

CHAPTER THREE

Empirical Findings on Prevalence and Risk Groups of Bullying in the Workplace

*Dieter Zapf, Jordi Escartín, Miriam
Scheppa-Lahyani, Ståle Valvatne Einarsen,
Helge Hoel and Maarit Vartia*

Taylor & Francis
Not for distribution

Introduction	105
The Frequency of Bullying	107
The Duration of Bullying	111
Gender Differences in Bullying	112
Gender of the Victims	113
Gender of the Bullies	114
The Number of Bullies	115
The Organizational Status of Bullies and Victims	117
The Status of the Victim	117
The Status of the Bully	118
The Frequency of Bullying in Various Sectors	121
Categories of Bullying	123
Conclusion	127
Bibliography	143

Introduction

When this volume was published the first time (Einarsen *et al.*, 2003a), the empirical foundation of bullying was rather limited. This has changed tremendously during the last years. There are now meta-analyses available on the effects of bullying on psychological and physical health (Bowling and Beehr,

2006; Nielsen and Einarsen, 2012; Nielsen *et al.*, 2016; Verkuil *et al.*, 2015), sickness absence (Nielsen *et al.*, 2016), the relation between personality and bullying (Nielsen, Glasø *et al.*, 2017), and the impact of methodological factors on prevalence rates of bullying (Nielsen *et al.*, 2010), all a clear indication that the field of bullying research has matured. New studies have also been published with regard to many of the issues described in this chapter.

The phenomenon of bullying, which includes being exposed to persistent insults or offensive remarks, persistent criticism, personal or even physical abuse, has been labelled ‘mobbing at work’ in some Scandinavian and German countries (Leymann, 1996) and ‘bullying at work’ in many English-speaking countries (Liefvooghe and Olafson, 1999). Typically, a victim is constantly teased, badgered and insulted, and perceives that he or she has little recourse to retaliate in kind. Bullying may comprise open verbal or physical attacks on the victim, but may also take the form of more subtle acts, such as excluding or isolating the victim from his or her peer group (Einarsen *et al.*, 1994; Leymann, 1996; Zapf, Knorz *et al.*, 1996). The following definition of bullying or mobbing seems to be widely agreed upon (Einarsen *et al.*, *this volume*):

Bullying at work means harassing, offending, socially excluding someone or negatively affecting someone’s work tasks. In order for the label bullying (or mobbing) to be applied to a particular activity, interaction or process it has to occur repeatedly and regularly (e.g. weekly) and over a period of time (e.g. about six months). Bullying is an escalating process in the course of which the person confronted ends up in an inferior position and becomes the target of systematic negative social acts. A conflict cannot be called bullying if the incident is an isolated event or if two parties of approximately equal ‘strength’ are in conflict.

(Einarsen *et al.*, 2003b, p. 15)

It should be noted that the increased attention bullying has received in research and practice during recent years has not led to an agreement on how to define and operationalize the phenomenon. Rather, there are authors/researchers who use more or less strict definitions with regard to the timeframe (e.g., within the last six months or at least six months) and the frequency of the bullying behaviour (e.g., at least once a week or less often than once a week) (cf. Einarsen *et al.*, *this volume*; Hoel *et al.*, 1999; Keashly, Tye-Williams *et al.*, *this volume*; Nielsen *et al.*, 2010; Zapf and Einarsen, 2005).

This chapter aims at summarising some descriptive empirical findings of bullying in the European workplace. We will start with the frequency and the duration of bullying. This is followed by an examination of the gender, number and status of bullies and victims, distribution of bullying across industries and occupations and the use of various categories of bullying. The empirical basis of this chapter is restricted to studies carried out in Europe (see Table 3.4 Appendix for an overview of the included studies). A worldwide comparison of studies of the years 2013–2018 can be found in León-Pérez *et al.* (2019).

The Frequency of Bullying

For practical reasons, in particular it is important to know how frequently bullying actually occurs in organizations, because efforts to develop measures against it would depend on this information. However, it is not easy to provide reliable numbers. The problem is that the frequency of bullying depends very much on how it is measured (cf. Hoel *et al.*, 1999; Nielsen *et al.*, 2010; Nielsen *et al.*, *this volume*). Furthermore, the measurement method employed is influenced by the general understanding of what constitutes bullying.

One of the major approaches in measuring bullying is using a questionnaire consisting of a list of bullying behaviours. Nielsen *et al.* (2010) called this the ‘behavioural experience method’. Another approach is to use a precise definition, e.g., the definition presented above and then ask the respondents to label themselves as bullied or not, bearing this definition in mind. This method has frequently been referred to as the ‘self-labelling method’ (Nielsen *et al.*, 2010). In the meta-analysis of Nielsen *et al.*, the behavioural experience method led to a prevalence rate of 14.8% bullying, whilst the self-labelling method led to a prevalence rate of 11.3% when a definition of bullying was used, compared with 18.1%, if no definition was given (see also Nielsen *et al.*, *this volume*). In the latter case, researchers have asked directly: ‘Have you been bullied during the last six months?’ (e.g., Rayner, 1997). This typically leads to a comparatively high amount of bullying, because people will also tend to say that they have been bullied when only occasional, minor negative acts have occurred.

Some researchers who administered questionnaires using the behavioural method have used a fixed cut-off point (e.g., Björkqvist *et al.*, 1994; Notelaers and Einarsen, 2013). Respondents scoring higher than the cut-off point were

considered to be victims of bullying. Usually, these studies report a prevalence rate as high as 10–17% bullying (cf. Table 3.4, Appendix). Other researchers using the behavioural experience method applied a strategy developed by Leymann (1996) which we will call the ‘Leymann criterion’: Here, the Leymann Inventory of Psychological Terrorization (LIPT; Leymann, 1990, 1996), or a similar questionnaire such as the Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ; Einarsen *et al.*, 2009; Escartín *et al.*, 2012; Notelaers *et al.*, 2019) is administered. To be considered a bullying victim, the response to at least one item or to one general item on the frequency of bullying actions should be: ‘at least once a week’, and the duration of bullying should be ‘at least six months’. The weighted (for sample size) mean prevalence rate (see, e.g., Schmidt and Hunter, 2014) for studies using this strategy (see Table 3.4, Appendix, and the summary Table 3.1) was 9.6%. Those studies using the weekly criterion, but asking for bullying ‘within the last 6 months’, had a weighted prevalence rate of 11.2%. In the meta-analysis of Nielsen *et al.* (2010), the self-labelling-method led to a lower prevalence rate than the behavioural experience method. In the present data, studies were included that used some kind of definition, in most of the cases, similar to the one of Einarsen *et al.* (2003b) cited above. This led to a prevalence rate of 6.0%. When combining the self-labelling-method with the behavioural experience criterion of bullying ‘at least once a week’, we could not observe any differences between studies that asked for bullying ‘within the last six months’ or ‘more than six months’. To account for this finding is likely that most definitions included that the bullying would go on for a longer time. We therefore considered both groups of studies. This led to a weighted prevalence rate of 3.0% bullying for the combined criterion in the studies included in the present review (see Table 3.1 and Table 3.4 in the Appendix). These data show that not all who are exposed to weekly negative behaviours feel victimized (9.6/11.2% vs. 3.0%) and not all who feel victimized are exposed to weekly negative behaviours (6.0% vs. 3.0%).

Compared to the previous versions of the chapter in earlier editions of this book (Zapf *et al.*, 2003, 2011), the overall sample sizes have more than doubled. The studies using the Leymann criterion and the ‘within last six months’ now provide similar prevalence rates suggesting that the frequency criterion is more important than the duration criterion. During the last 10 years, more studies involving large, partly representative, samples have been published. They report relatively similar prevalence rates for the definition or the combined criterion approach.

Table 3.1 Prevalence Rate of Workplace Bullying according to Different Criteria

	k	Definition	Leymann Criterion	Experience sampling: 1/week	Experience sampling + Definition
Europe	103	6.0	9.6	11.2	3.0
N		97347 (k = 33)	26751 (k = 23)	75218 (k = 40)	79007 (k = 26)
North	56	5.9	8.1	10.3	2.3
N		92313	4657	23363	60435
East	8	7.9	11.8	21.5	0.8
N		462	1940	3598	1737
South	26	16.9	7.8	11.9	3.9
N		1380	12977	21260	2838
West	13	2.9	13.2	10.0	6.0
N		3192	7177	26997	13997
Before 2000	17	6.0	5.2	–	1.2
N		9990	6048	0	7787
2001–2010	38	6.7	14.7	11.5	4.0
N		28888	2222	34994	39675
2011–2019	48	5.6	10.5	10.9	2.0
N		58469	18481	40224	31545

Notes:

k = Number of studies included in the analysis. The sum of k is unequal 103, because one study could comprise more than one result.

Leymann criterion: Negative acts at least once a week for at least six months

Experience sampling 1/week: Negative acts at least once a week within the last six months

Experience sampling + Definition: Negative acts at least once a week plus self-labelled victim status

With regard to the experience sampling method some studies still report very high prevalence rates, but at the same time low rates for the self-labelling method (e.g., Eisermann and de Constanzo, 2011). In most of these cases, work-related items such as permanent high workload or being frequently interrupted at work appear to be the reasons for the high prevalence rates. However, in such cases, most employees do not consider themselves as bullying victims. Comparing studies published until 2000 and the following two decades does not show a clear trend (Table 3.1). Studies published until 2000 are limited in

number. Comparing the other two decades after 2000, all prevalence rates decreased. An explanation for this could be that there is sufficient problem awareness since 20 years so that this factor did not further increase the prevalence rates of bullying, whereas successful intervention measures in recent years may have contributed to a decrease of the prevalence rates.

Moreover, we carried out analyses for different European regions¹ (see Table 3.1). One of the problems here is that most of the studies have been carried out in Northern Europe including Ireland and the UK. The variance among single studies is relatively high (see Table 3.4). A single large study (Evrin and Madziala, 2016) is, for example, responsible for the high prevalence rate according to the experience sampling method for Eastern Europe. Overall, high prevalence rates according to one criterion are counterbalanced by low prevalence rates in other criteria. It is, therefore, difficult to conclude that bullying is especially high or low in one of the European regions.

Taking the *combination of self-labelling and weekly bullying* as indicators of severe bullying, it can be concluded that a figure of between 3% and 4% serious bullying has emerged as an average prevalence rate for European workplaces in the sense of the above-given definition. For somewhat less severe cases (including bullying experienced less often than weekly and of a duration of less than six months), the meta-analytical results of Nielsen *et al.* (2010) as well as our own results based on the studies in Table 3.4, suggest a figure of about 10% bullying. Moreover, the meta-analytical results of Nielsen *et al.* on self-labelled bullying *without a definition* and the present data suggest that in many organizations, up to 20% of the employees are occasionally exposed to negative social acts frequently associated with bullying, such as being yelled at, teased or humiliated. Although this does not fall within the stringent definition of bullying, it does imply that these employees are exposed to severe social stressors at work which may also lead to symptoms of psychological strain (for a discussion from a methodological perspective see Nielsen *et al.*, *this volume*).

When we started analysing the prevalence rate of bullying in the first edition of this book (Zapf *et al.*, 2003), there were hardly any studies available from outside Europe. As shown by the summaries of Keashly (2018) and León-Pérez *et al.* (2019), this is not so anymore. Studies from other continents suggest

¹ According to the criteria of the United Nations: www.worldatlas.com/articles/the-four-european-regions-as-defined-by-the-united-nations-geoscheme-for-europe.html

that the bullying prevalence rates might be even higher there (see also Nielsen *et al.*, 2010). However, comparisons are difficult to draw because of the different measures of bullying used (Escartín *et al.*, 2019), the influence of culture (see Grimard and Lee, *this volume*; Salin *et al.*, 2019) and other contextual factors such as working conditions or leadership. More systematic cross-cultural studies are necessary here to be able to draw firm conclusions. To account for the differences in prevalence rates of bullying between European countries the EU Foundation (Eurofoundation, 2015), for example, pointed to the following factors: Differences in awareness of the phenomenon, its causes and consequences; the extent of debate and initiatives about bullying and harassment by trade unions, employers and governments; and the level of tolerance for violence and harassment within society (for an overview, see Hoel and Vartia, 2018).

From a practitioner's perspective, a figure of 3% of employees reporting serious bullying in a 1,000-employee-strong organization means that around 30 people are exposed to bullying at any one time. Given that not only the targets, but also many of the bullies and bystanders are, in one way or another, likely to be negatively affected by the bullying situation, we would consider this to be a sizeable figure indicating a very serious problem.

The Duration of Bullying

In daily working life in Europe, the terms 'mobbing' or 'bullying' are often used to account for even minor conflicts and arguments. Therefore, the duration of bullying is an important criterion to differentiate between bullying and everyday conflicts in organizations (Baillien *et al.*, 2017). Studies reporting on the duration of bullying are summarized in Table 3.2. These studies show that bullying is a long-lasting conflict. Looking at some large representative samples in Sweden (Leymann, 1996), Norway (Einarsen and Skogstad, 1996) and Germany (Meschkutat *et al.*, 2002), the average duration of bullying was 15, 18 and 16 months respectively. Among bullied Finnish prison officers, 66% of the women and 53% of the men had been bullied for more than two years (Vartia and Hyyti, 2002). In the study by Hoel and Cooper (2000), 39% of the victims had been bullied for more than two years. Among victims in a Finnish municipal institution 29% had been bullied for 2–5 years and as many as 30% for over five years (Vartia, 2001). In studies of victims only, the average duration was much higher, with a mean of more than three years (e.g., Leymann and Gustafsson,

Table 3.2 Average Duration of Workplace Bullying in Months

Study	Sample Size	Duration in Months
Finland (Salin, 2001)	34	32
Finland (Vartia and Hyyti, 2002)	896	24
Germany (DAG-Study, Zapf, 1999a)	56	47
Germany (Gießen Study, Zapf, 1999a)	50	40
Germany (Halama and Möckel, 1995)	183	40
Germany (Konstanz Study, Zapf, 1999a)	87	46
Germany (Stuttgart Study, Zapf, Renner <i>et al.</i> , 1996)	188	29
Germany (communal administration, zur Mühlen <i>et al.</i> , 2001)	55	34
Germany (army administration, zur Mühlen <i>et al.</i> , 2001)	55	24
Germany (representative study, Meschkutat <i>et al.</i> , 2002)	356	16
Ireland (O'Moore, 2000)	248	41
Norway (Einarsen and Skogstad, 1996)	268	18
Sweden (Leymann, 1996)	85	15
Spain (González and Graña, 2009)	2861	12
Spain (Segurado <i>et al.</i> , 2008)	235	30
Switzerland (von Holzen-Beusch <i>et al.</i> (1998)	28	36
Switzerland (Kudielka and Kern, 2004)	28	62
Turkey (Ozturk <i>et al.</i> , 2008)	162	36

1996; Zapf, 1999a). This difference is probably due to method discrepancies: Thus, if one tries to identify and enlist bullying victims via help-lines or self-help groups, etc., one will end up with a self-selected sample of more severely bullied victims (see also Nielsen and Einarsen, 2008). The figures for duration given above underscore that bullying is not a short episode but a long-lasting process that 'wears down' the victims, in most cases lasting much longer than one year.

Gender Differences in Bullying

A frequently asked question among the public is whether there are gender differences in bullying. Although data exist on the gender

of bullies and victims, there is limited theorizing or in-depth research on this issue (Escartín, Salin *et al.*, 2011; Salin and Hoel, 2013; Vartia and Hyyti, 2002). An overview that puts gender and its complex relationship into context can be found in Salin (2018).

