Marshall University
Marshall Digital Scholar

1-1-2013

Antecedents to Mobbing

Anita Lois Lane
lane80@marshall.edu

ANTECEDENTS TO MOBBING

A thesis submitted to
the Graduate College of
Marshall University

In partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

in

Communication Studies

by
Anita Lois Lane

Approved by
Dr. Camilla Brammer, Committee Chairperson
Dr. Cynthia Torppa
Dr. Kristine Greenwood

Marshall University
May 2013

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank the faculty of the Marshall University Communication Studies Department for all their moral and academic support. I am grateful for Douglas Evans and his extensive knowledge in statistical analysis. Dr. Cynthia Torppa went over and beyond her academic duties to provide me with guidance and constant support. Dr. Cam Brammer has been a constant academic and socially nurturing professional throughout this journey. Dr. Kristine Greenwood provided exceptional academic and pedagogical support. Thank you, Dr. Stephen Cooper for your abilities to minimize the stress associated with graduate students, like me, who wondered if they would abundantly meet the academic deadlines and demands with success. A special thank you goes out to my family for their constant patience through my academic journey and to Leon Ordonez for continuing maintenance of domestic services that minimized my life interruptions to complete my graduate studies.

Abstract

The research examines possible antecedents to mobbing behavior. Mobbing typically occurs following a bullying incident. Dyadic Power Theory (Dunbar, 2004) is applied to the behaviors associated with this phenomenon. Indirect Interpersonal Aggression can be perceived as a communicative strategy to demonstrate control attempts. Those who lack in self-assurance may be more apt to join in with the mob and cultivate mobbing episodes in the adult world. Emerging adults are entering vocational spheres in large numbers. Becoming aware of unethical communicative behaviors that lead to severe workplace and individual consequences is the focus of this study.

Keywords: *power, control, Dyadic Power Theory, Indirect Interpersonal Aggression, Self-Assurance, emerging adults, mobbing and bullying.*

Chapter 1: Introduction

Recently, problems with bullying have been on the rise. In 2000 there were over 12,000 cases reported; by 2005 the number of cases reported rose to over 25,000 and many of those cases involved adults in the workplace rather than children on the school ground (Booth, Van Hasselt,& Pvecchi, 2013). Bullying among youth and adolescents has received much attention, but there seems to be a wide conceptualization that adults should "know better." Bullying behaviors may be primarily associated with juveniles and adolescents. There are various types of bullying.

Bullying and other destructive behaviors are carried over into the workplace. Types of bullying behaviors in the workplace include harassment (Brodsky, 1976; Shelton, 2011; Bjorkqvist, 1997;); scapegoating (Thylefors, 1987); psychological terror (Leymann, 1990); workplace trauma (Wilson, 1991); petty tyranny (Ashforth, 1994); and mobbing (Matthiesen, Raknes, & Rrokkum, 1989). Mobbing is a particular type of bullying behavior and refers to a combined effort by colleagues in a vocational setting to isolate, chastise and demean a particular employee (Westhues, 2002). Although each of these types of bullying behaviors may be important to study in its own right, mobbing is of particular interest as it is indicative of communicative behaviors used to collectively bully in the workplace.

Both individuals and work organizations experience severe consequences as a result of bullying and mobbing behavior in the adult working world (Einerson, 2000). In professional settings, the consequences of bullying range from individual suffering to lost productivity and even financial costs that result when organizations initiate lawsuits against and/or defend themselves against charges of bullying (Yamada, 2004; Einerson, 2000; and Westhues, 2002). For example, some research suggests that the only alternative

for victims of mobbing in the workplace is to leave their place of employment entirely (Einerson, 2000; Yamada, 2004). In addition to negative consequences for individual workers, research also suggests that organizations suffer negative consequences, such as tarnished reputations, lack of production, and high-turnover rates. (Yamada, 2004; Einerson, 2000; Westhue, 2002; and Escartin, Rodriguez-Caraballeira, Zapf, Porrua & Martin-Pena, 2009). As a result, more and more business organizations have begun to offer programs to educate workers about the dangers and consequences of bullying, how to avoid being a victim of bullying, and how to recognize and stop others from bullying (Yamada, 2004).

