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Abstract

The development, measurement and implementation of a bystander intervention strategy: A field study on workplace verbal bullying in a large UK organisation.

This thesis addressed the bystander intervention gap in the workplace bullying literature. Bystanders are employees, other than the bully or target, who are present when bullying occurs. They are well placed to intervene but often they do not. Previous research suggested that increased bystander intervention may lead to a reduction in workplace bullying. Although suggestions for bystander intervention in workplace bullying were found in the literature none had been implemented or measured.

As field research this thesis addressed a real-world problem. The participating employees were from a large, mainland UK organisation where workplace verbal bullying had been identified as a problem. Therefore a strategy for bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying was designed, implemented and measured.

The new Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (RIDS) model combined existing theories on the bystanders' decision process and responsibility to support bystander intervention. This quantitative study developed and validated a new 15 item Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric. The concise metric was incorporated into a practical, single-page survey to test the RIDS model in the field.

Shop-floor employees participated in pre and post-intervention surveys ($N = 1501$) and one of four conditions. The RBI-VB metric demonstrated that responsible bystander intervention was positively correlated to bystander willingness to intervene in workplace verbal bullying. This could be increased with RIDS-based training or the in-house campaign; and was positively correlated to self-reported bystander intervention.
Abstract

The study is limited as it took place within a single UK organisation. However, the findings demonstrated the efficacy of the RIDS model and the practical application of the RBI-VB metric for baseline measurements, monitoring and to assess bystander intervention programmes. Willingness to intervene can be increased and this relates to actual intervention but most bystander intervention was carried out by previous targets of workplace verbal bullying. The implications are discussed.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Overview
This quantitative field study developed, implemented and measured a strategy to increase bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying. Increased bystander intervention in workplace bullying has been suggested in the literature as an additional strategy for workplace bullying reduction. To the researcher's knowledge a strategy of this kind has not been implemented or measured for workplace bullying, thus this gap was addressed. Specifically, the researcher conducted experiments to establish if employees could be enabled to intervene and discourage or stop workplace verbal bullying incidents. This thesis presents the design of a new theoretically-based strategy and metric for bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying. Development began with a critical evaluation of the literature on workplace bullying, workplace bullying interventions and bystanders with a reflexive review of literature in other areas to ensure a theoretically sound basis for the strategy.

Following an introduction to key terminology, the facts behind the motivation to increase bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying will be outlined. Briefly, working days are being lost to sickness absence, a common antecedent of which is workplace stress. A frequent cause of workplace stress is workplace bullying which includes but is not limited to workplace verbal bullying. By pursuing interventions which have the potential to reduce workplace verbal bullying, workplace stress and consequently lost working days may also be reduced. One avenue which, until this research, had no reported, implemented and measured strategy was bystander intervention. This thesis addressed the gap.

1.2 Background
The studentship for this research was awarded by the University of Portsmouth Business School. The research theme of a bystander intervention for workplace bullying was suggested and directed by Professor Charlotte Rayner, Head of Organisation Studies and Human Resource Management and an expert in workplace bullying. The precise focus of verbal bullying stemmed from the participating organisation.
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1.3 Terminology

In this thesis a bystander is defined as a person, other than the bully or the target, who is present when the incident occurs (Chapter 4). They could be described as a witness, observer, onlooker, spectator or the audience. Depending on the layout and nature of the work environment they may see the incident, hear it or both.

There is no agreed definition for workplace bullying and this will be scrutinised in Chapter 2. This lack of conformity extends to the terminology, in particular varying uses of the words bullying and mobbing. Throughout this thesis the researcher uses the term bullying but where the work of others is the focus their terms will be used. The classification of workplace verbal bullying, also does not have a universal definition. It is a type of bullying in which the bully's negative behaviour is verbalised. In this study, the definition for workplace verbal bullying is repeated, negative verbal behaviour at work, where the target feels they cannot defend themselves. Examples of this inappropriate behaviour include insults, excessive teasing, threats, humiliation, offensive remarks and persistent criticism.

1.4 Rationale of the study

1.4.1 The motivation for increasing bystander intervention

Finding a bystander intervention gap may have been inevitable given that the leading forces in bystander research stated, “It is perhaps surprising that anyone should intervene at all” (Latané & Darley, 1970, p. 31). Intervening in an unpleasant incident such as workplace verbal bullying is a responsibility that most people may not relish the thought of. Nevertheless, as will become apparent, workplace verbal bullying needs to be reduced and preferably eradicated. The literature stresses that repeated and multi-level strategies are necessary for workplace bullying reduction (Chapter 3). Thus unexplored directions for intervention should be pursued to maximise opportunities for bullying reduction. Research to resolve the bystander gap was long overdue.
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The people with the optimal opportunity for immediate intervention towards this aim are those who are there when the incident happens; the bystanders. To address the lack of bystander intervention strategies in workplace bullying there was much to gain from combining existing knowledge. Literature from the earliest bullying and bystander research continues to yield many more insights and arguments which together guide bullying reduction research.

The motivation for this thesis was the contribution intervening bystanders may be able to make to the reduction of workplace verbal bullying, thereby reducing workplace stress. Subsequently, employees' suffering may be reduced along with the number of days lost to sickness absence. Thus the development of a bystander intervention strategy to reduce workplace verbal bullying had the potential to benefit individuals, employers and society, whilst resolving a gap in the academic literature.

The need for a healthy workforce is promoted by the UK government and is beneficial to the economy, employers and the employees (Harrison, 2012, p. 590; Sparks, Faragher, & Cooper, 2001, p. 504). Thus addressing any antecedent to sickness absence is constructive and mutually advantageous (Health and Safety Executive, 2012).

Although the number of days lost to employee sickness in 2013 had reduced over the prior decade (178 million days in 1993; Office of National Statistics, April 2014, p. 1); there were still 131 million days lost to sickness absence. Minor illnesses (coughs and colds) were the most prolific reasons but musculoskeletal (back and neck) problems accounted for the greatest number of lost days (Office of National Statistics, April 2014, p. 3). Stress, anxiety and depression contributed substantially to absences with 15.2 million days lost to these mental health issues (Office of National Statistics, April 2014, p. 3). This has a wide reaching negative impact. Research in 31 European countries, using the national worker health productivity model, demonstrated a connection between worker health and gross domestic product (Dollard, & Neser, 2013, p. 14).

1.4.2 Workplace stress

Although it is both intuitive and evidenced that workplace stress affects our health and
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well-being (Fevre, Lewis, Robinson, & Jones, 2011; Hansen, Høgh, Persson, Karlson, Garde, & Ørbæk, 2006; Hoel, Cooper, & Faragher, 2001, p. 457; Leymann, & Gustafsson, 1996; Rayner, Hoel, & Copper, 2002; Vartia-Väänänen, 2003), the term stress has more than one interpretation. Recognising that stress has different meanings in different fields Beehr and Franz (1987) debated stress in the context of the workplace. In this thesis stress refers to negative stress levels (distress) which lead to detrimental consequences and not 'good' stress (eustress) which is necessary for survival.

Stress has been established as a common cause of sickness absence. Across the European Union up to 28% of the workforce experience work-related stress (Commission of the European Communities, 2005, p. 9). High levels of workplace stress are consistently found near the top of reported illnesses caused or exacerbated at work. Evidenced by the annual United Kingdom national Labour Force Survey, the highest incidence was in organisations with over 50 employees, with 2.3% of working hours lost to sickness absence (Office of National Statistics, April 2014, p. 10).

The ill treatment of employees can lead to stress and subsequently sickness absence (Fevre, Lewis, Robinson, & Jones, 2011). A study of one large British, finance sector organisation illustrated the extent of workplace stress from a single, minor ill-treatment. Although minimal exposure 60% of staff reported this led to them feeling stressed (Fevre, et al., 2011, p. 25). The organisation was held in esteem by employees and the public but changes in practice and the use of humiliation by management had created detrimental behaviour patterns (Fevre, et al., 2011, p. 25). Quantitative data exposed the extent of the negative influence of poor communication, performance, workload and deadline pressures combined with poor management practice (Fevre, et al., 2011, p. 25). The changes in the organisation mirrored those in the sector as a whole and therefore the potential for stress was likely to be widespread. A further indication of the negative impact of ill treatment was that 20% of those employees with at least one such experience contemplated seeking work elsewhere. Workplace verbal bullying qualifies as ill treatment, consequently it may lead to stress and sickness absence.
Chapter 1

Stress experienced over an extended period or of great intensity is especially detrimental both psychologically and physiologically (Johnson, Cooper, Cartwright, Donald, Taylor, & Millet, 2005, p. 179). Therefore, high levels of stress should be dealt with through removal of the source or by appropriate coping strategies (Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2010, p. 426). The poor managerial practices in the aforementioned financial sector case (Fevre, Lewis, Robinson, & Jones, 2011) could well have been detrimentally augmented by managerial stress being inappropriately manifested in aggressive behaviours. The destructive nature of workplace stress affects everyone and is self-perpetuating if not properly resolved.

1.4.3 The costs of workplace bullying

One of the key causes of workplace stress is the pertinacious problem of workplace bullying (Cooper, Hoel, & Faragher, 2004, p. 369; Earnshaw, & Cooper, 1994; Gardner & Johnson, 2001, p. 28; Health and Safety Executive, 2012; Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2010; Mikkelsen, & Einarsen, 2002; Parzefall, & Salin, 2010). It is not unusual for it to persist for extended periods (Einarsen, 2000, p.384). The cost of this for the individuals has been extensively researched (Einarsen, & Mikkelsen, 2003; Hallberg, & Strandmark, 2006; Vartia, 2001).

Workplace bullying was shown to be the source of stress in a study of American novice nurses (Berry, Gillespie, Gates, & Schafer, 2012, p. 84). Almost the whole sample of nurses (90%, n = 191) who had experienced workplace bullying reported at least moderate levels of stress. Beyond the personal implications, thebullied novice nurses' productivity was reduced as the stress affected their ability to handle their workload (Berry, et al., 2012, p. 86). Thus stress and in particular the increased incidence of sickness absence negatively impacts productivity (Fevre, Lewis, Robinson, & Jones, 2011, p. 34; Sparks, Faragher, & Cooper, 2001, p. 504).

At work it is not only the target but also other employees who suffer (Høgh, Mikkelsen, & Hansen, 2011, p. 108; Lovell, & Lee, 2011; Sheehan, 2004, p. 8; Vartia, 2001).
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Nonetheless, there was evidence from the health sector that the impact was greater on the target (Kivimäki, Elovainio, & Vahtera, 2000; Ortega, Christensen, Høgh, Rugulies, & Borg, 2011). The negative impact, on both health and eventually finances, may extend to family when workplace bullying increases stress on an employee (Duffy, & Sperry, 2007; Tracy, Lutgen-Sandvik, & Alberts, 2006; Owoyemi, 2011, p. 120; Zapf, Knorز, & Kulla, 1996, p. 217). In addition to the impact of workplace bullying being harmful to employee's health and the employer's productivity, it has an enormous financial impact on society (Sheehan, Barker, & Rayner, 1999; Beswick, Gore, & Palferman, 2006; Hoel, Sparks, & Cooper, 2001). In a 2008 report commissioned by the Dignity at Work Partnership on the cost of workplace bullying, guidance was presented for the development of business cases to address the problem of workplace bullying (Giga, Hoel, & Lewis, 2008). Complex calculations were based on existing data which included absenteeism, turnover and productivity (Giga, et al., 2008, p. 11). The report estimated that the cost of workplace bullying in the United Kingdom amounted to billions of pounds (Giga, et al, 2008).

1.4.4 Intervention strategies for workplace bullying

Interventions are required to reduce workplace bullying and its negative consequences (Saam, 2010). Although the phenomenon of workplace bullying has been chronicled for centuries and researched for decades, academic reports of tested solutions were in short supply at the turn of the millennium (Illing, Carter, Thompson, Crampton, Morrow, Howse, Cooke, & Burford, 2013, p. 217). In the 1990s there had been descriptive works which explored possible solutions (Bassman, 1992; Resch, & Schubinski, 1996; Sotile, & Sotile, 1999); but at the 2012 conference of the International Association on Workplace Bullying and Harassment robust interventions were still called for (Zapf, 2012). Interventions that reduce workplace stressors are known to improve health and economic development, according to a green paper from the Commission of the European Communities (2005, p. 9). The investigation of strategies to tackle workplace bullying are still in their infancy but the potential benefits to all concerned are worthy; thus this is the impetus for the current research (Carden, & Boyd, 2011, p. 1013; Myrden, Delorey, Xavier, Loughlin, 2011, p. 6).
Chapter 1

Discussion on stress reduction intervention in the 1990s stated that tertiary interventions were more common than primary and secondary (Hurrell, & Murphy, 1996). Similarly the bullying literature revealed that tertiary strategies were the first to be implemented (Leymann, 1990; 1996); with preventative and intervention strategies beginning to emerge later. An extensive review took place for the UK National Health Service (NHS) and was published in 2013, revealing that few actual interventions have been reported in any detail (Illing, Carter, Thompson, Crampton, Morrow, Howse, Cooke, & Burford, 2013). The implementation of intervention strategies is discussed in Chapter 3. At the time of writing no implemented bystander intervention strategies for workplace bullying had been published.

Recognised as an untapped potential, training witnesses (synonymous to bystanders in this context) to intervene is relatively unexplored in workplace bullying (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011; Illing, Carter, Thompson, Crampton, Morrow, Howse, Cooke, & Burford, 2013). However this has been a strategy for some time in school bullying (Slaby, Wilson-Simmons, & DeVos, 1994; White, Raczynski, Pack, & Wang, 2011); sexual harassment (Bowes-Sperry, & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005); sexual violence (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004; Coker, Cook-Craig, Williams, Fisher, Clear, Garcia, & Hegge, 2011); and racial prejudice (Ishiyama, 2000).

The value of bystander intervention has emerged in a few related studies. In their evaluation of a drama-based training programme within the NHS, Carter and Thompson (2013) reported an increase in witness intervention in bullying incidents after the inclusive training. An unexpected development from an action research approach to workplace bullying was collegial support for targets indicating that encouraging witnesses to intervene had potential (van Heugten, 2011). Further evidence for the potential value of intervening bystanders was presented in a phenomenological exploration of the subjective work experiences of call centre agents in India (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011, p. 271). Whilst not implementing an intervention, the work revealed the important role of witnesses. The impact of context, and in particular friendships, on the extent of support for targets was analysed. In a few cases the witness felt able to confront the bully (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011, p. 277). These recent studies reinforce the
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suggestion that witnesses are possible direction for research into bullying reduction (Rayner, & Keashley, 2005, p. 286).

1.5 Research question, aims and hypotheses

This thesis focusses on bystanders to workplace verbal bullying. The Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (RIDS) and Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric were developed in response to the research question:

What theoretically-based, measurable, bystander intervention strategy will increase bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying?

There were 4 aims set to answer the research question:

1. Develop a theoretically-based bystander intervention strategy.
2. Develop a metric for bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying.
3. Develop an intervention programme to increase bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying.
4. Field test the strategy using the new metric and intervention programme.

In satisfying these aims this research has contributed to knowledge in the fields of workplace bullying and bystanders. The participating organisation was provided with a baseline measure of bystander intervention and bystander's willingness to intervene in workplace verbal bullying. The new strategy is a framework on which practitioners may base bystander intervention programmes.

1.6 A field project

Laboratory experiments using undergraduate participants have a valuable role to play in research; not least availability, abundance and convenience (Foot, & Sanford, 2004, p. 256). Without these undergraduate volunteers almost all research would be more costly and time consuming. A long running criticism in psychological research has been the bias this practice introduces (Gallander Wintre, North, & Sugar, 2001; McNemar, 1946). Not only does this impact generalisability to the population as a whole there are ethical
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concerns in that participation may not be wholly voluntary (Sieber, & Saks, 1989). Although some students are prepared to volunteer for the experience or the price of a cup of coffee others do so for course credit (Padilla-Walker, Thompson, Zamboanga, & Schmersal, 2005). In the United States it was found that only 11% of participation pools were truly voluntary (Foot, & Sanford, 2004, p. 257). Furthermore alternatives to participation were generally so unattractive that they could not be considered a real choice (Kimmel, 2007, p. 217).

Clearly the reverse practice would be sampling from a wider population with the associated costs and inconvenience. There is a continuum between the two extremes of recruitment or rather a menu from which researchers can select; each option accompanied by its own costs and rewards. Hybridised between the decision to be laboratory based with control and sterility or in the field with treacherous confounds but real-world validity, the choices are complex. In this research the limitations posed by a field research were accepted and these will be described as they arise throughout the thesis.

The field research was not purely academic research designed for generalisability but collaborative research to resolve a real issue being experienced in an organisation. This required acceptance of the recruitment being carried out by the participating organisation and therefore a non-randomised sample. Control was limited for the researcher and it was unknown what background factors may have had the potential to impact results, beyond the information provided by the gatekeeper. Maintaining relevance and rigour as far as possible, this field context was dealt with through meticulous design. By introducing interventions deliberately timed to measure their effects with a highly specific and consistent measure, potential confounds were minimised. Baseline measurement; six independent groups in five geographically separate locations with two control groups and researcher led training were involved. As all the participants were employed in mainland Great Britain, by a single large, UK organisation the sample was only representative of that organisation or other very similar organisations.
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1.6.1 Recruiting the participating organisation

One of the defining aspects of this thesis is its field context. The Director of Studies had identified a potential organisation and it was planned from the outset that the research would be field tested. Therefore assumptions about the potential participating organisation were considered in the early planning stages. The assumptions were based on the Director of Studies previous collaboration with the organisation; where their openness to academic partnership had been established.

Bullying issues had been identified and the organisation's commitments to resolving them was clear. The organisation was recruited by the Director of Studies and the gatekeeper agreed that a proposal for a strategy to increase bystander intervention in workplace bullying would be considered. The new strategy was to be incorporated into the existing training programme with before and after measures. A short metric designed to assess the new bystander intervention strategy would be included in the organisation's monthly employee survey.

1.6.2 Acceptance of the proposal

When the proposal for the research was presented, organisational changes were revealed. The employee survey had been discontinued, trainers were no longer employed and no training programme was available to incorporate the research into. Thus it was necessary to design and administer a full survey specifically for the research. It was suggested and agreed that the researcher design a training programme and present it to an experimental group.

The organisation's preferred focus was verbal bullying as their discontinued organisation-wide surveying had indicated 70% of the employees had experienced verbal bullying (CiC Gatekeeper, 2011). The data for this had been shared in a previous collaboration with the Director of Studies although it was not made available for the current research. Focussing on this form of bullying had advantages for the researcher. Some forms of bullying may have been difficult to identify, for example shunning and graffiti, whereas verbal bullying was tangible. It cannot be ignored that physical bullying would also be tangible and likely more so. The researcher chose not to address
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physical bullying because it may be construed as battery, which, unlike other types of bullying, is an offence under the UK law. It was feasible to clarify verbal bullying for the employees and thus to measure it for the research.

The gatekeeper provided information on the organisation's previous bullying awareness campaign and it was agreed that this would be assessed in a separate condition to the researcher trained group. The proposal was accepted in principle and a meeting with the union was planned (Appendix A). This resulted in union approval to proceed with the research.

1.6.3 Confidential research

Non-academic organisations with the courage to voluntarily acknowledge their workplace bullying problems to outsiders are few and far between. Impression management amplifies sensitivity in field settings (King, Hebl, Morgan, & Ahmad, 2013). Organisations are justifiably concerned when tabooed topics are raised by academics in association with their institution. Those who are also prepared to admit a researcher to experiment specifically in this highly sensitive area are rare (Notelaers, 2010, p. 111). Confidential research ameliorates the concerns somewhat.

The identity of the organisation was kept confidential throughout the research with only the researcher and supervisory team aware of the organisation's name. In all communications the organisation was referred to as Company in Confidence (CiC). The organisation will not be named in this thesis and information which would identify it has not been included. This includes the name of the union; a glossary of terms used in the industry; descriptions of activities; exact locations of the participating groups; and the identity removed from documents such as the survey.

1.7 Structure of this thesis

This first chapter has provided an overview of the thesis which is presented in 9 chapters. The nature of the research, the research question, goals and the academic gap have been introduced. The participating organisation was also introduced within the
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bounds of their confidentiality remaining protected.

Chapter 2 reviews academic interest in the phenomenon of workplace bullying. Clarifying why workplace bullying is a problem it goes on to trace development of the research field from early bullying research to specialisations in workplace bullying. The current research is articulated in terms of specialisations. Current definition issues are examined and criteria which categorise specific behaviours as bullying are discussed.

Chapter 3 stays with the bullying literature to review the development of intervention strategies for the reduction and cessation of workplace bullying behaviours. The motivations for reduction are described prior to examining the characteristics of intervention strategies. A framework for scientific and robust strategies is explained. This chapter ends with a review of the progress in intervention strategies.

In Chapter 4 the bystander literature is critically reviewed. Beginning by defining the bystander, their presence in workplace bullying and the rationale for including them in intervention strategies are explained. The different roles that bystanders undertake in bullying are considered along with the implications of these roles for an intervention strategy. The foundations of the bystander decision process and inhibiting factors are detailed. Areas of research other than bullying where bystander intervention is already being implemented are explored to reveal potential theoretical approaches to an intervention strategy. The chapter ends with outlines of three frameworks; social categorisation, social norms and responsibility.

The methodological approach of the study is outlined in Chapter 5. The rationale for the design is explained prior to a description of each stage in the process. The overall project design decisions and considerations are reviewed. Following on from this the initial survey construction is justified. The purpose and development of the metric designed specifically to measure the bystander intervention strategy is discussed. The results of validation testing are given with an explanation of the need to reconstruct the survey.

In Chapter 6 the reconstruction and second pilot study are detailed. The development
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of the experimental programmes, including the field training and the organisation's own programme are discussed. The chapter ends with details of the launch of the field study.

The analyses of the data and results of the study are revealed in Chapter 7, illustrating the functionality of the new Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (RIDS). The preparation of the data is described and the variables are examined. Descriptive statistics provide information on the demographic characteristics of the participants and their exposure to workplace verbal bullying. The outcomes of the relational and experimental hypotheses are presented. The chapter ends with an assessment of the participating organisation's in-house anti-bullying campaign.

Chapter 8 places the results in the context of the literature. How the studies aims were addressed to answer the research question and the importance of the expected and unexpected results are discussed. The real-world impact of field work and the disadvantages are considered. The known limitations of the work are critically assessed.

Chapter 9 draws the thesis to a close with a review of the contribution this thesis makes to academic methodology, knowledge and the implications for practice. Suggestions are made for future bystander research and bystanders to workplace bullying in particular.

1.8 Chapter summary

In this chapter the nature of the problem being addressed was described along with an explanation supporting the importance of addressing the academic gap. There had not been an implemented and measured bystander intervention strategy for workplace bullying and this would be resolved. The motivation for increasing bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying was explained and it was this which drove this project to develop a robust and practical intervention strategy. Verbal bullying was the focus as it had been identified as an issue by the participating organisation. The collaboration was confidential and therefore information about the organisation was intentionally brief. Lastly the structure of the thesis was provided as a guide for the reader.
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2 Academic understanding of workplace bullying

2.1 Introduction
In this chapter the bullying literature is critically reviewed. The literature was examined both to fully understand the field and to justify the direction of this research. Confirming that bystander intervention in workplace bullying was suggested in the literature but not carried through, the gap was clearly visible. During the review process areas relevant to the development of a new strategy for workplace bullying were identified. A path will be drawn from the beginnings of bullying as an area of academic interest through to the development of specialisms; with particular attention on the current progress in workplace bullying interventions.

2.2 Development of bullying literature
Bullying research is a vast area which had been considered from many perspectives including, antecedents (Baillien, De Cuyper, De Witte, 2011; Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2011; Heames, Harvey, Treadway, 2006; Hoel & Salin, 2003; Johnson, 2011; Neuman, & Baron, 2003; Notelaers, De Witte, & Einarsen, 2010; Zapf, & Einarsen, 2003), measures (Cowie, Naylor, Rivers, Smith, & Pereira, 2002; Salin, 2001) and consequences (Duffy, & Sperry, 2007; Omari, 2007). The contexts in which bullying has been explored include schools (Olweus, 1973), workplaces (Einarsen, Raknes, & Matthiesen, 1994; Leymann, 1990), and countries (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2003). For the current research the relevant specialism was a less prolific area of the literature: workplace bullying interventions. To understand how research arrived at this area of interest the development of bullying research will be summarised in this chapter.

Initially a general realisation of bullying as an issue was addressed through exploration of the implications for people and subsequently their employers. Once the motivation for bullying research was established and there was academic materialisation of the research field, specialisms subsequently developed. These are reviewed according to the influence they had on the strategy and metric under development. Thus some areas will be dealt with in greater detail. The terms bullying and mobbing are often used interchangeably in the literature and this will be addressed in the section on description.
2.3 The emergence of bullying research

Bullying and harassment have existed as long as there have been workplaces; abhorrent actions by one person towards another have been occurring at work for centuries. It is recorded that ancient Greek workers, quarrying in the Nile region, sent a papyrus letter complaining about their foreman, Apollônios the ganger, in 255 B.C.E. (Petrie, Sayce & Griffith, 1891). The phenomenon is enduring but its acceptability is not.

Initially attention to the phenomenon of bullying people was raised by clinicians interpreting behaviours through existing knowledge and focussing on school bullying (figure 2.1 above). Considering the same phenomenon in the context of working adults emerged more slowly and became a research interest later (figure 2.1 above). The publication of psychiatrist Carroll Brodsky's (1976) study-based book highlighted the plight of beleaguered American employees, with detailed insight into the complexities of workplace harassment in California and Nevada. As an Independent Medical Examiner and through referrals from insurance companies Brodsky's interest in work
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pressure and harassment developed (Brodsky, 1976, p. xi). He was subject to the biases of his time, notably boundaries for behaviours relating to subcultures; with different expectations for assembly-line workers compared to business managers (Brodsky, 1976, p. 47). Notwithstanding this, his research is a rich resource of pertinent observations and analysis. Accepting that the sample of employees was not representative as all the cases were seeking compensation or disability payments, other psychiatrists reports were reviewed for comparisons and corroboration (Brodsky, 1976, p. xiii). Comprehending the complexity of the target's perception and external evidence, Brodsky identified lines of enquiry which continue today. These included the severity of implications beyond those reported by the harassed worker, that is, the enormous cost to industry (Brodsky, 1976, p. xi). From the case studies he construed the different directions of harassment such as top down and peer level and the key facet of unequal power (Brodsky, 1976, p. 30; p. 50). At the time of his publication the importance of his work was overlooked but interest re-emerged in Scandinavia in the 1980's (Leymann, 1990).

Remaining with the clinical focus, the earliest large-scale bullying studies were Olweus' pioneering work on aggression in Swedish schools following earlier work by Swedish school physician and author, Heinemann (1972) (Björkqvist, & Österman, 1999; Olweus, 1973; 1978; 1999; Vaillancourt, McDougall, Hymel, Krygsman, Miller, Stiver, & Davis, 2008). Heinemann's (1972) work interpreted the bullying behaviours of school children based on ethologist Lorenz's first description of mobbing in animals (Björkqvist, & Österman, 1999; Lorenz, 1966; Vaillancourt, et al., 2008). Concurrent with these early explorations Pikas began work on what was to develop into the shared concern method of group treatment (Pikas, 2002; Rigby, 2005). Pikas' Farsta-method for addressing school bullying was favoured on the islands between Sweden and Finland but a criticism was made of the strategy (Björkqvist, & Österman, 1999, p. 62). The point of contention was that Pikas' advocated forming a pact with the bully in which their parents were not informed (Björkqvist, & Österman, 1999, p. 62). Contrary to the Farst-method, Olweus' method, which encourage communication with parents, was the most common method in Finland (where Swedish is understood) (Björkqvist, & Österman, 1999, p. 62).
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At the behest of the Norwegian government Olweus began prevalence studies and the scope was later broadened into programmes for change (Olweus, 1993). Public and media attention was drawn to school bullying in the wake of the 1982 suicides of 3 children from the same small Norwegian town; all had been bullying victims (Olweus, 1991, p. 412). In the United Kingdom at the same time, Orton, a medical doctor who had already published on the subject in 1975 was chairing what was possibly the first symposium on mobbing (Orton, 1982). Although some aspects of these early works on child bullying inform workplace bullying research, the disparity in the dynamics necessitate caution before adapting it to adults at work.

2.4 European adult bullying research

Workplace bullying research was instigated in Sweden by German psychiatrist Heinz Leymann with the goal of restoring the health of his patients (Leymann, 1990; 1996). Recognised as the first in the academic field he went on to develop the Leymann Inventory of Psychological Terror (LIPT); the first measure for adults (Leymann, 1990; 1996). Although initially administered to patients it was intended as a metric and not a diagnostic tool (Leymann, 1990; Saam, 2010); it has also been described as a list of mobbing tactics (Hecker, 2007).

The severity of symptoms found in patients who had been subjected to workplace bullying were compared to those of post traumatic stress disorder and extended as far as suicide (Leymann, 1987 [in Swedish] cited in Leymann, 1990). Although his early work focused on those already presenting with health issues, much broader investigations demonstrated the presence of serious symptoms in the wider Swedish workforce (Leymann, 1996). The “...authoritative foundation...” of workplace bullying research is ascribed to Leymann but unfortunately much of his early work is untranslated (Hecker, 2007, p. 439).

2.5 Awareness in the United Kingdom: Adams and Field

British broadcaster and journalist Andrea Adams clarified the phenomenon as bullying and received an immense public response to the BBC radio documentaries on her investigations (Field, 1996; Yamada, 2011). Subsequently her book disclosed the
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ravages being perpetrated in the workplace, while seeking to improve the lives of victims and all workers (Adams, & Crawford, 1992; Field, 1996). After her untimely death her work was carried on by the first UK organisation to offer support and guidance on bullying in the workplace, the Andrea Adam's Trust (1996 – 2010) formed by Lyn Witheridge (Royal College of Psychiatrist, 2008).

British bullying activist, Tim Field, not only described workplace bullying but gave practical advice to challenge the behaviour in his book, 'Bully in Sight' (Field, 1996). Attributing the principle credit for identifying workplace bullying to Adams; Field likewise based his insights on actual reports and intended his advice to benefit everyone (Field, 1996, p. xiv). With awareness being raised practical support was needed for targets and Field founded the first UK advice line and website which he funded through sales of his book (Tim Field Foundation, 2010). Field died at the age of 53 having received honorary doctorates for his work (Messenger, 2006). The Quaker and Business Group (2010) continues his commitment to a world free of bullying after his death through the Tim Field Foundation.

2.6 Prevalence of workplace bullying

As the motivation for this study was the extensive negative impact of workplace bullying, further evidence was needed from the literature that this detrimental behaviour was taking place, not only in general but specifically in the UK. Previous collections of UK data would provide background support for the participating organisations claim that workplace bullying was a problem. Although this was not disputed the participating organisation had not provided a data set or results evidencing the problem.

Summarising studies worldwide and in their own country, the USA, researchers have suggested that workplace bullying is pandemic with a hold in many work forces (Lutgen-Sandvik, Namie, & Namie, 2009, p. 41). Variations between countries have been reported, such as a lower prevalence in Scandinavian countries than in the USA (Lutgen-Sandvik, Tracy, & Alberts, 2007, p. 852). However, Danish researchers have disagreed claiming that Denmark does not have comparatively lower rates (Ortega, Høgh, Pejtersen, & Olsen, 2009, p. 432). They went on to explain that the disparity in
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findings may have been owing to sample sizes and general awareness about the phenomenon (Ortega, et al., 2009, p. 432). In an analysis of European studies a detailed picture emerged showing an increase in prevalence related to a decrease in severity (Zapf, Einarsen, Hoel, & Vartia, 2003, p. 121). That is, although some cultural variation was noted, occasional bullying was experienced twice as often as severe bullying (Escartín, Rodríguez-Carballeira, Zapf, Porrúa, & Martín-Peña, 2009; Zapf, et al., 2003, p. 121). Prevalence rates have also been found to vary across employment sectors (Illing, Carter, Thompson, Crampton, Howse, Cooke, & Burford, 2013, p. 34). Within healthcare the rates are high with UK National Health Service (NHS) surveys indicating that 15% of staff had been bullied, with higher rates for junior doctors (Illing et al., 2013, p. 34). In a British study of over 70 organisations including 5,288 individuals almost a quarter of participants had experienced bullying in the previous 5 years (Hoel, & Cooper, 2001a, p. 3). The researchers suggested that sufficient evidence had been provided for workplace bullying to be, “...on any organisation’s agenda” (Hoel, & Cooper, 2000, p. 27). Although it seems that there are few organisations untouched by these toxic behaviours the quality of studies has varied (Zapf, et al., 2003, p. 122). Consequently further substantiation has been called for through more rigorous studies (Zapf, et al., 2003, p. 122). Nevertheless, there is adequate evidence of the occurrence of harmful workplace bullying including in Britain to justify the current study.

2.7 Growth of workplace bullying research

The initial drive to describe the phenomenon through the experiences of victims continued (Adams, & Crawford, 1992; Brodsky, 1976; Field, 1996; Leymann, 1990; 1996). The field of workplace bullying being firmly established, attention turned to specialisations (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2003, p. 7). An early and continuing aim was to gain quantitative insight into prevalence, thereby necessitating the development of scales (Björkqvist, Österman, & Hjelt-Bäck, 1994; Einarsen, Raknes & Matthieson, 1994; Einarsen, & Skogstad, 1996; Hoel, Giga, & Faragher, 2006; Leymann, 1990). Alongside these measures qualitative studies explored the experiences of targets (Hallberg, & Strandmark, 2006; Keashly, 2001; Lewis, & Orford, 2005; Verdasca, 2000); thus, together academics began to grasp the extent of the phenomenon.
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From its clinical beginnings (Groeblinghoff, & Becker, 1996; Leymann, 1990; 1996) and early general academic interest (Björkqvist, Österman, & Hjelt-Bäck, 1994; Einarsen, Raknes, & Matthiesen, 1994) the extent of the field became increasingly apparent, along with prevalence and target's experiences other specific sub-fields emerged. Knowledge sharing enabled researchers to become more targeted and was well established by the time of the suitably named conference in Montréal in 2008, Workplace Bullying: Sharing Our Knowledge (Lovell, & Lee, 2011, p. 344). Researchers could apply and advance their wide ranging expertise to a growing group of sub-fields. There have been approaches from the perspectives of many disciplines including: Clinical psychology and psychiatry (Leymann, 1990; 1996; Nolfe, Triassi, Cappuccio, Carbone, & Nolfe, 2012); occupational psychology (Agervold, & Mikkelsen, 2004; Baillien, De Cuyper, & De Witte, 2011); occupational health (Caponecchia, & Wyatt, 2009; Ortega, Høgh, Pejtersen, & Olsen, 2009; Vartia, 2001); law (Jarretta, García-Campayo, Gascon, & Bolea, 2004; Porteous, 2002); human resource management (D'Cruz, Noronha, & Beale, 2014; Harrington, Rayner & Warren, 2012; Lewis, & Rayner, 2003; Salin, 2008) and management (Beale, & Hoel, 2011; Branch, Ramsay, & Barker, 2013).

Globally an increasing number of research centres began to explore the phenomenon. Workplace bullying is researched within specific sectors and countries; such as the Norwegian public and private sectors (Einarsen, & Skogstad, 1996); UK, USA and Eire fire services (Archer, 1999); occupational health services in Finland (Vartia, 2001; Vartia, Korppoo, Fallenius, & Mattila, 2003); global organisations (Harvey, Treadway, & Heames, 2007); the Australian public sector (Omari, 2007); American libraries (Hecker, 2007); the Danish public sector (Agervold, 2007); British hospital dentists (Steadman, Quine, Jack, Felix, & Waumsley, 2009); junior doctors in Pakistan (Imran, Jawaid, Haider, & Masood, 2010); Japanese civil servants (Tsuno, Kawakami, Inoue, & Abe, 2010); Lithuanian management (Žukauskas, & Vveinhardt, 2010); support associations for target of bullying in Spain (Escartín, Rodríguez-Carballeira, Gómez-Benito, & Zapf, 2010); Indian call centres (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011); Australian school staff (Riley, Duncan, & Edwards, 2011); North American health sector (Johnson, 2011); Italian public sector (Balducci, Fracaroli, & Schaufeli, 2011);
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and UK higher education (Simpson, & Cohen, 2011); Italian psychiatric patients (Nolfe, Triassi, Cappuccio, Carbone, & Nolfe, 2012); UK National Health Service (Carter, Thompson, Crampton, Morrow, Burford, Gray, & Illing, 2013); New Zealand healthcare sector (Cooper-Thomas, Gardner, O'Driscoll, Catley, Bentley, & Trenberth, 2013); nurses in the USA (Stagg, Sheridan, Jones, & Speroni, 2013); and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (McKay, 2013). Reaching across every country, the advantages of the internet enabling wide discussion and collaboration, the study of workplace bullying research has genuinely become worldwide.

2.8 Specialisations

Combining perspectives, disciplines, countries and interests has led to wide ranging studies in the field of workplace bullying. Although there are a great many specialisations they can be categorised under five key sub-fields. These areas of workplace bullying are definition, exploring antecedents, investigating consequences and measurement. These four are necessary to increase knowledge of the phenomenon and move towards the fifth category of intervention. Specialisation in workplace bullying is unlikely to be clear cut as all the areas are interwoven and interdependent. That is, although the focus may be on a single area, some understanding of the others is essential. The extent to which each area is included is dependent on the particular study and the point of convergence is the phenomenon itself; workplace bullying. At the most basic level each area is considered in an overview (figure 2.2 below).
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Figure 2.2 Specialism in a basic workplace bullying study

It could be argued that a qualitative study could completely ignore the area of measurement or that a definition study could completely avoid intervention. However, at least a basic review of the literature takes place prior to any research and it would be unwise to neglect any area completely. Although there is diversity in the interim goals in workplace bullying research it is safe to say that the long term aim is to reduce workplace bullying (Cleary, Hunt, & Horsfall, 2010; Keashly, & Neuman, 2004; Tracy, Lutgen-Sandvik, Alberts, 2006; Wheeler, Halbesleben, & Shanine, 2010).

A general study would encompass all areas and consequently is likely to be large and complex, such as Illing and colleagues extensive report for the UK National Health Service (Ilging, Carter, Thompson, Crampton, Morrow, Howse, Cooke, & Burford, 2013). Hence, the visualisation of their study would indicate in-depth attention in all areas (figure 2.3 below).
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In summary, the research field of workplace bullying has grown to the extent that specialisations have been categorised and investigated enabling the details of this destructive phenomenon to be determined. The aims and scope of each study indicate the extent to which each specialisation is involved in a study. Whilst all areas should be considered each researcher or research group can focus on growing discerning workplace bullying knowledge. Through reviews, conferences, publications including meta-analyses, collaborations with practitioners and industry, the sum of knowledge contributes to the overall understanding of workplace bullying increasing the potential for methods of reduction to be found.

2.8.1 Specialisms and the current study
At the outset of the design, in collaboration with the participating organisation, the context for the research was set. The current study was not a general study of workplace bullying but an enterprise attending to a small piece of the puzzle. This was the development of a measurable bystander intervention strategy to target the most prolific bullying behaviour in the participating organisation; verbal bullying. Therefore the specialisms that would require particular attention could be identified. To begin an
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intervention development there are questions which must be answered. The nature of the targeted phenomena must be established, any existing methods for dealing with it must scrutinised and suitable instruments for measurement must be identified. These enquiries indicated the specialisms that required extensive review (figure 2.4 below).

![Figure 2.4 Establishing the focal specialisms for bystander intervention](image)

The behaviour was workplace verbal bullying which does not have an agreed definition. Nevertheless the criteria which make up any bullying definition apply equally to verbal bullying (Appendix B). Prior to the development of a bystander intervention strategy for workplace verbal bullying, existing bystander intervention strategies were investigated (Chapter 3). It was essential for the strategy to be measurable to ascertain its efficacy. Existing measures were explored to discover if they were appropriate for this study (Chapter 5).

The extent to which each specialism was included in this thesis was established by understanding the contribution each would make to the research. It was important to broadly understand the antecedents and consequences of workplace bullying in relation to bystander interventions. However a bystander intervention is a secondary rather than
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preventative action, thus antecedents were not a focus. The negative consequences of workplace bullying in general were the impetus for this research but specific consequences for the participating organisation were not being investigated. As a first venture into the implementation of a bystander intervention strategy for workplace bullying the goal was general; to increase bystander intervention specifically in workplace verbal bullying. The areas of definition, intervention and measurement must be researched to a greater extent with emphasis on the latter two as it is a new intervention which is being designed and measured. Thus, a visualisation of the weighting of specialisms in the current research can be seen below (figure 2.5).

Figure 2.5 Specialisms in the study of bystander intervention development and measurement

Antecedents, consequences, definition and intervention are explored in this chapter and measurement is reviewed as part of the methods (Chapter 5).

2.8.2 Antecedents and consequences of workplace verbal bullying

Initial research recognised the damage to the health of targets (Leymann, 1990); and consideration of antecedents began almost simultaneously (Einarsen, Raknes & Matthieson, 1994; Groeblinghoff, & Becker. 1996; Leymann, 1990). Over twenty years
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later the damage had been overwhelmingly evidenced and both aspects continue to be explored (Baillien, De Cuyper, & De Witte, 2011; Cooper, Hoel, Faragher, & Cooper, 2004; Samnani, & Singh, 2012; Vartia-Väännänen, 2003; Vie, Glasø, & Einarsen, 2011; Zapf, & Einarsen, 2001). It is intuitive that they do not exist without each other but in workplace bullying the relationship between the two can be complex (O'Leary-Kelly, Griffin, & Glew, 1996; Aquino, Grover, Bradfield, & Allen, 1999; Vartia, 1996, p. 212; Zapf, 1999). To illustrate; a stressful workplace can lead to bullying (the work environment hypothesis; Einarsen, Raknes, & Matthiesen, 1994; O'Leary-Kelly, et al., 1996; Salin, 2003b); and workplace bullying is a leading cause of high levels of workplace stress (Berry, Gillespie, Gates, & Schafer, 2012, p. 84; Cooper, Hoel, & Faragher, 2004, p. 369; Earnshaw & Cooper, 1996: Gardner & Johnson, 2001, p. 28; Health and Safety Executive, 2012; Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2010; Mikkelsen, & Einarsen, 2002; Parzefall, & Salin, 2010). Likewise repeated exposure to negative behaviours is a predictor of aggression (Aquino, 2000; O'Leary-Kelly et al., 1996). These examples of negative circular processes highlight the difficulty in analysing relationships between antecedents and consequences in workplace bullying.

It was the consequences of workplace bullying with the negative impact it had on employees which brought the subject to the attention of academia. As expressed earlier (section 1.4.1, p. 2) it is the severity of the consequences and their wide ranging damage that was the motivation for this thesis. Hoel and Cooper (2001b), in a cross-sector survey of 70 UK organisations noted that, where bullying is tolerated or ignored, the detrimental influence extends from the victim to the organisation, exposing all the employees to a negative environment. It has been reinforced since, that the consequences of workplace bullying are detrimental on every level; the individual, team, organisation and societal levels (Illing, Carter, Thompson, Crampton, Howse, Cooke, & Burford, 2013). Consequences have been researched over the longest time and the literature collection is large and still growing. New directions are arising such as the impact on families, as discovered in a study with New Zealand social workers (van Heugten, 2011, p. 647). With so many permutations and individual reactions to the behaviours more research is still needed (Høgh, Mikkelsen, & Hansen, 2011, p. 122); including more qualitative work (Hoel, Sheehan, Cooper, & Einarsen, 2011, p. 142).
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Antecedents to workplace bullying can be organised into people and social influences; or the physical and psychological environment. Frequently they are a combination and it may be difficult to establish which came first (Dick, 2010, p. 8; Zapf, & Einarsen, 2011, p. 195). They are the seeds that may grow into a problem (Zapf, & Einarsen, 2011, p. 218). Individual antecedents relating to people may be personality based, associated with discrimination or social group. There are stereotypical views of the targets of workplace verbal bullying perhaps reinforced by the inference of being powerless in the word 'target' (Brodky, 1976; Lutgen-Sandvik, & Tracy, 2012, p. 19). Similarly there are frequent portrayals of bullies as manipulative and premeditating (Lewis, 2006, p. 57; Tehrani, 2012, p. 9). Reportedly clinicians hold the view that a victim-personality leads to being the target of bullying (Zapf, 1999, p. 70); and this was supported by personality trait differences being found between victims and non-victims (Coyne, Seigne, & Randall, 2000). It may be difficult to argue for these packaged views when it has been known for some time that some employees may fall into both categories; both target and bully (McCarthy, 2000, p. 273). Whether or not employees can be categorised as target, bully or indeed both has been addressed in the literature (Dick, 2010, p. 8). Resolving these complexities was not necessary to progress the current research as the focus was the bystanders.

Investigations into actual personality traits as opposed to stereotypical assumptions were carried out with bullied Finnish, unionised employees (Vartia, 1996). Whether or not traits remained constant was not known personality assessments were not made before and after bullying incidents. Nevertheless targets were found to be more neurotic and have lower self-esteem than employees who had not experienced bullying (Vartia, 1996, p. 212). Neuroticism was also indicated in an Italian study but the authors found it was insufficient as a sole predictor and job demands and resources played a greater role in workplace bullying (Balducci, Fracaroli, & Schaufeli, 2011). Nonetheless, the extent to which characteristics play a role in workplace bullying or if they play any role at all is a point of contention. Leymann (1996) rejected the implications of victim-personality and placed the blame for bullying firmly with organisational factors, including leadership.
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The personality of the bully is understandably considered to be at fault by targets (Adams, & Crawford, 1992; Field, 1996; Zapf, & Einarsen, 2011, p. 180) and it is the targets who have provided the evidence of this (Zapf, 1999, p. 76). Although perhaps a common view, it is however one-sided until ways can be found for more bullies to have their say (Rayner, 1999, p. 33; White, 2007). Returning to Leymann's (1996) position of organisational factors being the source of the problem it seems likely, as suggested at the outset by Brodsky (1976), that negative organisational culture is the impetus fuelling unacceptable behaviours including those resulting from personality traits.

Antecedents arising from the organisation have been implicated as key in bullying. The way in which jobs are organised, lack of agency and inadequate information flow with poor mutual discussion about task and goals are factors which promote bullying (Vartia, 1996, p. 211). Role conflict and ambiguity are amongst the strongest predictors of bullying as confirmed in a meta-analysis (Bowling, & Beehr, 2006). A large Norwegian study, supporting job stressors as bullying antecedents highlighted that the extent to which there was support for such hypotheses was dependent on the metric used (Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2007, p. 236). Scandinavian research indicated peer bullying was an issue, for example in Sweden a, “...common view was that peer bullying emerges when frustrations or dissatisfaction within the group...” occurs (Hoel, & Einarsen, 2010, p. 43). Managers are often identified as the bullies (UK: Beale, & Hoel, 2011; Sparks, Faragher, & Cooper, 2001. USA: Lutgen-Sandvik, Namie, & Namie, 2009). With the ever increasing pressures of restructuring, downsizing, technological advances, global markets, economic recessions and a seemingly endless list of factors the accusation is unsurprising (Sheehan, & Jordan, 2000). Although there are other actors who bully and other reasons for managers bullying, it can be seen that another negative circular process exists. To clarify, bullying managers are often bullied (Harvey, Heames, Richey, & Leonard, 2006; Montes, Gutiérrez, & Campos, 2011).

The range and combinations of workplace bullying antecedent and consequences are extensive even before considerations of culture within countries and cross-culture in diverse and global workforces are taken into account (Harvey, Treadway, Heames, & Duke, 2009; Jordan, & Sheehan, 2000; Salin, 2003b). Consequently there is much more
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Research required with a need for increased sophistication in design to capture the complexities (Salin, & Hoel, 2011, p. 239). Existing empirical data indicates multiple causes of workplace bullying and each case should be individually considered (Zapf, & Einarsen, 2011; p. 195).

2.8.3 Identifying workplace bullying

This research did not seek to describe workplace bullying. It required a standpoint in order that the participants could be asked about bystanding in the context of workplace bullying. Clearly, asking if someone has been bullied without providing any boundaries may result in diverse responses (Nielsen, Notelaers, & Einarsen, 2011; Rayner, Hoel & Cooper, 2002, p. 23). Yet, with guidance they may still uniquely interpret the question according to their own criteria (Fevre, Lewis, Robinson, & Jones, 2011, p. 7; Nielsen, et al., 2011, p. 153). A methodological choice was made to provide participants with guidance in the form of a broad definition of workplace verbal bullying. To achieve this, issues in defining workplace bullying were explored. These are presented here.

2.8.4 Approaches to questioning

Enquiries about workplace bullying behaviour can be made under two general research methodologies. The positivist view makes use of closed choice questioning or measures responses based on predefined criteria. Alternatively, the interpretivist approach allows conclusions to be drawn from employees' narratives. It has been argued that the positivist approach may discount marginalised views (Liefooghe, & MacKenzie Davey, 2001). Moving away from definitions to listening to the voices of employees shifts the focus from the individual to organisational power systems (Liefooghe, & MacKenzie Davey, 2001). Interpretation can be further restricted when specific models are used to frame the research such school bullying (Harvey, Heames, Richey, & Leonard, 2006) or high levels of stress (Zapf, & Einarsen, 2003). However a positivist approach avoids issues arising from employees using focus groups and interviews to air any grievances whether actually bullying or not (Liefooghe, & MacKenzie Davey, 2001, p. 389). Both approaches are valuable and necessary to fully understand workplace bullying. They
may be used together or in isolation depending on the nature of the study.

There are two distinct ways in which research participants may be questioned to establish their knowledge or experience (as targets or not) of workplace bullying (Beswick, Gore, & Palferman, 2006; Carbo, & Hughes, 2010; Cooper, Hoel, & Faragher, 2004, p. 369; Nielsen, Notelaers, & Einarsen, 2011; Salin, 2003b, p. 6). Firstly, in direct questioning the participant is surveyed using lists of behaviours and factors, such as frequency and duration (Notelaers, Einarsen, de Witte, & Vermunt, 2006). The researcher compares responses to preselected classifications to establish if the participant has been bullied or not (Notelaers, et al., 2006). This is an, “...operational classification method...” (Notelaers, et al., 2006, p. 289). Alternatively there is the self-labelling method in which the employee makes their own judgement about their experiences of bullying (Nielsen, Notelaers, Einarsen, 2011, p. 151). This method is often accompanied by a definition for the participant to compare their experiences to (Coyne, Smith-Lee Chong, Seigne, & Randall, 2003, p. 210); this has been termed the subjective approach (Coyne, et al., 2003, p. 214). Predictably resulting rates are not consistent across different methods (Notelaers, et al., 2006). Carbo and Hughes (2010, p. 390) discussed the wide variation in prevalence rates being recorded by different methods; and it has been suggested that both methods should be used together (Mikkelsen, & Einarsen, 2001, p. 406; Nielsen, et al., 2011).

2.8.5 Self-labelling

Self-labelling is as it says, it is the participant and not the researcher who decides if bullying has taken place. This may be influenced by the definition, if one is provided, as the participant is asked to relate their experiences to it (Coyne, Smith-Lee Chong, Seigne, & Randall, 2003, p. 214). The question put to the participant is simply whether or not they have been bullied; usually followed by questions of frequency and duration. Although concise and straightforward a limitation of self-labelling method may be that not all bullied employees label themselves as such (Beswick, et al, 2006, p. 40; Nielsen, et al., 2011; Vie, Glasø, & Einarsen, 2011). Nevertheless the advantage of this method is that as no predefined criteria are presented no specific acts are excluded (Carbo & Hughes, 2010, p. 392). Considering the multitude of behaviours that are potentially
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bullying this lack of specificity casts the net wider.

2.8.6 Direct questioning

Specific underlying behaviours can be explored through the completion of inventories of bullying behaviours (Beswick, et al, 2006, p. 40; Carbo & Hughes, 2010; Nielsen, et al., 2011; Notelaers, Einarsen, de Witte, & Vermunt, 2006). This direct questioning method provides details of the constituent behaviours as opposed to the non-specific report which results from self-labelling (Nielsen, et al., 2011). Furthermore, employees who may not self-labelled as being bullied but are experiencing bullying behaviours may be identified as bullied using behaviour specified inventories (Nielsen, et al., 2011; Steadman, Quine, Jack, Felix, Waumsley, 2009). Further criteria may supplement the inventories such as frequency or number of behaviours the person has been exposed to. Whilst detailed inventories avoid the biases which arise in self-labelling (Djurkovic, McCormack, & Casimir, 2006) they bring with them inconsistent results owing to varying methods (Agervold, 2007, p. 166; Carbo, & Hughes, 2010; Mikkelsen. 2001). This raises the question as to what defines workplace bullying.

2.9 Bullied or not?

In early bullying research, Leymann (1990, p. 120) based his criteria on research in a major Swedish iron and steel plant with the purpose of identifying the start of psychological and physiological damage and excluding temporary quarrels. To this end he specified mobbing (or bullying) as acts which take place almost daily over at least 6 months (Leymann, 1990, p. 120). Mikkelsen and Einarsen (2001, p. 393) refined this adding a comparison between exposure to one act and two per week, finding the latter significantly reduced the figures. Comparisons of prevalence are seriously impaired by, “variation in time frames assigned...” by different researchers (Gillen, Sinclair, Kernohan, Begley, & Luyben, 2012, p. 2). If the two-per-week criteria were selected employees previously categorised as bullied would no longer be considered so. Furthermore this may lead to degrees of bullying (one-per-week or two-per-week) which Leymann (1990, p. 120) would contend is rare as he had stated that, “...either one is a victim or one is not”. To provide the participants in the current research with an example of what was meant by workplace bullying it was necessary to explore the ways
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in which bullying had been described and labelled.

2.10 Bullying or mobbing?

As a German, Leymann's (1990, p. 120) interpretation of the term mobbing was indicative of a single target whether one or more perpetrators were involved. His perception of the term bullying was more of physical violence than the psychological damage he was witnessing in his patients (Leymann, 1996, p. 167). The term mobbing was used in Scandinavian research but not exclusively; notably the Swedish legislation uses the term victimization (Hoel, & Einarsen, 2010, p. 32). The term mobbing was not unanimously accepted possibly as it had connotations of a group in the English language; that is, “The actions of a mob or group of people in attacking, harassing or crowding round a person...” (The Oxford English Dictionary, 2006). This semantic difference may exclude an interpretation of mobbing as a one-on-one behaviour by those with English as a first language. Nevertheless for many researchers the terms are interchangeable (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2011, p. 5; Einarsen, Mikkelsen, & Matthiesen, 2003. p. 25; Hoel, & Beale, 2006, p. 242; Sperry, 2009; Vartia-Väänänen, 2003, p. 8; Zapf, 1999, p. 70).

In line with the Oxford English Dictionary, distinction between the terms mobbing and bullying have been discussed as an issue by Australian researchers, with mobbing referring strictly to group incidents (Shallcross, Ramsay, & Barker, 2008, p. 2; Sheehan, 2004). Mobbing has been described as occurring by degrees (Davenport, Schwartz, & Elliott, 1999, p. 39) but again this is not unanimous as Leymann (1990, p. 120) claimed, “...people hardly ever suffer from degrees of mobbing...”. The inconsistencies have been considered problematic (Caponechia, & Wyatt, 2009). On the whole the accepted term in the United Kingdom is bullying (Adams, & Crawford, 1992; Field, 1996; Carter, & Thomson, 2012; Cowie, Naylor, Rivers, Smith, & Pereira, 2002; Hoel, & Beale, 2006; Quine, 2001; Rayner, 1999). As the research was exclusively within mainland UK and the researcher was British the term bullying was adopted for this study.

2.11 Bullying and harassment

Researchers may distinguish between bullying and harassment but once again this is not
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a consistent policy (Saunders, Huynh, & Goodman-Delahunty, 2007, p. 341). The distinction between sexual harassment and other workplace bullying was drawn early on in that victimisation could take place without sexual oppression (Björkqvist, Österman, & Hjelt-Bäck, 1994; Einarsen, Raknes, & Matthieson, 1994; Hannabuss, 1998; Keashly, 1997; Keashly, Trott, & MacLean, 1994, Spratlen, 1995). If ethnicity is the focus of the harassment it is also considered separate to bullying in general. In a 2003-2004 Norwegian study of the Sami population they were found to report significantly higher rates of ethnic bullying than in the ethnic Norwegian majority (Hansen, Melhus, Høgmo, & Lund, 2008, p. 105). Ethnic bullying was considered separately and reporting was found to be different to general bullying, nevertheless all bullying prevention has a high status in Norway. (Hansen, et al., 2008, p. 111). In the UK, harassment is unfair discrimination based on the protected characteristics of; age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, gender or sexual orientation as defined in legislation (Equality Act, 2010). Bullying involving a protected characteristic falls under legislation but specific legislation is not in place in the UK for other types of non-physical bullying. Elsewhere this is not the case, for example, Sweden’s Victimization at Work ordinance of 1993 legislates against bullying (Vega, & Comer, 2005, p. 105). As legislation varies it would make it difficult to adopt any legal definition as a universal definition. In the UK harassment is used in the context of these legally protected characteristics and therefore is not appropriate to use it in this thesis in the context of other types of workplace bullying except in reference to the work of others (Equality Act, 2010).

2.12 Defining and refining the phenomenon of workplace bullying
Since Brodsky's (1976, p. 2) first definition of harassment as,

“Repeated and persistent attempts by one person to torment, wear down, frustrate, or get a reaction from another. It is treatment that persistently provokes, pressures, frightens, intimidates, or otherwise discomforts another person”

a clear taxonomy has been pursued with each early research group proferring a version (Saunders, Huynh, & Goodman-Delahunty, 2007). It was perceived that definition
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would facilitate recognition which was a necessary precursor to action (Adams, & Crawford, 1992, p. 12; Crawshaw, 2009, p. 264). Definition was deemed important in both in terms of theory and practice (Fox, & Stallworth, 2009; Hoel, & Beale, 2006). Even this is not universally agreed and some qualitative researchers have eschewed predefined concepts in order to explore the variety of ways that employees use the term (Liefooghe, & McKenzie Davey, 2001, p. 379). Whether used with research participants or not, a unifying definition has proved elusive so far (Branch, Ramsay, Barker, 2013, p. 2; Lutgen-Sandvik, Tracy, & Alberts, 2007, p. 839; Parzefall, & Salin, 2010, p. 762; Saunders, et al., 2007). The concept is so multifarious, socially constructed and intimately abstract that its interpretation may forever be personal; disregarding academic efforts to distinguish and set boundaries on its features. Notwithstanding this, a core of frequently used characteristics appear in the definitions (Appendix B).

2.12.1 Criteria for workplace bullying

![Figure 2.6 Common criteria assigned to workplace bullying](image)

As yet there is not an agreement on which criteria define workplace bullying (Branch, Ramsay, Barker, 2013, p. 2). For behaviour to be identified as bullying there must be
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hostile, negative, offensive, destructive or abusive (Beale, & Hoel, 2011, p. 6). With the behaviour there are three commonly used criteria; power, repetition and duration (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2011, p. 22) (figure 2.6 above). Firstly these are described below. Secondly, other criteria are considered as they are included in some definitions, notably intention and impact on the victim (Gillen, Sinclair, Kernohan, Begley, & Luyben, 2012, p. 3).

2.12.2 Hostile behaviours

In 1994 (p. 2) Andrea Adams described the hostile behaviours that depict workplace bullying from the perspective of the target as “Offensive, intimidating, malicious or insulting behaviour...”. The behaviours are variously described from different perspectives; for example, what is done by the perpetrator,

“Repeated and persistent attempts by one person to torment, wear down, frustrate, or get a reaction from another. It is treatment that persistently provokes, pressures, frightens, intimidates, or otherwise discomforts another person.” (Brodsky, 1976, p. 2).

The focus may be the outcome,

“Repeated activities, with the aim of bringing mental (but sometimes also physical) pain and directed towards one or more individuals who, for one reason or another, are not able to defend themselves.” (Björkqvist, Österman, & Hjelt-Bäck, 1994, p. 174).

The perpetrator's intentions have also been included indirectly, “... in which terror is directed...” (Leymann, 1990, p. 120). Interestingly, a definition which directly included intention was used recently by a clinician group, who chose to refer to the dictionary and to the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS) rather than an academic research source, “Bullying is described by ACAS as “offensive, intimidating, malicious or insulting behaviour, an abuse or misuse of power through means intended to undermine, denigrate or injure the recipient” (ACAS cited in MacDougall, Adams, & Morris, 2013, p. 189). The use of the latter was potentially owing to the practitioner context. Notably this group also preferred the term 'undermining' to bullying because it
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has been used by General Medical Council since 2006 (MacDougall et al., 2013, p. 189). Their practitioner paper further illustrated the continuing diversity in terms and definitions.

In inventories the hostile behaviours are named specifically but in self-labelling it may be left entirely to the participant to decide. Although the latter may appear too open being presented with specific definitions may still lead to interpretations that are, “wildly different” (Fevre, Lewis, Robinson & Jones, 2011, p. 7). It may be that the hostile behaviours arose as part of a conflict with people being equally vicious and neither person feeling the incident was bullying. Consequently, hostile behaviour (real or perceived) is necessary but not sufficient for an incident to be regarded as bullying and other criteria are needed. Before the other criteria are considered the issue of the number of acts needed to meet a bullying label must be explored. Whether a single act can be bullying or not is another point of contention.

