WORKPLACE BULLYING: AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR AND THE IMPACT ON JOB
SATISFACTION AND PRODUCTIVITY OF EMPLOYEES IN IRELAND

By

Katarzyna Krzyzanowska

National College of Ireland

Master in Human Resources Management 2015/2016

Word Count 14530

Submitted to the National College of Ireland, August 2016

DECLARTATION

Submission of Thesis and Dissertation

National College of Ireland

Research Students Declaration Form

(Thesis/Author Declaration Form)

Name: Katarzyna Krzyznaowska

Student Number: x13102109

Degree for which thesis is submitted: Master in Human Resources Management

Material submitted for award

(a) I declare that the work has been composed by myself.

(b) I declare that all verbatim extracts contained in the thesis have been distinguished by quotation marks and the sources of information specifically acknowledged.

(c) My thesis will be included in electronic format in the College Institutional Repository TRAP (thesis reports and projects)

(d) *Either* *I declare that no material contained in the thesis has been used in any other submission for an academic award.

Or *I declare that the following material contained in the thesis formed part of a submission for the award of

_____
(State the award and the awarding body and list the material below)

Signature of research student: *Katarzyna Krzyzanowska*

Date: *16th August 2016*

Submission of Thesis to Norma Smurfit Library, National College of Ireland

Student name: **Katarzyna Krzyzanowska**   Student number :**x13102109**

School: **National College of Ireland** Course: **Master in Human Resources Managemnet**

Degree to be awarded: **Master Degree Level 9**

Title of Thesis:

WORKPLACE BULLYING: AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR AND THE IMPACT ON JOB SATISFACTION AND PRODUCTIVITY OF EMPLOYEES IN IRELAND

Signature of Candidate: *Katarzyna Krzyzanowska*

For completion by the School: National College of Ireland

The aforementioned thesis was received by_____

Date:_____

ABSTRACT

The project aims at finding how workplace bullying affects employee productivity and performance at Ireland organizations. For that reason, quantitative research methods were employed and survey was distributed to companies, nurnsing homes, universities and posted in social media. It also finds out the impact of bullying on employee job satisfaction and productivity. The most appropriate method for the study is quantitative research design in which variables have been measured. The quantitative research design is helpful in attaining information in a numeric way, by applying this method, the variables and their relationships are being attained The analysis depicted that due to workplace bullying, the target experiences low productivity, high mental and physical stress which ultimately leads to less job satisfaction. If organizational culture and environment do not restrict such behavior, which causes bullying incidents within the company, then company may face long-term financial losses. Thus, it has been proven that negative working environment lead towards decreasing employee productivity. The correlation analysis further depicted that aggressive behavior has an impact on employee job satisfaction. The findings of the project concluded that, workplace bullying directly affect employee productivity and performance.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this project to all the victims of workplace bullies whose struggles and determination need to be recognized. I admire their courage, their strengths of overcoming the confronted behavior at the workplace. I believe that you will succeed in whatever endeavor you do in future.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my family, my supervisor, peers and all the supportive people who assisted me during my project. I believe without their support I would not be able to complete this project. My special thanks to participants who spared their precious time and contributed to attain the project reliable outcomes. I would thank everyone who directly and indirectly supported me in my final year thesis project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Section Introduction

The introductory chapter of the dissertation discusses the overview. The chapter explains the overall topic of the dissertation, its background, aims and objectives, significance of the study, research question, rationale and brief summary of the dissertation structure.

Introduction of the Study

The studies Rosenthal, (2008) & Oade, (2009) suggested that bullying is defined as the aggressive and unwanted behavior of the individuals for others. Person shows aggressive behavior to force others to do something. There are different types of bullying, one of the most sensitive bullying types is workplace bullying. The workforce bullying is defined as the health harm and repeated mistreatement of one person against others. According to the study Salin, (2003) workplace bullying is considered as the most serious issue that organizations face in today's competitive environment. This is one of the most costly problems, which cannot be ignored. There are numerous studies published on the issue and explain the pain, physical illness, mental distress, and career fiasco of an employee due to workplace bullying. This topic helps in comprehending the aggressive, conflicting and violent prevailing behavior at the workplace for another coworker. The workplace bullying is the violent, malicious behavior that intentionally shows from one person to another one to control and harm them. The bullying shows an inappropriate and unacceptable behavior that affects the dignity of the worker. The humiliated behavior towards peers is because to feel the other person inferior at the workplace. The studies (Salin, 2003a; Salin, 2003b; Salin, 2004; MacDonald, 2004) discussed various types of bullying for instance, aggressive behavior, sexual behavior and humiliating behaviors etc. The studies

further supported that bullying harm an employee physically, as well as, emotionally. The workplace bullying can be done through verbal and nonverbal behaviors apart from that the cyberbullying is yet another common form of bullying. In this type of bullying, the person is victimized through the internet and mobile phones (Fox & Spector, 2005; Einarsen, Raknes & Matheisen, 1994; Einarsen & Raknes, 1997; Cyberbullying. 2006). However, no matter what type of workplace bullying a person is involved, the outcomes remain the same, that are social isolation and exclusion. Different actions have been taken by the government to discourage the bullying incidents at the workplace. However, there is a lack of proper law and regulation made by the government, so organizations fail to eradicate the bullying incidents completely from the workplace.

The finding depicted in the study that different European countries are involved in creating awareness on the government level and actions have also been taken against workplace bullying including the anti-bullying legislation establishment (Kitt, 2004). It has been reported that by 2006, there were only five states of United States that had pending legislations against this issue. Whereas, no official law had been passed against it. Many states have established general laws and regulations against harassment etc. Some states address hostile behavior issue at the workplace with the existing laws. It is difficult for any organization to get the evidence against bullying attitude prevailing in the workplace because most of the times, the incident occurs in the absence of supervisor and coworkers. As it is mentioned, earlier that bullying is costly to the employers because, the outcome that arises from bullying can cause adverse effect on the organizational environment (Schachter, 2004; Natinsky & Lynch, 2005; Needham, 2003; Newman, Carlson & Horne, 2004).

Workplace bullying is the most serious yet ignorant issue, which needs to be taken care of on the organizational management level for lessening the long-term adverse effect. This study discusses how bully's behavior affects the performance of a victim within the organization and how it affects a company's financial performance. The study also focuses on the ways the victim faces bullying behavior and the role of the company in alleviating the aggressive bullying behavior.

Background of the Study

Since past many years, bullying at the workplace has been observed and considered as the major problem for the management to handle. Human resource professionals of the organization have been studying the relationship of the aggressive attitude with the performance of an employee. In 2007, the two surveys were conducted by the Department Of Enterprise Trade And Employment. In the first survey, the incidents and characteristics of bullying were studied. In the second, the private and public sector employers' responses were attained about workplace bullying. The first survey results depicted that around 60% of the employees who experienced bullying attitude quitted their jobs. On the other hand, the employer survey depicted that the public sector established more policies than the private ones on the workplace bullying issue. The research depicted that victims spend more time on defending themselves instead of focusing on their tasks assigned. He/she seeks for support within the organization, become demotivated, stressed out and prefers to take an escape from office (Djokovic, McCormack & Casmir, 2004; Egan, Yang & Bartlett, 2004; Einarsen, 2000; Einarsen & Mikkelsen, 2003; Einarsen et al., 2003; Einarsen, Hoel & Nielsen, 2004).

Research Questions

Following are the research questions for the study:

1. Does bullying have a negative impact on job satisfaction and productivity of employees?

2. Does workplace bullying have any negative impact on employees' well-being?

3. What can the employer do to prevent bullying in the workplace?

4. To identify if bullying has negative impacts on the organization and what these negative impacts are.

Problem Statement

Workplace bullying has been observed in the organizations worldwide, which has the potential of having a devastating effect on the workers' performance and productivity. The 2007 ESRI reports depicted the results of two surveys conducted. In Ireland, women are more at risk regarding workplace bullying than men. It is suggested that the large organization is confronted with the issue more with the small organization. The results of the survey conducted by the employees depicted that organizational nature plays an eminent role in workforce bullying. The survey also depicted that organizations face adverse effect regarding aggressive behavior towards victims. Companies may face huge financial loss if the aggressive behaviors cannot be controlled at work. The survey was conducted by analyzing the steps taken by the organizations on the workplace bullying issue. The results depicted that public sector somehow manages to formulate policies against this issue.

On the other hand, few actions have been taken against the issue, but no structured policy established yet. Public sector organizations have at least a system or procedure that helps in

dealing with the workplace bullying issue. There are around 58% of the private sector

organizations that reported that bullying affects adversely to the employee morale. Around 47%

of the public sector and 30% private sector organizations reported that the workplace bullying

impact employee's absenteeism (Vartia, 2003; Zapf & Gross, 2001; Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2001;

Mobley, Horner & Hollingsworth, 1978; Neuman, 2004). It has been observed that those

employees who have been bullied take more sick leaves than those who never get victimization.

In the mid-90s, bullying was considered as the most important topic. However, few studies have

been conducted on finding the relationship between workplace bullying and the impact on

employee job performance. This quantitative study analyzes the workplace bullying prevalence,

as well as, its impact on employee job satisfaction and productivity. The study also analyzes the

measures that have been taken by the companies, universities, nursing homes and social media

participants. In the quantitative study, an online survey is conducted on Irish market and number

of responses is 50. Each participant has been asked to respond 24 questions. The questions focus

on the relationship between workplace bullying prevalence and its impact on employee

productivity and performance.

Purpose of the Study

      The study aims at finding out the impact of workplace bullying in different organizations

of Ireland and its impact on employee job satisfaction and productivity. The most appropriate

method for the study is quantitative research design in which variables are measured. In

comparison to qualitative study, this method helps to attain the statistical comparison of different

types of organizations and their employees. The survey tool has been involved in the study in

which responses are taken regarding workplace bullying in the statistical form in the following

areas: harassment, workplace culture and company involvement. The quantitative study analyzed the relationship between dependent and independent variables. The dependent variable of the study includes work environment, bully traits and target types. On the other hand, the independent variables include physical stress symptoms, mental health, and job satisfaction. Based on these variables, the research hypotheses have been established. The study also explores different secondary literature specific to Ireland on the workplace bullying issue.

Significance of the Study

The study helps in attaining the relationship between workforce bullying with employee job satisfaction and productivity within the organization. Numerous studies have been discussed the adverse effects of bullying behavior, for instance, an employee morale decreases, indulge in the depression state, physical and mental distress, low self-esteem, workplace violence, etc. This study has gathered the data in detail on the issue of workplace buying (Grimme & Grimme, 2006; Einarsen, Hoel & Nielsen, 2004). The study defines the impact of aggressive behavior on the job performance and productivity. The data attain from the point of view of both the targets as well as witnesses. The detail form of information attains in increasing the knowledge about how the bullying affects the whole organization. It is observed that bullies are although those who play an eminent role in causing stress in an organization. The targets become less productive in the workplace as they focus more on protecting themselves against bullying rather than on their work tasks. As there are not much-established policies and regulations against workplace bullying. That is why the bullies get the free hand to exploit and harass peers to attain some selfish desire.

Lack of policies and regulations in majority of the Ireland companies lead to an increase of bullying incidents at the workplace. The study on this topic is significant because bullying

issue increases the cost for the businesses. As the human resources face physical and mental distress due to aggressive behavior that leads to a decrease in the employee productivity, which ultimately cause financial losses. The study helps in understanding the direct and indirect costs that the organization may bear due to workplace bullying. The studies depicted that (Einarsen et al., 2003; Ellis, 2006; Field, 1996; Fineman, 2003) organizations may find the direct costs must easier to identify than the indirect ones. Direct costs that incur due to workplace bullying include increased turnover, employee absence, security expenses, etc. On the other hand, the indirect costs are those who are hard to identify, for instance, low employee morale, stressful working conditions, and employee low productivity. The study helps in comprehending the relationship between the direct and indirect costs that bear by the organization in Ireland due to aggressive behavior at the workplace. This study assists in comprehending organizations about the workplace bullying issue. Apart from that, the study also helps in providing the insights on the ways of protecting, managing and handling the bullying behavior within the organization. The data attained from this study helps the employers to get the in-depth information about the prevalence of bullying behavior in the workplace. The study also identified the ways through which companies of Ireland can ultimately protect such behaviors in future, which may cause a long-term adverse effect.

Nature of the Study

The quantitative research study has been selected for this study to find out the relationship between aggressive behavior with employee job satisfaction and productivity. The rationale for using the quantitative study was that it helps in measuring the large-scale data. The study highlighted all the factors, which may cause bullying behavior as well as the affect

employee satisfaction and productivity. If the bullying behavior is acceptable at the workplace, then the organization can lose their valuable employees and lucrative financial returns. The outcome of the study helps in creating awareness about the aggressive bullying behavior among managers, leaders, and employees.

Research Hypothesis

Following are the research hypothesis for this quantitative study:

The purpose of established research hypothesis is to find out the relationship of aggressive behavior with employee job satisfaction and productivity. Following variables are taking into consideration:

H_0 aggressive behavior does not have an impact on employee job satisfaction

H_1 aggressive behavior at the workplace impact employee job satisfaction

H_2: Bullying at workplace depends upon target's gender

H_{o2}: Bullying at workplace does not depend upon target's gender

H_3: Any of the mistreatments with the employees at workplace affect organizational performance

H_{03} any of the mistreatments with the employees at workplace affect organizational performance

The entire defined hypothesis helped the study attaining results pertinent on the ways through which the leaders and managers work together for eliminating the aggressive behavior from the workplace. The prevalence of aggressive behavior has been determined by this study. The study also helps in examining the impact of aggressive behavior on the organizational culture as well as employee job satisfaction and productivity. The survey questions have been formulated in a way that best help in answering the how and ifs of employees response towards mistreatment with them at the workplace.

Dissertation Structure

The dissertation is divided into five chapters. These chapters are as follows:

Chapter 1 is the introductory chapter, which discusses the purpose of the study, research hypothesis and questions and overall overview of the study.

Chapter 2 is the detailed review of secondary literature; based on that literature the results were attained. The literature comprised of different studies on the impact of aggressive behavior on the employee job satisfaction and productivity.

Chapter 3 is the methodology chapter, which included the details of research design and data collection and analysis tools. The chapter included discussed the applied research design's limitation and ethics.

Chapter 4 is the analysis and discussion chapter. This chapter-included findings attained from the secondary sources, as well as, primary sources that survey. The statistical tools were used to analyze the results. The limitations and ethical grounds were also analyzed.