With the increase in the incidence of bullying in general and mobbing in particular and their related social, human, and financial costs, a growing body of research has begun to learn more about the causes and effects of mobbing particularly in organizational settings. Mobbing is a fairly new concept in communication. Unlike the one-on-one bullying behaviors typically depicted in media, mobbing is a more systematic form of bullying that involves multiple people working in concert to harm a specific individual. Westhues (2002) defines mobbing as a collective bullying effort to intentionally
cause harm to targeted individuals. Mobbing is collective bullying and must follow an overt or covert bullying episode in order to evolve into a mobbing episode (Westhues, 2002).

The terms "bullying" and "mobbing" have been used interchangeably (Westhues, 2002). There is a need to specify the discreteness between the conceptualizations. Bullying is a behavior that can be executed by a single individual. Mobbing is a behavior carried out by a "mob" or group of people. Both can have severe consequences for the targeted person and surrounding environment. Bullying can take place without a mob, but mobbing cannot take place without bullying.

Mobbing is accomplished when an individual or small group of individuals select a target person for their bullying efforts and then recruit others to participate in a pattern of aggressive or dismissive actions directed toward that individual. Creating awareness about characteristics associated with mobbing behavior may help researchers design preemptive interventions that can be used to prevent these harmful behaviors in the workplace.

The specific purpose of this thesis is to identify communication characteristics of individuals that lead to mobbing behaviors in order to create awareness that offers preemptive strategic solutions to curb this behavior in the adult working world. Unethical communicative strategies can be used to create a superior/subordinate relationship. The literature review will reveal the damages associated with mobbing. The literature review will describe the characteristics of those engaging in mobbing episodes. Finally, the literature review will explain a theory that helps explain the behaviors

Literature Review: Chapter 2

Researchers have studied several categories of variables in their attempts to understand the phenomenon of mobbing. For example, one previous analysis suggests that certain personality traits may serve as antecedents to the phenomenon (Lane & Averbeck, 2012). Other studies have focused on power differentials among individuals within organizations in an attempt to understand the onset of mobbing and the reasons some individuals engage in mobbing behaviors. Understanding predictors and theories that help explain power attempts will help shed light on this phenomenon.

Studies of power differentials in organizational communication indicate that mobbing may occur when people are competing and striving for power in the workplace. By reducing the power of others, power imbalances in working relationships are created (Burgoon, 1998).

Dyadic Power Theory (DPT) may help shed some light on why people engage in control attempts in order to appear superior in the workplace (Dunbar, 2004). Realizing malicious actions can lead to demeaning the power of a targeted individual and can make the aggressor appear to have more power and control will lead to a greater understanding of how people become victims in the workplace. It is so important to identify predictors to mobbing. It may be particularly important to explore control attempts within the population of young adults entering the workforce.

An ever-increasing number of college graduates are entering the workplace and striving to make their mark in their quest for success. Arnett (2004) coined the term "emerging adults" to describe the contemporary cohort of people between the ages of 25-29. During the 1950s the average age of marriage was 20-22, today 25-27 year olds are among the current average age of marriage (Arnett, 2004).

Emerging adults are postponing the responsibilities of family life and engaging in self-indulgence in order to gain workplace and educational success before making the commitment of marriage and family. Emerging adults are engaged in a life-stage that is centered on personal success and gain (Arnett, 2004). Conceptualizing emerging adults will help researchers understand why workplace relational aggression is present and may explain its prevalence within this particular life-stage.

Emerging adults are the predominate population entering workplace organizations. Emerging adults are learning leadership behaviors and rely upon their experiences to shape their leadership style (Nelson, Springer, Nelson, & Bean, 2008). Work organizations typically house employees dependent on one another to accomplish common goals of their organization. There are times that the individual goals of success, recognition, and achievement can become a conflict between employees. The conflicts that arise from this dyadic interaction lead to perceived superior/subordinate relationship. Once someone is perceived as having less power, others become more powerful. In organizations in which emerging adults consistently vie for power, a pattern of destructively aggressive actions may develop. Indirect interpersonal aggression is often found to be a predominant strategy within those patterns.