2.12.2.1 Single incidents of hostile behaviour

Leymann (1990) considered that single occurrences of hostile behaviour may be harmless. Whilst the victim should not need to justify the label they give the behaviour, academically categorisation has been scrutinised. The inclusion of single acts of hostile behaviour have not typically been counted as bullying (Salin, 2003a). However, single incidents may be seen as bullying if there is a foresight of repetition; that is, the victim lives in fear of a further attack (Randall, 2004, p. 4). Furthermore if the single incident is extremely severe it may be considered bullying (Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service, 2013a; Randall, 2004). On the other hand extreme acts may be labelled workplace violence (Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002, p. 11). For some victims the impact on their dignity may lead them to perceiving a single incident as bullying (Carbo, & Hughes, 2010). Adherence to the criteria for repeated acts to equate to bullying and single acts to be excluded is essentially part of an operational definition prescribed on a study to study basis (Björkqvist, Österman, & Hjelt-Bäck, 1994; Einarsen, Raknes, & Matthieson, 1994; Zapf, 1999). Dependent on the enquiry, varying degrees of specificity can be used to customise the definition (Rayner, Sheehan, &
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Barker, 1999). Thus, some authors deny single hostile behaviours the label of bullying but acknowledge that they should not be tolerated (O’Moore, Seigne, McGuire, & Smith, 1998, p. 347). As a consequence of single acts being excluded from the definition of workplace bullying they are not accounted for in metrics. It has been argued that this should be reviewed as one-time incidents can be, “...manifestations of bullying behaviours” (D'Cruz, Noronha, & Beale, 2014, p. 1454).

2.12.3 Power

In line with the work in schools, bullying was described as being a different phenomenon to conflict, where self-defence and ultimately equality was possible; in other words a power imbalance was a defining feature (Björkqvist, Österman, & Hjelt-Bäck, 1994; Einarsen, Raknes, & Matthieson, 1994; Hecker, 2007; Porteous, 2002; Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002, p. 11; Salin, 2003a; Salin, 2003b; Turney, 2003). When the target feels powerless they are unlikely to be able to defend themselves against a bully (Einarsen, Raknes, & Matthiesen, 1994, p. 383). This is one of the most consistent elements of bullying definitions and yet it is not universal. As noted by Cowie and colleagues one reason for this is that it is not possible to establish this criterion from questionnaires of negative acts with no definition provided (Cowie, Naylor, Rivers, Smith, & Periera, 2002, p. 40).

Unsurprisingly power has been considered a social heuristic with priority going to the higher power in dyadic interactions (Herschcovis, & Barling, 2010; Keltner, Van Kleef, Chen, & Kraus, 2008). This raised the question of the interpretation of the words which made up a definition. Power is easily misconstrued as referring to hierarchical power but evidence reveals a wider interpretation (Porteous, 2002, p. 78); with some studies finding peers are the key perpetrators (Ortega, Høgh, Peijersen, & Olsen, 2009). The condition necessary for bullying to occur is a perceived power imbalance (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2003; Harrington, 2010; Hoel, & Beale, 2006; Rayner, et al., 2002, p. 11; Salin, 2003a, p. 7; Salin, 2003b, p. 11). Nonetheless hierarchical power was found to strongly relate to negative attitudes to the workplace and low performance to a greater extent than was found with peers or outsiders (Einarsen, & Raknes, 1997; Herschcovis, & Barling, 2010).
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There are studies which have focussed exclusively on a top-down interpretation of power (Hoel, & Beale, 2006; Lutgen-Sandvik, & McDermott, 2011; Vandekerckhove, & Commers, 2003). The common UK perception of hierarchical bullying perpetrated by managers, was clarified in a UK study across all organisational status groups (N = 5288) (Hoel, Cooper, & Faragher, 2001, p. 458). Almost three-quarters of those bullied reported that the bully held a higher status but managers and supervisors were no less likely to experience being bullied than other status groups (Hoel, et al., 2001, p. 459). Furthermore over a third of targets experienced bullying by someone of the same status (Hoel, et al., 2001, p. 459). Peer level bullying has also been evidenced in the health sector where it is commonly termed horizontal bullying (as distinguished from vertical bullying which refers to hierarchical bullying (Coverdale, Salon, & Roberts, 2009; Jackson, Clare, Mannix, 2002; Turney, 2003). Crucially, the bullying phenomenon is not restricted to any formal hierarchical pattern and bottom-up bullying, employees bullying the supervisor or manager has also been evidenced (Hoel, Cooper, & Faragher, 2001, p. 450). This has been acknowledged since research began (Leymann, 1996). Nevertheless if a person finds it difficult to defend themselves, it implies that, “... there must be an imbalance of power between the parties involved in bullying” (Matthiessen, & Einarsen, 2001, p. 468). In a study with Finnish professionals, those lower in the hierarchy experienced more bullying but the same study illustrated that power imbalance can also result from, “... other means than formal position” (Salin, 2001, p. 435). Tehrani (2012, p. 5) described these non-hierarchical power sources as; positional, relationship, resources, psychological, knowledge, delegated and personality. The impact on health was found to be consistent regardless of the hierarchical power of the perpetrator (Hershcovis, & Barling, 2010).

Unfortunately it is also possible for power to be equal at the outset but for the equilibrium to be upset as the behaviour persists (Leymann, 1990, p. 120; Zapf, Knorz, Kulla, 1996, p. 217). Although there is much agreement on the presence of a power imbalance in workplace bullying there are still unresolved questions. Concern was raised about the inclusion of a subjective experience in an objective set of predefined negative behaviours (Cowie, et al., 2002, p. 36). They questioned who it should be that decides there is a power difference (Cowie, et al., 2006, p. 36). The most frequently used metric for the prevalence of workplace bullying does not account for power
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(Glasø, Nielsen, & Einarsen, 2009, p. 1321). Whether or not power differences are necessarily a criterion in the definition of bullying the evidence points to real or perceived power differences in incidents of workplace bullying (Lutgen-Sandvik, & McDermott, 2011, p. 343). Although this may be illegitimate use of power in organisations (Liefooghe, & MacKenzie Davey, 2001, p. 377); it may also be interpersonal (Tehrani, 2003, p. 278).

The consensus appears to be that there must be a power disparity for an act to be categorised as bullying (Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service, 2013a; Adams, 1994; Beale, & Hoel, 2011; Björkqvist, Österman, & Hjelt-Bäck, 1994; Einarsen, Raknes, & Matthiesen, 1994; Hoel, & Cooper, 2001b; Leymann; 1990; Lutgen-Sandvik, & McDermott, 2011; Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002; Salin, 2001, p. 431; Trades Union Congress, 2013; Zapf, 1999). This is apparent in many definitions (Appendix B). This fundamental aspect of bullying was determined to be essential information for the participants and was therefore expressed in the definition provided (Appendices I, J & L).

2.12.4 Repetition

From the earliest works it has been recognised that persistence of abusive acts wears down the target (Brodsky, 1976). This has been defined as consisting of frequency and duration (Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002). Frequency or repetition is not as clear cut a characteristic as power but may be considered a boundary between other negative, uncivilised behaviours and bullying (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2003; Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002). Clearly, a single act cannot qualify as repeated (Leymann, 1990; Salin, 2003a). Thus the question arises again as to whether or not it can be considered bullying. Leymann (1990) described mobbing as systematic which includes the concept of repetition but also of duration, pattern and intention. Without repeated acts the situation was described as a temporary conflict (Leymann, 1996, p. 168); and this concept has been carried forward to more recent research,

“If these behaviours are used in isolation they may not be perceived as a problem but when used repeatedly and regularly they could have a stigmatising effect on the target”
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(Bloisi, 2012, p. 31).

The cumulative impact of hostile behaviours seems obvious and that repeated acts are deemed bullying is not in question,

“Screaming occasionally does not equate with bullying. Screaming over and over at the same person, day after day, week after week, and month after month—that is workplace bullying” (Lutgen-Sandvik, & Tracy, 2012, p. 18).

What is not clear is whether or not single acts may be considered bullying. In a confidential UK study with 288 public sector workers the criteria of repetition was scrutinised (Coyne, Smith-Lee Chong, Seigne, & Randall, 2003, p. 221). It was noted that prevalence rates were different if repetition was not included (Coyne, et al., 2003, p. 221). Although repetition was included to establish prevalence the authors acknowledge that targets of one or two acts of bullying were none-the-less victims of bullying (Coyne, et al., 2003, p. 221). As repeated hostile behaviours are common in definitions of workplace bullying and a consensus has not been reached on single incidents, repetition was included in the current study.

2.12.5 Duration
Brodsky (using the term harassment) stated that the duration may be a week or many years (1976, p. 2). Based on his Swedish research, a period of at least 6 months was used in Leymann's (1990, p. 120) operational definition of mobbing. The purpose of a threshold was to discount quarrels so that the focus was on damaging situations (Agervold, 2007, p. 165; Leymann, 1990, p. 120) Although the 6 month threshold has been used often it was suggested it may have been a random selection (Agervold, 2007, p. 165); and researchers have used different time frames (Zapf, & Gross, 2001, p. 498). In applying, often rigid frequency (such as weekly) and duration (for example, at least 6 months) criteria, surveys identify long-lasting stress and permanent conditions (Agervold, 2007, p. 165). It was suggested that this was required to justify putting effort into bullying reduction and without this qualification the phenomenon looses weight and seriousness (Agervold, 2007, p. 165). Albeit this may be true from an organisations
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point of view it is unlikely to be a perspective shared with targets. The implications of such criteria are that the target who has been bullied every working day for 3 months would not count (unless it continues); that an organisation with vicious bullying which regularly occurs every 2 months may not recognise it as problematic; or that nothing will be done until the level of target damage has become long-lasting stress or a permanent condition. Unequivocally the longer the exposure the greater the opportunity becomes for power difference to be magnified or even be created where it did not previously exist, turning from conflict to bullying (Balducci, Fraccaroli, & Schaufeli, 2011, p. 500; Zapf, 1999, p. 72). Although bullying behaviours in general should not be ignored it is the frequency and duration that turns conflicts into festering disputes (Macintosh, 2006, p. 667).

2.12.6 Other criteria

When criteria are selected to identify workplace bullying they are not necessarily the same as variation occurs between researchers. Whilst some identified power, repetition and duration as the essential components (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2011, p. 22); others considered repetition, outcome and power more appropriate (Gillen, Sinclair, Kernohan, Begley, & Luyben, 2012, p. 3). The outcome, or negative impact on the target, and perpetrator intention are two other criteria which appear frequently.

Figure 2.7 Potential attributes of the definition of workplace bullying
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2.12.7 Outcome

The consequences of workplace bullying for the target have been included in many definitions (Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service, 2013b, p. 1; Adams, 1994, p. 2; Brodsky, 1976, p. 2; Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper; 2003, p. 15; Gillen, Sinclair, & Kernohan, 2008, p. 16; Leymann; 1990, p. 120; Rayner, & Hoel, 1997, p. 183; Zapf, 1999, p. 73). Descriptions have included both mental and physical consequences,

“This abuse of power or position can cause such chronic stress and anxiety that the employees gradually lose belief in themselves, suffering physical ill-health and mental distress as a result.” (Adams, & Crawford, 1992, p. 2).

Whether or not inclusion of outcome as a specified criteria in a definition is necessary or not is debatable as workplace bullying as a problem was determined from the negative outcomes for targets (Leymann, 1990). There are no ambiguities about the consequences of bullying being negative for the victim (Lewis, Sheehan, & Davies, 2008, p. 287). It would seem therefore that the nature of the outcome is explicit in the term bullying.

2.12.8 Intention

An additional criteria considered by some to be indicative of bullying is intention of harm on the part of the perpetrator; the behaviour is carried out, “...in order to harass...” (Leymann, 1996, p. 170). Cowan (2009, p. 285) stated that most researchers included it as one of the five defining feature; “...frequency/repetition, duration, escalation, power disparity, and attributed intent” (figure 2.7 above). Later Gillen and colleagues in a report for The Cochrane Collaboration, tenuously considered intent as one of four attributes; the others being repetition, power and negative impact on the victim (Gillen, Sinclair, Kernohan, Begley, & Luyben, 2012, p. 3). This was stated with the comment that, “There is no consensus on whether to include it in definitions or not”, clearly the issue had not been resolved by 2012 (Gillen, et al., 2012, p. 3).

Whether or not to include intention stems partly from the difficulty in establishing it as a fact (Gillen, et al., 2012, p. 3). Deliberately targeting someone may be construed as
intent but only the perpetrator can know if harm was planned (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2011, p. 19). Although bullying is directed, that in itself does not constitute intention as some acts are likely perpetrated in ignorance (Leymann, 1990, p. 120). Intended acts may lead to unintended consequences; thoughtless acts to inadvertent outcomes; and intended acts to intended harm (Einarsen, et al., 2011, p. 19). Intention becomes more obscure when perception of intent is included. While perception of intent may lead a target to conclude they have been bullied it would be difficult to evidence (Saunders, 2007, p. 345). If taking the target's point of view is potentially skewed, self-report by the perpetrator with a reliance on a confession of intent to harm is equally unlikely to be an effective strategy (Einarsen, et al., 2011, p. 19). However, in qualitative research with targets of emotional abuse at work intent was not found to be a key element (Keashly, 2001, p. 259). Conversely, human resource practitioners included it in their construction of the phenomenon (Harrington, 2010).

Inclusion of intent as a criterion for workplace bullying is not as established as other criteria. Furthermore, it is clear that a target can be harmed whether or not intent was established (Einarsen, et al., 2011, p. 19). It has been suggested that bullying definitions with and without intent are valid until there is definitive evidence (Crawshaw, 2009, p. 266). Thus, intention to harm was not included as part of this research.

As the “precise nomenclature” is still a work in progress other work must continue in parallel for the foreseeable future (Crawshaw, 2009, p. 266). Although the nature of behaviours and their relationships to negative consequences can be illustrated generally, on a case by case basis it is the target who refines the details (Escartín, Rodríguez-Carballeira, Zapf, Porrúa, & Martín-Peña, 2009, p. 194). Whether or not the target's perspective is accepted as a defining factor rests, at least for the time being, with the researchers of each study.

2.13 Chapter summary
The focus of this chapter has been the workplace bullying literature which created the impetus for this research. From early attention to bullying in general, through increasing awareness, research in the area of workplace bullying has grown into a broad,
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multifaceted field. Moving through the literature enables pertinent links to be made between some aspects (such as intervention) and the current study whilst other aspects (for example, consequences) serve as a background. Thus it was established that the intervention literature was essential to the development of a bystander intervention strategy. It is therefore reviewed in the next chapter.
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3. The characteristics, aims and implementation of intervention strategies

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter the current knowledge on workplace bullying intervention is examined to inform the development of the new intervention strategy. The purpose of intervention, categorisation of intervention stages and levels are reviewed. Individual interventions are not discussed as the research does not evaluate existing interventions.

The consequences of workplace bullying indicate the need for the development of strategies to reduce and ideally eliminate the behaviours (Lutgen-Sandvik, & Tracy, 2012; Ortega, Christensen, Hogh, Rugulies, & Borg, 2011, p. 757; Turney, 2003). The complexity of the phenomenon has led to recommendations that multi-level strategies be used to address it (Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2011; Lutgen-Sandvik, Namie, & Namie, 2009; Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, & Schroeder, 2005; Saam, 2010). As situations in isolation may not constitute bullying (Lutgen-Sandvik, 2008a, p. 104), unless they persist and the power balance becomes unequal (Zapf, & Gross, 2001, p. 499), detection may be difficult. Consequently bullying became entrenched in many organisations before the need to quash it was realised (Carden, & Boyd, 2011; Cleary, Hunt, & Horsfall, 2010; p. 334). Furthermore not all companies are wholly convinced bullying is a bad thing and some have structures, designs or management which foster bullying (Beale, & Hoel, 2011; Einarsen, Raknes, & Matthiesen, 1994, p. 395; Ironside, & Seifert, 2003, p. 384; Lewis, 1999, p. 113; Liefooghe, & MacKenzie Davey, 2001, p. 376; Lutgen-Sandvik, Namie, & Namie, 2009; Sheehan, 1999). Of the companies that acknowledge workplace bullying as having a negative impact, some are fire-fighting so many urgent issues that bullying has not been prioritised to the level of action or it is side-lined for another urgent task (Rayner, 1999, p. 34). This section investigates the existing framework for reduction strategies, defines the levels and explores the interventions that have already been implemented. The lack of a bystander intervention strategy in workplace bullying is confirmed as a research gap.
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3.2 Clarifying the desired outcome of intervention

Workplace bullying reduction may be achieved through prevention and intervention strategies; and academics and practitioners are approaching potential solutions from many different perspectives (Illing, Carter, Thompson, Crampton, Morrow, Howse, Cooke, & Burford, 2013). The goal of intervention is to reduce and ideally eliminate bullying. Unplanned interventions to interrupt, defuse or stop workplace bullying may already take place. It is vital that all interventions, existing and new, do not inflame the situation, cause unnecessary disruption or perpetuate the problem (Namie, & Lutgen-Sandvik, 2010). Over time any measure taken to reduce bullying should contribute to a variety of benefits for both employee and employer. The realisation of this highlighted the importance of health management within the workplace (Hoel, Sheehan, Cooper, & Einarsen, 2011). It is noted here that no intervention strategy is likely to result in an immediate cessation of all bullying; that process is gradual. Interventions over time may lead to employees becoming aware and less tolerant of bullying; when employees see others intervene to stop bullying they are more likely to feel entitled to do so themselves; and bullies will not be enabled. Intervention may initially lead to an increase in reported bullying owing to heightened awareness (D’Orso, Latocca, Riva, & Cesana, 2014). For the current research, it was essential to consider the fundamental desired outcome of the intervention before existing strategies were investigated. The intention was to design, implement and test a strategy to increase bystander intervention in verbal bullying in a large UK organisation. The goal of this intention required clarification as interventions may have many goals, some of which are complex.

3.2.1 Organisational goals

Bullying reduction may have organisational objectives in terms of both direct and indirect costs (Yamada, 2008). These include areas such as employee retention (Gonzalez-Mulé, DeGeest, Kiersch, & Mount, 2013; Mayhew, McCarthy, Chappell, Quinlan, & Barker, 2004; Ortega, Christensen, Hogh, Rugulies, & Borg, 2011); especially considering that witnesses leave in addition to targets (Vickers, 2010, p. 9). Any organisation who has been through the legal system or in the media owing to
Chapter 3

bullying issues (and other organisations with forethought) are likely to be interested in decreased legal costs or reputation protection (Hollins-Martin, 2010; Keashly, & Neuman, 2004; Lutgen-Sandvik, & Tracy, 2012; Myrden, Delorey, Xavier, & Loughlin, 2011; Stouten, Baillien, Van den Broeck, Camps, De Witte, & Euwema, 2011). The focus for reduction may be increased productivity (Harvey, Heames, Richey, & Leonard, 2006; Kingsley, 2010; Neidl, 1996) as bullying may have an enormous negative impact on productivity (Duffy, 2009, p. 242; Harvey, Heames, Richey, & Leonard, 2006, p. 1). This is not only as a result of employees leaving but also stems from unhealthily high levels of stress which, for example can result in presenteeism where the employee attends work whilst sick (Jourdain, & Vézina, 2013, p. 12). Beyond individual employers there is a societal impact with a direct relationship being found between employee health and gross domestic product (Dollard, & Neser, 2013, p. 14).

Of the published interventions that have taken place the researcher could not find one which directly stated the goal was for the benefit of the organisation. Excepting that when bullying reduction was the goal, although not explicitly stated, it may be assumed that success would be beneficial to all concerned, including the organisation. On the whole goals other than reduced bullying were stated as; improved workplace climate (Dollard, & Bakker, 2010; Keashly, & Neuman, 2004; Law, Dollard, Tuckey, & Dormann, 2011; Sotile, & Sotile, 1999); employee well-being (Barclay, & Skarlicki, 2009; Bingham, Hallberlin, Walker, & Chung, 2009; Brinkert, 2011; Jennings, & Tiplady, 2010); or better communications (Evans, & Curtis, 2011; Latham, Hogan, & Ringl, 2008; Leon-Perez, Arenas, & Butts Griggs, 2012). It may be that organisational goals such as increased productivity and reduced absences appear in internal organisational reports while external reports and academic papers highlight positive well-being and improved employee procedures, support and fairness. Conversely it is possible that the human cost of workplace bullying is understood and other goals are secondary.
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One study which may be interpreted as taking a view more aligned with organisational rather than individual goals was Johnstone and Quinlan's (2011) qualitative study of Australian government health and safety inspectors. Their work focused on the difficulties inspectors face in implementing legislative changes and enforcing a new policy; an area which is likely to be of organisational interest. This illustrated that workplace bullying interventions can be researched with an organisational perspective. In the current study the interests of the organisation were secondary as the researcher's goal aligned with that of the individual.

3.2.2 Goals for the individual

It is intuitive that individuals would want bullying reduction to alleviate the negative impacts on health, relationships and finances but the goal may be more complex. Both targets and bystanders may simply want the bullying to stop. However, targets often want more than this (Tehrani, 2001). There is a continuum of requirements that targets may feel is necessary to redress the abuse (Rayner, Hoel & Cooper, 2002, p. 147; figure 3.1 below). Tehrani (2001) noted that targets frequently sought an apology or public atonement. At the extreme of target's requirements is the desire for vengeance, which brings with it the risk of escalating negative behaviours (Andersson, & Pearson, 1999).

![Figure 3.1 What targets want (based on Rayner, Hoel & Cooper, 2002, p. 147)](image-url)

The requirement of targets is that the bullying behaviour stops, enabling them to continue in their employment. However, having been abused the target may believe reparation can only be achieved through apology or public admission of wrong doing (Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002, p. 147). These requirements go beyond stopping the
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bullying and would require more resources and time. In some cases when the perpetrator becomes aware they may be appalled at their own thoughtlessness and apologise (Rayner, et al., 2002, p. 160; Stevens, 2002, p. 191). However, other perpetrators may contest the need, thereby perpetuating workplace disruption. While an advantage of apology to the perpetrator may be that the case remains informal (Saunders, 2011, p. 7); the advantage to the target is not as clear cut as it may seem. They may not feel as satisfied with the outcome as they had hoped; with others considering the matter closed but the target left ruminating (Turney, 2003, p. 4). This brooding can in itself result in negative effects for the target (Jiménez, Muñoz, Gamarra, & Herrer, 2009). Likewise with a public statement the target may acquire the label of victim and they may be perceived as an easy target (Heames, & Harvey, 2006; Vie, Glasø, & Einarsen, 2011).

Vengeance is even more problematic, although the target may feel it would be justified (Lutgen-Sandvik, & Tracy, 2012, p. 28; Tracy, Lutgen-Sandvik, & Alberts, 2006, p. 162). It is not something the target is likely to get any organisation to agree with. Moreover if the plan fails the outcome may reinforce the target's feelings of helplessness (Tracy, et al., 2006, p. 162). For some targets the fantasy of vengeance is a means to release tension (Adams, & Crawford, 1992, p. 178; Lutgen-Sandvik, 2006). Nevertheless, if this develops into reality the severity of the bullying situation may increase with extremely serious consequences (Lutgen-Sandvik, 2006). In the workplace the initial goal must be the first step on the continuum; for the bullying to stop without the target having to leave (figure 3.1 above).

3.3 Reducing workplace bullying

The primary concern is that bullying stops and that the intervention in place to achieve this is responsible. That is, it does not exacerbate the situation (Bloch, 2012; Scully, & Rowe, 2009, p.6). Impulsive interventions, which may already be occurring in the workplace may not fulfil this requirement. For example, through attributing the label 'victim' to a target, a sympathetic bystander may contribute to the targets exclusion
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(Bloch, 2012, p.95). Bystanders may adopt aggressive behaviours and inadvertently become bullies themselves. Monitoring and training is advisable to ensure than interventions are effective (Zapf, 2012). Thus, the current research began by developing a fundamental bystander intervention strategy to put a stop to bullying without exacerbating the situation.

3.3.1 Will bullying stop of its own accord?

Anecdotal advice is often that if bullying is ignored it will go away (Rowell, 2005, p. 379; Vickers, 2010, p. 16). Whether anyone really believes that ignoring bullying is an effective means of putting a stop to this behaviour is not known; based on an extensive search not revealing any supporting evidence. On the contrary evidence suggests that ignoring the behaviour is not an adequate strategy to halt it in its tracks (Duffy, & Sperry, 2007, p. 399; Vega, & Comer, 2005). Thus ignoring is not recommended as it is unlikely to be a successful strategy. The single exception to this for workplace targets is potentially dismissing a one-off incident (Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002, p. 148). Once a pattern of bullying has been established taking no action is more likely to lead to escalation as the perpetrator's behaviour is not being challenged (Duffy, & Sperry, 2007, p. 402). Less obvious but becoming increasingly more apparent is that employers are hugely disadvantaged by ignoring bullying (Giga, Hoel, & Lewis, 2008). Consequently an intervention strategy is required in order to reduce bullying and subsequently its impact on both employees and employers.

3.4 Categorising intervention stages

Interventions have been categorised into three stages; primary prevention; secondary prevention and tertiary prevention (Hurrell, & Murphy, 1996, p. 339; Leka, Vartia, Hassard, Pahkin, Sanna, Cox, & Lindsrom, 2008; Vartia, & Leka, 2011; Zapf, 2012). Academics and practitioners distinguish the stages of interventions whilst understanding that in practice strategies are compounded, incorporating different stages and levels (Leka, Vartia, Hassard, Pahkin, Sanna, Cox, & Lindsrom, 2008). There are 3 broad
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stages which indicate when the intervention occurs, who the intervention is directed
towards and the size of the group being addressed (figure 3.2 below). At the base of the
triangle the focus is on putting in place universal guidelines for all employees prior to
any bullying incidents (Johnstone, Quinlan, & McNamara, 2011; McCarthy, & Barker,
2000; Meloni, & Austin, 2011; Pate, & Beaumont, 2010). At the secondary stage
particular groups of employees are the focus of the intervention; the groups will vary
between organisations. Although not a universal strategy this stage may addresses a
wider group than those who have already been exposed to workplace bullying. The
tertiary stage is directed at those involved (bully and target) and is intended to be
restorative. This is an entirely reactive process which may include counselling for the
bully in addition to programmes for the well-being of the target. Although generally
considered to be an individual level where the interventions are largely one-to-one,
group relationships within the affected team may also need attention.

![Figure 3.2 Stages for workplace bullying interventions](image)

3.4.1 Primary prevention

The optimal preventative measure is to remove the source or the antecedents of bullying
thereby reducing the risk that bullying will occur (Notelaers, 2010; Zapf, 2012). To be
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proactive in this manner it is essential to identify the causes in order that the plan incorporates appropriate changes (Notelaers, Vermunt, Baillien, Einarsen, & De Witte, 2011). Primary strategies have foundations in risk management and as such there is a presumption that risk cannot be totally eliminated but it can be controlled (Caponecchia, & Wyatt, 2009, p. 444; Spurgeon, 2003, p. 328). The goal is to introduce methods of working which reduce risk (Notelaers, 2010). Although this stage is proactive and best implemented prior to any incidents, this is a generalisation as most established organisations will have had bullying incidents, whether reported or not. Thus this stage may be retro-fitted with existing policies and guidelines to be preventative for future incidents and inform current incidents.

3.4.2 Secondary prevention

The purpose of secondary prevention is to de-escalate or halt the bullying (Leka, Vartia, Hassard, Pahkin, Sanna, Cox, & Lindsrom, 2008; Notelaers, 2010; Zapf, 2012). By intervening as soon as the bullying begins to develop it may be defused or stopped (Leka, et al., 2008; Lerouge, 2013; Notelaers, 2010; Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002; Salin, 2008; Zapf, 2012). Programmes may be implemented after considering a particular risk, for preparedness or if aggressive behaviours have been noticed. Based on suggestions that aggressive behaviours have escalatory patterns, planning early interventions may prevent situations from spiralling out of control (Andersson, & Pearson, 1999; Keashly, & Nowell, 2003, p. 348; Glomb, 2002; Zapf, & Gross, 2001, p. 519). Similarly, immediacy may stop the development of a dysfunctional culture (Heames, & Harvey, 2006, p. 1216). Not only is immediacy advantageous in terms of the specific incident it also sends a message that bullying behaviours are not tolerated (Parzefall, & Salin, 2010).

It has been suggested that the optimal time for secondary intervention is when the bullying is work focused as once it becomes person focused the damage is more likely to have a negative health impact (Beswick, Gore, & Palferman, 2006). Aligning the behaviours with either a work or personal focus is dependent on recognition by the
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bystanders. In reality this may be very difficult and the assumption that one precedes the other is problematic (Beswick et al., 2006). Nevertheless the earlier the intervention the more likely it is that damage will be limited (O’Moore, Seigne, McGuire, & Smith, 1998, p. 345; Salin, 2006, p. 12; Tracy, Lutgen-Sandvik, & Alberts, 2006, p. 175; Zapf, & Gross, 2001). Consequently raising awareness is a fundamental requirement.

Secondary interventions which have been reported have included a focus on managers and supervisors (Barrett, Piatek, Korber, & Padula, 2009; Stevens, 2002). In hospitals, for example, this has included conflict management training as a proactive measure (Mikkelsen, Hogh, & Puggaard, 2011). In one study although awareness was raised and a shared understanding of bullying developed, failure to share the preventative intention with the participants may have lessened the value of the training (Mikkelsen, Hogh, & Puggaard, 2011).

Secondary prevention may also be reactive. In response to past bullying incidents groups of employees may be trained to increase awareness and be ready to act should incidents occur in the future. It has been suggested that training for secondary prevention may be incorporated into induction programmes for new staff (Illing, Carter, Thompson, Crampton, Morrow, Howse, Cooke, & Burford, 2013, p. 69).

Although an intervention was not implemented in a qualitative study with bullied social workers in New Zealand, it was noted that a feedback loop raised awareness and increased positive bystander behaviours (van Heugten, 2010). This illustrated the potential for secondary prevention in the form of bystander intervention training to reduce future incidents of bullying.

3.4.3 Tertiary prevention

If bullying is established it is vital to instigate measures to restore the workplace to a healthy environment (Vartia-Väänänen, 2013, p. 11). The recovery process may be
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provided in-house or externally, for example by employee assistance services. Attention must be paid to the health and working relationships of all employees and a single solution is unlikely to be adequate (Fevre, Lewis, Robinson, & Jones, 2011; Hurrell, & Murphy, 1996, p. 340; Leka, Vartia, Hassard, Pahkin, Sanna, Cox, & Lindsrom, 2008). Rehabilitation may be required for the bullies as well as the targets (Beswick, Gore, & Palferman, 2006; Tehrani, 2012). Keeping all concerned in the workforce if possible is of benefit to employees and employer alike (Spurgeon, 2003, Tehrani, 2003, p.135). As this is a reactive measure it must encompass strategies to ensure the problem will not reoccur (Caponecchia, & Wyatt, 2009; Zapf, 2012). In research on intervention for stress reduction in the USA tertiary strategies were found to be the most common approach (Hurrell, & Murphy, 1996, p. 340). This suggests that in dealing with workplace stress, American organisations may have a tendency to be reactive rather than proactive (Hurrell, & Murphy, 1996, p. 340). Although this does not constitute evidence that the same is true of workplace bullying, on reflection tertiary intervention was the first to take place (Leymann, 1990) and it is likely that to date, organisations have tended to be reactive rather than proactive.

Primary, secondary and tertiary intervention strategies target times in the process of bullying; before, during and after the event. It is optimal to address each of these in an overall plan. Addressing workplace bullying is not a single effort, rather it is a continuous process necessary to support safe workplaces (Bartlett, & Bartlett, 2011, p. 81). Along with when the intervention (the time in the process) takes place, who it is focussed on must also be considered. This may be targets, bullies, bystanders, all employees, specific groups such as managers or a combination.

3.5 Levels of intervention

The stages that have been described work across different levels in the workplace; micro, meso and macro levels. These levels will be described. The point of friction that ignites bullying is largely at the dyadic level; that is, communication between two individuals (Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2007). Generally it is an individual abuser
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who begins the bullying process and the individual target who is first to suffer (Zapf & Gross, 2001, p. 498). This is the most basic bullying exchange from the defined range of negative communications from 1:1 to many to many interactions (Einarsen, Raknes, & Matthiesen, 1994, p. 383). Leymann's (1990) introduction to the phenomenon was at this level, from the perspective of the abused individual. The individual employee at the heart of the issue is only one of many possible perspectives. Other perspectives include the employers (McCarthy, & Barker, 2000) and human resources practitioners (Harrington, Rayner, & Warren, 2012).

To reiterate a point made earlier, the basic requirement of the target is that the bullying stops. It is intuitive that an intervention at the individual level is required to reduce bullying but strategies encompassing three levels are recommended (Saam, 2010). These levels of communication have been labelled micro, meso and macro (Heames, & Harvey, 2006).

In the simplest of terms, at the micro level the individuals are addressed, meso refers to group strategies and macro to interventions at the top levels, that is the organisation or higher (Heames, & Harvey, 2006; Johnson, 2011; Lutgen-Sandvik, & Tracy, 2012; Saam, 2010). It is acknowledged here that there are variations in defining these levels and the descriptions presented are a broad overview. These interventions can be formal or informal actions (Hubert, 2003). Policies may suggest that informal resolutions are used where possible but often without specifying how this may be achieved (Rayner, & Lewis, 2011). It has been suggested that targets prefer an informal approach (Field, 1996); and policies should provide information on this (Lutgen-Sandvik, Namie, & Namie, 2009). If the employee does not have confidence in Human Resources' ability to action a formal complaint they are unlikely to submit one (Harrington, Rayner, & Warren, 2012). There should be trust and the opportunity to progress the matter to a formal procedure if needs be (Lutgen-Sandvik, et al., 2009); although some employees would rather leave, believing they would not be able to endure the formal process (Lutgen-Sandvik, et al., 2009, p. 60; Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002). The difficulty is
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that formal and informal responses require different abilities and experience from advisors (Rayner, & McIvor, 2008, p. 63).

3.5.1 Micro level intervention

Micro-level intervention focusses on individuals in the bully-target dyadic (Heames, & Harvey, 2006). For targets this may include coping strategies, rehabilitation and restoration of their health. Although rarely presented as bullying reduction, improving the resilience and modifying the reaction of the target may reduce the opportunity for bullies to take advantage (McCarthy, 2000, p. 273). At the individual level targets may feel able to confront the bully before a pattern is established but this is not without risks (Lutgen-Sandvik, Alberts, & Tracy, 2008, McKay, 2013, p. 13; Rayner, Hoel & Cooper, 2002). For bullies, counselling or training may improve their approach and communication skills to the extent that they are no longer perceived as bullies (Georgakopoulos, Wilkin, & Kent, 2011, p. 7; Vickers, 2006, p. 278).

Considering that the courage required to seek help is often underestimated, some policies and organisations expect a lot of the target (Bohns, & Flynn, 2010, p. 2; Ferris, 2004, p. 391). Notably, the Canadian Workplace Psychological Harassment Prevention Act requires target's to notify perpetrators, neglecting the fact that they may feel unable to do so (McKay, 2013, p. 13). In horizontal (lateral) violence in American nursing confronting the bully was considered beneficial although the difficulties were acknowledged (Griffin, 2004, p. 262). If the target feels that confronting the bully may worsen the situation it is not an appropriate strategy (Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002). A warning of potential issues in targets confronting the perpetrator was found in the sexual violence literature; concluding that badly planned interventions may be more damaging than no intervention (Bingham, & Scherer, 2011). Furthermore, there are indications that self-reporting by the target may not be a successful strategy (Bowes-Sperry, & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005; Keashly, 2001).
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Organisations have relied on a reactive response at the micro-level through the use of counselling or mediation (Leka, Vartia, Hassard, Pahkin, Sanna, Cox, & Lindsrom, 2008). By their very nature these interventions are likely to be too little and too late (Gardner, & Johnson, 2001, p. 25; Hannabuss, 1998, p. 304; Johnstone, Quinlan, & McNamara, 2011, p. 554; Mårup, 2012, p. 59; Saam, 2010, p. 63; Verdasca, 2011, p. 9). Nevertheless they are a vital part of an overall strategy. Programme structures vary and may include occupational health, counsellors, mediators and volunteers. Any of these methods are potentially subject to performance challenges, ranging from training to funding shortages (Lutgen-Sandvik, Namie, & Namie, 2009; Mawdsley, Lewis, & Jarvis, 2012). In-house advisers may be able to talk to the bully but they are unlikely to be able to provide the target with reassurance in the form of feedback owing to employee confidentiality (Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002).

Support for the target and in some cases counselling for the perpetrator may alternatively be provided by an external employee assistance programme (EAP) (Lutgen-Sandvik, Namie, & Namie, 2009). External providers and trained peer empathetic advisers may offer advice or only a listening service (Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002; Rayner, & Lewis, 2011). Untrained peer supporters may help the target's self-confidence (van Heugten, 2011, p. 224); and friend's may initially be proactive although they may withdraw as the cost to them increases (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011, p. 286).

Bullying support programmes (internal and external) have the potential to alleviate negative health aspects of bullying if actioned early but in the main these tertiary interventions only support the target and do not address the basic objective of stopping the bullying (Quine, 2001; Wheeler, Halbesleben, & Shanine, 2010). It should also be noted that an EAPs' primary role is to facilitate optimal work performance for the employer with the support of the employee being a means to that end (Lutgen-Sandvik, Namie, & Namie, 2009; Poilpot-Rocaboy, & Winter, 2007). Nonetheless they impart valuable coping and resilience skills (Branch, & Murray, 2008). Counselling
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specifically for perpetrators may reduce bullying behaviours, not least because perpetrators are not always aware of the impact of their behaviours (Owoyemi, & Sheehan, 2011, p. 71; Tehrani, 2003).

Promoting available programmes is important as it stands to reason that the employees must know about them if they are to access them (Macintosh, 2006). Whether employer provided services are available or not some targets go to their doctor which may lead to medication (Simpson, & Cohen, 2004); or therapeutic counselling (Lewis, 2006; Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002). In a large UK survey 10-15% of bullied employees consulted their doctor (Hoel, & Cooper, 2000). Notably this is substantially less than those reporting they had directly confronted the bully (Hoel, & Cooper, 2000). Reports indicated that on the whole targets talked to peers, family and friends about being bullied (Hoel, & Cooper, 2002). Nonetheless professional psychological or psychiatric treatment may be advisable, especially in severe cases and this has been a constant (Brodsky, 1976; Duffy, & Sperry, 2007; Groeblinghoff, & Becker, 1996; Leymann, 1990; McKay, & Fratszl, 2011). The therapeutic interventions of counsellors, psychologists and psychiatrists are likely to benefit individual employees but they are not an effective means of addressing bullying on other levels (Tehrani, 2003).

3.5.1.1 Mediation controversy

Initially mediation was one of the recommended micro-level interventions (Fox, & Stallworth, 2009; Kieseker, & Marchant, 1999). It may be seen as,"...very effective in deterring and responding to bullying" from the employer's point of view (Woodman, & Kumar, 2008, p. 9); however the method is designed for conflict and dispute resolution (Namie, Namie, & Lutgen-Sandvik, 2010; Vickers, 2006). The imbalance of power and the target's inability to defend themselves are defining features of bullying but not of conflict (Keashley, & Nowell, 2011); a major indication that conflict and bullying are not the same phenomenon. Furthermore, conflict mediation is dependent on both parties accepting a degree of responsibility and this would inappropriately imply that the target shares accountability for the problem (Vickers, 2006). Consequently, although
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mediation may be suitable if a situation is still a conflict and has not yet progressed to bullying but if it becomes bullying mediation may be detrimental to the target (Euwema, 2014; Lutgen-Sandvik, & Tracy, 2012).

Strategies that leave the target responsible for managing the situation may imply that the target is in some way to blame (Macintosh, 2006). With a blame-the-victim response already common, mediation is considered an unsuitable bullying intervention by many researchers and practitioners (Duffy, & Sperry, 2007; Keashley, & Nowell, 2011; Lutgen-Sandvik, 2006; Macintosh, 2006; Vickers, 2006); with the cautious exception of immediate action during the initial onset of the behaviour (Euwema, 2014; Namie, Namie, & Lutgen-Sandvik, 2010). For some, mediation is not seen as a clear-cut issue and its use continues in practice for workplace bullying rectification (Euwema, 2014). The UK Health and Safety Executive (HSE) and the online workplace bullying resource, Bullyonline, both have mediation as one of their suggestions (Bullyonline, 2005; Health and Safety Executive, 2014).

3.5.1.2 Conflict and immediacy

Two broad possibilities have been presented as the underlying driver of workplace bullying; predation and escalated conflict (Caponecchia, & Wyatt, 2009, p. 43; Einarsen, 1999, p. 16). These are not necessarily isolated and a combination was acknowledged as a possibility by Einarsen (1999, p. 22). Firstly, in predatory bullying the target has done nothing which could be considered justification for the perpetrators behaviour and the perpetrator's personality, the organisational context or group affiliations may be the impetus (Einarsen, 1999, p. 23; Hauge, Einarsen, Knardahl, Lau, Notelaers, & Skogstad, 2011, p. 317). Secondly, bullying may result from escalated conflict or disputes in which power has become unbalanced (Caponecchia, & Wyatt, 2009, p. 44; Keashly, & Nowell, 2003, p. 348; Lutgen-Sandvik, 2003, p. 481; Zapf, & Gross, 2001, p. 497).
Chapter 3

Although immediacy of intervention is pertinent to any form of bullying, with the conflict theory it has the potential to prevent a conflict escalating into bullying. The sooner the process is interrupted or halted the less likely it is to escalate to a destructive situation. Conflict theory describes bullying as a high level of conflict reached as a result of the inability to resolve the situation (Zapf, & Gross, 2001, p. 497). When conflict escalates to the point where the power becomes unbalanced it becomes bullying (Zapf, & Gross, 2001, p. 497).

Micro-level interventions have tended to be tertiary; reactions to the problem and efforts to correct the situation. They are necessary but not sufficient to combat workplace bullying (Lutgen-Sandvik, & Tracy, 2012).

3.5.2 Meso level intervention

At the group intervention level strategies are directed towards specific populations of an organisation, such as peers, teams and managers (Heames, & Harvey, 2006). Unchecked bullying is liable to spread its toxicity to these wider groups destroying positive interactions (Heames, & Harvey, 2006). Training is key to raising awareness and improving skills with the focus often on managers (Woodman, & Kumar, 2008). Programmes may already be in place for discrimination issues such as sexual or racial harassment and these may be extended to include bullying (Lutgen-Sandvik, & Tracy, 2012). At the meso level, training to increase conflict management abilities, improve stress management and encourage managers to explain decisions may be used to reduce poor or negative interactions and contribute to bullying reduction (Zapf, & Einarsen, 2005). Organisations that include training on bullying are perceived by their managers to be more effective at deterring bullying behaviours (Woodman, & Kumar, 2008).

Just as ignoring bullying at the individual level is likely to result in it continuing; at the group level it may desensitise employees to bullying behaviours leading to a negative work environment (Heames, & Harvey, 2006). Without appropriate training the group
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may be more likely to be silenced through fear of retribution (Saam, 2010); or they may
side with the bully in the belief it will reduce the chance of being the next target
(Heames, & Harvey, 2006). Ignoring, silencing and joining the bully all lead to the
behaviour not being challenged and therefore persisting.

3.5.2.1 Training as an intervention

Training usually focuses at meso level and includes improving communications and
awareness of bullying behaviours (Lutgen-Sandvik, & Tracy, 2012; Woodman, &
Kumar, 2008). An increased understanding helps employees, including managers, to
respond constructively (Lutgen-Sandvik, & Tracy, 2012). Notwithstanding this any
training must be approached with caution and well thought-out with suitable policy and
procedures in place. The reason is that clarification of workplace bullying may on one
hand lead to a reduction in employees' accusations (Branch, & Murray, 2008); but on
the other hand may be used to express discontent with the employer (Liefooghe, &
MacKenzie Davey, 2001). The latter highlighting the importance of well-trained
managers (Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002, p. 171). Consequently it is vital to have
procedures in place to effectively investigate reports. Unfortunately in the UK studies
have reported managers as the key perpetrators, thus reliance on this group alone may
be ineffective; therefore it is recommended that a critical mass of employees is trained
(Scully, & Rowe, 2009, p. 6; Vartia-Väänänen, 2013).

Although they may not have experienced bullying and may not have any supervisory
responsibilities all employees are potential witnesses to workplace bullying. As
witnesses they may quell or escalate the situation according to their behaviour (Heames,
& Harvey, 2006; Scully, & Rowe, 2009, p. 6). Training of potential witnesses is
beneficial to targets but also to the witnesses themselves as they may be negatively
impacted by bullying (Einarsen, & Raknes, 1997; Strandmark, 2013; Vartia, 2001). An
essential component of any training programme addressing bullying is adequate
information on the organisation's policy and how it is enacted (Cowan, 2011). For a
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sustained effect training must be repeated regularly (Hoel, & Giga, 2006; Leka, Vartia, Hassard, Pahkin, Sanna, Cox, & Lindsrom, 2008, p. 139).

3.5.3 Macro level intervention

Macro interventions are instigated at societal level down to organisational level (Lutgen-Sandvik, & Tracy, 2012; Vartia-Väänänen, 2003, p. 11). Setting appropriate boundaries for workplace behaviour to positively change the discourse on bullying may be facilitated by legislation and codes of practice (Turney, 2003). Legal protection from bullying varies by country, for example Sweden has specific legislation (Notelaers, 2010, p. 11; Porteous, 2002; Yamada, 2011); and in the UK support is complicated and limited (Porteous, 2002, p. 86). Whilst there is recognition that the law as regards bullying is inadequate (Lippel, 2014; Yamada, 2011); the need for specific bullying legislation is not unanimously advocated. Protective laws have the potential for paradoxical results and complex interpretations; as such they should be considered with caution (Hoel, Sparks, & Cooper, 2001; Vickers, 2006). Furthermore legislation does not necessarily address the root of the problem and, “...workplace bullying is not going to be eliminated merely by the passing of legislation” (Porteous, 2002, p. 87). Nevertheless greater structure and co-ordination is advised (Fevre, Lewis, Robinson, & Jones, 2011, p. 39); and legislation may encourage more organisations to implement policies (Porteous, 2002, p. 87). Together these will contribute to clarifying fuzzy constructs, moving towards a critical mass of employees who, “...share understanding...” (Lutgen-Sandvik, & Tracy, 2012, p. 30).

Fundamentally, a policy is required to initiate and support a proactive approach to bullying reduction and intolerance (Hoel, & Einarsen, 2010; Harvey, Treadway, Heames, Thompson, & Duke, 2008). In addition to clear boundaries for acceptable behaviour it should provide coherent procedures for all interventions (Macintosh, 2006; Rayner, & Lewis, 2011). Preferably everyone with responsibility for actioning any aspect of the policy should be involved as this leads to a commitment to deliver (Rayner, & McIvor, 2008). Expectations should not be unrealistic and it is highly
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unlikely any single intervention would eliminate all bullying (Lutgen-Sandvik, Namie, & Namie, 2009, p. 60; Semmer, 2006; Zapf, 2012). Thus meso and micro level interventions will rarely effect change without the support of the organisation at the macro level (Lutgen-Sandvik, & Tracy, 2012).

Ultimately the responsibility to tackle workplace bullying lies with the organisation (Liefooghe, & Mackenzie Davey, 2001); and ideally action should begin at the top (Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002, p. 176). Just as negative workplace environment exacerbates bullying (Einarsen, 2000, p. 7); a positive culture fosters a respectful and prosocial atmosphere (Cornoiu, & Gyorgy, 2013). Workplace bullying, "...reflects the social atmosphere..." (Helkavaara, Saastamoinen, & Lahelma, 2011, p. 5); thus a morally bereft environment is liable to be tolerant of bullying (Einarsen, 1999; Harvey, Treadway, Heames, Thompson, & Duke, 2008). The organisational stance sets the tone and if faulty or ambiguous it may condone bullying (Fevre, Lewis, Robinson, & Jones, 2011, p. 4).

In organisations with long standing bullying the upper hierarchy may be entrenched in the culture and deny bullying exists or is problematic, concluding that reduction is not worthy of resources (Lee, 2014; Namie, & Lutgen-Sandvik, 2010; Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002). For such organisations a top down approach may be met with reluctance and a tactful and sensitive approach, which is always advisable, becomes essential (Lee, 2014; Rayner, et al., 2002). For some clarification of the organisational costs of workplace bullying may be persuasive (Giga, Hoel, & Lewis, 2008; Hogh, & Hoel, 2011; Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002; Sheehan, 1999).

Bullying and harassment policies are ostensibly in the interest of employees but it may be the case for some organisations that encouraging reporting is ultimately designed to keep the issue in-house (Vickers, 2006). Without implementation policies may be counterproductive as the employee is likely to feel let down and resort to external action.
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(Cowan, 2009; Ferris, 2004). This may be because procedures have not been disseminated to all levels of the organisation (Cowan, 2011; Strandmark, 2013, p. 35). It is not sufficient to have a policy, it must be implemented with appropriate training on procedures (Turney, 2003); with interventions integrated at all levels (Harvey, Heames, Richey, & Leonard, 2006; Saam, 2010). Embedding the policy across the entire spectrum of the organisation's information processes (induction, publications, web-pages and training) promotes organisational engagement and responsibility (Rayner, & Lewis, 2011).

Acceptance of bullying as an issue and putting procedures in place varies across the 27 EU member states but many organisations now have a procedure (Vartia, 2013). The European survey of enterprises on new and emerging risks (ESENER) found procedures most common across Ireland with 90%; followed by the UK with 84%; and Sweden, Finland and Belgium all above 70% (Vartia, 2013, p. 6). Although positive, policies require additional interventions such as training if they are to reduce the prevalence rates of workplace bullying (Pate, & Beaumont, 2010).

3.5.3.1 A note on trade unions

Although membership is only half the number it was in the 1980s many UK employees belong to a trade union; reportedly 5.8 million Trade Union Congress-affiliated members in 2012 (Moylan, 2012). At the macro level unions are proactively involved in raising awareness on bullying and harassment with projects such as The Dignity at Work Partnership (Rayner, & McIvor, 2008). Organisations should involve union representatives in generating their policies especially as they may be approached with complaints (Leka, Vartia, Hassard, Pahkin, Sutela, Cox, & Lindstrom, 2008, p. 145; Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002). There was evidence for approaching the union being a lower risk strategy than asking a supervisor for help (Ferris, 2004, p. 390; Rayner, 2009). The complexities of union responses to workplace bullying are not discussed in this thesis. However, the relevant union for the research participants was approached for approval of the project and this was granted.
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3.5.3.2 The human resources practitioner

Employees may expect human resource practitioners to be able to address bullying complaints although policies commonly specify that managers are responsible for handling them (Salin, 2008, p. 227). Many factors influence the responsibilities and actions of human resources practitioner including the size of the organisation, the culture of the country and the organisation and the resources that are available (Harrington, 2010, p. 52; Salin, 2008, p. 235). Caught in the middle between employees and the organisation they can be left feeling powerless (Harrington, 2010, p. 52; Lovell, 2002). Some employees lack trust in their human resources department as they find there is a reluctance to label incidents as bullying; subsequently the service provided appears to fall short of expectations (Harrington, Rayner, & Warren, 2004, p. 403). Human resource departments may be proactive in providing training related to employee dignity and well-being but the sophistication of practice varies (Salin, 2008). In the current research human resource trainers were no longer employed by the organisation (although they had been in the past). The research was supported by the inclusion manager and permission was given for the researcher to provide training.

3.6 Summary

In summary, owing to its scope, bullying permeates through all layers of the workplace and it is necessary to consider all levels of an organisation when formulating reduction strategies (Heames, & Harvey, 2006; Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002; Saam, 2010). Whilst policy scaffolds the organisations attitude and strategies it does not function without effective implementation and support (Pate, & Beaumont, 2010, p. 180; Rayner, et al., 2002). Ensuring the environment is not supportive of bullying may be the best approach to prevention but continuous awareness is necessary in order that the ethos is maintained (Rayner, et al., 2002). Managers, human resources personnel and occupational health have multiple roles to play. Skills must be acquired to model appropriate behaviour and discretely intervene to resolve issues (Rayner, et al., 2002). Secondary strategies to immediately address potential bullying behaviours must be actioned, employees need to be encouraged to engage with a respectful culture through
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induction programmes, training and clear procedures. Rehabilitation (tertiary stage) must be available to restore equilibrium and limit damage to all concerned.

3.7 Implementation and evaluation

Academics and practitioners have made comprehensive suggestions for solutions to psychosocial workplace risks since workplace bullying was put on the agenda (Keashley, & Nowell, 2011; Namie, Namie, & Lutgen-Sandvik, 2011; Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002; Rayner, & Lewis, 2011; Tehrani, 2011; Vartia, & Leka, 2011; Vartia, 2013; Yamada, 2011). During the last two decades bullying has been a valid concern of professionals interested in workplace welfare (Spurgeon, 2003, p. 327). Whatever the specific risk the basics of intervention have been similar; policy, rules of conduct, training, counselling, mediation and treatment (Spurgeon, 2003). The success of an intervention can only be calculated if it is implemented and measured (Zapf, 2012). Evaluations of actual interventions are necessary if progress towards bullying reduction is to be made. Thus this study designed, implemented and evaluated an intervention following one of the untested suggestions; that bystanders are well placed to intervene (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2003).

At the most fundamental level an organisation must monitor not only the incidence of bullying but the psychosocial climate (Hogh, Hoel, & Carneiro, 2011). This may include sickness absence, turnover and data collected in employee surveys. such as intention to leave or responses to positive enquiries, for example, about employee satisfaction (Hogh, et al., 2011; Mathisen, Einarsen, & Mykletun, 2008. p. 63; Rayner, et al., 2002, p. 177). Levels of bullying may be assessed with existing metrics such as the revised Negative Acts questionnaire (NAQ-R, Einarsen, Hoel, & Notelaers, 2009) which is available in languages including Italian (Balducci, Spagnoli, Alfano, Barattucci, Notelaers, & Fraccaroli, 2010); Japanese (Tsuno, Kawakami, Inoue, & Abe, 2010) and Spanish (Jiménez, Muñoz, Gamarra, & Herrer, 2007).
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3.8 Framework for robust intervention strategies

Whatever measures are used the key is to be consistent so that longitudinal patterns can be accurately depicted (Zapf, 2012). Scientific and robust evidence is required in order that interventions can become structured, cost effective and reliable (Leka, Vartia, Hassard, Pahkin, Sutela, Cox, & Lindstrom, 2008, p. 164). Haphazard interventions with no clear evaluations are unlikely to provide adequate benefits for the cost (Nielsen, Fredslund, Christensen, & Albertsen, 2006, p. 283). A process of accurate implementation, maintenance and monitoring will provide the best chance of prevention and control (Leka, et al., 2008, p. 145; Spurgeon, 2003, p. 333; Zapf, 2012). For an accurate assessment of intervention strategies Zapf (2012) recommended a 7-point check-list (figure 3.3 below).

Figure 3.3 Framework for effective evidence of bullying interventions (adapted from Zapf, 2012)

Coordinated, well-designed strategies may work to reduce bullying but unless they are reliably measured it is not possible to establish if they have worked, how they have worked and whether or not the strategy is successful or it needs adapting. A robust plan for implementation of a strategy was presented by Zapf (2012) to maximise effectiveness and enable evaluation; the elements of this are clarified below.
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3.8.1 Conceptual theory

Any intervention programme must establish what it is that is being intervened in and what the goal is. Ideally an intervention would be preceded by an inductive phase where the nature of the phenomenon is investigated in the context of the organisation (Locke, 2011; Rayner, & McIvor, 2008; Zapf, 2012). Findings should be aligned with theory to identify the issue being addressed, for example, sexual harassment (O'Leary-Kelly, Tiedt, & Bowes-Sperry, 2004); abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000); physical violence (battery: Yamada, 2013, p. 171); occupational stress (Hurrell, & Murphy, 1996; Lerouge, 2013); or workplace bullying (Einarsen, Raknes, & Matthiesen, 1994). The latter being the case in this thesis necessitates that there is an indication that it is indeed a problem of workplace bullying. If a full inductive phase is not possible baseline measures should be taken in order to evidence changes (Hoel, Giga, & Faragher, 2006, p. 10).

3.8.2 Technological theory

Intervention should have a robust theoretical underpinning; success is dependent on a sound theory (Hoel, Giga, & Faragher, 2006, p. 10). Having assessed the issue within the context of the organisation, the source may be conceptualised as individual, group-level or organisational. Relevant theories on which to base the intervention strategy can then be explored (table 3.1 below for examples). The theory must lead to manipulables which have the potential to improve the situation (Zapf, 2012). This provides a framework for the intervention and guides measurements. For example, in the case of an organisation with a toxic environment an intervention may be based on improving communication and cooperation with before and after measures of social climate (Einarsen, Raknes, & Matthiesen, 1994). If bullying is ingrained it may be evident at all levels. Consequently, it may be necessary to prioritise, as addressing all levels at the same time may be impractical. Therefore the strategy with the highest chance of success should be implemented first. Successful interventions may increase employees' trust and encourage engagement in future interventions (Semmer, 2006;
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Zapf, 2012). However, employees may also be unconvinced that any bullying reduction will be sustained (Pate, & Beaumont, 2010, p. 181).

Table 3.1

Examples of theoretical basis for intervention at micro, meso and macro levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Theoretical basis for intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro</td>
<td>Self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meso</td>
<td>Social Identity (Tajfel, &amp; Turner, 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macro</td>
<td>Work environment (Einarsen, Raknes, &amp; Matthiesen, 1994)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8.3 Case appropriate measurements

One of the failings of interventions that have been implemented lies in the absence of appropriate measurements (Zapf, 2012). Before and after measures using reliable instruments are required to ascertain if the intervention programme was effective (Hoel, Giga, & Faragher, 2006, p. 10). It is recommended that a control group is included in order that inferences may be made about causal relationships (Hoel, et al., 2006). Changes in workplace bullying should be measured in conjunction with measures of the factors being manipulated in the intervention. Therefore if increased communication skills are expected to reduce bullying an adequate measure of the relevant communication skills should be included. Thus it may be established whether or not any changes may be attributed to the intervention.

3.8.4 Evaluation of the design

From the outset the design should ensure that the intervention is feasible in the context of the organisation involved. Support of the top management should be sought at the outset and the organisation should collaborate or be consulted as far as possible in the
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design process (Pate, & Beaumont, 2010; Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002). Likewise other key stakeholders such as union representatives should be engaged in the process (Zapf, 2012; Mikkelsen, Hogh, & Berg Puggaard, 2011). It is crucial that those involved are able to fulfil their role and gatekeepers should be active in verifying recruitment, timing and communications. Concerns should be addressed as the design progresses to minimise issues arising during implementation.

3.8.5 Change sensitivity of the measure

Part of the design process is to ensure that the instruments are sensitive to the expected changes (Zapf, 2012). It may be necessary to customise existing instruments or design a new scale, in both cases pilot studies would be required to verify the reliability of the modified or new measures. Not only is this a time consuming activity, it requires a sample which is separate from but representative of the field study as using the same group twice may prime the participants or bias the evaluation. In large organisations it may be possible to recruit from geographical separate groups but small and medium size organisations may require innovative solutions. It should be noted that self-reported reduction in levels of bullying alone may be an unreliable gauge. Failure to identify as bullied may result in under reporting (Pate, & Beaumont, 2010; Lutgen-Sandvik, Tracy, & Alberts, 2007). Over reporting has occurred when respondents wanted acknowledgement of the behaviour even though it did not conform to the time-frame being surveyed (Lutgen-Sandvik, 2007, p. 856).

3.8.6 Measure implemented

There are a number of factors to take into account when implementing field measures. Timings must be compatible with the employees’ availability and those involved such as managers, supervisors and trainers must be adequately prepared. Employees must be briefed on the process. Diverging interests may result in untimely or unrepresentative measurements and therefore it is important that all the stakeholders are committed to the intervention. Planning and monitoring must pre-empt potential problems and reliable
Chapter 3

processes must be put in place. As in any evaluation, a representative sample must be recruited with adequate numbers for the intervention to be effective and inferences to be drawn. It may be appropriate for training programmes to be compulsory (Pate, & Beaumont, 2010, p. 178; Zapf, 2012).

3.8.7 Design implemented

Unless the intervention is implemented as stated in the design, evaluation may be inaccurate, partial or not possible at all. In field studies it is essential that trust is developed between researchers, external agents (practitioners, trainers, unions) and members of the organisation (Zapf, 2012). Success of the intervention is dependent on financial and human resources (Georgakopoulos, Wilkin, & Kent, 2011, p. 6). Nevertheless with the complexity of the phenomenon combined with the difficulties of implementing robust field interventions it has been suggested that failure should not be surprising (Zapf, 2012, p. 9).

In conclusion, the framework for effective evidence of bullying interventions (adapted from Zapf, 2012) was considered a logical and robust process by which to achieve the aims of this research.

