some witnesses of low forms of workplace bullying such as incivility tend to punish perpetrators without necessarily defending the victim.

Most research on workplace bullying was conducted in European countries and abundant research on childhood bullying has been done in the United States. Most of the studies on childhood bullying were done with the intent to design and implement prevention programs (Holt et al., 2007). Many schools have enacted zero tolerance policies in an effort to reduce and prevent aggressive behavior by students. Unfortunately, bullying continues among children and adolescents moving from physical aggression to relational bullying, which may be difficult for victims to prove. In this chapter, I discuss the various types of childhood and adolescent bullying illustrating the similarities to workplace bullying tactics. I also describe possible causes of bullying such as justification for the use of aggression or the need to gain status or power. I highlight the previous research on workplace and childhood bullying and I discuss the possible relationship between childhood maltreatment and workplace bullying.

Organization of the Chapter

I first discuss the search criteria and databases used to identify pertinent articles on workplace bullying, childhood bullying, childhood maltreatment, and theories associated with aggression. The second section addresses numerous studies on workplace bullying. Although most of the research on workplace bullying has focused on the impact to victims, the studies addressed in this literature review include those that have

contained information on the bullies. The section on childhood bullying includes studies that have addressed bullying from the perspective of the bullies, victims, and bully-victims. This section also includes studies that focused on the family background and dynamics of the children. It was important to understand the factors that cause bullying behavior and possible reinforcement triggers. The next section includes several studies that focused on the maltreatment of children and future outcomes. This section includes studies with adult participants who had histories of abuse and/or neglect during childhood. The final section provides an overview of the two theories used to explain the factors behind workplace bullying, including childhood experiences that impeded healthy psychological, emotional, and social health.

Literature Search Strategy

I used EBSCO databases through Walden University's library including PsycINFO, ERIC, and Academic Search Premier. The search terms used to locate articles on workplace bullying were *bullying* and *workplace*, *workplace bullying*, *workplace hostility*, *workplace incivility*, and *adult bullying*. Search terms used to identify abuse/neglect with bullying were *child abuse* and *bullying*, *school bullying*, *childhood bullying*, *adolescent bullying*, and *domestic violence* and *bullying*. The same library service and databases provided articles that focused on the theoretical base for this study. The search terms used to locate related articles were *bullying theories*, *attachment* and *bullying*, and *social dominance* and *bullying*.

Workplace Bullying

There are numerous opinions regarding how workplace bullying develops in organizations. To understand workplace bullying more thoroughly, early researchers focused on the frequency, nature, and definition of workplace bullying (Jennifer, Cowie, & Ananiadou, 2003). As research on workplace bullying increased, the focus moved to the impact on victims and organizations. Some researchers examined how employers respond to workplace bullying while others investigated the work environment and characteristics of the employees involved (Blase & Blase, 2006; Cowan, 2013; Duffy, 2009; Ferris, 2009; McCulloch, 2010; Namie & Namie, 2009; Okaurame, 2013; Sedivy-Benton, Strohschen, Cavazos, & Boden-McGill, 2015).

Organizational Response to Bullying

Many researchers focused on the organizational responses to workplace bullying. For example, Ferris (2009) identified a pattern from employees referred through an employee assistance program in which specific responses from the organizations emerged. Some of the employees attempted to find help through their employers, but experienced threats by managers or ignored complaints (Ferris, 2009). According to Ferris, the employees were afraid of losing their jobs, feared retaliation, or worried the bullying would become worse. This fear was so intense that employees could not approach their managers or human resource personnel directly; instead, the employees requested intervention with their employers from Dr. Ferris. The companies had a wide range of sizes from fewer than 50 employees to over 500 workers and included government, private, non-profit, and education industries (Ferris, 2009). The employees

included individuals first entering the job market to older workers close to retirement (Ferris, 2009).

Ferris (2009) found there separate responses to workplace bullying that seemed to be common among employers: "see no evil," "hear no evil," and "speak no evil." Organizations that normalized workplace bullying and viewed it as acceptable were given the label of "see no evil" (Ferris, 2009). Most participants indicated that their employers told them to *toughen up* if they suffered psychological, emotional, or physical harm (Ferris, 2009). Companies that viewed workplace bullying as a personality conflict between the victim and bully were given the label of "hear no evil." Employees who reported this response indicated that employers blamed the victim, suggesting that his or her personality elicited bullying behavior from others (Ferris, 2009). Employees also indicated that their employers refused to provide help for the situation and told them to work it out for themselves (Ferris, 2009). The "hear no evil" response was found to cause the most emotional and psychological harm to the victims (Ferris, 2009). The most helpful response by an employer was the "speak no evil" response in which companies viewed bullying as inappropriate, investigated the allegations, and took action against the bullies when necessary (Ferris, 2009). This study provided an in-depth view of the experiences and perspectives of several victims, but there were limitations. First, Ferris gathered information only from employees who were already at a point of seeking help from a counselor. Embellishment of experiences by the participants due to resentment against their companies or the bullies may have occurred. Ferris may have strengthened

the study by gathering information from the organizations to provide an overall view of workplace bullying.

Like Ferris (2009), McCulloch (2010) focused on the organizations that had reports of workplace bullying. McCulloch's approach in gathering data was by acting as a mediator between the victims, bullies, and companies. McCulloch found that many of the human resource personnel interviewed considered bullying as a personality conflict between the bully and victim. McCulloch identified four types of bullies. The first type of bully that emerged was the individual who believed the victim deserved the treatment, which justified the bully's behavior (McCulloch, 2010). The second type of bully was the individual who bullied someone accidentally the first time, but repeated the behavior when it produced the desired results (McCulloch, 2010). The third type included individuals who were both bullies and victims creating a culture in which bullying seemed normal. The last type was the workplace psychopath. These individuals seemed to enjoy inflicting pain and distress on their coworkers (McCulloch, 2010). Although McCulloch gathered crucial information about workplace bullying from all parties, her study was somewhat biased because her work was for profit. A more objective approach may have included a sample of victims, bullies, and organizations unrelated to her work as a liaison.

Organizational Environment

Organizational culture tends to determine the likelihood of workplace bullying occurring. Many victims who report bullying face resistance from human resources and company executives (Blase & Blase, 2006; Cowan, 2013; Ferris, 2009; Namie & Namie,

2009; Sedivy-Benton et al., 2015). Employers who create an environment of extreme competition tend to overlook and even justify bullying behavior (Blase & Blase, 2006; Duffy, 2009). Leadership based on control or micromanaging creates an organizational culture of bullying and fear (Hartley-Wilkins, 2014). Inaction, threats of termination, and/or an increase in bullying severity were common responses when victims complained to management or human resource personnel (Blase & Blase, 2006; Cowan, 2013; NasrEsfahani & Shahbazi, 2014; Sedivy-Benton et al., 2015). Woodrow and Guest (2014) pointed out that while many companies have anti-bullying policies, there is a lack of implementation and enforcement.

Cowan (2013) examined what attributions human resource personnel make when bullying occurs. Cowan's approach included 36 human resource managers interviewed with open-ended questions and were asked for detailed descriptions of their bullying experiences. Cowan found a variety of opinions from participants about how bullying occurs and is maintained within an organization. Participants believed that aggressive management styles or poor communication skills were the causes of bullying (Cowan, 2013). Several participants believed that the organizational culture and personality differences caused most of the bullying. Cowan found that a small portion of the participants believed that external circumstances such as the economy or social issues were underlying causes of the bullying. A qualitative study allowed Cowan to examine detailed experiences from human resource professionals, but it is difficult to compare the results to other studies. The strength in Cowan's study was in identifying possible causes of workplace bullying.

Jennifer et al. (2003) investigated the relationship between the perceptions of social and organizational work environments and workplace bullying. Jennifer et al. examined differences in bullies, victims, witnesses, and individuals never exposed to workplace bullying. Using 677 participants from five different industries, Jennifer et al. found half of the employees had experienced workplace bullying; one third experienced bullying frequently, and one in five considered themselves as victims. The remainder of the bullied employees did not feel victimized, but had greater workloads than the self-appointed victims did (Jennifer et al., 2003). The researchers suggested that although both victims and non-victims experienced destabilization from workplace bullying, the interpretation of the bullying experience determined the severity of psychological and emotional impact (Jennifer et al., 2003). Their approach addressed key components of perception in workplace bullying, but focused primarily on victimization. Jennifer et al. suggested that bullying tends to be a natural part of corporate culture. The main weakness in this research was perceptions about bullying in the workplace from perpetrators.

Trad and Johnson (2014) examined the effects of workplace bullying on job performance and work environment from radiation therapists. Their approach included a 78-question survey to 308 radiation therapists. (Trad & Johnson, 2014). The survey measured the prevalence of workplace bullying, work environment, and effects on job performance. Trad and Johnson found that 68% of participants had experienced or witnessed workplace bullying and 63% reported difficulty in focusing on their work. Participants indicated that they frequently felt irritable because of the toxic environment, but 59% reported being happy with their job (Trad & Johnson, 2014). This study

demonstrated the detrimental effects of workplace bullying on the work environment, but used only one industry. Expanding their research to include other industries or type of work might provide a clearer view of the effects of workplace bullying.

Blase and Blase (2006) investigated bullying from the perspective of teachers who were bullied by their principals. Using a snowball sampling technique, Blase and Blase were able to connect with teachers and professors across the United States. The approach included structured and semi-structured telephone interviews with participants and verified incidents (Blase & Blase, 2006). Three levels of aggression were identified: indirect/moderate aggression, direct/escalating aggression, and direct/severe aggression (Blase & Blase, 2006).

Level one aggression included behaviors that ignore the individual, insensitivity to personal matters, and avoid the target (Blase & Blase, 2006). Bullies at level one showed a lack of support with work issues, withheld information, showed favoritism with other workers, and public reprimands (Blase & Blase, 2006). Level two aggressions included spying, sabotage of work and reputation, stealing, destruction of instructional aids, making unreasonable demands, and criticism (Blase & Blase, 2006). Level three aggressions included explosive behavior, an increase in public criticisms, lying about the target, threats, unwarranted written reprimands, and poor evaluations (Blase & Blase, 2006). The behaviors at level three also included forcing victims out of their jobs, sexual harassment, and racism (Blase & Blase, 2006). Participants experienced similar psychological, emotional, and physical symptoms reported in other research studies. Many participants reported self-doubt, low self-esteem, loneliness, PTSD symptoms,

sleep problems, and other stress related illnesses (Blase & Blase, 2006). Abused teachers reported an increase of dysfunction inside their classrooms that included a lack of motivation and intolerance to the students (Blase & Blase, 2006). This study demonstrated how workplace bullying affects the overall functioning of job performance and social interactions. Blase and Blase limited their study by focusing only on one industry.

Glasø, Bele, Nielsen, and Einarsen (2011) suggested that intensity and prevalence of workplace bullying varies across different industries. Workplace bullying tends to affect some individuals more depending on the type of work and stress experienced (Glasø et al., 2011). Service industries where workers frequently interact with irate customers may elicit higher incidents of workplace bullying than helping industries do. Glasø et al. (2011) indicated that the combination of stress with personality traits prone to anger might cause a certain amount of aggression toward other workers. In their study of the public transportation industry, Glasø et al. investigated the interaction between trait anger, exposure to workplace bullying and intention to leave. The sample included 1,023 Norwegian bus drivers with an average age of 48.5 years (Glasø et al., 2011). The method used included an anonymous survey that measured exposure to workplace bullying, trait anger, intention to leave the organization, job engagement, and job satisfaction (Glasø et al., 2011). The results indicated that 70% of the participants experienced bullying behavior in the previous six months. Coworkers were the most frequent perpetrators followed by passengers (Glasø et al., 2011). The results indicated that exposure to bullying, job satisfaction, and job engagement were reduced (Glasø et

al., 2011). When examining the contribution of trait anger, Glasø et al. found a significant

increase in the intention to leave the company after exposed to bullying. The weakness of

this study was focusing on only one industry and victimization. Lally (2009) and Youn

Ju, Bernstein, Mihyoung, and Nokes (2014) indicated that workplace bullying was an

extreme problem in the nursing field and usually occurred between coworkers. Lally and

Youn Ju et al. asserted that demanding and stressful nature, feelings of powerlessness,

and subservience increased the prevalence of workplace bullying. Hutchinson and

Jackson (2013) and Elmblad, Kodjebacheva, and Lebeck (2014) indicated that patient

care suffered when workplace bullying occurred in the nursing field. Parker (2014)

indicated that when employees attempted to communicate about being bullied to

employers, their attempts were subverted and impeded efficiency. Communication was

limited and negotiated to keep their job (Parker, 2014).

Trépanier, Fernet, and Austin (2015) investigated how workplace bullying relates

to poor psychological functioning and job attitude of employees. Trépanier et al.

surmised that burnout and work engagement were key indicators of psychological

functioning of employees. Trépanier et al. indicated that bullying interfered with basic

psychological needs, which inhibited the drive to invest fully into work. The approach

included administering a questionnaire to 508 nurses twice over 12 months (Trépanier, et

al., 2015). The survey measured workplace bullying, need satisfaction, burnout, work

engagement, and turnover intention. Trépanier, et al. found that exposure to workplace

bullying over time diminished the perception of need satisfaction and fostered burnout.

When bullying behavior was controlled by the organization, employees tended to be

more engaged in their work and felt psychological needs were being met (Trépanier, et al., 2015). The strength of this study was the longitudinal design using the same participants. The main weakness was using only one industry. Long hours and job related stressors may elicit workplace bullying in the nursing field. The organizational culture in the medical industry may differ from other industries prompting different results.

Glendinning (2001) pointed out that in good economies with plentiful jobs, victims of workplace bullying tend to leave their jobs and find others. Bad economies with few jobs force victims to endure maltreatment (Glendinning, 2001). According to LaVan and Martin (2008), inaction by the company when workplace bullying is reported or suspected can reduce profits through lost production, absenteeism, and work related injuries. Dollard, Skinner, Tuckey, and Bailey (2007) found that excessive absenteeism and high compensation claims were due to mental stresses such as bullying. Glendinning indicated that an important factor in employee happiness and well-being is the trust formed with the organization. When an employee experiences workplace bullying and receives little support from his or her company, trust, happiness, and loyalty diminishes (Glendinning, 2001).

Djurkovic, McCormack, and Casimir (2008) investigated the impact of workplace bullying on victim perceptions of company support and intention to resign. The participants consisted of schoolteachers; an industry found to have high rates of workplace bullying (Djurkovic et al., 2008). The approach included distributing questionnaires that measured the intention to leave the organization, exposure to workplace bullying, and perception of company support (Djurkovic et al., 2008). When

victims felt supported by their company, bullying had a lower impact than when employees felt unsupported (Djurkovic et al., 2008). There was a unique relationship found between employees and employer. Employees who believed their organizations valued their input and job performance, employees formed a sense of loyalty, obligation, and desired to stay with the organization (Djurkovic et al., 2008). Employees who felt they had little support from their company, bullying had a greater negative impact and increased the desire to leave. Djurkovic et al. indicated that examining only the intention to leave the organization as the dependent variable limited the results. There were items in the instruments used that were deleted, which might have altered the results of this study if left in place and measured (Djurkovic et al., 2008). Another weakness in this study was the focus of one industry making generalizability difficult.

Okaurame (2013) pointed out that the success of an organization can be measured by effectiveness; this might include customer satisfaction, high quality goods or services, corporate image, and employee retention. Researchers tend to debate the best way to measure organizational effectiveness, but agree that organizational climate is critical. Okaurame indicated that workplace bullying had a detrimental effect on an organizational climate and eventually on its effectiveness. Okaurame indicated that the amount of stress experienced by victims of workplace bullying affected their job performance, increased absenteeism, lowered job satisfaction, and reduced well-being. Okaurame investigated the effects of work stress, workplace bullying, and gender on organizational climate and effectiveness. The approach included survey data collected from 278 civil service employees from Nigeria (Okaurame, 2013). The survey measured work stress, workplace

bullying, and demographic information. Okaurame indicated that age was a significant factor in predicting organizational effectiveness. The results indicated that older employees had a more favorable view of organizational climate and effectiveness possibly due to life experience and maturity in dealing with stress. The results showed work stress had a negative relationship to organizational climate and effectiveness. Individuals with high levels of work stress had an unfavorable view of their work environment (Okaurame, 2013). The results did not indicate that workplace bullying reduced organizational climate or effectiveness unless combined with work stress and gender (Okaurame, 2013). The results did not show gender moderated the relationship between work stress and organizational climate contradicting previous research (Okaurame, 2013). Gender influenced the relationship between workplace bullying and organizational climate effecting the perceptions of women who experienced high levels of bullying on the job (Okaurame, 2013). Considering segments of this study contradicted prior research, Okaurame and other researchers might replicate the procedures by using a different sample. The weakness of this study was using a sample from the same service industry and geographical area.

Tuckey, Dollard, Hosking, and Winefield (2009) investigated the effects of psychosocial work environments and the onset of workplace bullying in law enforcement. The approach included the interaction between job demands, job control, and the amount of stress perceived as a result (Tuckey et al., 2009). Most research on workplace bullying shows poor working conditions with lack of control is associated with poor health and well-being. Tuckey et al. (2009) hypothesized that high company support and job control

would offset the impact of stress improving health and well-being. Tuckey and colleagues suggested poor working conditions influenced the interactions between employees resulting in workplace bullying (Tuckey et al., 2009). The results indicated that employees who had high levels of control over jobs and employer support, the impact from bullying were reduced (Tuckey et al., 2009). Stress from exposure to bullying increased when support and control were minimal (Tuckey et al., 2009). When control was high and support was low, there was no change in detrimental effects from bullying (Tuckey et al., 2009). When support was high and job control low, stress and poor health increased from exposure to workplace bullying (Tuckey et al., 2009). Workplace bullying can develop from toxic work environments and low job control, or negative environments may elicit the development of bullying (Tuckey et al., 2009). The sample from one industry limited the results and made it difficult to generalize to the rest of the population.

Laine, Saastamoinen, Lahti, Rahkonen, and Lahelma (2014) suggested that low forms of mental disorders are common within organizations. The researchers explored associations between several different psychosocial working conditions and changes in common mental disorders. Laine et al. used data from a prior longitudinal study that included a sample of 4,805 participants who were primarily woman. The focus included job strain, organizational justice, workplace bullying, work-to-family conflicts, and perceived social support (Laine et al., 2014). The instrument used measured questions regarding mood, emotions, self-worth, and worries (Laine et al., 2014). The results indicated 74% of the respondents with common mental disorders remained stable over

the course of the study. When participants reported a high level of job strain and little

perceived support, the mental health of participants deteriorated (Laine et al., 2014).

Participants, who reported strong conflict at home and experienced workplace bullying,

were twice as likely to report deterioration in their mental state (Laine et al., 2014).

Respondents who had no conflict at home, no bullying experience, and high social

support were more likely to report improvement in mental status (Laine et al., 2014).

Working conditions showed little difference in deterioration or improvement of common

mental disorders (Laine et al., 2014). The strength in this study was the large sample size,

but if the sample had consisted of equal genders, the results might have differed

substantially. The sample also consisted of individuals with diagnosed mental disorders.

The results might have differed if both individual with and without mental disorders were

used as a comparison.

Bully and Victim Characteristics

Many studies focused on characteristics of both victims and bullies. Some

researchers identified certain personality characteristics that may guard against (Zhou,

Yan, Che, & Meier, 2015) or instigate bullying behavior. Jennifer et al. indicated

researchers must consider the social construct of the environment regardless of

personality. Glasø et al. found little difference in the characteristics of victims and

bullies. Gemzøe Mikkelsen and Einarsen (2002) suggested that exposure to bullying may

increase the impact for those individuals who tend to have a negative outlook toward life.

Ariza-Montes, Muniz, Montero-Simó, and Araque-Padilla (2013) found healthcare

workers were more likely to refer to themselves as bullied if unsatisfied with their job,

believed there were no opportunities for advancement, or worked a rotating schedule. Ariza-Montes, Muniz, Leal-Rodríguez, and Leal-Millán (2014) found that female managers across various industries also referred to themselves as bullied if they did not perceive opportunities for promotions and worked in high stress positions. Samnani (2013) suggested that culture might contribute to victim response of workplace bullying. Samnani indicated that employees with an individualistic culture and low power distance attitude tended to rebel against workplace bullying. Individuals who identified with collectivism and had high power distance attitude, workplace bullying had a greater impact (Samnani, 2013). Dentith, Wright, and Coryell (2015) indicated victims of workplace bullying who possess positive characteristics such as confidence, kindness, or competency are perceived as threats to bullies who lack those qualities.

Glasø, Nielsen, and Einarsen (2009) pointed out that although research on the relationship between workplace bullying and the organizational environment provided satisfactory information, investigating the characteristics of both bullies and victims is also important. Previous research has found victims of bullying to be anxious, insecure, emotionally unstable, unsophisticated, introverted, and dependent (Brodsky, 1976; Coyne, Seigne, & Randall, 2000; Olweus, 1993; O'Moore, Seigne, McGuire, & Smith, 1998; Sliter, et al., 2014; Zapf, 1999; Zou, et al., 2014). Glasø, Matthiesen, Nielsen, and Einarsen (2007) found little difference in personality characteristics between victims and non-victims of workplace bullying. Zhou, Yan, Che, and Meier (2015) found that workplace bullying had a lower impact on individuals with high emotional stability than on individuals with low emotional stability.

There is insufficient information on the personality characteristics of bullies because few adults would admit to bullying others (Glasø et al., 2009; Rayner & Cooper, 2003). Evidence suggested that bullying was used as a means to compensate for low self-esteem (Astrauskaite, Kern, & Notelaers, 2014; Glasø et al., 2009). Parkins, Fishbein and Ritchey (2006) found bullies had high social anxiety, but were low in self-competence. Bullies tended to have low self-esteem and found to be highly aggressive (Parkins et al., 2006). Glasø et al. suggested that when using victims to determine the details of bullying behavior, the level of victimization might skew the results making generalizing to the rest of the population difficult.

Glasø and colleagues (2009) examined the personality characteristics of victims and bullies in a sample of 2,539 Norwegian workers between the age of 19 and 66 years. The approach included questions that measured exposure to workplace bullying, participation in bullying coworkers, or were victimized by bullying (Glasø et al., 2009). To distinguish the bullying participants from the victim participants, Glasø et al. provided a formal definition for bullying behavior. The results indicated victims and bullies tended to be more vindictive, cold, domineering, socially avoidant, intrusive, and distrustful than non-bully/victims (Glasø et al., 2009). The personality characteristics found may confirm the notion that certain characteristics of victims instigate bullying behavior (Glasø et al., 2009). Glasø and colleagues suggested the similar personality characteristics between victims and bullies, the intentions could be misinterpreted. Victims could believe maltreatment is intentional and the bullies were unaware of the damage caused by the behavior (Glasø et al., 2009). The results indicated the personality profiles of the victims

and bullies were not much different from workers who were not involved in bullying (Glasø et al., 2009). The results demonstrated that personality might play a role in workplace bullying; however, similar interpersonal problems in participants indicated factors other than personality characteristics might contribute to workplace bullying behavior (Glasø et al., 2009). Providing a formal definition of bullying limited how the participants responded to the survey. Aggression viewed as acceptable behavior would be reflected in the answers.

Gemzøe Mikkelsen and Einarsen (2002) postulated that workplace bullying is an escalating process where victims are exposed to more intense and frequent aggression over time. Gemzøe Mikkelsen and Einarsen indicated that exposure to workplace bullying has a greater effect on individuals who tended to react negatively to life events. The results indicated that 88% of participants experienced or was exposed to workplace bullying in the previous six months (Gemzøe Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2002). The results also indicated increased negative mood states caused the use of maladaptive coping strategies in participants exposed to workplace bullying (Gemzøe Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2002). The results indicated that increased negative emotional states and exposure to bullying caused individuals to misinterpret of the behaviors of others as personal insults and attacks (Gemzøe Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2002). The combination of stress from bullying and negative emotional states increased reported psychological and psychosomatic complaints (Gemzøe Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2002). One of the limitations in this study was that they only looked at state negative affect and generalized self-efficacy to explain the differences in reported health issues after exposed to bullying

(Gemzøe Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2002). Long-term exposure to bullying might diminish an individual's sense of empowerment, but personality traits might play a greater role in the impact to health. If an individual tends to view situations in a negative manner, the impact of bullying may seem more stressful causing more health concerns than if the individual had no exposure.

Gamian-Wilk (2013) suggested that victims of bullying might elicit non-compliance to organizational or group norms. The approach included administering two questionnaires to 197 employees from several industries (Gamian-Wilk, 2013). The instruments used measured workplace bullying and compliance in a sample of men and women with 81% of the sample consisting of women (Gamian-Wilk, 2013). The results indicated that long-term exposure to workplace bullying increased non-compliance to coworker requests (Gamian-Wilk, 2013). Victims refused to take on additional tasks, work extra hours when asked, or provided work materials to coworkers (Gamian-Wilk, 2013). This rebellious response to bullying might elicit additional bullying behavior by coworkers. The results contradicted previous research in how victims typically respond to workplace bullying. A larger sample might have provided different results. The results demonstrate the complexity of workplace bullying, but the study should be replicated to confirm the results.

Gardner et al. (2013) indicated the impact of workplace bullying was greater on ethnic minorities. Gardner et al. examined the notion that supervisor and peer support lessens the impact of workplace bullying (Gardner et al., 2013). The approach included a sample 1,733 participants from 36 organizations in New Zealand. The ethnicity of the

sample included 70.7% New Zealand European and 8.5% identified as Pacific Islanders, Asian/Indian, and Māori. Participants completed a survey that measured workplace bullying, support from supervisors, and support from colleagues (Gardner et al., 2013). The results indicated higher levels of reported workplace bullying among the Pacific Islanders, Asian/Indian, and Māori participants, but reported less psychological strain (Gardner et al., 2013). Supervisor support might be higher for this group lowering the impact of bullying from coworkers (Gardner et al., 2013). The strength in this study is the large sample size.

Baughman, Dearing, Giammarco, and Vernon (2012) examined the connection between bullying styles and the dark triad. The dark triad consists of three characteristics, subclinical narcissism, Machiavellianism or deceit in social situations, and a low form of psychopathy. The approach included two questionnaires, one assessed for the dark triad and the second assessed bullying (Baughman et al., 2012). Using 657 adult participants, Baughman et al. (2012) found all elements of the dark triad were associated with bullying, but psychopathy had the strongest correlation. The strength of this study was in using two different questionnaires to identify certain mental disorders and bullying. The analysis did not compare bullying with individuals who did not present with psychological disorders limiting generalizability.

Leadership Characteristics

Aasland, Skogstad, Notelaer, Nielsen, and Einarsen (2010) indicated that as of 1990, 75% of workers' compensation claims were due to mental stressors, 94% of which were reportedly caused by abusive treatment at work. Aasland et al. (2010) indicated

abusive behavior by supervisors and managers instigated negative consequences for the organization and for the abused employees. Quality of work decreased and problems with customer or client relationships developed (Aasland et al., 2010). Many of the bullying managers undermined the goals of the organization, stole resources, and encouraged similar behaviors by subordinate employees (Aasland et al., 2010). Leadership behavior viewed on a continuum was more accurate; destructive managers engaged in bullying behavior, constructive managers fostered organizational and subordinate goals and some managers engaged in both types of behavior (Aasland et al., 2010). Destructive leadership was detrimental to both the organization and subordinates, but the leaders also provided constructive leadership (Aasland et al., 2010). During constructive times, the leaders provided groundbreaking ideas, met deadlines, and inspired workers to meet company goals. If organizations enjoy those attributes in their leadership, ignoring the use of bullying during destructive periods is good for business (Aasland et al., 2010).

Aasland et al. (2010) explored the prevalence of four different types of destructive leadership in 4,500 subordinate employees. Their approach consisted of questionnaires measured demographics, exposure to bullying, observed leadership behavior of immediate supervisors, job satisfaction, subjective health complaints, and the psychosocial work environment (Aasland et al., 2010). The researchers elicited information for several different variables, but used only the data pertaining to demographics and observed leadership behavior. Aasland and colleagues found several different leadership styles. Tyrannical leadership consisted of behaviors that were pro-company and anti-subordinate (Aasland et al., 2010). Tyrannical managers showed

positive support and behaviors in front of upper level management while they bullied subordinates (Aasland et al., 2010). Derailed managers tended to exhibit both anti-organization and anti-subordinate behaviors (Aasland et al., 2010). Derailed managers used bullying tactics toward their employees while engaged in behaviors such as fraud, theft, and absenteeism that undermined organizational goals (Aasland et al., 2010). The results indicated approximately 61% of the sample reported exposure to destructive leadership concluding that this type of behavior is common among managers and supervisors (Aasland et al., 2010). Higher prevalence rates were found than in previous studies. Other studies have focused primarily on direct aggressions; this study was expanded to include indirect or passive forms of aggression (Aasland et al., 2010). Passive forms of destructive management can cause more damage and go unnoticed for a considerable length of time. Passive forms of aggression consists of humiliation, discouraging initiative, inconsideration for the employee, and has a direct negative impact on organizational goals (Aasland et al., 2010). The strength in this study is the diversity of the sample and industries. The main weakness of this study was that subordinate employees provided the information about leadership styles. Embellished or concealed information may have occurred if any of the employees held resentment toward their supervisors causing inaccurate results.

