

Eastern Michigan University
DigitalCommons@EMU

Master's Theses and Doctoral Dissertations


Master's Theses, and Doctoral Dissertations, and
Graduate Capstone Projects

2018

Not just the playground: Adult bullying in the K-12 workplace

Cynthia J. Kleinheksel

Follow this and additional works at: <http://commons.emich.edu/theses>

 Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#), and the [Elementary and Middle and Secondary Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kleinheksel, Cynthia J., "Not just the playground: Adult bullying in the K-12 workplace" (2018). *Master's Theses and Doctoral Dissertations*. 887.

<http://commons.emich.edu/theses/887>

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses, and Doctoral Dissertations, and Graduate Capstone Projects at DigitalCommons@EMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses and Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@EMU. For more information, please contact lib-ir@emich.edu.

Not Just the Playground: Adult Bullying in the K-12 Workplace

by

Cynthia J. Kleinheksel

Dissertation

Submitted to the Department of Leadership and Counseling

Eastern Michigan University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Educational Leadership

Dissertation Committee:

David Anderson, EdD, Chair

Perry Francis, EdD

Richard Geisel, JD, PhD

Theresa Saunders, EdD

January 23, 2018

Ypsilanti, Michigan

-I am considering leaving the profession because treatment like this is not right and not helpful in our main purpose of providing an education to our students.

-Because of an administrator's actions throughout the school year, veteran and new teachers are ready to quit teaching because of the stress level.

-I learned how to bully from the most skilled of them.

– Anonymous Bullying Research Survey Respondents*

Dedication

Dedicated to the targets of adult bullying who struggle each day with the emotional, physical, career, and financial consequences of being bullied by another adult in their K-12 workplace. It is not your fault. May peace, grace, dignity, and reconciliation be extended to you, and your recovery complete.

Dedicated also to the administrators, school boards, educational leaders, and all K-12 education professionals and staff who must be proactive and work immediately to prevent, stop, and eliminate all bullying, both adult and student, by recognizing that bullying exists in the workplace, creating and enforcing anti-bullying policies, providing training for prevention of and resolving bullying, creating safe and non-retaliatory methods for targets to report bullying, mediating bullying incidents, providing avenues to a positive resolution, disciplining bullies, providing options for targets to recover from bullying, and, most importantly, providing all a safe, non-threatening place to work and learn.

*See Appendix E

Acknowledgments

My profound thanks to Dr. David Anderson, my committee chair, for his expertise, guidance, and encouragement, and his patience in walking through the data analysis with me. My thanks, also, to Dr. Barbara Bleyaert, my original guide in the dissertation process, who believed this study should be done and offered many suggestions on how it could be done. Many thanks also to my committee members, Dr. Richard Geisel, my advisor through the Educational Specialist program at Grand Valley State University and former colleague at GVSU, for his expertise, guidance and friendship; and Dr. Perry Francis and Dr. Theresa Saunders for their guidance and time commitment to help me reach the goal.

Abstract

This non-experimental, explanatory, quantitative research study surveyed K-12 educators and other K-12 school employees to gather data about negative school workplace climate using the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised (NAQ-R). Through the NAQ-R and other demographic survey questions, the researcher studied the prevalence and characteristics of adult-on-adult bullying in the K-12 workplace. Categories of Emotional Intimidation, Workplace Intimidation, and Physical Intimidation were identified and regressions were completed to analyze results against a study by Einarsen, Hoel, and Notelaers (2009). Using R. J. Bies's four categories of interactional justice, the characteristics of adult bullying in the K-12 workplace were identified and analyzed to measure statistically significant relationships. Utilizing Survey Monkey, over 2,460 Michigan K-12 educators and staff were asked to anonymously complete a 46-question online survey with 324 completing the entire survey. Demographic comparisons were made to data available through the Michigan Department of Education. The survey respondents ($N = 324$) indicated that 27.8% of these school district employees had been bullied by another adult, at a frequency level from infrequently to daily, during the first 7 months of the 2016-2017 school year. Results demonstrate that school administrators and school boards need to recognize and proactively address this issue through policy, procedures, training, prevention, enforcement, and positive resolution to provide a safe, non-threatening environment in which to work and learn.

Table of Contents

Dedication	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iii
Abstract	iv
List of Tables	x
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
Problem Statement.....	2
Purpose of Study.....	4
Research Questions	5
Definition of Terms	5
Limitations.....	7
Delimitations	8
Conceptual Framework	8
Survey Instrument	12
Validity of the NAQ-R.....	12
NAQ-R components.....	12
Utilization of the NAQ-R.....	14
Chapter 2. Review of Literature.....	16
Descriptions and Examples	16
Bullying Versus Harassment	18

Bullying Statistics.....	19
The Target	20
The Bully.....	23
Bullying and Gender.....	25
The Environment of Bullying.....	26
Adult Bullying in K-12.....	32
Response to Bullying.....	36
Conclusion.....	38
Chapter 3. Methodology	39
Research Tradition.....	39
Participants	42
Research Methods	44
Legal, Ethical, and Moral Issues	46
Reliability and Validity	47
Chapter 4. Results	49
Survey Response	50
Demographic Data of Respondents	51
Gender.....	51
Education level.....	52
Age.....	53

Level of building.....	54
Number of years in district and building	54
Location of district and district size.....	54
Union membership.....	55
NAQ-R Results and Frequencies.....	55
Frequency for Question "Have You Been Bullied at Work?"	58
Results of Additional Bullying Questions	59
Were others bullied in your building?.....	59
Roles in bullying incidents.....	59
Degree to which K-12 workplace addressed bullying behaviors.....	60
Reporting of bullying incidents.....	61
Outcomes after bullying incidents reported	62
Working relationship between target and bully	63
Characteristics of the Bully	64
Gender of bully	64
Age of bully	65
Characteristics of the Target.....	65
Frequency of being bullied by gender.....	65
Frequency of bullying by education level.....	65
Frequency of being bullied by position.....	66

Frequency of being bullied by longevity	67
Frequency of being bullied by school building type.....	68
Frequency of being bullied by district location	69
Frequency of being bullied by union membership.....	69
Witness Behavior.....	70
Comparison of Components of Bullying Behavior with Einarsen et al. 2009 Study	71
Component questions	71
Factor analysis.....	72
Linear regression of Workplace, Emotional, and Physical Intimidation	75
Comparison to Bies	77
Mean of Derogatory, Deception, and Disrespect components.....	78
Variable significance in Derogatory component	78
Variable significance in Deception component	79
Variable significance in Disrespect component.....	79
Linear regression of Derogatory, Deception, and Disrespect components	79
Optional Question.....	81
Summary of Data Analysis.....	82
Chapter 5. Discussion	84
Discussion and Conclusions for Research Question 1	85
Discussion and Conclusions for Research Question 2	86

Discussion and Conclusions for Research Question 3	87
Additional Conclusions	87
Implications from This Study for Educational Leaders	88
Implications for Theory and Conceptual Frameworks to Study Adult Bullying	90
Implications for Future Research	90
References.....	92
Appendix A: Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised (NAQ-R).....	103
Appendix B: Permission to Use NAQ-R	105
Appendix C: Consent Form and Survey as Distributed Through SurveyMonkey	106
Appendix D: UHSRC Permission For Research	115
Appendix E: Results of Optional Question.....	116

List of Tables

Table	Page
1 K-12 Work Position by Gender.....	52
2 Highest Education Level Achieved by Gender	53
3 Age Range by Gender	53
4 Number of Years in District and School	54
5 Responses to the NAQ-R	56
6 Frequency of Adult Bullying in the K-12 Workplace.....	59
7 Role in Adult Bullying Situations in the K-12 Workplace	60
8 How Adult Bullying Was Addressed.....	61
9 To Whom Adult Bullying Was Reported.....	62
10 What Was the Outcome from Reporting Adult Bullying Behavior	63
11 Workplace Relationship of Bully to Target	64
12 Frequency of Being Bullied by Gender	65
13 Frequency of Being Bullied by Education Level.....	66
14 Frequency of Being Bullied by Position	66
15 Frequency of Being Bullied by Longevity in District.....	67
16 Frequency of Being Bullied by Longevity in Building.....	68
17 Frequency of Being Bullied by Building Type	69
18 Frequency of Being Bullied by Union Membership	70
19 Witness Behavior in Adult Bullying Incidents	71
20 Workplace Intimidation Factor Loading Comparison	73
21 Emotional Intimidation Factor Loading Comparison	74

22 Physical Intimidation Factor Loading Comparison 75

23 Comparison of Final Regression for Workplace, Emotional, and Physical Intimidation
with Beta Coefficients and Probability Level 76

24 Comparison of Final Regression for Derogatory, Deception, and Disrespect Components
with Beta Coefficients and Probability Level 81

Why don't schools recognize adult bullying occurs? Why are there no policies to prevent and resolve it? We have policies against and are trained how to recognize, intervene and resolve student bullying, but bullying by adults is allowed, ignored, retaliated against, and even, in my case, administrators observe it, but do nothing to stop it.

– Anonymous Bullying Research Survey Respondent

Chapter 1. Introduction

When most people think of the word bully, their first thoughts might envision K-12 students on a playground or in the hallway of their school in conflict with each other. One student might be the aggressor and another might be the target of that aggression. However, does a person ever envision an adult bullying another adult in that same school hallway?

Recent media coverage, research, Michigan school policy requirements (Michigan Department of Education, 2017), and student anti-bullying programming (Be Nice, 2017) have focused on student aspects of bullying, including face-to-face (Carrera, 2011; Parsons, 2005; U.S. Department of Education, 2015; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2017) and cyberbullying (Burnham, 2011; S.T.A.R., 2012; Williford & Depaolis, 2016). But students bullying each other is not the only bullying occurring in K-12 schools with which educators, administrators, and school boards need be concerned. Parsons (2005) states, "Bullying can occur anywhere in a school and can be perpetrated by anyone in that school. Bullies can be students or adults" (p. 38). In discussing the differences between school bullying of students and workplace bullying in schools, Badzmirowski (2016) states, "Both school and workplace bullying can result in devastating consequences for targets and schools."

Research regarding adult-on-adult bullying behavior in the general workplace began in the 1980s (Lutgen-Sandvik, Tracy, & Alberts, 2007; Namie & Namie, 2009). Although researchers and scholars remain divided on terminology, research has detailed the characteristics and consequences of bullying on the target, the bully, and the workplace environment (Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2007; Namie, 2014; Namie, 2017; Namie & Namie, 2000; Workplace Bullying Institute, 2007). Researchers have also begun to examine the problem of workplace bullying in K-12 schools (Blase & Blase, 2003a; Gibbs, 2007; Malahy, 2015).

As targets of bullying struggle with the physical, emotional, and financial consequences of bullying, organizations examine the need for policies and procedures to address adult bullying and provide safe work environments (Namie & Namie, 2009). Worldwide, countries have passed or are considering workplace bullying legislation, while such legislation in the United States languishes (Duffy, 2009). In the United States, there are no laws to prohibit adult bullying and to protect the target of bullying, but many states have introduced legislation to require a healthy workplace (Healthy Workplace Bill, 2011).

Problem Statement

For this study, the working definition of bullying includes aspects of many researchers' descriptions of bullying (Hodson, Roscigno, & Lopez, 2006; Namie & Namie, 2009; National Education Association, 2012; Workplace Bullying Institute, 2007):

Adult bullying is the repeated and persistent nonphysical mistreatment of a person including verbal abuse, threatening conduct, intimidation, attempts to frustrate or wear down, humiliate, pressure, and provoke that threatens the psychological integrity, career, safety, and health of the target.

Studies in the general population have shown that up to over one-third of adults experience bullying in their workplace and that this bullying has had a profound effect on the target's life and career (Namie, 2014; Namie & Namie, 2009; National Education Association, 2012; Workplace Bullying Institute, 2007). Namie and Namie (2009) described this bullying as the repeated and persistent nonphysical mistreatment of a person that threatens the psychological integrity, safety, and health of the target. The Workplace Bullying Institute (2007) described workplace bullying as repeated mistreatment including verbal abuse, threatening conduct, intimidation, humiliation, and sabotage by others that prevented employees from completing work. Hodson, Roscigno, and Lopez (2006) described bullying as repeated attempts to torment, wear down, or frustrate another person and as treatment that provokes, pressures, intimidates, or causes discomfort. Targets, or the victims, of workplace bullying experience many forms of bullying that range from name-calling and verbal assault to threats, intimidation, and job termination (Duffy, 2009; Namie, 2003), and Bies (2001) identifies a similar list when categorizing negative behaviors when studying interactional justice theory in the workplace.

The effects of workplace bullying often play out in the personal life of the target. Namie and Namie (2000), Von Bergen, Zavaletta, and Soper (2006), and the Washington State Department of Labor and Industries (2008) reported physical, mental, and psychosomatic health symptoms in targets that may persist for years, and the Workplace Bullying Institute (2007) reported 45% of targets had stress-related health problems.

Studies identify organizational factors that contribute to workplace bullying (Cowie et al., 2002; Duffy, 2009; Hodson et al., 2006; Salin, 2003) including power imbalances, workplace chaos, inadequate evaluation and reward systems, and the lack of policies and enforcement to deal with workplace bullying. Namie (2003), Duffy (2009), and Waggoner (2003) suggest

policies and procedures for addressing general workplace bullying, but in the United States, no legislation exists to protect and provide remedy for the target of adult bullying (Duffy, 2009; Healthy Workplace Bill, 2011; Namie & Namie, 2009).

While these studies have described and analyzed adult bullying in the general workplace population, a gap in the literature exists when specifically examining the prevalence and characteristics of adult-on-adult bullying in the K-12 workplace. This study helps to fill the gap to identify whether or not educators in the K-12 environment recognize and experience these same personal effects, descriptions, and organizational factors of adult bullying in their own lives, workplace, and school district.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this non-experimental, explanatory, quantitative study was to explore the prevalence of adult bullying of professional and non-professional K-12 employees from a sample of public school districts and public school academies in all 83 counties in Michigan; examine similarities and differences between adult bullying incidents reported and workplace climate, school demographics, and characteristics of the target using data from Michigan schools and previous bullying studies in the generalized workplace; compare results to the factors of work-related bullying, person-related bullying, and physically intimidating bullying identified by Einarsen, Hoel, and Notelaers (2009); and examine the relationship to Bies's (2001) four categories of interactional justice—derogatory judgments, deception, invasion of privacy, and disrespect—developed from Greenberg's theory of organizational justice (Greenberg & Cropanzano, 2001) as will be explained in the Conceptual Framework section of Chapter 1 (pp. 10-11).

An online survey, distributed through SurveyMonkey, was used to collect evidence of adult bullying incident types, workplace climate, bullying incident policies and resolutions, and the demographics and characteristics of adult bullying targets and bullies in urban, suburban, and rural school districts and public school academies of differing sizes in Michigan.

Research Questions

1. What similarities and differences exist between the prevalence and characteristics of adult workplace bullying in the generalized workplace (Namie, 2014; Workplace Bullying Institute, 2007) and the prevalence and characteristics of workplace bullying in the K-12 school environment?
2. What comparisons can be made between any identified latent bullying variables and the three inter-related factors associated with person-related bullying, work-related bullying, and physically intimidating bullying identified by Einarsen, Hoel, and Notelaers (2009)?
3. What relationships between adult bullying incidents and workplace climate, school demographics, and characteristics of the target and bully exist using Bies's (2001) four categories of interactional justice?

Definition of Terms

Bullying research uses multiple terms for, and definitions of, bullying. Searches in the ABI/INFORM, Education Abstracts, Educator's Reference Complete, ERIC, JSTOR, and PsycInfo databases, and Google Scholar uncovered the keywords bullying, mobbing, workplace abuse, workplace incivility, or workplace hostility used interchangeably and databases used differing subject headings. Difficulty delimiting adult bullying from student bullying in schools while searching by keywords resulted in the need to separate the identified documents manually.

Early research on adult bullying in the workplace began in the 1980s (Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2007; Namie & Namie, 2009). Swedish physician Heinz Leymann (Duffy, 2009; Namie, 2003; Namie & Namie, 2009; Sperry, 2009) adapted the term *mobbing* from the description of animal behavior in which a larger group of animals attacks a single larger animal. Leymann defined mobbing as "hostile and unethical communication at work directed in a systematic way by one or a few individuals toward one individual who is unable to defend himself or herself" (as cited in Namie & Namie, 2009, p. 202). Duffy (2009) described how Leymann also used the term *psychoterror* to describe mobbing and workplace abuse.

Lutgen-Sandvik (2008) expanded on the work of Leymann and looked at the defenselessness of mobbing victims, their feelings of humiliation, the intensity, and the duration of mobbing. Mobbing and *mobbing syndrome* are used by Davenport, Schwartz, and Elliott (1999) to separate the terms from bullying, which is often used when discussing childhood bullying, and define mobbing syndrome as the "malicious attempt to force a person out of the workplace through unjustified accusations, humiliation, general harassment, emotional abuse, and/or terror" (p. 40).

Namie (2003) introduced the term *workplace bullying* in 1998, and defined it as "interpersonal hostility that is deliberate, repeated and sufficiently severe as to harm the targeted person's health or economic status" (p. 1). In more recent definitions, Keashly (2010) describes workplace bullying as "persistent workplace aggression" (p. 18), Sperry (2009) defined workplace bullying as "abusive and harmful behavior directed towards specific targets" (p. 191), and Mattice (2016) describes workplace bullying as the "systematic psychological abuse aimed at degrading and humiliating others."

In her research, Duffy (2009) detailed the work of Keashley and Jagatic in which they used the term *emotional abuse* to describe pressure and harassment in the workplace and used *hostile workplace behaviors* to describe nonphysical aggression and abuse against workplace targets. Namie and Namie (2009) described workplace abuse as *bullying* and regarded bullying as the term of choice to describe workplace abuse and mobbing, although Namie (2003) and Mattice (2016) also use the term *incivility*. Milam, Spitzmueller, and Penney (2009) define *workplace incivility* as "low intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect" (p. 58).

Greenberg (2010) includes adult bullying in his broader definition of *insidious workplace behavior* that is defined as "a form of intentionally harmful workplace behavior that is legal, subtle, and low level (rather than severe), repeated over time, and directed at individuals or organizations" (p. 4). Crawshaw (2009) identified over 30 terms used to describe bullying phenomenon and concluded that difficulty in using conflicting terms and definitions impedes conceptualization and complicates collaboration among researchers.