Gender of the Victims

One can argue that there exists some relation between female socialization and the victim role because women are said to be brought up to be less self-assertive and less aggressive, and tend to be more obliging than men (Björkqvist, 1994). Consequently, women would be even less able than men to defend themselves when bullying emerges. Moreover, for various reasons, women hold less powerful positions in organizations (Salin, 2018; Salin and Hoel, 2013). For example, they are less often occupying managerial or supervisor positions (Davidson and Cooper, 1992). To explore this issue, we carried out an analysis based on 80 samples of bullying victims, most of them listed in Table 3.4, which reported gender distribution among victims. Weighted percentages with regard to sample size (total sample size $N = 14,119$ victims; $k = 79$ samples) showed that 65.8% of victims were women and 34.2% men.

An analysis of those studies where the gender distribution of victims and the gender distribution of the total samples were available led to the following results: Of the more than 10,000 victim ($N = 10,974$ from $k = 55$ samples), a total of 66.4% were women and 33.6% were men. These victims emerged from a total sample of nearly one hundred thousand employees ($N = 99,431$) with a gender distribution of 63.4% women and 36.6% men. This contrasts with the gender distribution of the workforce within the European Union (EU), where women make up 46.2% (Catalyst Eurostat Database, 2019²). These figures show that the men/women ratio of victims in our data base corresponds closely to the respective ratio in the overall sample, with women only marginally overrepresented among victims (a difference of 3%) whereas the gender distribution in our data base deviates substantially from the gender distribution in the EU (a difference of 17.2%). This suggests that the over-representation of women among victims is by and large due to the over-representation of women in the respective populations. Of course, one could argue that bullying in some sectors and occupations is higher because of their overrepresentation of women. For example, women make up around 70% of the health-service sector worldwide (Boniol *et al.*, 2019, p. 1) and there is evidence that the bullying prevalence rate is high in this sector

² www.catalyst.org/research/women-in-the-workforce-europe/ retrieved 05.09.2019; data for first quarter of 2018.

(e.g., Di Martino *et al.*, 2003; León-Pérez *et al.*, 2019; Zapf, 1999a). However, if women's attitudes and behaviours played a role, there should still have been an effect if the baseline (and thus the industry/occupation) is controlled for. All in all, there seems to be little evidence that women are more at risk because of any gendered socialization.

Nevertheless, in some samples, there exists a higher risk for women to be victimized. In the case of Nuutinen *et al.* (1999)'s police sample, the explanation of women's higher risk of victimization may lie in their visibility in a male-dominated organization (see also Archer, 1999). Minority groups who differ from the main groups in salient characteristics carry a higher risk of being socially excluded from the group (Schuster, 1996; see also Zapf and Einarsen, *this volume* and Lewis *et al.*, *this volume*). It follows that women may be seen as intruders in the male-dominated cultures of researchers, business professionals or the police force (Archer, 1999; Hoel *et al.*, 2001). Yet, in a study among a large representative sample of assistant nurses where men only represent a small minority of less than 3%, male nurses were nearly three times more likely being a target of bullying compared to female assistant nurses (Eriksen and Einarsen, 2004).

Gender of the Bullies

Less information is available on the gender of bullies. In the studies by Zapf (1999a), (N = 209) altogether 26% of victims reported being bullied by men only, 11% were bullied solely by women, whilst in 63% of all cases both men and women were identified as bullies. Einarsen and Skogstad (1996) reported that 49% of the victims were bullied by men, 30% by women and that in 21% of all cases the bullies were both men and women. The respective numbers in the study by Mackensen von Astfeld (2000) were: 32% men, 27% women and 37% bullied by both men and women. All in all, men seem to be clearly over-represented among the bullies in most studies (see also Meschkutat *et al.*, 2002; Rayner, 1997; an exception is UNISON, 1997). This result corresponds to similar findings in research on bullying in schools (Olweus, 1994). Bullying, at least in part, includes forms of direct aggression, such as shouting or humiliating someone. There is substantial empirical evidence that this kind of aggression is much more typical for men than for women, who for their part tend to make more use of indirect aggression such as social exclusion or spreading rumours (Björkqvist, 1994). Moreover, as managers and supervisors appear to play a dominant role in bullying scenarios (see below), and the fact that men are over-represented in such

positions, this may explain why men are more often identified as bullies than women.

Finally, Leymann (1993a, 1993b) reported that women are more often bullied by other women, whilst men are more frequently bullied by other men, which he explained in terms of labour market segregation. Similar results were reported by Einarsen and Skogstad (1996), Hoel *et al.* (2001), Mackensen von Astfeld (2000), Meschkutat *et al.* (2002), Niedl (1995), Rayner (1997), and Zapf (1999a). Whereas women are sometimes exclusively bullied by men, it appears to be rare that men are exclusively bullied by other women. This finding may be explained by the different power positions of men and women in organizations.

The Number of Bullies

Although bullying can be a conflict between two people, some victims report that everyone in the organization is bullying them. Data on the number of bullies in various studies are summarized in Table 3.3. Weighted by sample size (see footnote

Table 3.3 The Number of Bullies (%)

Bullies	N	1 Bully	2–4 Bullies	More than 4 Bullies
Austria (Hospital, Niedl, 1995)	82	20	52	28
Austria (Research institute, Niedl, 1995)	11	55	27	18
Czech (Zabrodska and Kveton, 2013)	121	62	36	2
Denmark (Török <i>et al.</i> , 2016) ^c	1833	83	15	2
Germany (DAG Study, Zapf, 1999a)	55	9	35	56
Germany (Gießen Study, Zapf, 1999a) ^b	50	10	50	40
Germany (Konstanz Study, Zapf, 1999a)	78	9	32	59
Germany (Mackensen von Astfeld, 2000)	115	38	46	16

(Continued)

Table 3.3 (Continued)

Hungary (Army, Kaucsek and Simon, 1995)	18	23	62	14
Ireland (O'Moore, 2000)	248	62	38	0
Ireland (O'Moore <i>et al.</i> , 1998)	30	63	33	3
Italy (Ege, 1998)	301	20	46	34
Norway (Einarsen and Skogstad, 1996) ^a	392	42	43	15
Spain (González and Graña, 2009)	234	51	27	22
Sweden (Leymann and Tallgren, 1993)	24	43	50	7
Sweden (Leymann, 1993b)	85	34	43	23
Total	3677	48	35	17

Notes:

N Sample size

^a The third category of this study was '4 and more bullies'^b The middle category of this study was '2–5 bullies'^c Because this sample represents almost 50% of the sample size and would therefore have a very strong impact on the overall result we decided to weight this sample by N = 500. If we would use the real sample size the respective numbers would be 61%, 28% and 11%.

c), in 48% of all cases, there was only one bully involved, in 35% there were 2–4 bullies, and in 17%, there were more than four bullies involved. In the German studies of bullying victims by Zapf (1999a), being bullied by only one person was much rarer. In fact, in these studies, in more than 50% of all cases more than four bullies were involved. These differences may be explained as follows: As described above, samples made up of bullying victims usually consist of more serious bullying cases, which, for example, show a longer mean duration of the bullying conflict. There is some evidence that bullying becomes more and more severe the longer it lasts. Studies by Einarsen and Skogstad (1996) and Zapf and Gross (2001) showed that bullying incidents/negative acts occurred more often the longer it lasted. In the study by Zapf (1999a), the duration of bullying correlated positively with the number of bullies. The average duration of bullying of those who were bullied by only one person was 28 months, for those who were bullied by 2–4, and by more than four people, the duration was 36 months and

55 months respectively. These data suggest that it is getting increasingly difficult to remain a neutral bystander the longer bullying goes on (see also Niven *et al.*, *this volume*). Therefore, more and more people may become involved as bullies in the course of time. This may explain the higher mean number of bullies in the pure victim samples which show a higher mean duration of bullying.

Some studies, especially the British ones (Hoel and Cooper, 2000; Rayner, 1997), report that many victims share their experience with other colleagues. For example, in the study by Hoel and Cooper, as much as 55% of the bullying victims reported that they shared their experience with other work colleagues, and 15% reported that everyone in the work group was bullied. Similar results were reported in the UNISON studies (1997, 2000). In other countries, such as Austria (Niedl, 1995) or Germany (Zapf, 1999a, 1999b), this is reported only occasionally. This may be a country-specific phenomenon; however, it may also have to do with the definition of bullying. The more stringent the definition of bullying, the more likely it is that it involves only one victim. While a perpetrator may occasionally bully everyone in the work group for months and years, it seems much more unlikely that he or she can bully to such intensity that everyone in the work group is exposed to bullying at least on a weekly basis.

The Organizational Status of Bullies and Victims

In the following, we review research findings on the organizational status of bullies and victims. Organizational status in this respect refers to the formal position within the organizational hierarchy.

The Status of the Victim

Relatively little has been reported about the status of the victim. Einarsen and Raknes (1997), in a study of male employees at a Norwegian engineering plant, found no difference between the experience of negative behaviours for workers, on the one hand, and supervisors/managers on the other. Similar results were found by Hoel *et al.* (2001). They found the risk of being bullied to be similar for workers, supervisors and middle or senior management. A representative sample of Finnish employees showed that white-collar employees in higher ranks experienced bullying somewhat more often than lower-ranked white-collar employees or workers (Pirainen *et al.*, 2000). Salin

(2001), however, found less bullying at the higher levels of the organization. Skogstad *et al.* (2008), in a representative sample of the Norwegian workforce, showed that although managers reported the same level of exposure to bullying behaviours, they labelled their experiences less as bullying compared to non-managers. Hoel *et al.* (2001) report some interesting interaction effects with gender: Whereas male workers and supervisors were bullied more than women at these levels, this was the other way round at the management level. The largest differences occurred for the senior management level, where 16% of the female senior managers reported having been bullied. This finding may be due to the visibility of women at this male-dominated hierarchical level and may reflect widespread prejudice against women in leadership positions (see also Davidson and Cooper, 1992).

All in all, the findings of Hoel *et al.* (2001) question a common assumption in various European countries that the weak and defenceless, in terms of organizational status, become the primary victims of bullying. Rather, there seem to be similar risks at all organizational status levels. Supervisors and senior managers may also experience a power imbalance relative to their colleagues and superiors.

The Status of the Bully

By contrast, the issue of perpetrator status has received considerable attention. Interestingly, the findings vary across countries. Leymann (1993b) introduced ‘mobbing’ as the definition of a lasting conflict among colleagues. Yet even in his study, there were only marginally more colleagues among the bullies than there were supervisors. However, taking the Scandinavian studies as a whole, people in superior positions were identified as offenders in approximately equal numbers to peers, with only a small number bullied by a subordinate (Einarsen and Skogstad, 1996; Leymann, 1992, 1993b). In contrast, British studies have consistently identified people in superiority positions as perpetrators in an overwhelming majority of cases (Cowie *et al.*, 2000; Hoel *et al.*, 2001; Rayner, 1997). Analysing the available samples listed in Table 3.4 (total $N = 17,919$ victims, $k = 60$ samples), the percentages weighted by sample size were as follows: 50.0% were bullied by supervisors, 42.5% by colleagues and 7.5% by subordinates respectively. For the last analysis, we took into consideration that in samples where no subordinates were reported as bullies, this category might not have been offered as a possible response. Therefore, these studies were excluded in the computation of

the percentage of bullying by subordinates. Thus, the overall picture across countries is—given that in organizations the number of supervisors is much smaller than the number of colleagues—supervisors are more often identified as the bullies than are colleagues. However, the numbers for colleagues and subordinates involved clearly speak against the view that bullying is primarily a top-down process. It is interesting to note that compared to our summary in Zapf *et al.* (2011), there was a notable drop of supervisor involvement from 65.4% to 50% and an increase in colleague involvement from 39.4% to 42.5%. One can only speculate why this is so. One possible reason could be that in various Anglo-American countries, a belief prevailed that bullying was associated with the behaviour of supervisors and managers, maybe due to the influencing book of Andrea Adams (1992). This view might have changed in the meantime and colleagues are now equally perceived as potential perpetrators in these countries.

Einarsen (2000), referring to Hofstede (1993), argued that some cultural differences between the Nordic and the central European countries may explain some of the different findings with regard to the organizational status of the bullies. Hofstede's studies suggest that low power differentials and feminine values prevail in the Scandinavian countries. The abuse of formal power is much more sanctioned in such countries. Power differences between immediate supervisors and their colleagues are small, hence producing more similar numbers of perpetrators for supervisors and colleagues. As far as Sweden is concerned, the predominance of horizontal bullying is also explained by reference to country-specific factors, such as strong emphasis on group loyalty and conformity, and a belief in consensus, or collective understanding, with social exclusion for perceived norm-breaching as a common feature (see Beale and Hoel, 2010). In a Danish study by Ortega *et al.* (2008), peer bullying was found to be the most typical kind of bullying, with colleagues being the main perpetrators in more than 70% of the cases.

Generally, superiors are seldom bullied by subordinates. In particular, there are only a small number of cases reported where superiors were *exclusively* bullied by their subordinates. Usually, subordinates bully a superior in conjunction with other supervisors or managers. The reason for this is, of course, that it is not easy to overcome the formal power of a superior using informal power. Although it is possible if the superior is socially isolated (which points at tensions or conflicts

within management), but it is almost impossible if the superior is backed up by superiors at the same level and/or by senior management. One can certainly say that only superiors, who have lost the support of their colleagues and of senior management or are considered a threat by fellow managers (Hoel *et al.*, 2001), carry the risk of becoming the victims of bullying by subordinates. A detailed discussion of upward bullying can be found in Branch *et al.* (2018).

Whereas in the previous edition of this chapter (Zapf *et al.*, 2011) we had to state that little is known about patterned negative supervisory behaviour, and that leadership studies have focused almost exclusively on the positive aspects of leadership, this has substantially changed in recent years. Although some of the common leadership questionnaires, such as the leader behaviour description questionnaire LBDQ (Fleishman, 1953), contain some items similar to those which appear in workplace bullying questionnaires, negative leadership behaviour has not really been investigated within this tradition. Humiliating, yelling or threatening somebody is, however, not simply the absence of positive leadership characteristics such as consideration or employee orientation. Bullying by superiors is, therefore, an issue for research into leadership in its own right (see Aasland *et al.*, 2009; Einarsen *et al.*, 2007) and destructive leadership and abusive supervision (Tepper, 2000, 2007) which come close to or resemble supervisor bullying, have received much attention (see the meta-analyses of Mackey *et al.*, 2017 and Schyns and Schilling, 2013). In a study employing a large scale sample of UK workers, Hoel and colleagues (2010) showed that both authoritarian, laissez-faire and inconsistent leadership were associated with experiences of bullying as reported by victims and observers alike. Yet, while observers regarded authoritarian leadership to be most strongly associated with bullying, reports by victims about bullying were most closely related to inconsistent leadership in the form of unpredictable punishment. In a representative study of Norwegian workers, reports of bullying, as made by both victims and observers, were strongly correlated with reports of tyrannical leadership from one's immediate supervisor (Hauge *et al.*, 2007), while Skogstad and colleagues (2007), employing the same data source, showed that laissez-faire leadership was associated with reports of bullying through its effect on role stressors and interpersonal conflicts in the work environment. Hence, there appears to be strong support for a view that leadership

styles are related to experiences of bullying among targets as well as among observers.