Nielsen (2013) investigated the association between three different leadership styles and workplace bullying. Nielsen described laissez-faire leadership as inadequate or ineffective leadership that contributed to stress, interpersonal tensions, and escalated conflicts within the work environment. Nielsen described transformational leadership as

individuals who unite employees to achieve a common goal while creating an environment of change and growth. Finally, authentic leaders were described as individuals who promote positive psychological capacities and ethical work climates while fostering self-awareness (Nielsen, 2013). The approach included a sample of 817 male crewmembers from two large Norwegian shipping companies (Nielsen, 2013). The instrument used measured workplace bullying and the three types of leadership styles. Nielsen found that laissez-faire leadership was positively associated with exposure to bullying, self-labeled victimization, and bullying perpetration. Transformational and authentic leadership styles were negatively associated to workplace bullying (Nielsen, 2013). Using only men from one industry limited the results of this study. In a duplicate study, Nielsen, Tvedt, and Matthiesen (2013) found similar results in the offshore petroleum industry in Norway.

Tepper, Moss, and Duffy (2011) pointed out the destructive consequences that employers and victims face when exposed to aggressive behavior over a long time. Previous studies that focused on the antecedents of abusive supervision found that most of the managers and supervisors sampled believed they themselves had experienced abuse by their superiors; therefore, treating their subordinates the same way felt justified (Tepper et al., 2011). The purpose of this study was to investigate the reasons that hostile supervisors target specific subordinates (Tepper et al., 2011). When abusive supervisors view the target as being dissimilar, had previous conflict with the individual, or the target is not useful, the victim was not worthy of moral consideration and treatment (Tepper et al., 2011).

The approach included recruiting both managers and subordinates from seven health care organizations. To ensure data elicited was on actual supervisor/employee relationships, the researchers matched volunteer supervisors with subordinate volunteers from the same organizations (Tepper et al., 2011). Researchers administered interviews and surveys to the participants that measured the perceptions of dissimilarity, performance, conflict, and abuse (Tepper et al., 2011). The results indicated that when a supervisor perceives a deep level of dissimilarity with a subordinate, there is also a perceived conflict in the relationship even if open conflict had not occurred (Tepper et al., 2011). As a result, the supervisor views the performance of the employee in a negative light and feels justified in mistreating the employee (Tepper et al., 2011). One of the weaknesses of this study was that supervisor and employee participants knew the identity of one another increasing the potential of additional suspicion and abuse in the workplace. Furthermore, the researchers used only one industry to recruit participants. Although the information examined in this study might explain some of the bullying behavior that occurs in the workplace, it was limited in assessing causation; the origins of the perceptions of dissimilarity could not be determined based on the variables examined.

Decoster, Camps, Stouten, Vandevyvere, and Tripp (2013) examined employee response to abusive supervision when organizational connectedness was present. When employees have a good relationship with their company, rebellion against an abusive supervisor is less likely to occur. Decoster et al. (2013) indicated that in many cases, abusive supervisors instill a sense of cohesion among work groups who then band together to retaliate with behaviors such as gossiping (Decoster et al., 2013). The

approach included administering surveys to 268 employees and matching supervisors.

The survey measured abusive supervision, perceived cohesion, and organizational

identification (Decoster et al., 2013). The supervisors completed a separate survey that

measured subordinate tendencies to gossip (Decoster et al., 2013). The results indicated

that when employees are confronted with an abusive supervisor, they tended to get closer

with colleagues if their organizational identification was high (Decoster et al., 2013). A

positive organizational identification buffered the impact of an abusive supervisor and

reduced the tendency of rebellion or retaliation against the supervisor (Decoster et al.,

2013). The strength in this study was maintaining anonymity in the sample; although

matched, the participants did not know the identity of one another reducing the risk of

additional abuse after the study ended. Furthermore, different data were collected from

employees and supervisors that provided an objective view of the perceptions held by the

participants.

Boddy (2011, 2014) explored the destructive nature of dysfunctional leadership.

The attributes used to describe psychopaths can be seen in executives of U.S.

corporations that have failed (Boddy, 2011, 2014). Psychopaths tend to be self-serving,

cruel, lack empathy, and ruthless toward other people (Boddy, 2011, 2014).

Dysfunctional executives did not show remorse for the damage they caused to the

organizations, employees who lost jobs, and lost investments (Boddy, 2011, 2014). Many

of the executives lied, bullied, and cheated to fulfill personal needs (Boddy, 2011, 2014).

Boddy (2011) examined the prevalence of bullying in organizations that employed

managers considered normal, dysfunctional, or corporate psychopaths. Boddy elicited

information about the observed behaviors of immediate supervisors from 346 white-collar workers from a variety of industries. The results indicated that when managers fit the criteria of psychopathy, bullying behavior is substantially higher than in organizations that employ normal or dysfunctional managers (Boddy, 2011). The main weakness of this study was basing the presence of psychopathy on the observations of subordinates. It was unethical to diagnose a supervisor as being a psychopath without professional expertise.

Boddy (2014) explored the association between conflict and bullying to unproductive work behavior. The approach included 304 participants who completed an online questionnaire that measured psychopathy, counterproductive work behavior, conflict, and bullying (Boddy, 2014). The results indicated a strong correlation between conflict, bullying, and unproductive work behavior (Boddy, 2014). Furthermore, the results indicated a strong association of conflict and bullying to the presence of corporate psychopaths (Boddy, 2014). This combination leads to low employee well-being and unproductive job performance (Boddy, 2014). The results did not indicate a difference between men and women in reporting conflict and bullying (Boddy, 2014). The main weakness in this study was Boddy's reliance on diagnosing psychopathy based on subordinate observations. As previously mentioned, using the responses of subordinate employees to determine the presence of mental illness was unethical.

Jhatial, Jariko, Tahrani, and Jam (2013) investigated workplace bullying and the presence of corporate psychopaths in Pakistan. The method included semi-structured interviews with 50 men and women from several different industries (Jhatial et al., 2013). Based on the responses by the participants, Jhatial et al. determined the presence of

psychopathy. Definitions of workplace bullying and psychopathy were provided to the participants prior to answering interview questions (Jhatial et al., 2013). The results consisted of ranking workplace bullying behaviors and symptoms of psychopathy (Jhatial et al., 2013). As with Boddy's (2011, 2014) work, diagnosing psychopathy based on observations from subordinates is unethical. Another weakness in this study was the absence of statistical analysis of the data. Even with a qualitative study, non-parametric analyses would yield valuable information.

Onorato (2013) examined how ethical leadership styles influenced the perception of victimization by subordinates. The approach included an online survey that measured ethical leadership and workplace bullying for 220 participants from a variety of industries (Onorato, 2013). Onorato hypothesized that a relationships exist between unethical leadership and workplace bullying, differences exist in leadership ethics between industries, and differences exist in prevalence of workplace bullying among industries. The results indicated there was a strong correlation between workplace bullying and unethical leadership behavior with the highest relationship found in higher education (Onorato, 2013). There was no significant difference in the leadership ethics between industries (Onorato, 2013). A significant difference was found in the prevalence of workplace bullying between industries with the highest found in the academic and accounting industries (Onorato, 2013). The weakness in this study was the small sample for such a broad spectrum of industries. The addition of variables such as type of ethical behavior, type of workplace bullying, or gender difference might have enriched this study.

Montes, Gutierrez, and Campos (2011) pointed out that the implementation of legislation and societal views that restrict employer demands has deterred bullying in organizations. Due to financial struggles that many organizations experience, the means of doing business has become extremely competitive forcing employees to produce at all costs (Montes et al., 2011). Similar to other researchers, Montes et al. (2011) indicated that workplace bullying occurs more often than typically reported. Interestingly, persistence and duration of workplace bullying were similar to other studies Montes and colleagues found the adverse effects do not occur until the victim realizes he or she is being bullied. Once the realization was made, the behaviors of bully and victim change and a new dynamic of the relationship developed (Montes et al., 2011). Victim resentment increased and work performance diminished (Montes et al., 2011). Bullying may increase if perpetrators believe a goal was achieved, a resource was gained, or power was gained (Montes et al., 2011). Causes and prevalence of workplace bullying among managers were examined in this study. Montes et al. used data from a European survey on working conditions conducted in 2005 that covered the span of 27 countries as well as Turkey, Croatia, Norway, and Switzerland (Montes et al., 2011). Subjects pulled from the European survey included 608 senior and middle level managers from public and private sector industries. Montes and colleagues indicated that the level of position would determine the likelihood of experiencing bullying; a senior manager would be less likely to experience bullying than would a lower level manager. Montes et al. hypothesized that managers who are insecure about their job, unsatisfied, and work in teams are more likely to be bullied (Montes et al., 2011). The results confirmed the notion that perceptions of

bullying are most prevalent among managers who feel insecure about their job and are unhappy with their income (Montes et al., 2011). Furthermore, managers whose jobs are emotionally demanding increased the probability of experiencing bullying (Montes et al., 2011). Overall, this study concluded that bullying occurs at every level within an organization. The results indicated that managers experienced the same types of interpersonal conflict and relationship dynamics that occur among subordinates (Montes et al., 2011). Although this study used a sample that covered multiple industries across several different countries, the information was based on self-reports by victims.

Bullying and Group Dynamics

Coyne, Craig, and Chong (2004) investigated the impact of bullying on a group or team environment. One of the main bullying behaviors found in team domains is that of social isolation (Coyne et al., 2004). In many cases, there is an expectation to conform to group norms; when this does not occur, the bully coerces the other members of the group to shun the victim (Coyne et al., 2004). Firefighters must work as a team in life saving situations; if there is a conflict between two members where bullying is used as a strategy, the victim may be isolated or mistrusted by the other firefighters (Coyne et al., 2004). Coyne et al. (2004) explored the perceptions of status that bullies and victims hold within a group context. Their approach consisted of administering questionnaires to a sample of 288 firefighters that measured victimization or perpetration of bullying behavior (Coyne et al., 2004). A randomly generated code provided to each participant avoided identification. Participants were given the list of codes with team names and asked to place a code next to the names of other employees who they considered to be

victims or bullies (Coyne et al., 2004). The results indicated that team members would rather work with victims than bullies (Coyne et al., 2004). Teams with bullies appeared to perform better, but the teams with more victims seemed were more cohesive than the teams with bullies (Coyne et al., 2004). Bullies experienced rejection by their peers, were considered part of the out-group, and isolated (Coyne et al., 2004). Bullying might occur because of rejection or rejection from peers might provoke bullying behavior (Coyne et al., 2004). The strength in this study was demonstrating the negative opinions of bullying behavior by employees whose trust is crucial to job performance. The drawback is that this study only included one industry. Investigating other industries that require working in teams might provide a better understanding of how bullying affects group dynamics.

Scott, Restubog, and Zagenczyk (2013) pointed out that a violation of group norms can result in sanctions such as social exclusion. Victims of workplace bullying might instigate coercive behavior by coworkers due to initial incivility (Scott et al., 2013). When an individual is rude or unfriendly, group members view him or her as untrustworthy and exclude them from the group (Scott et al., 2013). Two notions were explored in this study, the connection between victim uncivil behavior and group exclusion and (Scott et al., 2013). Victims considered valued employees experienced less exclusion regardless of their incivility or violation of group norms (Scott et al., 2013). The approach included 362 employees from four different call centers in the Philippines. The initial recruitment requested that the employees choose a coworker with daily interaction who would also participate in the study resulting in 181 matched dyads used for the sample (Scott et al., 2013). The survey used measured perceived incivility,

perceived distrust, negative exchange partner quality, and workplace exclusion over the previous three months (Scott et al., 2013). Controls were put in place for gender, age, and tenure to reduce the risk of skewed data. Females tended to report workplace incivility more often than men did, younger employees engaged in anti-social behavior more often than older participants did, and newer employees reported higher levels of exclusion (Scott et al., 2013). The results indicated there was no significant relationship between the victim behaviors of incivility and violation of group norms to experiences of exclusion (Scott et al., 2013). The results indicated that individuals perceived as high contributors did not experience exclusion often (Scott et al., 2013). Coworkers viewed victims as untrustworthy and often excluded them from the group if they were low contributors (Scott et al., 2013). There were a number of limitations in this study. First, the study was short-term giving the participants a 3-month timeframe to report perceived experiences. This is not long enough to conclude a relationship exists between the victim behaviors and workplace bullying. The sample included individuals from only one industry in one specific country. The results might be exclusive to the culture within a call center environment. Finally, Scott et al. (2013) relied on self-report surveys from matched employees limiting or altering the results if specific conflicts or resentments were present.

Summary

The research on workplace bullying has focused primarily on reports from victims and general losses to organizations. Some studies included attempts to elicit information about bullies and motives behind the behavior, but few studies included actual reports

from bullies. Several researchers examined organizational environments while others investigated how employers approach bullying when reported. Ferris (2009) and McCulloch (2010) examined organizational responses to bullying. Findings included blaming the victims, personality conflicts, and psychopathy in severe cases (Ferris, 2009: McCulloch, 2010). Researchers who investigated the organizational environment found many companies promoted the development of bullying through competition and demands to produce (Blase & Blase, 2006). Bullying tends to become a normal part of organizational culture and victims who complain or do not conform experienced threats (Blase & Blase, 2006; Constantinescu, 2014; Jennifer et al., 2003; Pomeroy, 2013; Trad & Johnson, 2014; Taylor, 2013; Trépanier, et al., 2013, 2015). Research indicated that workplace bullying has a higher impact to employees who feel they have little support from their organizations or no control over their job. This is especially seen in industries where the jobs tended to be extremely stressful (Bano & Malik, 2013; Djurkovic et al., 2008; Dollard et al., 2007; Glasø et al., 2011; Glendinning, 2001; Hershcovis, & Reich, 2013; Lally, 2009; LaVan & Martin, 2008; Tuckey et al., 2009).

Certain studies focused on the characteristics of bullies and victims. Some researchers found that victims were anxious, insecure, emotionally unstable, unsophisticated, introverted, and dependent (Brodsky, 1976; Coyne, Seigne, & Randall, 2000; Olweus, 1993; O'Moore, et al., 1998; Sliter, et al., 2014; Zapf, 1999; Zou, et al., 2014). Some researchers found that bullies had high social anxiety, low in self-competence, highly aggressive, and low in self-esteem (Parkins et al., 2006). Other researchers found few differences in personality characteristics between victims and

bullies (Glasø et al., 2007; Glasø et al., 2009; Hutchinson, & Hurley, 2013). Some researchers suggested that exposure to bullying may alter the emotional regulating proficiency in reacting to stressful situations (Gemzøe Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2002). Negative emotional states might cause victims to misinterpret the motivations of others believing the behaviors are attacks or threats (Gemzøe Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2002). Many managers considered bullies, tended to believe themselves victims of abuse (Tepper et al., 2011). The results of other studies indicated that bullies in leadership positions intentionally sabotaged the organization and terrorized subordinates (Aasland et al., 2010; Boddy, 2011, 2014). Bullying affects group dynamics regardless of leadership; members of teams tend to reject bullies when job function depends on the trust of coworkers (Coyne et al., 2004).

Coyne et al. (2004) pointed out that the majority of research on workplace bullying has focused primarily on the perceptions of the victims. Ethical implications are concerns when attempts are made to gain perspectives from the bullies (Coyne et al., 2004; Fahie, 2014). Researchers must depend on self-admission to bullying using self-report mechanisms when obtaining samples. Unlike research on childhood bullying in which teachers, peers, or parents identify bullies, it would be unethical to accuse adults of bullying behavior or depend on the word of victims, employers, or coworkers (Coyne et al., 2004). Research on workplace bullying has been extensive and has provided crucial information, but many of the studies have examined only one industry, victim perspectives, or limiting variables.

Vaughn and colleagues (2010) indicated that chronic bullying begins in childhood and persists into adulthood creating damage in the development and maintenance of healthy relationships. In a sample of over 43,000 U.S. residents, Vaughn et al. (2010) found that 1 in 17 adults reported a lifetime history of bullying other people. Boys who bullied others during childhood had a higher prevalence of antisocial personality disorder, criminality, and conviction rates than adult non-bullies did (Vaughn et al., 2010). Due to the high prevalence rate of bullying in the United States, Vaughn et al. suggested that there must be factors within American culture that instigates bullying behavior (Vaughn et al., 2010).

Homel (2013) suggested the level of bullying that a child engages in might extend the behavior into adulthood; children who physically bully others will continue to be physically aggressive as adults. Homel examined if persistent bullying perpetration during childhood and adolescence predicts future physical aggression (Homel, 2013). The use of alcohol consumption and college attendance was tested for possible moderating effects in adult aggression. The approach included using data from a previous longitudinal study that measured bullying behavior during elementary and high school, aggression, drinking frequency, and college attendance (Homel, 2013). The original sample included 571 pairs of children and parents with a final sample in adulthood of 76 (Homel, 2013). The participants completed an aggression scale that measured the frequency and level of adult physical aggression (Homel, 2013). The results indicated higher frequencies in physical aggressive behavior in adulthood among participants who had high levels of bullying during childhood (Homel, 2013). Even though persistent

bullying during childhood was associated to adult physical aggression, Homel found the consumption of alcohol increased aggressive behavior in this sample. The results also indicated that aggressive participants who attended college were less aggressive than those who did not attend college (Homel, 2013). The strength in this study was the use the same sample from a longitudinal study that measured bullying during childhood and physical aggression in adulthood. Homel might expand the work to include bullying behaviors other than physical aggression in the future.

Childhood Bullying

As previously mentioned, some researchers of childhood bullying have suggested that bullying behavior continues into adulthood (Baughman et al., 2012; Courtney & Wann, 2010; Homel, 2013; Ireland & Power, 2004; Vaughn et al., 2010). An understanding of childhood bullying might explain the development and occurrence of workplace bullying. Guerra, Williams, and Sadek (2011) indicated that most schools in the U.S. have moved away from prevention programs that focus on aggression and have turned to programs that are specific to bullying. Studies conducted on bullying prevention programs however have yielded weak results indicating the need to understand the phenomenon of childhood bullying more fully (Guerra et al., 2011). Dominguez (2013) pointed out that bullying persists because the culture in which it develops is rarely changed; reinforcement of bullying behavior occurs through the power and status gained (Dominguez, 2013). Bullying continues to occur unless changes in social culture changes with respect, kindness, and support (Dominguez, 2013).

Baldry (2003) indicated that as many as 70% of violent adults have a history of violence as children both as victims and as bullies. Children who witness violence in the home learn that aggression is acceptable behavior (Baldry, 2003; Guerra et al., 2011). Boys learn that aggression and bullying is an appropriate way to deal with conflict and the way to deal with weaker individuals (Baldry, 2003). Girls on the other hand who see their mothers beaten or intimidated on a regular basis may believe it is how women are normally treated (Baldry, 2003). Many of the studies conducted on childhood bullying have focused on different types of bullying behavior (Guerra et al., 2011). Girls tend to engage in relational aggression that includes behaviors such as gossiping, social exclusion, and spreading (Guerra et al., 2011). Boys use bullying strategies that are more physical or direct (Guerra et al., 2011). Research has found that victimization diminishes self-esteem; it is unclear however, whether bullies have low self-esteem due to mixed results in the research (Guerra et al., 2011).

Childhood Self-Esteem

Guerra et al. (2011) explored the relationship between self-esteem, beliefs about bullying, and perceptions of school environment. The approach included eliciting survey results from 2,678 elementary, middle, and high school students (Guerra et al., 2011). The instrument used measured bullying perpetration and victimization, self-esteem, bullying normative beliefs, and school climate perceptions (Guerra et al., 2011). In addition to the surveys, Guerra et al. conducted semi-structured interviews with the students to gain perspectives and discussion about bullying (Guerra et al., 2011). The results confirmed other research in how involvement in bullying contributed to low self-

esteem in victims, but low self-esteem was also found in the sample of bullies (Guerra et al., 2011). Bullies might use coercive strategies as a way to increase their self-esteem by acquiring power over others (Guerra et al., 2011). There was evidence that some bully participants had normal to high self-esteem if power had already been acquired prior to the start of the study (Guerra et al., 2011). The results from the semi-structured interviews indicated that most of the participants viewed bullying as a normal part of school life (Guerra et al., 2011). Students also indicated that being different was the motivation for most of the bullying that occurred (Guerra et al., 2011). The strength in this study was that the samples of students were from all three levels of childhood education, but the participants were the oldest within each level. The motivations for bullying other students changed as the children aged and moved on to the next level of education. This study demonstrates the complexity of bullying behavior from childhood through adulthood.

Omizo, Omizo, Baxa, and Miyose (2006) examined different areas that focused on bullying behaviors in children. The approach included semi-structured interviews of experiences, perspectives, and the feelings of bullies and victims (Omizo et al., 2006). The participants consisted of eight bullies and eight victims between the ages of 9 and 12 (Omizo et al., 2006). In analyzing the responses from the students, Omizo and colleagues (2006) found that bullies had a false sense of power. The bullies felt empowered by their bullying of others who they viewed as weaker (Omizo et al., 2006). The results indicated the bullies justified their behavior by blaming the victims. The victims blamed themselves for being bullied (Omizo et al., 2006). The victims possessed low self-esteem

and used strategies to avoid confrontations with the bullies (Omizo et al., 2006). The main weakness in this study was the small sample with two different sets of questions asked of each group. This makes comparison between the two groups difficult.

Lam and Liu (2007) explored reasons for engaging in bullying and perceptions of bullying in eight perpetrating children between the ages of seven through ten. Lam and Liu found similar scarcity of bullying disclosure in the child population as that in adulthood due to fear of negative consequences or punishment. With the assurance of non-disclosure with school administrators or parents, the bullies agreed to participate in the study and share their feelings and experiences (Lam & Liu, 2007). Children were asked questions regarding the age that they first bullied someone, why they bullied others, how they viewed bullying, and the consequences they experienced for the behavior (Lam & Liu, 2007). Participants indicated they sympathized with victims when they witnessed them being bullied (Lam & Liu, 2007). When engaged in bullying behavior for the first time, the bullies were found to experience guilt (Lam & Liu, 2007). When the bullies were supported and encouraged by peers, bullying behavior continued and the bullies found they enjoyed the feeling of having power over another (Lam & Liu, 2007). The advantage of using a qualitative method in this study was obtaining detailed information from each participant, but the sample was extremely small and limited the amount of information collected. Lam and Liu found common characteristics in the behaviors and reasons among the participants; increasing the sample would have strengthened the results.

According to Terranova, Harris, Kavetski, and Oates (2011), the perception of control may predict the intensity and adverse effects of bullying. When a child has a sense of control, he or she tends to have the courage to confront the bully, tell an adult, or fight back (Terranova et al., 2011). If a child feels powerless, each incidence of victimization will seem more intense causing the child to internalize feelings and lower his or her self-esteem (Terranova et al., 2011). Peer support reinforces bullying behavior by encouraging confidence and power with the assurance that peers will help the bully deal with current and future problems (Chan & Chui, 2013; Terranova et al., 2011). If the victim has a low sense of control, he or she may be unable to identify available support resulting in the inability to utilize the support in future encounters (Terranova et al., 2011). The purpose of this study was to examine the role that control, cognition, and social factors play in how children cope with peer victimization in a sample of 311 fifth and sixth-grade students from four private schools. Terranova and colleagues (2011) administered questionnaires to the students in two intervals six months apart. The questionnaires included items that elicited data on coping response, treatment by peers, attitudes about the use of aggression, and sense of control (Terranova et al., 2011). The results indicated that coping responses formed in young children tended to be stable once they reach adolescence (Terranova et al., 2011). If a child believes aggression is an acceptable way to deal with bullying, empowerment may ignite the use of aggression against his or her perpetrator and others who are viewed as a threat (Terranova et al., 2011). Prevention efforts must focus on the cognition of victims and teach them healthy coping skills without the use of aggression (Terranova et al., 2011). The main strength of

this study was in its longitudinal design; however six months is a short amount of time to identify changes in control, attitudes, and behaviors. Children may experience change in multiple areas such as home and school that influences their way of thinking and behavior during adolescence. Terranova et al. drew the sample from private schools, which might have different dynamics or work through a different culture than public schools. The results might better generalize to other adolescents if the sample consisted of students from both public and private schools.

Mathiassen (2013) investigated the long-term outcome of childhood bullying on 36 adults between the ages of 20 and 65. The approach included a qualitative design with individual interviews of each participant asking for specific details about bullying events during their childhood (Mathiassen, 2013). Mathiassen found many of the participants used bullying experiences as catalysts to stand against bullying during adulthood. In some cases, Mathiassen viewed the stance as enacting revenge against people who reminded the participant of similar situations or behaviors experienced during childhood. For instance, one participant transferred anger and disappointment in teacher support during childhood to his children's teachers resulting in harsh criticism (Mathiassen, 2013). This study provided insight into the long-term effects of childhood bullying, but a qualitative design elicits too many different responses making it difficult to compare to other studies. Using standardized measures to elicit information on coping and childhood trauma might have yielded results that could easily be compared to other studies and samples.

Boulton (2013) examined the role that childhood bullying plays in adult coping of social anxiety. The approach included administering a questionnaire to 582 college students over the age of 23 with a two week follow up of 360 students from the original sample (Boulton, 2013). The questionnaire measured childhood victimization, self-blame for victimization, ways of coping, and social phobia (Boulton, 2013). The results indicated that experiences of social exclusion and relational bullying during childhood predicted social anxiety in adulthood (Boulton, 2013). The results indicated that self-blame was associated with social exclusion, relational victimization, and verbal victimization during childhood and social anxiety in adulthood (Boulton, 2013). The strength in this study was the test-retest design to verify data from the initial distribution. Two weeks is a short amount of time to administer the same questionnaire; a longer timeframe between test-retest administrations might have enriched the results. One of the weaknesses of this study was that the sample consisted only of college students limiting the results to the general population.

Childhood Criminal Behavior and Bullying

Rudatskira et al. (2014) indicated that bullies and bully-victims are more apt to engage in delinquent behaviors than victims or individuals not involved in bullying. Turkel (2007) postulated that both bullies and victims are prone to violent behavior and are at greater risk of carrying weapons, fighting, and being injured. Turkel suggested bullying begins as physical aggression during childhood then transforms into relational bullying in adolescence continuing through adulthood. Turkel believed that bullying might lead to sexual harassment in adulthood. Turkel indicated that although rarely

reported, bullies have often been bullied themselves. As many as 15% of adolescents bully their peers while only 10% are victims (Turkel, 2007). Boys typically bully strangers and acquaintances while girls bully those within their own group of friends (Turkel, 2007). Relational aggression tends to cause more harm as its intent is to damage an individual's social status, relationships, and self-esteem (James et al., 2011; Turkel, 2007). The approach included the opinions based on only a few individuals. The research on bullying and sexual aggression might benefit through longitudinal studies with a large sample.

Pergolizzi et al. (2009) suggested that both bullies and victims are at risk for criminal behavior, depression, suicide, and overall functioning problems in school. With its abusive nature and disregard for the rights of others, the used of bullying behavior is an indication of future behavior with increased violence (Pergolizzi et al., 2009). Researchers examined 587 middle school students from four different schools to identify the frequency of bullying, types of bullying, actions taken by peers, and feelings of safety in school (Pergolizzi et al., 2009). The approach included administering a multiple-choice survey with closed-ended questions (Pergolizzi et al., 2009). The results indicated that 1 in 3 students had bullied someone and more than half of the students indicated they did nothing when witnessed bullying (Pergolizzi et al., 2009). There was a great deal of apathy found in the sample of this study indicating bullying is an accepted form of behavior and normal part of school culture (Pergolizzi et al., 2009). The main weakness in this study was closed-ended questions with multiple-choice answers risking influencing the results. The use of a Likert scale rather than ready-made answers might

have provided additional information about the variables examined in this study. Twemlow and Sacco (2013) suggested that school culture is the underlying cause of school bullying. The teachers and administrators encourage inaction of the students who witness bullying inadvertently promoting the use of aggressive behavior (Twemlow & Sacco, 2013).

