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Nordic co-operation

Nordic co-operation is one of the world’s most extensive forms of regional collaboration, involving Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden, and three autonomous areas: the Faroe Islands, Greenland, and Åland.

Nordic co-operation has firm traditions in politics, the economy, and culture. It plays an important role in European and international collaboration, and aims at creating a strong Nordic community in a strong Europe.

Nordic co-operation seeks to safeguard Nordic and regional interests and principles in the global community. Common Nordic values help the region solidify its position as one of the world’s most innovative and competitive.
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Foreword

Unfortunately, workplace bullying seems to flourish in all kinds of sectors and types of organisations. All Nordic countries have laws where the individual has the right to a safe working environment, requiring the employer to prevent bullying from occurring and to handle bullying firmly when a complaint is being made. Yet, research has shown that the security granted the individual worker by law is not necessarily enforced by employers or health and safety authorities in the respective countries.

This is the first Nordic report on the current scientific state of art of prevention activities regarding workplace bullying in the Nordic countries. During the last 20 years the Nordic countries have been among the leading ones regarding research on this important workplace stressor. Common features among the Nordic countries made it possible to eventually compare the Nordic countries’ national data on both measurements, risk factors, consequences and the prevention of bullying at the workplace. Hence, after these first 20 years of pioneering research a Nordic bullying network consisting of the leading research institutions in this field within the Nordic countries was established a few years ago with the aim to coordinate research efforts and existing knowledge combined with increased cross-national collaboration and fertilization in this field. Furthermore, the network aims to contribute to establishing a joint Nordic theoretical, empirical, conceptual and methodological platform for science and for the prevention of bullying at the workplace.

This report of the network concludes that in order to reduce the negative consequences workplace bullying may have on individuals and workplaces it is important for all organisations to implement anti-bullying policies by focussing on interventions at all levels: e.g. by improvement of the general psychosocial climate at work, the leadership practices, and the procedures for conflict management; by developing fair complaints procedures; and by developing counselling and therapeutic interventions for those already victimized at work.
I welcome this first Nordic report on such an important aspect of our working lives which we need to bring out in the open and face directly with the most efficient preventive measures we have at our disposal. To this end, the establishment of the Nordic bullying network and the platform for the development of such preventive measures that it provides is very useful. I am confident that the efforts of the network could in the years to come provide important contributions to reducing bullying at workplaces in the Nordic countries.

Halldór Ásgrímsson
Secretary General
Nordic Council of Ministers
Preface

The project has been planned and carried out in the Nordic bullying network group consisting of the following research institutions and members:

### Denmark:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annie Høgh</td>
<td>Department of Psychology, University of Copenhagen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Annie.Hogh@psy.ku.dk">Annie.Hogh@psy.ku.dk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Gemzee Mikkelsen</td>
<td>CRECEA Horsens</td>
<td><a href="mailto:egemzoe@hotmail.com">egemzoe@hotmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Bloch</td>
<td>Department of Sociology, University of Copenhagen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Charlotte.Bloch@sociology.ku.dk">Charlotte.Bloch@sociology.ku.dk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Åse Marie Hansen</td>
<td>National Research Centre for the Working Environment</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aamh@nrowe.dk">aamh@nrowe.dk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD students:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolina Magdalene Maier, Maria Gullander</td>
<td>University of Copenhagen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tine Eriksen-Jensen</td>
<td>University of Aarhus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referents: Lilie Darse, Louise Bang Olesen, Maj Wissing, Iris Olafsdottir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Finland:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maarit Vartia</td>
<td>Finnish Institute of Occupational Health Centre of Expertise for Work Organizationsmaart</td>
<td><a href="mailto:varia@ttl.fi">varia@ttl.fi</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise Salin</td>
<td>Department: Management and Organisation, Hanken School of Economics</td>
<td><a href="mailto:denise.salin@hanken.fi">denise.salin@hanken.fi</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Island:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gudbjörg Linda Rafnsdóttir, MA, F.i.dr, professor</td>
<td>University of Iceland</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gtlr@hi.is">gtlr@hi.is</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristinn Tömannson, Administration of</td>
<td>Occupational Safety and Health in Iceland</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kristinn@ver.is">kristinn@ver.is</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Norway:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ståle Einarsen, professor</td>
<td>Faculty of Psychology, University of Bergen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Stale.Einarsen@psyp.uib.no">Stale.Einarsen@psyp.uib.no</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stig Berge Matthiesen, professor</td>
<td>Faculty of Psychology, University of Bergen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stig@uib.no">stig@uib.no</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anders Skogstad, professor</td>
<td>Faculty of Psychology, University of Bergen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anders.skogstad@psyp.uib.no">anders.skogstad@psyp.uib.no</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lars Glasa, associate professor</td>
<td>Faculty of Psychology, University of Bergen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lars.glaso@psyp.uib.no">Lars.glaso@psyp.uib.no</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD students:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lars Johan Hauge, Morten Birkeland Nielsen, Brita Bjerkelø, Guy Notelars, Tina Løkke Vie</td>
<td>all University of Bergen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sweden:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margaretha Strandmark, professor</td>
<td>University of Karlstad</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Margaretha.strandmark@kau.se">Margaretha.strandmark@kau.se</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillemor Hallberg, professor</td>
<td>Department of Health and Society, Halmstad University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lillemor.hallberg@hos.hh.se">lillemor.hallberg@hos.hh.se</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD students:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Svensson, Helena Blomberg</td>
<td>Örebro University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:helena.blomberg@oru.se">helena.blomberg@oru.se</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This state-of-the-art report is a product of the contributions and discussion that took place at four meetings in the network group during 2008–2010.
Summary

This report gives a state-of-the-art on workplace bullying in the Nordic countries and is based on a summary of previous peer-reviewed papers, the presentations at the workshop, and the discussions at the meetings. An introductory meeting was held in April 2008 for the Network members. We decided to conduct workshops with the following topics:

- Risk factors of workplace bullying (November 2008).
- Health consequences of workplace bullying (June 2009).
- How is bullying prioritized in each country (June 2009).
- How much information is available?
- Intervention studies and prevention of bullying at the workplace (September 2010).

At each workshop the participants were asked to prepare an abstract and give a presentation. State-of-the-art on workplace bullying is based on papers from the participants or institutions included in the network. The articles on the list are written in English, Norwegian, Swedish or Danish. Previous and on-going research activities are included in appendixes 1–10 which include peer-reviewed papers, book chapters and magazine articles. Further a total of 10 PhD students attended the meetings and presented their projects.

Risk factors

Workplace bullying seems to flourish in all kinds of sectors and types of organisations. Stressful and poorly organized work environments as well as deficiencies in leadership may, however, facilitate work-related bullying either directly or by creating a negative work climate. Working under adverse physical or mental conditions are stressors that are likely to cause or result in an increased sense of stress or a nervous feeling among those exposed leading to both increased aggressiveness and vulnerability. It is important to recognize that the psychosocial working environment changes over time. Hence, it was discussed how often screening of the psychosocial working environment may be carried out to detect bullying or its risk factors at the workplace.

Health consequences

A vast amount of evidence exists regarding the negative consequences bullying may have on those targeted. The most robust finding for the psychological consequences of bullying at work is that it is a risk factor of develop-
Other observed outcomes are burn-out, anxiety and nervousness, reduced job satisfaction and reduced general well-being. Regarding the physical consequences, the most consistent consequences associated with bullying at work are cardiovascular disease and fibromyalgia. In addition to these, a number of factors may be of importance. The bully victims experience feelings of guilt, shame, and diminished self-esteem.

### Legislation

An important insight from the overall discussion of the phenomenon of bullying revealed that legally, bullying is viewed somewhat differently in the different Nordic countries. However, all the Nordic countries have enacted legislation and guidance for handling workplace bullying. All countries seem to have a law where the individual has the right to a safe working environment, requiring the employer to prevent bullying from occurring and to handle bullying firmly when a complaint is being made. Yet, research has shown that the security granted the individual worker by law is not necessarily enforced by employers or health and safety authorities in the respective countries.

### Prevention of bullying

The regulations against bullying aim to motivate initiatives against bullying in organizations and the introduction of local organizational anti-bullying policies and guidelines. A distinction is commonly made between primary, secondary and tertiary intervention on the one hand, and between policy, organization/employer, workplace/group/task and individual levels on the other hand. Some workplaces do have anti-bullying policies including procedures for prevention and management of harassment. Yet, this is not yet fully enforced in the different countries. However, it is important for all organisations to implement anti-bullying policies, by focussing on both primary intervention (e.g. improvement of the general psychosocial climate at work, improved leadership practices, and improved procedures for conflict management), secondary intervention (e.g. by developing fair complaints procedures), and tertiary level of intervention (e.g. by developing counseling and therapeutic interventions for those already victimized at work).
Introduction to the project

A number of studies stress that bullying at the workplace has severe consequences, both for the organisation, those targeted as well as for employees being bystanders. Bullying at work, according to most definitions, takes place when someone, repeatedly over a longer period of time (usually 6 months), is exposed to negative acts from one or several others, in a situation where he or she for different reasons may have difficulties defending him- or herself against these actions. Bullying may take different forms. Yet, also single incidents or shorter intermezzos of harassment and inappropriate behaviour at work may create stress and inefficiency at work, as well as being explicitly forbidden by law (e.g. in Norway). Direct bullying is aggressive acts that are aimed directly at the target, as for example teasing, scolding, spreading rumours, and threats. Indirect bullying may take the form of social isolation or withdrawal of necessary information. This social process of bullying is described as being rejected and ostracised at or even from the workplace. Repeated slander, deceit, insults and unjust treatment seem in the worst cases to lead up to a rejection and expulsion of the target of bullying. Bullying may be work-related in its nature (e.g. acts that make it difficult for the target to do his/her work) or personal in nature (e.g. offending teasing, rumours, slander, or sexual harassment) (1).

Research on bullying at work started in the 1980s in Sweden and soon spread to both Finland and Norway, with Denmark and Iceland catching up during the late 1990s. During the last 20 years the Nordic countries have been among the leading ones regarding research on this important workplace stressor. Common features among the Nordic countries make it possible to coordinate data on both measurement, risk factors, consequences and the prevention of bullying at the workplace. Hence, a coordination of research efforts and existing knowledge combined with increased cross-national collaboration and fertilization in this field was important after these first 20 years of pioneering research. This report describes the activities of a Nordic network in this field, as well as summarising the current scientific state of art. In addition, the report and its content may be an example of how collaboration in a Nordic network can develop this kind of knowledge-base within an emerging research field.

Scope of the network

The overall purpose of the network is to get an overview of the knowledge on bullying at the workplace in the Nordic countries. Further the network aims to contribute to establish a joint Nordic theoretical, empirical, concep-
tual and methodological platform for science and for the prevention of bullying at the workplace.

In addition to the overall aims described above, the specific aims of the project were:

- To establish a Nordic scientific network on bullying at the workplace including scientific workshops and seminars.
- To prepare a Nordic “state of the art” report on the current research activities in the Nordic countries on bullying at the workplace.
- To prepare a Nordic “state of the art” report on the current international research and activities in the Nordic countries on prevention of bullying at the workplace (intervention studies).
- To improve the knowledge on qualitative and quantitative scientific methods across the area.
- To make an overview of laws and regulations concerning bullying at the workplace and how these laws and regulations are enforced.
- To draw on the experience in the field between the qualitative and quantitative scientific methods.
- To produce a pamphlet covering the main findings and the future perspectives. The target group of the pamphlet is practitioners and political decision makers.
- Establish a platform for holding visits of PhD students from the participating institutions.
1. Risk factors and antecedent of bullying at the workplace

Fifteen studies concerning risk factors and antecedents of bullying at the workplace were identified by the network members. Seven studies addressed poor leadership (2–8), three studies addressed personality (9–11), and 5 studies addressed gender and age (12–16). Two of these studies were qualitative studies.

1.1 Risk factors in the working environment

Stressful and poorly organized work environments as well as deficiencies in leadership may facilitate work-related bullying either directly or by creating a work climate in which bullying can flourish (3;17–21). Studies have shown that bullying is more frequent in organisations with a negative psychosocial work environment characterised by a negative social climate, many conflicts, a low level of information and control, a high level of role ambiguity and role conflicts (22). When workplace stressors and interpersonal problems are not dealt with, they may escalate into bullying, resulting in high levels of psychological distress among those involved and even among those observing the bullying (6). A total of 17 studies concerning risk factors and antecedents of bullying at the workplace were identified. Five of these studies addressed poor leadership (2;3;6;8;12) and management style (8), six studies addressed organizational climate (4;15;21;23) or organizational changes (5;7), two studies addressed conflicts at work (24) (22), two studies addressed personality (9;10) and two studies addressed gender and bullying at the workplace (13;14). Fifteen studies were cross-sectional studies. Due to the fact that most/all studies are cross-sectional, it is not possible to determine the direction of cause and effect, if bullying is a consequence of factors in the psychosocial work environment or if a poor psychosocial working environment promotes bullying. Further, longitudinal studies showed that previous bullying is a risk factor for bullying (22;23).

1.2 Leadership

The management style may directly or indirectly contribute to a higher level of bullying (8;22). Work-related harassment is most strongly connected with dissatisfaction with supervisors and leaders, while personal derogation and social exclusion correlate most strongly with dissatisfaction with co-worker
interaction (12). The relationships between leaders and subordinates are strongly marked by affective experiences during interaction such as moods, emotions and emotion-laden judgement. Four similar emotional factors are revealed for subordinates and leaders, labelled recognition, frustration, violation, and uncertainty. These factors seem to be specific to leader-subordinate relationships and to remain stable across positions, gender, and the public and private sectors, as well as occurring in both positive and negative relationship (2). Hence, violation that is the resentment from interaction with others (such as feelings of mistreatment and harassment) is an emotional factor in all leader-subordinate relationships. Hence, both parties in this dyad are predisposed to react to negative behaviours by the other. Research has also documented how some leaders, supervisors and managers behave in a destructive manner, be it towards their subordinates, towards the organisation itself, or towards both (25–28). Strong associations have been found between exposure to destructive leadership and impaired health and well-being among subordinates (6;29;30). Hence, destructive leadership is a risk factor in the psychosocial work environment.

Destructive leadership can be defined as; “the illegal, or repeated behaviour by a leader, supervisor or manager that violate the legitimate interest of the organisation by undermining and/or sabotaging the organisation’s goals, tasks, resources, and effectiveness and/or the motivation, well-being or job satisfaction of his/her subordinates.” (26).

![Fig 1. A model of destructive and constructive leadership](From Einarsen et al, 2007, p. 211. (26).

Generally, leadership research focuses only on effective and constructive aspects of leadership, neglecting the fact that leaders may also misbehave. Research conducted by members of our network has therefore made important contributions to nuance the picture of leaders normally portrayed in the scholarly literature. In a model of destructive and constructive leadership
(26), four types of destructive leadership are defined and included (Fig 1). The four groups of leadership behaviours include active (tyrannical, derailed, and supportive-disloyal) as well as passive forms (laissez-faire) of destructive leadership behaviours. Further, two of them consist of constructive as well as destructive elements. That is, tyrannical leadership is anti-subordinate as well as pro-organizational, while supportive-disloyal leadership is pro-subordinate as well as anti-organizational. Hence, leaders may be both “good” and “bad” at the same time, making it difficult for the organisation and its management to intervene in case of e.g. bullying. Leaders may also face dilemmas of doing important things for the organisation while simultaneously mistreating their subordinates.

In relationship to workplace bullying, both Laissez-faire leadership and tyrannical and derailed leadership are known risk factors documented in many studies. Yet, one study showed how witnesses perceived autocratic leadership to be the risk, employees exposed to bullying themselves report that non-contingent leadership is the biggest risk, i.e. leadership practices where the leaders act in an inconsistent manner punishing subordinates in an arbitrary manner. High levels of laissez-faire leadership are associated with high levels of workplace stressors, hence possible being a root factor for bullying. Studies have also shown how laissez-faire leadership increases the negative relationship between role stressors and bullying, hence being a moderator of the stressor-bullying relationship.

As regards potential precursors of destructive leadership behaviours, there is a lack of studies regarding situational factors. In the light of studies concerning precursors of counterproductive work behaviours (cf., (31)) there are more good candidates, such as role stressors, organizational injustice and lack of autonomy and participative decision making. These should be investigated in relation to destructive leadership among leaders in prospective studies.

Studies of destructive leadership behaviours belong to a rather new research field containing many important research questions, and methodological issues are still to be addressed. Among them are how strong impact components of destructive leadership behaviour can have on health compared to other factors such as role stressors and social climate (6)?