The Frequency of Bullying in Various Sectors

In this section, we summarize some findings on the frequency of bullying in various sectors. Leymann (1993a, 1993b) reported an over-representation of bullying in the educational (approximately 2:1) and administrative (1.5:1) sectors, and an under-representation in the trade and retailing, production and health-service sectors. The prevalence of bullying in Swedish public administration was 1% higher than the average score of 3.5% (Leymann, 1993a). However, in other studies, Leymann also found a high level of occurrence in the health-service sector. In another study by Leymann and Gustafsson (1996), public administration, the social and health sectors, as well as religious organizations showed higher prevalence, whereas trade and industry reported lower levels of bullying. Meschkutat *et al.* (2002), Niedl (1995), Piirainen *et al.* (2000) and Vartia (1993, 1996) also report high levels of bullying in the health and social sector. In León-Pérez *et al.*'s (2019) study, most empirical studies reviewed come from this sector and many of them report high prevalence rates. Examples are the studies of Bambi *et al.* (2014), Høgh *et al.* (2018) or Stapelfeldt *et al.* (2013). In the studies by Einarsen and Skogstad (1996), the highest rate of frequent bullying (weekly or more often) was found among clerical workers (3.9%) and within trade and commerce (3.5%). For occasional bullying, the results were different. Here, in contrast to Leymann's Swedish study, there were significantly fewer respondents from public sector organizations who reported bullying than from private enterprises. The highest prevalence rate was found among industrial workers, where 17.4% reported having been occasionally bullied during the last six months. Bullying was also frequent among those who did graphical work, and hotel and restaurant workers. The lowest rate of bullying was found among psychologists and university employees.

In Germany, analyses based on almost 400 victims of serious bullying (Zapf, 1999a) showed that employees within the health and social services sector had a seven-fold risk of being bullied. Other occupational sectors where the risk of bullying were high or elevated were: public administration, 3.5:1, and the educational sector, 3:1. Moreover, there was also an increased risk

of being bullied in the banking and insurance sectors. In contrast, the risk was relatively low in the areas of transport, trade and farming, in the hotel and restaurant sector, as well as in the building industry. Hubert and van Veldhoven (2001) found increased risks of aggressive and unpleasant behaviour in service organizations, in industry and in education. Salin (2001) reported more frequent bullying in the public sector than in the private sector, as did Hoel *et al.* (2001), and Piirainen *et al.* (2000) in the municipal sector rather than the private sector or the civil service. More recent studies from Eisermann and de Costanzo (2011) and Venetoklis and Kettunen (2016) report similar results.

Taking the studies together, a higher risk of being bullied is reported for the social and health, public administration and education sectors, which all belong to the public sector in many countries. There may be various reasons which explain the differences between sectors. First, one may assume that bullying is less frequent in small family enterprises such as the hotel and restaurant business as well as in the building sector. Here personal relationships can be expected to develop between employees and between employers. If severe conflicts arise, one party may leave the 'family', as mobility within these sectors are generally high. Moreover, in these areas, short-term job contracts prevail; thus prolonged conflicts lasting several years are almost impossible because the employees would find it relatively easy to leave their jobs.

On the other hand, in many European countries—for example Germany, Norway and Sweden—working in public administration means having a secure, lifelong job which usually compensates for a somewhat lower-than-average salary. In this case, it is much more complicated to give up one's job when bullying occurs, because this would involve giving up the high job security which is among the most important aspects of these jobs. Frequently the specific knowledge gained in such jobs cannot easily be applied in the private sector. Moreover, moving to another job within the public sector may not resolve the problem because one still finds oneself within the same organization. A typical example would be the case of a bullied police officer. In a unitary organization such as the police force, rumours may spread fast and, in case of a requested move the officer's potential new superior might receive biased information, and, to be on the safe side, possibly reject the bullied officer's application (cf. Leymann, 1993b).

Yet another aspect may be inherent in the very nature of the job itself. Some jobs in the service sector, and in particular in the social and health service sector, require a high level of personal involvement, i.e., a form of emotional labour (Hochschild, 1983; Zapf, 2002), which means sensing and expressing emotions and building personal relationships. In other jobs, such as manufacturing work, a much more instrumental job attitude may suffice. The higher the level of personal involvement, the more personal information is out in the open, and the more possibilities for being attacked would therefore exist. Moreover, it is much more difficult to objectively evaluate or appraise these jobs which offer a lot of opportunity for attacking or unfairly criticizing someone. If a production worker is accused of doing a bad job, they can more easily defend themselves by referring to their job description compared to a teacher or a nurse, who may have much greater difficulties proving that they are doing a good job.

All in all, looking at the distribution of bullying across sectors, bullying seems to be a greater problem among white-collar workers, service employees and employees in supervisory positions than among blue-collar workers. Still, a representative study of the Norwegian workforce from 2005 showed that bullying prevailed in all kinds of organizations with no particular sector being ‘bully proof’ (Einarsen *et al.*, 2007; Rayner *et al.*, 2002).

Categories of Bullying

The final question addressed in this chapter is: Is bullying a homogeneous construct or are there specific types or categories of bullying which can be identified? Homogeneity of bullying would imply that all bullying actions show similar frequencies, have similar causes and consequences and occur under the same circumstances (Zapf, Knorz *et al.*, 1996). Leymann (1996) differentiated between five classes of bullying behaviour, which he referred to as the manipulation of: (1) the victim’s reputation; (2) the victim’s possibilities of communicating with coworkers; (3) the victim’s social relationships; (4) the quality of a person’s occupational and life situation; and (5) the victim’s health. In an empirical study, Leymann (1992) found factors which he labelled as negative communication: humiliating behaviour, isolating behaviour, frequent changes of tasks to punish someone, and violence or threat of violence. Using factor analyses,

Zapf, Knorz *et al.* (1996) found seven factors in two samples: Organizational measures consisting of behaviours initiated by the supervisor or aspects directly related to the victim's tasks. 'Social isolation' is related to informal social relationships at work. The third factor is related to individual attributes of the victim and the victim's private life. 'Physical violence' includes two items of sexual harassment as well as general physical violence or threat of violence. 'Attacking the victim's attitudes' is related to political, national and religious attitudes. The factor 'verbal aggression' consists of items related to verbal attacks. Finally, there was a factor consisting of two items related to spreading rumours (for comparable results see Niedl, 1995; Vartia, 1991, 1993; zur Mühlen *et al.*, 2001). More recent studies have come to similar results employing different questionnaires (cf. also Nielsen *et al.*, *this volume*, Table 6.1; Escartín *et al.*, 2019).

Factor analysis of the Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ) (Einarsen and Raknes, 1997) identified five factors, four of which appear to overlap with attacking the private person, social isolation, work-related measures and physical violence. Based on a revised version of the NAQ-R applied to a random sample of 5,288 UK employees, Einarsen *et al.* (2009) found three major factors: Person-related bullying, work-related bullying and physical intimidation. In the most recent version, the short form SNAQ (Notelaers *et al.*, 2019), items relating to work-related, person-related bullying and social exclusion were included in the nine-item scale.

Taking the existing studies together, most researchers have suggested differentiating between *work-related* bullying and *person-related* bullying. For work-related bullying researchers used a general factor in most of the cases, as in the case of Einarsen *et al.* (2009) for the much used NAQ-R, and in some cases authors suggested various categories such as control and manipulation of information, and control and abuse of working conditions (Escartín *et al.*, 2010). With regard to *person-related* bullying, a variety of sub-categories were suggested such as verbal aggression (e.g., Zapf, Knorz *et al.*, 1996), isolation or social exclusion (e.g., Einarsen and Raknes, 1997; Einarsen *et al.*, 2009; Escartín *et al.*, 2009; Notelaers *et al.*, 2019; Yildirim and Yildirim, 2007; Zapf, Knorz *et al.*, 1996), emotional abuse (Keashly, 1998) and humiliation (e.g., attacks towards self-esteem: Ozturk *et al.*, 2008; attacking the victim's private life: Moreno-Jiménez *et al.*, 2007; Zapf, Knorz *et al.*, 1996; and personal derogation: Einarsen and

Raknes, 1997). Moreover, most bullying categories can be considered to be active forms of aggression (most kinds of work-related bullying, verbal aggression, emotional abuse). Occasionally, passive forms of aggression are used such as withholding or not passing on information. Moreover, both direct forms of aggression (e.g., verbal aggression and most forms of emotional abuse) and indirect forms of aggression (e.g., spreading rumours: Zapf, Knorz *et al.*, 1996; most forms of work-related bullying) occur. Finally, physical and psychological bullying can be distinguished, as can social exclusion and ostracism. In the shipyard study by Einarsen and Raknes (1997), physical violence was reported by 2.4%, whilst in the various studies reported by Zapf (1999a) physical aggression occurred in between 3.6 and 9.1% of the bullying cases. Thus, the results underline that, in the first instance, bullying is primarily a form of psychological rather than physical aggression although some cultural differences exist (Escartín, Zapf *et al.*, 2011).

Correlational analyses of overall samples (e.g., Niedl, 1995) show that the bullying categories are very highly correlated. This means that if people are bullied, they tend to experience a large number of bullying behaviours from different behavioural categories. In Notelaers *et al.*'s (2019) latent cluster analysis, in the cluster representing the severely bullied all bullying categories (work-related, person-related, social exclusion) showed high scores. With regard to gender-specific bullying categories, Leymann and Tallgren (1993) report that women used slander and making someone look a fool, whereas men preferred social isolation. Mackensen von Astfeld (2000) found that women used significantly more strategies affecting communication, social relationships and social reputation, whereas men preferred strategies affecting the victim's work. In a sense, these results correspond to findings regarding schoolyard bullying. Here Björkqvist *et al.* (1992) found that boys used physical aggression more often, whereas girls preferred more indirect strategies such as rumours and social exclusion. In Vartia's (1993) study, women were more often the victims of strategies of indirect aggression such as spreading rumours and social isolation, whereas men were more often the victims of threats and criticism. However, to challenge possible stereotyping, Hoel and Cooper's (2000) nationwide British study reported that negative rumour and gossiping was particularly widespread in the police service, a highly male-dominated organization.

The meaning of work-related bullying is not always clear. Fevre *et al.* (2010) and Ólafsson and Jóhannsdóttir (2004) pointed out that behaviours such as ‘excessive monitoring of work’ or ‘being given tasks with unreasonable deadlines’ may not necessarily be seen as indicators of bullying but as a (legitimate) part of a manager’s behavioural repertoire. In fact, cluster analyses (Notelaers *et al.*, 2006, 2019) showed separate clusters for employees who were only exposed to work-related bullying. However, they can be considered bullying when applied excessively or for personal gain, and especially when they occur together with other types of bullying behaviour (Beale and Hoel, 2011) as is the case in the cluster of the severely bullied in the analyses of Notelaers *et al.* (2006, 2019).

Work-related strategies including acts such as being given tasks with impossible targets or deadlines, having one’s opinions and views ignored, and being given work clearly below one’s level of competence seem to be experienced more often among persons in superior positions (Hoel *et al.*, 2001; Salin, 2001). In the studies reported by Zapf (1999a) and Zapf, Knorz *et al.* (1996), coworkers used social isolation and attacking the private sphere more often than the supervisors or managers. Bullying was most frequent when both coworkers and supervisors were among the bullies. If only supervisors were identified as bullies, strategies such as social isolation, attacking the private sphere and spreading rumours occurred less often.

One explanation for these findings may be that some categories, such as social isolation and spreading rumours, only work if several people are involved. Hence, it is far more difficult for a single supervisor to isolate somebody. For other bullying categories, such as attacking the private sphere, personal and private information about the victim is necessary, which may be less often at hand for superiors.

Finally Escartín *et al.* (2009) were interested in what kind of bullying is experienced as most severe. They found that emotional abuse, a form of person-oriented bullying, was considered to be the most severe category, whereas isolation and devaluing professional roles were perceived as the least severe categories. In the study by Zapf, Knorz *et al.* (1996), attacking the private person, a kind of person-oriented bullying behaviour that overlaps strongly with the emotional abuse scale of Escartín *et al.*’s (2009) study was by far the strongest predictor of psychosomatic complaints and depression, whereas indirect forms of aggression such as isolation

were only weakly related to ill-health. Escartín *et al.* (2009, p. 200) concluded that ‘all in all, there seems to be converging evidence that bullying behaviours such as humiliating someone, treating someone with disdain or ridiculing them premeditatedly, summarized as ‘emotional abuse’ in this paper, are seen as most severe and causing most harm to the target’.

Conclusion

This chapter has summarized empirical findings of bullying studies in European countries over the past 30 years. Although different definitions and measures were used in these studies, and although there may be some cultural differences, a converging picture emerges showing that about 3% of employees may experience serious bullying, and about 10% occasional bullying. Between 10 and 20% (or even higher) of employees may occasionally be confronted with negative social behaviour at work which does not correspond to strict definitions of bullying but which is, nevertheless, still very stressful for the persons concerned. In most countries, there seems to be a tendency for bullying to occur more often in the public sector, although bullying seem to exist in all sectors of working life. Bullying occurs on all organizational levels and finds its targets among young and old and among women as well as men. Yet, men seem to be more often among the perpetrators. Perpetrators for their part may be supervisors or colleagues. Most studies report an average duration of bullying well beyond one year. Bullying can be a conflict between two people; however, very often, there is more than one perpetrator. More and more people seem to become involved the longer bullying lasts. Finally, there is some empirical evidence showing that a variety of bullying behaviours exists. At least some of the variations found in separate studies may be due to cultural differences. It is also important to note that overall findings may mask underlying trends with regard to prevalence as well as the nature of experience, for example with respect to gender and occupational status. Summarizing the existing results on workplace bullying shows that great progress has been made during the last three decades, which, overall, has led to converging results in the various European countries.