Piquero, Connell, Piquero, Farrington, and Jennings (2013) indicated that research on the long-term outcomes of adolescent bullying is lacking. Piquero et al. (2013) explored bullying and offending trajectories of participants with a history of adolescent bullying. The approach included survey data from a longitudinal study that focused on the development of offending and antisocial behavior (Piquero et al., 2013). The sample included 411 boys at the age of eight, the parents, and teachers (Piquero et al., 2013). Information was elicited on criminal behavior through public records, court documents, and police records up through participant age of 56 (Piquero et al., 2013). The results indicated that participants who bullied others during adolescence engaged in all types of criminal behavior (Piquero et al., 2013). When controlled for childhood risks such as family income, parent employment, and family dynamics, the association between adolescent bullying and adult criminal behavior was no longer significant (Piquero et al., 2013). There may be a link between bullying and future antisocial behavior, but bullying behavior is not the cause (Piquero et al., 2013). The strength in this study was the longitudinal design. One of the weaknesses was that the sample of children consisted only of males. This study found a connection between adolescent bullying and criminal

behavior, but it is difficult to account for all of the risk factors that might occur over the course of four decades.

Bender and Lösel (2011) pointed out that research should focus on the long-term outcomes of bullies such as criminal or antisocial behavior. Bender and Lösel explored the relationship between bullying in children and antisocial behavior in adulthood. The approach included three waves of surveys and interviews over the course of 10 years with an original sample of 1,163 seventh and eighth-grade male students from a small town in Bavaria (Bender & Lösel, 2011). After approximately 18 months, a subsample of 102 boys was assessed with an additional assessment of 87 young men at the nine-year mark (Bender & Lösel, 2011). The average age of the sample when the study began was approximately 14 and 25 when the study ended (Bender & Lösel, 2011). The surveys and interviews included questions that measured bullying, victimization, anti-social behavior, with family dynamics used as control variables (Bender & Lösel, 2011). The results indicated physical and relational bullying predicted future anti-social behavior with physical bullying being a stronger predictor (Bender & Lösel, 2011). The multiple types and unreported frequency of relational bullying might explain the stronger effect size of physical bullying (Bender & Lösel, 2011). There were several different types of indirect/relational bullying found such as rumor mongering and social exclusion. Even when the researchers controlled for individual and family risk factors, there was a strong correlation of bullying with future antisocial behaviors (Bender & Lösel, 2011). The strength of this study was that the researchers surveyed the same children at different

intervals as they matured. This allowed the researchers to identify the long-term negative

effects of bullying behavior. Using only male students in the sample limited the results.

Bully-Victims

Holt, Finkelhor, and Kantor (2007) pointed out that in spite of the number of anti-

bullying laws and prevention programs in schools, without addressing the factors that

contribute to bullying behavior, legislation and prevention will be ineffective. Victims

and bullies experience detrimental long-term psychosocial effects, but the most at-risk

group tends to be bully-victims (Holt et al., 2007). Bully-victims tend to have increased

psychological problems, lower self-esteem, fewer friends, and stigmatized more than

bullies or victims (Holt et al., 2007). Türkmen et al. (2013) found 41.7% of participants

who perpetrated bullying were also victims of physical bullying while 79.9% perpetrators

of emotional bullying were also victims. Holt et al. (2007) hypothesized that

victimization at home would increase the detrimental effects of bullying for certain

children (Holt et al., 2007). The intent of this study was to identify other types of

victimization that may contribute to bullying involvement (Holt et al., 2007). The

approach included administering scales that measured bullying, victimization,

maltreatment, and internalizing problems to 689 fifth-grade students (Holt et al., 2007).

The results indicated that both victims and bullies reported victimization in other

domains, but bully-victims reported the highest rates of victimization (Holt et al., 2007).

Holt et al. also found that bullies reported high rates of victimization within the home and

community (Holt et al., 2007). Results indicated that child maltreatment and crime

victimization predicted internalizing problems (Holt et al., 2007). The results supported

the notion of a strong relationship between child maltreatment and long-term negative outcomes (Holt et al., 2007). Although this study found a connection between victimization at home and bullying behavior, there were several limitations. The researchers used a sample of fifth-graders from only one school district, which may limit the generalization to children of different ages and other geographical areas. Most of the children in the sample were minorities from urban area schools (Holt et al., 2007). The prevalence of maltreatment, bullying, and victimization may differ in suburban or rural areas. Finally, as with other studies, the researchers depended on self-report mechanisms risking misinterpretation or bias.

According to Shakoor et al. (2012), children typically develop social skills at a young age that help them interpret the behavior of others, adapt to social cues, and form healthy relationships as they mature. When a child fails to develop these skills, they are vulnerable to victimization and becoming bullies (Shakoor et al., 2012). When children are unable to interpret social cues properly, the intentions of others can be viewed as hostile, causing the child to deal with conflict using strategies such as bullying (Shakoor et al., 2012). In their longitudinal study of 2,232 twins between the ages of 5 and 12, Shakoor et al. (2012) investigated if children with adjustment difficulties moderated the risk of bullying involvement in children who have problems understanding other people's behaviors (Shakoor et al., 2012). The approach included testing theory of mind abilities and IQ at age five, emotional and behavioral problems at age 7 and 10, and involvement in bullying at age 12 using in-person interviews and self-report questionnaires (Shakoor et al., 2012). Bully-victims had the highest deficit in the ability to interpret the behavior

of others at age five. The results indicated low social skills development among the bully

participants (Shakoor et al., 2012). Maltreatment during childhood and low

socioeconomic status had a greater influence on a child becoming a bully than delays in

developing social skills alone (Shakoor et al., 2012). The results contradicted the notion

that bullies have the ability to be "master manipulators" due to low social skills

development during childhood (Shakoor et al., 2012). As some researchers explained, in

order to manipulate a group of people to target an individual, the bully must have an in-

depth understanding of behaviors and the mental states of other people (Jacobson, 2010;

Shakoor et al., 2012). The results indicated that based on the low social skills found

among their bully participants, these children would have difficulty in manipulating

others (Shakoor et al., 2012). The weakness in this study was using a sample of twins

limiting generalizing to non-twin children. Shakoor et al. did not differentiate between

types of bullying such as physical or relational among boys and girls, which might have

further provided information on social skill development in interpretation of behavior.

Childhood Maltreatment

Lopes (2013) investigated the differences between victims and non-victims in

paranoid ideation, aggressive behavior, subordination, and social phobia. Lopes indicated

that repeated exposure to bullying might elicit paranoia causing children to be on

constant alert of threats or threating situations. Being in a paranoid state may lead to

aggression toward anyone who may cause harm (Lopes, 2013). Children may illustrate

submissive behavior when exposed to abuse at home to avoid rejection or maltreatment

by parents (Lopes, 2013). Submissive behavior may instigate bullying behavior from

peers at school (Lopes, 2013). The approach included a sample of 61 children diagnosed with paranoid schizophrenia and social anxiety disorder (Lopes, 2013). Treating psychiatrists diagnosed the children with persecutory delusions and auditory hallucinations and prescribed medication at the time of the study (Lopes, 2013). After signing an informed consent, participants completed a questionnaire that measured paranoia, aggressive/submissive behavior, social anxiety, early life experiences, and child abuse (Lopes, 2013). The results indicated a higher portion of the participants reported bullying victimization (Lopes, 2013). The results indicated that bully-victims reported family environments filled with neglect/abuse from parents, being submissive toward parents, and feeling less valued (Lopes, 2013). Individuals who showed psychotic symptoms were more aggressive, angry, and hostile. Lopes suggested that bullying is a traumatic event that leads to psychosis (Lopes, 2013). There are several weaknesses in this study. First, the sample included only children diagnosed with mental disorders who were experiencing delusions or social phobias. The results are not generalizable to the rest of the population such as the average child in school. Second, Lopes concluded cause and effect based on a small sample and concludes that bullying causes psychosis. Lopes' conclusions might be premature as additional research is necessary to prove such a causal relationship. Finally, there is a risk when depending on self-report instruments. There might be a higher risk of bias or inaccurate answers with this particular sample because of the psychotic symptoms.

Addington et al. (2013) investigated the relationship between early childhood trauma and psychosis. The approach included 360 participants that consisted of half at

high risk for clinical psychosis and half at low risk for psychosis (Addington et al., 2013). The sample consisted of a combination of males, females, children, and adults with an average age of 18.98. The method included semi-structured interviews that measured pre-psychotic symptomology, childhood trauma, childhood abuse, and bullying (Addington et al., 2013). The majority of participants at high clinical risk of psychosis reported more types of early trauma than the control group (Addington et al., 2013). Out of the high-risk group, female participants reported experiencing trauma more often than the male participants did (Addington et al., 2013). Relationships were found between early trauma, higher levels of anxiety, depression, negative sense of self, and a negative sense of others (Addington et al., 2013). Trauma was highly correlated to perceptions of discrimination. Addington et al found a higher correlation between poor social function and bullying than any other trauma examined in the study. The high-risk group was more likely to report trauma, but no relationship was found between early trauma and increased risk of developing psychosis (Addington et al., 2013). The strength in this study was using a sample of individuals showing preliminary psychotic symptoms and individuals with healthy mental functioning.

Seeds, Harkness, and Quilty (2010) investigated the deterioration of support and development of depressive symptoms when childhood maltreatment and bullying are present. The sample consisted of 101 teenagers between the ages of 13 and 18 diagnosed with Major Depressive Disorder, Dysthymia, or Adjustment Disorder (Seeds et al., 2010). Referral for participation came from local mental health facilities. Each student completed various scales that measured depression severity, childhood maltreatment,

bullying, and social support (Seeds et al., 2010). The results indicated that child

maltreatment determined the severity of impact on bullying victimization (Seeds et al.,

2010). Children who experienced abuse from their parents were prone to develop

depression more easily (Seeds et al., 2010). When exposed to bullying from peers,

depressive symptoms increased (Seeds et al., 2010). Children exposed to maltreatment at

home and bullying from peers tended to withdraw from everyone in their lives due to

feelings of isolation and lack of attachment to caregivers (Seeds et al., 2010). The main

weakness of this study was using only participants diagnosed with psychological

disorders making it difficult to generalize to individuals without emotional issues.

Carney (2008) examined the relationship between bullying and trauma in 91

sixth-grade students. The approach included answering survey questions after reading a

short vignette where the participant imagined being the victim (Carney, 2008). The

results indicated that children exposed to bullying over long periods experienced

symptoms of PTSD (Carney, 2008). The symptoms lead to avoidance strategies in some

children while others mimicked the behavior as a way to manage the intense feelings of

fear and vulnerability (Carney, 2008). One of the limitations of this study was the use of a

hypothetical bullying situation for students to base their traumatic experience on when

answering the questionnaire. The sample consisted of students from one rural school that

contained little diversity among the student base limiting generalizability.

Hamilton, Shapero, Stange, Hamlat, Abramson, and Alloy (2013) examined the

predictability of depression and anxiety from emotional abuse, emotional neglect, and

relational bullying. The approach included a longitudinal study of 225 adolescent male

and female participants with the majority (59%) females. The sample consisted only of Caucasian and African American students (Hamilton et al., 2013). Participants completed three self-report questionnaires over 18 months (Hamilton et al., 2013). The questionnaires measured depressive symptoms, anxiety symptoms, hopelessness, emotional abuse, emotional neglect, and relational bullying (Hamilton et al., 2013). The results indicated that individuals exposed to emotional abuse, neglect, and relational bullying showed increased depressive and anxiety symptoms between the first and second assessment intervals (Hamilton et al., 2013). Symptoms decreased however between intervals two and three, which was an unexpected outcome (Hamilton et al., 2013). There were no sex differences until interval three when girls reported an increase in depressive symptoms (Hamilton et al., 2013). Racial differences did not emerge until interval three when Caucasian adolescents reported more anxiety symptoms than African American students did (Hamilton et al., 2013). The weakness in this study was using only two ethnic groups. An increase in diversity might have produced different results. The strength in this study is in its longitudinal design by testing the same students at nine-month intervals.

According to Wolfe, Crooks, Chiodo, and Jaffe (2009), abused or neglected children live in a world of extreme turmoil that prevents them from developing emotional self-regulating skills to use in social interactions. Mistreated children learn to inhibit expressions of emotion as even crying could elicit a negative response from abusive caregivers (Wolfe et al., 2009). Children who are abused or neglected tend to view others with suspicion and mistrust impeding the development of healthy relationships (Wolfe et

al., 2009). There is increased risk of involvement in abusive adult relationships for individuals with a history of abuse or neglect in childhood (Coid et al, 2001; Sigurdardottir & Halldorsdottir, 2013). Using a sample of 1,400 students, Wolf et al. (2009) investigated the connection between childhood maltreatment and relationship outcomes over the course of one year. Wolfe and colleagues found that children with aggressive parents were predisposed to either perpetrate aggression towards others or become victims. The main weakness of this study was the short timeframe of only one year for collection of longitudinal data. Wolf et al. might have extended their study to a longer span of time to refine the results and confirm the connection between childhood maltreatment and the development of social skills.

Baldry (2005) examined the connection between animal abuse and bullying other children in 532 students with an average age of 11.8 years. The approach included in-person administration of a questionnaire that measured episodes of animal abuse, exposure to domestic violence, direct parental abuse, bullying, and victimization (Baldry, 2005). The results showed one in three children reported bullying their peers at school (Baldry, 2005). The results also indicated that over one-third of participants had experienced abuse by one or both parents (Baldry, 2005). Abuse of animals was three times more likely to occur when exposed to domestic violence or abuse was present (Baldry, 2005). The main weakness of this study was the dependency on self-reports. Even though the children were assured of anonymity and were offered psychological help if needed, fear or need for attention might have altered participant answers.

Dong, Cao, Cheng, Cui, and Li (2013) pointed out that children at high risk of abuse and neglect may experience victimization in other areas simultaneously. Dong et al. (2013) suggested that by limiting research to certain types of victimization, the odds of reversing the adverse effect is reduced substantially. The method included examining the prevalence and predictability of simultaneous victimization by using specific behavioral and demographic information of 3,200 Chinese children from elementary through high school (Dong et al., 2013). The results indicated 1 in 5 participants experienced multiple forms of victimization such as bullying, physical abuse, emotional abuse, witnessing violence, theft, and vandalism (Dong et al., 2013). The results indicated that young boys experienced simultaneous victimization twice as much as girls did in the same age category (Dong et al., 2013). The results showed children whose parents smoked, used alcohol, came from low-income families, and had mothers with low education were more likely to report simultaneous victimization (Dong et al., 2013). The strength in this study was the large sample of children from different age groups. However, using only demographic information, maternal education level, and parental substance use to predict child victimization limited the results.

Hixon (2009) suggested bullying/victimization is associated with children and adolescents, and the behaviors frequently occur in adulthood. Hixon indicated that maladaptive development in childhood might continue into adulthood causing difficulties with interpersonal relationships and coping with stress and conflict. Social status tends to influence the behavior of bullies and victims. Hixon indicated that when observing playful teasing, individuals with higher social status tended to tease in an aggressive

manner compared to victims who teased in a prosocial manner. Individuals high in social status may use tactics such as ridicule, insults, threats, or other bullying behaviors to get what they want and maintain their status (Hixon, 2009).

Hixon indicated that bullies are more likely to have experienced maltreatment during childhood than did non-bullies. Parental maltreatment has a direct impact on a child's competency to solve problems in interpersonal relationships and interferes with social cognition (Hixon, 2009). Regardless of the intent, victims will view the actions of others as hostile and respond with aggression (Hixon, 2009). Research that has focused on coping skill deficiencies, negative social cognitions, beliefs of justification for aggression, and goals for status and power have provided an extensive amount of information, but should also extend to preventing future aggressive behavior (Hixon, 2009). Burton, Florell, and Wygant (2013) found that adolescents who have normative beliefs about aggression tended to be victims and bullies more often than individuals who believed aggression is wrong.

Oshio, Umeda, and Kawakami (2013) examined the effects of childhood maltreatment and bullying on well-being during adulthood. Oshio et al. (2013) hypothesized that social support and higher levels of socioeconomic status would moderate and mediate the effects of childhood adversity. In other words, the researchers surmised that proper social support and higher income reduces the negative effects of childhood maltreatment and bullying while increasing well-being (Oshio et al., 2013). The approach included examining the data from a previous study with a sample of 3,292 Japanese residents (Oshio et al., 2013). The information examined included

demographics, income, education level, occupation, childhood adversity, perception of well-being, and social support (Oshio et al., 2013). The results showed a negative correlation with each type of childhood adversity to perceptions of well-being in adulthood (Oshio et al., 2013). The results indicated that social support was negatively associated to childhood adversity and positively associated to adulthood well-being with negative support showing the opposite associations (Oshio et al., 2013). The researchers found that participants who were employed and had a higher household income reported positive well-being and less adverse effects of childhood maltreatment (Oshio et al., 2013). The results indicated that even though socioeconomic status and social support were mediators, the negative impact of childhood maltreatment remained highly associated with the perception of well-being (Oshio et al., 2013). The strength of this study was the large sample size, but dependence on self-report mechanisms risks bias.

Family Environment

Holt, Kaufman, Kantor, and Finkelhor (2009) suggested that the characteristics of family members and the structure of the family dynamic influences bullying behavior. Low parental involvement, authoritarian parenting, absence of warmth, and low family cohesion is associated with bullying behavior (Holt et al., 2009; Rigby, 2013). Holt and colleagues examined the contrast between parent knowledge and actual episodes of bullying behavior. The approach included administering surveys to 205 parents and students fifth-grade students from 22 different schools. The student survey measured bullying, victimization, child maltreatment, exposure to domestic violence, and parental response to bullying behavior (Holt et al., 2009). The parental survey measured parental

attitudes toward bullying, family dynamics, parent awareness of child bullying, and parental response to bullying behavior (Holt et al., 2009). The findings indicated that parents are often unaware of their child's involvement in bullying behavior (Holt et al., 2009). Family characteristics such as frequent conflicts and lack of supervision were associated with bullying behavior (Holt et al., 2009). The results indicated there was a high rate of child maltreatment reported from bullies and victims, with additional exposure to domestic violence among bullies (Holt et al., 2009). This study yielded vital information about bullying behavior, child maltreatment, and exposure to domestic violence, but the small sample limited the results. The sample consisted of only fifth-grade students from one school district albeit 22 different schools. The results therefore may not generalize to other age groups or geographical areas (Holt et al., 2009).

Georgiou and Stavrinides (2013) examined the relationship between parental practices, bullying and victimization experiences, effects of parent-child conflict, parental monitoring, and child disclosure. Parent-child conflict refers to a negative reaction to something the other party says or does (Georgiou & Stavrinides, 2013). Parental monitoring refers to parent motivations and abilities to observe a child's behavior (Georgiou & Stavrinides, 2013). The researchers described child disclosure as the willingness to offer parents information on friends, whereabouts, academic issues, or other events that occur throughout the day (Georgiou & Stavrinides, 2013). The approach included a sample of 492 adolescents between the age of 13 and 15 and parents. The children's questionnaire measured bullying and victimization and the parent's survey measured the parent-child relationship and child disclosure (Georgiou & Stavrinides,

2013). The results showed that conflict with fathers tended to extend to a conflict with the mother (Georgiou & Stavrinides, 2013). When children feel safe to self-disclose to mothers, there is also corresponding disclosure to fathers (Georgiou & Stavrinides, 2013). There was a significant correlation between parent-child conflict, bullying, and victimization. When testing for parental monitoring, the results indicated a correlation of a mothers' monitoring to bullying behavior, but no correlation to bullying or victimization with fathers' monitoring (Georgiou & Stavrinides, 2013). Child disclosure negatively predicted bullying while parent-child conflict positively predicted bullying (Georgiou & Stavrinides, 2013). Even though the predictability of child disclosure and parent-child conflict was significant, these variables only explained 10% of the variance of bullying and victimization (Georgiou & Stavrinides, 2013). The strength in this study was the focus on how parenting practices affect a child's behavior. If the children also completed the child disclosure portion of the survey, the results might have shown additional information. By using only the parents' perception of disclosure, it is difficult to know how accurate the information.

Healy, Sanders, and Iyer (2015) investigated the relationship between parenting practices, relationships with peers, and bullying/victimization. Healy et al. (2015) suggested there is a relationship between social and emotional behaviors and a child's risk of being bullied. The approach included distributing different self-report instruments to 215 children between the ages of 5 and 11, their parents, and teachers (Healy et al., 2015). The survey given to the children measured loneliness and intentions of peer behaviors. For younger children, the researchers administered the survey in person with

explanations and examples (Healy et al., 2015). The parent survey measured parental

support, perceptions of their child's feelings, ability to make friends, strengths,

difficulties, and behaviors (Healy et al., 2015). Teacher surveys measured bully

victimization (Healy et al., 2015). The results indicated that when parents are supportive,

interactive in teaching social skills, and have loving relationships with their children, the

risk of bully victimization is reduced (Healy et al., 2015). The strength in this study was

the combination of children, parents, and teachers that provided a well-rounded vision of

the victimization experience. Healy et al. might have enriched their study however by

using bully perpetrators as a comparison.

Henry (2004) indicated that bullies retain power by instilling fear in their victims.

Every time the bully inflicts pain either through physical or emotional strategies, the

bully's power increases as the victim's emotional states decrease (Henry, 2004). The

victim dreads not only the current confrontation, but future encounters with the bully as

well. Henry's study suggested that children, bullies in particular, mimic the coping

strategies of their parents and employ the same strategies when bullying is seen to

achieve a goal or desire. The focus of this study was to investigate bullying, peer support,

coping, anxiety, and anger of 103 children between the ages of 10 and 11. Henry

administered various scales and conducted a workshop for the children that lasted eight

months (Henry, 2004). The purpose of the workplace was to observe the coping skills of

the children while an imaginary conflict between adults ensued (Henry, 2004). The

results of this study indicated that boys tended to use bullying strategies five times more

often than girls do (Henry, 2004). The results also indicated that anger was a motivating

factor in using bullying strategies when problem solving fails with adults or peers (Henry, 2004). For example, when a child's attempts to problem-solve with an abusive parent fails, the child internalizes the negative emotions resulting in anger, depression, and anxiety (Henry, 2004; Klomek, Kleinman, Altschuler, Marrocco, Amakawa, & Gould, 2011). As a result, the child will not use the same problem-solving strategy with his or her peers, but tend to use aggression as an alternative (Henry, 2004; Klomek et al., 2011). The strength of this study was in utilizing both standardized scales and field observations. This allowed for a deeper understanding of how children interpret and use the coping strategies of their parents. Using a larger sample with a wider range of ages however, might have provided additional information in the workshop environment.

Knafo (2003) examined bullying behavior in children raised by authoritarian fathers. Society typically views people with authoritarian natures as conservative, unaccepting of out-groups, and subservient to authority figures (Knafo, 2003). Authoritarians tend to have high power values and raise children who are also unaccepting of out-groups and others with different values (Knafo, 2003). Using a sample of 334 Israeli children between the age of 16 and 18, Knafo (2003) compared children raised by authoritarian and non-authoritarian fathers and their tendency to engage in bullying behavior. The results indicated children raised by authoritarian fathers had the highest degree of bullying (Knafo, 2003). The children tended to seek out others who have similar values and engage in bullying behavior to achieve social dominance (Knafo, 2003). The strength in this study was illustrating the influence of family dynamics in children's behavior. When aggression is an accepted value in the family unit, children

may feel justified in using bullying strategies especially against those who seem different or hold different values.

Exposure to Violence

Baldry (2003) investigated the relationship between exposure to domestic violence and children's behavior in school using 1,059 elementary and middle school children between the ages of 8 and 15. Baldry assumed the socioeconomic status of the families based on the occupation of the fathers instead of gathering actual data directly. Separated from classmates, participants were administered an in-person questionnaire that measured bullying, victimization, and exposure to domestic violence. Administrators read the questions aloud for the (Baldry, 2003). The results indicated an association between exposure to domestic violence, bullying, and victimization, but did not predict a child's behavior in school (Baldry, 2003). The association of exposure to violence at home and bullying in school accounted for a small portion of the variance demonstrating the complex nature of bullying (Baldry, 2003). Inferring socioeconomic status based on the type employment of the father, limited information about family dynamics. This study depended on self-report mechanisms to administered to children about violence occurring in the home and bullying involvement; two subjects that might instill fear in a child preventing him or her to tell the truth.

In contrast to other studies that have focused on the relationship between witnessing violence and bullying behavior, Mustanoja and colleagues (2011) investigated the potential differences in bullying involvement between adolescents who witnessed or experienced violence outside and inside of the home. The approach to this investigation

included a sample of 508 adolescents between the ages of 12 and 17 years recruited from

an inpatient psychiatric facility using semi-structured interviews (Mustanoja et al., 2011).

The results showed boys who observed inter-parental violence were 2.5 times more likely

to be victims of bullying. Boys who witness parental violence might develop certain

aspects of avoidant personality disorder like feelings of inadequacy and fear of rejection

that could last into adulthood (Mustanoja et al., 2011). The results also showed that girls

who had been victims of violence, either by caregivers or outsiders was 10 times more

likely to be bullies or bully-victims than were boys (Mustanoja et al., 2011). Using

psychiatric adolescents for the sample limited this study making it difficult to generalize

the results to children without a mental disorder. Other factors not examined in this study

might have altered the impact of witnessing or experiencing violence and involvement in

bullying behavior.

Orue and Calvete (2012) indicated that a child's exposure to violence combined

with the belief that violence is acceptable in conflict resolution predicted the use of

aggressive behavior. Exposure and beliefs are enhanced when individuals have

psychological problems with social information processing (Orue & Calvete, 2012). The

method included examining exposure to violence, justification of violence, and the

likelihood of aggressive behavior using 675 children between the ages of 8 and 12 years

(Orue & Calvete, 2012). The instrument used measured exposure to violence at home,

school, neighborhood, television, as well as the beliefs and justification in the use of

aggression (Orue & Calvete, 2012). The results indicated that exposure to violence in

school and in the community did not predict aggressive behavior, but exposure at home

and through television showed significant results (Orue & Calvete, 2012). A viable explanation for the association of exposure to violence at home and aggressive behavior is the assault on the trusted security within that environment (Orue & Calvete, 2012). An explanation for the exposure of violence on television and aggressive behavior is that most children have access to violent media at home more so than in any other environment (Orue & Calvete, 2012). Verlinden et al. (2014) found that high television exposure prior to five years of age is associated with an increased risk of bullying and victimization. The main weakness in this study was the use of self-report mechanisms. Considering the age of the younger participants, interpretation of the meaning of some questions might have altered the answers causing inaccurate results.

State and Local Government Involvement

Children who interact with state and local facilities seem to be at greater risk of bullying others. Browne and Falshaw (1996) investigated the prevalence and likelihood of bullying behavior among 44 children within a specific resident secure center. The sample was also found to be involved with child protective services (Browne & Falshaw, 1996). The results showed that 75% of the teenage participants from a youth treatment program frequently bullied others; 64% of these individuals were also victims (Browne & Falshaw, 1996). Several of the bully participants had a history of abuse and/or neglect by their caregivers (Browne & Falshaw, 1996). The main weakness in this study was using resident children from a secure youth center as the only sample. Non-resident program members might have provided different results.

Mitchell (2003) also found that children within the child protection system had experienced abuse and/or neglect by caregivers. Children removed from their families and placed in multiple foster homes or residential facilities tend to get lost in the system (Mitchell, 2003). According to Mitchell, these children experience abuse in several different areas of their lives; they face abuse or neglect at home, at school, in their communities, and by the very system designed to help them (Mitchell, 2003). These children seek support from others such as peers, teachers, and social workers. Dowling and Carey (2013) indicated that victims of bullying might seek help from various others depending on the goal they want to achieve. When victims do not receive the needed emotional support, anger and aggression can become more intense (Mitchell, 2003). There was little diversity in his population limiting the results. The only children included were those in low-income families who had been involved with the welfare system for a long time limiting generalizability to children from middle or upper-level income classes.

Mohapatra and colleagues (2010) investigated the relationship between family involvement with child protective services (CPS) and bullying involvement of 2,516 students between the ages of 12 and 19. The approach consisted of administering questionnaires that measured a family history of CPS involvement, bullying, victimization, family socioeconomic status, elevated psychological distress, and non-intact family status (Mohapatra et al., 2010). Girls whose families were involved with CPS were at higher risk of bullying other children than girls whose families had never been involved with the organization (Mohapatra et al., 2010). Boys who reported involvement with CPS were more likely to be victims of bullying rather than perpetrators

(Mohapatra et al., 2010). The findings indicated that the amount of psychological distress was significantly associated with bullying perpetration (Mohapatra et al., 2010). Due to ethical considerations, the researchers did not ask the students direct questions about parental abuse or neglect. Interaction with CPS has been known to involve abuse or neglect in many cases, without directly asking participants the nature of their involvement, Mohapatra et al. could not verify histories of maltreatment.

