



Volume 4, 2019

**LESSONS FROM BANDURA'S BOBO DOLL EXPERIMENTS:
LEADERSHIP'S DELIBERATE INDIFFERENCE
EXACERBATES WORKPLACE BULLYING
IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

Leah P. Hollis

Morgan State University
Baltimore, MD USA

leah.hollis@morgan.edu

ABSTRACT

Aim/Purpose	The purpose of this paper is to apply Albert Bandura's findings of the Bobo Doll experiments to organizational behavior and workplace bullying in higher education. The Bandura social psychological experiments confirm that people who see aggression also need to witness an intervention to aggression to learn that the organization does not welcome aggression in their work environment.
Background	By applying the Bandura experiment, the researcher shows how leadership can intervene to stop organizational aggression and abuse. Without leadership intervention, workplace bullying continues in higher education.
Methodology	The researcher used a data set of 730 higher education professionals. The central research question: <i>RQ Which personnel, bullied or not bullied, are more likely to report that no intervention was demonstrated in the organization's response to reports of workplace bullying on campus?</i> A chi-square analysis was used to examine if organizational inaction was more likely to lead to workplace bullying.
Contribution	The application of the Bobo Doll experiments confirms that workplace aggression is either curtailed or proliferates based on leadership's intervention to stop aggression in higher education. This social psychology approach contributes to the literature on workplace bullying in higher education about the need for leadership to intervene and stop bullying behaviors.
Findings	Those who reported organizational apathy, that is the "organization did nothing" were more likely to face workplace bullying in higher education at a statistically significant level, .05 level ($\chi^2(1, n = 522) = 5.293, P = 0.021$). These findings align with Bandura's theoretical approach that an intervention is needed to curtail aggression and workplace bullying.

Accepted as an empirical research article by Editor Brandon L. Wolfe | Received: May 4, 2019 | Revised: August 8, August 26, 2019 | Accepted: August 28, 2019.

Cite as: Hollis, L. P. (2019). Lessons from Bandura's bobo doll experiments: Leadership's deliberate indifference exacerbates workplace bullying in higher education. *Journal for the Study of Postsecondary and Tertiary Education*, 4, 85-102. <https://doi.org/10.28945/4426>

(CC BY-NC 4.0) This article is licensed to you under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/). When you copy and redistribute this paper in full or in part, you need to provide proper attribution to it to ensure that others can later locate this work (and to ensure that others do not accuse you of plagiarism). You may (and we encourage you to) adapt, remix, transform, and build upon the material for any non-commercial purposes. This license does not permit you to use this material for commercial purposes.

Recommendations for Practitioners	Organizational leadership should consider 360 evaluations, ombudsmen, and faculty oversight committees to collect data and intervene in workplace bullying problems on campus.
Recommendations for Researchers	Researchers can further examine how leadership engagement and intervention can curtail costly and corrosive workplace bullying in higher education.
Impact on Society	These findings confirm that workplace bullying will not just disappear if left unattended. Empirical data confirms that leadership apathy, or deliberate indifference, to interventions only enable aggression and bullying in the workplace.
Future Research	Future research projects can include qualitative approaches to discover what values encourage leaders to intervene in workplace bullying.
Keywords	workplace bullying, Bobo Doll, laissez-faire leadership, deliberate indifference

INTRODUCTION

Workplace bullying research has received increasing attention internationally with several governments, among which include France, several Canadian provinces, Scandinavian countries, Australia, and a handful of states in the United States, prohibiting abusive conduct on the job. In fact, those European countries which prohibit workplace bullying consider this abuse a health and wellness issue as the stress from workplace bullying can negatively affect sleep (Niedhammer et al., 2009) and contribute to post-traumatic stress (Islamoska et al., 2018; Spence Laschinger, & Nosko, 2015), mental health issues (Brousse et al., 2008), suicidal ideation (Hollis, 2017), and substance abuse (Nielsen, Gjerstad, & Frone, 2018).

In American higher education, close to two-thirds of respondents reported being affected by workplace bullying (Hollis, 2015, 2018). Those respondents also reported more absenteeism, insomnia, and intention to leave the organization (Hollis, 2017; Niedl, 1996; Trépanier, Fernet, & Austin, 2015). Employee disengagement costs colleges and universities \$2800 upwards to \$8000 per person annually, depending on that person's salary (Hollis, 2015). Further, women and people of color are more likely to endure workplace bullying in higher education (Attell, Brown, & Treiber, 2017; Hollis, 2018). However, even in the face of illegal harassment, discrimination sexism and racism, Crouch (2016) and Keashly (2019) remark that the leadership in higher education does precious little to address abusive behaviors. Particularly in the cases of workplace bullying, study respondents charge the leadership with inaction. Such apathy is similar to 'deliberate indifference (Baumann, 2017; Justiss, 2008) which is beyond mere negligence, but remaining inert with the knowledge that people are hurt.

Regardless of the organizational type or organizational position, respondents from these studies have provided a common response regarding how organizational leadership can create and maintain an emotionally healthy and vibrant work environment (Jaskyte, 2004; Ostroff, Kinicki, & Muhammad, 2012). Respondents anecdotally have pointed to leadership as the savior or sinner who has an impact on workplace bullying. Leaders can intervene to stop workplace bullying or leaders knowingly stand mute, allowing abuse to proliferate through the campus community.

Despite increasing research on the topic, in practice, workplace bullying is often ignored as a personality conflict in American higher education. Additionally, managers, supervisors, and human resources are often not trained to handle workplace bullying; they often operate in an organization that does not have policies defining or prohibiting workplace bullying (Spraggins, 2014). For Human Resources personnel who hear such complaints, their familiarity with established Title VII legislation does not prepare them to handle the socially deviant behaviors reported in workplace bullying.

Previous studies point to managers and leadership as the bully because they have more organizational power (Hoel, Glasø Hetland, Cooper, & Einarsen, 2010). Bullying, in turn, hurts the bystanders and witnesses who also lose faith in the organization. Productivity declines and employee commitment to

the organization is jeopardized (Cooper, Hoel, & Faragher, 2004). Bystanders who feel vulnerable in this environment are often resistant to intervening for fear of becoming the next target (Einarsen, Raknes, & Matthiesen, 1994). Consequently, laissez-faire leadership styles were confirmed as predictors to toxic environments with workplace bullying (Hoel et al., 2010). Therefore, this study will consider if laissez-faire leadership and precipitating deliberate indifference is a significant factor in why academic environments are 'rife' with workplace bullying (Keashly, 2019); the research question for this study specifically asks if bullied employees experienced an intervention from leadership to halt workplace bullying.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Workplace bullying has been well documented as an escalating series of negative behaviors that cost organizations thousands of dollars in turnover (Hollis, 2015, Keelan, 2000) and yield employee dissatisfaction (Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2007; Park & Ono, 2016; Trépanier et al., 2015). In addition to the negative consequences at the organizational level, individuals endure depression, anxiety, insomnia, suicidal ideation, alcoholism, and post-traumatic stress (Nielsen et al., 2018; Skogstad, Hetland, Glasø, & Einarsen, 2014; Spence Laschinger, & Nosko, 2015). Though researchers have confirmed the negative effects of workplace bullying, with the power differential between the bully and target at the root of the distress, little work has been conducted to empirically analyze the more powerful leader and that leader's deliberate indifference in addressing workplace bullying. Further, such an analysis has not been conducted in American higher education, which has higher rates of workplace bullying with approximately two-thirds of respondents claiming being affected (Hollis, 2015, 2016, 2018). To address the gap in the literature, this discussion will first consider various leadership styles and the impact on work environments. The analysis will continue with a brief meta-analysis of previously collected data and then transition to the chi-square study.

