

Workplace Bullying in Organizational Contexts: A Case-Study Review from the Organizational Behavior and Management Theory

Noel Muñiz-Rodríguez, Antonio Ariza-Montes* and Vicente Fernández-Rodríguez

Universidad Loyola Andalucía, Spain

*Corresponding Author: Antonio Ariza-Montes, Universidad Loyola Andalucía, Spain.

Received: August 04, 2017; Published: September 20, 2017

Abstract

In their personal development, people often seek their fulfillment, both physical and spiritual, becoming part of collectives that allow them to reaffirm their existence in society and thus satisfy, somehow, their particular expectations in life; being work perhaps, in the times we currently live, the most important facet of this individual and primordial longing. However, working environments are not always what we expect.

In our workplace, different situations typically linked to the logic interaction between individuals converge; peers that, despite belonging to the same community, enjoy different rankings and functions: an authentic and unique kingdom with particular and very specific networking and organizational characteristics.

These job characteristics are established in any economic unit through a joint but differentiating process that distinguishes those who determine the functions to be performed from those who have to materialize them. Such functioning substantially entails a series of contingent procedures in which, by means of mechanisms and combinations of “demand control” or “effort and reward” or “demand and resources,” certain impulses known as “stressors” exert their influence among those involved; giving rise to what is generally known as working conditions.

Working conditions therefore define the facilities or contingencies that could be found in the realization of our daily work activity. Its proper balance in the organization allows us to cultivate our capacity for learning, innovating and socializing, to name a few; however, when this balance is negatively broken on any tier of the organization, it can stimulate the emergence of certain relational tensions associated to the manifestation of abuse of power or authority, isolation and intentional exclusion, lack of support and labor solidarity, and many other forms of unfair treatment that sometimes we suffer, observe or even inflict on our colleagues in the workplace, labeling them with some familiarity under the English terminology of bullying or mobbing.

Indeed, several types of bullying have been studied: intimidation, harassment, victimization, aggression, emotional abuse, and psychological harassment or mistreatment at workplace, among others; this variation in definitions may hinder the conceptualization of the workplace-bullying phenomenon in a more consistent way, inhibiting effective contributions among researchers and practitioners.

Furthermore, bullying is commonly defined by its social manifestations, which are clearly classifiable under the same umbrella as aggressive behavior that generally occurs during interpersonal interactions in work settings. Regarding the extent of its manifestation, there is a strong disagreement about the prevalence of bullying; recent estimates range from 4% to 5% in Northern European Countries to 15% in Southern European nations. Certain factors, such as cultural characteristics and social changes, seem to explain the variations in these prevalence rates, as do issues related to the lack of a consensual definition for the event previously mentioned and certain research methodologies. For instance, studies on workplace bullying have utilized a wide variety of measurement methods, instruments, and research designs, to the extent that it appears reasonable to consider certain methodological procedures to be biased with respect to their reported prevalence rates.

Bullying is undoubtedly the most perverse expression that may arise from the constant human interactions within organizations; particularly for the innumerable psychosocial risks it embodies and the harmful health effects unfortunately caused at short, medium, and long term to those involved.

Because of the exponential occurrence of workplace bullying in contemporary world, its research has been rated as urgent, not only in the field of organizational behavior and management, but also in arenas such as health and psychology; being supported with increasing determination by the leading governments worldwide, including the European Union.

The present cases-study approach analyzes, through a corpus of findings obtained in workplace bullying exploration of concrete professional collectives –healthcare workers, managers, teacher, and teaching professionals, the potential identification of latent “risk groups” in occupational and professional populations from the perspective of the contextualization of subjects in behavioral and organizational management research, evidencing the prevailing dimensions in dissimilar organizational environments.

This work sustains the much cited work environment hypothesis linked to bullying and stressful work environment, providing implications for reducing organizational levels of workplace bullying by adjusting certain working conditions to those professionals especially susceptible to be bullied.

It evidences the potential design and implementation of promising guidelines in the prevention and alleviation of adverse well-being perception among staff, enriching thus the comprehension of this actual predicament and helping responsible ones facilitate well-adjusted environments and relationships in working settings.

The general conclusions of this analysis highlight an array of outcomes that propose, within the usual course of events, that workplace bullying could be reduced if job demands were fairly limited and job resources were suitably increased.

Keywords: Workplace Bullying; Organizational Behavior; Management Theory

Introduction

A job characteristics approach to explain workplace bullying

During the last two decades, numerous researchers in the organizational behavior and management arena –among many other academic fields have dedicated their scientific attempts to help explain how certain dimensions, either at the individual or the organizational level, might potential trigger the appearance of bullying in occupational settings [1,2].

In this regard, and as a sort of example, it is suggested that individuals with limitation to socialize or with specific personality traits could bear higher chances to become victims of workplace bullying [3]. In spite of this, current research on individual antecedents has not firmly demonstrated coherent outcomes [4].

In this vein, the general framework for the present case-study work is found on the proposition that workplace bullying turns to be inherently coupled to contingent organizational conditions [5,6] and job design [4]; that is why, according to Leymann [7], employers or their surrogates should permanently guarantee “non-bullying provoking” situations in their own occupational settings.