Summary

Research on childhood bullying is plentiful; however, investigators have focused primarily on prevention. Many researchers have speculated that childhood aggression tends to continue into adulthood (Baldry, 2003, 2005; Bauer et al., 2006; Bowes et al., 2009; Dussich & Maekoya, 2007; Shields & Cicchetti, 2001; Shujja et al., 2014; Vaillancourt & McDougall, 2013), but few studies exist to confirm this notion. Baldry (2003) suggested that as many as 70% of adults with violent tendencies experienced violence during childhood. Research indicated that if a child's family environment views the use of aggression as acceptable behavior, the child might use bullying as a strategy to solve problems (Baldry, 2003), increase self-esteem (Guerra et al., 2011; Lam & Liu, 2007; Omizo et al., 2006), or achieve control (Terranova et al., 2011). The impact of bullying behavior is detrimental to bullies and victims in that there is an increased risk of bullying from peers (Price-Robertson, Higgins, & Vassallo, 2013) engaging in criminal behavior (Pergolizzi et al., 2009; Piquero et al., 2013; Price-Robertson et al., 2013; Sansone, Lam, & Wiederman, 2013; Turkel, 2007) or anti-social behavior (Baldry, 2005; Bender & Lösel, 2011). Researchers have found that children who are both bully and

victim tend to have higher psychological issues, lower self-esteem, fewer friends, and stigmatized more than bullies or victims alone (Holt et al., 2007).

Children who experience maltreatment at home are at greater risk of victimization at school and in the community than children who do not experience abuse or neglect at home (Carney, 2008; Seeds et al., 2010). Maltreated children tend to view all of their future relationships with mistrust expecting the same treatment they received from their caregivers (Hixon, 2009; Wolfe et al., 2009). For many children, the family environment influences social interactions and provides a model for achieving goals and solving problems (Henry, 2004; Holt et al., 2009; Knafo, 2003). Children who witness violence in the home have an increased risk of using violence against others and becoming a victim (Mustanoja et al., 2011; Orue & Calvete, 2012). Children whose family has experience with state and local governments such as Child Protective Services are at greater risk of bullying and victimization (Browne & Falshaw, 1996; Mitchell, 2003; Mohapatra et al., 2010). Although the research on childhood bullying has discovered numerous factors that influence bullying behavior, the long-term behavioral influence in adulthood is still unknown.

Theories of Bullying

There are two different theories that were the basis of this study: social dominance theory and attachment theory. According to Mouttapa Valente, Gallaher, Rohrbach, and Unger (2004), social dominance theory is described as the need to dominate others considered weak to gain access to resources such as social status among peers. Attachment theory refers to the bond created between an infant and his or her

caregiver. Zosky (1999) suggested that early experiences create psychological templates that individuals use to base all future relationships. People who engage in domestic violence tend to have distorted relationships that suggest an early developmental pathology with caregivers (Zosky, 1999). Early research on domestic violence indicated that 81% of men who engaged in aggression toward their spouse either witnessed domestic violence between their parents or experienced abuse (Zosky, 1999). According to Cassidy (1998), a child's experiences with caregivers influence future feelings, behaviors, and expectations (Cassidy, 1998). Children tend to create models based on the interactions with their caregivers; experiences filled with abuse and rejection may create the model of relationships as one of mistrust (Astrauskaite et al., 2014). Attachment theory contends that the availability of the mother builds confidence that exploration of the external world is safe and secure; the mother is a source of comfort and safety (Cassidy, 1998). Papadaki and Giovazolias (2015) recently found however that a fathers' acceptance moderates the effects of a mothers' rejection and reduces a child's exposure to victimization and aggression. Cassidy (1998) indicated that there is an increased risk that pathology can develop when trauma occurs in early childhood.

Social Dominance Theory

Wu, Lyons, and Leong (2015) suggested that workplace bullying might have a greater impact on ethnic/racial minorities due to experiences of discrimination outside the workplace and desensitize them to future encounters. Wu et al. (2015) examined how workplace bullying, work stress, and social dominance orientation affects minority rejection sensitivity and responses to bullying (Wu et al., 2015). The approach included

distributing an online survey to 174 employed minority students from a large western public university (Wu et al., 2015). The survey measured, ethnic/racial bullying, ethnic/racial stress, ethnic/racial rejection sensitivity, and social dominance orientation (Wu et al., 2015). The results showed a positive relationship of ethnic/racial bullying to ethnic/racial stress and ethnic/racial rejection sensitivity (Wu et al., 2015). Ethnic/racial bullying however did not affect sensitivity to additional discrimination (Wu et al., 2015). The results indicated that participant beliefs about social dominance influenced the impact of stress and bullying. Participants who did not believe in social hierarchies had greater detrimental effects from stress and bullying (Wu et al., 2015). The weakness of this study was using only ethnic minorities in the sample. The researchers might have enriched the study by using a combination of minority and non-minority participants to compare the impact of workplace bullying and the influence of social dominance orientation.

Reijntjes and colleagues (2013) investigated the association between bullying, perceived popularity, social acceptance, and intra-psychological well-being. The approach included 394 children in the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades from 12 different elementary schools in the Netherlands (Reijntjes et al., 2013). The participants were interviewed at three different intervals over three years (Reijntjes et al., 2013). The interviews included questions that measured bullying, perceived popularity, peer acceptance, self-perceived social competence, and symptoms of internalizing problems (Reijntjes et al., 2013). The results indicated that bullying increased when children perceived high levels of popularity among peers (Reijntjes et al., 2013). The results

showed that bullies did not demonstrate internalizing problems or seemed to experience problems in social domains (Reijntjes et al., 2013). A small percentage of the bullies experienced extreme dislike, but bullies were accepted by the majority peers (Reijntjes et al., 2013). The results indicated that as children age and come closer to attending middle school, bullying behavior decreases (Reijntjes et al., 2013). The results indicated that bullies tend to believe they have high social competence regardless of being disliked by many of their peers (Reijntjes et al., 2013). The strength in this study was in the longitudinal design, but the researchers interviewed only preadolescents within a short amount of time. The researchers might have enriched this study if they had included children from middle and high school to understand the trajectory of bullying behavior and peer acceptance.

Mouttapa and colleagues (2004) indicated that bullies tend to have larger friendship groups and experience earlier dating than the average student does. The results of some studies indicated that aggressive behavior could be attributed to the behavior of others; an individual may bully others because his or her friends engage in bullying (Mouttapa et al., 2004). As Mouttapa et al. (2004) pointed out, not all children who have bullying friends mimic their behavior unless they have aggressive tendencies and engage in bullying behavior themselves (Mouttapa et al., 2004). The purpose of this study was to investigate whether bullies, victims, bully-victims, and their classmates differed in relationship variables and if friends played a role in the involvement of bullying behavior (Mouttapa et al., 2004). The approach consisted of administering a 160-item survey to 1,368 sixth-grade students from 16 different schools (Mouttapa et al., 2004). Inclusion

requirements were that most students were to be Latino, multi-ethnic, with a 30% Asian population (Mouttapa et al., 2004). The survey measured data on bullying, victimization, friendships, friendship aggression, friendship victimization, and ethnicity (Mouttapa et al., 2004). The results showed bullies and bully-victims who had aggressive friends were more likely to engage in aggressive behavior (Mouttapa et al., 2004). Bullies and bully-victims who had less aggressive friends showed a decrease in bullying behavior (Mouttapa et al., 2004). Victims, on the other hand who had non-aggressive friends experienced an increase in victimization (Mouttapa et al., 2004). Victims who had aggressive friends showed a decrease in victimization (Mouttapa et al., 2004). The male participants did not score differently than their classmates in using aggression to achieve a higher social status among their friends (Mouttapa et al., 2004). Female participants scored much higher than males in the need for social status, had fewer friends, but had closer ties to their existing friends (Mouttapa et al., 2004). Other theories might better explain the relationship dynamics in bullying behavior than social dominance theory due to the mixed results between genders (Mouttapa et al., 2004). The main weakness of this study was that the researchers concentrated on the Latino and Asian population, limiting generalizing to other ethnic groups difficult. The outcome might be different in samples of predominantly white students.

Sijtsema, Veenstra, Lindenberg, and Salmivalli (2009) indicated that the need for social status is a universal goal. The need for prestige however may overshadow the achievement of status (Sijtsema et al., 2009). Bullies have a greater need for dominance and prestige than most individuals do (Sijtsema et al., 2009). The purpose of this study

was to investigate the status goals of bullies and victims and the method used to achieve those goals (Sijtsema et al., 2009). The approach included 25 children between the ages of 10 and 15 from a small town in Finland (Sijtsema et al., 2009). The participants represented a sample from all of the elementary and middle schools within that geographical area (Sijtsema et al., 2009). The participants were administered a questionnaire during class while two research assistants supervised the process (Sijtsema et al., 2009). The information collected included bullying, victimization, direct status goals, proactive/reactive aggression, social preference, and perceived popularity (Sijtsema et al., 2009). The results indicated that as children reach adolescence, they set a higher value on achieving status than during childhood (Sijtsema et al., 2009). The results showed that gender was a factor in the difference between dominance and prestige; boys were more interested in achieving status through dominance while girls set their goals on prestige (Sijtsema et al., 2009). The results indicated that bullying was a common strategy used to achieve social status suggesting bullying behavior was intentional (Sijtsema et al., 2009). Reinforcement of bullying behavior occurs as an individual increases social status ensuring its future use as a viable strategy (Sijtsema et al., 2009). The weakness in this study was that the researchers used children from a town with a total population only 20,000. The results might have a different outcome with a sample extracted from a larger geographical area where the social culture could differ significantly.

Jacobson (2010) suggested that bullying strategies are used more when there is a desire to dominate than due to other motivating factors such as lack of understanding,

poor social skills, or school culture. Jacobson explained that we all have a self-image that may be seen differently by peers. As a result, individuals refrain from sharing their self-image with others to avoid ridicule and bully others to protect their image of self (Jacobson, 2010). Bullying typically occurs in social situations creating an imbalance of power (Longton, 2014). When a bully ridicules someone in front of others, he or she gains power by reducing the power of the victim (Jacobson, 2010). Bullying may represent a temporary avoidance of emotion or an attempt to transfer negative attributes of the perceived self-image onto the victim (Jacobson, 2010). The ability to create distance from fears, avoid inferior feelings, and a perceived increase in power, dominating others may become insatiable (Jacobson, 2010). This researcher concluded that due to the insatiable nature of bullying, prevention strategies might be ineffective (Jacobson, 2010). The main weakness in this study was that Jacobson based conclusions about bullying on one situation. Results may differ considerably using a larger sample with a diverse population.

Teisl, Rogosch, Oshri, and Cicchetti (2012) indicated that considering the nature and complexity of social dynamics, dominant individuals also employ prosocial strategies to achieve dominance within a group rather than using aggression alone. In order for an individual to obtain and maintain popularity within a social group, he or she must demonstrate a certain amount of social competence (Teisl et al., 2012). The purpose of this study was to understand how children achieve their social goals by examining the developmental differences in the strategies they use (Teisl et al., 2012). Considering the negative impact of maltreatment on children's social development, the sample included

children with and without a history of abuse and/or neglect (Teisl et al., 2012). The results indicated there is little difference in the dominance behavior of young children; however, when children reach adolescence, bullying behavior is less effective and new strategies are adopted (Teisl et al., 2012). Negative consequences for bullying behavior and exposure to influential adults may explain why some adolescents adopt new strategies to achieve dominance (Teisl et al., 2012).

Teisl and colleagues (2012) indicated that most children transition to using more prosocial strategies as they reach adolescence, although some children continue to use bullying as a means to gain resources. Child maltreatment and parental modeling may contribute to the use of coercive behavior to achieve dominance (Teisl et al., 2012). This study was also designed investigate the relationship between early child/parent relationships and the type of dominance behavior seen in children (Teisl et al., 2012). The hypothesis asserts that children who had experienced maltreatment would exhibit more aggressive social behavior than children whose history did not include maltreatment (Teisl et al., 2012). Teisl et al. indicated that age is a factor in using either bullying tactics or social competence whey attempting to gain dominance (Teisl et al., 2012). Younger children may be more apt to use bullying as a means to gain status while older children may demonstrate more prosocial behaviors (Teisl et al., 2012). The approach included administering a questionnaire and observing 470 children between the ages of 6 and 13 who attended a research summer camp (Teisl et al., 2012). Camp counselors placed each child in a group of children with the same sex and approximate age with half histories of maltreatment and half non-maltreated histories (Teisl et al., 2012). The groups then

engaged in activities while the counselors observed and rated the interactions and reported the findings at the end of camp (Teisl et al., 2012). The questionnaire elicited information that measured behavior, personality characteristics, social dominance, social competence, bullying, and victimization (Teisl et al., 2012). The results indicated that maltreated children are more likely to use bullying strategies to achieve dominance within their peer group (Teisl et al., 2012). The results also showed that the older children in the sample demonstrated prosocial behavior confirming their hypothesis of social competence relating to age (Teisl et al., 2012). However, the use of bullying strategies to achieve social dominance was higher in the children who had a history of maltreatment regardless of age (Teisl et al., 2012). The strength in this study was the two methods of obtaining the data: observations and questionnaires. The camp counselors had the task of observing the children's interactions without knowledge as to the purpose or hypotheses of the study. The weakness was that the researchers only focused on physical bullying. Considering relational aggression is often times used to influence social interactions, the researchers might have enriched the study if a relational component was included.

Williford, Brisson, Bender, Jenson, and Forrest-Bank (2011) and Williford, Boulton, and Jenson (2014) pointed out the difficult challenges faced by children as they move from childhood to adolescence. Elementary school may have afforded a sense of power and influence only to lose that perceived status when moving to middle school where a larger number of students are present (Williford et al., 2011, 2014). The transition between elementary and middle school occurs at a developmental stage in a child's life that is filled with physical and emotional changes (Williford et al., 2011,

2014). This is a stage when children depend on the acceptance of their peers and easily influenced by their social group. For many adolescents, this transition is a time to establish their peer group identity (Williford et al., 2011, 2014). Challenges are increased when children move and change schools leaving their elementary school friends behind (Williford et al., 2011, 2014).

Williford et al. (2011) indicated that as many as 35% of students have acted aggressively toward their classmates during this transition period. Williford et al. examined the stability of aggression and victimization during the transition from elementary school to middle school using the Latent Class Analysis (LCA) model in 458 fourth through sixth-grade students. The initial classes found in fourth and fifth-grade students included bullies, bully-victims, victims, and uninvolved students (Williford et al., 2011). Students were administered survey questions aloud that measured aggression and victimization. The results indicated that the majority of students in the sample moved from one class to another during the transition period between elementary and middle school with the most common move to the class of bully-victim (Williford et al., 2011). The only stable transition indicated in the results was 28% of the victims in fifth-grade who remained in the victim class as they moved to the sixth-grade (Williford et al., 2011). The results indicated that the type of aggression used during this transition period moved from overt aggression such as hitting to relational aggression that focused on a victims' social identity (Williford et al., 2011). The one latent class that did not remain was that of bully. Williford et al. indicated that this is contrary to other studies on childhood bullying but may be due to the sensitivity of the LCA model. Other researchers

assigned specific cut-off points to determine bully status. The instrument used in this study might have changed the criteria of victims and bullies resulting in the notion that aggressive behavior is stable over time (Williford et al., 2011). The transitory nature of the results was in line with the principles of social dominance theory; the age that children transition between elementary and middle school is a time of experimentation (Williford et al., 2011). Experimentation along with the need for acceptance from the peer group may explain the changes in class of some students and the importance of achieving power and control (Williford et al., 2011). Students in the sample may have used aggressive behavior to establish status, influence, and form relationships with their peers (Williford et al., 2011). The weakness of this study was in depending on a single self-report measure to determine the stability of bullying and victimization. A longitudinal design might have provided additional information that confirmed long-term behavior stability.

Attachment Theory

Shaver, Mikulincer, and Feeney (2009) indicated that the attachment created between parent and child provides an avenue for the child to explore the environment in a safe and secure manner. Attachment theory depends on several fundamental systems such as the neurological system that asserts individuals seek and rely on relationships with others (Shaver et al., 2009). The relationship with the child's caregiver is the basis of psychological and emotional development. Children learn how to interact with their physical world, regulate their emotions, interact with others, and deal with conflict (Shaver et al., 2009). A caregiver affirms the trust and security of the attachment bond

when he or she responds appropriately when the child signals fear, frustration, or physical needs (Shaver et al., 2009). When a caregiver is unavailable, abusive, or insensitive, the child's behaviors and mental health develops in a distorted way (Shaver et al., 2009). When the attachment between parent and child is toxic, the child may view relationships with others as potentially abusive, threatening, and unreliable (Shaver et al., 2009). Expressions of emotional distortions are seen through exaggerated emotional or physical behavior (Shaver et al., 2009). Depending on the toxicity of the attachment and the level of distortion in mental health, there may be tendencies to engage in criminal activity, extreme violence, and self-destructive behavior (Shaver et al., 2009).

Kokkinos (2013) pointed out that bullying does not occur in isolation; understanding comes only by examining the connection to family, peers, and the community. Kokkinos indicated that parental bonding and involvement plays a significant role in the development of a child's social and coping skills. The purpose of this study was to investigate the association between perceived attachment styles, parenting, bullying, and victimization. Kokkinos surmised that insecure attachment style and inappropriate parenting influence and increase the risk that a child will engage in antisocial behavior such as bullying. The approach included a sample of 601 children between the ages of 10 and 12 from Northern Greece. Each child completed a survey that measured bullying, victimization, perceived attachment, and perceived parenting style (Kokkinos, 2013). The results indicated that attachment style and parenting practices are associated to bullying and victimization (Kokkinos, 2013). Children who reported having a healthy relationship with their parents were less involved in bullying or victimization.

Participants who reported insecure attachments to their parents engaged in bullying behavior and experienced victimization (Kokkinos, 2013). The strength in this study was the large sample size, but Kokkinos only used children between the ages of 10 and 12. This study might have provided a deeper understanding of bullying if the researcher used a wider age range as multiple changes occur during childhood, adolescence, and adulthood.

Prather and Golden (2009) indicated that symptoms of poor parent-child attachment due to abuse or neglect causes problems with the relationships in adoptive and foster children and their new caregivers. Children who experienced abuse or neglect during critical developmental periods tend to exhibit emotional and behavioral problems that create strain on forming attachments with foster or adoptive parents (Prather & Golden, 2009). Children who experience multiple placements in several different families show an increase in traumatic symptoms (Prather & Golden, 2009). Mistreated children in foster and adoptive populations tend to exhibit different emotional and behavioral reactions than other children to regain secure attachments that were lacking with the abusive caregiver (Prather & Golden, 2009). Adopted and fostered children who have previously been mistreated find it difficult to trust, viewing foster and adoptive parents with suspicion and fear rather than sources of love and protection (Prather & Golden, 2009). These children tend to show an increase in aggression and poor impulse control when interacting with others (Prather & Golden, 2009). According to Prather and Golden, these children are described as shallow, emotionally distant, inflexible, have difficulty forming close relationships, and often demonstrate antisocial behaviors as adults. The

results indicated that certain techniques in treatment tended to alleviate the adverse

behaviors demonstrated by abused children (Prather & Golden, 2009). Forcing the

individual to acknowledge and experience the negative emotions from their past tends to

abate the anger, resentment, and antisocial behavior creating an opportunity to learn new

coping and social skills (Prather & Golden, 2009). The weakness in this study was that

the researchers focused primarily on adopted and fostered children. These children must

also deal with the emotions involved in being rejected by their parents making the

findings difficult to generalize.

Cloitre, Stovall-McClough, Zorbas, and Charuvastra (2008) indicated that

maltreated children with attachment problems tend to interpret the behaviors of others as

hostile even when the intent is benign. These individuals expect to be treated by others in

the same way they were treated in childhood making it difficult to establish close

relationships (Cloitre et al., 2008). The approach included a sample of 109 women

between the ages of 21 and 64 with histories of childhood abuse and experiencing PTSD

symptoms (Cloitre et al., 2008). Data were obtained on attachment and abuse experience

(Cloitre et al., 2008). In comparing individuals with secure and insecure attachment,

Cloitre and colleagues found significant differences in social support and emotion

regulation with the insecure attachment group. The insecure attachment group was also

found to have overall functional impairment (Cloitre et al., 2008). The results showed

that for individuals who experienced maltreatment as children, insecure attachment is a

contributing factor to psychiatric deficiencies (Cloitre et al., 2008). As attachment theory

implies, Cloitre et al. found that insecure individuals have difficulty regulating their

emotions and functioning in interpersonal relationships. One of the limitations in this study was that data were collected only from women; the results might have been different if males were also included in the sample. The sample consisted of individuals who had experienced child abuse making it difficult to generalize to non-abused children; attachment problems might develop without abuse or trauma.

Reder and Duncan (2001) found histories of child abuse, neglect, and rejection in a sample of parents who played a role in the deaths of their own children. The parents were described as frequently engaging in violence, threatening behavior toward professionals, domestic violence, and substance abuse (Reder & Duncan, 2001). This behavior might be the result of actual experiences such as rejection from parents, abuse, or neglect during childhood (Reder & Duncan, 2001). Some of the parents showed either excessive dependence on others and fear of abandonment and others showed excessive distancing and intolerance to the dependency of others (Reder & Duncan, 2001). Many of the parents interviewed admitted losing control and abusing their infants prior to death due to the child's natural dependency (Reder & Duncan, 2001). Attachment research has primarily focused on the reactions of infants to the consistency of their caregivers to meet their needs. Reder and Duncan (2001) pointed out that ongoing adverse parenting styles reinforce negative consequences of failed attachment in infancy. Attachment theory seems to explain aggression in adulthood, but individuals are unable to report experiences during infancy; therefore, research must depend on the subsequent relationship with caregivers to assess the parent-child attachment (Reder & Duncan, 2001). As an individual matures, psychological and emotional functioning demonstrates aspects of

attachment theory (Reder & Duncan, 2001). When a child endures ongoing hostile treatment by his or her caregiver, all areas of his or her life will be impacted (Reder & Duncan, 2001).

Summary

There are many opinions of how bullying develops and persists across the lifespan. Certain researchers believe that social dominance theory is the underlying factor that provokes an individual to bully another (Pratto, Sidanius, & Levin, 2006; Teisl, 2012). Other researchers believe that attachment theory in which the relationship between caregiver and child inhibit healthy social skills and coping abilities (Astrauskaite, et al., 2014; Kokkinos, 2013; Prather & Golden, 2009; Shaver et al., 2009). Some research indicated that the aggressive nature of an individual's friends influenced his or her behavior. Mouttapa et al. (2004) found that if a child's peer group is aggressive, it is likely that the child will also engage in bullying behavior. Victims who do not have aggressive friends experienced an increase in victimization (Mouttapa et al., 2004). Other research indicated that reinforcement of bullying behavior occurs each time an individual achieves social status (Sijtsema et al., 2009). The need to dominate others is an insatiable desire according to Jacobson (2010), which reinforces the use of bullying strategies. Teisl and colleagues (2012) found that as children mature, they tend to use prosocial behavior instead of bullying strategies to achieve social status, however bullying behavior continued for those children who had experienced maltreatment (Teisl et al., 2012). Finally, Williford et al. (2011, 2014) found that as children move from elementary to middle school bullying strategies move from physical aggression to relational aggression.

Victims of bullying remained victims during this transition while children who bullied in elementary school moved to the class of bully-victim (Williford et al., 2011, 2014).

Many researchers believe that experiences with caregivers from birth to early childhood explain the use of bullying (Astrauskaite et al., 2014; Cloitre et al., 2008; Kokkinos, 2013; Prather & Golden, 2009). Shaver et al. indicated that abusive parenting, inaccessibility, and insensitivity on the part of the caregiver might cause distortions in emotional and mental health as the child matures. The failure to establish a bond with a caregiver tends to cause difficulty in forming healthy relationships (Kokkinos, 2013; Prather & Golden, 2009; Shaver et al., 2009). Abused or neglected children are especially susceptible to relationship problems because they view others with mistrust and expect similar mistreatment (Cloitre et al., 2008; Prather & Golden, 2009). The long-term effects of insecure attachments may cause functional impairment, difficulty in regulating emotions, and problems coping in social situation (Astrauskaite, et al., 2014; Cloitre et al., 2008; Reder & Duncan, 2001). Workplace bullying might be explained through social dominance theory and attachment theory, but researchers must depend on self-report measures and current parental relationships to obtain data.

Summary

The central theme of this literature review is that bullying is harmful to everyone involved. Victims develop physical, psychological, and emotional problems; organizations lose assets through absenteeism, lost production, and employee turnover; and bullies may experience loneliness and social isolation. Researchers have attempted to understand workplace bullying by examining personality characteristics of bullies and

victims (Brodsky, 1976; Coyne et al., 2000; Hutchinson, & Hurley, 2013; Olweus, 1993;

O'Moore, et al., 1998; Sliter, et al., 2014; Zapf, 1999; Zou, et al., 2014). Research

includes the long-term psychological impact that may alter the victims perceptions

(Astrauskaite, et al., 2014; Gemzøe Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2002), and the organizational

culture (Blase & Blase, 2006; Cowan, 2013; Ferris, 2009; Namie & Namie, 2009;

Sedivy-Benton et al., 2015). The conclusion is that all of the factors investigated

contribute to the development and enduring aggressive behavior in the workplace, yet the

triggers that propel an adult to bully a coworker is unknown.

When investigating childhood bullying, researchers found similar tactics and

strategies as those used by adults (Baldry, 2003; Baughman et al., 2012; Courtney &

Wann, 2010; Dominguez, 2013; Guerra et al., 2011; Homel, 2013; Ireland & Power,

2004; Vaughn et al., 2010). Children are more likely to talk about their bullying

experiences, but are reluctant to give many details for fear of negative consequences

(Lam & Liu, 2007). Researchers have found that girls tend to use relational aggression as

a bullying strategy while boys are more apt to use physical bullying against those who

they view as weak (Dominguez, 2013; Guerra et al., 2011; Turner et al., 2014). The

results of some studies indicated that both bullies and victims have low self-esteem

(Guerra et al., 2011). Exposure to aggression tends to lower the self-esteem of victims

while bullies may use aggression to increase their self-esteem (Guerra et al., 2011).

Omizo et al. found that perpetrators know that their aggression causes the victims harm,

but justify their behavior by placing blame onto the victims. Prior to engaging in

bullying, some perpetrators sympathized with victims when witnessing bullying resulting in feelings of guilt when engaged in the behavior themselves (Lam & Liu, 2007).

Turkel suggested that both bullies and victims are prone to aggressive behavior a greater risk of carrying weapons, fighting, and injury. Other research has found that victims and bullies show an increased risk for depression, suicide, and violent criminal behavior (Pergolizzi et al., 2009; Piquero et al., 2013). Research has found that children exposed to maltreatment by caregivers are more likely to bully others (Holt et al., 2009; Wolfe et al., 2009). The results of some studies indicated that a family environment in which aggression is an accepted behavior in dealing with conflict increases the likelihood that a child will become a bully (Orue & Calvete, 2012). Other study results have indicated that children exposed to maltreatment have an inability to develop healthy social skills causing problems interpreting the intentions of others (Shakoor et al., 2012). Research has indicated that many adult bullies have a history of childhood maltreatment (Baldry, 2003, 2005; Bender & Lösel, 2011; Terranova et al., 2011).

Some research has indicated that an individual will bully others in an effort to gain some sort of resource, social status, or social dominance (Mouttapa et al., 2004). Jacobson suggested that the need for social dominance is actually the need to protect self-image if that image differs from the perceptions of others. Teisl et al. indicated that bullies also use prosocial behavior to gain social status and gain popularity among their social groups. However, children who have a history of maltreatment continue to use bullying in social situations (Teisl et al., 2012).

The relationship between caregiver and child can determine long-term outcomes in the way a child interprets social situations and deals with conflict. The attachment that develops between parent and child creates an atmosphere of trust and encourages healthy social relationships (Shaver et al., 2009). When children experience abuse or neglect, they are unable to interpret the intentions of others (Kokkinos, 2013; Shaver et al., 2009; Steinberg, 2010). Children can become overly dependent and aggressive when others do not fulfil their needs (Shaver et al., 2009). Although experiences during childhood might have a theoretical basis for bullying behavior, researchers must depend on self-reports and memory of adults (Reder & Duncan, 2001). Therefore, additional research is vital to understand the connection between childhood trauma and adult bullying.