LEADERSHIP STYLES & WORKPLACE BULLYING

Laissez-faire leadership styles appear to give the organization free reign and the latitude to proceed without regulation or oversight; however, without intervention through corrective policy and practice, the power differentials that exist in any organization can keep those without power in weaker positions, while those with power trample the subordinates. Leaders who are self-governed by an inner sense of empathy and fairness, presumably use this sense of fairness to intervene in employee conflict. Such action cultivates a healthy workplace which is emotionally and psychologically stable for all employees. An engaged and empathic leader who can anticipate the target's anguish is perhaps more motivated to halt the abuse (Marques, 2015; Mayer & Surtee, 2015).

For example, a study of 257 respondents from the southwest United States confirmed that empathetic leadership has a positive relationship with employees' job satisfaction. Further, empathic leadership unlike laissez-faire leadership promotes innovation and employee performance (Kock, Mayfield, Mayfield, Sexton, & De La Garza, 2019). Similarly, Skinner and Spurgeon (2005) studied Australian managers to confirm a relationship between empathy and transformational leadership styles. In short, leaders need to be caring and genuinely aware of their employee's feelings and concerns to motivate those employees for the betterment of the organization.

In comparison, laissez-faire leaders who often avoid their subordinates and remain inactive in the workplace, create role ambiguity and additional stress for those employees relying on them (Kelloway, Sivanathan, Francis, & Barling, 2005; Skogstad, Hetland, Glasø, & Einarsen, 2014). A recent Norwegian study of 1775 workers by Glambek, Skogstad, and Einarsen (2018) utilized a regression method to confirm that the laissez-faire or "hands-off" leadership styles increase workplace bullying. Whether the workplace bullying is occurring horizontally, (that is peer-to-peer), or vertically (from one organizational level to another), leaders who refuse to intervene employ deliberate indifference by knowingly remaining passive and allowing the abuse to continue. Consequently, apathetic, insecure, or self-centered leaders who allow aggressive behaviors to take root in the workplace also allow op-

pressive work environments to arise. This notion also aligns with Glambek et al.'s findings (2018) that stated that leaders who engage in avoidance and apathetic styles create the primary source of conflict.

This avoidance or apathy which contributes to deliberate indifference can also be the signs of a narcissistic leader who is only concerned about his or her own personal goals and career track. By definition, narcissistic leaders “are preoccupied with fantasies of unlimited success, believe they are special and unique, require excessive admiration, have a sense of entitlement, are interpersonally exploitive, lack empathy, and are arrogant and haughty” (Judge, LePine, & Rich, 2006, p. 762). To further analyze narcissistic leaders’ self-aggrandizing perceptions, Judge et al. (2006) used multiple regression to reveal a link between narcissistic leadership styles and workplace deviance.

Narcissism in leadership can manifest in several forms, such as an exploitive or entitled perspective in which the leader is a master manipulator and feels entitled to wield power and oppress others. Narcissistic leaders can also have an intensive sense of superiority; such arrogance and lack of empathy in a leader conveys to peers and subordinates that the leader feels he or she is better than others. Hence, his or her indifference is warranted as those who need leadership to intervene may be perceived as nuisance or undeserving of assistance. The message from narcissistic leaders is that organizational injustice and oppression are of no concern. Such leaders can be self-absorbed and just focused on their own upward mobility instead of serving those subordinates relying on their intervention and support (Judge et al., 2006). These self-centered leadership personalities jockey for affirmation and validation of their superiors. Such behaviors undercut vital organizational relationships because the strategies often used to self-aggrandize also include diminishing the accomplishments of others, deriding others, or undermining others (Judge et al., 2006; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). Hence, the strategies narcissists use to soothe their own desires coincide with workplace bullying behaviors, which destroy collegial organizational relationships and yield tyrannical work conditions.

The self-centered leader typically exhibits apathy and lacks a true commitment to cultivate a healthy work environments with a correction or even positive reinforcement for good behaviors (Rosenthal, & Pittinsky, 2006). The public announcements from self-centered leaders may appear positive, supportive, and caring, hence making him or her look like a positive leader to the board, media, or other external constituents. However, when the lights are off and the day-to-day business resumes, this narcissistic and/or laissez-faire leader returns to self-serving and indifferent behaviors. In turning a blind eye to organizational noncompliance of its own policies, indifferent and apathetic leaders cultivate toxic and nonproductive workplaces. Whether leaders embrace laissez-faire styles or pursues their careers through narcissistic tendencies, such leaders do not provide the proper attention to create and maintain psychologically healthy workplaces, nor do they have the empathy to reply to subordinates complaining about abusive and oppressive workplace bullying.

The result of narcissistic, apathetic, and laissez-faire leadership styles can lead to employee disengagement and burn-out (Byrne 2014; Laschinger, Wong, & Grau, 2012). Targets of workplace bullying also experience more health-related problems, such as anxiety, insomnia, and panic attacks. Rai and Agarwal (2018), along with (Lee, Brotheridge, Salin, & Hoel, 2013) Park and Ono (2016), and Trépanier et al. (2015), not only confirm that abused employees disengage, but these researchers also note that bullied and abused employees withhold creativity and innovation. Maltreated workers will sit in silence and save their emotional and psychological energy for unspoken projects, job searches, or other personal goals outside of the workplace (Brinsfield, 2013; Xu, Van Hoof, Serrano, Fernandez, & Ullauri, 2017).

In fact, Wilson (1991) stated that workplace abuse creates more stress than all the other workplace stressors combined. Nonetheless, such aggressive behaviors on the job prevail when those with organizational power, the leaders, fail to intervene or even perpetuate the bullying themselves (Glambek et al., 2018; Hauge et al., 2007; Hollis, 2017a; Leymann, 1996). While subordinates struggle in toxic work environments, the pseudo-transformational leaders almost focus exclusively on their achieve-

ments and career goals, as the remaining organization struggles to withstand abuse (Bass & Steidlmeier, 2006).