Appendix

Table 3.4 Studies on the Frequency of Workplace Bullying

Country	Authors	Sample	N°	Definition*	Prevalence
Albania	Buka and Karaj (2012)	Lecturers	105	1a + 3a	7%
	Dođar (2016)	Hospital employees	199	1a + 3a + 6b	10.5%
Austria	Niedl (1995)	Hospital employees	368	1b + 3a	26.6 % in sample; 7.8% of the population
		Research institute employees	63	1b + 3a	17.5% in sample; 4.4% of the population
Belgium	Notelaers and De Witte (2003)	association of local government, consulting office, non-profit-organization, print office, chemical production	873	8	16%
	Notelaers <i>et al.</i> (2006)	18 organizations	6175	1a + 3a	20.6%
				7	3.1%
	Notelaers <i>et al.</i> (2011)	General working population	8985	1a + 3a + 7	2.7% across cluster
	Janssens <i>et al.</i> (2016)	General working population	2983	5	26.6%
	Notelaers <i>et al.</i> (2019)	38 organizations	7790	3b + 7	3.5%
Bosnia & Herzegovina	Rodic (2016)	General working population	101	3a + 8	17.2% weekly 13.8% daily
Croatia	Russo <i>et al.</i> (2008)	School teachers	764	1b + 3b	22.4%
Cyprus	Zachariadou <i>et al.</i> (2018)	Health-care professionals	296	1b + 3a + 6	5.9%
Czech Republic	Zabrodská and Kveton (2013)	University employees	1533	1b + 3a + 4 1b + 3a + 6 1b + 3a + 6b	0.7% 13.6% 6.8%

Dobešová Cakirpaloglu <i>et al.</i> (2017)	Teachers	258	1a + 3a + 6b 4	7.75% 2.33%
Høgh and Dofradottir (2001)	Randomised sample	1857	5	2 %
Mikkelsen and Einarsen (2001)	Course participants at the Royal Danish School of Educational Studies	99	1b + 3a + 4	4: 2%; 1b 3a: 14% (7.8% for a more stringent criterion)
	Hospital employees	236	1b + 3a + 4	4: 3% now and then; 1b 3a: 16% (2 %)
	Manufacturing company	224	1b + 3a + 4	4: 4.1% now and then; 1b 3a: 8% (2.7%)
Mikkelsen and Einarsen (2002a)	Department store	215	1a + 3a + 4	4: 0.9%; 1b 3a: 25% (6.5%)
Agervold and Mikkelsen (2004)	Danish Manufacturing Company	224	1a + 3a + 6a 1a + 3a + 6b	8% 2.7%
	Danish Manufacturing Company	186	1a + 3a + 6a 3a + 4 3b + 4	13% 1.6% 10.3%
Agervold (2007)	Small Rural Authorities	3024	3a + 4	1%
	State Institutions		3b + 4	2.7%
	Day-Care Institutions		1a + 3a + 6a	4.7%
	Psychiatric wards in Hospitals		1a + 3a + 6b	1.2
Hansen <i>et al.</i> (2008)	General working population	3363	1a + 3a + 4 1a + 3b + 4	1.5% 8.5%
Ortega <i>et al.</i> (2008)	Danish Elderly Care Sector	6301	1b + 4 1a + 4	11.9% 1.6%
Ortega <i>et al.</i> (2009)	General working population	3429	1b + 4 1b + 3a + 4	8.3% within past year 1.6% within past year

(Continued)

Table 3.4 (Continued)

Country	Authors	Sample	N°	Definition*	Prevalence
	Agervold (2009)	Social security offices	898	1a + 3a 1a + 3b	0.4% 2.3% 2 or 3 times/month
	Høgh <i>et al.</i> (2011)	Healthcare workers (1st year at work after college)	2154	1b + 3a + 4 1b + 3b + 4 1b + 3c + 4	1.8% within past year 7.4% within past year 9.2% within past year
	Ortega <i>et al.</i> (2011)	Danish Elderly Care Sector	9949	1b + 4	11.9% 1.8% frequently 7.3% occasionally
	Rugulies <i>et al.</i> (2012)	Danish Elderly Care Sector	9826	1b + 3a + 4 1b + 3b + 4	1.9% within past year 10% occasionally, within past year
	Stapelheldt <i>et al.</i> (2013)	Municipal eldercare	2534	5	13%
	Hansen <i>et al.</i> (2014)	General working population	2919	1a + 3a + 4 1a + 3b + 4	1.5% 10.6% occasionally
	Eriksen <i>et al.</i> (2016)	General working population	3182	1a + 3a	7.0%
	Conway <i>et al.</i> (2016)	General working population	2865 (baseline) 1331 (follow-up)	1a + 3a + 4 1a + 3b + 4	1.3% 9.5% occasionally
	Török <i>et al.</i> (2016)	General working population	10605 (DWECS cohort) 16412 (WH2012 cohort)	1a + 3a + 4 1a + 3b + 4 1b + 8 1b + 4	1.4% 7.4% occasionally 9.7% 11.9%

Proof

Taylor & Francis
Not for distribution

Proof

Estonia	Høgh <i>et al.</i> (2018)	Healthcare providers in the eldercare sector	9212	1b + 3c + 4	7.7% within past year
	Tambur and Vadi (2009)	Customers of the Estonian Labour Market Board, 40% unemployed	67	1a + 3a + 6 1a + 4	44.7% 19.4% occasionally
	Tambur and Vadi (2012)	General working population	1941	1a + 3a + 6 1a + 3a	23.44% 10.46% 2 negative acts
	Björkqvist <i>et al.</i> (1994)	University employees	338	1a + 3a + 4 1a + 4	0.9% frequently 8% occasionally
Finland	Värtia (1996)	Municipal employees	949	1a + 2	16.9 %
	Kivimäki <i>et al.</i> (2000)	Hospital staff	5655	4	10.1 %
	Piirainen <i>et al.</i> (2000)	Representative of employed	1991	4	5.3 % 4.3 %
	Salin (2001)	Random sample of business professionals holding a university degree	385	1b + 4	1.6%; 8.8% occasionally; 1b and 3a: 24.1%
	Värtia and Hyyti (2002)	Prison Officers	896	1a + 4	20%; 11.8% bullied several times a month
	Kivimäki <i>et al.</i> (2004)	Hospital Employees	4791	4	4.8%
	Varhama and Björkqvist (2004a)	Municipal Finnish Employees	1961	1b + 4	16%
	Varhama and Björkqvist (2004b)	General working population	330	1b + 4	14%
	Värtia and Giorgiani (2008)	Immigrants Finnish employees	208 600	3b + 4 3b + 4	18% 10%
	Lallukka <i>et al.</i> (2011)	General working population	6646	4	5% currently

(Continued)

Table 3.4 (Continued)

Country	Authors	Sample	N°	Definition*	Prevalence
France	Salin (2015)	General working population	4392	4	4.4%
	Venetoklis and Kettunen (2016)	Ministry employees	1072	1b + 4 + 6 + (monthly to daily)	20.34% work related 11.38% person related
Germany	Niedhammer <i>et al.</i> (2007)	General working population	7694	1a + 3a 1a + 3a + 4	11.86% 9.74%
	Minkel (1996)	Employees of a rehabilitation clinic	46	1b + 3a	8.7%
	Mackensen von Astfeld (2000)	Administration	1989	1b + 3a	2.9%
	zur Mühlen <i>et al.</i> (2001)	Communal administration	552	1b + 3a	10.0%
Greece	Meschkutat <i>et al.</i> (2002)	Administration within federal armed forces	511	1b + 3a	10.8%
	Eisermann and de Constanzo (2011)	Representative sample of general working population	2765	4	2.7% currently 5.5% whole year
	Lange <i>et al.</i> (2019)	Public administration	3292	1b + 3a	Behörde A 16%, B21%: 18,3
	Apospori and Papatexandris (2008)	General working population in Athens Area	3301	1b + 3a + 4 1a + 3a 1c 1b + 3b	2.0% 6.7% 17.1% at least once 30%
	Galanaki and Papatexandris (2013)	Junior and middle managers	840	3a + 4 3a + 6 7	7.3% 44.8% 13.2%

	Karatzá <i>et al.</i> (2016)	Nursing staff	841	1a + 3a 3a + 8	3.1% 3.1%
	Chatziioannidis <i>et al.</i> (2018)	Hospital employees	398	1a + 3a + 6 1a + 3c 4	2% 53.5% 27.9%
Hungary	Kaucsek and Simon (1995)	Army	323	1b + 3a	5.6 %
		Bank employees	41	1b + 3a	4.9 %
		Bank inspectors	43	1b + 3a	2.5 %
Ireland	O'Moore (2000)	Random national sample	1009	4	16.9% occas. 6.2% frequently
	O'Connell and Williams (2002)	General working population	5252	1a + 3b + 4	7%
	O'Moore <i>et al.</i> (2003)	General working population	1057	1b + 4	6.2%
	O'Connell <i>et al.</i> (2007)	General working population	3579	1a + 4 + 6a	7.9%
Italy	Campanini <i>et al.</i> (2008)	General working population in Lombardy	9229	6b	7%
	Giorgi (2009)	General working population	926	1a + 3a + 6b	16.4%
	Giorgi <i>et al.</i> (2011)	General working population	3112	1a + 3a + 6b	15.2%
	Giorgi (2012)	Italian public university employees	371	1b + 3a + 6b	19%
	Bambi <i>et al.</i> (2014)	Nurses	1202	1b + 3a	22.4%
	Fattori <i>et al.</i> (2015)	Working population with chronic diseases	755	1a + 4	16.3%
	Fadda <i>et al.</i> (2015)	South Italian university employees	221	1b + 3a + 6b	10.1%

(Continued)

Table 3.4 (Continued)

Country	Authors	Sample	N°	Definition*	Prevalence
Lithuania	Arenas <i>et al.</i> (2015)	General working population	1151	1a + 3a + 6b	14.9%
	Malinauskienė <i>et al.</i> (2005)	School teachers from Kaunas city	475	1a + 3a + 4 1a + 3b + 4	2.6% 23%
	Malinauskienė and Einarsen (2014)	Family physicians	323	1b + 3a + 8 1b + 3b + 8	13% 17.3% occasionally
	Vveinhardt and Štreimikienė (2015)	General working population	1231	8	70.4%
	Zakauskas <i>et al.</i> (2015)	General working population	1086	1a + 3b	9% once per week or less
The Netherlands	Bermotaite and Malinauskienė (2017)	Teachers	517	1b + 3a 1a + 3c + 4	51% no less than once a week 11.2% overall 2.9% severe 8.3% occasionally
	Hubert <i>et al.</i> (2001)	Mixed production office business	427	4	4.4%
	Hubert and van Veldhoven (2001)	Financial institutions; stacked sample Sample including a variety of branches	3011 66764	3a + 4 2 + 5	1% 2.2% mean of 4 items referring to aggressive and unpleasant situations often or always
	Dehue <i>et al.</i> (2012)	General working population	356	1b + 3a	18% within past year
Norway	Matthiesen <i>et al.</i> (1989)	Nurses and assistant nurses	99	1a + 4	3.9% (3.9%)

Teachers	84	1a + 4	10.3 %
Einarsen and Skogstad (1996)	7787	1a + 4	Weekly 1.2% (yes, by and then: 3.4%); 8.6% occasional bullying
Health and welfare managers	344		0.3% (12.0%)
Psychologists' union	1402		0.6% (2.3%)
Employers' Federation	181		0.6 % (2.3%)
University	1470		0.7 % (2.8%)
Electricians' union	480		0.8 % (3.1%)
Health-care workers	2145		1.1% (2.2%)
Industrial workers	485		1.3% (6.5%)
Graphical workers' union	159		1.9% (8.9%)
Teachers' union	554		2.4% (2.0%)
Trade and Commerce	383		2.9% (4.3%)
Union of hotel/restaurant workers	172		2.9% (4.1%)
Clerical workers and officials	265		3%. 8.4% with previous experience
Representative sample from a county	745	1a + 4	4.5%
Einarsen <i>et al.</i> (1998)	6485	3a + 4	
Nurses	2539	1a + 3a	1.85%
Eriksen and Einarsen (2004)	4742	1a + 4	8.3%
Hauge <i>et al.</i> (2007)			
General working population			
Mathiesen and Einarsen (2007)			
6 Norwegian labour unions			
Mathisen <i>et al.</i> (2008)			
Restaurant Sector Employees	207	1c	0.5%
		1b	6.4%
		3a	12%

(Continued)

Table 3.4 (Continued)

Country	Authors	Sample	N°	Definition*	Prevalence
	Glasø <i>et al.</i> (2009)	General working population	2539	1a + 3a + 4	4.1%
	Lind <i>et al.</i> (2009)	Health care employees	435	4	9.66%
	Magerøy <i>et al.</i> (2009)	Royal Norwegian Navy	1604	1a + 4	2.5%
	Nielsen <i>et al.</i> (2009)	General working population	2539	1a + 4	4.6%
				1b + 4	5.2%
				1a + 3a + 4	0.6%
				1a + 3a + 6a	14.3%
				1a + 3a + 6b	6.2%
				7	6.8%
	Eriksen <i>et al.</i> (2011)	Hospital employees (nurses, therapists, and physicians)	440	1a + 3a	1%
				1a + 3b	10% now and then
	Finne <i>et al.</i> (2011)	General working population	1971	1a + 4	4.5%
	Glasø <i>et al.</i> (2011)	Bus drivers	1023	1a + 3a + 4	3.6% frequently
				1a + 3b + 4	8% occasionally
	Hauge <i>et al.</i> (2011)	General working population	10652	1a + 4	4.3%
	Nielsen (2013)	Vessel crew members	817	1a + 3a + 6	8%
				1a + 4	7.4%
	Einarsen and Nielsen (2015)	General working population (baseline)	2539	1a + 3a	12.5%
		General working population (follow-up)	1613	1a + 3c + 4	4.6%
		Nurses	1582	1a + 3a	9.2%
				1a + 3c + 4	4.1%
	Reknes <i>et al.</i> (2016)	Nurses	1582	1a + 4	6.3%
	Nielsen, Emberland <i>et al.</i> (2017)	General working population	12303	1a + 4	5.5%

Poland	Glambek <i>et al.</i> (2018)	General working population	1775	3c + 6	9.7%
	Varhama and Bjorkqvist (2004b)	General working population	66	1b + 4	23%
Portugal	Merecz <i>et al.</i> (2006)	Nursing staff	413	1b	69.6%
	Warszewska-Makuch (2008)	Polish Teachers	1080	1a + 3a	9.3%
	Evrin and Madziala (2016)	Paramedics	1820	1a + 3a 3a + 4	35.4% 37%
	Norton <i>et al.</i> (2017) da Silva João and Saldanha-Portelada (2016)	Health care professionals Nurses	707 3227	1a + 3a + 6 8	8% 18.28%
Romania	Chirilă (2012)	General working population	220	1a + 4 1a + 3a + 4	15% 1.8%
	Maidaniuc-Chirilă (2014)	General working population	313	1a + 3a + 6	1.8%
Serbia	Petrović <i>et al.</i> (2014)	General working population	1998	1a + 3a + 6b 1a + 3a + 4	16% 2.5%
	Sláviková and Pasternáková (2012)	General working population	127	1a + 3a + 6 1a + 3a + 8 1a + 3c + 8	1.4% 0% 11%
Slovenia	Mumel <i>et al.</i> (2015)	General working population	150	1a + 3a + 6b 8	24% 5%
	Kovacic <i>et al.</i> (2017)	General working population	355	5	31.8%
Spain	Fidalgo and Piñuel (2004)	General working population	1303	1a + 3a + 8	16%

(Continued)

Table 3.4 (Continued)

Country	Authors	Sample	N°	Definition*	Prevalence
	Moreno-Jiménez <i>et al.</i> , (2005)	Transport and Communication Sector Employees	103	1a + 3a	26%
	Gil-Monte <i>et al.</i> (2006)	Employees working with disabled people from Valencia	696	3b	19%
	Justicia <i>et al.</i> (2006)	University staff	548	3a	12%
	Piñuel. (2006)	General working population	4250	3b	9%
	Justicia <i>et al.</i> (2007)	University Employees	325	1a + 6a	9.2%
	Meseguer <i>et al.</i> (2007)	Fruits and Vegetables Producers Sector employees	396	4	24.1%
	Escartín <i>et al.</i> (2008)	General working population	300	1a + 3a	11%
	Fornés <i>et al.</i> (2008)	Professional School Nurses	464	1a + 3a	28%
	Segurado <i>et al.</i> (2008)	Local Police	235	4	10%
	González and Graña (2009)	General working population	2861	1b	17.2%
	Báguena <i>et al.</i> (2011)	General working population	1730	1c	57%
	Camero <i>et al.</i> (2012)	General working population	10887	1a + 3b	8.2%
	Escartín <i>et al.</i> (2012)	General working population	521	1a + 3a	5.8%
	Losa-Iglesias and de Bengoa (2012)	Nurses	538	1c + 4	19.5%
				1a + 3a + 6	12.8% very often
				1a + 3a + 6b	8.9% very often
				1a + 3a + 4 + 6	8.4% very often
				1b + 3a	5.84% within past year
				3c + 6	13% weekly or monthly
				1a	17%