Chapter 3: Research Method

Workplace bullying has a detrimental effect on the well-being of victims, the

organizations' profits, and the overall workplace environment. Investigating workplace

bullying from the bully's perspective has proven to be challenging due to the difficulty in

obtaining adult bully participants (Carbo, 2009). Embarrassment, fear of negative

consequences, or denial may prevent bullies from openly participating in workplace

bullying studies. It is also unethical to obtain a sample of individuals based on

accusations by victims or others (Coyne et al., 2004); therefore, it was necessary to

recruit a sample of bullies without making allegations. This study addressed the potential

relationship between workplace bullying, childhood abuse/neglect, adult abuse,

attachment style, and social dominance. The survey design included valid and reliable

scales to gather information on bullying behavior, childhood maltreatment, adult

maltreatment, the need for social dominance, and attachment style. In this chapter, I

describe the specific procedures for study.

Research Design and Rationale

I used a non-experimental quantitative method with a survey design. Responses to

the survey allowed me to assess the connection between bullying at work and

abuse/neglect during childhood, domestic violence, the need for social dominance, and

attachment style. A qualitative design would have provided specific information from

individuals about factors that contribute to bullying behavior, but the number of

participants would have limited the results (see Bordens & Abbott, 2005). Additionally,

anonymity would have been lost with a qualitative method because it would have

required personal communication with each individual. A quantitative method allowed for consistency in the type of information gathered, unlike a qualitative method in which answers might have varied considerably (see Bordens & Abbott, 2005).

Setting and Sample

The use of two different recruiting methods reduced the risk of biased enrollment of individuals accused of bullying. A Facebook page set up specifically for this study was used to explain the nature of the study, invite participants, and conduct the survey. The Facebook page provided a brief summary of how childhood abuse, neglect, and current abuse may affect an individual's interpersonal relationships. The page indicated that the purpose of this study was to investigate how these negative events influence coworker relationships. Requests made to Facebook visitors to forward the study information to their friends, family, and acquaintances might have yielded participants through *snowball* sampling (Rudestam & Newton, 2007). I used a third-party company to post the survey and gather the data to ensure anonymity. Specific conditions were required to answer the survey questions. Participants needed to be over the age of 18 and have worked or be currently working a full-time job. Answers to the questionnaire were used to determine whether the participant had used aggressive behavior that fit the definition of workplace bullying. Exclusion criteria included survey answers that did not indicate bullying behavior. A minimum of 84 participants were required to achieve a power of .80 and a medium effect size of .30 for valid results (Cohen, 1992).

Measures

Six scales made up the survey: the Social Dominance Q-Scale (Teisl et al., 2012), the Social Dominance Orientation Scale (Pratto et al., 1994), the Childhood Trauma Questionnaire – Short Form (Bernstein et al., 2003), the Coercion and Conflict Scale (Cook & Goodman, 2006), the Bullying Behavior Scale (Brotheridge & Lee, 2006), and the Adult Attachment Scale (Collins & Read, 1990). I removed scale names from the questionnaire to avoid directing or influencing participant answers. I also included a brief set of instructions between each scale for the participants to follow when answering that particular section.

Social Dominance

The Social Dominance Q-Scale is a 10-item scale used to measure trait social dominance as a higher social construct expressed through various coercive and cooperative forms (Teisl et al., 2012). Respondents record their answers on a 5-point Likert scale that ranges from "least characteristic" to "most characteristic" (Teisl et al., 2012). According to Teisl et al. (2012), this scale is used to measure social dominance without bias toward specific dominant behaviors such as aggression. In their study of 470 children from high-risk neighborhoods, Teisl et al. found that the Social Dominance Q-Scale assessed a factor separate from aggression or social competence. Using a principal components analysis that included social dominance, bullying, and social competence, Teisl et al. found a two-factor solution, one with -.81 for competence and .90 for bullying, with the other at .98 for dominance.

The Social Dominance Orientation Scale is a 16-item scale designed to measure attitudes and beliefs that some individuals are naturally superior or inferior to others as well as group equality (Pratto et al., 1994). Respondents are asked if they have positive or negative feelings toward each question. Participants record their answers on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from "extremely negative" to "extremely positive" (Pratto et al., 1994). Pratto et al. (1994) found that there was a moderate negative correlation of this scale with concern for others, tolerance, altruism, and communality. Additionally, Pratto et al. found a positive correlation with sexism, equal opportunities, patriotism, cultural elitism, conservatism, opposition to social programs, racial policies, women's rights, opposition to LGBT rights, and environmental programs. Overall, the scale showed good reliability with an average alpha of .83 (Pratto et al., 1994).

Childhood Abuse/Neglect

The Childhood Trauma Questionnaire – Short Form is a 25-item scale used to screen for maltreatment histories (Bernstein et al., 2003). Respondents record their answers on a 5-point Likert scale that ranges from "never true" to "very often true" (Bernstein et al., 2003). Using four separate samples, Bernstein et al. (2003) found that internal consistency of the scale ranged from .84 to .89 for emotional abuse, .81 to .86 for physical abuse, .92to .95 for sexual abuse, .88 to .91 for emotional neglect, and .61 to .78 for physical neglect. Comparing the responses of participants and ratings by therapists, Bernstein et al. found a close match supporting the discriminant and convergent validity of the scale.

Domestic Violence

The Coercion and Conflict Scale is a 13-item scale used to measure intimate partner violence (Cook & Goodman, 2006). Respondents record their answers on a 5-point Likert scale that ranges from "none of the time" to "all of the time" (Cook & Goodman, 2006) with the final selection of "N/A" for participants who are not currently in a romantic relationship. Internal consistency assessment revealed coefficient alphas of .71 for conflict and .74 for coercion (Cook & Goodman, 2006). Cook and Goodman (2006) found support for this instrument's validity in its ability to predict psychological, behavioral, and strategic responses.

Workplace Bullying

The Bullying Behaviors Scale (Brotheridge & Lee, 2006) is a 43-item instrument used to measures certain bullying behaviors directed at coworkers over the previous 6 months. Respondents record their answers on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "not at all" to "many times a week" (Brotheridge & Lee, 2006). This scale is unique in that it provides two options per question: "others did to me" and "I did to others" (Brotheridge & Lee, 2006). This dual option is used to distinguish between bullies and victims within the sample. Using a principal components analysis to test for validity, Brotheridge and Lee (2006) found three distinct factors that accounted for 43% of the variance: belittlement, work undermining, and verbal abuse (Brotheridge & Lee, 2006). Brotheridge and Lee used these emerging factors to create the subscales of the instrument. The validity tests indicated that the components of the subscales were moderately and positively interrelated, suggesting their use in combination to measure

workplace bullying (Brotheridge & Lee, 2006). Reliability testing indicated alpha coefficients of .94 for the entire Bullying Behavior Scale, .85 for belittlement, .91 for work undermined, and .81 for verbal abuse (Brotheridge & Lee, 2006). I used this scale to determine the prevalence of workplace bullying among the participants and to detect the types of bullying tactics used in the workplace.

Attachment Style

The Adult Attachment Scale (Collins & Read, 1990) is an 18-item scale used to measure the three attachment dimensions of dependence, anxiousness, and closeness of relationships. Participants record their answers using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "not at all characteristic" to "very characteristic" (Collins & Read, 1990). Collins and Read (1990) felt that the typical instruments used to research attachment theory included more than one aspect of attachment within each question. The Adult Attachment Scale is more sensitive than scales used in most attachment studies (Collins & Read, 1990). According to Collins and Read attachment dimensions have a direct relationship to self-esteem, expressiveness, instrumentality, trust in others, beliefs about human nature, and styles in loving others. The notion of dependence refers to how much an individual feels he or she can depend on others (Collins & Read, 1990). Anxiousness refers to feelings of possible abandonment and being unloved (Collins & Read, 1990). Closeness refers to the comfort an individual feels about connecting emotionally to others (Collins & Read, 1990). To test for validity, Collins and Read compared the results of this new attachment scale to others used to measure attachment styles. Because the intent of the Adult Attachment Scale was to measure a deeper dimension of attachment, Collins and Read

used a clustering method to ensure the scale measured the correct aspects of the

attachment styles outlined in attachment theory.

Collins and Read (1990) found that individuals who scored high on the

dependence and closeness aspects of the Adult Attachment Scale had greater trust than

those who scored low on these aspects. Individuals who scored high had a more positive

view of human nature and believed that people in general are altruistic (Collins & Read,

1990). Individuals who scored high in dependency and closeness believed they had

control over their lives and could easily adapt to changing social situations (Collins &

Read, 1990). In contrast, participants who scored low in dependency and closeness but

high in anxiety showed a tendency to be mistrustful of others, to have a low opinion of

self, and to conform to social pressures (Collins & Read, 1990). Reliability testing of the

Adult Attachment Scale included three different studies indicating a Cronbach's alpha of

.75, .72, and .69 (Collins & Read, 1990). A test-retest study using a subset of the original

sample resulted in Cronbach's alpha scores of .68, .71, and .52 (Collins & Read, 1990).

The developers stress the importance of integrating attachment theory in adult

relationship studies to gain a full understanding of the components that may govern

interactions and behaviors (Collins & Read, 1990).

Workplace bullying was the independent variable in this study with four

dependent variables: the need for social dominance, child abuse/neglect, domestic

violence, and attachment style. I investigated possible factors that may contribute to

bullying behavior within the workplace. Table 1 lists the instruments used to create the

survey, the question numbers on the survey, and the variables that each instrument

measured.

Table 1

Survey Instrument Match to Variables

Instrument	Workplace Bullying	Social Dominance	Childhood Abuse/Neglect	Domestic Violence	Attachment Style
Bullying Behavior Scale	*Q6 to Q46				
Social Dominance Q-Scale		*Q47 to Q56			
Social Dominance Orientation Scale		*Q57 to Q72			
Childhood Trauma Questionnaire – SF			*Q73 to Q97		
Coercion and Conflict Scales				*Q98 to Q110	
Adult Attachment Scale					*Q111 to Q126

Note, *Q is an abbreviation for Question, followed by the question number on the survey.

A copy of the survey is included in Appendix A. In a preliminary distribution of

the questionnaire to friends and family, I observed that the average length of time to

complete the survey was 15 minutes. The official distribution, however, indicated that

participants might have taken 30 minutes to complete the survey.

Data Analysis

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between workplace

bullying and childhood abuse/neglect, actual or perceived current victimization, the need

for social dominance, and attachment style. I chose an alpha level of .05 to indicate

significance of the analysis. Descriptive analyses included a frequency table that displayed the number of responses and the percentage of responses for each question.

Research Question 1: Is maltreatment during childhood such as abuse and neglect, related to workplace bullying?

H_{01}: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker do not report a history of abuse/neglect during childhood.

H_{a1}: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker report a history of abuse/neglect during childhood.

Research Question 2: Is current physical, psychological, or emotional abuse related to bullying others in the workplace?

H_{02}: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker do not report experiencing current physical, psychological, or emotional abuse.

H_{a2}: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker report experiencing current physical, psychological, or emotional abuse.

Research Question 3: Is the need for social dominance related to bullying coworkers in adulthood?

H_{03}: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker do not report a need for social dominance as measured by the survey questions.

H_{a3}: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker report a need for social dominance as measured by the survey questions.

Research Question 4: Is there a relationship between attachment style and bullying coworkers in adulthood?

*H*04: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker do not score high on anxiety as measured by the survey questions.

*H*a4: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker score high on anxiety as measured by the survey questions.

Research Question 5: Does the need for social dominance influence the relationship between childhood abuse/neglect and the use of bullying tactics toward coworkers in adulthood?

*H*05: A stronger relationship between childhood abuse/neglect and workplace bullying does not result from the moderating effects of social dominance for those participants who score high on the need for social dominance questions.

*H*a5: A stronger relationship between childhood abuse/neglect and workplace bullying does result from the moderating effects of social dominance for those participants who score high on the need for social dominance questions.

The Pearson correlation determined the relationship between the variables of hypotheses one through four. Separate Pearson correlations tested the relationships between workplace bullying and childhood abuse/neglect, workplace bullying and domestic violence, workplace bullying and social dominance, and workplace bullying and attachment style. Demographic variables such as age and job level provided insight into the prevalence and relationship to workplace bullying. A correlation analysis for hypotheses one through three using attachment style as the control variable described the linear relationship between childhood abuse/neglect, domestic violence, social

dominance, and workplace bullying. The results could have determined that an individual's relationship with his or her parents does not affect bullying behavior.

Testing for moderating effects of social dominance provided the strength of the childhood abuse/neglect and workplace bullying connection as well as the direction of the relationship (see Fairchild & MacKinnon, 2009). For example, if the scores for the social dominance questions were high, the relationship between workplace bullying and childhood abuse/neglect should be stronger than lower scores on the social dominance questions.

A separate regression analysis using the four dependent variables; childhood abuse/neglect, domestic violence, attachment style, and the need for social dominance predicted the likelihood of workplace bullying. Regression equations include one of the four dependent variables and workplace bullying. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) investigated potential connections or influences between the demographic characteristics of age, gender, income, job level, and industry with the frequency of occurrence of workplace bullying.

Threats to Validity

The results of the current study will not assume or imply that childhood abuse/neglect, domestic violence, need for social dominance, nor does attachment style cause workplace bullying. The sample of only individuals who have bullied coworkers however may cause difficulties in generalizing to larger populations. Each organization will address workplace bullying in a variety of ways, one company may have a zero tolerance with approachable managers while another may disregard the accusations.

Another consideration is how participants answered the questions on the survey. According to Brase and Brase (1999), people generally want to portray themselves as upstanding individuals. Many of the questions on the survey asked about behavior that is negative or disrespectful. It is possible that some of the participants tried to answer the questions in a way that misrepresented their actual experiences. The instruments used to create the survey are valid and standardized, but to eliminate response bias completely is not possible.

Ethical Considerations

The difficulty in obtaining samples of accused bullies has failed to provide researchers an understanding of the motives for workplace bullying. It is unethical to approach accused bullies based on reports from victims or employers (Coyne et al., 2004; Fahie, 2014). Therefore, all terminology that referred to bullying in the questions or instructions was removed. A third party Internet survey organization, Survey Monkey, housed the survey and Facebook advertisements provided an unbiased sample of respondents. The only personal information requested on the survey was age, gender, job level, income level, and type of industry that the respondent works. These precautions provided the respondents with anonymity.

Once the collection process ended, survey data was moved to an external hard drive for analysis. At the completion of the analysis, all data was transferred to a compact disk (CD) for long-term storage. There is no identifying information in the original survey responses or the retained data to ensure ongoing confidentiality. The only individuals who will have access to the data are the researcher and university faculty if

necessary. Retention of the CD is a minimum of five years after the final approval of the dissertation. Destruction of the CD and all data will take place once the minimum retention period has passed.

Summary

Workplace bullying is one of the most damaging phenomena's within an organization. Research on workplace bullying has consisted primarily of information collected from victims and organizations because of the difficulty in recruiting bully participants. There are ethical concerns in acquiring a sample of individuals based on accusations by companies or victims. The intention of this study was to explore a possible relationship between workplace bullying and childhood abuse/neglect, domestic violence, social dominance, and attachment style by obtaining the minimum sample of 84 individuals voluntarily. The Internet survey development company, Survey Monkey, stored the survey. Participant recruitment included advertising on Facebook and requesting visitors to the page forward the survey information to people they knew.

The use of a Facebook page and their advertising services provided a means to explain the nature of the study and included a link to the survey. The summary on the page provided potential participants a description of the possible negative effects that abuse has on coworker relationships. The summary indicated that the nature of this study was to explore how the trauma of abuse or neglect influences the relationships with coworkers. Once participants accessed the survey on Survey Monkey, they gave their consent by proceeding to the survey. Inclusion criteria to participate being over the age of 18 had or were currently working a full-time job. Exclusion criteria were survey

responses that did not indicate bullying activity. An analysis of the workplace bullying section of the survey determined which respondents participated in the study.

The survey consisted of 126 questions that included demographics and six standardized scales. The Social Dominance Q-Scale (Teisl et al., 2012) measured trait social dominance. The Social Dominance Orientation Scale (Pratto et al., 1994) measured the beliefs surrounding inherent superiority and inferiority of others. The Childhood Trauma Questionnaire – Short Form (Bernstein et al., 2003) measured histories of maltreatment during childhood. The Coercion and Conflict Scale (Cook & Goodman, 2006) measured abuse with current intimate partners. The Bullying Behaviors Scale (Brotheridge & Lee, 2006) measured the participation in bullying behavior at work. This particular scale has two options, behaviors used against others, and behaviors used against the participant. Finally, the Adult Attachment Scale (Collins & Read, 1990) measured the attachment styles of the participants.

This study was a non-experimental design using a quantitative method to analyze survey results. Workplace bullying was the independent variable with four dependent variables: childhood abuse/neglect, domestic violence, social dominance, and attachment style. The data analysis included examining the relationships between workplace bullying and childhood abuse/neglect, workplace bullying and domestic violence, workplace bullying and social dominance, and workplace bullying and attachment style using the Pearson correlation method. An analysis of variance test explored potential evidence of associations between the demographic information and the frequency of occurrence of workplace bullying. Examination of the moderating effects of social dominance indicated

the strength of the relationship between workplace bullying and childhood abuse/neglect. Regression analysis for each hypothesis predicted the likelihood of workplace bullying occurring and if one variable has a stronger influence in the likelihood of occurrence.

Finally, due to the ethical implications of this study, it was vital to obtain a sample of participants voluntarily. The purpose of this study was to investigate workplace bullying from the bully's perspective, acquiring a sample based on accusations from organizations or victims was unethical. I removed any term regarding bullying behavior from the instructions and questions to avoid inadvertent accusations. The personal information requested on the survey was general in nature that included age, gender, job level, income level, and type of industry prevented the disclosure of identifiable information. The use of Survey Monkey, a third party Internet company held the survey and provided an unbiased sample of participants meant to ensure anonymity.

Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this study was to investigate the potential relationships between workplace bullying and childhood abuse/neglect, domestic violence, need for social dominance, and anxious attachment style. I also examined whether the need for social dominance acted as a moderator in the relationship between workplace bullying and child abuse/neglect. There were five research questions each with a null and alternative hypothesis.

Research Question 1: Is maltreatment during childhood such as abuse and neglect, related to workplace bullying?

H_{01}: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker do not report a history of abuse/neglect during childhood.

H_{a1}: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker report a history of abuse/neglect during childhood.

Research Question 2: Is current physical, psychological, or emotional abuse related to bullying others in the workplace?

H_{02}: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker do not report experiencing current physical, psychological, or emotional abuse.

H_{a2}: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker report experiencing current physical, psychological, or emotional abuse.

Research Question 3: Is the need for social dominance related to bullying coworkers in adulthood?

H_{03}: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker do not report a need for social dominance as measured by the survey questions.

H_{a3}: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker report a need for social dominance as measured by the survey questions.

Research Question 4: Is there a relationship between attachment style and bullying coworkers in adulthood?

H_{04}: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker do not score high on anxiety as measured by the survey questions.

H_{a4}: Male and female participants who report using aggression toward a coworker score high on anxiety as measured by the survey questions.

Research Question 5: Does the need for social dominance influence the relationship between childhood abuse/neglect and the use of bullying tactics toward coworkers in adulthood?

H_{05}: A stronger relationship between childhood abuse/neglect and workplace bullying does not result from the moderating effects of social dominance for those participants who score high on the need for social dominance questions.

H_{a5}: A stronger relationship between childhood abuse/neglect and workplace bullying does result from the moderating effects of social dominance for those participants who score high on the need for social dominance questions.

In this chapter, I describe the data collection process including the instruments, recruitment of participants, and response rates. I also describe sample characteristics and demographics. The results section includes the results of hypothesis testing.

Data Collection

Recruitment Process

Advertising on Facebook provided the means to recruit participants. Even though it was sufficient to use only the advertising services, I created a special Facebook page to ensure that potential participants could see and respond to the ad. The advertising service only included a banner ad on the right side of member newsfeeds. The banner ad relied on potential respondents acknowledging the ad and clicking on it to participate in the study. By creating an actual Facebook page for the study (see Appendix B), I was able to have the advertising service send out a personal ad to members who fit the selection. The Facebook ad ran for 107 days with an initial daily budget of $1.00. In an effort to reach more potential participants, I increased the daily budget by $2.00 on Day 45 and Day 75. The target audience included individuals between the ages of 18 and 65. The Facebook page included a copy of the ad when first created as well as a request for participants on Days 48 and 102 with a study ending statement on Day 111 (see Appendix B). The ad had the potential of reaching approximately 1,800 Facebook members.

The total number of individuals who clicked on the survey website link was 860, but only 161 individuals chose to advance beyond the consent form located on the first page of the survey. The age response of three individuals indicated they were below the age of 18, resulting in deletion from the dataset. I removed the responses of two individuals who did not specify their age even though they indicated their employment and type of industry. An additional 20 individuals filled out the demographic information but failed to answer additional questions on the survey, resulting in deletion. Most of

these 20 individuals were women and 40% were between the ages of 40 and 49.

Additionally, 65% reported job levels of non-management with 35% earning below

$20,000 annually. According to the demographic responses, the individuals deleted from

the data set had similar characteristics as participants who finished the survey. The reason

why deleted individuals exited the survey prior to completion is unknown. Finally, the

responses of 10 individuals indicated that they did not use aggressive tactics toward

coworkers resulting in deletion from the dataset. The remaining participants totaled 126,

all of which indicated using bullying behavior toward their coworkers.

Sample Frequencies and Percentages

The sample (see Table 2) consisted of 88 women (70%) and 38 men (30%).

Although participants had a wide range of ages, the most frequent age range was between

40 and 49 (n = 31, 25%). Most of the participants held non-management positions (n =

70, 56%) working in retail, business support, and finance, although a wide variety of

industries were reported. Reported income ranged from below $20,000 to over $50,000

with a median range between $30,001 and $40,000 annually ($n$ = 33, 26%).

Table 2

Frequencies and Percentages for Nominal and Ordinal Variables

Variable	n	%
Age		
18-20	6	4.8
21-29	20	15.9
30-39	28	22.2
40-49	31	24.6
50-59	27	21.4
60 or older	14	11.1
Gender		
Female	88	69.8
Male	38	30.2
Income		
Below 20,000	19	15.1
20,001 – 30,000	24	19.0
30,001 - 40,000	33	26.2
40,001 - 50,000	18	14.3
Above 50,000	32	25.4
JLevel		
Executive	11	8.7
Management	22	17.5
Supervisor	21	16.7
Non- management	70	55.6
Industry		
Business support	15	11.9
Education	9	7.1
Financial services	16	12.7
Healthcare	9	7.1
Manufacturing	11	8.7
Retail	21	16.7
Telecommunications/IT	8	6.3

Note, Workplace bullying responses are missing from two participants.

Means and Standard Deviations

The observations for social dominance need ranged from 0.00 to 9.00, with an average of 5.51 ($SD = 1.17$). The observations for childhood abuse/neglect ranged from 0.00 to 5.00, with an average of 1.95 ($SD = 1.09$). The observations for domestic violence ranged from 0.00 to 5.00, with an average of 1.94 ($SD = 2.11$). The observations for workplace bullying ranged from 0.00 to 3.00, with an average of 1.75 ($SD = 0.58$). The observations for secure attachment style ranged from 0.00 to 5.00, with an average of 2.65 ($SD = 1.19$). The observations for avoidant attachment style ranged from 0.00 to 5.00, with an average of 3.02 ($SD = 1.23$). The observations for anxious attachment style ranged from 0.00 to 5.00, with an average of 2.34 ($SD = 1.04$). See Table 3 for descriptive details.

Instrument Frequencies and Percentages

There were six scales included in the survey for this study: the Bullying Behavior Scale (Brotheridge & Lee, 2006), the Social Dominance Q-Scale (Teisl et al., 2012), the Social Dominance Orientation Scale (Pratto et al., 1994), the Childhood Trauma Questionnaire – Short Form (Bernstein et al., 2003), the Coercion and Conflict Scale (Cook & Goodman, 2006), and the Adult Attachment Scale (Collins & Read, 1990). The Bullying Behavior Scale (Brotheridge & Lee, 2006) was used to measure the occurrence of workplace bullying and to determine the inclusion of participants in this study. If respondents indicated using bullying tactics toward their coworkers on the Bullying Behavior Scale, their remaining scores were included in the study. This scale asked the participants to choose how often they were the victim of bullying at work and how often

they bullied a coworker. The results indicate that 61% of participants were the victims of bullying over the previous 6 months and 50% bullied a coworker during the same timeframe. Over half of the participants ($n = 70$, 55%) experienced victimization while also bullying their coworkers. According to the demographic responses, this group of bully/victims did not differ significantly from the rest of the participants: 79% were women, 47% were between the age of 30 and 49, and 56% were in non-management positions with a reported income between $30,001 and $40,000.

The Social Dominance Q-Scale (Teisl et al., 2012) was used to measure trait social dominance as a higher construct that can take the form of bullying or collaboration. The Social Dominance Orientation Scale (Pratto et al., 1994) was used to measure attitudes and beliefs about group equality and the supremacy or inferiority of different individuals. A composite score from the Social Dominance Q-Scale and Social Dominance Orientation Scale was used to determine the independent variable of social dominance need. The results indicated that 81% of participants scored in the moderate range of social dominance need, one individual scored in the low range, and the remaining 17% scoring in the high range.

The Childhood Trauma Questionnaire – Short Form (Bernstein et al., 2003) was used to measure participants' experiences of child abuse/neglect. The results indicated that 43% of participants did not experience childhood abuse or neglect, 14% rarely experienced abuse/neglect, 13% experienced abuse/neglect sometimes, 12% experienced abuse/neglect often, and 15% of the participants experienced abuse/neglect frequently.

The Coercive and Conflict Scale (Cook & Goodman, 2006) was used to measure current abuse/neglect such as the behaviors that occur in domestic violence situations. The scores indicated that 29% of participants were not in a relationship at the time of the study. The other responses indicated that 45% did not experience domestic violence, 18% experienced violence some of the time, 2% reported violence half of the time, 2% reported experiencing violence more than half of the time, and 1% reported currently experiencing domestic violence all of the time.

The Adult Attachment Scale (Collins & Read, 1990) was used to determine the attachment style of each participant based on styles found in attachment theory. The results indicated that some of the participants did not respond to this scale ($n = 8$, 6%). Nine (7%) individuals responded to the scale with all of the same scores for each question. The results showed that 14 (11%) individuals scored moderate in avoidant attachment styles, 10 (8%) scored moderate in secure attachment style, and seven (6%) scored moderate in anxious attachment style. Results indicated that 39 (31%) participants scored high in avoidant attachment styles. The scores showed that 34 (27%) of the participants were highly secure in forming attachments. Finally, five (4%) participants scored high in anxious attachment style. Table 3 provides details on the frequency and percentages of responses.

Table 3

Frequencies and Percentages for Instrument Responses

Instrument	n	%
Bullying Behavior Scale		
Others did to me	77	61
I did to others	62	50
Bully/victims	70	55
Social Dominance Q-Scale and		
Social Dominance Orientation Scale		
Low	1	1
Moderate	102	81
High	21	17
Childhood Trauma Questionnaire - SF		
Never true	54	43
Rarely true	17	14
Sometimes true	17	13
Often true	14	12
Very often true	18	15
Coercion and Conflict Scale		
None of the time	56	45
Some of the time	22	18
Half the time	2	2
More than half the time	3	2
All of the time	1	1
Adult Attachment Style		
Secure – mod	10	8
Secure – high	34	27
Avoidant – mod	14	11
Avoidant – high	39	31
Anxious – mod	7	6
Anxious – high	5	4
Undetermined	9	7
No response	8	6

Results

Analysis of Variance

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) tested the association and mean differences between age, gender, income, job level, and industry to the frequency in occurrence of workplace bullying. The assumption of homogeneity of variances was tested for age and was found tenable using Levene's test $F(5, 120) = .93$, $\rho = .47$. The results of the ANOVA for age was not significant $F(5, 120) = .488$, $\rho = .79$. The Levene test of homogeneity of variance for gender indicated acceptable results $F(1, 124) = 1.37$, $\rho = .24$, but the results of the ANOVA for gender was not significant $F(1, 124) = .305$, $\rho = .58$. There was a violation of the assumption of homogeneity of variance for income according to the results of the Levene test making it was necessary to test the variance for income using the Welch test. The results of the Welch test for income was statistically significant $F(4, 121) = 4.417$, $\rho = .004$. $\eta2 = .12$. Although there was a medium effect size, income levels below \$20,000 and \$30,001 - \$40,000 had the strongest relationship to the occurrence of workplace bullying. Individuals who earn annual incomes between \$30,001 and \$40,000 ($M = 2.00$, $SD = .43$, $n = 33$) had a greater frequency of workplace bullying than individuals who earn below \$20,000 ($M = 1.42$, $SD = .61$, $n = 19$). The Levene test for the assumption of homogeneity of variances for job level was found tenable $F(3, 120) = 2.47$, $\rho = .07$. The results of the ANOVA for job level was not significant $F(3, 120) = 2.094$, $\rho = .11$. Similar to the results for income, the Levene test for industry type indicated the assumption was violated making it necessary to use the Welch test. The results of the Welch test for industry type was statistically significant

F(11, 105) = 2.455, ρ = .04. η2 = .19. Although the effect size is large, the main

difference was found between education (*M* = 1.33, *SD* = .71, *n* = 9) and business

support/logistics (*M* = 2.07, *SD* = .26, *n* = 15), which accounts for most of the effect size.

