

AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF
WORKFORCE BULLYING ON
THREE AFFECTIVE CONSTRUCTS:
SELF-EFFICACY, SATISFACTION AND STRESS

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The School of Human Resource Education
and Workforce Development

by

Elizabeth A. Nealy
B.S., University of Phoenix, 2001
M.M.C., Louisiana State University, 2004
August 2009

©Copyright 2008
Elizabeth A. Nealy
All rights reserved

Dedication

I dedicate this work to the legacy of my first example of a transformational leader, my grandfather and hero, Rudolph Newman “R.N.” Ball. His home-spun wisdom served as a framework through which I would judge all of life’s experiences. His intellectually stimulating conversations challenged me to question the status-quo and look for unorthodox solutions. His commitment to his fellow man, his dedication to service and his unconditional love enabled me to believe that anything is possible. His life inspires and motivates me to dream magnificent dreams and believe in unlimited possibilities.

Today, I celebrate this victory with my “Papa.”

Acknowledgements

I thank my four children, Leigh, Scott, Neal and Abbey, who at great personal cost have all supported me and encouraged me to earn this terminal degree. Special thanks to my son, Scott. When he first began pursuing his dental degree I was just beginning my graduate studies. He issued me a challenge ... “Who will be a doctor first?” More than 20 years his senior, I am deeply honored to accept the title first.

I thank my graduate committee chair, Dr. Michael Burnett, a patient mentor, wise and caring leader and now a trusted friend. He believed in the best in me, encouraged me to pursue my dream and gave me the second chance I did not deserve. I applaud the buckets of patience it required for him to reel in my “monkey mind.” Thanks also to the members of my committee, Dr. Ed Holton, Dr. Geraldine Johnson, Dr. Satish Verma and Dr. Richard D. White, whose spirit, help and encouragement made this work possible.

I also thank the three bullies in my life, whose names shall remain unmentioned, but without whom the idea for this research would not have been born. A dear friend often (too often) says, “Pain is the great teacher suffering is optional.” This body of work has transformed my suffering.

Finally, for the last eight years, I have carried in the front pocket of my three-ring, school binder a well-worn quote by Henry David Thoreau. It was hand written on a piece of yellow ruled paper, which I tore and kept with me in my

notebook. It inspired me during the first of many tough exams. I claim these words now as my creed and it is with them I leave you.

*“When I come to die,
I wish to be able to say that I have lived my life deliberately.”*

—Henry David Thoreau

Table of Contents

Dedication	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
List of Tables	ix
Abstract	xi
CHAPTER 1: RATIONALE	1
Productivity in the Workplace Is Critical	1
Numerous Factors Affect Employee Productivity	2
Definition of Workplace Bullying	3
Prevalence of Bullying in the Workplace	4
Bullying in the Workplace is a Critical Issue	4
Effects of Workplace Bullying	5
On the Individual	5
On the Organization	6
On Society	7
Workplace Bullying Disables Productive Employees	8
Construct Measures	9
College Classroom Simulates Workplace	9
Purpose Statement	11
Objectives and Hypotheses	11
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW	13
Introduction	13
It Pays To Be Nice	16
Improving Employee Performance	18
Contextual Framework	23
Identifying a Bully in the Workplace	33
Identifying Bullying Behavior	40
Psychology Behind Bullying Behavior	41
Eliminating Workplace Bullying	43
Contribution to Existing Body of Research	44
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY	47
Research Design	47
Population and Sample Selection	52
Instrumentation	53
Self-Efficacy Measure	54
Satisfaction Measure	55
Stress Measure	56
Internal Validity	57
External Validity	58

Data Collection	60
Confederates	60
Group 1 – Control Group	60
Group 2 – Treatment Group	62
Debriefing Session.	64
Summary	66
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS	67
Introduction	67
Objective 1	67
Gender of Participants	68
Self-Efficacy of Participants	68
Satisfaction of Participants	70
Stress of Participants	72
Objective 2	73
Gender of Participants	74
Hypothesis 1	74
Hypothesis 2	75
Hypothesis 3	77
Summary	78
CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	79
Summary of Purpose and Specific Objectives	79
Objective 1.	79
Objective 2	80
Hypothesis 1	80
Hypothesis 2	80
Hypothesis 3	80
Summary of Methodology	81
Summary of Major Findings	82
Objective 1.	83
Gender of Participants	83
Self-Efficacy of Participants.	83
Satisfaction of Participants	83
Stress of Participants.	84
Objective 2.	84
Hypothesis 1.	85
Hypothesis 2.	86
Hypothesis 3.	87
Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations	88
Conclusion One	88
Conclusion Two.	88
Conclusion Three.	89
Conclusion Four.	89
References	96

APPENDIX A: IRB CONSENT FORM.	104
APPENDIX B: NEW GENERAL SELF-EFFICACY SCALE	105
APPENDIX C: GLOBAL JOB SATISFACTION SCALE	107
APPENDIX D: WORK RELATED DEPRESSION, ANXIETY AND IRRITATION SCALE	109
APPENDIX E: BULLYING SCRIPT	111
APPENDIX F: NEW GENERAL SELF-EFFICACY PERMISSION	116
APPENDIX G: GLOBAL JOB SATISFACTION SCALE PERMISSION	117
APPENDIX H: WORK RELATED DEPRESSION, ANXIETY AND IRRITATION SCALE PERMISSION	119
Vita	121

List of Tables

1. Gender of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs 68
2. Self-Efficacy Classification of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs 69
3. Self-Efficacy of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs 70
4. Satisfaction Classification of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs 71
5. Satisfaction of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs 72
6. Stress Classification of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs 73
7. Stress of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs. 73
8. Cross Tabulation of Gender by Treatment Group of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs. 74
9. Comparison of Self-Efficacy of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs by Treatment Group 75
10. Comparison of Satisfaction of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs by Treatment Group 76
11. Comparison of Stress of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected

	Affective Constructs by Treatment Group	77
12.	Overall Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs for the Three Affective constructs of Self-Efficacy, Satisfaction and Stress.	78

Abstract

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the effects of “bullying” behavior on the affective constructs of self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress of students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university in the southern region of the United States.

The sample included 35 undergraduate students at one research-extensive university in the southern region of the United States who were enrolled in a leadership course in the spring semester of 2009. The dependent variables were participants’ scores on measures of self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress. The independent variable was whether or not participants were exposed to “bullying” behavior.

The measures used to collect data included the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSES) (Chen, et al. 2001) to measure self-efficacy; Global Job Satisfaction Scale (GJSS) (Pond & Geyer, 1991) to measure satisfaction; and the Work Related Depression, Anxiety and Irritation Scale (WRDAIS) (Caplan, et al. 1980) to measure stress.

Key findings revealed participants (N=35) had high self-efficacy. This was based on the finding that 33 (94.2%) of the students had scores classified as high or very high, and only 2 (5.7%) had scores lower than high. Study participants also had high satisfaction. This was based on the finding that 33 (94.3%) had high or very high scores, and only 2 (5.7%) had scores lower than high. In addition, study participants had low stress. This was based on 32 (91.4%) having scores classified as low or very low and only 3 (8.6%) with scores

higher than low. There was no difference by treatment group on measures of self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress. This was based on statistical analyses which revealed no differences in self-efficacy ($t=.423$; $p=.743$; $df=33$); satisfaction ($t=.048$; $p=.971$; $df=33$); and stress ($t=.032$; $p=.986$; $df=33$) by treatment level. This is inconsistent with the literature. Several possible explanations for this conclusion include IRB restrictions, small sample size and the brief exposure to the treatment.

The researcher recommended additional studies which could possibly explain the effects of bullying. Additional variables suggested were: elimination of confederates, increase the sample size, length of the treatment *and* use of an *ex post facto* research design.

Chapter 1: Rationale

PRODUCTIVITY IN THE WORKPLACE IS CRITICAL

As a business measure, productivity compares what business produces with the resources required to produce it. When an organization is able to produce more outputs and utilize less resources, productivity levels rise, and profitability margins increase. When this occurs, sustainability is achieved. Therefore, efficiency of productivity and its causal relationship to profitability and sustainability is a fundamental issue faced by all organizations (Ebert & Griffin, 1998).

In today's global marketplace, pressure on managers to deal with the complex and varied influences on organizational performance are greater than ever before. People—the workforce—and the management practices associated with the workforce have a significant impact on organizational performance. Employee performance impacts productivity, and productivity impacts profitability; productivity in the workplace is critical (Ebert & Griffin, 1998).

In order to gain a competitive edge, it is crucial for organizations to maximize profitability. No longer is the economy dependent on industry—the commodity of the new age is information, and information is a product of people. Hence, people are the most valuable resource in the modern business economy. Consequently, valuing employees, ensuring their safety, providing a positive working environment, encouraging high employee morale and providing adequate resources necessary for them to perform their job are critical assets in today's competitive marketplace (Jackson, 2005).

“Civilized workplaces are not a naïve dream, they do exist. Pervasive contempt can be erased and replaced with mutual respect when a team or organization is managed right—and civilized workplaces usually enjoy superior performance” (Sutton, 2007, p. 5).

NUMEROUS FACTORS AFFECT EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY

One factor that affects employee productivity is a lack of adequate resources to perform their job. When the tools necessary to perform one’s job are lacking, employee frustration leads to reduced productivity. Necessary resources might include up-to-date information technology (i.e., personal computers, relevant software, mobile phones, PDAs, Internet access); office equipment (i.e., fax machines, telecommunications, copy machines, scanners, shredders and maintenance contracts); adequate office space; safe location in which to work; adequate staffing; sufficient budget; and reasonable timelines to achieve successful results.

Adequate training to perform one’s job is another factor that affects employee productivity. This is an often overlooked necessity. Equipped with state-of-the-art technology, yet without the proper training to become proficient in the use of this new technology, the new technology itself does little good toward reaching the increased productivity levels desired by the organization. Without adequate resources and employee training productivity levels are destined to decline.

Poor leadership or the lack thereof, affects employee productivity as well. According to Bennis and Nanus (1985), leadership is the pivotal force behind successful organizations.

Poor organizational fit is another factor that can affect employee productivity. Organizational fit includes ensuring that an employee fits well within the culture of the organization. Organizational fit also includes ensuring that the employee is well suited to the job for which he or she was hired. Some organizations, in an effort to quickly fill staff positions, neglect the importance of matching a potential employee's skill, aptitude and experience, with the organization's job requirements, environment and expectations. Thus, rather than setting an employee up for success, this oversight dooms him or her to certain failure (Grensing-Pophal, 2007).

Another factor that has been shown to affect employee productivity is bullying in the workplace. No other factor destroys morale and motivation like workplace bullying. "Stressful working conditions are well known to have a negative impact on the worker's health" (Godin & Kittel, 2003). Health endangerment distinguishes bullying from routine office politics, teasing, roughhousing, prickliness, incivilities or boorishness, according to the Workplace Bullying Institute (2003).

DEFINITION OF WORKPLACE BULLYING

A wide range of aggressive behaviors have been identified in the workplace. The majority of these behaviors do not involve physical assault; rather, they involve aggression that is verbal and covert (Pietersen, 2007). Andrea Adams, a British broadcaster and journalist, first coined the expression, "workplace bully," in print in the mid-1990s. According to Adams, workplace bullying is, "Persistent, offensive, abusive, intimidating or insulting behavior [*sic*]. It is an abuse of power or unfair punitive sanctions which make the target feel

upset, threatened, humiliated or vulnerable. It undermines the target's self-confidence" (Adams, 1994, p. 3).

According to Robert I. Sutton, Ph.D., workplace bullying is, "Insidious, but more in the subtle ways that bullies and jerks undermine performance. A hallmark of teams and organizations that are led by assholes, or where swarms of assholes run rampant, is that they are riddled with fear, loathing and retaliation" (Sutton, 2007, p. 38).

Bennett Tepper claims that psychological abuse in the workplace is, "The sustained display of hostile, verbal and nonverbal behavior, excluding physical contact" (Tepper, 2002, p. 8).

PREVALENCE OF BULLYING IN THE WORKPLACE

Estimates suggest that between 10 and 50 percent of today's workforce are targets of bullying (Namie & Namie, 2003). A recently released nationwide study conducted by the Employment Law Alliance found that nearly 45 percent of American workers say they have experienced workplace abuse in the last year (Hirschfeld, 2007). According to Stephen J. Hirschfeld, CEO of Employment Law Alliance, "This poll reflects a growing recognition that abusive bosses are more than just an annoyance, they are a very real problem" (2007, p. 1).

BULLYING IN THE WORKPLACE A CRITICAL ISSUE

How one feels and what one thinks has a substantial impact on what one does (Pietersen, 2007). A large body of research suggests this is the case in regard to human aggression (Pietersen, 2007; Andersson, 1999; Chen & Spector, 1992). Just as personality traits may predispose individuals to respond in a particular way, subtle feelings and thoughts may predispose individuals to

particular forms of behavior, in this instance, to behave aggressively or not (Pieterse, 2007).

Workplace bullying is a critical issue because talent (the workforce) is a key resource in a knowledge economy. As some leaders acknowledge, “Our most important asset walks out the door every night! And, we can never own them like we can materials and utilities” (McLagan, 1999, p. 9). These “knowledge workers expect the workplace to be fit for human habitation and to be a ‘great place to work.’ If it isn’t they will take their assets elsewhere” (McLagan, 1999, p. 19). This bright-flight represents a serious threat to productivity and consequently to organizational profitability.

Workplace violence has been identified as the most important threat to American workplaces today (Hobler & Swanberg, 2006, p. 229). “Stress associated with workplace bullying is correlated to rising attrition rates, reduced productivity and lower employee commitment” (Hobler & Swanberg, 2006, p. 230). Demeaned targets of bullying are leaving abusive workplaces for more humane alternatives. “Bullies are too expensive to keep” (Congress, 2006, p. 2).

As the academy begins to conduct and publish research focused on the human and financial costs of workplace bullying to organizations, CEOs will no longer be able to ignore the damaging effects of workplace bullying to the corporate bottom-line (Hobler & Swanberg, 2006).

EFFECTS OF WORKPLACE BULLYING

On the Individual

Bullying of any kind is a source of stress to the target of the psychological abuse inflicted by the bully. Compounding matters, because bullying is often

covert, it may be tolerated and left publicly undetected for an extended period of time before it is finally brought to the attention of upper management for resolution (Workplace Bullying Institute, 2003). An increasing number of studies indicate that exposure to long-term bullying at work is associated with symptoms of stress typically seen in victims exposed to traumatic events and known as Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) (Leymann, 1992, 1996).

Bullying is a long-lasting phenomenon that wears down its victims (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996; Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2007). For the target of bullying, stress, ill health, low productivity and serious career difficulties are common impacts. Therefore, it is important that the complexity of this issue be understood. Bullying is not solely a problem of employer on employee. It takes many forms, such as manager to employee (the most common form); employee to manager; peer to peer; customer to employee; and employee to customer (Sutton, 2007).

On the Organization

Workplace bullying has a severe negative impact on the operations in an organization in terms of lost time and productivity (Coco, 1998) and interpersonal relations (Andersson, 1999). Workplace bullying has a quantifiable impact on an organization's bottom-line. Among the large employers who reported incidents of workplace violence, "10.5 percent reported absenteeism and 6.5 percent reported higher turnover rates after the bullying event. Twenty percent reported morale problems and 13 percent reported lower productivity" (Sutton, 2007, p. 22).

“While human pain and suffering are tantamount, also costly are lost dollars and lost productivity. These effects translate into millions of lost workdays and tens-of-millions of lost dollars in wages annually. Workplace injuries stemming from on-the-job bullying cost organizations a reported \$202 billion annually” (Buss, 1994, p. 361). “The organizational impact, in terms of both retention and recruitment, lost clients [and] excess organizational calories being expended on the wrong things” are just a few of the calculable costs of workplace bullying (Sutton, 2007, p. 44).

Additional costs to organizations include restoring property, extending psychological care to employees, heightened security and often the need to rescue an organization’s battered public image. According to Donald S. Carmichael, professor of organization and human resources, at the University of Buffalo, School of Management, human resource managers are beginning to realize there is a real productivity cost to bullying (1995). In this knowledge era, characterized by accelerated change, people issues are central to organizational success (McLagan, 1999).

On Society

Workplace bullying has a negative impact on society. Workplace bullying is a competitive drag on the economy, especially as society makes the transition to a knowledge based economy, which is more dependent on the innovative and creative capacity of all its workers (Farnell, 2004).

Successful businesses exist only through their relationship to every employee. This system has a profound effect on society as a whole, for one does not exist outside of its relationship to the other (Hobler & Swanberg, 2006).

Therefore, if relationships define society, “I respond to you as you respond to me,” (McLagan, 1999, p. 16), and when nearly 50 percent of the workforce reports an incidence of workplace bullying in the past 12 months, representing at least half of all the working population in society (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2006), the bully at work affects not only the target of bullying behavior, but the entire organization—and all of society.

This paradigm affects the thoughts and behaviors of society as well (i.e., the bully in the office is your problem, not mine). In the current societal paradigm, society pays the price for the imbalances it creates. Business bears a social responsibility to address the issue of bullying in the workplace; not just because it is the nice thing to do, but because it is a critical survival strategy for the future of any institution. Like Prometheus, society must accept the responsibility that goes along with the power, or it will contribute to its own destruction (McLagan, 1999).

WORKPLACE BULLYING DISABLES PRODUCTIVE EMPLOYEES

Bullying negatively impacts workers’ personal, psychological, cognitive, and physiological functioning (Leymann, 1990); interpersonal relationships, communication, and family functioning (Davenport, Schwartz, & Elliott, 1999); professional performance, job satisfaction, job stability, and workplace citizenship behaviors (Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002); and organizational productivity, reputation and stability (Bassman, 1992). “The overall nature of the effects of bullying indicate a deterioration or disabling of the target, the people around him or her, and the organization” (Keashley & Jagtic, 2000, p. 53).

When employees are bullied, they tend to devote their energy to protecting themselves, rather than dedicating their energy to creating innovations

that promote the organization and solicit superior performance (Sutton, 2007). “In a fear based organization, employees are constantly looking over their shoulders, trying to avoid the finger of blame and humiliation; even when they know how to help the organization, they are often afraid to do it” (Sutton, 2007, p. 38). When fear rears its ugly head, people focus on protecting themselves, rather than helping the organization improve (Deming, 2000).

When people feel mistreated and dissatisfied with their jobs, “they become unwilling to do extra work to help their organization or to expend ‘discretionary effort’” (Tepper, 2002, p. 29). “There is also evidence that when people work for cold and mean-spirited jerks, employees steal from their companies in order to even the score” (Sutton, 2007, p. 41).