1.2.1 Conflicts and power struggle in the workplace

As noted above, a stressful and poorly organized work environment as well as deficiencies in leadership may facilitate work-related bullying either directly or by creating a work climate in which bullying can flourish. In addition, a poor psychosocial working environment may contribute to role conflicts and interpersonal conflicts which are both strongly associated with bullying if unresolved (22;32). Overall, conflicts with the supervisor have the highest association with reports of workplace bullying. Long-standing struggles for power can precede systematic bullying at the workplace. These power struggles may emanate from conflicting values at the workplace.
caused by the interplay between poor organisational conditions, weak or indistinct leadership and the involved parties’ personalities and work-related expectations (24).

An un-published PhD study aimed to identify and discuss expressions of relationship conflict at work in two different organisations. Preliminary results show that a number of expressions can be linked to intergroup conflicts at work. These were a wish for involvement in the solution of conflicts, a non-confronting approach to conflict solution, emotions that “take over”, hidden or indirect communication and slander. The study also indicated that some of these expressions may be antecedents to workplace bullying. Placing the findings in a micro sociological framework inspired by Goffman (33), the study argued that employees who experience relationship conflicts at work found themselves in roles they did not approve of themselves. Therefore they seek moral redress in order to save their faces (34), again showing what a range of quantitative studies have shown; a strong association between reports of role stressors and exposure as well as enactment of workplace bullying.

1.2.2 The organization/ the environment/ the structure

In addition to risk factors of bullying at work found in the psychological work environment and the organizational climate of the organisation, bullying also seems to flourish in hectic and competitive environments, where employees are willing to sabotage the work performance of colleagues and to expel unwanted colleagues and subordinates in order to improve their own position (35). Workplace bullying may in some cases be a form of organisational politics, i.e. a deliberate, competitive strategy from the perspective of the individual perpetrator. Globalisation, increased pressures for efficiency, and restructuring, contributes to increased internal competition, and may potentially lead to more bullying (4). In general, victims of bullying report that envy, a weak superior, competition for tasks or advancement, and competition for the supervisor’s favour and approval are the most common reasons for bullying. The results concerning the communication climate demonstrate the importance of discussions, listening, and tolerance (7) for preventing bullying. To gain a broader understanding, bullying factors outside the organization must also be taken into consideration. An examination of societal forces and changes that enable, motivate and trigger bullying is thus an important venue for further research in the area.

Workplace bullying within the organization may also be associated with the structures and processes in the work environment. Salin (2008) identified three groups, i.e. enabling structures or necessary antecedents (e.g. perceived power imbalances, low perceived costs, and dissatisfaction and frustration), motivating structures or incentives (e.g. internal competition, reward systems, and expected benefits), and precipitating processes or triggering circumstances (e.g. downsizing and restructuring, organisational changes, changes in the composition of the workgroup). The authors concluded that bullying often
occurred in an interaction between structures and processes from all three groupings (36)(fig 2).

Fig. 2. Disenabling factors acting as a filter in the working environment.
From Salin, 2008, p. 223 (37).

1.2.3 Whistleblowing and power struggle

Whistleblowing is when a former or current employee discloses misconduct that is under his/her employers control to someone that may be able to do something about it (38). According to power theory, whistleblowing may be seen as a potential power struggle in which the dominant coalition accept or turn down the employees initiative by either terminating the wrongdoing, or balancing the power struggle by retaliating against the whistleblower (39). Exposure to bullying behaviours after whistleblowing may function as an organizations way to sanction an employee, to punish the person, but also to send out a warning signal to the surroundings. However, in line with Hirschmans notion of voice (1970) in his voice-exit model, reporting behaviour may also be a reaction to problematic events at work, such as bullying behaviours. Thus, the association may be turned around; bullying behaviours may also function as an antecedent of whistleblowing (40). Studies have shown that whistleblowing is related to bullying at work (41) and that retaliation after whistleblowing can develop into workplace bullying (42). One of the most common reasons for reporting wrongdoing at work is the bullying of a colleague at work (41).
1.3 Intrapersonal/individual risk factors

1.3.1 Personality

Leymann claimed that there is no association between workplace bullying and personality (20;43). An empirical study (44) also showed that there is no such thing as a general victim personality profile indicating vulnerability, at least when measured among employees that previously have been bullied at work and who are still working. Other studies on the personalities and emotional stability of persons who previously have been bullied at work have, however, shown that they as a group report higher scores on neuroticism, irritability (aggressiveness dimension) as well as impulsiveness (extraversion dimension), when compared to their non-bullied work colleagues. These characteristics can illustrate a self-image dominated by mistrust and embitterment as well as irritability and impulsiveness (44). Glasø et al. (9), however, found that the major part of the victims is quite like non-victims as far as personality is concerned. However, in the study of Glasø et al., one-third of the victims tended to be more neurotic and less agreeable, conscientious and extravert than non-victims. Further, emotional instability and introversion are associated with exposure to bullying as measured by the Negative Acts Questionnaire. Hence, the findings of the study confirm the notion that personality should not be neglected being an important factor in understanding the bullying phenomenon. Yet, personality does not easily differentiate targets from non-targets. The authors conclude that the main focus when intervening in order to prevent bullying in organizations must be on organizational factors more than on the personality of victims. A qualitative study (24) also showed that extra vulnerable as well as extra qualified persons make targets of workplace bullying. Accordingly, everybody can probably be bullied.

Taken together, these research findings may indicate that employees that have been bullied at work may become more neurotic and introvert than other employees as a consequence of bullying. However, we lack longitudinal studies to establish the direction of these relationships. It may be the case that different personality traits provoke different types of bullying. In order to prevent bullying in organizations, the main focus when intervening must be on organizational factors more than on the personality of victims (9).

1.3.2 Demographic risk factors

Some demographical risk factors for bullying seem to exist, although bullying can be directed at all kinds of employees in all kinds of organisations. A representative study from Norway showed very few such risk factors. A strong correlation between age and work-related harassment was, however, found in one study (12) where younger workers experienced more bullying behaviours.
Gender is also important when you discuss the relation between the perpetrator and the bullied – woman to woman, man to man, man to woman, or woman to man (45). For instance, the persons bullying female officers are usually co-workers, whereas men are bullied by co-workers and supervisors equally often. Unsatisfactory features of work and poor social climate were, however, significant predictors of bullying among both men and women.

Bullying had also similar effects on the feelings of stress, mental health, and job satisfaction of both men and women (16). Furthermore, the culture at typically female or male dominated workplaces seems to be an antecedent to workplace bullying. Among employees working with things (male-dominated occupations) or with clients/patients (female-dominated occupations), there is a higher prevalence of bullying than among employees working with symbols or customers. One example of this is a study suggesting that types of work and gender ratio are risk factors in the onset of workplace bullying (46). Further, belonging to a gender minority has been shown to be a risk factor for exposure to bullying at work. In one study, male assistant nurses were for instance more often exposed to bullying at work than their female colleagues (13).

A recent study focussed on gender differences among highly educated professionals. Approx. 8.8% of the respondents classified themselves as bullied and the respondents reported high levels of work-related negative acts. There are significant differences in self-labelling between men and women. Men and women also provided different explanations for bullying while men emphasize the role of the victim and women emphasize the role of the perpetrator or group processes. In addition, there is a positive relationship between organizational politics and bullying. The stories written by observers of bullying also showed that bullying was sometimes seen as a deliberate attempt to get rid of unwanted people, e.g. employees who were considered as threats or a burden (37). Further, organizational changes and the diversity of the work force were directly related to exposure to bullying (5).

Highly educated employees seem to have a lower risk than lower educated employees. Further, employees working in the food industry and the manufacturing industry are more at risk than employees in the service industry (47). These results were supported by a study of Ortega (46), which shows that unskilled workers also report the highest prevalence of bullying, while managers/supervisors reported the lowest prevalence (46).

Being an immigrant, especially of Non-western origin, also poses a higher risk of bullying at work, as shown by a Danish study of health-care workers (48).

The risks are everywhere. Individual risk factors may be irrelevant as bullying takes place everywhere. Bullying may be a part of being part of a group. A high exposure rate is not necessarily a sign of victimisation. Health care workers experience a lot of aggression from clients and patients but not always bullying. Some bullied persons can have a healthy life after having
experienced bullying. However, this is not the case for all bullied. It is all about the coping strategy which is why research is needed in this area.

1.3.3 Self-labelling of bullying

What about self-labelling of bullying? The presentation of a definition of bullying before answering a questionnaire has a large impact of the number of reported incidents of bullying. In fact you get the lowest prevalence of bullying if you ask with a definition (49). Over exposure of workplace bullying can create so much focus on bullying, that people start feeling bullied even though this is not the case. So how do we handle passing along information on workplace bullying without making it a risk factor.

Different measurement procedures can also influence on the identification of demographical risk groups in survey research on workplace bullying. The results from a study of 2,539 Norwegian employees, demographical risk groups were assessed with four different method (self-labelling, behavioural experiences with operational criterion (50), behavioural experiences with latent class cluster analysis, and behavioural experiences measured as a continuous variable (51)). The results showed that the self-labelling approach identified one risk group variable, whereas five risk group variables were identified with the continuous variable approach. Using the cluster approach, four risk group variables were identified, whereas three such variables were found with the operational criterion method. The authors concluded that the number of risk groups identified in survey research on workplace bullying is heavily dependent on the measurement procedure utilised.

Can the bullied victims benefit from being bullied? Sometimes the bullied person can benefit by labelling him- or herself as bullied, but it depends on how far along the bullying process is, because the personal consequences of bullying are so severe. This is one of the reasons why we need to investigate the impact of self-labelling more thoroughly in the future.

1.3.4 Previous experience of bullying at college and during training

Some empirical findings indicate that persons who were victimized at school are more likely to be victimized in the workplace (10). This indicates that previous experience of bullying at college and during training can influence later exposure to bullying at work. Since bullying at work by definition is characterised by repeated exposure to negative behaviour, which is often detrimental to the health and well-being of the target, a reasonable assumption might be that having been exposed to bullying earlier in life increases the risk of future exposure. A Danish study among health care workers aimed to test whether previous bullying increased the risk of bullying during the first year after finishing college (52). It was found that previous exposure to bullying constitutes a risk of future bullying. However, the magnitude of the risk depends on when the previous bullying took place (48).
Thus, there is a very high risk of being exposed to bullying in the first job after finishing college among those who had been bullied during their education. This suggests that preventive measures should be included in the school programme. Another study indicates that persons who were victimized at school are more likely to be victimized in the workplace (10).

1.3.5 Stress as a risk factor

A longitudinal study from Finland investigated whether susceptibility to workplace bullying is associated with psychological distress. The results showed that employees high on psychological distress had a higher risk of becoming bullied compared with those with a low level of psychological distress. The odds ratio of high psychological distress was 1.93 (95% CI 1.46 to 2.56) adjusted for gender. The study suggests that psychological distress can sometimes make an employee susceptible to bullying at work (7). A longitudinal study from Iceland showed that bullying at work has adverse effects on psychological health. Interestingly, the study shows that a reverse causal relationship is also possible, i.e. depressed individuals may be at higher risk than non-depressed individuals to be exposed to bullying at work. This implies that individual factors must be taken into account, along with environmental factors, when efforts are made to prevent bullying at work (23).

1.4 Discussion on risk factor of bullying

As described above, stressful and poorly organized work environments as well as deficiencies in leadership may facilitate work-related bullying either directly or by creating a negative work climate. Working under adverse physical or mental conditions is a stressor that is likely to cause or result in an increased sense of stress or a nervous feeling among those exposed. It is important to recognize that the psychosocial working environment changes over time. Hence, it was discussed how often screening of the psychosocial working environment may be carried out to detect bullying at the workplace. Leadership for instance changes over time. It should therefore be considered what the optimal interval for measuring leadership behaviours at work is.

Topics that were mentioned to be of great value to focus on were factors that may facilitate bullying:

- Leadership (which probably differs between cultures).
- Conflicts, not handling of conflicts, and climate for handling conflicts
- Power struggle
- Whistleblowing
- Previous experience of bullying at college and during training.
If you make a distinction between targets and victims of bullying and compare them to the people that never experience any bullying, some risk factors will occur. But if you take the complex work environment into account, other demographic risk factors will disappear. One factor alone is not a risk factor, several events or factors have to be present at the same time; often being a combination of a troublesome working environment and lack of appropriate leadership practices, combined with a culture that directly or indirectly rewards or at least accepts bullying.

Few demographic factors and personality profiles are systematically associated with bullying at work, at least when measured at one point in time. However, age, gender, marital status can be risk factors in some instances.