3.9 From suggestions to actual interventions

Information on measured workplace bullying interventions at any level is sparse (Beswick, Gore, & Palferman, 2006, p. 33; Hoel, Giga, & Faragher, 2006, p. 9; Pate, & Beaumont, 2010, p. 174). In particular, the potential of bystanders to intervene to reduce workplace bullying had not been tested. Unfortunately, scientific rigour such as that described by Zapf (2012) may be one of the reasons for a lack of evaluated interventions (Beswick, et al., 2006, p. 33). Outside of a laboratory setting a rigorous process may become complex and and appear unmanageable. There has been some acknowledgement that compromises will have to be made to implement interventions in
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the field (Beswick, et al., 2006, p. 33). Nevertheless this thesis illustrates that it is a worthwhile venture.

Interventions have been instigated because of knowledge of the detrimental effects of bullying, as a reaction to bullying incidents and in some countries owing to legal obligation. In a comprehensive review of workplace bullying interventions for the UK National Health Service (NHS), Illing and colleagues (2013) detailed 55 academic papers and reports of suggestions and programmes closely aligned to bullying reduction. The majority of implemented interventions occurred in the health sector. Of these 33 were of interventions which were implemented. Where terms such as conflict management, mediation, discrimination and healthy environment were used without mention of bullying, the studies were not considered to be adequately aligned to the current research. The remaining 23 interventions were evaluated to inform the progress of the current study (Appendix C).

3.9.1 Primary interventions progress

The primary interventions reported were mainly reactive but macro-level policies and codes of conduct are being implemented, albeit mostly without measurement (Illing, Carter, Thompson, Crampton, Morrow, Howse, Cooke, & Burford, 2013). Where evaluation has taken place the results are mixed. Stevens (2002) found a post-policy improvement in staff retention and Pate and Beaumont (2010, p. 178) reported, "...an impressive decline in perceptions of bullying...” Less encouraging results by Johnstone and colleagues indicated psychosocial risks such as bullying were still a marginal consideration compared to other hazards (Johnstone, Quinlan, & MacNamara, 2011) The difficulties of scientific level evaluations were apparent in a public sector intervention where no statistically significant differences were evidenced in the main variables tested (Hoel, Giga, & Faragher, 2006).
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3.9.2 Secondary interventions progress

There are some reports that secondary interventions have included training employees with the skills to stop or reduce bullying (Carter, & Thomson, 2012; Dimarino, 2011, Vartia, 2009). On the whole these meso-level strategies appear to be aimed at target reactions and responses but there is inadequate information to be certain (Griffin, 2004; Jennings, & Tiplady, 2010; Leon-Perez, Arenas, & Butts Griggs, 2012). This would not necessarily be an optimal approached based on existing knowledge of target's behaviour.

Einarsen, Raknes, and Matthieson (1994, p. 383) defined a target as any employee who perceives themselves to be the subject of systematic mistreatment over time, by another employee (or employees) and that they feel unable to successfully defend themselves. The latter part of the definition indicates that the target is not best placed to take responsibility for dealing with the behaviour (Bowes-Sperry, & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005). However, there are benefits, especially in terms of their self-esteem if targets are able to successfully deal with it and Griffin reported that cognitive rehearsal enabled targets to confront their bullies (2004). Nevertheless, an expectation of the target resolving the problem brings with it the risk of them being perceived to be culpable (Lutgen-Sandvik, 2003).

At the time of writing no published bystander interventions in workplace bullying could be found. However, inclusive training, although not focused on the bystander perspective, would clearly involve bystanders. Inclusive training involving all employees potentially educates the bullies themselves; improving group dynamics and communication which is likely to reduce bullying incidents (Carter, & Thompson, 2012). In one study targeting nurses with low interaction skills, communication skills were improved after group training sessions (Barrett, Piatek, Korber, & Padula, 2009). De-escalation requires prompt intervention and inclusive training provides the greatest opportunity for immediacy as more employees are available to respond appropriately (Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002). Thus the delay caused by later reporting to a manager or supervisor may be avoided and with it the time for the problem to fester.
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3.9.3 Tertiary interventions progress

Interventions to workplace bullying began at the tertiary micro-level with Leymann's (1990; 1996) treatment of victims. Even at that early stage in the field it was recognised that practical support was required along with psychosocial therapeutic rehabilitation (Leymann, 1990). An intermediary to oversee reconciliation and self-help groups were proffered as ways forward (Leymann, 1990, p. 124). The latter has evolved to employee assistance services and volunteer support groups but once again evaluation is almost non-existent. An exception is Rains' review of a peer listening service which found the scheme to be beneficial in the long term but stressed the importance of support for the listeners themselves (Rains, 2001). Specialised therapeutic treatment for in-patients with a goal of rehabilitation to the point of returning to working life was evaluated with significant improvement in employable patients' health found (Schwickerath, & Zapf, 2011, p. 413). Patients who were unemployable at the time of the follow-up survey, although improved immediately after therapy, returned to their pre-therapy states (Schwickerath, & Zapf, 2011, p. 415). Interestingly once health had been impaired being away from the workplace prior to treatment had no impact indicating that prompt treatment is key to initiating recovery (Schwickerath, & Zapf, 2011).

3.10 Chapter summary

Interventions have been present as long as workplace bullying has been an area of research. Leymann's (1990) research arose from treatment of bullying victims and the phenomenon was subsequently conceptualised. Although it is likely that practitioner and organisational interventions took place in the interim, the academic focus turned to understanding the nature, extent, antecedents and consequences of workplace bullying. Greater academic knowledge of the phenomenon brought with it an increased sense of urgency to strategise and ultimately implement solutions. From the start of the millennium interventions have been given greater attention and the need to have a robust framework for these has been acknowledged.
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Of the interventions actually implemented few have succeeded in providing reliable evidence. Immediacy has been identified as crucial in de-escalation or cessation of workplace bullying and yet those in the optimal position to do this, the bystanders, had not been the subject of an implemented intervention strategy. Therefore, this thesis addresses these points with a measurable strategy for intervention by those present when workplace bullying occurs. The next chapter moves away from the workplace bullying literature and critical reviews the literature on the bystanders.
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4 The development of bystander research, 1968 - 2013

4.1 Introduction
In this chapter the focus will be on bystander research. This has developed concurrent to bullying (over the last forty years) and likewise has divided into distinct but nonetheless related areas. The theories of bystander behaviour are fundamental to this thesis and will be scrutinised to assimilate existing knowledge on bystander and their roles in intervention. Owing to a paucity of explicit research on bystander intervention in workplace bullying, the development of the new strategy to increase bystander intervention in workplace bullying evolved from a combination of theories and findings including from aligned areas. Parallels in the sexual violence literature were significant in demonstrating the potential of bystander intervention and established psychological responsibility theory provided the basis for the framework. Literature in these areas will therefore be included in this bystander chapter.

4.2 Defining the bystander
To reiterate (from Chapter 1), a bystander is any person who is proximal to an event; they are near enough to an incident to see it, to hear it or both. From a single witness or observer to multiple spectators; the bystanders are the audience. Although the literature, on the whole, uses the term 'bystander', they are usually described as witnessing an incident (and not bystanding). It is unsurprising therefore, that the term 'witness' is also found (Lutgen-Sandvik, 2006, p. 426). Collins English Dictionary (2000) defines the word bystander as, “A person present but not involved; onlooker; spectator”. To interpret the word in this way, as indicating a lack of involvement on the basis of being present but inactive, can be misleading as the meaning is wider in academic use (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004; Bowes-Sperry, & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005; Twemlow, Fonagy, & Sacco, 2004). The word, bystander, was adopted by Darley and Latané (1968) in their research into helping behaviours and it developed into a multi-faceted term with greater implications of involvement than those perhaps perceived by the lay-person.
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It is intuitive that an intervening bystander is involved in an incident. However, being involved is less obvious when the bystander is inactive or disregards the situation. To clarify, non-participatory observers who perceive themselves as passive are unlikely to be a, “...neutral force...” (van Heugten, 2011, p. 219). As their presence has influence they are effectively involved whether passive or active. In the context of bystander research, and throughout this thesis, any third-party present whatever their position, whether an active spectator or disinterested party, is termed a bystander.

4.3 Bystander presence in bullying

The term, bystander, carried over to the workplace bullying literature as a third party, witness or observer who is neither the target nor abuser in that particular incident (Scully, & Rowe, 2009; van Heugten, 2011, p. 219). The basis of a bullying interaction is generally dyadic (other dynamics will be considered later); there is a bully and a target (Einarsen, & Skogstad, 1996; Namie, & Lutgen-Sandvik, 2010). When bullying occurs in the office, shop-floor or break-room there is the potential for the negative behaviour to be witnessed by one or more co-workers (Namie, & Lutgen-Sandvik, 2010; van Heugten, 2011, p. 224). Bystanders are often peers rather than managers; generally being a larger group than managers, peers are most likely to see or hear an incident as it happens (Scully, & Rowe, 2009, p. 2). Bullying which occurs in a community setting with others around extends beyond the dyadic owing to the presence of bystanders (van Heugten, 2011, p. 224).

Recognition of the difference in dynamics when bystanders are present was first noted in school violence research (Twemlow, Fonagy, & Sacco, 2004) (figure 4.1 below). In school research the bystander role has been widely acknowledged as an involved and active component of the social architecture (Twemlow, et al. 2004). This dynamic is transferable to workplace setting where an incident with bystanders ceases to be genuinely dyadic (Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002; Twemlow, Fonagy, & Sacco, 2004).
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Figure 4.1 Bullying as a triadic event

Although workplace bullying is primarily between the target and the perpetrator, with bystanders the dynamic becomes triadic; a three-way social interaction (Twemlow, Fonagy, & Sacco, 2004). Therefore the role of the bystander should not be overlooked as it has an impact on the interaction (Harvey, Buckley, Heames, Zinko, Brouer, & Ferris, 2007; Ho, & Cogin, 2010; Levine, Taylor, & Best, 2011; Twemlow, Fonagy, & Sacco, 2004). The bystander role is a potential force for good. This was demonstrated in a field study on violence using closed-circuit television in which bystanders tended towards conciliatory rather than escalatory behaviours (Levine, Taylor, & Best, 2011). Counter-intuitively a bystander who completely ignores an incident nevertheless is part of the social interaction and thereby alters the event by their presence (Samuelson, & Gentile, 2002; Twemlow, & Sacco, 2013). This is true even when the bystander takes no action and does not intend to influence the situation in any way (Hutchinson, Wilkes, Jackson, & Vickers, 2010; Lutgen-Sandvik & Tracy, 2012).

In ignoring the event the bystander may give a message to others that the situation is not worthy of attention (Anker, & Feeley, 2011, p. 14; Latané, & Darley, 1970, p. 32; Liefooghe, & MacKenzie Davey, 2001, p. 383); or the target is not worthy of sympathy (Bloch, 2012, p. 92; Mulder, Pouwelse, Bos, & van Dam, 2014). Furthermore, by disregarding the situation the bystander may be perceived as supportive of the bully;
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endorsing the bullying behaviour or enabling the bully (Einarsen, 1999). This may be to
the extent that the bystander is a passive accomplice; “...laughing at the jokes made at
targets’ expense” (Namie, & Lutgen-Sandvik, 2010, p. 349). It should be noted that
although there is overlap in the terms, bystander and passive accomplice, they are not
synonymous; the latter may be someone who ignores a report of bullying but who was
not a bystander (that is, they were not present at the time of the incident).

If the bully remains unchallenged the bullying behaviour may be unintentionally
perpetuated (Dick, 2010; Harvey, Treadway, & Heames, 2007; Rayner, & McIvor,
2008). Consequently, whether active or not the bystander's presence indicates a degree
of involvement and therefore it is not appropriate to absolve them of all responsibilities.
The reaction of bystander's, “...to bullying behavior will define the range of acceptance
of bullying behavior...” (Harvey, Treadway, & Heames, 2007, p. 2584).

In summary, any bullying incident where a bystander is present must be at least triadic
and this dynamic should be examined (Twemlow, Fonagy, & Sacco, 2004) (figure 4.1
above). The role of the bystander is integral in the social construction of the situation
and may perpetuate or quell abuse (Harvey, Treadway, & Heames, 2007; Lewis, &
Sheehan, 2003; Mulder, Pauwelse, Lodewijkx, & Bolman, 2008; Twemlow, Fonagy, &
Sacco, 2004). Predominantly, the bystanders, like the targets, have no choice in their
involvement and their presence is either accidental or planned by the bully to create an
audience. The exception to this, are manipulators who contrive an event with someone
else as the bully (Twemlow, Fonagy, & Sacco, 2004, p. 218) (Bystander roles p.80).
Bystanders do however have choices about the nature of their involvement and it is this
that provides the facets of bystanding. They can be active in support of either the target
or the perpetrator; or they can be passive and support the perpetrator through the role of
consenting audience, thereby setting a precedent for such behaviour (Harvey, Treadway,
& Heames, 2007; Mulder, Pauwelse, Lodewijkx, & Bolman, 2008).
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4.4 Rationale for bystander inclusion in bullying reduction strategies

As immediate responses are desirable to de-escalate bullying events (European Agency for Safety and Health at Work, 2002; Keashly, & Nowell, 2003; Salin, 2008) and bystanders are well placed to act, it is logical to consider bystanders in workplace bullying reduction strategies. This has been recognised in the literature and bystanders have been suggested as a possible direction for research into workplace bullying reduction (Rayner, & Bowes-Sperry, 2008; Rayner, & Keashly, 2005). However, to date few workplace-bullying intervention studies have addressed the bystander (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011; Illing, Carter, Thompson, Crampton, Morrow, Howse, Cooke, & Burford, 2013). A framework for the development of a strategy to increase bystander intervention in workplace bullying was sought through a review of existing bystander literature from 1968 to 2013.

4.5 Bystander roles

Going beyond the general dictionary definition of a bystander the school literature identified the roles which a bystander may fulfil. These were based on bystanders' reactions and the influence these have on the situation both at the time and subsequently. Categorisations have varied from four roles (Salmivali, 1999); eight roles (Olweus, 2001, p. 14); to thirteen roles (Paull, Omari, & Standen, 2012, p. 5). These bystanders' roles can be divided according to whether their behaviour is passive or active but this is not an indication of a positive or negative role (Paull, et al., 2012; van Heugten, 2011). An indication of positivity is the effect of the bystander behaviour, categorised as either destructive or constructive (Paull, et al., 2012; van Heugten, 2011). Constructive behaviour is more likely to lead to a positive outcome.

Paull and her colleagues explained bystander roles as a continuum from aligning with the bully to aligning with the target (2012, p. 4). Thus the extremes would be from an active, constructive bystander aligned with the target to active, destructive bystander aligned with the bully (Paull, et al., 2012, p. 4). Each category of bystander roles will be described to achieve an overall picture of bystanders' potential behaviours.
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4.5.1 Active, constructive bystander roles

Bystanders' reactions may be helpful, this is commonly referred to as prosocial behaviour; “...actions for the benefit of others...” (Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, & Schroeder, 2005, p. 14.2). Active, constructive bystanders are the most likely to intervene appropriately and thereby contribute to the reduction of workplace bullying. When witnessing an incident these bystanders will intervene or defuse the situation; they may defend the target or sympathise with them (Paull, Omari, & Standen, 2012, p. 9). Sympathisers, although similar to the empathisers, will communicate their support to the target unlike the empathiser who may remain passive and silent (Paull, et al., 2009, p. 9). In table 4.1 below the roles are described according to the descriptions of Paull and colleague with positioning of the roles by Salmivali and Twemlow denoted.

Table 4.1

Active, constructive bystander roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bystander role</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Salmivali, 1999</th>
<th>Twemlow, Fonagy, &amp; Sacco, 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervening</td>
<td>Takes action to halt bullying or avoid retaliation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defusing</td>
<td>Involves themselves in preventing escalation of the situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathising</td>
<td>Identifies with the victim – remains silent for fear of becoming target, offers comfort and support in private.</td>
<td>Helpful (altruistic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defending</td>
<td>Stands up for victim.</td>
<td>Defender</td>
<td>Helpful (altruistic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.2 Passive, constructive bystanders

Only empathy has been described as passive and constructive (table 4.2 below). Although aligned with the target these bystanders do not take any action. They may communicate their empathy and listen to the target but they are unwilling or unable to
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take action (Paull, Omari, & Standen, 2012, p. 8). In their work in Indian call centres
D'Cruz and Noronha found that bystanders retreat to this role because of the high costs
of helping (2011, p. 286). If they do not express their distress, the empathising
bystander may experience more persistent negative effects than the target (D'Cruz, &
Noronha, 2011, p. 286; Omari, 2007, p. 188; Paull, et al., 2012, p. 8).

Table 4.2

Passive, constructive bystander role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bystander role</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Salmivali, 1999</th>
<th>Twemlow, Fonagy, &amp; Saeo, 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathising</td>
<td>Identifies with the victim - says/does nothing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Avoidant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.3 Passive, destructive bystanders

Understanding how bystanders can take a passive yet destructive role helps to clarify
the concept of passive bystanding as detrimental (Paull, et al., 2012; van Heugten, 2011)
(table 4.3 below). Those who submit or succumb to the bullying behaviours become
victims. The intention may have been to take a more positive role, such as an
intervening bystander but in failing they become grouped with the target or drawn to the
attention of the bully (Paull, et al., 2012, p. 9).

Bystanders who abdicate may believe they have no responsibility to do anything or they
may feel they do not have the power to intervene (Paull, et al., 2012, p. 7). Those who
avoid the situation may be self-preserving, “...at the expense of the victim” (Paull, et
al., 2012, p. 7); as they are fearful of becoming the next target (Vickers, 2006, p. 271).
However their avoidance may reduce their productivity and increase their absences,
placing their livelihood at risk (Mayhew, McCarthy, Chappell, Quinlan, Barker, &
Sheehan, 2004). The avoidant and abdicating bystanders who remain in their job may
find their passivity identifies them as easy future targets (Harvey, Treadway, & Duke, 2009, p. 34). By ignoring the bullying behaviours they are risking a continuing and possibly worsening bullying culture (Harvey, Treadway, Heames, & Duke, 2009, p. 34).

Table 4.3

Passive, destructive bystander roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bystander role</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Salmivali, 1999</th>
<th>Twemlow, Fonagy, &amp; Sacco, 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdicating</td>
<td>Silently allows bullying to continue by doing nothing in spite of being in a position to do so.</td>
<td>Abdicating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>Walks away.</td>
<td>Outsider</td>
<td>Avoidant; abdicating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succumbing</td>
<td>Becomes fellow victim.</td>
<td>Victim (passive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitting</td>
<td>Substitute victim.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All passive bystanders, whether constructive or destructive contribute to a continuing negative environment. This may seem a harsh judgement on the empathising bystander but failure to intervene (even indirectly) is permissive of the negative bullying behaviour.

4.5.4 Active, destructive bystander roles

Although not the obvious bully, the active, destructive bystander may have instigated the incident or manipulated another person into being a bully (table 4.4 below). Instigators and manipulators are bullies in sheep's clothing covertly orchestrating negative acts (Paull, Omari, & Standen, 2012). To reiterate a point made earlier, they may provide an audience for the bully to play to; effectively as facilitators (Paull, et al.,
Chapter 4

2012, p. 7). The accomplice who actively collaborates with the bully may have various motivations for doing so, from approval seeking to sharing a dislike of the target (Paull, et al., 2012, p. 6). Powerful bullies may coerce bystanders into cooperating with them (Vickers, 2006, p. 271). These bystander roles perpetuate a bullying culture as their behaviour aligns with the bully (Paull, et al., 2012, p. 6).

Table 4.4

Active, destructive bystander roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bystander role</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Salmivali, 1999</th>
<th>Twemlow, Fonagy, &amp; Sacco, 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instigating</td>
<td>Sets up actions of bully, creates situation.</td>
<td>Bully (aggressive); puppet-master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulating</td>
<td>Seeks to influence actions of bully, takes advantage of existing situation.</td>
<td>Bully (aggressive); puppet-master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating</td>
<td>Actively joins in, assists bully.</td>
<td>Assistant Bully (aggressive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating</td>
<td>Provides audience (fine line to joining in), can be inadvertent</td>
<td>Reinforce Bully (aggressive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.5 Summarising bystander roles

Some personality types tend towards a habitual role whilst others may react according to relationships and circumstances (Hudson, & Bruckman, 2004, p. 189; Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, & Schroeder, 2005, p. 14.10; Reeves, 2011, p. 19; van den Bos, Müller, & van Bussel, 2009, p. 873). Complexity arises as bystander roles are not fixed and bystanders may change between roles even during an incident (Paull, et al., 2012; van Heugten, 2011). This appeared to be the case in Indian call centres where bystanders who were friends of a target initially took a defender stance (D'Cruz, &
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Noronha, 2011, p. 278). In two cases the bystanders intervened by approaching the bully with the target and in six case they accompanied the target on visits to the human resources department (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011, p. 279). It was clear however that in some case a supportive bystander role led to a succumbing role with the bully turning on the bystanders (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011, p. 280). Bystanders succumbing to bullying themselves were reportedly less severe with older bystanders (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011, p. 279). Over time the bystanders’ role often became more avoidant, perhaps moving to an empathising role (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011, p. 281). As the first study of its kind, further studies are needed to establish if the findings were culturally specific to India (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011). Figure 4.2 (below) illustrates the bystander roles in quadrants according to their position on the both the constructive – destructive continuum and active – passive continuum.

![Figure 4.2 Categorisation of bystander roles](image-url)

Figure 4.2 Categorisation of bystander roles
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4.5.6 Encouraging positive bystander roles
Positive and active roles are undertaken by responsible bystanders. As this chapter progresses it will become increasingly apparent that responsibility is key to optimal bystander behaviour. If bystanders can be encouraged to fulfil positive and active roles it is more likely they will intervene to stop workplace bullying (including but not limited to verbal bullying) (Scully, & Rowe, 2009). Changes in bystander behaviour in a positive direction occurred in a group of New Zealand social workers (van Heugten, 2011, p. 220). Although most bystanders had originally taken passive roles, after feedback and discussions bystanders became more active (van Heugten, 2011, p. 220). Acknowledging this fluidity, that the individual's role can change, implies that there may be an opportunity to alter bystanders’ responses to bullying situations. Training bystanders may lead to “…potentially promising interventions...” (van Heugten, 2011, p. 220). With encouragement more bystanders may be able to move into or sustain a more positive and active role, thereby improving the outcome of the incident for both the target and the bystanders.

4.6 Towards a bystander strategy
The strategy designed for the current research aimed to move bystanders towards intervening and encourage those who intervene to continue to do so appropriately. For some bystander roles this is less of a journey than for others. A group of bystanders to workplace verbal bullying may include any number of these roles and consequently there are multiple considerations in moving bystanders towards appropriate and effective intervention. Those who currently intervene must have guidance to ensure they have appropriate skills which will not escalate a situation (Bingham, & Scherer, 2001). This raised the question, what is appropriate intervention?

4.6.1 Appropriate and responsible intervention
The aim in this thesis is to bring previous literature together to develop a new bystander intervention strategy. However, the overall goal is to reduce workplace verbal bullying.
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Consequently, success in bystander intervention depends on that intervention being responsible. That is, intervention which de-escalates or stops bullying whilst not transferring the direction of bullying behaviours towards the bystander nor reducing the bystander to the role of a bully. This involves discouraging negative behaviour and encouraging socially desirable behaviours (Scully, & Rowe, 2009, p. 1). Thus bystander intervention already occurring in the workplace should be scrutinised to ensure the behaviours are appropriate and that best practice is taking place (Leka, Vartia, Hassard, Pahkin, Sutela, Cox, & Lindstrom, 2008, p. 140). New responsible bystander interventions should be designed to maximise the opportunity to reduce bullying and minimise the risk of exacerbating it.

4.6.2 Moving bystander roles towards intervention
Without the authority (real or perceived) to directly intervene the defusing bystander reduces tension and has a positive impact on behaviour, “...with skilful negotiation and communication.” (Paull, Omari, & Standen, 2012, p. 8). The defusing bystander takes an active role which calms the environment through de-escalating the situation (Paull, Omari, & Standen, 2012). Defusion is beneficial to all parties but may not be adequate to discourage future bullying. Nonetheless the communication skills of the defuser make them suitable candidates for future responsible intervention roles.

Other bystander roles may be more difficult to move towards the desirable goal of a responsibly intervening bystander. For example the empathiser may be motivated to become an interener but encouragement must be cautious. Training must be sensitive and unambiguous to reduce the potential for an empathiser to succumb or submit to bullying. The sympathiser may become a defender and whilst this is potentially desirable there needs to be appropriate behavioural guidelines to ensure responses are not aggressive. Aggressive reactions may be interpreted as bullying behaviours, continuing the negative culture (Leka, Vartia, Hassard, Pahkin, Sutela, Cox, & Lindstrom, 2008, p. 162). One person's defender may appear to be a bully from another
Avoidant and abdicating bystanders may be reducing their short-term costs by absenting themselves at the first sign of bullying (cost-reward matrix: section 4.18, p.106) (Paull, Omari, & Standen, 2012). Nevertheless in the long-term absenting as a strategy is unlikely to be cost free (Janson, Carney, Hazler, & Insoo, 2009; Mayhew & Chappell, 2007; Vartia, 2001). It has been evidenced that bystanders are at risk of stress only slightly below clinical significance (Mayhew, McCarthy, Chappell, Quinlan, Barker, & Sheehan, 2004). The level of stress experienced by a bystander may lead them to leave their job (Rayner, 1999). Consequently there are advantages in active constructive behaviour for the bystander as well as the target and other co-workers.

The collaborators in bullying along with any bystanders who engage in active, destructive roles may benefit from understanding that their behaviours are supportive of a bullying culture. They, as may sometimes be the case with bullies, may be unaware of the harm they are causing (Bloisi, & Hoel, 2008, p. 651). Those that knowingly cross the line may perceive that their modus operandi protects them from direct accusations, it should be made clear that the organisation interprets their behaviour as complicit.

In order to engage all bystanders in the process of moving towards active and constructive behaviours they should be included in programme development. The involvement of the team or peer group in the development of bullying interventions has been highlighted as crucial (Beswick, Gore, & Palferman, 2006, p. 33). Although there are indications that bystander intervention strategies may be successful (van Heugten, 2011, p. 220); it should be remembered that, rather than stand alone, they should be integrated into a multi-level approach to workplace bullying reduction (Saam, 2010).
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4.7 Positioning bystander intervention

A bystander intervention programme would take its place in a comprehensive strategy to reduce workplace bullying (figure 4.3 above). To reiterate categories of intervention (Chapter 3), whilst primary intervention sets out the future and tertiary interventions strive to correct the past, it is the secondary level programmes that have the potential to intervene as the event unfolds. Although no more or less essential than the other levels, secondary level programmes have potential immediacy which may stop negative behaviours quickly before they become persistent and embedded. Perpetuation of workplace verbal bullying depends on lack of action and escalation is enabled by lack of immediate intervention (Omari, 2007; Polanin, & Vera, 2013). Thus, secondary prevention programmes are designed to impart strategies and standards that can operate continuously at the meso-level.

The macro-level, policy and code of practice adoption prepares organisations and employees to exercise early interventions in the future and provide a continuing point of reference. Secondary meso-level programmes are guided by these macro-level
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protocols. At the other end of the scale, micro-level treatment and rehabilitation have restorative objectives, with the focus on affected individuals. Secondary meso-level intervention, the immediate intervention by those present at the time of the event, works in conjunction with the macro and micro levels to encourage direct and effective immediate action to turn the tide on bullying.

Meso-level programmes should ideally engage the entire workforce, in order to activate secondary level intervention processes. If this is an unrealistic expectation a critical mass of employees should receive training (Aarons, Hurlburt, & Horwitz, 2011, p. 16; Lutgen-Sandvik, & Tracy, 2012, p. 30; Voelpel, Eckhoff, & Förster, 2008, p. 273). The advantage of reaching a critical mass was explained as,

“An organization in which all targeted employees use a given innovation consistently and well is likely to be effective in its implementation and sustainment relative to organizations in which only some of the targeted employees use the innovation consistently and well” (Klein, & Sorra, 1996, p. 1057).

Very few interventions in workplace bullying have addressed a representative sample of all employees (Carter, & Thompson, 2013; Hoel, Giga, & Faragher, 2006; Keashly, & Neuman, 2004; Kowalski, & Harmon, 2003). On the whole meso-level programmes reported to date have focused on potential targets and in at least one case the potential perpetrators (Dimarino, 2011; Illing, Carter, Thompson, Crampton, Morrow, Howse, Cooke, & Burford, 2013). By far the greatest number of employees find themselves in the role of bystanders at some point. Managers, although commonly expected to intervene, are often not present when the bullying occurs. The possibilities for bystander intervention have remained untapped in the background; although many employees find themselves witnesses to bullying and there are indications that these employees may be “...a powerful mechanism to prevent bullying...” (Illing, Carter, Thompson, Crampton, Morrow, Howse, Cooke, & Burford, 2013, p. 138). This was evidenced by the support
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for targets that emerged through action research (van Heugten, 2011); and an inclusive training programme which led to an increase in bystander intervention (Carter, & Thompson, 2013). Secondary meso-level initiative may foster a zero tolerance of bullying whilst encouraging a supportive culture.

4.8 Bystander intervention strategies

Peer-reviewed reports of prior programmes were scrutinised for workplace bullying reduction programmes directed at bystander interventions. Although none were found a number of recorded interventions had implemented training programmes which were inclusive (Carter, & Thompson, 2012; Dimarino, 2011; Hoel, Giga, & Faragher, 2006). Some intervention programmes had identified bystanders in their data, although they were not the focus of the research (Carter, & Thompson, 2012; Griffin, 2004, p. 261; Hoel, et al. 2006, p. 33). The importance of the bystander role has also emerged in other studies (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011; van Heugten, 2011).

Phenomenological exploration was used to progress the understanding of bystander behaviours in Indian call centres revealing the relationship between friendship and bystanders (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011). Friendship was found to prompt helpfulness, within organisational constraints, resulting in a, “...helpless helpfullness...” (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011, p. 276). The findings are important to the current research as previous bystander studies largely focused on strangers in the bystander role; an unlikely scenario in the workplace.

Research into the workplace violence experiences of New Zealand social workers revealed an unexpected theme in the role of bystanders (van Heugten, 2011). In semi-structured interviews with targets of bullying it emerged that the presence or absence of co-worker support had considerable consequences (van Heugten, 2011). The support of bystanders was reported to be beneficial for the targets, whereas lack of support resulted in a loss of confidence (van Heugten, 2011, p. 220).
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In the absence of an existing, implemented and measured, strategy to increase bystander intervention in workplace bullying, factors in the bystander literature with the potential to positively contribute were investigated.

4.9 Bystander motivation

There are varying theories on what drives bystanders to help and what inhibits helping behaviours. These theories are considered in the context of workplace verbal bullying. Firstly the potential negative impact on bystanders will be addressed, followed by the advantage of helping; before moving on to understand that motivation to help may be necessary but it is not sufficient.

4.9.1 The impact of bullying on bystanders

Workplace bullying has the potential to expose all employees to damaging stress levels (Vartia, 2001, p. 67). Aside from the target, bystanders are at greater risk than those who are not bystanders (Bennett, Banyard, & Garnhart, 2013, p. 1; Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2007). Bystanders to bullying may suffer from anxiety and physiological stress symptoms (Einarsen, & Mikkelsen, 2003; Hansen, Høgh, Persson, Karlson, Gardea, & Ørbæk, 2006, p. 69; Vartia, 2001, p. 64). Furthermore, Swedish research in industrial organisations found that bystanders have an increased risk of depression (Emdad, Alipour, Hagberg, & Jensen, 2013). Knowing the personal consequences of bullying may be reason enough for some bystanders to become active. The potential health benefit of reduced psychological and physiological symptoms over time, indicate that it may be in the interest of bystanders to be proactive interveners.

4.9.2 The advantages of helping

The social benefits of helping, or prosocial behaviours, are not restricted to the person being helped (Pavey, Greitemeyer, & Sparks, 2011). Prosocial behaviours satisfy a basic psychological need (based on self-determination theory) for social connection with others; which in turn motivates further prosocial behaviour (Pavey, et al., 2011, p. 913).
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The implication is that prosocial behaviour, once established may become as self-perpetuating as anti-social bullying has been found to be; replacing the negative ripple effect in bullying with a positive ripple effect (Hoel, Einarsen and Cooper, 2003).

In the school literature, Twemlow and colleagues (2004) suggest that altruism was a basic drive and altruistic bystanders could benefit the community as catalyst for change in the form of inspirational models and moderators. However, from the work of Paull and colleagues it can be seen that this may not be ideal; altruism has been linked to defending and sympathising rather than intervention (Paull, Omari, & Standen, 2012). This may result in bystander behaviour which does not stop or reduce bullying behaviours. However, motivation to intervene can still be found in the absence of an altruistic attitude. Motivation for helping behaviours may be prosocial and even selfish, for example, in terms of enhancing self-esteem (Thoits, & Hewitt, 2001).

4.10 The bystander's decision to intervene

The process of deciding to intervene has multiple stages and is dependent on more than finding the motivation to take action. In one of their earliest bystander papers on bystander inhibition in emergencies Latané and Darley (1968, p. 216) pointed out that prior to intervention a bystander must decide an event is an emergency and that intervention would be appropriate. These seemingly obvious facts are the type of everyday processes which we often overlook but are pivotal to achieving a goal. The process is not as simple as a single decision to intervene or not (Latané, & Darley, 1970). Before there is any possibility of intervention there is a progression of cognitive decisions to be made (Latané, & Darley, 1970). These may be so basic that the process is entirely unconscious (figure 4.4 below).
By 1970 Latané and Darley had described the process in terms of a framework consisting of five consecutive stages (figure 4.4). Each stage must be affirmed in order to move on in the series and reach the end point; a negative response at any stage stops progress and results in non-intervention (Latané, & Darley, 1970). Although much of the bystander work had been in the context of emergency situations it was recognised that, “...there seems little reason to expect that these processes would be restricted to emergencies” (Latané, & Dabbs, 1975, p. 182). Each stage of the model will be described.

4.11 Five stage decision model of bystander intervention

4.11.1 Notice the event
Firstly, a bystander must be aware that something is happening (Latané, & Darley, 1970,
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p. 31; Latané, & Nida, 1981). If an event escapes their attention they will not intervene (Latané, & Darley, 1970). People adapt to their surroundings and familiarisation may reduce their attention; thus blocking signals which may provide clues to the nature of an event (Latané, & Darley, 1970, p. 32). Conversely, signals may be missed in unfamiliar environments as we, “…are unable to distinguish the exceptional from the routine” (Latané, & Darley, 1970, p. 32). In many cultures, including British, being inquisitive may be interpreted as impertinent and therefore people may be more inclined to be insular when in the company of others (Levine, 1999). Someone who would peruse their environment when alone may avoid doing so in crowds in order to avoid invading another person's privacy (Latané, & Darley, 1970).

4.11.2 Interpret the event as requiring attention

Once aware that something is occurring the bystander must decide that the event requires action (Latané, & Darley, 1970; Latané, & Nida, 1981). This can be difficult to ascertain as events are often ambiguous; a person staggering may be drunk or a hypoglycaemic diabetic, shouting in the street may be an assault or boisterous teenagers (Latané, & Darley, 1968, p. 216). As with noticing the event in the first place, unfamiliar surroundings or situations may prove difficult to interpret (Latané, & Darley, 1970, p. 32). Although ambiguity has been raised as an issue in emergency events (Latané, & Darley, 1970, p. 32), emergencies are often far clearer than workplace bullying events. Emergencies, on the whole are overt whereas, workplace bullying is often covert and intentionally ambiguous (Shallcross, Ramsay, & Barker, 2010, p. 27; Verdasca, 2011, p. 8). Accounts of bullying may be both ambivalent and ambiguous (Liefooghe, & Mackenzie Davey, 2001, p.381). Therefore determining the need for attention is likely to pose greater challenges in the context of workplace bullying.

The bystander to workplace bullying may convince themselves that the issue will resolve itself, or they may downgrade the severity to alleviate any guilt from not helping (Latané, & Darley, 1970). The more ambiguous the event the wider the scope for
interpretation and considering the relatively small benefits of helping in comparison to the potential risks, non-intervention may be the rational strategy for a bystander (Latané, & Darley, 1968, p. 215).

4.11.3 Take responsibility for intervention

When it is clear that an event requires intervention the bystander must decide if it is their place to act (Latané, & Darley, 1970; Latané, & Nida, 1981). To take responsibility the bystander must feel they, “…possess the necessary skills and resources to act (Latané, & Nida, 1981, p. 308). A number of factors contribute to the decision to take responsibility for intervention. Interestingly Latané & Darley (1970, p. 33) choose to note the worth of the victim before the competence of the bystander, perhaps a prequel to the importance that the subjective appears to have over the objective in emergency situations. This is likely to be as a result of emotional arousal. Similarly, in the context of workplace bullying, emotions are aroused in bystanders as well as the target and the perpetrator. The extent to which the target is deserving of help is a common consideration (Latané, & Darley, 1970). In a study of 161 Dutch government workers, bystander intention to intervene was negatively correlated to perception of victim responsibility (Mulder, Pouwelse, Lodewijks, & Bolman, 2008). In other words, less deserving targets elicited a lower intention to intervene. Societal and group norms also influence the likelihood of intervention and this underpins part of the issue with ambiguity (Latané, & Darley, 1970).

In a south-eastern American University, violence against women research revealed that men who increased their self-efficacy through a training programme correspondingly increased their intention to intervene (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Foubert, Hill, Brasfield, & Shelley-Tremblay, 2011). The implication of this was that bystander intervention may be increased by appropriate training. Finally, it was suggested that whether or not there was a relationship between the victim and bystander would impact the decision to intervene (Latané, & Darley, 1970).
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4.11.4 Decide how to intervene
If a bystander accepts responsibility for intervention they must decide on the nature of that intervention. Direct intervention is more likely to require skills than indirect intervention (Latané, & Darley, 1970) and the former has greater immediacy. Which course of action is best depends on the circumstances and is another potentially ambiguous juncture. Immediacy may not be best if the bystander is not competent to perform the intervention (Latané, & Darley, 1970). For example, a weak swimmer jumping into rough water to save a person from drowning may worsen the situation. Indirect action such as summoning help is likely to be more beneficial or an alternative direct action plan such as throwing something buoyant out for them to grab. Indirect action may require imagination or prior knowledge but is less likely to require specialist skills.

4.11.5 Intervene
Intervention can only take place once the other stages have been affirmed (Latané, & Darley, 1970). This stage may test the strength of the previous decisions as stress may increase performance difficulties (Latané, & Darley, 1970). The influence of stress on bystander performance was examined in a military experiment (Berkun, Bialek, Kern, & Yagi, 1962). By subjecting American combatants to stress it was discovered that their ability to undertake a task was diminished (Berkun, et al., 1962; Latané, & Darley, 1970). Simulating a situation which induced genuine fear of death of a colleague, as they did, was considered controversial by the 1970s (Latané, & Darley, 1970, p. 35), and is ethically unacceptable now.

Even supposing stages 1-4 are in place for intervention there are still circumstances under which bystanders fail to intervene (Latané, & Darley, 1970). Popularly attributed to apathy, extensive experimentation provided alternative explanations for bystander non-intervention. Taking an evolutionary perspective there is a tendency to believe that there is safety in numbers, in this way we improve predator detection and dilute the risk.
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(Lima, & Bednekoff, 1998). Nevertheless counterintuitive findings have proved robust in evidencing that the presence of others inhibits, “... the impulse to help” (Latané, & Darley, 1970, p. 38). There has been extensive research in the area of bystander non-intervention in group situations.

4.12 Bystander non-intervention

Reduced bullying would be beneficial to bystanders and they are well placed to intervene to de-escalate and stop bullying behaviours in the workplace. Nonetheless, bystanders who witness bullying at work often do not intervene (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2003). This enables harassment to continue unchallenged, with bullying becoming the norm within that environment (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2003; Heames, Harvey, & Treadway, 2006). Consequently a negative environment is cultivated which impacts employee health resulting in higher rates of absenteeism through sickness and difficulty with employee retention (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2003). Such cultures are likely to have lower morale and productivity than could otherwise be expected (Giga, Hoel, & Lewis, 2008); as, “emotionally intelligent norms” are required for teams to be productive (Heames, Harvey, & Treadway, 2006, p. 357). The tendency to avoid intervening must be overcome if bystanders are to contribute to bullying reduction strategies. Thus literature on non-intervention was examined.

Early studies mainly (but not exclusively) examined isolated emergency situations and identified factors underlying the intervention process (Darley, & Latané, 1968; Latané, & Darley, 1970; Piliavin, Dovidio, Gaertner, & Clark, 1981; Piliavin, Rodin, & Piliavin, 1969). Later bystander intervention was researched in diverse areas including the Holocaust (Ehrenreich, & Cole, 2005); sexual violence (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004; Bowes-Sperry, & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005); racial discrimination (Ishiyama, 2000); and school bullying (Twemlow, Fonagy, & Sacco, 2004).

The role of the bystander who witnesses workplace bullying incidents is not an identical
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role to that of the bystanders described in the early studies (Darley, & Latané, 1968; Latané, & Darley, 1968; Latané, & Darley, 1970; Piliavin, Rodin, & Piliavin, 1969). Nevertheless the similarities are sufficient for the early studies to provide a robust foundation for the current bystander intervention research. The major contextual difference between the early bystander experiments and workplace bullying was that bullying was usually characterised by repeated incidents (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2003); whereas the early bystander research had concentrated on isolated incidents. However, the phenomenon being addresses by the bystander studies and workplace bullying incidents is the same; that of non-intervention.

Bystander behaviour has been scrutinised in field and laboratory studies where there was a victim but not necessarily a perpetrator. Two schools of thought on non-intervention developed; one based on the number of bystanders present (Darley, & Latané, 1968; Latané, & Darley, 1968; Latané, & Darley, 1970; Latané, & Rodin, 1969); and another based on the costs of helping (Piliavin, Rodin, & Piliavin, 1969). The impact of bystander numbers on helping will be discussed first (Darley, & Latané', 1968; Latané, & Darley, 1968; Latané, & Darley, 1970); followed by the cost-reward matrix model (Piliavin, Rodin, & Piliavin, 1969).

4.13 The Bystander Effect

Darley and Latané (1968) were prompted to research the influence of groups on helping behaviour by the publicised non-response of bystanders in the Catherine Genovese murder in 1964. Reports of the time claimed a disturbing lack of bystander intervention on the part of 38 witnesses but later it was suggested this was an exaggeration (Manning, Levine, & Collins, 2007). The number of witnesses to the protracted attack was based on police interviews but was not substantiated and only three testified at the subsequent trial (Manning, et al., 2007). Of these three there was one corroborated account of intervention by shouting (Hardie, 2010). Nonetheless, the indifference of bystanders became a, “...pervasive psychological theory ...” based on the local news story (Hardie, 2010, p. 337).
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Investigating the apparent apathy of bystanders led to the discovery that the number of bystanders had an impact on the likelihood that a bystander would offer help to a victim (Darley, & Latané, 1968; Latané, & Darley, 1970). Darley and Latané (1968) demonstrated that as the number of bystanders increased, bystander helping behaviour decreased. The counter-intuitive phenomenon, known as the Bystander Effect, is a group dynamic that leads individuals in groups to be less likely to offer assistance than a lone bystander (Darley, & Latané, 1968; Latané, & Darley, 1968; Latané, & Darley, 1970). When faced with a victim, a group of bystanders are susceptible to inhibitory influences which negatively impact prosocial behaviours.

Latané and Darley's (1968) evidence suggested that the personality of the bystander and their potential apathy was less indicative of their likelihood to prosocially intervene than was the perceived number of bystanders who witnesses the incident. Latané and Darley (1970) stated that a reluctance to intervene was unsurprising considering the costs of intervention. The duality of intervention costs coupled with the costs of not helping results in the position of the bystander being unenviable (Latané, & Nida, 1981). They discovered that a prediction of who would assist in an emergency situation could not be made from the personality related scales they used (Darley, & Latané, 1968). The inhibiting influence of other bystanders however was repeatedly evidenced (Darley, & Latané, 1968). They proposed three explanations for this Bystander Effect phenomenon: Diffusion of responsibility; audience inhibition; and social influence.

4.13.1 Diffusion of responsibility

Latané and Darley's (1970) experiments illustrated their diffusion of responsibility explanation. This occurred when a bystander is in a group as they do not feel an obligation to assist when help is required because of a perceived dilution of their responsibility (Latané, & Darley, 1970). When a trouble is shared it was found likely that no individual will take responsibility (Latané & Darley, 1970). Thus a single bystander is more likely to feel it is their responsibility to take action because there is no one else; whereas an individual among many bystanders does not feel uniquely
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responsible as there are others present who may be responsible.

4.13.2 Audience inhibition
Latané & Darley's (1970) hypothesis of the inhibiting influence of an audience was found in group situations. Not intervening to help for fear of being seen to do the wrong thing, described as a 'stage-fright' reaction, resulted from the real or perceived presence of an audience. Latané & Darley (1970) demonstrated that the bystander is influenced, becoming self-conscious when others are observing them, resulting in inaction. Audience inhibition extends to situations where the bystander perceives they may be being observed, even if they cannot see their fellow observers (Latané & Darley, 1970).

4.13.3 Social influence
When a bystander can observe others witnessing the same incident, whether or not the bystander can be seen, they feel compelled to match the behaviour of others; this is social influence. So strong is the influence of the group that it was suggested the connection between the bystanders and the group was more relevant to intervention than the connection between the bystander and the victim (Darley, & Latané, 1968). The indication is that behaviour that is exhibited by the other bystanders is likely to be mirrored and the perception of the individual bystander may be distorted accordingly. A social paralysis is created through all the bystanders mimicking each other’s non-intervention. Whilst the other bystanders may feel intervention is not necessary they may also be paused to assess the situation prior to acting. Observing each other's inaction may lead them to a false consensus that no action is necessary.

Consequently the three Bystander Effect's of diffusion of responsibility, audience inhibition and social influence provided an explanation of bystanders' failure to intervene in group situations. Evidence supported the influence of group size on helping behaviours underpinning inhibition as opposed to apathy. Before scrutinising Bystander Effects further. Other group concepts will be described.
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4.14 Other group concepts

The Bystander Effects are similar to a number of group influences; pluralistic influence; Groupthink; and the Abilene Paradox. Whereas pluralistic ignorance was established a long time before bystander research the latter two concepts emerged at a similar time to the Bystander Effects. These three group influences will be described.

4.14.1 Pluralist ignorance

Bystander Effects are consistent with the earlier concept of pluralistic ignorance, first discussed by Allport in observing the behaviour of individuals in the context of their institution (1933, p. 28). It is described as misperception where the individual rejects a belief or practise whilst believing the other group members accept it (Harvey, Buckley, Heames, Zinko, Brouer, & Ferris, 2007; Prentice, & Miller, 1996, p. 161). Pluralistic ignorance may result from inadequate communication, with perception rather than actual knowledge directing the group’s behaviour (van Dyne, Ang, & Botero, 2003). When there is ambiguity in a situation the bystander is likely to look to others for clarification, which given the powerful effects of social inhibition may lead to pluralistic ignorance (Latané, & Darley, 1970; Latané & Nida, 1981). Pluralistic ignorance results from individuals' performance in their knowledge that there is an audience. It is a group error of social understanding which may result in actions (or inaction) the individual would not otherwise have considered (Prentice, & Miller, 1996, p. 161).

4.14.2 Groupthink

Although the concept of Groupthink is somewhat similar it affects teams who are striving for cohesion above all else (Janis, 1972). It can lead to ineffective decisions, owing to pressure to conform to the groups view (Janis, 1972, p. 197; McAvoy, & Butler, 2007). Groupthink better explains the failure of an entire group to consider alternative courses of action, rather than an individual. Thus a difference between Groupthink and the Bystander Effect is that the former is increased as the group communicates whereas the latter may be reduced by effective communications.
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4.14.3 Abilene Paradox

The Abilene paradox results from group mis-perception in which all parties incorrectly believe the other parties wish to follow a course of action which they themselves are adverse to; nevertheless they do not admit it (Harvey, Novicevic, Buckley, & Halbeslebe, 2004; Kim, 2001, p. 169; van Dyne, et al., 2003, p. 1373). Hence, the course of action cannot succeed owing to a lack of communication between the parties (Harvey, et al., 2004; Kim, 2001, p. 169; van Dyne, et al., 2003, p. 1373). The outcome is that everyone blames everyone else for something nobody wanted to do (Harvey, et al, 2004; McAvoy, & Butler, 2007).

The Abilene Paradox arises from fear, ineffective communication and misperception within groups and results in, “...a decision-making process that is not entirely open to individual differences of opinion.” (Harvey, Novicevic, Buckley, & Halbesleben, 2004, pp. 215-216). Problems in the workplace are masked by a consensus which may be very detrimental to both the organisation and its staff (Harvey, et al., 2004). The leadership in this situation is likely to be ineffective and individuals may feel dissatisfied with the group decision (Harvey, et al., 2004; Kim, 2001). As the group is not cohesive the individual does not feel responsible for the decision and consequently blame others in the group (Harvey, et al., 2004; Kim, 2001).

The Abilene Paradox, with poor leadership and lack of group cohesion, differs from Groupthink where the group is cohesive-defensive and the leadership is likely to be overpowering (Harvey, et al., 2004; Kim, 2001, p. 170). In organisations where bullying has been an accepted part of the culture, new employees may assume their view is counter to the existing workforce and suppress their own disagreement (van Dyne, et al., 2003). This may lead to the Abilene Paradox and an unnecessary, negative group experience may be endured although no member actually wanted to participate (Harvey, et al., 2004; Kim, 2001, p. 169; McAvoy, & Butler, 2007; van Dyne, et al., 2003, p. 1373).

Although all these concepts may lead to poor or inaccurate decisions there is a key
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difference from the Bystander Effects. Pluralistic ignorance, Groupthink and the Abilene Paradox are considered group behaviours, whereas Bystander Effects are the influence of the group on individual behaviours. This could be seen as an academic argument of sociology versus psychology in which other phenomena, such as collective behaviour and crowd psychology could expand the investigation (Kashefi, 2011). Further scrutiny was thought to detract from the aim of the current research. The negative influence of bystander numbers on behaviours had already been established by the plethora of experiments in the 40 years of bystander research. Furthermore, these findings have been confirmed in reviews (Fischer, Krueger, Greitemeyer, Kastenmüller, Vogrinic, Frey, Heene, Wicher, & Kainbacher, 2011; Latané, & Nida, 1981). Thus pluralistic influence, Groupthink and the Abilene Paradox were not explored further in this thesis.

4.15 Bystander Effects: A robust finding

An appraisal of the evidence for social inhibition of helping behaviours was carried out by Latané and Nida (1981) with the intention of discovering any limitations of the effect. Their review encompasses the original emergency focus and studies of a variety of less urgent scenarios. Unsurprisingly the inhibition effect was found in Latané, & Rodin's (1969) study in which the bystander heard a cry and apparent fall and only the victim appeared to be in danger. Less predictable findings appeared from a variety of experiments which appeared to expose everyone present to danger and thus intervention behaviour would not necessarily be altruistic (Latané, & Nida, 1981). The Bystander Effects were still present (Latané, & Nida, 1981). For example, diffusion of responsibility was evidenced in a smoke filled room scenario in spite of the potential for self-protective behaviour from the bystanders (Latané, & Darley, 1970, p. 48). The behaviour of bystanders observed in isolated emergencies was found to be a consistent with behaviour occurring in other contexts (Latané & Nida, 1981).

When dangerous scenarios were replaced with anti-social behaviours outcomes were similar. In a book theft scenario the size of the bystander group continued to predict the
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Inhibition effect (Howard, & Crano, 1974). This context was of particular interest to the current research as in addition to the target and bystander a perpetrator was present which would be the case in a bullying scenario. “Social inhibition appears, then, to be a powerful phenomenon in both emergency and non-emergency situations” (Latané & Nida, 1981, p. 313).

4.16 Differences between traditional bystander studies and the current study

The findings of the studies on the influence of group size on intervention are relevant to the present research as workplace verbal bullying is often witnessed by bystanders who fail to act. However there are four notable differences between the majority of these studies and the field context of the current research: Bystanders in the workplace are not likely to be strangers; bullying is not generally an emergency situation; bullying always involves a perpetrator; and the current doctoral study was a true field study rather than a contrived field or laboratory based study. Nevertheless the Bystander Effect was not restricted to emergencies and it was consistent when a perpetrator was present, therefore it appeared likely the phenomenon would influence bystanders to workplace bullying.

4.17 Disputing the consistency of diffusion of responsibility

It was noted in Latané and Nida's (1981) review of helping in group contexts that there had been speculation that diffusion of responsibility was not a consistent finding (Piliavin, Rodin, & Piliavin, 1969). Field work by the Piliavins suggested that the non-intervention in groups phenomena was entirely laboratory based (Piliavin, Rodin, & Piliavin, 1969). The proposition was that the lack of visual information, as in Latané and Rodin's (1969) experiments where a crash was heard but the incident was not seen, reduced the diffusion of responsibility (Piliavin, Rodin, & Piliavin, 1969). Regardless of this criticism of audio-only laboratory experiments the finding still served to improve understanding of bystander effects. Furthermore, in the current study it is entirely plausible that workplace bystanders may hear but not see what is occurring, they still witness the event. With hindsight the Piliavin's suggestion that diffusion of responsibility stems from situations with no visual information lacked support (Latané
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& Nida, 1981). Subsequent to the Piliavins' claim the inhibitory group effect has been evidenced in a variety of situations (Latané & Nida, 1981). There was, however, evidence for the Bystander Effect being stronger when no visual information was available (Solomon, Solomon, & Stone, 1982).

4.18 The bystander cost-reward matrix

An alternative explanation for non-intervention which emerged alongside the Bystander Effect was based on the cost of helping to the bystander (Piliavin, Rodin, & Piliavin, 1969). Piliavin and colleagues began development of a cost-reward model as a decision based process which influences bystanders' actions (Piliavin, Rodin, & Piliavin, 1969). With the assumption that bystanders in emergency situations are emotionally aroused, this was the factor which was manipulated (Piliavin, et al., 1969). Emotional arousal was considered to be moderated by proximity to the event; empathy for the victim and the elapsed time with no helpful intervention. The more proximal and empathetic the bystander was and the longer the event the greater their emotional arousal (Piliavin, et al., 1969). Reduction of the state of arousal was possible through providing help (directly or indirectly), leaving the incident, or perceiving the victim as unworthy of help (Piliavin, et al., 1969, p. 298). This was included in a multi-factor, contrived field experiment.

Further hypothesising that factors other than the number of bystanders present were instrumental in predicting intervention outcomes, experiments were carried out manipulating race, state (intoxicated or sick) and modelled behaviour in addition to group size (Piliavin, et al., 1969, p. 297). Each factor was considered to have an associated cost which would influence the behaviour of the bystander. In their complex studies with a naïve captive audience between stations on the New York subway it was demonstrated that the state of the victim and latency in responding did influenced bystanders (Piliavin, et al., 1969). For example, it was evidenced that a sick person was more likely to receive help than a drunken person but contrary to Latané and Darley's (1970) findings no group size effect were evidenced (Piliavin, et al., 1969).
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Helping was associated with costs such as fear, physical risk, and embarrassment; not helping with costs such as self-blame (Piliavin, Rodin, & Piliavin, 1969). Conversely, helping may be rewarded with praise and not helping with saved effort (Piliavin, et al., 1969). Bystander behaviour (to intervene or not) was dependent on the balance of the cost-reward model for the incident (Piliavin, et al., 1969). It was suggested that the diffusion of responsibility effect was positively related to high costs (Piliavin, et al., 1969).

Modelled behaviour was planned by using a confederate who was prepared to set an example (Piliavin, Rodin, & Piliavin, 1969). The intention was for help to be offered after a specific time had elapsed (Piliavin, et al., 1969). However, testing of this influence was inconclusive as bystanders intervened or moved away before the appointed time for the planned confederate intervention (Piliavin, et al., 1969). Additionally, the subway project was problematic as the students collecting data failed to follow instructions and terminated the trials early due to strike action on the subway (Piliavin, Rodin, & Piliavin, 1969). The study concluded with no conclusive support for Bystander Effects being artificially induced through laboratory experiments.

The review of bystander studies by Latané & Nida (1981) concluded that the Piliavins' conjecture that the Bystander Effect was an artefact of laboratory studies unnecessarily clouded the progress of research. They noted that no evidence had been provided to contradict the Bystander Effect. The implication of the Piliavin experiments was that the cost-reward model and Bystander Effects worked in tandem.

4.18.1 Cost reward within the decision process

Fritzsche, Penner and Finkelstein (2000) used policy capturing in their study on Piliavin's arousal cost-reward model, which considers the bystander's decision making process. The authors’ findings indicated that cognitive processes are used to weigh the costs and benefits of a situation prior to deciding on action (Fritzsche, et al., 2000). In
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reality there may not be time for conscious processing of information so heuristics may be used (Burnstein, Crandall, & Kitayama, 1994; Cialdini, & Trost, 1998). The lack of time to deliberate on whether or not to intervene in an incident increases the likelihood that unconscious processes are activated. Thus the unconscious processes would require support in order for helpful intervention to become automated (Bargh, & Chartrand, 1999).

The costs of intervening in any event may be great and disproportionate to the potential gain. In the context of emergencies the bystander who intervenes may be held accountable, possibly to the extent of being sued or physically harmed (Latané, & Darley, 1970, p. 79). In workplace bullying the bystander costs may be in terms of physical safety, psychological safety and job security (Keuskamp, Ziersch, Baum, & LaMontagne, 2012, p. 119). There are also costs associated with non-intervention but these are generally psychological (Latané, & Darley, 1970, p. 80). Furthermore, it is not possible to predict the success of any intervention and this serves to reinforce the bystanders’ position as an unattractive one. Weighing the unpredictable risks of intervention against the personal psychological disadvantages of not intervening may lead the bystander to rationalise that intervention is not necessary.

With an increase in prosocial behaviour, antisocial behaviour may become more unacceptable (Scully, & Rowe, 2009). Subsequently, negative events would be more likely to result in cognitive dissonance. There would then be potential for the bystander to intervene to restore congruency (Beehr, Glazer, Fischer, Larissa, Linton, & Hansen, 2009; Festinger, 1957; Rasinski, Andrew, Geers, & Czopp, 2013; Weaver, 2006). This premise was supported by a study of dissonance as a motivator which found that, “there are important intrapersonal consequences of not confronting prejudice.” (Rasinski, et al, 2013, p. 856). In other words intervening may be motivated when the costs of not intervening become too high.
Chapter 4

4.19 Heterogeneous but compatible models
The two models; Bystander Effects and Cost-Reward Matrix, have been treated as opposing (Latané & Nida, 1981; Piliavin, Rodin, & Piliavin, 1969). Scrutiny of the papers and Latané and Darley's 1970 book revealed that neither research group directly denied the feasibility of the alternative theory. In fact both groups included both models. In their discussion of avoidance-avoidance conflict Latané and Nida raised the issue of costs (1981, p. 309). An increase of diffusion of responsibility was associated with increased costs in the research carried out by Piliavin and colleagues (1969, p. 298). The meta-analysis of bystander research including studies up to 2010 also supported coexistence of the two models, although still not overtly (Fischer, Krueger, Greitemeyer, Kastenmüller, Vogrincic, Frey, Heene, Wich, & Kainbacher, 2011). The findings were consistent with the cost-reward model highlighting that the Bystander Effect was extinguished in extreme danger (Fischer, et al., 2011). Hence both models have a role to play. The two models although heterogeneous are not exclusive and may complement each other in an explanation of bystander non-intervention.

4.20 Contemporary research
Pushing the boundaries of the Bystander Effects Greitemeyer and Mügge explored situations where it was necessary for more than one bystander to provide assistance (2013). Their hypothesis was based on bystanders rationalising whether or not their contribution was essential (Greitemeyer, & Mügge, 2013). The findings evidenced that Bystander Effect, diffusion of responsibility did not inhibit bystanders in group situations where more than one helper was required (Greitemeyer, & Mügge, 2013, p. 7). Their study controlled the Bystander Effects of audience inhibition and social influence; consequently in real situations these would influence the overall outcome. In the current study it was considered unlikely that multiple bystanders would be necessary for an intervention, although this may be beneficial in some cases.

4.21 Influences on Bystander Effects
With the assumption that Bystander Effects will influence bystanders to workplace
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bullying, evidence was sought from the literature for factors that may reduce these effects. Methods of reducing Bystander Effects (incorporating the consideration of costs and rewards for the bystander) had the potential to underpin a strategy to increase bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying. A number of studies provided insight into potential influences and these were examined with the context of the current research in mind. The aim was to discover factors which could potentially be manipulated to improve the likelihood of bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying. Particular attention was paid to reoccurring themes across bystander studies from 1969 to 2013. These factors were categorised by the current researcher into self-efficacy, relationships, and ambiguity.