CONSTRUCT MEASURES

This researcher chose to measure the effects of bullying on three affective constructs: self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress. According to Lynch and O’Moore (2007) individuals who were the recipients of bullying behavior were more likely to have low self-esteem and those who have lowered self-esteem are more likely to suffer general physical and psychological ill-health and depression. Those who are anxious due to their negative experiences in the workplace, are more likely to withdraw from attempts to address work related challenges in a productive and efficient manner (Lynch & O’Moore, 2007).

COLLEGE CLASSROOM SIMULATES WORKPLACE

In order to test the following research objectives and hypotheses, a junior level classroom at a research extensive university was utilized as a simulation of the workplace environment. According to Olson, et al. (2005), managerial

decision-makers have long accepted this concept as a pedagogical tool.

Simulating the workplace in an education environment is further accepted for its applicability in pedagogical learning situations and more specifically to the general operations of the firm at the microeconomic level (Olson, et al. 2005).

Additionally, research on how people learn and behave in the workplace is often demonstrated in simulated work environments created in constructivist environments (Payne, et al. 2007). Research further states, that a simulated approach to understanding the dynamics of the workplace and training allows students not only to simulate a problem, but also to solve it within the confines of a safe environment, where mistakes are not critical and costs of frequent attempts are not limiting. Such a principle was suggested by Kofman and Senge (1993), who insisted that learning arises through practice and performance and is a proven strategy in workplace learning (Payne, et al. 2007).

Various authors have suggested that a shift toward a stronger experiential learning focus in career education could help students make the transition from fact-based learning about employment to skilled job performance (Barth, 1984; Klausmeier & Daresh, 1983). In this manner, learners are provided with opportunities for active experimentation in solving realistic problems, which require the integration of knowledge, skills, personal attitudes and positive work values (Carins, 1995).

By using the college classroom as a simulation of the workplace, students can formulate and test hypotheses, identify patterns in their own and others' behavior, make decisions and observe consequences which might, on the job, take weeks to transpire (Carins, 1995). Further, the essential elements of the

workplace are experienced in the classroom environment, but without its attendant hazards and inconveniences (Price, 1991).

PURPOSE STATEMENT

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the effects of bullying behavior in a university classroom on the affective constructs of self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress among students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university.

OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES

The following objectives were developed by the researcher to accomplish the purpose of the study:

1. To describe students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university in the southern region of the United States on the following selected characteristics:
 - (a) Gender;
 - (b) Self-efficacy as measured by the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSES) (Chen, et al. 2001).
 - (c) Satisfaction as measured by the Global Job Satisfaction Scale (GJSS) (Pond & Geyer, 1991).
 - (d) Stress as measured by the Work Related Depression, Anxiety and Irritation Scale (WRDAIS) (Caplan, et al. 1980).
2. To compare students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university in the southern region of the United States who received instruction in a “bullying” environment with those who

received instruction in a traditional classroom environment by gender.

Based on previous research findings and other conceptual evidence from the review of related literature, the following objectives were written in the form of research hypotheses to be tested:

1. Students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university who receive instruction in a “bullying” environment would perform significantly lower on a measure of self-efficacy than students who receive instruction in a traditional classroom environment.
2. Students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university who receive instruction in a “bullying” environment would perform significantly lower on a measure of satisfaction than students who receive instruction in a traditional classroom environment.
3. Students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university who receive instruction in a “bullying” environment would perform significantly higher on a measure of stress than students who receive instruction in a traditional classroom environment.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

INTRODUCTION

In 1998, this researcher was working for a large state agency in an entry-level position when she first encountered workplace bullying. In its most stereotypical form, she, a young, powerless employee experienced bullying from the agency's commissioner.

Once again in 2000, working under the supervision of a bully, this researcher was isolated, demeaned and bullied at work. As the result of intolerable conditions and again unable to confront or report the personal damage she experienced by the bully, she sought employment elsewhere.

Lastly, in 2007, this researcher experienced the most blatant and devastating experience of bullying in the workplace. Then, the vice president of marketing for a local Web based training company, she was bullied by the founder and CEO of the company. It was then, after the third experience working under the supervision of a bully, that the idea for this study was born.

In addition to the author's personal experiences with workforce bullying, two individuals who also had personal experience with a bully at work agreed to be quoted and have their stories included in this research.

The first personal account is from a priest who experienced the effects of this behavior from within the administration of an Episcopal church for which he worked. The second account is from an individual who experienced the effects of workplace bullying while serving as the CEO of a nonprofit organization.

The first account is from an Episcopal priest who ministered in a southern Louisiana town under the supervision of a Rector-In-Charge of a large Episcopal church. According to this priest:

It was my judgment to put on hold much of the program focus of my ministry in light of the very high level of anxiety (and conflict) that emerged within the community of the Church.

For the past two years, I have worked to understand the forces and dynamics that have been at work at St. James within its leadership and beyond. These forces have been complicated by the ongoing, serial bullying behavior exhibited from the primary leadership and directed both toward the staff and parishioners.

During the seven year period between 1995 and 2001, a total of 28 staff members were terminated, left the organization under negative circumstances, or quit (i.e., 5 priests, 18 lay staff, and 3 day-school staff).

One of the five priests has sued the Church and that suit is still pending.

I publicly became a target of serial bullying in late August 2000. I began a regular series of meetings with my Bishop that continued until I terminated our ongoing consultations in early February 2003.

Since then, I have been working with a clinical psychologist to process my own experiences and to begin the process of personal healing that will require a lot of work and time.

As a part of my own healing, I began researching the subject of serial bullying in the workplace about 18 months ago. The materials on the subject that I have reviewed and studied have given me great cause for

concern. Especially vulnerable is the Church for a variety of reasons, most of which, I'm sure you are aware. Different leadership styles and expectations among clergy and laity contribute to the confusion and anxiety. The role of the Bishop seems also to be in such a state of transition as to leave the office impotent under certain conditions. Serial bullying can easily flourish under such an environment (Contos, 2008).

The second personal account of a bully in the workplace was from a New England native and self-made millionaire, who was recruited to become the CEO of a floundering south Louisiana nonprofit organization. This mature, self-assured, high-level executive experienced the toxic effects of workplace bullying by several of the organization's key governing board of directors. His personal statement is recorded below.

I liken this experience to nothing less than a modern day lynching. The new, incoming Board wanted me out. They had made up their minds that I had to go. They would not listen to me, and it was merely a matter of time before I was forced to go.

I was held to unreasonable standards and given unacceptable demands. I was told to wear a tie to work, that I was too friendly with the staff, and that I should be in the office from 9 to 5. I was criticized because my wife (back in New England caring for her elderly mother) would not move to the South. They [*the Board*] believed that I showed a lack of commitment because my family did not live here.

I was also sharply criticized because on several occasions while conducting a public address, I mentioned that one of the real causes of

problems here in the South is poverty. Certain members of the Board told me not to say that publicly anymore.

The worst part about it was I felt guilty. I felt responsible for the damage that would come to the staff members who I had hired and was leaving behind. I heard that the remaining staff members were told that if they talked to me after I left, they would be fired.

The Board Chairman is vengeful and vindictive. It is such a shame because she is not that smart; and yet, certain members of the board are letting her have her way in order to serve their own private agendas. What is so terrible is this behavior is damaging the entire organization and the community. The Board has driven a lot of good people away.

It was a completely demoralizing experience. I felt disrespected. It was just terrible. They stopped at nothing to make it happen (Taylor, 2008).

It is because of these personal incidents of bullying in the workplace that this researcher decided to embark on this body of research. This research aims to call attention to the effects of bullying behavior by investigating through experimental research the effects of bullying on characteristics associated with productivity in the workplace.

IT PAYS TO BE NICE

A recent Harvard University study conducted by Martin Nowack and David Rand involved 100 Boston-area college students. This study found that, “Screaming sports coaches and cutthroat tycoons have it wrong: Nice guys do finish first” (Borenstein, 2008, p. 1). The study involved students playing a

punishment-heavy version of the classic one-on-one brinksmanship game of prisoner's dilemma.

In their experiment, Nowak and Rand included students who played more than 8,000 games of prisoner's dilemma, using dimes to punish and reward. In the standard game, two players are given two options: cooperate or defect. If both players cooperate, each ends up winning a dime. If both players defect, each receives nothing. If one player cooperates and the other defects, the cooperative player loses 20 cents and the defector wins 30 cents.

Nowack then added a costly punishment to the game, "A player could choose to punish someone who didn't cooperate. That penalty cost the non-cooperative player 40 cents; however, the other player had to pay a dime to mete out the punishment." The researchers compared the amount of money players earned or lost and found that over the long-run there was a noticeable correlation between the amount of punishment and overall money earned (Borenstein, 2008).

"On the individual level, we find that those who use punishments are the losers," Nowack said. "Those who escalate the conflict often end up doomed." "This research sends a very positive message," said study co-author, David Rand, a Harvard biology graduate student researcher. "In general," Rand said, "the thing that is most, sort of, rational and best for your own self-interest is to be nice" (Borenstein, 2008, p. 1).

The Nowack and Rand study plays off a common game theory which holds that punishment makes two equals cooperate. However, "when people compete in repeated games, punishment fails to deliver," said Nowack, the

director of the Evolutionary Dynamics Lab at Harvard where the study was conducted (Borenstein, 2008, p. 1).

In the game, players who punished their opponents the least, or not at all, made the most money. Those players who punished the most made the least money. When faced with a nasty opponent, “turning the other cheek and continuing to cooperate—or at least not handing out punishment—paid off more in the long run” (Borenstein, 2008, p. 1).

Their study is intuitive in its view at repeated interaction. Norwak said, his next step is to study chief executives to see if the findings play out in the real world (Borenstein, 2008).

IMPROVING EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

A study conducted at the Center for Economic Performance in the London School of Economics (Patterson, 1998) found that people management practices have a powerful impact on performance, regardless of whether performance is measured in terms of productivity or profitability.

Where businesses face international competition; where they are committed to excellence and quality standards; where creativity, innovation and problem solving are essential to moving the business forward – employee commitment and a positive psychological contract between employer and employee are fundamental to improving performance (Buckingham, 1999).

Invest in the best employees. Treat people the way they deserve to be treated, bearing in mind what they have accomplished. Human beings crave attention, so spend time with them and invest in the organization’s future. Focus on their strengths and not their weaknesses. Build relationships with employees.

Familiarity does not breed contempt. Listen without judgment. This is the climate in which great managers thrive, employees excel, and the companies grow. “The company’s search for value and the individual’s search for identity will change the corporate landscape forever” (Buckingham, 1999, p. 17).

Good managers consider the possibility that they are to blame for their employees’ poor performance. Teams are built around individual excellence. A productive team is one where each person knows what role he plays best (West, 1996).

So what factors most influence company performance? “Many organizations still neglect to invest resources, time and creativity in the management of people within organizations” (West, 1996, p. 2). Two underlying assumptions are: “People are the most valuable resource of an organization and that the management of people makes a difference in company performance” (West, 1998, p. 2).

These findings suggest that if management wishes to influence the performance of their companies, the most important area they should emphasize is the management of their people. “What factors most influence company performance and what can managers do to ensure the effectiveness of their companies? Answers to these questions include external factors such as market share and market environment, as well as internal company factors including organizational culture, management styles and human resource management practices” (West, 1996, p. 2).

Recently, the increasing level of worldwide competition has led managers and researchers to focus even more sharply on these questions. The pressures

on managers to manage the complex and varied influences on company performance are greater now than ever before.

In 1998, for the first time in research history, an organization set-out to prove the link between employee satisfaction and business performance. Companies compiled scores for each business unit (defined by branch or outlet) measuring business outcomes such as productivity, profitability, employee retention and customer satisfaction (Buckingham, 1999, p. 4). The data revealed a positive correlation between employees' job satisfaction and productivity, proving that attitudes matter.

So what does a great workplace look like? Gallup (1998) ran a meta-analysis of data using 2,500 business units' performance data and 105,000 employees' opinion surveys. The meta-analysis was designed to cut through the various industries' performance measures and zeroed in on concrete links between employee opinion and business unit performance. The results found that employees who responded positively to the 12 questions contained in the survey worked in business units with higher levels of productivity, profitability, employee retention and customer satisfaction. The results also proved that, "It is the employees' immediate supervisor (not salary, benefits, perks, or a charismatic corporate leader) who plays the critical role in building a strong workplace" (Buckingham, 1999, p. 4). "People leave managers not companies" (Buckingham, 1999, p. 5). This means that when a relationship with an immediate supervisor is fractured, no amount of company-sponsored incentives can persuade an employee to stay and perform. A bad manager can scare away talented employees, and drain the organization of its profits and power,

especially since top-level executives are often unaware of what is happening down on the production floor.

Additionally, 10 out of the 12 questions on the employee survey showed a direct link to productivity while eight of the 12 questions were linked to profitability. Thus, “a single employee directly affects organizational profit, from turning off more lights, to negotiating a higher sale” (Buckingham, 1999, p. 4).

In 1997, a successful retailer hired Gallup to measure the strength of its work environments. Based on a sample of 28,000 employees who were willing to participate in the survey, from 300 stores across the United States, results revealed that even an employees' perception of the physical environment is colored by his or her relationship with his or her manager (Gallup, 1997).

Stores that ranked in the top 25 percent on the employee opinion survey were 4.56 percent over their sales targets for the year. Stores in the bottom 25 percent were 0.84 percent below their sales target. This equals a real difference of \$104 million in sales per year or a 2.6 percent increase in the total sales of the company. Profits of the top 25 percent stores on the employee opinion survey were 14 percent over the company's target. The bottom 25 percent group on the employee opinion survey fell 30 percent below the company's profit goals. Employee retention in the 25 percent group was 12 more per year on average than the bottom 25 percent group. That's 1,000 more employees retained per year. Compare this to the high cost of hiring and training new employees every year (Gallup, 1997).

The drain of employees who have built valuable relationships with customers and colleagues is another great and immeasurable loss to the

company. According to, *First, Break All the Rules*, by Marcus Buckingham and Curt Coffman, “The great manager mantra is this: People don’t change that much. So don’t waste time trying to put in what was left out. Try to draw out what was left in” (1999, p. 7).

In their book, Buckingham and Coffman state that it is impossible to achieve excellence without natural talent. They say, “You cannot teach talent” (1999, p. 7). “How the employee builds relationships, how he thinks, how he solves problems, the driving force behind him, his own unique view and style is more important” (1999, p. 7). They used an example from the Mercury Space Program, in which General Don Flickinger selected seven men to be a part of NASA’s space program. Each of these seven men had the same qualifications, training and even physiques. Yet despite this uniformity, the success of each of the missions corresponded to each individual’s own talent, creativity and personality.

The significant finding of this study is that each man reacted differently to the same stimuli (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999). One can conclude from this study that each person’s mental filter is different. How an individual handles the same situation will be different, and great managers respect this.

As a result, several questions were raised in this researcher’s mind. If each man’s filter is different and each man reacts differently to stimuli, what do these differences look like? If talent is not something that you can teach a man, but is inherent within a man, and if this talent can be encouraged and caused to increase, then, this talent can also be subdued and even squelched through poor management techniques such as bullying. Since a man’s mental fiber, his

personality and his attitudes affect his behavior, what are the effects of bullying on those attitudes? Are the effects of bullying on the three chosen affective constructs of self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress observable and measurable?

Some management theories have focused on the relationship between employee performance and the negative effects of managers have been included in a later portion of this text.

CONTEXTUAL FRAMEWORK

Upon the review of literature regarding leadership and motivational theories, models and practices, much has been written on the subject of the relationship between the leadership approach and the behavior of subordinates. The predominant goal of much of the formerly developed theory has been devoted to determining the most appropriate management style with the most appropriate environment in order to teach the most effective approaches to leaders and thereby achieve optimal organizational productivity and profitability.

There is also a vast amount of literature that has studied the negative approaches and models some leaders use to manage, which affects employees' attitudes. The negative affects on an employee affects his or her behavior, which harms organizational productivity and profitability. It is to this end that this body of research is focused.

This review of relevant literature focuses on several predominant theories that guide leadership and motivational behaviors as well as the damaging effects of bullying in the workplace. It is within the contextual framework of the effects of bullying in the workplace on employee attitudes and behavior that several management and leadership theories were found to be applicable.

The Situational Approach provides a model that suggests that a leader's attention should be paid to the demands of a particular situation. The situation model describes how different leadership styles can be applied to subordinates who work at different levels of their working experience. This model states that effective leadership occurs when the leader accurately diagnoses the development level of the subordinates in a task situation, and uses a leadership style that best suits the situation (Blanchard, 1993).

While it may be the goal of the bully to motivate the subordinate to accomplish desired tasks, this is clearly not an effective management style over time. It may motivate the subordinate to be productive in the short term; however, it quickly reaches the point of diminishing returns, because the severity of the bullying frequently is not matched to the situation in which the subordinate operates on a daily basis.

Path Goal Theory was developed to explain how leaders motivate subordinates to be productive and satisfied with their work. It is a contingency approach to leadership, as its effectiveness depends on the fit between the leader's behavior and the characteristics of the subordinate and his or her task (House, 1996; Wilson, 2004).

Unlike Path Goal Theory which focuses on developing employees, the bully focuses on motivating employees through fear and coercion. Rather than motivating employees to be productive and satisfied, the bully breeds frustration and discontent, which leads to poor employee performance and poor organizational productivity.

Current theories of Charismatic Leadership were strongly influenced by the ideas of Max Weber (1947). Weber used the term “charisma” to describe a form of influence based not on tradition but rather on follower perceptions that the leader is endowed with exceptional qualities (Wilson, 2004; Weber, 1947).

Charismatic Theory was adapted from situations of social crisis. In a crisis, the leader emerges to present a radical vision that offers a solution to the crisis; the leader attracts followers to believe in the vision; the followers experience some successes that make the vision appear to be attainable and they subsequently come to perceive the leader as extraordinary (Weber, 1947).

Thus, according to Weber’s theory, in certain situations a bully might be perceived as an extraordinary leader within the context of a crisis situation. This is particularly relevant in the case of public servants and military personnel who use extraordinary measures as motivational tactics in crisis situations. However, in these situations, the intent is typically not to cause personal damage to the target but to achieve an immediate and effective response to an emergency situation.

According to Occupational Health News, people in service oriented occupations are more likely to experience bullying. For instance, nurses are being left traumatized and some are leaving the profession altogether because of the violence and aggression they face during the course of their workday (2007). The British Crime Survey found that, apart from security and protective staff nurses are the occupational group at highest risk of suffering violent assaults while working (2000).

Similarly, the Leadership Attribution Model describes the reaction of a manager to poor performance as a two-step process. In the first step, a manager tries to determine what caused the poor performance. In the second step, a manager tries to select an appropriate response to correct the problem. Managers generally attribute the major cause of poor performance to either something internal to the subordinates or to external problems out of the subordinates' control (Conger, 1987).