The research field mainly consists of cross-sectional studies which may be a weakness for the results. Therefore, more longitudinal studies should be performed in the future.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Study design* and purpose</th>
<th>Number of participants (men/women)</th>
<th>Measures and analysis</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Discussion/Conclusion (as stated in the article, no own comments or ideas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>C &amp; QUAN To investigate relationships between bullying and other psychosocial work environment factors within a particular organizational setting.</td>
<td>186 blue-collar (140 men and 46 women)</td>
<td>ANOVA and Chi-square were used to examine associations between bullying, psychosocial factors.</td>
<td>Significant differences in bullied and non-bullied employees’ ratings of psychosocial factors such as job control, management style, role clarity, social climate, social contact and work centrality.</td>
<td>The results did not provide support for the hypothesis that a generally poor psychosocial work environment creates the conditions for bullying. Nonetheless, they do suggest that management style may directly or indirectly have contributed to a higher level of bullying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>C &amp; QUAN An exploratory and descriptive investigation of the prevalence and severity of harassment among men. Respondents were introduced to a definition of bullying.</td>
<td>460 male industrial workers, supervisors and managers.</td>
<td>A principal component analysis with varimax rotation, Cronbach’s alpha, Pearson’s product-moment correlations.</td>
<td>On a weekly or daily basis, 6.7% (n=31) of the men had been subjected to one or more of the behaviours of personal derogation. The strongest correlation was found between age and work-related harassment, which suggests that younger men experience more victimization than older men.</td>
<td>Men experiencing harassment at work report lowered overall job satisfaction. Work-related harassment is most strongly connected with dissatisfaction with supervisors and leaders, while personal derogation and social exclusion correlated most strongly with dissatisfaction with co-worker interaction. This may indicate that supervisors and colleagues use different means of harassment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>C &amp; QUAN To explore the emotions, moods and emotion-laden judgements that leaders and subordinates experience during interaction.</td>
<td>270 leaders and 542 subordinates (36% men and 64% women).</td>
<td>Frequency analysis, correlation analysis, and a principal component analysis were performed on the data.</td>
<td>The relationships between leaders and subordinates are strongly marked by affective experiences. The affects that scored lowest among both subordinates and leaders carried strong personal or negative connotations, such as “jealousy”, “full of hatred” or “harassed”.</td>
<td>Leadership is an emotionally charged process. Four similar emotional factors were revealed for subordinates and leaders, labelled recognition, frustration, violation and uncertainty, and consisting of emotions, moods and emotion-laden judgements. These factors seem to be specific to leader-subordinate relationships and to remain stable across positions, gender, and the public and private sectors, as well as occurring in both positive and negative relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>C &amp; QUAN To investigate the importance of a broad spectrum of stressors at work in connection with different measures of workplace bullying.</td>
<td>2539 respondents. 48% men and 52% women.</td>
<td>Data screening was performed following the recommendations of Tabachnick and Fidell (2007).</td>
<td>All bullying measures were found to correlate significantly with the work environment variables. The overall strongest correlates were found for tyrannical leadership, laissez-faire leadership, interpersonal conflicts, and role conflict.</td>
<td>The results substantiate that bullying at work affects much larger working populations than those directly exposed to it. Bystanders to bullying reported their work environment as being nearly as stressful as employees directly exposed to bullying, hence validating the reports made by targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>C &amp; QUAN To test the assumption that laissez-faire leadership behaviour is not a type of zero-leadership, but a type of destructive leadership behaviour that shows systematic relationships with workplace stressors, bullying at work, and psychological distress.</td>
<td>2273 Norwegian employees, 50% men and 50% women.</td>
<td>Correlation analyses and partial correlations were executed. WLS was used due to substantial deviations from normality.</td>
<td>The mean was 0.52, reflecting the fact that the majority of workers experienced a low level of laissez-faire leadership. The strongest correlation was found between laissez-faire leadership and bullying. High levels of laissez-faire leadership were associated with high levels of workplace stressors.</td>
<td>When workplace stressors and interpersonal problems are not dealt with, they may escalate into bullying, resulting in high levels of psychological distress among those involved and even among those observing the bullying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Study design* and purpose</td>
<td>Number of participants (men/women)</td>
<td>Measures and analysis</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Discussion/conclusion (as stated in the article, no own comments or ideas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>C &amp; QUAL</td>
<td>To investigate the manner in which bullying is initiated at workplaces in the public service sector in order to facilitate workplace bullying prevention.</td>
<td>22 informants; (7 men/15 women)</td>
<td>Grounded theory methodology</td>
<td>Four categories generated from the data: “potential arena for conflicts”, “personal strength or vulnerability”, “professional and personal value conflicts” and “struggling for power” as the core category.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>C &amp; QUAN</td>
<td>To empirically test that there is in fact a relationship between a high degree of perceived organisational politics and the occurrence of bullying. Respondents were presented to a definition of bullying.</td>
<td>385 business professionals 57.3% women and 42.7% men.</td>
<td>Perceptions of Politics Scale (POPS): Cronbach’s alpha was 0.88, Spearman correlation coefficients</td>
<td>Workplace bullying can in some cases be a form of organisational politics, i.e., a deliberate, competitive strategy from the perspective of the individual perpetrator. The findings imply that globalisation, increased pressures for efficiency, and restructur- ing, contribute to increased internal competition, and may lead to more bullying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>C. QUAN &amp; QUAL</td>
<td>To describe the prevalence of bullying experienced by business professionals and to further the understanding of bullying. Respondents were presented to a definition of bullying.</td>
<td>385 business professionals 42.7% men/57.3% women.</td>
<td>Perceptions of Politics Scale (POPS): Cronbach’s alpha was 0.88, NVivo software</td>
<td>8.8% of the respondents reported that they had been bullied during the past 12 months. 30.4% reported that they had observed bullying in their own workplace. 11.6% of the women as compared to 5% of the men classified themselves as being bullied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>C &amp; QUAN</td>
<td>To identify the work-related risks of bullying in the psychological work environment and the organisational climate. Respondents were presented to a definition of bullying.</td>
<td>949 public employees. (85% women and 15% men).</td>
<td>Pearson’s Product-moment Correlations, Multiple Regression Analysis</td>
<td>10.1% felt bullied. Gender and age did not explain bullying. The victims of bullying felt that envy, a weak superior, competition for tasks or advancement, and competition for the supervisor’s favour and approval were the most common reasons for bullying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>C &amp; QUAN</td>
<td>Direct as well as indirect relationships between organisational changes and exposure to bullying at work are investigated.</td>
<td>2408 employees (48% men/52% women)</td>
<td>Frequencies analyses, descriptive statistics, reliability analyses, correlation analyses, ANOVA, exploratory factor analysis and regression analysis were conducted.</td>
<td>Different organizational changes are positively associated with exposure to task-related and person-related workplace bullying, and that being exposed to more organizational changes increases the likelihood of being exposed to bullying. The relationships are strongest between organizational changes and task-related bullying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Study design* and purpose</td>
<td>Number of participants (men/women)</td>
<td>Measures and analysis</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Discussion/conclusion (as stated in the article, no own comments or ideas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td><strong>C &amp; QUAN</strong> To examine differences in personality between a group of bullied victims and a non-bullied group. Respondents were introduced to a definition of bullying.</td>
<td>72 bullied (21 men/51 women) and 72 references (21 men/51 women), with administration/executive or healthcare work.</td>
<td>Frequency analysis, t-test, univariate analysis of variance, TwoStep cluster analysis, and correlation analysis.</td>
<td>Emotional instability and introversion seem to be associated with exposure to bullying behaviour. Two different personality groups among the victims: Cluster 2 (36%) differed significantly from the control group and tended to be significantly less extrovert, agreeable, conscientious and open to experience, but more emotionally unstable than the victims in cluster 1 (84%).</td>
<td>The results indicate there is no such thing as a general victim personality profile indicating vulnerability. Victims are, or become as a consequence of bullying, more neurotic and introvert than non-victims. Different personality traits of victims may provoke different types of bullying. The main focus when intervening in order to prevent bullying in organizations must be on organizational factors more than on the personality of victims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10)</td>
<td><strong>C &amp; QUAN</strong> To investigate whether targets and perpetrators of bullying at work portray certain personality characteristics.</td>
<td>2215 employees: 53% men and 47% women.</td>
<td>The following analyses were performed: One-way ANOVA, reliability analysis with Cronbach's alpha, cross-tab analysis for categorical data, and frequency statistics.</td>
<td>About 16% of the sample may be categorized as either perpetrators (5.4%), provocative victims (2.1%), or as targets of bullying (8.3%). Most provocative victims and most perpetrators were males. Respondents with no experience of bullying were used as a comparison group (n=1,838).</td>
<td>Empirical findings indicate that persons who were victimized at school are more likely to be victimized in the workplace. Individual differences exist when perpetrators and targets of bullying are compared. Bullied victims can be divided into at least two groups: targets of bullying and provocative victims. The provocative victims deserve more attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td><strong>C &amp; QUAN</strong> To investigate gender differences in facing and experiencing bullying at work in a violent, male dominated working environment, namely prisons. Respondents were introduced to a definition of bullying.</td>
<td>773 male and 123 female prison officers.</td>
<td>Hierarchical regression analysis, MANOVA</td>
<td>20% of the respondents perceived themselves as victims of bullying. Female victims had been subjects of sexual harassment significantly more often than their male colleagues. The persons bullying female officers were usually co-workers, whereas men were bullied by co-workers and supervisors equally often.</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory features of work and poor social climate were significant predictors of bullying among both men and women. Bullying had similar effects on the feelings of stress, mental health, and job satisfaction of both men and women.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13)</td>
<td><strong>C &amp; QUAN</strong> To investigate whether being different in a work group simply in terms of one's gender, may be a risk factor for exposure to bullying at work.</td>
<td>6485 nurses (247 men/6234 women)</td>
<td>Reliability analyses, chi-square tests, Fisher's exact tests, and logistic regression analyses were used.</td>
<td>A larger proportion of males than females reported that they had been exposed to bullying (10.2% vs. 4.3%). Males reported less often high commitment to the work unit, and were less likely to be bothered by long-term health problems.</td>
<td>In conclusion, the study supports the hypothesis that belonging to a gender minority is a risk factor for exposure to bullying at work, inasmuch as male assistant nurses are more often exposed to bullying at work than their female colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td><strong>C &amp; QUAN</strong> To estimate the prevalence of bullying and to identify risk groups in a representative population sample. Respondents were introduced to a definition of bullying.</td>
<td>3,429 employees (52.4% women)</td>
<td>Tests of null-hypothesis, Chi-square test</td>
<td>1.6% of the sample reported daily to weekly bullying. Unskilled workers reported the highest prevalence of bullying, while managers/ supervisors the lowest prevalence. People working with things (male-dominated occupations) and people working with clients/patients (female-dominated occupations) reported higher prevalence of bullying than people working with symbols or customers.</td>
<td>The findings suggest that types of work and gender ratio are risk factors in the onset of workplace bullying. Future studies should take into account the type of work and the gender ratio of the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Study design* and purpose</td>
<td>Number of participants (men/women)</td>
<td>Measures and analysis</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Discussion/conclusion (as stated in the article, no own comments or ideas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23)</td>
<td><strong>L</strong>&lt;br&gt;To (a) assess the prevalence of bullying in an Icelandic hospital trust and (b) to determine the influence of negative affectivity (NA) on bullying self-reports. Bullying was determined via 21-item scale assessing participants' exposure to persistent bullying behaviours.</td>
<td>708 hospital employees; 105 men and 603 women in Iceland.</td>
<td>Prevalence rates were assessed through frequency analyses (proportion of participants reporting bullying experiences in the past 12 months). Influence of negative affectivity was assessed through correlation and regression analysis.</td>
<td>28% of employees reported exposure to bullying (persistent bullying behaviours) at work in the past 12 months. Some 34% had witnessed the bullying of others. Types of bullying most frequently reported were work-related bullying, personal derogation and isolation. Male and female participants were just as likely to report bullying at work. A significant, yet low, correlation was found between bullying reports and negative affectivity.</td>
<td>Working in hospitals may place people at great risk of being bullied. Other Scandinavian studies have pointed to high levels of bullying in hospitals. According to the current study, negative affectivity (defined as mood-dispositional dimension, reflecting negative emotionality and self-concept) does not play a critical role in bullying self-reports. This finding, combined with the finding that 34% had witnessed bullying at work, is important since it suggests that bullying at work is not purely a subjective phenomenon but a real interpersonal stressor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21)</td>
<td><strong>C</strong>&lt;br&gt;To assess the association between well-being, work environment and health among employees in savings- and other bank branches in Iceland with reference to whether they had been exposed to bullying at work.</td>
<td>All employees (N=1847) in savings- and other bank branches in Iceland in the spring of 2002.</td>
<td>A questionnaire based on the General Nordic Questionnaire for Psychological and Social Factors at Work was sent to all employees. The data was analyzed using the SPSS statistical package.</td>
<td>Response rate 80%. 8% (N0110) had experienced bullying. The victims of bullying were more likely to have poor psychosocial work environment and were less likely to have experienced a positive relationship with supervisors and other staff.</td>
<td>In the light of the association between work organization and bullying, it is of importance that supervisors and employers are well versified in communication skills pertaining to staff relations and recognizing psychosocial risk factors in the employees’ work environment??.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(48)</td>
<td><strong>L</strong>&lt;br&gt;To explore whether (a) immigrant health care workers (HCW) are more at risk of bullying at work than Danish staff members, (b) this association is increased by previous exposure to bullying and, (c) immigrants experience more bullying from supervisors, colleagues and clients/residents.</td>
<td>Health care students (N=5,696, 10.4% immigrants) Follow-up: one year (N=3,109, 9.1% immigrants).</td>
<td>A questionnaire including socio-demographic factors, working conditions, physical and psychological health. Only one question about bullying was included about exposure to bullying.</td>
<td>At follow-up, 9.1% of the total cohort had been exposed to bullying at work during their first year of employment, hereof 1.8% frequency. “Non-Western” immigrants had a significantly higher risk of exposure to bullying at work during follow-up than the Danish respondents independent of previous experience with bullying (OR=1.85 (1.18–2.93)). Danish and immigrant health care workers were more exposed to bullying from co-workers than from supervisors with no statistically significant difference between the Danes and the immigrant groups. Both “Western” and “non-Western” respondents were more at risk of bullying from clients/residents than the Danish respondents.</td>
<td>The attempt of the present study was not to “blame the victim” but to look at potential differences in exposure to bullying among different immigrant groups and to discuss possible reasons for these differences. This might be useful for preventive interventions. The implications for not doing anything against bullying might be high dropout rates among students and new employees. To prevent future re-exposure, it is important that targets of bullying get help and support on how to cope with the effect of bullying so that this does not turn into a negative circle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L=longitudinal, C=cross sectional, I=intervention, QUAN=Quantitative, QUAL=Qualitative
2. Health consequences of workplace bullying

In summary 17 studies concerning health consequences of workplace bullying were identified. Thirteen of these discussed bullying and psychological health consequences, such as stress and PTSD symptoms (53–56), burnout (57), depression (58), lack of psychological well-being (59) 17394–95, psychological trauma (60), psychological and somatic stress symptoms (23;49;61;62). Also cardiovascular diseases (58) and fibromyalgia (63) were discussed as well as changes in salivary cortisol (64;65).

An interview study with 20 targets found that they usually developed psychological and psychosomatic symptoms already a few months after the bullying started. At first, the symptoms only appeared when the targets were at work. However, over time the symptoms became more chronic. The targets described a number of psychological symptoms (i.e. inability to concentrate, mood swings, anxiety, sleep problems, fear and depressive symptoms) as well as psychosomatic symptoms (i.e. headaches, respiratory and cardiac complaints, hypertension and hypersensitivity to sounds, etc.) If the targets had a chronic disease, the symptoms often became worse (60).

Over the past three decades, research into the consequences of bullying at work in the Nordic countries have shown that exposure to systematic negative behaviour at work such as bullying or mobbing may have devastating effects on the health and well-being of the exposed individuals. Most research on the consequences of bullying at work has been cross-sectional studies, a few case-control studies and clinical interviews with those targeted. Only a few longitudinal studies have been published. Correlation studies have found associations between exposure to bullying and chronic fatigue, psychosomatic, psychological and physical symptoms, general stress, insomnia, and mental stress reactions etc. (see e.g. for reviews (66–68)). Common symptoms such as muscular-skeletal complaints, anxiety, irritability and depression were reported by targets in different European countries (69–72). Some victims displayed symptoms analogue to Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) (42;43;73–75). Self-hatred and suicidal thoughts have also been reported ((76;77). Qualitative studies (29;60;71;77–79) have demonstrated consequences such as reduced self-confidence, low self-worth, shyness, an increased sense of vulnerability as well as feelings of guilt and self-contempt. The bullies blame the problems at the workplace on the bully victims. When the victims bring this guilt inside themselves, they experience feelings of shame because they are not worth more than to be bullied (60). Indeed, many targets reported that their physical health and mental well-being had been permanently damaged (49). Not surprisingly,
exposure to bullying seemed to be associated with increased sickness absence (80), risk of unemployment (74;78) and early retirement (81).

Bullying at work not only affects the targets. Non-bullied witnesses or bystanders also reported significantly more general stress and mental stress reactions than employees from workplaces without bullying (54) and some employees may leave their jobs as a result of witnessing bullying (82). Witnesses report their work environment as being nearly as stressful as employees directly exposed to bullying (3;64).

Psychological health consequences

Previous studies show that there are substantial psychological health problems among victims of bullying, lack of treatment procedures and treatment possibilities for these targets, and exclusion from work-life. A large American study showed significant associations between bullying and bipolar disorder (psychiatric interviews), lifetime alcohol and marijuana use disorders, nicotine dependence, conduct disorder, antisocial, paranoid, and histrionic personality disorders, and family history of antisocial behaviour (83). The authors conclude that prevention and treatment targeting bullying behaviours, co morbid conditions, and their precursors could potentially reduce the prevalence and consequences of bullying.

2.1 Depression and anxiety

A number of studies have addressed the health consequences of bullying at work with focus on depression (23;58;59;64) and anxiety (23;59;64). A Norwegian study of assistant nurses found that bullied nurses reported more anxiety and depression compared to non-bullied (59). Similar results were found among Icelandic hospital employees (84) and Swedish men and women (64). Results from a large study among 5432 Finnish hospital employees showed a strong association between workplace bullying and subsequent depression which suggests that bullying is an aetiological factor for the risk of developing a mental health problem. The longer the bullying had taken place, the higher the risk of incident depression (58). A Danish study shows that exposure to bullying in 2005 predicted symptoms of both anxiety and depression in 2007. Only symptoms of anxiety in 2005 predicted exposure to bullying in 2007 (84). While symptoms of anxiety may act as both antecedents and consequences of bullying, depression seems mainly to be a consequence of prior exposure to bullying. Bullying has an impact on the person’s environment such as loss of friends and loss of a lot of other things (85). A recent study (86) found that bullied showed high levels of perceived stress at work, more anxiety and depression compared to non bullied respondents. Among bullied there was a significant change in symptoms of anxiety while there was no change in symptoms of depression twelve months later. Further, the study concludes that stress at work and depression influenced significantly the capacity to return to work. Further, at 12
months’ assessments, the bullied that worked showed a significantly better score on the HAD scale than non-workers. Over half the targets presented a neuroticism-related predominant personality trait. (86)

2.2 Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder

Employees who previously have been exposed to bullying at work may suffer from PTSD analogue symptoms, while not necessarily fulfilling the criteria of exposure to an extreme traumatic stressor PTSD put forward in the DSM-IV-TR (56). They do, however, suffer from re-experiencing the trauma and persistent avoidance of trauma related stimuli, which may increase arousal. For the diagnosis to be used, the symptoms must have lasted for at least a month, causing significant impairment in functioning in various spheres of the victims’ lives. The results indicate that victims suffer very significantly from being bullied at work in terms of such PTSD symptoms. In particular, their assumptions about the world being a good place to live in are severely invalidated (9). In addition, a study from Norway found that exposure to destructive leadership was associated with symptoms of post-traumatic stress in 84% of the employees who reported being bullied (53). Hence, being bullying by the leader seems to be particularly associated with PTS symptoms.

2.3 Sleep problems

Sleep deprivation may be regarded as a neurobiological and physiological stressor (MR). Sleep problems interfere significantly with daytime functioning and overall well-being, and may lead to serious clinical consequences. Sleep deprivation may be regarded as a neurobiological and physiological stressor (MR). Targets of bullying are more likely to have sleep difficulties (21;87), to have impaired sleep quality (88), and to use more sleep-inducing drugs and sedatives (54) compared to non-bullied respondents. A Danish study found that the bullied employees had more sleep problems after controlling for gender and age irrespectively of frequency and duration (34). A recent French study found that workplace bullying was strongly associated with sleep disturbances. Past exposure to bullying also increased the risk for sleep disturbances. The more frequent the exposure to bullying, the higher the risk of experiencing sleep disturbances. Observing someone else being bullied in the workplace was also associated with the outcome. Adjustment for covariates did not modify the results. Additional adjustment for self-reported health and depressive symptoms diminished the magnitude of the associations that remained significant (89).
2.4 Physiological reactions

Only few studies have addressed the physiological response to workplace bullying (64;90). Kudielka and Kern presented tentative evidence of an altered circadian cycle of cortisol secretion among targets. Likewise, Hansen and colleagues observed signs of an altered HPA-axis activity among targets manifested as lower excreted amount of salivary cortisol in the morning. Similar results were reported recently among young adults in as much as salivary cortisol levels and systolic blood pressure were lower in male targets who reported having no feelings of anger about their experience compared to controls and those who did report anger (91). A newly published study among Danish employers showed that only frequently bullied employers had lower salivary cortisol (65).