Chapter 5 is the last chapter, which concludes and summarizes the key findings. The recommendations and future study suggestions were also provided in the study.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Section Overview

The literature review chapter included the detailed review of the secondary database. The aim of this study is to find the relationship between aggressive behavior with employee job satisfaction and productivity. Chapter 2 included the history of aggressive behavior at the workplace. The studies published on the similar topic were included in this chapter. The pertinent theoretical framework was included in the study. The section identifies the gaps exist in the literature review on the topic "workplace bullying and its impact on employee job satisfaction and productivity" and its importance to this project.

Theoretical Framework

Workplace bullying is the debatable topic yet less focused issue of today's working environment. The chances of bullying are high where people interact with each other more often. To take the competitive edge over others companies are more prone towards expansion. For that purpose, they need to recruit and train more diverse staff members (Christen, Iyer & Soberman, 2006). The studies Grimme & Grimme, (2006); Harvey et al., (2006); Crowley & Elster (2006); Daniel, (2004) depicted that the problem of bullying in the workplace is common in the large organizations because a number of employees is more there. The studies further depicted that people where more with each other interact; there bullying issues have been observed more. Organizations have to bear heavy cost due to workplace bullying issue. The secondary sources depicted that workplace bullying cause severe issues among the victims (Judge et al., 2001; Fineman, 2003; Furnham, 2004).

Victims of workplace bullying may face mental and physical stress, career fiasco and other psychological issues. In the scientific literature, the effects of workplace bullying on employee productivity and job satisfaction have been discussed in detail. According to the studies (Quine, 1999; Quine, 2001), the workplace bullying in the NHS trust England depicted that the sufferings of nurses from aggressive behavior affect adversely on the employee job satisfaction and productivity. Nurses who became the victim of workplace bullying experienced high anxiety level, distress, and depression. However, in the study, provision of support to the nurses enabled them to bring them back to the normal psychological conditions. There are some other studies, which provided the results that workplace bullying affects negatively to the victims as it decreases the job satisfaction level, employee productivity and brings physical illness.

The emotional distress among colleagues due to internal conflict lead the victim to nowhere but low job performance. The studies further suggested that managers must put their efforts to improve their employee's performance and work with them to subside the negative attitude and behavior with the positive ones. It is quite difficult to determine the effect of bullying on the job performance because many employees bear the torture and pursue their job tasks. Organizations bear cost as the performance deteriorates with every passing year due to workplace bullying (Oghojafor, Muo & Olufayo, 2012; Owoyemi & Sheehan, 2011; Rayner, Hoel & Cooper, 2002; MacIntosh & Doherty, 2010).

The workplace environment plays an eminent role because employees' most of the time has been spent interacting with their peers and boss at the workplace. If the working environment is not comfortable enough for the employees in which they get the opportunity to freely focus on their skills and abilities, and then the job productivity drops down. The mental stress of an employee compels them to focus on the negative options like quitting the job; not performing the

job tasks or gives up the career progression opportunities. Tepper study depicted the causes of the high turnover rate in the organization (Tepper, 2000). The findings depicted that aggressive behavior of subordinates and peers lead an employee to quit the job. Djurkovic study depicted the direct relationship of systematic workplace bullying in the form of aggressive behavior with the adverse impact on employee mental and physical health conditions. Quine study depicted the result that the employees of NHS experienced bullying at the workplace, which caused a high level of depression and anxiety along with the imminent reduction in the job satisfaction level. The secondary sources suggested that aggressive bullying at the workplace adversely affect the attitudes and behaviors of the employees. However, there are other types of bullying as well, to which the studies depicted the same result as it showed the aggressive bullying behavior (Quine, 1999a; Quine, 2001).

Studies focus on the bullies' behaviors and their impact on the victims. The research on the bully's behavior provided the fact that their behaviors are driven by the desire of controlling other people by suppressing their attitudes. Bullies seek pleasure by showing a dominating behavior on the weak ones. According to the study, the bully's victim is not selected randomly but it is utterly possible to predict the fact that who is going to be victimized. The common cause of bullying is that the bullies feel insure and inferior to others and to take superiority on others they try to suppress the victim through humiliating behavior. The reason discussed in the study is that bullies mostly try to suppress their subordinates to calm their inner self with the humiliation they face from their bosses. They want to seek satisfaction by transferring the humiliation and aggression to their subordinates (Levine, Breitkopf Sierles & Camp, 2003; Lambert, Hogan & Barton, 2001; Judge, 2006; Judge & Church, 2000; Judge & Klinger, 2007; Keashly & Jagatic, 2003).

A nonscientific study was conducted in 1998, in which the campaign against workplace bullying was administered. In that study, around 200 participants were selected. The selection of sample was not made randomly. The study depicted the in-depth information about the negative workplace environment. Djurkovic, McCormack & Casmir (2004) outcomes depicted that both genders whether they are men and women faced the bullies and become victimized. Mostly those employees were victimized were good at performance. The aggressive behavior towards the employees was mainly to suppress them and make them feel inferior. The findings further indicated that bullying would be dangerous for the career, physical, and mental health of the being. As it may damage employee skills and abilities and make them utterly devastating. The study further advises that employers must focus on this issue and implement tactics, which help in eliminating the aggressive behaviors at the workplace.

Bullying At the Workplace

The latest study Einarsen & Nielsen, (2014) depicted that the fact that workplace bullying is the sort of criminal act in which employees start to feel inferior and indulge in fear and depression. Other study Frenking (2016) supported this fact and revealed that many employees quit their jobs due to workplace bullying acts from their peers and supervisors. The act is unacceptable in many countries; however, this problem still exists commonly not just in developing countries but also in developed countries. There are numerous studies conducted on defining the bullying and its impact on victims at workplace.

According to the studies Davenport, Schwartz & Elliott, (2005); Davidson & Dougherty (2003) the workplace bullying in another words defined as the emotional abuse, harassment, psychological terror, and victimization. The bullying can be done through verbal and nonverbal

actions. No organization is free of bullying. However, many organizations control the bullying actions, which make the environment quite feasible for the employees to work productively. The harmful and insidious bullies are present in every organization; if they are not controlled, then they may be the cause of company's fiasco. Workplace bullying can be done through hostile email messages, physical aggression and even with gossips. These all types of bullying agitate the workers, which make them unable to concentrate on the work. According to the research, there are three different elements of bullying. These elements include aggressive and negative behavior, which aims to harass people, the repeated behavioral act, and the behavior, which originates from the power imbalance between the parties involved. The possible reasons of workplace bullying include victims' socially exposed position, the absence of leadership, absence of work design and low morale standards at the department. The literal meaning of bullying includes, when a person is exposed to the negative actions repeatedly over time by one or more oppressors (Judge et al., 2001; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Lee, 2000; Lee & Brotheridge, 2006).

It is suggested in different studies that the bullying behavior must be examined and studied because it is directly linked up with the long-term costs of organizations, as well as, employees. Heavy costs have been associated with the bully behavior because such behavior augments numerous issues within the organizations. Schwepker, (2001) defined that employees and organizations face legal, health and productivity issues because of aggressive behavior at the workplace. It is the responsibility of the employers to emphasize on this sensitive issue and provide full safeguards to the employees from any bullying behavior at the workplace. This can be done not just by creating the roles, responsibilities, safety and behavioral expectations within the business environment but also maintaining them to reduce the occurrence of any bullying behavior at the workplace. In comparison to the sexual harassment, the prevalence of bullying at

the workplace is three times more. It has been reported that those employees who are being the victim of bullying ask for more sick leaves than others. This may lead to the organization more cost as more employee health programs can be availed by the employees, which lead the employers to pay more premiums (Judge & Klinger, 2007; Lambert, Hogan & Barton, 2001; Tepper, 2000; Vartia, 1996)

The studies Baron Neuman, (1998); Deshpande & Joseph, (2009) Zapf & Einarsen, (2003); Zapf & Gross, (2001); Silverthorne, (2004); Simons, (2008); DC Yamada, (2008) depicted that organizations in developed and developing countries are still not able to formulate strategies that help in controlling the bullying behavior. Every fifth employee reported the bullying incident to the organization's human resource department. This is one of the evidences of bullying; however, with regardless of the provided evidence, the employers do not take proactive actions against this issue. Bullying culture is dangerous for the organization's success. Employees feel reluctant in joining and retaining that company where bullying culture is common. The studies Tehrani, (2004); Einarsen, Hoel & Cooper, (2003); Zapf, Knorz & Kulla, (1996); Rayner & Cooper, (2006) elaborated the fact that those organizations that fail to provide non-toxic and non-bullying environment will face deteriorating financial outcomes. The main problem of not controlling the bully behavior is that human resources and other leaders are not trained enough to handle such situation. The lack of experience and expertise to handle bully incidents lead to high employee turnover rate. There are studies conducted which discussed the impact of bullying on the job performance and satisfaction. Until now, employers do not estimate the actual loss they face due to aggressive behavior at the workplace (Keashly, 1998; Keashly & Jagatic, 2003; Keyserlingk, 2002; Kinney & Johnson, 1993; Kitt, 2004; Lutgen-Sandvik, 2005; Vartia, 2001; Schachter, 2004).

The internal working environment also plays an eminent role in the business success. Employers do not focus on this aspect; they ignore the changing performance and behavior of their employees. As most of the employers only care about their financial returns rather than human resources well-being. This attitude will create a lack of trust and disassociation with the organization among employees. This thesis focuses on the following criterions: the first one is the impact of bullying behavior on the job satisfaction and the second one is the impact aggressive behavior on the victim's productivity (Leymann, 1996; Hoel & Salin, 2003).

The study depicted that the employee productivity can be affected by physical stress systems, decrease in the cognitive and thinking abilities and job dissatisfaction. All these predictors affect employee productivity. Because of the mentioned factors, the employee feels trauma, which affects the productivity adversely. The victims of bullying may face low self-esteem and morale. Studies have been conducted on the relationship between health status and job involvement. The victim's absence from the workplace due to health issues are being reported more than those who are not victimized (Lloyd, 2006; Lloyd, 2006; Einarsen et al., 2003; Burns, 1978; Business Research Lab, 2003)

Characteristics of Bully

There are different studies conducted that revealed the characteristics of bully at workplace. Some of the latest studies Kimberly, (2014) and Frenking (2016) agreed with the common facts that bullies are usually self-centered people who actually want to make inferior to others by either harassing them or by their behaviors or acts. The studies also supported that mostly people who are selfish and looking for shortcuts in life get involved in the bully acts at workplace. They feel threatened from other people who are better than they are. Apart from the

latest studies, there are other researches as well that focus on some common characteristics of bully at workplace.

According to the studies Cairns, Xie & Leung, (1998); Christen, Iyer & Soberman, (2006); Cortina (2003); Locke, (1976); Ford, (2005) managers unable to detect workplace bullying as it exists in the subtle form in the organization. Most of the bullying behavior is underlined by the abusive attitude to dominate others. It is very difficult to study the workplace bullying that is the reason its categorization has been based on the opinions of the victims. Bullies are actuated to suppress others due to different reasons, for instance, they may have some personality disorders, which is originated from the early childhood. The bullies' selfish and commanding attitudes depict that they need to meet their own desires at any costs. The studies Infante Rancer & Womack, (2003); Institute for Management Excellence, (2005); Jansen, (2006); Joyce, (2005); Hoel & Salin, (2003) supported the fact that the most trivial characteristics of bullies are as follows: selfish, seductive, manipulated and attractive. They are the most pessimist individuals who see everyone as hostile and negative. The study suggested that a bully person believes in taking revenge because they formulate negative perceptions in their minds for others. They are being compelled to act aggressively to attain forceful respect and power from others. The most constructive trait as per the theory of aggressive communication is assertiveness. The person who possesses this trait focuses on achieving the personal goals whereas he/she also creates an optimistic feeling among others (Lewis & Gunn 2007; Leymann, 1993; Leymann, 1996; Hoel Cooper & Faragher, 2001; Hotchkiss, 2003). The studies Schwepker, (2001); Miller & Medalia, (1955); Mobley, Horner & Hollingsworth, (1978); Natinsky & Lynch, (2005); National Institute of Safety and Health, (2004) supported the fact that

it is the most difficult thing to identify bully attitude of the candidates during recruitment process.

There are companies that pay heavy amount on insurance to safeguard their working environment with bullies. It will be an ideal situation if managers ascertain who is going to be hired in the organization. The manager would scrutinize the behavior of the employees and identified whether they are involved in creating negativity at the workplace. The research studies Adams & Crawford, (1992); Ames, (2003); Babiak & Hare, (2006); Bahl, (2003); Bass, (1990); Bion, (2001); Bolman & Deal, (1997) depicted that work bullies find it difficult to hide their inefficiencies and pretend to be efficient employees of the organizations. For that reason, they are involved in the wrong doings. Work bullies lack in emotional intelligence and coping skills. They prefer to indulge in the blame game rather than accept their responsibilities. For controlling others, the work bullies indulge in the wrong doings. They do not confess their mistakes, but their aggressive behavior shows everything. Work bullies aggressive behavior is unacceptable in the society. The studies Bully online, (2006); Rayner Hoel & Cooper, (2002); Neuman, (2004); Newman-Carlson & Horne, (2004); Oghojafor, Muo & Olufayo, (2012); Olsen, (2002) supported the common fact that gender difference plays an eminent role in promoting the bully behavior with the organization. The studies further elaborated on the fact that in comparison to the males, female work bullies create more drama in the organization. They pretend to be the victim and make the actual victim as the villain. In the working environment where such attitudes and behaviors exist, there the working culture is paralyzed by apprehension, employee less productivity, destructive employment practices, and unhealthy workforce (Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2001; Needham, 2003; Luthans, 1995; MacDonald, 2004; MacIntosh & Doherty, 2010; Markovits, Davis & Van Dick, 2010).

Victim Characteristics

The research studies Braun, (2004); Brenner, (2006); Brunner & Costello, (2003) supported the fact that some people show their bully behavior towards certain target group. The bully does not torment everyone. The bully behavior is aggressive to the certain victims. These victims are being selected based on the bully's inadequacy and position at work. If a person is a better performer than the bully, the chances of being victimized gets more. However, anybody can be the victim, but the two most common characteristics are as follows: non-confrontational personal style and desire to cooperate. The studies depicted that Egan, Yang & Bartlett, (2004); Einarsen & Mikkelsen, (2003); Einarsen, (2000); Einarsen & Raknes, (1997) the victim unable to mingle and socialize with others as the bully's action make them underestimated.