Implicit Leadership Theory is founded on beliefs and assumptions about the characteristics of effective leaders. Implicit theories usually involve stereotypes about relevant traits, skills, or behaviors of leaders (Eden, 1975). The primary purpose of Implicit Leadership Theory is to differentiate leaders and non-leaders, to differentiate effective and ineffective leaders, or to differentiate among various types of leaders (Offerman, 1994).

In Social Exchange Theory, the amount of status and power attributed to a leader is proportionate to the group's evaluation of the leader's potential contribution to members or followers (Hollander, 1961). Social Exchange Theory explains that the most fundamental form of social interaction is an exchange of benefits, which can include not only material benefits, but also psychological benefits such as expressions of approval, respect, esteem and affection.

Individuals learn to engage in social exchanges early in their childhood and they develop expectations about reciprocity and equity in these early exchanges. Member expectations about what leadership roles the person should have in the group are determined by the leader's loyalty and demonstrated competence (Hollander, 1980).

This might explain why some targets of bullying are hesitant to speak up and in other situations protect the identity of the bully. Studies on victims' emotional reactions have pointed to both feelings of self-pity and self-blame and feelings of revengefulness and anger toward their bullies (Borg, 1998). Often the victim's answer to a bullying episode is characterized by a sense of helplessness and difficulties to react to and establish a more balanced relationship with their colleagues (Menesini, 1999).

A situational model developed by Fiedler (1986) deals with the cognitive abilities of leaders. According to Cognitive Resources Theory, the performance of a leader's group is determined by the complex interaction among leader's traits of intelligence and experience. One type of leader behavior is directed leadership and two aspects of these leadership situations are personal stress and the nature of the group's task.

Cognitive Resources Theory examines the conditions under which cognitive resources such as intelligence and experience are related to group performance. This relationship is an important research question because organizations use measures of prior intelligence and experience in selecting future managers (Fiedler, 1992).

In their research on cognitive management styles, James L. McKenney and Peter G.W. Keen developed a cognitive management style model. "Our main aim has been to better understand the cognitive aspects of the decision making process" (1974, p. 80). Accordingly they assert that problem solving and decision making are central factors in determining the future success of managers. "The manager's activities are bounded not only by the formal constraints of his job, but

also by the informal traditions and expectations implicit in his role. Because of this, the decision making activity is strongly influenced by his perception of his position” (McKenney & Keen, 1974, p. 81).

Many management tasks begin with research. “For example, modeling a complex environment ...generally requires a complicated first step in which two areas of a problem are worked on in parallel: (1) the generation of concepts to ‘explain’ reality and identify the most relevant variables; and (2) the definition of the outputs, aims, and implementation of the model” (McKenney & Keen, 1974, p. 85). “In our model of cognitive management style, we focus on problem solving, but our central argument is that decision making is above all situational and therefore includes problem finding. The manager scans his environment and organizes what he perceives. His efforts are as much geared to clarifying his values and intents as to dealing with predefined problems. He generally has some discretion in the selection of problems to deal with and in the level of aspiration he sets for himself” (McKenney & Keen, 1974, p. 81).

The ability to systematically, intuitively and creatively solve problems represents the core of a manager’s experience. Organizations place a high value on these management skills, and yet, unfortunately, these are the very skills which are most vulnerable to the negative effects of bullying. When subjected to a bully in the workplace, “people tend to withdraw, and disengage” and their ability to “problem solve is often short-circuited by the effects of this ill treatment” (Namie & Namie, 2004, p. 2). For managers a, “decision situation exists when he sees some event or cue in his environment that activates him into a search-analyze-evaluate sequence that results in a decision. This sequence is initiated

by and depends on his environment” (McKenney & Keen, 1974, p. 81). This sequence is negatively impacted when the environment becomes caustic due to bullying (McKenney & Keen, 1974).

We know from the literature that targets of bullying experience a range of effects. These effects include: feelings of frustration and/or helplessness, increased sense of vulnerability, panic, anxiety; inability to concentrate; low morale and low productivity (Canada’s National Occupational Health & Safety Resource, 2006). Each of these consequences of bullying alone has the power to short-circuit creativity, problem-solving and consequently productivity. According to research conducted by Schat, Frone and Kelloway (2006), prolonged exposure to negative acts are associated with feelings of powerlessness. Feelings of powerlessness can also circumvent creativity, problem-solving and productivity.

Leader Member Exchange (*LMX*) *Theory* runs counter to the principles of fairness and justice in the workplace by suggesting that some members of the work unit receive special attention and others do not. The perceived inequalities created by the use of in-groups have a devastating impact on the feelings and attitudes, and behaviors of out-group members (Graen, 1995). Bullies frequently use this approach to ostracize and isolate their targets.

The Power Approach of leadership focuses on leaders who manage a complex network of power relationships and influence processes. These relationships are more than just superior-subordinate, but also include the manager’s ability to influence his or her boss, the ability to influence peers and colleagues, and the ability to influence and motivate employees to perform at a

high level (Bradford, 1984). Different types of power exist in organizations. For instance, French and Raven developed a taxonomy to classify five different types of power which can be acquired through: rewards, coercion, legitimacy, expertise and reference” (1959).

Power is achieved when a manager controls rewards (reward power) or administers punishment (coercive power). Power can come from an implied obligation to comply based on agreed upon roles and responsibilities (legitimate power). Power can also be acquired when an individual has unique knowledge relevant to the task at hand (expert power), or is admired and others seek the individual (expert power), or admired approval (referent power) (Bass, 1990).

Etzioni’s (1961) analysis of power was similar to that of French and Raven’s. He saw power as being physical, material or symbolic. Like French and Raven, Etzioni defined power as coercive (achieved through physical sanctions, applied or threatened) or remunerative (based on rewards). He added a source of power, non-native power, which depends on the allocation and manipulation of symbolic rewards and sanctions (Hunt, 1991). Bass (1960) categorized power as coming from either the individual’s position in the organization or personal traits. Leaders with positional power can recommend punishments and rewards, provide instructions to the group, and correct the job performance of group members. Bullies pervert this use of power through coercion, manipulation and punishment.

Pfeffer (1981) adds another element to the model: political power. Political processes involve efforts by managers to increase their power or protect existing power sources. Managers use their existing position power to increase their initial

basis of power in a number of ways. Common political processes in organizations include forming coalitions, gaining control over important decision processes, co-opting rivals, and institutionalizing power. Control over information has more recently been identified as a relevant source of power (Yukl, 1991). As the acquisition and use of information becomes a critical success factor for 21st century organizations, this source of power will increase in importance for leaders of organizations.

Douglas McGregor in his book, *The Human Side of Enterprise*, (1960) examined theories on behavior of individuals at work and he formulated two models which he called Theory X and Theory Y. In Theory Y, the assumption is that the average human being has an inherent liking of work. The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest (1960). Theory Y assumes that control and punishment are not the only means to get people to work and that given the opportunity, man will direct himself. McGregor believed that if a job is satisfying the result will be the individual will be committed to the organization. Further that imagination, creativity and ingenuity can be used to solve work problems by large numbers of employees. Theory Y states that under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of the average man are underutilized (McGregor, 1960).

Theory X on the other hand, assumes that the average man is inherently lazy and will avoid work when possible. Burns (1978) said that because of their dislike for work, most people must be controlled and threatened before they will work hard enough. The average human prefers to be directed, dislikes responsibility, is unambitious and desires security above everything else. These

assumptions lie behind most organizational principles today, and give rise both to tough management with punishments and tight controls, and soft management which aims at harmony at work.

Both of these assumptions are misguided because man needs more than financial rewards at work. He also needs deeper, higher order motivation (i.e., the opportunity to fulfill himself). Theory X managers do not give their staff this opportunity so that the employees behave in the expected fashion (McGregor, 1960).

Rensis Likert (1961) conducted extensive research on human behavior within organizations, particularly in industrial situations. He examined different types of organizations and leadership styles and contended that in order to achieve maximum profitability, good labor relations and high productivity, organizations must optimize the use of its human capital.

This type of organization will contain “highly effective work groups linked together in an overlapping pattern by similarly effective groups” (Likert, 1961).

Likert identified four management styles:

- Exploitative – authoritative system. Where decisions are imposed on subordinates, where motivation is characterized by threats, where high levels of management have great responsibilities but lower levels have virtually none, where there is very little communication and no joint teamwork. Clearly the preferred management style of a bully.
- Benevolent – authoritative system. Where leadership is by a condescending form of master-servant trust, where motivation is

mainly by rewards, where managerial personnel feel responsibility but lower levels do not, where there is little communication and relatively little teamwork.

- Consultative System. Where leadership is by superiors who have substantial but not complete trust in their subordinates, where motivation is by rewards and some involvement, where a high proportion of personnel, especially those at the higher levels feel responsibility for achieving organization goals, where there is some communication (vertical and horizontal) and a moderate amount of teamwork.
- Participative – Group System. This is the optimum solution. Where leadership is by superiors who have complete confidence in their subordinates, where motivation is by economic rewards based on goals which have been set in participation, where personnel at all levels feel genuine responsibility for the organizational goals, where there is much communication, and a substantial amount of cooperative teamwork (Likert, 1961).

IDENTIFYING A BULLY IN THE WORKPLACE

“When a person is persistently warm and civilized toward people who are of unknown or lower status, it means that he or she is a decent human being” (Sutton, 2007, p. 25); the converse of this is a bully.

A bully will target a person and begin to systematically discount, humiliate, isolate or embarrass his or her target. The bully will recruit a group to participate in shunning the target, making fun of him or her, starting rumors about him or

her, isolating the target and suggesting that he or she is not emotionally well, or that the target is lying, or is not doing his or her job. The group is then encouraged by the bully not to communicate with the target unless a third person is present in the room. This creates mistrust, suspicion and isolation on the part of the target. Group members (i.e., staff, colleagues) are also encouraged to spy on the target in order to try to discredit him or her, which serves to further create mistrust, insecurity and generalized anxiety throughout the workplace.

Bullies move easily into positions of authority because they are willing to destroy the reputation and career of anyone who is viewed as a threat. In the workplace, the bully becomes a powerful source of distrust, fear and dysfunctional behavior. If not stopped, the bully's repeated behavior will continue to result in the disruption and/or destruction of many individuals and their careers as well as to block the positive goals and growth of the organization.

Furthermore, it is the bully's intent to instill sufficient fear in other staff members (i.e., loss of job, loss of income, loss of status and/or isolation) and drive them into silent obedience for fear of becoming the next target, or because they are afraid of losing their own personal power, which they gained through alliances with the bully.

Bullying is learned in childhood, but the behavioral form of the bully changes when he or she enters the workplace. By adulthood, bullies have learned that they need to network with several key leaders in the organization. The bully shows these leaders only a charming side of him or herself because they have power over the bully; a bully needs allies. A bully uses any means at

his or her disposal to isolate and discredit his or her targets and shares negative information about targets liberally with key leaders in the organization.

Bullies in the workplace target potential and perceived competitors, especially those who could make them look bad by comparison. Workplace bullies abuse others to gain power or prestige, and keep potential competitors from threatening their powerbase. Bullies also choose victims in order to blame them for their own personal mistakes and inadequacies.

If potential targets are popular and competent, the bully's first step is to isolate the target from his or her supporters and friends. Bullies also use lies (including telling the truth falsely), rumors and deceptions to isolate their targets from those with whom they work. For instance, if the target is home ill, the bully will quietly spread a rumor to other staff and top leaders that the target is out for mental health problems and that this information is strictly confidential. The bully may hint that the target is not going to be with the organization for long, is not doing his or her job, or cannot help take the organization to the next level. More important, the bully will indicate that it would be wise for colleagues to keep their distance from the target in order to avoid risking their own jobs or careers (Sutton, 2007).

Workplace bullies not only choose weak and vulnerable employees as their targets, but they also tend to target colleagues who are among the most competent in the organization and who have a high level of integrity. Bullies tend to go after colleagues who try to stop the bullying behavior. Workplace bullies are compulsive at finding targets and are brilliant at setting them up for a series of

mean-spirited experiences designed to discredit them, discount their personal worth and run them out of the organization.

Consequently, those who try to stop bullies are aware that they need to be careful and vigilant. In the face of resistance to their bullying behavior by a target, the bully will try even harder to have the target dismissed or fired. If the target tries to report the bullying behavior to a supervisor or stop the bullying in other ways, the bully generally will try to eliminate the target from the workplace harshly and aggressively.

Workplace bullies tend to have antisocial and narcissistic personalities. Experts recommend against using mediation as a means of correcting problems with bullies. Bullies will often show great charm to those who are in power over them or who are serving to protect their power in order to secure power for themselves (Sutton, 2007).

Bullies will work carefully behind the scenes to isolate their target and present the target as incompetent by cutting-off the information and resources that the target would need to complete their job successfully. Bullies will align themselves with other bullies in the organization in order to enhance their power base. Bullies tend to select as targets persons who are not actively involved in office politics, because it is easier to isolate and remove a target who is independent and less popular.

Bullies tend to project their own deficiencies onto their victims. Knowing this, targets need to clearly label the allegations of bullies as projections. Targets need to arm themselves with facts about the past failures of the bully since it is

much easier to make a case for projection by focusing attention on the bully's past failures in order to label the bullying behavior as projection.

Bullies will often try to prove that their victim is mentally unbalanced. If this doesn't work the bully will claim to be the victim of the target's attacks. Bullies in the workplace are often very good at strategies such as isolating, attacking and counter-attacking targets, and if they are charged with bullying, playing the victim themselves.

Tim Field in his book, *The Bully in Sight*, identifies bullying as, "The common denominator of harassment, discrimination, prejudice, abuse, conflict and violence," and describes the main perpetrator as, "the serial bully" (2001, p. 2).

Buckingham and Coffman state that, Demeaning managers prevent employees from taking responsibility for their own style of working. This kills learning. Every rule takes away choice. Choice is the fuel for learning (1999).

Statistically one-in-six people are directly affected by bullying and an additional one-in-three are affected indirectly, making it one of the most prevalent issues in the workplace today. Research has shown that bullying diminishes productivity (i.e., lowered self-esteem, lost productivity, negative organizational culture, and reduced organizational performance). Diminished productivity is often the result of increased absences, decreased job satisfaction, employee turnover, increased healthcare costs, and reduced organizational commitment (Field, 2001).

Beyond its obvious insidious nature, bullying is a form of harassment that often takes the form of belittling, career sabotage, and a host of other passive

aggressive behaviors. It contributes to a culture of fear and creates an environment of psychological and emotional abuse in the workplace. It is an attempt to exert power and control over the target (Field, 2001).

Workplace bullying ruins employee morale, lowers productivity and devastates the entire culture of an organization. It is one of the most stressful, destructive, humiliating and financially undermining forces in the modern workplace. "Over time the target begins to believe that perhaps he is the problem or that outsiders' will view him as the problem. If you think you are being bullied, you are" (www.Bullybuster.net, 2007).

Some examples of bullying behaviors, as outlined by Andrea Adams in a speech she delivered to a conference sponsored by the British Trade Union Manufacturing, Science and Finance include:

- Setting objectives with impossible deadlines, unachievable tasks in the allotted time.
- Removing areas of responsibility and giving people menial or trivial tasks to do instead.
- Taking credit for other peoples' ideas.
- Ignoring or excluding an individual by talking to them through a third party.
- Withholding information.
- Spreading malicious rumors.
- Constantly undervaluing effort.
- Persistent criticism (Adams, 1994).

Workplace aggression constitutes behaviors that are intended to cause psychological harm. This distinction is consistent with much of the general

human aggression literature (Andersson, 2002). There are varieties of behaviors that constitute workplace aggression, from seemingly minor non-physical behaviors such as being glared at, to more serious non-physical behaviors such as verbal threats, to actual physical assaults with or without the use of a weapon (Greenberg, 1999; Neuman, 2002; Schat, 2003).

Two researchers recently called attention to a phenomenon they phrased as, downward incivility spirals in the workplace, wherein violence tends to be the result of patterns of escalating negative interactions between individuals (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). For instance, what starts out as two coworkers engaging in rude or inappropriate comments could eventually escalate into physical violence (Hoobler & Swanberg, 2006).

Andrea Adams, a British broadcaster and journalist was the first person to coin the phrase, “workplace bullying,” in print. She recognized the significance of bullying in the workplace and its overwhelmingly destructive influence on people’s lives and personalities. According to Adams, “Workplace bullying constitutes offensive behaviour [*sic*] through vindictive, cruel, malicious or humiliating attempts to undermine an individual or groups of employees. 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” (Adams, 1994, p. 3).

The key to differentiating bullying from reasonable management action, taken in a reasonable way by an employer in connection with a person’s

employment is that it is persistent, offensive, abusive, intimidating or insulting behavior. Bullying is an abuse of power or unfair punitive sanctions. It makes the target feel upset, threatened, humiliated and/or vulnerable. It undermines the employees' self-confidence and causes them to suffer stress. Workplace bullying is generally intentional in nature and harms the psychological welfare of the target (Adams, 1994).

IDENTIFYING BULLYING BEHAVIOR

Bullying behavior has four primary conditions:

1. Bullies have unequal power over their chosen targets. They are bigger and more influential, have group backing (usually 3-6 people), passive group acceptance and other advantages over the designated target.
2. Bullies tend to harm, humiliate or embarrass their targets.
3. Bullies repeat their bullying behavior.
4. Bullies appear matter of fact about their attacks, while their targets appear very upset (Namie & Namie, 2003).

It is appropriate to view bullying as a group behavior, because groups of people often participate in bullying a victim. One way this frequently occurs is a group of bystanders tolerates the bullying, which is a passive way of supporting the bullying behavior (Namie & Namie, 2003).

Sometimes serial bullying in the workplace results in Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). PTSD in the context of "bullycide" is a natural emotional reaction to a deeply shocking and disturbing series of experiences (Kinchin, 2001). Symptoms of PTSD include: sleep disorders, severe gastroenteritis,

nightmares, sleep deprivation, flashbacks and replays, impaired memory, poor concentration, hypervigilance, hypersensitivity, detachment and avoidant behaviors, exaggerated startle response, irritability, violent outbursts, depression and undue anxiety. Some survivors of bullying experience abnormal feelings of guilt for having survived when other colleagues did not.

Trauma and psychic injury from serial bullying is often far more devastating than physical injury. Left untreated, PTSD symptoms can last a lifetime, impairing health, damaging relationships and inhibiting personal growth. PTSD is one of the more serious consequences of workforce bullying and has devastating effects on the life, health, family and career of the target. The consequences of this type of trauma require, on average, a minimum of five years of professional guidance and/or therapeutic treatment in order to fully recover (Kinchin, 2001).