The aforementioned studies whether about empathetic leadership, narcissistic leadership, transformational leadership or laissez-faire leadership, all point to the need for an engaged and humanitarian approach to leadership in cultivating a healthy and innovative workplace devoid of workplace bullying. Without intervention, toxic workplaces develop which allow for deviant behaviors. The cross-section of studies in this discussion informs this analysis which fills a gap in the literature by specifically addressing leadership in higher education and how leadership styles may be related to workplace bullying in the higher education context. Bandura's Bobo Doll experiment, as discussed below solidifies the theoretical underpinning

THEORETICAL FRAME: BANDURA'S BOBO DOLL EXPERIMENT

This study utilizes Bandura's 1961 groundbreaking study, often referred to as the Bobo Doll experiments (Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1961). The Bobo Doll behavioral model is applied to this study and can elucidate how aggression becomes acceptable in workplace bullying situations. The previous discussions on leadership creating the work environment (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006), and higher education researchers identifying apathetic leadership in the academy as a problem inspired the choice to apply Bandura's work to the workplace bullying problem in higher education (Crouch, 2016; Keashly, 2019).

Bandura's study separated children into three groups. One group of children was presented with a variety of toys, including crayons, stickers, and pictures. In the corner, a Bobo Doll was about three and a half feet tall and weighted at the bottom much like weebles. When punched, pushed, or cajoled, the doll would return to an upright position. In the first group, the children at play observed an adult enter the space and then engage in verbal and physical aggression with the Bobo Doll. This group saw the Bobo Doll punched, hit with a mallet, and batted about the head. Also, the adult yelled aggressive speech at the Bobo Doll, ranting while punching and kicking. When the adult completed the abuse, he simply left the room.

A second group, separate from the first, was at play when an adult entered the room. This group witnessed Bobo Doll and saw the available mallets. However, for this group, the adult did not abuse the Bobo Doll, and the children did not observe aggressive behavior and continued to play with their other toys. The third group, separate from the first two groups, was also at play when an adult entered in the room. The adult abused the Bobo Doll, batting it about the head with mallets. The adult used aggressive behavior and speech with the Bobo Doll. However, in this third scenario, a second adult entered and disciplined the first adult abusing the Bobo Doll. The children witnessed the abuse and the correction for hurting the Bobo Doll.

In the next phase of the experiment, children were invited to play with the crayons and pictures. After a few minutes, they were told to abandon their play abruptly, yet they were led to a different set of toys. The next set of toys had aggressive and nonaggressive toys, such as crayons, paper, and balls, along with mallets, a dart gun, and the Bobo Doll. For children who had witnessed the aggressive behavior in the first phase, and the adult model was not admonished for the aggressive behavior (so the children who had witnessed aggression without correction), those children were more likely to repeat the aggression. They engaged in batting the Bobo Doll about the head and body, yelling aggressive language. In converse, the second group of children, who were told to play, also lost access to toys and was led to a second room with aggressive and nonaggressive toys. This second group of children, who had not witnessed the aggressive behavior, did not abuse the Bobo Doll when given the opportunity.

The third group of children also was also invited to play with crayons and pictures. After a few minutes, they were told to abruptly abandon their play. They too were led to the next set of aggressive and non-aggressive toys such as crayons, paper, and balls, along with mallets, a dart gun, and the

Bobo Doll. While this group witnessed the Bobo Doll being abused, they also witnessed the abuser being corrected and admonished for the abuse. Apparently, the group that had not witnessed aggressive behavior directed at the Bobo Doll or the group who saw the adult being corrected and admonished for abusing the Bobo Doll did not repeat the abusive behavior against the Bobo Doll when given access to do such (Lansford, 2016).

Bandura's social psychological experiment regarding aggression, correction, and learned behaviors is applicable to organizational workplace bullying. Personnel who witness aggressive behavior, without the aggressor being admonished or corrected, are likely to repeat the aggressive behavior. Similarly, when no consequences or interventions are levied against bullies, the bullying continues and others in the work environment learn that such aggression is acceptable. Just as both physical and verbal aggression was normalized in the Bandura experiment (1961), verbal aggression and perhaps physical aggression are normalized when leaders do not intervene to correct aggressive behavior. In the Bandura experiment, the actor is the adult in the room, the one with understood power over the children given the adult status. When the adult abused the Bobo Doll, that aggression was normalized because the adult received no correction or admonishment for abusive behavior.

The parallel organizational construction is the leader or supervisor, who by status has power over the underlings. When the powerful are not checked for aggressive behavior, the culture normalizes the aggression. Not only does this manager realize that the environment will tolerate his or her aggressive behavior, those in the organizational culture learn that aggressive behavior is accepted. For example, when someone is hired into a new culture, a common process is to engage in that learning curve, to understand the culture, thereby learning acceptable behavior. By watching which behaviors and language are accepted or rejected, employees learn the cultural norms.

In the long term, the uncorrected behavior sets the tone for what is acceptable and appropriate. If no one with power intervenes, which is the case in a laissez-faire leadership model or narcissistic leadership model, correction of destructive and harmful behaviors seldom occurs. Contentious malevolent behavior flourishes and the culture embraces a warped sense of what is appropriate. When intimidation is overlooked, it evolves into a normalized experience. Therefore, when organizational deviance emerges in harassment, oppression, and discrimination, bullying becomes commonplace when those in power do not offer the interventions needed to snuff out bullies and protect the organizational culture from the social and institutional ills which follow in the wake of abusive behavior.

Bandura's controlled experiment about learned aggression occurs with young people in a substantially shorter period than an academic term or full year. Workplace bullying in higher education exposes both the bully and target to long-term reinforcement that bullying is acceptable and tolerated in their organization. If subjects in the three stages of Bandura's experiment learned about aggression in a day of experiments with the Bobo Doll (Bandura, Ross & Ross, 1961), then adults involved in bullying, either as the direct target or witness, who have been exposed to workplace aggression and bullying for years, presumably learned the continuously reinforced notion that bullying is acceptable in their workplace. Arguably, children and adults who see behavior that is accepted without admonishment, be it good or bad behavior, will model such behavior according to what is deemed social learning theory (Bandura, 1977).

RESEARCH METHODS

PRELIMINARY DATA

To contribute to this body of literature and specifically investigate workplace bullying in American higher education, this researcher has previously engaged in four instrument-based studies in which data was collected through SurveyMonkey™ instruments distributed via the Internet in 2012, 2014, 2016, and 2017/2018. These primary data were collected for this researcher's sole analysis. These

four previous data collections utilized original instruments with over 35 questions that were beta-tested by scholars and higher education practitioners. The result of these studies yielded four data sets regarding workplace bullying in American higher education, which are in the possession of the researcher. These data collections have resulted in 1,588 respondents from community colleges, four-year schools, research institutions, minority-serving institutions, and for-profit institutions. All levels of higher education are represented, as the respondents included graduate students, directors, coordinators, deans, assistant professors, associate professors, full professors, vice presidents, provosts, and others. While the instruments are too lengthy to append to this publication, the specific questions used for this analysis are included below in italics.