Duffy (2009) and Salin (2003) noted that the term mobbing is used mainly in Scandinavian, German-speaking, and Mediterranean countries, and the terms bullying or incivility are used mainly in English-speaking countries. For the purpose of this study, the terms used for bullying are interchangeable and based on the cited researchers' use, and the term target generally used for the victim of the abuse.

Limitations

The ability to obtain access to study adults in a K-12 environment limits the study to an online survey approach. It is unlikely this research could be conducted as interviews in schools

due to the sensitive nature and legal issues surrounding the adult bullying/workplace abuse issue (Blase & Blase, 2003b).

Delimitations

This study is delimited to adult employees in K-12 public school districts and public school academies of varying sizes throughout Michigan.

Conceptual Framework

In reviewing existing research, there is a gap in the literature regarding adult-on-adult bullying in the K-12 school workplace. To provide background to the concepts and research theories previously used, the following review pertains to adult bullying research conducted mainly in workplace settings in business and industry and a brief discussion of the limited number of theories used in prior research involving K-12 workplaces; this is followed by a discussion of the theory of organizational justice and its subsets that have been used in this research.

Researchers have applied various theoretical and conceptual frameworks as they studied adult bullying in business and industry. Rayner and Hoel (1997) described Geen's research on aggression, Baron's research based on attribution theory, and stress research done by Cooper and Payne. Conflict literature by Van Vliert and deDreu, and Jehn completed Rayner and Hoel's discussion. Hodson et al. (2006) included research using conflict theory, job security, organizational trust, exercise of power, organizational chaos, and leadership traits as frameworks for past research. In addition, the research report of Roscigno, Lopez, and Hodson (2009) used status-based power differentials, relationship and social theories, organizational constraint, and the victim-perpetrator-guardian model to represent positions within the bullying phenomenon.

Lutgen-Sandvik et al. (2007) traced bullying research and provided frameworks for studying the bullying phenomena to include workplace aggression, counterproductive workplace behaviors, workplace injustice, antisocial work behavior, workplace deviance, and broadly defined workplace violence. Other phenomena studied included emotional abuse, social undermining, workplace harassment, workplace mistreatment, discrimination, ethnic harassment, sexual harassment, and abusive supervision. Subordinate phenomena studied included incivility, petty tyranny, social ostracism, verbal abuse, verbal aggressiveness, and victimization.

Bullying phenomena provides the framework for numerous research studies worldwide, as does the impact of bullying on employers and workplace performance (as cited in Harvey, Heames, & Richey, 2006). Salin (2003) used a framework classified into three groupings: enabling, motivating, and precipitating structures and processes, to study bullying behavior. The presence and interaction of at least two groupings provided a base for understanding bullying behavior. Salin, however, cautioned that regardless of factors studied, "bullying is a complex process, in which a number of different structures and processes interact" (p. 1228).

There are a limited number of empirical studies of adult bullying in the K-12 workplace in the United States and internationally. Blase and Blase (2003b, 2006) conducted qualitative research involving principal bullying and mistreatment of teachers using a grounded theory approach. These researchers interviewed 50 teachers identified as mistreated by their principals to describe the phenomenon.

Gibbs (2007) utilized a phenomenological study involving interviewing seven elementary teachers to study teachers bullying teachers, and de Wet (2011) used a phenomenological approach to study educator-on-educator bullying involving ten South African educators.

Cemaloglu (2011) used a survey approach to examine if transformational leadership styles affect organizational health and if there is a relationship to adult bullying in Turkish primary schools.

One theory used to advance adult bullying research in the general workplace has been organizational justice and its subsets and will be the focus of this research. Greenberg first used the term *organizational justice* to describe the study of people's perceptions of fairness in organizations (Greenberg & Cropanzano, 2001). Greenberg (2007) observes that the "field of organizational justice has emphasized not the attainment of justice per se, but the avoidance of injustice" (p. 159). Greenberg outlines the theory of organizational justice to include the following:

- *Distributive justice*—The perceived fairness of the distribution of rewards and resources between parties.
- *Procedural justice*—The perceived fairness of the methods and procedures used as the basis for making decisions.
- *Interactional justice*—The perceived fairness of the interpersonal treatment accorded others in the course of communicating with them.

Cowan (2009) also studied justice in the workplace and added restorative justice, which focuses on repairing the damage done to relationships in bullying situations. In restorative justice, bullies are called on to be responsible for their behaviors and repair the damage done to targets, and organizations giving the target a formal apology, admitting what was done to the target, and trying to rectify the problem.

Of these justice theories, interactional justice studies the interpersonal treatment and social interaction of people within organizations and would include the issue of adult-on-adult

bullying. Bies (2001) states, "Interactional (in)justice matters to people. People are concerned about the interpersonal treatment they receive from others" (p. 100).

In his own research, Bies (2001) looks at the dynamics of interactional justice within organizations and breaks interpersonal injustices into four categories: derogatory judgments, deception, invasion of privacy, and disrespect (p. 101). He defines *derogatory judgments* as the truthfulness and accuracy of statements and judgments made by one person about another, *deception* as the correspondence between one's words and actions, the *invasion of privacy* as the legitimacy of disclosing personal information about one person to another, and *disrespect* as the signs and symbols conveying the value or worth of an individual.

Bies (2001) explains these definitions and provides examples in each of the four categories:

1. Derogatory judgments—Wrongful or unfair accusations about work performance, being discredited, bad-mouthing someone behind their back, and using pejorative labels such as "troublemaker" or "traitor."
2. Deception—Failing to fulfill the expectations of honesty and honoring promises in dealings with others as a foundation of trust, being lied to, being manipulated, and breaking promises of help or promotion.
3. Invasion of privacy—The disclosure of confidences and secrets, asking improper questions, the recruiting and use of spies within the organization, and demanding employees be snitches.
4. Disrespect—The lack of timely feedback, inconsiderate actions, failure to explain decisions, abusive words or actions, rudeness, publically criticizing and berating people, destruction of physical property, threatening or physical violence, actions intended to

embarrass or humiliate, insults, name-calling, questioning intellectual capacities, inflicting undue psychological or physical pain, coercion, and duress.

Survey Instrument

The Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ) was a survey instrument originally developed in Norway by Stale Einarsen, group leader of the Bergen Bullying Research Group at the University of Bergen, and Bjorn Raknes, for measuring perceived exposure to bullying at work (Bergen Bullying Research Group, 2010). Users are cautioned to "be aware that the NAQ is not a diagnostic instrument, but an inventory strictly made for measuring frequency, intensity and prevalence of workplace bullying." Einarsen et al. (2009) noted cultural bias problems with the NAQ when translated from use in Scandinavian countries to the English language. The Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised (NAQ-R) provided an adaptation to Anglo-American cultures.

The NAQ-R (Appendix A), is free for use, with permission (Appendix B), and written in behavioral experience terms without reference to the word bullying (Bergen Bullying Research Group, 2010; Nielsen, Notelaers, & Einarsen, 2011). It consists of 22 inventory items to which participants respond. After completing the inventory, a definition of bullying at work is given to respondents and they are then asked if they consider themselves targets of such bullying.

Validity of the NAQ-R. Einarsen et al. (2009) investigated the validity of the NAQ-R by reanalyzing adult workplace bullying data gathered from a large-scale survey of United Kingdom employees (Hoel, Cooper, & Faragher, 2001). They determined the NAQ-R showed a high level of validity and reliability, was comprehensive yet short, and proposed the NAQ-R be used as a standardized and valid instrument to measure workplace bullying.

NAQ-R components. From that same study Einarsen et al. (2009) used factor analysis to frame the questions into three components as follows:

Work-related bullying:

- Q1. Someone withholding information which affects your performance
- Q3. Being ordered to do work below your level of competence
- Q14. Having your opinions ignored
- Q16. Being given tasks with unreasonable deadlines
- Q18. Excessive monitoring of your work
- Q19. Pressure not to claim something to which by right you are entitled (e.g., sick leave, holiday entitlement, and travel expenses)
- Q21. Being exposed to an unmanageable workload

Person-related questions:

- Q2. Being humiliated or ridiculed in connection with your work
- Q4. Having key areas of responsibility removed or replaced with more trivial or unpleasant tasks
- Q5. Spreading of gossip and rumors about you
- Q6. Being ignored or excluded
- Q7. Having insulting or offensive remarks made about your person, attitudes or your private life
- Q10. Hints or signals from others that you should quit your job
- Q11. Repeated reminders of your errors or mistakes
- Q12. Being ignored or facing a hostile reaction when you approach
- Q13. Persistent criticism of your errors or mistakes
- Q15. Practical jokes carried out by people you don't get along with

Q17. Having allegations made against you

Q20. Being the subject of excessive teasing and sarcasm

Physically intimidating:

Q8. Being shouted at or being the target of spontaneous anger

Q9. Intimidating behaviors such as finger-pointing, invasion of personal space, shoving, blocking your way

Q22. Threats of violence or physical abuse or actual abuse

Utilization of the NAQ-R. While the NAQ or NAQ-R has been utilized to determine the prevalence and characteristics of adult bullying in business and industry (Baillien & De Witte, 2009; Cooper, Hoel, & Faragher, 2004; Fevre, Robinson, Jones, & Lewis, 2010), healthcare (Hickson, 2012; Houshmand, O'Reilly, Robinson, & Wolff, 2012; Simons, Stark, & DeMarco, 2011), and mixed workplaces (Lee & Brotheridge, 2006; Wardell, 2011), only two references to the use of the NAQ in elementary-secondary education were identified. One was found in a Turkish study of primary school principals' leadership styles (Cemaloglu, 2011) and the other in a study involving K-12 educators from Illinois schools (Malahy, 2015).

For the purpose of this study, this researcher focused on the adult bullying phenomenon through the lens of interactional justice theory (Greenberg & Cropanzano, 2001) and Bies's (2001) four categories using the NAQ-R to survey professional and nonprofessional employees in K-12 school districts and public school academies in Michigan and compared the results to the Einarsen et al. (2009) study, which validated three inter-related factors associated with person-related bullying, work-related bullying, and physically intimidating bullying.

The questions in the NAQ-R can be divided into three of the four categories from Bies, specifically derogatory judgments (Questions 2, 5, 11, 13, 17), deception (Questions 1, 3, 4, 10,

16, 18, 19, 21), and disrespect (Questions 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 20, 22), although some questions arguably could be in two categories. Bies's fourth category, invasion of privacy, may be indirectly identified in Question 7 of the NAQ-R, but that question also includes non-private components. Questions and survey participant responses to the NAQ-R, district demographics, and personal characteristics provided insight into the prevalence of adult bullying and its characteristics in the K-12 workplace.

Principal tries to control everything. She thinks nothing of humiliating teachers in front of colleagues and parents. She feels some of us are unqualified and fires off questions about subject content in front of others in an attempt to trip us up and then accuses us of not knowing answer if we hesitate even a second. This is often done in front of her favorite teachers and they laugh.

– Anonymous Bullying Research Survey Respondent

Chapter 2. Review of Literature

Literature and research about adult bullying in the K-12 environment is limited. In order to provide a full spectrum description of the problem; explain how bullying differs from the legal definition of harassment; and provide examples, statistics, and information about the bully and their targets, this literature review will draw from business and industry before reviewing the small amount of literature available about the K-12 environment.

Descriptions and Examples

While no consensus exists on one term used for adult bullying, descriptions are similar. Salin (2003) identified the major difference between normal workplace conflicts and bullying "is not what or how it is done, but rather the frequency and longevity of what is done" (p. 1215). The Workplace Bullying Institute (2007) described workplace bullying as repeated mistreatment, including verbal abuse, threatening conduct, intimidation, humiliation, and sabotage by others that prevented employees from completing work. In addition, Hodson et al. (2006) described bullying as repeated attempts to torment, wear down, or frustrate another person and as treatment that provokes, pressures, intimidates, or causes discomfort.

Namie and Namie (2009) stated there is a consensus among practitioners and academics that bullying is repeated and persistent nonphysical mistreatment of a person that threatens the psychological integrity, safety, and health of the target. Keashly (2010) describes workplace bullying as "persistent relational aggression" (p. 18). Bullying behavior observed also includes nonverbal actions directed at the target such as crude gestures, eye rolling, and head shaking (Gibbs, 2007).

Duffy (2009) identified an incomplete list of examples to describe the phenomenon of mobbing/bullying in the workplace:

- Spreading false information about a worker.
- Failing to correct information known to be false about a worker.
- Spreading malicious gossip.
- Discrediting a person's work performance.
- Making personal character attacks and invoking a person's private life to discredit the person.
- Minimizing job-related competencies and exaggerating job-related limitations.
- Isolating a worker physically by separating them from coworkers or isolating a worker occupationally by not including them in communication loops required to do their job.
- Belittling.
- Name-calling, in particular, using psychiatric or psychological labels to discredit and therefore isolate a worker from others.
- Participating in rumor or gossip campaigns.
- Abusive supervision that includes making unsubstantiated negative comments about supervisees verbally to others and/or in writing in personnel evaluations. (p. 256)

Namie (2003) described bullying as mostly covert psychological violence. It can be a nearly invisible, non-physical, sub-lethal source of workplace violence. Bullying, either in the form of verbal assaults or actions taken against the target to render them unproductive and unsuccessful, identifies the bully's desire to control the target. "Work shouldn't hurt" (Namie & Namie, 2000, p. 54) or cause emotional or psychological damage.

Davenport et al. (1999) identified 10 factors that occur with frequency and in various combinations to describe what they call the mobbing syndrome:

1. Assaults on the dignity, integrity, credibility, and professional competence of employees.
2. Negative, humiliating, intimidating, abusive, malevolent, and controlling communication.
3. Committed directly, or indirectly, in subtle or obvious ways.
4. Perpetrated by one or more staff members—"vulturing."
5. Occurring in a continual, multiple, and systemic fashion, over some time.
6. Portraying the victimized person as being at fault.
7. Engineered to discredit, confuse, intimidate, isolate, and force the person into submission.
8. Committed with the intent to force the person out.
9. Representing the removal from the workplace as the victim's choice.
10. Not recognized, misinterpreted, ignored, tolerated, encouraged, or even instigated by the management of the organization. (p. 41)

Bullying Versus Harassment

Bullying is different from harassment. *Harassment* has a legal definition of discrimination against a protected class such as race, sex, or disability (Washington State Department of Labor & Industry, 2008). The Workplace Bullying Institute (2007) identified that only one of five bullying cases included harassment based on the definition of illegal

discrimination, and Namie (2003) noted that around 25% of bullying qualified as legally protected sexual harassment or racial discrimination. Hall (2005) noted, "Workplace bullying is twice as prevalent as sexual harassment" (p. 45). Namie pointed out that bullying is not illegal, which makes it easy for society and organizations to ignore, even though it is "three times more prevalent than its better-recognized, illegal forms" (p. 2) of discrimination. Mattice (2012) notes, "Bullying happens when the bullying individual is an equal-opportunist, or picking on people with motivations unrelated to race, gender, religion, or any other protected classes" (p. 2).

Bullying Statistics

The Workplace Bullying Institute (WBI; 2007) commissioned Zogby International to conduct a survey representative of American adults. The survey, including over 7,700 adults, cited in many research articles, showed the following:

- 37% of workers have been bullied.
- 72% of bullies were bosses.
- 60% of bullies are women.
- Women bullies target women in 71% of incidents.
- Bullying is four times more prevalent than illegal harassment.
- 62% of employers ignore the problem.
- 40% of bullied individuals never tell their employers.
- 45% of targets suffer stress-related health problems.
- 3% of bullied people file lawsuits.
- Once targeted, 64% of targets lose their job for no reason.

Hodson et al. (2006) analyzed trends in workplace bullying by studying several decades of organizational ethnographies. They concluded that perceived growth in workplace bullying represented recent increases in bullying research and not increases in bullying incidents.

The Target

Harvey et al. (2006) explored that there are few common characteristics for the target of bullying. Descriptions ranged from highly educated, successful individuals who, in a changing organization, found themselves in competition with rivals, to the opposite end of the spectrum, where the stereotyped target is described as passive, with little power, and not well connected in the organization. The history of these targets showed that previously bullied individuals were vulnerable to future bullying.

Lutgen-Sandvik et al. (2007) noted that targets often dread the workday and have a sense of doom. Targets "steal through the workplace on a state of high alert, in anticipation of the next attack" (p. 837). Targets are often ashamed of being victimized and do not know how to fight back to protect themselves.

Davenport et al. (1999) identified that targets have a great commitment to their work, love their work, are loyal, and believe in the goals of the organization. This commitment often means they stay in a bullying situation longer, keep quiet longer about the abuse, suffer longer, and may not seek assistance as readily.

Duffy (2009) described the results of being the target of a bully as "humiliation, devaluation, discrediting, degradation, loss of professional reputation" (p. 245) and often the loss of employment. Cowie et al. (2002) also included social exclusion, unwanted physical contact, undermining confidence of targets, and lower self-esteem. Von Bergen, Zavaletta, and Soper

(2006) reported physical, mental, and psychosomatic health symptoms in targets and emphasized that symptoms may persist for years.

According to Namie and Namie, (2000), "Falling prey to a bully's destructive tactics is a career hazard" (p 271), and Hout (2016) states, "Targets of workplace bullying are in a minefield. The normal rules of fairplay, common sense, and common decency don't apply." Three out of four targets of bullying reported that the bullying stopped only when they left the job. Bullies falsified facts or provided no reason for bullying and forcing the target to quit.

In addition to changes in the workplace and potential loss of employment, the effects of bullying often play out in the personal life of the target. Targets of bullying frequently suffer from mild to severe physical and mental health problems (Cooper, Hoel, & Faragher, 2004). According to the Workplace Bullying Institute (2007), 45% of targets had stress-related health problems including clinical depression, anxiety, panic attacks, and post-traumatic stress syndrome. Washington State Department of Labor and Industries (2008) identified physical and emotional problems including high stress, post-traumatic stress disorder, financial problems due to absence, reduced self-esteem, musculoskeletal problems, phobias, sleep disturbances, increased depression, self-blame, and digestive problems.

Namie and Namie (2000) found that bullying devastates the target and they suffer from stress, anxiety, depression, exhaustion, insecurity, self-doubt, shame, embarrassment, and other long-term effects. Targets reported frequent or constant negative thoughts about the bullying in over 80% of the cases within the year after the bullying stopped. Over 23% of targets distanced by 18 months to 10 years from the bullying reported frequent or constant thinking about the bullying. Even 10 years after the bullying, 80% of targets reported they sometimes still thought about it.

Gibbs' (2007) research detailed how one target lost the ability to form relationships and trust others and another divorced following the bullying incidents at work due to lack of understanding and support from the spouse. After leaving the environment where bullying occurred, Gibbs also reported that targets felt vulnerable to future bullying and felt professionally unprepared to find another position.