Indirect interpersonal aggression is a communicative strategy to impose harm on others while saving face and preserving the aggressor's self-image (Valencic, Beatty et al., 1998). Indirect interpersonal aggression provides an individual seeking power over others a strategy for achieving that goal while maintaining a nonaggressive overt image.

Those socialized to use indirect interpersonal aggression as an acceptable means to achieve goals may grow to exhibit mobbing behaviors when vying for leadership. Chaotic and leadership-competitive climates set the stage for emerging adults to resort to aggressive behaviors to establish themselves as leaders (Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2007). Practicing these aggressive acts in covert or hidden ways enables the aggression to

5

take place with little to no detection. Oftentimes, when someone becomes a target at the workplace, employees ban together and view the targeted person as less desirable. Mobbing is an example of employees attributing negative connotation to a particular employee and the mobbing begins (Westhues, 2002).

Understanding that chaotic and unorganized work places create an environment that promotes power struggles may help explain the types of conditions that are ripe for a mobbing episode to occur (Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2007). The competitiveness to be on top at the workplace discounts the qualities of targeted individuals and enhances a negative image that seems to become a generalization held by employees about a certain individual.

Understanding the quest for power in the workplace leads to a discussion of Dyadic Power Theory (DPT) in order to apply the tenants of the theory to mobbing behaviors (Dunbar, 2004). Dyadic Power Theory was developed to examine power relationships in families and has been expanded to consider interpersonal and organizational relationships generally. Dunbar discusses Dyadic Power Theory (DPT) in relation to "manifest" and "latent" power. Manifest power is defined as overt displays of power and latent power is defined as covert displays of power (Dunbar, 2004). Control attempts may be latent displays of power due to the indirect nature of the strategies being discussed.

DPT predicts individuals will engage in control attempts when they perceive a balance in "relative power" (Dunbar & Abra, 2010, p. 239). The conceptualization of relative power refers to undefined power relationships. Those who do not engage in clearly defined superior/subordinate power relationships are more apt to try to gain power of the individuals with whom they are interacting (Dunbar, 2004; Dunbar & Abra, 2010). Those with relatively more power have used their resources in order to gain authority over

others and have no motivation to engage in control attempts. Simultaneously, those who perceive an imbalance of relative power such that they have little to none are also not likely to engage in control attempts. A relative balance in power results in the control attempts.

Dunbar & Abra (2010) contend that the interaction itself becomes the focal point for gaining power. Emerging adults are at the forefront striving for power in their organizations. Typically, many of these individuals have already invested in their education and want to claim authority in the workplace. The assumption that techniques or tactics used in the communication process become central for gaining dominance over the other participant involved in the interaction. The dominant individual and the subordinate are interconnected through the power dynamics that define the relationship (Dunbar, 2004; Dunbar & Abra, 2010; Burgoon, 1998).

Control attempts are likely to be observed in situations in which a relative balance is perceived. Individuals who may be uncertain of an organization's hierarchy may be more likely to perceive a relative balance in power and, thus, will engage in control attempts. Any action taken to reduce the power of another is considered a control attemp(Dunbar, 2004). Uncertainty pertaining to the organizational hierarchy prompts the emerging adult to strive to climb the hierarchical ladder of success. Enthusiasm for success can lead to demeaning the power of others in order to appear higher up on the vocational ladder. Dunbar refers to tactics associated with demeaning the power of others as control attempts. Uncertainty associated with emerging as a responsible adult creates chaos and insecurity.

Understanding young adults' inner turmoil and lack of self-assurance may aid in understanding why young adults would engage in indirect interpersonal aggression. Understanding that following those perceived as more powerful within a group is an avenue people may take in order to feel more self- assured about their job and working

relationships.

The study investigates intentions to mob and is focused on workplace situations where more direct actions to alter the behaviors of others carry serious repercussions (reprimands, termination, fraud, etc.). The goal of this study is to explore the more indirect communication tendencies likely to be employed to create an imbalance of power.