2.5 Sickness absence

Studies have also shown that targets may cope with bullying by using sickness absence or taking drugs. Some may even contemplate suicide. With respect to sickness absenteeism, a large Swedish study of postal workers found that bullied women had a 1.6 times higher risk of taking sickness absence (92). Similar results were found among women in the Swedish public sector (93). A Danish longitudinal register based study showed that frequently bullied had twice as high a risk of long-term sickness absence (6 consecutive weeks or more) than non-bullied (80). A Finnish study among hospital staff, found that medically certified sickness absence after adjustment for age and gender was 51% more frequent among targets of bullying that among other employees (94). Among Danish health care workers, targets of frequent bullying had a four times higher risk of sick leave above 15 days (95). The risk was 2.3 times higher of sick leave above 15 days among the occasionally bullied. Still compared to non-bullied employees, more targets went to work even when they were sick (i.e. presenteeism) (95).

2.6 Personality disorders

Within the occupational health literature, there is increasing interest in the relationship between individual personality traits and workplace bullying (96). During the course of this development, personality traits, or personal dispositions, have primarily been studied as an antecedent to becoming a victim of harassment or bullying, as a factor that moderates the bullying process, or as a factor associated with the perpetrators (62;64;97–99). Since being bullied at work implies systematic exposure to repeated negative acts (e.g. name-calling, threats, physical aggression and social isolation), it is also conceivable that enduring harassment, via traditional learning mecha-
nisms (i.e. classical and operant conditioning as well as modelling), change the individual and consequently affects the individual’s self-presentation in personality trait questionnaires.

In a study based on Norwegian and American victims, bullying has been linked to personality disorders (96) as measured by the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI-II). The MMPI-II is one of the most frequently used personality tests in mental health. The MMPI-2 profile of victims showed three sub-groups of victims:

- the normal group
- the suspicious and depressed group and
- the seriously wounded group.

Oversensitive and suspicious persons may excessively blame others, and may tend to convert psychological distress into physical complaints.

However, because no study yet has attempted to disentangle these questions in a longitudinal design, it remains undetermined whether certain personality traits should be regarded as antecedents or consequences of worksite bullying (96). A recent Swedish study used the Swedish universities’ Scale of Personality to assess personality traits related to the three major dimensions of neuroticism, extraversion, and aggressiveness. Bullied persons had higher scores on all six scales within the neuroticism dimension as well as higher irritability (aggressiveness dimension) and impulsiveness scores (extraversion dimension), when compared with their non-bullied work colleagues. The authors concluded that bullied persons display a self-image that is dominated by mistrust and embitterment as well as irritability and impulsiveness (44). A recent American study found associations between bullying and historic personality disorders (83). However, the results are diverging, as also shown above, and whether a negative personality is a consequence of bullying or if persons with a negative personality are at risk of being bullied is still an open question.

2.7 The long-term consequences

The above-mentioned studies also showed that being exposed to bullying at work may have long-term health effects.

Qualitative studies show how bullying may be perceived as a psychic trauma. In one Swedish study, open interviews were conducted with 22 informants; 20 bully victims and two persons working with bullying prevention. Data was analyzed in line with grounded theory methodology. Bullying resulted in feelings of guilt, shame and diminishing self-esteem. Physical and psychosomatic symptoms gradually emerged and medical treatment and sick listening followed. The longer the bullying continues, the more limited the possibility to change the situation leaving the victim with a more limited space of action. Returning to a ‘normal’ life was possible, but presupposes
that the victim had worked through the course of events. The bullied person also tried to obtain redress, such as through monetary compensation or professional confirmation. Despite this, bullying left an internal scar (60). The study also showed that voluntary work such as sport training or studies of interesting topics seemed to provide strength, motivation and confirmation, as well as to give a new meaning in life and inspired the victims to move on. Psychological and religious knowledge could also help the bully victims to understand the bullying and some victims received power and consolation from religious faith. Bullying in a few cases resulted in positive experiences in that the bullied persons became more humble and attentive towards other people and had developed mental strength (60).

2.8 Other health consequences

2.8.1 Cardiovascular disease

A longitudinal Finnish hospital study of primarily female employees (58) showed a much higher risk of cardiovascular disease for targets of prolonged bullying compared to non-targets (OR=2.3). Adjustment for overweight at baseline attenuated the OR to 1.6. The targets have a four times higher risk of developing depressive symptoms controlled for gender, age, salary, overweight, and illness at baseline.

2.8.2 Fibromyalgia

The incidence of newly diagnosed fibromyalgia was investigated in a longitudinal Finish study among 4791 hospital employees (4259 women and 541 men). Stress, as indicated by high workload, low decision latitude, and being a victim of workplace bullying, was assessed in the first survey. The authors concluded that stress seems to be a contributing factor in the development of fibromyalgia, but further research is needed to examine whether stress perceptions are affected by undiagnosed fibromyalgia. Incident cases (n=47) were employees reporting physician-diagnosed fibromyalgia in 2000 but not in 1998 (63).

2.9 Final conclusion on health effects

The most robust finding regarding psychological consequences of bullying at work is that it seems to be a risk factor of developing depression. Regarding the physical consequences, the most consistent consequences associated with bullying at work are cardiovascular disease. In addition to these, a number of factors may be of importance.
Factors not included in a longitudinal design are:

- Possible personality changes
- Mental disorders
  - Depression
  - Anxiety
  - PTSD
  - Burn-out
  - Alcoholism and other substance use disorders
- General health
- Well-being
  - Meaningfulness (lack of)
- Sleep problems
- Physiological status
- Behavioural problems
  - Hostile behaviour
  - Hyper arousal
  - Introversion
  - Avoidance
  - Loneliness
- Life style changes
  - Alcohol, coffee, smoking etc.
  - Loss of friends
- Physical problems
  - Somatic stress symptoms
  - Musculoskeletal problems
- Individual factors
  - Premorbid conditions
  - Previous bullying
  - Shame
  - Blame
- Protective topics
  - Social support
  - Company support
  - Educational status

Witnesses
- Sleep
- Depression
- Anxiety
2.10 Future research

Based on survey data, this overview has shown a clear association between harassment and psychosomatic symptoms, with some longitudinal evidence as well. However, a pool of psychiatric studies of the causal association between bullying and specific psychiatric disorders among workers appears to be lacking. These studies are needed to better assist the victims of workplace bullying as well as their counsellors and therapists.

Most of the studies on bullying and health consequences of such exposure appear to be published in journals not likely to be read by general practitioners. The exception to this is if papers deal with bullying within the profession. It is clearly needed to get the knowhow about bullying into mainstream medical journals in order for more regular health care providers to be actively involved in treating victims and providing high quality consultation on prevention.

Bullying is a considerable expense to society. We lack knowledge on “How may we treat and prevent mental health problems (anxiety, depression, etc.) among targets?” And “How may we help them recover (e.g. sleep problems) and maintain a productive work-role?” Hence, more work needs to be put in tertiary prevention that is the treatment and rehabilitation of those already exposed to bullying at work.

Further, we have little if any knowledge at all about perpetrators and witnesses. Childhood bullying or being a bully – What consequences may it have for your adulthood? Minority issue and the risk of being bullied/ being a bully/health effects and the impact of family history, spill over effects into the affected employee’s family, bullying on marital relationship and workplace bullying.
Table 2. Health consequences of bullying at work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Study design* and purpose</th>
<th>Number of participants (men/women)</th>
<th>Methods and analysis</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Discussion/conclusion (as stated in the article, no own comments or ideas)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(54)</td>
<td>C &amp; QUAN</td>
<td>949 municipal employees. (15% men/85% women)</td>
<td>Factor analysis, varimax rotation, ANOVA, pair wise t-tests and a multiple regression analysis</td>
<td>Both the targets of bullying and the observers reported more general stress and mental stress reactions than did respondents from the workplaces with no bullying. The targets also expressed feelings of low self-confidence. Being bullied, but also features of one’s work, especially haste, excessively difficult tasks and poor goal clarity, predicted the stress reactions reported.</td>
<td>Not only the targets of bullying, but also bystanders, suffer when someone is bullied in the workplace. Bullying must therefore be regarded as a problem for the entire work unit and not merely as a problem of the target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(53)</td>
<td>C &amp; QUAN</td>
<td>221 respondents of whom 199 had been the target of bullying from one or more of their superiors.</td>
<td>Frequency, correlation, reliability and regression analyses.</td>
<td>Actions associated with tyrannical and laissez-faire leadership seem to be the most common behaviours among the reported bullies. The findings indicate that 84% of the respondents experienced symptoms of post-traumatic stress above the recommended cut-off values.</td>
<td>The results clearly demonstrate that destructive leadership in the form of bullying represents a serious problem for the victims. In particular, leaders characterized by behaviours compatible with the criteria for tyrannical leadership, constitute a severe stress factor, as this style was associated with all three symptom groups of posttraumatic stress. This association endured also after controlling for the effects of the bullying behaviours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(55)</td>
<td>C &amp; QUAN</td>
<td>Bullied victims (n=102). 74% were women.</td>
<td>Frequency, one way ANOVA, correlation and partial correlation analysis, and multiple linear regression.</td>
<td>The post-traumatic stress scores among victims of bullying were higher than for all the three test groups consisting of parents of school children involved in a bus accident, United Nation personnel 1 year after returning from war zone, and a group of medical students.</td>
<td>A majority of the respondents exceed recommended threshold-values indicating PTSD. It remains a debatable question whether PTSD is an appropriate psychiatric diagnosis in the case of bullying at work, at least according to the criteria of DSM-IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(56)</td>
<td>C &amp; QUAN</td>
<td>118 (11 men and 107 women) victims of bullying. Control group of 118 (11 men and 107 women) who had never been subjected to bullying.</td>
<td>Not specified.</td>
<td>Based on self-reported measures, 76% of the victims portrayed symptoms indicating post-traumatic stress disorder. They did not report serious injuries or threats to their physical integrity while being bullied. Compared with victims who failed to meet all or several diagnostic criteria for PTSD, a significantly higher percentage of the victims meeting all criteria reported feeling more negatively affected by an event other than bullying, indicating that exposure to other traumatic life events may increase the victims’ vulnerability. Increased negative views on self, others, and the world.</td>
<td>Many victims of bullying at work may suffer from PTSD analogue symptomatology, although they may not fulfil the strict criteria for PTSD put forward in the DSM-IV-TR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Study design* and purpose</td>
<td>Number of participants (men/women)</td>
<td>Methods and analysis</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Discussion/conclusion (as stated in the article, no own comments or ideas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>C &amp; QUAN To explore the occurrence of bullying in the restaurant sector and its potential consequences.</td>
<td>207 superiors and employees. 124 men and 81 women</td>
<td>Non-parametric statistics were used: The Mann-Whitney U-test, Spearman's rank correlation &amp; logistic regression.</td>
<td>At restaurant level, 6% of the restaurants reported that bullying had been witnessed often during the last 6 months, while bullying was seen now and then in 25% of the restaurants. 0.5% of respondents indicated that they to a large extent had been bullied while 6.4% had to some extent been bullied the last 6 months.</td>
<td>Bullying and negative acts seem with caution to occur more often in restaurants than in other sectors. Bullying is not limited to a few luxury restaurants. There is a positive association between exposure to bullying behaviour and individual burnout. A relationship was found between bullying and intention to leave the job. However, no relationship existed between bullying and intention to leave the profession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(58)</td>
<td>L &amp; QUAN To examine exposure to workplace bullying as a risk factor for cardiovascular disease and depression in employees.</td>
<td>5432 hospital employees; 601 men and 4831 women</td>
<td>Logistic regression analyses were used to test predictive relations of bullying to cardiovascular disease and depression.</td>
<td>The prevalence of bullying was 5% in the first survey and 6% in the second survey. Two per cent reported bullying experiences in both surveys, an indication of prolonged bullying. The odds ratio of incident cardiovascular disease for victims of prolonged bullying compared to non-bullied employees was 2.3. A further adjustment for overweight at baseline attenuated the odds ratio to 1.6.</td>
<td>A strong association between workplace bullying and subsequent depression suggests that bullying is an aetiological factor for mental health problems. The victims of bullying also seem to be at greater risk of cardiovascular disease, but this risk may partly be attributable to overweight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(59)</td>
<td>C &amp; QUAN To investigate the frequency of bullying among a representative group of Norwegian assistant nurses and the potential negative consequences on the psychological well-being. Respondents were introduced to a definition of bullying.</td>
<td>745 mainly female Norwegian assistant nurses.</td>
<td>Job satisfaction was measured with a 20-item scale originally developed in Australia. Burnout was measured with a 25-item inventory developed by Matthiesen &amp; Dyregrov. Psychological well-being was measured with a six-item scale.</td>
<td>3% admitted to being bullied at work at present. No one reported patients/clients or relatives as the source of bullying. Bullied assistant nurses were far more burnt out than their fellow workmates. The bullied nurses also reported more psychological problems, such as sleeping problems, anxiety, depression and irritability. Furthermore, they were more dissatisfied with their jobs than the non-bullied assistant nurses.</td>
<td>The results clearly indicate that bullying at work is a problem among assistant nurses. An interesting result is that most victims reported other assistant nurses or superior nurses as their bully, indicating that the perpetrators were mostly females. This supports the notion that a kind of systematic aggression does exist within female peer groups and within female subordinate/superior relationships. The kinds of aggression used in these relationships seem mainly to be of an indirect and social manipulative kind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>C &amp; QUAL To explore health consequences of workplace bullying as experienced by informants.</td>
<td>20 bully victims &amp; 2 persons working with bullying prevention (7 men/15 women)</td>
<td>Hierarchical analysis consisting of initial coding, focused coding and memo writing.</td>
<td>The longer the bullying continued the more limited the possibility to change the situation. Working through the course of events, the victim has to convince himself that the bullying is unjust and not his fault. This is a difficult process that in some cases requires professional help.</td>
<td>A person exposed to workplace bullying is marked for life. Adult bullying can be seen as a serious psychological trauma leaving internal wounds that will never entirely heal. Despite this, returning to a &quot;normal&quot; life may be possible but requires a long and painful process of working through the course of the unpleasant events that the victim has experienced. Some form of redress seems to be necessary for a bullied individual's return to as normal a life as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Study design* and purpose</td>
<td>Number of participants (men/women)</td>
<td>Methods and analysis</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Discussion/conclusion (as stated in the article, no own comments or ideas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49) C &amp; QUAN</td>
<td>To chart the prevalence of bullying in Danish workplaces and to replicate findings from other countries on the extent to which bullying is related to psychological and psychosomatic stress symptoms.</td>
<td>90 students, 158 hospital employees, 224 manufacturing employees and 215 department store employees.</td>
<td>Not specified.</td>
<td>2-4% of the respondents reported being victims of bullying, in most cases only occasionally. Compared to self-reported bullying, prevalence levels based on an operational definition of bullying were higher in all the samples. Exposure to bullying was found to be associated with increased self-reported strain reactions.</td>
<td>Based on the findings, it is argued against using only operational criteria of exposure to one negative act weekly over a period of 6 months to assess the prevalence of bullying at work. The study provides additional support to the notion that exposure to repeated negative behaviours at work may have a detrimental effect on the targets health and well-being.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(61) L &amp; QUAN</td>
<td>To investigate organizational climate and long-term effects of exposure to nasty teasing at work.</td>
<td>8,583 people in the baseline and 4,647 in the follow-up. (51% men/49% women)</td>
<td>Cross-lagged analyses, partial correlation analyses, linear regression analyses, and hierarchical linear regression analyses.</td>
<td>In 1995, 6.3% were subjected to nasty teasing with no significant gender difference. At baseline, we found significant associations among nasty teasing, a negative organizational climate, and psychological health effects. In the follow-up analyses, associations were found between exposure to nasty teasing at baseline and psychological health problems at follow-up.</td>
<td>The results indicated that being subjected to aggression at work in the form of nasty teasing has long-term psychological health effects for the targets and that some of these effects are mediated by a negative organizational climate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(62) C &amp; QUAN</td>
<td>To investigate the relationships between exposures to behaviours identified as workplace bullying and self-report measurements of psychological and psychosomatic health complaints.</td>
<td>224 white- and blue-collar employees. 55% men and 45% women.</td>
<td>Hierarchical regression analyses following the prescriptions of Baron and Kenny (1986).</td>
<td>Exposure to bullying behaviours was associated with an increase in psychological health complaints, increased levels of psychosomatic complaints and an elevated level of state negative affectivity. Results pointed to state negative affectivity as a partial mediator of the reported exposure to bullying behaviours and both measures of self-reported health.</td>
<td>Exposure to bullying behaviours is associated with an increase in psychological health complaints and increased levels of psychosomatic health complaints. Furthermore, results of the study were indicative of state-NA as a partial mediator of the relationships between exposure to bullying behaviours and self-reported strain reactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(63) L &amp; QUAN</td>
<td>To examine the prospective association between occupational stress and incidence of newly diagnosed fibromyalgia.</td>
<td>4791 hospital employees; 4250 women and 541 men.</td>
<td>Logistic regression analysis was used to test predictors of the incidence of fibromyalgia.</td>
<td>After adjustment for covariates, the odds ratio of incident diagnosed fibromyalgia for workplace bullying was 4.1. The corresponding odds ratio for high workload and low decision latitude were 2.1 (1.2–3.9) and 2.1 (1.1–4.0), respectively.</td>
<td>Stress seems to be a contributing factor in the development of fibromyalgia, but further research is needed to examine whether stress perceptions are affected by undiagnosed fibromyalgia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(64) C &amp; QUAN</td>
<td>To investigate the associations among bullying at work, self-reported health symptoms, and physiological stress response in targets of bullying and in employees witnessing bullying. Physiological stress reactivity was measured as cortisol in the saliva.</td>
<td>437 employees (143 men/294 women).</td>
<td>In a one-way ANOVA, the differences in somatisation, anxiety, depression, NA, and social support among non-bullied, bullied respondents, and witnesses were tested.</td>
<td>Of the respondents, 5% of both women and men reported bullying, whereas 9% of the women and 11% of the men had witnessed bullying at work. Bullied reported more symptoms of somatisation, depression, anxiety, and negative affectivity than non-bullied. Witnesses reported more symptoms of anxiety and lower support from supervisors than non-bullied employees. Concentrations of cortisol in the saliva were lower at awakening in bullied respondents compared with non-bullied respondents.</td>
<td>The present results show that being subjected to bullying seems to affect both the self-reported stress reactions as well as the physiological stress response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Study design* and purpose</td>
<td>Number of participants (men/women)</td>
<td>Methods and analysis</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Discussion/conclusion (as stated in the article, no own comments or ideas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(65)</td>
<td>C &amp; QUAN The study aimed to elucidate the relationship between bullying at work and cortisol secretion. Of particular interest was to examine whether frequently and occasionally bullied persons differed from nonbullied persons.</td>
<td>1944 employees from 55 workplaces in Denmark (531 men/1413 women)</td>
<td>In SPSS: General linear model procedure, Pearson's product-moment correlations and Spearman's rho. SAS: multilevel regression analysis using the Proc mixed procedure.</td>
<td>1.1% was frequently bullied and 7.2% occasionally bullied. Frequently bullied persons reported poorer mental health and had a 24.8% lower salivary cortisol concentration compared with the non-bullied reference group. Occasionally bullied persons had a poorer self-reported mental health, but their cortisol concentrations did not deviate from the group of non-bullied persons. The associations remained significant even after controlling for age, gender, exact time of sampling, mental health, and duration of bullying.</td>
<td>Frequent bullying was associated with lower salivary cortisol concentrations. No such association was observed for occasional bullying. Whether the generally lower secretion of cortisol among the frequently bullied persons indicates an altered physiological status remains to be evaluated in future studies. Yet, the physiological response seems to underscore the possibility that bullying indeed may have measurable physiological consequences. Hence, the physiological response supports the mental symptoms found among the frequently bullied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>C &amp; QUAN To investigate psychological correlates of bullying among former and current victims. Respondents were presented to a definition of bullying.</td>
<td>85 bullying victims. 77% were women.</td>
<td>Frequency analysis, cluster analysis, correlation analysis, univariate analysis of variance, and multivariate analysis (MANOVA).</td>
<td>The study demonstrated that the sample of bullied victims can be divided into three personality groups (&quot;the seriously affected&quot;, &quot;the disappointed and depressed&quot;, and &quot;the common&quot;). The seriously affected group reported a high level of generalized anxiety, fear of specific inci- dences, and many health concern worries.</td>
<td>Some victims of bullying are either more sensitive to bullying, or react more dramatically than others when bullying takes place. Hence, our findings disagree with the claim of Leymann (1996) that personality is irrelevant in connection to bullying at work. We cannot speak of a general 'victim personality' as such, since the participants in this study appear to have different personality configurations and thus various degree of susceptibility. People, including victims of bullying, are diverse and may react quite differently upon being exposed to tough interpersonal conflicts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(101)</td>
<td>C &amp; QUAN The main objective was to examine and describe whether bullied persons and witnesses to bullying showed deviations on the Swedish Universities Scale of Personality (SSP) when compared with their non-bullied work colleagues.</td>
<td>247 men and women from 19-64 years of age in manual labour.</td>
<td>GHQ-12 – mental health status. SSP – personality traits JCQ – perceived work environment). ANOVA analysis, pair-wise post-hoc analyses with LSD (the Least significant Difference) procedures, and Fisher's exact probability tests.</td>
<td>Three groups were defined: bullied (N=14), witnesses (N=31) and non bullied respondents (N=202). Bullied persons had higher scores on all 6 scales within the neuroticism dimension as well as higher irritability (aggressiveness dimension) and impulsiveness scores (extraversion dimension), when compared with their non-bullied work colleagues.</td>
<td>To conclude, bullied persons display a self-image that is dominated by worry, mistrust and embitterment as well as irritability and impulsiveness. Accordingly, when dealing with bullying at work, the need for ego-supportive actions should be considered in conjunction with more organisational, collective oriented action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L=longitudinal, C=cross sectional, I=intervention, QUAN=Quantitative, QUAL=Qualitative
3. How is bullying prioritized in each of the Nordic countries in terms of legislation?