4.21.1 Self-efficacy

Skills and experience were found to influence bystander’s intervention. Horowitz (1971) found those with suitable skills were more likely to intervene than those without. Furthermore, diffusion of responsibility was influenced by the bystander's perception of their reference group, that is, an individual was less likely to intervene if they thought other bystanders were better qualified (Horowitz, 1971). A later study examined bystanders with and without experience of intervening in criminal incidents (Huston, Ruggiero, Conner, & Geis, 2010). The finding were that bystanders who actually intervened had some relevant training, considered themselves more imposing than the perpetrators and were taller and heavier than the non-intervention group (Huston, et al., 2010). Although the work stands out for its exploration of real-life rather than simulated incidents, the results were not generalisable as the convenience sample was identified through their claims for compensation (Huston, et al., 2010). These finding were mirrored in research on intention to intervene; with the assumption that intention is positively related to actual intervention (Laner, Benin & Ventrone, 2001). Intention to intervene was found to relate to the bystanders' belief that they were stronger and more aggressive than the victim in violent situations (Laner, et al, 2001). Additionally, previous experience and being more sympathetic than others influenced their intentions rather than altruism (Laner, et al, 2001). The incidents described in this study were all
physically violent, which may not be the case in workplace bullying incidents, nevertheless, what was taken from this was an indication that self-efficacy is worthy of investigation.

4.21.2 Relationships

Relationship (real or perceived) influences have arisen in bystander research (Bennett, Banyard, & Garnhart, 2013; D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011; Latané, & Rodin, 1969; Levine, 1999; Levine, & Crowther, 2008). Researchers have scrutinised the relationship between the bystander and target, the perceived relationship between target and perpetrator and the relationship between bystanders.

Expanding from group size as an influence on the action of bystanders, the degree of group cohesion was suggested to be a source of differences in findings (Howard, & Crano, 1974). In their naturalistic bystander study, Howard and Crano (1974) highlighted that in some cases the bystander had to decide to support the target or the perpetrator. The incident involved a malicious, staged theft in a library. Thus, this context provided a better simulation of the Catherine Genovese case, in which bystander intervention could have reduced the malicious injury, potentially saving the victim's life (Howard, & Crano, 1974).

As there was a perpetrator it was also more closely aligned to a workplace bullying context than were the emergency studies. Female victims were found to receive more aid (Howard, & Crano, 1974); however, this may be related to the attitudes of the time. Forty years have elapsed since publication; consequently reports of chivalrous behaviour may not be generalisable to current times. Nevertheless, even minimal relationships (from a brief conversation) between bystander and target were found have a considerable effect, although priming may have been a factor (Howard, & Crano, 1974, p. 501).

Being strangers resulted in slower intervention than being friends, although friends were
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not as quick to intervene as individuals (Latané, & Rodin, 1969). It was suggested that misinterpretation of initial inaction was less likely between friends than strangers, therefore getting to know co-workers may be beneficial (Latané, & Rodin, 1969, p. 189). The converse cannot be ruled out; there is also a risk that friends may mirror each other’s lack of concern (Latané, & Nida, 1981). The positive influence of friendship on bystander intervention was confirmed in the qualitative field research of D'Cruz and Noronha (2011). However, intervention was found to wane as costs increased for the bystanders (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011, p. 281).

The work of Laner and colleagues also addressed the impact that the perceived relationship between the victim and the abuser would have on the intention of the bystander to intervene (Laner, Benin, & Ventrone, 2001). The results showed gender effects (Laner, et al, 2001). Males had a reduced intention to intervene with knowledge of a relationship between the perpetrator and target but the influence on females’ intention varied depending on the victim (Laner, et al., 2001). A perceived relationship between target and perpetrators was suggested to contribute to non-intervention in real-life situations (Levine, 1999).

4.21.3 Ambiguity

Boundaries to social inhibition may result from manipulation of situational ambiguity; Clark and Word (1972) suggested this was a possible clue to weakening the non-intervention phenomena. In emergencies they found that Bystander Effects were reduced when the situation was unambiguous (Clark, & Word, 1972, p. 392; Latané & Nida, 1981, p. 313). Bystander Effects may be quashed in dangerous or violent emergencies (Fischer, Greitemeyer, Pollozek, & Frey, 2006). When the expectation of danger or violence to the victim and the bystander was high intervention was more likely (Fischer, et al., 2006, p. 275). When the expectation was low the Bystander Effect was evidenced, aligning with the Cost-Reward model (Fischer, et al., 2006, p. 276). This may indicate that bystanders would be less likely to intervene in verbal bullying than they would in physical bullying, as physical abuse is frequently perceived to be more
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dangerous than other forms of bullying.

In intimate partner violence bystander role ambiguity was suggested to inhibit action (Cismaru, Jensen, & Lavack, 2010, p. 76). Similarly a lack of role clarity was noted as a factor in non-reporting of peer wrong-doing (King III, & Hermondsen, 2010, p. 310). Researchers in sexual violence posited that clarity of the situation is instrumental in bystander intervention; with perceived distress, request for assistance and attribution of blame all being indicated as influencing the motivation to intervene (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004, p. 67). Ambiguity appears to stifle intervention and may be particularly relevant in workplace bullying where bystanders may be unsure of their role and may not be clear when negative behaviours is bullying.

Through identifying factors which have reduced bystander inhibition, past research has provided clues which may improve bystander intervention. Although not all of these are feasible in the participating organisation there are indications that improving skills, getting to know co-workers, clarifying an appropriate bystander's role and characteristics of the workplace bullying phenomenon may prove fruitful.

4.22 Bystander intervention in other areas

As no published research on an implemented and measured strategy to increase bystander intervention in workplace bullying was found, literature in other areas was considered. Third-party interventions have taken place in the areas of sexual violence (O'Leary-Kelly, Tiedt, & Bowes-Sperry, 2004; Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2005), school bullying (Olweus, 1994; Twemlow, Fonagy, & Sacco, 2004), and discrimination (Ishiyama, 2000).

4.23 Contextual differences with existing bystander intervention programmes

Bystander intervention has been developed and practiced in areas other than workplace bullying. Research in these areas was considered with regard to the specific context of
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the current research. Relevant audiences, theories and dynamics were crucial to the success of the field work and it was important to extract the transferable knowledge while being cognisant of differences. Research in which the participants were disparate to those in the current research and programmes where peer reviewed reports were not freely available were not pursued further.

The first bystander intervention programmes were developed to counter school bullying. Interventions designed for school children take into account the teacher-pupil relationship, developmental stage of the children and appropriate learning styles. These are all remote from the workplace context. However, as explained earlier, it was in the area of school research that the triadic dynamic of bully, target, and bystander was realised (Twemlow, Fonagy, & Sacco, 1994). This was a fundamental factor, transferable to any bystander research. Anti-racism response training (A.R.T.) was developed and piloted in Canada to counter discrimination by High School pupils (Ishiyama, 2000). As copyrighted material, access to the programme was restricted and no peer-reviewed outcomes were available to the researcher. Furthermore, an American study found that although discrimination and bullying appear to be similar behaviours the underlying traits are distinct (Parkins, Richey, & Fishbein, 2006). The field of sexual harassment and violence had developed bystander intervention strategies (O'Leary-Kelly, Tiedt, & Bowes-Sperry, 2004). Once again, the phenomenon was different but the gulf was not as wide, as the focus was adults at work. The literature was accessible and included exploration of underlying theories; these were reviewed for the current research.

4.23.1 The bystander to sexual harassment

The importance of the observer's role was supported in a paper on indirect exposure to sexual harassment; it was found that there are negative effects on people who observe harassment (Glomb, Richman, Hulim, & Drasgow, 1997). Later, Bowes-Sperry and O'Leary-Kelly (2005) noted that, in spite of its relevance, there was a lack of exploration into the observer's role in hostile workplace climates. Highlighting the
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negative impact on bystanders to workplace bullying followed (Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2007); along with acknowledgement of their potential (van Heugten, 2011). The sexual harassment literature was ahead in terms of bystander research and thus was able to inform the current research.

Legally, tolerance for negative workplace behaviour in the form of sexual harassment had become unacceptable but the reality did not match this (O'Leary-Kelly, Tiedt, & Bowes-Sperry, 2004). In fact harassment continued unchallenged by either target or bystanders (O'Leary et al., 2004). This is replayed in workplace bullying; in spite of knowledge about the detrimental effects bullying still persist (Liefooghe, & MacKenzie Davey, 2001; Mayhew, & Chappell, 2007; Namie, 2003). The inconsistency between acceptability of and responses to harassment was questioned by O'Leary-Kelly and colleagues (2004, p. 86).

One issue behind the inconsistency was possibly the use of heuristic reasoning (O'Leary-Kelly, et al., 2004, p. 87). Heuristic reasoning is short-cut decision making based on the use of existing prescriptions (guidelines for behaviour), experience, or capitulation to an audience (Kahneman, & Tversky, 1972). Tetlock's accountability model considered heuristics as a factor in decision making when extended time to think was not available (1989, p. 638). Tetlock's view was that accountability may motivate more rigorous decision making and this line of enquiry was followed by those researching sexual harassment (Bowes-Sperry, & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005). A lack of time to think about a reaction was likely to be a common occurrence for bystanders to workplace bullying.

In their exploration of decision making O'Leary-Kelly and colleagues applied accountability theory to explain the behaviours of targets, perpetrators and bystanders (O'Leary-Kelly, et al., 2004, p. 86). They explored three accountability models; these were from Tetlock (1992), Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy and Doherty, 1994; and Frink and Klimoski (1998). Of interest to the current thesis was their views on bystanders (O'Leary-Kelly, et al., 2004); including that employers often prefer
bystanders to act immediately (O'Leary-Kelly, et al., 2004, p. 86). This resulted from the development of sexual harassment theory and along with it societal expectations for the behaviour of employees (O'Leary-Kelly, et al., 2004, p. 86). Just as this expectation has developed for bystanders to sexual harassment it is plausible that it may also emerge for bystanders to workplace bullying.

In relating accountability theory to the inaction of observers, the reasoning of O'Leary-Kelly (2004, p. 86) and colleagues mirrors that of Latané and Darley's (1970) audience inhibition, that is, if others do not intervene then neither does the observer (Crawford, 1999; Lutgen-Sandvik, 2003). However, this is dependent on the referent audience because the opposite also has the potential to occur (O'Leary-Kelly, Tiedt, & Bowes-Sperry, 2004, p. 99; Tetlock, Skitka, & Boettger, 1989, p. 638; Voelpel, Eckhoff, & Förster, 2008, p. 277).

4.23.2 The bystander and sexual violence

Illustrating their community psychology approach to sexual violence prevention with the example of college communities Banyard and colleagues investigated message receptivity (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004, p. 65). This is an essential consideration in programmes for change as it had been noted that selective audiences gave rise to mixed messages (Banyard, et al., 2004). To clarify, female audiences may interpret a prevention message as categorising them as victims; and male audiences may interpret they are being categorised as potential rapists (Banyard, et al., 2004, p. 65). As there had been a tendency to target at-risk groups, audiences may have been susceptible to negative perspectives (Banyard, et al., 2004, p. 65). An example would be portraying men as perpetrators which not only leads them to feel defensive, it also overlooks that men are also subjected to sexual abuse (Larimer, Lydum, Anderson, & Turner, 1999). Programmes with limited focus exclude the wider community, reducing the receptivity of the message and therefore restricting the possibility of cultural change (Mayhew, McCarthy, Chappell, Quinlan, Barker, & Sheehan, 2004; Swift, & Ryan-Finn, 1995). Acceptance and support across the community is necessary to bring about a
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fundamental change in attitude and redefine the social norm (Bond, 1995).

An underlying requirement, before any attempt to facilitate social change, is that the audience is prepared to listen and is open to addressing the problem. The effectiveness of a new prevention method is dependent on the communities' readiness to change (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004). Communities will differ in the stage that they are at regarding an attitude change. The use of a community-readiness model allows assessment of progress along the path from no awareness of the issues to sharing responsibility (Edwards, Jumper-Thurman, Plested, Oetting, & Swanson, 2000). Bond proposed that within the workplace a coherent community has the power to move away from a negative culture of accepting harassment towards shaping a positive climate (1995).

Receptivity to the messages may be improved by engaging the community (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004). With a focus on community change it may be possible to, “...decrease resistance and foster community responsibility” (Banyard, et al., p. 66). The bystander literature was thought to have implications for “...a theoretical model for a community approach to sexual violence prevention ...” (Banyard, et al., 2004, p. 67). In reviewing the Bystander Effects it was noted that some research had revealed cohesive groups were more likely to develop a consensus on helping (Banyard, et al., 2004, p. 67; Harada, 1985, p. 178). Drawing from bystander studies they concluded that the use of role models was beneficial in reducing Bystander Effects (Banyard, et al., p. 67). Role modelling was supported by the eminent psychologist, Bandura (2005, p. 10), “...much of what we learn is through the power of social modelling”. Appropriate skills were also a key component in intention to intervene (Banyard, et al., 2004, p. 68). In child-abuse research, one characteristic of intervening bystanders had been self-efficacy (Christy, & Voigt, 1994, p. 841); confirming intuition that knowing how to intervene is fundamental to actually intervening (Banyard, et al., 2004, p. 68). Concluding that bystander studies, by defining a specific role for community members, provided a broader approach to the prevention of sexually violent behaviour, Banyard and colleagues pursued this direction (Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007).
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In the first experimental evaluation of an inclusive bystander intervention study findings indicated improvement in prevention programme groups (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2007, p. 478). In their longitudinal study two programs were evaluated (along with a control group). One programme was a single 90 minutes session and the other was three 90 minute sessions, both were followed up with a 30 minute booster session 2 months later (Banyard, et al., 2007, p. 466). Although the positive changes were more prominent in the longer programme group evidence suggested shorter programmes were worthwhile when training time was limited (Banyard, et al., 2007, p. 478).

4.23.2.1 Measuring a sexual violence intervention programme

To establish that bystander intervention strategies were effective in reducing negative behaviour, valid and reliable measures were taken. For the purposes of their study bystander intervention attitude measures were developed, with the Bystander Behavior Inventory being used in two ways; to measure actual interventions as well as intention to intervene in incidents. The Bystander Efficacy Scale was also developed to measure the degree of confidence the participants had in their ability to carry out their intentions (Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007). A thorough evaluation was made using 8 measures along with demographic questions resulting in more than 243 items (Banyard, et al., 2007, p. 467). A positive change in attitude, greater knowledge and an increase in self-reported bystander behaviours was found (Banyard, et al., 2007, p. 475). Gender differences, although found, were thought to potentially result from the context; however, the authors highlighted the possibility that different skill-sets and approaches for males and females may be more productive (Banyard, et al., 2007, p. 476). It was suggested that a measure of the opportunity to intervene should be included in future measurements (Banyard, 2008).

The work of Banyard and colleagues demonstrated that bystander intervention can prove effective. Their results indicated that greater knowledge of sexual violence and the bystanders' perceived effectiveness improved prosocial bystander behaviours (Banyard, 2008). The detail provided in their publications gave promising indications
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that bystander intervention had potential as a direction for workplace bullying reduction. Furthermore, the research groups of both Banyard and O'Leary-Kelly had explored underlying theories which elucidated the possibilities for a new bystander strategy (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004; Bowes-Sperry, & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005).

4.24 Frameworks for bystander intervention

With evidence of an effective bystander intervention strategy in a similar field, the literature review was extended to theories which may underpin a new strategy. The foundation provided by the bystander research in general, and the later work in sexual harassment and sexual violence in particular, led to frameworks that had the potential to support the development of a strategy to increase bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying.

Three robust theoretical frameworks with a potential to be implemented to instigate change were examined: Social categorisation; social norms; and responsibility. The first ostensibly discounted Bystander Effects, the second may be a force to counter Bystander Effects and the third may provide the means to regulate the social norm enabling individuals to intervene.

4.24.1 Social categorisation approach to bystander intervention

Although a well-supported theory, the bystander effect is simplistic in that it neglects social constructions and a deeper analysis was due (Levine, 1999). The lack of practical intervention strategies arising from forty years of bystander research may be based in the conceptualisation of the research questions (Levine, 1999). That is, the description of the inhibiting influences by the mere presence of other bystanders had not accounted for social context (Levine, 1999).

Contrasting the influence of the bystander effect with the relevance of social categorisation, it was argued that social construction plays a substantial role in bystander non-intervention (Levine, 1999). This was illustrated by scrutinising transcripts from the James Bulger case, which Levine suggested had striking similarities
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to the Catherine Genovese case (Latané, & Darley, 1970). Support for the importance of social construction was found in the testimony of witnesses who had seen James Bulger with his attackers (Levine, 1999). Having established that the bystanders’ failure to intervene was not owing to their lack of awareness that the situation was unusual, the contributions of other factors were considered (Levine, 1999). Bystanders had perceived or been persuaded that the three were brothers and it was this assumption which served to inhibit intervention rather than the presence of other bystanders (Levine, 1999). The most notable factor was that, even when disturbed by the perceived poor parenting of the boys, an assumed family relationship had overridden the impulse to act (Levine, 1999). Specifically, intervention in family issues is not usually considered social appropriate in the UK. It was noted that this explanation, by the bystanders, for their failure to adequately intervene may have been falsified (Levine, 1999). The implication of this was that the bystanders held a belief that it was an acceptable excuse and therefore a normative reason for not intervening under the circumstances (Levine, 1999).

The author's main argument concerning the Bystander Effect was that the explanation was too reductionist; and the James Bulger case provided significant evidence of decisions based on social categorisation (Levine, 1999). The suggestion was that Bystander Effects were not evident. In explanation, the transcripts of the witnesses did not provide direct information concerning group size but locations (a busy shopping centre) and time of day (rush hour) served as indicators for the normal numbers expected (Levine, 1999). These informed estimates illustrated that over the course of the incident the number of bystanders had ranged from one to a large number. Nevertheless, transgressing from the premise of the Bystander Effects, there had not been a successful intervention (Levine, 1999). To clarify, whether a single bystander or a crowd of bystanders were present, the overriding factor in the failure to act was a perceived family relationship (Levine, 1999).

Whether or not this proposition conflicted with or furthered the traditional conceptualisation of the bystander effect is unclear from the available information.
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Establishing this was further clouded as numerous bystander interventions were reported in the case but were discounted as they were unsuccessful. Bystander Effects are an explanation of non-intervention but not of the degree of success of an intervention; Levine’s interpretation appears to have deviated from this meaning. Notwithstanding this Levine concluded that Bystander Effects were not as indicative of bystander non-intervention as was social categorisation (1999). Societal norms and the consequences of perceived social groupings were suggested directions for future research.

Social categorisation was further explored in terms of the relationships between bystanders and between the victim and bystander, in violent situations (Levine, Cassidy, Brazier, & Reicher, 2002). When a willingness to intervene in a violent situation was demonstrated and witnessed by a fellow bystander, the social categorisation was salient to that bystander (Levine et al., 2002). The bystander was susceptible to the influence of others when they all belonged to the same in-group; however they were not influenced by perceived out-group members (Levine et al., 2002). The relationship between the bystander and victim influences the likelihood of intervention, in that in-group victims are more likely to receive assistance than out-group victims (Levine et al., 2002). It was concluded that social categorisation was a determinant of the bystanders' response.

Extending the social categorisation approach to the understanding of prosocial bystander behaviour, geographic and identity groupings were varied to ascertain their influence on the offer of help (Levine, & Thompson, 2004). Bystander intervention is dependent on the individual but their concept of self is influenced by group-level categorization in that relationships are based on their in-groups and out-groups. Laboratory tests by Levine and Thompson led to the conclusion that social category was more “important than emotional reaction or geographical proximity in increasing helping behavior after natural disasters” (2004, p. 229). This expands the work of Latané and Darley (1970) in that it illustrates that it is not only the presence of other bystanders that is salient but also the social categorization of all parties.
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The social categorisation research reveals a difficulty in applying theories to the design of strategies for implementation in the workplace. Utilising a framework which activates social categories would be a risky strategy in the workplace as strengthening in-group bonds implies there is also an out-group. Consequently, in the workplace this may have the effect of increasing the risk of being bullied for out-group members (Harvey, White, Hood, & Sherif, 1961).

4.24.2 Social norms approach to bystander intervention

In spite of there being varying interpretations, bullying general contravenes society's standards for acceptable behaviour (Lutgen-Sandvik, & McDermott, 2011). A skewed standard, or norm, may result in the reduced likelihood that workplace bullying will be rejected by a group as a whole (Neuman, & Baron, 2011). This can occur where there is an established culture of acceptance of bullying behaviours as was found in the fire service in the UK, USA and Eire (Archer, 1999). Similarly, this was found to be the case in Finnish prisons with male-dominated, power-based cultures and enduring traditions stated as being the common denominator (Vartia, & Hyyti, 2002).

When negative behaviours have been permitted to continue they become entrenched over time and the employees may perceive that it is the norm within that environment (Illing, Carter, Thompson, Crampton, Morrow, Howse, Cooke, & Burford, 2013; Lutgen-Sandvik, & McDermott, 2011). As new employees join the organisation and strive to fit in they are likely to conform and accept bullying or become bullies themselves (Lutgen-Sandvik, & McDermott, 2011; Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002; Salin, & Hoel, 2011). This has commonly been regarded as par for the course in commercial kitchens (Bloisi, & Hoel, 2008). High prevalence in the National Health Service (UK) has been attributed to the environment rather than individual character flaws (Lewis, 2006); with nurses in particular being targets (Quine, 2001). This is mirrored across Europe (Ariza-Montes, Muniz, Montero-Simó, & Araque-Padilla, 2013; Høgh, Hoel, & Carneiro, 2011). Thus, bystander interventions may be minimised by the negative social norm of the work environment. Conversely, Italian research on
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bystander intervention in school bullying found peer normative pressure was positively related to helping behaviour and negatively related to passive responses (Pozzoli, & Gini, 2010). Similarly, a shift in the social norm within a college setting was found to be one of the effective means by which to increase positive bystander behaviours in sexual violence against women (Coker, Cook-Craig, Williams, Fisher, Clear, Garcia, & Hegge, 2011). These support the claim that “Bullying can only be stopped by a culture that genuinely refuses to accept it” (Vartia, 2013).

Further complexities arise when the norm is one which would be socially acceptable in general society and yet behaviour does not appear to align. In American college studies of sexual violence against women, male bystander behaviours were strongly connected to their perception of others (Fabiano, Perkins, Berkowitz, Linkenback, & Stark, 2003). Findings indicated that these perceptions were underestimated and accurate representations (Fabiano, et al., 2003). Previous research based on alcohol consumption had illustrated that misperception existed in underestimations of risk and overestimations of protection (Fabiano, et al., 2003, p. 106; Perkins, 2003, p. 167). Fabiano and colleagues concluded that this supported the inclusion of accurate normative data as a critical component of bystander training (2003, p. 105). If bystander's perceptions were inaccurate they would be upholding a misperceived norm (Fabiano, et al, 2003); and Berkowitz (2002) argued that this would prevent them from intervening. Consequently, a strategy which addressed undesirable, skewed or misperceived norms may increase bystander intervention when workplace verbal bullying occurs.

4.24.2.1 Implementation of social norm strategies

Organisational norms have been considered at the macro level with programmes and recommendations targeting management skills (Dollard, & Bakker, 2010; Law, Dollard, Tuckey, & Dormann, 2011; Illing, Carter, Thompson, Crampton, Morrow, Howse, Cooke, & Burford, 2013; Rayner, & McIvor, 2008; Sheehan, 1999). At the meso-level, as already stated, bystander strategies in the workplace are uncommon and those that
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exist largely undocumented (Illing, et al., 2013). Activating bystanders to reinforce positive norms was a training goal highlighted in a review of workplace interventions (Scully, & Rowe, 2009). Although details of the training programmes and outcomes were not presented the themes that emerged did provide grounds for bystander strategies. The balance between accentuating the positive and discouraging the negative behaviours (anecdotally) had already been incorporated into training programmes in the workplace (Scully, & Rowe, 2009); and there is evidence of programme development for schools (Twemlow, Fonagy, Sacco, Gies, Evans, & Ewbank, 2001; Frazier, 2013; White, Raczynski, Pack, & Wang, 2011); and colleges (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004; Coker, Cook-Craig, Williams, Fisher, Clear, Garcia, & Hegge, 2011).

Recognition of positive behaviour, termed micro-affirmation, was posited as beneficial with the caveat that training would be required across the board (Rowe, 2008; Scully, & Rowe, 2009, p. 6). Before bystander intervention, “...positively shapes a workplace climate” (affects a change in the social norm) it would be necessary to train a, “...critical mass...” of employees (Scully, & Rowe, 2009, p. 6); reiterating the importance of an adequate percentage of employees being trained in any new bystander strategy. This raised the question of what strategy could be implemented to affect a change in the social norm?

Apart from social norms, personal accountability was an alternative direction noted by the authors but not detailed (Scully, & Rowe, 2009). The authors alluded to work by the US military (Scully, & Rowe, 2009). Although the details were not revealed this may be related to the work of Britt (1995; 1999) who utilised the Triangle of Responsibility and Pyramid of Accountability arising from the work of Schlenker & colleagues (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994). It may be that rather than an alternative direction, personal accountability may be a means to an end. If individual's could be enabled to take responsibility, this may lead to widespread responsibility and an improvement in the social norm.
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4.24.3 A responsibility framework

Schlenker and colleagues described responsibility as a core concept in the understanding of, “how people evaluate, sanction, and try to control each other's conduct” (Schlenker et al., 1994, p. 632). The Triangle Model of Responsibility (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy & Doherty, 1994) was developed to understand the complex concept of responsibility as it pertains to individuals or organisations. Collins English dictionary (2013) provides 6 definitions for the word responsible:

1. Having control or authority
2. Being accountable for one's actions and decisions
3. Involving decision and accountability
4. Being the agent or cause of some action
5. Able to take rational decisions without supervision; accountable for one's own actions; a responsible adult
6. Able to meet financial obligations; of sound credit

At the time of Schlenker and colleague's research the concept of responsibility was considered important yet ambiguous; inadequacy in definition created a lack of distinction between related terms. Hence, examination took place to determine the origins and use of the concept in order to identify the vital elements of responsibility. Their goal was to construct an integrated model of responsibility (Schlenker et al., 1994, p. 632). Two establish facets emerged; causality and answerability (Schlenker et al., 1994). Whether or not a consequence can be attributed to an individual's action or inaction indicated causality. The factors influencing the individual's behaviour, such as intentionality, indicated the extent to which they may be held responsible for the event or its consequences (Heider, 1958). Concomitant with this is answerability; the extent to which the individual was liable (Schlenker et al., 1994). This facet is dependent on applicable rules, duties and obligations. Liability and with it, blame, were not required in the new bystander intervention strategy. Nonetheless it was important to consider this in the construction of a new strategy to ensure any obligation on the part of the bystander to intervene was intrinsically motivated. Any possibility that bystanders could be held answerable to an organisation for a failure to intervene would be a dangerous
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and negative consequence.

What was sought for the new strategy were keys to being responsible (intra-personal) and not to being held responsible (inter-personal). The relationship between causality and consequences was therefore potentially more fruitful than answerability. If bystander behaviour, whether active or not impacts consequences, then changing that behaviour has the potential to change the consequences.

The model of responsibility which ensued from Schlenker and colleague's (1994) investigations consisted of three elements; event, prescriptions and identity, each of equal importance to the model's explanatory and predictive functions (figure 4.5). Briefly, the event-element represented the action under scrutiny; the prescriptions-element referred to the relevant guidelines for behaviour; and the identity-element corresponded to the actor's role with regard to the other elements (Schlenker, 1997; Schlenker et al., 1994).

Figure 4.5 The Triangle Model of Responsibility (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy & Doherty, 1994)
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The extent to which an individual perceived responsibility for an event was explained by the strength of the relationships between the three elements. These relationships influence perception of responsibility for the modelled event by anyone who judged it.

4.24.3.1 Responsibility in the Triangle Model
Responsibility in this model is considered in terms of psychological connectivity; the bond that holds the elements together. The stronger the connections of the triangle are as a whole, the greater the responsibility is perceived to be. That is, a strong relationship between the elements of the Triangle Model is positively correlated with greater responsibility. The extent to which an individual (identity) perceives or is perceived as being associated with the action (event) and the guidelines (prescription) predicts their perception of responsibility in that specific situation.

4.24.3.2 Ambiguity in the Triangle Model
Ambiguity in an element weakens the individual’s psychological connection and therefore reduces their perception of responsibility (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994). This was interesting because in bystander experiments ambiguity had resulted in less intervention (Clark, & Word, 1972; Shotland, & Heinold, 1985; Solomon, Solomon, & Stone, 1978; Solomon, Solomon, & Maiorca, 1982). Further to this Latané and Nida (1981) commented that it was specifically the Bystander Effect of social influence that reduced intervention in ambiguous events. Fundamental to this was the use of, “...social comparison as a basis of reality testing” (Bamberger, & Biron, 2007, p. 183). Subsequent behaviour may be guided by this process of looking to others for valid information (Bamberger, & Biron, 2007, p. 183). The time which elapses while each person decides whether or not help is needed is lengthened by the lack of information, causing the individuals to seek direction from the others. As everyone undertakes a similar process they each witness the others' inactivity and may interpret the event, “... as less critical than it actually is...” or that inaction is the norm (Latané, & Nida, 1981, p. 309). It appeared that as non-intervention was related to
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ambiguity which was related to responsibility there was potential for the model to theoretically underpin a new strategy for bystander intervention.

4.24.3.3 Evaluation of responsibility
The evaluation of responsibility in a distinct event may be scrutinised using the Triangle Model of Responsibility (Schlenker, 1997; Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994). Extending this, an individual's identity at the time may be assessed to ascertain if they have pertinent obligations and their behaviour may be judged to establish if it falls within prescribed guidelines (Schlenker, 1997; Schlenker, et al., 1994). This is a simplification as foundations must exist for the possibility of responsibility. That is, there must be a prescription available for the event; and identity which has potential prerogative to apply the prescription. Therefore, without exception, information on all three elements is fundamental to appraising a situation (Schlenker, 1997; Schlenker, et al., 1994).

4.24.3.4 Identity element
Within the context of the situation the individual's identity comprises relevant aspects of their personality (Schlenker, 1997; Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994). This includes both objective and subjective attributes such as the obligations of their role at that time, their ego, level of competence, conflicts, aspirations and group membership (Schlenker, 1997; Schlenker, et al., 1994). Thus an individual's identity is constructed for each situation and it may differ each time. To clarify, people may behave differently according to transient states (Fisher, 2000). Identity is therefore a malleable construct.

4.24.3.5 Prescription element
Behaviour may be governed by laws, guided by rules and influenced by moral codes; all of which constitute the prescription element (Schlenker, 1997; Schlenker, Britt,
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Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994). Both explicit and implicit information may
direct behaviour not only to achieve a goal but also as a means of evaluation (Schlenker,
1997, p. 253; Schlenker, et al., 1994, p. 635). That is, primarily prescription is a guide to
conduct but it also allows comparison of what did occur to what should have occurred
(Schlenker, 1997). An individual knows what behaviour is appropriate by referring to a
prescription; this may include company regulations, health and safety law, and morality.
Thus, there may be multiple guidelines for any situation. Consequently, there is the
potential for the applicable prescriptions to conflict or for one to be overruled by
another. This may occur along an extensive continuum from intra-personal integrity to
international law. For example, circumstances may dictate that group norms supersede
societal norms; or European law may be discordant with the rules of a parish council.

4.24.3.6 Event element
Each referent situation is described as an event; a unit of action (Schlenker, Britt,
Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994, p. 635). This may be a single occurrence or a
collection of related incidents which are being considered as a whole. The event may
have taken place or be anticipated (Schlenker, 1997). The magnitude may vary from a
single action by an individual to a world war and is circumscribed by the purpose of the
evaluation.

4.24.3.7 Potency of the elements
The person judging (including self-judgement) the situation will apportion importance
to each element in accordance with the expected consequences (Schlenker, 1997;
Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994). The aggregate importance of
the elements relates to the severity of the consequences and was termed, “potency”
(Schlenker, et al., 1994, p. 636). The outcome of the event, in terms of consequences for
the individual, increases with the potency (Schlenker, 1997, p. 254). Schlenker and
colleagues proposed and subsequently found that responsibility was a direct function of
the links between the elements of the Triangle Model (1994, p. 638).
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4.24.3.8 Prescription-event link
This connects guidelines for action to a situation. The link is strong when there are unambiguous rules or a code of conduct applicable to the event (Schlenker, 1997). A prior clear and pertinent prescription facilitates a sense of purpose (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994). A procedure has greater clarity the stronger this link is, which leads to the likelihood an individual will have a higher degree of confidence (Schlenker, 1997; Schlenker, et al., p. 638). When there are conflicting prescriptions, ambiguous information or alternative interpretations the link is weakened (Schlenker, 1997). In unique or unusual events, if a relevant set of rules is not available, an individual is likely to feel anxious (Schlenker et al., 1994). When proper instructions are not available poor performance is probable (Schlenker, et al., 1994, p. 638). This may be counteracted through preparation and role modelling (Schlenker et al., 1994); providing adequate guidance for future events.

4.24.3.9 Prescription-identity link
The extent to which the individual perceives the prescriptions are appropriate to their role at the time is represented by this link (Schlenker, 1997; Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994). Prescriptions may be available but not relevant to the actor for example an individual may know how to drive but not have a licence; in which case the link would be weak. In a situation where a pharmacist dispensed medication the link would be strong. The attributes of the individual indicate their authority over the prescription; the greater the relevance the more confident the individual is likely to feel in carrying out an objective (Schlenker, et al., 1994, p. 638).

4.24.3.10 Identity-event link
Early analyses of responsibility primarily focussed on the link between the identity and event, defining, “...responsibility only in terms of intentional conduct”, neglecting the importance of other connections (Schlenker, 1997, p. 257). Each individual has a variable level of association with an event. Control over the event increases the strength
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of the connection, as does being prepared for it to happen (Schlenker, 1997; Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994). Conversely if an individual has no authority or the event is unexpected the connection would be weakened. The influence the individual has and the extent to which they have autonomy moderates the strength of the link. When the consequences are intended the link is strongest (Heider, 1958; Schlenker, 1997). The effect on the individual is that “...greater personal control over outcomes, appears to increase the actor's commitment to the task and determination for goal accomplishment” (Schlenker, et al., 1994, p. 640).

It was established that information (known or presumed) about elements was essential to determine responsibility (Schlenker, 1997, p. 251). These elements are inextricably linked to describe the individual's responsibility for a specific occasion, from the perspective of the individual making the evaluation (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994).

4.24.3.11 Valid and reliable model

Schlenker and colleague's initial testing of the Triangle theory sought to determine if the strength of the link would influence judgements of responsibility in others (1997). Laboratory testing with students took place and scenarios were judged for responsibility levels. This was achieved through manipulation of the strength of Triangle links and 12 perception questions. The a priori expectation was that the responses would fall into two factors; responsibility and determination. Although 3 factors were found, the 2 predicted factors accounted for 61% of variance and accounted for 10 of the responses. The third factor (2 responses and 10% variance) was not carried forward for further analysis.

Stronger links were found to predict greater responsibility and determination (Schlenker, et al., 1994, p. 643). Additionally the links were of equal importance and none took precedence over the others. A second test was based around participants selecting questions from a pool (of 34 items) to determine a fictitious employee's
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responsibility for a firm's sales goal failure (Schlenker, et al., 1994, p. 645). Questions relating to the strength of triangle links were preferred as a means of determining responsibility (Schlenker, et al., 1994, p. 647). Links had an additive function in perception of responsibility and therefore a missing link could dominate a judgement (Schlenker, 1997, p. 259). With the knowledge that the strength of the links predicted people's perception of the responsibility of others, research continued to demonstrate that, “...they also predict subjects' own perceptions...” (Schlenker, 1997, p. 275).

Applying the theory in field research was undertaken in a military setting to predict soldiers' feelings of responsibility for a mission (Britt, 1995). Surveys were carried out prior to and during deployment (Britt, 1995). The links were found to predict responsibility and commitment independently, with stronger links indicating greater responsibility and commitment (Britt, 1995, p. 22). An additional finding was that the three links appeared to be related to morale (Britt, 1995, p. 24; Schlenker, 1997, p. 277). Britt's (1999) work furthered use of the theory with the inclusion of an inward view (self-assessment) of commitment, engagement and disconnection in military roles.

The exploration of excuse making took an opposite perspective of weakening the triangle links to minimise personal responsibility (Scheldon, & Schachtman, 2007, p. 376; Schlenker, Pontari, & Christopher, 2001, p. 15). Of greatest interest to the current study was use of the Model in self-assessment. However a particular scale was not developed for this applications of the Triangle Model in field work. Different and varying numbers of items were used to represent the Triangle links (Britt, 1999). Therefore a repeatable Triangle metric for self-assessment of responsibility was not available.

Additional applications of the Triangle of Responsibility model have included; providing a conceptual framework for the analysis of excuses (Schlenker, Pontari, & Christopher, 2001); clarification of the relationship between the Protestant work ethic (Christopher, & Schlenker, 2005); validation of a, “...pharmacist model of perceived responsibility for drug therapy outcomes...” (Planas, Kimberlin, Segal, Brushwood,
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Hepler, & Schlenker, 2005, p. 2393); analysis of the process of partisan bias (Rudolph, 2006); and the development of a strategy for the management of excuse-making (Burke, & Rau, 2007).

4.24.3.12 Summary
Schlenker and colleagues de-constructed the concept of responsibility to identify the essential three elements; prescription, identity and event (1994). The Triangle Model of Responsibility was a valid and reliable model which provided an indication of how people judge others (looking outward) in laboratory tests (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994). Although the Model was used in field research a consistent and comparable measurement was not developed.

4.24.4 The Accountability Pyramid
The Triangle Model of Responsibility was expanded to take into account the person or people making the evaluation, including self-evaluation (Schlenker, 1997). This was labelled the audience element; expanding the original Model to become the Accountability Pyramid (Schlenker, 1997) (figure 4.6).

Figure 4.6 The Accountability Pyramid (Schlenker, 1997)

“Accountability, then, is defined as being answerable to audiences for performing up to prescribed standards...” (Schlenker, 1997, p. 249). Behaviour is influenced by a person's
belief that they are accountable; bystanders are inclined to consider how others will appraise their behaviour. Thus an audience, including self-evaluation, may impel bystanders towards appropriate action (Schlenker et al., 1994, p. 632). This appeared to be an intrinsic motivator pertinent to a bystander strategy. Furthermore it aligns with the Bystander Effect where the audience was shown to be a major inhibitor of bystander helping behaviour (Latané and Darley, 1970).

The accountability pyramid has informed research on, “...sub par decisions that are biased by conformity pressures” (Quinn, & Schlenker, 2002, p. 472); advanced the study of training transfer (Burke, & Saks, 2009); and contributed a perspective to Nigerian public expenditure accountability (Iyoha, & Oyerinde, 2008). These have illustrated diverse usage and flexibility in the application of the models. Hence, the Triangle Model of Responsibility with the audience element (the Accountability Pyramid), was a potential foundation for a new bystander intervention strategy (Schlenker, 1997; Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994).

4.25 Considering bystander stress in intervention

It is known that bullying has a detrimental effect on bystanders and this is largely in the form of unhealthy stress levels (Einarsen, & Mikkelsen, 2003; Hansen, Høgh, Persson, Karlson, Gardea, & Ørbæk, 2006, p. 69; Vartia, 2001, p. 64). A responsibility framework was only useful if it was unlikely to add to stress levels. There was no point in a strategy that replaced one stressor with another. Schlenker (1997) addressed the issue of the burden of responsibility and stated that it was possibly but not necessarily a stressor. When the links to the event (prescription-event and identity-event) are strong stress-levels can be reduced owing to clear goals and perceived personal control (Schlenker, 1997, p. 286). A possible issue was highlighted if these two links were weak and only the prescription-identity link was strong as performance pressure may arise through striving to achieve the required standard (Schlenker, 1997) (figure 4.7 below). This may or may not be balanced by the relief of the strong link to the prescription providing a clear sense of purpose (Schlenker, 1997).
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Figure 4.7 A strong prescription-identity link alone may lead to stress

To test this potential stress effect it was examined in a study of academic responsibility and a significant positive correlation was found between stress and prescription-identity link (Schlenker, 1997). If an individual doubts they can achieve the goals that they believe they should, they will experience anxiety (Schlenker, 1997, p. 287). Therefore, one link appears to increase stress but stress does not inevitably partner responsibility.

4.26 Chapter summary
This chapter has critically reviewed the research on bystanders and bystander intervention. Since its inception as an area for research, progress has being made towards predictions of bystander behaviour. From an understanding of their impact on the dynamics of a situation to areas where bystander intervention has already been implemented, the importance of bystanders has been explained.

The literature on bystander intervention varies in its applicability to workplace bullying but the illustrations of the different bystander roles provided direction for desirable bystander behaviour. The vast literature on Bystander Effects, and the smaller literature on the cost and rewards of helping, whilst of vital importance in bystander intervention strategies, have swamped a basic foundation of bystander research. That is the decision
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process, established early in bystander research by Latané and Darley (1968, p. 216). It appears fundamental that a bystander must be at least partial engaged in this process (consciously or unconsciously) before inhibition can occur.

Theories on which to base an intervention programme were found in the bystander work in sexual violence and harassment (O'Leary-Kelly, Tiedt, & Bowes-Sperry, 2004; Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004). The literature provided a rich resource but contextual differences necessitated discriminative transfer to the strategy developed in the current study. A case in point was Levine's (1999) research into social categorisation; although this may be particularly salient within the workplace it was inadvisable to manipulate it owing to the risk of increasing bullying for some. It was paramount that the new strategy to increase bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying optimised existing knowledge to ensure matters were not made worse (Beehr, Jex, Stacy, Murray, 2000; Fenlason, & Beehr, 1994; Fox, & Stallworth, 2010, Moynihan, Banyard, Arnold, Eckstein, & Stapleton, 2010; Scully, & Rowe, 2009). The responsibility framework developed by Schlenker and colleagues appeared to offer a sound theory capable of supporting the bystanders decision process. The development, measurement and implementation of the Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (RIDS) are described in Chapters 5 and 6.
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5 Methodology and methods

5.1 Introduction

The literature reviewed in the previous chapters suggested that bystanders’ intervention in workplace bullying has been very limited and further research and measurement of a theoretically-based bystander intervention strategy would be useful.

The research design for this thesis is described in this chapter. The development of the new bystander intervention strategy is explained. Details are provided for the construction of the survey, the new metric, and the first pilot study.

5.2 Rationale for the methodology

A positivist rather than interpretivist philosophy is appropriate for hypotheses testing research (Leitch, Hill, & Harrison, 2010; Spector, & Brannick, 2011). For practitioners empirical studies can contribute to the justification of evidenced based practice by providing measurable strategies (Aarons, Hurlburt, & Horowitz, 2011). The positivist assumption that the truth can be sought out through quantitative research has been linked to the quantitative imperative which prevents research into abstract constructs (Michell, 2003). However, this thesis does not adopt a naïve realist methodology but a post-positivist paradigm which pragmatically accepts realism. Ramlo and Newman (2011, p. 176) noted that the goal of a post-positivist philosophy is to, “...maintain as much objectivity in research as possible”. Nevertheless social construction is accepted as important in understanding reality (Johnson, & Gray, 2010). Consequently measurement may be imperfect and even though it may not be fully achievable, objectivity in research may be improved by replication (Bloisi, 2012, p. 131).

Academics who have taken an interpretivist approach have provided crucial background to this research. Through their inductive approach, common behaviours and circumstances have been identified. An example is, Baillien, Neyens, De Witte, and De Cuyper's (2009) exploration of the way in which antecedents develop into bullying. Nonetheless an inductive research perspective was not planned for this research. Doctoral study involves designing a research project that is realistic, focussed and
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achievable. To achieve development and measurement of a bystander intervention strategy within the constraints of field collaboration during doctoral research was a complex project. To add an inductive field research stage would have been overly ambitious; potentially resulting in a failure to answer the research question. Furthermore, the researcher perceived the prominent gap to be quantitative. Although few bystander intervention studies have touched on workplace bullying; the research that has highlighted the bystander has been qualitative (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011; van Heugten, 2011). Quantitative bystander intervention in workplace bullying research was conspicuous by its absence; consequently this was the gap addressed.

Had a qualitative approach been taken it was considered that action research may have successfully improved bystander intervention at CiC (Lewin, 1946). The method is particularly suited to social practice involving practitioners and researchers (Lewin, 1946, p. 39). The collaborative and democratic nature of action research may be beneficial to progressing socially sensitive change in the workplace (Flood, 2010). As an iterative process with a large and repeated time commitment it was considered to be overly intrusive for the specific operations' environment, especially as the researcher wanted to engage shop-floor employees. At the supervisory level where fewer manual-workers are employed the approach would have had greater feasibility but it was considered that larger numbers of bystanders to verbal bullying would be captured by focussing mainly on shop-floor employees. Despite action research not being pursued for this project it has much to recommend it.

The hypothetico-deductive methodology adopted for this thesis was based on the research question which developed from the literature review. Evaluations of interventions were required and robust measurements had been called for (Zapf, 2012). This was an experimental study with before and after intervention measures to test the hypotheses, therefore a single time-point survey was not appropriate. As the sample had potential to change (although participants were consistently from the same pool) it was not a panel study. It was more than a trend study as the participants all belong to the same organisation. Therefore a prospective cohort study was designed; repeating the same survey at different times with samples from the target population. Confidentiality was specified to maximise participation in this sensitive field study and was assured
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through anonymous responding (Cowie, Naylor, Rivers, Smith, & Pereira, 2002, p. 40). Consequently, longitudinal tracking was of changes in employees at CiC but not of identifiable individuals. This necessitated an independent groups design although a mixed within and between groups design would have been preferable.

5.3 Research design

5.3.1 The new Responsible Intervention Decision model

What had been discovered from the literature was that a decision process was fundamental to bystander responsible intervention. In order to intervene appropriately bystanders must progress through the process (consciously or unconsciously). It may be argued that some bystanders may impulsively intervene without any forethought or unconscious decision making; whilst this cannot be ruled out it should be avoided, especially in the workplace. It may be that bystanders who have previously been bullied may be more likely to react when they witness someone else being bullied. However, they may still be distressed and vulnerable from their own experiences which may lead to aggressive rather than an assertive intervention. To clarify, impulsive intervention by any observer to any event is always a possibility but uncontrolled responses may worsen a situation (Chapter 3). Therefore responsible strategies are required for the workplace. Although various theories are available which may be adaptable to support bystander intervention the requirement was for one which was practical within a working environment. The Triangle Model of Responsibility had the potential to support the bystander decision process (figure 5.1 below).
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Figure 5.1 The decision process model (Latané, & Darley, 1970) supported by the Triangle of Responsibility (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994).

Before this new Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (RIDS) could be implemented and tested the practicalities of the field research had to be considered. The following sections describe all the processes and decisions which took place.

5.4 Field research

The lack of real-world relevance and an absence of collaboration with industry are criticisms levelled at the traditional doctorate model which have been addressed in this research (Raddon, & Sung, 2009; Scott, Brown, Lunt, & Thorne, 2004, p. 16). From the outset the issues faced in the workplace provided a foundation for the research question. This interconnection between the research and industry strengthened during the design, intervention and data collection phases. Not only did this ensure the acute pertinence of this research, it has provided insight for germane avenues for future research. A counter-point made for the traditional doctorate was the quest for clear knowledge for the enhancement of society (Raddon, & Sung, 2009; Scott et al., 2004). Nevertheless a doctorate with robustly designed field research can, “...enable development of applied knowledge” as will be illustrated in this thesis (Raddon, & Sung, 2009, p. 6).
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5.5 Method of data collection

A method of data collection was established that was within the resources available to the researcher and CiC. Four methods were considered based on the bullying and bystander literature. These were: Survey (Banyard, & Moynihan, 2011; Notelaers, 2010; Vartia-Väänänen, 2003); online survey (Fox, & Stallworth, 2010; Namie, & Lutgen-Sandvik, 2010; Owoyemi, & Sheehan, 2011); focus groups (Hoel, Giga, & Faragher, 2006; Lowe, Levine, Best, & Heim, 2012; Omari, 2007); and interviews (Harrington, Rayner, & Warren, 2012; Hoel, & Einarsen, 2010; Shallcross, Ramsay, & Barker, 2010) (table 5.1 below). Each method was scrutinised in the context of resources and requirements.

Table 5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>On-Site Time</th>
<th>Time Cost Organisation</th>
<th>Feasibility Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups Individual Interviews Online</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Paper Survey</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The feasibility of each method of data collection was dependent on operations at CiC and the resources available to the researcher. The amount of time spent on-site was considered from both the researcher's and CiC's point of view. The cost, largely in terms of releasing employees to participate, had to be both feasible and worthwhile for CiC. Presenting a proposal with an unrealistic time commitment may have discouraged CiC from the outset. The availability of CiC's resources for the research were investigated including practicalities in terms of interview rooms and survey distribution and collection. Confidentiality issues were assessed, for example, employees may not have responded to a survey if their supervisors could view their individual responses.
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5.5.1 On-site time and time costs for CiC

The gatekeeper was given the freedom to recruit from anywhere in the mainland UK, with a researcher preference of the south of England requested. Travel and overnight stays were constrained by economic reality.

The participating employees' roles were manual, time sensitive and demanded they were in certain locations at specified times in order to accomplish their tasks. The work required 24 hour, 7 days a week cover and employees worked fixed shifts; early, late, night and weekends; rarely working on another shift unless on overtime. Accordingly the time employees could be released from duties to participate in the study was restricted by operational requirements. The working style facilitated participation of a large numbers of employees for a very short time more easily than small numbers for an extended time. Therefore the time requested by the researcher had to be sufficient to collect adequate data but minimised in order that CiC would not find it excessively intrusive. CiC may have declined to participate if doing so had the potential to impact the smooth running of operations. Similarly the employees or union may have been less willing to participate if rest breaks or social time were impinged upon. Therefore the optimal approach was to ask for access to a large number of employees for a short duration, during their usual work time.

5.5.2 Feasibility of methods within CiC's work environment

The methods were required to fit into the specific field context. Interviews and focus groups would require space where the process could be conducted in privacy. It was necessary for the research to be carried out in the workplace which may have led to interviewees feeling exposed. Although physical space away from the shop-floor was available, privacy could not be assured. The conditions were not well-suited to the collection of sensitive qualitative data.

Questionnaires do not have the same physical space requirement and the privacy issues are easier to resolve. The possibility of conducting an electronic survey was assessed. Surveys have been completed online, for example by email, for over fifteen years (Sheehan, 2001). Electronic surveys have the potential for higher response rates than
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mail surveys (Saunders, 2012, p. 63). However, union agreement for the project would not have been possible without fairness and inclusivity. Thus, it was vital to take into account the availability of internet access to all potential participants (Couper, Blair, & Triplett, 1999, p. 46). CiC was asked about employee internet access at work and employees and the population for this study did not have that facility.

The intention was for the research to be applicable to practice at CiC as well as being of academic value. Consequently the normal data preferences of CiC were taken into account. Two site visits enabled the researcher to observe an overwhelming numerical bias, with statistical and graphical presentation of a multitude of processes prominent across both sites. Consistent with the existing knowledge of CiC as being numbers driven; this confirmed a quantitative data collection was most appropriate for working with this stakeholder.

5.5.3 Impact of the field context

Conducting a field survey rather than a laboratory survey had both advantages and disadvantages. The collection of sensitive field data is important as the findings may be beneficial to real-world organisational issues which may not be revealed in laboratory studies (King, Hebl, Morgan, & Ahmad, 2013). However, in the field sensitive topics may be more susceptible to impression management which may present a challenge to maintaining rigour (King, et al., 2013). Owing to their economic dependence on work, employees may have been reluctant to participate honestly if their responses were identifiable (Björkqvist, Österman, & Hjelt-Bäck, 1994). This may have resulted in a higher chance of socially desirable responding (SDR) or a reluctance to fully engage in the process (Cowie, Naylor, Rivers, Smith, & Pereira, 2002, p. 40).

In research on bystanders to sexual violence the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability measure (Crowne, & Marlowe, 1960) was used to assess SDR (Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007, p. 471). It is possible to investigate SDR with such scales when extensive item lists are not prohibitive (Paulhus, 2002, p. 52). In this research an additional scale would have extended the time required from each employee; which was already established as limited. In the interest of minimising employee's participation time the
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investigation of social desirable responding was rejected as not practicable. If future field studies have the benefit of more employee time, the inclusion of such a measure should be considered. For this research the emphasis was placed on providing tangible confidentiality.

Not requesting names or employee references was the most transparent means to assure the participants that their individual response would be kept confidential. The perceived disadvantages of identification may be reduced by providing anonymity. Anonymous data collection has been used in other sensitive research such as a rape prevention programme (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Fouber, Brasfield, & Shelley-Tremblay, 2011). Participants can be provided with appreciable anonymity through self-administered rather than researcher-administered surveys. Therefore it was agreed with CiC that employees would be issued with surveys and given the time to complete them at work. Pre-paid envelopes addressed to the researcher at the University of Portsmouth were provided to preserve confidentiality.

5.5.4 Summary

Prior to designing the field research it was necessary to decide on the type of data collection that would answer the hypotheses and be applicable to CiC. Consideration was given to CiC's familiarity with quantitative results; and operational requirements which restricted the availability of employees. The sensitivity of the subject and necessity of conducting this research in the workplace were also taken into account. It was decided that an anonymous, short, quantitative, paper survey completed during working hours would be the most effective method of data collection for this research.

5.6 Sample size and power

5.6.1 Overview

The design was between groups. This requires a larger sample size than a within groups design but it has the advantage of being more sensitive, that is the margin for error is smaller based on the law of large numbers and Central Limit Theorem (Lumley, 2012). Nonetheless, small effect sizes or weak correlations can still be detected (Lumley, 2012,
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Each group had a different experimental condition and would be surveyed twice (pre and post research intervention). The original proposal requested 3 survey runs but owing to numerous delays this was not feasible. It was not possible to know if the same people had participated in each condition for both surveys because the study was anonymous and voluntary; therefore within group calculations could not be made. Anonymity, confidentiality and limited space on the physical survey removed the possibility of match-pairs. The planned tests were Pearson's correlations and analysis of variance calculations. The optimal sample size for the analyses was calculated.

5.6.2 Power

Prospective use of power dictated the target sample size for this field study (Lenth, 2007). This was calculated in order that the magnitude of any effects could be inferred from the statistical significance (Lenth, 2001). The number of groups and participants in groups were manipulated as a planning aid (table 5.2 & 5.3 below). Thus the number of participants and groups required to be recruited to yield useful information was available for the design of the experimental framework. Initially it was assumed that there would be 3 conditions; Control (no intervention); Feedback (poster intervention); Training (research based training). The nature of the conditions are dealt with elsewhere (section 6.5, p. 16). Effect sizes are best estimated from previous studies or pilot studies (Lenth, 2001). There were no bystander interventions in verbal bullying studies found during this research. Previous bystander intervention studies in other areas did not publish effect sizes (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004; Ishiyama, 2000). Although it was possible to run pilot studies to facilitate validation of the survey it was not possible to run the full-size study more than once. Consequently it was decided to use Cohen's (1988) effect sizes which were based on analyses of the social science literature. This was against advice which rejects these estimates as "t-shirt" sizes (Lenth, 2007, p. E26). A small effect was assumed based on the persistence of CiC's verbal bullying issue and the limited duration of the research intervention. The conclusion was that 300 to 500 employees would be required for each condition (table 5.2 & 5.3 below).
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Table 5.2

Power calculations for a 3 condition study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Effect size (small)</th>
<th>Significance 5%</th>
<th>Per group n</th>
<th>Sample size N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\text{Using Cohen (1988)}\)

Where \(n\) = the number of participants required in each group

Where \(N\) = the number of participants required for a 3 condition study

Based on these calculations CiC was asked to seek sites with potential volunteer groups with a minimum of 300 employees. The number of conditions was revised upwards to 4 after the in-house programme was included in the study (table 5.3).

Table 5.3

Power calculation for a 4 condition study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Effect size (small)(^1)</th>
<th>Significance 5%</th>
<th>Per group n</th>
<th>Sample size N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\text{Using Cohen (1988)}\)

Where \(n\) equals the number of participants required in each group

Where \(N\) equals the total number of participants required for a 4 condition study

5.6.3 Method of recruiting

All recruiting was done by the gatekeeper, with no direct contact between the potential site managers and the researcher. Sites were approached based on the gatekeeper’s knowledge of their numbers and likely interest in the project. As the recruiting process progressed information was received about the groups. CiC ran a shift working system comprising day, evening, night and weekend shifts. Early recruiting resulted in groups from day and evening shifts. The addition of a night shift led to consideration of a 5 condition study. However, the number of night shift employees was potentially low and
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it was decided to incorporate the night shift into a control group; retaining the 4 condition plan. This would provide control data producing a baseline which was an accurate representation across a complete 24 hour shift pattern.

5.6.4 Characteristics required in the sample

Details were given to the gatekeeper on the particular characteristics necessary for the planned experiment. The gatekeeper recruited sites based on the sample requirements that each group must:

- Be isolated from the others
- Be over 300 in number
- Commit to having two surveys administered at a set time
- Be suited to a unique condition

The specific requirements for each condition were as follows:

Poster feedback: The group would agree to display posters in prominent locations at the requested time. The group must not have participated in the in-house campaign.

Training: The group would schedule on-site training sessions with the researcher, enabling the entire group to be trained at a specific time between the two surveys. This would require suitable facilities to be made available. The group must not have participated in the in-house campaign.

In-house programme: The group must complete the in-house campaign between the two surveys.

Control: The group must not undertake any bullying related training between the surveys.

5.6.5 The impact of actual recruitment on the research design

The researcher was not directly involved in any recruiting. The gatekeeper identified
and negotiated participation with site managers until the required sample was recruited. Characteristics of the recruited sites were given to the researcher in order to schedule events. Sites were referred to by location name but in this thesis they have been coded for anonymity. Unfortunately the information on sample requirements was misinterpreted and the volunteer groups did not fit the design requirements. Half the groups had already completed the in-house campaign preventing an equitable baseline measurement across all conditions. Additionally it was not possible for any group to undertake the in-house campaign between the two surveys.

5.6.6 Recruitment numbers

The number of employees recruited at each location was lower than expected and this would impact the power of the study. Expectations had been based on employee numbers during previous collaborations and numbers had been down-sized in the intervening years. This heightened the need to maximise survey return rates in order to decrease the chances of a type II error, which may occur owing to a sample size which is too small. This would have increased the likelihood of a null hypothesis being erroneously found. Lenth (2001) made realistic suggestions on the issues surrounding sample size. One of which was that an underpowered study may support the argument for a larger study with a bigger budget (Lenth, 2001, p. 190). Therefore, in spite of sample size issues, findings from this study may have the potential to encourage further investment in larger projects. The potential sample size was improved when the CC1 and CC2 manager requested inclusion of the weekend shift. They were subsequently grouped with the smallest group (CC1 night shift) in a control condition (table 5.4 below).
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Table 5.4

Recruited groups with number of employees and in-house campaign status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number in group</th>
<th>Campaign status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CB1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>seen campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>seen campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>seen campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>not seen campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC1(^1)</td>
<td>N204 + W30 = 234</td>
<td>not seen campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2(^2)</td>
<td>E86 + L184 = 270</td>
<td>not seen campaign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)N night shift were grouped with W weekend shift
\(^2\)E early shift were grouped with L late shift

5.7 Adjusting to field realities

The value of gaining access to a field sample outweighed the adjustments necessary to conduct the research. The most practical solution to the recruitment issues was to redesign the research around the available sample. Two distinct categories had emerged with 3 sites in each. Thus two, 3 condition experiments were planned in place of the single 4 condition experiment. These comprised of one experiment for the sites which had completed the in-house campaign and one for the sites that had not. For each experiment there were control, poster and programme conditions (table 5.5 below).

Table 5.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experimental conditions based on exposure to the in-house campaign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The programme condition would be the researcher designed and led training. It was discovered later that it was not feasible for the researcher to cover training at both programme sites. As it was also not possible to run the in-house campaign between the surveys at any site, reinforcement of the in-house campaign was planned as the
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programme condition at a site that had seen the campaign some months earlier. Details of the conditions are discussed elsewhere (section 6.5, p. 16).

5.8 Logistics

All groups would complete the survey twice and all sites would complete the initial survey in the same month (table 5.6 below). After the appropriate programme for each condition was completed the second survey would take place. Timings were synchronised across the groups for consistency. As the CC1 and CC2 conditions were in the same geographic location it was vital to ensure that conditions were not confounded in the control condition by the training received by the programme condition. Therefore it was planned that the control condition, CC1, would have their second survey prior to the programme condition, CC2, proceeding with training (table 5.6 below). This would ensure that there were no confounds as a result of managers moving employees between shifts to cover holidays or overtime. The scheduling also removed the potential for confounding information to be shared socially within the tight-knit community.

Table 5.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>August 1st</th>
<th>September 1st</th>
<th>September 10th</th>
<th>October 1st</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB1</td>
<td>Survey 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Campaign reinforcement</td>
<td>Survey 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>Survey 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>No programme</td>
<td>Survey 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP0</td>
<td>Survey 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poster</td>
<td>Survey 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>Survey 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Poster</td>
<td>Survey 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC1</td>
<td>Survey 1</td>
<td>Survey 2</td>
<td>No programme</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2</td>
<td>Survey 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Research based training</td>
<td>Survey 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Timings designed to ensure independent conditions in CC1 & CC2.

Participants would be asked to reflect on the prior month. The timing schedule ensured that there was no cross-over in the month the surveys referenced (table 5.6 above).
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5.9 Planning data entry

Forward planning of data entry took place in order that data would be collected in a practical format. The expectation was that the field study would provide a large data set. As the researcher was solely responsible for completion of all tasks, time efficiency was important and manual input of data was not an optimal method.