This suggests that individuals who work in business support/logistics tend to report a

greater frequency of workplace bullying than people who work in education. Table 4

details the results of the analysis of variance for the demographic variables.

Table 4

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) between Demographic Variables and Workplace Bullying.

	df	*F*	*η2*	*ρ*
Age	5	.488	-	.785
Gender	1	.305	-	.582
Income	4	4.417	.12	.004
Job Level	3	2.094	-	.105
Industry	11	2.455	.19	.040

Note, *N* = 126

Pearson Correlation

Research question one asks if maltreatment during childhood such as abuse and

neglect related to workplace bullying. The null hypothesis indicates that participants who

report using aggression toward a coworker do not report a history of abuse or neglect

during childhood. The alternative hypothesis indicates that the participants report a

history of abuse/neglect during childhood. The results showed a significant negative

correlation between workplace bullying and childhood abuse/neglect *r* = -0.25, *ρ* = .005,

n = 126 indicating that greater levels of reported childhood abuse/neglect are associated

with lower levels of reported workplace bullying. This result leads to a rejection of the

null hypothesis.

Research question two asks if current physical, psychological, or emotional abuse related bullying others in the workplace. The null hypothesis specifies that participants who report using aggression toward a coworker do not report experiencing current physical, psychological, or emotional abuse. In contrast, the alternative hypothesis indicates that participants report experiencing current physical, psychological, or emotional abuse. The outcome showed there is no significant correlation between workplace bullying and domestic violence, $r = 0.06$, $\rho = .517$, $n = 126$, resulting in retention of the null hypothesis.

Research question three asks if the need for social dominance related to bullying coworkers in adulthood. The null hypothesis indicates that individuals who report using aggression toward a coworker do not report a need for social dominance. In contrast, the alternative hypothesis states that individuals who report using aggression toward a coworker report a need for social dominance. The results indicated that there is no significant relationship between workplace bullying and the need for social dominance, $r = -0.02$, $\rho = .805$, $n = 126$, retaining the null hypothesis.

Research question four asks if there is a relationship between attachment style and bullying coworkers in adulthood. The null hypothesis indicates that participants who report using aggression toward a coworker do not score high on anxious attachment style as measured by the survey questions. The alternative hypothesis indicates that participants who report using aggression toward a coworker score high on anxious attachment style as measured by the survey questions. The results indicated there is not a

relationship between workplace bullying and high anxious attachment style, $r = -0.17$, $\rho = .789$, $n = 126$, resulting in retention of the null hypothesis.

The results of the correlation analysis indicated a significant positive correlation between social dominance need and childhood abuse/neglect, $r = 0.31$, $\rho < .001$, $n = 126$, suggesting a greater level of reported social dominance is associated with greater levels of reported childhood abuse/neglect. The analysis did not identify other significant relationships among the independent variables. Table 5 presents the results of the correlation analyses.

Table 5

Pearson Correlation Matrix Between Social Dominance Need, Childhood Abuse/Neglect, Domestic Violence, Workplace Bullying, Secure, Avoidant, and Anxious Attachment Styles

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.Social Dominance Need	-									
2.Childhood Abuse/Neg.	0.31**	-								
3.Domestic Violence	0.06	0.11	-							
4.Workplace Bullying	-0.02	-0.25**	0.06	-						
5.Secure Moderate	-	-	-	-	-					
6.Secure High	-0.02	0.10	0.40	0.06	-	-				
7.Avoidant Moderate	-	-	0.09	-	-	-	-			
8.Avoidant High	0.12	0.09	-0.06	0.24	-	-	-	-		
9.Anxious Moderate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
10.Anxious High	0.33	-	-0.31	0.17	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note, ** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Linear Regression Analysis

Testing for multicollinearity did not identify an impact to the variance in workplace bullying. Plotting the model residuals against the predicted model values tested the assumptions of normality and homoscedasticity. The results of the regression analysis for childhood abuse/neglect was significant, $F(1,124) = 7.28$, $\rho = .008$, R2 = 0.06, indicating that childhood abuse/neglect explains 6% of the variance in workplace bullying.

Moderation

Research question five asks if the need for social dominance influences the relationship between childhood abuse/neglect and the use of bullying tactics toward coworkers in adulthood. The null hypothesis suggests a stronger relationship between childhood abuse/neglect and workplace bullying does not result from the moderating effects of social dominance for those participants who score high on the need for social dominance questions. The alternative hypothesis indicates that a stronger relationship between childhood abuse/neglect and workplace bullying does result from the moderating effects of social dominance for those participants who score high on the need for social dominance questions. A Baron and Kenny (1986) moderation analysis assessed the moderating effects of social dominance need on the relationship between childhood abuse/neglect and workplace bullying. For better interpretability, childhood abuse/neglect and social dominance need, the independent and moderator variable respectively, were mean centered.

In the first step, I created a regression model with workplace bullying as the

outcome variable with childhood abuse/neglect and social dominance as predictors. In the

second step, I created a regression model that included the interaction between childhood

abuse/neglect and social dominance. In the first step, the variables accounted for a

significant amount of the variance in workplace bullying, $F(2, 123) = 4.05$, $\rho = .020$. The

second step included the interaction term. While childhood abuse/neglect, $B = -.14$, $\rho = $

$.005$, was a significant predictor in reducing the occurrence of workplace bullying, social

dominance need was not significant, $B = .04$, $\rho = .365$. There was evidence that

moderation had not occurred, $B = -.02$, $\rho = .624$. Table 6 presents the results of the

regression models.

Table 6

Regression Results with Social Dominance Need Moderating the Relationship between Childhood Abuse/Neglect and Workplace Bullying.

		B	*SE*	*t*	*ρ*
Step 1:	Workplace Bullying (Intercept)	1.79	0.24	7.35	0.000
	Childhood Abuse/Neglect	-0.14	0.05	-2.85	0.005
	Social Dominance Need	0.04	0.05	0.91	0.365
Step 2:	Workplace Bullying (Intercept)	1.67	0.35	4.82	0.000
	Childhood Abuse/Neglect	-0.06	0.18	-0.32	0.752
	Social Dominance Need	0.06	0.07	0.98	0.329
	Childhood Abuse/NeglectXSocial Dom. Need	-0.02	0.03	-0.49	0.624

Summary

This study explored the relationships between workplace bullying and childhood

abuse/neglect, domestic violence, social dominance need, and attachment style. This

study also examined the moderating effects that social dominance had on the relationship

between workplace bullying and childhood abuse/neglect. The recruitment process

included of advertising on Facebook targeting individuals above the age of 18. Even

though the ad had the potential of reaching over 1,800 Facebook members, only 860

clicked on the ad that took them to the survey. Out of the 860, only 161 individuals

advanced passed the consent form and into the survey. It was necessary to delete the

responses of 35 individuals due to an invalid age response, missing data, or did not

engage in workplace bullying; leaving a sample of 126 participants. The sample consisted

of 88 women and 38 men with most ranging in age between 40 and 49 years. Most of the

participants reported non-management positions working in industries of retail, business

support, and finance. The majority of the sample reported an average income between

$30,001 and $40,000. There is no comparison as to how this particular sample stands up

to the rest of the population, but over half of the respondents indicated using bullying

tactics against coworkers.

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) tested potential connections or influences

between demographic characteristics of age, gender, income, job level, and industry and

the frequency of workplace bullying. The results of the ANOVA for age, gender, and job

level was not significant, however income and industry resulted in significant findings.

The analysis for income showed a medium effect size for annual income levels below

$20,000 and between $30,001 and $40,000. The results for industry indicated a large

effect size for education and business support/logistics.

The Pearson correlation addressed research questions one through four. The

results showed a significant negative relationship between maltreatment during childhood

and bullying others in adulthood confirming research question one and rejecting the null

hypothesis. There was no relationship found between workplace bullying and domestic violence resulting in retention of the null hypothesis for research question two. The outcome for research question three did not find a significant relationship between social dominance need and workplace bullying resulting in retention of the null hypothesis. There was no relationship between workplace bullying and a high score on anxious attachment style resulting in retention of the null hypothesis for research question four. The analysis indicated a relationship between the independent variables of childhood abuse/neglect and social dominance need, but the impact to the variance of workplace bullying was negligible.

To address research question five, the first step consisted of creating a regression model with childhood abuse/neglect and social dominance need as predictors of workplace bullying. The results of the first step indicated that childhood abuse/neglect accounted for a significant amount of variance in workplace bullying. The second step added the interaction of social dominance need with the relationship between childhood abuse/neglect and workplace bullying. Adding social dominance need did not yield significant results indicating no moderation effect occurred.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Overview

Study Topic

The purpose of this study was to explore potential causes of workplace bullying. Specifically, I explored possible relationships between workplace bullying and childhood abuse/neglect, domestic violence, need for social dominance, and attachment style. Workplace bullying has increased over the past two decades and has included a number of fatal incidents (Cook, 2004; Deneberg & Denenberg, 1996). Namie and Namie (2009) suggested that workplace bullying afflicts one in six workers each day, Smith (2014) indicated 21% of employees experience bullying, and other researchers have found the occurrence as high as 29% (Zabrodska & Kveton, 2013). Workplace bullying has become such a global problem that some countries like France and Sweden have passed legislation to protect employees by holding both the bully and company responsible (Kaplan, 2010). Bullying tactics reportedly used against victims include humiliation, mocking, ridicule, physical altercations, and sabotage (Einarsen et al., 2009; Johnson & Trad, 2014; Namie & Namie, 2009; Trad, & Johnson, 2014). The stress experienced by victims of workplace bullying is usually based on small incidents that can be easily hidden and dismissed by management causing feelings of helplessness and powerlessness in victims. In most cases victims remove themselves from the situation by resigning; however, depending on the mental stability of the victim, suicide or revenge may result (Djurkovic et al., 2008; Srabstein, 2013). Research indicated that workplace bullying affects the victim's external environment such as relationships with friends and family,

and has an adverse effect on work performance (Bibi et al., 2013; Celep & Konakli, 2013; Djurkovic et al., 2006; Ekici, & Beder, 2014; Misawa & Rowland, 2015; Namie & Namie, 2009; Oladapo & Banks, 2013; Sansone et al., 2013; Trad, & Johnson, 2014; Tuckey & Neall, 2014). Workplace bullying also has a detrimental effect on the profit margins of the organization through decreased production and retraining efforts (Bano & Malik, 2013; Oladapo & Banks, 2013). Most research on workplace bullying has concentrated on the impact to the victims and organizations involved; although helpful, and have provided insight into the phenomenon, information from the bully's perspective is lacking. This study contributed to the literature by addressing the perpetrators of workplace bullying.

To understand adult bullying in the workplace, it was important to examine possible causes that might stem from childhood experiences such as abuse and or neglect. Researchers found that in many cases, children exposed to violence, abuse, and neglect use bullying strategies to avoid further victimization and may use these strategies well into adulthood (Baldry, 2003, 2005; Bauer et al., 2006; Bowes et al., 2009; Dussich & Maekoya, 2007; Shields & Cicchetti, 2001; Shujja et al., 2014; Vaillancourt & McDougall, 2013). In addition to exploring the possible connections between childhood abuse/neglect to workplace bullying, I also examined domestic violence victimization, the need for social dominance, and attachment style. Furthermore, I examined the possible influence of the need for social dominance on the connection between childhood abuse/neglect and workplace bullying.

Research Questions

Five research questions were used to guide the study. The first research question addressed the relationship between maltreatment during childhood such as abuse/neglect and workplace bullying. The second research question addressed the relationship between current abuse such as that which occurs in domestic violence situations and bullying coworkers. Research Question 3 addressed the relationship between the need for social dominance and bullying coworkers in adulthood. The fourth research question addressed the relationship between anxious attachment style and bullying others in adulthood. Finally, Research Question 5 addressed whether the need for social dominance influenced the relationship between childhood abuse/neglect and workplace bullying.

Findings

I began the analysis by examining the relationship between demographic information and workplace bullying. The results of the ANOVA for age, gender, and job level were not significant. The non-significant findings for gender and job level were somewhat surprising given that women composed 70% of the sample. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2016), as of 2015 women occupied most mid-level positions in industries such as business support (64%), education (69%), healthcare (79%), and financial services (53%). Even though the landscape of the workforce has been slowly changing (Shen-Miller & Smiler, 2015), most low- to mid-level positions are held by women. Therefore, it seemed likely that gender and job level would have produced significant results. Workplace bullying consists primarily of relational behaviors, which women tend to engage in more than men do (Dominguez, 2013; Guerra et al., 2011;

Turner et al., 2014). Although women in the United States are not as suppressed as in countries such as Bengal (Dutta, 2013), many companies create an atmosphere of competition and stress with low wages and few promotions that contributes to the likelihood of workplace bullying (Blase & Blase, 2006; Duffy, 2009; Leo et al., 2014; Petrescu-Prahova & Stiller, 2016). Again, considering that most of the sample included women with low to medium incomes, it seemed likely that gender and workplace bullying would have yielded significant results. The analysis for income was statistically significant indicating 10% of the variance in workplace bullying. Incomes below $20,000 and those between $30,001 and $40,000 were significantly associated with the occurrence of workplace bullying. The result of the Welch test for industry was statistically significant indicating 11% of the variance stemming primarily from education and business support/logistics industries. These results suggested that low wages, competitive work environments, and excessive stress might explain why workplace bullying occurs so often.

A Pearson correlation analysis was used to answer Research Questions 1-4. The results for the first research question addressing the relationship between childhood abuse/neglect and workplace bullying were statistically significant. However, the results indicated a negative correlation suggesting that a history of abuse or neglect during childhood is associated with lower levels of reported workplace bullying occurrences. This result was unexpected. The assumption underlying the alternative hypothesis for the first research question was that abused or neglected children would develop deep-seated anger and a need to lash out at others. Bullying others in the workplace would provide a

means to take control of life where control was lacking as a child (Hamilton et al., 2013).

There could be a number of reasons for this finding. Hooven, Nurius, Logan-Greene, and

Thompson (2012) suggested that the mental health and accompanying behaviors of adults

who experienced childhood abuse/neglect vary with the type and severity of the

experience. It is possible that some participants viewed their experiences during

childhood as abuse or neglect while others viewed the treatment as a normal part of

childhood. Exposure to maltreatment in multiple domains tends to increase the negative

effects on mental health (Hooven et al., 2012). Hooven et al. also found that childhood

abuse/neglect was associated with victimization rather than bullying behavior

compounded by family dysfunction. Klest (2012) found that childhood traumas as well as

dissociation are strong predictors of adult victimization rather than aggression. The

analyses for the current study included separating the responses by gender. The results for

Research Question 1 indicated a slight negative correlation between childhood

abuse/neglect and workplace bullying in the responses of male participants, but not

strong enough to produce a significant outcome. In contrast, results for female

participants indicated a stronger negative correlation between childhood abuse/neglect

and workplace bullying.

The results for Research Question 2 addressing the relationship between current

domestic violence and workplace bullying were not significant. This finding was not

consistent with other finding on the association between childhood abuse and domestic

violence perpetration. Millett, Kohl, Jonson-Reid, Drake, and Petra (2013) found that

childhood maltreatment significantly predicted intimate partner perpetration, even when

controlling for substance abuse and mental health problems. However, the sample was mainly men, which might explain the difference in results compared to the current study, which included mostly women. Additionally, Millett et al.'s sample consisted of African American men, which might introduce a cultural component that was beyond the scope of the current study. I did not collect data on race, which might have provided a clearer explanation of the results for Research Question 2. Jennings, Richards, Tomsich, Gover, and Powers (2013) found that childhood abuse is not a causal factor in domestic violence perpetration when accounting for relevant confounding variables. Child abuse/neglect may contribute to adult aggressive behavior through witnessing domestic violence from caregivers; however, other factors must be present in the lives of victims to establish an association with domestic violence perpetration (Jennings et al., 2013).

The results for Research Question 3 addressing the relationship between the need for social dominance and workplace bullying were not significant. Goodboy, Martin, and Rittenour (2016) found a significant association between the need for social dominance and bullying behavior, but only among male participants. Specifically, physical victimization and attacks on property were statistically significant for male participants but not significant for female participants (Goodboy et al., 2016). This finding appears to be consistent with the current study, which included mostly female participants. It is possible that other motivating factors provoke bullying behavior in women.

The results for Research Question 4 indicated no significant correlation between anxious attachment style and workplace bullying. Schimmenti and Bifulco (2015) found that children who experienced abuse/neglect and formed an insecure attachment to

caregivers had a greater tendency to develop anxiety disorders in adulthood. Schimmenti and Bifulco indicated that the more severe the emotional neglect such as parental hostility, rejection, and coldness, the higher the risk of anxiety disorders. These individuals were more likely to experience victimization in the workplace than to perpetrate bullying against a coworker. Cyr, Pasalich, McMahon, and Spieker (2014) found that insecure attachment significantly predicts conduct problems and aggression by the first grade. There may be intervening experiences or factors that reduce or eliminate aggressive behavior between childhood and adulthood. To identify a possible impact of attachment style on workplace bullying in the current study, I separated responses into categories of secure moderate, secure high, avoidant moderate, avoidant high, anxious moderate, and anxious high. The results did not indicate significant relationships between attachment style and the occurrence of workplace bullying.

Results indicated a correlation between the need for social dominance and childhood abuse/neglect; however, the impact on workplace bullying was minimal. The regression analysis indicated that childhood abuse/neglect explained 6% of the variance in workplace bullying. To answer Research Question 5, I constructed a regression model with childhood abuse/neglect and the need for social dominance as predictors and workplace bullying as the outcome. Findings indicated that no moderation occurred.

Future Research

This study addressed only a small portion of the possible factors in workplace bullying. The results did not indicate that childhood abuse/neglect, current domestic violence, the need for social dominance, or anxious attachment style predicts workplace

bullying. The results indicated that the more child abuse/neglect reported, the less workplace bullying occurs. Future research efforts need to be focused on other factors that may instigate bullying behavior in individuals such as personality disorders. Even though there was a wide range of industries reported, most of the participants reported similar incomes in non-management positions. There may be similar environmental factors or undue pressure placed on individuals at these levels that prompt bullying behavior in certain people. Future researchers might focus efforts on common factors found in most industries at organizational and human resource levels.

Limitations

The design of this study was an attempt to avoid the limitations experienced by other researchers such as using convenience samples (Ferris, 2009) or investigating only one industry (Scott et al., 2013). Regardless of taking certain precautions, this study had numerous limitations. First, I used self-report instruments to gather data. Numerous other studies on workplace bullying suggest that the use of self-report mechanisms risk participant bias (Hershcovis, & Reich, 2013; Tuckey et al., 2009). There was no way of preventing participants from using the survey to express anger, resentment, or exaggerate the frequency of experiences. Likewise, it is difficult to know if individuals who have perpetrated bullying underreported behaviors. The collection process included precautionary measures to maintain anonymity of the participants reducing the risk of bias.

Another limitation of this study is the risk of misinterpretation of survey questions regardless of using standardized scales. The beliefs and values of the participants may

have influenced the way questions were answered. Although the term bullying did not appear in the summary, instructions, or survey questions, some questions regarding various acts against other individuals were open to interpretation. The scales that were included on the survey were not able to assess all types of bullying behavior. This increased the risk of misinterpretation that could have led to inaccurate responses to some questions. Culture might have also influenced the answered from the participants. Lam and Liu (2007) indicated that cultural differences tend to influence the meaning of bullying and victimization. If an individual's family environment viewed aggression as acceptable behavior, he or she may not see the behaviors described in the survey questions as negative. Investigation of the cultural differences and moral perceptions about bullying was beyond the scope of this study.

Another limitation of the current study was the number of questions included on the survey. This issue was obvious with the lack of some responses resulting in deletion and the way some participants responding with the same scores across the different attachment style questions. Even though only a sample of 84 participants were needed to achieve a power of .80 (Cohen, 1992), 126 respondents might be too low to understand the full complexity of workplace bullying from the bully's perspective. As previous research has indicated, obtaining a sample of individuals who admit they are bullies is very difficult (Carbo, 2009). The design of this study was to elicit information from bullies without making accusations or depending on the opinions of others while trying to ensure anonymity. Future research on workplace bullying from the bully's perspective

should focus on larger sample sizes to achieve a broader understanding of the phenomena.

Social Change

The intent of this study was to add to the literature by addressing possible causes of workplace bullying. The results did not support the assumptions that childhood experiences of abuse/neglect, existing domestic violence, and the need for social dominance promote the use of aggression toward coworkers. According to the results, individuals with traumatic experiences of abuse during childhood, individuals with an insecure attachment to caregivers, and individuals who do not report social dominance need are more likely to become victims rather than perpetrators of workplace bullying. This information may provide mental health professionals with an understanding that adult bullying may not stem from experiences of abuse during childhood, but is more complex. The results of this study may help mental health professionals focus on other factors when presented with workplace issues. Although the results indicated that children who experience abuse/neglect might be more vulnerable to victimization, there is still the risk of mental instability resulting in retaliatory or suicidal behavior (Klomek et al., 2011; Zirkel, 2013). Findings may also be used to raise awareness of workplace bullying so that organizations can design or modify training methods, workplace environments, and policies that will empower workers and alleviate some of the conflict that occurs on the job. Most bullying programs in schools have focused on prevention programs (Holt et al., 2007). The results from this study suggest the need to identify children who are victims of bullying and provide them with a safe place to share their

experiences. Finally, U.S. policy-makers may benefit from the results of the study by gaining a deeper understanding of workplace bullying.

Conclusions

It is important to note that the nature of this study was exploratory. Few studies have focused on workplace bullying by collecting data from perpetrators. The research questions addressed the expectation that experiences of abuse or neglect in childhood would prompt the use of aggression against coworkers in adulthood. The results contradict that notion suggesting that mistreatment during childhood is more likely to evoke victimization rather than aggression. Workplace bullying can cause psychological and emotional harm to the victims including depression, anxiety, low self-esteem, distrust, and poor concentration (Blase & Blase, 2006; Constantinescu, 2014; Pomeroy, 2013; Trad & Johnson, 2014; Taylor, 2013; Trépanier, et al., 2013, 2015). Workplace bullying has been found to have detrimental effects on organizations in lost production (Bano & Malik, 2013; Oladapo & Banks, 2013), high turnover and retraining rates (Trépanier, et al., 2015), and civil law suits (Carbo, 2009). The perpetrators of workplace bullying may have trouble forming interpersonal relationships resulting in increased adverse behavior (Courtney & Wann, 2010).

This study demonstrated the complexity of workplace bullying by potentially reducing the likelihood of possible causes. The results indicated that childhood abuse/neglect, domestic violence, need for social dominance, and anxious attachment style does not predict workplace bullying. However, there were common attributes found in participant income and industry that seemed to have an effect on the occurrence of

workplace bullying. Unlike previous research that used convenience samples (i.e. Ireland & Power, 2004; Carbo & Hughes, 2010; Okaurame, 2013; Omizo et al., 2006; Parkins et al., 2006), this study attempted to open the survey to the general public. As a result, there was wide variation in the number of industries reported by the respondents. The results did not indicate the use of bullying strategies to avoid victimization as suggested by other researchers (Baldry, 2003, 2005; Bauer et al., 2006; Bowes et al., 2009; Dussich & Maekoya, 2007; Shields & Cicchetti, 2001; Shujja et al., 2014; Vaillancourt & McDougall, 2013). The results indicated that individuals who experience abuse in childhood are more likely to continue to experience victimization rather than to become aggressive. It is important that additional research in this field continue to confirm these results. The impact could affect organizational environments, policies regarding bullying behavior, and training. The results might also influence legislation that protects victims of workplace bullying. Ultimately, mental health professionals might understand the increased risk of childhood experiences and adult victimization. Considering the amount of harm that can happen to victims, organizations, and perpetrators it is vital that research on workplace bullying continues. There will always be conflict in the workplace, but it is important to reduce the risk of conflict that caused psychological, physiological, and financial damage to all involved.

References

Aasland, M., Skogstad, A., Notelaers, G., Nielsen, M., & Einarsen, S. (2010). The
prevalence of destructive leadership behaviour. *British Journal of Management*,
21(2), 438-452. doi:10.1037/t03624-000

Addington, J., Stowkowy, J., Cadenhead, K. S., Cornblatt, B. A., McGlashan, T. H.,
Perkins, D. O., ... Cannon, T. D. (2013). Early traumatic experiences in those at
clinical high risk for psychosis. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry*, *7*(3), 300-305.
doi:10.1111/eip.12020

Allen, K. P. (2013). Understanding bullying in an affluent, academically rigorous U.S.
high school: A grounded theory analysis. *Journal of Human Behavior in the
Social Environment*, *23*(4), 413-436. doi:10.1080/10911359.2013.771523

Ariza-Montes, A., Muniz, N. M., Montero-Simó, M. J., & Araque-Padilla, R. A. (2013).
Workplace bullying among healthcare workers. *International Journal of
Environmental Research and Public Health*, *10*(8), 3121-3139.
doi:10.3390/ijerph10083121

Ariza-Montes, J. A., Muniz R, N. M., Leal-Rodríguez, A. L., & Leal-Millán, A. G.
(2014). Workplace bullying among managers: A multifactorial perspective and
understanding. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public
Health*, *11*(3), 2657-2682. doi:10.3390/ijerph110302657

Astrauskaite, M., Kern, R. M., & Notelaers, G. (2014). An individual psychology
approach to underlying factors of workplace bullying. *Journal of Individual
Psychology*, *70*(3), 220-244. doi:10.1353/jip.2014.0020

Baillien, E., Neyens, I., De Witte, H., & De Cuyper, N. (2009). A qualitative study on the development of workplace bullying: Towards a three way model. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 19*(1), 1-16. doi:10.1002/casp.977

Baldry A. C. (2003). Bullying in schools and exposure to domestic violence. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 27*, 713-732. doi:10.1016/S0145-2134(03)00114-5

Baldry, A. C. (2005). Animal abuse among preadolescents directly and indirectly victimized at school and at home. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, *15*(2), 97-110. doi:10.1002/cbm.42

Bano, S., & Malik, S. (2013). Impact of workplace bullying on organizational outcome. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce & Social Sciences*, *7*(3), 618-627.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 1173-1182. doi:0022-3514

Bauer N. S., Herrenkohl T. I., Lozano P., Rivara F. P., Hill K. G., & Hawkins J. D. (2006). Childhood bullying involvement and exposure to intimate partner violence. *Pediatrics, 118*(2), e235-e242.

Baughman, H. M., Dearubg, S. S., Giammarco, E. E., & Vernon, P. A. (2012). Understanding bullying in adulthood. *Clinician's Research Digest 52* (7). doi:10.1037/e570172012-012.

Bender, D., & Lösel, F. (2011). Bullying at school as a predictor of delinquency, violence and other anti-social behaviour in adulthood. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, *21*(2), 99-106. doi:10.1002/cbm.799

Bernstein, D. P., Stein, J. A., Newcomb, M. D., Walker, E., Pogge, D., Ahluvalia, T.,…

    Zule, W. (2003). *Childhood Trauma Questionnaire--Short Form.* Retrieved from

    http://www.apa.org/pubs/databases/psyctests/index.aspx. doi:10.1037/t09716-000

Bibi, Z., Karim, J., & ud Din, S. (2013). Workplace incivility and counterproductive

    work behavior: Moderating role of emotional intelligence. *Pakistan Journal of*

    Psychological Research, *28*(2), 317-334.

    doi:695eefd086f7e7b1960ad789ae326976

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2006). Teachers' perspectives on principal mistreatment. *Teacher*

    Education Quarterly, *33*(4), 123-142. ISSN: 07375328

Boddy, C. (2014). Corporate psychopaths, conflict, employee affective well-being and

    counterproductive work behaviour. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *121*(1), 107-121.

    doi:10.1007/s10551-013-1688-0

Boddy, C. R. (2011). Corporate psychopaths, bullying and unfair supervision in the

    workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *100*(3), 367-379. doi:10.1007/s10551-010-

    0689-5

Bordens, K. S., & Abbott, B. B. (2005). *Research design and methods: A process*

    approach. (6th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Boulton, M. J. (2013). Associations between adults' recalled childhood bullying

    victimization, current social anxiety, coping, and self-blame: Evidence for

    moderation and indirect effects. *Anxiety, Stress & Coping*, *26*(3), 270-292.

    doi:10.1080/10615806.2012.662499

Bowes L., Arseneault L., Maughan B., Taylor A., Caspi A., Moffitt T. E. (2009). School, neighborhood, and family factors are associated with children's bullying involvement: A nationally representative longitudinal study. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry 48*(5), 545-553. doi:10.1097/CHI.0b013e31819cb017

Brase, C. H. & Brase, C. P. (1999). Understandable statistics: Concepts and methods. (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin

Bretherton I. (1992). The origins of attachment theory: John Bowlby and Mary Ainsworth. *Developmental Psychology 28*(5), 759. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.28.5.759

Brodsky, C. M. (1976). *The harassed worker*. MA. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Lexington Books.