The studies Davidson & Dougherty, (2003); Harvey et al., (2006) supported the fact that victims' self-esteem and self-confidence drop down due to bullying behavior, apart from that, they get hurt emotionally and physically. In order to regain their confidence level, trainings and sessions must be arranged by the organizations. Most of the characteristics, which a victim possesses, are intelligence, competence, integrity, dedication, and accomplishments. The study further suggested that the victims are considered as emotionally intelligent people. Victims of workplace bullying are often known as achievers. They have strong performance, which make the bully jealous and insecure (Einarsen & Mikkelsen, 2003; Groeblinghoff & Becker, 1996; Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996; Daniel, 2004).

Organizational Culture and Working Environment

The study Humphries, (2011) revealed the fact that the organizational culture plays an eminent role in employee's motivation. In any organization where employees retain for many years show that, the working environment of the organization is supportive and progressive. Many organizations claim to maintain progressive and productive working environment but in reality, their employees are demotivated due to workplace bullying incidents. The progressive environment is that in which every employee feels free to share problems and issues with their immediate boss without any reluctance.

The studies Furnham, (2004); Groeblinghoff & Becker, (1996) supported the importance of organizational performance and its impact on employee retention. The other studies also supported the fact that Giga Cooper & Faragher, (2003) organizational environment plays an eminent role in retaining and attracting employees. However, the malicious worker can ruin the healthy working environment and make people less productive. It has been observed that peoples' personality traits, nature, biological factors compel them to dominate and control others. Managers and human resource department find it quite challenging to maintain an unbiased working environment.

The common concern of many organizations is lack of proper strategies formulated against workplace bullying actions. Due to which, the quality human resources get adversely affected by the bully's negative actions. Apart from the bully, there are other people as well who are directly and indirectly involved in workplace bullying. These people are those who stay silent and tolerate bully's actions against others. Working environment also witnesses groups and gangs for supporting bully for attaining some mutual benefits. Such informal gangs and groups would lead organizations towards fiasco and sometimes utter wipeout. The past studies supported the

fact that workplace bullying has become more common today than ever before. However, irrespective of the frequency, this issue has remained overlooked by most of the companies in developing and developed countries. The ignorance and lack of seriousness on this issue would lead to a reduction in victim morale, less job satisfaction, less productivity and augmentation of health cost. The studies Einarsen & Skogstad, (1996); Daniel, (2004); Davidson & Dougherty, (2003) supported the finding that bully does not survive for long in the organization instead the survival is based on plagiarizing others notions instead of creating their owns. Leg pulling is the most common characteristics of bully. The research depicted that bullying is associated with numerous factors. These factors include social work environment, work control, weak leadership and role conflict. Bully is responsible for creating any mistreatment at work. The bully's actions depict direct correlation of dissatisfaction with their abilities, management and fewer capabilities of handling the work tasks.

The studies Hodge & Gillespie, (2005); Hoel & Cooper, (2000); Hoel & Cooper, (2003); depicted the importance of family bounding. The studies depicted that social support and social gatherings are important for the survival of any negative vibes. The study supported the fact that those employees who receive social support from their family members and workplace are less affected by the aggressive behavior than those who do not receive. The studies Richey & Leonard, (2006); Ellis, (2006); Field, (1996) further suggested the common fact that the bullying behavior in the organization is not a major issue if the management take proactive strategies over this issue. The studies further supported the finding that bullying is controllable. Only those organizations face this issue where proper actions are not taken against bullying behavior. If the organization practices rigid hierarchy, then they may face the autocratic behavior within the organization. The findings suggested that the bully's workers discourage to report the issue, as

they do not want the problem to be solved. The study depicted that there are numerous peers and colleagues who support the bully's behavior by remaining silent. On the other hand, there are some who do not involve in any matter and walk away from the bullying environment without raising voice against it (Goleman, 2005; Crowley & Elster, 2006; Harvey et al., 2006; Einarsen et al., 2003; Fineman, 2003).

On the organizational level, the negative bullying effects can be observed. The evidence depicted the fact that bullying behavior is being associated with numerous factors like low job satisfaction, job conflict, high stress, workloads, peer problems, and leadership. The study Einarsen, Hoel & Nielsen, (2004) depicted the relationship between bullying behavior with organizational performance. All features that have been arisen by the bullying behavior negatively affect the organizational performance. The study showed that the person with aggressive behavior sometimes leaves the organization by themselves after holding the new position in other organization. The bully starts the bullying behavior in the new workplace. The studies Einarsen et al., (2003); Ellis, (2006); Field, (1996) further supported the fact that the victim's time is wasted on defending themselves and seeking support for subsiding their problems. Victims involve in the nonproductive things like taking sick leaves, become demotivated and become stressed out, etc. It is beneficial for the organizations to formulate and implement strict anti-bullying policies. These policies would be helpful in creating more peaceful environment, which helps in increasing job satisfaction, less sick leaves, and health costs, high staff retention and better decision making (Vartia, 2003; Zapf & Gross 2001).

Studies on Bullying Behavior and Employee Productivity

Workplace bullying is the most debatable topic, and numerous studies have been published on the similar issue. The studies Rayner, Hoel & Cooper, (2002); Tehrani, (2012) discussed the cost involved due to workplace bullying. These studies also elaborated the fact that organizations must take preventive measures in order to minimize the cost occur to the organization. The research study discussed the finding that there are two types of costs involved at the workplace due to bullying. The first one is pertinent to the direct costs and the other one is the indirect costs. An organization easily identified the direct costs that occur due to workplace bullying. The direct costs include employee turnover rate, augmentation of legal fees, recruitment and training costs, hiring part-time employees, uninformed absence from the company, increase in sick leaves, low job satisfaction, low employee morale, etc. There are some researchers who said that mental health condition, job dissatisfaction and physical stress symptoms can be seen in the victims due to workplace bullying which lead to negative employee productivity (Grimme & Grimme, 2006; Einarsen, Hoel & Nielsen, 2004; Fineman, 2003).

According to the study conducted by Djurkovic, McCormack & Casmir (2004), there were around 10 to 25% victims of the bully at the workplace who wasted their time on defending themselves and seeking support from the network instead focusing on the assigned tasks. On the other hand, the results further suggested that the targets due to aggressive behavior face demotivation, stress, and illness, etc. The studies Owoyemi & Sheehan, (2011); Patton, (2002); Persaud, (2004) supported the common fact that the organizations are more prone to criminal behaviors because of work bullies. The study further stated that the bullies are responsible for creating corruption in the organization. The aggressive and humiliating behavior of the bully causes the victim to suffer from humiliation, shame and depression, which also affects their job

performance. The study indicated that employers are afraid of this issue as this problem leads

their quality human resources towards poor health conditions. The research also indicated that

the workplace bullying causes stress among the victims, which is adverse for the organizations,

as well as, individuals. The study depicted the connection between depression and stress with

various health diseases like heart problems, depression, mental disturbance, alcoholism, job

dissatisfaction, family issues and accidents, etc (Olweus, 1999; Owoyemi & Sheehan, 2011;

Patton, 2002; Persaud, 2004; Mathisen, Einarsen & Mykletun, 2008).

However, the study further categorizes the eight common types of bullying that effect the

wellbeing of the victims. These effects are as follow: poor concentration, shame, insecurity,

depression, nightmares, sleeplessness, etc. The problem is hazardous not for the organizations

where the bullying behavior is not restricted but also for the victims. The different views that can

be observed between bully-victim problems and factors associated with the health. The effect of

bullying is normally adverse for the health of the victim, however; sometimes it has some

positive effect as well. The victim may perform well after going through the victimization and

fights back harder through their performance. However, the few may take the victimization as

positive, majority of the victims suffer from the adverse effects of workplace bullying (Vartia,

2003).

The bullies who use aggressive physical actions for bullying others like boss and

coworkers through adopting psychological harassment is observed as the most devastating for

the organizations and victims. The study depicted the high prevalence of disease that exists in the

world is mental health issues. These issues include depression, sleep disturbance, and anxiety

etc. As per the study conducted by business research lab, there were 40% of the respondents who

accepted the fact that they faced bullying, on the other hand, there are others who witnessed

others of being bullied. The study further depicted the fact that the mental conditions of those who are victimized are less psychologically well than those who are not bullied (Olweus, 1999; Mathisen, Einarsen & Mykletun, 2008).

The study further depicted the fact that those people who are victimized compelled to leave their jobs due to the employer's failure to provide healthy working environment. It is very difficult for explaining the poor health conditions of the bullies especially if they hold a successful position in the organization. The study further suggested that many victims face PTSD post trauma stress disorder in which they cannot give work productivity because of the imbalance of emotions and mental state. It has been suggested that there are some bullies, which face troublesome due to their bullying tactics. However, the study negates the fact that it is not right to assume all the bullies lack empathy and feeling of shame (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

Literature Gaps and Summary

The chapter included different study's findings. The section discusses areas, which would help this project in attaining the reliable and valid outcomes. The studies discussed the characteristics of bully and victim and highlighted those factors that compel bully to victimize others. The discussed areas in the section help the study to develop the questionnaire. The chapter included different study's findings. The workplace bullying is considered as the poor phenomena, which has not been addressed completely in the organizations. The bullying problem is the most common issue, which is prevalent in most of the sectors of work industry. Different studies have been discussed in details on the similar issue. Studies mentioning the relationship between employee job performance and effect of workplace bullying have been discussed in details. The studies that have been conducted to find out the relationship between

the scope of actions and involvement of bully, environment and victims discussed in the chapter. The negative and some positive aspects of workplace bullying have been mentioned in detail. The chapter provided the broader view of bullying perspectives and the relationship of bullying with job satisfaction and productivity. The next is the methodology chapter, which addresses the need of research design used in the study to attain the respective information. The chapter also includes rationale of selecting the quantitative research design in the study.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter discusses the research methodology that is used for data collection. The chapter includes a brief overview of the research design, the pros and cons of applying it and data collection techniques. All the tools and techniques, which are used in collecting data, has been discussed regarding the relationship between workplace bullying with job satisfaction and productivity.

Research Design Selection and Justification

The research design is the overall plan of the researcher, which he/she used for attaining answers to the research questions. According to the study, the research design helps in implementing the methods in a way, which best help in attaining the outcomes. By employing research design in the study helps in augmenting the chances of attaining the informative data, which ultimately help in obtaining the authentic results. In this study, the quantitative research design has been used. The quantitative research design is helpful in attaining information in a numeric way, by applying this method, the variables and their relationships are being attained (Sherry, 1997; Creswell, 2002; Patton, 2002). On the other hand, the qualitative research method is exploratory by nature.

There are numerous characteristics of quantitative research design that makes it more appropriate for the study to employ. Through quantitative research the results can be attained through measurement; the results attained in the concise form; helps in examining and determining relationships and variables; large sample population can be used; the reliability and

validity of the instruments used are critical. Whereas, the reason for not choosing qualitative research method was that the attained outcomes would not be conclusive. The outcomes could not be used for generalizations. The purpose of employing the quantitative research method is to find out the association and relationship between workplace bullying behavior and its impact on the job performance and productivity of the employees. This research design is the most appropriate one as it helps in adding value in the past conducted researches on the workplace bullying and its impact on employee performance and productivity. Through employing quantitative research, tools not qualitative research tools, the broad base of insight could be attained on which project can easily give the final recommendations. It is also optimum for this study as the design evaluated the similar factors that were discussed in the similar past situations in the different studies. The quantitative research methods attained the statistical findings and quantitative results by using the research instruments. The responses attained from the surveys were used for measuring the relationship between workplace bullying and its impact on the job satisfaction and productivity. However, through qualitative research tools, the responses can be attained with unlimited expressions, which may restrict in attaining systematic and structured outcomes. Whereas, the quantitative research tools help in attaining responses on the reformulated questions. The relationship between the variables can be addressed through research questions and hypothesis.

Research Setting

The research setting is defined as the methods and tools used for data collection. In this study, the quantitative research data have been collected by using the primary and secondary source. In the primary data collection close ended surveys were used which helped in attaining

the information pertinent to the workplace bullying in different organization of Ireland and its impact on their employee performance and job satisfaction. On the other hand, the secondary sources were used for attaining the information. The secondary sources were research journals, books, and all authentic published literature. The literature used in the study was attained through google scholars, Ecampus library, Ebsco, and Sage. Apart from that, the official websites were also used for attaining the government and employers efforts against workplace bullying.

Research Instrument and Justification

The primary data collection means attaining the in-depth and first-hand information. The benefits of using primary sources for data collection are that it helps in attaining the insight information, which is not published before. This includes attaining information regarding opinions, beliefs, and other in-depth information. The quantitative study used questionnaire survey as the research instrument. The questionnaire was conducted in the study with the employers and employees of different companies of Ireland. The questionnaire was developed after identifying the variables, which need to be studied. All the identified variables were pertinent to workplace bullying and its impact on employee job satisfaction and productivity. 24 close-ended questions asked the chosen participants. The survey was the most suitable and appropriate research instrument, which helped in identifying the structured and most pertinent responses about workplace bullying and employee job satisfaction. The outcomes attained from the questionnaire were coded into numerical form, which then decoded in the statistical software through which the results attained in the form of tables and charts. This research instrument is helpful in attaining the reliable and valid outcomes. The online survey was conducted through surveymonkey.com. The employees were informed to fill the online survey through sending an

email. It was further informed to the employers to fill the questionnaire with their employees. As there were 50, employers/employees selected for filling up the survey. Participants were given six weeks' time to fill and submit the survey. As the commercial survey site is used for the study so the responses would be automatically accessed. Participants have the equal choice to opt out of the survey. The multiple-choice questions were formulated in the survey. 50 respondents were approached to participate in this study. Among them, few did not respond well to the asked questions.

Sample Population and Selection

As the topic of the project was to find out how workplace bullying affects employee job productivity and satisfaction in Ireland. The population selected for conducting survey was not more than 50 employees from different Ireland public, private and semi-private organizations. The reason for choosing participants from different industries was to get the insights how workplace bullying affect employees productivity at all level. The selection of sample size was based on convenience sampling method. The convenience sampling method is also known as non-probability sampling method, such type of method focuses on that part of population who are easy to reach. Through this sampling method, 50 employees were selected on convenience basis. They were asked to fill in 24 close-ended survey questions. They were also allowed to withdraw from the research anytime they wanted to.

Research Variables

Following are the research variables for the study:

The dependent variables of the study include work environment, bully traits and target types. On the other hand, the independent variables include physical stress symptoms, mental health, and job satisfaction.