Lagerspetz at al. (1988) observed that maintaining anonymity is a goal for those partaking in indirect aggression tactics. These hidden aggression strategies serve as control attempts in workplace organizations (Dunbar, 2004; Beatty, Valencia, Rudd, & Dobos, (1999). Intentionally giving someone the wrong information and/or withholding information are considered control attempts that are characteristics of indirect interpersonal aggression. Following the logic of DPT, those who engage in mobbing behaviors are more likely to engage in indirect interpersonal aggression and lack self-assurance (Burgoon, 1998, Beatty, Valencia, Rudd & Dobos, 1999; Dunbar, 2004).

People who are socialized not to express aggression may employ indirect interpersonal aggression as a strategy to deal with dislike for others. Indirect interpersonal aggression is an avenue that enables negative expression through covert strategies (Lagerspetz, Bjökqvist, & Peltonen, 1988). Dunbar & Abra (2010) assert that individuals will engage in varying strategies of communication in order to obtain dominance in relationships. It may be inferred that indirect interpersonal aggression is a behavior that is predictive of mobbing. Those lacking in self-assurance are likely to follow people who appear more powerful.

Burgoon, Johnson, and Koch (1998) assert that "Communication, then becomes a useful, powerful, and efficient way to control others." Conceptualization of indirect interpersonal aggression and recruitment of employees lacking self-assurance as related

to mobbing brings light to understanding how using unethical means of communication can serve as tools to aid in mobbing. Those engaging in control attempts through indirect aggression enact mobbing episodes that leave the targeted individual and the organization to suffer the consequences of mobbing in the workplace (Yamada, 2004; Einerson, 2000).

Identifying the relationships between predictors of mobbing is an important step in understanding mobbing behavior. In addition to indirect interpersonal aggression, previous research has identified a lack of self-assurance as a significant predictor of mobbing behavior. Lane and Averbeck (2012) found that Indirect Interpersonal Aggression and a Lack of Self-Assurance explained 51% of the variance in mobbing behavior. However, the relationship between indirect interpersonal aggression and lack of self-assurance is unknown. The current study will test potential relationships between these two predictors of the intention to mob in emerging adults.

The purpose of the current study is to explore these two predictors as intentions to mob. As stated earlier, understanding why people intend to mob is the first step toward reducing this detrimental behavior. Social researchers will benefit from additional knowledge about this phenomenon because it will enable them to add to the knowledge base of this important societal issue. Health communication professionals may be able to use this information as a preemptive measure for intervening for potentially mobbing situations. Future communication researchers will benefit from this knowledge by drawing upon the resources of this new knowledge to heuristically build upon and further advance understanding of mobbing among emerging adults in workplace organizations. Not only researchers, but also all organizations can benefit from understanding the variables associated with mobbing. Organizations lose thousands of dollars every year due to consequences of bullying and mobbing in the workplace (Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2007; Kaukiainen, Salmivalli, Bjorkqvist, Osterman,, Lahtinen, Kostamo, & Lagerspets, 2001). Educational Institutions can benefit from this study in order to

promote an egalitarian learning environment. Mobbing not only has financial, physical, and psychological consequences for targets, it may also severely interrupt the learning process (Lane & Averbeck 2011). Exploratory questions into these phenomena will help form building blocks for future research.

RQ1: What is the relationship between Self-Assurance and Intention to Mob?

RQ2: What is the relationship between Indirect Interpersonal Aggression and Intention to Mob?

RQ3: Do Self-Assurance and Indirect Interpersonal Aggression operate independently or do they interact to influence Intention to Mob?

Method: Chapter 3

A survey study was conducted to assess two antecedent variables that may influence mobbing intentions. Particular emphasis was placed on understanding the effects of lacking self-assurance and indirect interpersonal aggression on mobbing intentions.

Research Design

The design for this study was administering a survey scale online that evaluates relationship possibilities between indirect interpersonal aggression and the lack of self-assurance leading to mobbing intention. It was decided that a survey would be the best match for this study because it uses interpersonal scales with previously established reliability and validity to measure the variables of interest in this study (Burgoon, 1998; Valencic, Beatty, Rudd, Dobos, & Heisel, 1998).

A Likert Scale Survey strengthened this project because of the variance accounted for in the items.

Approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) was obtained to ensure ethical treatment of participants before the study began. Participants were recruited by distributing a flyer, through email, and colleagues offered the survey in college classrooms.