Washington State Department of Labor and Industry (2008) suggested actions targets could take to remedy bullying situations in the work environment. Suggestions included the following:

- Recognize that bullying is occurring.
- Realize that bullying is not the target's fault.
- Recognize that bullying is about control and not about the target's performance.
- Keep a diary detailing bullying incidents including dates, times, places, what was said or done, and who was present.
- Obtain copies of paperwork that contradicts the bully's accusations including time sheets, audit reports, memos, and email.
- Expect the bully to deny and/or misconstrue your accusations of bullying and have a witness with you during any meetings with the bully.
- Report the behavior to an appropriate person.

While specific to the State of Washington, the report provides targets everywhere suggestions for recognizing and coping with bullying behavior directed toward themselves, recording and reporting bullying behaviors, and most importantly, emphasizing that targets are not the source of the problem.

The National Education Association (2012) uses suggestions from the United Kingdom National Workplace Advice Line as action steps to take toward resolving workplace bullying:

1. **Regain Control**—Recognize what is happening to you as bullying—the bully has the problem, which he or she is projecting onto you. Recognize that bullying is about control and has nothing to do with your performance. Don't be fooled into believing unfounded criticisms or allegations against you have any validity. Don't try to handle bullying by yourself.
2. **Plan for Action**—Find out everything you can about bullying before taking action.
3. **Take Action**—Keep a log (journal, diary) of everything related to the bullying—it's not each incident that counts, but the number, regularity, and especially the patterns that reveal bullying. Get and keep everything in writing. Keep copies of all letters, memos, and emails.

The Bully

Early research and a misunderstanding of adult bullying often placed the blame on the target. In addition, self-reporting by the targets and their biases affect research results and the ability to find patterns of behavior between bullies and the targets (Rayner & Hoel, 1997).

Later research, however, found bullying behavior traits in aggressors. Hall (2005) and Namie (2003) noted characteristics of bullies and identified four common traits: the intimidator who uses rage and anger; the behind-the-scene bully who uses belittling, berating, gossip, and lies to ruin reputations; the critic who erodes self-esteem and confidence; and the gatekeeper who uses unreasonable deadlines, improper training, and withholding information to sabotage an individual's work. Salin's research (2003) identified that bullies use the imbalance of power within their organizations and believe their risk of discipline is relatively low.

Davenport et al. (1999) discuss the "evil personality...divine right...threatened egotism, inflated self-appraisal, and ...narcissistic personality" (pp. 59-61) of the bully. They summarize the work of Leymann, as he identified the fear and insecurity of people who resort to bullying to cover their own deficiencies (pp. 58-59):

1. To force someone to adapt to a group norm—To force them out if a person does not conform.
2. To revel in animosity—To eliminate people they do not like.
3. To gain pleasure, out of boredom—To derive pleasure from the torment they inflict, sadistically motivated.
4. To reinforce prejudices—To use bullying behaviors because they dislike or hate people who happen to belong to a particular group.

Badzmirowski (2016) states, "workplace bullies often choose their targets based on perceived strength" of the target in the areas of physical skill, subject matter expertise or popularity and added, "Bullies harass others based on their own issues related to self-esteem and inadequacy."

Keashly (2010) summarized the work by Rayner and Hoel (1997) in categorizing behaviors by the bully toward the target of the bullying:

1. Threat to Professional Status—Questioning competence, belittling opinion, professional humiliation in front of colleagues, negative comments about intelligence, questioning a person's ability to supervisors, spreading rumors or gossip. These are primarily active behaviors.

2. Threat to Personal Standing—Name-calling, insults, verbal abuse, tantrums, intimidating behaviors, devaluing with reference to age, gender, race/ethnicity or appearance, hostile gestures. These are predominantly active behaviors.
3. Isolation—Exclusion from work-related gatherings, silent treatment, withholding information, ignoring contributions, not taking concerns seriously, preventing access to opportunities or promotion, poisoning others against the target. These behaviors tend to be passive in nature.
4. Overwork/Unreal Expectations—Undue pressure, impossible deadlines, unnecessary disruptions, setting up to fail, unreal or ambiguous expectations; more so than for others in the same environment.
5. Destabilization—Others take credit for work, assigning meaningless tasks, removing responsibility, denied raise or promotion without reason, excessive monitoring. (p. 12)

Bullying and Gender

A 2014 Workplace Bullying Institute survey (Namie, 2014) found that when the target was a woman, women bullied women 68% of the time and when the target is a male, the bully is another man in 43% of incidents. The survey also showed that 77% of the individuals of either gender reporting being bullied by the same gender. An earlier survey by WBI showed that 60% of bullies were women (2007), which reflected large changes from the late 1990s, when Rayner and Hoel (1997) noted that research identified 33% of bullies were women. Men and women are bullies, confirmed Namie (2003), and pointed out that almost 40% of bullies are men and 60% are women.

Overall, Namie (2014) reports that when targets or bullies lose their jobs because of workplace bullying, 82% of targets versus 18% of bullies lose their jobs. The percentage is even higher, 89% over 11%, when the bully and the target are both female.

Brunner and Costello (2003) argue that bullying of women by women keep competent women from being noticed or promoted within organizations, and "the female bully also serves as a poor representative and role model for working women in general" (p. 4).

The Environment of Bullying

Organizational studies identify many factors that contribute to workplace abuse. Cowie et al. (2002) identified "some imbalance of power" (p. 36) as a bullying characteristic. In addition, power imbalances can evolve over time and the bullying process can further increase power imbalances (Salin, 2003). In addition, Salin reported supervisory bullying could occur during the evaluation process, in setting production quotas, in providing incentives that rank employees, and where a reward system exists that allow departments to compete or achieve higher pay. Thoroughgood, Tate, Sawyer, and Jacobs (2012) studied toxic leadership styles and bullying and its consequences.

Duffy (2009) described how an organization impacts mobbing and that workplace abuse cannot only be top-down but multidirectional within an organization. Duffy also recognized the role organizations play when bullying and workplace abuse occurs. Bullying occurs where organizations attempt to hide managerial inadequacies and employees drawn into the phenomenon (Hall, 2005). Lutgen-Sandvik and Tracy (2012) noted that bullying manifests itself in organizations where leaders disregard or minimize the mistreatment of workers. Hodson et al. (2006) also concluded that job insecurity and organizational practices create chaotic work environments that allow for the substitution of bullying for more civil interactions.

Keashly (2001) looks at the systemic nature of bullying within organizations and how an organization's structure and processes "play pivotal roles in whether and how bullying is manifested (p. 17)." Keashly (2010) states, "It is this belief of the systemic nature of bullying that has researchers and professionals calling for organizational leaders and managers to take responsibility for leading the efforts in prevention and management of workplace bullying."

Sperry (2009) provided a continuum perspective on bullying within four specific organizational contexts. Type I organizational contexts represent a healthy workplace unlikely to support or condone bullying or any form of abusive behavior or actions. Type II organizational contexts represent a workplace where culture, structure, or leadership unwittingly foster bullying behavior. Type III organizational contexts represent workplaces where two or more members of a work group are directly or indirectly involved in mobbing behavior and organizational culture is complicit with mobbers' behavior. Last, Type IV organizational contexts represent workplaces where the intensity and extent of abusiveness includes the direct involvement of the organization. Sperry concluded, however, that organizations fostering contexts for bullying does not mean that abusive behavior occurs.

Harvey et al. (2006) identified organizational dynamics and societal changes that are driving an acceleration of bullying activities in the workplace. First, the pressure of change, from globalization, competition, consolidation, outsourcing, and technological change, created uncertainty. Second, time pressures accelerated completion time for tasks. Third, diversity in the workplace had the potential to heighten tension between newly introduced groups—women, minorities, foreign employees, and more highly educated employees. Fourth, right-sizing created uncertainty among surviving employees. Fifth, downsizing reduced the number of middle management level positions and flattened the organizational chart, thereby leaving fewer

managers to supervise larger work groups. Sixth, the globalization of companies and different cultural norms reduced socialization to organizational standards, rules of conduct, and training.

Based on a 1998 study by Pearson, Waggoner (2003) pointed out that bullying disrupts work patterns and the effectiveness of targets and others within an organization. This study showed that, out of 775 responses, incivility distracted over 50% of employees at work and they completed less work; 28% reported they lost work time trying to avoid a bully; and 22% reported not doing their best work due to the incivility. Vickers (2004) discussed marginalized workers due to bullying and likened workplace bullying to torture and a form of evil in organizations.

Research conducted by Lutgen-Sandvik (2006) revealed targets attempt to resist bullying behaviors through multiple means. Quitting or transferring to other departments is often the first line of resistance followed by joining with coworkers to develop a collective voice and provide mutual advocacy. Resisters developed influential allies, filed grievances, and documented bullying incidents. Subversive disobedience, labor withdrawal, and working-to-rule provided further avenues for resistance.

In reporting bullying behavior to the bully's manager within the organization, targets received positive help in only 18% of cases, but in 42% of reported cases, management responses made the situation worse, and in 40% of cases, management choose not to provide a response (Namie, 2003). Similarly, when targets reported cases to their human resources department, 17% received positive help, in 32% of cases, the situation got worse, and in 51% of the cases, HR departments did nothing. "Doing nothing is not a neutral response to when an individual asks for relief" (Namie, Namie, & Lutgen-Sandvik, 2009, p. 12).

Hout (2016) provides an example of what may happen when bullying is reported to management: "You might believe that if you report the workplace bullying to management they

will see that it is wrong and is undermining the productivity of the workplace. In most cases management does not thank you. Instead they attack you and join with the bully."

Bullying not only affected the target but employees witnessing the workplace abuse. Lutgen-Sandvik et al. (2007) conducted research with non-bullied employees who witnessed bullying within an organization and results showed elevated negativity, stress, decreased work satisfaction, and decreased rating of their work experiences. This research provided insight into the broader implications of workplace bullying for organizations and the impact of bullying on workgroups, thus pointing out that "bullying is not simply an interpersonal issue, but is an organizational dynamic that impacts all who are exposed" (p. 855). In addition, Lutgen-Sandvik (2006) reported that onlookers of bullying incidents react with the same shock and fright as those bullied, and Hogh, Mikkelsen, and Hansen (2011) point out adult bullying at work is a potent stressor to witnesses that negatively affects their health and well-being.

As Namie (2003) pointed out, employers must consider the impact of negative emotional behavior on productivity and be willing to change the rules to stop the bullying. When employers recognize that bullies create toxic work environments and drive out talented employees, and turnover is high, health premiums increase due to work-related stress, recruitment and retention are difficult, and the employer's reputation suffers, policy development needs to follow. Salin (2003) concludes that if organizations lack a workplace bullying policy and provide no monitoring of, or punishment for, bullying behavior, bullying becomes acceptable behavior within the organization.

Fostering a healthy, safe workplace environment is the responsibility of employers and their representatives. Namie (2003) outlined a values-driven workplace policy and procedures that include the following:

- A declaration of unacceptability—the organization states its displeasure with misconduct.
- Hostile workplace protections for everyone—to extend rights to everyone regardless of legally protected group status and combine with or replace existing anti-violence and anti-harassment policies.
- Inescapable definitions—to preserve prohibitions for severe incidents and to clarify the threshold for taking action.
- Non-punitive separation for safety—to appropriately place bullying in the health and safety domain.
- Documentation of adverse impact—to discourage frivolous complaints or abuse of the policy and to incorporate perpetrator pattern and practice over time.
- Credible third-party investigation and adjudication processes—to foster employee trust and to remove influence of personal relationships.
- Progressive disciplinary action—to allow for change in conduct
- Prohibit retaliation—to count offenses of retaliation separately to stop the cycle of violence.
- Coaching for identified perpetrators—to change behavior.
- Interviewing affected work teams—to identify those most harmed and to provide counseling.
- Provide executive orientation and commitment, managerial training, HR preparation and compliance, and workplace training—to implement policy.

Bullying, not identified as illegal, leaves employers reluctant to recognize, correct, or prevent workplace abuse (Namie, 2003). Targets often feel victimized a second time by the lack

of organizational policies and legal statutes addressing such abuse (Meglich-Sespico, Faley, & Knapp, 2007).

Cowan (2009) studied adult bullying and justice in a hostile workplace and suggested that organizations adopt a process of restorative justice. Mediation may be used and restorative justice may take the form of an organization giving the target a formal apology or admitting that harm was done to the target and trying to rectify the situation. Cowan noted, "It seems intuitive that achieving justice in some form could serve to mitigate some of the negative and damaging effects of workplace bullying" (p. 286).

Duffy (2009) suggested organizations develop policies to address bullying behavior in the workplace that include the following key elements:

1. Purpose of the policy.
2. The organizational understanding of the concept of bullying and its human and organizational costs.
3. Examples of bullying behaviors.
4. Identifying appropriate contact personnel at all levels in the organization for reporting incidents.
5. Alternative resolution options.
6. Procedures for formal complaints with time frames, findings, and appeal process.
7. Internal evaluation and possible changes needed to identify circumstances allowing the bullying and how prevent it in the future.

Harvey et al. (2006) noted bullying is not going away and expressed concerns if bullying embeds itself into organizational culture. Without changes in organizations and policies, legislation may prove to be the only way to recognize and change a climate of bullying.

Adult Bullying in K-12

Even though educators have experience and training in dealing with student bullying, the Sioux City Community School District in Iowa, in 2009, became the first school district in the United States to implement a comprehensive anti-bullying policy and system for teachers and staff (Namie et al., 2009). The policy (Sioux City Community Schools, 2015) defined adult bullying behavior and lists consequences for violating the policy (Workplace Bullying Institute, 2010). The district developed teams to educate all employees about bullying and create a school culture intolerant of bullying among adults and to model appropriate behavior for students.

Namie et al. (2009) correlate, "It is a logical step to see that the quality of interpersonal relationships among the adults is the context for student behavior or misconduct" (p. 14). Research showed teachers in K-12 schools, even though trained in identifying student bullying, were not reporting adult bullying and often viewed being the target as their fault (Hall, 2005). Laws in 48 states mandate that schools address bullying among students, including Michigan, which passed such legislation in 2011 (Office of the Governor, 2012), but fail to follow Sioux City's lead to prevent adult-on-adult bullying.

Like their counterparts in other helping professions such as nursing and counseling, teachers targeted by bullies were self-confident, conscientious, and skillful before the bullying started (Hall, 2005). Teachers reported their health suffered while trying to comply with overwhelming demands and coping with the workplace abuse directed toward them. Hall (2005) also reported that while they tried to figure out what happened and how to correct the situation,

teachers felt emotional distress and trapped by their inability to transfer easily to another school district.

Gibbs (2007) interviewed teachers who had a strong commitment to and passion for teaching to determine the aftermath of workplace bullying on their teaching ability and inability to locate another position if fired or they had left the position in which they were bullied. Gibbs concluded that bullying of teachers by teachers left the target with a sense of powerlessness, high levels of stress, negative impacts on job performance, and long-term emotional effects. Targets indicated a lack of administrative support after they reported the bullying, sabotage and manipulative behavior by the bully, jealousy of the target from the bully, verbal and non-verbal abuse, and the bullying teachers' desire for power and control.

Waggoner (2003) suggested bullying intensified when budget reductions threatened jobs and teachers thought bullying was the only way to survive potential job cuts. Non-tenured teachers faced a hostile environment where malevolent actions tried to force targets out of the workplace or make them miserable.

Blase and Blase (2003a, 2003b) describe the effects of principal mistreatment of teachers. They report that principals' direct and indirect behavior toward teachers causes fear, traps and isolates teachers, damages health and reputations, and causes problems within the school environment and in the personal life of the target of bullying. Teachers who complained of mistreatment were subjected to "vicious methods to suppress, punish, and intimidate them" (p. 75). These researchers' study also looks at the impact of abusive principals on the success of the learning environment within the school.

Parsons (2005) examined the impact of the bullying culture in schools from the point of view of students, educators, and parents who bully or are targeted, and stated, "Adult bullies often attempt to undermine and subvert the work of the most talented, creative, independent, and self-assured teachers on staff, without regard to how it is affecting the school" (p. 47). He concludes that the problem of student bullying will not be resolved until all school boards, school administrators, teachers, parents, and students work together to eradicate bullying at all levels.

Hall (2005) suggested teachers approach their union representatives with complaints involving workplace abuse and bullying but recognized that not all teachers have union representation. Hall urged unions to advocate for safe workplaces and support anti-bullying legislation.

The National Education Association (2012) suggests contacting local union representatives for bullying assistance but recognizes that no federal or state law offer protection against adult workplace bullying. The Winchester Massachusetts Education Association (2013) has approved contract language (Article 1.A.D) stating, "Inappropriate forms of communication, including but not limited to bullying, demeaning, sarcastic or unprofessional comments with/to a staff member will not be tolerated," and added that, "no administrator shall demean, bully, reprimand, or otherwise speak about a personal or professional matter regarding a staff member to another staff member or in the presence of another staff member or in any public forum."

Research explored the role of school leadership in preventing workplace bullying and found that administrators often ignored bullying behavior among adults (Waggoner, 2003). Although some school districts have policies on student bullying and sexual harassment, they fail to have policies defining adult bullying and providing procedures for dealing with workplace abuse.

Similar to Namie's (2003) and Duffy's (2009) suggestions for addressing general workplace bullying, Waggoner (2003) urged school districts to address the problem of adult bullying by engaging in the following:

- Recognize that bullying is not a joke.
- Understand that bullying is serious, malicious behavior with consequences.
- Examine individual administrative leadership styles and how each solves conflict.
- Recognize that administration sets the tone for the school.
- Adopt a workplace abuse policy including examples of disrespectful and unacceptable behavior.
- Specify what steps will be taken if bullying is identified.
- Make it plain that retaliation will not occur for reporting abuse.
- Use conflict resolution and mediation to ensure the problem has been resolved.
- Recognize that every teacher has the right to be treated with dignity.
- Recognize the right to safe working conditions.

Malahy (2015) sought to study the frequency, demographic factors, and possible K-12 workplace policies that play into teacher-to-teacher bullying in a number of Illinois schools. Malahy's mixed methods research results showed that 18.9% of teachers surveyed indicated they had been bullied in the past six months, and 72.6% of teachers had observed teacher bullying behavior in their schools. Only one school district in the study had a workplace bullying policy.

While discussing the role of school boards in dealing with bullying, Parsons (2005) emphasizes that "boards of education and their designated school managers...share the responsibility for ensuring that their schools are bully-free" (p. 77), but notes that "school boards are as prone to bullying as any individual; only the methods differ" (p. 81).