Sweden	Carretero and Luciano (2013)	Employees working with people with intellectual disability	696 (T1) 422 (T2)	1b + 3a + 3b + 6 1b + 3a + 3b + 6	18.97% 20.4%
	Escartín <i>et al.</i> (2013)	General working population	4848	3a + 3b + 6	7% weekly or monthly
	Topa and Moriano (2013)	Nurses	388	1a + 6	74.2%
	León-Pérez <i>et al.</i> (2013)	General working population	1619	7 (work-related bullying)	12%
				7 (severe bullying)	5%
				7 (bullying and aggression)	3%
	Arenas <i>et al.</i> (2015)	General working population	705	1a + 3a + 6b	15%
	Leymann (1992)	Handicapped employees; non-profit organization	179	1b + 3a	8.4%; 21.6 % handicapped; 4.4% not handicapped
	Leymann and Tallgren (1993)	Steelworks employees	171	1b + 3a	3.5% (probably lower because of dropouts)
	Leymann (1993a)	Sawing factory	120	1b + 3a	1.7%
Leymann <i>et al.</i> in Leymann (1993b)	Nursery schools	37	1b + 3a	16.2%	
Leymann (1993a, 1993b)	Representative of employed except self-employed	2438	1b + 3a	3.5%	
Lindroth and Leymann (1993)	Nursery school teachers	230	1b + 3a	6%	
Hansen <i>et al.</i> (2006)	Pharmaceutical	91	1a + 4	2%	
	Telecommunication	101	1a + 4	5%	
	High School	172	1a + 4	7%	
	Wood industry	34	1a + 4	6%	
	Social Insurance	39	1a + 4	3%	

(Continued)

Table 3.4 (Continued)

Country	Authors	Sample	N°	Definition*	Prevalence
	Forssell (2016)	General working population	3371	1a + 4	3.5%
	Xu <i>et al.</i> (2018)	Multicohort study (Sweden, Denmark & Finland)	45647	1b + 3c	9%
Switzerland	Tong <i>et al.</i> (2017)	Care workers in nursing homes	5311	1a + 3c	4.6%
Turkey	Cemaloğlu (2007)	School teachers	337	1a + 3b	6.4%
	Soylu <i>et al.</i> (2008)	General working population	152	1a + 3a	48%
	Ozturk <i>et al.</i> (2008)	Academic Nurses	162	1c + 3b	20.4%
	Yıldırım <i>et al.</i> (2007)	University Nursing School Academics	210	1b	17%
	Yıldırım and Yıldırım (2007)	Nurses from the European side of Istanbul province	505	1c + 3b	86.5%
	Bilgel <i>et al.</i> (2006)	Public Sector Organizations	877	1b + 3b	55%
	Aytac <i>et al.</i> (2011)	General working population	1708	1b + 3c + 4	30.3%
	Gök (2011)	Banking employees	384	1b + 3a + 6b	32%
	Yapıcı <i>et al.</i> (2011)	Agriculture industry	248	1a + 5	56.2%
	Civilidag (2014)	Hotel employees	273	6	15.8%
	Ertürk and Cemaloglu (2014)	Teachers	1316	3a + 6	4.1% every day
	Picakciöfe <i>et al.</i> (2017)	Health workers	119	1b + 3c	31.1%
	Yağcı and Uluöz (2017)	Teachers	313	1a + 6	10.5%
	Mimbas-Poussard <i>et al.</i> (2018)	Faculty member participants at junior ranks	481	1b + 3a	26%

UK	Rayner (1997)	Part-time students	581	1c + 4	53%
	UNISON (1997)	Public sector union members	736	1 + 4	14%; 1c+4: 50%
	Quine (1999)	National Health Service	1100	3b	38% persistently bullied within last 12 months
	Cowie <i>et al.</i> (2000)	International organization	386	4	15.4%
	Hoel <i>et al.</i> (2001)	Representative sample	5288	1a + 3a + 4	1.4%; 3b: 10.6%
	Baruch (2005)	Multi-National Corporation	649	8	22.8%
	Tehrani (2004)	Care Professionals	162	1c	40%
	Simpson and Cohen (2004)	University Teachers	378	8	25%
	Coyne <i>et al.</i> (2004)	Fire-fighters	288	1a + 4	16%
	Jennifer <i>et al.</i> (2003)	3 Large European Organizations (Portugal, Spain, UK)	677	4	21.1%
	Paice <i>et al.</i> (2004)	21 hospitals from London north of the Thames	2730	4	18%
	Quine (2002)	Junior doctors of the British Medical Association	594	4 1b + 3b	37% 84%
	Lewis and Gun (2007)	13 Public Organizations in South Wales (UK)	247	1a + 3a	20%
	Thomas (2005)	Employees Educational Sector	42	8	45%
	Coyne <i>et al.</i> (2003)	Public Sector organization	288	4 1a + 3a + 4	39.6% 3.9%
	Fevre <i>et al.</i> (2009)	General working population	4010	1b + 8	7%

(Continued)

Table 3.4 (Continued)

Country	Authors	Sample	N°	Definition*	Prevalence
	Carter <i>et al.</i> (2013)	National Health Service	2950	1a + 3a + 4 1a + 3a + 6 1a + 3a	2.7% 18.3% 3.7% five or more negative acts
	Lewis <i>et al.</i> (2016)	Small and medium enterprises	1357	3c + 8	7%
	Tee <i>et al.</i> (2016)	Nursing students	657	1b + 3c	42.18%
	Birks <i>et al.</i> (2017)	Baccalaureate nursing students	561	1b + 8	35.5%

**Notes:*

1. denotes duration of acts: 1a within the last six months; 1b over six months; 1c ever in the career
2. denotes type of acts included in judgements (it is asked 'intention to harass')
3. denotes frequency of acts: 3a at least weekly; 3b less frequently than weekly; 3c ever
4. denotes victims label themselves as bullied based on a definition
5. denotes approximate criterion
6. denotes number of negative acts per week: 6a one negative act; 6b two negative acts or more; 6 at least one negative act
7. Latent class cluster analysis (LCC)
8. denotes victims label themselves (without a definition)

Bibliography

- AASLAND, M. S., SKOGSTAD, A., NOTELAERS, G., NIELSEN, M. B. AND EINARSEN, S. (2009) The prevalence of destructive leadership behaviour. *British Journal of Management*, 21(2), 438–452.
- ADAMS, A. (1992) *Bullying at work. How to confront and overcome it*. London: Virago Press.
- AGERVOLD, M. (2007) Bullying at work: A discussion of definitions and prevalence, based on an empirical study. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 48, 161–172.
- . (2009) The significance of organizational factors for the incidence of bullying. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 50(3), 267–276.
- AGERVOLD, M. AND MIKKELSEN, G. E. (2004) Relationships between bullying, psychosocial work environment and individual stress reactions. *Work & Stress*, 18(4), 336–351.
- APOSPORI, E. AND PAPALEXANDRIS, N. (2008) Workplace bullying and organizational culture: A multi-level approach. *6th international conference on workplace bullying* (pp. 52–54), 4–6 June, Montreal, Canada.
- ARCHER, D. (1999) Exploring “bullying” culture in the para-military organisation. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20, 94–105.
- ARENAS, A., GIORGI, G., MONTANI, F., MANCUSO, S., PEREZ, J. F., MUCCI, N. AND ARCANGELI, G. (2015) Workplace bullying in a sample of Italian and Spanish employees and its relationship with job satisfaction, and psychological well-being. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 1912.
- ASHFORTH, B. E. (1994) Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human Relations*, 47, 755–778.
- AYTAC, S., BOZKURT, V., BAYRAM, N., YILDIZ, S., AYTAC, M., AKINCI, F. S. AND BILGEL, N. (2011) Workplace violence: A study of Turkish workers. *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics*, 17(4), 385–402.
- BÁGUENA, M. J., BELEÑA, M. A., DE LA PAZ TOLDOS, M. P. AND MARTÍNEZ, D. (2011) Psychological harassment in the workplace: Methods of evaluation and prevalence. *The Open Criminology Journal*, 4, 102–108.
- BAILLIEN, E., ESCARTÍN, J., GROSS, C. AND ZAPF, D. (2017) Towards a conceptual and empirical differentiation between workplace bullying and interpersonal conflict. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 26(6), 870–881.
- BALDUCCI, C., ALFANO, V. AND FRACCAROLI, F. (2009) Relationships between mobbing at work and MMPI-2 personality profile, post-traumatic stress symptoms, and suicidal ideation and behavior. *Violence and Victims*, 24(1), 52–67.
- BAMBI, S., BECATTINI, G., GIUSTI, G. D., MEZZETTI, A., GUAZZINI, A. AND LUMINI, E. (2014) Lateral hostilities among nurses employed in intensive care units, emergency departments, operating rooms, and emergency medical services: A national survey in Italy. *Dimensions of Critical Care Nursing*, 33(6), 347–354.

- BARUCH, Y. (2005) Bullying on the net: Adverse behavior on e-mail and its impact. *Information & Management*, 42, 361–371.
- BEALE, D. AND HOEL, H. (2010) Workplace bullying, industrial relations and the challenge for management: Britain and Sweden compared. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 16, 101–118.
- . (2011) Workplace bullying and the employment relationship: Exploring questions of prevention, control and context. *Work, Employment and Society*, 25(1), 5–18.
- BERNOTAITE, L. AND MALINAUSKIENE, V. (2017) Workplace bullying and mental health among teachers in relation to psychosocial job characteristics and burnout. *International Journal of Occupational Medicine and Environmental Health*, 30(4), 629–640.
- BILGEL, N., AYTAC, S. AND BAYRAM, N. (2006) Bullying in Turkish white-collar workers. *Occupational Medicine*, 56, 226–231.
- BIRKS, M., CANT, R. P., BUDDEN, L. M., RUSSELL-WESTHEAD, M., ÜZAR ÖZÇETİN, Y. S. AND TEE, S. (2017) Uncovering degrees of workplace bullying: A comparison of baccalaureate nursing students' experiences during clinical placement in Australia and the UK. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 25, 14–21.
- BJÖRKQVIST, K. (1994) Sex differences in aggression. *Sex Roles*, 30, 177–188.
- BJÖRKQVIST, K., LAGERSPETZ, K. M. J. AND KAUKIAINEN, A. (1992) Do girls manipulate and boys fight? Developmental trends in regard to direct and indirect aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 18, 117–127.
- BJÖRKQVIST, K., ÖSTERMAN, K. AND HJELT-BÄCK, M. (1994) Aggression among university employees. *Aggressive Behavior*, 20, 173–184.
- BONIOL, M., MCISAAC, M., XU, L., WULIJI, T., DIALLO, K. AND CAMPBELL, J. (2019) *Gender equity in the health workforce: Analysis of 104 countries*. Working paper 1. World Health Organization, Geneva.
- BOWLING, N. A. AND BEEHR, T. A. (2006) Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: A theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 998–1012.
- BRANCH, S., RAMSAY, S., SHALLCROSS, L., HEDGES, A. AND BARKER, M. (2018) Bosses get bullied too: Exploring upwards bullying to learn more about workplace bullying. In P. D'Cruz, et al. (eds.), *Pathways of Job-related negative behaviour. Handbooks of workplace bullying, emotional abuse and harassment* (Vol. 2, pp. 1–32). Singapore: Springer Nature.
- BUKA, M. S. M. AND KARAJ, T. (2012) Mobbing in the academe: The case of Albanian universities. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Human and Social Sciences*, 8, 26–29.
- CAMPANINI P., GILIOLI, R., PUNZI, S., CASSITTO, M. G., CONWAY, P. M. AND COSTA, G. (2008) Workplace bullying in a large sample of Italian workers. Sixth International Conference on Workplace Bullying. I *Book of Abstracts: Sixth International*

Conference on Workplace Bullying, 4–6 June 2008, Montreal, Canada.

- CARNERO, M. A., MARTÍNEZ, B. AND SÁNCHEZ-MANGAS, R. (2012) Mobbing and workers' health: Empirical analysis for Spain. *International Journal of Manpower*, 33(3), 322–339.
- CARRETERO, N. AND LUCIANO, J. V. (2013) Prevalence and incidence of workplace bullying among Spanish employees working with people with intellectual disability. *Disability and Health Journal*, 6(4), 405–409.
- CARTER, M., THOMPSON, N., CRAMPTON, P., MORROW, G., BURFORD, B., GRAY, C. AND ILLING, J. (2013) Workplace bullying in the UK NHS: A questionnaire and interview study on prevalence, impact and barriers to reporting. *BMJ Open*, 3(6), e002628.
- CATALYST (2019) *Women in the workforce – Europe: Quick take* (January 9, 2019) Retrieved from www.catalyst.org/research/women-in-the-workforce-europe/; 5.9.2019.
- CEJA, L., ESCARTÍN, J. AND RODRÍGUEZ-CARBALLEIRA, A. (2012) Organizational contexts that foster positive behaviour and well-being: A comparison between family-owned firms and non-family businesses. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 27(1), 69–84.
- CEMALOĞLU, N. (2007) Okul yöneticilerinin liderlik stilleri ile yıldırma arasındaki ilişki. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 33, 77–87.
- CHATZIOANNIDIS, I., BASCIALLA, F. G., CHATZIVALSA, P., VOUZAS, F. AND MITSIAKOS, G. (2018) Prevalence, causes and mental health impact of workplace bullying in the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit environment. *BMJ Open*, 8(2), e018766.
- CHIRILĂ, T. (2012) Perceived victimization as a consequence of bullying among Romanian employees: Gender differences. *Annals of the Al. I. Cuza University, Psychology*, 21(2), 85–98.
- CIVILIDAG, A. (2014) Hotel employees' mobbing, burnout, job satisfaction and perceived organizational support: A research on hospitality in Turkey. *European Scientific Journal*, 10(35).
- CONWAY, P. M., CLAUSEN, T., HANSEN, Å. M. AND HOGH, A. (2016) Workplace bullying and sickness presenteeism: Cross-sectional and prospective associations in a 2-year follow-up study. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 89(1), 103–114.
- COWIE, H., JENNIFER, D., NETO, C., ANGULA, J. C., PEREIRA, B., DEL BARRIO, C. AND ANANIADOU, K. (2000) Comparing the nature of workplace bullying in two European countries: Portugal and the UK. In M. Sheehan, S. Ramsey and J. Patrick (eds.), *Transcending the boundaries: Integrating people, processes and systems. Proceedings of the 2000 Conference* (pp. 128–133). Brisbane: Griffith University.
- COYNE, I., CRAIG, J. AND SMITH-LEE, P. (2004) Workplace bullying in a group context. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 32(3), 301–317.
- COYNE, I., SMITH-LEE, P., SEIGNE, E. AND RANDALL, P. (2003) Self and peer nominations of bullying: An analysis of incident rates, individual differences, and perceptions of the working

- environment. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 12(3), 209–228.
- CUBELA, V. AND KVARTUC, T. (2007) Effects of mobbing on justice beliefs and adjustment. *European Psychologist*, 12(4), 261–271.
- DA SILVA-JOÃO, A. L. AND SALDANHA-PORTELADA, A. F. (2016) Mobbing and its impact on interpersonal relationships at the workplace. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*.
- DAVIDSON, M. J. AND COOPER, C. L. (1992) *Shattering the glass ceiling*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- DEHUE, F., BOLMAN, C., VÖLLINK, T. AND POWELSE, M. (2012) Coping with bullying at work and health related problems. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 19(3), 175–197.
- DICK, U. AND DULZ, K. (1994) *Zwischenbericht Mobbing-Telefon für den Zeitraum 23.8.93–22.2.1994 [Intermediate report of the mobbing telephone]*. Hamburg: AOK.
- DI MARTINO, V., HOEL, H. AND COOPER, C. (2003) *Preventing violence and harassment in the workplace*. European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- DOBEŠOVÁ ČAKIRPALOĞLU, S., ČECH, T. AND KVINTOVÁ, J. (2017) The incidence of workplace bullying in Czech teachers. In P. A. Da Silva Pereira, O. Titrek and G. Sezen-Gultekin (eds.), *ICLEL 17 conference proceeding book* (pp. 425–431). Sakarya: Sakarya University.
- DOĞAR, N. (2016) Workplace bullying perceptions among health sector employees: A research in a private hospital in Albania. *Istanbul Gelişim Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 3(1), 105.
- EGE, H. (1998) *I numeri del Mobbing. La prima ricerca italiana* [The frequency of bullying. The first Italian study]. Bologna: Pitagora Editrice.
- EINARSEN, S. (2000) Harassment and bullying at work: A review of the Scandinavian approach. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 4, 371–401.
- EINARSEN, S., AASLAND, M. S. AND SKOGSTAD, A. (2007) Destructive leadership: A definition and a conceptual model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 207–216.
- EINARSEN, S., HOEL, H. AND NOTELAERS, G. (2009) Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure and psychometric properties of the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised. *Work & Stress*, 23(1), 24–44.
- EINARSEN, S., HOEL, H., ZAPF, D. AND COOPER, C. L. (eds.) (2003a) *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace. International perspectives in research and practice*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- . (2003b) The concept of bullying at work: The European tradition. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf and C. L. Cooper (eds.), *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace. International perspectives in research and practice* (pp. 3–30). London: Taylor & Francis.
- EINARSEN, S., MATTHIESEN, S. B. AND SKOGSTAD, A. (1998) Bullying, burnout and well-being among assistant nurses. *Journal of Occupational Health and Safety*, 14, 563–568.