Research Validity

There are two types of validities: internal validity and external validity. The internal validity has the ability to adequately test hypothesis. This type of validity enables the researcher to attain the insights of the outcomes of the study. If the internal validity is strong, then it is said that the research has reliable measures of variables. The strong validity also means that the variables like job satisfaction, mental health, and physical health are all associated with the employee productivity. The purpose of using the internal validity is to attain two objectives: the first one is to test bully effect with job satisfaction through theoretical framework, and the other one is to investigate if the aggressive behavior brings out something positive for the organization or not (Sherry, 1997; Creswell, 2002; Patton, 2002). On the other hand, the external validity can be achieved when the population is restricted; conditions are tightly controlled, and the subject selection is bias. In the external validity, the study is being generalized to the other situations, as well as, population. A strong external validity is only possible if the sampling method selected is probability sample.

Limitations

The survey was conducted from the small sample size. To conduct a study on large sample size, there are different advantages, as well as, disadvantages. It becomes difficult for the quantitative survey to escalate processes and capture patterns. Such survey seldom provides ample data for the identification of targets experiences and the subjective data meaning. In comparison to the quantitative methods, the qualitative method provides amply detailed data regarding a number of cases and people (Losh, 2002). The responses are not limited to specific answers. It is not possible for the quantitative methods to reflect all the aspects of aggressive behavior at the workplace and its impact on employee performance and job satisfaction. The limitation of the research methods is that no open-ended interviews have been conducted to attain the in-depth information about the topic. The respondents were asked to opt out from the survey. However, there were chances of attaining the bias response from the respondents.

Data Analysis

The data attained through primary sources like survey responses were analyzed by using the surveymonkey.com . Statistical tests were run along with the interpretation. On the other side, the secondary sources information is evaluated through different studies, which were previously published on the similar topic. The statistical response results were backed by the secondary sources to attain the most reliable outcomes. The responses were centered on the variables, which were mentioned in the research hypothesis. The relationships among the variables were attained through surveymonkey.com. The variables then evaluated through statistical tests. These hypotheses are as follows:

H_1 aggressive behavior at the workplace impact employee job satisfaction

H_0 aggressive behavior does not have an impact on employee job satisfaction

H_2: Bullying at workplace depends upon target's gender

H_{o2}: Bullying at workplace does not depend upon target's gender H_3: Any of the mistreatments

with the employees at workplace affect organizational performance

H_3: Any of the mistreatments with the employees at workplace affect organizational performance

H_{03} any of the mistreatments with the employees at workplace affect organizational performance

The reason for choosing the above hypothesis was to find out the influence and impact of workplace bullying with employee job satisfaction and productivity at Ireland workplaces. The topic is quite sensitive, as the confidentiality factor remains the foremost priority of this study. If the survey does not take care of the anonymity, then it creates serious problems for the participants. Most of the participants may have fears and concerns that if they do not participate in the survey, then they would be hurt or something like that. However, in that pressure, they would not be able to focus on providing the honest response, which leads to research study fiasco. In this study, the statistical tests that were used included frequencies, means, and standard deviations and correlations (partial and Pearson). The outcomes of the tests would be helpful in describing and comparing the prevalence and forms of mistreatments. The tests would also help in evaluating the impact of bully behavior on employee's well-being. The information attained from the survey coded in a way that helped in interpreting the results by using statistical software. The bullying and its impact on employee performance can be negative, as well as, positive. The study found the impact on employee performance through statistical analysis and buttresses them through secondary sources.

Ethical Consideration

The participants chosen in the study were asked to acknowledge the informed consent before filling the survey. The informed consent clearly declared the fact that the selected population was willingly participating in the survey. They were free to opt out the survey anytime they felt like. The unbiased interpretation of the responses was done. The questions of the survey did not formulate in a way that actuates the participants to respond in any particular direction. Apart from that, the names of the companies and employees were kept secret and anonymous.

Summary

This chapter has discussed the research method used in the study. The chapter also discussed the significance of using quantitative research methods for evaluating the relationship between aggressive behavior and its impact on employee performance and job satisfaction. This chapter also discussed in detail the research instrument used in the study. A close-ended questionnaire was used and circulated to the employers/employees in Ireland. Participants were allowed to withdraw from the survey anytime. The individuals and companies names did not disclose in the study to keep the confidentiality and privacy. The internal and external validities of selecting and implementing the research design were discussed in depth. The data collected through primary and secondary sources were analyzed on the surveymonkey.com was analyzing the primary data responses. The statistical test and charts provided the results, which would then, evaluated through secondary sources.

<div align="center">**CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION**</div>

Introduction

This chapter included the survey responses and its statistical analysis. The frequency distribution tables were interpreted; means and standard deviation of the responses and correlation of the variables were evaluated. The chapter also included the discussion section, which supported the responses from the secondary literature. The survey was conducted by different companies' employees. The responses attained of the survey questions were 24. The participants were targeted from various industries in order to attain the in-depth information about workplace bullying and its impact on employee productivity and performance. The participants belonged to the different sectors like small for-profit, large for-profit, non-profit, government, education and medical.

Survey Findings

Frequency Table

The initial questions asked from the respondents were regarding the country they belong. The findings depicted the fact that the Ireland companies are struggling hard towards workplace bullying issue. As the purpose of conducting, a survey from all the organizational rank was to attain the unbiased findings about workplace bullying. The survey question inquired about designation respondents holds in Ireland companies. The findings depicted that majority of the participants held non-supervisory positions at their workplace. This shows that the responses attained through this survey depicted how employees at non-supervisory positions suffer from workplace bullying. In this study, the researcher tried to eliminate the bias aspects. As random

sampling was done in the survey so questions were formulated in the manner that helped in filtering out the irrelevant participants from the study in the start. Initially, participants were asked whether they had been mistreated in the last 12 months or not. Majority of the respondents did not face bullying incidents at their workplace within a year. This depicts that there might be some measures have been taken by the employers to reduce bullying incidents within the working environment.

On the other hand, there were asked whether they had been ever faced mistreatment at workplace or not. Those respondents who never faced bullying incidents were excluded from the survey. There were most of them who did not respond to the asked question and they were excluded from survey. However, among those there were around nine participants who said that they were being bullied at their workplace. In Ireland, the employment rate of males are more than females so the aggressive behavior towards peers and subordinates are more towards minorities i.e., females. As per the findings suggested, mostly females are the victims at Ireland companies. Although, males are not excluded from being victimized but as per the survey results, females are considered as the most bullied at the workplace. The attained response regarding "who was targeted for mistreatment" was quite confusing. Majority of the respondents gave equal response towards multiple responses. Half of the respondents said that only the target was singled out; there were no others and half responded that others were also mistreated. However, the confusion of the above responses quite cleared out when the respondents were asked whether harasser work alone or in-group. In response to this question, the participants admitted the fact that mostly solo harasser is the cause of victimization.

The secondary source supported the survey finding as it suggested that Crowley & Elster (2006), organizations sometimes feel threatening when the harasser holds a senior position and

considers as the valuable resource of the company. Employers usually feel reluctant to take actions against the harasser due to his/her position and performance at the workplace. The survey results revealed that there is less employability rate of women at Ireland workplaces, less female staffs are being employed, which results in attaining undue favors, and promotions at workplace. In order to hold monopoly in the workplace, female staffs are being observed in involving more in harassment cases.They try to bully the other staffs of the same gender in order to hold their position strong at the workplace. Therefore, organizations admitted the fact that they are being in the challenging position to reduce the bully incidents from female harassers towards female victims.

The survey results depicted that the victims belonged to the non-supervisory positions or junior positions and the findings revealed that they were being victimized by those females as well as males who ranked higher than they did. The responses from the questionnaire depicted the fact that harassers who rank higher at the workplace suppressed their juniors through ill treatment. The bullying incidents are common in the large profitable organization. Few incidents are also witnessed from the small for profit organizations. Where there is more number of employees work, the chances of bullying increases. This fact has been supported well through questionnaire responses. Where, people who work in the large for profit organization victimized more from bullying incidents. This shows that in large organizations, people involve in negative competition, which compel them to indulge in negative and mistreatment attitudes with the juniors.

The survey findings depicted that the key reason of victimizing others is that, they can hold strong position in the company by suppressing and humiliating others. The bullying issue has not been addressed much in the organizations. The employers do not formulate strict actions

and policies, which help in restricting such actions from happening in future. Majority of the employers in Ireland say that they do not get any report of such incidents. Apart from that if, they get rarely then they request the victims and harassers to tolerate each other for the benefit of the company. The findings supported the fact that harassers and target were not protected in Ireland companies. Every problem has a solution, similarly, workplace bullying is the most serious issue, which needs to be stopped and controlled by the organization. Most of the people suggested that the best way to reduce and eliminate mistreatment incidents is that organizations must take strict harassers' transfer, terminate decision, or strengthen their anti-bullying laws and regulations.

The survey results depicted that the victims do not find any way out of keeping them away from the bullying incidents except quitting the job and find any other good working place. On the other hand, employers take another action to minimize bullying incidents. They transfer the victim to other department; this act is beneficial yet dangerous at the same time for the organization. The victim might not perform in the transferred department due to numerous reasons: lack of interest, not adjusting in the new environment etc. or feeling disappointed. Majority of the organization prefer to talk to the harassers about the issue and verbal warnings yet requests given to them. This strategy is not much effective as chances of repeating such incidents are high. Workplace bullying can be of different forms. The human resources department is the most eminent department which deals organizational sensitive issues like sexual harassment and bullying behavior etc. most of the companies in Ireland do not have efficient human resource department where proper actions against organizational issues are handled or addressed.

The secondary study Einarsen, (2000) depicted that lack of awareness, training, and incompetency of HR department leads to augmentation of this bullying issue within the

workplace. The failure of addressing this issue well leads to nowhere but adverse outcomes whether in terms of quitting of quality human resources or other. Most of the companies' HR department do nothing but request the harasser to quit bullying behavior. One of the reasons might be that, the harasser holds a good position in the company so HR department might feel reluctant in taking any strict actions against the harasser. HR department is not given proper training on the workplace bullying issue, which leads them nowhere when it comes to tackle the situation.

The pity situation is revealed while the participants were being asked whether employer's health and safety or workplace relation commission addresses the workplace bullying incidents or not. Very unfortunate situation was revealed and as per that, there is no such department in Ireland organizations or no separate person is assigned for handling this issue. Most of the time, the target do not report the issue because organizations do not have created trust among the employees over this issue. If any bullying incident is reported against harasser, so the immediate boss of the harasser does not do anything except taking any of the following ineffective solutions: Resolve or attempt to resolve the situation positively, completely or partially; do nothing despite requests for relief; and there was no such person or department or the target did not inform. Most of the victims belong to the non-supervisory positions, so when they seldom report the bullying incident to the executive and senior manager then most of the time, managers do not know how to address this situation or resolve the situation partially.

The survey findings depicted that people who bullied at their workplace mostly by the female supervisors reported the types of bullying behavior they usually faced. Female harassers usually victimized their targets by unnecessarily interference in the work performance, misusage of authority and threatening targets of their professional status. Those who have ever victimized

by bullying behavior reported that their morale decline whenever they witnessed any mistreatment during work either by peers or supervisors which lead to ultimate decline in the productivity. There is not a single organization that flourishes without motivated human resources. Employee motivation is depended on numerous factors that are monetary and non-monetary. The negative attitude at the workplace from peers and supervisors affect employee's productivity adversely.

The study Furnham, (2004) supported the fact that it is the right of every employee to take a legal action against organizational discrimination. However, many companies in Ireland are not given freedom to take legal actions against any discrimination happened with the employees within organizational premises. The most disappointing fact is that victims are not encourage to file any legal action against the harassers. There might be numerous reasons for that, may be organizations do not have formulated laws and regulations on this issue; lack of awareness of legal actions among HR department and employees; discourage employees to go for legal action on this situation. This is one of the biggest reasons that the employees are not inclined towards taking any legal action against harassers. They know that their organizations do not support them in this matter so they remain quiet and bear aggressive behavior.

The bullying effects the employees and organization adversely and this has been proven by the survey findings. After employees faced the bullying incidents, majority of the employees become more resilient. However, quitting the job is the most common consequence of bullying incident. The victims know that the organization would not support them because there are not set rules and regulations against bullying incidents so they prefer to switch the jobs instead of bearing the torture from the harasser. Victims have suffered from such incidents become emotionally and mentally shattered which affect their productivity, as well as, performance.

The participants were asked their general perception and opinion about bullying and job satisfaction. In response to this question, they have revealed the fact that if an employee faces bullying behavior in the organization, then they become shattered from inside which depicts on their behavior as well. However, it depends on from person to person to what extent they bear their stress, anxiety, and maltreatment. A general view of the outcomes, which usually victims experience, include social isolation, loss of concentration, increase in sabotage, more absents reported, productivity decline, failure to work in the team, etc. Their self-esteem and morale decrease and they try to look for some other options like quitting the job or taking long sick leaves. All these actions due to workplace bullying affect their productivity level and job satisfaction. When the question was asked from the participants whether the harassers were being punished for their bullying behavior, the majority of them negated that fact. The negative responses depicted that organizations do not take strict action towards harassers. The 'do nothing' attitude depicted that the harasser has been protected to some extent by the organizations.

Victims who have been bullied become least satisfied with their jobs. The survey findings supported the statement that the bully behavior negatively affect the victims and make them less productive. Victims were also asked during the survey that the witness satisfaction level also affect or not. In victims' point of view, the job satisfaction of the witness also affected. They thought that they might also be targeted in future. The sense of ownership decreases and job insecurity arises among employees. The participants responded to the question asked whether others were also mistreated or not. In response to this, majority of the respondents reported that others were also mistreated within the organizations. The harassers who engaged in the bullying activities belonged to the same designation, as the victims possess.

Correlation

H$_1$ aggressive behavior at the workplace impact employee job satisfaction

H$_0$ aggressive behavior does not have an impact on employee job satisfaction

The partial correlation was tested to find out the significant linear relationship between those victims who mistreated repeatedly and within 12 months. The controlling variable here is employee job performance and satisfaction. The partial correlation was employed here just to get to know where mistreatment at the workplace has any influence on employee job performance/satisfaction. The table has been divided into two parts 1) Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients of the defined variables, which include dependent, controlling and variables 2) the outcome from the partial correlation where the variables have been adjusted to find out the influence of controlling variable on them. The correlation analysis figures depicted the strong, positive partial correlation between dependent variable (mistreated at workplace) and independent variable (organization rank) and the controlling variable (employee job satisfaction) (r=.352, p=.005).