Specifically, the surveys used to generate the aforementioned four data sets included the following question. *“If you experience(d) a healthy workplace during your career in higher education, which factors were significant in creating that healthy work environment?”* Of the 1300 respondents who answered this specific question, 1024 (79%) stated that the healthy workplace was based on the “positive attitude of the boss/supervisor.” The respondents’ perceptions seem reasonable as it is the boss, head of the department, or the dean, director, vice president or provost who sets policies, establishes compensation and presumably monitors organizational success.

Further, in these four data collections, respondents were asked specifically: *“How did the organization deal with the BULLY? (Choose up to three options).”* Choices included: did nothing, coached the bully, fired the target, transferred the bully, supported the bully, transferred the target, and fired the bully. Of the 996 respondents who answered this question, 785 (79%) reported that the organization “did nothing.” The lack of intervention stems from leaders who are deliberately indifferent, or they are so engrossed in reaching their personal goals, they fail to stamp out destructive bullying behaviors, which hurt employees and ultimately hurt the institution.

Note that the children from the Bobo Doll experiments adopted these behaviors relatively quickly, in this application of adults copying aggressive behaviors, adults have been exposed to workplace bullying behaviors for several academic terms to over three years (Hollis, 2015). Further, when leaders exhibit bullying behaviors and maintain their privileged place on the organizational ladder, or even get promoted, the organization learns that the culture operates with indifference about the employee’s welfare.

With the aforementioned theoretical frame in mind, these data were also used to consider the duration of workplace bullying. The meta-analysis, of the 2012, 2014, 2016, and 2017/2018 data collections, shows that 71% of respondents endured workplace bullying for at least a year. The question read in each of the four surveys, *“How long did the TARGET endure bullying?”* See Table 1.

Table 1: Meta-analysis, duration of workplace bullying reported 2012–2017/2018; n=1073

Duration		N
One- year	19%	N = 200/1073
Two- three years	24%	N = 261/1073
More than three years	28%	N = 301/1073
Total of one year or more	71%	N = 762/1073

These responses over six years of research have inspired this current study with data collected in late 2017/ early 2018. The goal of this analysis is to consider if leadership behavior has a significant impact on workplace bullying. The findings would contribute to the literature on workplace bullying and leadership in higher education.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Four data sets, collected between 2012 and 2018, reveal a majority of higher education respondents reporting that the organizations look to leadership to mitigate workplace bullying on campus. The literature considers how leadership can be transformational change agents (Chappell, et al., 2016; Hughes, 2015; Salman & Broten, 2017) or damaging through laissez-faire or narcissistic leadership behaviors (Buch, Martinsen, & Kuvaas, 2015; Skogstad, Hetland, Glasø, & Einarsen, 2014). Therefore, this study will use the most recent data (2017/2018) to examine the likelihood that bullied employees and employees who are not bullied identify laissez-faire leadership traits that do not respond to reports of workplace bullying.

DATA COLLECTION & ANALYSIS

In 2017–2018, the most recent data set collected, 730 higher education respondents replied to a survey distributed via the Internet asking questions about workplace bullying. A mix of instrument dissemination methods was used; the survey link was emailed to respondents and posted in several online industry-specific list serves and social media interest groups such as LinkedIn Special Interest groups for higher education and Facebook pages focusing on higher education. Many sample respondents were randomly chosen from the *Higher Education Publication* (HEP), which has contact information for faculty members and upper administration such as directors, deans, executive directors, and vice presidents in the United States. These colleagues received an email inviting them to participate in the study. The researcher, who has conducted four other instrument-based studies, designed the instrument. A link to the SurveyMonkey™, which hosted the instrument, was distributed via the Internet every three weeks starting in November 2017. From December 15, 2018, through January 10, 2018, the data collection was suspended given the holidays, yet it was resumed in mid-January 2018 and concluded in February 2018. Given the multiple dissemination approaches, a response rate cannot be calculated. See Table 2 for the demographic breakdown of the sample.

Table 2: Respondent demographics; n = 730

Race		Age	
White	79.97%	28-35	6.48%
Black	15.03%	36-40	6.90%
Hispanic / Latino	4.55%	41-49	26.90 %
Asian / Pacific Island	2.07%	50-60	40.16%
		61 +	18.76%

In the most recent data set, collected in 2017–2018 with 730 respondents, 58% reported being affected by workplace bullying in higher education. Specifically, of the respondents, 70% were women and 30% were men. Of this sample, 62% of the women (361 of 478) women reported being affected by workplace bullying, while 45% of the men (88 of 197) reported being affected by workplace bullying.

CENTRAL RESEARCH QUESTION & FINDINGS

The central research question for this analysis is the following.

RQ: Which personnel, bullied or not bullied, are more likely to report that no intervention was demonstrated in the organization's response to reports of workplace bullying on campus?

H₁: Bullied persons will be more likely to report that no intervention was demonstrated in the organization's response to reports of workplace bullying on campus.

To answer this question, a chi-square analysis was performed using IBM SPSS version 25. The chi-square analysis is appropriate to determine the likelihood that a condition exists. This statistical test

was chosen, as chi-square is best for analyzing categorical variables. Respondents' answers were coded in the following manner. Bullied personnel who did not answer "the organization did nothing" were coded "1." Bullied personnel who confirmed laissez-faire leadership with the answer "the organization did nothing" were coded "2." Personnel who were not bullied and did not answer "The organization did nothing" were coded "1." Personnel who were not bullied and confirmed laissez-faire leadership with the answer "the organization did nothing" were coded "2." Bullied personnel coded as 1 and 2 and subsequently, non-bullied personnel coded as 1 and 2 were inputted to SPSS. Table 3 reports the results of the chi-square analysis.

Variable #1 is the code for the respondents left the option blank that the "organization did nothing" in response to workplace bullying in higher education. Variable #2 is the code for "Organization did nothing about bullying." The chi-square analysis showed that bullied personnel reported more actual instances of the organization doing nothing. A count of 334 was found but the expected count was 325.6. For those not bullied, the actual number for the "organization did nothing about bullying" was 54, but the expected count was higher, i.e., 62.4. Those who were not bullied reported that "the organization did nothing," registered fewer responses than the expected count. For non-bullied employees, 62.4 respondents were expected to report that the organization did nothing but the actual count of this report was 54, which are fewer than the expected 62.4. Therefore, H_1 , "Bullied persons will be more likely to report laissez-faire style leadership demonstrated in the organization's apathy to address workplace bullying on campus," is accepted. Further, the difference is *statistically* significant at the .05 level ($\chi^2(1, n = 522) = 5.293, P = 0.021$).