- EINARSEN, S. AND NIELSEN, M. B. (2015) Workplace bullying as an antecedent of mental health problems: A five-year prospective and representative study. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 88(2), 131–142.
- EINARSEN, S. AND RAKNES, B. I. (1991) *Mobbing i arbeidslivet* [Bullying in working life]. Bergen: University of Bergen.
- . (1997) Harassment at work and the victimization of men. *Violence and Victims*, 12, 247–263.
- EINARSEN, S., RAKNES, B. I., MATTHIESEN, S. B. AND HELLESØY, O. H. (1994) *Mobbing og harde personkonflikter. Helsefarlig samspill på arbeidsplassen* [Bullying and severe interpersonal conflicts. Unhealthy interaction at work]. Soreidgrend: Sigma Forlag.
- EINARSEN, S. AND SKOGSTAD, A. (1996) Prevalence and risk groups of bullying and harassment at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5, 185–202.
- EINARSEN, S., TANGEDAL, M., SKOGSTAD, A., MATTHIESEN, S. B., AASLAND, M. S., NIELSEN, M. B., BJØRKELO, B., GLASO, L. AND HAUGE, L. J. (2007) Et brutalt arbeidsmiljø? En undersøkelse av mobbing, konflikter og destruktiv ledelse i norsk arbeidsliv [A brutal work life? An investigation of bullying, conflicts and destructive leadership in Norwegian working life]. Bergen, Norway: University of Bergen.
- EISERMANN, J. AND DE COSTANZO, E. (2011) *Die Erfassung von Mobbing—Eine Konstruktvalidierung aktueller Datenerhebungsverfahren: Forschung Projekt F 2128* [The measurement of bullying—a construct validation of current measurement procedures]. Dortmund: Baua.
- ERIKSEN, G. S., NYGREEN, I. AND RUDMIN, F. W. (2011) Bullying among hospital staff: Use of psychometric triage to identify intervention priorities. *E-Journal of Applied Psychology*, 7(2), 26–31.
- ERIKSEN, T. L. M., HOGH, A. AND HANSEN, Å. M. (2016) Long-term consequences of workplace bullying on sickness absence. *Labour Economics*, 43, 129–150.
- ERIKSEN, W. AND EINARSEN, S. (2004) Gender minority as a risk factor of exposure to bullying at work: The case of male assistant nurses. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 13(4), 473–492.
- ERTÜRK, A. AND CEMALOĞLU, N. (2014) Causes of Mobbing Behavior. *Procedia—Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 3669–3678.
- ESCARTÍN, J., CEJA, L., NAVARRO, J. AND ZAPF, D. (2013) Modeling workplace bullying using catastrophe theory. *Nonlinear Dynamics, Psychology, and Life Sciences*, 17(4), 493–515.
- ESCARTÍN, J., MONZANI, L., LEONG, F. AND RODRÍGUEZ-CARBALLEIRA, Á. (2017) A reduced form of the Workplace Bullying Scale—the EAPA-TR: A useful instrument for daily diary and experience sampling studies. *Work & Stress*, 31(1), 42–62.
- ESCARTÍN, J., RODRÍGUEZ-CARBALLEIRA, A., GÓMEZ-BENITO, J. AND ZAPF, D. (2010) Development and validation of the Workplace

Bullying Scale “EAPA-T”. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 10, 519–539.

ESCARTÍN, J., RODRÍGUEZ-CARBALLEIRA, A., PORRÚA, C. AND MARTÍN-PEÑA, J. (2008) Estudio y análisis sobre cómo perciben el mobbing los trabajadores. *Revista de Psicología Social*, 23(2), 203–211.

ESCARTÍN, J., RODRÍGUEZ-CARBALLEIRA, A., ZAPF, D., PORRÚA, C. AND MARTÍN-PEÑA, J. (2009) Perceived severity of various bullying behaviours at work and the relevance of exposure to bullying. *Work and Stress*, 23, 191–205.

ESCARTÍN, J., SALIN, D. AND RODRÍGUEZ-CARBALLEIRA, A. (2011) Conceptualizations of workplace bullying: Gendered rather than gender-neutral? *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 10(4), 157–165.

ESCARTÍN, J., SORA, B., RODRÍGUEZ-MUÑOZ, A. AND RODRÍGUEZ-CARBALLEIRA, Á. (2012) Adaptation and validation of a Spanish version of the Negative Acts Questionnaire at Work showed by bullies: NAQ-Perpetrators. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 28(3), 157–170.

ESCARTÍN, J., VRANJES, I., BAILLIEN, E. AND NOTELAERS, G. (2019) Workplace bullying and cyberbullying scales: An overview. In P. D’Cruz, E. Noronha, G. Notelaers, C. Rayner (eds.), *Concepts, approaches and methods. Handbooks of workplace bullying, emotional abuse and harassment* (Vol. 1). Singapore: Springer.

ESCARTÍN, J., ZAPF, D., ARRIETA C. AND RODRÍGUEZ-CARBALLEIRA, A. (2011) Workers’ perception of workplace bullying: A cross-cultural study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(2), 178–205.

EUROFOUND (2015) *Violence and harassment in European workplaces: Causes, impacts and policies*. Dublin.

EVRIN, T. AND MADZIALA, M. (2016) The scale of the mobbing problem among paramedics in the United States and Poland. *Disaster and Emergency Medicine Journal*, 1(1), 50–54.

FADDA, S., GIORGI, G., BENITEZ MUÑOZ, J. L., JUSTICIA JUSTICIA, F. AND SOLINAS, G. (2015) Do negative acts in Italian academia have a quadratic relationship with determinants of health? *International Journal of Educational Management*, 29(2), 158–166.

FATTORI, A., NERI, L., AGUGLIA, E., BELLOMO, A., BISOGNO, A., CAMERINO, D. . . . VIORA, U. (2015) Estimating the impact of workplace bullying: Humanistic and economic burden among workers with chronic medical conditions. *BioMed Research International*, Article 708908.

FEVRE, R., NICHOLS, T., PRIOR, L. AND RUTHERFORD, I. (2009) *Fair treatment at work report: Findings from the 2008 survey*. Employment Relations Research Series No. 103. Department of Business, Innovation and Skills, London.

FEVRE, R., ROBINSON, A., JONES, T. AND LEWIS, D. (2010) Researching workplace bullying: The benefits of taking an integrated approach. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 13, 71–85.

FIDALGO, A. AND PIÑUEL, I. (2004) La escala Cisneros como herramienta de valoración del mobbing [Cisneros scale to assess

- psychological harassment or mobbing at work]. *Psicothema*, 16(4), 615–624.
- FINNE, L. B., KNARDAHL, S. AND LAU, B. (2011) Workplace bullying and mental distress—a prospective study of Norwegian employees. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 37(4), 276–287.
- FLEISHMAN, E. A. (1953) The measurement of leadership attitudes in industry. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 37(3), 153–158.
- FORNÉS, J., MARTÍNEZ-ABASCAL, M. AND DE LA BANDA, G. (2008) Análisis factorial del cuestionario de hostigamiento psicológico en el trabajo en profesionales de enfermería [Factor analysis of the questionnaire of psychological harassment at work in clinic employees]. *International Journal of Clinical and Health Psychology*, 8(1), 267–283.
- FORSSELL, R. (2016) Exploring cyberbullying and face-to-face bullying in working life—Prevalence, targets and expressions. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 58, 454–460.
- GALANAKI, E. AND PAPALEXANDRIS, N. (2013) Measuring workplace bullying in organisations. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(11), 2107–2130.
- GIL-MONTE, P. R., CARRETERO, N. AND LUCIANO, J. V. (2006) Prevalencia del mobbing en trabajadores de centros de asistencia a personas con discapacidad [Prevalence of mobbing in centers assisting people with disabilities]. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 22(3), 275–292.
- GIORGI, G. (2009) Workplace bullying risk assessment in 12 Italian organizations. *International Journal of Workplace Health Management*, 2(1), 34–47.
- . (2012) Workplace bullying in academia creates a negative work environment. An Italian study. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 24(4), 261–275.
- GIORGI, G., ARENAS, A. AND LEÓN-PÉREZ, J. M. (2011) An operative measure of workplace bullying: The negative acts questionnaire across Italian companies. *Industrial Health*, 49(6), 686–695.
- GLAMBEK, M., SKOGSTAD, A. AND EINARSEN, S. (2018) Workplace bullying, the development of job insecurity and the role of laissez-faire leadership: A two-wave moderated mediation study. *Work & Stress*, 32(3), 297–312.
- GLASØ, L., BELE, E., NIELSEN, M. B. AND EINARSEN, S. (2011) Bus drivers' exposure to bullying at work: An occupation-specific approach. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 52(5), 484–493.
- GLASØ, L., NIELSEN, M. B. AND EINARSEN, S. (2009) Interpersonal problems among perpetrators and targets of workplace bullying. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 39(6), 1316–1333.
- GÖK, S. (2011) Prevalence and types of mobbing behaviour: A research on banking employees. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 8(1), 318–334.
- GONZÁLEZ, D. AND GRAÑA, J. L. (2009) El acoso psicológico en el lugar de trabajo: prevalencia y análisis descriptivo en una muestra multiocupacional [Bullying in the workplace: Prevalence and descriptive analysis of a sample with multiple occupations]. *Psicothema*, 21(2), 288–293.

- HALAMA, P. AND MÖCKEL, U. (1995) 'Mobbing'. Acht Beiträge zum Thema Psychoterror am Arbeitsplatz ['Mobbing': Eight contributions to the issue of psychological terror at work]. In Evangelischer Pressedienst (ed.), *epd-Dokumentation* (Vol. 11/95). Frankfurt am Main: Gemeinschaftswerk der Evangelischen Publizistik.
- HANSEN, Å. M., HØGH, A., GARDE, A. H. AND PERSSON, R. (2014) Workplace bullying and sleep difficulties: A 2-year follow-up study. *INTERNATIONAL ARCHIVES OF OCCUPATIONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH*, 87(3), 285–294.
- HANSEN, Å. M., HØGH, A., PERSSON, R. AND GARDE, A. (2008) Associations between bullying, witnessing bullying and sleep problems. *6th international conference on workplace bullying* (pp. 133–134), 4–6 June, Montreal, Canada.
- HANSEN, Å. M., HØGH, A., PERSSON, R., KARLSON, B., GARDE, A. AND ORBAEK, P. (2006) Bullying at work, health outcomes, and physiological stress response. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 60, 63–72.
- HAUGE, L. J., EINARSEN, S., KNARDAHL, S., LAU, B., NOTELAERS, G. AND SKOGSTAD, A. (2011) Leadership and role stressors as departmental level predictors of workplace bullying. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 18(4), 305–323.
- HAUGE, L. J., SKOGSTAD, A. AND EINARSEN, S. (2007) Relationships between stressful work environments and bullying: Results of a large representative study. *Work & Stress*, 21(3), 220–242.
- HOCHSCHILD, A. R. (1983) *The managed heart*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- HOEL, H. AND COOPER, C. L. (2000) *Destructive conflict and bullying at work*. Manchester: Manchester School of Management (UMIST).
- HOEL, H., COOPER, C. L. AND FARAGHER, B. (2001) The experience of bullying in Great Britain: The impact of organisational status. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10, 443–465.
- HOEL, H., GLASØ, L., HETLAND, J., COOPER, C. L. AND EINARSEN, S. (2010) Leadership styles as predictors of self-reported and observed workplace bullying. *British Journal of Management*, 21(2), 453–468.
- HOEL, H., RAYNER, C. AND COOPER, C. L. (1999) Workplace bullying. In C. L. Cooper and I. T. Robertson (eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 14, pp. 195–230). Chichester: Wiley.
- HOEL, H. AND VARTIA, M. (2018) *Bullying and sexual harassment at the workplace, in public spaces, and in political life in the EU*. Policy department for citizens' right and constitutional affairs. Directorate general for internal polices of the union. Brussels: European Parliament.
- HOFSTEDE, G. (1993) Cultural constraints in management theories. *The Executive*, 7, 84–91.
- HØGH, A., BAERNHOLDT, M. AND CLAUSEN, T. (2018) Impact of workplace bullying on missed nursing care and quality of care in the

- eldercare sector. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 91(8), 963–970.
- HØGH, A. AND DOFRADOTTIR, A. (2001) Coping with bullying in the workplace. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10, 485–495.
- HØGH, A., HOEL, H. AND CARNEIRO, I. G. (2011) Bullying and employee turnover among healthcare workers: A three-wave prospective study. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 19(6), 742–751.
- HOLZEN BEUSCH, E. V., ZAPF, D. AND SCHALLBERGER, U. (1998) Warum Mobbingopfer ihre Arbeitsstelle nicht wechseln [Why the victims of bullying do not change their job]. University of Konstanz: Department of Psychology.
- HUBERT, A. B., FURDA, J. AND STEENSMA, H. (2001) Mobbing, systematisch pestgedrag in organisaties [Mobbing: Systematic harassment in organisations]. *Gedrag & Organisatie*, 14, 378–396.
- HUBERT, A. B. AND VAN VELDHOVEN, M. (2001) Risk sectors for undesired behaviour and mobbing. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10, 415–424.
- JANSSENS, H., CLAYS, E., DE CLERCQ, B., DE BACQUER, D., CASINI, A., KITTEL, F. AND BRAECKMAN, L. (2016) Association between psychosocial characteristics of work and presenteeism: A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Occupational Medicine and Environmental Health*, 29(2).
- JENNIFER, D., COWIE, H. AND ANANIADOU, K. (2003) Perceptions and experience of workplace bullying in five different working populations. *Aggressive Behavior*, 29, 489–496.
- JUSTICIA, F. J., BENÍTEZ MUÑOZ, J. L. AND FERNÁNDEZ DE HARO, E. (2006) Caracterización del acoso psicológico en el contexto universitario [Characterization of bullying in the university context]. *Revista de Psicología del Trabajo y de las Organizaciones*, 22(3), 293–308.
- JUSTICIA, F. J., BENÍTEZ MUÑOZ, J. L., FERNÁNDEZ DE HARO, E. AND BERBÉN, A. G. (2007) El fenómeno del acoso laboral entre los trabajadores de la universidad [The phenomenon of mobbing among university employees]. *Psicología em Estudo*, 12(3), 457–463.
- KARATZA, C., ZYGA, S., TZIAFERI, S. AND PREZERAKOS, P. (2016) Workplace bullying and general health status among the nursing staff of Greek public hospitals. *Annals of General Psychiatry*, 15, 7.
- KAUCEK, G. AND SIMON, P. (1995) *Psychoterror and risk-management in Hungary*. Paper presented as poster at the 7th European Congress of Work and Organizational Psychology, 19–22nd April, Győr, Hungary.
- KEASHLY, L. (1998) Emotional abuse in the workplace: Conceptual and empirical issues. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 1, 85–117.
- . (2018) Prevalence of workplace bullying and mobbing among US working adults: What do the numbers mean? In M. Duffy and D. C. Yamada (eds.), *Workplace bullying and mobbing in the United States* (Vol. 1, pp. 25–52). Santa Clara: Praeger.