Research on the abusive personalities of a bully reveals that aggressive behavior is used to assert control over a target, who is often envied for his or her talents, social skills or independence. Workplace bullies typically fit this general profile. Bullies go after a single employee until that person inevitably quits or is fired. Then the bully goes after another employee with whom they may have previously had a good relationship. The behavior of a serial bully can have a serious, negative and profoundly destructive impact upon the organization long after the bully is gone.

PSYCHOLOGY BEHIND BULLING BEHAVIOR

People engage in bullying behavior in the workplace for many reasons, some of them are quite complex. On a basic level, people bully others in order to

draw most, if not all, attention to themselves and thereby seize and maintain control and manipulation over colleagues, coworkers and those whom they supervise. Bullying is a negative, unhealthy process to increase and sustain one's power within an organizational system and is usually performed, but not always, by those in authority positions.

If anyone in the workplace is permitted to get away with bullying behavior, this pattern of abuse tends to grow and deepen. When the victim of a bully at work quits his or her job, leaves the organization, or is fired, another target is quickly chosen.

Bullying is not the same as fighting, horseplay, teasing, rude or crass behavior, nor is it aggressive, ego-centric behavior designed to inspire others best efforts. Workplace bullying has several conditions:

- Bullying is dysfunctional and destructive. Bullies have unequal power over those whom they target. They can be physically larger, more influential, have group backing (key leaders or staff) as well as other advantages over the targeted person. The key leaders providing support and cover for the bully will usually not be allowed by the perpetrator to witness the more abusive forms of behavior toward a target.
- Bullies intend (sometimes subconsciously) to humiliate and to embarrass their targets. They intend to cause harm to the target's personal sense of worth and dignity. They seek to have the individual removed from the work environment. The bully often

justifies such abusive treatment by suggesting that the target is incompetent, unorganized and deserves such treatment.

- Bullies repeat their bullying behavior. When a target is removed or quits his or her job, another victim is quickly selected.
- Bullies appear nonchalant about their attacks on their target, while the target appears very upset (Sutton, 2007).

ELIMINATING WORKPLACE BULLYING

Dealing with bullies in the workplace is often uncomfortable and difficult. Confronting a bully takes courage and skill. Instead of confronting bullies, organizations often shield bullies in hopes of avoiding possible lawsuits from targets. This is unfortunate, because it is this same bully who, if successful, eventually consumes much of the creative and productive energy of an organization. Bullies in positions of power can destroy the effectiveness of an organization. Once bullies are identified, swift efforts must be taken to prevent them from building an offensive to maintaining power and control (Sutton, 2007).

During a personal interview with “Colleen,” a Hilton Head, SC, resident and the director of national accounts for a large corporation that develops and manages exclusive private resorts around the world, she said, “The most difficult experience for me and for my colleagues has been, and is, the experience of serial bullying in our work environment” (2007).

Current national data indicates that bullying in the workplace has reached epidemic proportions. It occurs four times more frequently than the illegal forms of bullying (e.g., discrimination and harassment) (Freedom from Bullies, 2003). In order to be effective in stopping and preventing bullying in the workplace, staff

and management need to be able to discern between bullying and other behaviors that may look similar, but which are vastly different in depth and consequence (Freedom from Bullies, 2003).

Even within the art community bullying has destructive effects. Julia Cameron, author, director and spiritual guide states in her book, *The Artist's Way*:

Perhaps the most damaging form of artistic loss has to do with criticism. The criticism that damages an artist is the criticism—well intentioned or ill—that contains no saving kernel of truth yet has a certain damning plausibility or an unassailable blanket judgment that cannot rationally be refuted. ... A trusting student hears from an unscrupulous teacher that good work is bad or lacks promise or that he, the guru-teacher, senses a limit to the student's real talent or was mistaken in seeing talent, or doubts that there is a talent. Personal in nature, nebulous as to specifics, this criticism is like covert sexual harassment—a sullyng yet hard to quantify experience. The student emerges shamed, feeling like a bad artist, or worse, a fool to try (Cameron, 2005, p. 130).

CONTRIBUTION TO EXISTING BODY OF RESEARCH

The current body of research investigating the phenomenon of workplace bullying presents data which are derived entirely from survey instruments. These surveys were conducted to empirically test specific theoretical propositions and not necessarily to provide population level information regarding the prevalence of workplace bullying. In fact, many of the surveys are based on convenience or purposive samples, which are limited and are therefore ungeneralizable to the

greater population. As a result these research weaknesses render the findings they contain limited.

Two national surveys studying workplace bullying were recently conducted. The first was led by the Northwestern National Life Insurance Company (1993), and the second by the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University (2000). Although population samples were designed to be representative of the American workplace, each suffers from methodological limitations (e.g., small sample sizes and low response rates). Moreover, although each study drew a probability sample, neither study used fully developed sampling weights to adequately adjust for differential probability of selection, non-response rates, and post-stratification errors to known population totals (Schat & Kelloway, 2003).

Thus, due to the limitations in the scope and methodology, the existing studies on the prevalence of workplace bullying, exclusively using survey instruments and relying on self-reported results, are inconclusive. Consequently, this researcher believed more conclusive research was warranted.

Initial investigation has yet to be documented and very little is known about the prevalence of actual exposure to workplace bullying quantified by empirical evidence. The available data suggest that, exposure to workplace bullying varies across potential perpetrators of aggression and that exposure to aggression from different sources is associated with different patterns of consequences (Schat, Frone & Kelloway, 2006; Frone, 2000; Leblanc & Kelloway, 2002).

Thus, investigative research is needed to explore the actual effects of the exposure to workforce bullying. Such experimental research may be able to provide a clearer understanding of who is at greater risk by measuring the effects of bullying on the attitudes and performance levels of participants. This study sought to open the door for future research, which is more precisely aimed at studying the phenomenon of workforce bullying.

This research also sought to contribute to the greater body of evidence and begin to lay a foundation for future interventions to help prevent workplace bullying. It may also sound the trumpet to call for legislation which can provide protection for targets of workplace bullying. This study represents a step toward addressing the limitations of prior research.

This research has identified a need to investigate through experimental research the observed effects of bullying behavior on participants' response. The following chapters present the study design and investigate the effects of bullying behavior on study participants' scores on tests designed to measure three affective constructs: self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress. Conclusions were drawn from the data collected and are presented in a subsequent Chapter.

Chapter 3: Methodology

RESEARCH DESIGN

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the effects of bullying behavior on the affective constructs of self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress of students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university in the southern region of the United States.

The following objectives were developed by the researcher to accomplish the purpose of the study:

1. To describe students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university in the southern region of the United States on the following selected characteristics:
 - (a) Gender;
 - (b) Self-efficacy as measured by the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSES) (Chen, et al. 2001).
 - (c) Satisfaction as measured by the Global Job Satisfaction Scale (GJSS) (Pond & Geyer, 1991).
 - (d) Stress as measured by the Work Related Depression, Anxiety and Irritation Scale (WRDAIS) (Caplan, et al. 1980).
2. To compare students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university in the southern region of the United States who received instruction in a “bullying” environment with those who received instruction in a traditional environment by gender.

Based on previous research findings and other conceptual evidence from the review of related literature, the following objectives were written in the form of research hypotheses to be tested:

1. Students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university who received instruction in a “bullying” environment would perform significantly lower on a measure of self-efficacy than students who received instruction in a traditional classroom environment.
2. Students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university who received instruction in a “bullying” environment would perform significantly lower on a measure of satisfaction than students who received instruction in a traditional classroom environment.
3. Students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university who received instruction in a “bullying” environment would perform significantly higher on a measure of stress than students who received instruction in a traditional classroom environment.

The dependent variables (response variables) were participants’ performance levels as measured by their scores on the three instruments designed to measure affective constructs of self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress. The independent variable was whether or not participants were exposed to the environment in the classroom which included the bullying behaviors (treatment).

To test the stated hypotheses, the following experimental research study was conducted at a selected research-extensive university in the southern region of the United States. The participants were undergraduate students who were enrolled in a junior level leadership course. This course was scheduled during the spring semester of 2009.

This experimental study was expected to yield powerful results due to the potential anticipated relationship between the treatment (bullying) and the decreased levels of performance indicated by participants' scores. If this result was observed, it could be stated that the treatment had a causal effect on the differences that were found in the dependent variables. This would have allowed the researcher to make causal interpretations from the results of the study.

Because this research was one of a limited number of experimental studies of its kind (none were identified by this researcher through this review of literature), it was believed to add knowledge to the limited body of research literature by documenting the effects of bullying. As stated by Cronbach, experimental research of this kind is essential because it can be generalized to the real world (1951).

Pursuant to the review of literature a Posttest-Only Control Group Design experimental study was warranted (Campbell & Stanley, 1963). The methodology included hiring two facilitators, one to lead each group (Control Group/Group 1 and Treatment Group/Group 2); one videographer (filmed each group); and no less than six confederates (no less than three in the Treatment Group). In addition, a trained clinical psychologist was hired and remained on location during the experiment. The psychologist was responsible for overseeing

participants who experienced unbearable levels of discomfort and removed themselves from the experiment. The psychologist also led the debriefing session at the conclusion of the experiment, and was available to assist in the event of any unexpected situation. The researcher was also present and available to assist as necessary.

Prior to the experiment, it was explained to the students that they had been invited to participate in an experimental research study conducted by a doctoral student. Students were told that participation in the study was voluntary and that participation or lack thereof would have no effect on their grade or good standing in the course (as required by the IRB). Participants were told that in order to be included as participants they must sign an IRB Consent Form (Appendix A). Participants were informed in the IRB Consent Form to, "Please be aware that you may experience overwhelming feelings of discomfort and if so, you may discontinue your participation in the experiment. However, if you choose to leave the classroom please remain in the adjacent hallway until the conclusion of the experiment. As a participant you agree to remain on the premises until the experiment has been completed" (Appendix A).

Each student in the course was given the opportunity to participate in the experiment. Each participant in the study was offered a token of appreciation for their time (\$10 per student). This thank-you was placed in an envelope and distributed to participants upon class dismissal.

The experiment began with all participants initially gathering in the regularly assigned course classroom. Participants were asked to read, sign and return the IRB Consent Forms to the facilitator. Once the IRB Consent Forms

were collected, participants were randomly assigned to two groups and the groups were randomly assigned to levels of treatment, which included an experimental (treatment) group and a comparison (control) group. If all members of the selected course volunteered to participate, each of the groups consisted of approximately 20 participants.

Random assignment to the two groups was conducted by having all participants draw from a jar which contained slips of paper labeled “Group 1” or “Group 2,” the classroom assignment for the appropriate group was indicated on the opposite side of the slips of paper. The slips of paper contained inside the jar were equal in number to the number of student participants included in the study. With his or her assignment, each participant reported to the classroom designated for his or her assigned group.

Once the random assignment process was completed, and upon arriving at the designated classroom, participants were introduced to their respective group facilitator. The facilitators of both groups were women, trained educators and approximately the same age. Both groups were videotaped through the duration of the experiment. These videotapes served as evidence that the stated objectives of the study were conducted as outlined in the research design.

In order to minimize any actual psychological harm to the students as a direct result of the bullying behavior, the IRB required this researcher to use confederates as the direct targets of the bullying behavior. In order to comply with this restriction the researcher identified confederates (no less than $N=6$) and then pre-assigned them to both groups: Control Group/Group 1 (approximately $n=3$); Treatment Group/Group 2 (no less than $n=3$) prior to the onset of the

experiment. During the random assignment process the confederates pretended to draw their group assignment from the slips of paper contained in the jar.

In order to ensure that at least six confederates participated in the experiment, no less than eight confederates were invited to participate. On the date and time of the experiment those confederates who were present were assigned to groups, with no less than three confederates assigned to the treatment group.

POPULATION AND SAMPLE SELECTION

The target population of this study was defined as undergraduate students enrolled in a research-extensive university in the southern region of the United States. The accessible population of this study was defined as all undergraduate students at one selected research extensive university in the southern region of the United States who were enrolled in leadership courses in the spring semester of 2009. The sample of this study included the census of students enrolled in one junior level leadership development course in the spring semester of 2009.

In order to determine a minimally acceptable sample size a power analysis was appropriate. Any statistical test is a complex relationship between the power of the test, the region of rejection, the sample size and the magnitude of the effect in the population (Cohen and Cohen, 1983). Cohen and Cohen also state that the effect size of an independent variable on a dependent variable found in similar studies can be used to direct subsequent research (1983).

Based on an acceptable range of estimates for the proportion of variance explained in participants' performance by their scores on the three instruments (self efficacy, satisfaction and stress) an estimate of effect size was determined

for the present study. Cohen and Cohen (1983) advise that an effect size of 0.10 would be considered small, a 0.30 would have a medium effect, and a 0.50 would have a large effect. From the range in effect size from previous studies, which indicates an above average effect, and based on Cohen and Cohen's guidelines, an effect size of 0.40 was used in this power analysis.

Using an effect size of 0.40 and a power of 0.80 at the 95 percent confidence level, a minimum sample size of 40 was suggested by the appropriate table in Cohen and Cohen (1983). However, since the final sample was $N=35$, the effect size needed to be detected by the statistical procedures in this study would be .55.

By using a sample size of 35, the generalizability of this study was somewhat limited. However, small sample sizes are a common practice within an academic environment when conducting true experimental research (Kennedy, 1994; 1995). Additionally, because the target population was limited to enrollment in the leadership course, the total sample size was directly affected by student enrollment.

INSTRUMENTATION

The instruments that were used to collect data for this study were designed to measure three chosen affective constructs: self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress. These three instruments are described in the following sections including information on the establishment of validity and reliability of the measure. This study involved experimental methods utilizing reliable and valid instruments designed to measure self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress. The

instruments used to collect the data included self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress measures.

Self-Efficacy Measure

The selected measure of the affective construct of self-efficacy was the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSES) (Appendix B) which included eight items designed to measure self-efficacy (Chen, et al. 2001). Chen, Gully and Eden (2001) conducted three studies in which they revised an earlier NGSES (Chen & Gully, 1997) and compared its content validity to that of the Sherer (1982) General Self-Efficacy (GSE) scale. The authors then further compared the reliability and validity of the NGSES and the GSE scale in various samples. GSE scale (Sherer, 1982) was developed for clinical research, but has been used in organizational research and is considered to be the most widely used self-efficacy scale (Chen, et al. 2001).

Chen, Gully and Eden's (2001) measure of NGSES was validated overall on approximately 600 graduate students and 54 managers in three different studies. Factor analysis of NGSES yielded a single factor solution for the eight items, with reliabilities ranging from Cronbach's alpha of .85 to .88. The test-retest reliability coefficients for the eight item NGSES were high; $r_{t1-t2}=.65$, $r_{t2-t3}=.66$, $r_{t1-t3}=.62$. Thus, the final eight NGSES items yielded a scale that is theory based, unidimensional, internally consistent and stable over time (Chen, et al. 2001). In each consecutive study the results were replicated and the unidimensionality of the construct was observed.

On the NGSES, responses are obtained on a 5-point Likert scale from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree. The measure developed by Chen, Gully

and Eden (2001), “was used to capture one’s belief with regard to one’s ability to perform specific leadership behaviors successfully” (Chen, et al. 2001, p. 75).

Based on the item face validity, inter-item correlations and factor loadings eight items were chosen. Principal components analyses yielded a single-factor solution for these eight items on all three occasions (Coefficient alpha of .87, .88, and .85). The test-retest reliability coefficients for the eight item scale were high, at .62. Thus the final eight NGSES items yielded a scale that is theory based, unidimensional, internally consistent and stable over time (Chen, et al. 2001).

The researcher gained permission to use the NGSES in this dissertation research by contacting Sage Publications which holds the copyright at permissions@sagepub.com; permission for use was granted (Appendix F).

Satisfaction Measure

The selected measure for the affective construct of satisfaction was the Global Job Satisfaction Scale (GJSS) (Appendix C) developed by Samuel B. Bond, III and Paul D. Geyer (1991), which included seven questions designed to measure participants’ job satisfaction. For this experiment, this instrument was adjusted to represent satisfaction in an academic environment rather than job satisfaction. Responses on questions one through six were obtained on a 5-point response scale, where 1=not at all to 5=a great deal. The seventh item was obtained on a 7-point scale where 1=terrible, 2=unhappy, 3=mostly dissatisfied, 4=mixed (about equally dissatisfied and satisfied), 5=mostly satisfied, 6=pleased and 7=delighted. This measure used seven items to measure an employee’s general affective reaction to his or her job without reference to any specific facets (Fields, 2002, p. 12).

Pond and Geyer's (1991) study was based on questionnaire responses from 116 textile workers (80% response rate) in the southeastern United States. Data collected from the questionnaires were used to conduct analyses to examine the multidimensional measures of job satisfaction. In addition to measuring job satisfaction, they "explored the relationship between perceived job alternatives and other facets of job satisfaction (i.e., satisfaction with work, pay, promotion, co-workers, and supervision)" (p. 253). Coefficient alpha for the seven-item measure was .89 (Pond & Geyer, 1991).

Permission for use of the GJSS was sought and obtained by the researcher from Elsevier Journals which holds the copyright at usbkinfo@elsevier.com (Appendix G).

Stress Measure

The selected measure of the affective construct of stress was the Work-Related Depression, Anxiety, and Irritation Scale (WRDAIS) (Appendix C) which included 13 items designed to measure participants' stress levels. Responses were obtained on a 1-4-point anchored response scale where 1=never or a little of the time, 2=some of the time, 3=a good part of the time, and 4=most of the time (Caplan, et al. 1980, p. 274)

The measure developed by Caplan, Cobb, French, Van Harrison and Pinneau (1980), assessed three dimensions of employee stress and strain. These included the extent to which employees felt depressed (e.g., unhappy, sad, blue); anxious (e.g., nervous, jittery); and irritated (e.g., annoyed, angry) while working in their job. For the purposes of this experiment, the instrument

was adjusted to represent an academic environment rather than the work-related environment and the depression dimension was removed from the scale.

Twenty-three jobs were selected to represent a wide range and variety of job stresses. A questionnaire was administered to 2010 men employed in these jobs. The questionnaire measured twenty job stresses, seventeen strains and a variety of demographic and personality variables. Coefficient alpha values ranged from .81 to .86. (Caplan, et al. 1980, p, i).

Permission for use of the WRDAIS was obtained and granted from Sage Publications which holds the copyright at permissions@sagepub.com (Appendix H).

Internal Validity

According to Campbell and Stanley (1963) threats to internal validity, including maturation threats, testing effects, statistical regression effects and selection effects were controlled by full power of random assignment.