Table 3: Chi-square analysis of bullied and not bullied personnel; n = 522

		Did not indicate "organization did nothing"	Confirmed "organization did nothing"	Total
1 = Yes, Bullied	Count	104	334	438
	Expected Count	112.4	325.6	438
2 = No, Not Bullied	Count	30	54	84
	Expected Count	21.6	62.4	84
Total	Count	134	388	522
	Expected Count	134	388	522

Further, the instrument concluded by asking an open-ended question: Any other comments about workplace bullying in higher education? The comments offered below parallel the voices of the 79% of respondents in the previous preliminary data segment in which the organization 'does nothing' in the face of workplace bullying. These comments were not coded or analyzed for emergent themes as this study did not pursue a phenomenological approach. However, these voices are consistent in naming deliberate indifference about the workplace bullying problem in higher education. See Table 4.

Leadership should know that employee dissatisfaction leads to expensive turnover. According to the Society of Human Resources Managers, organizations spend 150% of a person's salary when that person leaves the position (Hollis, 2015). For this data set from late 2017–early 2018, respondents reported their intentions to leave their organization due to workplace bullying. See Table 5.

Table 4: Open-ended responses regarding apathetic leadership

Respondent #641	Reported but nothing done
Respondent #722	Bullying is an acceptable strategy for administrators here
Respondent #587	Nothing works; it's a culture that has been allowed for so many years that it's a way of life
Respondent #577	The University settled a discrimination lawsuit filed because of the bully for a large six-figure sum. Yet the president continues to shield this bully from any consequences
Respondent #459	There is nothing in place to prevent this behavior. Reporting doesn't help and only increases the risk to others in the unit

Table 5: Respondents' departure intentions, multiple answers were allowed; n = 553

29%	I think about leaving but there are few positions to apply to in this job market
22%	I tried to leave (applied or interviewed) but the job market keeps me here
22%	I am considering leaving higher education
16%	I will just endure the problem

DISCUSSION

The higher education respondents in the last six years of this researcher's work, respondents have commented that workplace bullying is an all too common part of higher education. These respondents claim that leadership, human resources, and others in power are deliberately indifferent and knowingly allow bullying to continue at the employees' expense. With close to two-thirds of any data set from 2012 through 2018 stating that they were affected by workplace bullying, workplace bullying behaviors in higher education are more of an epidemic than Namie and Namie state in their 2009 study for the general American population. To improve these higher education cultures, engaged leaders who are adept at change management would need to move past indifference and intervene. As noted in the Bobo Doll experiments, witnesses who saw the leader intervene learned that aggression was not welcomed in that environment (Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1961). In contrast, those who witnessed no correction or admonition directly after the bad behavior learned that aggression is permitted and goes unpunished (Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1961). Regarding intervention and change, Kotter (2012) commented that the change in management practices occurs when vision and urgency are injected into the environment. With such urgency, a leader needs to imagine a civil place to work and set in motion the policies and practices to shift the culture. Those in the organization also need to embrace the urgency of a cultural shift.

Longstanding administrators and faculty who have built their careers in higher education may have been lulled into an accepting nonchalance that bullying culture remains common in higher education. One 2012 respondent, who was over 60 years of age and presumably had a long career in higher education stated, "I have not experienced a healthy workplace during my career in higher education!" (Personal communication respondent #349, 2012). McCaffery (2018) also referenced a "malaise" in higher education communities when leaders remark on how valuable employees are, while simultaneously ignoring employees' needs.

Those wishing to change the higher education culture would need to tackle pervasive indifference and complacency, a complacency that probably arises from not trusting that workplace bullying will ever be handled. Along with complacency as an obstacle to change, as Kotter (2012) states, snakes and egos destroy the trust needed to change. The snake of an employee is someone whose purpose weaves distrust into a unit with gossip, misinformation, and manipulation. The ego, discussed earlier with narcissistic leadership styles, also cultivates distrust. When employees recognize that powerful employees and leaders are indifferent to employee well-being and instead governed by their egos, the employees become reluctant to trust change and contribute innovative ideas to make such changes possible. While snakes and egos strangle organizational synergy, those who remain aloof regarding organizational abuse are also untrustworthy. Aligning with Bandura's outcomes (1961), whether workplace bullying manifests from narcissism, manipulation, favoritism, or deliberate indifference, leaders who do not address workplace bullying cannot possibly expect to make long-term and meaningful change.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

Regardless of the sector, or the country, researchers nationally and internationally have connected leadership, management and supervisors to the prevalence of workplace bullying in their respective work environments. O'Moore and Lynch (2007) confirmed that laissez faire leadership styles contribute to bullying in their Irish workforce study. Leadership's emotional intelligence is the focus of Hutchinson and Hurley's (2013) Australian study that confirmed that leadership's emotional capabilities can mitigate harmful bullying. In a study examining teacher and principals in Turkey, Cemaloğlu (2011) found an inverse relationship between a principal exhibiting transformational leadership styles and the presence of workplace bullying. In short, the more inspiration, motivation, creativity, and positive energy a leader uses (the elements of transformational leadership: Bass & Avolio, 1993; Bass & Steidlmeier, 2006) the less likely workplace bullying will emerge. Workplace bullying does not emerge by happenstance but is directly related to the leaders and managers who govern the environment.

Consequently, this study and its findings are consistent with previous studies in which the leader is a mitigating factor in workplace bullying. The application of the Bobo Doll experiments and the findings from this chi-square analysis firmly notes that intervention from the powerful leaders can extinguish abuse and aggression in the workplace in higher education. With this in mind, organizations should be conscientious in choosing and promoting people to powerful leadership positions.

To this point, leaders should be vetted and coached to create and maintain a productive and stable workplace. Both internal and external candidates have a track record of performance. Consider if the internal candidate has been the subject of several complaints, a history of malfeasance or precipitated high turnover in his or her area. These markers signify if such an internal candidate would be an appropriate caretaker of the unit. Also, promoting someone internally who is undeserving sends a message to subordinates of what values the organization truly rewards. As Sumarni (2011) promoting and retaining bad employees motivates the good employees to leave. Rewarding an internal bad actor who does not have a history of quashing bad behavior is only inviting such bad behavior to flourish. As noted previously (Bass & Avolio, 1993; Cemaloğlu, 2011), leadership can stamp out workplace bullying with positive and transformational work behaviors. In an internal search, the committee should already have access to such leadership behaviors and be in a better position to make a sound decision that cultivates innovation rather than jeopardizing creativity (Anderson, 2011).

With the well-being of colleagues in mind, the organization and the hiring authority should be committed to conducting a complete search without skipping vital steps such as reference checks (Arms & Bercik, 2016). In this digital age, executive leaders have profiles of successes and failures. Discover the turnover record under a candidate. If an initial search fails to yield the appropriate candidate, the organization in the long term would lose less money to reopen the search than to acquiesce to an

unqualified candidate. When the organization needs to change, hiring the internal candidate, while tempting, would bring more of the same bad behaviors.