Response to Bullying

Worldwide, bullying/mobbing has received legal recognition and policies are in place in some countries to prevent, report, and list consequences to bullying behavior. The Netherlands, Sweden, France, Belgium, and Finland enacted legislation intended to protect employees from "psychological aggression inflicted over time in the workplace by other employees, subordinates, or superiors" (Duffy, 2009, p. 259). In France, workplace bullying, termed *moral harassment*, carries criminal sanctions including prison and substantial fines. In Denmark, Luxembourg, Ireland, and the United Kingdom, existing workplace legislation and collective bargaining agreements provide provisions for psychological aggression.

In Quebec, Canada, the province's 2002 overhaul of the Labour Standards Act banned psychological harassment in the workplace including "vexatious behavior in the form of repeated and hostile or unwanted conduct that affect an employee's psychological or physical integrity, including unwanted attitudes, comments, and gestures" (Namie, 2003, p. 6). Australia authorized a government task force to complete a study of workplace bullying in 2002 that concluded with a set of 19 recommendations to stem workplace-bullying behaviors (Vega & Comer, 2005).

In the United States, legislation, referred to as the "Healthy Workplace Bill" (Duffy, 2009; Healthy Workplace, 2016; Namie & Namie, 2009), introduced in 29 states since 2004, has not been approved, although Tennessee was first to pass an "abusive conduct" or awareness law in 2014, California was second in 2014 (but does not specifically address workplace bullying), Utah passed similar legislation in 2015, and North Dakota in 2015. Although the proposed legislation varies from state to state, the original proposed Healthy Workplace Bill would hold employees and employers responsible for compensation for targets identified with physical or psychological harm but give employers multiple opportunities to escape liability for a bully's

abusive conduct (Namie et al, 2009). The proposed law provides redress for the target, but its purpose is "to convince employers to stop bullying proactively" (p. 9).

A web search on workplace bullying uncovered a unique report from the Washington State Department of Labor and Industries (2008) that provided a description of workplace bullying, detailed how bullying affects people and organizations, provided a sample policy for adaptation by organizations to combat bullying, and listed resources available in Washington to assist employees and employers. Similar resources in other states are nonexistent.

While no specific law currently exists in the United States, targets have attempted legal remedies for workplace abuse (Von Bergen, Zavaletta, & Soper, 2006). Using status-based employment discrimination laws and tort claims for emotional distress, targets received limited remedies.

Workplace bullying research from North America, Europe, Australia, and South Africa (Duffy, 2009) showed the body of literature continues to grow as the problem and its consequences impact adults in the workplace. Research involving adult bullying showed the history, demographics, impact, consequences, and current legal standing in the United States and worldwide. It also suggested the development of organizational policies to combat bullying and move their cultures in the direction of civility (Meglich-Sespico, Faley, & Knapp, 2007).

Gaps in the literature exist in the areas of proactive organizational responses to adult bullying and adult bullying in K-12 schools. Duffy (2009) suggested the workplace must be the primary site to prevent adult bullying and emphasizes that needs include "legislative efforts to improve the quality of work life for American workers and to address the severe impact on victims of workplace mobbing/bullying" (p. 260).

While not specifically addressed in Duffy's (2009) work, K-12 schools, too, must be proactive in addressing the problem of adult bullying. As Gibbs (2007) identified, teachers have reported bullying behavior by other teachers and administrators targeted toward them with little response. It is time school districts respond and develop policies to ensure safe work environments. Malahy (2015) concluded by calling the school board the "shepherds" of a school district and stated, "Wake up, policy makers; wake up, school boards; wake up, educational leaders. You are protecting our children, now protect our teachers" (p. 141).

Conclusion

As reviewed here, research of adult-on-adult bullying in the workplace began in the 1980s and has provided evidence on the prevalence of adult bullying—characteristics and demographics for the target, bully, and the workplace environment, and ways organizations contribute to or can manage adult bullying in the workplace—through qualitative and quantitative research. These studies have included research in different types of organizations, from business and industry to health care, but few qualitative and fewer quantitative research studies exist on the prevalence of adult bullying in the K-12 school workplace. As Blase and Blase (2006) propose, there needs to be large-scale survey studies to determine the frequency and prevalence of adult mistreatment in schools.

Respondents to the survey in this research provide information to begin to fill that gap.

-He attacked me, verbally, leaving me shook by the entire event. For the rest of the school year it seems like I couldn't do anything right.

-This is a very real situation that needs to be brought to light. We are truly powerless.

-Fear continues to reign and there is no trust.

– Anonymous Bullying Research Survey Respondents

Chapter 3. Methodology

This non-experimental, explanatory, quantitative study explored the prevalence of adult bullying of professional and non-professional K-12 employees from a sample of public school districts and public school academies in all 83 counties in Michigan; examined similarities and differences between adult bullying incidents reported and workplace climate, school demographics, and characteristics of the target using data from Michigan schools and previous bullying studies in the generalized workplace; compared results to the factors of work-related bullying, person-related bullying, and physically intimidating bullying identified by Einarsen et al. (2009); and examined the relationship to Bies's (2001) four categories of interactional justice.

An online survey was conducted using the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised (NAQ-R; Appendix A). Additional questions in the full online questionnaire about adult bullying and demographics (Appendix C) collected data of adult bullying incident types, workplace climate, and the demographics and characteristics of adult bullying targets and bullies in K-12 districts and public school academies of differing sizes in urban, suburban, and rural areas in Michigan.

Research Tradition

Educational research is important as educators strive for continual improvement (Creswell, 2002). Research addresses problems and issues, searches for solutions, fills gaps in

knowledge, tests old results, adds to existing knowledge, may improve educational practices, and informs educators on policy issues.

Creswell (2009) identifies the three major types of research methods and their forms of data collection and analysis. Quantitative research uses instrument based questions, performance data, attitude data, observational data, and census data to statistically analyze and interpret a research problem, and qualitative research uses open-ended questions, interview data, observation data, document data, and audio-visual data to analyze and interpret themes and patterns in a research problem. Mixed-methods research uses both qualitative and quantitative methods to collect, analyze, and interpret a research problem.

Traditional quantitative research, begun in the late 19th century and the oldest educational research method (Creswell, 2002), focused primarily on two methods: survey research and experimental research. Survey research provides a quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions from a sample of the population, and experimental research assesses the outcome or influence of a specific treatment on one group over another group that did not receive treatment (Creswell, 2009).

Non-experimental research has historically been the design most used in education (Dimsdale & Kutner, 2004). Non-experimental research is described by Johnson and Christensen (2012) as research that does not manipulate independent variables, allows no random assignment of participants to groups, and does not allow for researchers to jump to a conclusion of cause and effect because there will be too many other alternative explanations for the relationship between two variables. Belli (2009) notes that one reason for using non-experimental research is that attribute variables such as gender or other personal characteristics cannot be manipulated.

Non-experimental research can be classified by objective into types (Johnson & Christensen, 2012). Of the three most common types—descriptive, predictive, and explanatory—explanatory, non-experimental research will best provide a picture of the status and characteristics of adult bullying in the workplace phenomenon.

Cowie, Naylor, Rivers, Smith, and Pereira (2002) detailed various research methods employed to research bullying and its impact on individuals and organizations. Methods included questionnaires and surveys, self-reporting, diary keeping, personal accounts through interviewing, personal accounts through focus groups, critical incident technique, observational methods, and case studies.

Kerlinger (1986) described survey research as a "useful tool for educational fact-finding...and is best adapted to obtaining personal and social facts, beliefs, and attitudes" (p. 386). A *questionnaire* (Johnson & Christensen, 2012) is a self-reported data collection instrument filled out by research participants. Dimsdale and Kutner (2004) describe questionnaires as a flexible survey tool suited for non-experimental research, but note that while they are good for gathering useful information, they do not allow researchers to make causal claims.

Questionnaires are used to measure individuals' thinking about behavior, experiences, attitudes, opinions, beliefs, values, knowledge, and background or demographic information, and can reference the past, present, or future (Johnson & Christensen, 2012). The NAQ-R is such an instrument and provides questions meeting the need for evidence as expressed in the research questions of this study.

Providing participants access to the NAQ-R through an online survey tool website such as SurveyMonkey by emailing the link to the online questionnaire permitted a speedy response to

the questionnaire, an inexpensive way to administer and compile the responses to the questionnaire, and provided a high level of perceived anonymity by the participants (Johnson & Christensen, 2012).

Participants

Generally, quantitative survey research would be conducted with as great a number of people, or sample, as possible (Creswell, 2002) to reflect the characteristics of a larger group, called the population. In this study, the population would be all K-12 employees in all public school districts and academies in Michigan.

There is no centralized database of contact information for K-12 school employees available either through the Michigan Department of Education or online. Expensive database lists are available for purchase from companies such as MDR, but it could not be determined if the database was up to date or accurate.

Repeated attempts were made over the last three years through individual superintendents, individual human resource directors, and individual principals to survey their employees about adult bullying to no avail. This researcher also emailed contact personnel through the union websites for the Michigan Education Association, the National Education Association (NEA), and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), without receiving any response to the request to survey their memberships. Phone calls were made to and messages left with the NEA and the AFT, but no response was received.

Contact was made with the then consultant for K-12 education from the Workplace Bullying Institute in 2013 and 2015. While the consultant was encouraging the research, he was not able to provide any access to a database of K-12 educators or suggest a way to obtain contact information for educators anywhere in the United States. Pamela Lutgen-Sandvik, a noted

researcher on the issue of adult bullying in the workplace, was contacted in early 2016. While she was happy to offer suggestions about using the NAQ-R, she did not have additional suggestions about accessing contact information for school employees.

At this point, it appeared that the only way to collect contact information for K-12 employees was from individual school and district websites. The target population was chosen semi-systematically from school district employees from districts of various sizes and geographic locations whose email addresses are publicly available online. During the time-consuming process of manually harvesting email addresses from school district websites, an attempt was made to select every third to fifth name from each building's list while keeping a wide range of grade levels, departments, and employee levels in mind as to not choose a large number from one grade or department at the exclusion of others. Many school districts only list professional personnel online, which prevented a large number of support staff email addresses from being harvested.

Convenience sampling, a type of non-probability sampling (Johnson & Christensen, 2012), occurred based on the online availability of educator and staff email contact information and their willingness to participate, but convenience sampling limited generalizing about the total population.

The participants in this study were non-administrative, adult professional and nonprofessional employees from school districts in Michigan. Personnel from school districts of various sizes (small, medium, and large) and locations (rural, suburban, and urban) were recruited to participate in the study through emails sent directly to participants from SurveyMonkey. Email addresses and contact information for 2,480 employees in schools districts in all 83 counties in Michigan were harvested from district or school websites based on

their availability (many districts do not post or mask their individual personnel email addresses through portals). The goal of an approximate response rate of 10–15% was set.

Participants were provided informed consent information (Johnson & Christensen, 2012), including information about the survey and the confidentiality, anonymity, and privacy of its data; information about their choice of voluntary participation in, or withdrawal from, the survey; and survey risks to the participant, and once agreeing to the consent, they were linked to the actual online questionnaire. A deadline of April 30, 2017, was set to participate in the online survey.

Research Methods

To address the three research questions, an anonymous, online survey of professional and non-professional adult K-12 employees was conducted in districts and public school academies in Michigan.

After receiving permission for human subjects' research from Eastern Michigan University, distribution of a link to the online tool provided participants access to the survey questions. The self-reported responses to the survey questions collected evidence of incidents of adult bullying in the K-12 environment, on adult bullying incident types, and the characteristics and demographics of adult bullying targets and bullies in urban, suburban and rural school district of differing sizes in Michigan.

NAQ-R questions (Appendix A) allowed for choice from a fully anchored 5-point numeric scale (Johnson & Christensen, 2012), while additional mutually exclusive questions and demographic checklists in the full online survey (Appendix C) allowed responses from a list of set responses. One optional open-ended question (Question 46) in the questionnaire allowed participants to tell their story of adult bullying.

In the actual online survey (Appendix C), there are a total of 45 questions and the optional comment question. The order of questions were as follows: first, the demographic questions; second, the NAQ-R (Appendix A); and third, the additional questions. The questions were formatted to work in SurveyMonkey. An oral read and response to the 45 questions demonstrated that the survey could be answered in 8–10 minutes with additional time needed if participants completed the optional comment question.

This research was designed to collect descriptive statistics to summarize, describe, and explain adult-on-adult bullying in the K-12 workplace. It was not designed to make conclusions or test hypotheses used in an inferential statistical study (Belli, 2009).

The processing and compilation of survey data provided a view of the adult bullying phenomenon in K-12 schools through total frequency distribution and the computation of central tendency statistics (Creswell, 2002). Participant responses were used to provide a descriptive view of collected data and answer questions regarding prevalence, demographics, and characteristics of targets and bullies. Comparisons of categories were made through frequency analysis, factor analysis, and linear regression using SPSS software to measure statistically significant relationships (Johnson & Christensen, 2012) between the Einarsen et al. (2009) study and the collected data, and using Bies's (2001) categories of interactional justice.

A detailed presentation of the results allows dissertation discussion and analysis, and shows comparisons to the existing demographic data from the Michigan Department of Education (Center for Educational Performance and Information [CEPI], 2016) and bullying data from the general workplace (Namie, 2014; Workplace Bullying Institute, 2007) as identified in the research questions of this study. Using convenience and purposive sampling, generalizing the results to other school districts in Michigan or other states was not possible.

Legal, Ethical, and Moral Issues

All doctoral research involving humans needs to be reviewed by an institution's internal review board (Johnson & Christensen, 2012). Eastern Michigan University requires doctoral candidates planning to use human subjects in their research to submit a Request for Approval of Research Involving Human Subjects form, along with their dissertation proposal, to the University Human Subjects Review Committee (UHSRC) at the Graduate School prior to beginning any research (Eastern Michigan University, 2010). The UHSRC, which is responsible for the protection of human resources used in research studies, reviewed the proposed methodology to evaluate the research-related risk to human subjects, to protect the confidentiality or anonymity of all participants, and to identify the category of review required by the committee. Categories are exempt studies that involve no risk from participant, expedited review that is reviewed by fewer members of the UHSRC, and a full board review that requires the full UHSRC for approval. As part of Eastern Michigan University doctoral level classes, this researcher completed the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) program in research, ethics, regulatory oversight, and responsible conduct of research. Following this online training, certification in the required modules and additional elective modules was completed. Required recertification was completed in 2017. The proposal was approved as presented in March 2017 (Appendix D).

Ethical and moral issues in research require a high level of integrity by the researcher to protect from misconduct and to protect the participants (Creswell, 2009). Researchers need to develop a trust with research participants and conduct the research with a higher level of attention when doing research electronically (Johnson & Christensen, 2012), as was completed in

this research. Informed consent applies when providing information to participants with emphasis on what is public and private and when research is conducted electronically.

Due to the personal, sensitive nature of adult bullying, the informed consent (Appendix C) given to participants before they participated in this study included information about confidentiality, possible harm or stress in remembering the bullying situations, how the data collected will be used, assurance that they can withdraw at any time, and contact information for this researcher (Creswell, 2009).

Reliability and Validity

In research, reliability refers to the consistency, dependability, and stability of the data in the study, and validity refers to the accuracy of the inferences and interpretations made and whether or not it is measuring what was intended to be measured (Belli, 2009). Johnson and Christensen (2012) note that if there is validity, research must have reliability, but reliability in and of itself is not enough to ensure validity.

One type of reliability is *internal consistency reliability* that shows consistency for one construct measured with a test. Johnson and Christensen (2012) note the internal consistency reliability requires only one administration of the test and can be measured using Cronbach's alpha. A Cronbach's alpha score over .70 in a measurement of one construct or trait indicates a high level of consistency.

Validity can be measured using evidence based on content, the internal structure of the content, or criterion-based evidence (Johnson & Christensen, 2012), but note that validity and reliability of a study is typically based on a norming group and differences in the makeup of the group will increase the questionability of the evidence.

Einarsen et al. (2009) evaluated the reliability of the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised and measured Cronbach's alpha at .90, indicating a high level of consistency and reliability for the questionnaire in measuring workplace hostility. These same researchers explored criterion validity of the NAQ-R with measures of bullying, health, psychosocial work environment, and leadership and showed a high level of correlation. They conclude that the NAQ-R comprises a "reliable and valid measure of exposure to workplace bullying" (p. 38), and Nielsen et al. (2011) note that the NAQ-R has been validated in several studies, but little is known about the accuracy or trustworthiness of other negative workplace measurement tests.

Based on its measures of reliability and validity, the NAQ-R was used to measure the prevalence and characteristics in the K-12 workplace and did not need to be piloted.

In order to determine if the instrument operates properly (Johnson & Christensen, 2012), the survey instruments for the additional adult bullying questions and for the demographic questions (Appendix C) were reviewed by the dissertation committee.

-Bullying is allowed by administrators and board. Nothing has been done to adopt an adult bullying policy.

-I was warned not to file a complaint and I was retaliated against, disciplined and threatened with firing on a regular basis. Facts and documentation mean nothing and it was pointed out by HR that bullying is not illegal.

– Anonymous Bullying Research Survey Respondents

Chapter 4. Results

This non-experimental, explanatory, quantitative research study surveyed K-12 educators and other K-12 school employees to gather data about negative school workplace climate utilizing the 22 question Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised (NAQ-R), 10 questions to identify school characteristics and demographic data, and 13 questions to ask respondents if they or others in their building were being bullied and to identify characteristics of the workplace environment, target and the bully, and one optional question if participants wanted to make a comment (Appendix C). Results were compared with results from generalized studies in workplace bullying (Namie, 2014; Workplace Bullying Institute, 2007) and K-12 school and personnel statistics from the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI, 2016), and analyzed to respond to the research questions of this study.

Participants in the survey were recruited from professional and non-professional K-12 employees from a sample of public school districts and public school academies from all 83 counties in Michigan. Personnel from school districts of various sizes (small, medium, and large) and locations (rural, suburban, and urban) were asked to participate in the study through emails sent directly to potential participants from SurveyMonkey. Email addresses and contact

information for 2,480 employees in schools districts and public school academies in Michigan were harvested from district or school websites based on their availability online and uploaded to SurveyMonkey.

Email invitations sent from SurveyMonkey included basic information to recruit participants to respond to a survey about workplace climate. The words "bully" and "bullying" did not appear in the email or the consent form and did not appear in the survey until late in the questionnaire, Question 34, as recommended by Einarsen and fellow researchers (Bergen Bullying Research Group, 2010; Nielsen, Notelaers, & Einarsen, 2011).