In this section, we will investigate how bullying is prioritized in each country in terms of legislation. In the following, the legislation regarding bullying at work will be described.

3.1 The European Framework Agreement on harassment and violence at work

The EU and national laws define the employers’ duty to protect workers against harassment and violence in the workplace. The European social partners recognize that harassment and violence may affect any workplace and any worker, irrespective of the size of the company, field of activity or type of employment contract or relationship (102).

A few EU Member States (notably Sweden) have adopted specific legislation with regard to bullying in the workplace. Other EU Member States are working on legislative proposals (e.g., Italy). The increasing impact of bullying on workplaces has motivated the social partners of Europe to deal with it in collective agreements and codes of conduct (103). According to the fourth European Working Conditions Survey (2007) published by the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions1, 5% of workers report having been exposed to bullying or harassment in the last 12 months. The European social partners2 signed a Framework Agreement3 on harassment and violence at work and the European Commission4 in the European Strategy signed an agreement on Health and Safety (2007–2013) (103). The aim of this agreement is to increase awareness and understanding of employers, workers and their representatives of workplace harassment and violence, and provide employers, workers and their representatives at all levels with an action-oriented framework to identify, prevent and manage problems of harassment and violence at work (102).

---

1 http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/areas/industrialrelations/dictionary/definitions/europeanfoundationforimprovementoflivingandworkingconditions.htm
2 http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/areas/industrialrelations/dictionary/definitions/europeansocialpartners.htm
3 http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/areas/industrialrelations/dictionary/definitions/frameworkagreements.htm
4 http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/areas/industrialrelations/dictionary/definitions/europeancommission.htm
The framework agreement on harassment and violence provides an outline of general principles to be implemented in the Member States “either in accordance with the procedures and practices specific to management and labour and the Member States or at the joint request of the signatory parties, by a Council decision on a proposal from the Commission” (Article 139(2) EC) (104). The implementation of this agreement will be carried out within three years after the date of signature of this agreement and the Social Dialogue Committee will prepare and adopt a yearly table summarizing the on-going implementation of the agreement (102).

The Yearly Joint Table from 2009 presents results from among others Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden. In Denmark, the regional and municipal social partners agreed to implement the European agreement on harassment and violence into their existing Agreement on corporation and participation. In the Agreement on corporation and participation, there has been an article added covering the issue of violence and harassment saying that the work councils in each region/municipality will have to make guidelines on how to prevent, identify and manage violence and harassment at the workplace. In Finland, a lot of different organizations and confederations are currently working on a joint brochure to combat workplace harassment incorporating the main messages of the framework agreement. The social partners, Confederation of Finnish Industries, Commission for Church Employers, Commission for Local Authority Employers, Office for the Government as Employer, Akava – Confederation of Unions for Professional and Managerial Staff in Finland, Finnish Confederation of Professionals STTK and SAK Central Organization of Finnish Trade Unions have published a joint leaflet called “Good behaviour preferred – inappropriate behaviour unacceptable”. With the help of the Centre for Occupational Safety, the social partners have arranged a training tour in different Finnish cities. During the half day, training bullying and inappropriate behaviour and measures to prevent and how to handle the issue are discussed.

In Norway, a working group established in 2008 (see joint table 2008) planned a national conference on harassment and violence at work in October 2009. Furthermore in April 2009, a new paragraph in The Norwegian Working Environment Act was approved which entails that the employer has to assess/reduce risk factors when the employee works alone. The employee’s organizations want detailed regulations in order to prevent harassment and violence at work. In Sweden, many activities were initiated prior to or independent of the social dialogue agreement. Examples: Several of the unions within the Swedish Trade Union Confederation, The Swedish Confederation of Professional Employees and the Swedish Confederation of Professional Associations cover violence in their education and training programs, seminars and member meetings. The Union of commercial employees has together with the employer organizations conducted a campaign “secure in the shop”.

5 http://resourcecentre.etuc.org/linked_files/documents/pdf_Implementation_HV_table_2008-EN.pdf?PHPSESSID=8fb1dce863ae59548256d129f3f7f8
A handbook and a web-based support for dealing with violence and threat at work are prepared by the social partners within the state sector. Furthermore, the Swedish Union of Local Government Officers conducted a full day seminar on good practice from the EU member states within the framework agreement on how to work with third party violence (105).

3.2 How is bullying prioritized in the Nordic countries?

The social partners in the municipal sector at Nordic level (Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland) discuss the Framework Agreement on harassment and violence at work in their annual conference (105). A side from the European Framework agreement on harassment and violence at work each country has its own legislation concerning bullying and harassment in the workplace. However, the legislation deviates a lot between countries and considerable differences can be observed on how the law is implemented.

3.2.1 Iceland

The Icelandic ACT on Working Environment, Health and Safety in Workplaces No. 46/1980, paragraph 38 states “After receiving the comments of the Board of the Administration of Occupational Safety and Health, the Minister of Social Affairs shall issue further regulations on which provisions shall be complied with as concerns the organisation, arrangement and execution of jobs, such as: … on measures against bullying in workplaces (point e in the ACT).

Based on this, the ministry of social affairs has passed regulation nr.1000/2004. The scope of the regulation is to promote action against “einelti” (bullying and mobbing). This is further defined as any reprehensible or repeated inappropriate behaviour or act that as such is likely to offend, insult, downgrade, harass and cause distress within whom the behaviour is targeted against. Sexual harassment and other mental and physical violence fall under this.

The regulation states that the employer should organize the work in such a manner to reduce the risk for such circumstances which are likely to result in bullying. The employer should also make it clear to the employee that such behaviour is forbidden. The employer should in a written risk assessment plan assess the risk for bullying and act accordingly. The employer should consult with an employee representative in creation of his plans and action for prevention of bullying. The employee is obliged to inform the employer or the employee representative if he or she becomes aware of bul-

7 http://www.vinnueftirlit.is/vinnueftirlit/upload/files/log_reglur/reglur_og_reglugerdir_sem_heyra_undir_vinnuverndarlog/1000_2004_reglugerdir_um_adgerdir_gegn_einelti_a_vinnustad.pdf
lying. The employer is responsible to act as soon as possible after he or she receives information or complaints about bullying at the workplace.

The Administration for occupational health and safety (Vinnueftirlitið) is responsible for monitoring the progress of the regulation. The Administration will act if the behaviour falls under the definition of bullying. If the case has not been reviewed and acted on at the workplace, the employer is asked to take on the task. If, however, the scenario is such that it is unlikely that the workplace will or can deal with the bullying, e.g. the employer is the primary actor, then the administration for occupational health and safety will take up the case.

A written permission from the alleged victim is needed. The Administration for occupational health and safety will per se not rule on whether alleged behaviour was bullying or not, but will ensure that psychosocial risk assessment is in place and that such is fully acted on. However, in case of no action plan is implemented then the workplace will be instructed to complete a psychosocial risk assessment and action plan or to revise their action plan, most often with external consultation and act accordingly.

3.2.2 Norway

In the Norwegian work Environment Act, an explicit ban of harassment at work has existed since the mid 1990s. In addition, the Act protects employees from all kinds of inappropriate behaviours and stress while at work. Furthermore, the employers have the obligation to investigate all complaints of bullying, harassment or other forms of inappropriate behaviours and to take proper remedy if the case is proven. Hence, the employer is to act as both “Police” and “judge” in a self-regulatory system. The employer is also required by the law and its accompanying regulations to have complaints and whistleblowing procedures in place as a part of their internal control system for health and Safety (see figure 3) together with procedures for the prevention of bullying and harassment.

The companies may be controlled by the Labour Inspectorate. In this, they may take advice, be required to do investigations in general or in particular cases, be required to develop policies and procedures and be required to engage in appropriate activity in order to solve the problem. The labour Inspectorate may also conduct its own investigation in individual cases, although this is seldom. (For an English version of the act, see http://www.arbeidstilsynet.no/regelverk/index.html)
Fig 3. The Norwegian system for investigating complaints of workplace bullying (based on the work of Einarson & Pedersen, 2007)

3.2.3 Finland

The Occupational Safety and Health Act (738/2002) came into operation January 1st 2003. The Act has a separate section on the obligation for the employer to take action if someone at the workplace is exposed to harassment and inappropriate behaviour. The Act also include obligation for the employees.

Section 1 – Objectives

The objectives of this Act are to improve the working environment and working conditions in order to ensure and maintain the working capacity of employees as well as to prevent occupational accidents and diseases and eliminate other hazards from work and the working environment to the physical and mental health, hereinafter referred to as health, of employees.

Section 28 – Harassment

If harassment or other inappropriate treatment of an employee occurs at work and causes hazards or risks to the employee’s health, the employer, after becoming aware of the matter, shall by available means take measures for remedying this situation.
A new law was formed in 2003, which includes more precise bullying. In the old law from 1993 the employer had to take care of everything in the psychosocial working environment.

**Section 18 – Employees’ general obligations**

3) Employees shall avoid such harassment and other inappropriate treatment of other employees at the workplace which causes hazards or risks to their safety or health.

The Act has also other sections, e.g. on the obligation to monitor the working environment, and to identify the health hazards and risks which relate also to prevention and management of harassment and bullying at work. Figure 5 shows a summary of all these sections.

---

**Fig. 5 Monitoring the working environment in Finland**

In Finland, harassment and bullying is highly prioritized by safety inspectors. Principle: In all inspections, inappropriate behaviour and harassment are taken into account.

Inspectors always ask whether the workplace has had any cases, about the policy, procedures in case of bullying, about training in relation to harassment and inappropriate behaviour (managers, supervisors, employees). A survey called “VALMERI” is used which includes a question on harassment and inappropriate behaviour. Authorities can also force the employer to carry out an analysis and assessment of the risks at work (section 10). If there is an acute case in the organization and nothing has been done, the inspector gives an obligation to take action.

Contact from a client/employee (most often by telephone). The inspector tries to clarify what has happened. Has the client told about the harassment/bullying to the employer? If not, he/she is given guidelines and advice,
and support material is sent to him/her. If yes, and the employer has neglected his duty to take action, a form "request for proceedings" is sent to the client (what has happened, for how long, impact on his/her health, when was the employer informed, what activities has the employer taken, etc.). By signing the form, the client gives the occupational safety and health inspectorate permission to investigate the situation with his/her name.

A decision in the inspectorate who takes the “case” is that the inspectors work with in pairs. Most often the employer is asked for a written report. Has the situation been a health risk? Sometimes an inspection is carried out at the workplace. When the inspectors receive the report from the employer, they decide whether they need to carry out an inspection at the workplace, or if they need further information from the client, etc. A report of inspection is written. The inspectorate decides if the employer has taken sufficient actions. If necessary, the report includes a proposal for action to remedy the situation. The employer is given a deadline by which he has to report about the actions that have been carried out. If the employer does not take any actions: an administrative coercive measure will be applied, a request of a preliminary investigation for the police. The report is sent to the client.

An evaluation on the implementation of the Finnish Occupational Health and Safety Act (Personal communication with reference to Salminen et.al. 2007) found that the new section on harassment and other inappropriate treatment from 2003 was recognized in most workplaces and that in many workplaces, anti-bullying policies and procedures for prevention and management of harassment have been adopted. The regulation had motivated initiatives against bullying in organizations and introduced organizational anti-bullying policies and guidelines.