Other mistakes include only considering active candidates and then taking too long to confirm such candidates (Arms & Bercik, 2016). If a candidate is actively looking at one job, he or she is looking at several jobs; therefore, long lapses in time are harmful to the search. Also, on average 20%-25% of candidate find their jobs through active searches; consequently, recruiting passive candidates, who are happy in their current positions, can bring happy finalists who are not evading a previous mess.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTICE

The following recommendations extend from the findings which confirmed that leaders often “do nothing” that is practice deliberate indifference when workplace bullying is reported. With the Bobo Doll experiment in mind (Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1961), the following recommendations for practice are devised to create the intervention necessary to curtail workplace bullying in higher education. Establishing anti-bullying policies would be an initial action for organizations to engage. However, when leaders fail to intercede, even solid policies would be an afterthought when not utilized. The recommendations below are designed to generate leadership intervention for organizations. Often, for the targets of workplace bullying to experience relief from stressful abuse in bullying experiences, leadership must step in to quash aggressive behaviors.

CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN

Appoint a campus ombudsman who collects data about conflicts. While data should not maintain employees’ personal details, such data and subsequent reports can elucidate data-driven divisions of concern. Such a report should be given to the president’s cabinet and the Board of Trustees. The ombudsman would garner information from across the university and be in a better and objective position to determine departmental concentrations of workplace bullying. At times, a savvy employee learns how to use workplace bullying in a charge of illegal harassment and discrimination. The ombudsman can serve as that person in the environment who can identify internal threats and help administration resolve the problems before they metastasize into legal complaints. Overall, an ombudsman can use the information to guide leadership on where to intervene to stop costly workplace bullying. By employing and empowering such a position, the organization would be in a better position to collect data about workplace bullying on campus; and in turn, have a data-informed approach to creating an intervention.

360- EVALUATIONS

Conduct 360-evaluations for those in leadership roles. Those subordinates who experience workplace bullying or a healthy workplace can report their experiences anonymously without fear of retaliation. The university should establish a benchmark for civility and intervention. If such benchmarks are not met, then a certified life coach should be assigned to the leader to coach him/her in managing issues. At times, organizational leadership finds coaching expensive. However, when one considers that losing an employee costs 150% of that employee’s salary (Hollis, 2015), the cost of a coach is considerably less than the cost of losing the employee and the other witnesses to bullying who also disengage and leave the organization.

FACULTY OVERSIGHT

Have a faculty oversight committee and a separate staff oversight committee, which would have clear grievance procedures. Higher education often has leaders who are apathetic about workplace bullying; true faculty oversight can function as the agent that curtails workplace bullying in place of an inactive leader. The committees would make recommendations for changes and intervention. The manager or leader of troubled areas would need to report back regarding the progress of resolving

issues. Each committee would rotate in a staggered fashion every two years. One person could not serve two consecutive terms.

While a healthy workplace is everyone's responsibility, those with power in the organization have the purview to intervene or tacitly support bullying. Those with less power tend to be women, people of color, or members of the LGBTQ community, as established in a previous study (Hollis, 2018). Therefore, the oppression experienced through workplace bullying jeopardizes a mission's often-stated goal of maintaining social justice for all community members. Nonetheless, as confirmed in the Bobo Doll experiments (Bandura, Ross & Ross, 1961), when the aggressive behavior is not admonished or corrected, the aggressive behavior is learned by onlookers and proliferates through the community.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Higher education continues to face a number of external and internal threats to viability. While executive leaders who maintain the power of upper-echelon positions need to tend to external threats, they also need to establish internal mechanisms to minimize costly workplace bullying. Future research can examine which interventions are most successful in curtailing workplace bullying in higher education. In addition, a qualitative approach can examine various leaders' values, which inspire a commitment to intervention to stop workplace bullying. The following recommendations parallel the practical recommendations.

CAMPUS OMBUDSMAN & WORKPLACE BULLYING

Some researchers have recommended that an ombudsman can identify and address workplace bullying (Hollis, 2016; Keashly, 2010). Specifically, O'Farrell and Nordstrom (2013) identify the ombudsman as part of a self-monitoring work environment that is related to fewer reported incidents of workplace bullying. A topic for future research would employ a mixed methods approach in which the relationship between workplace bullying and the presence of an ombudsman on campus. A qualitative phenomenological approach could be added to collect the lived experiences and insight ombudsmen have first-hand in dealing with workplace bullying and executive leadership who can diminish workplace bullying in higher education.

STUDY 360-EVALUATION DATA ON CAMPUS

An institutional level study would employ the 360-evaluations. These evaluations have been used to assess leadership effectiveness (Skipper & Bell, 2006). By collecting responses of faculty and staff, and then using turnover and absentee data, an organizational researcher could not only determine which departments and divisions have workplace bullying but also which departments are costing the organization the most in costly employee disengagement behaviors (Huang, Wellman, Ashford, Lee, & Wang, 2017). To receive accurate replies from respondents, the study should strive to avoid any personally identifiable information (for example asking for gender in a department where there is only one woman). Targets of workplace bullying should be shielded from retaliation.

FACULTY OVERSIGHT

In the absence of leadership who will intervene to curtail workplace bullying, an empowered faculty oversight can deliver interventions. To further investigate this recommendation, a researcher could survey three types of schools, 1) colleges and universities with active AAUP chapters (American Association of University Professors), 2) colleges and universities with active faculty senates 3) colleges and universities neither a senate or AAUP. Such schools could report via an instrument on the prevalence of workplace bullying. Three correlation tests could determine the relationship, if any, between faculty governance and workplace bullying in American higher education.