- KIVIMÄKI, M., ELOVAINIO, M. AND VAHTERA, J. (2000) Workplace bullying and sickness absence in hospital staff. *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 57, 656–660.
- KIVIMAKI, M., LEINO-ARJAS, P., VIRTANEN, M., ELOVAINIO, M., KELTIKANGAS-JARVINEN, L., PUTTONEN, S., VARTIA, M., BRUNNER, E. AND VAHTERA, J. (2004) Work stress and incidence of newly diagnosed fibromyalgia. Prospective cohort study. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 57, 417–422.
- KOVACIC, A., PODGORNIK, N., PRISTOV, Z. AND RASPOR, A. (2017) Mobbing in a non-profit organisation. *Organizacija*, 50(2), 178–186.
- KUDIŁKA, B. AND KERN, S. (2004) Cortisol day profiles in victims of mobbing (bullying at the work place): Preliminary results of a first psychobiological field study. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 56, 149–150.
- LALLUKKA, T., RAHKONEN, O. AND LAHELMA, E. (2011) Workplace bullying and subsequent sleep problems—the Helsinki Health Study. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 37(3), 204–212.
- LANGE, S., BURR, H., CONWAY, P. M. AND ROSE, U. (2019) Workplace bullying among employees in Germany: Prevalence estimates and the role of the perpetrator. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 92(2), 237–247.
- LEÓN-PÉREZ, J. M., ESCARTÍN, J. AND GIORGI, G. (2019) The presence of workplace bullying and harassment worldwide. In P. D’Cruz *et al.* (eds.), *Handbooks of workplace bullying, emotional abuse and harassment, Vol. 1: Concepts, approaches and methods*. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.
- LEÓN-PÉREZ, J. M., NOTELAERS, G., ARENAS, A., MUNDUATE, L. AND MEDINA, F. J. (2013) Identifying victims of workplace bullying by integrating traditional estimation approaches into a latent class cluster model. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(7), 1155–1177.
- LEWIS, D. AND GUNN, R. (2007) Workplace bullying in the public sector: Understanding the racial dimension. *Public Administration*, 85(3), 641–665.
- LEWIS, D., MEGICKS, P. AND JONES, P. (2016) Bullying and harassment and work-related stressors: Evidence from British small and medium enterprises. *International Small Business Journal*, 35(1), 116–137.
- LEYMANN, H. (1990) *Handbok för användning av LIPT-formuläret för kartläggning av risker för psykiskt vald* [Manual of the LIPT questionnaire for assessing the risk of psychological violence at work]. Stockholm: Violen.
- . (1992) *Fran mobbning till utslagning i arbetslivet* [From bullying to exclusion from working life]. Stockholm: Publica.
- . (1993a) Ätiologie und Häufigkeit von Mobbing am Arbeitsplatz—eine Übersicht über die bisherige Forschung [Etiology and frequency of bullying in the workplace—an overview of current research]. *Zeitschrift für Personalforschung*, 7, 271–283.

- . (1993b) *Mobbing—Psychoterror am Arbeitsplatz und wie man sich dagegen wehren kann* [Mobbing—psychoterror in the workplace and how one can defend oneself]. Reinbeck: Rowohlt.
- . (1996) The content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5, 165–184.
- LEYMANN, H. AND GUSTAFSSON, A. (1996) Mobbing and the development of post-traumatic stress disorders. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5, 251–276.
- LEYMANN, H. AND TALLGREN, U. (1990) *Investigation into the frequency of adult mobbing in a Swedish steel company using the LIPT questionnaire*. Unpublished manuscript.
- . (1993) Psychoterror am Arbeitsplatz [Psychological terror in the workplace]. *Sichere Arbeit*, 6, 22–28.
- LIEFOOGHE, A. P. D. AND OLAFFSON, R. (1999) ‘Scientists’ and ‘amateurs’: Mapping the bullying domain. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20, 16–27.
- LIND, K., GLASØ, L., PALLESEN, S. AND EINARSEN, S. (2009) Personality profiles among targets and nontargets of workplace bullying. *European Psychologist*, 14(3), 231–237.
- LINDROTH, S. AND LEYMANN, H. (1993) *Vuxenmobbing mot en minoritetsgrupp av män inom barnomsorgen. Om mäns jämställdhet i ett kvinnodominerat yrke* [Bullying of a male minority group within child-care. On men’s equality in a female-dominated occupation]. Stockholm: Arbetarskyddstyrelsen.
- LOSA-IGLESIAS, M. E. AND DE BENGUA VALLEJO, R. B. (2012) Prevalence of bullying at work and its association with self-esteem scores in a Spanish nurse sample. *Contemporary Nurse*, 42(1), 2–10.
- MACKENSEN VON ASTFELD, S. (2000) *Das Sick-Building-Syndrom unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Einflusses von Mobbing* [The sick building syndrome with special consideration of the effects of mobbing]. Hamburg: Verlag Dr Kovac.
- MACKEY, J. D., FRIEDER, R. E., BREES, J. R. AND MARTINKO, M. J. (2017) Abusive supervision: A meta-analysis and empirical review. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1940–1965.
- MAGERØY, N., LAU, B., RIISE, R. T. AND MOEN, B. (2009) Association of psychosocial factors and bullying at individual and department levels among naval military personnel. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 66(4), 343–351.
- MAIDANIUC-CHIRILĂ, T. (2014) Study on workplace bullying exposure among Romanian employees: Gender differences. *Romanian Journal of Human Resources*, 12(2), 147–158.
- MALINAUSKIENE, V. AND EINARSEN, S. (2014) Workplace bullying and post-traumatic stress symptoms among family physicians in Lithuania: An occupation and region specific approach. *International Journal of Occupational Medicine and Environmental Health*, 27(6), 919–932.
- MALINAUSKIENE, V., OBELENIS, V. AND DOPAGIENE, D. (2005) Psychological terror at work and cardiovascular diseases among teachers. *Acta Medica Lituanica*, 12(2), 20–25.

- MATHISEN, G. E., EINARSEN, S. AND MYKLETUN, R. (2008) The occurrences and correlates of bullying and harassment in the restaurant sector. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 49, 59–68.
- MATTHIESEN, S. B. AND EINARSEN, S. (2001) MMPI-2-configurations among victims of bullying at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10, 467–484.
- . (2007) Perpetrators and targets of bullying at work: Role stress and individual differences. *Violence and Victims*, 22(6), 735–753.
- MATTHIESEN, S. B., RAKNES, B. I. AND RÖKKUM, O. (1989) Mobbing på arbeid-splassen [Bullying in the workplace]. *Tidsskrift for Norsk Psykologforening*, 26, 761–774.
- MERECZ, D., RYMASZEWSKA, J., MOSCICKA, A., KIEJNA, A. AND JAROSZ-NOWAK, J. (2006) Violence at the workplace—a questionnaire survey of nurses. *European Psychiatry*, 21, 442–450.
- MESCHKUTAT, B., STACKELBECK, M. AND LANGENHOFF, G. (2002) *Der Mobbing-Report. Repräsentativstudie für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. [The mobbing report. Representative study for the Federal Republic of Germany]. Bremerhaven: Wirtschaftsverlag.
- MESEGUER, M., SOLER, M., SÁEZ, M. AND GARCÍA, M. (2007) Incidencia, componentes y origen del mobbing en el trabajo en el sector hortofrutícola [Incidence, components and source of bullying at work in an agrofruit sector]. *Anales de Psicología*, 23(1), 92–100.
- MIKKELSEN, G. E. AND EINARSEN, S. (2001) Bullying in Danish work-life: Prevalence and health correlates. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10, 393–413.
- . (2002) Relationships between exposure to bullying at work and psychological and psychosomatic health complaints: The role of state negative affectivity and generalized self-efficacy. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 43, 397–405.
- MINIBAS-POUSSARD, J., SECKIN-CELIK, T. AND BINGOL, H. B. (2018) Mobbing in higher education: Descriptive and inductive case narrative analyses of mobber behavior, mobbee responses, and witness support. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 18(2), 471–494.
- MINKEL, U. (1996) *Sozialer Stress am Arbeitsplatz und seine Wirkung auf Fehlzeiten* [Social stress at work and its consequences for sickness absence]. Unpublished diploma thesis. Social Science Faculty, University of Konstanz.
- MORENO-JIMÉNEZ, B., RODRÍGUEZ-MUÑOZ, A., GARROSA, E., MORANTE, M. AND RODRÍGUEZ, R. (2005) Diferencias de género en el acoso psicológico en el trabajo: un estudio en población española [Gender differences in bullying at work: A study in the Spanish population]. *Psicología em Estudo*, 10(1), 3–10.
- MORENO-JIMÉNEZ, B., RODRÍGUEZ-MUÑOZ, A., MARTÍNEZ, M. AND GÁLVEZ, M. (2007) Assessing workplace bullying: Spanish

- validation of a reduced version of the negative acts questionnaire. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 10(2), 449–457.
- MUMEL, D., JAN, S., TREVEN, S. AND MALC, D. (2015) Mobbing in Slovenia: Prevalence, mobbing victim characteristics, and the connection with post-traumatic stress disorder. *Naše gospodarstvo/Our economy*, 61(1), 3–12.
- NIEDHAMMER, I., DAVID, S. AND DEGIOANNI, S. (2007) Economic activities and occupations at high risk for workplace bullying: Results from a large-scale cross-sectional survey in the general working population in France. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 80, 346–353.
- NIEDL, K. (1995) *Mobbing/Bullying am Arbeitsplatz. Eine empirische Analyse zum Phänomen sowie zu personalwirtschaftlich relevanten Effekten von systematischen Feindseligkeiten* [Mobbing/bullying at work. An empirical analysis of the phenomenon and of the effects of systematic harassment on human resource management]. Munich: Hampp.
- . (1996) Mobbing and well-being: Economic and personnel development implications. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5, 239–249.
- NIELSEN, M. B. (2013) Bullying in work groups: The impact of leadership. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 54(2), 127–136.
- NIELSEN, M. B. AND EINARSEN, S. (2008) Sampling in research on interpersonal aggression. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 34, 265–272.
- . (2012) Outcomes of workplace bullying: A meta-analytic review. *Work and Stress*, 26(4), 309–332.
- NIELSEN, M. B., EMBERLAND, J. S. AND KNARDAHL, S. (2017) Workplace bullying as a predictor of disability retirement: A prospective registry study of Norwegian employees. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 59(7), 609–614.
- NIELSEN, M. B., GLASØ, L. AND EINARSEN, S. (2017) Exposure to workplace harassment and the Five Factor Model of personality: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 104, 195–206.
- NIELSEN, M. B., INDREGARD, A-M. R. AND ØVERLAND, S. (2016) Workplace bullying and sickness absence: A systematic review and meta-analysis of the research literature. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 42(5), 359–370.
- NIELSEN, M. B., MATTHIESEN, S. B. AND EINARSEN, S. (2008) Sense of coherence as a protective mechanism among targets of workplace bullying. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 13(2), 128–136.
- . (2010) The impact of methodological moderators on prevalence rates of workplace bullying. A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83(4), 955–979.
- NIELSEN, M. B., SKOGSTAD, A., MATTHIESEN, S. B., GLASØ, L., AASLAND, M. S., NOTELAERS, G. AND EINARSEN, S. (2009) Prevalence of workplace bullying in Norway: Comparisons across time and estimation methods. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 18(1), 81–101.

- NIELSEN, M. B., TANGEN, T., IDSOE, T., MATTHIESEN, S. B. AND MAGERØY, N. (2015) Post-traumatic stress disorder as a consequence of bullying at work and at school. A literature review and meta-analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 21, 17–24.
- NORTON, P., COSTA, V., TEIXEIRA, J., AZEVEDO, A., ROMA-TORRES, A., AMARO, J. AND CUNHA, L. (2017) Prevalence and determinants of bullying among health care workers in Portugal. *Workplace Health & Safety*, 65(5), 188–196.
- NOTELAERS, G. AND DE WITTE, H. (2003) De relatie tussen werkstress, pesten en welbevinden op het werk [The relationship between job stress, bullying and well-being at work]. In W. Herremans (Ed.), *Arbeidsmarktonderzoekersdag, 2003* (pp. 139–163). Leuven, Belgium: Steunpunt Werkgelegenheid, Arbeid en Vorming.
- NOTELAERS, G. AND EINARSEN, S. (2013) The world turns at 33 and 45: Defining simple cutoff scores for the Negative Acts Questionnaire—Revised in a representative sample. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 22(6), 670–682.
- NOTELAERS, G., EINARSEN, S., DE WITTE, H. AND VERMUNT, J. (2006) Measuring exposure to bullying at work: The validity and advantages of the latent class cluster approach. *Work & Stress*, 20(4), 289–302.
- NOTELAERS, G., VAN DER HEIJDEN, B., HOEL, H. AND EINARSEN, S. (2019) Measuring bullying at work with the short-negative acts questionnaire: Identification of targets and criterion validity. *Work & Stress*, 33(1), 58–75.
- NOTELAERS, G., VERMUNT, J. K., BAILLIEN, E., EINARSEN, S. AND DE WITTE, H. (2011) Exploring risk groups workplace bullying with categorical data. *Industrial Health*, 49(1), 73–88.
- NUUTINEN, I., KAUPPINEN, K. AND KANDOLIN, I. (1999) *Tasa-arvo poliisitoimessa* [Equality in the police force]. Helsinki: Työterveyslaitos, Sisäasiainministeriö.
- O'CONNELL, P. J., CALVERT, E. AND WATSON, D. (2007) *Bullying in the workplace: Survey reports, 2007*. Dublin: The Economic and Social Research Institute.
- O'CONNELL, P. J. AND WILLIAMS, J. (2002) *The incidence and correlates of workplace bullying in Ireland*. Dublin, Ireland: Economic and Social Research Institute.
- OLAFSSON, R. AND JOHANNSDOTTIR, H. (2004) Coping with bullying in the workplace: The effect of gender, age and type of bullying. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 32(3), 319–333.
- O'MOORE, M. (2000) *Summary report on the national survey on workplace bullying*. Dublin: Trinity College.
- O'MOORE, M., LYNCH, J. AND NIC DAEID, N. (2003) The rates and relative risks of workplace bullying in Ireland, a country of high economic growth. *International Journal of Management and Decision Making*, 4(1), 82–95.
- O'MOORE, M., SEIGNE, E., MCGUIRE, L. AND SMITH, M. (1998) Victims of bullying at work in Ireland. *Journal of Occupational Health and Safety: Australia and New Zealand*, 14, 569–574.