Brotheridge, C. M, & Lee, R. T. (2006). *Bullying Behaviors Scale*. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/pubs/databases/psyctests/index.aspx. doi:10.1037/t00356-000

Browne, K., & Falshaw, L. (1996). Factors related to bullying in secure accommodation. *Child Abuse Review*, *5*(2), 123-127. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-0852(199605)5:2<123::AID-CAR251>3.0.CO;2-W

Bunk, J. A., & Magley, V. J. (2013). The role of appraisals and emotions in understanding experiences of workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *18*(1), 87-105. doi:10.1037/a0030987

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2016). *Labor force statistics from the current survey* (Report No. 1062). Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat18.htm

Burkhart, K., Knox, M., & Brockmyer, J. (2013). Pilot evaluation of the ACT Raising Safe Kids Program on children's bullying behavior. *Journal of Child & Family Studies*, *22*(7), 942-951. doi:10.1007/s10826-012-9656-3

Burton, K. A., Florell, D., & Wygant, D. B. (2013). The role of peer attachment and normative beliefs about aggression on traditional bullying and cyberbullying. *Psychology in the Schools*, *50*(2), 103-115. doi:10.1002/pits.21663

Carbo, J. (2009). Strengthening the healthy workplace act—lessons from Title VII and IIED litigation and stories of targets' experiences. *Journal of Workplace Rights*, *14*(1), 97-120. doi:10.2190/WR.14.1.f

Carbo, J., & Hughes, A. (2010). Workplace bullying: Developing a human rights definition from the perspective and experiences of targets. *The Journal of Labor and Society*, *13*(3), 387-403. doi:10.1111/j.1743-4580.2010.00297.x

Carlson, D. S., Ferguson, M., Perrewé, P. L., & Whitten, D. (2011). The fallout from abusive supervision: An examination of subordinates and their partners. *Personnel Psychology, 64*(4) 937-961. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01232.x

Carney, J. V. (2008). Perceptions of bullying and associated trauma during adolescence. *Professional School Counseling, 11*(3), 179-188. doi:10.5330/PSC.n.2010-11.179

Cassidy, J. (1998). Attachment and object relations theories and the concept of independent behavioral systems: Commentary. *Social Development*, *7*(1), 120-126. doi:10.1111/1467-9507.00054

Celep, C., & Konakli, T. (2013). Mobbing experiences of instructors: Causes, results, and

    solution suggestions. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, *13*(1), 193-199.

    ERIC Number: EJ1016648

Černi Obrdalj, E., Zadro, K., Batić-Mujanović, O., & Zalihić, A. (2014). Satisfaction with

    the program of school bullying prevention and mental health promotion – Cross

    sectional study among primary school pupils in Mostar. *Acta Medica Academica*,

    43(1), 35-39. doi:10.5644/ama2006-124.98

Chan, H. O., & Chui, W. H. (2013). Social bonds and school bullying: A study of

    Macanese male adolescents on bullying perpetration and peer victimization. *Child

    & Youth Care Forum*, *42*(6), 599-616. doi:10.1007/s10566-013-9221-2

Chestnut, B. (2008). Understanding the development of personality type: Integrating

    object relations theory and the enneagram system. *Enneagram Journal*, *1*(1), 22-

    51. doi:66b0d5cfdb347b176923d7f361d79d15

Ciby, M., & Raya, R. P. (2014). Exploring victims' experiences of workplace bullying: A

    grounded theory approach. *Vikalpa: The Journal for Decision Makers*, *39*(2), 69-

    81. doi:10.1177/0256090920140207

Cloitre, M., Stovall-McClough, C., Zorbas, P., & Charuvastra, A. (2008). Attachment

    organization, emotion regulation, and expectations of support in a clinical sample

    of women with childhood abuse histories. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, *21*(3),

    282-289. doi:10.1002/jts.20339

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, *112*(1), 155-159.

    doi:10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155

Coid, J., Petruckevitch, A., Feder, G., Chung, W. S., Richardson, J., & Moorey, S. (2001). Relation between childhood sexual and physical abuse and risk of revictimisation in women: A cross-sectional survey. *Lancet*, *358,* 450–454. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(01)05622-7

Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). *Adult Attachment Scale*. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/pubs/databases/psyctests/index.aspx. doi:10.1037/t01997-000

Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*(4), 644-663. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.58.4.644

Constantinescu, V. (2014). Mobbing: Psychological terror in the workplace. *Scientific Research & Education in the Air Force - AFASES*, *2*511-514. doi: 54762f1e0cf2778985b07c24

Cook, A. J. (2004). Columbine author speaks at conference: Reclaiming children and youth. *The Journal of Strength-Based Interventions*, *13*(3), 181. ISSN: 10895701

Cook, S. L., & Goodman, L. A. (2006). *Coercion and Conflict Scales.* Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/pubs/databases/psyctests/index.aspx. doi:10.1037/t24862-000

Courtney, J. J., & Wann, D. L. (2010). The relationship between sport fan dysfunction and bullying behaviors. *North American Journal of Psychology*, *12*(1), 191-198. doi:10.1037/t14963-000

Cowan, R. L. (2013). "It rolls downhill" and other attributions for why adult bullying happens in organizations from the human resource professionals' perspective.

Qualitative Research Reports in Communication, *14*(1), 97-104. doi:10.1080/17459435.2013.835347

Coyne, I., Craig, J., & Chong, P. (2004). Workplace bullying in a group context. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, *32*(3), 301-317. doi:10.1080/03069880410001723530

Coyne, I., Seigne, E., & Randall, P. (2000). Predicting workplace victim status from personality. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *9*(3), 335–349. doi:10.1080/135943200417957

Cyr, M., Pasalich, D. S., McMahon, R. J., & Spieker, S. J. (2014). The longitudinal link between parenting and child aggression: The moderating effect of attachment security. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 45*(5), 555-564. doi:10.1007/s10578-013-0424-4

Decoster, S., Camps, J., Stouten, J., Vandevyvere, L., & Tripp, T. M. (2013). Standing by your organization: The impact of organizational identification and abusive supervision on followers' perceived cohesion and tendency to gossip. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *118*(3), 623-634. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1612-z

Deneberg, T., & Denenberg, R. V. (1996). Dispute resolution & workplace violence. *Dispute Resolution Journal*, *51*(1), 6-16. ISSN: 1074-8105

Dentith, A. M., Wright, R. R., & Coryell, J. (2015). Those mean girls and their friends: Bullying and mob rule in the academy. *Adult Learning*, *26*(1), 28-34. doi:10.1177/1045159514558409

Djurkovic, N., McCormack, D., & Casimir, G. (2008). Workplace bullying and intention to leave: The moderating effect of perceived organisational support. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *18*(4), 405-422. doi:10.1111/j.1748-8583.2008.00081.x

Dollard, M., Skinner, N., Tuckey, M., & Bailey, T. (2007). National surveillance of psychosocial risk factors in the workplace: An international overview. *Work & Stress*, *21*(1), 1-29. doi:10.1080/02678370701254082

Dominguez, J. (2013). A fresh approach to peer victimization. *Reclaiming Children & Youth*, *22*(3), 37-40. ERIC Number: EJ1032693

Dong, F., Cao, F., Cheng, P., Cui, N., & Li, Y. (2013). Prevalence and associated factors of poly-victimization in Chinese adolescents. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *54*(5), 415-422. doi:10.1111/sjop.12059

Dowling, M. J., & Carey, T. A. (2013). Victims of bullying: Whom they seek help from and why: An Australian sample. *Psychology in the Schools*, *50*(8), 798-809. doi:10.1002/pits.21709

Drabek, M., & Merecz, D. (2013). Job stress, occupational position and gender as factors differentiating workplace-bullying experience. *Medycyna Pracy*, *64*(3), 283-296. doi:10.13075/mp.5893/2013/0024

Duffy, M. (2009). Preventing workplace mobbing and bullying with effective organizational consultation, policies, and legislation. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *61*(3), 242-262. doi:10.1037/a0016578

Dussich J. P., Maekoya C. (2007). Physical child harm and bullying-related behaviors: A

comparative study in Japan, South Africa, and the United States. *International

Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology 51*(5), 495-509.

doi:10.1177/0306624X06298463

Dutta, S. D. (2013). Suppression of women in Bangladesh: A demonstrative scenario.

ASA University Review, 7(2), 11-18.

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Notelaers, G. (2009). Measuring exposure to bullying and

harassment at work: Validity, factor structure and psychometric properties of the

Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised. *Work & Stress*, *23*(1), 24-44.

doi:10.1080/02678370902815673

Ekici, D., & Beder, A. (2014). The effects of workplace bullying on physicians and

nurses. *Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *31*(4), 24-33. ISSN: 0813-0531

Elmblad, R., Kodjebacheva, G., & Lebeck, L. (2014). Workplace incivility affecting

CRNAs: A study of prevalence, severity, and consequences with proposed

interventions. *American Association of Nurse Anesthetists Journal*, *82*(6), 437-

445. ISSN: 0094-6354

Emdad, R., Alipour, A., Hagberg, J., & Jensen, I. B. (2013). The impact of bystanding to

workplace bullying on symptoms of depression among women and men in

industry in Sweden: An empirical and theoretical longitudinal study. *International

Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, *86*(6), 709-716.

doi:10.1007/s00420-012-08131

Ertureten, A., Cemalcilar, Z., & Aycan, Z. (2013). The relationship of downward mobbing with leadership style and organizational attitudes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *116*(1), 205-216. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1468-2

Espinoza, G., Gonzales, N. A., & Fuligni, A. J. (2013). Daily school peer victimization experiences among Mexican-American adolescents: Associations with psychosocial, physical and school adjustment. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, *42*(12), 1775-1788. doi:10.1007/s10964-012-9874-4

Fahie, D. (2014). Doing sensitive research sensitively: Ethical and methodological issues in researching workplace bullying. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *13*19-36. doi:10.1177/160940691401300108

Fairchild, A. J., & MacKinnon, D. P. (2009). A general model for testing mediation and moderation effects. *Prevention Science*, *10*(2), 87-99. doi:10.1007/s11121-008-0109-6

Ferris, P.A. (2009). The role of the consulting psychologist in the prevention, detection, and correction of bullying and mobbing in the workplace. *Consulting Psychology Journal, 61*(3), 169–189. doi:10.1037/a0016783

Fite, P. J., Williford, A., Cooley, J. L., DePaolis, K., Rubens, S. L., & Vernberg, E. M. (2013). Patterns of victimization locations in elementary school children: Effects of grade level and gender. *Child & Youth Care Forum*, *42*(6), 585-597. doi:10.1007/s10566-013-9219-9

Franks, J., Rawana, E., & Brownlee, K. (2013). The relationship between strengths in youth and bullying experiences at school. *Educational & Child Psychology*, *30*(4), 44-58. ISSN: 0267-1611

Gage, N. A., Prykanowski, D. A., & Larson, A. (2014). School climate and bullying victimization: A latent class growth model analysis. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *29*(3), 256-271. doi:10.1037/spq0000064

Gamian-Wilk, M. (2013). Does bullying increase compliance? *Social Influence*, *8*(2/3), 131-148. doi:10.1080/15534510.2012.756429

Gardner, D., Bentley, T., Catley, B., Cooper-Thomas, H., O'Driscoll, M., & Trenberth, L. (2013). Ethnicity, workplace bullying, social support, and psychological strain in Aotearoa/New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, *42*(2), 84-91. doi:10.1037/t27542-000

Geller, E. S. (2014). Are you a safety bully?. *Professional Safety*, *59*(1), 39-44. doi:2b30396768eb05e42510419989d0b53b

Gemzøe Mikkelsen, E., & Einarsen, S. (2002). Relationships between exposure to bullying at work and psychological and psychosomatic health complaints: The role of state negative affectivity and generalized self–efficacy. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 43*(5), 397-405. doi:10.1111/1467-9450.00307

Georgiou, S., & Stavrinides, P. (2013). Parenting at home and bullying at school. *Social Psychology of Education*, *16*(2), 165-179. doi:10.1007/s11218-012-9209-z

Giorgi, G., Ando, M., Arenas, A., Shoss, M. K., & Leon-Perez, J. M. (2013). Exploring personal and organizational determinants of workplace bullying and its

prevalence in a Japanese sample. *Psychology of Violence*, *3*(2), 185-197. doi:10.1037/a0028049

Glasø, L., Bele, E., Nielsen, M., & Einarsen, S. (2011). Bus drivers' exposure to bullying at work: An occupation-specific approach. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *52*(5), 484-493. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9450.2011.00895.x

Glasø, L., Matthiesen, S. B., Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Do targets of bullying portray a general victim personality profile? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *48*, 313–319. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9450.2007.00554.x

Glasø, L., Nielsen, M., & Einarsen, S. (2009). Interpersonal problems among perpetrators and targets of workplace bullying. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *39*(6), 1316-1333. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2009.00483.x

Glendinning, P. (2001). Workplace bullying: Curing the cancer of the American workplace. *Public Personnel Management*, *30*(3), 269-286. doi:10.1177/009102600103000301

Goodboy A. K., Martin M. M., & Rittenour C. E. (2016). Bullying as a display of social dominance orientation, *Communication Research Reports, 33*(2), 159-165. doi:10.1080/08824096.2016.1154838

Greif, J., & Furlong, M. (2006). The assessment of school bullying: using theory to inform practice. *Journal of School Violence*, *5*(3), 33-50. doi:10.1300/J202v05n03_04

Guerra, N. G., Williams, K. R., & Sadek, S. (2011). Understanding bullying and

victimization during childhood and adolescence: A mixed methods study. *Child*

Development, *82*(1), 295-310. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01556.x

Habashy Hussein, M. (2013). The social and emotional skills of bullies, victims, and

bully–victims of Egyptian primary school children. *International Journal of*

Psychology, *48*(5), 910-921. doi:10.1080/00207594.2012.702908

Hamilton, J. L., Shapero, B. G., Stange, J. P., Hamlat, E. J., Abramson, L. Y., & Alloy, L.

B. (2013). Emotional maltreatment, peer victimization, and depressive versus

anxiety symptoms during adolescence: Hopelessness as a mediator. *Journal of*

Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, *42*(3), 332-347.

Hartley-Wilkins, D. (2014). Workplace bullying: The silent epidemic. *Human Resources*

Magazine, *19*(5), 4-8. doi:10.1080/15374416.2013.777916

Hauge, L., Skogstad, A., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Relationships between stressful work

environments and bullying: Results of a large representative study. *Work &*

Stress, 21(3), 220-242. doi:10.1080/02678370701705810

Healy, K., Sanders, M., & Iyer, A. (2015). Parenting practices, children's peer

relationships and being bullied at school. *Journal of Child & Family Studies*,

24(1), 127-140. doi:10.1007/s10826-013-9820-4

Henry, S. (2004). Bullying -- Like Father Like Son? The contentious findings of a year-

long study. *Education Journal*, (77), 23-26. ISSN: 13644505

Heponiemi, T., Kouvonen, A., Virtanen, M., Vänskä, J., & Elovainio, M. (2014). The

prospective effects of workplace violence on physicians' job satisfaction and

turnover intentions: The buffering effect of job control. *BMC Health Services Research*, *14*(1), 1-16. doi:10.1186/1472-6963-14-19

Hershcovis, M. S., & Reich, T. C. (2013). Integrating workplace aggression research: Relational, contextual, and method considerations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(Suppl 1) S26-S42. doi:10.1002/job.1886

Hixon, S. (2009). Psychosocial processes associated with bullying and victimization. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, *37*(3), 257-270. doi:10.1080/08873260903113519

Holt, M. K., Finkelhor, D., & Kantor, G. (2007). Hidden forms of victimization in elementary students involved in bullying. *School Psychology Review*, *36*(3), 345-360. doi:5d89193c2acefd707bc2b921a2359e4f

Holt, M. K., Kaufman Kantor, G., & Finkelhor, D. (2009). Parent/child concordance about bullying involvement and family characteristics related to bullying and peer victimization. *Journal of School Violence*, *8*(1), 42-63. doi:10.1080/15388220802067813

Homel, J. B. (2013). Does bullying others at school lead to adult aggression? The roles of drinking and university participation during the transition to adulthood. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, *65*(2), 98-106. doi:10.1111/ajpy.12002

Hoobler J. M, Brass D. J. (2006). Abusive supervision and family undermining as displaced aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(5), 1125–1133. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.1125

Hooven, C., Nurius, P. S., Logan-Greene, P., & Thompson, E. A. (2012). Childhood violence exposure: Cumulative and specific effects on adult mental

health. *Journal of Family Violence*, *27*(6), 511-522. doi:10.1007/s10896-012-9438-0

Hunter, S. C., Durkin, K., Boyle, J. E., Booth, J. N., & Rasmussen, S. (2014). Adolescent bullying and sleep difficulties. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, *10*(4), 740-755. doi:10.5964/ejop.v10i4.815

Hutchinson, M. H., & Jackson, D. J. (2013). Hostile clinician behaviours in the nursing work environment and implications for patient care: A mixed-methods systematic review. *BMC Nursing*, *12*(1), 25-44. doi:10.1186/1472-6955-12-25

Hutchinson, M., & Hurley, J. (2013). Exploring leadership capability and emotional intelligence as moderators of workplace bullying. *Journal of Nursing Management*, *21*(3), 553-562. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2834.2012.01372.x

International Labour Organization. (2006). New forms of violence at work on the rise worldwide [news release]. *Geneva: International Labour Organization, United Nations*.

Ireland, J. L., & Power, C. L. (2004). Attachment, emotional loneliness, and bullying behaviour: A study of adult and young offenders. *Aggressive Behavior*, *30*(4), 298-312. doi:10.1002/ab.20035

Jacobson, R. (2010). A place to stand: Intersubjectivity and the desire to dominate. *Studies in Philosophy & Education*, *29*(1), 35-51. doi:10.1007/s11217-009-9156-0

James, D., Flynn, A., Lawlor, M., Courtney, P., Murphy, N., & Henry, B. (2011). A friend in deed? Can adolescent girls be taught to understand relational bullying?. *Child Abuse Review*, *20*(6), 439-454. doi:10.1002/car.1120

Javier, R. A., Dillon, J., DaBreo, C., & De Mucci, J. (2013). Bullying and its consequences: In search of solutions-Part II. *Journal of Social Distress & the Homeless*, *22*(2), 59-72. doi:10.1179/1053078913Z.0000000008

Jennifer, D., Cowie, H., & Ananiadou, K. (2003). Perceptions and experience of workplace bullying in five different working populations. *Aggressive Behavior*, *29*(6), 489-496. doi:10.1002/ab.10055

Jennings, W. G., Richards, T. N., Tomsich, E. A., Gover, A. R., & Powers, R. A. (2013). A critical examination of the causal link between child abuse and adult dating violence perpetration and victimization from a propensity score matching approach. *Women & Criminal Justice*, *23*(3), 167-184. doi:10.1080/08974454.2013.802271

Jhatial, A. A., Jariko, G. A., Tahrani, A., & Jam, Y. (2013). Psychopathy in management behaviour and bullying at work: hearing some unheard voices from Pakistan. *Gomal University Journal of Research*, *29*(1), 104-117. ISSN:1019-8180

Joaquim, C. J. (2014). Developmental stage of performance in reasoning about school bullying. *Behavioral Development Bulletin*, *19*(2), 81-99. doi:10.1037/h0100579

Johnson, J., & Trad, M. (2014). Bullying behavior among radiation therapists and its effects on personal health. *Radiation Therapist*, *23*(1), 11-20. ISSN:1084-1911

Jong-Hyo, P. (2013). Differential correlates of bully/victim status and bystander roles of school violence with school adjustment in Korea. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy*, 119-133. doi: 8512deba5f01dd1b0e2377acebb03f8a

Juni, S. (2009). Conceptualization of hostile psychopathy and sadism: Drive theory and object relations perspectives. *International Forum of Psychoanalysis*, *18*(1), 11-22. doi:10.1080/08037060701875977

Kaplan, J. F. (2010). Help is on the way: A recent case sheds light on workplace bullying. *Houston Law Review*, *47*(1), 141-173. ISSN:0018-6694

Klest, B. (2012). Childhood trauma, poverty, and adult victimization. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, *4*(3), 245-251. doi:10.1037/a0024468

Klomek, A., Kleinman, M., Altschuler, E., Marrocco, F., Amakawa, L., & Gould, M. (2011). High school bullying as a risk for later depression and suicidality. *Suicide & Life-Threatening Behavior*, *41*(5), 501-516. doi:10.1111/j.1943-278X.2011.00046.x

Knafo, A. (2003). Authoritarians, the next generation: Values and bullying among adolescent children of authoritarian fathers. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy (ASAP)*, *3*(1), 199-204. doi:10.1111/j.1530-2415.2003.00026.x

Kokkinos, C. M. (2013). Bullying and victimization in early adolescence: Associations with attachment style and perceived parenting. *Journal of School Violence*, *12*(2), 174-192. doi:10.1080/15388220.2013.766134

Kolstrein, A. M., & Toledo Jofré, M. I. (2013). Bullying: An analysis from the perspective of human rights, target groups and interventions. *International Journal of Children's Rights*, *21*(1), 46-58. doi:10.1163/157181812X637136

Kupferman-Meik, F. E., Burris-Warmoth, P., Rapaport, S., Roychoudhury, K., & Javier, R. A. (2013). Bullying in children and adolescents: A healthcare perspective. *Journal of Social Distress & the Homeless*, *22*(2), 94-118. doi:10.1179/1053078913Z.0000000006

Laine, H., Saastamoinen, P., Lahti, J., Rahkonen, O., & Lahelma, E. (2014). The associations between psychosocial working conditions and changes in common mental disorders: A follow-up study. *BMC Public Health*, *14*(1), 451-471. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-14-588

Lally, R. M. (2009). Bullies aren't only on the playground: A look at nurse-on-nurse violence. *ONS Connect*, *24*(2), 17. ISSN:19351623

Lam, D. B., & Liu, A. H. (2007). The path through bullying: A process model from the inside story of bullies in Hong Kong secondary schools. *Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal*, *24*(1), 53-75. doi:10.1007/s10560-006-0058-5

LaVan, H., & Martin, W. (2008). Bullying in the U.S. workplace: Normative and process-oriented ethical approaches. *Journal of Business Ethics, 83*(2), 147-165. doi:10.1007/s10551-007-9608-9

Le Mire, S., & Owens, R. (2014). A propitious moment? Workplace bullying and regulation of the legal profession. *University of New South Wales Law Journal*, *37*(3), 1030-1061. ISSN:0313-0096

Leo, L., Reid, R., Geldenhuys, M., & Gobind, J. (2014). The inferences of gender in workplace bullying: A conceptual analysis. *Gender & Behaviour*, *12*(1), 6059-6069. ISSN:1596-9231

Lester, L., & Cross, D. (2014). The effect of chronic victimisation on emotional and behavioural difficulties of adolescents. *Australian Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, *24*(2), 137-151. doi:10.1017/jgc.2014.16

Lewis, D., Sheehan, M., & Davies, C. (2008). Uncovering workplace bullying. *Journal of Workplace Rights, 13*(3), 281-301. doi:10.2190/WR.13.3e

Leymann, H. (1990). Mobbing and psychological terror in workplaces. *Violence and Victims, 5,* 119-126. ISSN:0886-6708

Lobbestael, J., Arntz, A., Harkema-Schouten, P., & Bernstein, D. (2009). Development and psychometric evaluation of a new assessment method for childhood maltreatment experiences: The Interview for Traumatic Events in Childhood (ITEC). *Child Abuse & Neglect, 33*(8), 505-517. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2009.03.002

Longton, S. (2014). Bullying and workplace violence. *Nephrology Nursing Journal*, *41*(3), 243-244. doi: 10d5cd5435d28dc2f358f0a29a9ed387

Lopes, B. C. (2013). Differences between victims of bullying and non-victims on levels of paranoid ideation and persecutory symptoms, the presence of aggressive traits, the display of social anxiety and the recall of childhood abuse experiences in a Portuguese mixed. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, *20*(3), 254-266. doi:10.1002/cpp.800

Low, S., & Van Ryzin, M. (2014). The moderating effects of school climate on bullying prevention efforts. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *29*(3), 306-319. doi:10.1037/spq0000073

Martin, W., & LaVan, H. (2010). Workplace bullying: A review of litigated cases. *Employee Responsibilities & Rights Journal*, *22*(3), 175-194. doi:10.1007/s10672-009-9140-4

Mathiassen, C. (2013). Bullying - transformative potentiality?. *Outlines: Critical Practice Studies*, *14*(2), 184-204. ISSN: 1904-0210

McCulloch, B. (2010). Dealing with bullying behaviours in the workplace: What works - A practitioner's view. *Journal of the International Ombudsman Association, 3*(2), 39-51. ISSN: 2153-2362

Mikkelson, E., & Einarsen, S. (2001). Bullying in Danish work-life: Prevalence and health correlates. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10*(4), 393–414. doi:10.1080/13594320143000816

Millett, L. S., Kohl, P. L., Jonson-Reid, M., Drake, B., & Petra, M. (2013). Child maltreatment victimization and subsequent perpetration of young adult intimate partner violence: An exploration of mediating factors. *Child Maltreatment*, *18*(2), 71-84. doi:10.1177/1077559513484821

Misawa, M., & Rowland, M. L. (2015). Academic bullying and incivility in adult, higher, continuing, and professional education. *Adult Learning*, *26*(1), 3-5. doi:10.1177/1045159514558415

Mitchell, M. L. (2003). The million dollar child. *Reclaiming Children & Youth*, *12*(1), 6-8. doi:f48f7a1a42f35b8513f703ec8ca86f08

Mohapatra, S., Irving, H., Paglia-Boak, A., Wekerle, C., Adlaf, E., & Rehm, J. (2010). History of family involvement with child protective services as a risk factor for bullying in Ontario schools. *Child & Adolescent Mental Health*, *15*(3), 157-163. doi:10.1111/j.1475-3588.2009.00552.x

Montes, J., Gutiérrez, A., & Campos, E. (2011). The "bullied" manager: An empirical study of individual, organizational, and contextual factors. *International Business & Management, 2*(2), 6-23. doi:10.3968/j.ibm.1923842820110202.002

Morrow, M. T., Hubbard, J. A., & Swift, L. E. (2014). Relations among multiple types of peer victimization, reactivity to peer victimization, and academic achievement in fifth-grade boys and girls. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, *60*(3), 302-327. doi:10.13110/merrpalmquar1982.60.3.0302

Mouttapa, M., Valente, T., Gallaher, P., Rohrbach, L., & Unger, J. (2004). Social network predictors of bullying and victimization. *Adolescence*, *39*(154), 315-335. doi:7b24c5a78e7296d70489f81a672c904a

Mustanoja, S., Luukkonen, A., Hakko, H., Räsänen, P., Säävälä, H., & Riala, K. (2011). Is exposure to domestic violence and violent crime associated with bullying behaviour among underage adolescent psychiatric inpatients?. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, *42*(4), 495-506. doi:10.1007/s10578-011-0222-9

Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2009). U.S. workplace bullying: Some basic considerations and consultation interventions. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *61*(3), 202-219. doi:10.1037/a0016670

NasrEsfahani, A., & Shahbazi, G. (2014). Workplace bullying in nursing: The case of Azerbaijan province, Iran. *Iranian Journal of Nursing & Midwifery Research*, *19*(4), 409-415. ISSN: 0001-8449

Nielsen, M. B. (2013). Bullying in work groups: The impact of leadership. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *54*(2), 127-136. doi:10.1111/sjop.12011

Nielsen, M., & Einarsen, S. (2013). Can observations of workplace bullying really make you depressed? A response to Emdad et al. *International Archives of Occupational & Environmental Health*, *86*(6), 717-721. doi:10.1007/s00420-013-0868-7

Nielsen, M., Tvedt, S., & Matthiesen, S. (2013). Prevalence and occupational predictors of psychological distress in the offshore petroleum industry: A prospective study. *International Archives of Occupational & Environmental Health*, *86*(8), 875-885. doi:10.1007/s00420-012-0825-x

O'Moore, M., Seigne, E., McGuire, L., & Smith, M. (1998). Victims of workplace bullying in Ireland. *Irish Journal of Psychology*, *19*, 345–357. doi:10.1080/03033910.1998.10558195

Okurame, D. E. (2013). Impact of negative workplace factors and the moderator effects of gender on critical organisational climate for effectiveness. *Gender & Behaviour*, *11*(2), 5618-5634. ISSN : 1596-9231

Oladapo, V., & Banks, L. T. (2013). Management bullies: The effect on employees. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, *4*(4), 107-120. doi:29ee8cd0f5a6886315aead94894f1226

Olender-Russo, L. (2009). Creating a culture of regard: An antidote for workplace bullying. *Creative Nursing, 15*(2), 75-81. doi:10.1891/1078-4535.15.2.75

Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at schools: What we know and what we can do*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell. doi:10.1007/978-1-4757-9116-7_5

Omizo, M., Omizo, S., Baxa, G., & Miyose, R. (2006). Bullies and victims: A phenomenological study. *Journal of School Violence*, *5*(3), 89-105. doi:10.1300/J202v05n03_07

Onorato, M. (2013). An empirical study of unethical leadership and workplace bullying in industry segments. *SAM Advanced Management Journal (07497075)*, *78*(2), 4-16. doi:cdb03be3b816556bb021287302f8e06d

Orue, I., & Calvete, E. (2012). Justification of violence as a mediator between exposure to violence and aggressive behavior in children. *Psicothema*, *24*(1), 42-47. ISSN: 02149915

Oshio, T., Umeda, M., & Kawakami, N. (2013). Childhood adversity and adulthood subjective well-being: Evidence from Japan. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *14*(3), 843-860. doi:10.1007/s10902-012-9358-y

Papadaki, E., & Giovazolias, T. (2015). The protective role of father acceptance in the relationship between maternal rejection and bullying: A moderated-mediation

model. *Journal of Child & Family Studies*, *24*(2), 330-340. doi:10.1007/s10826-013-9839-6

Parker, K. A. (2014). The workplace bully: The ultimate silencer. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications & Conflict*, *18*(1), 169-185. doi:37f9ad5541bf53a9c332a7b217e6bc75

Parkins, I., Fishbein, H. D., & Ritchey, P. (2006). The influence of personality on workplace bullying and discrimination. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *36*(10), 2554-2577. doi:10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00117.x

Pergolizzi, F., Richmond, D., Macario, S., Gan, Z., Richmond, C., & Macario, E. (2009). Bullying in middle schools: Results from a four-school survey. *Journal of School Violence*, *8*(3), 264-279. doi:10.1080/15388220902910839

Petrescu-Prahova, M. m., & Spiller, M. W. (2016). Women's wage theft. *Work & Occupations, 43*(4), 371-400. doi:10.1177/0730888416661019

Piquero, A., Connell, N., Piquero, N., Farrington, D., & Jennings, W. (2013). Does adolescent bullying distinguish between male offending trajectories in late middle age?. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, *42*(3), 444-453. doi:10.1007/s10964-012-9883-3

Pomeroy, E. C. (2013). The bully at work: What social workers can do. *Social Work*, *58*(1). 5-8. doi:10.1093/sw/sws055.