While intrasession history threats cannot be anticipated and thus cannot be controlled for, the possibility of it occurring was reduced, but not eliminated by shortening the length of the experimental study to include only one class period. Further, the risk of this effect was minimized by the researcher setting up the experiment in advance (e.g., holding a rehearsal meeting prior to the actual experiment in an effort to ensure that all the actors will be familiar with their roles in the experiment, checking the environment of the classrooms prior to the experiment, setting up the video equipment prior to the experiment and confirming attendance of all the actors prior to the experiment). The researcher also monitored the experimental conditions and reported any unusual circumstances in the research findings.

Instrumentation threats were minimized by using the same three measures in both groups, conducting the experiment during one class period, limiting the scoring to the doctoral researcher and eliminating a pretest. Instrumentation effects were also limited because the nature of the scores do not lend themselves to subjective interpretation (participants' scores on the measuring instruments were definitive).

While having equivalent groups did not control for this threat, mortality effects was minimized by the experiment being conducted during one class period (no longer than 40 minutes). The researcher also monitored and reported any mortality that occurred in the research findings.

External Validity

The following threats to external validity were controlled or minimized by the research design.

The Hawthorne Effect states that participants' knowledge that they are participating in an experiment will have an effect on the dependent variable resulting from the treatment (Ary, et al, 2002). Due to the nature of this study, the threat of the Hawthorne Effect was unavoidable because participants were told beforehand that they would be participating in an experimental study. However the effects were reduced by keeping the classroom environment as traditional as possible. Additionally, this threat was minimized because participants were given minimal information regarding the nature of the treatment prior to the experiment (i.e., participants were told that they would be participating in a research experiment and may experience discomfort). The presence of videotaping equipment and a videographer may have led to the Hawthorne Effect as well.

However, these effects were minimized by having the video equipment set-up prior to the experiment and by minimizing the presence of the videographer in the classroom during the experiment as much as was possible. The researcher believed that the information gained from the video footage warranted this risk.

Novelty or disruption threats due to the addition of confederates to the original group of students were limited. College students are accustomed to having students from other classes sit-in on their class in order to gain extra credit or make up coursework. The presence of videotaping equipment and a videographer may have led to the novelty or disruption effects. However, the information gained from the video footage warranted this risk. Further these threats were minimized by having the video equipment set up in advance of the experiment commencing.

Because the bully in this experiment was an actor, and personalities are by nature individual; hence, all bullies are not equal. This effect was minimized by selecting facilitators who were both women, approximately the same age and both professionally trained educators. There is evidence in the literature that suggests that demographic characteristics and occupation have an effect on the level of bullying experienced by the target (i.e., gender, age and supervisory authority) (Schat, et al, 2006). Exploration of this topic warrants future research.

The research design also reduced the effects of pretest sensitization by the omission of a pretest. Ecological threats such as extraneous events could not be controlled for because they could not be anticipated and thus could not be avoided.

DATA COLLECTION

Confederates

In order to minimize any actual psychological harm to the college students as a direct result of the bullying behavior, the IRB required this researcher to use confederates as the direct targets of the bullying behavior. In order to comply with the IRB restrictions this researcher identified confederates (no less than N=6) who were included as members of the sample. These confederates were introduced to the student participants by the instructor of the class at the onset of the experiment, as students from another section of the class who needed to make-up missed class work. Because this is a common practice within the university classroom setting, minimal disruption effects were anticipated.

The confederates were chosen from a pool of AmeriCorps volunteers who were assigned to City Year Louisiana and were serving as senior corps members. The confederates were selected in advance of the experiment and were informed of the study design. They indicated their understanding and agreed to the experimental treatment by signing an IRB Consent Form (Appendix A). Confederates were scripted in advance and received compensation for their participation (\$20 per person).

Group 1 – Control Group

After the random assignment process was completed and participants were settled in their designated classroom, the facilitator led a brief discussion on leadership behaviors and attitudes, from Chapter 4 of Andrew J. DuBrin's text, *Leadership* (2004). The discussion lasted approximately 20 minutes. The following objectives were covered:

1. Task-related attitudes and behaviors.
2. Relationship-oriented attitudes and behaviors (2004, p. 94-132).

The facilitator of the Control Group/Group 1 reminded participants that her role was to assist them throughout the class and that she was available to answer any questions. The facilitator established a traditional college classroom environment. The facilitator was an experienced college professor with more than 20 years teaching experience. She conducted herself and the group in her own conventional, professional style.

Upon completion of the instruction, participants (approximately $n=23$)—students and confederates—were told there are three affective constructs common to every individual who holds a position of leadership: self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress. For this reason, participants were administered instruments designed to measure these three affective constructs (Appendices B, C & D).

Participants were advised that the scores on the instruments would remain confidential and would have no effect on their grades in the course (as required by the IRB). Participants were given instructions on how to complete the instruments. They were reminded that the instruments had to be completed within the allotted time frame. They were instructed to remain quiet and work independently. Minimal discussion among students was allowed.

The three measures were administered in paper format. The instruments were taken in succession, with five minutes given to complete each instrument (15 minutes total). After this portion of the experiment, participants were asked to

hand in their completed instruments to the facilitator and rejoin Treatment Group/Group 2 in the original classroom for a 15 minute debriefing session.

Group 2 – Treatment Group

After the random assignment process had been completed and participants were settled in their designated classroom, the facilitator led a brief discussion focused on leadership behaviors and attitudes from Chapter 4 of Andrew J. DuBrin's text, *Leadership* (2004). The discussion lasted approximately 20 minutes. The following objectives were covered:

1. Task-related attitudes and behaviors.
2. Relationship-oriented attitudes and behaviors (2004, p. 94-132).

The facilitator of the Treatment Group/Group 2 established a strict, authoritarian environment. She conveyed that her role was to ensure that the experiment was conducted properly. The facilitator spoke in vague terms. She was abrupt and dismissive and moved through the instructions for completing the instruments quickly and unclearly.

Upon completion of the instruction, participants (approximately n=23)—students and confederates—were told that three affective constructs are common to everyone who holds a position of leadership: self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress. For this reason, participants were administered instruments designed to measure these three affective constructs (Appendices B, C & D). Participants were told that these instruments were designed to reveal if they actually possessed the attitudes and characteristics which would qualify them as future leaders.

Participants were given minimal instructions on how to complete the instruments. They were reminded that completing the instruments was a timed exercise, and told that while they were completing the instruments no talking would be allowed and they must work independently.

The three measures were administered in succession and participants were given five minutes to complete each instrument (15 minutes total). The completed instruments were returned to the facilitator. Participants were told that the scores on the instruments would remain confidential.

During the experiment, the facilitator of the Treatment Group/Group 2 exhibited the following bullying behaviors. With the exception of behavior number nine, all bullying was directed at the confederates. Thus, the effects of these behaviors were experienced by the student participants indirectly. Behavior number nine was experienced directly by all participants.

While bullying is a form of aggression, the actions of a bully can be both obvious and subtle. It is important to note that the following is not an exhaustive checklist of behaviors, nor does it mention all forms of bullying. This list was chosen as a model to replicate some of the most common ways in which bullying occurs in the workplace (Workplace Bullying Institute, 2003). It also is important to note that bullying is usually considered a pattern of behavior where one or more incidents occur in clusters and typically over an extended period of time.

1. Intimidation—verbal and nonverbal.
2. Sarcastic joking and/or teasing.
3. Rude interruptions.
4. Personal insults.

5. Treat someone as if he or she is invisible.
6. Nonverbal behaviors (i.e., dirty looks, the raising of eyebrows or making faces in response to comments from the target).
7. Verbal remarks that could be characterized as snide or sarcastic.
8. Abrupt responses to questions.
9. Actions that undermine the target's ability to perform (i.e., rushing, constant distractions).
10. Complaining to others about an individual's behavior.
11. Attributing all that goes wrong to one person.
12. Raising one's voice.
13. Criticizing a person.
14. Belittling a person's opinions.

(See Bullying Script - Appendix E).

Upon completion of this portion of the experiment, participants were told to hand in their completed instruments and to rejoin Control Group/Group 1 in the original classroom for a mandatory debriefing session.

Debriefing Session

The experiment concluded with 15 minutes remaining in the class period. At this time the Control Group/Group 1 and the Treatment Group/Group 2 returned to the original classroom. All participants were led through a debriefing session facilitated by a trained clinical psychologist and the study researcher.

During the debriefing session, the actual objectives of the study and experiment were explained in detail and the facilitators' true identities were revealed. The confederates' identities were also revealed. Participants were

given an opportunity to ask questions, discuss their feelings and process the experience prior to class dismissal.

Discussion began with participants being reminded that it is sometimes difficult to know if bullying is occurring in the workplace. Many studies acknowledge that there is a fine line between a strong management style and bullying. Comments that are objective and are intended to provide constructive feedback are not considered bullying, but rather are intended to assist the employees in their work.

In order to determine if an action or statement is considered bullying, the reasonable person test can be administered by answering the question, "Would most people consider this action unacceptable?"

The debriefing discussion was facilitated using the following questions:

1. Did you feel you were a target of bullying?
2. What was your response to this behavior?
3. Do you believe the bullying behavior impeded your performance?
4. How did you feel when you witnessed a classmate being bullied?
5. Questions? Comments?

After completing the debriefing session, the researcher distributed the thank-you envelopes and class was dismissed.

The experiment lasted no longer than 80 minutes. The treatment (bullying) lasted no longer than 40 minutes. The experiment was videotaped in its entirety. The evidence supplied by the videotapes documented that the experiment was conducted as outlined in the study design. The footage also documented participants' responses to the bullying behavior.

SUMMARY

This chapter described the methodology used in this study to test the objectives and research hypotheses to determine if bullying had a negative effect on participants' productivity as measured by mean scores on three instruments designed to measure the affective constructs of self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress. The objectives and hypotheses were stated and all variables were defined. The population, sample selection and data collection methods were discussed. This chapter included the instrumentation rationale as well as evidence to demonstrate the validity and reliability of the three designated measures.

The resulting data, findings, discussion and conclusions of this experimental research are detailed in Chapters 4 and 5 to follow.

Chapter 4: Results

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of bullying behavior in a university classroom on the affective constructs of self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress among students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university. Therefore, this study attempted to test the effects of bullying through experimental research intended to measure the effects through simulating a bullying environment and administering instruments created to measure participants' self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress.

The following objectives and research hypotheses were developed by the researcher to accomplish the purpose of this study.

OBJECTIVE 1

The first objective of the study was to describe students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university in the southern region of the United States on the following selected characteristics:

- (a) Gender;
- (b) Self-Efficacy as measured by the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSES) (Chen, et al. 2001).
- (c) Satisfaction as measured by the Global Job Satisfaction Scale (GJSS) (Pond & Geyer, 1991).
- (d) Stress as measured by the Work Related Depression, Anxiety and Irritation Scale (WRDAIS) (Caplan, et al. 1980).

All of the 35 study participants (100%) agreed to participate in the study and completed the research instruments.

Gender of Participants

Regarding the first study variable of Objective 1, to describe study participants on the characteristic of gender, 14 (40%) participants reported their gender as male and 21 (60%) reported their gender as female.

To further summarize the data on the variable gender, study participants are also reported by subgroups. The Control Group/Group 1, consisted of 16 participants, of whom 7 (43.8%) reported their gender as male and 9 (56.2%) reported their gender as female. The Treatment Group/Group 2, consisted of 19 participants, of whom 7 (36.8%) reported their gender as male and 12 (63.2%) reported their gender as female. Information regarding the gender of study participants is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Gender of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs

Gender	Group		
	Experimental n/%	Control n/%	Total N/%
Male	7/36.8	7/43.8	14/40
Female	12/63.2	9/56.2	21/60
Total	19/100	16/100	35/100

Self-Efficacy of Participants

The second variable on which study participants were described was the affective construct of self-efficacy. The instrument selected to measure participants' self-efficacy was the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSES) (Chen, et al. 2001). A total of 35 participants (100%) completed the instrument to yield useable data.

The NGSES (Chen, et al. 2001) included eight items with a total possible raw score of 40. The reliability of the scale was estimated using the Cronbach's alpha procedure and was determined to be $\alpha = .97$ in this study. A total self-efficacy score is reported by calculating a mean of the responses to the eight items. Each item used a 5 point Likert-type response scale with values ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.

The mean score (N=35) of the self-efficacy scale was 4.11 (standard deviation .862). The lowest score was 1.13 and the highest score was 5.00. Information regarding self-efficacy classification, range, frequency and percentage is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Self-Efficacy Classification of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs

Self-Efficacy Classification	Range	Frequency	Percent
Very High	4.50 – 5.00	13	37.1
High	3.50 – 4.49	20	57.1
Moderate	2.51 – 3.49	0	.0
Low	1.51 – 2.50	0	.0
Very Low	1.00 – 1.50	2	5.7
Total	1.00 – 5.00	35	100

Self-efficacy scores of study participants are also reported by subgroups. The Control Group/Group 1, (n=16) had a computed mean score of 4.04 (standard deviation .874). The lowest score was 1.13 and the highest score was 5.00. The Treatment Group/Group 2, (n=19) had a computed mean score of 4.16 (standard deviation .872). The lowest score was 1.13 and the highest score was

5.00. Information regarding the self-efficacy of study participants is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Self-Efficacy of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs

NGSE Scale	<u>n</u>	Mean	SD	Minimum Score	Maximum Score
Group 1: Control Group	16	4.04	.874	1.13	5
Group 2: Treatment Group	19	4.16	.872	1.13	5
Total	35	4.11	.862	1.13	5

Satisfaction of Participants

The third variable on which study participants were described was the affective construct of satisfaction. The instrument selected to measure participants' satisfaction was the Global Job Satisfaction Scale (GJSS) (Pond & Geyer, 1991). For this research, the instrument was adjusted to reflect participants' satisfaction within an academic setting and not job satisfaction. A total of 35 participants (100%) completed the measuring instrument to yield useable data.

The GJSS (Pond & Geyer, 1991) included seven items with a total possible raw score of 37. The reliability of the scale was estimated using Cronbach's alpha procedure and was determined to be $\alpha = .79$ in this study. A total satisfaction score is determined by summing the seven items which yields a score for each individual in the study. Six of the seven items used a 5 point Likert-type response scale with values ranging from 1=the most negative

response, to 5=the most positive response. The seventh item used a 7 point Likert-type response scale with values ranging from 1=terrible to 7=delighted.

The mean score (N=35) of the satisfaction scale was 31.66 (standard deviation 3.58). The lowest score was 22 and the highest score was 37.

Information regarding satisfaction classification, range, frequency and percentage are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Satisfaction Classification of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs

Satisfaction Classification	Range	Frequency	Percent
Very High	33 – 37	19	54.3
High	26 – 32	14	40.0
Moderate	19 – 25	2	5.7
Low	12 – 18	0	.0
Very Low	7 – 11	0	.0
Total	7 – 37	35	100

Satisfaction scores of study participants are also reported by subgroups. The Control Group/Group 1, (n=16) had a computed mean score of 31.67 (standard deviation = 3.67). The lowest score was 23 and the highest score was 37. The Treatment Group/Group 2, (n=19) had a computed mean score of 31.68 (standard deviation = 3.60). The lowest score was 22 and the highest score was 37. Information regarding the satisfaction of study participants is presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Satisfaction of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs

GJS Scale	n	Mean	SD	Minimum Score	Maximum Score
Group 1: Control Group	16	31.63	3.67	23	37
Group 2: Treatment Group	19	31.68	3.60	22	37
Total	35	31.66	3.58	22	37

Stress of Participants

The fourth variable on which study participants were described was the affective construct of stress. The instrument selected to measure participants' stress was the Work Related Depression, Anxiety and Irritation Scale (WRDAIS) (Caplan, et al. 1980). A total of 35 participants (100%) completed the measuring instrument to yield useable data.

The WRDAIS (Caplan, et al. 1980) included 13 items. The reliability of the scale was estimated using the Cronbach's alpha procedure and was determined to be $\alpha = .74$ in this study. A total stress score is reported by calculating a mean of the individual responses to the 13 items. Each of the 13 items used a 1-4 anchored response scale with values ranging from 1=never or a little of the time to 4=most of the time. Two of the 13 items were reverse scaled (items 3 and 8). Therefore, prior to calculating the mean, these two items were reverse coded.

The mean score (N=35) of the stress scale was 1.60 (standard deviation .434). The lowest score was 1.31 and the highest score was 2.77. Information regarding stress classification range, frequency and percentage is presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Stress Classification of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs

Stress Classification	Range	Frequency	Percent
Very High	4.50 – 5.00	0	0
High	3.50 – 4.49	0	0
Moderate	2.51 – 3.49	3	8.6
Low	1.51 – 2.50	19	54.3
Very Low	1.00 – 1.50	13	37.1
Total	1.00 – 5.00	35	100

Stress scores of study participants are also reported by subgroups. The Control Group/Group 1, (n=16) had a computed mean score of 1.60 (standard deviation .459). The lowest score was 1.31 and the highest score was 2.62. The Treatment Group/Group 2, (n=19) had a computed mean score of 1.59, (standard deviation .480). The lowest score was 1.31 and the highest score was 2.77. Information regarding the stress of study participants is presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Stress of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs

WRDAI Scale	n	Mean	SD	Lowest Score	Highest Score
Group 1: Control Group	16	1.60	.459	1.31	2.62
Group 2: Treatment Group	19	1.59	.480	1.31	2.77
Total	35	1.60	.434	1.31	2.77

OBJECTIVE 2

The second objective was to compare students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university in the southern region of the United

States who received instruction in a “bullying” environment with those who received instruction in a traditional environment on the characteristic of gender.

Gender of Participants

Regarding the study variable of Objective 2, which was to compare study participants on the characteristic of gender, participants were compared by subgroups (Control Group and Treatment Group). Chi-square was used to determine if the variables treatment group and gender were independent and was determined to be $\chi^2 = .173$; $p=.678$; $df=1$. Results of the comparisons showed that the variables were independent and therefore not related (at the $p = .05$ level). Information regarding cross tabulation of gender by treatment group is presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Cross Tabulation of Gender by Treatment Group of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs

Gender	Group		
	Experimental n/%	Control n/%	Total N/%
Male	7/36.8	7/43.8	14/40
Female	12/63.2	9/56.2	21/60
Total	19/100	16/100	35/100

Note. $\chi^2 = .173$; $p=.678$; $df=1$.

Based on previous research findings and other conceptual evidence from the review of literature, the following objectives were written in the form of research hypotheses to be tested:

HYPOTHESIS 1

Hypothesis 1 stated that students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university who received instruction in a “bullying” environment

would perform significantly lower on a measure of self-efficacy than students who received instruction in a traditional classroom environment.

The Independent *t*-test procedure was used to determine if differences existed in the variable, self-efficacy, as measured by the scores on the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSES) (Chen, et al. 2001) by groups of student participants (Control Group and Treatment Group). Results of the comparisons showed that there was no significant difference (at the $p = .05$ level) in self-efficacy by treatment group.