The zero order correlation in which the job satisfaction variable is excluded. In that the relationship between dependent and independent variables depicted quite acceptable, positive correlation (r=.385, p=.005). The figures depicted that there is a positive and good relationship among between variables and the controlling variables have strong influence on other dependent and independent variables.

H$_2$: Bullying at workplace depends upon target's gender

H$_{o2}$: Bullying at workplace does not depend upon target's gender

The above correlation table revealed the relationship between mistreatment at workplace with target's gender. The Pearson correlation test was applied here, the relationship between independent and dependent variables are acceptable and negative (r=-.332*, p=.019). The finding depicts that if one variable increases then other variable decreases. The bullying at workplace does not depend upon target's gender.

H_3: Any of the mistreatments with the employees at workplace affect organizational performance
H_{03} any of the mistreatments with the employees at workplace affect organizational performance

The significance value must be less than or equal to 0.05, only then the values are significant. The value of this relationship is r=.216, p=.001. This shows that there is positive relationship between variables and if one variables increases then its impact can be seen on the other variable too. If organizations become the victim of workplace bullying behavior then its impact on the organizational performance gets worsen.

Mean and Standard Deviation

The mean depicts the average responses for each survey question. The findings depicted that mean values depict the mix responses. This means that on average the participants show mix responses of agree and disagree on the asked questions on the large scale. Participant's responses do vary, as the value of standard deviation is mostly greater to mean.

Discussion

The study Silverthorne, (2004) supported that the organization is comprised of human resources, which give the final output through their performance that ultimately end up with lucrative results. On the other aspect, human resources are also responsible for organizations' failure (Silverthorne, 2004). The internal conflicts, politics, and bullying attitude affect adversely on the financial performance of the overall organization. Companies identify that their employee turnover rate increases due to internal conflict within working conditions. Apart from that, the number of absenteeism increases because employees compel to escape from their current situations and find ways for some alternatives. Organizations face the lack of teamwork due to bullying behavior from the peers and colleagues. The studies Markovits, Davis & Van, (2010), Tehrani, (2012) supported the finding that the aggressive attitude restricts others to work in groups or teams. Although, participants identified different groups formulated those groups were established for their personal gain not for the benefit of the organization.

Bad word of mouth spread all over about the company is working environment. Employees do not want to join those organizations, which do not help them in excelling their skills. The company faces recruitment problems, as candidates do not want to join the organization, which lead to a labor shortage and ultimately affect company's productivity and performance. When an employee does not see the company's efforts towards their rights and self-esteem protection than the association with the company declines, which lead to a decrease in job satisfaction, morality, and job security (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). The employee sabotage increases and frequency of discrimination complaints increases.

The secondary source Judge et al., (2001) backed the fact that the environment of the workplace plays a major role for the employee performance. If there is a prevalent pressure in

the workplace, it will certainly have a negative impact on the motivational level. The workplace

bullying is a reality that can heavily deter the employees from working at their optimal levels.

Secondary research from the literature review has identified that workplace bullying has a

negative impact on the employee performance. It does not only have a negative impact on the

performance, but it also creates negative vibes in the workplace. While it directly affects the

employee being bullied but it also has a negative influence on other people (Judge et al., 2001).

Many organizations tend to put this issue under the carpet without the realization that it exist.

Ignoring issues do not help to heal a situation, but in fact, it intensifies it. Therefore, the

organizations must realize the existence of issues and must develop a strategy to solve it.

There are two approaches to solving the problem of workplace bullying: one is

reactionary and the other one is proactive. The reactionary approach may mitigate the further

impact of the situation, but since it has already been done, so the damage is already there. If both

approaches are compared then, the later one is the more preferable. The proactive approach can

be utilized by creating a formal policy framework that already identifies the kind of acceptable

behavior in the organizational setting. If someone crosses the line, the policy comes in place to

hamper the behavior. As the policy already has the reactionary actions if something wrong

happens, so it already has a set of actions that ultimately restricts a person from doing the

bullying, the finding is also supported by the studies (Workplace bullying: Finding some

answers, 1997; Workplace bullying: Key facts, 1999).

In the backdrop of the study, it was found that aggressive behavior has an effect on the

job satisfaction. The secondary source Christen, Iyer & Soberman, (2006) also supported the fact

that aggressive behavior that is considered as bullying can heavily affect the job satisfaction. For

the performance of any employee, the job satisfaction is of prime significant. If a person is not

positively inclined towards his job, it is difficult that the employee will give the performance at his or her optimal level. Investigation on the notion that there is a relationship between employee satisfaction and employee performance is significant because the whole premise is built upon the same idea (Christen, Iyer & Soberman, 2006).

Therefore, the same notion has been investigated in the research that proves that there is such relation. If the aggressive behavior has an effect on the job satisfaction and if job satisfaction has an impact on productivity; therefore, the matter of bullying is significant for an organization to solve. If such behavior is not controlled, it is will have a negative impact on productivity, which will result in financial loses. If the organization is doing financial losses due to the negative behavior of the employees, this is extremely unjust for the stakeholders of the company (Markovits, Davis & Van, 2010; Lambert, Hogan & Barton, 2001). The major responsibility and primary goal for any organization are to enhance the stakeholder profitability. If the profitability has any negative impact due to the internal problems, then the organization cannot be considered an efficient organization. Organizations need to review their hiring policies. HR department are not aware of numerous policies regarding the sensitive issues like sexual harassment and workplace bullying. The women have less employment rate, and the already hired employees intentionally bullied the same gender in order to hold their persistent position in the organization. The findings suggested the fact that there is a need to focus on the tighten the laws and regulations against workplace violence. The current findings revealed that without accountability and punishment from the organizational management side, the bullying incidents could not be controlled.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

The project aims at finding how workplace bullying affects employee productivity and performance at Ireland organizations. For that reason, quantitative research methods were employed and on survey reply 50 respondents. The statistical analysis was done on the attained responses. Organizations that tend to find a reactionary action for the bullying actions will face problems; therefore, a proactive approach is the most recommended one. Human resources are called the assets of the company. The organizations consider workforce as their resources. Due to globalization, no organization can be successful if their employees are not motivated and satisfied with the assigned jobs. Organizations fail to attain maximum employee productivity without employee motivation. There are different factors, which play an eminent role in motivating staffs with the organizations. One of most important one is working environment. The organizational culture and working environment lead towards motivating employees, which ultimately give maximum output. HR department needs to revise their anti-bullying policies.

The proactive approach can be attained by formally drafting a holistic policy that defines and identifies the disciplinary action towards the one who does the bullying. The first step involved in the process is the notion of identifying what comes under the definition of bullying. Due to the forces of globalization, workplaces are becoming highly diverse. While diversity brings fresh and novel ideas but the same is associated with numerous challenges. The definition of bullying may vary based on different cultures and practices. A practice that is considered quite normal at one place may be completely inappropriate for someone else; therefore, a unifying policy is important. This policy will help control the negative behavior in the organizational

setting because it highlights the disciplinary action that will be in place for certain kind of behaviors.

Lack of policies and regulations in the majority of the Irish companies lead to an increase of the level of bullying incidents at the workplace. The analysis of the secondary sources and the primary research delineates that there is a relationship between aggressive behavior and job satisfaction. The same research also proves a relationship between job satisfaction and productivity of the employees. If the productivity level is being compromised due to the aggressive behavior, the issue must be resolved; otherwise, it will have a negative impact the profitability. For any organization, the ultimate goal is the profit maximization of the stakeholders, and if it is not done in an appropriate manner, then it will be termed as inefficient.

The findings from the secondary and primary sources depicted that workplace bullying adversely affected employee satisfaction and productivity. The statistical analysis depicted that due to workplace bullying the target face low productivity, high mental and physical stress that ultimately lead to less job satisfaction. If organizational culture and environment do not restrict such behavior which causes more bullying incidents within the company. Thus, it is proven that negative working environment leads towards decreasing employee productivity. The correlation analysis further depicted that aggressive behavior has an impact on employee job satisfaction. The findings depicted that mean for all responses are greater than the standard deviation. This means that the responses do not disagree in on the large scale. Participant's responses do not vary much as the value of standard deviation is closer to mean.

Workplace bullying is difficult to detect as it lies in the subtle form. Most of the bullying behavior is underlined by the abusive attitude to dominate others. It is very difficult to study the workplace bullying that is the reason its categorization has been based on the opinions of the

victims. Bullies are actuated to suppress others due to different reasons, for instance, they may have some personality disorders, which is originated from the early childhood. The bullies selfish and commanding attitude depict that they need to meet their desires at any costs. The common characteristics of bullies are as follows: selfish, seductive, manipulated and attractive. They are the most pessimist individuals, who see everyone as hostile and negative. It has been observed that peoples' personality traits, nature, biological factors compel them to dominate and control others. Managers and human resource department find it quite challenging to maintain an unbiased working environment. The common concern of many organizations is a lack of properly formulated strategies against workplace bullying actions. A proper policy in place to control bullying is not enough, but the organization must implement it in true spirit. There is a high probability that if such policy is put in place, certain important figures could be identified as bullies. For making it successful, it is the responsibility of the leadership to make the system so efficient that it will have the same treatment to everyone in the organization.

The statistical and secondary findings depicted the fact that organizations need to work on their policies and procedures to eliminate bullying behavior at the workplace. HR departments need to communicate well to the hierarchy and not just that, unbiased policies need to be introduced. The findings of the project concluded that, workplace bullying directly affect employee productivity and performance. Thus, it can be concluded that workplace bullying in Ireland companies is considered as the most serious issue, which needs to be taken care of on priority. There is need to scrutinize the cause and effect of workplace bullying at organizational financials and resources. Workplace bullying negatively affect the human resources who work at any organizational level. It creates negative working environment, which may lead them to either quit from their respective jobs or lower their productivity level. In both cases, organizations face

severe financial losses. The more employees are dissatisfied with the work and employer, the more company faces losses.

Recommendations

As this topic mainly covers workplace bullying at Ireland companies so less focus has been given to the government rules and regulations over this sensitive issue. Although, the government of Ireland has passed different laws, employment acts rules and regulations on the workplace bullying. However, many organizations have not taken this issue seriously. Organizations lack in proper policy making on this issue. Although, sexual harassment and actions taken on this issue have been added up in the organizational policies manual but it lacks implementation. It is highly recommended for the organizations to take proactive measure for eliminating this issue. There is a need to take strict action against harassers no matter in what designation he/she is in the organization. Ireland companies' HR department need to assign the counseling tasks to the individuals whose responsibility would be to interact with the staff members and discuss their problems. The HR representatives would be responsible not just to ask the queries and issues but to provide solutions in that matter. They must develop and amend organizational policies to strengthen the preventive measures against this issue. Employees must be taught in the orientation and routine based sessions that they can file legal action against the person who is directly or indirectly involved in the workplace bullying. Organizations must support and take preventive measures against workplace bullying issues (Tehrani, 2004).

The findings depicted that no illegal action has been taken against the harassers, which motivate them to involve in the bullying incidents in the future again. The negative act cannot be controlled if people are not being punished for their injustice acts. There is a need to implement

policies, laws and regulations against bullying incidents. Without accountability and punishment from the organizational management side, the bullying incidents cannot be controlled. Most of the harassers are female and they usually targeted to the same gender. As the number of female employment is low in Ireland companies, so superiority complex compel female supervisors to show aggressive behavior to their subordinates. Organizations need to provide equal employment opportunities to both the genders. The gender equality helps in reducing this extreme behavior from women at the workplace. Employees must be given trustable environment where they can openly share their problems and issues with their hierarchy. If the immediate boss is involved in the bullying acts then employees must have been given an environment where they can cross the hierarchy and communicate their problems to the management. Employees would be more motivated if they are given safe and secure environment. It is highly recommended to the Ireland companies to prioritize problems, which need to be taken care. The first and foremost thing any organization should do is to formulate laws and regulation within the company against workplace bullying acts. The second thing needs to be done is to make sure that the formulated laws are implemented transparently. The organization should be involved in the periodic scrutinizing of such issues. If they confront with any complains or issues against other co-worker/employee then unbiased action must be taken against. The more such issues are minimized the more financial progression is possible. There is a need to conduct further study in which there is a need to conduct pilot study in which employees complains against workplace bullying are catered well. There is a need to study and evaluate if catering employees complains unbiased influence their job productivity and work satisfaction or not.

Reflection/Development Record

NAME: Katarzyna Krzyzanowska	STUDENT NUMBER: X13102109			
COVERING THE PERIOD FROM:	January, 2016	TO	AUGUST, 2016	
Key dates	What did you do?	Why?	What did you learn from this?	How have/will you use this? Any further action?
January -March	Thesis topic selection and passed on to topic approval. Proposal submitted before 29th January 2016	Supervisor was assign to students. The thesis topic selection is the most eminent part before start working on the project. If the topic does not cater the untapped areas of market, then doing research would be of no use. Supervisor has all the expertise to evaluate the appropriateness of the topic. Therefore, the topic was sent to him for approval.	Topic "Workplace bullying: Aggressive behavior and the impact on Job Satisfaction and productivity of employees in Ireland" has been approved by College.In Ireland, the workplace bullying is the unaddressed area. However, this topic provides the causes of frequent incidents of workplace bullying. It also helps in finding out the ways through which this	After topic approval and selection. The relevant data has been collected to identify the research problem, research objectives and questions of the study.

			problem can be solved.	
March-April	Proposal on the topic has been made which was sent to supervisor for further approval	This was the most crucial part before commencing work on the final project. The aims and objectives, research questions and research methods will be finalized which helped in the final thesis.	By the help of supervisor, I was able to comprehend the do and don'ts of making research questions, objectives and selection of appropriate methods.	I have used the formulated structure of the thesis for data collection of the most relevant information about the topic
May-June	The selected research methods were employed to collect relevant information and data about the project	The information attained assisted in evaluating the results and findings, which ultimately helped in attaining reliable outcomes.	The survey method was one of the most difficult and time-consuming methods. As the response rate was not impressive.	The findings attained from the survey were further analyzed through SURVEYMONEKY.COM
June- August	The statistical findings were backed by the literature.		The findings depicted that Ireland companies did not have proper rules and regulations over workplace bullying incidents. The internal	The findings provided clarity what needs to be done in order to reduce the bullying incidents from the workplace. There is a need to conduct a research through interview analysis as well. It would help in attaining more authentic results and in-depth information about the problem. The findings of the project help in sending

			departments are not aware of handling the bullying issues	out different strategies to different Ireland companies. By implementing on those strategies, companies would be able to eliminate or at least reduce the causes of workplace bullying.