The evaluation was carried out quite soon after the law reform. It is characteristic of law reforms that they change workplace practices and activities in the long run. Considering this, it can be stated that the act has established itself at workplaces quite well.

3.2.4 Sweden


Section 1: The purpose of this Act is to prevent ill-health and accidents at work and generally to achieve a good working environment.

A guidance for victimization at work Ordinance AFS 1993:17:

Section 1: These Provisions apply to all activities in which employees can be subjected to victimization. By victimization is meant recurrent reprehensible or distinctly negative actions which are directed against individual
employees in an offensive manner and can result in those employees being placed outside the workplace community.

Section 2: The employer should plan and organize work so as to prevent victimization as far as possible.

Section 3: The employer shall make clear that victimization cannot be accepted in the activities.

In 2006, a new regulation was established on insulting behaviour among children. What about the working environment? The law regulating bullying at the workplace (Ordinance AFS 1993:17 Victimization at work (Kränkande särbehandling i arbetslivet)) focuses on how the work shall be adjusted to human beings’ different prerequisites related to physical and psychological conditions. The aim is to ensure that the work offers possibilities of variation, social contact and co-operation with context between separate tasks. There is a law of discrimination (Diskrimineringslagen 2008:567). This law states a protection towards discrimination in connection with sex, ethnicity, religion, handicap, sexual disposition, and age.

Then there is the Criminal code (Brottbalken 1962:700) that deals with powerlessness, abuse of one’s exposed disposition, and insulting behaviour. The Swedish Work Environment Authority visit workplaces and exert control and treat reports of lacks in the work environment. Since the closing of the Swedish Institute of the Working Environment, a general institute for working life research has been missing. It is difficult to get an overview of research, knowledge and possible co-operation partners. The Swedish Council for Working Life and Social Research (FAS, 2009) and the Swedish working life research – a resource for welfare, health and growth, support research in the working environment. In 2003, FAS stated that bullying is as an important feature in two main/core areas, work organization, and care and social relations. Bullying is an element in Staffan Marklund’s reports Arbetsliv och hälsa (2000) and Den höga sjukfrånvaron – problem och lösningar (2005). The FAS research strategy 2009–2012 – Bullying is not named. It means that they will not prioritize bullying. In 2009, the Swedish research council had a theme of bullying, mostly about school bullying. Nothing stated on workplace bullying.

The Swedish ordinance against bullying from 1993 and its effect has recently been evaluated by Hoel and Einarsen (106). Semi-structured, interviews were carried out with 18 key stake holders from employer and trade unions, enforcement authorities, academia and victim support organisations. A range of potential for its limited success was identified, although the ordinance also has given the issue of bullying some credibility. Based on the study, one can conclude that for legislation to be successful, it must be accompanied by well-informed, trained and motivated employers and trade unions who in collaboration are willing to deal with the problem proactively on an organisational level as well as responding constructively to individual cases when they occur. Any legislation must also be supported and enforced
by an enforcement agency or inspectorate which is equipped and geared up for its role.

3.2.5 Denmark

Legislation:
§ 1 The law seeks to create a safe and healthy working environment at all times in accordance with the technical and social development in the community and the basis for the enterprises themselves can resolve health and safety issues with guidance from social organizations and guidance and control by the Labour Inspectorate.

At-guidance D.4.2
March 2002, on Bullying and sexual harassment at work
In the Executive Order on the Performance of Work (only relevant passages are included below)\(^8\).

Part 2. Planning and organising work, no 4. All aspects related to work shall be planned and organised so as to ensure safe and healthy working conditions. Planning and organisation of work shall take into account the principles of prevention stated in Annex 1. It shall be ensured that no designs, plans, detailed solutions or working methods which may be dangerous to or otherwise impair health or safety in connection with the performance of work are prescribed or assumed to be used. Moreover, it shall be ensured that the overall impact on the working environment does not in the short or the longer term impair the health and safety of the employees.

All aspects related to work shall be performed so as to ensure health and safety, both in the light of an individual assessment and in the light of an overall assessment of the physical, ergonomic and psychosocial conditions of the working environment which in the short or the longer term may affect the physical or mental health of the employees.

In the case of work having a physically or mentally harmful or stressful effect in the short or the longer term, the Danish Working Environment Authority may demand that special occupational health and safety measures be carried out. Such measures may be special welfare measures and any other occupational health and safety measures necessary for the prevention of diseases, wearing-down, accidents, etc.

Where work may involve particular risks to health and safety, the Danish Working Environment Authority may demand breaks and limited working hours for such work where such risk cannot otherwise be prevented. The same requirements may be stipulated where special working clothing and personal protective equipment are used.

\(^8\) http://www.at.dk/ENGELSK/Regulations/Executive-Orders/559-Arbejdets-udfoerelse.aspx?sc_lang=en#afs9
Part 3, No 9a. In connection with the performance of work, it shall be ensured that the work does not involve a risk of physical or mental impairment to health as a result of bullying, including sexual harassment.

Supervision, evaluation, and managing bullying in Denmark

A screening is implemented regularly – approximately every 3 years. Problems are discovered with the help of a question guide, which has been designed as support for the supervisor. This guide assists, among other things, tracing if there are problems with occurrence of bullying and sexual harassment at the workplace. But it is unrealistic to believe that bullying will be detected at a screening. A process line if bullying is discovered for the Danish Working Environment Authority (DWEA) is shown below.

Fig. 6. The process line on bullying for the DWEA

- Screening at the workplace
  Problems may be discovered with the help of an interview guide, which has been designed as support for the supervisor (from DWEA). This guide assists, among other things, in tracing problems related to bullying and sexual harassment at the workplace.
  From the 1st of January 2009 there will be even more focus on bullying and sexual harassment in the interview guide. A screening is implemented regularly. The idea is that it should be carried out every 3 years.

- Adapted supervision is implemented as a consequence of the screening, to focus on the problems this has demonstrated. 

  or

  Detailed or systematic supervision is implemented as a consequence of a complaint of exposure to bullying / sexual harassment or reported negative psychosocial work environment. Reported cases of bullying are anonymous; it can therefore be extremely difficult to follow up on the complaint in certain cases.
• Order to investigate
  If there is not enough "proof" of the problem, a paragraph 21 injunction – an order to investigate – is issued. The organisation is ordered to hire an authorised work environment consultant at their own expense to work out a report on the problem.

• Plan of action
  A decision is made by the DWEA, which is sent to the organisation for hearing. Following this, the organisation has 8 weeks to develop a time and action plan on how to solve the problem. The action plan is presented to the DWEA.

• Order to seek advice
  If the action plan does not fulfil the demands of the DWEA, an order to seek advice is issued. The organisation has to hire an authorised work environment consultant at their own expense, which can help them work out an action plan.

• Follow up
  The intervention is followed up by feedback from the organisation, and a control visit from the DWEA.

Reported cases of bullying are anonymous; it can therefore be extremely difficult to follow up the complaint in certain cases due to the right to anonymity. You can, however, write an open letter with the complaint to your union, the workplace and the DWEA, which opens a dialog about the problem and makes it easier to investigate the problem. Before taking the case any further, the supervisor presents the plaintiff with a definition of bullying to make sure that they have the same understanding of the term and that there is substance in the complaint. If an employee has handed in a complaint and the DWEA pays the workplace a visit, the workplace has no right to know of the complaint, and the DWEA has every right to conceal the intention of their visit, which can make the workplace suspicious and not willing to cooperate.

In the spring of 2010, a hotline was established at the DWEA on demand from the Danish Minister of Employment. Labour inspectors were trained to answer calls from bullied employees or other employees who wanted to report bullying at their workplaces (personal information).

3.3 Discussion

An overall discussion of the phenomenon of bullying revealed that bullying is regarded somewhat differently in the different Nordic countries. However, all the Nordic countries have legislation and guidance for handling work-
place bullying, securing the individual the right to a safe working environment. The existing legal frameworks should in principle protect employees against bullying. However, in practice the burden of proof generally lies with the target if the work environment is reported not to be safe. Furthermore, the legal frameworks do not necessarily work in practice as intended.

The law of occupational safety and health (OSH) covers all employees. The problem is how the employee acts if he/she is insulted by something, which is not described in the law. E.g. paragraph 1.1 in the Danish OSH law states that the legislation seeks to create a safe and healthy working environment at all times in accordance with the technical and social development in the community. Due to the negative health effects of bullying, transposing legislation to workplace bullying, it is forbidden to bully. Legislation states that the problem has to be taken care of when a complaint is made. The new European Framework Agreement from 2007 states clearly that employers must have complaint procedures in place with tools for a fair investigation or hearing process. In this, it is very important that the employee has a safe place to report or make a complaint which is then investigated in a fair and swift manner, followed up with the appropriate sanctions and interventions to restore a safe working environment for the target if the case is proven as a case of bulling.

The way the labour marked is organized also has an impact on whether the employees report work place bullying. In Denmark employers can easily fire people based on “collaboration problems”, which bullying may “easily” be explained as. The burden of proof is always with the victim in Denmark.

In Iceland, you can sack an employee without any reason! Being bullied in the private sector may therefore be a particular problem because any complain may lead to firing. In the public sector, it is nearly impossible to fire employees. Hence, in practice one may say that: If you are bullied by an employer – find another job. The legislation only protects if you are publicly employed and bullied by a colleague. If you are sacked and have been bullied prior to being sacked, you may have a case to go to court.

In Norway, the conditions seem to be better than on Iceland and in Denmark, as there is legal protection against retaliation against any who reports a problem at the workplace to the employer. Firing people also requires a fair reason and a fair procedure, again protecting victims who complain.

Raising awareness and appropriate training of managers and workers can reduce the likelihood of harassment and violence at work (102). The employers and managers need to be made aware of existing regulation on bullying which must be included in any leadership training and education. Often leaders know that they have to do something, but not what to do. Often employers and managers do not know that they must investigate any reported complaints and that they may use warnings to stop any bullying that is proven to be taken place after a fair hearing of all parties’ experiences, including any witnesses.
Enterprises need to have a clear policy statement outlining that harassment and violence will not be tolerated, in line with the legal frameworks of each country. This statement will specify procedures to be followed where cases arise. Procedures can include an informal stage in which a person trusted by management and workers is available with advice and assistance. Pre-existing procedures may be suitable for dealing with harassment and violence (102).

According to the European Framework Agreement on harassment and violence at work, such a suitable procedure will be underpinned by but not confined to the following:

- It is in the interest of all parties to proceed with the necessary discretion to protect the dignity and privacy of all
- No information should be disclosed to parties not involved in the case
- Complaints should be investigated and dealt with without undue delay
- All parties involved should get an impartial hearing and fair treatment
- Complaints should be backed up by detailed information
- False accusations should not be tolerated
- External assistance may help

The systematic work with work environment, including such procedures on workplace bullying, shall be integrated as a natural part of the daily activities at work and the employers’ systems for securing a healthy workplace. Such systems shall include all physical, psychological, and social circumstances of meaning for the work environment including bullying.
4. Interventions for workplace bullying

According to Oeij et al. (2006), the term intervention has been applied to indicate a process of change set in motion within and with regard to work organizations. Different strategies have been used to prevent and manage workplace bullying and its associated health effects. A distinction is commonly made between primary, secondary, and tertiary intervention on the one hand, and between policy, organization/employer, workplace/group/tasks, and individual levels on the other hand (107).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Primary interventions</th>
<th>Secondary interventions</th>
<th>Tertiary interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Law/regulations</td>
<td>Court case</td>
<td>Provision of rehabilitation opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective agreements</td>
<td>Industrial tribunal</td>
<td>Corporate agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anti-bullying policies</td>
<td>Handling procedures</td>
<td>Programs and contracts of professional after-care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of organizational culture</td>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management training</td>
<td>Investigation of complaints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization/employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace/Group/task</td>
<td>Psychosocial work environment redesign</td>
<td>Staff surveys</td>
<td>Group recovery programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risk analysis</td>
<td>Case analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training (awareness, recognition of bullying)</td>
<td>Training (e.g. conflict management, investigation skills)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict/case resolution, mediation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Social support</td>
<td>Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Counselling</td>
<td>Counselling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Redress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only a few studies concerning interventions of bullying at the workplace were identified.

4.1 Policy

A study from 2008 (Maarit Vartia, personal communication) on the anti-bullying policy implemented in the municipality of Helsinki in 2000 showed that only 12% of the respondents were well acquainted with the policy. A total of 33% were superficially acquainted with the policy, 13% had seen it, 27% has heard about it but not seen it, and 15% were unaware of its existence. Of the respondents, 48% had never discussed the policy in their work unit, and 80% had never attended any training sessions or information meetings on the policy. Bullying occurred among 6% of the respondents at the time of the survey and 23% had been bullied before. Only 26% had used the
guidelines of which 25% thought it worked well, 16% poorly, and 59% did not know.

During the past years, a lot has been done in the Nordic countries to prevent and reduce bullying at work such as training, and organizations have been encouraged to draw up their policies. Evaluated interventions for the prevention and management of bullying both at the organizational, group, and individual levels have so far been quite limited in number.

4.2 Organization/employer level interventions

In 2008, the Finnish Institute of Occupational Health launched a study of factors affecting workplace well-being and the reasons behind sickness absences in the forest industry (Maarit Vartia, Personal communication). The participants were four major forest industry companies and they were sent two questionnaires. Furthermore, thematic interviews were carried out in all participating units (n=166). In the first survey, the level of inappropriate behaviour and bullying was relatively high in almost all participating units (on average 14%). (The perception of inappropriate behaviour or bullying was clearly higher than in manufacturing in general.)

- Most of the companies have a zero tolerance against bullying in the workplace. To prevent bullying, different initiatives were taken by the organisations.
- Supervisors have been trained on how to speak with their subordinates if they notice any problems in the work unit.
- Supervisors have been trained to arrange network meetings with employees, managers, safety delegates (or the like), and OH care personnel, to find a solution to a particular situation
- Prepared a handbook of how to handle bullying and distributed it to all employees
- Instructed new employees with information on what to do if bullying occurs

Inappropriate behaviour or bullying is after these initiatives more openly discussed. During the project period, companies have updated anti-bullying policies and procedures, published articles in international journals, etc.

At follow-up, no significant difference in the level of perceived inappropriate behaviour or bullying was observed (14% to 12.5%).

Salin (2008) (37) found that the introduction of written anti-bullying policies and the provision of information were the most common measures adopted by organizations to counteract workplace bullying in Finland.

A Swedish intervention study at the organization/employer level is undertaken during the time of our meetings in the network. The research project is constructed as an intervention study in collaboration with hospitals in
one county council and one region and six municipalities in one county council and one region. The overall aim of this ongoing research project is to outline and describe the problem of bullying, as it occurs in a number of workplaces within the health and social care systems. In addition, the study will analyze the relationship between the presence of bullying and the psychosocial work environment, leadership and health, as well as establish routines to resist bullying-related problems. Furthermore, a program for action will be developed and implemented in order to prevent and eliminate bullying. Finally, this study aims to evaluate the implementation and the results of this program. No data are available yet (personal communication from Margaretha Strandmark).

4.3 Workplace/group/task level interventions

A few studies have previously implemented and evaluated prevention strategies such as development of an anti-bullying policy and information about bullying and negative acts and potential consequences (108;109).

4.3.1 A Danish intervention study at the workplace level as primary and secondary interventions

A baseline study on psychosocial work-environment was carried out at 60 workplaces in 2006 (n = 3,363; response rate 45.9%). Based on this survey, 10 workplaces were contacted and asked to participate in the present study; three workplaces agreed to participate. Two of the workplaces agreed to implement all the proposed interventions, i.e. a hospital department (A) and a business school (B) whereas the last workplace which involved 5 departments in a university (C) only received parts of the intervention. The purpose of the study was to develop, implement and evaluate efficient strategies to prevent bullying and serious interpersonal conflicts in the workplace. The intervention lasted for approximately ½–1 year and included:

- 1–1½ hours lectures about bullying and negative behaviour (all staff invited) (three workplaces: A–C).
- Dialogue meetings (all staff) (two workplaces: A,B).
- A two day course in conflict management (leaders and key staff members) (two workplaces: A,B).
- Steering group meeting incl. supervision (three workplaces, A–C).
- Written information (all staff) (three workplaces, A–C).
  - Pamphlet about bullying.
  - Newsletters and posters about the project (4 letters).

Process (qualitative) and effect (quantitative) evaluations were carried out during the follow-up period.
The criteria for success were a reduction of negative acts, bullying, conflicts and a commitment of the workplace to work with the psychosocial work-environment.