5.9.1 Electronic survey

Collection of data electronically through an online survey would have provided digitised data with no need for manual data entry by the researcher. Unfortunately this had already been ruled out as participants did not have workplace access to computers. Allowing completion of an electronic survey outside of the workplace was rejected for three reasons. Firstly, it was not known if employees had internet access at home. Secondly, the motivation to complete the survey was likely to be greater during working hours than in personal time. Thirdly, co-workers, especially friends may have had greater opportunity to influence each other’s responses. However, an online version of the survey was produced for piloting and for future research.

5.9.2 Personal Response System

Electronic data collection can be facilitated with a Personal Response System (PRS). This enables anonymous interactive responses to be rapidly recorded while the statements are displayed in a presentation. Enquiries were made to University departments who used this system. Although effective in a lecture theatre it was not known if it would be practical in other settings and therefore testing would be required. Additionally the researcher's own department did not own a PRS. Consequently this method was rejected.

5.9.3 Optical Mark Reading

A scan and capture, post data collection method of inputting data was also in use by the University. Optical Mark Reading (OMR) was used for multiple-choice exams and satisfaction surveys. This enables rapid input of data from paper surveys. The necessary equipment and software were potentially available for this study. OMR is an accurate
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high-speed method for large volumes of data (Hussmann, & Deng, 2005). It consists of scanners, marking software and pre-formatted response sheets (Lumbantobing, Nachrowi, & Hartono, 2001). OMR is well suited to multiple-choice responses (Hussmann, & Deng, 2005). The respondent is required to accurately fill-in one bubble for each question or item (figure 5.2 below).

![Examples](image)

Figure 5.2 Guide for accurate bubble filling-in for Optical Mark Reader (OMR)

The presence of marks in pre-defined positions is interpreted by the programmable software (Hussmann, & Deng, 2005). Errors must be boldly crossed out if a change is made; this is detected by the scanner and flagged for checking by the technician. The pre-formatted response sheet must be on white paper of a weight adequate for responses not to leech through to the other side as this would cause misreads (Hussmann, & Deng, 2005). The weight of the paper was also important to avoid crumpling which may lead to feed problems.

The researcher established that it was possible to design a custom response sheet and therefore OMR was adaptable for the current research needs. The researcher learned to programme the software and designed a response sheet for the research. This dictated a large section of the page layout as it was necessary to allocate space for response bubbles.

The framework for the study had been designed so that elements could be reconfigured if difficulties arose. Potential changes in experimental conditions, sample sizes and CiC's environment had been modelled. This robust foundation allowed a relatively rapid re-design to incorporate the realities of field work and indirect recruiting.

The next step was to design all aspects of the survey within the parameters set by the research design. The CiC imposed, operational limitation of a single page for the survey
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presented practical problems in incorporating all the aspects needed. This will be explained in the next section.

5.10 Survey design

The two-sides of the survey page were required to include information for the participants; a working definition of the phenomenon being addressed; statements and responses for demographic data; exposure to workplace verbal bullying data and the new bystander metric. In addition to this each page required coding for experimental condition and survey run. The page was to be clearly legible and unambiguous while also being formatted as an Optical Mark Reader response sheet. Each will be explained.

5.10.1 Information for the participants

Four types of information for the participant were required on the survey:

5.10.1.1 Key participant information

The participant was informed that the survey was voluntary and anonymous and that the study was approved by the University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth Business School. Participation could be withdrawn by not returning the survey. Informed consent was included; advising the participant that the study was doctoral research and all data would be held securely prior to being destroyed at the end of the project.

A description of verbal bullying was used to set the context of the study and provide an example definition for the participant to refer to (Appendix I).

5.10.1.2 Instructions

The participant was asked to read the example definition and fill-in a single response for each statement, on both sides of the page, with their current workplace in mind. An example was included. They were informed of how to return the survey to the researcher.
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5.10.1.3 Signposting and thanks
The researcher's email address was provided for further information. Details of where confidential advice could be obtained (by telephone or email) if the survey raised issues was added at the bottom of the front-side of the page and repeated on the reverse. The latter was preceded by a brief message of thanks.

5.10.2 Demographic data collection
Analyses by demographic data were not required to investigate the hypotheses in this research. However it was appropriate to consider general sample characteristics and to use that data to confirm the sample was representative of CiC. Furthermore, past research in the bystander and bullying fields had collected demographic data; consequently demographic collection was included on the grounds of maximising potential comparisons with other research.

5.10.2.1 Gender
The gatekeeper stated that women represented approximately 20% of the workforce. To ensure the data collection reflected this it was necessary to request the participants' gender. Gender differences were not expected but analyses were planned to confirm this.

5.10.2.2 Age
Workplace surveys commonly request age in categories. It was considered that the general age of an employee should be analysed to detect any patterns in responses. Age was divided into 4 categories, these were; under 25 years representing young adults, termed generation Y; 26-35 years, adult likely to have more work experience than the younger category but still generation Y; 36-54 years, adults of generation X; and 55 years and over, adults of generation X who have reached the earliest age that an employee could take voluntary retirement under CiC's pension plan.

5.10.2.3 Tenure
Workplace surveys often request length of tenure. For example, Rizzo, House and
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Litzman’s (1970) research addressing role ambiguity considered tenure. Although this demographic was not predicted to impact the outcome of the study it was considered prudent to include it for post-doctorate analysis. Age and tenure may influence attitudes to workplace verbal bullying and intervention. The categories were selected to typify new, settled, firmly established and long term employees. These were categorised as; under 1 year; over 1 year; over 5 years; and over 10 years.

5.10.2.4 Hours worked

Exposure to workplace verbal bullying is likely to be impacted by the number of hours the individual spends in the workplace. Part-time staff may have less opportunity to participate in awareness programmes or they may be less engaged. Full-time staff may be more confident or jaded. Knowledge of any differences attributed to hours worked may be useful to CiC, for example, in planning training. The categories selected were; 16 hours or less; 17-31 hours; and 31 hours or more. At the time of planning these categories reflected HM Revenues boundaries relating to social security benefits. Employees working more than 16 hours were eligible for working tax credit as part-time workers. Employees working 31 hours or more were considered full-time. These boundaries have now changed.

5.10.2.5 Location

It was essential to know the work location of the participant, as different conditions in this research were largely divided by geographic location. The single exception to this was that one location was also divided by time (working different shifts). It was not necessary to ask the individuals' their condition (location) as it was pre-printed (an OMR scan code) on the surveys.

5.10.2.6 Position

The bystanders being surveyed in the field study were shop-floor workers who largely functioned within the same physical space (at their site) at the same hierarchical level. Management had an intermittent presence and were not being sampled. Therefore position was not requested.
5.10.3 Guiding definition

In the literature there was no consensus on the definition of workplace bullying and therefore a standard definition could not be provided. The context for the survey was specifically verbal bullying which also has no agreed definition. The experience of workplace verbal bullying is subject to personal perception and varies widely. Providing no guideline may have resulted in people including types of bullying other than verbal. It was considered necessary to include a guideline as an example of the types of behaviour being targeted. The behaviours included were based on the literature and discussions with the supervisory team (definitions: Appendix B; pilot survey 1 Appendix I). The intention was to be open so that behaviours not listed were not excluded, whilst being clear that verbal behaviour was the focus. The following was used:

Verbal bullying is negative verbal behaviour where one or more persons feel they can't defend themselves. This includes inappropriate behaviour such as insulting remarks, teasing, badgering, threats, ridicule, belittling, offensive comments and persistent criticism.

5.10.4 Exposure to workplace verbal bullying

Bystander intervention was dependent on the opportunity to intervene. In other words an incident had to occur and be witnessed. Verbal bullying may not have occurred during the study. Therefore data was required on employees' exposure to the phenomenon to ascertain whether there had been incidents or not. The number of employees who had been verbally bullied, the number who had witnessed verbal bullying and the number who had intervened in verbal bullying were collected. The data on exposure to workplace verbal bullying provided evidence on the efficacy of the new scale. The means by which these data could be collected were considered.

5.10.4.1 Observation

The ideal measurements would have been collected through observation. This would have required employees to be watched throughout their shift using complex and expensive closed-circuit television with effective audio. Owning to participant numbers,
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geographic spread and the study duration, multiple sets of equipment would have been required. Furthermore this method was probably impractical owing to the machinery noise. Receiving ethical permission for this kind of intrusion was highly unlikely. Additionally, employees were likely to change their behaviour when observed. This method was therefore rejected.

5.10.4.2 Formal report

The extent of the issue may be misrepresented in formal reports as under-reporting can occur (Keashly, & Neuman, 2004). Additionally, official figures of formal reports which aligned with this study of verbal bullying and co-worker intervention were not available from CiC.

5.10.4.3 Self report

Self-report responses for being verbally bullied, intervening in verbal bullying and witnessing verbal bullying would provide data on the individual's perspective of their own exposure to bullying. It has been argued that self-report often threatens research validity as it may be susceptible to bias (Donaldson, & Grant-Vallone, 2012, p. 245). The risk is for under or over reporting to occur (Obermann, 2011, p. 135). Nonetheless, self-report remains the only means to discover the individual's own experience of bullying (Obermann, 2011).

5.10.4.4 Peer report

A peer report of workplace verbal bullying is the same data as self-reported data on witnessing and intervening. That is, if an individual has witnessed or intervened in workplace verbal bullying, another person was perceived to be bullied. An insight into group attitudes can be gained from peer-reporting although it is also subject to bias (Graham, Bellmore, & Juvonen, 2007). In the school bullying literature it has been suggested that combining self and peer reports may decrease the issues arising from bias by providing both perspectives (Graham, Bellmore, & Juvonen, 2007). Multiple items would be required to establish accurate comparison between self-report ('I have been bullied') and peer-report ('I have witnessed' and 'I have intervened in bullying'). For
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eexample, questions to distinguish between witnessing but not intervening and witnessing and intervening; how many witnesses observed each incident; and how many witnesses intervened in the same incident. Limited survey space was available for collection of exposure data as this was not a prevalence study.

5.10.4.5 Collecting both perspectives

The collection of data on witnessing was fundamentally necessary as bystander intervention could only take place if a verbal bullying incident had been witnessed. However it also served to yield data as a peer-report of numbers that had been bullied. The peer view would illustrate whether co-workers are noticing bullying. This was not expected to tally with self-reports of being bullied as more than one individual may report witnessing the same bullying incident. A high total of self-reported of bullying incidents with a low self-report of witnessing incidents may have indicated covert bullying. Without data on how many witnesses there were to each incident the data had limited use but was nonetheless essential. Although further items on this line of enquiry would have yielded greater detail there was inadequate space to pursue it (a single page; 2 sides of A4 paper).

5.10.5 Duration in focus

The time frame in the current study included both pre and post intervention surveys in less than 6 months. For the data to be useful the survey responses had to be distinct and not overlap. To capture variability between survey runs participants were asked about the preceding month.

5.10.6 Exposure statements

The statements included in the survey to ascertain the participants exposure to workplace verbal bullying were:

- During the last month I witnessed another employee being verbally bullied at work.
- During the last month I have intervened when someone was being verbally bullied at work.
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- During the last month I have been verbally bullied at work.

5.10.6.1 Response options for exposure statements

Previous self-reported bullying surveys were consulted for their response options. Although response scales varied the investigation found them to be unsuitable for the current research. This was owing to their common time frame reference which was 6 months (BRAT: Hoel, Giga, & Faragher, 2006; NAQ-R: Einarsen, & Hoel, 2001; WHS: Björkqvist, & Österman, 1992). The duration of this research required the survey to collect data for the preceding month. The response options were selected to reflect frequency of the experience: Never; once, twice, weekly; and daily.

5.10.7 Willingness to intervene

As actual intervention cannot occur unless there is an incident it would be useful to know if employees were willing to intervene should an incident occur. This was particularly useful as there was no guarantee that a verbal bullying incident would occur during this research. It was thought that willingness to intervene would be a precursor to actual intervention. That is, a willing employee would be more likely than an unwilling employee to intervene. Leading from this it was necessary to confirm that willingness to intervene was positively related to actual intervention. The statement included in the survey to ascertain the participant was willing to intervene in workplace verbal bullying was:

- If I see someone being verbally bullied I will intervene.

5.11 Design of the new metric

5.11.1 Background

The theoretical underpinning of the strategy was the Triangle Model of Responsibility (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994). Briefly, to recap, the Triangle Model demonstrated that the strength of cohesion between event (incident), identity (individual role) and prescription (relevant guidelines) impacts an individual's perception of responsibility (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994).
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5.11.2 Operationalising the Triangle of Responsibility Model

Evidence in support of the Triangle Model illustrated that, “... attributions of responsibility are a direct function of the combined strengths of the 3 linkages...” (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1997, p. 632). Experiments based on the model were focused on judging others and were not in the context of workplace bullying and therefore were not suitable for this study.

Research has evidenced that clarity in the relationships of the Triangle Model strengthens perceived responsibility (Britt, 1995; 1999; Schlenker, 1997; Schlenker et al., 1994). Thus a measure of the clarity surrounding event, identity, and prescription would provide insight into an individual's perceived responsibility for intervention. This sense of responsibility should predict the extent to which they were willing to intervene. By extension, this should indicate their likelihood of actually intervening if they were a bystander to workplace verbal bullying.

A metric to capture data representative of the Triangle Model in the context of workplace verbal bullying was predicted to positively relate to willingness to intervene and actual intervention (self-reported). Through measuring the employees' perceived responsibility regarding workplace verbal bullying their willingness to intervene in such events would, hypothetically, be gauged. The prediction was that strengthening the individual's sense of responsibility would support the decision to intervene, thereby increasing the likelihood of bystander intervention.

The requirement was therefore a metric which quantified an individual's clarity surrounding verbal bullying events, their related role, and the relevant guidelines or rules.

5.11.3 Exploring existing instruments

Prior to the construction of a new research instrument an investigation of existing instruments was made. Previous scales were examined for items which were aligned with the requirements of the current study. The discovery of the gap in the literature relating to bystander intervention in workplace bullying was an indication that there was
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not likely to be an existing instrument for its measurement. Similarly the Triangle Model of Responsibility (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994) had not been used in the context of workplace bullying. The scope of the search was therefore wide in order to encompass scales which would provide a foundation for the new metric.

5.11.3.1 Bullying measures

After investigation of the literature some scales warranted closer scrutiny (Appendix D). These instruments could not be imported directly to the present study as they measured antecedents, consequences, frequency and bullying behaviours but not clarity in the factors that would increase the likelihood an individual would intervene. Additionally, it should be noted that the focus of the current study was verbal workplace bullying as opposed to bullying in general. Nonetheless, the current work is in the field of bullying and the existing scales were a valuable resource for understanding the nature of workplace bullying. The examination process is chronologically detailed here and new items generated from previous scales are recorded.

5.11.3.1.1 Leymann Inventory of Psychological Terrorization (LIPT) (Leymann, 1990)

The earliest development in measuring workplace bullying was the Leymann Inventory of Psychological Terrorization (Leymann, 1990). The LIPT enabled identification of those mobbed and not mobbed, categorising different bullying behaviours (González de Rivera, & Rodríguez-Abuin, 2003; Jiménez, Muñoz, Gamarra, & Herrer, 2007; Leymann; 1990). It was designed for distressed victims rather than a workforce in general and quantified 45 or 46 behaviours (depending on the version of the instrument used). The current research was targeted at verbal bullying in general and distinction between different types of verbal bullying was not sought. This was largely because of the one page restriction on the size of the survey but additionally specifying distinct behaviours may have the disadvantage of excluding some targets through omission of the specific behaviour they experienced (Carbo, & Hughes, 2010, p. 392).

Leymann's interviews and subsequent scale formed the foundations for the development
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of further scales including the Negative Acts Questionnaire (Einarsen, Hoel, & Notelaers, 2009; González de Rivera, & Rodríguez-Abuín, 2003; Jiménez, Muñoz, Gamarra, & Herrer, 2007). Whilst increasing understanding of the impact of bullying on targets the LIPT scale could not function to clarify verbal bullying in the context of bystander responsibility for intervention.

5.11.3.1.2 Björkqvist and Österman's (1992) Work Harassment Scale (WHS)
The WHS addressed specific negative behaviours experienced as bullying over the preceding 6 months (Björkqvist, & Österman, 1992). The six month time-frame of the WHS was not appropriate for the current research. As it would span the entire pre and post intervention period differences between surveys would not be identified.

The only item found to exclusively reference verbal bullying was, “Being shouted at loudly?” Over half of the instruments 24 items potentially refer to verbal bullying but equally they could refer to another form of bullying. There was ambiguity in some statements as to whether the responses captured would refer to verbal bullying, physical bullying (gesture), shunning (ignoring) or cyber-bullying (email, Twitter, Facebook or other social networking). To clarify, the item, “Lies about you told to others?” will be used as an example. It may incorporate an incident of verbal bullying but is also a frequent behaviour in cyber-bullying (Beran, & Li, 2005). Without further elucidation the item may confound the data as a respondent may have been exclusively cyber-bullied. Adapting the item (and the other ambiguous items) to specify verbal bullying was feasible but may have become long and cumbersome. As with LIPT the level of behaviour details was not necessary for the current research. Furthermore the perspective of both scales was that of the target and the focus of the new metric was mainly to capture the bystander perspective.

5.11.3.1.3 Work Atmosphere Scale (WAS ©) (Björkqvist, & Österman, 1992)
From the same battery of tests as the WHS, Björkqvist and Österman's (1992) Work Atmosphere Scale also focussed on detailed behaviours. These were not bulling behaviours but items concerned with the working environment. The individual's perception of the atmosphere they work in may clarify their connection with events that
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occur. Thus the idea of atmosphere in the context of verbal bullying was explored in the new metric with the item, “If anybody on a shift is being verbally bullied the whole shift is stressful”.

5.11.3.1.4 Bergen Bullying Index (Einarsen, Raknes, & Matthiesen, 1994)
The 5 item Bergen Bullying Index explored how problematic bullying is perceived to be at organisation and individual levels (Einarsen et al., 1994). Unlike the previous scales it does not detail specific behaviours, rather it addresses bullying in general to assess potential consequences. For the first time, this index included bystanders along with victims (Einarsen et al., 1994, p. 387). The individual's perception of the impact of bullying in the workplace is the focus. The index was used in conjunction with two exposure questions asking if the participant had been or seen bullying in their workplace in the prior six months (Einarsen et al., 1994, p. 387). Consequences of workplace bullying were not the focus of the new metric and a single item on environmental impact, “If anybody on a shift is being verbally bullied the whole shift is stressful”, had already been included. Therefore no further items were added based on this index.

5.11.3.1.5 Negative Acts Questionnaire and revisions
The most widely used bullying metric has been the Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ), its revisions and translations (Einarsen, & Hoel, 2001; Einarsen, & Raknes, 1997; Einarsen, Raknes, Matthieson, & Hellesøy, 1990; 1994). The NAQ was unique in that it had undergone scrutiny including peer-review and evidence of its development and psychometric properties were provided (Einarsen, Hoel, & Notelaers, 2009).

After its introduction in Norwegian the NAQ (Einarsen, Raknes, Matthieson, & Hellesøy, 1994) was revised leading to the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised (NAQ-R) (Einarsen, & Hoel, 2001). The latter 22-item scale had the advantage of not drawing attention to the term bullying as it asks about specific acts. Targets may have experienced bullying behaviours but not labelled them as such. The NAQ-R does not require the target to have labelled the behaviour as bullying. The items in the NAQ-R cover different and possibly combined modes of bullying behaviours some of which may include verbal bullying. The NAQ-R precedes its statements with, “During the last
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6 months, how often have you been subjected to the following negative acts in the workplace?” (Einarsen, & Hoel, 2001). Eight of the items relate to written, gesture or action behaviours rather than verbally abusive behaviours. A further twelve items may refer to verbal bullying but could also be other forms of bullying and these were, “Being shouted at or being the target of spontaneous anger (or rage)” and “Being the subject of excessive teasing and sarcasm” (Einarsen, & Hoel, 2001). As with the earlier bullying behaviour scales the scope was more than required for the current study.

It could be argued that use of detailed items on bullying behaviour would have led to higher likelihood of accurate reporting with the advantage of not priming the participant with the words, ‘verbal bullying’. This should be reviewed for future studies if a longer survey is planned. For the current study careful consideration of the requirement for the survey to be concise ruled out the possibility of further items. Consequently items from the NAQ-R were not incorporated into the current metric.

5.11.3.1.6 Bullying Risk Assessment Tool (BRAT: Hoel, Giga, & Faragher, 2006)

A more recently designed bullying scale was the Bullying Risk Assessment Tool (BRAT: Hoel, Giga, & Faragher, 2006, p. 75). With attention paid to literature on risk and stress in the workplace the developers of the tool noted that measures should be context specific if they are to be applicable in a particular environment (Giga, Cooper, & Faragher, 2003; Hoel, Giga, & Faragher, 2006, p. 15). The 29 item scale consisted of 5 factors and focus groups were held to assist in development of the tool (Hoel, & Giga, 2006, p. 18). In one of these factors (role conflict) ambiguity about job description is rated. This was potentially relevant as clarity in the individual's role is directly related to the current research. However, the BRAT were designed to assess risk factors rather than bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying and therefore the context was not appropriate. Although items from the BRAT could not be adapted for the new metric the importance of ambiguity or clarity as related to intervention in workplace verbal bullying will be returned to later in this thesis (section 5.11.3.2, p. 164).

5.11.3.1.7 Setting the scope

It was found that the previous scales mainly detailed the behaviour experienced (LIPT;
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WHS; NAQ-R); but scales to address some surrounding issues such as atmosphere, consequences and risk assessment did exist (WAS; BBI; BRAT). The detail of these scales would return too much information on bullying behaviours experienced whilst not adequately clarifying perceptions of verbal bullying. Together the scales provided guidance on the nature of bullying.

Response options varied and a period of 6 months was found to be a frequently used duration of focus. This aspect of the metric were left until the items had been constructed.

It was noted that scales were specifically aligned to the nature of the enquiry and in the absence of a single suitable instruments researchers are selective. Combining items and adapting items from various scales is not uncommon. When this method fails to satisfy the requirements of the research new scales are developed.

Surveys should be restricted to collecting data for the study and not elicit additional unnecessary information (Lenth, 2001). The research survey being designed required a count of self-reported, observations and interventions in incidents of verbal bullying without a requirement to quantify the different underlying behaviours individually. Therefore it would not have been ethical to request the level of detail in the existing scales from the respondents of the current study (Lenth, 2001). Furthermore, the principles of ethical research include that researchers are respectful of the time that participants donate to research by using the most effective and efficient instrument possible (Lenth, 2001). Additionally it was considered unlikely that an exhaustive list of verbal bullying behaviours could be created. If a detailed list was included there would have been a risk that an incident would be discounted as it was not specified in the survey.

Scrutiny of the bullying literature confirmed that there was not a scale which aligned with the requirements of the current study. Few items from the previous scales were practically adaptable for inclusion in the new metric. The scope of the search was therefore extended to examine scales which addressed clarity. Conversely, scales measuring ambiguity were found.
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5.11.3.2 Ambiguity measures

Having established that the existing bullying measures addressed different facets of the phenomenon to the current study, checks were made to discover if other measures were suitable. Clarity surrounding verbal bullying at work was predicted to increase an individual's sense of responsibility for intervention. The issue of clarity has been raised in the bullying literature, although it is often present from the opposite perspective. For example, ambiguity concerning the definition of workplace bullying has been discussed (Agervold, 2007). Ambiguity (rather than clarity) measures were found in many areas of research. Thus, similarities to the requirements of the new metric were investigated in studies addressing ambiguity.

5.11.3.2.1 Relevant definition of ambiguity

Frisch and Baron (1988) explained the rationality of ambiguity in probability judgements and decision making. The current study addressed the ambiguity surrounding verbal bullying. Their definition of ambiguity is salient to the present study, “...the subjective experience of missing information relevant to a prediction” (Frisch and Baron, 1988, p. 152). Frisch and Baron (1988) made use of Budner's (1962) instrument and argued that the salience of the ambiguous information impacts decision making. In the current study ambiguity was predicted to impact a bystander’s decision to intervene.

5.11.3.2.2 Tolerance of Ambiguity Scale (Budner, 1962)

Budner (1962) developed an instrument to measure the way in which individuals tolerate ambiguity. He believed that ambiguous situations are perceived as threatening when an individual is intolerant of ambiguity. Individuals who are tolerant of ambiguity do not have a negative perception of ambiguous situations and may have greater decision making skills (Endres, Chowdhury, & Milner, 2009). However, the variable measured by Budner's (1962) Tolerance of Ambiguity Scale is tolerance or intolerance of ambiguity and it does not measure the degree of ambiguity experienced. This rendered it unsuitable for the current study.
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5.11.3.2.3 Ambiguity of knowledge (Simonin, 1999)
With a questionnaire developed by Simonin (1999) ambiguity of knowledge was identified as a mediator of other related factors (such as tacitness, organisational distance and prior experience) in knowledge transfer outcomes. The negative impact of ambiguity on knowledge is important in the current research. However the context (strategic alliance) and company level targeted by Simonin's (1999) questionnaire are too remote for it to be adapted for inclusion here.

5.11.3.2.4 Work-role ambiguity
Measuring ambiguity in the workplace has appeared in the literature in the form of work-role ambiguity (Kelloway, & Barling, 1990; Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970; Schuler, Aldag, & Brief, 1977). Role ambiguity is one of the elements surrounding verbal bullying but the meaning here is somewhat different to that found in the literature. Previous scales interpreted role-ambiguity in the context of the contracted work duties that an employee is expected to perform in exchange for remuneration. The current study focused on role ambiguity in the bystanders' role as a respectful and responsible colleague. This role may not be prescribed by any contract (although there may be rules and expectations) but by conscience, personal values and community accountability.

Whilst Rizzo, House and Lirtzman's (1970) Role Ambiguity and Conflict Scale could be adapted to the context of the present studies requirement, the 14 items encompass only one of the present studies requirements. Additionally there have been concerns over the scales construct validity (Kelloway, & Barling, 1990; McGee, Ferguson, & Seers, 1989). Of the 14 items in the scale, 8 relate to role conflict and 6 to role ambiguity. From the latter there were 4 which are affiliated to the current requirement (table 5.7 below).
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Table 5.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I feel certain about how much authority I have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clear, planned goals and objectives for my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I know exactly what is expected of me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Explanation is clear of what has to be done.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the scale was based on role in the context of paid for employment the items (table 5.7 above) could be used in the context of community responsibility to support peers. The current study incorporated the following items:

- Items 4, 20 and 26 contributed to the statement, “I know how to deal with verbal abuse at work”.
- Items 2 and 20 contributed to the statement, “It is my responsibility to do something about verbal abuse at work”.

5.11.3.3 Statements based on existing scales

Through a review of the literature 3 items were generated for the new metric. These were:

- If anybody on a shift is being verbally bullied the whole shift is stressful.
- I know how to deal with verbal abuse at work.
- It is my responsibility to do something about verbal abuse at work.

5.11.4 Generating new statements

The space available on the survey page indicated that approximately 20 statements could be included in the metric (dependent on the length of the statements). Only 3 adapted statements had been generated from existing scales. There was adequate space for approximately 17 more statements to capture data on the strength of relationships based on The Triangle Model of Responsibility (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994). The purpose of each statement was to measure the links of the model
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on a scale representing clarity to ambiguity. The models of Schlenker and colleagues were reviewed as a basis for these statements.

5.11.4.1 The Accountability Pyramid (Schlenker, 1997)

Schlenker's (1997) Accountability Pyramid extended the Triangle Model of Responsibility (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994) to include the audience. Schlenker's (1997) extended model acknowledged that individuals are influenced by both real and perceived audiences. Schlenker (1997) posited that actions are influenced by accountability to others and also to our own conscience. Thus the extended Pyramid model reflected accountability.

5.11.4.1.1 Audience

The Pyramid of Accountability (Schlenker, 1997) adds audience to the three elements of the Triangle model of Responsibility (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994). In the current study measurement of the links between the initial 3 elements (identity, prescription & event) were predicted to gauge the bystanders' responsibility for intervention in workplace verbal bullying. The addition of a 4th element would provide data on the audience; the potential inhibitor of intervention.

5.11.4.1.2 Audience in the Bystander Effect (Latané, & Darley, 1970)

The description of actions being influenced by others who are present or who will pass judgement on the individual is paralleled with the concept of audience evidenced as an inhibitor of bystander intervention in the Bystander Effect (Latané, & Darley, 1970). Latané and Darley's (1970) work revealed that the presence of an audience (real or perceived) led to 3 potential inhibiting effects (diffusion of responsibility, audience inhibition and social influence); all of which resulted in lower bystander intervention than found with a lone individual.

In the context of this study the individual's perception of the audience's view of workplace verbal bullying would enable basic testing of the relationship between an individual's actions and the audience. That is, if the views differed and whether or not
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that impacted perceived responsibility.

5.11.4.2 Response continuum

It was useful to consider the response continuum prior to setting the statements. This assisted in wording the statements. Strength for each element of the model (identity, prescription, event, audience) would reflect the perception of responsibility for bystander intervention. This would equate to clarity of understanding for items concerning workplace verbal bullying. Ambiguity, therefore, would indicate weakness and a lower perception of responsibility. This had emerged from the three theories: Latané and Darley's (1970) Bystander Effect; Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, and Doherty's (1994) Triangle of Responsibility and Schlenker's (1997) Accountability Pyramid. It was vital for the reliability of the scale that all the theories were incorporated into the items in the metric. As there were 4 elements and space for 20 items the goal was to have 5 items for each. Potential ambiguities had to be identified for each theory with statements phrased accordingly. These are presented in table 5.8 and n below.

Table 5.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model element</th>
<th>Nature of ambiguity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prescription (P)</td>
<td>Rule ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event (E)</td>
<td>Event ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity (I)</td>
<td>Role ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>see Latané, &amp; Darley (1970) Bystander Effect below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there is no policy it may be very difficult to know how to deal with a workplace situation, owing to rule ambiguity (Duffy, 2009; Fox, & Stallworth, 2009). Bullying and harassment policies have been critical in providing frameworks for reducing bullying behaviours in organisations. Policies provide a structure on which to build bullying and harassment prescriptions for all employees; they are a point of reference. Clarity does not result from the mere existence of a policy however (Cowan, 2011; Harrington,
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Rayner, & Warren, 2012). It is necessary to have clear dissemination of the information; and this is a two way process (Farmer, 2011). Employees at all levels need to be engaged and know what is and is not a bullying event (Pate, & Beaumont, 2010). Furthermore the organisation should be clear about the role individual's play (table 5.8 above).

Table 5.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bystander Effect</th>
<th>Nature of ambiguity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social influence (SI)</td>
<td>Social norm ambiguity/ Situation ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience inhibition (AI)</td>
<td>Role ambiguity/ Protocol ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffusion of responsibility (DR)</td>
<td>Role ambiguity/ Action ambiguity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The social influence of other employees results not only from reality but from perceptions. Open dialogue, clear induction programmes and continuing development will reduce ambiguity (Carden, & Boyd, 2011). Not being clear of one's role in a situation, not knowing the rules or what action is appropriate may hinder any decision to intervene (Clark, & Word, 1972; Harada, 1985; Mason, & Allen, 1976; Solomon, Solomon, & Majorca, 1982; Solomon, Solomon, & Stone, 1978) (table 5.9 above). Ambiguity aids the Bystander Effect (Darley, & Latané, 1968).

5.11.4.3 Statement criteria

In addition to representing elements of the underlying model the statements were required to adhere to the excepted criteria for research surveys. Statement construction was guided by well-established rules (Babbie, 1990; Janes, 1999; Siniscalco, & Auriat, 2005). These include both contextual and scale-centred considerations. Contextually clarity is established by eliminating colloquialisms, acronyms, jargon and ambiguity when constructing the statements (Punch, 2003). Precision can be improved by ensuring there is only one point in each statement (no double-barrelled items) and eliminate double negatives (Janes, 1999; Likert, 1974, p. 234). Leading statements must also be avoided (Janes, 1999). The survey had to be accessible to people with varying reading levels. Although plain English is a desirable attribute of any public document (Petelin, 2010) it is particularly important to the reliability of data collection for research
5.11.4.4 Positive and negative wording
Acquiescence bias and control method effects may be reduced by the use of positive and negative worded statements (Conway, & Lance, 2010). Positive and negative wording was considered after the statements had been selected, as balance could be achieved by reversing the wording of some items. Subsequently it was decided that it was more important to maximise comprehension rather than to reverse wording. The reason for this was that employees' reading levels were unknown and were potentially wide ranging. As an alternative, statements were worded to include positive and negative values (a negative example was, 'Some people who are verbally bullied deserve it') rather than including any negative wording.

5.11.4.5 Manipulable variable
The statements represented a manipulable (independent) variable. The intention was to develop a training programme which would strengthen bystanders' perception of responsibility for intervention. Consequently the statements were representative of areas that had the potentially be changed. To recap, it was a research aim to develop a programme to increase bystanders' willingness to intervene in workplace verbal bullying. Strength of responsibility (lack of ambiguity) would be measured to indicate willingness to intervene. Therefore it had to be possible to potentially improve employees' scores on the metric.

5.11.5 New metric statements
A list of statements was drafted and considered for inclusion in the metric. Each statement was associated with at least one theoretical element. A panel of 3 volunteer assistants assessed the statements for adherence to construction rules and were asked to highlight any statements they found ambiguous. Subsequently, a short list of statements was discussed with the supervisory team (Appendix E). This resulted in 20 items, categorised by the theoretical elements (tables 5.10 – 5.13 below).
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Table 5.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements for identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identity statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. It's management's job, not mine, to intervene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is my responsibility to do something about verbal bullying at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If I see someone being verbally bullied at work I will intervene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Some people who are verbally bullied deserve it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If I see verbal bullying outside of work I intervene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I accept that verbal bullying is part of being at work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements for prescription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prescription statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I know what the policy on bullying and harassment is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I know how to deal with verbal bullying at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is okay to intervene if someone is being verbally bullied at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It's clear I'm expected to do something about verbal bullying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I know what to say to intervene effectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements for event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I know verbal bullying when I see it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If I witness an incident at work I can be sure it is harmless banter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Most people are over-sensitive about verbal bullying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Friendly banter gets mistaken for verbal bullying at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Verbal bullying has been stamped out in this organisation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements for audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audience statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I would intervene if I knew my co-workers agreed with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would intervene if I knew my co-workers would support me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If anybody on a shift is being verbally bullied the whole shift is stressful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Most people I work with accept that verbal bullying is part of being at work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5.11.6 Metric response scale

The first consideration in developing the response scale for the new metric was that it should produce the necessary data to answer the hypotheses. The minimum requirement was for each statement to have three choices; ambiguous, undecided or clear.

The physical size of the survey was limited to a single page to enable completion in 10 minutes or less (CiC stipulated). This is atypical in bullying or bystander related measures owing to the complex and abstract phenomena being operationalised. The restriction was necessary in this study because the survey would take place during working hours on an industrious shop-floor. Furthermore, based on the information from the gatekeeper and the researcher's observations during site visits, it was unlikely the participants would engage in a longer survey.

Lastly, the method of data input was considered. The layout was prescribed by the need to fit instructions, demographic data, bullying experience data, 20 statements into a specific format constricted response options. The decision to use an Optimal Mark Reader (section 5.9.3, p. 151) to digitise the paper surveys necessitated space being allocated for response bubbles. The potential style for response options had to be considered in the context of an Optical Mark Reader Response form.

5.11.6.1 Visual analogue scale (VAS)

A visual analogue scale (VAS) in which the two ends of a 10 centimetre horizontal line are defined is useful when an abstract phenomenon is being measured as it provides a high degree of sensitivity (Cummins, & Gullone, 2000). The respondent marks the line to represent their perception and this is measured in millimetres to determine the score (Gould, Kelly, Goldstone, & Gammon, 2001, p. 706). This free-form format cannot be accommodated by an OMR response sheet (figure 5.3 below).

![Figure 5.3 A 10-point free-form scale](image)
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5.11.6.2 Free-form responses

Fill-in the blank, write a percentage, ranking statements and other free-form response are not suited to OMR coding. If the scale is only partially free-form in that there are a selection of fixed points to choose from it could be OMR coded (figure 5.2 above). A 10-point example was formatted by the researcher and although the bubbles looked systematic it was rejected as being too crowded for the current field context (figure 5.4 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How clear are you on:</th>
<th>unclear</th>
<th>clear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I can do about verbal bullying.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The policy and rules regarding verbal bullying.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What verbal bullying is.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful things I could say to stop verbal bullying if I saw it happening.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal bullying at work being unacceptable.</td>
<td>○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.4 Example of 10-point OMR formatting

5.11.6.3 Likert scales

Likert scales can be used to assess the strength of agreement with a statement with unidimensional ordered responses (Likert, 1974, p. 235). True Likert scales have 5 or 7 points and require equal intervals between bipolar anchors (Likert, 1974, p. 235). If the scale does not run from one extreme to the other through a neutral point (for example if it represents from weak to strong agreement) it is a Guttman scale (Burt, 1953). If the scale does not have a mid-point (4, 6, and 8 for example) it should be referred to as a Likert-type scale (Westermann, 1983). Likert-type response scales have been used in the bullying field and have expressed an adequate range of responses (Einarsen, Hoel, & Notelaers, 2009; Escartin, Rodríguez-Carballeira, Gómez-Benito, & Zapf, 2010; Leymann, 1997). A Likert response scale would enable scrutiny of individual items and summated items. The results could easily be presented in bar chart form, increasing accessibility for the organisation. A 7-point scale was rejected as excessive response bubbles on the page may appear confusing, especially when time for completion is limited. Thus a scale of 5-points was selected to represent a range from strongly agree to strongly disagree.
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5.12 Validating the metric

Prior to using a new metric in the field it is vital to test its validity and establish it is fit for its designed purpose (Outtz, 1998, p. 41). The battery of assessments used to establish efficacy and are explained in this section.

5.12.1 Face validity

Assessing a survey by, “asking people to rate the validity of a test as it appears to them” is referred to as face validity (Nevo, 1985, p. 288). Face validity is not necessarily considered to be an advantageous test as its correlation with real validity is variable (Kline, 1999, p. 18). It has been noted that a scale which appears to measures that which it claims to measure may motivate participants (Kline, 1999, p. 18). This is the case when the participants perceive accuracy as beneficial, for example, when they want to demonstrate a high level of knowledge to achieve promotion. Contrary to this face validity may induce refusal when participants consider the task time wasting or derisory (Kline, 1999, p. 18). The target sample for the new survey developed here were unlikely to be motivated by the face value of each item. Having visited locations identified for the field study the researcher concluded it was likely some employees would perceive the survey to be a waste of their time. Simplicity, clarity and conciseness were considered to be the best means to encourage the participants to complete their surveys. This is in line with Kline's (1999, p. 19) conclusions that in non-face validity testing care should be taken to construct tests that participants will find realistic.

It is not only participants that should be considered as test raters; they are one of three categories the others being those who make use of results and the wider audience (Nevo, 1985, p. 288). Albeit rejecting the relevance of face validity from the participants point of view it was not set aside in its entirety. During survey construction a small group of academics discussed and modified wording of the items to satisfy face validity incorporating inter-rater agreement, in the knowledge of the underlying aims of the measurement. A similar group of non-academics focussed exclusively on other non-academic construction criterion including item comprehension and lack of ambiguity.
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5.12.2 Concurrent validity testing
The new metric was developed in the absence of an existing measure for bystander intervention in workplace bullying. Consequently concurrent validity testing was not an option as there were no suitable tests of the same variable with which to correlate the new measure (Kline, 1999, p. 19).

5.12.3 Pilot studies
Validation of a new metric in advance of a major study can be made by running a pilot study on a smaller sample (van Teijlingen, & Hundley, 2002). A pilot survey was conducted to validate the metric prior to its use in the planned field study. Cronbach's Alpha was used as a measure of internal consistency.

5.13 Ethical approval for the study
Ethical approval was sought and granted, prior to any contact with participants. The ethical application and approval can be found in Appendices F and G.

5.14 Pilot studies for this research
Permission was obtained to administer the survey in Portsmouth Business School classes. Participants were all students on Foundation degree or Master's degree courses who were also in work. No inducements were offered to students. The surveys were distributed in 6 classes with an instruction sheet provided for consistency in administration. This included informed consent and instructions to be read aloud to the participants prior to participation (Appendix H).

All participants ($N = 80$) were able to complete the survey in under 10 minutes. Therefore the duration of the survey was fit for purpose in the field study. The survey was accompanied by an optional feedback form requesting comments from the participants. Three participants commented negatively on the use of neutral as a response option, with the suggestion of don't know as a replacement. Two participants noted that the age categories needed adjustment to include 25 year olds. Some participants and the administrators noted that clearer instruction were required for
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correcting mistakes.

5.14.1 Data entry
Data was entered manually into IBM SPSS Statistics Release Version 20 (2011) and also scanned into the Optical Mark Reader (OMR). The two data-sets were compared for accuracy. No differences were found and therefore OMR was considered to be a suitable method for entering data for the field study. A limitation of this OMR test was the low number of surveys relative to the number expected in the field study (from tens to over a thousand).

5.14.2 Data treatment
Missing values for statements with 5-point Likert type response options were marked as neutral on the grounds that the respondent chose to neither agree nor disagree. Missing values in exposure counts were left blank. Items which were reverse scored are listed below with explanations:

- Some people who are verbally bullied deserve it.
  Agreeing with this statement indicates a weak understanding of the detrimental impact of bullying.

- I accept that verbal bullying is part of being at work.
  Agreeing with this statement indicates the employee does not reject workplace verbal bullying behaviours.

- It's management’s job, not mine, to intervene.
  Agreeing with this statement indicates the employee does not share responsibility for intervention.

- Most people are over-sensitive about verbal bullying.
  Agreeing with this statement minimises the right to not feel verbally bullied at work.
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- Friendly banter gets mistaken for verbal bullying at work.
  Agreeing with this statement also minimises the right to not feel verbally bullied at work.

5.14.3 Results and discussion of the initial pilot study

5.14.3.1 Demographic data and exposure counts

A convenience sample of part-time Portsmouth Business School students \((N = 80)\) who were in employment volunteered to take part in the initial pilot survey, 57.5\% were female \((F = 46, M = 34)\). The participants were asked to choose a category for their age, tenure and hours of work (table 5.14 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of the initial pilot survey sample</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 1 year</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 1 year</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 5 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 10 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hours</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or less</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 – 30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>93.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scale was constructed to cover the four elements of Schlenker's (1997) Accountability Pyramid. The three elements forming the original Triangle of Responsibility: Identity, prescription and event (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994) and the fourth element, audience, from the Pyramid model (Schlenker, 1997). Exposure to verbal bullying was measured by the respondents' self-report of being verbally bullied (20\%), intervening (24\%) and witnessing (33\%) during the last month (table 5.15 below).
5.14.3.2 Reliability of the scale
Cronbach's alpha may be used to measure the reliability of a scale, with measures between .7 and .8 being considered acceptable. The acceptable value depends on the nature of the scale, with .8 or higher expected for cognitive tests (for example, intelligence) and .7 or higher for ability. The diversity of psychological constructs indicates that below .7 is not an unrealistic expectation (Kline, 1999). Therefore a value of .7 was considered to be an acceptable goal. The 4 theoretical sub-scales were analysed prior to establishing which statements should be included in the overall scale.

5.14.3.2.1 Identity sub-scale
The 6 identity sub-scale statements (table 5.10) were checked for internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = .517). However, scrutiny led to the removal of the statement, 'If I see someone being verbally bullied I will intervene'. Although it related to identity it was realised that this item should have been categorised as a dependent variable rather than an independent variable.
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Analysis suggested that alpha would be improved by the removal of, 'It’s management’s job, not mine, to intervene'. Removal of this item would be acceptable as the study was not trying to identify where the respondents' think responsibility lies but whether or not they perceive they have responsibility. The 4 remaining statements had an unacceptably low alpha ($\alpha = .431$). The 4 statements were:

- It is my responsibility to do something about verbal bullying at work.
- Some people who are verbally bullied deserve it.
- If I see verbal bullying outside of work I intervene.
- I accept that verbal bullying is part of being at work.

Based on greater internal consistency in the sub-scale being indicated the nearer Cronbach’s alpha coefficient is to 1.0; this sub-scale had poor internal consistency (Gliem, & Gliem, 2003, p. 87).

5.14.3.2.2 Prescription sub-scale

The 5 prescription sub-scale statements (table 5.11) were checked for internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = .767). The research intention was to have an equal number of statements for each sub-scale and therefore an assessment was made to ascertain if this sub-scale could be reduced to 4 statements. Removal of a statement for this purpose was impractical because the statement that was statistically suggested was not theoretically practical (table 5.16 below).

Table 5.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Alpha if deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is okay to intervene if someone is being verbally bullied at work.</td>
<td>.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what the policy on bullying and harassment is.</td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's clear I'm expected to do something about verbal bullying at work.</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to deal with verbal bullying at work.</td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what to say to intervene effectively.</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is illustrated in the table (5.16 above) the statistics suggested the removal of, 'It is okay to intervene if someone is being verbally bullied at work', as this was fundamental
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to the research it was not removed. Therefore all 5 statements were retained ($\alpha = .767$) and exceeded the goal of a Cronbach's alpha coefficient .7 or above.

5.14.3.2.3 Event sub-scale

The 5 event sub-scale statements (table 5.12) were checked for internal consistency ($\alpha = .307$). Analysis suggested removal of, 'Friendly banter gets mistaken for verbal bullying at work'. This resulted in 4 statements with an improved alpha ($\alpha= .445$). Consequently the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was still below the goal of .7 and indicated the sub-scale had poor internal consistency.

5.14.3.2.4 Audience sub-scale

The 4 audience sub-scale statements (table 5.13) were checked for internal consistency and were found to be below the research goal of .7 ($\alpha =.548$). There were major issues with this sub-scale. Two of the statements were likely to have been interpreted as meaning the same thing by the participants. This was illustrated by mean and variation if deleted (first two statements in the table 5.17 below). Feedback from the ethics committee and some participants indicated they perceived a repeated statement.

Table 5.17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean if deleted</th>
<th>Variance if deleted</th>
<th>$\alpha$ if deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would intervene if I knew my co-workers agreed with me.</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>3.226</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would intervene if I knew my co-workers would support me.</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>3.240</td>
<td>.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If anybody on a shift is being verbally bullied the whole shift is stressful. Most people I work with accept that verbal bullying is part of being at work.</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>5.807</td>
<td>.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>6.356</td>
<td>.693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cronbach's Alpha can be artificially high if the same statement appears more than once with slightly different wording. Although repetition creates a survey with a high Alpha, it would also have a high level of redundancy. If either of these two items were removed
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the Alpha would be extremely low, suggesting that they are supporting this sub-scale. This led the researcher to review the theory (Schlenker's Accountability Pyramid, 1997) and it was realised that the audience element should be treated as a dependent variable and not an independent variable. This was because the strategy was to increase bystander responsibility for intervention and not to decrease the influence of the audience; although the outcome may be comparable. Ambiguities in the 3 links (identity; prescription; event) were predicted to indicate weakness in the Triangle of Responsibility (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994). Therefore, audience was removed as a sub-scale but included as a dependent measure.

5.14.3.3 Assessment of the whole pilot metric

The metric piloted was not considered to be uni-dimensional but to consist of sub-scales based on the elements of the underlying theoretical model. The removal of the statements relating to audience resulted in a scale formed from the 3 remaining sub-scales: Identity (4 statements), prescription (5 statements) and event (4 statements). This scale had an acceptable alpha (\(\alpha = .747\)) but as it was not a uni-dimensional and the sub-scales were not all over .7 the scale was not considered valid.

5.14.3.4 Limitations of the pilot study

The pilot sample had more females (57%) than males which was not representative of the planned male-skewed field population. The low numbers that had experienced bullying in the last month were unlikely to mirror the experiences of the planned field population. CiC had reported a high level of verbal bullying. To reiterate, although CiC's previous data on bullying had not been provided for this study it had been seen by the Director of Studies and indicated 70% of employees had experienced verbal bullying. Furthermore, the pilot sample participants were all taking higher education classes which may have given them a different perspective on the phenomenon to the planned field population. CiC's employees were largely manual workers, operating machinery and undertaking physical tasks in a 24/7 operations environment. The participants in the pilot sample were more likely to have office based jobs.
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5.14.3.5 Conclusion
Although the overall scale had an acceptable Cronbach's alpha coefficient only the prescription element was acceptable at sub-scale level. The audience element had been inaccurately conceived and scrutiny brought to light many areas for improvement. Exploration of theoretical sub-scales failed to find internal consistency and therefore the scale was revised. Rather than make multiple adjustments to the scale a complete reconstruction was undertaken, returning to the literature and including useful lessons from the initial pilot survey.

5.15 Chapter summary
In this chapter the research paradigm has been described and rationalised. The process of designing a theoretically-based bystander strategy for intervention in workplace verbal bullying has been detailed. This included the initial development of the new Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric and the first pilot study. The outcome of the pilot study indicated fundamental flaws in the survey items and the operationalisation of the Triangle Model. In particular the audience element had been inappropriately applied. The developed scale was not valid and consequently was inadequate for the field study. The pilot study results necessitated a complete reconstruction of the survey and this can be found in Chapter 6.
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6. Survey reconstruction

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter the survey reconstruction and second pilot study are detailed. The development of the experimental programmes, including the field training and CiC’s in-house programme are discussed. The chapter ends with details of the launch of the field study.

The decision was taken to reconstruct the survey as the results of the first pilot did not validate the survey. The sub-scale statements in the metric for the first pilot had not achieve a higher enough Cronbach's Alpha to be useful. The results illustrated that the variables had not been accurately operationalised and thus the researcher considered it more prudent to begin again with a complete survey restructure. Had any items shown potential they could have been retained but there was no indication that this was the case. The demographics, with the exception of minor amendments were suitable to be carried forward. The Optical Code Reader (OCR) layout had been well received and easily completed by the participants, with no negative feedback, thus this was also retained.

6.2 Aligning the verbal bullying definition

The reconstruction decision provided the opportunity to improve all aspects of the survey. Thus, the definition provided as guidance was also reconsidered. As the study did not extend to an inductive investigation of the negative behaviours defined as bullying the first survey's definition had been based on the literature and discussed in a number of supervisory meetings. In reviewing the definition a methodical alignment with the bullying literature and information provided by CiC was carried out. The context of verbal bullying led to the exclusion of some common behaviours found in definitions, for example, shunning (Björkqvist, & Osterman, 1992).
Chapter 6

The following definition was provided on the revised survey for guidance:

“Verbal bullying is repeated, negative verbal behaviour where the target feels they can't defend themselves. This includes inappropriate behaviour such as insulting comments, excessive teasing, threats, humiliating interaction, jokes, offensive remarks about someone's private life and persistent criticism.”

Alignment with the bullying literature particularly scrutinised the Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ: Einarsen, & Raknes, 1997; Einarsen, Raknes, Matthieson, & Hellesøy, 1994: In Norwegian; NAQ-R: Einarsen, & Hoel, 2001) and CIC’s bullying and harassment policy (CiC, 2004). The source for each part of the definition is contained in table 6.1 below.

Table 6.1
Aligning the definition with the literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guide definition</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>repeated</td>
<td>definitions Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative [verbal] behaviour</td>
<td>Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can't defend themselves</td>
<td>Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inappropriate</td>
<td>Appendix B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insulting comments</td>
<td>NAQ-R: Einarsen &amp; Hoel, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excessive teasing</td>
<td>NAQ-R: Einarsen &amp; Hoel, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threats</td>
<td>NAQ-R: Einarsen &amp; Hoel, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humiliating interaction</td>
<td>NAQ: Einarsen &amp; Raknes, 1997; Einarsen, Raknes, Matthieson, &amp; Hellesøy, 1994: In Norwegian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jokes</td>
<td>NAQ-R: Einarsen &amp; Hoel, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offensive remarks about someone's private life</td>
<td>NAQ-R: Einarsen &amp; Hoel, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persistent criticism</td>
<td>NAQ-R: Einarsen &amp; Hoel, 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As field based research it was crucial that the survey and any programme arising from the current research complied with CiC's bullying and harassment policy. Consequently, their policy was scrutinised and its terms were incorporated into the survey definition (CiC, 2004). This is illustrated in table 6.2 below by underlining extracts from CiC's guidelines.
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### Table 6.2

Aligning the definition with CiC’s policy (CiC, 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guide definition</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>insulting comments</td>
<td>“What is Bullying and Harassment? INAPPROPRIATE and UNWANTED behaviour that could reasonably be perceived by the recipient or any other person, as affecting their dignity”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threats</td>
<td>“…accompanied by threats to the individual’s job or career”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humiliating interaction</td>
<td>“Workplace bullying is intimidation on a regular and persistent basis or as a one off, which undermines the competence, effectiveness, confidence and integrity of the person on the receiving end. The bully misuses their power, position or knowledge to criticise, humiliate and destroy a subordinate, a colleague or even their own boss”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jokes</td>
<td>“Comments, jokes, banter, insults, and language related to age, creed, disability, nationality, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation or any other personal characteristic which are offensive to an individual or group of individuals”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offensive remarks about someone's private life</td>
<td>“Questions, jokes or banter about aspects of an individual’s private life…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>persistent criticism</td>
<td>“Workplace bullying is intimidation on a regular and persistent basis or as a one off, which undermines the competence, effectiveness, confidence and integrity of the person on the receiving end. The bully misuses their power, position or knowledge to criticise, humiliate and destroy a subordinate, a colleague or even their own boss”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© CiC 2004 - Bullying and Harassment Procedure (Investigators Guide)
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6.3 The new metric

It was established that the independent variable (the new metric) consisted of 3 sub-scales based on Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, and Doherty's (1994) Triangle Model of Responsibility. The previous statement construction was based on clarity of the individual elements; identity, prescription, and event. Returning to the literature it was decided that the statements should be based on the links between the elements because strength in the links represents responsibility (sections 4.24.3.8 – 4.24.3.10, p. 130). Descriptions and meanings of the links were taken from the original paper and subsequent studies that discussed and tested the model (Britt, 1995; Burke, & Rau, 2001; Burke, & Saks, 2009; Christopher, & Schlenker, 2005; Schlenker, 1997; Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994; Schlenker, Pontari, & Christopher, 2001). The original items could not be used directly because of the differences in purpose and context (Schlenker, et al., 1994, p. 646). The original laboratory study explored general judgements of responsibility using vignettes with the purpose of validating the model.

6.3.1 The metric in context

To review the goal; the fundamental problem addressed by this thesis is bystander non-intervention. Prior to intervention bystanders make decisions (Latané, & Darley, 1970; section 4.10, p. 93). Consequently, the new metric must measure items which influence this decision making process.

The theoretical hypothesis of this study was that the Triangle Model could be utilised as the framework for a metric to measure bystander responsibility for intervention. The experimental hypothesis was that strengthening the model would increase bystander responsibility for intervention. To recap, the survey statements must reflect something that has the potential to be manipulated to improve an individual's strength of responsibility. As a field study, a statement which indicates strength in a link but could not be practically manipulated in the workplace would not be suitable for this metric. This is because there would be no potential to effect change. An example statement would be, 'It is my job to reduce verbal bullying at work', because it is beyond the boundaries of this research to change job descriptions. Accordingly new statements were generated to align with the links of the Triangle Model and be realistically
6.3.2 Defining the sub-scales
Each sub-scale of statements would align with one link and therefore must include the two elements the link connects. Each individual statement must be able to represent a strong and a weak link in the context of workplace verbal bullying. Strength can be expressed by agreeing with the statement and weakness by disagreeing, that is, agreement with the statement indicated stronger bystander responsibility for intervention. The statements must be realistic in terms of being reasonable expectations in the workplace. To clarify, they could not be based on individual’s knowledge of UK legislation, specific personality traits or attending training course which would take them away for work for an unacceptable duration. The construction of each statement will now be described. Each element will be highlighted using underlining (table 6.3 below for key).

Table 6.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of Triangle Model</th>
<th>Denoted by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Single underline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription</td>
<td>Double underline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify</td>
<td>Dotted underline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall the statements must include the stages of Latané and Darley's (1970) 5-Stage Decision Model (section 4.10, p. 93). For convenience the stages are reiterated here:

- Stage 1: Notice the event.
- Stage 2: Interpret the event as requiring attention.
- Stage 3: Take responsibility.
- Stage 4: Decide how to intervene.
- Stage 5: Intervene.

6.3.2.1 Prescription-event link
The definition of this link is, “...the extent to which a clear and salient set of prescriptions is perceived to exist that should be applied to an event and should govern
Chapter 6

conducted.” (Schlenker, et al., 1994, p. 638). This link was also labelled the prescription clarity link (Burke, & Rau, 2007). The statements pertain to clearly defined steps to the goal (Schlenker et al., 1994, p. 646). A strong link is based on the individual having contextual knowledge of the rules and guidelines for behaviours. Each statement in this sub-scale must connect the two relevant elements; event and prescription. The context of this research is verbal bullying therefore this event must be in each of the 5 statements, illustrated by single-underlining below. The prescription refers to a rule or a guideline for behaviour, illustrated by double-underlining below (table 6.3 above for element key). The name of the company has been anonymised and is referred to as CiC. Sources are listed below each statement.

It is **okay to intervene** if someone is being verbally bullied.

The prescription is pertinent to the situation being considered (Schlenker, 1997, p. 254).

CiC has **rules** about verbal bullying.

The goals were specified in advance (Schlenker, et al., 1994, p. 646).

The rules were explained (a reversal of Burke, & Rau, 2007, p. 422; Schlenker, Pontari, & Christopher, 2001, p. 18).

**Immediate intervention** reduces verbal bullying.

The link will be stronger if the employees “believe performance results in outcomes” (Burke, & Rau, 2007, p. 422).


There **needs to be less** verbal bullying at CiC.

“...goals must be clearly specified” (Burke, & Saks, 2009 p. 392; Schlenker et al., 1994, p. 638).

**Verbal bullying at work is unacceptable.**

Disagreement with this item would indicate the rules about this aren't clear (Burke, & Rau, 2007, p. 422). In addition to being part of the sub-scale this item will be used to compare self-reported acceptance of the behaviour with perception of the audience's acceptance of the behaviour. It will also provide the data for the feedback poster condition (section 6.5.1, p. 200).

### 6.3.2.2 Prescription-identity link

The definition of this link is, “...the extent to which a particular set of prescriptions are seen as applicable to the actor by virtue of the actor's characteristics, roles and convictions” (Schlenker, et al., 1994, p. 641). When the employee has been trained for and accepts the prescribed obligation the link will be stronger than when the
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prescription is not relevant to their role or goals. This link was also labelled the prescription obligation link (Burke, & Rau, 2007). Each statement in this sub-scale must connect the two relevant elements; prescription and identity (element key; table 6.3 above). The prescription refers to a rule or a guideline for behaviour. Identity is the personal attachment.

It’s my duty to intervene in verbal bullying.
In Schlenker et al., 1994 survey (p. 646) an item asks if the target obligation was relevant to the actor's job; this is adapted here as the target behaviour is not part of the job description.
For the link to be strong the employee must have a, “strong sense of specific personal duties” (Burke, & Rau, 2007, p. 423).
In the sexual harassment literature, “zone of responsibility” is used in reference to whom the prescriptions apply. Employees who are not supervisors may justify their actions by denying that the responsibility was within their zone (O'Leary-Kelly, Tiedt, & Bowes-Sperry, 2004, p. 91).
The link will be weak if the employee is, “…unsure of precise duties.” (Schlenker, 1997, p. 255).

I know the steps to reduce verbal bullying
In the original work an item checked that there was an awareness of the steps to reach the goal (Schlenker, et al., 1994, p. 646).

It's clear that I'm expected to do something about verbal bullying at work.
If expectations are ambiguous or unknown, “unspoken expectations”, the link will be weak (Schlenker, et al., 1994, p. 646). Clarity in the procedure to be followed is included in an item when the model was utilised in the context of the Protestant Work Ethic (Christopher, & Schlenker, 2005, p. 1506).

I know what to say to intervene effectively.
Whether or not the employee had appropriate training was used as a direct indicator in the original study (Schlenker, 1994, p. 646). This has been stated more specifically in the current work as the employees may not know what training would be appropriate. The specificity will also enable clearer measurement of the research programme training.

I share the responsibility to reduce verbal bullying.
Understanding that there is an obligation (which would be a moral obligation in the current context) is necessary but not sufficient. The employee must also accept the obligation because, “…failure to make a commitment…” weakens the link (Schlenker et al., 1994, p. 639). If control over the behaviour is internal rather than external; if the sense of obligation exceeds obvious external motivations, then the link will be stronger (Christopher, & Schlenker, 2005, p. 1504).
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6.3.2.3 Identity-event link
The definition for this link is an event over which the actor perceives personal control and is, “...intentionally producing the consequences without coercion or pressure.” (Schlenker, et al., 1994, p. 641). This link was also labelled the personal control link (Burke, & Rau, 2007). Each statement in this sub-scale must connect the two relevant elements; identity and event (element key; table 6.3 above). Identity is the personal attachment. The context of this research is verbal bullying therefore this event must be in each of the 5 statements.

I recognise verbal bullying when I see it.
If an event is unforeseeable the link is weak (Schlenker et al., 1994, p. 642). A prerequisite of foresight is the knowledge to accurately identify the event. Latané and Darley's (1970) 5-stages model, stage 1.