The point is that working conditions, as work-related antecedents of workplace bullying, are usually encapsulated as particular job traits deeply rooted in the Job-Characteristic Model and Work Redesign claimed by Hackman and Oldham [8], where these job characteristics and the subject’s traits mingle to shape an environment that whether tend or not to constructive behaviors enhanced milieu or imminent exposure to occupational abuses poor milieu [9-11], essential tenets for the statement of the Work Environment Hypothesis. Likewise, this perspective integrates and explains to some extent the fundamental roles of the bully, the team synergy, and the target notions on bullying events [12,13]. In spite of this, Hauge., *et al.* [14] allege that knowledge of the association between working conditions and bullying is still fractional.

The work environment hypothesis, thus, is based on the premise that job settings, where stress and paucity of competent organization, may bring up some critical drivers for the surfacing of workplace bullying, contending that certain traits of the work environment could have some direct bearing on maltreatment at work, providing a stressful organizational climate where this kind of negative acts might burgeon [6] and health turns totally detrimental [3].

In this vein, deleterious consequences and occupational strains have been inextricably intertwined on subject’s health, and utilized as essential constituents to formulate one of the most relevant and leading theories in occupational stress: the Job Demand–Control (JDC) Model [15,16].

According to Karasek [15], excessive job demands and the dearth of job control lead to nurture emotional drainage, stress, and frustration; spawning tensions and frictions among personnel, hampering adaptive coping mechanisms, and snowballing into the violation of norms, habits, expectations, values, violent behaviors and finally bullying the strain hypothesis [17]. However, as a stimulus-response approach, JDC-Model may conversely lead to the recreation of a learning and motivational atmosphere, with new behaviors and abilities, by concurrently incrementing job demands and job control the learning hypothesis. Indeed, JDC model may provide a fertile field for the comprehension of bullying phenomenon on subjects [17].

In the view of the strain hypothesis, on one hand, target’s reports of bullying in extant research have been positively correlated to adverse working conditions such as high workload and low autonomy [18,19], role conflict and lack of constructive leadership behavior [18], unbalanced social climate and poor working conditions [20]; being lumped all together, thus, as potential predictors, while job satisfaction significantly behaves negatively associated to this regrettably event [14].

On the other hand, the association between occupational stress, workplace bullying, and subject's health seem to be concatenated in physical ramifications. In this regards, it is remarkable the number of cases liking psychological exhaustion, depletion of energy, fear, anxiety, depression, sleep problems, posttraumatic stress syndrome, suicide thoughts, cardiopathies, and burnout among several others to the multiple forms of harassment and violent at work [21], yet resulting in bullying "targetization" for targeted employees [22].

Another approach linked to job strain and violent behaviors is the Effort Reward Imbalance (ERI) Model [23]. From this standpoint, it is presupposed that job tensions and strain happen as a disproportion between extrinsic job demands/intrinsic motivations to cope with demands effort and a collection of drivers such as esteem, status, salary, job security and other opportunities reward. The premise enacts that inappropriate balance might potentially trigger occupational stress.

Finally, it is remarkable to underline that all the former theoretical frameworks have been ultimately abridged into a well-known assumption in organizational behavior and management, claimed by professors Bakker and Demerouti and dubbed as the Job Demand-Resources model [24,25]. According to this proposition, job characteristics (encapsulated in job demands or job resources) bear latent effects on occupational health and, therefore, on personnel welfare and institutional robustness.

Thus, on the foregoing, job demands allude to any either physical/psychological or social/organizational workplace characteristics, which entail constant efforts or competences not only cognitive but emotional in connection with particular detriment of physiological and/or psychological nature: unbalance between work and family life, poor physical working conditions, occupational pressure, unpleasant experiences with customers or users [25].

When the convergence of demands implies excessive subject's involvement from which they are not prepared to endure, those demands could ultimately become job stressors [26], vindicating once again the destructive advent of workplace bullying.

However, JD-R model may engender motivational drivers among personnel intrinsically and extrinsically speaking since job resources could potentially induce to depleted cynicism, job commitment, learning eagerness, work excellence, and the achievement of personal and organizational aspirations.

Identifying bullying "risk groups" among distinct occupations: Working conditions and psychosocial risks

The current case-study approach pursues to analyze the foremost findings on four different European professionals, focusing on those latent "target groups" with the potentially precise attributes to experience and suffer from workplace bullying, and examining the results from a compendium of personal characteristics, working conditions, and sectoral traits that seem to define, to some extent, potential predictors for the appearance of these unjustifiable events.

In the study of workplace bullying, the comprehension of "risk group" arrangement turns significantly essential for the establishment of reliable internal measures of prevention in occupational settings [27,28]. However, Hauge., *et al.* [14] state that only certain studies in extant research have been conducted relying on representative samples of concrete working populations. The following paragraphs illustrate the most relevant findings in professional milieus plus some of the most pertinent personal characteristics within each sector, both in connection with bullying target groups.