Results of the survey were analyzed to answer the research questions:

1. What similarities and differences exist between the prevalence and characteristics of adult workplace bullying in the generalized workplace (Namie, 2014; Workplace Bullying Institute, 2007) and the prevalence and characteristics of workplace bullying in the K-12 school environment?
2. What comparisons can be made between any identified latent bullying variables and the three inter-related factors associated with person-related bullying, work-related bullying, and physically intimidating bullying identified by Einarsen, Hoel, and Notelaers (2009)?
3. What relationships between adult bullying incidents and workplace climate, school demographics, and characteristics of the target and bully exist using Bies's (2001) four categories of interactional justice?

Survey Response

The survey invitations were sent April 11, 2017, three reminders were sent within the next two weeks, and the survey closed on April 30, being open for responses for 20 days. Out of the original 2,480 email addresses utilized to distribute the invitation to participate in the survey,

167 (6.7%) of the emails were blocked by their district or bounced. Of the 2,313 actually receiving the email, 1,381 (59.7%) potential participants opened the email.

Of the 457 potential participants who clicked through from the email to the consent form, 324 consented to participate in and completed the entire survey, but 63 exited without additional response and 70 denied consent to participate in the survey, and were, thereby, automatically exited from the survey. The participants ($N = 324$) represent a 14% response rate based on 2,313 receiving the emailed invitation.

Demographic Data of Respondents

In the first section of the questionnaire respondents were asked to address demographic questions including their gender; position within their district/building; education level achieved; their age; the grade level(s) in which they worked; the number of years they worked for the district and within their individual building; whether their district is urban, suburban, or rural; the number of students in their district; and whether or not they were members of an unionized employee group.

Gender. Michigan K-12 reported data (CEPI, 2016) show that 26.6% of K-12 education employees are male and 73.4% are female. An attempt was made to invite a similar percent to participate in the survey recognizing that in many cases gender could not be identified by first names (e.g., Kelly, Chris, or just initials). Results of the survey indicate that 13.9% ($N = 45$) of respondents were male and 86.1% ($N = 279$) were female.

While harvesting email addresses from school and district websites, it was noted that many schools do not list non-professional staff. An effort was made to recruit a range of positions which resulted in 17.9% ($N = 58$) of respondents being teacher aides or paraprofessionals, building support (e.g., custodial, cafeteria, and security personnel), student

support (e.g., counselors, nurses, psychologists, social workers), or supervisors, and 82.1% ($N = 266$) teachers. This contrasts with CEPI (2016) demographic data, which shows that teachers make up 38.9% of the K-12 personnel in Michigan.

Table 1 represents the frequency of males and females by respondents in each type of K-12 position.

Table 1

K-12 Work Position by Gender

Position in school building or district	Male	Female	Total
Paraprofessional/Teacher Aide	0	6	6
Building Support (Custodial, Cafeteria, Security, etc.)	0	1	1
Student Support (Counselor, Nurse, Psychologist, Social Worker, etc.)	3	34	37
Teacher	40	226	266
Low-level administrator, supervisor	2	2	4

Education level. Most respondents held either a bachelor's level college degree (33.0%, $N = 107$) or a master's level degree (63.9%, $N = 207$). Nine held no college degree, and one indicated a doctorate. CEPI (2016) reported 59.3% held a graduate degree. Table 2 illustrates the highest level of education achieved by gender.

Table 2

Highest Education Level Achieved by Gender

Degree	Male	Female	Total
High school degree or equivalent	0	1	1
Some college but no degree	0	5	5
Associate degree	0	3	3
Bachelor degree	17	90	107
Graduate degree	28	179	207
Doctorate	0	1	1

Age. In Michigan, the average age of K-12 employees is 42.1 (CEPI, 2016). Of those responding to the survey, the average age is 44. Table 3 illustrates the frequency by age range of respondents by gender.

Table 3

Age Range by Gender

Age	Male	Female	Total
18–25	2	10	12
26–35	13	67	80
36–45	15	93	108
46–55	10	82	92
56–65	5	27	32
65 and older	0	0	0

Level of building. Respondents were asked the type or level of building in which they worked. Elementary and K-8 level compose 43.8% ($N = 142$), and Middle/Jr. High and High School level compose 51.2% ($N = 166$), recognizing that K-8 and Middle/Jr. High levels overlap and respondents could only indicate one choice. The remaining 4.9% ($N = 16$) work in preschool, alternate school, vocational school, or central office settings.

Number of years in district and building. CEPI (2016) data reports teacher longevity as 15.7% for 2–4 years and 32.7% for 5–15 years. Two questions indicated how many years respondents had worked in their district and in their specific building(s). Table 4 illustrates the largest number of respondents spent 2–4 years in their district and school.

Table 4

Number of Years in District and School

Number of Years	Years in District		Years in Building	
	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent
1 or Less	30	9.3	41	12.7
2–4	76	23.5	95	29.3
5–10	64	19.8	78	24.1
11–15	35	10.8	48	14.8
16–20	55	17.0	35	10.8
More than 20	64	19.8	27	8.3

Location of district and district size. Self-reporting by respondents of school district location indicates that 13.3% ($N = 43$) work in urban districts, 26.9% ($N = 87$) work in suburban districts, and the majority, 59.9% ($N = 194$), work in rural school districts.

School district size was broken into four categories with respondents indicating those under 500 students, 16.1% ($N = 52$); under 2,000 students, 43.8% ($N = 142$); 2,001-10,000 students, 38.9% ($N = 126$); and over 10,000 students, 1.2% ($N = 4$).

Union membership. A majority of respondents reported being a member in a union with 77.8% ($N = 252$) to 22.2% ($N = 72$) not being members of a union.

NAQ-R Results and Frequencies

In the second section of the survey, participants were asked to respond to the 22 questions of the Negative Acts Questionnaire Revised (NAQ-R; Appendix A) after the initial explanatory paragraph: "The following behaviors are often seen as examples of negative behavior in the workplace. During the current school year, how often have you been subjected to the following negative acts in your current position?" This was respondents' first exposure to the phrase "negative behavior in the workplace" and the words bully or bullying were not used in the invitation to participate, consent form, in any demographic questions which preceded the NAQ-R questionnaire and within the 22 questions of the NAQ-R for reasons previously noted in this chapter.

The NAQ-R provided a 5-point scale response: *never*, *infrequently*, *monthly*, *weekly*, or *daily*. Table 5 illustrates the frequencies of responses for each question.

Table 5

Responses to the NAQ-R

Question	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)	(N)
	Never	Infrequently	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
Someone withholding information which affects your performance	35.2 (114)	39.2 (127)	16.4 (53)	7.4 (24)	1.9 (6)
Being humiliated or ridiculed in connection with your work	59.9 (194)	29.9 (97)	5.9 (19)	3.4 (11)	0.9 (3)
Being ordered to do work below your level of competence	54.0 (175)	27.2 (88)	6.2 (20)	6.5 (21)	6.2 (20)
Having key areas of responsibility removed or replaced with more trivial or unpleasant tasks	54.3 (176)	24.4 (79)	10.5 (34)	6.8 (22)	4.0 (13)
Spreading of gossip and rumors about you	50.6 (164)	37.4 (121)	8.0 (26)	2.8 (9)	1.2 (4)
Being ignored or excluded	34.9 (113)	40.1 (130)	11.7 (38)	7.7 (25)	5.6 (18)
Having insulting or offensive remarks made about your person, attitudes or your private life	63.6 (206)	28.1 (91)	4.3 (14)	2.8 (9)	1.2 (4)
Being shouted at or being the target of spontaneous anger	66.4 (215)	24.7 (80)	4.3 (14)	3.1 (10)	1.5 (5)
Intimidating behaviors such as finger-pointing, invasion of personal space, shoving, blocking your way	79.6 (258)	15.4 (50)	2.5 (8)	2.2 (7)	0.3 (1)
Hints or signals from others that you should quit your job	79.9 (259)	13.6 (44)	3.4 (11)	2.8 (9)	0.3 (1)
Repeated reminders of your errors or mistakes	63.9 (207)	26.5 (86)	6.2 (20)	3.1 (10)	0.3 (1)
Being ignored or facing a hostile reaction when you approach	60.2 (195)	24.7 (80)	6.2 (20)	6.2 (20)	2.8 (9)

Table 5 *continued*

Question	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
	(<i>N</i>)	(<i>N</i>)	(<i>N</i>)	(<i>N</i>)	(<i>N</i>)
	Never	Infrequently	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
Persistent criticism of your work or work-effort	66.7 (216)	21.9 (71)	5.9 (19)	4.3 (14)	1.2 (4)
Having your opinions or views ignored	34.0 (110)	39.9 (129)	13.6 (44)	8.0 (26)	4.6 (15)
Practical jokes carried out by people you don't get along with	90.7 (294)	7.4 (24)	0.6 (2)	1.2 (4)	0.0 (0)
Being given tasks with unreasonable deadlines	43.5 (141)	38.0 (123)	13.0 (42)	3.1 (10)	2.5 (8)
Having allegations made against you	73.2 (237)	20.0 (65)	3.4 (11)	2.5 (8)	0.9 (3)
Excessive monitoring of your work	59.0 (191)	26.2 (85)	6.8 (22)	4.3 (14)	3.7 (12)
Pressure not to claim something to which by right you are entitled (e.g., sick leave, personal days, holiday, entitlement, travel expenses)	62.0 (201)	25.9 (84)	6.8 (22)	2.5 (8)	2.8 (9)
Being the subject of excessive teasing and sarcasm	82.1 (266)	15.1 (49)	1.5 (5)	1.2 (4)	0.0 (0)
Being exposed to an unmanageable workload	29.3 (95)	26.5 (86)	17.3 (56)	10.5 (34)	16.4 (53)
Threats of violence or physical abuse or actual abuse	91.7 (297)	5.9 (19)	0.9 (3)	1.2 (4)	0.3 (1)

As illustrated in the results in the NAQ-R questions, over 50% of respondents reported negative acts in their workplace in the following areas: 70.7% ($N = 229$) feel they were exposed to an unmanageable workload, 66% ($N = 214$) believe their opinions or views are ignored, 65.1%

($N = 211$) feel ignored or excluded, 64.8% ($N = 210$) note someone is withholding information which affects their performance, and 56.5% ($N = 183$) believe they are given tasks with unreasonable deadlines.

At the lower end of frequencies for NAQ-R questions, 8.3% ($N = 27$) report threats of violence or abuse, 9.3% ($N = 30$) report having practical jokes played on them by someone they do not get along with, 17.9% ($N = 58$) report being subjected to excessive teasing and sarcasm, 20% ($N = 65$) report hints or signals from others that they should quit their jobs, 20.4% ($N = 66$) report intimidating behaviors such as finger-pointing, invasion of personal space, shoving, blocking their way, and 26.9% ($N = 87$) report allegations have been made against them. The frequencies reported by the respondents to the other 11 NAQ-R questions range from 30 to 50% as illustrated in Table 5.

Frequency for Question "Have You Been Bullied at Work?"

Question 35, "Have you been bullied at work?" of the survey was the first exposure by respondents to the word "bully" and its working definition: "Adult bullying is defined as the repeated and persistent nonphysical mistreatment of a person including verbal abuse, threatening conduct, intimidation, attempts to frustrate or wear down, humiliate, pressure, and provoke that threatens the psychological integrity, career, safety, and health of the target." Table 6 illustrates that 27.8% of respondents indicated they were bullied in their workplace at a frequency rate of infrequently to daily.

Table 6

Frequency of Adult Bullying in the K-12 Workplace

	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)
Question	Never	Infrequently	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
Have you been bullied at work?	72.2 (234)	19.8 (64)	3.4 (11)	2.5 (8)	2.2 (7)

Results of Additional Bullying Questions

In addition to the NAQ-R, respondents were asked to identify characteristics of the bullying situation, their school or district response to adult bullying, and, if they were the target of bullying, the characteristics of the bully.

Were others bullied in your building? Survey respondents were asked if they were the only person in their building or if others in their building were the targets of bullying. Results indicate that 41% ($N = 133$) indicated that one or more adults in their workplace were bullied by the same or a different bully as themselves.

Roles in bullying incidents. While 27.8% of respondents report themselves as the target of bullying, Table 7 illustrates that they may have had other roles in witnessing, mediating, and reporting bullying behavior or being the bully, and also illustrates the role(s) non-bullied K-12 personnel had in any bullying incident(s). They could indicate as many roles as applied.

Table 7

Role in Adult Bullying Situations in the K-12 Workplace

Role (Respondents could indicate multiple responses)	Response Percent	<i>N</i>
Target/Victim	27.8	90
Bully	0.6	2
Witness	25.2	85
Mediator	10.8	35
Person to whom adult bullying was reported	11.7	38
No role	50.6	164

Degree to which K-12 workplace addressed bullying behaviors. Respondents indicated the degree to which their K-12 workplace addressed adult bullying behaviors. They could indicate as many responses as applied to their building. Table 8 illustrates most, 65.1% ($N = 211$), indicated adult bullying in their building/district has not been addressed.

Table 8

How Adult Bullying Was Addressed

How Adult Bullying was Addressed (Respondents could indicate multiple responses)	Response Percent	<i>N</i>
Adopted a workplace abuse policy including examples of disrespectful/unacceptable behavior among adults	18.2	59
Specified what steps will be taken if adult bullying is identified	8.3	27
Used adult conflict resolution and/or mediation to ensure problems have been resolved	10.8	35
Provided administrative and/or staff training to recognize, prevent, or resolve adult bullying	12.4	40
Has not been addressed	65.1	211
Unsure	8.0	26

Reporting of bullying incidents. Incidences of adult bullying were reported to occur in 73.8% of situations while 26.2% were not reported. Most 38.9% ($N = 126$) reported the bullying to their building administrator or 33.0% ($N = 107$) to their union. Table 9 indicates to whom bullying was reported. Respondents could indicate multiple responses.

Table 9

To Whom Adult Bullying Was Reported

Reported To (Respondents could indicate multiple responses)	Response Percent	<i>N</i>
No One	26.2	85
Building Administrator	38.9	126
District Administrator	14.2	46
Human Resources Dept.	5.9	19
School Board	4.0	13
Union	33.0	107
Unsure or no bullying reported	22.8	74

Outcomes after bullying incidents reported. Respondents were asked to indicate the outcome(s) of reported bullying within their building. Table 10 shows that in most reported cases, 25% ($N = 81$), adult bullying did not stop and that in many cases the target was disciplined or received negative consequences from reporting the bullying behavior. If respondents marked "Other" and specified why, many reported that incidents were being investigated, targets or bullies were in counseling, the target was forced to retire, the union did nothing, or they were unsure that bullying and/or reporting had occurred within their building.

Table 10

What Was the Outcome from Reporting Adult Bullying Behavior

Outcome of Report (Respondents could indicate multiple responses)	Response Percent	N
Nothing changed/bullying did not stop	25.0	81
The bullying increased	3.1	10
The bullying stopped	12.0	39
The report was ignored	11.1	36
You/they were encouraged not to file a formal report	3.7	12
You/they were reprimanded or disciplined	6.5	21
You/they experienced retaliation	6.5	21
The bully was disciplined	5.6	18
The bully was fired	0.6	2
You/they changed position or moved to another building	5.6	18

Working relationship between target and bully. Respondents, whether or not they were the target or witness to adult bullying in their building, indicated the workplace relationship between the target and bully in Table 11. Of those who responded "Other," their comments indicated the relationship came through the union, HR or business office, grandparent of student, department chair, board member, did not occur, or they were not aware of adult bullying occurring in their building. One respondent did not think adult bullying was possible.

Table 11

Workplace Relationship of Bully to Target

Relationship (Respondents could indicate multiple responses)	Response Percent	<i>N</i>
Supervisor	8.0	26
Building Administrator	18.8	61
District Administrator	5.9	19
Same level colleague	27.8	90
Support position	3.7	12
Student	3.1	10
Parent	8.6	28
Other	45.7	148

Characteristics of the Bully

Only targets of adult bullying were asked to report on the characteristics of the bully in their situation. The following illustrates their responses.

Gender of bully. Targets indicated that 73.5% ($N = 61$) of the bullies were female and 26.5% ($N = 22$) were male. In 74.1% ($N = 63$) of the targets were the same gender as their bully, while 25.9% ($N = 22$) indicated their bully was of the opposite gender. Male ($N = 7$) targets reported being bullied by another male in three cases and by females in four cases. Female ($N = 78$) reported being bullied by another female in 60 cases and by males in 18 cases.

Age of bully. Targets were asked if the bully was approximately the same age, older, or younger than themselves. Responses show that 33.3% ($N = 28$) were approximately the same age, 45.2% ($N = 38$) were older, and 21.4% ($N = 18$) were younger.

In reporting the approximate age of the bully, target respondents indicated their bullies were in the following age ranges: Age 18–25, 1.2% ($N = 1$); Age 26–35, 3.6% ($N = 3$); Age 36–45, 39.8% ($N = 33$); Age 46–55, 33.7% ($N = 28$); and Age 56–65, 21.7% ($N = 18$). No bully was reported to be over 65 years old.

Characteristics of the Target

Frequencies based on gender, education level, position, longevity in district and building, district location, and union membership were calculated and illustrated in Tables 12-18.

Frequency of being bullied by gender. Table 12 illustrates the frequency of being bullied calculated by gender.

Table 12

Frequency of Being Bullied by Gender

	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)
Gender	Never	Infrequently	Monthly	Weekly	Daily	Total
Male	11.4 (37)	1.6 (5)	0.3 (1)	0.3 (1)	0.3 (1)	13.9 (45)
Female	60.8 (197)	18.2 (59)	3.0 (10)	2.1 (7)	1.9 (6)	86.1 (279)

Frequency of bullying by education level. Respondents self-reported their attained education level. There was no significant level of adult bullying reported for those who had a high school education, some college, an associate degree, or doctoral level education. Table 13 indicates the level of bullying reported by those with bachelor or graduate degrees.

Table 13

Frequency of Being Bullied by Education Level

	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)
Education level	Never	Infrequently	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
Bachelor degree	79.4 (85)	15.9 (17)	3.7 (4)	0.9 (1)	0.0 (0)
Graduate degree	68.1 (141)	22.2 (46)	2.9 (6)	3.4 (7)	3.4 (7)

Frequency of being bullied by position. Respondents ($N = 11$) who held paraprofessional and building level support positions indicated two of them experienced infrequent to monthly bullying by other adults in their workplace. Of the four low level supervisory or administration positions, one respondent indicated they were the target of bullying on a daily basis. Table 14 illustrates the frequency of adult bullying experienced by student support personnel and teachers.