Participants

The online survey was active during a four-week period and 219 communication graduate and undergraduate students participated. The students were from a medium-sized Eastern University in the United States participated in the study. Most of the students were undergraduates (67% were freshmen, 22% were sophomores,

6% were juniors, 7% were seniors and 3% were graduate students). Caucasians made up the majority of the respondents (84%); 16% reported being members of other races or declined to respond.

Materials and Procedure

Survey Gizmo, an Internet-based survey program, was used. Several faculty in the Communication Studies Department agreed to invite their students to take part in this study. All students in those classes were invited to participate, and all students who were willing to take part were provided with the link to the website where the survey to be completed for this study was found. The online survey was available from March 18 to April 17, 2013. The first item on the survey was the informed consent information as required by the IRB.

The beginning of the survey explained that the process would take approximately 20 minutes and that participants could withdraw at any point with no repercussions. The survey scale is attached in Appendix I. Participants were asked to respond using a 5-point Likert scale to statements related to indirect interpersonal aggression, self-assurance and mobbing intentions. Responses ranged from 1 (always) to 5 (never). The final section of the survey requested demographic information including, race, year in school, and age. Mean scores, standard deviations, and reliability coefficients for the scales are reported in Table 1.

Sample Size and Power

To determine the number of participants to recruit for this study, an *a priori* power analysis using G*Power 3.1 was conducted. The results indicated that in order to have adequate statistical power to reject a null hypothesis, 45 participants were needed to test the regression models ($\alpha = .05$, $\beta = .80$, $f = .15$; Faul, Erfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 1997).

Instrumentation

Scales for indirect interpersonal aggression, self-assurance, and mobbing were presented. The Mobbing Scale is labeled The Leymann Inventory of Psychological Terror (LIPT; Niedhammer, et. al, 2006) is a 14-item scale that measure behaviors intended to disrupt other's behavior. Example items include "I deny others the opportunity to express themselves," "I constantly interrupt others," and "I use insulting terms that are obscene or degrading." LIPT had a = (M= 4.35; *SD* = .55).

Indirect Interpersonal Aggression. Beatty, Valencic, Rudd, and Dobos's (1998) 10-item scale was used to measure indirect interpersonal aggressiveness. The items measured how likely a person is to engage in harmful strategies toward others while utilizing face-saving tactics. The scale included items such as "I would provide inaccurate information to a person who has been hostile or unfair to me," I would withhold important information from someone who has been hostile to me," and I might 'forget' to relay information to someone who has been hostile to me." The mean score for Indirect interpersonal aggressiveness was 4.4; *sd* = .72).

Self-Assurance. Self-assurance measured the extent to which an individual is confident interacting with others. Items measuring self-assurance included "I act nervous in conversations," "I am more a follower than a leader," and "I often have trouble thinking of things to talk about."(Interpersonal Dominance; Burgoon, 1998). Self – assurance had a mean score of 3.37; *sd* = .82).

Tests of mulitcolinearity. To test for potential multicolinearity among the independent variables analyses in order to examine the intercorrelations among the variables, their tolerances and the variance inflation factor (VIF) were computed. Looking first at the intercorrelations for self-assurance and indirect interpersonal aggression, a

correlation of .176 was found. The correlation between the independent variables

appears to be low enough to allow self-assurance and indirect interpersonal aggression

to be examined as separate variables. To further test for potential multicolinearity

among these two independent variables, a regression analysis was computed to examine

tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF) among the independent variables. The

results of the regression analysis showed a tolerance of 1.0 and a VIF of 1.0, both of

which indicate that multicollinearity is not problematic.

Results: Chapter Four

The first research question asked whether there was a relationship between self-assurance and intention to mob. To examine RQ1, a regression analysis was computed in which intention to mob served as the dependent variable and self-assurance was used as the independent variable. The results indicated that R^2 was significantly greater than zero [$F (1, 215) = 11.05$, $p < .001$ ($R^2 = .049$)]. As shown in Table 2, self-assurance had a significant zero-order correlation with intention to mob although it accounted for only about 5% of the variance in intention to mob.