The manifestation of bullying target groups within professionals sectors

Bullying research seems to indicate that victimization risk happens to be more salient in the public sector, compared to the private one [29-31]; for instance, in the public administration [2], health and educational sectors [2,32], education employees [33], police officers [34], among many others.

Within the private sector, trade and commerce [35], as well as hotel and restaurant industry [36] report noteworthy outcomes in this arena. Similarly, white-collar, supervisory, and service employees, exhibit more significant bullying rates than blue-collar jobholders [37].

In this vein, Zapf, *et al.* [37] posit that the highest prevalence rate of occupational bullying can be found amongst industrial workers, and frequently identify among graphical-work jobholders, hotel and restaurant employees, and banking and insurance sectors; while lower ratios are registered for psychologists, farming and university employees, and building industry.

In this regard, Zapf, *et al.* [37] deduce that working in public-service sector, for instance, makes professionals more vulnerable to workplace harassment because of the elevated degree of personal interactions and involvement, as well as the long-term nature of public job contracts prevailing in European countries; broadening the chances for continual and permanent hostilities.

However, this last circumstance could paradoxically help emerge jobholders' resilience to harassment at work due to the sense of a secured lifelong job and a considerable difficulty of applying the acquired skills in a new private-sector post, compensating this fact to some extent the bad attitude of colleagues and superiors [37] and its adverse consequences on job satisfaction and health [38].

Personal traits and job characteristics for bullying "targetization" within sectors

Some studies have centered their attention to the importance of personal traits or variables within the different lines of research on bullying. One of the most studied personal traits regarding occupational bullying is gender. In this vein, research seems to prove that there are more bullied females than males at workplace. Nevertheless, on the word of professors Zapf, *et al.* [30], just a 27% of the research gives an account of more female targets after contrasting gender distribution in bullied subjects with the complete gender distribution in observed samples.

For various reasons, women hold less powerful positions in organizations. Consequently, women are even less able than men to defend themselves when bullying emerges – e.g. in managerial or supervisory positions [39]. In weighing percentages relating to sample, the results depict a 62.5% of women as victims, while a 37.5% happens to be men [37].

According to Zapf, *et al.* [37], these results might indicate that part of the overarching explanation could be found in the overrepresentation of women among targeted subjects given the overrepresentation of women in concrete collectives, concluding that workplace bullying turns acute for certain sectors and professional groups due to their overrepresentation of women.

Another widespread explanation is based on minority groups, which owing to their differences in significant traits compared to the core fraction of peers bear higher risk of exclusion [40], such as the police force [41], the collective of assistant nurses [42], among others. It seems clear that further research is still needed on this personal characteristic not just to identify whether or not gender prevalence exists within a specific sector, but also to help explain why it may appear and how to tackle its development and progression.

Age has been, as well considered by various researchers, as another potential personal characteristic that might cause subjects to be prone to triggering bullying emergence. In this sense, some studies unfold certain exposure to ill treatment not only for senior members of the personnel [35,43], but also for novel colleagues holding lower levels of formal or informal authority [44,45] since as beginners it could take time for the rest of the collective to accept them.

As stated by professor Notelaers [28], middle-aged workers from public sector appear to bear an appreciably salient risk of bullying victimization while young jobholders with temporary contracts seem to exhibit a slight risk. In the view of the foregoing, staff with stable contracts and no shift work at night is less inclined to suffer from harassment.

Similarly, organizational position seems to be to some extent a fair job characteristic that could expose employees to workplace bullying as potential risk driver; however, Notelaers [28] asserts that research in this arena turns rather insufficient and inconsistent in term of

its findings: less bullying at higher levels of the organization [29], comparable bullying propensity for lower-level jobholders, supervisors, and middle/senior management [46]; significant exposure for white-collar staff compared to the lower level registered for blue-collar peers [47], while male personnel and supervisors seem to be more prone than women at both levels to suffering from harassment even when at the management level the ratios happen to be divergent [37].

Likewise, work process is considered a critical job characteristic for bullying risk among professionals. In this vein, Ortega, *et al.* [48] affirm that there exists substantial dissimilarity when it comes to harassment prevalence at work as comparing this job characteristic with organizational position or status. For instance, it seems that the propensity to suffer from bullying escalates when jobholders happen to be inexperienced, contrary to the occurrences for managers or supervisors that turn rather inferior; moreover, among male dominated and female-dominated professions, studies give an account of a more elevated maltreatment exposure compared to those who deal with clients and symbols [48].

Accordingly, Hoel and Cooper [49] argue that employment contract, as a job characteristic, represents a latent risk driver for bullying incidence at workplace. Based on this argumentation, short-term staff seems to be more inclined to suffer from abuses due to a wrong appreciation of these as potential intrusion to general job stability and teamwork unity [50].

The organizational prerogative of contextualizing bullying research in management theory

A significant observation to context as been conducted and assessed during the last four decades in scientific research, being extensively validated by the copious demands of a more critical reflection of contextualizing subjects in management theory [51], in the view of a further overarching comprehension and explanation of human behavior in concrete organizational settings or contexts; thus, contextualization may help exploit generalizability and study crucial observable fact and social interconnections thoroughly [52].