Reducing verbal bullying is within my control.
The amount of control the actor has, was found to be a valuable question in the original study (Schlenker et al., 1994, p. 646). The extent to which an individual feels connected to the event influences the strength of this link (Schlenker et al., 1994, p. 639). The employee must feel they have the “...ability to manage the event” (Burke, & Rau, 2007, p. 424).

I want to help to reduce verbal bullying.
The employee must have the intention to bring about consequences and the link is strong if this is, “without coercion or pressure” (Schlenker et al., 1994, p. 641).

When others are verbally bullied it's bad for me.
The greater the consequences of the event are for the employee the stronger this link will be, therefore the employee must be aware of the impact the event may have on them (Britt, 1999, p. 699). If the employee perceives the event to be important the link will be strengthened and this requires prior knowledge of the potential personal outcome (Britt, 1995, p. 17).

I have some influence over verbal bullying incidents.
The link is weakened by disengaging the, “...self from negative event.” (Burke, & Rau, 2007, p. 416).

6.3.2.4 Revised metric response options
Agreeing with a statement indicated strength and disagreeing weakness. Not knowing
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would also be weak and this was represented by disagreement, for example, 'I know what to say to intervene effectively'. It was noted that this did not work for all statements and disagreeing did not always facilitate an option to respond, don't know. To clarify, disagreement with, 'I want to help to reduce verbal bullying', does not indicate don't know, it indicates that the respondent doesn't want to. To rectify this a don't know option was added where needed.

6.3.3 Audience element

The audience of the Accountability Pyramid (Schlenker, 1997) was inaccurately placed in the initial pilot. Owing to the space limitation it was only possible to include a single statement in the reconstruction to represent audience:

- Other people think verbal bullying is unacceptable.

The audience statement served two functions. Firstly for correlation with, 'Verbal bullying at work is unacceptable'. If the respondent has answered without a socially desirability bias, or a misperception of their co-workers the two items should have a highly significant positive correlation.

Secondly, analysed together these statements indicate the social norm through self-report and perception of audience. If bullying has impacted the social norm the majority of participant may respond that they found verbal bullying at work acceptable and perceived their colleagues do as well. Conversely if the verbal bullying was localised it may not have impacted the social norm and the majority may be expected to find it unacceptable and perceived their colleagues do also. This data would contribute to understanding the depth of the problem and be helpful in targeting training.

6.3.4 Exposure count

On reassessing the wording of the exposure counts it was decided to remove the words, during the last month and incorporate time in the response options. As the duration being measured for the purpose of the experiment was 1 month it was considered that some participants may be tempted to falsely respond they had experienced verbal bullying in the last month. This may occur if they wanted to declare that they had experienced it even though it wasn't actually in the last month. A solution to this type of false responding was to providing the participants with the option, ever. This allowed
Chapter 6

participants to satisfy any need to be counted as a target of bullying, whilst enabling greater accuracy in the monthly count. Furthermore this response option would provide data which could be used to establish if ever being bullied, ever witnessing or ever intervening had an impact on responses and therefore responsibility for intervention in verbal bullying. This would be particularly useful for a long term view.

As this was a single organisation, experimental field study it was important to focus the participants on the context of their current workplace and not extend the boundary to include previous workplaces. This was incorporated into the wording at the top of the page and also just prior to the exposure section.

The limited space on the page led to the previous response options of once, twice, weekly and daily being amended. This was justified on the grounds that whether or not there had been exposure was being measured as opposed to the frequency of the exposure within the month. The revised exposure response options were; in the last month; in the last year; since I have worked here and never at CiC.

6.3.5 Reviewing positive and negative wording of statements

Although mixed wording may be used to counter acquiescence bias, where respondents agree with everything, it must be considered in context (Sauro, & Lewis, 2011, p. 1). The use of both positively and negatively worded statements in surveys may be a disadvantage in that it may reduce usability, particularly in a short survey to be completed quickly in the workplace (Sauro, & Lewis, 2011, p. 1). On balance it was decided importance lay in being straightforward; to aid the participants in not making mistakes. Therefore all the statements were worded in the same direction.

6.3.6 Summary of the revision process

The revision returned to the original model and referenced three theoretical sub-scales aligned with links in the Triangle Model: prescription-event; prescription-identity and identity-event. The Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric consisted of 15 statements; 3 sub-scales of 5 statements each. The survey would contain five dependant variables; audience; willingness to intervene; bullied; witnessed and intervened and collect simple demographics. A second pilot survey was required to
validate the new metric (Appendix J).

6.4 Second pilot survey: Analysis and discussion of new RBI-VB metric
A second pilot survey was used to ascertain the internal consistency and dimensionality of the new Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal bullying (RBI-VB) metric.

6.4.1 Method
A new and larger convenience sample of administrators were recruited through the director of studies' existing network. Owing to time limitations and geographic distribution of the new sample a paper survey was not practical and electronic survey was used. This removed the need for data entry using the Optical Mark Reader (OMR). A third-party gatekeeper distributed a link to the e-survey by email to UK administrators who were UNISON union members. Limesurvey (2012) electronic-survey software was used to administer the survey.

6.4.2 Data treatment
The electronic data-set had no missing items. There had been no intention of reversing scores as the statements were intended to be worded in the same direction. However, the audience variable, 'Other people think some verbal bullying is acceptable', was inadvertently negative and therefore was reverse scored.

6.4.3 Scoring
Only one response was possible for each of the dependent variables; bullied, witnessed or intervened. Therefore each participant could score either 1 for each item they had experienced or 0 if they had not had that experience.

A single response was required for each of 15 RBI-VB statements; the possible score for each participant was therefore from 15 to 75 (table 6.4). The greater the score the stronger the bystander responsibility for intervention in verbal bullying was.
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Table 6.4

Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.4 Participants

Of the 3232 people who opened the survey 2332 completed all items and gave their consent for their data to be used (N = 2332; M = 32.2%; F = 67.8%). The participants were asked to choose a category for their age, tenure and hours of work (table 6.5 below).

Table 6.5

Characteristics of the second pilot survey sample (N = 2332)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-55</td>
<td>1403</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 1 year</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 1 year</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 5 years</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 10 years</td>
<td>1303</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or less</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 – 30</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The metric had been constructed to measure the three links forming the original Triangle of Responsibility Model: Identity-prescription, prescription-event and event-identity (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994). The 5 dependent variables included, audience, from Schlenker's (1997) Accountability Pyramid along with willingness to intervene and 3 exposure counts; bullied, witnessed and intervened. As the focus here is the internal reliability of the 15 BRI-VB metric the dependent variables are reported but not analysed. Exposure to verbal bullying was measured by the respondents' self-report of being verbally bullied, intervening and
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witnessing during the last month (table 6.6 below).

Table 6.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-report (%) of intervening, being bullied and witnessing (N = 2332)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervened</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the last month</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the last year</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>since I have worked here</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never at this organisation</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experienced</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the last month</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the last year</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>since I have worked here</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never at this organisation</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Witnessed</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the last month</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the last year</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>since I have worked here</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never at this organisation</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.5 Reliability of the scale

The internal consistency of the scale was analysed using IBM SPSS Statistics Release Version 20 (2011) to calculate Cronbach's Alpha coefficients. It was calculated for the 15 item scale and for the 3 theoretical sub-scales, each consisting of 5 items: Prescription-event; prescription-identity and identity-event.

Inter-correlation for the whole Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric had an alpha coefficient of .838 for the 15 items indicating a high internal consistency. This provided support that the scale measured the underlying construct.

The three theoretical sub-scales based on Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy and Doherty's (1994) Triangle Model of Responsibility were tested. The resulting alphas demonstrated that the prescription-identity consisted of closely related items (table 6.7
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below). The other two sub-scales achieved values below .7 which may reflect the fact that short scales are somewhat less reliable (Revelle, & Zinbargh, 2009; Zinbarg, Revelle, Yovel, & Li, 2005).

Table 6.7
Theoretical sub-scales and Cronbach's Alpha for the RBI-VB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-scale statements</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prescription-event</strong></td>
<td>.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is okay to intervene if someone is being verbally bullied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CiC has rules about verbal bullying.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate intervention reduces verbal bullying.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There needs to be less verbal bullying at CiC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal bullying at work is unacceptable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prescription-identity</strong></td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my duty to intervene in verbal bullying.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the steps to reduce verbal bullying.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's clear that I'm expected to do something about verbal bullying.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what to say to intervene effectively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share the responsibility to reduce verbal bullying.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity-event</strong></td>
<td>.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I recognise verbal bullying when I see it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing verbal bullying is within my control.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to help to reduce verbal bullying.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When others are verbally bullied it's bad for me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have some influence over verbal bullying incidents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4.6 Discussion

Kline (1999) stated that the acceptable value of alpha depends on the nature of the scale
and the goal in the revised pilot had been to achieve .7 or higher. Cronbach's alpha coefficient is affected by the number of items (statements) the scale contains and therefore judgements should be cautious (Cortina, 1993; Gliem, & Gliem, 2003). What is clear is that the closer the value is to 1, the better the internal consistency of the scale is (Gliem, & Gliem, 2003).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's alpha coefficient</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;.9</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;.8</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;.7</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;.6</td>
<td>Questionable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;.5</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;.5</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the revision resulted in much higher sub-scale alphas than found in the initial pilot (section 5.14.3.3, p. 183) the goal of .7 or higher was only achieved for the prescription-event sub-scale. Values of between .6 and .7 were found in the identity-event and prescription-identity sub-scales. Although this could be considered questionable (table 6.8 above) above .6 is not unrealistic in socio-psychological phenomenon and has been accepted here (George, & Mallery, 2000; Kline, 1999). The reason may have been that the statements selected for inclusion in these sub-scales were inadequate to capture the links represented, either by content or number. It may not be coincidental that the more abstract and subjective phenomena, identity, was present in the less reliable sub-scales. This may be further explored by refining the relevant statements or extending the size of the survey to include more statements (the latter was not possible for this research because of the limited space available on the paper survey). Owing to a lack of time and availability of a third pilot sample it was not possible to pursue higher alphas through further revision. It was concluded that the 15 item RBI-VB will be used as a metric but not the sub-scales. The only change to the survey was to reverse the wording of the audience (dependent variable) statement. Therefore, in the field survey, 'Other people think some verbal bullying is acceptable', will be changed to, 'Other people think verbal bullying is unacceptable'.
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6.5 Experimental programmes

The new Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric had been designed to measure a strategy to increase bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying. After an initial survey experimental programmes would take place with the aim of increasing bystander willingness to intervene and subsequently actual interventions.

Three experimental conditions were planned; a control condition, a feedback poster condition and a training condition. Later a fourth condition was added to assess CiC's in-house anti-bullying campaign.

6.5.1 Rationale for the feedback poster condition

A minimalist approach was planned for one of the experimental condition. Previous bystander intervention programmes in other contexts had used posters, such as college students' willingness to intervene in sexual violence incidents (Potter, Moynihan, Stapleton, & Banyard, 2009). In their report on bullying at work, Beswick, Gore and Palferman (2006, p. 35) suggested a poster as a suitable medium for dissemination of bullying information at work. They also noted that it was suggested in a working paper for the European Parliament (Beswick, Gore, & Palferman, 2006 cites Social Affairs Series, SOCI 108 EN, 8 – 2001). During the visits to CiC the researcher had observed prolific use of posters. Therefore it was considered appropriate to use posters as a condition in this study.

Social influence is one of the three bystander effects (Latané, & Darley, 1970). The influence of the audience is also explored in Schlenker's (1997) Accountability Pyramid. During the moments when individuals are taking their cue from the other bystanders they may assume that the socially accepted behaviour is to not intervene. Social influence may inhibit bystander intervention based on the bystanders’ perception of others. The individual's assumption of acceptable behaviour may be based more in their perception of other bystanders than actual knowledge. If data is captured and fed-back to the individuals, social influence is less likely to be based on mis-perception.
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6.5.1.1 Data for the poster programme

A decision was made to feedback specific information from the survey to the employees in the form of posters displayed at their place of work. The information was obtained from the first survey and was only be fed back to the group who generated it. This would ensure that confidentiality was not compromised and that the information was directly relevant to those receiving it.

Initially four facts were to be displayed but ultimately the survey only had space for one item for this condition (posters; figure 6.1, p. 202). The statement was:

- Other people think verbal bullying is unacceptable.

Posters were displayed after survey 1 with the specific group's percentage for finding verbal bullying unacceptable. The hypothesis was that feeding back data would increase bystander interventions as there would be greater accuracy in the perception of others.

6.5.1.2 Design

The emphasis was on the poster as a visual communication tool (Hess, Tosney, & Liegel. 2010). The posters were only likely to be viewed in passing and therefore a brief, high impact message was required. Using image software (GIMP © 2.6.12, 1995-2008) a poster was designed incorporating employees and the image of an ear, suggesting they should 'listen' or take note of the text (visual representation poster; figure 6.1, p. 202). Although this design was not selected for the poster it was used in the training presentation.

A contemporary approach to attract attention is to use humour in a demotivational image (Mumby, 2009). A design in this form was made using the same software (demotivational poster; figure 6.1, p. 202). Although this design was not selected for the poster it was used in the training presentation.

Colour can be used to great effect and analogous schemes can be very powerful (Kyrmin, 2012). A simple but striking poster was based on this and was selected for use in the poster condition (analogous poster ; figure 6.1, p. 202).
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Multiple items poster                         Demotivational poster

Visual representation poster                    Analogous poster

Figure 6.1 Feed-back condition poster designs
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6.6 Rationale for training condition
Bystander intervention training has taken place in other contexts including youth violence and aggression (Slaby, Wilson-Simmons, & DeVos, 1994); school bullying (Frazier, 2013; Lodge, & Frydenberg, 2005); college sexual violence (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2005) and college racial discrimination (Ishiyama, 2000) (Chapter 4). The training objectives for this research are based on RIDS; supporting bystanders willingness to intervene.

6.6.1 CiC's involvement
Although CiC was unable to offer a training programme which could incorporate new material they were willing to allow the researcher to provide training. Once it was established that the researcher was to develop and present the training a request was made to CiC for one hour sessions. It was estimated that approximately 300 employees should be trained (power; section 5.6, p. 144). Training would be at their place of work.

Funding for travel and subsistence was through the researcher's university department with no funding from CiC. It was imperative that scheduling was refined to minimise expenditure. For practical purposes it was requested that sites in the south of the UK were targeted.

A site in Wales was recruited by the gatekeeper with 270 employees who could attend training; subject to an initial meeting between the site manager and the researcher. Information was provided on weekly work-flow and daily work patterns. This enabled the researcher to submit a training schedule proposal which facilitated the research requirement within those bounds (table 6.9 below). The proposed schedule avoided core operations while keeping the number of visits by the researcher as low as possible.
Feedback on the proposed schedule was not received but further information was acquired during 3 site visits by the researcher. The sample comprised shop-floor workers who would normally receive training on equipment operations and health and safety. They also had weekly 35 minute feedback session during which company statistics were shared and messages were reinforced by supervisors and managers. These were occasionally supplemented with video presentation. As employment was in a busy operations environment the opportunities to release staff for training were very limited. The training session at one site the researcher visited were presented to 9 employees at a time, taking 6 weeks for a new procedure to be disseminated to all employees.

For financial reasons it was not feasible for the researcher to undertake 30 training sessions (270 employees in groups of 9). The participating site manager was committed to the reduction of verbal bullying and open to training interventions and a mutually acceptable solution was negotiated; employees would be released for 3 training sessions of 45 minutes (approximately 90 employees per session), over two days (one day shift; one evening shift session and a pick-up session). Overtime payments were available for any employee not scheduled to be at work.

While being an exceptional undertaking from the site manager there were challenges for the researcher; a reduced session time of 45 minutes and large groups limiting potential interaction. The researcher offered a question and answer session following the training but no response concerning this was received and handouts were declined.
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6.6.2 Purpose of training programme
Manipulating the strength of the individual's responsibility for intervention was fundamental to this experimental research. To recap, the intention from the outset was to field test a measurable, bystander intervention strategy through training the CiC's employees. The training was to inform, explain or reinforce the 15 points contained in the statements of the Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric.

6.6.3 Context
The training sample was mostly male manual workers. The researcher requested that all staff attend, including line managers and managers. The site manager stated she would attend all sessions to show support. The training site was in Wales. As organisations in Wales are required to treat Welsh and English language equally checks were made to see if materials would be required in both languages (Welsh Language, 2011). CiC advised that this was not necessary. The researcher asked about inclusion requirements and was assured a hearing loop would be provided when necessary. This was the only additional requirement needed.

6.6.4 Design of training programme
Although a number of formats were considered for the programme the only practical and affordable option was an informative presentation with a practice session. This was arrived at through a process of elimination and attention to the resources available for this research.

Disseminating information in a presentation may increase awareness and understanding of the seriousness of bullying (Dedousis-Wallace, & Shute, 2009, p. 2). A presentation is a straightforward means to cover simple points with a large audience and the programme can be presented to any number of participants by a single presenter (He, Sanocki, Gupta, & Grudin, 2000). Lack of interaction may lead the audience to passively listen as presentations with slides may disconnect the presenter and participants (He, et al., 2000). This method was possible within the resources available. Audience engagement was encouraged by introducing a practice session.
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Other methods of delivery were considered. A short audio visual presentation DVD would have enabled some or all of the components to be covered efficiently and consistently. There was neither adequate lead time nor the budget to pursue this format. Role play has often been used to facilitate learning including bystander interventions (Ahrens, Rich, & Ullman, 2011; Boal, 1979; Carter, & Thomson, 2012; Ishiyama, 2000). It is particularly useful as a rehearsal for difficult situations that may be encountered and can include, “...techniques to move participants out of the role of passive spectators into the role of active participants.” (Ahrens, et al., 2011, p. 2). Inadequate time was available with the employees for this method.

6.7 Bystanders to verbal bullying programme 2012

A presentation and practice session was developed to enable bystanders to appropriately intervene in workplace verbal bullying. Overall the 45 minute programme would raise awareness for all participating employees. The fundamental elements of the Triangle Model of Responsibility (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994) and Accountability Pyramid (Schlenker, 1997) were incorporated into the presentation. The steps necessary to intervene were introduced to strengthen each statement of the RBI-VB. Through indirect reinforcement (the RBI-VB statements were not listed or read out) the concept of bystander intervention was explained. Time for participant interaction was very limited owing to the amount of information that was to be covered within 45 minutes. In spite of this agreement with concepts from the RBI-VB was sought en mass and gained. Expectations of positive behaviours at work were affirmed. Points were raised which could later be discussed, reflected on or acted on. For example, the requirement for a reduction in verbal bullying was questioned by the researcher and agreement on the point noted through eye contact nodding and brief comments by the participants (training plan; Appendix K).

An assumption was made (which was later confirmed) that on the whole the participants would not disagree with most of the information. Points where disagreement may occur were placed later in the presentation and managed with positive statements. This would ensure that agreements had already been reached prior to more difficult ideas such as an expectation that all bystanders should do something. Thus outright rejection of an idea was less likely and was replaced with discussion or reflection.
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6.8 CiC's existing campaign

Some time after the original research proposal had been put to CiC it was discovered that they had an in-house campaign which aligned with some of the research training objectives. The focus of this existing in-house campaign was to raise awareness that verbal bullying causes harm and should be stopped, “...it's everyone's responsibility to put a stop to unacceptable behaviour and language” (CiC, 2011). The campaign included a call for bystander intervention. Campaign packs were distributed to a number of locations but further details of dissemination or outcome were not shared with the researcher. Packs contained a short DVD dramatising the impact of verbal bullying, a booklet to guide managers; and posters with a call to action and a helpline telephone number. The campaign was presented during small team sessions.

Although relevant to the current research project the campaign did not have theoretical underpinning or pre-determined measurable outcomes. The impact of the campaign could be assessed using the newly developed RBI-VB. This would be possible by measuring participants before and after the campaign was presented. The intention was to include the campaign as a separate research condition. This would enable comparison with the poster, training and control groups. CiC agreed to recruit sites who could participate; the necessary qualifications was that they had not already seen the campaign and they were prepared to present it during the research training period. Employees at these locations would then be offered the option of participating in the measurement survey before and after their campaign exposure.

6.9 Field study

The new Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (RIDS) had been developed satisfying the first aim of the research. The Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying metric (RBI-VB) had been validated in response to the second aim of the research. The third aim of developing an intervention programme was complete with both a research training condition based on RIDS and a poster condition based on a feed-back loop prepared. Additionally CiC's own anti-bullying campaign had been included as a condition. Consequently, field implementation could take place and data collected to achieve the fourth aim of field testing the strategy. This was carried out using the survey containing the new RBI-VB metric (field survey: Appendix L).
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During the development of the strategy, metric and intervention programme (training and poster conditions) assumptions and expectations arose based on the new RIDS model. These were expressed as 8 hypotheses to be tested through analysis of the field data:

1. High scores on bystander intervention will be associated with low scores on being bullied.

2. A high score on the Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric will correlate with a high score on willingness to intervene.

3. A high score on willingness to intervene will correlate with a high score for bystander intervention.

4. A high score on perception of audience will correlate with a high score for willingness to intervene.

5. RBI-VB scores will increase between survey 1 and survey 2 in the experimental conditions (poster and training) but not the control condition for experimental group 1.

6. The experimental conditions (poster and training) for experimental group 1 will have an increase in perception of audience scores between survey 1 and survey 2.

7. RBI-VB scores will increase between survey 1 and survey 2 in the experimental conditions (poster and campaign reinforcement) but not the control condition for experimental group 2.

8. The experimental conditions (poster and campaign reinforcement) for experimental group 2 will have an increase in perception of audience scores between survey 1 and survey 2.
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6.9.1 Distribution and collection of surveys

Surveys for each condition had pre-printed visual and OMR codes (table 6.10 below). Batches of 300 surveys (based on numbers provided, table 6.11 below), return-addressed labels and participation instructions were dispatched to the gatekeeper prior to the pre-intervention survey \((n = 1672)\); and post-intervention survey \((n = 1672)\). The gatekeeper distributed batches to the 6 participating groups (conditions allocated by the gatekeeper) at the appropriate times \((N = 3600)\). Site managers distributed surveys to managers for employees to complete during their regular information sessions. During the sessions 10 minutes was given to complete the survey (optional). For anonymity and confidentiality each survey employees were instructed to mail their completed survey form if they wished to participate. It was planned that each survey would be available for one week.

Table 6.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>OMR code survey-1</th>
<th>Date code survey-1</th>
<th>OMR code survey-2</th>
<th>Date code survey-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CB1</td>
<td>●●●●●●</td>
<td>Aug 2012</td>
<td>●●●●●●</td>
<td>Oct 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>●●●●●●</td>
<td>Aug 12</td>
<td>●●●●●●</td>
<td>Oct 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP0</td>
<td>●●●●●●</td>
<td>08/12</td>
<td>●●●●●●</td>
<td>10/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>●●●●●●</td>
<td>08-2012</td>
<td>●●●●●●</td>
<td>10-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC1</td>
<td>●●●●●●</td>
<td>August 2012</td>
<td>●●●●●●</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2</td>
<td>●●●●●●</td>
<td>August 2012</td>
<td>●●●●●●</td>
<td>October 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OMR code front page bottom left.
Date code front page bottom right.

Table 6.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>CC1</th>
<th>CC2</th>
<th>CP1</th>
<th>CS1</th>
<th>CP0</th>
<th>CR1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.9.2 Post launch changes

After the launch of the survey the CB1 group were advised by CiC's lawyers to withdraw their participation owing to a legal situation regarding bullying. The
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gatekeeper was able to recruit a substitute site, CP1, but extra time was required for them to receive and complete surveys. CR1's participation was delayed owing to industrial action. When no responses were received the researcher made enquiries and it was agreed more time would be given for surveys to be returned. Poster and training programmes were rescheduled accordingly.

6.9.3 Finalising data collection
Enquiries about low response rates for survey 2 (post-programme) revealed a number of issues, all of which were eventually resolved. Some managers requested a delay for survey 2 as more pressing items were scheduled. The low response rate for the researcher trained group was of concern and extensive communications with the company led to numerous extensions to the data collection. It was discovered that some employees had not been given the opportunity to participate as there had been a waiver of the requirement for them to attend a normally compulsory meeting where the surveys would have been handed out. This was resolved by higher levels of management. The data collection was closed on 21st December 2012.

6.9.4 Data entry change
The method of data entry was changed as the Optical Mark Reader proved unreliable when scanning large volumes of data. The software was designed to flag anomalies for checking but the researcher noticed unflagged errors resulting from misalignment and double page feeds. This drawback of OMR use is acknowledged in the literature (Hussmann, & Deng, 2005, p. 27). Therefore all the data was entered manually by the researcher.

6.9.5 Chapter summary
In this chapter the development of the new Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric was continued with a reconstruction of the survey and a second, larger pilot study which successfully validated the new metric. The experimental conditions were described (poster, training and in-house campaign) and the researcher designed conditions were rationalised. The hypotheses which would be tested were stated and the launch of the field work was described with information on unexpected changes.
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The next chapter will present the findings which resulted from the data collection, identifying supported and unsupported hypotheses. Additional discoveries which arose during the quantitative analysis are also presented.
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7 Results

7.1 Introduction
This chapter describes the process of analysing the data from the treatment of the raw data to hypothesis testing. The findings from the quantitative field survey are presented to address the research question:

What theoretically-based measurable bystander intervention strategy will increase bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying?

The data were analysed as a single data set from the treatment of the raw data, through examination of the descriptive statistics, determining the reliability of the RBI-VB metric and testing the relational hypotheses.

The data were then split into 2 experimental groups for testing the experimental conditions. These groups were identified by their participation in a prior anti-bullying campaign within CiC. Differences between conditions were analysed with parametric and non-parametric tests and the results are presented. Additional analyses arising from the process are included. The chapter ends with a statistical assessment of CiC's in-house anti-bullying campaign using the RBI-VB metric.

For convenience the hypotheses are restated:

1. High scores on intervention will be associated with low scores on being bullied.

2. A high score on the Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying metric will correlate with a high score on willingness to intervene.

3. A high score on willingness to intervene will correlate with a high score for intervention.

4. A high score on perception of audience will correlate with a high score for
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willingness to intervene.

5. RBI-VB scores will increase between survey 1 and survey 2 in the experimental conditions (poster and training) but not the control condition for experimental group 1.

6. The experimental conditions (poster and training) for experimental group 1 will have an increase in perception of audience scores between survey 1 and survey 2.

7. RBI-VB scores will increase between survey 1 and survey 2 in the experimental conditions (poster and campaign reinforcement) but not the control condition for experimental group 2.

8. The experimental conditions (poster and campaign reinforcement) for experimental group 2 will have an increase in perception of audience scores between survey 1 and survey 2.

7.2 Preparation of the data

7.2.1 Collected data

All employees in the 6 conditions were provided with the single page survey and time to complete it during working hours ($n = 1672$), on two occasions; pre and post-intervention ($N = 3344$). The voluntary survey was anonymous therefore repeated measures and matched-pair calculations were not possible; the 12 survey batches were calculated as independent.

Response rates were calculated from the advised employee numbers and surveys received for each group, excluding blanks (table 7.1 below). The total number received from the pre-intervention survey was 719 (43% response) and from the post-intervention survey was 782 (47% response).
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Table 7.1
Number of employees, surveys received and response percentage for each group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of employees $n$</th>
<th>Survey 1 $n$</th>
<th>Survey 1 %</th>
<th>Survey 2 $n$</th>
<th>Survey 2 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC1</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>43.59</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>35.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>94.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26.35</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>72.67</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>57.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>34.67</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>30.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>40.07</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>44.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>42.89</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>47.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $n =$ number.

All surveys were manually entered into IBM SPSS Statistics 20 and the case number was written on each survey. Ambiguous responses were left blank, for example where there were two or more responses for the same item.

7.2.2 Initial data verification
Frequency analyses were used as an initial data accuracy check on the 24 survey items. Out of range entries were corrected by referring to the original survey. Surveys with any data entry error had all 24 items checked. For each group the first survey, every following 9th and the last survey were also verified.

7.3 Characteristics of the sample
There were 719 cases received for survey 1 and 782 for survey 2 ($N = 1501$). Demographics were collected to check the sample was consistent with the wider organisation. Participants were asked for their gender, age, tenure and weekly hours of work (table 7.2 below). The gatekeeper confirmed that the characteristics were
consistent with those of CiC. Gender was not disclosed by 6.5% of participants. Males were heavily represented as was expected (M = 71%).

Table 7.2
Gender, age, tenure and hours of all participants (N = 1501)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>25 and under</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 to 35</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 to 54</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 and over</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Under 1 year</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 1 year</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 5 years</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>16 or less</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 to 30</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four age categories were available; age was not disclosed in 1.6% of surveys. The majority of participants were 36 years or older (74.1%) with most being 36 to 54 years old (58.8%). Over 60% of the participants had worked at CiC for over 10 years; 2.3% did not disclose how long they had worked at CiC. Most were employed full-time (67.6%); 1.4% did not disclose hours worked.

7.4 Whole case analysis
Whole cases (all 24 items completed) for each group were counted; these were usable without any further treatment (n = 1104). Whole surveys as a percentage of all surveys received for each group were calculated (table 7.3 below).
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Table 7.3
Number and percentage of whole-case surveys received for each group \((N = 1104)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Survey 1 (n)</th>
<th>Survey 1 %</th>
<th>Survey 2 (n)</th>
<th>Survey 2 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77.45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>63.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>78.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>84.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>68.35</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>75.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70.19</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70.64</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>516</strong></td>
<td><strong>72.99</strong></td>
<td><strong>588</strong></td>
<td><strong>75.24</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(n\) = number.

7.5 Missing data strategy

The strategy for dealing with missing data was designed to maximise utility of the collected data set. The overall response rate was 45% \((N = 1501)\) but the complete (whole-case) surveys only totalled 33% of the employees who received a survey \((n = 1104)\). To make the best use possible of the incomplete cases \((n = 397)\) the following decisions were taken:

1. Cases with missing demographic data \((n = 177)\) were used in all analyses as demographics were not the basis of any hypothesis.
2. The new 15 item, Responsible Bystander Intervention – Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric provided one of the fundamental variables for this study. The researcher set a 10% imputation limit; thereby requiring 14 of the items to be present for a case to be included in analyses. Cases with more than one RBI-VB item missing were excluded. The justification for this was that, whereas one missing item represented 6.67% of the RBI-VB, two were 13.33% and this
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would exceed the 10% limit. This decision included consideration of the magnified impact that missing items would have in the sub-scales. Single missing RBI-VB items were replaced with the series mean \((n = 36)\).

3. Cases missing, ‘Other people think verbal bullying is unacceptable’ \((n = 137)\) were excluded from the hypothesis based on that item.

4. Cases missing, ‘Willingness to intervene’ \((n = 266)\) were excluded from all analyses except the exposure counts for; ‘Intervened’, ‘Bullied’, and ‘Witnessed’.

5. Cases missing; ‘Intervened’ \((n = 89)\), ‘Bullied’ \((n = 78)\), and ‘Witnessed’ \((n = 57)\) were used in all analyses except the relevant exposure counts.

7.6 Don't know responses

During survey construction it was realised that 10 of the 15 items did not have a response option which aligned with not knowing. Therefore a decision was made to include a ‘don’t know’ option for these items (Chapter 6). The intention was for ‘don’t know’ responses to be scored as 1 as they represented a weak responsibility for intervention. After collection of the data the scoring of ‘don’t know’ as 1 was highlighted as an issue as it could not share the same point in the scale as ‘strongly disagree’. The number of cases with a ‘don’t know’ response for each condition and survey run are presented (table 7.4 below).
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Table 7.4
Number of cases containing ‘don’t know’ responses (n = 529) for each condition and survey run (N = 1672)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of employees n</th>
<th>Survey 1 n</th>
<th>Survey 2 n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC1</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = number.

In cases with a single ‘don’t know’ the series mean was used (n = 14). Cases with more than 1 ‘don’t know’ were excluded from the metric reliability analysis. The number of valid cases after this process were 1154; 552 for survey 1 and 602 for survey 2 (table 7.5).

Table 7.5
Number of valid surveys after removal of case with more than one ‘don’t know’ response for each group (N = 1154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of employees n</th>
<th>Survey 1 n</th>
<th>Survey 2 n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC1</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = number.
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7.6.1 Analysing 'don’t know' responses

As the ‘don’t know’ responses could not be scored as planned all items with a ‘don’t know’ response were analysed for equality of means between survey 1 \( (n = 259) \) and survey 2 \( (n = 270) \) using t-tests (table 7.6 below). There were no significant differences found at the \( p = < .05 \) level.

Table 7.6
Descriptive statistics and t-tests for equality of means between Survey 1 and survey 2 ‘don’t know’ responses (\( n = 529 \))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey item</th>
<th>Survey 1</th>
<th>Survey 2</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other people think verbal bullying is unacceptable.</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I see someone being verbally bullied I will intervene.</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is okay to intervene if someone is being verbally bullied.</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate intervention reduces verbal bullying.</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to help to reduce verbal bullying.</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When other people are verbally bullied it's bad for me.</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing verbal bullying is within my control.</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal bullying at work is unacceptable.</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share the responsibility to reduce verbal bullying.</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There needs to be less verbal bullying at work.</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have some influence over verbal bullying incidents.</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s my duty to intervene in verbal bullying.</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( M = \) Mean. \( SD = \) Standard Deviation. \( p = \) Significance.

For each condition ‘don’t know’ responses were summed across all items for survey 1 and survey 2. A univariate ANOVA showed that there were no significant differences at the \( p = < .05 \) level between the total ‘don’t know’ responses for any group between survey 1 (719) and survey 2 (782), \( F(11,1489) = 1.517, p = .119 \).

Although cases with more than a single ‘don’t know’ response could not be included in
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the analyses owing to the survey design it was established that pre and post programme 'don't know' response were consistent for every group. The treatment of the raw data included consideration of incomplete surveys and 'don't know' responses. Of the 397 incomplete cases received, 50 were recovered through the missing data and 'don't know' response treatment. The raw data set \(N = 1501\) provided a working data set \(N = 1154\) representing 34.51% of the surveys distributed.

7.7 The Responsible Bystander Intervention – Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric

7.7.1 Scoring the metric
The 15 item Responsible Bystander Intervention – Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric had a Likert-type response scale ranging from ‘strongly disagree’ (scored as 1) to ‘strongly agree’ (scored as 5). Scores across the 15 items were summated. A higher summated score indicated stronger responsibility for intervention. An individual’s score could range from a minimum of 15 to a maximum of 75. The 'don't know' responses were not scored as they were found to be inconsistent across the design of the full scale.

7.7.2 Reliability of the metric
To assess the reliability of the new RBI-VB metric a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was calculated using IBM SPSS Statistics Release Version 20 (2011) for the 15 item RBI-VB metric across all valid case of the pre-programme survey \(n = 552, \alpha = .876\). The alpha could not be improved by deleting any items. This indicated a high internal consistency in agreement with the pilot findings (George, & Mallery, 2000). A reliability analysis showed that 2 of the 3 sub-scales had inadequate Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of < .7 (table 7.7 below).
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Table 7.7
Theoretical sub-scales of the RBI-VB \((n = 552)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical sub-scale items with Cronbach's alpha ((\alpha))</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha ((\alpha))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prescription-event</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is okay to intervene if someone is being verbally bullied.</td>
<td>.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CiC has rules about verbal bullying.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate intervention reduces verbal bullying.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There needs to be less verbal bullying at CiC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal bullying at work is unacceptable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prescription-identity</strong></td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my duty to intervene in verbal bullying.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the steps to reduce verbal bullying.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's clear that I'm expected to do something about verbal bullying.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what to say to intervene effectively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share the responsibility to reduce verbal bullying.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity-event</strong></td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I recognise verbal bullying when I see it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing verbal bullying is within my control.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to help to reduce verbal bullying.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When others are verbally bullied it's bad for me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have some influence over verbal bullying incidents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.7.3 Dimensionality
To investigate the scale’s dimensionality a principle components analysis was conducted. The Bartlett’s test of sphericity < .001 indicated suitability for sub-scale analysis (Munro, 2005, p. 336). Oblique rotation was indicated as the sub-scales were expected to be correlated (Costello, & Osborne, 2005). High loadings were maximised with a direct oblimin rotation to find a simple structure. Dimension reduction extracted 3 components; these were described as perception, process and power (table 7.8).
The RBI-VB components incorporated all sides of the Triangle of Responsibility Model; prescription, identity and event (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy & Doherty, 1994); accounting for 58.94% of the total variance with all the alphas above the acceptable level of .7 (Gliem & Gliem, 2003) (table 7.9 below).
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Table 7.9
Components, percentage of variance and alpha coefficient for the RBI-VB with each item’s theoretical source \((n = 552)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>% of variance</th>
<th>(\alpha)</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Triangle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>37.22</td>
<td>.819</td>
<td>It is okay to intervene if someone is being verbally bullied.</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Immediate intervention reduces verbal bullying.</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I want to help to reduce verbal bullying.</td>
<td>IE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When others are verbally bullied it’s bad for me.</td>
<td>IE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal bullying at work is unacceptable.</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I share the responsibility to reduce verbal bullying.</td>
<td>PI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There needs to be less verbal bullying at CiC.</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>.810</td>
<td>CiC has rules about verbal bullying.</td>
<td>PE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I know the steps to reduce verbal bullying.</td>
<td>PI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It’s clear that I'm expected to do something about verbal bullying.</td>
<td>PI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I know what to say to intervene effectively.</td>
<td>PI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I recognise verbal bullying when I see it.</td>
<td>IE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>Reducing verbal bullying is within my control.</td>
<td>IE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I have some influence over verbal bullying incidents.</td>
<td>IE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is my duty to intervene in verbal bullying.</td>
<td>PI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Triangle = the link the item was constructed for: PE = prescription-event; PI = Prescription-identity; IE = Identity-event.

The greatest portion of variance was accounted for by the participant’s perception and included all sides of the triangle model (table 7.9 above). The participant’s understanding of the process also combined all sides of the model. The sense of power the participant felt included the model’s links from identity to both prescription and
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event. It did not however encompass a direct link between prescription and event.

Items were considered to be salient if the loading were >.40 (table 7.10 below). There were 2 ambiguous items (loading at >.40 on 2 components). These were, ‘I share the responsibility to reduce verbal bullying’ and ‘I recognise verbal bullying when I see it’. It was decided these item should be retained as they were important to the scale’s construct. Both were indicated by work of Schlenker, Britt, Pennigton, Murphy and Doherty (1994). To recap, recognition is an essential precursor to taking responsibility and it is necessary to perceive a degree of personal obligation. These are also clear steps in Latané and Darley’s (1970) decision process model (section 4.10, p. 93).

Table 7.10
Component loadings >.40 for dimension reduction of the RBI-VB (n = 552)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is okay to intervene if someone is being verbally bullied</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate intervention reduces verbal bullying</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to help to reduce verbal bullying</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When others are verbally bullied its bad for me</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal bullying at work is unacceptable</td>
<td>.841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share the responsibility to reduce verbal bullying</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>-.465</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There needs to be less verbal bullying at CiC</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CiC has rules about verbal bullying</td>
<td>- .677</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the steps to reduce verbal bullying</td>
<td>- .845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's clear that I'm expected to do something about verbal bullying</td>
<td>- .775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what to say to intervene effectively</td>
<td>- .738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Thus the RBI-VB consisted of 15 items in 3 sub-scales: Perception, process and power which operationalised the Triangle of Responsibility Model (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy & Doherty, 1994) to support the decision process (Latané, & Darley, 1970). All survey data was examined prior to hypotheses testing.

7.8 Examination of survey data

The collected data were; the self-reported exposure to verbal bullying at work; declaration of willingness to intervene in workplace verbal bullying; perception of the other employees' acceptance of verbal bullying; and the RBI-VB. Responses for all groups across both surveys are presented.

7.8.1 Quantifying exposure to workplace verbal bullying

Participant’s experiences were self-reported in 3 categories. These were; being verbally bullied, witnessing verbal bullying or intervening in verbal bullying. Participants were asked to select one response from 4 options, for each category (table 7.11 below).
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Table 7.11
Self-reported exposure to verbal bullying \((N = 1501)\): Intervening, being bullied and witnessing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>When exposed</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervened</td>
<td>in the last month</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the last year</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>since I have worked here</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>never at CiC</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullied</td>
<td>in the last month</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the last year</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>since I have worked here</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>never at CiC</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed</td>
<td>in the last month</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the last year</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>since I have worked here</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>never CiC</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.8.2 Willingness to intervene

Measurement of ‘willingness to intervene’ was by the response to the item, ‘If I see verbal bullying I will intervene’. The response choices were from a 5-point Likert-type scale: 1-strongly disagree, 2, 3, 4, or 5-strongly agree. There was also the choice to respond, ‘don’t know’. A small group of the participants (4.7%) strongly disagreed that they were willing to intervene in verbal bullying incidents (table 7.12 below).
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Table 7.12
Responses to, 'If I see someone being verbally bullied I will intervene' (N = 1501)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( M \) = Mean \((1–5)\), \( SD \) = Standard deviation \((1–5)\).

7.8.3 Perception of audience
The employees’ perception of other employees' acceptance of workplace verbal bullying was measured by the item, ‘Other people think verbal bullying is unacceptable’ using a 5-point Likert-type scale: 1-strongly disagree, 2, 3, 4, or 5-strongly agree. There was also the choice to respond; 'don’t know'. The majority of the participants (61.4%) strongly-agreed or agreed with the statement (table 7.13). This perception of the audience will be referred to as the audience variable.

Table 7.13
Responses to, 'Other people think verbal bullying is unacceptable' (N = 1501)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( M \) = Mean \((1–5)\), \( SD \) = Standard deviation \((1–5)\).

7.8.4 Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB)
The Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric was measured with 15 items using a 5-point Likert-type response scale ranging from 'strongly disagree' (scored as 1) to 'strongly agree' (scored as 5). There was also the choice to respond; 'don’t know'. The percentage of missing responses were recorded for each item. The observed sub-scales comprised 7 items for perception, 5 items for process and 3 items for power (table 7.14 below). Items with a potential skew were noted (marked * in table 7.14).
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Table 7.14
RBI-VB item descriptives including percentages for each response option, sub-scale values and totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RBI-VB Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Dk</th>
<th>Miss</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is okay to intervene if someone is being verbally bullied.*</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate intervention reduces verbal bullying.</td>
<td>1458</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to help to reduce verbal bullying.*</td>
<td>1461</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When others are verbally bullied it's bad for me.</td>
<td>1461</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal bullying at work is unacceptable.*</td>
<td>1457</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share the responsibility to reduce verbal bullying.</td>
<td>1457</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There needs to be less verbal bullying at CiC.*</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-scale values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CiC has rules about verbal bullying.</td>
<td>1457</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the steps to reduce verbal bullying.</td>
<td>1444</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's clear that I'm expected to do something about verbal bullying.</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what to say to intervene effectively.</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I recognise verbal bullying when I see it.</td>
<td>1455</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-scale values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-scale values 25.06 5.16

Sub-scale values 17.32 4.89
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RBI-VB Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dk</td>
<td>Miss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Power

Reducing verbal bullying is within my control

I have some influence over verbal bullying incidents.

It is my duty to intervene in verbal bullying.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dk</td>
<td>Miss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-scale values 14.13 4.16

Scale values 59.29 11.84

Note. * = responses are negatively skewed. n = number of valid response. 1 strongly disagree - 5 strongly agree = response scale. dk = don’t know response option. miss = missing value, non-response. M = mean. SD = standard deviation.

7.8.4.1 Consideration of skewed items

Following guidelines that skewness should fall within ± 2 times the standard error of skewness, 4 of the 15 RBI-VB items were non-normative (Field, 2013). These items were in the perception sub-scale. Applying the rule of thumb that skewness should be within an absolute value of 2.0, the item, ‘verbal bullying at work is unacceptable’, still fell outside normality (Tabachnick, & Fidell, 1996). To clarify the status of these items objective exploration was carried out using Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests (Razali, & Wah, 2011). The null hypothesis was rejected for all 4 items indicating that they did not have normal distributions (table 7.15 below).
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Table 7.15
Examination of distribution for potentially non-normative items of the RBI-VB \((N = 1501)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(M)</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>(SD)</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>(K-S)</th>
<th>(K-S) (p)</th>
<th>(S-W)</th>
<th>(S-W) (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is okay to intervene if someone is being verbally bullied.</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.354</td>
<td>-1.217</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to help to reduce verbal bullying.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.178</td>
<td>-1.418</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal bullying at work is unacceptable.</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>-2.239</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There needs to be less verbal bullying at CiC.</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.174</td>
<td>-1.542</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(M = \text{Mean}, SD = \text{Standard deviation, } K-S = \text{Kolmogorov-Smirnov, } S-W = \text{Shapiro-Wilk, } p = \text{significance.}\)

These findings prompted consideration of non-parametric tests for analyses containing the RBI-VB as a variable. The majority of items in the RBI-VB were normally distributed (73%; 11 items) and the assumption of homogeneity of variance was not violated. For the following correlations a check was made between parametric and non-parametric results in all analyses with the RBI-VB as a variable. For example when comparing self-reported verbal bullying with the RBI-VB metric calculations were carried out using a non-parametric Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient and a parametric Pearson’s product-moment correlation coefficient. This found almost identical results from both procedures (results were the same to 2 decimal places). A decision was therefore taken to use parametric procedures for all the correlations.

It was decided that difference testing would take place at sub-scale level as 2 of the sub-scales, process and power, did not violate assumptions but 1 sub-scale, perception was non-normative. Therefore parametric tests were used for the process and power sub-scales; and, as the perception sub-scale had over 50% of items negatively skewed non-parametric analyses were used for hypothesis testing with this sub-scale.
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7.9 Exploring demographic and exposure data for RBI-VB differences

7.9.1 Demographic analyses

Demographic data were collected for gender, age, tenure and hours worked in order to confirm the characteristics of the sample with CiC and for future comparisons with other studies. Basic exploration took place to investigate potential differences on the Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric based on this data. Differences in mean scores between the demographic characteristics were explored by analysis of variance for the whole scale and sub-scales; perception, process and power. This was carried out for survey 1 and survey 2 resulting in 32 analyses. Significant differences \( p = < .01 \) were found on the process sub-scale for two of the characteristics and are reported here.

7.9.1.1 Tenure

A significant difference was found for tenure between RBI-VB scores on the process sub-scale in survey 2, \( F(4,601) = 4.65, p = .001 \). Employees who had worked at CiC for between 1 and 5 years had significantly higher scores on the process sub-scale than employees who had worked at CiC for over 10 years; and those who had worked at CiC for over 5 years (table 7.16 below).

Table 7.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1 year</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.80</td>
<td>5.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 5 years</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>19.15</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5 years</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>16.89</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>17.13</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.9.1.2 Hours

There was a significant difference found for hours on the process sub-scale of RBI-VB
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in survey 2, $F(3,601) = 3.72$, $p = .011$. Employees working 17-30 hours had a significantly higher process score than employees in the other categories (table 7.17).

Table 7.17
Number of employees in each category of hours worked in survey 2, with mean and standard deviation for the process sub-scale of the RBI-VB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 hours or less</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-30 hours</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>18.17</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 hours or more</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours unknown</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.9.1.3 Summary
Of the 32 demographic analyses of the Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric carried out across pre and post programme survey data two differences were significant at the $p = <.01$ level or higher on the process sub-scale for survey 2. There were two demographic differences in the employees’ understanding of what they can do about verbal bullying at work at survey 2 which were not present at survey 1. Employees working 17-30 hours scored significantly higher than all other groups; and employees who had worked at CiC for between 1 and 5 years scored significantly higher than those who had been there longer.

7.9.2 Exposure to verbal bullying at work
Self-reported data for being verbally bullied at work, witnessing and intervening in verbal bullying at work were investigated for potential differences on the Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric. Differences in mean scores were explored by analysis of variance for the whole scale and sub-scales; perception, process and power. This was carried out for survey 1 and survey 2 resulting in 24 analyses. Significant differences ($p = <.001$) were found for witnessing and being bullied; these are presented below. No significant differences were found for intervening
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in verbal bullying.

7.9.2.1 Witnessing verbal bullying at work

There were significant differences between scores of the RBI-VB for employees' self-reports of witnessing verbal bullying at work in survey 2, $F(4,601) = 6.30, p = .001$. Employees who had never witnessed verbal bullying at CiC had a significantly higher RBI-VB score than those who had witnessed verbal bullying in the last year and the last month. Employees witnessing verbal bullying since they have worked at CiC had a significantly higher RBI-VB score than those witnessing verbal bullying in the last month (table 7.18).

Table 7.18

Number of employees who reported witnessing workplace verbal bullying in survey 2, with mean and standard deviation for RBI-VB scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Witnessed</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>58.01</td>
<td>11.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since*</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>57.70</td>
<td>11.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last year</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>53.72</td>
<td>11.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last month</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>51.74</td>
<td>11.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * Since working for the organisation

7.9.2.2 Verbally bullied at work

There were significant differences between scores of the RBI-VB for self-report of being bullied in survey 2, $F(4,601) = 7.76, p = .001$. Employees who had never been verbally bullied at CiC had a significantly higher RBI-VB score than those who had been verbally bullied in the last year and in the last month. Employees who had been verbally bullied since working at CiC had a significantly higher RBI-VB score than those who had been verbally bullied in the last month (table 7.19).
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Table 7.19

Number of employees for each category of being verbally bullied in survey 2, with mean and standard deviation on the RBI-VB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bullied</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>58.04</td>
<td>10.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since*</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>57.21</td>
<td>12.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last year</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52.82</td>
<td>11.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last month</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>50.71</td>
<td>12.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * Since working for the organisation

7.9.2.3 Summary

Temporal proximity to verbal bullying at CiC had a negative impact on employees' responsibility for intervention as measured by the RBI-VB. Investigation of exposure to verbal bullying at work illustrated a consistent pattern across being verbally bullied and witnessing verbal bullying in survey 2. The more recently the employee had been exposed to verbal bullying at work, the lower their scores on the RBI-VB metric were; whether the employee was bullied or they had witnessed bullying.

This concludes the examination of the demographic and exposure data for RBI-VB differences. The research hypotheses will be presented in the following 2 sections; relational and experimental. Firstly, relationships between self-reported exposure to verbal bullying (being bullied, witnessing verbal bullying and intervening in verbal bullying) over different durations (in the last month, in the last year and since working for CiC) will be scrutinised. Correlations between exposure to workplace verbal bullying and the variables (willingness to intervene; RBI-VB; audience) will also be explored. The experimental hypotheses are then addressed in two sections according to experimental groups. These were defined by the prior participation in the in-house bullying awareness campaign. Experimental group 1 had not participated in the campaign and experimental group 2 had participated. Differences in sub-scale scores of the RBI-VB according to research conditions are analysed, concluding the hypotheses testing.
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7.10 Results of the relational research hypotheses

7.10.1 High scores on intervention will be associated with low scores on bullied
The hypothesis that a high score on, 'I have intervened when someone was being verbally bullied at work' since working at CiC would be associated with a low score on, 'I have been verbally bullied at work' since working at CiC was not supported.

As both variables were categorical a Pearson chi-square was conducted. The relationship was analysed for employees who reported being verbally bullied since being at CiC, in the last year or in the last month.

7.10.1.1 Since working for CiC
The focus was placed on those who had self-reported being verbally bullied since working at CiC (ever bullied) and self-reported interventions (ever intervened) since working for CiC. Most participants reported that since being at CiC they had not been verbally bullied ($n = 664$) and had not intervened ($n = 754$). The results were statistically significant in the opposite direction to that expected, $X^2(1, N = 1154) = 183.20, p < .001$ (table 7.20). The effect size as indicated by the Phi coefficient was .40.

Table 7.20
Cross tabulation of verbally bullied and intervention since working at CiC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never intervened</th>
<th>Ever intervened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never bullied</td>
<td>72% ($n=542$)</td>
<td>30% ($n=122$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever bullied</td>
<td>28% ($n=212$)</td>
<td>70% ($n=278$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was found that employees who reported they had been verbally bullied since working for CiC were more likely to report they had intervened than those who had never been verbally bullied.
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7.10.1.2 In the prior year

A Pearson chi-square was conducted to assess the association between self-report of being verbally bullied in the prior year and interventions self-reported for the prior year. The prediction that employees who had not been verbally bullied would be more likely to intervene than those that had been verbally bullied was not supported.

Most participants reported they had not been verbally bullied \((n = 918)\) and had not intervened \((n = 858)\) in the last year. The results were statistically significant in the opposite direction to that expected, \(X^2(1, N = 1154) = 165.77, p < .001\) (table 7.21). The effect size as indicated by the Phi coefficient was .38.

Table 7.21
Cross tabulation of verbally bullied and intervention in the last year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not intervened last year</th>
<th>Intervened last year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not bullied last year</td>
<td>93% ((n = 858))</td>
<td>7% ((n = 60))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullied last year</td>
<td>62% ((n = 146))</td>
<td>38% ((n = 90))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consistent with the analysis for reports of being bullied and intervention since being at CiC the findings for the last year were not as predicted. Employees who reported they had been verbally bullied in the last year were more likely to report they had intervened in the last year than those who had never been verbally bullied.

7.10.1.3 In the prior month

A Pearson chi square was also computed for employees' self-reports of being verbally bullied in the prior month and interventions self-reported for the prior month. The hypothesis was not supported.

Most participants reported they had not been verbally bullied \((n = 1035)\) and had not intervened \((n = 1107)\) in the last month. The results were statistically significant in the opposite direction to the hypothesis, \(X^2(1, N = 1154) = 164.04, p < .001\) (table 7.22).
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The effect size as indicated by the Phi coefficient was .38.

Table 7.22
Cross tabulation of verbally bullied and intervened in the last month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not intervened last month</th>
<th>Intervened last month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not bullied last month</td>
<td>98% (n = 1019)</td>
<td>2% (n = 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullied last month</td>
<td>74% (n = 88)</td>
<td>26% (n = 31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This confirmed the rejection of the hypothesis indicating that those employees who self-reported that they had been verbally bullied in the last month were more likely to intervene than those who had not been verbally bullied in the last month.

7.10.1.4 Summary
This hypothesis predicted that self-reported intervention in workplace verbal bullying would be associated with employees who had not self-reported experience of workplace verbal bullying. This was analysed for different durations; since working for CiC, in the last month and in the last year. The expectation was that employees would be less inhibited if they had little or no experience of being verbally bullied themselves and this would be evidenced by a negative correlation. The hypothesis was not supported over any duration and what was found was significant in the opposite direction. Employees with self-reported experience of verbal bullying were found to be more likely to self-report they had intervened in verbal bullying. This was evidenced by the reports since working at CiC, in the last year and in the last month. The percentage of those bullied who intervened was found to increase from reports in the last month to reports in the last year. Most notably this percentage almost doubled from reports in the last year to reports since working at CiC.
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7.10.2 Further investigation of relationships with self-reports of being verbally bullied

The unexpected finding between self-reports of being verbally bullied and self-reported intervention led to the scrutiny of relationships of other variables with self-reports of being verbally bullied. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated with willingness to intervene, the RBI-VB scale and the 3 sub-scales: Perception, process, and power (table 7.23).

Table 7.23

Descriptive statistics for bullied, willingness to intervene, RBI-VB and sub-scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullied since working at this organisation</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullied in last year</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullied in last month</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to intervene</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBI-VB</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>56.29</td>
<td>11.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>25.06</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>17.32</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>14.13</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $n =$ number. $M =$ Mean. $SD =$ Standard deviation.

7.10.2.1 Willingness to intervene and self-reports of being verbally bullied

As it was found that those with experience of being verbally bullied were more likely to self-report actual intervention the question was posed; were those with experience of being verbally bullied more willing to intervene? Self-reports of being verbally bullied were analysed with willingness to intervene as measured by the item; ‘if I see verbal bullying at work I will intervene’, using a Pearson's correlation (table 7.24). This was investigated for self-report of being verbally bullied in the last month, last year and since being at CiC.
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Table 7.24
Pearson’s correlation between self-report of being verbally bullied and willingness to intervene

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bullied since working at organisation</th>
<th>Bullied in last year</th>
<th>Bullied in last month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willing to intervene</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>-.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All correlations were negative and significant at the 0.05 level. As all the correlation coefficients were below -.12, indicating less than 2% of variance explained, the relationships were not considered strong enough to be useful.

7.10.2.2 The RBI-VB metric and self-reports of being verbally bullied

The Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric was designed as a measure of willingness to intervene and therefore the relationship between the RBI-VB scores and self-reports of being verbally bullied should mirror that between willingness to intervene and self-reports of being verbally bullied. This was investigated with a Pearson's correlation (table 7.25 below) for the scale as a whole and the 3 sub-scales: Perception, process and power.

Table 7.25
Pearson’s correlations between self-report of being verbally bullied and the RBI-VB including sub-scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bullied since working at organisation</th>
<th>Bullied in last year</th>
<th>Bullied in last month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RBI-VB</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>-.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>-.173</td>
<td>-.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>-.112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationship between the new metric and self-report of being verbally bullied was found to reflect the relationship with willingness to intervene, as expected. This also
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held at the sub-scale level. All correlations were negative and significant at the 0.05 level with most reaching the 0.01 level. All the correlation coefficients were in the -.01 to -.19, indicating less than 4% of variance explained with a sample size of above 1000 in all analyses (table 7.23 above for all relevant sample sizes). The relationships were therefore considered negligible within the theoretical context of this study.

7.10.2.3 Summary

It was concluded that employees with experience of being verbally bullied could not be meaningfully evidenced to be more willing to intervene than those without that experience. This illustrates a divergence between self-report of actual intervention and willingness to intervene which is considered in the discussion.

7.10.3 A high score on the Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying metric will correlate with a high score on willingness to intervene

The 2nd hypothesis that a high score on the RBI-VB metric would correlate with a high score for willingness to intervene was supported. Although this hypothesis was directional the metric is new and therefore a 2-tailed test was used to ensure any contrary effect was detected. A Pearson correlation was computed to assess the relationship between the new RBI-VB metric and willingness to intervene. There was a significant positive relationship between the responsible bystander intervention in verbal bullying (RBI-VB) score and their willingness to intervene, $r = .64, p$ (1-tailed) < .01. This indicated that 40.9% of variability in willingness to intervene was explained by the new RBI-VB metric (table 7.26 for the descriptive statistics).

Table 7.26

Descriptive statistics for RBI-VB metric and willingness to intervene

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RBI-VB</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>52.40</td>
<td>14.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to intervene</td>
<td>1452</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = number. M = Mean. SD = Standard deviation.
Chapter 7

7.10.3.1 Summary
The 15-item Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric was found to significantly contribute to the measurement of the abstract concept of willingness to intervene.

7.10.4 A high score on willingness to intervene will correlate with a high score for intervention
The 3rd hypothesis that a high score on, 'if I see someone being verbally bullied I will intervene' (willingness to intervene) would positively correlate with a high score for intervention was supported.

The relationship was investigated for the last month, the last year and since working for CiC. Although a positive correlation was predicted a 2-tailed test was used as the research is unique and the relationships have not been tested before.

7.10.4.1 Since working at CiC
Cases of respondents who had ever witnessed verbal bullying at CiC were selected because intervention was only possible if an event had been witnessed. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between willingness to intervene and self-reported intervention since working for CiC. There was a significant positive relationship between willingness to intervene and self-reported intervention since working for CiC, $r = .22, p$ (2-tailed) < .01. This indicated that 5% of variability in self-reported intervention since working for CiC is explained by willingness to intervene (table 7.27 for descriptive statistics).
Table 7.27
Descriptive statistics for willingness to intervene and self-reported intervention since working at CiC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to intervene</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervened</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $n$ = number. $M$ = Mean. $SD$ = Standard deviation.

7.10.4.2 In the last year
Cases of respondents who had witnessed verbal bullying in the last year were selected because intervention in the last year was only possible if an event has been witnessed in the last year. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between willingness to intervene and self-reported intervention in the last year. There was a significant positive relationship between the willingness to intervene and self-reported intervention in the last year, $r = .22$, $p$ (2-tailed) < .01. This indicated that 5% of variability in self-reported intervention in the last year is explained by willingness to intervene (table 7.28 for descriptive statistics).

Table 7.28
Descriptive statistics for willingness to intervene and self-reported intervention in the last year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to intervene</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervened</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $n$ = number. $M$ = Mean. $SD$ = Standard deviation.

7.10.4.3 In the last month
Cases of respondents who had witnessed verbal bullying in the last month were selected because intervention in the last month was only possible if an event had been witnessed in the last month. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between willingness to intervene and self-reported intervention in
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the last month. There was a significant positive relationship between the willingness to intervene and self-reported intervention in the last month, \( r = .32, p \) (2-tailed) < .01. This indicated that 10% of variability in self-reported intervention in the last month is explained by willingness to intervene (table 7.29 for descriptive statistics).

Table 7.29
Descriptive statistics for willingness to intervene and self-reported intervention in the last month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( SD )</th>
<th>( n )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to intervene</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervened</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( n \) = number. \( M \) = Mean. \( SD \) = Standard deviation.

The employees' willingness to intervene was related to self-report of intervention as expected. The reports for the prior month accounted for twice the variability (10%) when compared to reports for the year (5%) or since being at CiC (5%).

7.10.4.4 Summary
Although the variability accounted for is not large it doubled with temporal proximity. This contributes to the understanding of bystander intervention and is deliberated in the discussion.