In a comparison of the two surveys, preliminary results showed an overall reduction of both frequent and occasional bullying in non-intervention workplaces as well as a reduction of both work-related and person-related negative acts ($p < .001$). At follow-up, a lower level of bullying and person-related negative acts was observed in workplace A. In workplace B, there were fewer conflicts, a better social climate and more commitment after the intervention. The level of bullying did not change. In workplace C, there was a lower level of person-related negative acts. However, more conflicts were observed in one department. In conclusion, they seemed to find a mixed picture with a general reduction of bullying and negative acts in non-intervention workplaces and in workplace A, and a tendency of reduction in some of the negative acts in the 3 intervention workplaces.

Researchers and consultants continuously documented the progression of the study and how interventions were implemented. The participants at the conflict prevention and management course also completed a short evaluation questionnaire. Furthermore, post-intervention group interviews were conducted (interviewees’ knowledge of the project, perceived commitment from management and perceived benefits from interventions). Process evaluation data and post intervention group interviews indicated whether those who participated in the interventions at the two workplaces had benefitted from them, in particular the dialogue meetings and the courses in conflict prevention and management. The factors stimulating the implementation and effects of interventions were identified as implementing measures that fit well with the organisation, a participatory approach, building trustful relationships between the organisation and researchers/consultants, a well-functioning steering group and sustained commitment from management. Conversely, obstructing factors were lack of continuous management commitment, poor planning and organisation of interventions, lack of clarification of roles and expectations, time constraints, lack of identification with the targeted stressors and cultural aspects such as for instance reluctance to confront problems. The obstructing factors may also have contributed to reducing the likelihood of interventions resulting in a general reduction in bullying and negative acts. The conclusion was that future studies on prevention and management of conflicts and bullying pay attention to such factors during all the stages of the research process.

4.3.2 A Finish intervention study carried out at the workplace level as a primary intervention

The intervention was carried out in eight primary schools in one municipality in Finland. There were between 25–90 teachers and other members of staff in every school. The aim of the intervention was to reduce the amount
of perceived inappropriate behaviour, perceived bullying and observed bullying in the work units. Only inappropriate behaviour and bullying among staff was looked at, not inappropriate behaviour among pupils. The intervention was based on the environmental view on the antecedents of workplace bullying. The project lasted approximately one year. In each school, the interventions included:

- An initial meeting with a pre-intervention survey and training about the phenomenon and causes of bullying (about 2 hours).
- A feedback session with training and discussion about bullying, particularly about the risks of inappropriate behaviour in the specific school (about 1½ hours).
- A joint event for all the participants (1/2 day).
- A meeting where a post-intervention survey was conducted with discussion (about 1/2 hour).
- A feedback session with discussion (about 1 hour).

The intervention demonstrated that this kind of approach works and there are plans to adapt the same procedure at other workplaces in the city.

Inappropriate behaviour and bullying were directly discussed in the workplace with the whole staff several times during one year. For the evaluation pre- and post-intervention measurements were used. The pre-intervention questionnaire included questions on different forms of inappropriate behaviour, perceived bullying, observed bullying, psychosocial work environment, including the atmosphere in the workplace and some questions on leadership style. The post-intervention questionnaire included the same questions on inappropriate behaviour and bullying, and questions about the intervention and the effectiveness of the activities carried out. The results demonstrated that by bringing up inappropriate behaviour and bullying with the whole staff, and discussing and examining the risk situations and antecedents of bullying in the respective work unit, it is possible to gain positive results. A slight decrease in some forms of perceived inappropriate behaviour, and observed bullying was received. The intervention was experienced positively. Many employees reported that they paid more attention to their own behaviour toward co-workers than before, and that they intervened more easily if they saw inappropriate behaviour occurring. Many employees found that not enough had been done in their own workplace to reduce inappropriate behaviour. The reason for this was most often due to a high workload experienced by the majority of employees.

---

9 http://prima-ef.org/bhi.aspx
4.4 Individual level interventions

The planning of a clinical unit for patients that have become sick from trauma and psychosocial strain at work was started in March, 2010, in Bergen at Haukeland University Hospital. The unit will be established as a research clinic and will receive patients with traumatic stress disorders and persons who are victims of bullying, sexual harassment or suffer from hard conflicts at work. A lot of research on post-traumatic stress disorder and the treatment of this condition has been conducted. However, there are very few units world-wide that are specifically designated at treating people who are victims of bullying, and very little literature exists to document what kind of treatment is needed. One of the major goals of the clinical research unit will be to study what kind of treatment benefits those who suffer from bullying. So far, no data are available.

4.4.1 Interventions in other European countries

See http://prima-ef.org/bhi.aspx for such an overview.

4.5 Discussion and conclusion

All Nordic countries have policies describing laws and regulations and collective agreements that may contribute to intervention on bullying at the primary level. The regulations aim to motivate initiatives against bullying in organizations and to the introduction of organizational anti-bullying policies and guidelines. A Finish study showed that most workplaces have anti-bullying policies, procedures for prevention and management of harassment. A Finish study also showed that only 12% of the respondents were well acquainted with the policy, a total of 33% were superficially acquainted with the policy, 13% had seen it, 27% has heard about it but not seen it, and 15% were unaware of its existence. This may indicate that primary intervention at the organisational level in Finland is implemented, although not necessarily very well communicated to the employees and the local managers, whereas interventions at the secondary and tertiary level should have more focus. In the Finish study, 48% of the respondents never discussed the policy in their work unit, and 80% had never attended any training sessions or information meetings on the policy. Further, only 26% had used the guidelines, of which 25% thought it worked well, 16% poorly, and 59% did not know.

It is often said that policies act preventively, but no studies have investigated this. Furthermore, there is a lack of evaluations of the effectiveness of the organizational policies on the occurrence of bullying and on handling the cases.

It is still a question to what extent bullying can be separated from and assessed in the same way as the other cumulative stressors. Furthermore, one
opinion was that it can be questioned whether it is possible to do interventions with a factor this seldom, and if so, the question is if it is relevant to do prevention on so few people? There are very few intervention studies in the Nordic countries concerning bullying, and knowledge about the causality and intermediating factors are still sparse.

4.5.1 Future interventions

How do we expand our knowledge of what works and what does not? We may learn from the workplaces where bullying does not exist. Hereby we may gain knowledge on how to avoid bullying. To make a realistic assumption of what to be expected, we need to know the exact effect of an intervention. Is it possible to prevent bullying at all, and can we use programs where we know that the bullied people receive treatment?

We also need more information on how third parties approach or should approach the victim after a bully-episode? What are their needs and how shall managers and others behave in order to help. In line with this, we need much more information on how we may help the victims? This regards rehabilitating victims, how compensations may help restore their health and self-esteem, and along with this, how do we conduct a fair investigation and prove that a person has been bullied? Often targets have other cumulative stressors other than bullying that also need to be taken into account.
5. Ongoing studies in Sweden
Appendix 1

Margaretha Strandmark, GullBritt Rahm, Gun Nordström, Bodil Wilde-Larsson, Ingrid Rystedt. Karlstads University, Sweden

5.1 Bullying in the Workplace – An Evaluation of Processes and Results

To date, research on bullying has primarily focused on incidence, prevalence and risk factors, as well as the relationship between bullying and unhealth. It is less common that studies identify measures to prevent and stop bullying. The overall aim of this ongoing research project is to outline and describe the problem of bullying, as it occurs in a number of workplaces within the health and social care systems. In addition, the study will analyze the relationship between the presence of bullying and psychosocial work environment, leadership and health, as well as establish routines to resist bullying-related problems. Furthermore, a program for action will be developed and implemented in order to prevent and eliminate bullying. Finally, this study aims to evaluate the implementation and the results of this program.

The project is based on the following questions:

- How prevalent is bullying in workplaces within the health and social care systems?
- How does bullying manifest itself in the workplace?
- Is there a connection between bullying, psychosocial work environment, leadership, individual coping ability and self rated health?
- What is currently being done to prevent and resist bullying in the workplace?
- What should a program for action optimally contain to prevent and resist bullying?
- Does the implementation of the program succeed?
- Does this program decrease the prevalence of bullying, improve psychosocial work environment and overall employee health?

The research project is constructed as an intervention study in collaboration with workplaces. In the first phase, data is collected by questionnaires, qualitative interviews and focus group interviews to describe the prevalence of bullying, the characteristic of ongoing bullying, and the current actions to prevent and eliminate bullying. The associations between bullying, work
environment, leadership and self rated health are also outlined by these questionnaires. Moreover, data is subsequently collected via focus group interviews to develop and describe the program for action, and the process to implement this program. Finally, the implementation and the impact of the program are evaluated through collected data by focus group interviews and repeated questionnaires. Further a comparison is made between the case group and control groups.

This project is carried out over the course of three years and is funded by AFA insurance.

5.2 The bullying narrative – about co-production and production of the stories narrated by bullied.

Helena Blomberg, doctoral student. The department of social sciences, Örebro University

The purpose of this presentation is to discuss my research in progress about workplace bullying. The preliminary title of my thesis, see above, reveal that the methodological and theoretical point of departure is narrative analysis. Narrative analysis in this qualitative research can bring knowledge about how bullied persons positioning and categorize themselves in relation to other characters in the bullying narrative, and also bring knowledge how bullying is being viewed and talked about at the present time.

Adopting a social constructionist perspective, the aim of this work in progress is to study the narratives of 12 interviewed, 9 (so far) written narratives of bullied persons and information’s of 3 websites. Three central questions arising from the study of narratives about bullying are as follows:

- Which positionings, categorizations and self –categorizations are made?
- Which interpretative repertoires are used in the socially accepted narrative form of bullying narratives?
- How can one understand and describe the co-production between research knowledge of bullying, bullying narratives narrated to a researcher, written bullying narratives published in different media contexts, and Swedish websites information’s about bullying?

In bullying narratives, both the content and the form are of great importance to the analysis of the narrators bullying experiences. It is not only what they talk about but also how they tell their story. If a narrative is intended to be a mutual understanding or to be convincing to a listener, then its content has to follow socially accepted narrative forms. The narrative analysis in this study uses a fusion of form and content, which can be identified as an approach developed by Elliot Mishler (1986, 1999).
In the way people tell a story and in the content, it is possible to recognize how interpretative repertoires are being used as narrative resources by the narrators. Interpretative repertoires are to be understood as resources in different contexts: in other words how a discourse is put into action in different contexts (Potter, J. & Whetereill, M. 1992). To identify which interpretative repertoire can be used by the narrators, one needs to first grasp the scientific discourse on bullying in workplaces to see how the research field portrays bullying and then the way that the media portray it. These two sources of bullying illustrations can be seen how a co-production may function. One point in my research in progress is to reveal how important the co-production between different social practices are to legitimize the research field of bullying and how we actually imagine and talk about bullying in a socially accepted way. The co-production usually begins in the researchers interest of discussing a social problem and for the informants interest, which is one part involved in a social problem, for an acknowledgment (Jasanoff, S. ed. 2006). Important to mention is; that during the interview with the informant one can notice that my study also is a part of this co-production.

In my preliminary results I have identified that the informants are mainly using an interpretative repertoire that are closely connected with how researcher and journalists talk about bullying in the formulation of their own narratives. For example, they are using phrases like being the target of gossip and slander, criticism, ignorance etc. One can also identify that the narrators are using a socially accepted narrative form which relate to a general narrative on bullying. The central turning points or the metaphors in their narratives are illustrating bullying as a social battle, as an entrapment which can be divided in to two dimensions socially trapped and bully trapped, the last metaphor are bullying as insight.

In several bullying narratives one can identify a resistance against being categorized as a victim, which also can be identified as one part of an available repertoire. It is a resistance, which they express in the narrative by positioning and categorizing themselves as active, reflective and as conflict-resolving. In other words, their self-categorizations in the narratives do not match the attributes of a victim category. In spite of a resistance to the victim category, the informants’ bullying narratives show an indirect victimization. Victimization is a part of a socially accepted narrative form in a bullying narrative or, more correctly, in an interpretative repertoire of bullying. One example is the narrator’s way of expressing pain, physically and psychologically. On the other hand, this can illustrate that bullying is about violence and abuse. Being abused places the informants in a category of being a victim.

The preliminary conclusions of the research suggest discussing how knowledge on bullying are being produced and re-produced in a co-production and what impact it has on the bullied person’s ability to use it as narrative resources and thereby understand their experiences or to use it as a resistance in their own narrative versions. Further, the research suggest seeing metaphors in the bullying narrative as an alternative understanding of bullying.
experience than to talk about specific phases in a bullying process. The research also suggests seeing the bullied person as an individual with experience of violence and not only in terms of a victim. One must see beyond the victimization to be able to give an understanding of the complexity of bullying.

5.2.2 References:

5.3 Whistleblowing processes in Swedish public organizations – complaints and consequences

Ulla-Carin Hedin and Sven-Axel Månsson. Department of Social work, University of Göteborg and Department of Social Work, University of Malmö

Research on whistleblowing in Sweden is scarce. In this explorative study 21 cases of whistleblowing from human service organizations in Sweden were examined. Extensive material from thematic interviews with 28 whistleblowers, 30 key persons and documents from supervisory authorities has been analysed.

Some findings were that the organization problems motivating whistleblowing were usually cutbacks in vital services for users, unethical working methods or abuse of clients. Internal whistleblowing was usually met with silence from supervisors and directors. The whistleblowers then went on with external whistleblowing by reporting the bad conditions to higher supervisory authorities who started thorough investigations. Their actions caused a lot of negative reactions in the organization, but they were also supported by media and ordinary citizens.

The retaliation processes against the whistleblowers were described. Half of the interview groups have left their positions, either on sick leave or by changing jobs. The findings show a stigmatization process with severe consequences for the individuals. But the cited organizations usually had to change their illegal or immoral practices and benefited in the long run from the whistleblowing events.
6. Ongoing studies in Norway

Appendix 2

The research group FALK (In Norwegian; Forskningsgruppe for arbeidsmiljø, ledelse og lonflikt), faculty of Psychology, University of Bergen, has for the last 20 years conducted a vast amount of research on issues related to workplace bullying, destructive leadership, and interpersonal conflicts at work. In English the group has also been known under the name of Bergen Bullying Research Group (BBRG). FALK consist of 3 professors (Ståle Einarsen, Stig Berge Matthiesen, Anders Skogstad), two associate professors (Lars Glasø & Jørn Hetland. Between 2005 and 2012 the group has had 8 PhD students in 100% positions conducting research on workplace bullying and destructive leadership. (Lars Glasø; Morten B. Nielsen, Merethe Aasland, Brita Bjørkelo, Lars Johan Hauge, Guy Notelaers, Leo Kant and Tina Løkke Vie (from 1/6 2010). The group is led by Professor Ståle Einarsen. From 2005 and onwards this research group conducts research particularly in five main overlapping areas;

- Leadership; with a particular focus on emotional and destructive aspects of the leadership process.
- Interpersonal mistreatment and victimization at work; particularly focusing on issues related to workplace bullying and harassment; its antecedents, consequendes and remedial actions.
- The measurement of workplace bullying and destructive leadership in surveys and investigations.
- The nature, antecedents and outcomes of whistleblowing at work
- The cross-cultural psychology of destructive leadership and conflicts in organisations.

Our research focus mainly on theories, methods and concepts from the fields of work and organisational psychology, personality psychology and social psychology, with some interdisciplinary work in relation to law and health promotion, and how climatic and economical conditions shape human interaction and leadership practices in different countries.
7. Ongoing studies in Finland
Appendix 3

Denise Salin, Department of Management and Organisation. Hanken School of Economics

7.1 “I wish I had...”: Target reflections on coping with workplace mistreatment
(with Marie-Elène Roberge, Aino Salimäki, & Jennifer Berdahl)

The aim of this study is to analyze target experiences of mistreatment at work and target responses. More precisely, we look at what forms of mistreatment targets report and how this is affected by target and perpetrator gender and relative organizational power of the target versus the instigator. We also examine target responses and how they are affected by the gender of those involved and the relative status of the target and instigator. Furthermore, we analyze the discrepancy between how targets responded and how they ideally would have liked to respond. In particular, we look at how gender and ethnic similarity, perceived intention and organizational status differences influence this discrepancy.

The data of this study were collected at a North-American university and 737 replies were obtained from the staff. Respondents were asked about their experiences of mistreatment and more precisely, about “the person that had bothered them the most”. Respondents were asked to list which acts this person had subjected them to, how many times it had happened, how much it had bothered the respondent (i.e., very little, somewhat, quite a bit, a lot) and how the respondent had coped with the mistreatment. Respondents were also asked to give demographic information about themselves and the perpetrator. Furthermore, respondents were asked how they should ideally have responded to the situation and they provided open answers to this question. These replies were coded by two expert coders with reference to the amount of discrepancy between the actual response and the desired response. Finally, respondents were asked “what do you think motivated this person to act this way toward you?” Based on this open end question, the perceived intent and target’s perception of the attribution of the mistreatment were coded by two expert coders.