- OLWEUS, D. (1994) Annotation: Bullying at school—basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 35, 1171–1190.
- ORTEGA, A., CHRISTENSEN, K. B., HØGH, A., RUGULIES, R. AND BORG, V. (2011) One-year prospective study on the effect of workplace bullying on long-term sickness absence. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 19(6), 752–759.
- ORTEGA, A., HØGH, A. AND BORG, V. (2008) Bullying, absence and presenteeism in Danish elderly care sector: A one-year follow-up study. *6th international conference on workplace bullying* (pp. 84–86), 4–6 June, Montreal, Canada.
- ORTEGA, A., HØGH, A., PEJTERSEN, J. AND OLSEN, O. (2009) Prevalence of workplace bullying and risk groups: A representative population study. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 82, 417–426.
- OZTURK, H., SOKMEN, S., YILMAZ, F. AND CILINGIR, D. (2008) Measuring mobbing experiences of academic nurses: Development of a mobbing scale. *Journal of the American Academy of Nurse Practitioners*, 20, 435–442.
- PAICE, E., AITKEN, M., HOUGHTON, A. AND FIRTH-COZENS, J. (2004) Bullying among doctors in training: Cross sectional questionnaire survey. *British Medical Journal*, 329, 658–659.
- PETROVIC, I., CIZMIC, S. AND VUKELIC, M. (2014) Workplace bullying in Serbia: The relation of self-labeling and behavioral experience with job-related behaviors. *Psihologija*, 47(2), 185–199.
- PICAKCIEFE, M., ACAR, G., COLAK, Z. AND KILIC, I. (2017) The relationship between sociodemographic characteristics, work conditions, and level of “mobbing” of health workers in primary health care. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 32(3), 373–398.
- PIIRAINEN, H., ELO, A.-L., HIRVONEN, M., KAUPPINEN, K., KETOLA, R., LAITINEN, H., LINDSTRÖM, K., REIJULA, K., RIALA, R., VILUKSELA, M. AND VIRTANEN, S. (2000) *Työ ja terveys—haastattelututkimus* [Work and health—an interview study]. Helsinki: Työterveyslaitos.
- PIÑUEL, I. (2006) *Mobbing, acoso psicológico en el trabajo* [Mobbing—psychological harassment at work]. Madrid: Instituto Regional de Seguridad y Salud en el Trabajo. Conserjería de Empleo y Mujer.
- QUINE, L. (1999) Workplace bullying in NHS community trust: Staff questionnaire survey. *British Medical Journal*, 3, 228–232.
- . (2002) Workplace bullying in junior doctors: Questionnaire survey. *British Medical Journal*, 324, 878–879.
- RAYNER, C. (1997) The incidence of workplace bullying. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 7, 199–208.
- RAYNER, C., HOEL, H. AND COOPER, C. L. (2002) *Workplace bullying. What we know, who is to blame, and what can we do?* London: Taylor & Francis.
- REKNES, I., EINARSEN, S., PALLESEN, S., BJORVATN, B., MOEN, B. E. AND MAGERØY, N. (2016) Exposure to bullying behaviors at work and subsequent symptoms of anxiety: The moderating role of individual coping style. *Industrial Health*, 54(5), 421–432.

- RODIC, V. (2016) Mobbing in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the member states of the European Union. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, 144, 12016.
- RUGULIES, R., MADSEN, I. E. H., HJARSBECH, P. U., HOGH, A., BORG, V., CARNEIRO, I. G. AND AUST, B. (2012) Bullying at work and onset of a major depressive episode among Danish female elder-care workers. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 38(3), 218–227.
- RUSSO, A., MILIC, R., KNEZEVIC, B., MULIC, R. AND MUSTAJBEGOVIC, J. (2008) Harassment in workplace among school teachers: Development of a survey. *Croatian Medical Journal*, 49, 545–552.
- SALIN, D. (2001) Prevalence and forms of bullying among business professionals: A comparison of two different strategies for measuring bullying. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10, 425–441.
- . (2015) Risk factors of workplace bullying for men and women: The role of the psychosocial and physical work environment. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 56(1), 69–77.
- . (2018) Workplace bullying and gender: An overview of empirical findings. In P. D’Cruz *et al.* (eds.), *Handbooks of workplace bullying, emotional abuse and harassment, Vol. 3: Dignity and inclusion at work*. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.
- SALIN, D., COWAN, R., ADEWUMI, O., APOSORI, E., BOCHANTIN, J., D’CRUZ, P., DJURKOVIC, N., DURNIAT, K., ESCARTÍN, J., GUO, J., IŠIK, I., KOESZÉGI, S., MCCORMACK, D., MONSERRAT, S. AND ZEDLACHER, E. (2019) Workplace bullying across the globe: A cross-cultural comparison. *Personnel Review*, 48(1), 204–219.
- SALIN, D. AND HOEL, H. (2013) Workplace bullying as a gendered phenomenon. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 28(3), 235–251.
- SCHMIDT, F. L. AND HUNTER, J. E. (2014) *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- SCHUSTER, B. (1996) Rejection, exclusion, and harassment at work and in schools. *European Psychologist*, 1, 293–317.
- SCHWICKERATH, J., RIEDEL, H. AND KNEIP, V. (2006) Le harcèlement moral sur le lieu de travail: fondements et thérapie cognitivo-comportementale des maladies psychosomatiques liées au harcèlement moral dans le milieu hospitalier [Bullying in the workplace: Principles and cognitive-behavioral therapy of psychosomatic disorders in relation to bullying in an inpatient setting]. *Journal de Thérapie Comportementale et Cognitive*, 16(3), 108–112.
- SCHYNS, B. AND SCHILLING, J. (2013) How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 138–158.
- SEGURADO, A., AGULLO, E., RODRÍGUEZ, J., AGULLÓ, M., BOADA, J. AND MEDINA, R. (2008) Las relaciones interpersonales como fuente de riesgo de acoso laboral en la Policía Local

- [Interpersonal relations as a source of risk of mobbing in the Local Police]. *Psicothema*, 20(4), 739–744.
- SIMPSON, R. AND COHEN, C. (2004) Dangerous work: The gendered nature of bullying in the context of higher education. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 11(2), 163–186.
- SKOGSTAD, A., EINARSEN, S., TORSHEIM, T., AASLAND, M. S. AND HETLAND, H. (2007) The destructiveness of laissez-fair leadership. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12, 80–92.
- SKOGSTAD, A., GLASØ, L. AND HETLAND, J. (2008) Er ledere i kraft av sin stilling beskyttet mot mobbing? [Are leaders protected against bullying?]. *Søkelys på arbeidslivet*, 25(1), 119–142.
- SKOGSTAD, A., NIELSEN, M. AND EINARSEN, S. (2017) Destructive forms of leadership and their relationships with employee well-being. In K. Kelloway, K. Nielsen and J. Dimoff (eds.), *Leading to occupational health and safety: How leadership behaviours impact organizational safety and well-being* (pp. 163–195). Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- SLÁVIKOVÁ, G. AND PASTERÁKOVÁ, L. (2012) Mobbing and its occurrence in the Slovak Republic. *Acta Technologica Dubnicae*, 2(1), 27–41.
- SOYLU, S., PELTEK, P. AND AKSOY, B. (2008) The consequences of bullying at work on organization-based self-esteem, negative affectivity, and intentions to leave: A study in Turkey. *6th international conference on workplace bullying* (pp. 6–8). June 4–6, Montreal, Canada.
- STAPEL FELDT, C. M., NIELSEN, C. V. ANDERSEN, N. T., KRANE, L., FLETEN, N., BORG, V. AND JENSEN, C. (2013) Are environmental characteristics in the municipal eldercare, more closely associated with frequent short sick leave spells among employees than with total sick leave: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health*, 13, 578.
- TAMBUR, M. AND VADI, M. (2009) Bullying at work: Research in Estonia using the negative acts questionnaire revised (NAQ-R). *Review of International Comparative Management*, 10(4), 791–805.
- . (2012) *Bullying at work: Do industries differ in the Estonian case?* Retrieved from <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1998906>.
- TEE, S., ÜZAR ÖZÇETİN, Y. S. AND RUSSELL-WESTHEAD, M. (2016) Workplace violence experienced by nursing students: A UK survey. *Nurse Education Today*, 41, 30–35.
- TEHRANI, N. (2004) Bullying: A source of chronic post traumatic stress? *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 32(3), 357–366.
- TEPPER, B. J. (2000) Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(2), 178–190.
- . (2007) Abusive supervision in work organization: Review, synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 33(3), 261–281.
- THOMAS, M. (2005) Bullying among support staff in a higher education institution. *Health Education*, 105(4), 273–288.
- TONG, M., SCHWENDIMANN, R. AND ZÚÑIGA, F. (2017) Mobbing among care workers in nursing homes: A cross-sectional

- secondary analysis of the Swiss Nursing Homes Human Resources Project. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 66, 72–81.
- TOPA, G. AND MORIANO, J. A. (2013) Stress and nurses' horizontal mobbing: Moderating effects of group identity and group support. *Nursing Outlook*, 61(3), e25–31.
- TÖRÖK, E., HANSEN, Å. M., GRYNDRUP, M. B., GARDE, A. H., HØGH, A. AND NABE-NIELSEN, K. (2016) The association between workplace bullying and depressive symptoms: The role of the perpetrator. *BMC Public Health*, 16, 993.
- UNISON. (1997) *UNISON members' experience of bullying at work*. London: UNISON.
- . (2000) *Police staff bullying report* (No. 1777). London: UNISON.
- VARHAMA, L. M. AND BJORKQVIST, K. (2004a) Conflicts, burnout, and bullying in a finish and a polish company: A cross-national comparison. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 98, 1234–1240.
- . (2004b) Conflicts, workplace bullying and burnout problems among municipal employees. *Psychological Reports*, 94, 1116–1124.
- VARTIA, M. (1991) Bullying at workplaces. In S. Lehtinen, J. Rantanen, P. Juuti, A. Koskela, K. Lindström, P. Rehnström and J. Saari (eds.), *Towards the 21st century. Proceedings from the international symposium on future trends in the changing working life* (pp. 131–135). Helsinki: Institute of Occupational Health.
- . (1993) Psychological harassment (bullying, mobbing) at work. In K. Kauppinen-Toropainen (ed.), *OECD Panel group on women, work, and health* (pp. 149–152). Helsinki: Ministry of Social Affairs and Health.
- . (1996) The sources of bullying—psychological work environment and organizational climate. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5, 203–214.
- . (2001) Consequences of workplace bullying with respect to well-being of its targets and the observers of bullying. *Scandinavian Journal of Work Environment and Health*, 27, 63–69.
- VARTIA, M. AND GIORGIANI, T. (2008) Bullying of immigrant workers. *6th International Conference on Workplace Bullying* (pp. 149–150), 4–6 June, Montreal, Canada.
- VARTIA, M. AND HYYTI, J. (1999) *Väkivalta vankeinhoitotyössä* [Violence in prison work]. Helsinki: Oikeusministeriön vankeinhoito-osaston julkaisuja 1 (English summary).
- . (2002) Gender differences in workplace bullying among prison officers. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 11, 1–14.
- VENETOKLIS, T. AND KETTUNEN, P. (2016) Workplace Bullying in the Finnish Public Sector. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 36(4), 370–395.
- VERKUIL, B., ATASAYI, S. AND MOLENDIJK, M. L. (2015) Workplace bullying and mental health: A meta-analysis on cross-sectional and longitudinal data. *PLoS One*, 10(8).

- VVEINHARDT, J. AND ŠTREIMIKIENĖ, D. (2015) The intensity of the expression of mobbing in employees' relations at lithuanian organizations. *E+M Ekonomie a Management*, 18(4), 53–67.
- WARSZEWSKA-MAKUCH, M. (2008) Workplace bullying, the big five personality dimensions, and job insecurity findings from a polish teachers' sample. *6th international conference on workplace bullying* (pp. 72–73), 4–6 June, Montreal, Canada.
- XU, T., MAGNUSSON HANSON, L. L., LANGE, T., STARKOPF, L., WESTERLUND, H., MADSEN, I. E. H., RUGULIES, R., PENTTI, J., STENHOLM, S., VAHTERA, J., HANSEN, Å. M., KIVIMÄKI, M. AND ROD, N. H. (2018) Workplace bullying and violence as risk factors for type 2 diabetes: A multicohort study and meta-analysis. *Diabetologia*, 61(1), 75–83.
- YAĞCI, E. AND ULUÖZ, T. (2017) Leadership styles of school administrators and its relation with the mobbing experience levels of social, science and mathematics teachers. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 14(1), 155–166.
- YAPICI AKAR, N., ANAFARTA, N. AND SARVAN, F. (2011) Causes, dimensions and organizational consequences of mobbing: An empirical study. *Ege Akademik Bakis (Ege Academic Review)*, 11(1), 179.
- YILDIRIM, A. AND YILDIRIM, D. (2007) Mobbing in the workplace by peers and managers: Mobbing experienced by nurses working in healthcare facilities in Turkey and its effect on nurses. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 16, 1444–1453.
- YILDIRIM, D., YILDIRIM, A. AND TIMUCIN, A. (2007) Mobbing behaviours encountered by nurse teaching staff. *Nursing Ethics*, 14(4), 447–463.
- ZABRODSKA, K. AND KVETON, P. (2013) Prevalence and forms of workplace bullying among university employees. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 25(2), 89–108.
- ZACHARIADOU, T., ZANNETOS, S., CHIRA, S. E., GREGORIOU, S. AND PAVLAKIS, A. (2018) Prevalence and forms of workplace bullying among health-care professionals in Cyprus: Greek version of “Leymann Inventory of Psychological Terror” Instrument. *Safety and Health at Work*, 9(3), 339–346.
- ZAPF, D. (1999a). Mobbing in Organisationen. Ein Überblick zum Stand der Forschung [Mobbing in organisations. A state of the art review]. *Zeitschrift für Arbeits- und Organisations psychologie*, 43, 1–25.
- . (1999b). Organizational, work group related and personal causes of mobbing/bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20, 70–85.
- . (2002) Emotion work and psychological strain. A review of the literature and some conceptual considerations. *Human Resource Management Review*, 12, 237–268.
- ZAPF, D. AND EINARSEN, S. (2005) Mobbing at work: Escalated conflicts. In S. Fox and P. E. Spector (eds.), *Counterproductive work behaviour* (pp. 237–270). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- ZAPF, D., EINARSEN, S. E., HOEL, H. AND VARTIA, M. (2003) Empirical findings on bullying in the workplace. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf and C. L. Cooper (eds.), *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace. International perspectives in research and practice* (pp. 103–126). London: Taylor & Francis.
- ZAPF, D., ESCARTÍN, J., EINARSEN, S., HOEL, H. AND VARTIA, M. (2011) Empirical findings on the prevalence and risk groups of bullying in the workplace. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf and C. L. Cooper (eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 75–105). Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- ZAPF, D. AND GROSS, C. (2001) Conflict escalation and coping with workplace bullying: A replication and extension. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 10, 497–522.
- ZAPF, D., KNORZ, C. AND KULLA, M. (1996) On the relationship between mobbing factors, and job content, the social work environment and health outcomes. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5, 215–237.
- ZAPF, D., RENNER, B., BÜHLER, K. AND WEINL, E. (1996) *Ein halbes Jahr Mobbingtelefon Stuttgart: Daten und Fakten* [Half a year mobbing telephone Stuttgart: Data and facts]. Konstanz: University of Konstanz, Social Science Faculty.
- ZUKAUSKAS, P., VVEINHARDT, J., MELNIKAS, B. AND GRANČAY, M. (2015) Dynamics of attack actions in the mobbin strategy: The case of Lithuania. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 16(4), 733–752.
- ZUR MÜHLEN, L., NORMANN, G. AND GREIF, S. (2001) *Stress and bullying in two organizations*. Unpublished manuscript. Faculty of Psychology, University of Osnabrück.