7.10.5 A high score on perception of audience will correlate with a high score for willingness to intervene
The 4\(^{th}\) hypothesis that a high score on the variable audience as represented by the item, 'Other people think verbal bullying is unacceptable' would positively correlate with a high score for willingness to intervene as represented by the item, 'If I see someone being verbal bullied I will intervene' was supported.
A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed and found a significant positive relationship between, 'other people think verbal bullying is
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unacceptable' and, 'If I see someone being verbal bullied I will intervene', $r = .31$, $p$ (1-tailed) < .01. The effect size indicated that 10% of variability in willingness to intervene is explained by perception of audience (table 7.30).

Table 7.30
Descriptive statistics for audience and willingness to intervene

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to intervene</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $M =$ Mean, $SD =$ Standard deviation. $n =$ number.

7.10.5.1 Summary
The Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying metric combined with the variable indicating the employees' perception of their audience regarding verbal bullying at work account for over 50% of variability in willingness to intervene. It was clear that willingness contributed to actual intervention (self-reported) but that other factors must also influence the process. This is considered in the discussion.

7.10.6 Exploring the relationship between audience and self-reported intervention
The predictions of the relationships between perception of audience and willingness to intervene; and willingness to intervene and actual intervention had been tested as planned. Following on from the exploration of these relationships it seemed prudent to test the relationship between perception of audience and self-reported intervention.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was computed to assess the relationship between 'Other people think verbal bullying is unacceptable' (audience) and self-reported intervention for the last month, the last year and since working for CiC (table 7.31 below).
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Table 7.31
Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between audience \((n = 1017)\) and self-reported intervention \((n = 1154)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervened in last month</td>
<td>-.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervened in last year</td>
<td>-.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervened since working at organisation</td>
<td>-.065*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at \(p < 0.05\) level.

Although there was a significant negative relationship between audience and intervention since working at CiC the percentage of variability it represented was negligible in this context.

7.11 Results of the experimental research hypotheses

The RBI-VB metric was developed to measure employees' willingness to intervene in workplace verbal bullying. This enabled baseline measurements and evaluation of intervention programmes intended to increase intervention. Being willing to intervene was considered a necessary precursor to responsible intervention (as opposed to impulsive and potentially inappropriate intervention); this assumption was tested (p. 241, 7.10.4). Experimental programmes, including control groups, were devised to test the Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (RIDS); a feedback poster and CiC's in-house campaign. CiC provided access at 6 locations; half of the locations had previously participated in an in-house bullying awareness campaign (experimental group 2, \(n = 539\)) and half had not (experiment group 1, \(n = 602\)). Each location was allocated to a research condition (table 7.32). Analyses were conducted for each experimental group using IBM SPSS Statistics version 20 (2011).
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Table 7.32
Research condition for each location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental group 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC1</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>Poster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental group 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP0</td>
<td>Poster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>Campaign reinforcement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1N night shift were grouped with W weekend shift
2E early shift were grouped with L late shift

7.11.1 Experimental group 1

This experimental group comprised 3 independent groups who had not participated in the in-house bullying awareness campaign. The groups were allocated by the gatekeeper to 1 of the 3 conditions; control, poster and training (table 7.33). Surveys were conducted before and after the research programmes. Although the same groups were surveyed, individual responses were not matched owing to an anonymity guarantee; therefore the 6 groups were analysed as independent. That is, each condition before (survey 1, \( n = 244 \)) and after (survey 2, \( n = 358 \)) the research programmes.

Table 7.33
Experimental group 1 conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC1(^1)</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>Poster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2(^2)</td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)N night shift were grouped with W weekend shift
\(^2\)E early shift were grouped with L late shift
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7.11.1 RBI-VB scores will increase between survey 1 and survey 2 in the experimental conditions (poster and training) but not the control condition for experimental group 1

Hypothesis 5 was analysed at sub-scale level using a parametric test for the process and power sub-scales as the test assumptions were not violated. Although the variation within the population was equal, the perception sub-scale violated the assumption of a normal distribution and therefore a non-parametric test was used for the perception sub-scale (section 7.8.4.1, p. 229). The hypothesis was supported on the process sub-scale.

7.11.1.1 Process and power sub-scales parametric tests

Differences in mean scores for survey 2 across the 3 conditions in experimental group 1 were explored by analysis of variance for the sub-scales; process and power. Variances were equal as indicated by Levene’s tests for homogeneity of variance which were not significant (process, $p = .512$; power, $p = .250$). There was a statistically significant difference between the 3 conditions for the process sub-scale, $F(5, 602) = 2.737, p = .019$, $\eta^2 = .022$; but no statistically significant differences for the power sub-scale, $F(5, 602) = 0.859, p = .310$, $\eta^2 = .007$ for experimental group 1. The results of a post hoc Fisher LSD test for the process sub-scale revealed that CC2 (training condition, survey 2) and CR1 (poster condition, survey 2) had significantly higher scores than CC1 (control, survey 2) (table 7.34 and 7.35 below). The training group (CC2, survey 2) achieved the highest scores on both the process and power sub-scales in experimental group 1. The control group's (CC1) score dropped on both the process and power sub-scales in the second survey to below that in their first survey but not significantly.
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Table 7.34
Experimental group 1: Number, mean and standard deviation for the process sub-scale of the RBI-VB metric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Process Survey 1</th>
<th>Process Survey 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>15.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>16.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.35
Experimental group 1: Number, mean and standard deviation for the power sub-scale of the RBI-VB metric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Power Survey 1</th>
<th>Power Survey 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>13.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>13.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>13.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.11.1.1.2 Perception sub-scale non-parametric test
As the perception sub-scale did not have a normal distribution a parametric test was not suitable. The non-parametric rank-based Kruskal-Wallis H test may be used to identify differences between independent-variable groups if the data are continuous or ordinal (Field, 2005, p. 543). There were no differences in mean rank scores between the 3 conditions for experimental group 1 as analysed using the non-parametric rank-based Kruskal-Wallis H test for the perception sub-scale, $H(5) = 3.226$, $p = .665$ (table 7.36).
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Table 7.36
Experimental group 1: Number and mean rank (Kruskal-Wallis H test) for the perception sub-scale of the RBI-VB metric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Perception Survey 1</th>
<th>Perception Survey 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>306.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>306.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>319.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = number. MR = Mean rank.

7.11.1.1.3 Summary
Summarising the results of experimental group 1 (employees who had not previously participated in the in-house campaign); the prediction that the poster and training groups would increase their RBI-VB scores after the programmes was supported for the process sub-scale (the individual's knowledge). No differences were found on the power (the capacity or ability to act) or perception (the way in which the individual interprets, regards and understands.) sub-scales.

The results indicated that the 45 minute, evidenced-based researcher training programme was the most effective method of increasing the RBI-VB process sub-scale score for employees. The poster condition also improved the employees’ RBI-VB process sub-scale score but to a lesser extent.

7.11.1.2 The experimental conditions (poster and training) for experimental group 1 will have an increase in perception of audience scores between survey 1 and survey 2
To test the 6th hypothesis, differences in mean scores for, ‘Other people think verbal bullying is unacceptable’ between the 3 conditions for experimental group 1 were explored by univariate analysis of variance. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not significant ($p = .219$). The hypothesis was not supported.
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There were no statistically significant differences in mean score of ‘Audience’ between pre and post programme surveys of any conditions for experimental group 1. Therefore the prediction that the poster and training groups would increase ‘Audience’ scores after the programmes was not found in experimental group 1; $F(5,530) = 0.427, p = .830$ (descriptive statistics; table 7.37 below).

Table 7.37
Experimental group 1: Number, mean and standard deviation for the audience variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Survey 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Survey 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $n =$ number. $M =$ Mean. $SD =$ Standard deviation.

7.11.1.2.1 Summary
Over the duration of this study the employees who had not seen the in-house campaign did not change their perception of audience. That is, their thoughts on other employees' views on the acceptability of workplace verbal bullying remained statistically the same.

7.11.2 Experimental group 2
This experimental group comprised 3 independent groups who had previously participated in the in-house bullying awareness campaign. The groups were allocated by the gatekeeper to 1 of the 3 conditions; control, poster and campaign reinforcement (table 7.38 below). The latter being reiteration of the messages given in the in-house bullying awareness campaign. Surveys were conducted before and after the research programmes. Although the same groups were surveyed individual responses were not matched owing to an anonymity guarantee; therefore the 6 groups were analysed as independent. That is, each condition before (survey 1, $n = 302$) and after (survey 2, $n = 237$) the research programmes.
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Table 7.38
Experimental group 2 conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP0</td>
<td>Poster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>Campaign reinforcement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.11.2.1 RBI-VB scores will increase between survey 1 and survey 2 in the experimental conditions (poster and campaign reinforcement) but not the control condition for experimental group 2

Hypothesis 7 for experimental group 2 was analysed at sub-scale level on the same basis as experimental 1 group. That is, the process and power sub-scales did not violate assumptions for parametric testing but the perception sub-scale did and therefore required a non-parametric test. The hypothesis was supported on the perception sub-scale.

7.11.2.1.1 Process and power sub-scales parametric tests

Differences in mean scores between the 3 conditions for experimental group 2 were explored by analysis of variance for the sub-scales, process and power. Variances were equal as indicated by Levene’s tests for homogeneity of variance which were not significant (process, $p = .986$; power, $p = .443$). There were no differences between conditions for the process sub-scale, $F(5, 539) = 1.65$, $p = .145$, $\eta^2 = .015$; and the power sub-scale, $F(5, 539) = 1.55$, $p = .171$, $\eta^2 = .014$ for experimental group 2 (tables 7.39 and 7.40 below).
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Table 7.39
Experimental group 2: Number, mean and standard deviation for the process sub-scale of the RBI-VB metric at survey 1 and survey 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Process Survey 1</th>
<th>Process Survey 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>18.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = number. M = Mean. SD = Standard deviation.

Table 7.40
Experimental group 2: Number, mean and standard deviation for the power sub-scale of the RBI-VB metric at survey 1 and survey 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Power Survey 1</th>
<th>Power Survey 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>14.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = number. M = Mean. SD = Standard deviation.

7.11.2.1.2 Perception sub-scale non-parametric test
A difference was found in mean scores between the 3 conditions for experimental group 2 as analysed using the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis H test for the perception sub-scale, \( H(5) = 12.58, p = .028 \). The results of a post hoc Wilcoxon signed-rank test indicated a significant difference with CP1 survey 2 (campaign reinforcement) being higher than CP0 survey 2 (poster); \( Z = 3016.00, p = .008 \) (table 7.41).
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Table 7.41
Experimental group 2: Number and mean rank for the perception sub-scale of the RBI-VB metric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Perception Survey 1</th>
<th>Perception Survey 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>MR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>285.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>248.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>300.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = number. MR = Mean rank.

7.11.2.1.3 Summary
The prediction that the poster and campaign reinforcement groups would increase RBI-VB scores after the programmes was not supported for the process and power sub-scales for experimental group 2. There was partial support in the perception sub-scale as the campaign reinforcement group was found to have a significantly higher score. This indicated that the poster and reinforcement groups did not improve employees' understanding of what they can do about verbal bullying at work. Their sense of control over verbal bullying at work also did not change. Reinforcement of the in-house programme did have a positive impact on the participating employees’ point of view on verbal bullying at work.

7.11.2.2 The experimental conditions (poster and campaign reinforcement) for experimental group 2 will have an increase in perception of audience scores between survey 1 and survey 2
To test hypothesis 8 differences in mean scores for, ‘Other people think verbal bullying is unacceptable’ between the 3 conditions for experimental group 2 were explored by univariate analysis of variance. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not significant \( p = .061 \). There were no statistically significant differences in mean score of ‘Audience’ between pre and post programme surveys of any conditions. Therefore
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the prediction that the poster and training groups would increase ‘Audience’ scores after the programmes was not found; \( F(5,475) = 1.434, p = .211 \) (descriptive statistics; table 7.42 below).

Table 7.42
Experimental group 2: Number, mean and standard deviation for the audience variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Survey 1</th>
<th>Survey 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( n \) = number. \( M \) = Mean. \( SD \) = Standard deviation.

7.11.2.3 Analysis of self-reports of being bullied, witnessing, intervening and willingness to intervene by condition

The strategy was designed to strengthening employees' responsibility for workplace verbal bullying, thereby increase bystander’s willingness to intervene. It was not expected that actual self-reports of being verbally bullied, witnessing or intervention would not show any significant difference over the short duration of this study. Willingness to intervene as represented by, ‘If I see verbal bullying I will intervene’ in the survey was predicted to change.

For future tracking and feedback for CiC analyses took place of the self-reports of exposure and willingness to intervene for all conditions between pre and post-intervention surveys. Thus the analyses were of data for the month before and the month after the research programmes.

7.11.2.3.1 Self-report of exposure to bullying

To ascertain if there were differences between survey 1 and survey 2 in self-reported exposure to workplace verbal bullying for each condition, 18 independent sample t-tests were calculated (tables 7.43 - 7.45 below). A single significant difference (2-tailed) was found between CP1 in survey 1 \( (M = .02, SD = .125) \) and CP1 in survey 2 \( (M = .14, SD = .354) \); \( t (104) = 2.62, p = .03 \). This indicated that self-reports of being bullied
increased between survey 1 (1.6%) and survey 2 (14.3%) in the in-house campaign reinforcement condition in CP1. No other differences were found.

Table 7.43
Descriptive statistics and t-tests (2-tailed) for equality of means between survey 1 and survey 2 for self-reports of being verbally bullied for each condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey 1</th>
<th>Survey 2</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC1</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP0</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.604</td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation, p = Significance.
* Significant at p < 0.05 level

Table 7.44
Descriptive statistics and t-tests (2-tailed) for equality of means between Survey 1 and survey 2 for self-reports of witnessing verbal bullying for each condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey item</th>
<th>Survey 1</th>
<th>Survey 2</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC1</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.445</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP0</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.322</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.607</td>
<td>.545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation, p = Significance.
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Table 7.45
Descriptive statistics and t-tests (2-tailed) for equality of means between Survey 1 and survey 2 for self-reports of intervention in verbal bullying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey item</th>
<th>Survey 1</th>
<th>Survey 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP0</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( M = \) Mean, \( SD = \) Standard Deviation, \( p = \) Significance.

7.11.2.3.2 Willingness to intervene

In the interest of completeness, willingness to intervene was analysed for each condition, to ascertain if there were differences between survey 1 and survey 2 in responses to, ‘If I see verbal bullying I will intervene’, 6 independent sample t-tests were calculated (table 7.46 below).

Table 7.46
Descriptive statistics and t-tests (2-tailed) for equality of means between Survey 1 and survey 2 for willingness to intervene for each condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Survey 1</th>
<th>Survey 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS1</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( n = \) Number, \( M = \) Mean, \( SD = \) Standard deviation, \( p = \) Significance. \* Significant at \( p < .05 \) level.

There was a significant difference (2-tailed) found between CR1, survey 1 \( (M = 3.86, SD = 1.24) \) and CR1, survey 2 \( (M = 3.37, SD = 1.43) \); \( t (138) = 2.16, p = .032 \). This indicated that willingness to intervene decreased between survey 1 and survey 2 in the poster condition in CR1.
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7.12 Assessing the in-house campaign
At the outset of this research the participating employees fell into 2 distinct experimental groups, those who had completed an in-house campaign on bullying awareness and those who had not. The RBI-VB metric was used to assess the in-house programme’s impact on willingness to intervene by comparing the baseline measures (survey 1) of the 2 experimental groups. A parametric test was used on the grounds that 73% of the items were normally distributed (section 7.8.4.1, p. 229).

Experimental group 1 comprised 3 groups who had not participated in the in-house campaign \( (n = 247) \) and experimental group 2 comprised 3 groups who had participated in the in-house campaign \( (n = 304) \). Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not significant \( (p = .405) \), indicating equal variances across the groups. The result of a univariate analysis of variance was, \( F(1,549) = 9.527, p = .002 \), indicating that the groups who had participated in the previous in-house campaign \( (M = 57.72, SD = 12.23) \) had a significantly higher RBI-VB score than those had not participated in the previous in-house campaign \( (M = 54.58, SD = 11.37) \).

Subsequently the same analysis was carried out after the research programmes to investigate if the difference was sustained (survey 2). Experimental group 1 \( (n = 364.) \) and experimental group 2 \( (n = 238) \) were compared using an univariate analysis of variance. Levene’s test for homogeneity of variance was not significant \( (p = .304); F(1,600) = 7.630, p = .006 \). The result indicated that at survey 2, the in-house participation group \( (M = 57.90, SD = 11.08) \) sustained a significantly higher RBI-VB score than the group that had not participated in the previous in-house programme \( (M = 55.21, SD = 12.05) \).

7.12.1 Summary
The assessment of the in-house campaign was carried out using the RBI-VB metric which provided an indication of employees' willingness to intervene in verbal bullying incidents at work. This had been evidenced as relating to actual bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying. When comparing the RBI-VB scores of all participating
employees, the in-house programme group were found to have a significantly higher score which was sustained after the research programmes.

7.13 Chapter summary
The Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric provides a practical, single page, measure of employees' responsibility for intervention in workplace verbal bullying. This positively correlates with actual bystander intervention. For employees who had not experienced the in-house campaign, process scores for their responsibility for workplace verbal bullying were increased by a single 45 minutes RIDS based training session. That is, the employees' knowledge relating to workplace verbal bullying was increased and this had a positive relationship to their willingness to intervene.

CiC's in-house programme was evidenced as increasing willingness to intervene; and a second exposure to their campaign (condition CP1) further increased perception scores of participating employees. That is, the way in which employees' interpret, regard and understand workplace verbal bullying. This was positively related to their willingness to intervene. Employees who had participated in the in-house programme had significantly higher RBI-VB scores than participating employees who had not seen the in-house campaign. The power component of the RBI-VB was not significantly changed by any programme (RIDS training, feedback poster or in-house campaign).

The expectation that employees' with no experience of workplace verbal bullying would be more likely to intervene was not found. The opposite was evidenced; employees' who had been bullied were more likely to report they had intervened. The data illustrated that experiencing verbal bullying increased the likelihood of bystander intervention. Contrary to this employees who had experience of workplace verbal bullying were likely to score low on the RBI-VB indicating that they were not willing to intervene. This is explored in the discussion.
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8 Discussion

8.1 Introduction
Chapter 7 presented the results of the hypotheses testing and further analyses which originated in the data; references back to this chapter in the form of table or section numbers will be provided for convenience. The two experimental groups will be referred to as the naïve and non-naïve groups for brevity; those who had not participated in the in-house campaign (naïve) and those who had (non-naïve). The research concluded with all four aims satisfied. Specifically these were to:

- Develop a theoretically-based bystander intervention strategy.
- Develop a metric for bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying.
- Develop an intervention programmes to increase bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying.
- Field test the strategy using the new metric and intervention programme.

The research comes full circle having achieved the aims and answered the research question. To the researcher's knowledge this is the first intervention research directed specifically at bystanders to workplace verbal bullying and the first metric developed to measure bystander's responsibility for intervention in workplace bullying. Additionally it is believed to be the first venture into calculating the magnitude of social influence on bystander intervention. This research makes an important contribution to understanding bystander willingness to intervene in workplace verbal bullying and actual intervention.

8.2 Responding to the research question
A gap existed in the workplace bullying literature; there was not an implemented, measured and reported strategy to increase bystander intervention in workplace bullying. The research to resolve this gap was long overdue. Bystander intervention was a strategy in other areas of inappropriate behaviour; school bullying (Twemlow, Fonagy, & Sacco, 2004), sexual violence (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004; Bowes-Sperry, & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005); and racial discrimination (Ishiyama, 2000). In the case of
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workplace bullying there had been suggestions and indications that it may be a worthwhile direction to pursue (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011; Rayner, & Bowes-Sperry, 2008; Rayner, & Keashly, 2005; van Heugten, 2011). This call was taken up, specifically to develop a strategy to increase bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying. The focus was on verbal bullying and not the broad phenomenon of workplace bullying its entirety. To reiterate the main reason behind this; the participating organisation had identified verbal bullying as a major issue. Based on this the research question was:

What theoretically-based, measurable, bystander intervention strategy will increase bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying?

Having completed the research project, the answer to this question was that the Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (RIDS) has the potential to increase bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying.

In response to the call for robust, theoretically-based intervention strategies, effectively implemented and reliably measured, the Responsible Bystander Decision Strategy (RIDS) combined existing theories to model a new strategy for bystander intervention. This model will be described and considered in terms of functionality.

8.3 The Responsible Bystander Decision Strategy (RIDS)

In investigating the gap many antecedents to bystander non-intervention became evident (Latané, & Dabbs, 1975; Latané, & Darley, 1970; Paull, Omari, & Standen, 2012). The emphasis in over forty-five years of research had largely been on group inhibitors with the costs and rewards of intervening considered to a lesser extent. More recently researchers had begun to explore ideas which had the potential to positively alter the pattern of bystander behaviour (Rayner, & McIvor, 2008; Scully, & Rowe, 2009). The bystanders' role had been portrayed as a difficult one (Latané, & Darley, 1970); and it remains so (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2012). Nevertheless after many years of bystander intervention research it was time that an intervening bystander was not surprising but a reasonable expectation. To achieve this in the workplace was quite different from
understanding it in the laboratory. Much of the evidence on non-intervention highlighted factors which were not feasible to filter out; such as the proximity of other workers (Bickman, 1971). All known inhibitors could not be removed, owing to limited training time, the complexities involved and ethical concerns. A case in point is that it was unacceptable to dictate who employees should befriend; despite the knowledge that bystanders' perception of targets is related to the bystanders' intention to intervene (Latané and Rodin, 1969; Mulder, Pouwelse, Lodewijckx, & Bolman, 2008). In other words, although friends are more likely to support each other employers cannot tell employees who to be friends with. As field research, the targeted antecedent to non-intervention had to be practical and reasonable to manipulable in the workplace.

8.3.1 The core of bystander intervention
An aspect of bystander inhibition had been long overlooked. Early in bystander research it was acknowledged that each bystander must make certain judgements if they are to reach a decision to intervene; this was called the decision process model (Latané, & Darley, 1970). Careful attention to this was fundamental to enabling bystanders to intervene, as without achieving each step in the decision process bystander intervention was unlikely. What is more, if the unlikely occurred and intervention took place without forethought the risks of inflaming the situation were likely to be high (Bowes-Sperry, & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005). As expressed by Scully and Rowe, any intervention was not necessarily better than no intervention at all (2009, p. 6). Consequently training must be thorough to maximise efficacy (Scully, & Rowe, 2009). Thus, taking this research back to the foundations of bystander intervention, their decision process, was the core of the new strategy. The focus was on a theory capable of supporting the decision process, not only to enable bystander intervention but to guide training in responsible bystander intervention.

8.3.2 Intra and inter-personal strategies
The structured approach taken in this research supported the intra-personal decision process as the foundation needed for bystander responsible intervention. The literature had highlighted and extensively explained the inhibiting influences of other bystanders
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(Bennett, Banyard, & Garnhart, 2013; D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011; Latané, & Darley, 1970; Latané, & Nida, 1981). In this research these were considered secondary to the decision process and therefore an area for subsequent research. It is acknowledged that in real-life intra and inter-personal process coexist and in workplaces the decision process does not stand apart from group inhibitors. Therefore it is essential for research in this area to build on from the RIDS model and find strategies to counter the inter-personal phenomena which influence bystander intervention.

8.3.3 The theoretical basis for RIDS

This development of a bystander intervention strategy through quantitative research required a principle by which it could be argued the conceptual model had a chance of success; and, crucially, it had to be measurable. Logically the most efficient means to establish that a conceptual model had the potential to be effective was to base the strategy on models which had already been tested and were reliable. The concept underpinning the new bystander intervention strategy was an expansion of the decision process model (Latané & Darley, 1970), incorporating the Triangle of Responsibility (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994). These existing models were adapted to form the Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (figure 8.1).

![Figure 8.1 The Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (RIDS) model](image-url)

Figure 8.1 The Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (RIDS) model
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The first aim of the research was fulfilled; a theoretically-based bystander intervention strategy had been developed. This contributed to academic knowledge in the field of bystanders, workplace bullying and responsibility theory. The new Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (RIDS) contributions will be explained.

8.3.4 Contribution to bystander and workplace bullying literature
The Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (RIDS) addresses the need for a workplace bullying intervention strategy focussed on those well placed to immediately intervene; the bystanders. This is the first implemented and measured bystander strategy of its kind for workplace verbal bullying. Although verbal bullying was specifically targeted at the request of the organisation the RIDS strategy may be used in the future for bystander intervention in other forms of workplace bullying.

Training based on the RIDS model increased bystander's willingness to intervene in workplace verbal bullying (tables 7.34, p. 248 & 7.26, p. 240); and willingness was shown to be positively correlated to actual intervention (section 7.10.4, p. 241). Responsible intervention may reduce workplace verbal bullying in a number of ways. Immediate intervention to stop bullying behaviour makes it clear to the bully and other bystanders that the behaviour is unacceptable (Scully, & Rowe, 2009, p. 2; Salin, 2009). This may be enough for some bullies to realise their behaviour was wrong (Scully, & Rowe, 2009, p. 2). If that is not the case then the intervention may disrupt continuation or escalation of the bullying. Additionally intervention may dissuade the bully from repeating the behaviour in the future (Salin, 2009). Assertive, calm intervention provides a model of behaviour for others (Bowes-Sperry, & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005). Training bystanders to intervene is not only advantageous as, “... individuals become more able to be active bystanders but that the accumulation of many active bystander interventions positively shapes a workplace climate” (Scully, & Rowe, 2009, p. 6). The more bystanders intervene the more likely community intolerance for verbal bullying will grow. As with the negative ripple effect of bullying (Heames, & Harvey, 2006; Hoel, Einarsen, & Cooper, 2003; Kivimäki, Virtanen, & Vartia, 2003; Lewis, & Orford, 2005; Lutgen-Sandvik, & McDermott, 2008); a ripple effect of supportive employees who will not tolerate bullying may develop. Furthermore an organisational advantage
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is that a supportive environment may, “...reduce targets’ intentions to quit.” (Bentley, Catley, Cooper-Thomas, Gardner, O’Driscoll, Dale, & Trenberth, 2012, p. 353).

Bystander intervention is not without pitfalls and monitoring must take place to ensure that previously overt verbal bullying is not replaced with covert bullying behaviours, as was found in school bullying research (Houghton, Nathan, & Taylor, 2012). Monitoring should be regular and include items on all types of bullying along with audits of official reporting.

8.3.5 Summary
The Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (RIDS) contributes to academic bystander knowledge by providing a theoretical-based, implemented and tested model illustrating the requirements to progress a bystander from being present at an event to responsibly intervening. In this instance the model has been applied to workplace verbal bullying. Academic knowledge in the field of workplace bullying has been increased with the addition of the RIDS model which specifically addresses the bystander intervention gap in the literature. In doing so RIDS provides a secondary intervention which may be used in conjunction with other interventions to complete an overall multi-level strategy. As the first implemented and measured bystander strategy specifically for workplace bullying it also illustrated that the bystander potential can become a reality. Measurement provided functional data as will be seen in the next section. The RIDS was tested with a newly developed metric (Chapter 6) and training programme (Appendix K). The new Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric will be examined.

8.4 Measuring Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying
The call for monitoring was followed through with the Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric, developed specifically for the RIDS. The second aim of the research, to develop a metric for bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying, was addressed in the context of the 1st research aim. That is, the measure was designed to assess the level of responsibility an individual employee
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perceived they had for intervening in workplace verbal bullying.

8.4.1 The Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric

Based on the RIDS the Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric was designed to measure manipulable components of bystander responsibility, representative of employees' willingness to intervene in workplace verbal bullying events. The new RBI-VB metric explained over 40% of willingness to intervene in workplace verbal bullying (section 7.10.3, p. 240). Expressly, the extent to which a bystander feels responsible to intervene in workplace verbal bullying does give an indication of how willing they are to intervene. Once validated, the RBI-VB metric provided the researcher with a tool to assess the RIDS and the participating employer with baseline data enabling comparisons between groups.

8.4.2 The RBI-VB in context

The application of the Triangle Model in a bystander intervention metric varied from earlier work using the Model. Whilst sharing the underlying concept of responsibility, the context and perspective were different. The original research by Schlenker and colleagues had participants attribute responsibility to an actor in four scenarios (Britt, 1995, p. 18; Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994). This aligned with research on the information sought by individuals for determining responsibility of others (Britt, 1995, p. 18; Schlenker, et al., 1994). In the current research the participants were conducting a self-assessment of responsibility for intervention in verbal bullying at their workplace.

Initially, perception of responsibility is intra-personal and perhaps sub-conscious, relying largely on information available before the event. This encompasses the individual's knowledge and stance on verbal bullying, combined with their perception of authority to act. It is noted that in real-life the nature of the specific incident, intra and inter-personal process may appear almost concurrent but they are considered consecutively here in the interest of clarity. External factors; incident specific and inter-personal influences were considered secondary and therefore subsequent step.
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As an intra-personal construct bystander responsibility is a self-assessment of obligation and not a judgement of accountability or where to lay blame. This is of vital importance as there must be caution to ensure organisations with a blame the victim culture do not commute to a blame the bystander culture. Previous field work with the Triangle Model had not established a consistent and repeatable metric. Consequently development of a repeatable measure based on the Model is unique.

8.4.3 The dimensionality of the RBI-VB metric

It was by no means certain that the adaptation of the Triangle Model for use in the RIDS would result in a tri-dimensional metric. The fact that all links would be required to ascertain responsibility indicated a potential unidimensional model. Attributions of responsibility to others had previously been described as the, “...psychological glue...” between identity, prescription and event and whilst these are present in the new model they manifest in a holistic manner (Schlenker, 1997, p. 241). The key reason for this may be that attribution (previous applications) and self-attribution (the current research) are different perspectives. To clarify, from an external (judging others) perspective the individual can be described as linking to the event or prescription separately. Likewise, under academic scrutiny an element can be removed from the assessment and the remaining two can be considered distinctly. Contrary to this self-assessment of responsibility is likely to integrate identity, how it links to the event and the rules they can access. In this intra-personal perspective the links are not distinct. This may be the reason behind Britt's (1995) finding that each link independently predicted responsibility (Britt, 1995, p. 20). Analysis of dimensionality of the RBI-VB revealed responsibility in workplace verbal bullying comprised three components; process, perception and power (section 7.7.3, p. 221). This contributes to understanding the way in which individuals construct their own sense of responsibility.

8.4.3.1 Assumptions of responsible bystanding

The assumption of the Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (RIDS) was that the decision process must be supported to enable an individual to responsibly intervene. To clarify, impulsive intervention may occur with, for example, no information about the
appropriate steps to take or what to say, and this has a greater risk of failure than a prepared response (Bowes-Sperry, & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005, p. 298). Intervention is more likely to be responsible and effective if the decision process has been supported. The optimal bystander would understand the processes involved, have a perception of verbal bullying and intervention conducive to intervening, and feel adequate power to carry out an intervention. If lacking in any of these factors, responsible intervention becomes less feasible. These assumptions were supported by the field data collected. The strength of the RBI-VB (higher scores being stronger) indicated the support available for the decision strategy and where weakness may lie. Academically this provides an understanding of the way in which bystander responsibility is constructed; in practice it guided the employer to where improvements (training, campaigns, information) were required to enable intervention by bystanders.

**8.4.3.2 Process in the Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (RIDS)**

Process is the most objective component; the knowledge necessary to reach a responsible intervention decision. A verbal bullying event may not be noticed if the bystander has no point of reference for categorising the behaviour (decision stage 1 and 2) (figure 8.2).

![Figure 8.2 Process component of the Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy](image)

Figure 8.2 Process component of the Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy
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Acceptable behaviour may be difficult to clarify, especially if banter has become inappropriate over a long time. Consequently it is vital to establish boundaries in the workplace. It is inadequate to determine what is respectful solely based on the simplistic idea of treating others as you would like to be treated (Melé, 2009, p. 228; Wattles, 1987, p. 106); as this accepts the lowest common denominator. Equally, leaving behaviour to expectations is problematic. Lutgen-Sandvik and McDermott found a perception that high achievers were entitled to treat others badly (2011, p. 362). Clearly this would not be a basis for a bully-free workplace. Furthermore, there is a strong contextual element, with different industries expecting different standards, which would cloud interpretations creating fuzzy boundaries (Alexander, MacLaren, O’Gorman, & Taheri, 2011; Lucas, 2011). For these reasons policy, codes of conduct and adequate dissemination are essential components in an organisation's approach to anti-bullying (Dimarino, 2011; Meloni, & Austin, 2011; Pate, & Beaumont, 2010); and preferably this should be proactive (Hoel, & Einarsen, 2010; Sotile, & Sotile, 1999).

Adequate implementation of policy should be followed by employees, and managers in particular, modelling appropriate behaviours. During fieldwork the researcher experienced situations where those tasked with monitoring the guidelines overtly overstepped them. Employees need clear, modelled and enforced guidelines (Lutgen-Sandvik, Namie, & Namie, 2009). Whether this could include dubious behaviours such as disrespectful communication in a professional kitchen being accepted is a matter considered elsewhere (Alexander, MacLaren, O’Gorman, & Taheri, 2011; Bloisi, 2012).

It is possible to intervene without information but the intervention would have an increased risk of escalating the abuse perhaps by becoming retaliatory. Even if an individual feels they should intervene likelihood decreases if they do not know what they can do. This is why process includes understanding how to intervene (decision stage 4 ). Teacher's who felt school policy and training lacked guidance for dealing with bullying were associated with bystander abdication; exposing how bystander process influences their willingness to intervene (Twemlow, et al., 2004, p. 223 - 224).
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The process component of the RBI-VB provides information on the strength of the employee's knowledge about verbal bullying (section 7.7.3, p. 221). This may be used to monitor an entire workforce or be part of an individual assessment. Weak areas, for example, not knowing what to say, can then be targeted for improvement. This can be achieved with training as evidenced by the RIDS training (section 7.11.1, p. 246).

8.4.3.3 Perception in the Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (RIDS)
The perception component is a subjective reflection; the participant's personal interpretation of workplace verbal bullying (section 7.7.3, p. 221). To reiterate, this is cognitive and not sensory perception. To progress through the decision process the bystander needs to perceive that the event requires attention (decision stage 2) and that they share responsibility for verbal bullying reduction (decision stage 3) (figure 8.3).

![Figure 8.3 Perception component of the Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy](image)

Individual perception has been recognised as an important factor in all aspects of workplace bullying since it was first described by Brodsky (1976). As an abstract and socially constructed phenomena the individual's response to it is personal. It is intuitive therefore that bystander perception should influence their feeling of responsibility for
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intervention in workplace verbal bullying. The greater the employee's belief that workplace verbal bullying has a negative impact, including on themselves, and that intervention is a shared responsibility, the more likely they are to be willing to intervene. Although seemingly obvious, support is needed for this assumption. The results from the analysis of RBI-VB data provided clear evidence that employees who are disconnected from the phenomenon and see no need for bullying reduction are not willing to intervene (section 7.10.3, p. 240). The views of disconnected employees may range widely from those who believe it is nothing to do with them unless they are a target, to those who are destructive-active bystanders who find bullying in some way gratifying (Paull, Omari, & Standen, 2012). Although the focus here is the intra-personal decision process the likelihood of this step in the process being cognitively concurrent with the inter-personal processes must be noted. Disconnection may occur through inter-personal influences, such as Bystander Effects, in spite of a strong intra-personal willingness to intervene. The inter-personal impact will be expanded on later (section 8.8, p. 283).

As a subjective component aligning employees' interpretation of verbal bullying is not as straightforward as improving their process knowledge. However, the field study provided evidence that a brief (under 30 minutes) second exposure to a campaign raising awareness about the impact of verbal bullying and calling for bystanders to intervene improved employees' perception (section 7.11.1.1, p. 247). That is, their likelihood of intervening was increased.

8.4.3.4 Power in the Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (RIDS)

The ability to influence the situation or the authority to take control may empower a bystander to intervene (decision stage 5) (figure 8.4). The power component is both subjective and objective (section 7.7.3, p. 221). That is, the capability to intervene may be influenced by the objective; whether or not you have the potential to intervene. Examples are being able to leave your work-station; having accepted authority over the bully; or having influence, in the latter case perhaps being a union representative, a long-standing employee or one who has gained trust from the other employees. This is seen through a subjective screen. Although the employee may have authority (or not) it
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is how they feel which will move them to actually intervene. If they feel it is their duty, they have some influence or control over the situation they will be more likely to act.

The lack of power is a driver of the persistence of workplace bullying. Bullying may start with equal power between perpetrator and target (Zapf, & Gross, 2001, p. 498); but the eventual power imbalance leaves targets unable to defend themselves (Einarsen, Raknes, & Matthiesen, 1994; Zapf, Knorz, & Kulla, 1996). Similarly, a bystander may be a peer of the bully but if a power imbalance is created (perhaps through fear) their ability to intervene will diminish. In research on bystander intervention in sexual violence funded by the U.S. Department of Justice it was found that those who felt less control were less likely to intervene (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2005, p. 99). The lack of power to act is a general bystander intervention inhibitor. Bullying in the workplace is perpetuated by a lack of power to do something about it. Even those tasked with dealing with bullying issues, such as human resources managers, feel compromised by powerlessness (Harrington, 2010).

It is unsurprising then, that bystanders must feel they have adequate power to intervene before they are willing to do so. When bystanders are aware that intervention is one of their duties they are more likely to take responsibility (decision stage 3). At shop-floor level this is unlikely to be specified in the job description but it may be included in the
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organisations bullying and harassment policy or a dignity and respect code. In their work on bystanders and social control, Chekroun and Brauer (2002, p. 861) found that intervention was associated with the bystander's perception of their own duty. This perception proved strong enough to overcome Bystander Effects (Chekroun, & Brauer, 2002). Thus the stronger the sense of power (a high score on the RBI-VB sub-scale) the more likely a bystander will be able to overcome subsequent Bystander Effects (Latané, & Darley, 1970).

During this research there were no statistically significant differences found in the employees' sense of power after any programme, indicating that this is perhaps more difficult to improve that process and perception. The researcher considered that the work environment and culture would have an impact on power but this was not tested. In hindsight, in appears logical that power may be associated with the cost-rewards model of bystander inhibition and it is recommended that future research investigates this.

8.4.3.5 Summary

The main academic contribution made by the development of the Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric is that it is the first instrument designed for bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying. Furthermore it is a brief metric, thereby contributing to an increased likelihood of external collaborations. To clarify, it is not easy to gain access for workplace bullying research but it is even less likely if completion of a time consuming battery of tests is required. The metric's positively correlates with bystander willingness to intervene and actual intervention, thus has responded to suggestions for research on bystander intervention in workplace bullying. The 3 dimensions, process, perception and power explain bystanders responsibility for intervention which has not previously been clarified. Furthermore, the RBI-VB illustrates how each dimension supports the decision process model (Latané, & Darley, 1970). Thus, in achieving the 2nd research aim, the RBI-VB has provided insight and a means to measure bystander intervention.

In practice the RBI-VB clarifies responsibility for intervention in verbal bullying
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including specific items that contribute towards a stronger (or weaker) willingness to intervene. Incorporated into a single paged, straightforward survey it enables baseline measurement for the RIDS model and a brief but consistent means of monitoring. The strength of bystander responsibility can be assessed for an individual, team, division or entire organisation. Understanding the connection between bystander responsibility and willingness to intervene can guide training. Focussed efforts can improve bystander willingness to intervene through workplace programmes. This contribution to practice was evidenced by the quasi-experimental phase of this research.

8.5 The impact of intervention programmes

Training was developed using the RIDS model and a poster feedback loop was designed to ascertain if a minimalist approach would have impact. These developments fulfilled the 3rd research aim. The poster condition did illustrate that a simple action may raise awareness. Higher scores on the RBI-VB were achieved in this condition for the post-intervention survey for the naïve group (table 7.34, p. 248). This was not the case in the non-naïve group. The researcher-led training based on the RIDS model improved RBI-VB scores in the post-intervention survey (table 7.34, p. 248) demonstrating that a 45-minute training programme was sufficient to have impact on naïve employees.

8.5.1 Improving process knowledge

The naïve group provided evidence that a single exposure to a pro-intervention programme had an impact on the more concrete aspects of bystander intervention. The processes of knowing there are rules, what bullying is and is not, and knowing what to do and say, in hindsight, are probably the most straightforward of the three areas of RBI-VB to influence. Although a very simple step towards bystander intervention, letting employees know the basics, as in the RIDS-based training, was effective. The problem of not knowing what the rules are or what can be done is portrayed by the complexities the topic presented for American Human Resources professionals (Cowan, 2011). A particularly salient point was,

“The absence of the term or any definition that speaks to bullying could leave some employees with the impression that anti-bullying measures are not a
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priority in their organization” (Cowan, 2011, p. 317).

Providing clear guidelines for behaviour; clarifying what can be done; and demonstrating that it is important to the organisation, helps to remove ambiguities that hamper decisions to intervene. Furthermore, dissemination and explanation of policy demonstrates that the organisation is supportive of bullying reduction (Illing, Carter, Thompson, Crampton, Howse, Cooke, & Burford, 2013; Pate & Beaumont, 2010; Zapf, 2012). This demonstration of organisational support for anti-bullying is essential as the organisation's culture is likely to define the boundaries which managers work within (Harvey, Heames, Richey, & Leonard, 2011, p. 5; Salin, 2003b, p. 13).

8.5.2 Clarifying perception

The post-intervention RBI-VB scores of the non-naïve group evidenced a significant rise in perception scores indicating that their view of workplace verbal bullying was influenced by reinforcement of their in-house campaign. The outcome of the experimental programme for the non-naïve group was admittedly harder to interpret owing to limited information being available from the organisation on the nature of the reinforcement. Nevertheless the groups post-programme views were more conducive to a decision to intervene than they had been pre-programme. Support for an association between increased perception and positive bystander behaviours has been found in rape prevention research (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2005, p. 137).

It was likely that the non-naïve group's previous exposure to their in-house campaign was the source of their initial process information. However, this assumption could not be validated as they had already completed the campaign by the start of this research. As the researcher was not involved in the reinforcement programme all that was known was that the group had previously participated in the organisations campaign and managers had agreed to reinforcement. The gatekeeper stated that employees in this condition would be reminded about the campaign but no information was available on how this had taken place or whether or not the entire group received a refresher. Nonetheless the rise in perception was not seen in other groups (table 7.41, p. 253).

The result of the reinforcement may have been a secondary effect which built on the
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foundation of the previously instilled process. That is, with one training session or campaign the process is taken in and then assimilated; a second exposure then helps to clarify the employees views on workplace verbal bullying as they have already grasped the process. Nevertheless, one of the limitations of the study was the lack of detail on the nature of the reinforcement. This was compounded by data not being available for the time when the group were naïve; unfortunately a common issue in organisational intervention studies (Shadish, Chacón-Moscoso, & Sánchez-Meca, 2005). Evaluation of field programmes are known to be subject to these types of obstacles (Illing, Carter, Thompson, Crampton, Howse, Cooke, & Burford, 2013, p. 19). Consequently control groups and consistent measurement, as carried out in this research, are vital (Zapf, 2012).

8.5.3 Power and the bystander

Noticeable by its absence in the results were any changes in the power sub-scale of the RBI-VB metric. No changes in RBI-VB power scores were found in either the naïve or non-naïve group and it may be that power is the most difficult factor to influence. In European research in the context of bureaucratic organisations, bystanders were found to be more likely to help powerful targets; suggesting sensitivity to authority (Mulder, Pouwelse, Lodewijks, & Bolman, 2008). The seemingly counter-intuitive bystander decision was explained as potentially stemming from their perception of the outcome (Mulder, et al., 2008). The stronger target poses a greater potential threat if help is not offered; consequently helping is the path of least danger (Mulder, et al., 2008). The implications of power for bystanders was also illustrated by research in Indian call centres (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2010, p. 281). The study discovered that supportive bystanders found themselves thwarted in the face of authority (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2010, p. 281). It seems that power plays a pivotal role in bystander behaviour. Power imbalance enables bullying; disabling targets objections (Lutgen-Sandvik, & McDermott, 2011). Furthermore, the impact of power misuse may easily extend to the entire group, particularly in the case of hierarchical power (Bassman, 1992; Hoel & Beale, 2006; Lutgen-Sandvik & McDermott, 2011; Vandekerckhove, & Commers, 2003).
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Horizontal bullying which manipulates informal power differentials between peers of equal standing (Lutgen-Sandvik & McDermott, 2008) may not have the same overt power to silence witnesses (Lutgen-Sandvik, 2003, p. 476; Lutgen-Sandvik, & Tracy, 2012, p. 17). Nonetheless with or without legitimate (albeit abused) authority powerlessness may ripple through the group just as the effects of bullying ripple through relationships outside the workplace (Lewis, & Orford, 2005, p. 37). The same factors that lead the target to feel powerless are likely to have implications for bystander intervention (Paull, Omari, & Standen, 2012, p. 2).

There is the possibility, as yet untested, that process and perception must be strong before the sense of power can be increased. This is logical on the grounds that not knowing what to do or how to do it has been seen to lead to helplessness (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2010, p. 276); so increasing process and perception would provide a foundation on which power may eventually be improved. Until positive changes can be made in power scores it may be that employees, as a community, are not ready for change (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2005). Alternatively organisational changes and an improved environment may be an essential prerequisite; affording bystanders adequate power to carry through an intervention.

Whether or not RIDS-based training would have had the same success in the group which had experienced the campaign is unknown as it was not possible for that group to attend researcher-led training. However, the RIDS model and RBI-VB were functional in assessing the in-house campaign. To recap, use of the RBI-VB metric illustrated that RIDS-training for a naïve group significantly increased process scores. RBI-VB scores also increased in the non-naïve group. In contrast this group, with a second exposure to information, had an increase in perception scores rather than process. Thus, the RIDS model and RBI-VB metric were able to distinguish changes in different aspects of bystander responsibility.

8.5.4 Summary
RIDS-based training, the in-house campaign and the poster feedback were all able to
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increase bystanders' willingness to intervene to some extent indicating that positive impact for practice is a reality. The duration of the study was too short to discover if the long-term impact was increased intervention; although the relational results indicated this was possible with the RIDS-based training. Academically the intervention programmes, including the in-house campaign evidenced the efficacy of the RIDS model and the RBI-VB metric. This is believed to be the first evidence of the outcome of a workplace bullying bystander intervention strategy.

8.6 Contribution to research methods

The RIDS model contributed a new strategy to both the workplace bullying and bystander literature; providing the framework for increasing bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying. The model has the potential to be applied to other forms of workplace bullying and other bystander interventions through adaptation of the metric. The RBI-VB metric contributes a single-page, straightforward new instrument for bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying. This was designed for electronic and paper administration; with the latter incorporating Optical Code Reader formatting.

As the successful development and implementation of the RIDS model and RBI-VB metric adhered to Zapf's (2012) 7-stage framework for workplace bullying intervention programmes there is a further contribution to research methods (Chapter 3). This is evidence that a robust and methodical approach is worthwhile and effective.

8.7 New bystander intervention insights

During the research willingness to intervene and actual intervention were compared and contrasted. In this section the discussion treads new ground as field research on bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying is unique. In the absence of workplace bullying comparisons the areas of sexual violence (Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007) and conflict resolution (Zweibel, Goldstein, Manwaring, & Marks, 2008) are drawn upon. With hindsight established researchers in the field of workplace bullying may offer explanations for some of the unexpected findings.
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8.7.1 From willingness to actual bystander intervention

Without an incident there can be no bystander intervention. One of the great difficulties in intervention field research is conducting experiments and measurements over a period in which the phenomena occurs. In this research, actual intervention was dependent on incidents of overt verbal bullying occurring in the four weeks between the programmes and the post-programme survey. Willingness to intervene was found to explain between 5% and 10% of self-reported bystander intervention. The positive correlation was stronger when the intervention was in the last month than when it was in the last year or since being at the organisation (figure 8.5 below). The data shows a temporal nature in the relationship and the possible reasons for this will be considered (section 7.10.4, p. 241).

![Diagram showing the temporal relationship between willingness to intervene and actual intervention (self-reported)](image)

Figure 8.5 The temporal relationship between willingness to intervene and actual intervention (self-reported)

The field study was longitudinal with a period after the bystander programmes in which actual intervention could potentially occur. The proximity of the measurement period to
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the bystander programme may have ensured the information was fresh in the minds of the employees. Conversely it may have given them insufficient time to assimilate the skills (in the case of the training). An extended time-frame may go some way to ensuring that incidents occur within the experimental period and those who are willing have opportunity to intervene. However, a longer gap between intervention and measurement in field research brings its own difficulties.

Organisational compliance with data gathering mechanisms may vary (Hoel, Giga, & Faragher, 2006, p. 64); energy may wane (Zimmerman, & Amori, 2011, p. 12); and confounds may present difficulties in analysing outcomes (Illing, Carter, Thompson, Crampton, Morrow, Howse, Cooke, & Burford, 2013, p. 19). Previous longitudinal intervention evaluation in the somewhat similar area of conflict resolution experienced such issues. Research which included an intensive follow-up data collection was hampered by low post-intervention response rates (Zweibel, Goldstein, Manwaring, & Marks, 2008).

With forewarning of the hurdles from previous intervention research in other areas the relationship between willingness to intervene and actual intervention was analysed. Each period was analysed independently, that is, those who intervened in the preceding month were not also counted in other analyses. The existence of a significant positive relationship between being willing and actual intervening in workplace verbal bullying varied according to time (figure 8.5 above). It can be seen that more recent intervention events accounted for a larger percentage of willingness than those longer ago. It is particular interesting that since being at the organisation (anything over a year) and in the last year (1 to 12 months ago) willingness to intervene remains consistent explaining only 5% of actual intervention. A possible explanation for this would be that participants reflecting on anything more than a year ago generalise or merge their memories.

Recall delay, the inability to accurately recall past incidents when the recall period is too long can potentially be reduced by shortening the recall period (Eisenhower, Mathiowetz, & Morganstein, 2011, p. 135). This would be advisable for frequent
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routine events, whereas longer reference periods are suited to major events (Eisenhower, et al., 2011). It has been suggested that bullying (and by extension intervention to stop it) is not commonly a shock in terms of episodic memory; thus it is more likely to be routine than major (Hoel, Rayner, & Cooper, 1999; Høgh, Hoel, & Caneiro, 2011). In the context of this research verbal bullying was considered routine by the organisation, indicating that a shorter recall period was likely to have less recall bias. That said, the data in this research did not reflect 70% of employees being verbally bullied as stated by the organisation (CiC Gatekeeper, 2011); the highest reported rate was 42% (table 7.20, p. 235). Nonetheless, the researcher considers this to be relatively routine. The discrepancy may indicate that there has been an improvement since the in-house survey ended. This may be related to the partial implementation of the in-house campaign. However, the current study was not prevalence research and the items were not the same as those on the in-house survey, thus comparison is not appropriate. Recall delay was unlikely to have impacted the results of this research as each period of recall for intervention (last month, last year and since working for the organisation) was analysed independently.

The variability explained by willingness to intervene doubled with temporal proximity. This suggests a level of relative immediacy in the relationship; although memory effects cannot be ruled out based on the available data. It would be interesting if people who reported willingness who have not had the opportunity to intervene could be monitored over time to see if they do actually intervene.

To the researcher's knowledge there were no comparable studies in workplace bullying and limited similarities with bystander studies in sexual violence. Banyard and colleagues analysed 2, 4, and 12 month follow-up evaluations finding persistence of effects at 2 months with some decline in the 4 and 12 month data (Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007). It should be noted that a reduced sample size and gender disparity may have impacted the 4 and 12 month follow-ups (Banyard, et al., 2007, p. 476). Self-reports of actual bystander behaviours after 2 months found all the groups including the control group showed increases, with the treatment groups ranking the highest (Banyard, et al., 2007, p. 475). The characteristics of their participants may be
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too dissimilar to have any meaning for the current study; as college students they were primed to learn whereas the shop-floor workers of the current study were not. What can be drawn from the current study and the sexual violence study is that bystander programmes can result in positive changes in very different contexts. It may be that a 2 month follow-up in the current study would have revealed increased self-reported actual intervention as in the sexual violence study. Nonetheless differences are too great to make much of comparisons. Future bystander intervention studies in workplace bullying will be more appropriate for comparison.

The relationship between willingness to intervene and actual intervention in workplace bullying had not been tested previously. This evidence of the positive relationship is a valuable addition to knowledge. This research demonstrated that it is possible to support the essential decision process by increasing RBI-VB scores and thus willingness to intervene. Being willing to intervene is positively related to actual intervention in workplace verbal bullying; but perhaps not to the extent imagined (section 7.10.4, p. 241). Further investigation is needed to discover why the relationship diminishes over time. Data for intervention that day (when completing the survey) or within the week would enable a better picture. It remains that willingness to intervene accounts for a maximum of 10% of self-reported actual intervention. From the intervention development perspective it is more pressing to discover what other manipulable factors drive actual intervention.

8.7.2 The relationship between being bullied and being a responsible bystander

It had been expected that employees who had experienced being bullied would shy away from intervention; that they would not want to expose themselves to the risk of being a target of a bully again. If, as suggested by Westhues (2004), bullying is communal and a high percentage of cases are ignored by management (Namie, & Lutgen-Sandvik, 2010, p. 356), then individual intervention by a previous target would be highly risky (Namie, & Lutgen-Sandvik, 2010, p. 361). Paradoxically the data revealed that employees who have been verbally bullied at work self-reported more intervention than those who had not been verbally bullied at work (section 7.10.1, p. 235). This was the case across all analyses, that is, since being with the organisation, in
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the last year or in the last month. Analyses were individual and not aggregated with the gulf between the behaviours of the non-bullied and previously bullied changing over time.

8.7.2.1 Bystanders who had been bullied

By intervening, previous targets demonstrated an allegiance to other targets, indicating a potential for collective resistance (Namie, & Lutgen-Sandvik, 2010, p. 362); which has been associated with bullying reduction (Lutgen-Sandvik, 2006, p. 426). The bystander's courage to intervene when someone else is being bullied may come from the realisation that bullying is not personal to them (Lutgen-Sandvik, & Tracy, 2012, p. 35). Alternatively those who have previously been bullied have been sensitised and this may trigger a different pattern of behaviour to those with no personal experience. Bandura stated that, “The self-regulatory mechanisms governing moral conduct do not come into play unless they are activated,...” (1999, p. 192). Thus being bullied may activate some individuals into helping others.

Considering the impact that bullying has on a target, finding that a quarter of those bullied in the last month reported that they had intervened when someone else was being bullied in the last month was unexpected (table 7.22, p. 237). This may indicate a strong sense of camaraderie amongst these employees as seen in the, “primacy of friendship” demonstrated by bystanders in Indian call centres (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011, p. 276). In the current research those who intervened may have overcome the perception that they need to hold back, perhaps because they saw more options (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011, p. 281). Another possibility is that having been recently bullied themselves they felt less alone and saw an opportunity to restore a sense of justice (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011, p. 275). The latter does raise the question of the nature of the previous targets intervention and highlight the need to be cautious. If the intervention is ineffective it may reinforce the negative experiences of the target, the bystander or both (Scully, & Rowe, 2009, p. 7; Tracy, Lutgen-Sandvik, & Alberts, 2006, p. 162). An aggressive or otherwise inappropriate intervention could result in the bystander being accused of bullying either justifiably so or because people commonly misinterpret the intentions of others (Ames, 2004, p. 574; Bowes-Sperry, & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005, p. 298). For this reason training must include those who already
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intervene to ensure they do so appropriately (Bowes-Sperry, & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005, p. 297).

Whilst the direction of the findings remained consistent, participants who reported they had been bullied in the last year were more prolific interveners than those who had been bullied in the last month. The disproportionate increase was seen again with those who reported they had been bullied at the organisation (but not in the last month or year) having the highest self-reported intervention. Rather than remaining proportionate, intervention by those bullied in the last year increased by 50% over those bullied in the last month. The increase was 85% between those bullied in the last year and those bullied since being at the organisation. These levels of self-reported intervention from employees who had been bullied made a startling contrast to the 30% self-reported intervention, which was the highest rate reported by those who had never been bullied. The increase in proportion was surprising as previous evidence demonstrated that being bullied is related to long-term negative effects (Høgh, Hoel, & Caneiro, 2011, p. 8). The implication of this would be that the proportion would remain the same. That targets' intervention increased when their own experience was over a month ago may indicate that they had gained coping skills (Zapf, & Gross, 2001); re-framed the previous event (Lutgen-Sandvik & McDermott, 2011); built resilience (Tracy, 2010) or that the bullying was not severe (Hoel, Faragher, & Cooper, 2004). These or other explanations require further exploration.

For the participating organisation qualitative data from those who have intervened would be valuable in understanding their actions. This may lead to adequate data for the academic development of a quantitative inventory that could be used and compared over time. For other organisations it may be possible to incorporate the collection of these data from the outset.

Participants whom reported they had been bullied since working at the organisation reported more than twice the number of interventions of those who reported they had never been bullied at the organisation. It may be prudent for employers to look to recruit those previously bullied as empathetic models for appropriate bystander behaviour (Bowes-Sperry, & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005). The caveat being that the way in which these
employees intervene must be scrutinised. If those who have been bullied are taking the opportunity to vent their frustration, make an example or aggressively regain their self-esteem, their intervention would be negative and unsuitable. The motivation of the previously bullied bystander must lead to a productive intervention; which may not be the case as a qualitative exploration of targets in online support communities revealed that retaliation is often discussed (Cowan, 2009, p. 295).

8.7.2.2 Bystanders who had not been bullied
Participants who had not been bullied since working at the organisation were in the majority and were less than half as likely to have self-reported that they had intervened (section 7.10.1, p. 235). The organisation, from their past employee surveys, perceived the verbal bullying problem to be considerable (anecdotally 70% but evidence was not available for this research). The research surveys, being anonymous and confidential, gave employees the opportunity to freely report. In this context, finding that the majority self-reported they had not experienced workplace verbal bullying within the organisation may be a positive indication. Nevertheless, as the researcher was not entrenched and a comprehensive behaviour inventory was not used, this is not an adequate gauge to indicate a decline in verbal bullying. In another respect the data provides encouraging evidence; interventions were reported by those bullied and not bullied. Increasing intervention has the potential to be easier than initiating intervention from the beginning as existing intervening bystanders serve as models; learning from observation as opposed to experience (Bowes-Sperry, & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005; Hunt, Davidson, Fielden, & Hoel, 2007, p. 43). However, modelling only works if the intervening bystanders stay with the organisation; and bullying is known to expedite staff turnover (Heames, & Harvey, 2006, p. 1225; Høgh, & Dofradottir, 2001, p. 487).

There was a temporal effect: Those who have never been verbally bullied report intervening least; self-reported intervention progressively increased for those who were verbally bullied in the last month or year; and those who have been verbally bullied since being at the organisation but not within the last year report the most interventions. It may be that the experience of being a target leads people to intervene on behalf of others but not when the experience is recent. In complete contrast to this there is no
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evidence for those who report having been verbally bullied being more willing to intervene than those who have not been verbally bullied. There is however, a very small effect in the opposite direction (that is, those who have been verbally bullied are less willing to intervene). Qualitative follow-up research, if possible, may provide insight into the motivations of previously bullied employees who intervene in workplace verbal bullying.

8.7.3 Summary

This field research makes a significant contribution to knowledge of bystander behaviour in workplace verbal bullying. It has been shown that through enabling the decision process, willingness to intervene can be increased. However, willingness has been identified as only one contributing factor to bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying. Previous targets of workplace verbal bullying are often prepared to intervene although their RBI-VB scores indicated they were not willing. This paradox may indicate that they have not processed a responsible decision to intervene. For example, they may not know the organisation's rules or the appropriate steps to intervene effectively. In the workplace it is vital to have control over the situation and not have previous target intervening in a potential detrimental manner. Monitoring and training is necessary to optimise effective interventions. The willing intervener may be a better prepared, more suitable role model than the untrained previous-target intervener. Consequently although willingness accounts for a minor percentage of actual interventions it is important and should be encouraged.

8.8 The intra and inter personal decision process

This research is centred on bystander intervention from the individual's perspective of reaching a decision to intervene in workplace verbal bullying; an intra-personal view. What is clear from the years of bystander research is that inter-personal influences are highly inhibitory (Latané & Darley, 1970; Latané, & Nida, 1981). In this section the boundary between intra-personal and inter-personal processes is introduced as a guide for future research. The unplanned discovery of potentially the first measurement of a Bystander Effects, social influence, may encourage further investigation into the
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magnitude of these inhibitors.

The failure of bystanders to intervene to help in incidents has been explained in over 40 years of research. Inhibitors were identified early on and were explained in 3 categories: Decision process (Latané, & Darley, 1970, p. 31), Bystander Effects (Latané, & Dabbs, 1975; Latané, & Nida, 1981) and the Cost-Reward model (Latané, & Darley, 1970, p. 6; Piliavin, Rodin, & Piliavin, 1969). To recap, the bystander intervention strategy developed in this research was based on the assumption that the decision process was the initial and essential prerequisite to responsible bystanding (Latané, & Nida, 1981, p. 308). Thus consideration of the potential inhibitory influences (other people and costs) were secondary. The new strategy had centred on the elements of responsible bystanding necessary to establish if bystanders were willing to intervene in workplace verbal bullying. Countering the Bystander Effect will be briefly touched on owing to the interwoven complexity of real life decision making. Strategies focusing specifically on group inhibitors or adjusting a cost-reward model in favour of intervention would be a secondary phase and were not included in this study.