In an attempt to conceptualize context, numerous academics have incorporated their approaches to the general theorization. In this regard, professor Johns [51] describe context as a field of situational opportunities and constraints that might come to influence on the materialization of an event, organizational behavior, or functional association among measures –such as physical workplace conditions [53], normative environments, or organizational climate [54]. Additionally, at a major level, behavior of organizations could be affected by internal regulations or particular structures pertaining to specific regimes [55].

However, according to Ross and Nisbett [56], it appears that relevant contextual triggers might eventually exert minor repercussions on subject' conduct, while conversely minor contextual stimuli might ultimately cause remarkable effects.

Furthermore, today development in statistical approaches and software applications has turned to be essential for accelerating the evolution from contextualization to context theory formation and assessment; in this vein, studying how setting or occasional group of variables arises and mediates mechanisms to elicit their influence on subjects happens to be of the highest interest in behavior and management theory [52].

In the present case-study analysis, it is revised the scientific results obtained in three different organizational context healthcare workers, managers, and teaching professionals and one subgroup teachers within educational professionals in order to identify bullying “risk groups” of exposure. In line with the previous paragraphs, the research in the contextual milieu of these collectives turns reasonable since they might explain under which conditions certain context-related variables shape the configuration of these targeted employees within both health and education sectors, where it is factually assumed the existence of salient bullying prevalence. For the case of managers, these deleterious behaviors have been barely studied and contextualized in this sort of staff and status position.

Conclusions

From a utilitarian perspective, the conclusions referenced below encapsulate promising implications not only for healthcare workers, managers, teachers, and teaching professionals, but also for hospitals, clinics, companies, schools, educational institutions, and any other public or private organization that pursues the continual improvement of their own occupational health, internal networking harmony, and organizational performance. Its outcomes could be implemented within organizations via dynamic and integral policies primarily led by the responsible and aimed at facilitating healthy and harmonious social relationships among professionals and other closely linked stakeholders.

Those people in charge could ground their strategies in certain guiding principles positively prevailing in their own sectoral settings, such as fairly limiting job demands, properly increasing job resources, managing conflict through problem solving [57], enhancing social resources of institutions such as opportunities to receive professional recognition or social support [58,59] among others.

Furthermore, upgrading professionals interests, adjusting variables presumably connected to job dissatisfaction, adverse working conditions, and jobholders' wellbeing (especially of those susceptible of being bullied), nurturing group cohesion and organizational climate [60], and fostering organizational culture could increase organizational health promotion and a more proactive implication at work [61].

The execution of these potential solutions could certainly bring benefits to organizations in enhancing professionals' welfare, motivation, and management; as well as contributing to a higher quality of knowledge curiosity and transfer. Its effects could have a concurrent impact on families, local communities, and even regional or national governments as well [62].

Having said that, the next paragraphs summarize the conclusions for this case-study.

Firstly, according to Ariza-Montes., *et al.* [63], the research on European healthcare workers reveals a prevalence rate of 11.3%, labeling themselves thus as bullied in their specific professions; nevertheless, this ratio is still far from the results obtained in the U.S., where 38% of the healthcare employees report psychological harassment [64]. This relationship is similar to that described by Dellasega [65], who finds that 44.0% of nurses experience episodes of bullying at some point during their working lives. Additionally, the regression analysis outcomes indicate a tendency for young female healthcare workers with only secondary education and with children at home to suffer bullying; the group described above is certainly in a position of greater weakness in relation to other groups that have greater power, for example, men with university degrees or higher seniority in their organizations: these women, therefore, are more likely to end up as victims of workplace bullying.

Furthermore, some organizational factors are found to increase the odds of workplace bullying against healthcare workers. At the organizational level, this study emphasizes that the propensity for a healthcare worker to experience bullying escalates among those who work on a shift schedule, perform monotonous and rotating tasks, suffer from work stress, experience a lack of satisfaction due to their working conditions, and do not perceive any opportunity for promotion within their organization. These settings seem to be characterized by insecurity, role conflict, and tension, allowing few opportunities for socialization and even less time for conflict resolution, and contributing to the emergence of aggressive behaviors and bullying where a stressful social climate and precarious work atmosphere create a breeding ground for workplace bullying, as reflected in the present study.

Secondly, the research conducted by Ariza-Montes., *et al.* [66] on European senior and middle managers unveils a prevalence rate of 49.5% in European subjects who have labeled themselves as bullied within their respective professions. This relation is similar to that described by Woodman and Cook [67] where 49.0% of middle managers report having been bullied in the last three years. Comparable but in other professions, Dellasega [65] finds that 44.0% of nurses experience episodes of bullying at some point during their working

lives; and more recently Mintz-Binder and Calkins [68] reveal that the 32.8% of program directors affirm having been exposed to bullying due to the influence of students and faculty within the last 12 months. These results indicate that the rate of workplace bullying for professionals in managerial positions is larger than the predicted average calculated, with similar parameters, for employees laboring in any other occupational level and sector.