Porath, C., & Pearson, C. (2013). The price of incivility. *Harvard Business Review*, *91*(1-2), 114. ISSN: 00178012

Prather, W., & Golden, J. A. (2009). A behavioral perspective of childhood trauma and attachment issues: Toward alternative treatment approaches for children with a history of abuse. *International Journal of Behavioral Consultation & Therapy*, *5*(2), 222-241. doi:10.1037/h0100872

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., & Levin, S. (2006). Social dominance theory and the dynamics of intergroup relations: Taking stock and looking forward. *European Review of Social Psychology, 17*, 271-320. doi:10463280601055772

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). *Social Dominance Orientation Scale*. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/pubs/databases/psyctests/index.aspx. doi:10.1037/t01146-000

Price-Robertson, R., Higgins, D., & Vassallo, S. (2013). Multi-type maltreatment and polyvictimisation. *Family Matters*, (93), 86-98. ISSN: 1030-2646

Pryor, M. G., Odom, R. Y., & Toombs, L. A. (2014). Organizational implosion -- A threat to long-term viability. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, *13*(2), 111-122. doi:1b62d301208952d54bb8d030ebc74b8d

Ramirez, O. (2013). Survivors of school bullying: A collective case study. *Children & Schools*, *35*(2), 93-99. doi:10.1093/cs/cdt001

Rayner, C., & Cooper, C. L. (2003). The black hole in "bullying at work" research. *International Journal of Management and Decision Making*, *4*(1), 47–64. doi:10.1504/IJMDM.2003.002488

Reder, P., & Duncan, S. (2001). Abusive relationships, care and control conflicts and insecure attachments. *Child Abuse Review*, *10*(6), 411-427. doi:10.1002/car.720

Reich, T. C., & Hershcovis, M. S. (2015). Observing workplace incivility. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*(1), 203-215. doi:10.1037/a0036464

Reijntjes, A., Vermande, M., Olthof, T., Goossens, F. A., van de Schoot, R., Aleva, L., & van der Meulen, M. (2013). Costs and benefits of bullying in the context of the peer group: A three wave longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *41*(8), 1217-1229. doi:10.1007/s10802-013-9759-3

Rigby, K. (2013). Bullying in schools and its relation to parenting and family life. *Family Matters*, (92), 61-67. ISSN: 1030-2646

Roland, C. B. (2013). Incivility, harassment, and bullying: Young adults at risk. *Adultspan Journal*, *12*(1), 2-3. doi:10.1002/j.2161-0029.2013.00011.x

Rudatskira, E., Babaniyi, O., Siziya, S., Mulenga, D., Muula, A. S., & Mazaba-Liwewe, M. L. (2014). Correlates of bullying victimization among school-going adolescents in Algeria: Results from the 2011 global school-based health survey. *International Journal of Medicine & Public Health*, *4*(4), 407-412. doi:10.4103/2230-8598.144112

Rudestam, K. E., & Newton, R. R. (2007) *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content and process.* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Samnani, A. (2013). The early stages of workplace bullying and how it becomes prolonged: The role of culture in predicting target responses. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *113*(1), 119-132. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1286-6

Sansone, R. A., Lam, C., & Wiederman, M. W. (2013). Victims of bullying in childhood, criminal outcomes in adulthood. *International Journal of Psychiatry in Clinical Practice*, *17*(1), 69-72. doi:10.3109/13651501.2012.693185

Sansone, R. A., Leung, J. S., & Wiederman, M. W. (2013). Self-reported bullying in childhood: Relationships with employment in adulthood. *International Journal of Psychiatry in Clinical Practice*, *17*(1), 64-68. doi:10.3109/13651501.2012.709867

Saunders, P., Huynh, A., & Goodman-Delahunty, J. (2007). Defining workplace bullying behaviour professional lay definitions of workplace bullying. *International Journal of Law & Psychiatry, 30*(4/5), 340-354. doi:10.1016/j.ijlp.2007.06.007

Schimmenti, A., & Bifulco, A. (2015). Linking lack of care in childhood to anxiety disorders in emerging adulthood: The role of attachment styles. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health, 20*(1), 41-48. doi:10.1111/camh.12051

Scott, K. L., Restubog, S. D., & Zagenczyk, T. J. (2013). A social exchange-based model of the antecedents of workplace exclusion. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *98*(1), 37-48. doi:10.1037/a0030135

Sedivy-Benton, A., Strohschen, G., Cavazos, N., & Boden-McGill, C. (2015). Good ol' boys, mean girls, and tyrants: A phenomenological study of the lived experiences and survival strategies of bullied women adult educators. *Adult Learning*, *26*(1), 35-41. doi:10.1177/1045159514558411

Seeds, P. M., Harkness, K. L., & Quilty, L. C. (2010). Parental maltreatment, bullying, and adolescent depression: Evidence for the mediating role of perceived social

support. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, *39*(5), 681-692. doi:10.1080/15374416.2010.501289

Sercombe, H., & Donnelly, B. (2013). Bullying and agency: Definition, intervention and ethics. *Journal of Youth Studies*, *16*(4), 491-502. doi:10.1080/13676261.2012.725834

Shakoor, S., Jaffee, S. R., Bowes, L., Ouellet-Morin, I., Andreou, P., Happe, F., ... Arseneault, L. (2012). A prospective longitudinal study of children's theory of mind and adolescent involvement in bullying. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *53*(3), 254-261. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2011.02488.x

Shalev, I., Moffitt, T. E., Sugden, K., Williams, B., Houts, R. M., Danese, A., & Caspi, A. (2013). Exposure to violence during childhood is associated with telomere erosion from 5 to 10 years of age: A longitudinal study. *Molecular Psychiatry*, *18*(5), 576-581. doi:10.1038/mp.2012.32

Shaver, P. R., Mikulincer, M., & Feeney, B. C. (2009). What's love got to do with it? Insecurity and anger in attachment relationships. *Virginia Journal of Social Policy & the Law*, *16*(2), 491-513. ISSN: 1068-7955

Shen-Miller, D., & Smiler, A. P. (2015). Men in female-dominated vocations: A rationale for academic study and introduction to the special issue. *Sex Roles, 72*(7-8), 269-276. doi:10.1007/s11199-015-0471-3

Shepard, M. F., & Campbell, J. A. (1992). The abusive behavior inventory: A measure of psychological and physical abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7*(3), 291-305. doi:10.1177/088626092007003001

Shields A., Cicchetti D. (2001). Parental maltreatment and emotion dysregulation as risk factors for bullying and victimization in middle childhood. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology 30*(3) 349-363. doi:10.1207/S15374424JCCP3003_7

Shujja, S., Atta, M., & Shujja, J. M. (2014). Prevalence of bullying and victimization among sixth graders with reference to gender, socio-economic status, and type of schools. *Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi/Journal of Social Sciences*, *38*(2), 159-165. ISSN: 1305-5143

Sigurdardottir, S., & Halldorsdottir, S. (2013). Repressed and silent suffering: Consequences of childhood sexual abuse for women's health and well-being. *Scandinavian Journal of Caring Sciences*, *27*(2), 422-432. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6712.2012.01049.x

Sijtsema, J. J., Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., & Salmivalli, C. (2009). Empirical test of bullies' status goals: Assessing direct goals, aggression, and prestige. *Aggressive Behavior*, *35*(1), 57-67. doi:10.1002/ab.20282

Sliter, M., Withrow, S., & Jex, S. M. (2014). It happened, or you thought it happened? Examining the perception of workplace incivility based on personality characteristics. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *22*(1), 24-45. doi:10.1037/a0038329

Smith, R. (2014). Over 65 million workers affected by bullying; Employer response inadequate. *HR Focus*, *91*(5), 9-10. ISSN: 1059-6038

Srabstein, J. C. (2013). News reports of bullying-related fatal and nonfatal injuries in the

Americas. *Pan American Journal of Public Health*, *33*(5), 378-382.

doi:10.1590/S1020-49892013000500010

Stalcup, A. (2013). Surviving toxic work environments. *Analytical & Bioanalytical

Chemistry*, *405*(4), 1145-1147. doi:10.1007/s00216-012-6612-4

Steinberg, N. (2010). Hidden gifts of love: A clinical application of object relations

theory. *The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, *91*(4), 839-858.

doi:10.1111/j.1745-8315.2010.00281.x

Taylor, G. (2013). Workplace bullying: Are you part of the solution?. *Australian Nursing

Journal*, *20*(9), 31. doi:846af6fb2ea7af13580a16c3b8dbe4a1

Taylor, S. G., & Pattie, M. W. (2014). When does ethical leadership affect workplace

incivility? The moderating role of follower personality. *Business Ethics

Quarterly*, *24*(4), 595-616. doi:10.5840/beq201492618

Tehrani, N. (2004). Bullying: A source of chronic post-traumatic stress? *British Journal

of Guidance & Counselling, 32*(3), 357-366.

doi:10.1080/03069880410001727567

Teisl, M., Rogosch, F. A., Oshri, A., & Cicchetti, D. (2012). Differential expression of

social dominance as a function of age and maltreatment experience.

Developmental Psychology, *48*(2), 575-588. doi: 10.1037/a0024888

Teisl, M., Rogosch, F. A., Oshri, A., & Cicchetti, D. (2012). *Social Dominance Q-Scale*.

Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/pubs/databases/psyctests/index.aspx.

doi:10.1037/t10272-000

Tepper, B. J., Moss, S. E., & Duffy, M. K. (2011). Predictors of abusive supervision: Supervisor perceptions of deep-level dissimilarity, relationship conflict, and subordinate performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *54*(2), 279-294. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2011.60263085

Terranova, A. M., Harris, J., Kavetski, M., & Oates, R. (2011). Responding to peer victimization: A sense of control matters. *Child & Youth Care Forum*, *40*(6), 419-434. doi:10.1007/s10566-011-9144-8

Trad, M., & Johnson, J. (2014). Bullying among radiation therapists: Effects on job performance and work environment. *Radiologic Technology*, *86*(2), 122-131. ISSN: 00338397

Trépanier, S., Fernet, C., & Austin, S. (2013). Workplace bullying and psychological health at work: The mediating role of satisfaction of needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. *Work & Stress*, *27*(2), 123-140. doi:10.1080/02678373.2013.782158

Trépanier, S., Fernet, C., & Austin, S. (2015). A longitudinal investigation of workplace bullying, basic need satisfaction, and employee functioning. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *20*(1), 105-116. doi:10.1037/a0037726

Tuckey, M. R., & Neall, A. M. (2014). Workplace bullying erodes job and personal resources: Between- and within-person perspectives. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *19*(4), 413-424. doi:10.1037/a0037728

Tuckey, M. R., Dollard, M. F., Hosking, P. J., & Winefield, A. H. (2009). Workplace bullying: The role of psychosocial work environment factors. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *16*(3), 215-232. doi:10.1037/a0016841

Turkel, A. (2007). Sugar and spice and puppy dogs' tails: The psychodynamics of bullying. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis & Dynamic Psychiatry*, *35*(2), 243-258. doi:10.1521/jaap.2007.35.2.243

Türkmen, N., Dokgöz, H., Akgöz, S., Eren, B., Vural, P., & Polat, O. (2013). Bullying among high school students. *Maedica - A Journal of Clinical Medicine*, *8*(2), 143-152. ISSN: 18419038

Turner, I., Reynolds, K. J., Lee, D. E., Subasic, E., & Bromhead, D. (2014). Well-being, school climate, and the social identity process: A latent growth model study of bullying perpetration and peer victimization. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *29*(3), 320-335. doi:10.1037/spq0000074

Twemlow, S. W., & Sacco, F. C. (2013). How & why does bystanding have such a startling impact on the architecture of school bullying and violence?. *International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies*, *10*(3), 289-306. doi:10.1002/aps.1372

Vaillancourt, T., & McDougall, P. (2013). The link between childhood exposure to violence and academic achievement: Complex pathways. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 41*(8), 1177-1178. doi:10.1007/s10802-013-9803-3

Vaughn, M. G., Fu, Q., Bender, K., DeLisi, M., Beaver, K. M., Perron, B. E., & Howard, M. O. (2010). Psychiatric correlates of bullying in the United States: Findings

from a national sample. *Psychiatric Quarterly*, *81*(3), 183-195.

doi:10.1007/s11126-010-9128-0

Verlinden, M., Tiemeier, H., Veenstra, R., Mieloo, C. L., Jansen, W., Jaddoe, V. V., & ...
Jansen, P. W. (2014). Television viewing through ages 2-5 years and bullying
involvement in early elementary school. *BMC Public Health*, *14*(1), 1-27.
doi:10.1186/1471-2458-14-157

Von Korff, M., Alonso, J., Ormel, J., Angermeyer, M., Bruffaerts, R., Fleiz, C., de
Girolamo, G., … Uda, H. (2009). Childhood psychosocial stressors and adult
onset arthritis: Broad spectrum risk factors and allostatic load. *Pain, 143*(1-2), 76-
83. doi:10.1016/j.pain.2009.01.034

Weijun, W., Vaillancourt, T., Brittain, H. L., Krygsman, A., Smith, D., Haltigan, J. D., &
... Hymel, S. (2014). School climate, peer victimization, and academic
achievement: Results from a multi-informant study. *School Psychology Quarterly*,
29(3), 360-377. doi:10.1037/spq0000084

Williford, A., Brisson, D., Bender, K. A., Jenson, J. M., & Forrest-Bank, S. (2011).
Patterns of aggressive behavior and peer victimization from childhood to early
adolescence: A latent class analysis. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *40*(6),
644-655. doi:10.1007/s10964-010-9583-9

Williford, A., Boulton, A. J., & Jenson, J. M. (2014). Transitions between subclasses of
bullying and victimization when entering middle school. *Aggressive Behavior*,
40(1), 24-41. doi:10.1002/ab.21503

Wolfe, D. A., Crooks, C. C., Chiodo, D., & Jaffe, P. (2009). Child maltreatment, bullying, gender-based harassment, and adolescent dating violence: Making the connections. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *33*(1), 21-24. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2008.01469.x

Woodrow, C., & Guest, D. E. (2014). When good HR gets bad results: Exploring the challenge of HR implementation in the case of workplace bullying. *Human Resource Management Journal*, *24*(1), 38-56. doi:10.1111/1748-8583.12021

Wu, I. C., Lyons, B., & Leong, F. L. (2015). How racial/ethnic bullying affects rejection sensitivity: The role of social dominance orientation. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *21*(1), 156-161. doi:10.1037/a0037930

Youn Ju, L., Bernstein, K., Mihyoung, L., & Nokes, K. M. (2014). Bullying in the nursing workplace: Applying evidence using a conceptual framework. *Nursing Economic$*, *32*(5), 255-267. doi:bbbcd899036537a6ba217190f1e7093

Yuanyi, C., Lance Ferris, D., Ho Kwong, K., Ming, Y., Mingjian, Z., & Ying, H. (2013 Self-love's lost labor: A self-enhancement model of workplace incivility. *Academy of Management Journal*, *56*(4), 1199-1219. doi:10.5465/amj.2010.0906

Zabrodska, K., & Kveton, P. (2013). Prevalence and forms of workplace bullying among university employees. *Employee Responsibilities & Rights Journal*, *25*(2), 89-108. doi:10.1007/s10672-012-9210-x

Zapf, D. (1999). Organisational work group related and personal causes of mobbing/bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, *20*(1/2), 70–85. doi:10.1108/01437729910268669

Zhou, Z. E., Yan, Y., Che, X. X., & Meier, L. L. (2015). Effect of workplace incivility on end-of-work negative affect: Examining individual and organizational moderators in a daily diary study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *20*(1), 117-130. doi:10.1037/a0038167

Zirkel, P. A. (2013). Public school student bullying and suicidal behaviors: A fatal combination?. *Journal of Law & Education*, *42*(4), 633-652. ISSN: 02756072

Zosky, D. L. (1999). The application of object relations theory to domestic violence. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, *27*(1), 55-69. doi:10.1023/A:1022861331105

Zou, M., NiveditaGanguli, & Shahnawaz, M. G. (2014). Personality and connectedness as predictors of school bullying among adolescent boys. *Journal of Indian Association for Child & Adolescent Mental Health*, *10*(4), 249-270. ISSN: 0973-1342

Appendix A: Aggression Survey

Please note: The questions asked in this survey may be distressing. If at any time you feel uncomfortable answering the questions, you have the right to leave the survey.

Thank you for participating in this survey. The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of abuse or neglect during childhood and adulthood on interpersonal relationships. Your answers will be completely confidential and your identity anonymous. Therefore, it is vital that you answer the questions as truthfully as possible.

1. Age _____

2. Gender = M, F

3. Job Level =

Executive ☐ 1

Management ☐ 2

Supervisor ☐ 3

 Non-management ☐ 4

4. Industry =

Banking ☐ 1

Finance ☐ 2

Manufacturing ☐ 3

Sales ☐ 4

Retail ☐ 5

Construction ☐ 6

Other ☐ 7

Please specify _____

5. Income Level –

Below $20,000   ☐ 1

$20,000-$30,000   ☐ 2

$30,001-$40,000   ☐ 3

$40,001-$50,000   ☐ 4

Above $50,000   ☐ 5

This section asks you to do two things. <u>First</u>, please rate how often you have had each of the following <u>done to you </u>during the past six months. <u>Next</u>, please rate how often you have <u>done each of the following to others </u>during the past six months. For both steps, use the following scale:

Not at All	Once or Twice	Now and Then	About Once a Week	Many Times a Week
1	2	3	4	5

6. Intimidated you.

         Others did to me   I did to others
       ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

7. Ordered to stay late.

         Others did to me   I did to others
       ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

8. Took credit for your work.

         Others did to me   I did to others
       ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

9. Asked you to do uncomfortable things.

Others did to me
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

10. Belittled and undermined you.

Others did to me
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

11. Put down or humiliated you in front of others.

Others did to me
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

12. Told you that you were incompetent.

Others did to me
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

13. Yelled at you.

Others did to me
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

14. Accused you of wrongdoing.

Others did to me
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

15. Made jokes at your expense.

Others did to me
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

16. Gave you the silent treatment.

Others did to me
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

17. Made angry outbursts.

Others did to me
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

18. Criticized your abilities.

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

19. Used sarcasm

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

20. Glared at you

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

21. Had a tantrum

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

22. Revealed your private information

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

23. Spread rumors about you

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

24. Treated you like you were incompetent

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

25. Swore at you

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

26. Blamed you for other's errors

Others did to me   I did to others

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

27. Threw items at you

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

28. Pushed or grabbed you

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

29. Doubted your judgment

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

30. Flaunted their status

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

31. Ignored you or your contributions

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

32. Talked down to you

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

33. Interrupted/prevented you from expressing yourself

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

34. Failed to return phone calls/responded to memos

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

35. Threatened you verbally and/or non-verbally

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

36. Teased you

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

37. Withheld necessary information

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

38. Put undue pressure to produce work

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

39. Set impossible deadlines

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

40. Shifted goals without telling you

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

41. Undervalued your efforts

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

42. Attempted to demoralize you

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

43. Removed your areas of responsibility without consultation

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

44. Set you up to fail

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

45. Overloaded you with work

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

46. Harassed you

Others did to me   I did to others
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Please use the following scale to answer the questions below.

Least Characteristic 1	2	3	4	Most Characteristic 5

I consider myself:

47. Self-assertive   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

48. Self-reliant, confident   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

49. Does not give up easily   ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

50. Exhibits dominating behavior ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

51. Competent and skillful ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

52. Goes to pieces under stress ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

53. Shy, reserved ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

54. Indecisive, vacillating ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

55. Gives in during conflicts ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

56. Easily victimized ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Which of the following objects or statements do you have a positive or negative feeling towards? Please use the following scale to indicate the degree of your positive or negative feeling.

Extremely Negative 1	Somewhat Negative 2	Slightly Negative 3	Neutral 4	Slightly Positive 5	Somewhat Positive 6	Extremely Positive 7

57. We should strive to make incomes as equal as possible.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7

58. Group equality should be our ideal.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7

59. It's OK if some groups have more of a chance in life than others.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7

60. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7

61. We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7

62. It's probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and others are at the bottom.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7

63. Inferior groups should stay in their place.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7

64. We would have fewer problems if groups were treated more equally.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7

65. It would be good if groups could be equal.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7

66. In getting what you want, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7

67. All groups should be given an equal chance in life.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7

68. If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7

69. We should strive for increased social equality.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ 7

70. Sometimes other groups must be kept in their place.

□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7

71. Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.

□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7

72. No one group should dominate in society.

□ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5 □ 6 □ 7

This section asks about childhood experiences.

Please use the following scale to answer these questions.

Never True 1	Rarely True 2	Sometimes True 3	Often True 4	Very Often True 5

During your childhood, did you experience the following by your caregiver?

73. Called names by family □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

74. Parents wished was never born □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

75. Felt hated by family □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

76. Family said hurtful things □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

77. Was emotionally abused □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

78. Hit hard enough to see doctor □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

79. Hit hard enough to leave bruises □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

80. Punished with hard objects □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

81. Was physically abused □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

82. Hit badly enough to be noticed □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

83. Was touched sexually □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

84. Hurt if didn't do something sexual □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

85. Made to do sexual things □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

86. Was molested □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

87. Was sexually abused □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

88. Felt loved □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

89. Made to feel important □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

90. Was looked out for □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

91. Family felt close □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

92. Family was source of strength □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

93. Not enough to eat □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

94. Got taken care of □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

95. Parents were drunk or high □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

96. Wore dirty clothes □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

97. Got taken to doctor □ 1 □ 2 □ 3 □ 4 □ 5

This section is designed to measure the relationship with your partner. Please read each statement and indicate how often each occurred using the scale below. If you are not currently in a romantic relationship, or if you have not been in a relationship during the last year, please select option 5, N/A.

None of the Time	Some of the Time	About Half of the Time	More than Half the Time	All of the Time	N/A
0	1	2	3	4	5

How often:

98. Did she or he say you had to do what she or he wanted because you were his or her girlfriend, woman, or wife?

☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

99. Did she or he threaten you with a weapon?

☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

100. Could you tell that she or he was going to act this way?

☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

101. Did she or he do it to keep you from doing something you wanted or needed to do?

☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

102. Did she or he say she or he acted this way because you owed him/her drugs or money?

☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

103. Did she or he act this way out of the blue?

☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

104. Did she or he threaten to hurt you unless you did what she or he wanted?

☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

105. Were you in a fight?

☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

106. Did she or he threaten to hurt your child/children or someone you love unless you did what she or he wanted?

☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

107. Did she or he threaten to kill you unless you did what she or he wanted?

☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

108. Did she or he act this way to make you do something you didn't want to do?

☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

109. Did she or he use physical force (like holding you down or twisting your arm) to make you do what she or he wanted?

☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

110. Were you in an argument?

☐ 0 ☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Please use the scale below to answer the following questions.

Not at All Characteristic 1	2	3	4	Very Characteristic 5

111. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on others.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

112. People are never there when you need them.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

113. I am comfortable depending on others.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

114. I know that others will be there when I need them.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

115. I find it difficult to trust others completely.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

116. I am not sure that I can always depend on others to be there when I need them.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

117. I do not often worry about being abandoned.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

118. I often worry that my partner does not really love me.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

119. I often worry my partner will not want to stay with me.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

120. I want to merge completely with another person.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

121. My desire to merge sometimes scares people away.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

122. I find it relatively easy to get close to others.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

123. I do not often worry about someone getting too close to me.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

124. I am somewhat uncomfortable being close to others.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

125. I am nervous when anyone gets too close.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

126. Often, love partners want me to be more intimate than I feel comfortable being.

☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

Appendix B: Facebook Page

Workplace Relationships Study Participation
November 11, 2015 ·

Thanks to everyone who participated in this study. Your help is much appreciated. This study has now ended.
Like **Comment** **Share**

Workplace Relationships Study Participation
November 2, 2015 ·

Hi, I am still looking for participants for my study. I am attempting to explore how childhood and/or adult experiences affect workplace relationships and interactions. The survey is completely anonymous and voluntary. It will take between 20 and 30 minutes to complete. The survey can be found at https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/workplaceinteractions

Thanks for your help

Please share.

Workplace Relationships Study Participation

September 9, 2015 ·

Hello, my name is Sandra Trott. I am in need of participants for my dissertation study. The purpose of the study is to explore the effects that childhood and adult experiences have on coworker relationships and interactions. The only criteria to participate are adults 18 or over and have previously or are working a full time job. The survey takes about 30 minutes to complete and is completely anonymous and confidential. I would really appreciate your help by participating in my study or forwarding the information to people you know. The link to the survey is

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/workplaceinteractions

Thanks for your help.

Workplace Relationships Survey

Workplace Relationships Study Participation

July 23, 2015 ·

Hello, my name is Sandra Trott. I am working toward my PhD and need participants for my dissertation study. The purpose of the study is to explore the effects that childhood and adult experiences have on coworker relationships and interactions. The only criteria to participate are adults 18 or over and have or are working a full time job. The survey takes about 30 minutes to complete and is completely anonymous and confidential. I would really appreciate your help by participating in my study or forwarding the information to people you know. The link to the survey is

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/workplaceinteractions

Thank you very much for your help.

Workplace Relationships Study Participation

July 23, 2015 ·

Participating in this study is completely anonymous and confidential. The survey does not collect any identifying information, even your IP address is blocked from collection. The criterion to participate is adults over the age of 18 and has or is working a full time job.
Like **Comment** Share