The second research question asked whether there was a relationship between indirect interpersonal aggression and intention to mob. To examine RQ2, a regression analysis was computed in which intention to mob served as the dependent variable and indirect interpersonal aggression was used as the independent variable. The results indicated that R^2 was significantly greater than zero [$F (1, 215) = 194.78$, $p < .000$ ($R^2 = .394$)]. As shown in Table 2, indirect interpersonal aggression had a significant zero-order correlation with intention to mob, and accounted for 47.5% of the variance in intention to mob.

To examine RQ3, the results from the two regression analyses computed for research questions one and two were compared with the results from an additional regression analysis that was computed with both self-assurance and indirect interpersonal aggression entered together in a block. The results from the third regression analysis indicated that R^2 was significantly greater than zero [$F (2, 214) = 101.02$, $p < .000$ ($R^2 = .486$)]. Looking at the results of the regression analyses computed previously, self-assurance accounted for .049% of the variance in intention to mob, and indirect interpersonal aggression accounted for 47.5% of the variance in intention to mob. If

these two independent variables were unrelated and therefore accounted for separate and independent amounts of variance in mobbing, then it would be expected that together self-assurance and indirect interpersonal aggression would account for 53.5% of the variance in mobbing (summing R^2 for self-assurance and R^2 for indirection interpersonal aggression: .049 + .475 = .535). However, when entered into the regression equation together, they accounted for only 48.6% of the variance in mobbing. The results show that adding self-assurance to indirect interpersonal aggression only accounted for about one percent of the variance in mobbing (.475 + .011 = .486). Thus, indirect interpersonal aggression subsumes the variance accounted for by self-assurance.

Discussion: Chapter 5

Bullying incidences more than doubled in a five-year span. The shocking increase in bullying may be much greater than what is actually reported. It is thought that a number of bullying cases go unreported (Yamada, 2004; Einerson, 2000). Bullying is a problem that transcends childhood or adolescences. Many emerging adults reported themselves as willing to use bullying behaviors in the workplace. Adults' bullying strategies are often covert and may go undetected because of a lack of knowledge about bullying and mobbing.

It is important to recognize bullying and/or mobbing behaviors. These behaviors have led to devastating losses for organizations and individuals. Shedding light on some variables that are associated with bullying and mobbing in the adult world may provide concrete suggestions for organizational trainings designed to help curb these behaviors. One variable in particular may be especially useful; this study showed that indirect interpersonal aggression has the potential to lead to mobbing behaviors in the work place.

Persons lacking in self-assurance are more apt to use indirect interpersonal aggression or other types of covert control maneuvers than are persons high in self- assurance. It is likely that someone who lacks self-confidence and self-assurance would be more likely to attach himself/herself to a more aggressive person. The attachment may decrease their insecurities. Dyadic Power theory clearly explains how those who engage in control attempts are perceived to be more powerful. Joining these persons in mobbing behaviors may serve as validation for perceived power and increased self-assurance for those who feel less powerful on their own.

The results of this study indicated that indirect interpersonal aggression is the stronger predictor of mobbing when compared with a lack of self-assurance. The lack of self-assurance is subsumed within indirect interpersonal aggression. Findings suggests that a lack of self-assurance is only related to mobbing because it is predictive of the use of indirect

17

interpersonal aggression. An organizational training program designed to curb bullying and

mobbing should focus on teaching workers more direct and socially appropriate influence

strategies to replace the covert strategies that are often used. By teaching individuals appropriate

and effective influence strategies, the felt need to engage in indirect interpersonal aggression

should subside.

Future researchers may want to include male and female demographic data to

explore the possibilities of gender differences in these characteristics. It would be an interesting

extension of this study to evaluate whether men or women are more likely to engage in indirect

aggressive acts in order to gain control in organizations. Realizing that

a single bullying incident can quickly morph into a mobbing episode may help to alert

organizations and individuals to be sensitive and attentive to claims of bullying and to

recognize potential symptoms of bullying behaviors.

One limitation of this study is that it was conducted using a self-report survey. A

survey was deemed the best possible way to assess these behaviors in order to promote the least

invasive methodology to attempt to discover the antecedents associated with mobbing behaviors.