On the other hand, the regression analysis here utilized seems to indicate at the individual level a tendency for female managers, who are living with children under 15 at home, to suffer from bullying; this group appears somehow to be in a position of greater likelihood to suffer from bullying in relation to the other identified groups, for example, men with or without children under their care.

These circumstances could definitely make the subjects of this group particularly more vulnerable and likely to end up as victims of workplace bullying. Furthermore, some organizational factors are found to increase the odds of workplace bullying against managers. For instance, with respect to working conditions, this study emphasizes that the propensity at the organizational level for a worker in a managerial position to experience bullying escalates among those who work in poor working conditions such as working at night and on a shift system, suffer from job stress, experience a lack of satisfaction due to their working conditions and payment, and perceive reduced opportunity for promotion within their organization. Moreover, seniority, job insecurity, and type of sector seem to have no effect on workplace bullying among managers.

Adjusting job demands and improving job resources and conditions may lessen workplace bullying among managers. To this respect, one option could be to orientate general directors about “internal marketing” as a way to sell the company culture internally to employees and senior/middle managers and to somehow help prevent these negative organizational experiences [69,70].

Thirdly, the research in European teachers discloses some noteworthy research conclusions. At the first place, Ariza-Montes., *et al.* [71] detects a prevalence workplace bullying rate of 4.4% among these subjects, which turns to be a very different result from other contemporary studies [72-77]; this variation might arise from the diverse methodologies researchers utilize to assess their own workplace bullying ratios. However, this value reveals that teaching activity is under several tension foci, which are rooted in accentuated demands that teachers must face nowadays.

In this line, following the research conclusions, these demands certainly result in direct impacts on subject’ health, concretely on the stress level developed during his/her work; indeed, the main stressors within the academic environment are having to deal daily with angry customers that neither value nor respect the teacher’s effort, the work overload, the performance of tasks that come into conflict with personal values, the high emotional demand of work, the accomplishment of monotonous tasks and having to take work to home during weekends. All of this generates feelings of anguish and frustration that, sooner or later, can lead to work-related stress.

Additionally, the high vocational component of the teaching profession, coupled with the availability of certain resources that are unique and idiosyncratic of the teaching activity, generates among these a motivational process that can counterbalance the demands tied to it. In this way, the analysis indicates that job resources (such as perceiving a good salary, receiving feedback from the supervisor about the performance reached, the possibility of choosing the coworkers, career opportunities and the support from colleagues) have an important influence on European teachers’ motivation. Conversely, it was neither possible to find support for the impact of JR (Job-Resource relation) on work-related stress, nor the effect of JD (Job-Demands relation) on the employees’ motivation.

On the other hand, this academic work finds support for the main focus of this research the teachers’ workplace bullying perception, as teachers happen to be more stressed when they are more likely to perceive a feeling of harassment; while, among the more motivated ones, this feeling gets reduced. From this perspective, bullying among teachers would result from an unstable set of balances between the stress experienced as a result of the demands that must be faced and the degree of intrinsic motivation that they raise due to the resources provided by the institution. Accordingly, this research suggests that only those work environments in the education sector where

resources have more weight than the demands can generate a healthy organizational environment conducive to reduce the negative effects of workplace bullying.

Finally, regarding teaching professionals, the examined research in teaching professionals denotes a structural model that exhibits a strong predictive connection between self-reported bullying and detrimental health perception in these European people [78], which makes the exposition to episodes of occupational harassment an evident distress signal for future emotional and physical complications in victims. According to this propositional approach, workplace bullying here acts as a predictive predecessor of health deterioration; in essence, its early detection might substantially facilitate the implementation of internal precautionary actions in educational organizations.

It might corroborate that teachers tend to grade their own health perception as negative mostly under the premise of having experienced intense stress levels, recurrent absence of motivation, and inadequate work-family balance; while involvement in complex tasks, shift work, copious amount of assignments, limited grades of autonomy, and further inclusion in night work do not seem to prove a significant relevance [78].

Furthermore, when the individual influence on health is modeled, occupational stress, complex tasks, and work overload emerge as the utmost powerful conditions; others such as work-family balance, autonomy, night work, and motivation denote moderated significance, while performing monotonous tasks happens to behave irrelevantly [78].

When it comes to job dissatisfaction, as mediating construct, appears to evidence a higher probability of health deterioration when teachers report having been exposed to bullying episodes; particularly for the personal dissatisfaction associated with working conditions, salary, and promotion, resulting intrinsically related to bullying by mediating and hardening its effects on teachers' health impairment [78].

On the other hand, the association of both deteriorated working conditions and job dissatisfaction constructs seemingly reveals that displeased teachers who additionally report suffering from intense stress, inadequate work-family balance, copious amount of assignments, unusual involvement in complex tasks, recurrent absence of motivation, limited grades of autonomy, and further inclusion in shift or night work, are more predisposed to perceive health deterioration; while performing monotonous tasks behaves irrelevant [78].

Focused on this mediating effect, it seems that both working conditions and occupational health tend to exhibit correlations when job satisfaction declines in teachers; this clarifying assertion sheds light on latent positive associations of indirect path from specific working conditions to occupational health through job satisfaction, and reinforce the need for close and pertinent surveillance of school environment for potential tuning of educators' job contentment [78].