REFERENCES

Adams, A., & Crawford, N. (1992) *Bullying at work*. London. Virago.

Ames, M. (2003). *Going postal rage, murder, and rebellion: From Reagan's workplaces to Clinton's Columbine and beyond*. New York: Soft Skull Press.

Babiak, P., & Hare, R. (2006) *Snakes in suits: When psychopaths go to work*. New York: HarperCollins.

Bahl, T. (2003) The workplace bullies. *The Hindu Business Line*. [online] Available at: http://www.blonnet.com. [Accessed 6th June, 2016].

Bass, B. (1990) *Bass & Stodgill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research & managerial application*s. New York: Free Press.

Bion, W. R. (2001) *Experiences in groups and other papers*. New York: BrunnerRoutledge.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1997) *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Braun, J. (2004) Bullying prevalent in many workplaces. *Arizona Business Gazette*, p. 2.

Brenner, R. (2006) *101 ways for managing conflict*. [online] Available at: http://www.chacocanyon.com/. [Accessed 21st May, 2016].

Brunner, P., & Costello, M. (2003) When the wrong woman wins: Building bullies and perpetuating patriarch. *Advancing Women in Leadership*. [online] Available at: http://www.advancingwomen.com [Accessed 21st May, 2016].

Bully Online. (2006) *Bullying in the family: Dealing with a serial bully, psychopath or sociopath in the family*. [online] Available at: http://www.bullyonline.org [Accessed 21st May, 2016].

Burns, J. (1978) *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Business Research Lab. (2003) *Workplace Bullies*. [online] Available at:

http://www.busreslab.com [Accessed 21st May, 2016].

Cairns, R., Xie, H., & Leung, M. (1998) *The popularity of friendship and the neglect of social networks: Toward a new balance*. online] Available at: http://www.medscape.com [Accessed 21st May, 2016].

Christen, M., Iyer, G. & Soberman, D (2006). Job satisfaction, job performance and effort: A reexamination using agency theory. *Journal of Marketing, 70,(1)* 137-150.

Cortina, S. (2003) *UI doctoral student to help study bully behavior, health problems* [News release]. Iowa City: University of Iowa.

Creswell, J. (2002) *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluatingquantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Crowley, K., & Elster, K. (2006) *Working with you is killing me: Freeing yourself from emotional traps at work*. New York: Warner Business Books

Cyberbullying. (2006) *Mobilizing educators, parents, students, and others to combat online social cruelty*. [online] Available at: http://www.cyberbully.org/ [Accessed 21st May, 2016].

Daniel, B. (2004) *Workplace bullying: A communication perspective*. Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee.

Davidson, W., & Dougherty, J. (2003) *Most likely to succeed at work*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

DC Yamada (2008) Workplace bullying and ethical leadership - *Journal of Values-Based Leadership, Vol. 1, No. 2,* p. 49

Deshpande, S.P., & Joseph, J. (2009) Impact of emotional intelligence, ethical climate, and behavior of peers on ethical behavior of nurses. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *85*(3), 403-410.

Djurkovic, N., McCormack, D. & Casmir, G. (2004) The physical and psychological effects of workplace bullying and their relationship to intention to leave: A test of psychosomatic and disability hypothesis. *International Journal of Organizational Theory & Behaviour, 7(4),* 469-497.

Egan, T.M., Yang, B. & Bartlett, K.R.(2004) The effects of organizational learning culture and job satisfaction on motivation to transfer learning and turnover intention. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 15(3),* 279–301.

Einarsen, S. & Mikkelsen, G. (2003) *Individual effects of exposure to bullying at work. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in research and practice*. London: Taylor & Francis. (pp. 127-144)

Einarsen, S. (2000) Harassment and bullying in the workplace : A review of the Scandinavian approach. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 5*, 379-401.

Einarsen, S. and Raknes, B. (1997) Harassment in the workplace and the victimization of men. *Violence and Victims, 12(3),* 247-263.

Einarsen, S. Hoel, H., Zapf, D. & Cooper, C. (2003) *The Concept of bullying at work: The European tradition. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf & 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. Raknes, B. & Matheisen, S. (1994) Bullying and Harassment at work and their

      relationships to work environment quality: An exploratory study. *The European Work*

      and Organizational Psychologist, 4, 381-401.

Einarsen, S., & Raknes, B. (1997) Harassment at work and the victimization of men. *Violence*

      and Victims, 12, 247-263.

Einarsen, S., & Skogstad, A. (1996) Bullying at work: Epidemiological Findings in Public and

      private organizations. *European Journal of work and organizational Psychology, 5 (2),*

      185-201.

Einarsen, S., et al. (2003) *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace*.

      London: Taylor & Francis.

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H. & Nielsen, M. B. (2004) *Workplace Bullying*. Norwegian Labour

      Inspection Authority, 47-60.

Einarsen,S., Hoel, H., & Cooper, C. (2003) *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace:*

      International perspectives in research and practice. London: Taylor and Francis. p. 15.

Einarsen. S., & Nielsen B., M., (2014) *Workplace bullying as an antecedent of mental health*

      problems: a five-year prospective and representative study. Springer Berlin Heidelberg

Ellis, A. (2006) *Workplace bullying*. [online] Available at: http://www.worktrauma.org

      [Accessed 21st May, 2016].

Field, T. (1996) *Bully in sight: How to predict, resist, challenge and combat workplace bullying*.

      Oxfordshire, Great Britain: Wessex Press.

Fineman, S. (2003) *Understanding emotion at work*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ford, J. (2005) *Organizational issues: Organizational management conflict*. [online] Available

      at: http://www.mediate.com [Accessed 21st May, 2016].

Fox, S. & Spector, P. (2005*) Counter productive work behaviour*. Washington: American Psychological Association.

Frenking, S. (2016). *Feel Good Management as valuable tool to shape workplace culture and drive employee happiness. Strategic HR Review, 15(1), 14-19. doi:10.1108/shr-11-2015-0091*

Furnham, A. (2004) Work bullies must be stamped out. *Sunday Times* (London), p. 11.

Giga, S., Cooper, C., & Faragher, B. (2003). The development of a framework for a comprehensive approach to stress management interventions at work. *International Journal of Stress Management, 10,* 280-296.

Goleman, D. (2005) *Emotional intelligence (10th anniversary ed.).* New York: Bantam.

Grimme, D., & Grimme, S. (2006) *Workplace violence: The realities and options*. [online] Available at: http://www.workplace-violence-hq.com/ [Accessed 21st May, 2016].

Groeblinghoff, D. and Becker, M.(1996) A Case Study of Mobbing and the Clinical Treatment of Mobbing Victims. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5(2),*277-294.

Harvey, M., et al. (2006) Bullying: From the playground to the boardroom. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 12,* 1-11.

Hodge, D., & Gillespie, D. (2005) Phrase completions: An alternative to Likert scales. *Social Work Research, 27,* 45-54.

Hoel, H. & Cooper, C. (2000) *Destructive conflicts and bullying at work*. Unpublished Reports, Manchester School of Management, University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology.

Hoel, H. & Cooper, C. (2003) *Organizational effects of bullying: Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in research and practice (pp. 145-146).* London: Taylor & Francis.

Hoel, H. & Salin, D. (2003) *Organizational antecedents of workplace bullying. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in research and practice (pp. 203-218).* London: Taylor & Francis.

Hoel, H., Cooper, C. L., & Faragher, B. (2001) The experience of bullying in GreatBritain: the impact of organizational status. *European Journal of Work & Orga-nizational Psychology, 10(4),* 443-465.

Hotchkiss, S. (2003) *Why is it always about you?* New York: Free Press.

Humphries, M. (2011). The Bully in the Workplace. *Stories to Tell Your Students,* 60-62. doi:10.1057/9780230370432_29

Infante, D., Rancer, A., & Womack, D. (2003) *Building communication theory (pp. 146-147).* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Institute for Management Excellence. (2005) *Bullying in the workplace (Dealing with difficult people).* [online] Available at: http://www.itstime.com/ [Accessed 21st May, 2016].

Jansen, J. (2006). *You want me to work with who? Eleven keys to a stress-free, satisfying, and successful work life no matter who you work with.* New York: Penguin Books.

Joyce, A. (2005) *Big bad boss tales: Overbearing management styles are all the rage. Did we say rage?* Washington Post, p. 01.

Judge, T. (2006) *What turns a person into a bully? Irish Times, p. 3*. [online] Available at: www.proquest.com [Accessed 21st May, 2016].

Judge, T. A. & Church, A. H. (2000) *Job satisfaction: Research and practice. In C. L. Cooper & E. A. Locke (Eds.), Industrial and organizational psychology: Linking theory with practice (pp. 166-198)*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Judge, T. A. & Klinger, R. (2007) *Job satisfaction: Subjective well-being at work. In R. Larsen (Ed.), The science of subjective well-being, (pp. 393-413).* New York: Guilford Press.

Judge, T., et al., (2001) The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin, 127(3),* 376-407.

Keashly, L. & Jagatic, K. (2003) *By any other name: American perspectives in workplace bullying. In S.Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace:International perspectives in research and practice (pp. 31-62).* London: Taylor & Francis.

Keashly, L. (1998) Emotional abuse in the workplace: Conceptual and empirical issues. *Journal of Emotional Abuse, 1 (1),* 85-117.

Keashly, L., & Jagatic, K. (2003) *By any other name: American perspectives on workplace bullying. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. Cooper (Eds.), Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International research and practice perspectives (pp. 31–61).* London: Taylor & Francis.

Keyserlingk, H. (2002) *Dealing with workplace bullies*. Record (Sherbrooke, Que.), p. 7.

Kimberly A. P., (2014) The Workplace Bully: The Ultimate Silencer. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communication and Conflict 18.1.* 169-185.

Kinney, J., & Johnson, D. (1993*) Breaking point: The workplace violence epidemic and what to do about it*. Chicago: National Safe Workplace Institute.

Kitt, J. (2004) *Workplace bullying: An overview*. The Mandate Trade Union News, pp. 6-13.

Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N.L., & Barton, S. M. (2001) The impact of job satisfaction on turnover intent: a test of a structural measurement model using a national sample of workers. *The Social Science Journal, 38(2),* 233–250.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984) *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York: Springer.

Lee, D. (2000) An analysis of workplace bullying in the UK. *Personnel Review, 29(5):* 593–612

Lee, R. & Brotheridge, C. (2006) When prey turns predatory: Workplace bullying as a predictor of counter aggression/bullying, coping and well-being; *European Journal of work and organizational Psychology, 15 (3),* 352-377.

Levine, R., et al. (2003) Complications associated with surveying medical student depression: The importance of anonymity. *Academic Psychiatry 27,* 12-18.

Lewis, D., & Gunn, R. (2007) Workplace bullying in the public sector: Understanding the racial dimension. *Public Administration, 85(3),* 641−665.

Leymann, H. (1993) *Mobbing*. Reinbeck: Rowolt.

Leymann, H. (1996) The content and development at work: *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5 (2)* 165-184.

Lloyd, K. (2006) *Jerks at work: How to deal with people problems and problem people*. New York: Barnes & Noble.

Lloyd, S. (2006) *Everyday tyrants: The adult bully*. The Globe and Mail, p. 18.

Locke, E., A. (1976) *The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.),*

Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 1297-1343). Chicago: Rand

and McNally.

Losh, S. (2002) *Reliability, validity, causality and experiments.*

Lutgen-Sandvik, P. (2005) *Water smoothing stones: Subordinate resistance to workplace*

bullying. [online] Available at: www.proquest.com [Accessed 21st May, 2016].

Luthans, Fred. (1995) Doing business in Central and Eastern Europe: political, economic, and

cultural diversity. *Business Horizons, 38,* 9-16.

MacDonald, J. (2004*) Bully type 1: Constant critic*. [online] Available at:

http://www.bankrate.com [Accessed 21st May, 2016].

MacIntosh, E. W., & Doherty, A. (2010) The influence of organizational culture on job

satisfaction and intention to leave. *Sport Management Review, 13(2),* 106–117.

Markovits, Y., Davis, A. J. & Van Dick, R. V. (2010) The link between job satisfaction and

organizational commitment: Differences between public and private sector employees.

International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 7(1), 77-99.

Massingill, T. (2002) *Conference focuses on harm of workplace bullies*.

 Contra Costa Times, p. 2

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: 1, 59–68.

Mikkelsen, E. & Einarsen, S. (2001) Bullying in Danish work life: prevalence and health

correlates. *European Journal of work and organizational psychology, 10,* 393-413.

Miller, D. C., & Medalia, N. Z. (1955) Efficiency, Leadership, and Morale in Small Military

Organizations. *Sociological Review, 3,* 93-107.

Mobley, W.H., Horner, S.O., & Hollingsworth, A.T. (1978) "An Evaluation of Precursors of

Hospital Employee Turnover". *Journal of Applied Psychology, 63(4),* 408-414.

Natinsky, P., & Lynch, J. (2005) *Workplace bullying is legal: Does that mean you should be*

tolerant? Rockville, MD: Association of Professional Office Managers.

National Institute of Safety and Health. (2004) *Stress and health related injuries*.

Needham, A. (2003) *Workplace bullying: The costly business secret*. New York: Penguin Group.

Neuman, J. (2004) *Injustice, Stress and aggression in organizations: The dark side of*

organizational behaviour. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Newman-Carlson, D., & Horne, A. (2004) Bully Busters: A psychoeducational intervention for

reducing bullying behavior in middle school students. *Journal of Counseling and*

Development, 82(3), 259.

Oade, A. (2009) Managing Workplace Bullying. doi:10.1057/9780230249165

Oghojafor, B. E., Muo, F. I. & Olufayo, T. O. (2012) Perspective of bullying problem at

workplace in Nigeria: The experience of workers. *International Journal of Arts and*

Commerce, 1(3), 1-18.

Olsen, H. (2002) *Workplace bullying and domestic violence*. New Zealand: Workplaces Against

Violence in Employment.

Olweus, D. (1999) *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do. In P. K. Smith et al.*

(Eds.), The nature of school bullying: A cross-national perspective (pp. 193-112).

London: Routledge.

Owoyemi, O. & Sheehan, M. (2011) Exploring workplace bullying in an Emergency service

 Organization in the UK. *International Journal of Business and management, 6 (3),* 3-4.