For the variable self-efficacy, the Control Group/Group 1 ($n = 16$) had a mean value of 4.04 (standard deviation .874), while the Treatment Group/Group 2 ($n = 19$) had a mean value of 4.16 (standard deviation .872) as measured on a 1-5 Likert-type scale ($t = .423$; $p = .743$; at $df = 33$). Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was not confirmed by the data. Table 9 includes complete data on the comparison of mean differences on self-efficacy by treatment group.

Table 9: Comparison of Self-Efficacy of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs by Treatment Group

Participant Groups	n	Mean	SD	t^a	p	df
Group 1: Control Group	16	4.04	.874			
				.423	.743	33
Group 2: Treatment Group	19	4.16	.872			
Total	35	4.11	.862			

^aOne-tailed significance

HYPOTHESIS 2

Hypothesis 2 stated that students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university who received instruction in a “bullying” environment

would perform significantly lower on a measure of satisfaction than students who received instruction in a traditional classroom environment.

The Independent *t*-test procedure was used to determine if differences existed in the variable, satisfaction, as measured by the scores on the Global Job Satisfaction Scale (GJSS) (Pond & Geyer, 1991) by groups of student participants (Control Group/Group 1 and Treatment Group/Group 2). Results of the comparisons showed that there was no significant difference (at the $p = .05$ level) in satisfaction by treatment group.

For the variable satisfaction, the Control Group/Group 1 ($n = 16$) had a mean value of 31.63 (standard deviation 3.67), while the Treatment Group/Group 2 ($n = 19$) had a mean value of 31.68 (standard deviation 3.60) as measured on a 1-5 point Likert-type scale for items 1 through 6 and a 1-7 point Likert-type scale for item 7 ($t = .048$; $p = .934$, at $df = 33$). Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was not confirmed by the data. Table 10 includes complete data on the comparison of mean differences by satisfaction.

Table 10: Comparison of Satisfaction of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs by Treatment Group

Participant Groups	n	Mean	SD	t^a	p	df
Group 1: Control Group	16	31.63	3.67			
				.048	.934	33
Group 2: Treatment Group	19	31.68	3.60			
Total	35	31.66	3.58			

^aOne-tailed significance

HYPOTHESIS 3

Hypothesis 3 stated that students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university who received instruction in a “bullying” environment would perform significantly higher on a measure of stress than students who received instruction in a traditional classroom environment.

The Independent *t*-test procedure was used to determine if differences existed in the variable, stress, as measured by the scores on the Work Related Depression, Anxiety and Irritation Scale (WRDAIS) (Caplan, et al. 1980) by groups of student participants (Control Group/Group 1 and Treatment Group/Group 2). Results of the comparisons showed that there was no significant difference (at the $p = .05$ level) in stress by treatment group.

For the variable stress, the Control Group/Group 1 ($n = 16$) had a mean value of 1.60 (standard deviation .459), while the Treatment Group/Group 2 ($n = 19$) had a mean value of 1.59 (standard deviation .480) as measured on a 1-4 point anchored response scale ($t = .032$; $p = .986$, at $df = 33$). Therefore, Hypothesis 3 was not confirmed by the data. Table 11 includes complete data on the comparison of mean differences by stress.

Table 11: Comparison of Stress of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs by Treatment Group

Participant Groups	n	Mean	SD	t^a	p	df
Group 1: Control Group	16	1.60	.459			
				.032	.986	33
Group 2: Treatment Group	19	1.59	.480			
Total	35	1.60	.434			

^aOne-tailed significance

SUMMARY

This chapter described the analysis of data, presented the findings of this research, and presented the effects of workforce bullying on the affective constructs of self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress of students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university in the southern region of the United States. Thirty-five study participants contributed to the results contained herein. Data were analyzed to supply levels of agreement by category. Table 12 includes complete data on the comparison of mean differences between groups by self efficacy, satisfaction and stress. Chapter 5 presents a summary of the conclusions, implications and recommendations for further research.

Table 12: Overall Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of University Students Participating in an Experiment to Determine the Effects of Bullying Behavior on Selected Affective Constructs for the Three Affective constructs of Self-Efficacy, Satisfaction and Stress

Measures	Mean	SD	t	p^a
Self-Efficacy ^b	4.11	.862	.423	.725
Satisfaction ^c	31.66	3.58	.048	.934
Stress ^d	1.60	.434	.032	.986

^aOne-tailed significance

^bAs measured by New General Self-Efficacy Scale (Chen, et al. 2001)

^cAs measured by Global Job Satisfaction Scale (Pond & Geyer, 1991)

^dAs measured by Work Related Depression, Anxiety and Irritation Scale (Caplan, et al, 1980).

Chapter 5: Summary, Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations

SUMMARY OF PURPOSE AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the effects of “bullying” behavior on the affective constructs of self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress of students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university in the southern region of the United States. The dependent variables (response variables) of this study were participants’ performance levels as measured by their scores on three instruments designed to measure affective constructs of self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress. The independent variable was whether or not participants were exposed to the environment in the classroom that included the bullying behavior (treatment).

With this stated, the following specific objectives were formulated to guide this research study.

OBJECTIVE 1

To describe students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university in the southern region of the United States on the following selected characteristics:

- (a) Gender;
- (b) Self-Efficacy as measured by the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSES) (Chen, et al. 2001).
- (c) Satisfaction as measured by the Global Job Satisfaction Scale (GJSS) (Pond & Geyer, 1991).

- (d) Stress as measured by the Work Related Depression, Anxiety and Irritation Scale (WRDAIS) (Caplan, et al. 1980).

OBJECTIVE 2

To compare students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university in the southern region of the United States who received instruction in a “bullying” environment with those who received instruction in a traditional environment by gender.

Based on previous research findings and other conceptual evidence from the review of related literature, the following objectives were written in the form of research hypotheses to be tested.

HYPOTHESIS 1

Students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university who received instruction in a “bullying” environment would perform significantly lower on a measure of self-efficacy than students who received instruction in a traditional classroom environment.

HYPOTHESIS 2

Students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university who received instruction in a “bullying” environment would perform significantly lower on a measure of satisfaction than students who received instruction in a traditional classroom environment.

HYPOTHESIS 3

Students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university who received instruction in a “bullying” environment would perform

significantly higher on a measure of stress than students who received instruction in a traditional classroom environment.

SUMMARY OF METHODOLOGY

The target population for this study was defined as undergraduate students enrolled in a research-extensive university in the southern region of the United States. The accessible population of this study was defined as all undergraduate students at one selected research university in the southern region of the United States who were enrolled in leadership courses in the spring semester of 2009.

Thus, the researcher identified a leadership course on the recommendation of the director of the School of Human Resource and Workforce Development. The instructor of the course was contacted and the researcher gained his permission and support to use the leadership class in which to conduct the experimental research. The sample included students enrolled in a leadership course in the spring semester of 2009. Thus, there were 35 (100%) undergraduate students selected as the sample for this study.

Three instruments designed to measure the affective constructs of self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress, were used to collect data for this study. These measures included the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSES) (Chen, et al. 2001) to measure self-efficacy; Global Job Satisfaction Scale (GJSS) (Pond & Geyer, 1991) to measure satisfaction; and the Work Related Depression, Anxiety and Irritation Scale (WRDAIS) (Caplan, et al. 1980) to measure stress.

Permission to conduct this study was requested and granted from University administrators; permission to access undergraduate students enrolled

in a junior level course at a research extensive university in the southern region of the United States was requested and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Permission to use the NGSES to measure self-efficacy was granted from Sage Publications which holds the copyright at permissions@sagepub.com (Appendix F). Permission to use the GJSS to measure satisfaction was granted from Elsevier Journals which holds the copyright at usinfo@elsevier.com (Appendix G). Permission to use the WRDAIS was granted from Sage Publications which holds the copyright at permission@sagepub.com (Appendix H).

The first objective of this study was descriptive and was analyzed using descriptive statistics. Frequencies and percentages were used for variables that were measured on a categorical scale (nominal or ordinal). Means and standard deviations were used for variables that were measured on interval or higher measurement scales.

Data analysis used to accomplish the second objective and the first, second and third hypotheses included the Independent *t*-test. For variables that were measured on an interval or higher scale of measurement, the Independent *t*-test was used to compare students who received instruction in a “bullying” environment with those students who received instruction in a traditional environment. A significance level of .05 was used to determine if the independent variables were statistically significant.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

The major findings of this study are discussed by objectives and hypotheses.

OBJECTIVE 1

Objective 1 was to describe students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university in the southern region of the United States on the following selected characteristics:

- (a) Gender;
- (b) Self-Efficacy as measured by the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSES) (Chen, et al. 2001).
- (c) Satisfaction as measured by the Global Job Satisfaction Scale (GJSS) (Pond & Geyer, 1991).
- (d) Stress as measured by the Work Related Depression, Anxiety and Irritation Scale (WRDAIS) (Caplan, et al. 1980).

Gender of Participants

Of the 35/100% student participants, there were more females ($n=21$, 60%) than males ($n=14$, 40%).

Self-Efficacy of Participants

A total of 35 student participants (100%) completed the New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSES) (Chen, et al. 2001) to measure self-efficacy. The NGSES included eight items with a total possible raw score of 40. The computed mean score ($N=35$) of the self-efficacy scale was 4.11 (standard deviation .862), with the lowest score of 1.13 and the highest score of 5.00.

Satisfaction of Participants

A total of 35 student participants (100%) completed the Global Job Satisfaction Scale (GJSS) (Pond & Geyer, 1991) to measure satisfaction. The GJSS included seven items with a total possible raw score of 37. The computed

mean score (N=35) of the satisfaction scale was 31.66 (standard deviation 3.58), with the lowest score of 22 and the highest score of 37.

Stress

A total of 35 student participants (100%) completed the Work Related Depression, Anxiety and Irritation Scale (WRDAIS) (Caplan, et al. 1980) to measure stress. The WRDAIS included 13 items. The computed mean score (N=35) of the stress scale was 1.60 (standard deviation .434), with the lowest score of 1.31 and the highest score of 2.77.

OBJECTIVE 2

Objective 2 was to compare students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university in the southern region of the United States who received instruction in a “bullying” environment with those who received instruction in a traditional classroom environment on the characteristic of gender. Of the student participants (N=35/100%), there were more females ($n=21$, 60%) than males ($n=14$, 40%).

To further compare the data on the variable gender by subgroups. The Control Group/Group 1, ($n=16$), included 7 males (43.8%) and 9 females (56.2%). The Treatment Group/Group 2, ($n=19$), included seven males (36.8%) and 12 females (63.2%). Chi-square was used to determine if the variables treatment group and gender were independent and was determined to be $\chi^2 = .173$; $p = .678$; $df = 1$. Results of the comparisons showed that the variables were independent and therefore not related (at the $p = .05$ level).

HYPOTHESIS 1

Hypothesis 1 stated that students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university who received instruction in a “bullying” environment would perform significantly lower on a measure of self-efficacy than students who received instruction in a traditional classroom environment. Of the study participants (N=35/100%) regarding the variable self-efficacy, the computed mean score was 4.11 (standard deviation .862). The lowest score was 1.13 and the highest score was 5.00.

To further compare data on the variable self-efficacy by subgroups, the Control Group/Group 1 ($n=16$) had a computed mean score of 4.04 (standard deviation .874), while the Treatment Group/Group 2 ($n=19$) had a computed mean score of 4.16 (standard deviation .872). The Independent *t*-test procedure was used to determine if differences existed in the variable self-efficacy by groups (Control Group-Treatment Group) and was determined to be $t=.423$; $p=.743$; $df=33$. Hypothesis 1 was not confirmed by the data.

The New General Self-Efficacy Scale (NGSES) (Chen, et al. 2001) included eight items with a total possible score of 40. The reliability of the self-efficacy scale was estimated using the Cronbach’s alpha procedure and was determined to be $\alpha = .97$ in this study. A total self-efficacy score is reported by calculating a mean of the responses to the eight items. Each item used a 5 point Likert-type response scale with values ranging from 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.

HYPOTHESIS 2

Hypothesis 2 stated that students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university who received instruction in a “bullying” environment would perform significantly lower on a measure of satisfaction than students who received instruction in a traditional classroom environment. For all study participants (N=35/100%) the computed mean score on the variable satisfaction was 31.66 (standard deviation 3.58). The lowest score was 22 and the highest score was 37. In addition, the Control Group/Group 1 (n=16) had a computed mean satisfaction score of 31.63 (standard deviation 3.67), while the Treatment Group/Group 2 (n=19) had a computed mean score of 31.68 (standard deviation 3.61).

The Independent *t*-test procedure was used to determine if differences existed in the variable satisfaction by groups (Control Group-Treatment Group) and was determined to be $t=.048$; $p=.934$; $df=33$. Hypothesis 2 was not confirmed by the data.

The Global Job Satisfaction Scale (GJSS) (Pond & Geyer, 1991) included seven items with a total possible raw score of 37. The reliability of the scale was estimated using Cronbach’s alpha procedure and was determined to be $\alpha = .79$ in this study. A total satisfaction score is reported by summing the seven items. Six of the seven items used a 5 point Likert-type response scale with values ranging from 1=definitely not participate ..., to 5=definitely participate The seventh item used a 7 point Likert-type response scale with values ranging from 1=terrible to 7=delighted.

HYPOTHESIS 3

Hypothesis 3 stated that students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university who received instruction in a “bullying” environment would perform significantly higher on a measure of stress than students who received instruction in a traditional classroom environment. Of the study participants (N=35/100%) regarding the variable stress, the computed mean score was 1.60 (standard deviation .434), with the lowest score of 1.31 and the highest score of 2.77.

To further compare data on the variable stress by subgroups, Control Group/Group 1 (n=16) had a computed mean score of 1.60 (standard deviation .459), while Treatment Group/Group 2 (n=19) had a computed mean value of 1.59 (standard deviation .480).

The Independent *t*-test procedure was used to determine if differences existed in the variable stress by groups (Control Group-Treatment Group) and was determined to be $t=.032$; $p=.986$; $df=33$. Hypothesis 3 was not confirmed by the data.

The Work Related Depression, Anxiety and Irritation Scale (WRDAIS) (Caplan, et al. 1980) included 13 items. The reliability of the scale was established using the Cronbach’s alpha procedure and was determined to be $\alpha = .74$ in this study. A total stress score is reported by calculating a mean of the responses to the 13 items. Each of the 13 items used a 1-4 anchored response scale with values ranging from 1=never or a little of the time to 4=most of the time.

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings from this study the researcher has derived the following conclusions, implications and recommendations:

Conclusion One

Student participants (N=35) had high self-efficacy. This conclusion is based on the findings that 33 participants (94.2%) had high or very high self-efficacy scores and only 2 participants (5.7%) had self-efficacy scores lower than a high classification.

Because study participants scored high on self-efficacy this could further explain the lack of difference in the dependent variables of the study. This researcher proposes that individuals reporting higher than average self-efficacy may be less susceptible to the effects of one isolated incident of bullying than individuals who scored significantly lower on a measure of self-efficacy.

Conclusion Two

Student participants (N=35) had high satisfaction. This conclusion is based on the findings that 33 participants (94.3%) had high or very high satisfaction scores and only 2 participants (5.7%) had satisfaction scores lower than a high classification.

Because study participants scored high on satisfaction this could further explain the lack of difference in the dependent variables of the study. This researcher proposes that individuals reporting a higher than average satisfaction may be less susceptible to the effects of one isolated incident of bullying than individuals who scored significantly lower on a measure of satisfaction.

Conclusion Three

Student participants (N=35) had low stress. This conclusion is based on the findings that 32 participants (91.4%) had low or very low stress scores and only 3 participants (8.6%) had stress scores higher than a moderate classification.

Because study participants scored low on stress this could further explain the lack of difference in the dependent variables of the study. This researcher proposes that individuals reporting lower than average stress may be less susceptible to the effects of one isolated incident of bullying than individuals who scored significantly higher on a measure of stress.

Conclusion Four

The treatment “bullying” had no effect on the measures of self-efficacy, satisfaction or stress of students enrolled in a junior level course at a research extensive university in the southern region of the United States.

This conclusion is based on statistical analyses which were computed and revealed no significant differences (at $p=.05$ level) in self-efficacy ($t=.423$; $p=.743$; at $df=33$); satisfaction ($t=.048$, $p=.934$, at $df=33$); and stress ($t=.032$, $p=.986$, at $df=33$) by treatment level (Control Group-Treatment Group).

This conclusion is inconsistent with the findings of other studies in the literature. One possible reason for this inconsistency is the fact that this study is a different design. Therefore, one would not expect the existing literature to specifically address expected results of this study. However, Leymann (1990) found that bullying negatively impacts workers’ personal, psychological, cognitive and physiological functioning. Zellars, et al. (2002) found that professional

performance, job satisfaction, job stability and workplace citizenship behaviors are negatively affected by bullying. Bassman (1992) stated that bullying has a negative effect on organizational productivity and specifically the reputation and stability of its workers. According to Keashley and Jagatic (2003, p. 53), "The overall nature of the effects of bullying indicate a deterioration or disabling of the target." Lynch and O'Moore (2007) stated that individuals who were the recipients of bullying behavior were more likely to report a low self-esteem.

Namie and Namie (2004) found that when subjected to a bully in the workplace, "people tend to withdraw and disengage," and their ability to perform is often "short circuited by the effects of this ill treatment." A Gallup study (1997) revealed that even an employee's perception of the physical environment is colored by his or her relationship with his or her manager. According to Field (2001), research has shown that bullying results in lowered self-esteem, lost productivity, negative organizational culture and reduced organizational performance. Further, Adams (1994) stated that the bully's abuse of power causes stress by undermining the employee's self-confidence, and Sutton (2007) stated that 20 percent of workers reported being bullied and reported low morale.

The findings of this study are not supported by the literature. Even though the study was a different design than found in the literature, the results were still quite unexpected. This researcher can offer several possible reasons to explain these findings.

First, the IRB imposed three specific restrictions upon this experiment, which in this researcher's opinion compromised the effectiveness of the treatment. These restrictions included:

- (a) The first and most damaging restriction was that the researcher was forced to use confederates as the sole targets of the bullying behavior.
- (b) The second restriction was that students had to be informed of the nature of the research in the IRB Consent Form.
- (c) The third restriction was that students had to be informed that the research experiment would have no effect on their standing or grade in the course.

Because student participants quickly discerned the confederates' identities and the experimental treatment (bullying) was directed only toward the confederates, the researcher believes the results from the measures were compromised. Even though the confederates were introduced to the student participants as "students from another class who needed the extra credit," due to the small size of the class (N=35) and the familiarity of its members, it appeared to this researcher that the confederates' identities were recognized within the first few minutes of the experiment.