Table 14

Frequency of Being Bullied by Position

	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)
Position	Never	Infrequently	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
Student Support	64.9 (24)	18.9 (7)	2.7 (1)	5.4 (2)	8.1 (3)
Teacher	72.9 (194)	21.1 (56)	2.6 (7)	2.3 (6)	1.1 (3)

Frequency of being bullied by longevity. In analyzing whether or not longevity in either their district or their building influenced the level of bullying encountered, respondents indicate all longevity levels experienced some degree of adult bullying. Table 15 illustrates longevity by district and Table 16 by longevity by building.

Table 15

Frequency of Being Bullied by Longevity in District

	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)
Longevity in District	Never	Infrequently	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
1 year or less	86.7 (26)	10.0 (3)	0.0 (0)	3.3 (1)	0.0 (0)
2 to 4 years	78.9 (60)	13.2 (10)	5.3 (4)	1.3 (1)	1.3 (1)
5 to 10 years	71.9 (46)	20.3 (13)	3.1 (2)	3.1 (2)	1.6 (1)
11 to 15 years	77.1 (27)	14.3 (5)	5.7 (2)	2.9 (1)	0.0 (0)
16 to 20 years	63.6 (35)	27.3 (15)	1.8 (1)	3.6 (2)	3.6 (2)
More than 20 years	62.5 (40)	28.1 (18)	3.1 (2)	1.6 (1)	4.7 (3)

Table 16

Frequency of Being Bullied by Longevity in Building

	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)
Longevity in Building	Never	Infrequently	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
1 year or less	82.9 (34)	7.3 (3)	2.4 (1)	4.9 (2)	2.4 (1)
2 to 4 years	76.8 (73)	16.8 (16)	4.2 (4)	1.1 (1)	1.1 (1)
5 to 10 years	71.8 (56)	17.9 (14)	5.1 (4)	3.8 (3)	1.3 (1)
11 to 15 years	77.1 (37)	16.7 (8)	0.0 (0)	2.1 (1)	4.2 (2)
16 to 20 years	51.4 (18)	40.0 (14)	2.9 (1)	2.9 (1)	2.9 (1)
More than 20 years	59.3 (16)	33.3 (9)	3.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	3.7 (1)

Frequency of being bullied by school building type. Respondents indicated the school building type they worked in ranging from preschool to central office. No bullying was reported by those working in preschools or vocational schools, and only one report of monthly level bullying at an alternative school. Table 17 illustrates the frequency of being bullied by another adult by the other types of buildings in which the target worked.

Table 17

Frequency of Being Bullied by Building Type

	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)
Building Type	Never	Infrequently	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
Elementary	74.2 (95)	17.2 (22)	4.7 (6)	3.1 (4)	0.8 (1)
K-8	85.7 (12)	14.3 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Middle School/Jr. High	72.4 (42)	24.1 (14)	1.7 (1)	0.0 (0)	1.7 (1)
High School	68.5 (74)	24.1 (14)	2.8 (3)	2.8 (3)	1.9 (2)
Central Office	33.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	66.7 (2)

Frequency of being bullied by district location. In analyzing the data, there was no significant differences between percentages in respondents who indicated they were from urban, suburban, or rural districts, or in respondents who indicated the various population size of students in their districts.

Frequency of being bullied by union membership. A slight difference in frequency of those targeted by an adult bully was noted when respondents indicated whether or not they were members of an employee union. Table 18 illustrates this difference.

Table 18

Frequency of Being Bullied by Union Membership

	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)	Percent (N)
Union Member	Never	Infrequently	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
Yes	71.8 (181)	21.4 (54)	3.6 (9)	2.0 (5)	1.2 (3)
No	73.6 (53)	13.9 (10)	2.8 (2)	4.2 (3)	5.6 (4)

Witness Behavior

Those respondents who were the targets of bullying or witnesses to bullying incidents reported on the reactions they observed in the witnesses. While 23.5% ($N = 39$) reported no witnesses to adult bullying incidents in their building, Table 19 illustrates the witness responses. Those indicating "Other" commented that witnesses were afraid to get involved, witnesses were "authorities" and/or union representatives who didn't choose to get involved, or those who reported no bullying incidents occurred in their workplace.

Table 19

Witness Behavior in Adult Bullying Incidents

Witness Behavior (Respondents could indicate multiple responses)	Response Percent	<i>N</i>
There were no witnesses	23.5	39
Witnesses did nothing	22.3	37
Witnesses attempted to intervene to stop the bullying situation	13.3	22
Witnesses participated in bullying	6.0	10
Witnesses reported the bullying to appropriate authorities	12.7	21
Witnesses were upset or stressed by the bullying incident	28.3	47
Witnesses discussed the bullying with target	26.5	44
Other	32.5	54

Comparison of Components of Bullying Behavior with Einarsen et al. 2009 Study

Einarsen et al. (2009) studied workplace bullying and in separating the 22 questions of the NAQ-R, defined three factor types of behavior: work-related bullying, person-related bullying, and physically intimidating. These three types are not identified in the questionnaire nor are the questions in order by these factor types.

Component questions. Factor analysis of the Einarsen et al. (2009) study places the NAQ-R questions into the following components as explained in Chapter 1 (pages 12–13):

- Work-related Bullying: Questions 1, 3, 14, 16, 18, 19, 21
- Person-related: Questions 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 20
- Physically intimidating: Questions 8, 9, 22

Factor analysis. When analyzing the factor loading types for the latent variables in this study as compared to the 2009 study, results demonstrate that questions of the current survey fall differently into three components that will be referred to in this study by the following— Workplace Intimidation, Emotional Intimidation, and Physical Intimidation. Two questions (14 and 18) appear in two of the components, Workplace Intimidation and Emotional Intimidation, and have been dropped and noted in the tables.

In only one question, Q9, "Intimidating behaviors such as finger pointing, invasion of personal space, shoving, blocking your way" in the Workplace Intimidation component, does the factor loading in the current study show a stronger relationship than in the Einarsen et al. (2009) study, and the remaining questions in the Workplace Intimidation and Physical Intimidation components show a similar relationship. In one component, Emotional Intimidation, analysis shows a factor loading variance greater than .10 and up to .37 in 7 out of 11 questions. Table 20 illustrates the factor loadings from the results of the Einarsen et al. study and compares them to the current study.

Table 20

Workplace Intimidation Factor Loading Comparison

NAQ-R Question	Current Study	Einarsen, Hoel, and Notelaers Study
Q1. Someone withholding information which affects your performance	.67	.71
Q3. Being ordered to do work below your level of competence	.76	.77
Q4. Having key areas of responsibility removed or replaced with more trivial or unpleasant tasks	.77	.86 (in person-related bullying factor)
Q14. Having your opinions ignored	(Analyzed into both Workplace and Emotional and therefore dropped)	.88
Q16. Being given tasks with unreasonable deadlines	.77	.85
Q18. Excessive monitoring of your work	(Analyzed into both Workplace and Emotional and therefore dropped)	.82
Q19. Pressure not to claim something to which by right you are entitled	.71	.77
Q21. Being exposed to an unmanageable workload	.73	.81

Table 21

Emotional Intimidation Factor Loading Comparison

NAQ-R Question	Current Study	Einarsen, Hoel, and Notelaers Study
Q2. Being humiliated or ridiculed in connection with your work	.79	.86
Q5. Spreading gossip and rumors about you	.70	.84
Q6. Being ignored or excluded	.74	.83
Q7. Having insulting or offensive remarks made about your person, attitudes or your private life	.77	.87
Q10. Hints or signals from others that you should quit your job	.79	.93
Q11. Repeated reminders of your errors or mistakes	.80	.90
Q12. Being ignored or facing a hostile reaction when you approach	.80	.88
Q13. Persistent criticism of your work or work-effort	.89	.95
Q15. Practical jokes carried out by people you don't get along with	.48	.85
Q17. Having allegations made against you	.79	.92
Q20. Being the subject of excessive teasing and sarcasm	.72	.91

Table 22

Physical Intimidation Factor Loading Comparison

NAQ-R Question	Current Study	Einarsen, Hoel, and Notelaers Study
Q8. Being shouted at or being the target of spontaneous anger	.87	.88
Q9. Intimidating behaviors such as finger pointing, invasion of personal space, shoving, blocking your way	.90	.86
Q22. Threats of violence or physical abuse or actual abuse	.78	.83

Linear regression of Workplace, Emotional, and Physical Intimidation. A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict the Workplace Intimidation component of adult bullying based on demographic, and target and bully variables. A significant regression equation was found, $F(3,77) = 8.023$, $p < .000$, with an R2 of .238. Significant predictors for this regression are listed in Table 23.

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict the Emotional Intimidation component of adult bullying based on demographic, and target and bully variables. A significant regression equation was found, $F(4,76) = 8.823$, $p < .000$, with an R2 of .317. Significant predictors for this regression are listed in Table 23.

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict the Physical Intimidation component of adult bullying based on demographic, and target and bully variables. A significant regression equation was found, $F(2,78) = 9.022$, $p < .000$, with an R2 of .188. Significant predictors for this regression are listed in Table 23.

Linear regressions were conducted for each of the three components: Workplace Intimidation, Emotional Intimidation, and Physical Intimidation, against all variables in the study with the exclusion of the NAQ-R questions. Table 23 illustrates the significant variables and their Beta coefficients' value and probability levels remaining at the end of the regressions in each of three component categories.

Table 23

Comparison of Final Regression for Workplace, Emotional, and Physical Intimidation with Beta Coefficients and Probability Level

Survey Question	Workplace Intimidation Beta Coefficient with P Levels	Emotional Intimidation Beta Coefficient with P Levels	Physical Intimidation Beta Coefficient with P Levels
Q35. More than one person besides yourself by the same bully	.254***	.438***	
Q35. More than one person besides yourself by a different bully	.359*	.310**	
Q40. What position did the bully have in relation to your/their position – Same level Colleague			.553*
Q43. What age was the bully in relation to your age	.136*	.220*	.566***
Q44. What was the approximate age of the bully		.208*	

* Significant at the .05 probability level.

** Significant at the .01 probability level.

*** Significant at the .001 probability level.

Comparison to Bies

As reviewed in Chapter 1 (pp. 10–11) of this study, in 2001, Bies explained and provided examples for the four categories of Interactional Justice:

1. Derogatory judgments—Wrongful or unfair accusations about work performance, being discredited, bad-mouthing someone behind their back, and using pejorative labels such as "troublemaker" or "traitor."
2. Deception—Failing to fulfill the expectations of honesty and honoring promises in dealings with others as a foundation of trust, being lied to, being manipulated, and breaking promises of help or promotion.
3. Invasion of privacy—The disclosure of confidences and secrets, asking improper questions, the recruiting and use of spies within the organization, and demanding employees be snitches.
4. Disrespect—The lack of timely feedback, inconsiderate actions, failure to explain decisions, abusive words or actions, rudeness, publically criticizing and berating people, destruction of physical property, threatening or physical violence, actions intended to embarrass or humiliate, insults, name calling, questioning intellectual capacities, inflicting undue psychological or physical pain, coercion, and duress.

For the purpose of this study each of the 22 NAQ-R questions were divided into Bies's categories as follows:

- Derogatory judgments: Questions 2, 5, 11, 13, 15
- Deception: Questions 1, 3, 4, 10, 16, 18, 19, 21

- Invasion of privacy: No questions identified although Question 7 may be indirectly identified as such, but the question also includes non-private components and was, therefore, included in the Disrespect category
- Disrespect: Questions 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 20, 22

Mean of Derogatory, Deception, and Disrespect components. In analyzing the relationships between the results of this study of adult bullying behaviors and Bies's (2001) four categories of interactional justice, results show that the Derogatory component had a calculated mean of 1.5, the Deception component had a mean of 1.8, and the Disrespect component had a mean of 1.5 on a 5-point scale of 1–5 from *never* to *daily* occurrences of adult bullying behavior.

Although having the highest mean, the Deception component had only two of the four highest mean in questions: Q1, "Someone withholding information which affects your performance" (2.0), and Q21, "Being exposed to an unmanageable workload" (2.6). The Disrespect component also had two of the four highest mean: Q6, "Being ignored or excluded" (2.1), and Q14, "Having your opinions or views ignored" (2.1). The Disrespect component also had the lowest two mean: Q15, "Practical jokes carried out by people you don't get along with" (1.1), and Q22, "Threats of violence or physical abuse or actual abuse" (1.1).

The loading factor mean for the Derogatory component was .68, the Deception component .71, and the Disrespect component .69.

Variable significance in Derogatory component. It is notable that no significance was identified during regression for the variables in the demographic areas such as school district size, district location (urban, suburban, rural), the years worked in the respondent's school and district, age of target, the age difference between the target and bully, and in the working relationship between the target and the bully.

Variables demonstrating minor significance included the highest level of education achieved by the target, the workplace location level (e.g., grade level or building level such as elementary or high school), and gender of target and bully. Slightly more significance was shown for workplace location level and gender issues. Only the variables of "more bullying by the same bully" and "more bullying by a different bully" in the same building of the target demonstrated significance.

Variable significance in Deception component. In the Deception component, regressions show similar results. Variables that showed no to minor significance included demographics such as age, longevity in building/district, position, building level and type, district size or location, and gender of the target. The variables of significance include (a) more bullying by the same bully, (b) more bullying by a different bully, (c) the age of the bully in relation to your age, and (d) the approximate age of the bully.

Variable significance in Disrespect component. Regression for the Disrespect component also resulted in no to minor significance for variables in the areas of demographics of the target and location data. Variables showing the highest significance were (a) more bullying by the same bully, (b) more bullying by a different bully, and (c) the age of the bully in relation to your age.

Linear regression of Derogatory, Deception, and Disrespect components. A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict the Derogatory component of adult bullying based on demographic, and target and bully variables. A significant regression equation was found, $F(2,78) = 10.937, p < .000$, with an R^2 of .219. Significant predictors for this regression are listed in Table 24.

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict the Deception component of adult bullying based on demographic, and target and bully variables. A significant regression equation was found, $F(5,75) = 7.049$, $p < .000$, with an R2 of .320. Significant predictors for this regression are listed in Table 24.

A multiple linear regression was calculated to predict the Disrespect component of adult bullying based on demographic, and target and bully variables. A significant regression equation was found, $F(3,77) = 11.390$, $p < .000$, with an R2 of .307. Significant predictors for this regression are listed in Table 24.

Table 24 illustrates the variables remaining after conducting linear regressions with their Beta coefficients' value and probability levels for each of the Bies components against all of the variables in the demographic questions, the bullying characteristic questions, and all other survey questions outside the NAQ-R. Two variables remained in common in the three Components—the same, or a different bully, bullied more than one person in their schools.

Table 24

Comparison of Final Regression for Derogatory, Deception, and Disrespect Components with Beta Coefficients and Probability Level

Survey Question	Derogatory Beta Coefficients with P Levels	Deception Beta Coefficients with P Levels	Disrespect Beta Coefficients with P Levels
Q35. One person besides yourself by the same bully		.200*	
Q35. More than one person besides yourself by the same bully	.452***	.419***	.413***
Q35. More than one person besides yourself by a different bully	.209*	.327**	.297**
Q43. What age was the bully in relation to your age		.247*	.274**
Q44. What was the approximate age of the bully		.207*	

* Significant at the .05 probability level.

** Significant at the .01 probability level.

*** Significant at the .001 probability level.

Optional Question

Optional survey Question 46 asked participants, "If you have personally experienced adult bullying or witnessed adult bullying, please share your story. Please do not use names, specific locations, or identifying characteristics." Of the total ($N = 324$), 22.8% of survey participants chose to respond to this optional question, and those 74 comments can be broken in to seven categories. See Appendix E for a preliminary analysis.

Some of the participants' responses are used at the beginning of chapters in this dissertation to illustrate the personal experiences, impact on, and thoughts of targets of K-12 workplace bullying and not to illustrate any qualitative form of research.

Summary of Data Analysis

This chapter reported the results of data analysis for this non-experimental, explanatory, quantitative research survey of K-12 educators and other K-12 school employees in Michigan. Total survey respondents numbered 324.

Demographic data from the respondents were compared with Michigan K-12 data (CEPI, 2016) when available, and frequencies of being bullied were calculated by gender, education level, position, longevity in district and building, district location, and union membership.

Data were gathered through the utilization of the 22 question Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised (NAQ-R), 10 questions to identify school characteristics and demographic data of the respondents, and 13 questions to ask respondents if they or others in their building were being bullied and to identify characteristics of the workplace environment, target and the bully, and one optional question if participants wanted to make a comment (Appendix E). Demographic results were compared with Michigan education data and results of the NAQ-R, and adult bullying characteristics were illustrated in Tables 1–24.

Regression of variables, with the exception of the NAQ-R questions, were completed and compared with Einarsen et al. (2009) study of workplace bullying categories. This 2009 survey defined three factor types of behavior within the 22 questions: work-related bullying, person-related bullying, and physically intimidating behavior. Three slightly different categories of Emotional Intimidation, Physical Intimidation, and Workplace Intimidation were identified and compared to the 2009 results.

Variables, again with the exception of the NAQ-R questions, were analyzed through regression with Bies's (2001) theory of interaction justice (as discussed on pages 19–20 of this research) and variables demonstrating the highest significance were identified.

-It is terrifying to report to the district about being bullied daily and then become the target of retaliation not only by the bully but by the administration and board. Doctor says I will not live through this if I don't quit or try to control the stress which is causing major health problems.

-Thank you for recognizing that this goes on everyday at public schools. I wanted to say something but was afraid of reprisal.

– Anonymous Bullying Research Survey Respondents

Chapter 5. Discussion

The purpose of this non-experimental, explanatory, quantitative study was to explore the prevalence of adult bullying of professional and non-professional K-12 employees from a sample of public school districts and public school academies in all 83 counties in Michigan; examine similarities and differences between adult bullying incidents reported and workplace climate, school demographics, and characteristics of the target using data from Michigan schools and previous bullying studies in the generalized workplace; compare results to the factors of work-related bullying, person-related bullying, and physically intimidating bullying identified by Einarsen et al. (2009); and examine the relationship to Bies's (2001) four categories of interactional justice—derogatory judgments, deception, invasion of privacy, and disrespect—developed from Greenberg's theory of organizational justice (Greenberg & Cropanzano, 2001).

Three research questions were asked and the following data and research summary will discuss the findings for these questions and conclusions.

Discussion and Conclusions for Research Question 1

The first research question of this study asks, "What similarities and differences exist between the prevalence and characteristics of adult workplace bullying in the generalized workplace (Namie, 2014; Workplace Bullying Institute, 2007) and the prevalence and characteristics of workplace bullying in the K-12 school environment?"