CONCLUSION

The notion of self-monitoring and self-policing organizations remain commonplace nationally and internationally (Skipper & Bell, 2006). Whether at a local level within municipalities, state government with rules and procedures, and national organizations such as the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) and the Americans with Civil Liberties (ACLU), community leaders monitor policies and practices to support the individual's right to self-determination, protect against abuse, and promote social justice (Mithaug, 1996). Higher education, organizations that train leadership, cannot be exempt from the same self-monitoring activities among its leadership. Not only does the intervening leadership protect faculty and staff on their respective campuses, they also would be modeling a moral engagement (Bandura, 2016) for the next generation of emerging leaders.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, T. D. (2011). Beyond eureka moments: Supporting the invisible work of creativity and innovation. *Information Research: An International Electronic Journal*, 16(1), n1. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ925561.pdf>
- Arms, D., & Bercik, T. (2016). 10 hiring mistakes to avoid. *Strategic Finance*, 97(7), 46-53. Retrieved from <https://sfmagazine.com/post-entry/january-2016-10-hiring-mistakes-to-avoid/>
- Attell, B. K., Brown, K. K., & Treiber, L. A. (2017). Workplace bullying, perceived job stressors, and psychological distress: Gender and race differences in the stress process. *Social Science Research*, 65, 210-221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2017.02.001>
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (2016). *Moral disengagement: How people do harm and live with themselves*. New York, NY: Worth Publishers. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2015-43532-000>
- Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. A. (1961). Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 63(3), 575-582. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0045925>
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 17(1), 112-121. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40862298>
- Bass, B. M., & Steidlmeier, P. (2006). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership. *Ethics*, 12(42), 1-24. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.152.4873&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Baumann, P. (2017). Deliberate indifference: How to fix title IX campus sex-assault jurisprudence. *Georgetown Law Journal*, 106(4), 1139-1160. Retrieved from <https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/glj106&collection=journals&id=1151&startid=&endid=1172>
- Brinsfield, C. T. (2013). Employee silence motives: investigation of dimensionality and development of measures. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(5), 671-697. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1829>
- Brousse, G., Fontana, L., Ouchchane, L., Boisson, C., Gerbaud, L., Bourguet, D., Perrier, A., Schmitt, A., Llorca, P. M., & Chamoux, A. (2008). Psychopathological features of a patient population of targets of workplace bullying. *Occupational Medicine*, 58(2), 122-128. <https://doi.org/10.1093/occmed/kqm148>
- Buch, R., Martinsen, Ø. L., & Kuvaas, B. (2015). The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior: The mediating role of economic leader-member exchange relationships. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 22(1), 115-124. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051813515302>
- Byrne, Z. S. (2014). *Understanding employee engagement: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203385944>
- Cemaloğlu, N. (2011). Primary principals' leadership styles, school organizational health and workplace bullying. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(5), 495-512. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578231111159511>

- Chappell, S., Pescud, M., Waterworth, P., Shilton, T., Roche, D., Ledger, M., Slevin, T., & Rosenberg, M. (2016). Exploring the process of implementing healthy workplace initiatives: Mapping to Kotter's leading change model. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 58(10), e341-e348. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000000854>
- Cooper, C. L., Hoel, H., & Faragher, B. (2004). Bullying is detrimental to health, but all bullying behaviours are not equally damaging. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 32(3), 367-387. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03069880410001723594>
- Crouch, M. (2016). Why can't we behave? Justice and ethical conduct in the academy. *Social Philosophy Today*, 32, 7-26. <https://doi.org/10.5840/socphiltoday201672230>
- Einarsen, S., Raknes, B. I., & Matthiesen, S. B. (1994). Bullying and harassment at work and their relationships to work environment quality: An exploratory study. *European Work and Organizational Psychologist*, 4(4), 381-401. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594329408410497>
- Glambek, M., Skogstad, A., & Einarsen, S. (2018). Workplace bullying, the development of job insecurity and the role of laissez-faire leadership: A two-wave moderated mediation study. *Work & Stress: An International Journal of Work, Health & Organizations*, 32(3), 297-312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2018.1427815>
- Hauge, L. J., Skogstad, A., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Relationships between stressful work environments and bullying: Results of a large representative study. *Work & Stress: An International Journal of Work, Health & Organizations*, 21(3), 220-242. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370701705810>
- Hoel, H., Glasø, L., Hetland, J., Cooper, C. L., & Einarsen, S. (2010). Leadership styles as predictors of self-reported and observed workplace bullying. *British Journal of Management*, 21(2), 453-468. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2009.00664.x>
- Hollis, L. P. (2015). Bully university? The cost of workplace bullying and employee disengagement in American higher education. *Sage Open*, 5(2), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015589997>
- Hollis, L. P. (2016). Canary in the mine: Ombuds as first alerts for workplace bullying on campus. *Journal of International Ombudsman Association*, 9(1), 23-31. Retrieved from https://ioa.memberclicks.net/assets/docs/JIOA-16-V9-1_FNL.pdf#page=24
- Hollis, L. P. (2017). Workplace bullying II: A civilizational shortcoming examined in a comparative content analysis. *Comparative Civilizations Review*, 77(77), Article 9. Retrieved from <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/ccr/vol77/iss77/9>
- Hollis, L. P. (2017a). Evasive actions: The gendered cycle of stress and coping for those enduring workplace bullying in American higher education. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 4(7), 59-68. <https://doi.org/10.14738/assrj.47.2993>
- Hollis, L. P. (2018). Bullied out of position: Black women's complex intersectionality, workplace bullying, and resulting career disruption. *Journal of Black Sexuality and Relationships*, 4(3), 73-89. <https://doi.org/10.1353/bsr.2018.0004>
- Huang, G. H., Wellman, N., Ashford, S. J., Lee, C., & Wang, L. (2017). Deviance and exit: The organizational costs of job insecurity and moral disengagement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(1), 26. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000158>
- Hughes, M. (2015, July). How did Bernard Bass and John Kotter frame transformational leadership and leading change? Paper presented at the 7th Developing Leadership Capacity Conference. Greenlands, UK: Henley Business School. Retrieved from <http://eprints.brighton.ac.uk/15063/1/HENLEYFrame.pdf>
- Hutchinson, M., & Hurley, J. (2013). Exploring leadership capability and emotional intelligence as moderators of workplace bullying. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 21(3), 553-562. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2834.2012.01372.x>
- Islamoska, S., Grynderup, M. B., Nabe-Nielsen, K., Høgh, A., & Hansen, Å. M. (2018). Does the association between workplace bullying and post-traumatic stress symptoms differ across educational groups? *Journal of European Psychology Students*, 9(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.5334/jeps.432>