The decision to intervene is a combination of intra-personal choices and judgements, with potential inter-personal influences depending on the context. The intra-personal decision process is always necessary in responsible intervention either alone or as a foundation for further processing incorporating group influences. In the case of workplace verbal bullying the entire process must be completed in a brief time-frame if immediate intervention is to take place (Latané, & Nida, 1981, p. 309). Consequently unconscious processing is highly probable (Bargh, & Chartrand, 1999).

The initial stages of the decision process up to the point at which there is a willingness to intervene is dominated by intra-personal processes, automaticity and heuristics. That is, personal without conscious thought using previous scripts and inclined towards satisficing (Penner, Dovidio, Piliavin, & Schroeder, 2005). Once the individual establishes willingness, intervention is by no means guaranteed. Practical, physiological and group effects may prevent progress to actual intervention.
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Physical obstacles, for example distance, may impede intervention. There may be machinery which cannot be left unattended or it may be inadvisable for safety reasons to prolong the distraction. This may be the only hurdle or there may be a combination. The level of stress manifested in the moment and the degree of difficulty in the actual act may lead to problematic physiological complications (Bowes-Sperry, & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005, p. 298). Anxiety may slow thinking, cause clumsiness or nervousness (Berkun, Bialek, Kern, & Yagi, 1962; Hansen, Høgh, Persson, Karlson, Garde, & Ørbæk, 2006, p. 70; Latané, & Darley, 1970, p. 35).

At CiC workplace bullying was often (but not always) observed by many bystanders. The group context causes inter-personal process to take place. Examining the intra-personal and inter-personal processes in isolation is taking a very simplistic view. In reality the two process will coexist or merge, especially owing to the potentially short time available to reach a decision and act. However, to extricate each step and understand what takes place they are illustrated here as if consecutive (figure 8.6 below).
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Figure 8.6 Intra and inter personal precursors to responsible bystander intervention (simplistic representation)

As mentioned earlier the focus of this work are the early stages of the process leading to a willingness to intervene. If other bystanders are perceived to be present this intra-personal process will be subjected to inter-personal influences. For simplicity, the flowchart above has been presented with the intra-personal process completed before the group influences are imposed (figure 8.6). Nevertheless the inter-personal influences may occur concurrently in the third stage of the decision process; taking responsibility (figure 8.7).
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Figure 8.7 Steps to intervention illustrating cross-over intra-personal and inter-personal link

If the bystander is not alone the decision to take responsibility may be immediately influenced and diffused. The effects can occur if the bystander believes others are observing them whether this is true or not (Latané, & Nida, 1981, p. 311). The greater the number of bystanders the greater the potential influence. A caveat in the case of bullying in the workplace is the evidence that a single extra bystander (two bystanders in total) may not have a noticeable impact if they are friends, whereas larger groups may invoke Bystander Effects (Latané, & Darley, 1970; Latané, & Rodin, 1969). Friendships were probable at CiC especially as many of the employees had long tenure. These relationships may help to reduce negative influences. Large numbers of employees
Chapter 8

worked in the same physical space at CiC, consequently high numbers of bystanders were likely to witness verbal bullying events. Thus the full complement of possibilities were present.

8.8.1 Diffusion of responsibility

In the workplace, especially if verbal bullying is frequent, distributing responsibility across all those present and the possible justification of excluding oneself altogether would be a very attractive proposition (Latané, & Nida, 1981, p. 309). The psychological division of the responsibility to take action may reduce the feelings of personal obligation, with a greater number of bystanders resulting in a weaker sense of responsibility (Latané, & Dabbs, 1975, p. 187). More recent investigation has illustrated that strong personal moral disengagement may compound the diffusion leading some bystanders to deny any responsibility at all (Baumert, Halmburger, & Schmitt, 2013). Thus, any intervention is the result of a number of hurdles.

The inclusion of the inter-personal influence concurrent with the intra-personal decision process may inhibit a bystander in spite of a willingness to intervene. To clarify, if all the barriers are overcome and the bystander does reach a decision that they are willing to intervene, responsibility may still be diffused by the number of other bystanders present once an event takes place. The myth of safety in numbers has been tested and supported (Latané, & Nida, 1981. p. 310).

8.8.2 Social influence

Previous research had demonstrated that the Bystander Effects of diffusion of responsibility, social influence and audience inhibition were activated by group presence. As yet there has been no indication of how much these influences account for inhibition.

The survey item, 'Other people think verbal bullying is unacceptable' was generated to capture the individual's perception of audience (other bystanders). As the basis of the Bystander Effects is the influence of others, asking what employees thought of others
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was an insight into their willingness to intervene (section 7.10.5, p. 243). It was an indicator of social influence on the bystander. Conforming to a social norm may include a misperceived norm as was found in sexual violence (Berkowitz, 2010); and school bullying research (Perkins, Craig, & Perkins, 2011). The feedback poster was used to broadcast the employees' actual opinion; their response to 'Verbal bullying at work is unacceptable'. The poster condition was designed to impact RBI-VB scores only if there had been a misperception. There was no evidence of misperception hence no differences were found in the condition (sections 7.11.1.2 & 7.11.2.2, pp. 249-253). In other words, employees' own perception of the unacceptability of workplace verbal bullying was aligned with their perception of others. For CiC this was a good finding as over 80% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that workplace verbal bullying was unacceptable (table 7.14, p. 228). The data also provided the unplanned potential for a basic exploration of the relationship between inhibition and social influence.

8.8.3 Accounting for willingness to intervene

Although a naïve observation (a single item) the audience item provided an insight into social influence (section 4.13.3, p. 101). To recap, the Bystander Effect known as social influence is the tendency for a bystander to mimic the behaviour of other bystanders (the audience). By analysing the relationship between audience and willingness to intervene this study evidenced that social influence accounted for 10% of variability in willingness to intervene (section 7.10.5, p. 243). Thus the indication in this particular context was that the influence of the audience was a minor factor in an intervention decision. Strengthening the evidence for social influence being relatively minor (in this context) was the finding on self-reported intervention. From the theoretical view of social influence it may be expected that there would be a positive correlation between perceiving the audience as finding verbal bullying an unacceptable behaviour and self-reported intervention. This was not the case (section 7.10.6, p. 244). The results demonstrated that the relationship between actual intervention and a perception that the other potential bystanders found bullying unacceptable was negligible at best. Quantifying social influence further contributes to an understanding of bystanders' willingness to intervene.
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Figure 8.8 Components of bystander willingness to intervene

What is now known as a result of this research is that 50% of variability in willingness to intervene can be accounted for by social influence (10%) and Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) scores (40%) (figure 8.8 above). This was an unexpected contribution to academic knowledge.

8.8.4 Summary

The earliest research on bystander intervention refuted the viewpoint that bystanders had become apathetic (Latané, & Darley, 1970, p. 6). One of the questions posed was, “What determines in a particular situation whether one person will help another?” (Latané, & Darley, 1970, p. 6). The analyses in this study clearly demonstrate factors which contribute to a bystander's willingness to intervene and that this does have a significant positive correlation with actual intervention. At the conclusion of this study, research was in progress on the influence that the coping style of the victim has on bystanders' behaviour (Mulder, Pouvelse, Bos, & van Dam, 2014, p. 161). The results of that research and future testing may reveal the extent to which other components contribute to willingness to intervene.
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8.9 Limitations

All of the findings of this research directly relate to the real life situation in one large, mainland UK organisation. With the exception of the pilot studies, participation in this research was restricted to the organisation that participated in the field study and therefore broad inferences cannot be made to the wider population. The findings have advantageous implications for the organisation and if they choose to publicise their participation, to other similar businesses.

Providing anonymity, whilst limiting access to contextual details, has facilitated real-world research in a highly sensitive area. Nevertheless the response rate was under 50% indicating that even anonymity, a very brief time requirement and union endorsement, failed to attract a majority participation from shop-floor employees. It may be that personal reputations were being protected (Bloisi, 2012, p. 367); for example by access to the survey being restricted (section 6.9.3, p. 210). Another possibility was a lack of trust in the confidentiality agreement; possibly indicative of a cultural issue. Furthermore, it may be that shop-floor employees are difficult to engage in this type of survey. Without further information explanations are purely speculative.

The lack of information available for the reinforcement condition restricted interpretation of the results for that group. Direct researcher contact with the group may have improved the quality of contextual information received though face-to-face communication and observation of the reinforcement sessions. However this would also have increased the risk of researcher bias. Researcher presence may have led to increased engagement of the employees; an increase in socially desirable responding on the survey; or in complete contrast, the introduction of an out-group member may have led to reduced engagement. Nonetheless, the researcher was not present for the reinforcement condition. Researcher influence was possible with the training group as the research conducted the training. This was partially mitigated by the lack of researcher presence for the surveys.

There was no significant change in bystander intervention during the study which may indicate that insufficient time was allowed between programmes and the
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post-programme survey (section 7.9.2, p. 232). Nonetheless the trend was in the right direction with less verbal bullying reported since the in-house employee survey.

8.10 Chapter summary

This chapter has brought together the new findings of this research with the existing literature on both workplace bullying and bystanders. Although most of the hypotheses were supported the results illustrated that it is the unplanned findings that were more interesting. Some aspects confirm intuitive ideas, for example, that it is relatively straightforward to provide employees with information about processes but much more work is required to increase their sense of power. On the other hand, that those who actually intervene do not score high on willingness to intervene is a counter-intuitive finding that opens new questions and directions for investigation.

Bystander Effects have been known for a considerable time but this is believed to be the first venture into quantifying a group influence. At the outset of this research the aims did not include exploration of the contribution inhibitors made to bystander non-intervention. One of the bonuses of field research is that potential new directions may be revealed. It is serendipitous that an enquiry into audience perception also provided data illustrating the relationship between social influence and a bystanders willingness to intervene in workplace verbal bullying. The Bystander Effect of social influence (influences of a real or perceived audience) were not as strong as was expected. It may be that Bystander Effects are somewhat different in workplace contexts and this may be a case for greater focus on cost and reward models of bystander inhibition. Fortunately recent examination of cost-reward factors indicate that there is potential to reverse the Bystander Effects (Baumert, Halmurger, & Schmitt, 2013, p. 3). Information on the magnitude of specific bystander intervention inhibitors will enable future strategies to focus more effectively.
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9 Conclusion

9.1 Introduction
The previous chapter discussed the expected and unexpected results of this research in the context of workplace bullying literature and bystander literature. The limitations have been critically assessed and areas of focus for future research have been raised. This chapter summarises the contributions made to academic knowledge and research methods with the implications for practice.

This thesis responds to the research question:

What theoretically-based, measurable, bystander intervention strategy will increase bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying?

The findings contribute to academic literature in the areas of bystanders, responsibility and workplace bullying. The impact of the research on the participating organisation is described and implications for practice in general are suggested.

9.2 Contributions

9.2.1 Contribution to academic knowledge and research methods
This thesis contributes to knowledge about bystander intervention in the context of workplace verbal bullying, the bystander decision process and bystander responsibility.

The literature on bystanders to workplace bullying was limited and four studies have explored bystander intervention to date (Illing, Carter, Thompson, Crampton, Morrow, Howse, Cooke, & Burford, 2013); they did not, however, implement a bystander intervention. This field research is important as it has specifically addressed the development, implementation and measurement of a strategy for bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying for the first time.

Bystanders play an important role in workplace verbal bullying (D'Cruz, & Noronha, 2011; Mulder, Pouwelse, & Lodewijkx, 2010; Rayner, & McIvor, 2008; Salin, 2009;
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Scully, & Rowe, 2009; van Heugten, 2011) and this study determined factors which contribute to their willingness to intervene; how this relates to actual intervention and indicators of the bystanders that do so.

Willingness to intervene may be measured using the newly developed and validated RBI-VB and the potential to strengthen responsibility thereby improving willingness to intervene been demonstrated. However the study has also evidenced that willingness to intervene accounts for a small percentage of actual intervention. It may be argued that a change in context may reveal differing relationships and although the results presented here are unable to provide contextual comparisons the RIDS strategy may be used for exploration in future bystander intervention studies.

This empirical study furthers the previous applications of Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy and Doherty’s (1994) Triangle of Responsibility. Incorporating their model into a strategy from a different perspective; to reflect on self rather than others. The use of their theory in the RIDS model extends its application into the field of workplace verbal bullying for the first time. The development of a measure for bystander responsibility in verbal bullying demonstrated that a repeatable, concise and practical metric can be adapted from the original Triangle of Responsibility (Schlenker, et. al., 1994). Whereas extensive one-off measures have been associated with the model in the past (Schlenker, et al., 1994; Britt, 1999), there is now a repeatable metric. The components of responsible bystander intervention; process, perception and power, have been identified and bystander intervention relationships have been specified; in the context of the participating organisation.

This research furthers workplace bullying knowledge through the development and testing of the new bystander intervention strategy and metric. In doing so, Latané and Darley (1970) decision process model has been extended and practically applied as a workplace bullying intervention strategy.

Guided by the methodological structure for effective evidence of bullying interventions presented by Zapf (2012) this research achieved its goal of developing a measurable,
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theoretically based bystander intervention strategy. Providing evidence from an experimental design with an appropriate theoretical framework is an important move forward in addressing some of the criticisms of previous intervention programmes (Hoel, Sparks, & Cooper, 2001; Runyan, Zakocs, & Zwerling, 2000; Zapf, 2012). The advantage of following advice on intervention design was two-fold. Firstly, the effectiveness of following the recommended approach presented by Zapf (2012) and suggested by others was corroborated (Hoel, Sparks, & Cooper, 2001; Runyan, Zakocs, & Zwerling, 2000). Although logical and academically intuitive the efficacy of guidelines cannot be known until they are tried and tested. The current research has actioned this in the context of workplace verbal bullying. This may serve to reassure future research regarding intervention strategies in general (including but not limited to workplace bullying) that the methodical and structured approach is worthy of investment. Secondly and crucial for practice, the robust structure ensured the new strategy was fit for purpose and was sufficiently flexible to conform to the fluid requirements of field research with a large, industrious external organisation.

The Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (RIDS) utilised theories from the bystander literature combined with responsibility literature to provide a model on which to base bystander intervention programmes. The Triangle of Responsibility (Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994) was taken into a new arena, that of workplace verbal bullying. The Latané, & Darley (1970) decision process model has been extended and applied in the field adding value to the original model and providing a foundation for future bystander interventions.

Particular attention was paid to accurate implementation of the strategy with rigorous measurement using the Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric. This instrument, developed specifically to assess the Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (RIDS) demonstrated that a single page survey can quickly provide useful information. Brief instruments may encourage organisations to consider academic access, as minimal employee time is required. This successful, confidential collaboration provides the evidence that academic partnerships with industry can be effective.
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Consistent measurement is essential for monitoring progress in workplace well-being and the willingness of bystanders to intervene in workplace verbal bullying is no exception. A workplace in which there is bullying is an antithesis of an environment which promotes mental well-being. As with any aspect of physical health and safety, preparedness for mental well-being establishes the groundwork for a healthy working environment. The RBI-VB metric enabled a baseline assessment of bystander responsibility which was shown to be related to their willingness to intervene in workplace verbal bullying. Individual responsibility in this context is intended to disseminate intolerance of bullying and enable employees to take immediate action to intervene and object to verbal bullying acts. Analysis of RBI-VB data revealed the roles of process, perception and power in bystander responsibility. Understanding how these components align with the bystander's decision process clarifies the steps needed to move forward towards bystander intervention. Stumbling points where greater effort may be required to facilitate progress were highlighted.

The development of researcher training in line with the Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (RIDS) allowed testing and demonstrated where change can be stimulated. The RBI-VB metric provided post-intervention data for the evaluation of both researcher developed and in-house programmes. Understanding the components of bystander responsibility may provide a structure which could be included in training programmes. A time efficient (45 minutes, single exposure) programme was adequate to improve process knowledge in employees not previously trained in bullying intervention. Clarification of individual perceptions of workplace verbal bullying and intervention was achieved by a second exposure to an in-house anti-bullying campaign. Neither approach was able to increase the employees sense of power and therefore this requires further attention. Nevertheless the implication is that repeated exposure to short training can improve employees willingness to intervene in workplace verbal bullying.

Academic access to future data from CiC would enable further longitudinal analyses. Further data collection using the RBI-VB and RIDS-based training is now required to test the strategy in other organisations.
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9.2.2 Contributions to practice
The participating organisation was able to compare all participating groups based on the survey and in particular to identify the employees' strength (or weakness) in process, perception and power in relation to workplace verbal bullying. The advantages of this were that the RBI-VB metric has provided a baseline measurement which is available to support anti-bullying strategies; the metric is theoretically based, practical, brief and repeatable; the in-house programme and research led programme were assessed; and future programmes or repeats of existing programmes can be compared for efficacy.

Bystander intervention in workplace verbal bullying in other organisations may apply RIDS in order to, at first understand, and then improve willingness to intervene, either using the RBI-VB or an adaptation designed for their own specific context. The RIDS may also be adapted to provide a framework for bystander intervention in other situations.

The research has revealed that employees who have been bullied are the most likely to intervene and training these employees in responsible intervention may provide appropriate models for bystander behaviour. Untrained intervention or lack of monitoring is inadvisable as according to Hubert (2003), inappropriate advice on bullying can often result in escalation of the conflict. Previous interventions (not specifically aimed at bystanders) have required training sessions of half a day or longer (Carter, & Thompson, 2012; Illing, Carter, Thompson, Crampton, Morrow, Howse, Cooke, & Burford, 2013). The evidence presented here demonstrated that a reinforcement or single 45 minute training session improves process or perception scores with a positive impact on willingness to intervene. Although willingness accounts for a minor percentage of actual interventions it is important. It has been noted that, “Unfortunately, as it stands, most workplace bullying interventions are reactive if existent at all” (Tracy, Lutgen-Sandvik, & Alberts, 2006, p. 175). Willingness is essentially proactive and should be encouraged as preparedness increases self-efficacy (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004; Illing, et. al., 2013, p. 239; p.255; Rayner, & McIvor, 2008; Stagg, & Sheridan, 2011); whilst identifying behaviours which are
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inappropriate (Carter, & Thompson, 2012, p. 33).

Consistent monitoring, including the RBI-VB, continued implementation of RIDS-training and the in-house programme throughout the organisation is likely to be beneficial. Further academic collaboration to qualitatively investigate power may further enhance the organisation's progress in bullying reduction.

9.3 Chapter summary

This doctoral thesis has demonstrated the process of strategising bystander intervention from existing theories, through measurement, testing and training, to establish a methodology on which to base workplace intervention; and to increase understanding of bystander behaviours.

The bystander intervention strategy presented here seeks to establish a sense of responsibility among employees in the interest of everyone's well-being. Baseline measurement with the Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric provides the starting point for monitoring and a means by which to assess training outcomes. Employees who are trained in the steps of responsible intervention have the potential to move towards a greater willingness to intervene. This willingness, whether an opportunity to intervene arises or not, is progress in the right direction; towards increased intervention. In being willing to intervene, the employees foster the ethos of a positive environment. If this is disseminated and strengthened throughout the workforce, it may positively impact the social norm and increase mutual respect. It has been suggested that positive emotions, “...may be as contagious as the negative emotions” (Scully, & Rowe, 2009, p. 2). Those who do intervene may become change agents for prosocial behaviour and encourage intolerance of verbal bullying (van Heugten, 2011, p. 223). In this way, the employees themselves would be directly involved in positively adjusting their social norms (Morrow, McElroy, & Scheibe, 2011, p. 9).
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Appendix A

Proposal for a bystander intervention programme for verbal bullying

The problem
The impact that bullying behaviours have on an organisation and its employees are understood by CiC. Their investment and trailblazing in anti-bullying programmes testifies to their commitment to change. Academic literature supports the need for anti-bullying policies and proactive development towards a less stressful culture. It is evident, however, that even with a comprehensive policy, organisations need practical training strategies to educate and empower their workforce, across all levels, to motivate the necessary changes in behaviour. Training strategies are often directed at management, targets or abusers.

The purpose
The proposed programme is intended to stimulate the progress made by CiC, in reducing bullying behaviours at work by targeting a specific behaviour (verbal abuse) and empowering bystanders to intervene. Measurements will enable practical feedback and relevant recommendations.

The bystander
The stress and negative outcomes for targets of bullying have recently been identified as impacting the bystanders to workplace bullying incidents. Therefore, the common assumption that, 'it's none of my business' is unfounded. Bystanders' reluctance to intervene has been well researched, with ambiguity and not knowing what action to take being major obstructions.

Verbal bullying
As with all bullying, the longer it is ignored the more the behaviour is perpetuated. Policy and intervention contribute to eradicating toxic behaviours. However, interventions are often instigated a long time after the incident. This time enables further deterioration of the working environment and greater damage to relationships, which extends the recovery time and the return to an acceptable environment. An appropriate intervention during the incident is likely to reduce escalation and recovery time. Targets have not been found to be particularly effective in diffusing situations and management
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are not always aware until long after the incident. Bystanders, being available but somewhat removed from the emotional intensity of the incident, are ideally placed to intervene.

The programme

This bystander strategy to counter verbal bullying consists of three core elements: measurement surveys; a feedback loop; and bystander intervention training. It is unique in its approach in that it empowers the wider workforce, removing the focus from abusers and targets. It recognises that bystanders, the employees who are not the intended target, are also impacted by negative behaviours. Providing the bystander with the essential tools to widen their choice of action, the programme will activate their option to intervene.
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### Workplace bullying definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS, 2013)</td>
<td>“Bullying and harassment means any unwanted behaviour that makes someone feel intimidated, degraded, humiliated or offended. It is not necessarily always obvious or apparent to others, and may happen in the workplace without an employer's awareness. Bullying or harassment can be between two individuals or it may involve groups of people. It might be obvious or it might be insidious. It may be persistent or an isolated incident. It can also occur in written communications, by phone or through email, not just face-to-face.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams (1994, p. 2)</td>
<td>Workplace bullying constitutes offensive behaviour through vindictive, cruel, malicious or humiliating attempts to undermine an individual or groups of employees. And these persistently negative attacks on their personal and professional performance are typically unpredictable, irrational and often unfair. This abuse of power or position can cause such chronic stress and anxiety that the employees gradually lose belief in themselves, suffering physical ill-health and mental distress as a result.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Andrea Adams Trust | Unwarranted humiliating offensive behaviour towards an individual or groups of employees
- Such persistently negative malicious attacks on personal or professional performance are typically unpredictable, unfair, irrational and often unseen
- The abuse of power and position that can cause such anxiety that people gradually lose all belief in themselves, suffering physical ill-health and mental distress as a direct result
- The use of position or power to coerce others by fear, persecution or to oppress them by force or threat.
- Bullying can range from violence and intimidation to less obvious actions such as deliberately ignoring someone at work.” |
| Baron, & Richardson (2004) | “Interpersonal aggression - any form of behavior directed toward the goal of harming or injuring another living being who is motivated to avoid such treatment” |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brodsky (1976, p. 2)</td>
<td>Harassment “Repeated and persistent attempts by one person to torment, wear down, frustrate, or get a reaction from another. It is treatment that persistently provokes, pressures, frightens, intimidates, or otherwise discomforts another person.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Björkqvist, Österman &amp; Hjelt-Bäck (1994)</td>
<td>Work harassment “Repeated activities, with the aim of bringing mental (but sometimes also physical) pain and directed towards one or more individuals who, for one reason or another, are not able to defend themselves.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di Martino, Hoel, &amp; Cooper (2003, p. 6)</td>
<td>“Both mobbing and bullying involve offensive behaviour through vindictive, cruel, malicious or humiliating attempts to undermine an individual or group of workers. These persistently negative attacks on their personal and professional performance are typically unpredictable, irrational and unfair.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, &amp; Cooper (2003, p. 15)</td>
<td>“Bullying at work means harassing, offending, socially excluding someone or negatively affecting someone’s work tasks. . . . It has to occur repeatedly and regularly (e.g., weekly) and over a period of time (e.g., at least six months). Bullying is an escalating process in the course of which the person confronted ends up in an inferior position and becomes the target of systematic negative social acts.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einarsen, Raknes &amp; Matthiesen (1994; 1996)</td>
<td>“Bullying (harassment, badgering, niggling, freezing out, offending someone) is a problem in some workplaces and for some workers. To call something bullying it has to occur repeatedly over a period time, and the person confronted has to experience difficulty in defending himself or herself. It is not bullying if two people of approximately equal “strength” are in conflict or the incident is an isolated event.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field, 2002, p. 34</td>
<td>“Bullying differs from harassment in that there is no obvious bias towards race, gender or disability,...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoel &amp; Cooper, 2000</td>
<td>“A situation where one or several individuals persistently over a period of time perceive to be on the receiving end of negative actions from one or several persons, in a situation where a target of bullying has difficulty in defending him/ herself against these actions. We will not refer to one-off incidents as bullying.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keashly (1997, p. 85)</td>
<td>“…emotional abuse in the workplace. Hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors that are not linked to sexual or racial context yet are directed at gaining compliance from others.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Definition/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keashly, Trott, &amp; MacLean, (1994, p. 342)</td>
<td>Abusive behaviour “... abusive behaviours in the workplace refer to hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviours (excluding physical contact) directed by one or more persons towards another that are aimed at undermining the other to ensure compliance.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leymann (1990, p. 120)</td>
<td>“Psychological terror or mobbing in working life involves hostile and unethical communication, in which terror is directed in a systematic way by one or a few individuals mainly towards one individual who, due to mobbing, is pushed into a helpless and defenceless position, being held there by means of continuing mobbing activities. These actions occur on a very frequent basis (statistical definition; at least once a week) and over a long period of time (statistical definition: at least six months).”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MacDougall (2013)                              | “Bullying is described by ACAS as “offensive, intimidating, malicious or insulting behaviour, an abuse or misuse of power through means intended to undermine, denigrate or injure the recipient”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Definition/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McCarthy, &amp; Mayhew (2004, p. 9)</td>
<td>“Bullying-related incidents usually involve a range of covert and overt behaviours which are repeated over time. Thus, multiple tactics by perpetrators are to be expected”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Moore, Seigne, McGuire, &amp; Smith (1998)</td>
<td>“Bullying is destructive behaviour. It is repeated aggression, verbal, psychological and physical, conducted by an individual or group against others. Isolated incidents of aggressive behaviour, while not to be tolerated, should not be described as bullying.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rayner &amp; Hoel (1997, p. 183)</td>
<td>“Bullying is defined within five main categories: 1- Threats to an individual’s professional status (e.g. public humiliation and accusation of mistakes); 2 – Threats to an individual’s personal standing (e.g. insults, teasing and spreading rumours); 3- Isolation – withholding work-related information or prohibiting access to opportunities for development;4 – Overwork (e.g. impossible to meet deadlines);5 – Destabilisation (e.g. lack of recognition or reward for good work). The authors are also of the opinion that the victim must actually feel harassed by this activities and their work affected as a result.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salin, 2001, p. 431</td>
<td>“Repeated and persistent negative acts that are directed towards one or several individuals, and which create a hostile work environment. In bullying the targeted person has difficulties defending himself; it is therefore not a conflict between parties of equal strength.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Definition/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simpson &amp; Cohen (2004, p. 164)</td>
<td>“Both harassment and bullying concern unwanted behaviour which causes offence to the targeted individual and which is not justified by the working or professional relationship. This behaviour could be considered as harassment when directed against someone because of their race, sex, disability, age, sexual orientation or some other physical group orientated feature. Yet it might be considered bullying when based on ‘individual’ factors such as personality traits, work position or levels of competence in the job.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith (1997, p. 249)</td>
<td>“Bullying can be described most succinctly as the systematic abuse of power persistent and repeated actions which are intended to intimidate or hurt another person.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spratlen, 1995</td>
<td>Workplace mistreatment...a behavior or situations without sexual or racial connotations which the person perceives to be unwelcome, unwanted, unreasonable, inappropriate, excessive, or a violation of human rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thylefors (1987) cited in Einarsen (2000)</td>
<td>Bullying regarded as a Scapegoating process One or more persons during a period of time are exposed to repeated, negative actions from one or more other individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades Union Congress (TUC, 2013)</td>
<td>“Workplace bullying can be defined as offensive, intimidating, malicious, insulting or humiliating behaviour, abuse of power or authority which attempts to undermine an individual or group of employees and which may cause them to suffer stress.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vartia (2001, p. 64)</td>
<td>“Bullying is long-lasting, serious negative action and behavior that is annoying and oppressing. It is not bullying if you are scolded once or someone shrugs his or her shoulders at you once. Negative behavior develops into bullying when it is continuous and repeated. Often the target of bullying feels unable to defend him or herself.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zapf (1999, p. 73)</td>
<td>“Mobbing at work means harassing, bullying, offending, socially excluding someone or assigning offending work tasks to someone in the course of which the person confronted ends up in an inferior position.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Workplace bullying interventions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sector/ participants</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barrett, Piatek, Korber, &amp; Padula</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Nursing. All participants had low scores on National Database of Nursing Quality Indicators (NDNQI) RN-RN interaction subscale.</td>
<td>Lateral violence</td>
<td>Group cohesion. No control group. Quantitative &amp; qualitative methods.</td>
<td>Post intervention improvement in group cohesion scores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, &amp; Thompson</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>National Health Service (NHS)</td>
<td>Workplace bullying</td>
<td>Drama-based training in bullying intervention (n=179). Longitudinal quantitative and qualitative questionnaires</td>
<td>&quot;...general reduction in the proportion of staff experiencing several negative behaviours.&quot; (p.8). &quot;...significant reduction in negative behaviours in the half-day group&quot; &quot;...no significant reduction was found in the full-day groups&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Nursing. 20 students.</td>
<td>Lateral violence and conflict management</td>
<td>Alternate dispute resolution. Online virtual reality simulation.</td>
<td>89% of participants were able to effectively apply learned strategies 95% reported that scenarios represented real life bullying. 72% preferred virtual learning for exploring conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Nursing. 26 recently qualified nurses; bystanders = 96%; bullied = 46%.</td>
<td>Lateral violence and staff retention</td>
<td>Cognitive rehearsal. Qualitative focus group 1 year after training (post intervention only).</td>
<td>Improved ability to depersonalise, confront and resolve lateral violence reported. All targets confronted bully. Positive impact on retention.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix C

## Workplace bullying interventions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sector/ participants</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jennings, &amp; Tiplady</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Health trust. Internal staff trained to be mediators (N=19).</td>
<td>Workplace bullying, harassment and interpersonal problems</td>
<td>Mediation training Qualitative.</td>
<td>100% of mediations ended in agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnstone, Quinlan, &amp; McNamara</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Government occupational health and safety inspectors (N=167)</td>
<td>Bullying and harassment, occupational violence and work stress</td>
<td>Policy. Longitudinal semi-structured interviews and observations.</td>
<td>Psychosocial hazards were found to be a marginal area of inspectorate activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Workplace bullying interventions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sector/ participants</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Leon-Perez, Arenas, & Butts Griggs | 2012 | Spanish manufacturing organisation intermediate managers trained (n=42).                | Bullying                   | Conflict management training. Pre (N=195) and post (N=127) intervention questionnaires | "Employees reported a significant reduction in the number and intensity of interpersonal conflicts, but no significant decrease was observed in negative acts."  
"There was also some evidence that there were fewer bullying targets and cases." (Illing, et. al., 2013, p.111). |
| Meloni, & Austin              | 2011 | Private and public hospital employees (N=1791).                                         | Bullying and harassment     | Organisational development, policy, work group and contact officers. Longitudinal case study and questionnaire. | Staff survey found improvements in satisfaction and responses on bullying and harassment.         |
| Mikkelsen, Hogh, & Puggaard   | 2011 | 2 Danish public sector organisations.                                                   | Bullying and work conflict | Conflict prevention and                                                | Some conflict prevention tools acquired but not                                                |
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### Workplace bullying interventions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sector/ participants</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pate, &amp; Beaumont</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Single organisation (n=200).</td>
<td>Workplace bullying and harassment</td>
<td>Top-down (organisational policy) reactive engagement, commitment and measurement. Longitudinal quantitative study including secondary and primary data from surveys (3 years between pre and post intervention measures).</td>
<td>Significant reduction in the number of employees who perceived bullying to be an issue but no increase in trust of senior management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rains</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>UK Royal Mail.</td>
<td>Bullying and harassment</td>
<td>Peer listeners volunteer scheme.</td>
<td>The selection process identified unsuitable listeners (p.159). The number of cases increased initially. The number of informal resolutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Workplace bullying interventions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sector/ participants</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salin</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Finnish public sector human resources managers (n=205); 27 bullying policies analysed.</td>
<td>Workplace bullying</td>
<td>Online questionnaire on policy years after legislation introduced.</td>
<td>Increased and there was an improvement in culture (p.161).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwickerath, &amp; Zapf</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Pre-treatment patients (n=102); patients follow-up (n=51).</td>
<td>Workplace bullying</td>
<td>Inpatient therapy. Evaluation study. No control.</td>
<td>Employable patients were benefited by treatment but unemployable patients were not (p.413).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stagg, &amp; Sheridan</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Medical and surgical staff nurses (n=15).</td>
<td>Bullying and Violence</td>
<td>Cognitive rehearsal training. Internet-based survey.</td>
<td>Knowledge of workplace bullying significantly increased. Nurses significantly more likely to report bullying after training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Employee retention; intimidation; bullying.</td>
<td>Bullying culture; personal responsibility. Pre and post intervention qualitative data collection. Case study of workshop intervention.</td>
<td>Policy document developed (p.191); decreased employee turnover at 1 year follow-up and the next 3 years (p.192).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strandmark, Nordström, Wilde-Larsen, Rahm, &amp; Rystedt</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>In collaboration with the Public Health Sciences and Nursing at Karlstad University in Sweden.</td>
<td>Workplace bullying</td>
<td>Current intervention study including: develop and implement a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Workplace bullying interventions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sector/ participants</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>van Heugten</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Bullied social workers (n=17).</td>
<td>Workplace bullying</td>
<td>Active bystanders and culture change (not an intentional implementation. Qualitative semi-structured interviews, and descriptive account of action research approach. Grounded theory.</td>
<td>&quot;...lack of collegial support resulted in loss of confidence, and healing could take place when such support was available. &quot; (p.220). &quot;When participants began to talk with colleagues and found they were fellow targets, some found opportunities to take a team approach in raising issues with managers or external auditors:&quot; (p. 221)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vartia</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>School staff including teachers in 8 schools (n=25-90).</td>
<td>Workplace bullying</td>
<td>Meetings with whole staff, surveys and training over 1 year. Based on environmenta l antecedents.</td>
<td>“A slight decrease in some forms of perceived inappropriate behaviours, and observed bullying” (p.15). Employees considered their own behaviour and intervened more easily.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Workplace bullying measures

Chronological list of scales scrutinised to inform the development of the Responsible Bystander Intervention – Verbal Bullying metric (RBI-VB):

- Leymann Inventory of Psychological Terrorization (Leymann, 1990).
- Bjorkvist and Osterman (1992) Work Harassment Scale (WHS)
- Bergen Bullying Index (Einarsen, Raknes & Matthieson, 1994)
- The Negative Acts Questionnaire (Einarsen, Raknes, Matthieson & Hellesøy, 1994)
- The Bullying Risk Assessment Tool (Hoel & Giga, 2006)
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Survey item development: Statements short-list with Triangle Model elements
(Schlenker, Britt, Pennington, Murphy, & Doherty, 1994)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have been verbally bullied at work.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the last month I have been verbally bullied at work.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have seen someone being verbally bullied at work.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the last month I witnessed another employee being verbally bullied at work.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some people who are verbally bullied deserve it.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I see verbal bullying outside of work I intervene.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know verbal bullying when I see it.</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not my responsibility to do something about verbal bullying at work.</td>
<td>I/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If anybody on a shift is being verbally bullied the whole shift is stressful.</td>
<td>E/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People leave to get away from the verbal bullying here.</td>
<td>E/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel confident that someone would assist me if I was verbally bullied at work.</td>
<td>E/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people I work with accept that verbal bullying is part of being at work.</td>
<td>E/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal bullying at my workplace makes me want to work somewhere else.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I accept that verbal bullying is part of being at work</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal bullying at my workplace has got worse over the last month.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There has been less verbal bullying at my workplace in the last month.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I witness an incident at work I can be sure it is harmless banter.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly banter gets mistaken for verbal bullying at work.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal bullying has been stamped out in this organisation.</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what to say to intervene effectively.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is okay to intervene if someone is being verbally bullied at work.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know what the policy on bullying and harassment is.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I witness an incident at work I can't be sure if it is verbal bullying.</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people expect verbal bullying to go on at work.</td>
<td>P/I/E/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I expect verbal bullying to happen at work.</td>
<td>P/I/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is clear when someone is verbally bullying at work.</td>
<td>P/I/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know how to deal with verbal bullying at work.</td>
<td>P/I/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe verbal bullying at work can be justified.</td>
<td>P/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaining about verbal bullying at work is pointless.</td>
<td>P/E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I witness verbal bullying at work I expect someone else to deal with it.</td>
<td>P/I/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

I feel able to do something about verbal bullying at my place of work. P/I
If I witness verbal bullying at work I know what I can do about it. P/I
It's clear I'm expected to do something about verbal bullying. P/I
As long as I'm not being verbally bullied it is not my problem. I/E
I do not feel I can speak out about verbal bullying at work. I/E
I would intervene if I knew my co-workers agreed with me. A
Most people are over-sensitive about verbal bullying. A
I would intervene if I knew my co-workers would support me. A

P – prescription; I – identity; E – event; A – audience.
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Ethical review checklist

An ethical review checklist was sent to the Ethics Committee, Portsmouth Business School, University of Portsmouth for scrutiny and approval to carry out this research. Approval was received on the 21st March 2012.

PBS ETHICS APPROVAL V3: 2007

Ethical Review Checklist – Staff and Doctoral Students

This checklist should be completed by the researcher (PhD students to have DoS check) and sent to Sharman Rogers who will coordinate Ethics Committee scrutiny.

No primary data collection can be undertaken before the supervisor and/or Ethics Committee has given approval.

If, following review of this checklist, amendments to the proposals are agreed to be necessary, the researcher must provide Sharman with an amended version for scrutiny.

1. What are the objectives of the research project?
   1.1 To develop and field test a training programme to clarify ambiguities surrounding bullying behaviours, thereby increasing bystanders’ options to intervene.
   1.2 To develop and test a multi-dimensional scale for use in a questionnaire to specifically measure ambiguities surrounding bullying behaviours, intention to intervene and intervention.
   1.3 To test the proposition that an intervention programme using Schlenker’s Accountability Pyramid (1997) can effectively counteract the phenomena collectively known as the Bystander Effect (Latanè & Darley, 1970). This will be achieved through 1.1 and 1.2 above.

2. Does the research involve NHS patients, resources or staff?  YES / NO (please circle).
   If YES, it is likely that full ethical review must be obtained from the NHS process before the research can start.
   No

3. Do you intend to collect primary data from human subjects or data that are identifiable with individuals? (This includes, for example, questionnaires and interviews.) YES / NO (please circle)
   If you do not intend to collect such primary data then please go to question 14.
   If you do intend to collect such primary data then please respond to ALL the questions 4 through 13. If you feel a question does not apply then please respond with n/a (for not applicable).
   Yes.
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4. What is the purpose of the primary data in the dissertation / research project?
The purpose of the primary data from questionnaires (1.2) administered before and after the training intervention (1.1) is to measure and assess the intervention.

5. What is/are the survey population(s)?
**Pilot survey** to test the validity of the questionnaire. University of Portsmouth, Business school, foundation degree students.

**Field study** Employees of a large UK organisation will complete questionnaires before and after the training intervention. Some of these employees will also participate in a training session.

6. How big is the sample for each of the survey populations and how was this sample arrived at?
**Pilot survey** Convenience sample of approximately 100

**Field survey** 240-1000. The minimum number was calculated to ensure the study has adequate power and the maximum number was calculated to account for a potential return rate of 25%.

**Field training** 240. The number was calculated to achieve power in the study.

7. How will respondents be selected and recruited?
**Pilot study** University of Portsmouth Business School, Foundation degree students were selected as being a convenience sample with experience of being an employee. By agreement with the relevant authorities the students will be asked if they will volunteer and complete a paper survey.

**Field survey** The organisation stakeholder will advise the researcher on suitable UK sites for surveys. The requirements will be: appropriate number of employees; local management cooperation; union approval; knowledge of the site’s participation in the in-house programme.

**Field training** The organisation stakeholder will advise the researcher on sites where employees can be released to participate in training.

8. What steps are proposed to ensure that the requirements of informed consent will be met for those taking part in the research? If an Information Sheet for participants is to be used, please attach it to this form. If not, please explain how you will be able to demonstrate that informed consent has been gained from participants.

**Surveys** The first page of the survey will request participation and completion and submission of the questionnaire will be accepted as consent. The participant may withdraw from the survey by not submitting it.

**Training** Employees' consent will be given by choosing to take part in the training. Employees may withdraw by not completing the training. The training will be one hour or less during normal working hours.

9. How will data be collected from each of the sample groups?
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Survey Participants will complete surveys on paper. The site the participant works at will be recorded and demographic information will be requested. No individual identifiers will be collected or recorded. The completed survey will be anonymous and will be collected in a ballot style box or by the researcher (who does not know any of the employees).

Training Only the number of employees trained and the site at which the training takes place will be recorded. No other data will be collected during training.

10. How will data be stored and what will happen to the data at the end of the research? The paper surveys will be securely stored in a locked room at the University of Portsmouth Business School.

The data will not identify any individual. The study will be presented in the doctoral thesis and in a document prepared for the organisation. The data will be destroyed on completion of the research and after any subsequent publications.

11. How will confidentiality be assured for respondents? No individual, identifying information will be collected.

12. What steps are proposed to safeguard the anonymity of the respondents? Survey Names or any individual identifiers (student number/employee number) will not be collected. It will not be possible to attribute a survey to an individual.

Training Names will not be recorded.

13. Are there any risks (physical or other, including reputational) to respondents that may result from taking part in this research? YES / NO (please circle).

If YES, please specify and state what measures are proposed to deal with these risks.

No

14. Are there any risks (physical or other, including reputational) to the researcher or to the University that may result from conducting this research? YES / NO (please circle).

If YES, please specify and state what measures are proposed to manage these risks.

No

15. Will any data be obtained from a company or other organisation. YES / NO (please circle) For example, information provided by an employer or its employees.

If NO, then please go to question 18.

Yes, the organisation have provided information which is publicly available and they will help with sample identification.

16. What steps are proposed to ensure that the requirements of informed consent will be met for that organisation? How will confidentiality be assured for the organisation?
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The company will be anonymised in the thesis and publications. The process will be transparent and the company will receive a written agreement which will include confidentiality information.

17. Does the organisation have its own ethics procedure relating to the research you intend to carry out? YES / NO (please circle).

If YES, the University will require written evidence from the organisation that they have approved the research.

No

18. Will the proposed research involve any of the following (please put a √ next to ‘yes’ or ‘no’; consult your supervisor if you are unsure):

- Vulnerable groups (e.g. children)? YES □ NO √
- Particularly sensitive topics? YES √ NO □
- Access to respondents via ‘gatekeepers’? YES √ NO □
- Use of deception? YES □ NO √
- Access to confidential personal data? YES □ NO √
- Psychological stress, anxiety etc? YES □ NO √
- Intrusive interventions? YES □ NO √

19. Are there any other ethical issues that may arise from the proposed research?

Reduction of verbal bullying may increase negative behaviour in another form, i.e. less verbally abusive behaviour may lead to a higher level of shunning or other method of bullying. The company is experienced in this area and they provide a trusted and well-used harassment and bullying helpline.
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Details of applicant

The member of staff undertaking the research should sign and date the application, and submit it directly to the Ethics Committee. However, where the researcher is a supervised PhD candidate, the signature of the Director of Studies is also required prior to this form being submitted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Lynn Lansbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Studies</td>
<td>Professor Charlotte Rayner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>22\textsuperscript{nd} February 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approval by Ethics Committee E204 21/03/2012
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Ethics revision after the first pilot study

A second pilot of the survey was added with amendments made to the items (Appendix J). An ethics revision was sent to the Ethics Committee and it was approved on the 29th May 2012.

VERSION: __2__
Please describe the nature of the change and impact on ethics:
Survey revised as result of pilot - item changes attached
2nd Pilot survey to test the validity of the revised questionnaire.

No foreseeable change in impact.

Please print the name of:                      I/We grant Ethical Approval
Researcher Lynn Lansbury             FREC

Signed:                                      (Signed)

Date  9th May 2012                   Date

(please cut and paste the next section, together with the heading at the top of this page, as many times as required)

Amendments approved by the ethics committee E204 29/05/2012
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Ethical approval emails

Approval for research E204

>>> Sharman Rogers 21/03/12 2:32 PM >>>

Dear Lynn

I can confirm that Ethics Committee's LCM has responded that in her view you have answered all the additional questions raised [although it was noticed that one item recurred twice on the items and response sheet - an observation only as this may be intentional?] and your application has been approved.

Best wishes

Sharman Rogers
Business Services and Research
Portsmouth Business School
T: +44(0)23 9284 4202

Approval for amendment E204

>>> Sharman Rogers 29/05/12 11:01 AM >>>

Dear Lynn

- Ethics Committee have reviewed and approved the amendments submitted on the Changes to Ethics Permission.

Best wishes

Sharman
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Empowering Bystanders Study

Informed consent and instructions.

- Please distribute the single page surveys to your group and read aloud the information below.
- You are welcome to participate if you would like to do so.
- At the end of the survey ask that all forms are handed back to you.
- Please return the forms in the stamped addressed envelope provided and mail it as soon as possible.
- You can receive feedback about this research by writing to the researcher at, Lynn Lansbury, Postgraduate Centre, Portsmouth Business School, Richmond Building, Portland St., Portsmouth, PO1 3DE.

To be read aloud to participants prior to participation.

This is a doctoral research study about empowering bystanders to counter verbal bullying at work.

Participation is voluntary and anonymous, no identifying information will be collected. It will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Please participate in the study by completing the double-sided survey and handing it back at the end. Read the definition at the top of the form and with your workplace in mind choose one response for each statement. The surveys will be scanned so please fill-in only one circle for each response. Do not use marker pens or any other pen which will go through both-sides of the paper. Do not fold or crumple the paper. [Erase any mistakes completely]. Please do not discuss the survey until all forms have been handed back.
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Empowering bystanders research study

This survey is voluntary and anonymous. The research is part of a University of Portsmouth doctoral study. Please participate by completing the survey and putting it in the collection box. All data will be held securely and destroyed at the end of the project. You may withdraw your participation by not returning the survey. Please read the following definition. You can refer back to it during the survey.

Verbal bullying is negative verbal behaviour where one or more persons feel they can’t defend themselves. This includes inappropriate behaviour such as insulting remarks, teasing, badgering, threats, ridicule, belittling, offensive comments and persistent criticism.

With your current workplace in mind, choose your response from the options by filling-in one circle for each statement. Please complete both sides of the page.

**Example**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am taking part in a survey</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Empowering Bystanders Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>under 25</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>36-45</th>
<th>over 45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>under 1 year</th>
<th>over 1 year</th>
<th>over 5 years</th>
<th>over 10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How long have you worked for your current employer?</th>
<th>16 or less</th>
<th>17 - 30</th>
<th>31 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many hours a week do you usually work?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study has been approved by the University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth Business School.

If you would like further information you can contact the researcher by email at

Lynn.Lansbury@port.ac.uk

Please continue over the page

If you would like to talk to someone in confidence about issues raised by this survey contact Fern Lewis, Academic caseworker on 023 92 84 5390 or by email at Fern.Lewis@Port.ac.uk

21 March 2012
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Give your response for today about each of the following statements by filling-in one circle for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Twice</th>
<th>Weekly</th>
<th>Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the last month I witnessed another employee being verbally bullied at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the last month I intervened when someone was being verbally bullied at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the last month I have been verbally bullied at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If I witness an incident at work I can be sure it is harmless banter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is okay to intervene if someone is being verbally bullied at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I see someone being verbally bullied at work I will intervene.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what the policy on bullying and harassment is.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If anybody on a shift is being verbally bullied the whole shift is stressful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would intervene if I knew my co-workers agreed with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some people who are verbally bullied deserve it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to deal with verbal bullying at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would intervene if I knew my co-workers would support me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people I work with accept that verbal bullying is part of being at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know verbal bullying when I see it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is my responsibility to do something about verbal bullying at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I accept that verbal bullying is part of being at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s management’s job, not mine, to intervene.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what to say to intervene effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal bullying has been stamped out in this organisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s clear I’m expected to do something about verbal bullying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I see verbal bullying outside of work I intervene.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people are over-sensitive about verbal bullying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly banter gets mistaken for verbal bullying at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for completing this survey.

If you would like to talk to someone in confidence about issues raised by this survey contact Fern Lewis, Academic caseworker on 023 92 84 5390 or by email at Fern.Lewis@Port.ac.uk

21 March 2012
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Validation of Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric.
About you.

2. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

3. How old are you?

- 25 and under
- 26 - 35
- 36 - 54
- 55 and over

4. How long have you worked for your current employer?

- 1 year and under
- over 1 year - 5 years
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386

5

How many hours a week do you usually work?

Please choose only one of the following:

- Over 5 years - 10 years
- Over 10 years
- 16 or less
- 17 - 30
- 31 or more

Complete with your current workplace in mind

Fill-in one circle for each statement.

6

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>In the last month</th>
<th>In the last year</th>
<th>Since I have worked here</th>
<th>Never at this organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have been verbally bullied at work.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have intervened when someone was being verbally bullied at work.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have witnessed another employee being verbally bullied at work.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Complete with your current workplace in mind

Fill-in one circle for each statement.

6

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the last month</th>
<th>In the last year</th>
<th>Since I have worked here</th>
<th>Never at this organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have been verbally bullied at work.
I have intervened when someone was being verbally bullied at work.
I have witnessed another employee being verbally bullied at work.

7

Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is okay to intervene if someone is being verbally bullied.
Other people think some verbal bullying is acceptable.
Immediate intervention reduces verbal bullying.
I want to help to reduce verbal bullying.
When others are verbally bullied it is bad for me.
Reducing verbal bullying is within my control.
Verbal bullying at work is unacceptable.
I share the responsibility to reduce verbal bullying.
If I see someone being verbally bullied I will intervene.
There needs to be less verbal bullying at work.
I have some influence over verbal bullying incidents.
It's my duty to intervene in verbal bullying.
Please choose the appropriate response for each item:

My organisation has rules about verbal bullying.
I know the steps to reduce verbal bullying.
It’s clear that I’m expected to do something about verbal bullying.
I know what to say to intervene effectively.
I recognise verbal bullying when I see it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Researcher: Lynn Lansbury, Department of Human Resources and Marketing Management, Portsmouth Business School, University of Portsmouth, Lynn.Lansbury@port.ac.uk

Director of Studies: Professor Charlotte Rayner, Department of Human Resources and Marketing Management, Portsmouth Business School, University of Portsmouth. Charlotte.Rayner@port.ac.uk

Where can I go to for advice about issues raised by this survey?

Contact your local UNISON steward or health and safety rep as soon as possible. If you don’t know who your local UNISON is or aren’t sure who to contact, ring their hotline (have your membership number ready):

UNISONdirect 0845 355 0845 (calls charged at local rate)

Freephone 0800 0 067 068

Lines are open 6am - midnight Monday - Friday and 9am - 4pm Saturdays.

UNISON Health and Safety Zone

If you have concerns about this study, or the way in which it was conducted.

You can contact the researcher, Lynn Lansbury at Postgraduate Centre, Portsmouth Business School, Richmond Building, Portland St., Portsmouth, PO1 3DE. If your concerns are not dealt with you can contact Professor Charlotte Rayner in writing at, Portsmouth Business School, Richmond Building, Portland St., Portsmouth, PO1 3DE.

Thank you for your participation.
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Training plan
The outline of the 45 minute training programme is presented here with the duration of each section in brackets. The sections in which each RBI-VB statement are covered are provided first (see table J.1).

Table J.1
Numbered survey statements for training programme cross-reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey statement</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is okay to intervene if someone is being verbally bullied.</td>
<td>3,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CiC has rules about verbal bullying.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Immediate intervention reduces verbal bullying.</td>
<td>2,3,4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There needs to be less verbal bullying at CiC.</td>
<td>2,3,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Verbal bullying at work is unacceptable.</td>
<td>3,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It's my duty to intervene in verbal bullying.</td>
<td>3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I know the steps to reduce verbal bullying.</td>
<td>3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It's clear that I'm expected to do something about verbal bullying at work.</td>
<td>3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I know what to say to intervene effectively.</td>
<td>3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I share the responsibility to reduce verbal bullying.</td>
<td>3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I recognise verbal bullying when I see it.</td>
<td>2,3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Reducing verbal bullying is within my control.</td>
<td>3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I want to help to reduce verbal bullying.</td>
<td>3,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. When others are verbally bullied it's bad for me.</td>
<td>3,4,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I have some influence over verbal bullying incidents.</td>
<td>3,4,5,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning Objectives

1. Employees will be aware of key feedback points from the survey results for their centre.
2. Employees will know the impact of the verbal bullying on bystanders.
3. Employees will have practised intervention phrases.
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Introduction (5 minutes)
Ground rules
Housekeeping
Introduce trainer and research.

Remind the participants about their survey and tell them that survey feedback presented during the session will only relate to their site. This will clarify that the information relates to them and reconfirm that the survey had purpose, is anonymous and confidential. These points will be reinforced throughout the session.

Verbal bullying (5 minutes)
The definition of verbal bullying will be explained as being difficult to pin-down and this will be used to introduce the idea that respectful communications are required at work. The definition from the survey will be reiterated as a guide. The discomfort often felt when witnessing inappropriate verbal behaviour will be suggested as a cue that these types of behaviours should be stopped. Survey feedback will be given on the percentage of employees at this site agreeing there needs to be less verbal bullying. The point will be made that allowing inappropriate verbal behaviour to continue leads to a very high risk of bullying. Examples of verbal bullying that are raised will be written on the whiteboard.

Bystanders (5 minutes)
Descriptions of bystanders in general and in verbal bullying at work will be given. The percentage of employees who recognises verbal bullying will be fed back, illustrating what a bystander is. Highlight that research provides evidence that bystanders’ stress levels increase as a result of bullying. This programme is about how they can put a stop to it before it gets going because early intervention can prevent escalation. While signposting the organisation's policy on bullying and harassment explain the concept of appropriate intervention; that it is both permissible and advisable for verbal bullying reduction. Reinforce that a way to stop persistent bullying is to object immediately before it becomes a habit. Advise against accepting it or supporting it as normal.

Address the myth that not becoming involved will reduce the behaviour; ignoring it
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permits it to carry on; it does not go away if ignored. Seek agreement that verbal bullying needs to stop and point out that the participants are in agreement on this. Clarify that when bystanders feel uncomfortable about the way that a colleague is being targeted it may be bullying and they have the right to ask for the behaviour to stop. There is not a risk of wrongly identifying bullying as you are objecting to inappropriate behaviour. You are not labelling it as bullying, engaging in conversation about it or accusing anyone of bullying; you are objecting to the behaviour. Reiterate that it is likely to be stressful for bystanders, as it is for targets, and thus bystanders are always involved. Confirm that it is not better to leave it in the hope that it will improve. The more times the behaviour is rejected by bystanders the less likely it is to continue. Feedback the percentage of employees at this site who agreed verbal bullying is unacceptable.

Stopping verbal bullying (5 minutes)
Ask the participants to set their own new ground-rules by not permitting verbal bullying. Clarify that it is highly unlikely to stop unless someone points out it needs to stop. Acknowledge that verbal bullying can make anyone feel angry. Describe how being angry prevents good decision making and therefore you have to be in control of your own behaviour before you object to other behaviour. Explain how aggressive behaviour escalates emotions and if you act prior to controlling your own emotions this may lead your acts to be misconstrued as bullying. Objecting to verbal bullying should only be done in a calm and non-aggressive manner. You can be prepared by thinking about verbal bullying situations and what you can say to appropriately intervene. Verbal bullying is too serious for witty comments or vicious retorts. The focus must be on the aim; and the aim is to stop verbal bullying. It is like fire drill or first aid training, if you have an appropriate plan and if you have practised it, you are more likely to be able to deal with a situation when it arises.

Practise (20 minutes)
With a verbal bullying incident in mind, practise appropriate phrases in pairs. Do not discuss incidents but take the opportunity to find a brief appropriate phrase you could use. Ask the partner for feedback. Switch around. Discuss appropriate and inappropriate
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phrases, writing the appropriate phrases on the whiteboard. Reiterate the appropriate list.

Conclusion (5 minutes)
Verbal bullying is repeated negative behaviour that is seen as bullying by the target or other employees. Bystanders are all the employees who see or hear verbal bullying. Bystanders are stressed by verbal bullying at work and have the right to a respectful environment, they are best placed to say stop. Saying something has to be calm and appropriate; it is as much about how you say something as what you say.

Request that they complete the next research survey they receive.
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Field Survey: Anonymised and formatted for inclusion in thesis

Empowering bystanders to counter verbal bullying

This survey about workplace verbal bullying is part of a university research study. It is voluntary and anonymous. Please participate by completing the survey and mailing it in the envelope provided. All data will be held securely and destroyed at the end of the project.

Verbal bullying is repeated, negative verbal behaviour where the target feels they can't defend themselves. This includes inappropriate behaviour such as insulting comments, excessive teasing, threats, humiliating interaction, jokes, offensive remarks about someone's private life and persistent criticism.

With your current depot in mind, choose your response by filling-in one circle for each statement. Please complete both sides of the page.

Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is an example item.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Empowering Bystanders Survey

What is your gender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How old are you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>25 and under</th>
<th>26-35</th>
<th>36-54</th>
<th>55 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How long have you worked for CiC?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>under 1 year</th>
<th>over 1 year</th>
<th>over 5 years</th>
<th>over 10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many hours a week do you usually work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>16 or less</th>
<th>17 - 30</th>
<th>31 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study has been approved by the University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth Business School.
For further information you can contact the researcher by email at Lynn.Lansbury@port.ac.uk

Please continue over the page.

Bullying & Harassment 24 hour helpline: 0000 0000 0000

10-2012
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For each statement, fill-in one circle that best represents your experience at this depot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>In the last month</th>
<th>In the last year</th>
<th>Since I have worked for RM</th>
<th>Never at RM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have witnessed another employee being verbally bullied at work.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have intervened when someone was being verbally bullied at work.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been verbally bullied at work.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With your current depot in mind, fill-in one circle for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is okay to intervene if someone is being verbally bullied.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people think verbal bullying is unacceptable.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate intervention reduces verbal bullying.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to help to reduce verbal bullying</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When other people are verbally bullied it’s bad for me.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing verbal bullying is within my control.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal bullying at work is unacceptable.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I share the responsibility to reduce verbal bullying.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I see someone being verbally bullied I will intervene.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There needs to be less verbal bullying at work.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have some influence over verbal bullying incidents</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s my duty to intervene in verbal bullying.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With your current depot in mind, fill-in one circle for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CiC has rules about verbal bullying.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know the steps to reduce verbal bullying.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's clear that I'm expected to do something about verbal bullying.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know what to say to intervene effectively.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I recognise verbal bullying when I see it.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for completing this survey, please mail it in the envelope provided.
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Field information for administration of the survey

Empowering Bystanders Study

Informed consent and instructions.

- Please distribute the single page surveys to your group and read aloud the information below.
- At the end of the survey ask that all forms are mailed in the provided envelopes.

To be read aloud to participants prior to participation.

This survey about workplace verbal bullying is part of a university of research study. It is voluntary and anonymous. Please participate by completing the survey and mailing it in the envelope provided. All data will be held securely and destroyed at the end of the project.

Verbal bullying is repeated, negative verbal behaviour where the target feels they can't defend themselves. This includes inappropriate behaviour such as insulting comments, excessive teasing, threats, humiliating interaction, jokes, offensive remarks about someone's private life, and persistent criticism.

With your current depot in mind, choose your responses by filling-in one circle for each statement. Please complete both sides of the page.
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FORM UPR16
Research Ethics Review Checklist

Please complete and return the form to Research Section, Quality Management Division, Academic Registry, University House, with your thesis prior to examination.

Postgraduate Research Student (PGRS) Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate Name:</th>
<th>Lynn N. Sander Lansbury</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td>Organisation Studies and Human Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Supervisor:</td>
<td>Professor Charlotte Rayner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student ID:</td>
<td>398616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Date:</td>
<td>October 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study Mode and Route:

- Part-Time
- Full-time
- MPhil
- MD
- PhD
- Integrated Doctorate (New Route)
- Prof Doc (PD)

Title of Thesis:
The development, implementation and measurement of a bystander intervention strategy: A field study on workplace verbal bullying in a large UK organisation.

Thesis Word Count:
82,741 (excluding ancillary data)

If you are unsure about any of the following, please contact the local representative on your Faculty Ethics Committee for advice. Please note that it is your responsibility to follow the University’s Ethics Policy and any relevant University, academic or professional guidelines in the conduct of your study. Although the Ethics Committee may have given your study a favourable opinion, the final responsibility for the ethical conduct of this work lies with the researcher(s).
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