Our plan is to present the first results from this study at SIOP in April and 2011 and EAWOP in May 2011.
7.2 Perceptions and conceptualisations of workplace bullying as a gendered phenomenon

This project is about how gender affects perceptions of workplace bullying. This has so far resulted in two article manuscript.

- *The Significance of Gender for Third Parties’ Perceptions of Negative Interpersonal Behaviour: Labelling and Explaining Negative Acts.* *(Accepted for publication in Gender, Work and Organization.)*

The aim of this study was to analyze the significance of gender for whether third parties label negative behaviour as bullying, what they perceive to be the likely consequences, and how they explain the occurrence of negative behaviour. This was accomplished by analyzing 293 respondents’ qualitative replies to three different versions of a case description of bullying, with different target-perpetrator configurations. The results indicate that the gender of the target, the gender of the perpetrator and the gender of the third party all were important for whether negative behaviour was perceived as bullying. In addition, whereas men to a higher degree than women conceptualized bullying as an individual problem, women to a greater extent conceptualized it as an organizational problem and more strongly emphasized both organizational antecedents and organizational consequences. The implications that these gender differences in perceptions have for human resource management are discussed.

- *Gender differences in conceptualizations of workplace bullying: Definitions and perceived severity of different forms of bullying* *(submitted; with Jordi Escartín & Álvaro Rodríguez-Carballeira from University of Barcelona)*

For this paper we use data from three separate studies in order to analyze the significance of gender for how employees define workplace bullying (study 1) and how severe they rate different forms of bullying to be (study 2 and 3). The data were collected in Spain and Costa Rica, both among employees and experts on workplace bullying. The results show that female employees emphasize emotional abuse and professional discredit more than male employees in their own definitions of workplace bullying. Moreover, both female employees and female experts in the field of bullying, consider emotional abuse to be more severe than their male counterparts do. These findings suggest that gender is an important factor for how workplace bullying is conceptualized. This may have important implications for how and when HR managers and line managers of either gender think it is necessary to take measures against negative behaviour and what kind of measures they deem appropriate for specific offences.
8. Ongoing studies in Denmark
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Åse Marie Hansen, Roger Persson and Adriana Ortega, The National Research Centre for the Working Environment, Denmark
Annie Høgh, Department of Psychology, University of Copenhagen
Charlotte Bloch, Department of Sociology, University of Copenhagen
Eva Gemzøe Mikkelsen, Crecea Horsens, Denmark

8.1 A 3-year prospective study on bullying in Danish workplaces

The aim of this paper is to present the design and first results from a longitudinal study of bullying at work. The study is a comprehensive, multicentre study. Using both qualitative and quantitative methods its overall purposes are to render visible and eventually prevent bullying in Danish work life. More specific, the objectives are: 1) to investigate the prevalence of workplace bullying as well as to study organisational and individual risk-factors of bullying in different types of jobs, 2) to analyse physiological and health-related consequences of bullying and its consequences on work and social relations, and finally 3) to develop, test and evaluate methods to reduce or prevent bullying at work.

The study consists of a main project, a background project and four subprojects that each focus on different objectives of the study. The main project is a prospective study of psychosocial work environment in 60 organisations with approximately 7,500 employees. The methods include interviews and a longitudinal questionnaire survey (with baseline in 2006 and a follow-up in 2008). The questionnaire includes questions on bullying, harassment, conflicts, health, sickness absence, job satisfaction, social climate and various organisational factors. With the exception of the background project, all subprojects will use data from the questionnaire study. A further purpose of the main study is to compile and share the knowledge collected in all these projects.

The baseline questionnaire survey was carried out in the fall of 2006 with about 7500 employees from 60 public and private organisations with an overall response rate of 46% (3363 participants). A follow-up study will be carried out in the fall of 2008.

The background study aimed firstly at investigating the prevalence of bullying in different jobs. Secondly, using existing questionnaire surveys and register data on long-term sickness absence and early retirement, the
study aims at investigating whether bullying is related to long-term sickness absence and early retirement of victims. It will thereby be possible to calculate some of the economic costs of bullying for the society, the organisation and the victim. Two articles, one investigating bullying in different jobs and one about sickness absence and sickness presenteeism, have been submitted. One article dealing with long-term sickness absence is almost ready for submission.

In the subproject: “Social interaction, emotions and bullying’, the interactional and emotional processes, that may form part of an escalating process where negative interpersonal interaction develops into bullying, will be investigated. The purpose of the subproject “Social interaction, Emotions and Bullying” is to explore how social processes in work-life may escalate to bullying. The project is based on 40 semi-structured interviews distributed equally between victims, witnesses and perpetrators. The interviewees were asked to describe/reconstruct episodes of bullying/continuous negative acts. These descriptions were followed by questions concerning self- and other-target emotions, coping, managements of emotions, experienced power- and status relationships, micro hierarchies, emotional cultures of the workplace etc. Drawing on interactionistic and social emotional theories the transcribed interviews are currently analyzed from the perspectives of different research questions.

One such question concerns the key-term in bullying research, the so-called negative acts. How does social interaction become negative acts. Drawing on interactionistic and social emotion theories the described negative acts are analyzed in terms of conflicting interpretations of social reality, experienced power-, status- and social place negotiations, self- and other target emotions, coping etc. The purpose of this analysis is to show how different types of negative acts (treats, gossips, slander, teasing, ignoring etc) in differential way contribute to processes of bullying. Another question concerns the witnesses’ contribution to bullying/mobbing as a process. From an interactionistic perspective witnesses play a significant role in bullying as a process. Drawing on interactionistic and social emotion theories the witnesses’ interpretations, emotions and coping are to be analyzed. A third question concerns the dynamic interplay between witnesses, victims and perpetrators. Bullying may be interpreted as distorted communication. The empirical data include interviews that present the victim’s, the perpetrator/s and witnesses experience/interpretations of the same social processes. Drawing on Scheff’s theory of communication, social bonds and emotions the dynamic interplay between the three agents in mobbing as process are to be analyzed. A fourth question concerns the relationship between work cultures, emotional cultures and characteristics of mobbing as a social process. The interviews are drawn from two types of workplaces/organisations: knowledge institutions and a workplace based on physical work and a strong masculine culture. Based on a comparative perspective the dynamic relationships between culture and types of mobbing and coping are to be explored.
The subproject dealing with “Physiological response and coping with bullying” explores the physiological response, measured as saliva cortisol, of exposure to bullying. The purpose of this study is twofold: First, to investigate whether bullying may result in changes in level of cortisol as an early indicator of potential health effects such as cardiovascular disease, depression or symptoms of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder. Second, to analyse the potential mediating or moderating effects of the victim’s coping strategies on the relationships between bullying and changes in level of cortisol. The methodology include measurements of saliva cortisol from 250 bullied and a control group of 500 respondents at baseline, and at follow-up measurements of cortisol from the 250 bullied respondents, 100 previously bullied respondents and 600 from the control group. Questionnaire data and semi-structured interviews will be used to investigate the coping strategies of bullied and non-bullied respondents. With the baseline questionnaire the participants received three saliva tubes and a small questionnaire to be filled in together with the saliva sampling. Of 7500 employees from the 60 public and private organisations 2565 gave saliva samples, 8 respondents failed to collect the evening sample. The total number of samples was 7687. All samples are analysed for cortisol and a database is established. A follow-up study will be carried out in the fall of 2008.

The third subproject “Organisational culture and – structure in organisations with and without bullying “, is a Ph.D. study. The purposes of this study are: 1) To investigate which general organisational practices that explicitly or implicitly may result in a working environment, that allow bullying; 2) to investigate subconscious or hidden processes, values and attitudes in organisations with bullying; and 3) to analyse whether these processes, values and attitudes have an impact on the success or failure of interventions that aim to reduce or prevent bullying. In this project we use data from the questionnaire study and from interviews in 4 organisations, two with and two without bullying (see also separate abstract).

The fourth subproject is an intervention study which aims at developing, testing and evaluating strategies to prevent bullying, harassment and serious conflicts in organisations and to prevent the negative consequences of such behaviour. The following research questions are investigated: 1) to what extent will it be possible to prevent bullying at work; 2) will the effects of a preventive effort reduce potential stress-reactions among employees and leaders, and 3) to what extent do organisational structure and –culture play a role in relation to the development, implementation and maintenance of preventive measures? Interventions are evaluated using both process and effect evaluation.

Out of the 60 workplaces in the baseline study, 10 were invited to take part in the present intervention study. Three workplaces agreed to participate: A, a business college (n=157); B, a large hospital department (n=264) and C, five faculties at a university (n=500).
Local steering groups were formed and initial interviews with key employees and managers were carried out. The purpose of these interviews was to increase researchers’ and consultants’ knowledge of the organisations. Based on the interview data and results from the survey study, as well as a review of research literature, a range of interventions was developed and implemented in collaboration with the consultants targeted at the level of the individual and the organization (Peiró, 2006):

- 5–6 project steering group meetings.
- 1–1½ hour lectures for all employees on bullying given by the organisational consultant.
- 5–6 dialog-meetings (2½ hours each) chaired by the organisational consultant, where issues concerning the psychosocial work environment were discussed.
- A two day course in conflict management for all managers and key employees held by two organisational consultants.
- A total of 4–6 hours of group coaching in relation to the development of an instrument enabling key employees to better deal with problems relating to the psychosocial work environment.

Organisations A and B received interventions 1–4, while organization C received interventions 1, 2, and 5.

As a part of the evaluation phase, researchers, consultants and local steering group members continuously evaluated the progression of the study and the quality/success of the interventions. Participants at the conflict management course also completed a four page questionnaire designed to evaluate its overall relevance and value as well as the performance of the consultants.

The importance of this prospective study lies in its potential usefulness of being able to determine psychosocial, organisational as well as cultural factors that may promote or impede bullying or serious conflicts in the workplace.

8.2. MODENA project

Maria Gullander, Jane Frølund Thomsen and Jens Peter Bonde, Department of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, Bispebjerg University Hospital
Morten Willert and Henrik Kolsted, Department of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, Aarhus University Hospital
Åse Marie Hansen and Roger Persson, The National Research Centre for the Working Environment, Denmark
Annie Høgh, Department of Psychology, University of Copenhagen

The project is a longitudinal study. A total of 8500 persons will be invited to participate in the third round. The two previous rounds were established in
two previous studies on workplace bullying and mental diseases, respectively. A subsample of the participants will be invited to a psychiatric interview. The project aims to study the negative behaviour at the workplace and risk of psychological disorders.

The overall scientific question:

- Is bullying at the workplace associated with an increased risk of depression, anxiety and sleep problems?, and if so:
  a) if the association is causal?
  b) if gender, age, leadership, coping and personality modify the associations?

Further to investigate if bullying is related to dysfunction of the HPA-axis [blunted reactivity and delayed recovery], decrease work ability and increase sick leave.

8.3 Rehabilitation of employees exposed to workplace bullying – an early intervention

Project leader and coordinator as well as taking care of the job intervention is Inger Lise Eriksen-Jensen, Specular.

In charge of the course are Anny Hadrup, Dagmar Møller-Kristensen and Hanne Thorup, psychologists at Specular

Evaluator is Annie Hogh, Assistant Professor, PhD. Department of Psychology, University of Copenhagen

The aim of the project is to develop, test and evaluate an early intervention with the intention of rehabilitating targets of bullying and improve the work conditions with the aim of minimising mental attrition and exclusion from the labour market. The model includes a course in rehabilitation of bully targets and a job intervention. Part of the job intervention includes training mentors, who can help the targets stay in the workplace and be instrumental in bringing about knowledge to colleagues and superiors with the aim of preventing future bullying. The duration of the project is app. 3 years and consists of 5 phases: 1) recruiting targets and workplaces to the project; 2) the course: 8–9 months; 3) job intervention: app. 16 months; 4) evaluation; 5) communication. The project is now in phase 3 and 4.

8.4 Ongoing studies in Denmark

Caroline M. Maier, National Research Centre for the Working Environment, Denmark.
8.4.1 Organisational culture and relationship conflicts at work. A qualitative study.

Aim of the paper
The aim of this paper is to present the design and first results from a qualitative study on the interplay between organisational culture and relationship conflicts at work. The study is fundamentally explorative in its attempt to identify possible sources of interpersonal conflict in the organisational culture. By taking a cultural approach to the understanding of relationship conflicts at work, the intention is to extend the scope of research into relationship conflicts at work in order to encompass the more private, informal, and non-rational aspects of disputes. By casting a closer glance upon the disputes and conflicts that are embedded in the interactions among organisational members at they perform their daily activities, we can hope to understand better the other face of organisational conflict – the conflicts “hidden” in the routine and mundane activities that comprise life in organisations (Kolb, 1992). Can there, in other words, be identified elements in the organisational culture that either encourage or counteract the risk of relationships conflicts taking place at work?

Background
Within workplace conflict research, little research has been done on the interplay between relationship conflicts and organisational culture. In a study on the relationship between organisational culture and interfirm relationships, Beugelsdijk et al conclude, that organisational culture is an important antecedent of interorganisational performance (Beugelsdijk, 2006). In particular, the authors point out that organisational cultures characterised by a high degree of innovative orientation and stability orientation lead to stronger relationship skills and alliance capabilities among the employees. In another study, Bate (Bate, 1984) conclude that organisational culture to a high degree can shape patterns of organizational behaviour and in particular that certain cultural orientations can constrain problem-solving behaviour. Bate argues that this occurs because that the culture affects the type and quality of interpersonal relationships and these relationships affect the approach to joint problem-solving processes. In other words, shared cultural meanings, norms and values define acceptable behaviour.

Methodology
The study uses a cultural approach to study organisational cultures and relationship conflicts. In the present context, culture is understood as a root metaphor that is as something that an organisation is. At the same time, it is intended to operate with a distinction between culture and social structure. And finally, the approach to culture is inspired by the symbolic school, meaning that culture is seen as stemming from the meanings and actions – and the sense making of these actions and interactions – of individuals. The
study takes its point of departure in a large quantitative study of cooperation and working climate in 60 Danish organisations. Among these organisations, three have been selected to participate in this study. These three organisations were selected on the basis of their results on variables regarding conflict (as being considered either positive or negative), atmosphere, cooperation, social community, negative actions and bullying. Looking at these results – and regarding also geographical factors, one organisation with a seemingly very well functioning organisational climate (at a children’s day care centre), one organisation somewhere in between good and bad (a union’s head quarters), and one with poor results on organisational climate (a nursing home) were selected. The argument for making such a conscious selection of organisations should be found in the assumption that the three different organisations – given the very different results they scored in the survey – hold different organisational cultures.

Participant observation was carried out in these three different organisations for a period of two months in each organisation. At the end of each period, three to four focus group interviews were carried out in each organisation. The focus of the observation and the interviews was upon relationship conflicts – their outcomes, their expressions, their (possible) solutions, and the meanings and understandings that the employees made out of these conflicts. All relevant observations were entered in field diaries. The notes from the participant observation were analysed using content analysis (Werner, 1987), letting relevant categories elaborate and grow out of the content of the notes. The focus group interviews were analysed using discourse analysis, inspired by Fairclough’s critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1992). By making use of this approach, it has been the intention to try to identify social constructions of the workplace culture that have a kind of self-regulatory effect and that to a certain degree are presented as self-evident facts of the social reality.

First results
At this point, only data from two of the organisations has been analysed. These are the union’s head quarters (the well-functioning workplace) and the children’s day care centre (the workplace with both good and bad results). Data from the nursing home (the workplace with many relationship conflicts) are still to be analysed. However, preliminary results show that one factor that seems to influence the degree and amount of relationship conflicts is involvement. In the well-functioning organisation, employees were highly involved in the decisions and activities of the organisation and they had practically no relationship conflict. In the other organisation, however, there was an obvious but unsatisfied need for the employees to feel involved in the organisational decisions. However, they were withheld from this which meant that there was not much visibility between the employees and as a result some degree of hallway gossiping. The organisation was characterised by an unspoken fear to get too personal in criticising each other.
The employees seemed afraid to be gossiping when speaking of other employees, and the leader was afraid to be too direct when speaking of conflictual episodes. This only ended in even more hallway gossiping.

Another important distinction is including and excluding cultures. In the well-functioning organisation the culture was highly including, making it easy for any newcomer to quickly get accepted in the employee group. In the other organisation, the culture was much more excluding, which could be seen in both a kind of exclusion of the only male employee and a difficulty to be accepted to the inner circles as a new employee.

Finally, a third factor is leadership. The two organisations were very different when it comes to leadership style. Whereas the well-functioning organisation had a leader who was very confronting, who delegated out responsibility and who was not afraid to take up a discussion with her employees, the leader of the other organisation avoided any conflict he could possibly avoid. When he had to respond to a conflict, he chose to do it under four eyes, speaking to one employee at a time, not taking up the issue at an employee meeting where everybody would have had a possibility to be heard. This was highly frustrating for the employees.
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