- Jaskyte, K. (2004). Transformational leadership, organizational culture, and innovativeness in nonprofit organizations. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 15(2), 153-168. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.59>
- Judge, T. A., LePine, J. A., & Rich, B. L. (2006). Loving yourself abundantly: Relationship of the narcissistic personality to self-and other perceptions of workplace deviance, leadership, and task and contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(4), 762-776. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.4.762>
- Justiss, G. (2008). Deliberate indifference under § 1983: Do the courts really care? *The Review of Litigation*, 28(4), 953-982. Retrieved from <https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/rol28&collection=journals&id=961&startid=&endid=990>
- Keashly, L. (2010). A researcher speaks to ombudsmen about workplace bullying. *Journal of the International Ombudsman Association*, 3(2), 10-23. Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/5d99/dd1edae365d232ea76747f07c75468d082f7.pdf>
- Keashly, L. (2019). Workplace bullying, mobbing and harassment in academe: Faculty experience. *Special topics and particular occupations, professions and sectors* (pp. 1-77). Singapore: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5154-8_13-1
- Keelan, E. (2000). Bully for you. *Accountancy*, 125(1281), 56.
- Kelloway, E. K., Sivanathan, N., Francis, L., & Barling, J. (2005). Poor leadership. In J. Barling, E. K. Kelloway, & M. R. Frone (Eds.). *Handbook of work stress* (pp. 89–112). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Retrieved from <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/handbook-of-work-stress/book226100>
- Kock, N., Mayfield, M., Mayfield, J., Sexton, S., & De La Garza, L. M. (2019). Empathetic leadership: How leader emotional support and understanding influences follower performance. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 26(2), 217–236. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051818806290>
- Kotter, J. P. (2012). *Leading change: How to change your business successfully in eight steps*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Press. <https://doi.org/10.15358/9783800646159>
- Lansford, J. E. (2016). Bobo doll experiment. In V. Zeigler-Hill, & T. K. Shackelford (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences*, (pp. 1-3). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-28099-8_1214-1
- Laschinger, H. K. S., Wong, C. A., & Grau, A. L. (2012). The influence of authentic leadership on newly graduated nurses' experiences of workplace bullying, burnout and retention outcomes: A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 49(10), 1266–1276. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2012.05.012>
- Lee, R. T., Brotheridge, C. M., Salin, D., & Hoel, H. (2013). Workplace bullying as a gendered phenomenon. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 28(3), 235-251. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683941311321187>
- Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), 165–184. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594329608414853>
- Marques, J. (2015). The changed leadership landscape: What matters today. *Journal of Management Development*, 34(10), 1310-1322. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-02-2015-0010>
- Mayer, C. H., & Surtee, S. (2015). The leadership preferences of women leaders working in higher education. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Gender Studies*, 4(1), 612-636. Retrieved from <https://hipatiapress.com/hpjournals/index.php/generos/article/viewFile/1320/1177>
- McCaffery, P. (2018). *The higher education manager's handbook: Effective leadership and management in universities and colleges* (3rd edition). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351249744>
- Mithaug, D. E. (1996). *Equal opportunity theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unraveling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory processing model. *Psychological Inquiry: An International Journal for the Advancement of Psychological Theory*, 12(4), 177–196. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PL1204_1
- Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2009). *Bully at work: What you can do to stop the hurt and reclaim your dignity on the job*. Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks, Inc.

- Niedhammer, I., David, S., Degioanni, S., Drummond, A., Philip, P., & 143 Occupational Physicians (2009). Workplace bullying and sleep disturbances: Findings from a large scale cross-sectional survey in the French working population. *Sleep*, 32(9), 1211-1219. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sleep/32.9.1211>
- Niedl, K. (1996). Mobbing and well-being: Economic and personnel development implications. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), 239-249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594329608414857>
- Nielsen, M. B., Gjerstad, J., & Frone, M. R. (2018). Alcohol use and psychosocial stressors in the Norwegian workforce. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 53(4), 574-584. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10826084.2017.1349797>
- O'Farrell, C., & Nordstrom, C. R. (2013). Workplace bullying: Examining self-monitoring and organizational culture. *Journal of Psychological Issues in Organizational Culture*, 3(4), 6-17. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jpoc.21079>
- O'Moore, M., & Lynch, J. (2007). Leadership, working environment and workplace bullying. *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior*, 10(1), 95-117. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOTB-10-01-2007-B005>
- Ostroff, C., Kinicki, A. J., & Muhammad, R. S. (2012). Organizational culture and climate. In I. B. Weiner (Ed.). *Handbook of Psychology, Second Edition*, 12, 643-676. New Jersey, US: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118133880.hop212024>
- Park, J. H., & Ono, M. (2016). Effects of workplace bullying on work engagement and health: The mediating role of job insecurity. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28(22), 3202-3225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1155164>
- Rai, A., & Agarwal, U. A. (2018). Workplace bullying and employee silence: A moderated mediation model of psychological contract violation and workplace friendship. *Personnel Review*, 47(1), 226-256. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-03-2017-0071>
- Rosenthal, S. A., & Pittinsky, T. L. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 617-633. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.005>
- Salman, Y., & Broten, N. (2017). *Leading change: Why transformational efforts fail*. The Macat Library Series. Routledge.
- Skinner, C., & Spurgeon, P. (2005). Valuing empathy and emotional intelligence in health leadership: A study of empathy, leadership behaviour and outcome effectiveness. *Health Services Management Research*, 18(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1258/0951484053051924>
- Skipper, C. O., & Bell, L. C. (2006). Assessment with 360 evaluations of leadership behavior in construction project managers. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 22(2), 75-80. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0742-597X\(2006\)22:2\(75\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0742-597X(2006)22:2(75))
- Skogstad, A., Hetland, J., Glasø, L., & Einarsen, S. (2014). Is avoidant leadership a root cause of subordinate stress? Longitudinal relationships between laissez-faire leadership and role ambiguity. *Work & Stress: An International Journal of Work, Health & Organizations*, 28(4), 323-341. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2014.957362>
- Spence Laschinger, H. K., & Nosko, A. (2015). Exposure to workplace bullying and post-traumatic stress disorder symptomology: The role of protective psychological resources. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 23(2), 252-262. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.12122>
- Spraggins, C. (2014). A global overview of legal proceeds. In L. Hollis, & E. Turner (Eds.). *Bully beyond the tower: A collection of peer reviewed essays on workplace bullying* (pp. 199-215). Wilmington, DE: Patricia Berkly LLC.
- Sumarni, M. (2011). The influence of employee retention on turnover intention and employee performance. *Akemenika Upy*, 8, 20-47.
- Taniguchi, T., Takaki, J., Hirokawa, K., Fujii, Y., & Harano, K. (2016). Associations of workplace bullying and harassment with stress reactions: A two-year follow-up study. *Industrial health*, 54(2), 131-138. <https://doi.org/10.2486/indhealth.2014-0206>
- Trépanier, S.-G., Fernet, C., & Austin, S. (2015). A longitudinal investigation of workplace bullying, basic need satisfaction, and employee functioning. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20(1), 105-117. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037726>

Wilson, C. B. (1991). US businesses suffer from workplace trauma. *The Personnel Journal*, 70(7), 47–50.

Xu, S., Van Hoof, H., Serrano, A. L., Fernandez, L., & Ullauri, N. (2017). The role of coworker support in the relationship between moral efficacy and voice behavior: The case of hospitality students in Ecuador. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 16(3), 252-269.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2017.1253431>

BIOGRAPHY



Leah P. Hollis EdD, associate professor at Morgan State is a noted national and international expert on workplace bullying. Her most recent book, *The coercive community college; Bullying and its costly impact on the mission to serve underrepresented populations*, which was released by Emerald publications in 2016 is an extension of her work on bullying in higher education. Other notable work includes, *Bully in the Ivory Tower: How Aggression and Incivility Erode American Higher Education* is based on independent research on 175 colleges and universities. She has spoken nationally and internationally to help over 200 schools address incivility on campus. Dr. Hollis has taught at Northeastern University, the New Jersey Institute of Technology, and Rutgers University. Dr. Hollis earned her Doctorate of Education from Boston University, as a Martin Luther King,

Jr. Fellow of Social Justice. She is also the president and founder of her own consultant group Patricia Berkly LLC, a healthy workplace advocate at www.diversitytrainingconsultants.com.