Additionally, this researcher believes that because student participants knew they were a part of an experiment and were told that they may experience extreme discomfort (as revealed in the IRB Consent Form) the results may have been compromised. Had students not been aware of the exact nature of the treatment to which they were being subjected, their scores may have been more reflective of the effects of bullying behavior. Also, because they knew that their participation in the experiment had no effect on their good standing or ultimate grade in the course it may have seemed more like a game to them.

In consideration of constraints required by the IRB, one possible alternative research design is suggested. In order to conduct an experiment within an academic environment a future study could identify a faculty member who has a history of creating a positive teaching environment and a faculty member who has a history of creating a “bullying” environment. At the end of the semester the course grades from the two classes could be compared to determine if the “bullying” behavior had an effect on student productivity as measured by their final grades in the course.

Additionally, this researcher suggests research using measures that test participants’ on cognitive behavior rather than affective constructs. It is suggested that this may more accurately reflect the effects of bullying behavior. In order to perform cognitive functions such as word associations and geometric shape puzzles requires concentration and a higher level of thinking than merely answering questions regarding how one is feeling at one moment. This researcher believes participants’ ability to perform under pressure and complete measures to score cognitive behavior may produce more meaningful results. Therefore, future research is recommended to test the effects of bullying on participants’ scores on selected measures of cognitive performance.

Third the small sample size of this study (i.e., census of one junior level leadership class at a research extensive university in the southern region of the United States, N=35) may have diminished the results. This researcher recommends conducting a similar study using a larger sample size, which will yield more data, which may more accurately reflect the effects of bullying on participants’ scores. This recommendation is based on Cohen and Cohen’s

guidelines (1983) which state that using an effect size of .20, and power at .80, at the 95 percent confidence level, would require a larger sample size than was used in this study. Additionally, with a larger sample size it would be far easier to conceal the identity of the confederates, if the IRB were to impose those restrictions on further research experiments of this type.

If, for instance, an experiment were conducted in a larger class and was held very early in the semester (the second or third session) the number of students enrolled in the class would provide a natural camouflage for the confederates' identities. Thus, when the confederates were "bullied" it would not be so easy for the enrolled student participants to identify the confederates as outsiders. A study design of this type may yield more genuine reactions to the secondary effects of bullying and more meaningful results.

Fourth, because the experiment was conducted for such a brief amount of time, (40 minutes) this may further explain why the "bullying" behavior had no measurable effect on the scores on the measures of self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress. In order to measure the effects of bullying behavior on the affective constructs of self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress the experimental treatment "bullying" may need to be experienced by participants over a longer period of time and through repeated exposure.

Although this study design (true experimental research) was different from prior studies found in the existing literature, the length of exposure to the treatment (bullying) is confirmed in the literature as an important factor in other research. According to Adams (1994) bullying is persistent behavior, Tepper (2002) claims that bullying is the sustained display of hostile, verbal and

nonverbal behavior, and Sutton (2007) maintains that bullies repeat their bullying behavior. The Workplace Bullying Institute (2003) indicates that exposure to long-term bullying at work is associated with symptoms of stress. Einarsen and Skogstad (1996), and Matthiesen and Einarsen (2007) contend that bullying is a long-lasting phenomenon that wears down its victims. Therefore additional research is recommended which is conducted over a longer period of time. A long-term study may yield data that is more authentically representative of the effects of bullying behavior.

Fifth and finally, after viewing the videotapes of both the Control Group/Group 1 and the Treatment Group/Group 2 during the experiment and the subsequent debriefing session, it was discovered that several of the participants seemed confused about whether their responses to the items on the measures of self-efficacy, satisfaction and stress were a reflection of their opinions of the original course and the course instructor or the experiment and facilitator of the experiment. This confusion may have affected the integrity of the results of the experiment.

In the videotapes, several students revealed during the debriefing session that they were confused when asked on one of the measures, "Would you recommend this class to a friend?" Several students indicated that they did not want to reflect badly on the original course instructor, who had established a very supportive classroom environment, but they would definitely never recommend the experimental treatment to a friend. Another item asked, "Are you comfortable in this class?" Again, students stated that they definitely were not comfortable in the experimental class but in the course as a whole they were quite comfortable.

Even though the researcher included at the top of each measure a statement that read, “Please read each statement carefully and check the box that most closely corresponds with your belief in this class-period at this point in time only” (Appendix B, C & D) it is impossible to be certain that all students fully comprehended the instructions. As a further precaution to avoid this confusion, the facilitators of both groups delivered the instructions verbally while the instruments were being distributed.

References

- Adams, A. (1994). "The Person Who Coined the Phrase 'Workforce Bullying.'" Speech by Andrea Adams given at a conference sponsored by the British Trade Union MSF (Manufacturing, Science and Finance) May 24, 1994.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C. & Razavieh, A. (2002). Introduction to Educational Research. New York: Holt, Rienhart & Winston.
- Avolio, B.J. & Bass, B.M. (1987). Charisma and beyond. In J.G. Hunt (Ed.), Emerging leadership vistas, p. 29-49. Boston: Lexington.
- Andersson, L., & Pearson, C. (1999). Tit for Tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 453-471.
- Bass, B.M. (1960). Leadership, psychology, and organizational behavior. New York: Harper.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). Bass and Stogdill's handbook of Leadership: A survey of theory and research. New York: Free Press.
- Bassman, E. (1992). Abuse in the Workplace. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row.
- Blanchard, K., Zigarmi, D., & Nelson R. (1993). Situational leadership after 25 years: a retrospective. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 1(1), 22-36.
- Borenstein, S. (2008). Study: nice guys actually finish 1st. *The Advocate*, 3.20.2008. Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
- Borg, M.G. (1998). The emotional reaction of school bullies and their victims. *Educational Psychology*, 18, 433-444.
- Boyle, G. J. (1991). Does item homogeneity indicate internal consistency or item redundancy in psychometric scales? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 12, 291-294.
- Bracht, G.H. & Glass G.V. (1968). External validity of experiments. *American Education Research Journal*. 5, 437-474.
- Bradford, D.L. & Cohen, A.R. (1984). Managing for excellence: The guide to developing high performance organizations. New York: John Wiley.
- Buckingham, M. and Coffman, C. (1999). First, Break All the Rules. What the world's greatest managers do differently. New York: Simon & Schuster.

- www.Bullybuster.net (2007). Referenced on July 22, 2007.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2006). www.bls.gov/ces/home.htm Vol. 85 Issue 22, p.18-20,2p, 19. Referenced on June 7, 2007.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Buss, D. M. (1994). Toward a psychology of person-environment (PE) correlation: the role of spouse selection. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 47, 361–377.
- Cameron, J. (2002). *The Artist's Way. A Spiritual Path to Higher Creativity*. 10th Ed. New York: Penguin Putnam, Inc.
- Campbell, D.T. & Stanley, J.C. (1963). *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research*. Reprinted from N.L. Gage (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Testing*. Chicago: Ran McNally and Co.
- Canadian Centre for Occupational Health & Safety. (2006). *Canada's National Occupational Health & Safety Resource*. Referenced on February 14, 2009 from <http://www.ccohs.ca/oshanswers/psychosocial/bullying.html>
- Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S., French, J. R. P., Van Harrison, R., & Pinneau, S. R. (1980). Job demands and worker health, p. 274. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.
- Carins, K. (1995). Using simulations to enhance career education. *ERIC Digest*. Greensboro, NC.
- Carmichael, D., (1995). *Administrative Management Theory*. SUNY at Buffalo.
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of New General Self-Efficacy Scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4, 62. Sage Publications.
- Chen, P. Y. & Spector, P. E. (1992). Relationships of work stressors with aggression, withdrawal, theft, and substance use: An exploratory study. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*: 65, 177-184.
- Coco, M. P. (1998). The New War Zone: The Workplace. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 63(1), 15-20.
- Cohen, J. & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied Multiple Regression Correlational Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd Ed. Hillsdale, N.J: Lawrence Erlbaum, Associates. p. 530.

- Colleen (2007). She is a Hilton Head, S.C. resident and the director of national accounts for a large corporation. Quotation taken during a personal interview with Elizabeth Nealy. Colleen wishes to remain anonymous.
- Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 471-482.
- Contos, G. (2008) Personal Interview with Elizabeth Nealy, the author. Permission to print granted in 2008.
- Cronbach, L.J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*. 16, 297-334.
- Davenport, N., Schwartz, R. D. & Elliott, G. P. (1999). *Mobbing. Emotional Abuse in the American Workplace*. Ames, IA: Civil Society Publishing.
- Demming, W. E. (2000). *The New Economics: For Industry, Government, Education*, 2nd Ed. MIT Press.
- DuBrin, A. J. (2004). *Leadership. Research Findings, Practice, and Skills*. 4th Ed. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 94-132.
- Ebert, R.J. & Griffin, R.W. (1998). *Business Essentials*. 2nd Ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Eden, D. & Leviatan, U. (1975). Implicit leadership theory as a determinant of the factor structure underlying supervisory behavior scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 736-741.
- Einarsen, S. & Skogstad, A. (1996). Bullying at work: epidemiological findings in public and private organizations. *European Work and Organizational Psychologist*, 5, 2, 185-201.
- Etzioni, A. (1961). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York: Free Press.
- Field, T. (2001). *Bully In Sight. How to Predict, resist, Challenge and Combat Bullying*. Success Unlimited Press.
- Fields, D. L. (2002). *Taking the Measure of Work. A guide to Validated Scales for Organizational Research and Diagnosis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1964). A contingency model of leadership effectiveness. In L. Berkowitz (Ed), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 149-190). New York: Academic Press.

- Fiedler, F.E. (1986). The contribution of cognitive resources to leadership performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, v16, 532-548.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1992). Time-based measures of leadership experience and organizational performance: A review of research and preliminary model. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3, 5-23.
- Fleishman, E.A. & Hunt, G. (1973). *Current Developments in the Study of Leadership*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Freedom From Bullies, National Freedom From Bullies Week. October 18-24, 2003. The Workplace Bullying & Trauma Institute. Referenced on July 11, 2007 from www.workdoctor.com
- French, J. & Raven, B.H. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies of Social Power*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, pp. 150-167.
- Frone, M.R. (2000). Interpersonal conflict at work and psychological outcomes: Testing a model among young workers. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5, 246-255.
- Godin, I. & Kittel, F. (2003). Experimental approach to cognitive abnormality among victims of bullying at work. Roald Bjorklund, Institute of Psychology, University of Oslo, Norway.
- Graen, G.B., & Uhl-bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi-domain approach. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 219-247.
- Greenberg, L., & Barling, J. (1999). Predicting employee aggression against co-workers, subordinates and supervisors: The roles of person behaviors and perceived workplace factors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 897-913.
- Grensing-Pophal, L. (2007). *Extinguish the flame*. Human Resources Essentials. SHRM.
- Hirschfeld, S. J. (2007). *Workplace bullying: The next legal frontier?* Employment Law Alliance. San Francisco Daily Journal: San Francisco, CA.
- Hoobler, J.M. & Swanberg, J. (2006). The enemy is not us: Unexpected workplace violence trends. *Public Personnel Management*, 35: 3.

- Hollander, E.P. (1961). Some effects of perceived status on responses to innovative behavior. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 63, 247-250.
- Hollander, E.P. (1980). Leadership and social exchange processes. In K.J. Gergen, M.S. Greenberg, and R.H. Willis (Eds.), *Social Exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 103-118). New York: Plenum Press.
- House, R.J. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 323-352.
- Hunt, J.G. (1991). *Leadership: a new synthesis*. Newbury Park: Sage. Institute for Research on Higher Education. The academy in a changing world: restructuring higher education. *Change*, July/August 1995.
- Jackson, R. T. (2005). The impact of transformational leadership training on organizational and institutional effectiveness within the Baton Rouge Community College System. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Capella University.
- Jago, A.G. (1982). Leadership: Perspectives in theory and research. *Management Science*, 28(3), 315-336.
- Keashley, L. & Jagtic, K. (2000). Workplace abuse and aggression. Paper presented at *Workplace Bullying 2000: Redefining Harassment*. Okland, CA.
- Kennedy, J.E. (1994). Exploring the limits of science and beyond: Research strategy and status. *Journal of Parapsychology*, 58, 59-77.
- Kennedy, J.E. (1995). Methods for investigating goal oriented psi. *Journal of Parapsychology*, 59, 47-62.
- Kinchin, D. (2001) *Bullycide and Complex PTSD: The Invisible Injury*. Success Unlimited.
- Leblanc, M.M., & Kelloway, E.K. (2002). Predictors and outcomes of workplace violence and aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 444-453.
- Leymann, H. (1990). Mobbing and Psychological Terror at Workplaces. *Violence and Victims*, 5(2), 119-126.
- Leymann, H. (1992). *From Bullying to Exclusion From Working Life*. Stockholm: Publica.
- Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5, 165-184.

- Likert, R. (1961). *New Patterns of Management*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Lynch, J. & O'Moore, M. (2007). *Workplace bullying: Psychological effects, coping strategies and personality constructs of recipients of bullying behaviours*. Trinity College, Ireland.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Matthiesen, S.B. & Einarsen, S. (2007). *About perpetrators and targets of bullying at work. Some personality differences*. University of Bergen, Norway.
- McKenny, J.L. & Keen, P.G.W. (1974). *How managers think*. *Harvard Business Review*, 52, 3; 79-90.
- McLagan, P. (1999). *Jumping up & down on a Fault Line ... The role of HRD as we enter a new Millennium*. www.Leader-Values.com, Mick Yates.
- Menesini, E. (1999). *Bullying and emotions: Report of the working party*. University of Firenze, Italy.
- Namie, G.M. & Namie, R. (2003). *The Bully at Work. What You Can Do to Stop the Hurt and Reclaim Your Dignity on the Job*. Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks.
- National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University. (2000). *Report of the United States Postal Service Commission on a Safe and Secure Workplace*. New York: Author.
- Neuman, J.H., & Baron, R.A. (1998). *Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence concerning specific forms, potential causes, and preferred targets*. *Journal of Management*, 24, 391-419.
- Northwestern National Life Insurance Company. (1993). *Fear and violence in the workplace: A survey documenting the experience of American Workers*. Minneapolis, MN: Author.
- Norwack, M. & Rand, D. (2008). www.princeton.edu/umdainels/PD/PD.html accessed on July 11, 2008.
- Offerman, L.R., Kennedy, J.K., & Wirtz, P.W. (1994). *Implicit leadership theories: Content, structure, and generalizability*. *Leadership Quarterly*, 5, 43-58.

- Olson, D.L., Shipley, M.F., Johnson, M., Dimitrova, P., Marchevski, I., Stoykov, I. & Yankov, N. (2005). Simulation as a pedagogical tool for managerial decision making in a transition economy. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 57, 9, pp. 1019-1026(8). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Patterson, M.G., West, M.A., Lawthom, R., & Nickell, S. (1997). *Impact of People Management Practices on Business Performance*. Institute of Personnel and Development, IPD House, London SW19 4UX
- Payne, A.M., Stephenson, J.E., Morris, W.B., Tempest, H.G., Mileham, A., & Griffin, D.K. (2007). The use of an e-learning constructivist solution in workplace learning. School of Information systems, Computing and Mathematics, Brunel University, Uxbridge.
- Pietersen, C. (2007). Perceived frequency, intensity of feelings toward, and expected impact of different forms of workplace aggression (WA). University of the North, South Africa.
- Pfeffer, J. (1981). *Power in Organizations*. Marshfield, MA: Pittman.
- Pond, S. B., & Geyer, P. D. (1991). Differences in the relation between job satisfaction and perceived work alternatives among older and younger blue-collar workers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 39, 251-262. Academic Press.
- Price, R.V. (1991). *Computer-aided instruction: A guide for authors*. Pacific Grove, CA.: Brooks Cole.
- Quinn, R.P., & Shepard, L. (1974). The 1973-1974 quality of employment survey: Descriptive statistics. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research. Survey Research Center.
- Rice, R. W., Gentile, D.A., & McFarlin, D. B. (1991). Facet importance and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(1), 31-39. American Psychological Association.
- Schat, A.C.H. & Kelloway, E.K. (2003). Reducing the adverse consequence of workplace aggression and violence: The buffering effects of organizational support. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 8, 110-122.
- Schat, A.C.H., & Kelloway, E.K. (2004). Workplace aggression. In J. Barling, M. Frone, & E.K. Kelloway (Eds.), *Handbook of work stress* (pp. 189-218). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schat, A.C.H., Frone, M.R. & Kelloway, E.K. (2006). Prevalence of workplace aggression in the U.S. workforce: Findings from a national study. *Handbook of Workplace Violence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Sutton, R. I., (2007). *The No Asshole Rule. Building a Civilized Workplace and Surviving One That Isn't*. New York: Warner Business Books.
- Taylor, H. (2008). Personal Interview with Elizabeth Nealy, the author. Permission to print granted in 2008.
- Tepper, B. J., (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*; 87(6): 1068-76.
- U.S. Congress. (2006). *BP Bully Backstabbed by Corporate Execs Under Congressional Spotlight An American First!*
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organizations*. (T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Free Press.
- West, M.A., Lawthom, R., Patterson, M.G. & Stainforth, D. (1996). *Still far to go: the management of UK manufacturing*. Institute of Work Psychology: University of Sheffield, Sheffield, S10 2TN.
- West, M.A., Patterson, M., Lawthom, R., Maitlis, S. & Nicolitsas, D. (1997). *The Sheffield organisational effectiveness programme: a description of methods*. Institute of Work Psychology, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, S10 2TN.
- Wilson, M.S. (2004). *Effective Developmental Leadership: A study of the Traits and Behaviors of a Leader Who Develops Both People and the Organization*. Louisiana State University. Baton Rouge, LA.
- Workplace Bullying Institute. (2003). *Report on Abusive Workplace: Prevalence, Perception, Degree, and Impact*. Referenced on January 1, 2009 from <http://www.bullyinginstitute.org/res/burend.pdf>
- Yukl, G.A. & Falbe, C.M. (1991). The importance of different power sources in downward and lateral relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 416-423.
- Zellars, K. L., Tepper, B. J. & Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 6, 1068-1076

Appendix A IRB Consent Form

By accepting the terms and conditions detailed below, you are agreeing to participate in an experimental study that is part of Ph.D. dissertation research. If you have any questions you may contact the researcher, Elizabeth Nealy, Monday-Friday between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. at 225.226.8906.

The purpose of the study is to investigate leadership characteristics and performance levels as determined by participants' scores on evaluation instruments designed to measure three affectation constructs of leadership.

All participants in this study must be 18 years old, a currently enrolled student in at Louisiana State University and in good physical and mental health. Please exclude yourself from this study if you or pregnant, or may be pregnant.