Patton, M. (2002) *Qualitative research & evaluation methods (3rd ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA:

 Sage.

Persaud, R. (2004) *How to beat the office bully*. Associated News Media, p. 2.

Quine, L. (1999) Workplace bullying in NHS community trust: staff questionnaire survey.

 British Medical Journal, 318, 228-232.

Quine, L. (2001) Workplace Bullying in Nurses. *Journal of Health Psychology, 6 (1),* 73-84.

Rayner, C. Hoel, H. & Cooper, C. (2002) *Workplace bullying.* New York: Taylor and Francis.

Rayner, C., & Cooper, C. L. (2006) *Workplace Bullying. In Kelloway, E., Barling, J. & Hurrell

 Jr., J. (eds.), Handbook of workplace violence* (pp. 47-90). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rayner, C., Hoel, H., & Cooper, C. L. (2002) *Workplace bullying: What we know, who is to

 blame, and what can we do?* London: Taylor & Francis.

Rosenthal, B. (2008) *Bullying*. Detroit: Greenhaven Press.

Salin, D. (2003a) Ways of explaining workplace Bullying: A Review of Enabling, motivating

 and precipitating structures and processes in the work Environment. *Human Relations, 56

 (10),* 10-17.

Salin, D. (2003b) *Workplace bullying among business professionals: Prevalence, organisational

 antecedents and gender differences*. Doctoral dissertation, Swedish School of Economics

 and Business Administration, Helsinki, Finland.

Salin, D. (2004) *Organizational responses to workplace harassment: An exploratory study*. A

 paper presented at the European work and organizational Psychology conference,

 Stockholm, Sweden.

Schachter, S. (2004) *Mind your manners at the office, in school*. The Gazette (Montreal, Que.),

    p. .2.

Schwepker, C. H. (2001) Ethical climate's relationship to job satisfaction, organizational

    commitment, and turnover intention in the salesforce, *Journal of Business Research,*

    54(1), 39–52.

Sheehan, M. (2006) *The Fight at Eureka Stockade: Down with the Tyrant and Bully*, A paper

    presented at the Inaugural Professorial Lecture, Glamorgan Business School.

Sherry, L. (1997) *Validity*. University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center.

Silverthorne, C. (2004) The impact of organizational culture and person-organization fit on

    organizational commitment and job satisfaction in Taiwan. *Leadership & Organization*

    Development Journal, 25(7), 592–599.

Simons, S. (2008) Workplace bullying experienced by Massachusetts registered nurses and the

    relationship to intention to leave the organization. *Advances in Nursing Science, 31(2),*

    48-59.

Tehrani, N. (2004) Bullying: A source of chronic post traumatic stress? *British Journal of*

    Guidance & Counselling, 32, 357–366.

Tehrani, N. (2012) *Workplace bullying: Symptoms and solutions*. London: Routledge.

Tepper, B. J. (2000) Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal,*

    43, 178–190.

Vartia, M. (1996) The sources of bullying: Psychological work environment and organizational

    climate. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 15 (2),* 203-214.

Vartia, M. (2001) Consequences of workplace bullying with respect to the well-being of its targets and the observers of bullying. *Scandinavian Journal of Work Environment and Health, 27,* 63-69.

Vartia, M. (2003) *Workplace Bullying: A study on the work environment well-being and health.* Unpublished PhD Thesis, Helsinki.

Workplace bullying: Finding some answers. (1997) Adelaide, (S. Aust.): Working Women's Centre of. *Workplace bullying: Key facts.* (1999) Dublin: The Centre.

Zapf, D. & Einarsen, S. (2003) *Individual antecedents of bullying: Victims and perpetrators. In S.Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in research and practic*e (pp. 165-184). London: Taylor & Francis.

Zapf, D., & 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. & Kulla, M. (1996) On the relationship between knobbing and bullying at work.*International Journal of Manpower, 5*, 215-235.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baron, R.A. and Neuman, J.H., (1998) Workplace Aggression--The Iceberg Beneath The Tip Of Workplace Violence: Evidence On Its Forms, Frequency, And Targets. *Public Administration Quarterly, 21(4), pp*. 446-464

Board, B.J. & Fritzon, K. F., (2005) Disordered personalities at work. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 11, 17–32

Prentice, S. (2005) *From playground to boardroom—Bullies are like a cancer*. [online] Available at http://www.adultbully.com/ [Accessed 21st May, 2016]

Rigby, K. (2002).*New perspectives on bullying*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Rosen, M. (2006) Bullied...to death? How to spot and prevent childhood violence on the Internet. *Ladies' Home Journal, 73*, 123-127.

APPENDIX A

Survey Questions From Employees/Employers

The dependent variable of the study include work environment, bully traits and target types. On the other hand, the independent variables include physical stress symptoms, mental health and job satisfaction.

Introduction to Survey

My name is Katarzyna Krzyzanowska and this survey is a part of the requirements for completion of my master degree at the National College of Ireland.

 The study is titled, "Workplace bullying: Aggressive behavior and the impact on job satisfaction and productivity of employees in Ireland.

 It will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete the 24 multiple choice questions.

Your responses will be kept confidential, and your participation is voluntary and anonymous.

 https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/ZQ392M8

Please assist me in this project by completing the survey by 16th of June 2016.

Thank you for your assistance.

Katarzyna Krzyzanowska

Survey/Questionary

1. You work in which state/county:

2. You work in which industry ?

3. Your organizational rank:

○   non-supervisory employee

○   supervisor

○   mid-mgr

○   senior mgr

○   exec

4. At work, have you been repeatedly mistreated (through verbal abuse, threatening conduct or work interference) so intensely that it harmed your health or caused an economic setback?

	Yes	No
A)in the last 12 months	○	◉
B)ever in your working life? If you answered yes, go directly to question 5. If no, go to 4c.	○	◉
4c) if you have answered "no" above, have you ever witnessed the mistreatment of others?	◉	○

5. Gender of the targeted person?

○ female

○ male

How long targeted? ___ months? ___years?

[   ]

6. Who was targeted for mistreatment?

○ a) only the target was singled out; there were no others

○ b) others were also mistreated

○ c) do not know

7. Did the harasser work alone or were there several people involved in the mistreatment?

○ a) solo harasser

○ b) several harassers

If several harassers, please refer only to the principal harasser or instigator for the following

questions.

8. The harasser's gender:

○ female

○ male

9. The harasser's workplace rank relative to the targeted person:

○ a) harasser was ranked higher

○ b) both were peers with the same rank

○ c) the target was ranked higher

10. The employer:

○ small for-profit

○ large for-profit

○ non-profit

○ government

○ education

○ medical

11. Describe the mistreatment. Check all categories that apply.

☐ verbal abuse, e.g., shouting, swearing, name calling, malicious sarcasm, threats to safety

☐ behaviors/actions, e. G., public or private, that were threatening, intimidating, humiliating, hostile, offensive, inappropriately cruel conduct

☐ interference with work performance, e.g., sabotage, undermining, ensuring failure, overwork, setting impossible deadlines

☐ abuse of authority, e.g., undeserved evaluations, denial of advancement, stealing credit, tarnished reputation, arbitrary instructions, unsafe assignments

☐ destruction of workplace relationships, e.g., with coworkers, bosses, or customers

☐ isolation, e.g., withholding necessary information, freezing out, ignoring, or excluding target, unreasonable refusal of applications for leave, training, or promotion

☐ destabilization, e.g., shifting of goals, constant undervaluing of efforts, persistent attempts to demoralize target, removal of areas of responsibility without consultation

☐ threat to professional status, e.g.., persistent attempts to belittle and undermine work, unjustified criticism and monitoring of target's work, persistent attempts to humiliate in front of colleagues, intimidating use of discipline or competence procedures

☐ threat to personal standing, e.g., undermining personal integrity, making inappropriate jokes about target, persistent teasing, physical violence, violence to property

12. Sometimes mistreatment is based on discrimination due to race, gender, ethnicity, religion, disability or age. Based on those categories, some people enjoy 'protected' status by law. Compare the target's status with that of the harasser's.

○ a) harasser and target both were 'protected'

○ b) neither the harasser nor target was 'protected'

○ c) the harasser only is 'protected'

○ d) the target only is 'protected'

13. What impact on job satisfaction, if any, did you observe? Check all that apply.

☐ excessive absenteeism

☐ work team disruption

☐ drop in productivity

☐ morale decline

☐ employee sabotage as a result

☐ lost work time worrying about the incident or future interactions

☐ lost work time avoiding the instigator

☐ changed jobs to avoid the instigator

☐ positive impact

☐ none

☐ other (please specify)

14. What impact did bullying have on your job satisfaction, if any? Check all that apply.

☐ excessive absenteeism

☐ work team disruption

☐ drop in productivity

☐ morale decline

☐ employee sabotage as a result

☐ lost work time worrying about the incident or future interactions

☐ lost work time avoiding the instigator

☐ changed jobs to avoid the instigator

☐ positive impact

☐ none

☐ other (please specify)

```
[                              ]
```

15. What impact on the organization, if any, did you observe? Check all that

apply.

☐ disproportionate turnover in effected units

☐ excessive absenteeism

☐ work team disruption

☐ recruitment problems

☐ drop in productivity

☐ drop in profitability

☐ morale decline

☐ workers compensation claims

☐ disability claims

☐ discrimination complaints

☐ employee sabotage as a result

☐ damaged employer reputation

☐ lost work time worrying about the incident or future interactions

☐ positive impact

☐ none

☐ other (please specify)

[   ]

16. What stopped the mistreatment?

○ a) it has not stopped, it is ongoing

○ b) harasser was transferred or terminated

○ c) harasser stayed but stopped after sanctions or threats

○ d) target transferred and stayed with the same employer

○ e) target voluntarily left the organization

○ f) target was terminated

○ other (please specify)

[   ]

17. How did the following employer representatives respond to the mistreatment?

Human resources

○ a) resolved or attempted to resolve the situation positively, completely or partially

○ b) did nothing despite requests for relief

○ c) retaliated or caused retaliation against the target, worsened the situation

○ d) there was no such person or department or the target did not inform

○ e) don't know what was done

○ other (please specify)

[   ]

18. How did the following employer representatives respond to the mistreatment?

Health and safety authority in ireland and workplace relation commission

○ a) resolved or attempted to resolve the situation positively, completely or partially

○ b) did nothing despite requests for relief

○ c) retaliated or caused retaliation against the target, worsened the situation

○ d) there was no such person or department or the target did not inform

○ e) don't know what was done

○ other (please specify)

```
_____
|                      |
|                      |
|_____|
```

19. How did the following employer representatives respond to the mistreatment?

Harasser's manager/supervisor

○ a) resolved or attempted to resolve the situation positively, completely or partially

○ b) did nothing despite requests for relief

○ c) retaliated or caused retaliation against the target, worsened the situation

○ d) there was no such person or department or the target did not inform

○ e) don't know what was done

○ other (please specify)

```
_____
|                      |
|_____|
```

20. How did the following employer representatives respond to the mistreatment?

Executive or senior manager

○ a) resolved or attempted to resolve the situation positively, completely or partially

○ b) did nothing despite requests for relief

○ c) retaliated or caused retaliation against the target, worsened the situation

○ d) there was no such person or department or the target did not inform

○ e) don't know what was done

○ other (please specify)

```
_____
|                      |
|_____|
```

21. Did the target take legal action?

○ yes

○ no

22. Has anything 'positive' happened from the bullying situation?

○ a) made target more competitive

○ b) target became more resilient

○ c) target found better job

○ d) litigation successful

○ e) no

○ other (please specify)

[   ]

23. If you were a target of a bully, rate your job satisfaction after the incident(s), 1

being the least satisfied and 5 being very satisfied. Please circle.

	1	2	3	4	5
Least satisfied/very satisfied	○ least satisfied/very satisfied 1	○ least satisfied/very satisfied 2	○ least satisfied/very satisfied 3	○ least satisfied/very satisfied 4	○ least satisfied/very satisfied 5

24. If you witnessed a bullying situation, rate your job satisfaction after the incident(s),

1 being the least satisfied and 5 being very satisfied. Please circle.

1	2	3	4	5
Least satisfied/very satisfied	○ Less satisfied	○ Low satisfied	○ least satisfied/very satisfied 3	○ least satisfied/very satisfied 4	○

References

Fisher-Blando, J. (2008) Workplace Bullying: Aggressive Behavior and its Effect on Job satisfaction and Productivity. Unpublished PhD thesis. Phoenix: University of Phoenix.

Frequency Tables

Frequency Table

Q1 You work in which State/Country:

	Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent
Dublin	43	86	86.0	86.0
Ireland/Kildare	5	10	10.0	96.0
Meath/Countryside	1	2	2.0	98.0
Cork	1	2	2.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Q2 You work in which industry ?

	Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent
Social Care	2	4.0	4.0	4.0
Marketing	1	2.0	2.0	6.0
Recruitment	7	14.0	14.0	20.0
Careers	8	16.0	16.0	36.0
Education	10	20.0	20.0	56.0
Food Production/Manufacturing	3	6.0	6.0	62.0
Software/IT	1	2.0	2.0	64.0
Real Estate/Operation	1	2.0	2.0	66.0
Gaming/Gambling	3	6.0	6.0	72.0
HR Consulting	2	4.0	4.0	76.0
Retail	1	2.0	2.0	78.0
Telecom	1	2.0	2.0	80.0
Catering Office	1	2.0	2.0	82.0
Pension Regulation	1	2.0	2.0	84.0
Advertising	1	2.0	2.0	86.0
HR/Talent Acquisition	1	2.0	2.0	88.0
Training/Coaching	1	2.0	2.0	90.0
Transport	4	8.0	8.0	98.0
Ecommerce	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Q3 Your Organizational Rank

		Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent
Valid	non-supervisory employee	18	36.0	36.0	36.0
	supervisor	6	12.0	12.0	48.0
	mid-mgr	7	14.0	14.0	62.0
	senior mgr	2	4.0	4.0	66.0
	Exec	17	34.0	34.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Q4 At work, have you been repeatedly mistreated (through verbal abuse, threatening conduct or work interference) so intensely that it harmed your health or caused an economic setback?