Further Research

The present review of scientific results, compiled in the here presented case-study approach, has spawned a bundle of new questions, which represent a non-negligible source of potential future research on the prediction of workplace bullying risk groups within professional occupations; the general proposition is arranged as follows:

First, the research examined offers an empirical basis for further studies related to healthcare workers and health sector issues in Europe. For instance, it is suggested to examine in more depth matters related to managerial function such as attracting and retaining the

most qualified and experienced professionals for successful and competitive healthcare organizations, urging them to implement strategies oriented toward reducing workplace bullying.

Second, this scientific exploration on European managers proposes a promising ground for further research. It is recommended a further examination of potential sexist attitudes in occupational settings, as well as other structural barriers that could inhibit women's careers to a certain extent compared to their male colleagues; this examination could definitely contribute to the definition of this and other groups as particularly more vulnerable ones in which people are likely to end up as victims of workplace bullying.

Third, research in bullied teachers in Europe invites for further exploration on the utilization of other methodological tools that may certainly identify the origin of the bullies or bullying perpetrators in this arena -superiors, colleagues, students, etc, assessing the relationships between the different types of perpetrators and teachers' workplace bullying, and constituting a clearly future research line to address in next works. In this regard, Negative Acts Questionnaire [79] is considered as a potential line for further research, particularly in those issues related to delving into other demand factors and resources accessible to educators, segmenting the sample of teachers as demands and resources may differ from one educational level to another.

Finally, the research here studied on European teaching professionals suggests for further research the examination of the specific role of job satisfaction intermediation on teacher management, mainly for the scarcity of studies on this domain. Indeed, future explorations on this subject could be oriented as well to the examination of additional environmental factors that may jointly help elaborate organizational policies to better working conditions and infrastructures in learning settings.

Moreover, further research may derive from both the delimitation of teaching professionals' subcategories even by country and sector, and the utilization of other ways to collect and obtain subject's information such as the Negative Acts Questionnaire Revised [80,81] in order to assess potential variations in constructs responses and health perception.

Bibliography

1. Coyne I, *et al.* "Predicting workplace victim status from personality". *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 9.3 (2000): 335-349.
2. Zapf D. "Organisational, work group related and personal causes of mobbing/bullying at work". *International Journal of Manpower* 20.1-2 (1999): 70-85.
3. Mikkelsen E and Einarsen S. "Basic assumptions and symptoms of posttraumatic stress among targets of bullying at work". *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 11.1 (2002): 87-111.
4. Giorgi G and Majer V. "Il mobbing in Italia. Uno studio condotto presso 21 organizzazioni (Mobbing in Italy. A study in 21 Italian organizations)". *Risorsa Uomo* 14.3 (2008): 171-188.
5. Leymann H. "Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces". *Violence and Victims* 5.2 (1990): 119-126.
6. Bowling NA and Beehr TA. "Workplace bullying from the target's perspective: A theoretical model and meta-analysis". *Journal of Applied Psychology* 91 (2006): 998-1012.
7. Leymann H. "The content and development of mobbing". *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 5.2 (1996): 165-184.
8. Hackman JR and Oldham GR. "Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory". *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 16.2 (1976): 250-279.

9. Baillien E and De Witte H. "Why organizational change is related to workplace bullying: Role conflict and job insecurity as mediators". *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 30.3 (2009): 348-371.
10. De Cuyper, *et al.* "Job insecurity and workplace bullying among targets and perpetrators: Moderation by employability". *Work and Stress* 23.3 (2009): 206-224.
11. Notelaers G., *et al.* "Workplace bullying: A job characteristics approach". *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 19.4 (2010): 487-504.
12. Zapf D. "European research on bullying at work". In P. McCarthy, J. Rylance, R. Bennet, & H. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Bullying: From backyard to boardroom*. Sydney: Federation Press (2001): 11-22.
13. Notelaers G., *et al.* "Testing the strain hypothesis of the Demand Control Model to explain severe bullying at work". *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 34.1 (2013): 69-87.
14. Hauge LJ, *et al.* "Relationships between stressful work environments and bullying: Results of a large representative study". *Work and Stress* 21.3 (2007): 220-242.
15. Karasek RA. "Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign". *Administrative Science Quarterly* 24.2 (1979): 285-308.
16. Karasek RA and Theorell T. "Healthy work: Stress, productivity, and the reconstruction of working life". New York: Basic books (1990).
17. Baillien E., *et al.* "Job autonomy and workload as antecedents of workplace bullying: A two-wave test of Karasek's Job Demand Control Model for targets and perpetrators". *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* 84.1 (2011): 191-208.
18. Einarsen S., *et al.* "Bullying and harassment at work and their relationships to work environment quality: An exploratory study". *The European Work and Organizational Psychologist* 4.4 (1994): 381-401.
19. Zapf D., *et al.* "On the relationship between mobbing factors, and job content, social work environment, and health outcomes". *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 5.2 (1996): 215-237.
20. Vartia M and Hyyti J. "Gender differences in workplace bullying among prison officers". *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 11.1 (2002): 113-126.
21. Matthiesen SB and Einarsen S. "Psychiatric distress and symptoms of PTSD among victims of bullying at work". *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling* 32.3 (2004): 335-356.
22. Hoel H and Salin D. "Organisational antecedents of workplace bullying". In: S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C.L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in research and practice*. London: Taylor and Francis (2003): 203-218.
23. Siegrist J and Peter R. "Measuring effort-reward imbalance at work: Guidelines". Düsseldorf, Germany: Heinrich Heine University (1996).
24. Bakker AB., *et al.* "Dual processes at work in a call centre: An application of the Job Demands-Resources model". *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 12.4 (2003): 393-417.
25. Demerouti E., *et al.* "The job demands-resources model of burnout". *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86.3 (2001): 499-512.
26. Meijman TF and Mulder G. "Psychological aspects of workload". In PJ. Drenth, H. Thierry, & C.J. de Wolff (Eds.), *Handbook of Work and Organisational Psychology*, 2nd edition. Hove, UK: Erlbaum (1998): 5-33.