Participation in this study is voluntary. As a participant you will be compensated \$10, which you will receive at the conclusion of the experiment. The experiment shall last no longer than 80 minutes (the length of the regular class period). Participation in the experiment will have no effect on your grade in the class.

Please be aware that you may experience overwhelming feelings of discomfort and if so, you may discontinue your participation in the experiment. However, if you choose to leave the classroom please remain in the adjacent hallway until the conclusion of the experiment. As a participant you agree to remain on the premises until the experiment has been completed.

The results of the study will remain confidential. The results of the evaluation instruments will remain confidential. The experiment will be recorded both visually and auditorally. This recording shall remain confidential and will only be used as qualitative results within the researcher's findings. By signing below, you grant the researcher permission to use your likeness recorded in this footage as a part of the research project.

By signing below you agree to the terms and conditions of this study as described above and acknowledge the researcher's obligation to provide you with a copy of this consent form and the study results, in its entirety, upon request.

Please contact the researcher if you have any questions concerning the study. If you have questions about human subjects' rights or other concerns regarding the study, you may contact Robert C. Mathews, Chair, LSU Institutional Review Board (225) 578-8692.

Print Name: _____

Male: _____ Female: _____

Signed: _____

Dated: _____

Witnessed: _____

Dated: _____

Appendix B New General Self-Efficacy Scale

Please read each statement carefully and check the box that most closely corresponds with your belief in this class-period at this point in time only with regard to your ability to perform specific leadership behaviors successfully.

1. I will be able to achieve most of the goals that I have set for myself.
 - strongly disagree
 - disagree
 - neutral
 - agree
 - strongly agree

2. When facing difficult tasks, I am certain that I will accomplish them.
 - strongly disagree
 - disagree
 - neutral
 - agree
 - strongly agree

3. In general, I think that I can obtain outcomes that are important to me.
 - strongly disagree
 - disagree
 - neutral
 - agree
 - strongly agree

4. I believe I can succeed at most any endeavor to which I set my mind.
 - strongly disagree
 - disagree
 - neutral
 - agree
 - strongly agree

5. I will be able to successfully overcome many challenges.
 - strongly disagree
 - disagree
 - neutral
 - agree
 - strongly agree

6. I am confident that I can perform effectively on many different tasks.
- strongly disagree
 - disagree
 - neutral
 - agree
 - strongly agree
7. Compared to other people, I can do most tasks very well.
- strongly disagree
 - disagree
 - neutral
 - agree
 - strongly agree
8. Even when things are tough, I can perform quite well.
- strongly disagree
 - disagree
 - neutral
 - agree
 - strongly agree

(NGSE, Chen, et al. 2001, p. 79)

Appendix C

Global Job Satisfaction Scale

Please read each statement carefully and check the box that most closely corresponds with your belief in this class-period at this point in time only in regard to your satisfaction with this class.

1. (Knowing what you know now), If you had to decide all over again whether to participate in this class, what would you decide?
 - definitely not participate in the class
 - might not participate in the class
 - mixed (about equal to participating and not participating in the class)
 - might participate in the class
 - definitely participate in the class

2. If a (good) friend asked if he/she should participate in this class with this facilitator, what would you recommend?
 - not recommend at all
 - might not recommend
 - mixed (about equal to not recommend or recommend)
 - might recommend
 - recommend strongly

3. How does this class compare with your ideal class (class you would most like to take)?
 - very far from ideal
 - not ideal
 - mixed (about equally not ideal and ideal)
 - somewhat ideal
 - very close to ideal

4. (In general) How does this class measure up to the sort of class you wanted when you agreed to participate in it?
 - not at all like I wanted
 - unlike what I wanted
 - mixed (about equally not what I wanted and just like I wanted)
 - similar to what I wanted
 - just like what I wanted

5. All (in all) things considered, how satisfied are you with this current class?
 - not at all satisfied
 - somewhat dissatisfied
 - mixed (about equally dissatisfied and satisfied)
 - somewhat satisfied

- completely satisfied
6. In general, how much do you like this class?
- not at all satisfied
 - somewhat dissatisfied
 - mixed (about equally dissatisfied and satisfied)
 - somewhat satisfied
 - greatly satisfied
7. How do you feel about this class overall?
- terrible
 - unhappy
 - mostly dissatisfied
 - mixed (about equally dissatisfied and satisfied)
 - mostly satisfied
 - pleased
 - delighted

(GJS, Pond & Geyer, 1991, p. 254)

Appendix D

Work Related Depression, Anxiety and Irritation Scale

Here are some items about how people may feel. When you think about **yourself and this class-period at this time only**, how much of the time do you feel this way?

1. I feel nervous.
 - never or a little of the time
 - some of the time
 - a good part of the time
 - most of the time

2. I feel jittery.
 - never or a little of the time
 - some of the time
 - a good part of the time
 - most of the time

3. I feel calm.
 - never or a little of the time
 - some of the time
 - a good part of the time
 - most of the time

4. I feel fidgety.
 - never or a little of the time
 - some of the time
 - a good part of the time
 - most of the time

5. I get angry.
 - never or a little of the time
 - some of the time
 - a good part of the time
 - most of the time

6. I get aggravated.
 - never or a little of the time
 - some of the time
 - a good part of the time
 - most of the time

7. I get irritated or annoyed.
- never or a little of the time
 - some of the time
 - a good part of the time
 - most of the time
8. I feel useful and needed in this class.
- never or a little of the time
 - some of the time
 - a good part of the time
 - most of the time
9. I feel confused.
- never or a little of the time
 - some of the time
 - a good part of the time
 - most of the time
10. I feel tense.
- never or a little of the time
 - some of the time
 - a good part of the time
 - most of the time
11. I feel frustrated.
- never or a little of the time
 - some of the time
 - a good part of the time
 - most of the time
12. I feel lonesome.
- never or a little of the time
 - some of the time
 - a good part of the time
 - most of the time
13. I feel tired for no reason.
- never or a little of the time
 - some of the time
 - a good part of the time
 - most of the time

(WRDAI, Caplan, et al. 1980, p. 274).

Appendix E

Bullying Script

The following are a list of bullying behaviors that will be acted out by the facilitator of the experimental group (Group 2).

1. Sarcastic joking and/or teasing

During Instruction

Confederate #1 Ask the person sitting next to her for a pen or pencil.

Facilitator Hears this and addresses her by saying, "Do you make it your habit to dress like this?"

2. Rude interruptions

During Instruction

Confederate #3 Raise his hand to ask the question ... "Could you please repeat that?"

Facilitator While the confederate is raising his hand and asking his question the facilitator interrupts him mid-sentence and continues her instruction. She turns away and walks off, completely ignoring him.

3. Personal insults

During Instruction

Confederate #1 Ask the question: "I don't understand. Could you please give me another example?"

Facilitator Responds with, "Oh, you must be one of our transfer students from the community college."

Confederate #1 Shocked and offended, she tries to resume her work but begins crying quietly.

4. Nonverbal behaviors (i.e., dirty looks, the raising of eyebrows or making faces in response to comments from the target)

During Instruction

Confederate #2 Send a text message using her phone.

Facilitator Raises hands in air, looks up, purses her lips sarcastically.

Confederate #1 Bites her fingernails.

Facilitator Stares at her for an uncomfortable length of time.

Confederate #3 Jokes with another student.

Facilitator Raises her eyebrow at him.

5. Verbal remarks that could be characterized as snide or sarcastic

During Instruction

Confederate #2 She is obviously not paying attention, but suddenly focusing in on the instruction, raises her hand and asks, "So what actually makes someone a leader?"

Facilitator Snaps back – using a patronizing tone says, "Is this exercise over your head? Perhaps you need some extra time
D – e – a – r?"

Confederate #2 Gasps at this response.

6. Intimidation—verbal and nonverbal

During Testing

Facilitator During the period of time when participants are completing the instruments, the facilitator will pace around the classroom. She will choose one confederate, linger at her desk and peer over her shoulder while she is working. The facilitator will laugh sarcastically and walk away.

Confederate #1 Realizing that the facilitator is hovering over her shoulder. She shifts her weight in her seat, takes a double-take. Let's out a loud sigh.

7. Abrupt responses to questions

During Testing

Confederate #2 Begins to dig through her purse making a lot of noise and creating a distraction.

Facilitator Slams a book shut or slams her hand down on the desk or podium.

Confederate #2 Jumps.

8. Actions that undermine the target's ability to perform (i.e., rushing, constant distractions)

During Testing

Facilitator Throughout the testing, the facilitator will say repeatedly, "Hurry up! You have three minutes left ... You have two minutes left. ..You have one minute left... You have 30 seconds left... You have 15 seconds left..." The facilitator will also use an annoying tone and pitch.

Confederates #1, #2 and #3 all display obvious discomfort and stress.

9. Treat someone as if he or she is invisible

During Testing

Facilitator Ask a confederate to get up and move to the back of the room.

Confederate #3 Responds with a laugh. Then when he realizes she is serious asks, "Seriously?" he then mumbles under his breath, "I can't believe this! This is so unfair. Hey, wait a minute ... I don't have to take this ... You can keep your \$10." He gets up and leaves the classroom.

Facilitator Ignores him completely.

10. Complaining to others about an individual's behavior

During Testing

Confederate #2 Becomes overwhelmed by the Bully's behaviors and rises to leave.

Facilitator Says, "Excuse me, did I give you permission to leave?"

Confederate #2 Sits back down, visibly disturbed.

11. Attributing all that goes wrong to one person

During Testing

Confederate #3 Asks “How long do we have to finish this test?”

Facilitator Says, “If anyone has difficulty completing the instruments it is most assuredly the fault of Mr. X’s due to his constant and unnecessary interruptions.”

Confederate #3 Looks around the room awkwardly.

12. Intimidating a person

During Testing

Confederate #1 Ask, “What time is it?”

Facilitator When the confederate this question, the facilitator slowly moves toward her and invades her personal space. She then says in an exaggeratedly slow speed, “I cannot believe you are actually enrolled in a college course on leadership!”

Confederate #1 Is dumbfounded.

13. Raising one’s voice

During Testing

Facilitator When addressing a confederate – she will raise her voice to an uncomfortable level.

14. Criticizing a person

During Testing

Confederate #2 The Target.

Facilitator After completing the instructions for the final instrument, the facilitator will invade the confederate’s personal space. She will put her hands on the confederate’s desk, move in too closely to the confederate’s face and say in a patronizing tone, “Do all of our blondes understand the instructions for completing this assignment? Or shall I repeat them, in s-l-o-w motion?”

Confederate #2 Reacts incredulously. Eyebrows raised, look of confusion and amazement, which sinks into despair.

15. Belittling a person's opinions

During Testing

Confederate #1 Respectfully takes up for one of the other confederates who is being bullied. "Excuse me, she didn't mean any disrespect."

Facilitator Responds with, "Did anyone ask you for an opinion!"

Appendix F – New General Self-Efficacy Permission



Elizabeth Nealy <enealy1@tigers.lsu.edu>

Permission to use New General Self-Efficacy Scale

4 messages

Elizabeth Nealy <enealy1@tigers.lsu.edu>

Tue, Mar 17, 2009 at 3:48 PM

To: permissions@sagepub.com

I am a doctoral student at LSU. I would like to gain permission from Sage to use an instrument used to measure self efficacy.

The title of the measuring instrument (test) is: New General Self-Efficacy Scale

it can be located online at: <http://orm.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/4/1/62>

I would also like to obtain a copy of the actual instrument that was used in the research for the journal article.

Please respond,
Elizabeth Nealy, Ph.D. candidate

permissions (US) <permissions@sagepub.com>

Tue, Mar 17, 2009 at 6:03 PM

To: Elizabeth Nealy <enealy1@tigers.lsu.edu>

Dear Ms. Nealy,

Thank you for your request. Please consider this written permission to use the scale detailed below in your dissertation. Proper attribution to the original source should be included. This permission does not include any 3rd party material found within the work. Please contact us for any future usage or publication of your dissertation.

Unfortunately, I cannot provide a copy of the scale, but I would suggest contacting the authors, as they may be able to provide a copy.

Best,

Adele

Subject: Permission to use New General Self-Efficacy Scale

[Quoted text hidden]

Appendix G – Global Job Satisfaction Scale Permission



Elizabeth Nealy <enealy1@tigers.lsu.edu>

FW: [Ref: #238729] Permission to use a copyrighted instrument

JournalCustomerService-usa <JournalCustomerService-usa@elsevier.com>

Thu, Mar 19, 2009 at 4:13 AM

To: enealy1@tigers.lsu.edu

Cc: "Rights and Permissions (ELS)" <Permissions@elsevier.com>

Dear Elizabeth Nealy,

Re: *Journal of Vocational Behavior*

Thank you for your interest in Elsevier journals.

Because of the age of this issue, volume 39 issue 2 is no longer available in print. I apologize for the inconvenience.

I can have a Xerox copy made from the original. This is a high-definition copy that may have black and white pictures instead of colored. The cost for this issue copy is \$144.00, including postage and handling.

If you wish to pay on the basis of a proforma invoice, please be so kind as to inform me of your complete billing and shipping address.

Should you prefer to order on the basis of a prepayment, you may do so by submitting your order through one of the following 3 options clearly stating your complete bill-to and ship-to address:

- Bank transfer:

Remit the amount due to our account 62.65.07.634 with the Hollandsche Bank Unie NV, Rotterdam, The Netherlands.

SWIFT address: HBUANL2R

IBAN code: NL25 HBUA 0623 0604 93

- Cheque:

Send payment to:

Elsevier

P.O. Box 7247-7682

Philadelphia, PA 19170-7682



Title: Differences in the relation between job satisfaction and perceived work alternatives among older and younger blue-collar workers

Author: Samuel B. Pond and Paul D. Geyer

Publication: Journal of Vocational Behavior

Publisher: Elsevier

Date: October 1991

Copyright © 1991 Published by Elsevier Inc.

User ID

Password

Enable Auto Login

[Forgot Password/User ID?](#)

Welcome to Rightslink

Elsevier has partnered with Copyright Clearance Center's Rightslink service to offer a variety of options for reusing Elsevier content. Select the "I would like to ..." drop-down menu to view the many reuse options available to you.

I would like to...



Copyright © 2009 [Copyright Clearance Center, Inc.](#) All Rights Reserved. [Privacy statement.](#) Comments? We would like to hear from you. E-mail us at customercare@copyright.com



TESTED DAILY 07-JULY

**Appendix H –
Work Related Depression, Anxiety and Irritation Scale
Permission**



Elizabeth Nealy <enealy1@tigers.lsu.edu>

**FW: Permission to use a measuring instrument
you published**

6 messages

Yan Fu <yanfu@isr.umich.edu>
To: Elizabeth Nealy <enealy1@tigers.lsu.edu>

Mon, Mar 23, 2009 at 12:39 PM

Hi Elizabeth,

You have permission to use the instrument. I am sorry that I do not have a copy of the instrument that is different from yours.

Let me know if you have further questions.

Yan

Yan Fu

Population Studies Center Library

Institute for Social Research

University of Michigan

Ann Arbor, MI 48104

734-763-2152

From: Elizabeth Nealy [mailto:enealy1@tigers.lsu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2009 5:11 PM
To: ISR Information
Subject: Permission to use a measuring instrument you published

I am a doctoral student at LSU and seek your permission to use a measuring instrument for which you apparently own the copyright. The name of the measure is: Work-Related Depression, Anxiety, and Irritation Scale.

Source: Caplan, R.D., Cobb, S., French, J.R.P., Van Harrison, R., & Pinneau, S. R. (1980).

Job demands and worker health. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research. Items were taken from text, p. 274. Copyright in 1980.

I thank you in advance for permission to use this instrument in my dissertation research and I am hoping that you can send me a copy of the actual instrument. The one that I have seen does not have the participant instructions included.

My experiment is scheduled for April so I thank you very much for your prompt attention.

Elizabeth Nealy, phd candidate

Vita

Elizabeth Nealy is a Baton Rouge native and graduate of Robert E. Lee High School in 1976. After graduating from high-school and completing several semesters of college coursework, she married and subsequently began raising a family. In 1998, while working for the Louisiana Department of Agriculture, Nealy resumed full-time study and earned her bachelor's degree in marketing from the University of Phoenix in 2001. Then in 2004, she completed her master's degree in mass communication from Louisiana State University. Then, under the guidance of Dr. Michael F. Burnett, the director of the School of Human Resource Education and Workforce Development she began her pursuit of this life-long goal.

Nealy has held numerous positions in development. Most recently the director of development for City Year Louisiana, prior to this she was the director of major gifts for the Capital Area United Way. Before which she was the executive director of the Baton Rouge Community College Foundation, the director of public relations for the LSU Foundation and held various development positions for the LSU Alumni Association.

Her academic awards include the University of Phoenix Alumni Scholarship from 1998-2001; UOP Dean's Honor Roll from 1998-2001; CASE IV Scholarship in 2001; and in 2008 she was included in the BRAC Leadership Class. She was also inducted into the National Society of Collegiate Scholars in 2002 and Gamma Sigma Delta Honors Society in 2006.

Nealy has served on numerous boards, including the International Hospitality Foundation as Chairman of the Board; Baton Rouge Gallery, Board Member; St. Timothy's Episcopal Church, Former Vestry Member; Cadets of the Ole War Skule, past Public Affairs Director; Special Forces, Chapter XXX, past Public Affairs Director; LSU Faculty Club, past Board of Directors, Secretary; LSU Women's Faculty Club, past Secretary/Treasurer. She also actively serves as a community volunteer for such organizations as St. James Episcopal Church, "We Care" Ministry, City Year Louisiana, the Arts Council of Greater Baton Rouge, and VIPS, *Everybody Reads*.

She is a member of St. James Episcopal Church, Sunrise Rotary of Baton Rouge; Sales and Marketing Executives International (SMEI); Public Relations Association of Louisiana; Public Relations Society of America; Louisiana Association of Nonprofit Organizations; Association of Fundraising Professionals; Southern Public Relations Federation; Women's Philanthropy Institute and Louisiana CASE. She has also served as Judge, 57th, 58th and 59th Voice of Democracy Contest Veterans of Foreign Wars; presented at the American Society of Public Administration, 2004, International Conference, Ethics in Governance; "Bullying in the Workplace."

Her teaching experience includes serving as guest lecturer at LSU in the fields of public relations, ethics in communication and professional writing. Her teaching experience also includes Grantwriting 101, 102 and Presentation Matters at Baton Rouge Community College as well as teaching COM 225, 340, 400; COMM 102, 105, 110, 208, 215, 301, 310, 315, 400; ENG 130, 135, 215, 221, 340, 495; RES 110 and SOC 110 at the University of Phoenix.

Nealy has four children, Leigh Sicard Babin, Francis Scott Sicard, Neal Edward Sicard and Abbey Elizabeth Sicard; and one grandchild, Asher Lee Sicard.