In this first of its kind, quantitative study of Michigan educators, results illustrate that adult-on-adult bullying occurs in the K-12 workplace in the state. Frequencies reported in this study indicate that 27.8% of respondents were bullied on an infrequent to daily rate during the first seven months of the 2016-2017 school year which compares closely with adult bullying levels in the generalized workplace. K-12 schools are not exempt from adults bullying other adults in their workplace.

Data collected in this study compare the prevalence of adult bullying in the K-12 work environment with the data from similar studies in the generalized workplace including business, higher education, organizations, and nursing where up to over one-third of adults experience bullying in their workplace (Namie, 2014; Workplace Bullying Institute, 2007). An even larger percentage of respondents, 41%, indicated that at least one other adult in their building was the target of adult-on-adult bullying.

Unlike the results of the Workplace Bullying Institute (WBI; 2007) study (as discussed on page 19 of this research study), where 72% of the adult bullies were reported to be bosses, K-12 school personnel in this study responded that most bullying (27.8%) was from a same level colleague and only 8% was by a supervisor, 18.8% by a building administrator, and 5.9% by a district administrator, for a total of 32.7%.

It is interesting to note that the results of this study show that 73.5% of the bullies were female as compared with 30% female from the latest WBI study (Namie, 2017). The respondents in this K-12 study, both male and female, also indicated that their bully was the same gender as themselves in 74.1% of the incidents compared to 65% male and 67% female in the WBI study.

The WBI (2007) study reported that only 40% of targets reported adult-on-adult bullying to their employers while 73.8% of those bullied in Michigan reported bullying incidents to someone in their school or district (Table 9). It could be argued that more school personnel reported being bullied to employers because, even though similar percentages were bullied by higher and same level adults (Table 11), more school personnel were bullied by a same level employee than in the generalized workplace and, therefore, felt they could report incidents to administrators.

WBI reports that 62% of employers ignore the problem of adult bullying in their workplace, but in this study, the outcomes of reported bullying were more varied (Table 10). K-12 school respondents seemed to indicate that their reported bullying was ignored less often, but it can be noted that respondents could and often indicated multiple responses. Only 11.1% of reports were ignored, although respondents also reported that for 25%, the bullying did not stop, and 3.1% indicated bullying increased after reporting. In only 18.2% of the incidents did respondents indicate the bullying stopped or the bully was disciplined or fired.

Discussion and Conclusions for Research Question 2

The second question asks, "What comparisons can be made between any identified latent bullying variables and the three inter-related factors associated with person-related bullying, work-related bullying, and physically intimidating bullying identified by Einarsen, Hoel, and Notelaers (2009)?"

It was interesting how closely the factor analysis grouped the latent variables for the questions of the NAQ-R in this study with the results of the Einarsen et al. (2009) study. There were few differences when conducting the factor analysis for the current data. As noted in Tables 20–22, results demonstrate that questions of the current survey fall into slightly different components that this study refers to as Workplace Intimidation, Emotional Intimidation, and Physical Intimidation.

Discussion and Conclusions for Research Question 3

The third question asks, "What relationships between adult bullying incidents and workplace climate, school demographics, and characteristics of the target and bully exist using Bies's (2001) four categories of interactional justice?"

It is not surprising to report that if one person is bullied in a building, others in the same building are also being bullied. Regressions completed for three of Bies's categories of interactional justice, as described on pages 19–20, and reported in Table 24, showed the only two of the variables respondents reported were in common in each of the categories. The two variables were that the same bully also bullied others in their building, and that a different bully bullied others in the building. These two variables also demonstrated the highest probability levels.

Additional Conclusions

A comparison can also be made between educational personnel bullying and student bullying research results. K-12 educational personnel have, as identified in this survey, been the target of adult-on-adult behavior at a frequency of 27.8%. In comparison to this percentage, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2017) reports that from 20.8% to one-third of K-12 students are bullied by fellow students. These educational personnel who are adult targets

of bullying often receive training in preventing and resolving student bullying but have not received similar training regarding adult bullying, with only 12.4% of survey respondents indicating they had received some type of training to recognize, prevent, or resolve adult bullying. As these results show, it would be a myth to assume they themselves would not bully or not work to prevent or resolve adult-on-adult bullying in the school workplace.

Similarly, Michigan now requires schools to approve and implement policies against student bullying, but policies to protect adults from adult bullies in these same schools seldom exist. With the current emphasis on requiring school districts in Michigan to develop and adopt policy to report, prevent and resolve student-on-student bullying under Matt's Safe School Law (Michigan Department of Education, 2017), it is notable that no such requirement or law regarding adult behavior in the K-12 workplace exists and only 18.2% of respondents reported their schools have policies regarding adult bullying.

Implications from This Study for Educational Leaders

Superintendents, schools boards, and school administrators must be proactive and engage in preventing and resolving adult bullying behavior in the K-12 workplace. If 27.8% of students in their schools were being bullied, immediate action would be demanded of them and action would be taken to help alleviate the problem. With 27.8% of the respondents to this study indicating another adult in their school is actively bullying them, and 41% reporting adult bullying occurs in their school from the same or a different bully, there is a definite negative workplace problem in their school or district for educational leaders to address.

The results of this study demonstrate the need for improvement in the climate of the K-12 workplace. It is past time to develop workplace bullying policies and procedures. Policy makers need to look to existing policies (Winchester MEA, 2013; Healthy Workplace Bill, 2011); adopt

and approve a district policy and local procedures, as suggested by Waggoner (2003); and enforce these policies to help prevent and resolve adult bullying.

Educational leaders must not ignore adult bullying problems. As this study reveals, reporting adult bullying incidents did not resolve the problem or stop the bullying in almost 40% of incidents (Table 10). Respondents also indicated that in over 65% of K-12 schools, the issue of adult bullying has never been addressed.

From the results of the NAQ-R questions (Table 5), 50–70% of respondents reported the highest level of negative acts in their workplace in the following areas: (a) feel they were exposed to an unmanageable workload, (b) believe their opinions or views are ignored, (c) feel ignored or excluded, (d) note someone is withholding information which affects their performance, and (e) believe they are given tasks with unreasonable deadlines. Identifying best practices in these areas would assist educational leaders move toward ameliorating these bullying factors.

The cry for help and protection by the target of adult bullying has been heard through these survey results. Action needs to be taken and be effective to reduce the toll adult bullying takes on the targeted person and on others in the school district. School leaders must address the stress and emotional toll on the target and the remaining staff and how adult bullying affects their performance if bullying were allowed to continue. As one respondent commented, "I am considering leaving the profession because treatment like this is not right and not helpful in our main purpose of providing an education to our students." There is a cost to the students and the school when teachers leave or cannot be recruited to teach or sub in their classrooms.

As stated in the dedication of this research study, administrators, school boards, educational leaders, and all K-12 education professionals and staff must be proactive and work

immediately to prevent, stop, and eliminate all bullying, both adult and student, by recognizing that bullying exists in the workplace, creating and enforcing anti-bullying policies, providing training for prevention of and resolving bullying, creating safe and non-retaliatory methods for targets to report bullying, mediating bullying incidents, providing avenues to a positive resolution, disciplining bullies, providing options for targets to recover from bullying, and, most importantly, providing all a safe, non-threatening place to work and learn.

Implications for Theory and Conceptual Frameworks to Study Adult Bullying

As described in the conceptual framework section of Chapter 1 and research tradition section of Chapter 3, many theories and conceptual frameworks have been used to study adult-on-adult bullying in the generalized workplace. The results of this study were analyzed through the lenses of the Einarsen et al. (2009) study, and the Bies's (2001) framework of interactional justice. Future adult bullying researchers need not look far from theories used in the past to frame their research and analyze adult bullying data.

Implications for Future Research

The number of respondents that could be recruited limited this study to a sample of K-12 educational personnel in Michigan. Further quantitative and qualitative research is needed to gain additional data about the prevalence and characteristics of adult-on-adult bullying in K-12 schools around the United States and elsewhere around the world.

As noted from the responses to the NAQ-R questions as illustrated in Table 5, more than half reported feeling they were exposed to an unmanageable workload, believe their opinions or views are ignored, feel ignored or excluded, note someone is withholding information which affects their performance, and believe they are given tasks with unreasonable deadlines. Further

research is needed to confirm this data and explore ways to lessen these negative workplace incidents in adult bullying.

Survey results and optional comments (Appendix E) from the survey respondents about their feelings, opinions, fear for their career, health, and adult bullying indicate additional research on adult-on-adult bullying in K-12 are needed to answer the following questions: How does the target change while and after being bullied? Does adult bullying affect the target's career, their personal life, or their health? What types and characteristics of bullies can be identified and why do they bully other adults?

The respondent comments about their health and careers and possibly leaving the field of education point to the need for studies to determine the financial costs to the school and district when they ignore adult bullying in their workplace. The target of bullying in K-12 schools may experience increased absences from work, experience more health care costs to deal with stress induced problems, or decide to leave the school or district. Recruiting replacements or substitutes, hiring, and training new replacements incur costs.

Respondents to this study have clearly indicated that adult bullying is occurring in K-12 schools in Michigan. It is past time to prevent and resolve adult bullying in the workplace. Will educational leaders stop tolerating and take the necessary action to address this problem?

References

- Badzmirowski, W. (2016). The difference between school bullying and workplace bullying. Retrieved from <https://www.crisisprevention.com/Blog/June-2016/School-Bullying-Workplace-Bullying>
- Baillien, E., & De Witte, H. (2009). Why is organizational change related to workplace bullying? Role conflict and job insecurity as mediators. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 30, 348-371.
- Be Nice. (2017). *Be Nice homepage*. Retrieved from <https://www.benice.org/>
- Belli, G. (2009). Nonexperimental quantitative research. In Lapan, S.D. & Quartaroli, M. T. (Eds.). *Research essentials: An introduction to designs and practices* (pp. 55-77). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons. 55-77. Retrieved from http://media.wiley.com/product_data/excerpt/95/04701810/0470181095-1.pdf
- Bergen Bullying Research Group. (2010). *NAQ*. Retrieved from <http://www.uib.no/rg/bbrg/projects/naq>
- Bies, R. J. (2001). Interactional (in)justice: The sacred and the profane. In J. Greenberg & K. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice* (pp. 89-118). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2003a). *Breaking the silence: Overcoming the problem of principal mistreatment of teachers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2003b). The phenomenology on principal mistreatment: Teachers' perspectives. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(4), 367-422.
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2006, Fall). Teachers' perspectives of principal mistreatment. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 123-142.

- Brunner, P. W., & Costello, M. L. (2003). When the wrong woman wins: Building bullies and perpetuating patriarchy. *Advances in Woman Leadership, 13*, 1-9.
- Burnham, J., Wright, V. H., & Houser, R. A. (2011). Cyberbullying: Emergent concerns for adolescents and challenges for school counselors. *Journal of School Counseling, 9*(15).
- Center for Educational Performance and Information. (2016). Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) Summary Report 2016. Retrieved from http://www.michigan.gov/documents/cepi/Fall_2016_REP_State_Summaries_560671_7.pdf
- Carrera, M. V., DePlama, R., & Lameiras, M. (2011). Toward a more comprehensive understanding of bullying in school settings. *Educational Psychology Review, 23*(4), 479-499. doi: 10.1007/s10648-011-9171x
- Cemaloglu, N. (2011). Primary principals' leadership styles, school organizational health and workplace bullying. *Journal of Educational Administration, 49*(5), 495-512.
- Cooper, C. L., Hoel, H., & Faragher, B. (2004). Bullying is detrimental to health, but all bullying behaviours are not necessarily equally damaging. *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling, 32*(3), 367-387. doi: 10.1080/03069880410001723594
- Cowan, R. L. (2009). "Rocking the Boat" and "Continuing to Fight": Un/Productive episodes and the problem of workplace bullying. *Human Communication, 12*, 283-302.
- Cowie, H., Naylor, P., Rivers, I., Smith, P. K., & Pereira, B. (2002). Measuring workplace bullying. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 7*, 33-51.
- Crawshaw, L. (2009). Workplace bullying? Mobbing? Harassment? Distractions by a thousand definitions. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 61*(3), 263-267. doi:10.1037/a0016590

- Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Davenport, N., Schwartz, R. D., & Elliott, G. P. (1999). *Mobbing: Emotional abuse in the American workplace*. Ames, IA: Civil Society Publishing.
- De Wet, N. C. (2011). Educator-on-educator workplace bullying: A phenomenological study. *Africa Education Review*, 8(3), 450-466.
- Dimsdale, T., & Kutner, M. (2004, December). *Becoming an educated consumer of research: A quick look at the basics of research methodologies and design*. Paper presented at the Meeting of the Minds Practitioner-Researcher symposium. Washington, D.C.: American Institutes for Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED491593). Retrieved from <http://www.air.org>
- Duffy, M. (2009). Preventing workplace mobbing and bullying with effective organizational consultation, policies, and legislation. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 61(3), 242-262. doi:10.1037/a0016578
- Eastern Michigan University Graduate School. (2010, Winter). *Dissertation Manual*. Ypsilanti, MI: Eastern Michigan University.
- Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Notelaers, G. (2009). Measuring bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure, and psychometric properties of the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised. *Work & Stress*, 23(1), 24-44.

- Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (2011). *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Fevre, R., Robinson, A., Jones, T., & Lewis, D. (2010). Researching workplace bullying: The benefits of taking an integrated approach. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 13(1), 71-85. doi: 10.1080/1364557080264671
- Gibbs, S. S. (2007). *Teachers bullied by other teachers* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses: Full Text database. (UMI No. 3273619)
- Greenberg, J. (2007). Positive organizational justice: From fair to fairer—and beyond. In J. E. Dutton & B. R. Ragins (Eds.), *Exploring positive relationships at work: Building a theoretical and research foundation* (pp. 159-178). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Greenberg, J. (2010). *Insidious workplace behavior*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Greenberg, J., & Cropanzano, R. (Eds.). (2001). *Advances in organizational justice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hall, P. S. (2005). Bullying and the teacher. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 72(1), 45-49.
- Harvey, M. G., Heames, J. T., Richey, R. G., & Leonard, N. (2006). Bullying: From the playground to the boardroom. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 12(4), 1-11.
- Healthy Workplace Bill Homepage. (2011). Retrieved from <http://www.healthyworkplacebill.org/>
- Healthy Workplace Bill State of the Union. (2016). Retrieved from <http://healthyworkplacebill.org/states/>

- Hickson, J. (2012). *Nursing hostility and job satisfaction as perceived by new graduate nurses: Magnet versus non-magnet hospitals*. (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses: Full Text database. (UMI No. 3508503)
- Hodson, R., Roscigno, V. J., & Lopez, S. H. (2006). Chaos and the abuse of power: Workplace bullying and interactional context. *Work and Occupations, 33*, 382-416.
doi:10.1177/0730888406292885
- Hoel, H., Cooper, C. L., & Faragher, B. (2001). The experience of bullying in Great Britain: The impact of organizational status. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10*(4), 443-465.
- Hogh, A., Mikkelsen, E. G., & Hansen, A. M. (2011). Individual consequences of workplace bullying/mobbing. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Workplace bullying: Development in theory, research and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 129-147). London: Taylor & Francis.
- Houshmand, M., O'Reilly, J., Robinson, S., & Wolff, A. (2012). Escaping bullying: The simultaneous impact of individual and unit-level bullying on turnover intentions. *Human Relations, 65*(7), 901-918. doi:10.1177/0018726712445100
- Hout, A. (2016). *Are you being bullied at work?* Retrieved from <http://www.overcomebullying.org>
- Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2012). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Keashly, L. (2001) Interpersonal and systemic aspects of emotional abuse at work: The target's perspective. *Violence and Victims, 16*(3), 233–268.

- Keashly, L. (2010). Some things you need to know but may have been afraid to ask: A researcher speaks to ombudsmen about workplace bullying. *Journal of the International Ombudsman Association*, 3(1), 10-23.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). *Foundations of behavior research* (3rd ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Lee, R. T., & Brotheridge, C. M. (2006). When prey turns predatory: Workplace bullying as a predictor of counteraggression/bullying, coping, and well-being. *European Journal of Work and Psychology*, 15(3), 352-377.
- Lutgen-Sandvik, P. (2006). Take this job and....: Quitting and other forms of resistance to workplace bullying. *Communication Monographs*, 73(4), 406-433.
doi:10.1080/03637750601024156
- Lutgen-Sandvik, P., & Tracy, S. J. (2012). Answering five key questions about workplace bullying: How communication scholarship provides thought leadership for transforming abuse at work. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 26(1), 3-47. doi:
10.1177/0893318911414400
- Lutgen-Sandvik, P., Tracy, S. J., & Alberts, J. K. (2007). Burned by bullying in the American workplace: Prevalence, perception, degree and impact. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44(6), 837-862.
- Malahy, S. (2015). *Workplace bullying: Teacher-to-teacher* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses: Full Text database. (UMI No. 3739757)
- Mattice, C. M. (2012). *White paper: The cost of bad behavior in the workplace*. Retrieved from <http://civilitypartners.com>
- Mattice, C. M. (2016). *Civility Partners*. Retrieved from <http://civilitypartners.com/keynotes/>

- Meglich-Sespico, P., Faley, R. H., & Knapp, D. E. (2007). Relief and redress for targets of workplace bullying. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 19, 31-43.
doi:10.1007/s10672-006-9030y
- Michigan Department of Education, (2017). *OK2SAY Program*. Retrieved from http://www.michigan.gov/ok2say/0,5413,7-309-69477_69480---,00.html
- Milam, A. C., Spitzmueller, C., & Penney, L. M. (2009). Investigating individual differences among targets of workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(1), 58-69. doi:10.1037/a0012683
- Namie, G. (2003, November-December). Workplace bullying: Escalated incivility. *Ivey Business Journal*, 1-6.
- Namie, G. (2014). *2014 WBI U.S. workplace bullying survey*. Retrieved from <http://www.workplacebullying.org/wbiresearch/wbi-2014-us-survey/>
- Namie, G. (2017). *2017 WBI U.S. workplace bullying survey*. Retrieved from <http://www.workplacebullying.org/wbiresearch/wbi-2017-survey/>
- Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2000). *The bully at work: What you can do to stop the hurt and reclaim your dignity on the job*. Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks, Inc.
- Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2009). U.S. workplace bullying: Some basic considerations and consultation interventions. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 61(3), 202-219. doi:10.1037/a0016670
- Namie, G., Namie, R., & Lutgen-Sandvik, P. (2009). Challenging workplace bullying in the USA: A communication and activist perspective. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Workplace bullying: Development in theory, research and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 447-467). London: Taylor & Francis.