27. Schat ACH., *et al.* "Prevalence of workplace aggression in the U.S. workforce: Findings from a national study". In E.K. Kelloway, J. Barling, & J.J. Hurrell (Eds.), *Handbook of Workplace Violence*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage (2006): 47-89.
28. Notelaers G., *et al.* "Exploring risk groups workplace bullying with categorical data". *Industrial Health* 49.1 (2011): 73-88.
29. Salin D. "Prevalence and forms of bullying among business professionals: A comparison of two different strategies for measuring bullying". *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 10.4 (2001): 425-441.
30. Zapf D., *et al.* "Empirical findings on bullying in the workplace". In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C.L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace. International perspectives in research and practice*. London: Taylor & Francis (2003): 103-126.
31. Piirainen H., *et al.* "Työ Ja Terveys -Haastattelututkimus v. Taulukkoraportti". Finland: Finnish Institute of Occupational Health (2000).
32. Mikkelsen GE and Einarsen S. "Bullying in Danish work-life: Prevalence and health correlates". *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 10.4 (2001): 393-413.
33. Hubert AB and van Veldhoven M. "Risk sectors for undesired behaviour and mobbing". *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 10.4 (2001): 415-424.
34. Waddington PA and Braddock Q. "'Guardians' or 'Bullies'? Perceptions of the Police amongst adolescent black, white and Asian boys". *Policing and Society: An International Journal* 2.1 (1991): 31-45.
35. Einarsen S and Skogstad A. "Bullying at work: Epidemiological findings in public and private organizations". *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 5.2 (1996): 185-201.
36. Mathisen GE., *et al.* "The occurrences and correlates of bullying and harassment in the restaurant sector". *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology* 49.1 (2008): 59-68.
37. Zapf D., *et al.* "Empirical findings on prevalence and risk groups of bullying in the workplace". In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C.L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice*. Boca Raton, FL: Taylor and Francis Group (2011): 75-106.
38. Arenas A., *et al.* "Workplace bullying in a sample of Italian and Spanish employees and its relationship with job satisfaction, and psychological wellbeing". *Frontiers in Psychology* 6 (2015): 1912.
39. Davidson MJ and Cooper CL. "Shattering the glass ceiling". London: Paul Chapman (1992).
40. Schuster B. "Rejection, exclusion, and harassment at work and in schools". *European Psychologist* 1 (1996): 293-317.
41. Nuutinen I., *et al.* "Tasa-arvo poliisitoimessa [Equality in the police force]". Helsinki: Työterveyslaitos, Sisäasiainministeriö (1999).
42. Eriksen W and Einarsen S. "Gender minority as a risk factor of exposure to bullying at work: The case of male assistant nurses". *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 13.4 (2004): 473-492.
43. Painter K. "Violence and vulnerability in the workplace: psychosocial and legal implications". In M.J. Davidson & J. Earnshaw (Eds.), *Vulnerable workers: Psychosocial and legal issues*. New York: John Wiley and Sons (1991): 160-178.
44. Einarsen S and Raknes BI. "Harassment in the workplace and the victimization of men". *Violence and Victims* 12.3 (1997): 247-263.
45. Paoli P. "Second European Survey on Working Conditions in the European Union". European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, Dublin (1997).