		Frequency YES	Frequency NO	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent
Valid	a)Last 12 Months	3	7	20.0	20.0	20.0
	b)Ever in your working life?If you answered YES,go directly to question 5. If NO, go to 4c.	21	4	50.00	50.0	70.0
	4c) if you have answered "no" above, have you ever witnessed the mistreatment of others?	3	12	30.0	30.0	100.0
	Total	27	23	100.0	100.0	

Q5 Gender of the TARGETED person

		Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent
	No resp	16	32.0	32.0	32.0
Valid	Female	23	46.0	46.0	78.0
	Male	11	22.0	22.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Q6 WHO was targeted for mistreatment?

		Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent
	No resp	16	32.0	32.0	32.0
Valid	Only the target was singled out; there were no others	12	24.0	24.0	56.0
	Others were also mistreated	20	40.0	40.0	96.0
	Do not know	2	4.0	4.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Q7 Did the harasser work ALONE or were there SEVERAL PEOPLE involved in the mistreatment?

		Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent
	No resp	16	32.0	32.0	32.0
Valid	a) Solo harasser	21	42.0	42.0	74.0
	b) Several harassers	13	26.0	26.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Q8 The HARASSER'S gender

		Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent
	No resp	16	32.0	32.0	32.0
Valid					
	Female	24	48.0	48.0	80.0
	Male	10	20.0	20.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Q9 The harasser's workplace RANK relative to the targeted person:

		Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No resp	16	32.0	32.0	32.0
	a) Harasser was ranked higher	19	38.0	38.0	70.0
	b) Both were peers with the same rank	9	18.0	18.0	88.0
	c) The target was ranked higher	6	12.0	12.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Q10 The EMPLOYER:

		Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No resp	16	32.0	32.0	32.0
	___ small for-profit	8	16.0	16.0	48.0
	___ large for-profit	18	36.0	36.0	84.0
	___ government	2	4.0	4.0	88.0
	___education	6	12.0	12.0	100.0
	___medical	0	0	0	
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Q11 Describe the MISTREATMENT. Check all categories that apply.

		Responses	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Total Respondents
	No resp	16	32.0	32.0	
Valid	VERBAL ABUSE	7	14.0	14.0	
	BEHAVIORS/ACTIONS	4	8.0	8.0	
	ISOLATION	6	12.0	12.0	
	INTERFERENCE WITH WORK PERFORMANCE	15	30.0	30.0	
	ABUSE OF AUTHORITY	13	26.0	26.0	
	DESTRUCTION OF WORKPLACE RELATIONSHIPS	8	16.0	16.0	
	DESTABILIZATION	6	12.0	12.0	
	THREAT TO PROFESSIONAL STATUS	11	22.0	22.0	
	THREAT TO PERSONAL STANDING	8	16.0	16.0	
					34

Q12 Sometimes mistreatment is based on discrimination due to race, gender, ethnicity, religion, disability or age. Based on those categories, some people enjoy 'protected' status by law. Compare the target's status with that of the harasser's.

		Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent
	No resp	16	32.0	32.0	32.0
Valid	a) Harasser and target BOTH were 'protected'	5	10.0	10.0	42.0
	b) NEITHER the harasser nor target was 'protected'	18	36.0	36.0	78.0
	c) The HARASSER ONLY is 'protected'	10	20.0	20.0	98.0
	d) The TARGET ONLY is 'protected'	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Q13 What IMPACT ON JOB SATISFACTION, if any, did you observe?

Check all that apply.

	Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Total Respondents
No resp	16	32.0	32.0	
Valid				
__ excessive absenteeism	10	20.0	20.0	
__ work team disruption	9	18.0	18.0	
__ drop in productivity	18	36.0	36.0	
__ morale decline	24	48.0	48.0	
__ employee sabotage as a result	6	12.0	12.0	
__ lost work time worrying about the incident or future interactions	11	22.0	8.0	
__ lost work time avoiding the instigator	7	14.0	14.0	
__ changed jobs to avoid the instigator	8	16.0	16.0	
___positive impact	0	0	0	
___none	0	0	0	
__ other	1	2.0	2.0	
				34

Q14 What impact did bullying have on YOUR job satisfaction, if any? Check all that apply.

		Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Total Repsondents
	No reps	16	32.0	32.0	
Valid	__ excessive absenteeism	4	8.0	8.0	
	__ drop in productivity	26	52.0	52.0	
	__ morale decline	30	60.0	60.0	
	__ employee sabotage as a result	3	6.0	6.0	
	__ lost work time worrying about the incident or future interactions	16	32.0	6.0	
	__ lost work time avoiding the instigator	9	18.0	18.0	
	__ changed jobs to avoid the instigator	16	32.0	32.0	
	__ none	1	2.0	2.0	
					34

Q15 What IMPACT ON THE ORGANIZATION, if any, did you observe? Check all thatapply.

		Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Total Respondents
	No reps	16	32.0	32.0	
Valid	__ disproportionate turnover in effected units	5	10.0	10.0	
	__ excessive absenteeism	4	8.0	8.0	
	__ work team disruption	3	6.0	6.0	
	__ recruitment problems	3	6.0	6.0	
	__ drop in productivity	20	40.0	40.0	
	__ drop in profitability	4	8.0	8.0	
	__ morale decline	28	56.0	56.0	
	__ workers compensation claims	3	6.0	6.0	
	__ discrimination complaints	1	2.0	2.0	
	__ employee sabotage as a result	2	4.0	4.0	
	__ damaged employer reputation	3	6.0	6.0	

__ lost work time worrying about the incident or future interactions	14	28.0	8.0	
__positive impact	0	0	0	
__disability claims	0	0	0	
__ none	1	2.0	2.0	
__other	0	0	0	
				34

Q16 What STOPPED the mistreatment?

		Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent
	No resp	16	32.0	32.0	32.0
Valid	a) It has not stopped, it is ongoing	2	4.0	4.0	4.0
	b) Harasser was transferred or terminated	6	12.0	12.0	16.0
	c) Harasser stayed but stopped after sanctions or threats	14	28.0	28.0	44.0
	e) Target voluntarily left the organization	6	12.0	12.0	56.0
	f) Target was terminated	2	4.0	4.0	60.0
	g) Other:				
	*Harasser left employment	1	2.0	2.0	62.0
	* Harassers left the organization few months later claiming compensations to the organization	1	2.0	2.0	64.0
	* Maternity leave	1	2.0	2.0	66.0
	* Bonus not paid	1	2.0	2.0	68.0
	Total Responses	34			100.0

Q17 How did the following employer representatives RESPOND to the mistreatment? HUMAN RESOURCES

		Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent
	No resp	16	32.0	32.0	32.0
Valid	a) Resolved or attempted to resolve the situation positively, completely or partially	2	4.0	4.0	36.0
	b) Did nothing despite requests for relief	14	28.0	28.0	64.0
	c) Retaliated or caused retaliation against the target, worsened the situation	5	10.0	10.0	74.0
	d) There was no such person or department or the target did not inform	3	6.0	6.0	80.0
	e) Don't know what was done	9	18.0	18.0	98.0
	f) Other	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
	* Investigated and resolvex				
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Q18 How did the following employer representatives RESPOND to the mistreatment?Health and Safety Authority in Ireland and Workplace Relation Commission

		Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent
	No resp	16	32.0	32.0	32.0
Valid	b) Did nothing despite requests for relief	0	0.0	0.0	32.0
	c) Retaliated or caused retaliation against the target, worsened the situation	1	2.0	2.0	34.0
	d) There was no such person or department or the target did not inform	25	50.0	50.0	84.0
	e) Don't know what was done	7	14.0	14.0	98.0
	f) Other	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Q19 How did the following employer representatives RESPOND to the mistreatment?HARASSER'S MANAGER/SUPERVISOR

		Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent
	No resp	16	32.0	32.0	32.0
Valid	a) Resolved or attempted to resolve the situation positively, completely or partially	7	14.0	14.0	46.0
	b) Did nothing despite requests for relief	2	4.0	4.0	50.0
	c) Retaliated or caused retaliation against the target, worsened the situation	5	10.0	10.0	60.0
	d) There was no such person or department or the target did not inform	5	10.0	10.0	70.0
	e) Don't know what was done	15	30.0	30.0	100.0
	f) Other	0	0.0	0.0	
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Q20 How did the following employer representatives RESPOND to the mistreatment?EXECUTIVE OR SENIOR MANAGER

		Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent
	No resp	16	32.0	32.0	32.0
Valid	a) Resolved or attempted to resolve the situation positively, completely or partially	8	16.0	16.0	48.0
	b) Did nothing despite requests for relief	2	4.0	4.0	52.0
	d) There was no such person or department or the target did not inform	4	8.0	8.0	60.0
	e) Don't know what was done	20	40.0	40.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Q21 Did the Target take legal action?

		Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent
	No resp	16	32.0	32.0	32.0
Valid	yes	3	6.0	6.0	38.0
	no	31	62.0	62.0	100.0
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Q22 Has anything 'positive' happened from the bullying situation?

		Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent
	No Respond	16	32.0	32.0	32.0
Valid	a) Made Target more competitive	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	b) Target became more resilient	2	4.0	4.0	36.0
	c) Target found better job	10	20.0	20.0	56.0
	d) Litigation successful	0	0.0	0.0	—
	e) No	22	44.0	44.0	100.0
	f) Other	0	0.0	0.0	—
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Q23 If you were a target of a bully, rate your job satisfaction after the incident(s), 1 being the least satisfied and 5 being very satisfied. Please circle.

	Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent
No Resp	16	32.0	32.0	32.0
Valid (Scale 1 to 5)				
1 .Least Satisfied	31	62.0	62.0	94.0
2.	2	4.0	4.0	98.0
3.	1	2.0	2.0	100.0
4.	0	0.0	0.0	
5. Very Satisfied	0	0.0	0.0	
Total	50			

Q24 If you witnessed a bullying situation, rate your job satisfaction after the incident(s), 1 being the least satisfied and 5 being very satisfied. Please circle.

		Frequency	Percent (%)	Valid Percent (%)	Cumulative Percent
	No Respon	16	32.0	32.0	32.0
Valid	(Scale 1 to 5)				
	1.Least Satisfied	9	18.0	18.0	50.0
	2.	14	28.0	28.0	78.0
	3.	11	22.0	22.0	100.0
	4.	0	0.0	0.0	
	5. Very Satisfied	0	0.0	0.0	
	Total	50	100.0	100.0	

Mean and standard deviation

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Organizational Rank	50	1.00	5.00	2.8800	1.73370
repeatedly mistreated	50	1.00	2.00	1.6400	.48487
Gender of the TARGETED person	50	.00	2.00	.9000	.73540
WHO was targeted for mistreatment?	50	.00	3.00	1.1000	.81441
Did the harasser work ALONE or were there SEVERAL PEOPLE involved in the mistreatment?	50	.00	2.00	1.0200	.71400
The HARASSER'S gender	50	.00	2.00	1.0000	.63888
The harasser's workplace RANK relative to the targeted person:	50	.00	3.00	1.2600	.94351
The EMPLOYER:	50	.00	4.00	1.5200	.95276
Describe the MISTREATMENT. Check all categories that apply.	50	1.00	8.00	5.1200	1.90209
Sometimes mistreatment is based on discrimination due to race, gender, ethnicity, religion, disability or age. Based on those categories, some people enjoy 'protected' status by law. Compare the target's status with that of the harasser's.	50	.00	4.00	1.7800	1.09339
: What IMPACT ON JOB SATISFACTION, if any, did you observe? Check all that apply.	50	.00	11.00	3.6200	2.73966
What impact did bullying have on YOUR job satisfaction, if any? Check all that apply.	50	1.00	10.00	5.3400	2.30890

What IMPACT ON THE ORGANIZATION, if any, did you observe? Check all thatapply.	50	1.00	15.00	6.6400	3.60136
What STOPPED the mistreatment?	50	.00	7.00	2.4800	3.11835
How did the following employer representatives RESPOND to the mistreatment? HUMAN RESOURCES	50	.00	6.00	1.6600	1.98577
: How did the following employer representatives RESPOND to the mistreatment?Health and Safety Authority in Ireland and Workplace Relation Commission	50	.00	6.00	2.5200	2.14989
How did the following employer representatives RESPOND to the mistreatment?HARASSER'S MANAGER/SUPERVISOR	50	.00	5.00	1.9600	1.90552
How did the following employer representatives RESPOND to the mistreatment?EXECUTIVE OR SENIOR MANAGER	50	.00	5.00	2.1800	2.26500
Did the Target take legal action?	50	.00	2.00	1.4400	.81215
Has anything 'positive' happened from the bullying situation?	50	.00	5.00	2.5400	2.24254
If you were a target of a bully, rate your job satisfaction after the incident(s), 1 being the least satisfied and 5 being very satisfied. Please circle.	50	.00	3.00	1.0000	.98974
If you witnessed a bullying situation, rate your job satisfaction after the incident(s), 1 being the least satisfied and 5 being very satisfied. Please circle.	50	.00	3.00	1.5400	1.34331
Valid N (listwise)	50				

Table 2: Mean and Standard Deviation

Correlation

Correlations

Control Variables			repeatedly mistreated	Organizational Rank	What impact did bullying have on YOUR job satisfaction, if any? Check all that apply.
-none-[a]	repeatedly mistreated	Correlation	1.000	.385	.203
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.005	.158
		df	0	48	48
	Organizational Rank	Correlation	.385	1.000	.250
		Significance (2-tailed)	.005	.	.080
		df	48	0	48
	What impact did bullying have on YOUR job satisfaction, if any? Check all that apply.	Correlation	.203	.250	1.000
		Significance (2-tailed)	.158	.005	.
		df	48	48	0
What impact did bullying have on YOUR job satisfaction, if any? Check all that apply.	repeatedly mistreated	Correlation	1.000	.352	
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.005	
		df	0	47	
	Organizational Rank	Correlation	.352	1.000	
		Significance (2-tailed)	.005	.	
		df	47	0	

a. Cells contain zero-order (Pearson) correlations.

Table 2: Partial correlation

Correlations

		Gender of the TARGETED person	repeatedly mistreated
Gender of the TARGETED person	Pearson Correlation	1	-.332*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.019
	N	50	50
repeatedly mistreated	Pearson Correlation	-.332*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.019	
	N	50	50

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Table 3: Pearson Correlation

Correlations

		repeatedly mistreated	What IMPACT ON THE ORGANIZATION, if any, did you observe? Check all thatapply.
repeatedly mistreated	Pearson Correlation	1	.216
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001
	N	50	50
What IMPACT ON THE ORGANIZATION, if any, did you observe? Check all thatapply.	Pearson Correlation	.216	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	
	N	50	50

Table 4: Pearson Correlation