- National Education Association. (2012). *Workplace bullying: A silent crisis*. Retrieved from http://neatoday.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/13039_BullyingBklet_new.pdf
- Nielsen, M. B., Notelaers, G., & Einarsen, S. (2011). Measuring exposure to workplace bullying. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Workplace bullying: Development in theory, research and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 149-174). London: Taylor & Francis.
- Office of the Governor. (2012). *Snyder signs anti-bully bill*. Retrieved from <http://www.michigan.gov/snyder/0,4668,7-277--266963--,00.html>
- Parsons, L. (2005). *Bullied teacher, bullied student: How to recognize the bullying culture in your school and what to do about it*. Markham, Ontario, Canada: Pembroke Publishers.
- Rayner, C., & Hoel, H. (1997). A summary review of literature relating to workplace bullying. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 7, 181-191.
- Roscigno, V. J., Lopez, S. H., & Hodson, R. (2009). Supervisory bullying, status inequalities and organizational context. *Social Forces*, 87(3), 1561-1589.
- Salin, D. (2003). Ways of explaining workplace bullying: A review of enabling, motivating and precipitating structures and processes in the work environment. *Human Relations*, 56(10), 1213-1232.
- Simons, S. R., Stark, R. B., & DeMarco, R. F. (2011). A new four-item instrument to measure workplace bullying. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 34, 132-140.
- Sioux City Community Schools. (2015). Workplace bullying. Policy Code Number 403.5. Retrieved from <http://www.siouxcityschools.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/403.5.pdf>
- Sperry, L. (2009). Mobbing and bullying: The influence of individual, work group, and organizational dynamics on abusive workplace behavior. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 61(3), 190-201. doi:10.1037/a0016938

- S.T.A.R. School Technology Action Report (2012). *Tackling School Bullying: What you need to know about bullying and cyber bullying legislation, prevention, and best practices*. Bethesda, MD: eSchoolNews. Retrieved from <http://www.eschoolnews.com/files/2012/06/STARBullyingHMH0604.pdf>
- Thoroughgood, C. N., Tate, B. W., Sawyer, K. B., & Jacobs, R. (2012). Bad to the bone: Empirically defining and measuring destructive leader behavior. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 19(2), 230-255.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2015). *Student reports of bullying: Results from the 2015 School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey*. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2017/2017015.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2017). *Prevention at school*. Retrieved from <https://www.stopbullying.gov/prevention/at-school/index.html>
- Vega, G., & Comer, D. R. (2005). Sticks and stones may break your bones, but words can break your spirit: Bullying in the workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 58, 101-109.
doi:10.1007/s10551-005-1422-7
- Vickers, M. H. (2004). The traumatized worker: A concern for employers and employees. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 16, 113-116.
- Von Bergen, C. W., Zavaletta, J. A., & Soper, B. (2006). Legal remedies for workplace bullying: Grabbing the bully by the horns. *Employee Relations Law Journal*, 32(3), 14-40.
- Waggoner, C. (2003, August). Teachers behaving badly. *American School Board Journal*, 29-31.
- Wardell, M. M. (2011). *The effects of bullying on men and women in American workplaces* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses: Full Text database. (UMI No. 3482735)

- Washington State Department of Labor and Industries. (2008, April). *Workplace bullying: What everyone needs to know*. (Report No. 87-2-2008). Retrieved from <http://www.lni.wa.gov/Safety/Research/Files/Bullying.pdf>
- Williford, A., & Depaolis, K. J. (2016). Predictors of cyberbullying intervention among elementary school staff: The moderating effect of staff status. *Psychology in the Schools*, 53(10), 1032-1044. doi:10.1002/pits.21973
- Winchester Massachusetts Education Association. (2013). *Teacher contract*. Retrieved from <http://winchester.massteacher.org/local-contracts/teacher-contracts/>
- Workplace Bullying Institute. (2010). *Schools tackle teacher-on-teacher bullying*. Retrieved from <http://www.workplacebullying.org/tag/sioux-city-community-schools/>
- Workplace Bullying Institute. (2007). *2007 United States workplace bullying survey*. Retrieved from <http://www.workplacebullying.org>

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised (NAQ-R)

Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised

The following behaviors are often seen as examples of negative behavior in the workplace. Over the last 6 months, how often have you been subjected to the following negative acts at your current job? Please circle the number that best corresponds with your response.

	Never	Now and Then	Monthly	Weekly	Daily
1. Someone withholding information which affects your performance	1	2	3	4	5
2. Being humiliated or ridiculed in connection with your work	1	2	3	4	5
3. Being ordered to do work below your level of competence	1	2	3	4	5
4. Having key areas of responsibility removed or replaced with more trivial or unpleasant tasks	1	2	3	4	5
5. Spreading of gossip and rumors about you	1	2	3	4	5
6. Being ignored or excluded	1	2	3	4	5
7. Having insulting or offensive remarks made about your person, attitudes or your private life	1	2	3	4	5
8. Being shouted at or being the target of spontaneous anger	1	2	3	4	5
9. Intimidating behaviors such as finger-pointing, invasion of personal space, shoving, blocking your way	1	2	3	4	5
10. Hints or signals from others that you should quit your job	1	2	3	4	5
11. Repeated reminders of your errors or mistakes	1	2	3	4	5

12. Being ignored or facing a hostile reaction when you approach	1	2	3	4	5
13. Persistent criticism of your work or work-effort	1	2	3	4	5
14. Having your opinions or views ignored	1	2	3	4	5
15. Practical jokes carried out by people you don't get along with	1	2	3	4	5
16. Being given tasks with unreasonable deadlines	1	2	3	4	5
17. Having allegations made against you	1	2	3	4	5
18. Excessive monitoring of your work	1	2	3	4	5
19. Pressure not to claim something to which by right you are entitled (e.g., sick leave, holiday, entitlement, travel expenses)	1	2	3	4	5
20. Being the subject of excessive teasing and sarcasm	1	2	3	4	5
21. Being exposed to an unmanageable workload	1	2	3	4	5
22. Threats of violence or physical abuse or actual abuse	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix B: Permission to Use NAQ-R

Reprinted with permission.

From: Ståle Einarsen <Stale.Einarsen@psysp.uib.no>
Subject: FW: Negative Acts Questionnaire
To: "cjkleinhe@yahoo.com" <cjkleinhe@yahoo.com>
Date: Wednesday, August 8, 2012, 11:51 AM
Dear Cynthia

Thank you for your interest in the Negative Acts Questionnaire. I have attached the English version of the NAQ, a SPSS database, psychometric properties of the questionnaire and the articles suggested on our website. Please use the Einarsen, Hoel and Notelaers article (2009) in *Work and Stress* as your reference to the scale. I have also attached a book chapter on the measurement of bullying where you also find information on how to measure bullying.

We hereby grant you the permission to use the scale on the condition that you accepted our terms for users found in the work file attached to this mail. Please fill this in and return.

One of our terms is that you send us your data on the NAQ with some demographical data when the data is collected. These will then be added to our large Global database which now contains some 50.000 respondents from over 40 countries. Please send them as soon as your data is collected. A SPSS database is attached to this mail in the Naqinfo file.

If you have any questions, we will of course do our best to answer them.

In case of problems with opening the rar-file? Please have look at this guide: <http://www.tech-pro.net/howto-open-rar-file.html>

Best regards,
Professor Ståle Einarsen
Bergen Bullying Research Group

Appendix C: Consent Form and Survey as Distributed Through SurveyMonkey

You have been randomly selected to participate in a short 10-12 minute online workplace climate survey. Your perspective and experiences in the K-12 workplace in Michigan will be invaluable in studying the workplace climate in school buildings and how it compares to the workplace climate in other types of organizations. For this survey, workplace climate is defined as the conditions in the school as viewed by and among employees in the areas of communication, behavior, treatment, conflict, and working relationships.

Some questions regarding negative climate may make you feel uncomfortable. You do not have to answer any questions that make you feel uncomfortable or that you do not want to answer.

My name is Cynthia Kleinheksel and I am a doctoral student in educational leadership at Eastern Michigan University. If you have any questions regarding the survey or your participation, please contact me directly at ckleinhl@emich.edu. For questions about your rights as a survey participant, you can contact the Eastern Michigan University Office of Research Compliance at human.subjects@emich.edu or by phone at 734-487-3090.

Your response to this survey will be kept in strict confidence and will be analyzed in combination with other respondents to protect your privacy, and stored in password protected computer files.

Compiled results from this online survey will be used in dissertation research and may be published or used for teaching and further research by researchers outside of Eastern Michigan University. Any possible identifiable information will not be used for these purposes. While you may not directly benefit from participating in this research, the results could positively influence the K-12 school workplace climate.

Participation in this research study is your choice. You may refuse to participate at any time, even after clicking to consent to this form. You may choose to leave the study at any time. If you leave the study, the information you provided will be kept confidential. You may request, in writing, that your identifiable information be destroyed. However, we cannot destroy any information that has already been published.

Consent:

I have read this form. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and am satisfied with the answers I received. By clicking "Yes" I consent to participate in the survey or "No" to not participate. Click "Continue" below to access the survey or exit this survey.

Thank you for participating in this survey. Your feedback is important.

1. Do you consent to participate in this survey as described? You must click Yes in order to take the survey.

- Yes
- No

2. Your position in school building or district?

- Paraprofessional/Teacher Aide
- Building Support (Custodial, Cafeteria, Security, etc.)
- Student Support (Counselor, Nurse, Psychologist, Social Worker, etc.)
- Teacher
- Administrator
- Other (please specify)

3. Building where you spend most time working

- Preschool
- Elementary
- K-8
- Middle School/Jr. High
- High School
- Alternative School
- Vocational School
- Central Office
- Other (please specify)

4. Number of years you worked in this district

- 1 or less
- 2 to 4
- 5 to 10
- 11 to 15
- 16 to 20
- More than 20

5. Number of years you worked in current building

- 1 or less
- 2 to 4
- 5 to 10
- 11 to 15
- 16 to 20
- More than 20

6. Is your school district/school considered

- Urban
- Suburban
- Rural

7. Total number of K-12 students in your school district

- Under 500 students
- Under 2,000 students
- 2,001 to 10,000 students
- Over 10,000 students

8. Are you a member of a school employee union?

- Yes
- No

9. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- High school degree or equivalent (e.g., GED)
- Some college but no degree
- Technical/Vocational College
- Associate degree
- Bachelor degree
- Graduate degree
- Doctorate

10. Are you male or female?

- Male
- Female

11. What is your age?

- 18 to 25
- 26 to 35
- 36 to 45
- 46 to 55
- 56 to 65
- 65 or older

The following behaviors are often seen as examples of negative behavior in the workplace. During the current school year, how often have you been subjected to the following negative acts in your current position?

12. Someone withholding information which affects your performance

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

13. Being humiliated or ridiculed in connection with your work

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

14. Being ordered to do work below your level of competence

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

15. Having key areas of responsibility removed or replaced with more trivial or unpleasant tasks

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

16. Spreading of gossip and rumors about you

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

17. Being ignored or excluded

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

18. Having insulting or offensive remarks made about your person, attitudes or your private life

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

19. Being shouted at or being the target of spontaneous anger

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

20. Intimidating behaviors such as finger-pointing, invasion of personal space, shoving, blocking your way

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

21. Hints or signals from others that you should quit your job

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

22. Repeated reminders of your errors or mistakes

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

23. Being ignored or facing a hostile reaction when you approach

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

24. Persistent criticism of your work or work-effort

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

25. Having your opinions or views ignored

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

26. Practical jokes carried out by people you don't get along with

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

27. Being given tasks with unreasonable deadlines

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

28. Having allegations made against you

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

29. Excessive monitoring of your work

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

30. Pressure not to claim something to which by right you are entitled (e.g., sick leave, personal days, holiday, entitlement, travel expenses)

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

31. Being the subject of excessive teasing and sarcasm

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

32. Being exposed to an unmanageable workload

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

33. Threats of violence or physical abuse or actual abuse

- Never
- Infrequently
- Monthly
- Weekly
- Daily

34. Using the following definition, please state whether you have been bullied at work during the current school year? Have you been bullied at work? Adult bullying is defined as the repeated and persistent nonphysical mistreatment of a person including verbal abuse, threatening conduct, intimidation, attempts to frustrate or wear down, humiliate, pressure, and provoke that threatens the psychological integrity, career, safety, and health of the target. We will not refer to a one-time incident as bullying.

- Never
- Yes, infrequently
- Yes, monthly
- Yes, weekly
- Yes, daily

35. Using the same definition of bullying as in Question 33, have others in your workplace been bullied?

- No one has been bullied in your workplace
- Yes, one person beside yourself – by the same bully
- Yes, one person beside yourself – by a different bully
- Yes, more than one person beside yourself – by the same bully
- Yes, more than one person beside yourself – by a different bully

36. What was your role in any adult bullying situation in your workplace? (Check all that apply)

- Target/Victim
- Bully
- Witness
- Mediator
- Person to whom adult bullying was reported
- No role

37. To what degree has your K-12 workplace addressed adult workplace abuse? (Either separate or a part of your student bullying policy) (Check all that apply)

- Adopted a workplace abuse policy including examples of disrespectful/unacceptable behavior among adults
- Specified what steps will be taken if adult bullying is identified
- Used adult conflict resolution and/or mediation to ensure problems have been resolved
- Provided administrative and/or staff training to recognize, prevent, or resolve adult bullying
- Has not been addressed
- Other (please specify)

38. If you or someone else in your building were the target of adult bullying in your K-12 workplace, to whom did you/they report the problem? (Check all that apply)

- No One
- Building administrator
- District administrator
- Human Resources Dept.
- School Board
- Union
- Other (please specify)

39. If you or someone else in your building reported a problem with adult bullying in your K-12 workplace, what was the outcome? (Check all that apply)

- Nothing changed/the bullying did not stop
- The bullying increased
- The bullying stopped
- The report was ignored
- You/they were encouraged not to file a formal report
- You/they were reprimanded/disciplined
- You/they experienced retaliation
- The bully was disciplined
- The bully was fired
- You/they changed position or moved to another building
- Other (please specify)

40. If you or someone else in your building were the target of adult bullying in your K-12 workplace, what position did the bully have in relation to your/their position? (Check all that apply)

- Supervisor
- Building administrator
- District administrator
- Same level colleague
- Support position
- Student
- Parent
- Other (please specify)

If you were not the target of adult bullying in your K-12 workplace, please skip to Question 45.

41. If you were the target of adult bullying in your K-12 workplace, specify the gender of the bully in relation to your gender.

- Same gender
- Opposite gender

42. If you were the target of adult bullying in your K-12 workplace, specify the gender of the bully.

- Female
- Male

43. If you were the target of adult bullying in your K-12 workplace, what age was the bully in relation to your age?

- Approximately same age
- Older
- Younger

44. If you were the target of adult bullying in your K-12 workplace, what was the approximate age of the bully?

- 18 to 25
- 26 to 35
- 36 to 45
- 46 to 55
- 56 to 65
- Over 65

45. If you were the target of adult bullying in your K-12 workplace, what reactions did you observe from witnesses to the bullying incident(s)? (Check all that apply)

- There were no witnesses
- Witnesses did nothing
- Witnesses attempted to intervene to stop the bullying situation
- Witnesses participated in bullying
- Witnesses reported the bullying to appropriate authorities
- Witnesses were upset or stressed by the bullying situation
- Witnesses discussed the bullying with you
- Other (please specify)

46. (Optional) If you have personally experienced adult bullying or witnessed adult bullying, please share your story. Please do not use names, specific locations, or identifying characteristics.

RESEARCH @ EMU

UHSRC Determination: EXEMPT

DATE: March 26, 2017

TO: Cynthia Kleinheksel

Department of Leadership and Counseling

Eastern Michigan University

Re: UHSRC: # 1028557-1

Category: Exempt category 2

Approval Date: March 26, 2017

Title: Dissertation proposal

Your research project, entitled **Dissertation proposal**, has been determined **Exempt** in accordance with federal regulation 45 CFR 46.102. UHSRC policy states that you, as the Principal Investigator, are responsible for protecting the rights and welfare of your research subjects and conducting your research as described in your protocol.

Renewals: Exempt protocols do not need to be renewed. When the project is completed, please submit the **Human Subjects Study Completion Form** (access through IRBNet on the UHSRC website).

Modifications: You may make minor changes (e.g., study staff changes, sample size changes, contact information changes, etc.) without submitting for review. However, if you plan to make changes that alter study design or any study instruments, you must submit a **Human Subjects Approval Request Form** and obtain approval prior to implementation. The form is available through IRBNet on the UHSRC website.

Problems: All major deviations from the reviewed protocol, unanticipated problems, adverse events, subject complaints, or other problems that may increase the risk to human subjects **or** change the category of review must be reported to the UHSRC via an **Event Report** form, available through IRBNet on the UHSRC website

Follow-up: If your Exempt project is not completed and closed after **three years**, the UHSRC office will contact you regarding the status of the project.

Please use the UHSRC number listed above on any forms submitted that relate to this project, or on any correspondence with the UHSRC office.

Good luck in your research. If we can be of further assistance, please contact us at 734-487-3090 or via e-mail at human.subjects@emich.edu. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Beth Kubitskey

Chair

College of Education Human Subjects Review Committee

Appendix E: Results of Optional Question

The quotations used at the beginning of chapters are taken from comments anonymous survey participants provided in response to the last optional question (Q46) in the survey (Appendix C) in which they were asked to comment or share their experience as the target or witness of workplace bullying without using any identifiable names, locations, or personal characteristics. The quotes are used to illustrate the personal experiences, impact on, and thoughts of targets of K-12 workplace bullying and not to illustrate any qualitative form of research.

Of the total ($N = 324$), 22.8% of survey participants chose to respond to this optional question, and those 74 comments can be broken in to seven categories. The number of comments and the percentage out of the total of 74 comments are listed in parentheses:

1. Describing incidents of adult bullying directed toward self (34 or 45.9%)
2. Describing incidents of adult bullying witnessed toward others (10 or 13.5%)
3. Relaying incidents of adult bullying outside the timeline specified for reporting or outside of their K-12 building (13 or 17.6%)
4. Expressing different or limited definitions of adult bullying other than used in survey (6 or 8.1%)
5. Expressing comments about the survey itself (3 or 4.1%)
6. Describing the question as "not applicable" (4 or 5.4%)
7. Making positive comments about their workplace or that adult bullying was not happening in their building (4 or 5.4%)