46. Hoel H., *et al.* "The experience of bullying in Great Britain: The impact of organizational status". *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 10.4 (2001): 443-465.
47. Piirainen H., *et al.* "Työ ja terveys -haastattelututkimus 2003. Taulukkoraportti [Work and health interview survey 2003. Table report]". Helsinki: Finnish Institute of Occupational Health (2003).
48. Ortega A., *et al.* "Prevalence of workplace bullying and risk groups: A representative population study". *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health* 82.3 (2009): 417-426.
49. Hoel H and Cooper CL. "Destructive conflict and bullying at work". Manchester, UK: University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology (2000).
50. Baron RA and Neuman JH. "Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes". *Aggressive Behavior* 22.3 (1996): 161-173.
51. Johns G. "The essential impact of context on organizational behavior". *Academy of Management Review* 31.2 (2006): 396-408.
52. Bamberger P. "Beyond contextualization: Using context theories to narrow the micro-macro gap in management research". *Journal of Academy of Management* 51.5 (2008): 839-846.
53. Elsbach KD and Pratt MG. "The physical environment in organizations". *Academy of Management Annals* 1.1 (2007): 181-224.
54. Bamberger PA and Biron M. "Group norms and excessive absenteeism: The role of peer referent others". *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 103.2 (2007): 179-196.
55. Rowley T., *et al.* "Redundant governance structures: An analysis of structural and relational embeddedness in the steel and semiconductor industries". *Strategic Management Journal* 21.3 (2000): 369-386.
56. Ross L and Nisbett RE. "The person and the situation: Perspectives of social psychology". Philadelphia: Temple University Press (1991).
57. Leon-Perez JM., *et al.* "The relationship between interpersonal conflict and workplace bullying". *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 30.3 (2015): 250-263.
58. Kokkinos CM. "Job stressors, personality and burnout in primary school teachers". *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 77.1 (2007): 229-243.
59. Stoeber J and Rennert D. "Perfectionism in school teachers: Relations with stress appraisals, coping styles, and burnout". *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping* 21.1 (2008): 37-53.
60. Giorgi G., *et al.* "Exploring personal and organizational determinants of workplace bullying and its prevalence in a Japanese sample". *Psychology of Violence* 3.2 (2013): 185.
61. Hosseinkhanzadeh AA., *et al.* "Investigate relationship between Job satisfaction and organizational culture among teachers". *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 84 (2013): 832-836.
62. Papanastasiou EC and Zembylas M. "Job satisfaction variance among public and private kindergarten school teachers in Cyprus". *International Journal of Educational Research* 43.3 (2005): 147-167.
63. Ariza-Montes A., *et al.* "Workplace Bullying among Healthcare Workers". *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 10.8 (2013): 3121-3139.

64. Dunn S. "What's Going on with Mobbing, Bullying and Work Harassment Internationally?" Workplace Bullying Institute: Bellingham, WA, USA (2003).
65. Dellasega CA. "Bullying among nurses". *American Journal of Nursing* 109.1 (2009): 52-58.
66. Ariza-Montes JA., et al. "Workplace Bullying among Managers: A Multifactorial Perspective and Understanding". *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 11.3 (2014): 2657-2682.
67. Woodman P and Cook P. "Bullying at Work: The Experience of Managers Chartered". Management Institute: London, UK (2005).
68. Mintz-Binder RD and Calkins RD. "Exposure to bullying at the associate degree nursing program director level". *Teaching and Learning in Nursing* 7.4 (2012): 152-158.
69. Sanchez-Hernandez MI and Miranda FJ. "Linking internal market orientation and new service performance". *European Journal of Innovation Management* 14.2 (2011): 207-226.
70. Sanchez-Hernandez I and Grayson D. "Internal marketing for engaging employees on the corporate responsibility journey". *Intangible Capital* 8.2 (2012): 275-307.
71. Ariza-Montes JA., et al. "Workplace Bullying among Teachers: An Analysis from the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model Perspective". *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 58.8 (2016): 818-827.
72. Keashly L and Neuman JH. "Final report: Workplace behaviour (bullying) project survey". Mankato: Minnesota State University (2008).
73. Herranz Bellido J., et al. "La prevalencia del estrés laboral asistencial entre los profesores universitarios [The prevalence of assistance work stress among university professors]". *Análisis y modificación de conducta* 32.146 (2006): 743-766.
74. Jennifer D., et al. "Perceptions and experience of workplace bullying in five different working populations". *Aggressive Behavior* 29.6 (2003): 489- 496.
75. Lewis D. "Workplace bullying-interim findings of a study in further and higher education in Wales". *International Journal of Manpower* 20.1-2 (1999): 106-119.
76. Spratlen LP. "Interpersonal conflict which includes mistreatment in a university workplace". *Violence and Victims* 10.4 (1995): 285-297.
77. Björkqvist K., et al. "Aggression among university employees". *Aggressive Behavior* 20.3 (1994): 173-184.
78. Muniz R., et al. "A Purposeful Approach for Implementing Preventive Measures among European Teaching Professionals: Bullying, Deteriorated Organizational Factors, and the Mediating Role of Job Dissatisfaction in Poor Health Perception". *International Journal of Human Resource Management* (2017).
79. Einarsen S and Hoel H. "The Negative Acts Questionnaire: development, validation and revision of a measure of bullying at work". Oral presentation at the 10th European Congress on Work and Organizational Psychology (2001).
80. Giorgi G., et al. "An operative measure of workplace bullying: The negative acts questionnaire across Italian companies". *Industrial Health* 49.6 (2011): 686-695.
81. Vukelić M., et al. "Psychometric properties of the Serbian version of the negative acts questionnaire-revised". *Psihologija* 48.1 (2015): 19-33.

Volume 5 Issue 4 September 2017

©All rights reserved by Antonio Ariza-Montes., et al.