In addition, there were several ethical and logical reasons for using a survey methodology.

First, it would be unethical to place people in an experiment situation and subject

them to the harmful behaviors of mobbing. It would also be unethical to promotindirect

interpersonal aggression among people in an experiment. Therefore, an experiment would not

be a good match for this study. Ethnography or a content analysis would not be feasible for this

study because of the time constraints inherent to a master's degree program. To conduct either

of these types of analyses, the researcher would have to observe and/or tape record many hours

of conversation in order to find enough incidences of indirect interpersonal aggression to be

able to link them to other variables of interest.

Additional limitations for this study include using participants from a pool of college students instead of applying a truly random sample of workplace organizations. The same limitation can be considered strength due to the definition associated with emerging adults and the growing number of this population entering the workforce. The researcher of this study hopes that future communication research will heuristically build upon this research in order to eventually promote pre-emptive strategies that reduce bullying and mobbing in the workplace. These strategies may include training individuals in ethical ways to communicate when vying for status in the workplace.

Appendix A

w w w . m a r s h a l l . e d u

Office of Research Integrity	FWA 00002704
Institutional Review Board	
401 11th St., Suite 1300	IRB1 #00002205
Huntington, WV 25701	IRB2 #00003206

March 7, 2013

Camelia Brammer, PhD
Communication Studies

RE: IRBNet ID# 428022-1
At: Marshall University Institutional Review Board #2 (Social/Behavioral)

Dear Dr. Brammer:

Protocol Title:	[428022-1] antecedents to mobbing	
Expiration Date:	March 7, 2014	
Site Location:	MU	
Submission Type:	New Project	APPROVED
Review Type:	Exempt Review	

In accordance with 45CFR46.101(b)(2), the above study and informed consent were granted Exempted approval today by the Marshall University Institutional Review Board #2 (Social/Behavioral) Designee for the period of 12 months. The approval will expire March 7, 2014. A continuing review request for this study must be submitted no later than 30 days prior to the expiration date.

This study is for student Anita Lane.

If you have any questions, please contact the Marshall University Institutional Review Board #2 (Social/ Behavioral) Coordinator Michelle Woomer, B.A., M.S at (304) 696-4308 or woomer3@marshall.edu. Please include your study title and reference number in all correspondence with this office.

20

Appendix B

Table 1 Means, Standard Deviations, and Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients for the Scales Reported

Variable	*M*	*SD*
Mobbing		
IIA	4.4	.72
SA	3.37	.82

Table 2 Regression Analysis Summaries for Mobbing, Self-Assurance Scale and Indirect Interpersonal Aggression Scale

Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	t-value	Sig. level
IIA	.507	.038	.671	13.48	.000
SA	.069	.033	.103	2.072	.039

Appendix C

Mobbing Antecedents

Working Relationships.

1. Anonymous Online Survey Consent

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled "Antecedents to Mobbing" This question has data designed to analyze possible antecedents to mobbing intentions. The study is being conducted by Dr. Cam Brammer and Anita Lane from Marshall University. The research is being conducted as part of the thesis class requirements for Anita Lane. The survey is comprised of 64 questions (including demographic information) and will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. There are no known risks involved with this study. Participation is completely voluntary and there will be no penalty or loss of benefits if you choose not to participate in the study or withdraw. You may choose to not answer any question by simply leaving it blank. Completing the on-line survey indicates your consent for use of the answers you supply. If you have any questions about the study you may contact Dr. Cam Brammer at 304-696-2810 or Anita Lane at 740-250-5540.If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant you may contact the Marshall University Office of Research Integrity at 304-696-4303.By completing this survey and returning it you are also confirming that you are 18 years of age or older. Please keep this page for your records.

I give my consent to take part in this study.

Yes/No

On the following pages you will be asked some general questions about your interactions with others in a work or other organizational setting. Answer the following statements as honestly as possible.

 Page Jump/Disqualify Logic -the following conditions will run when Page ID 1(above) gets submitted:

IF the answer to Question #1 is no THEN: Jump to Page #5. Thank You!

2. When my working relationships exert pressure on me:

always   often   sometimes   rarely   never

- I yell and curse out loud
- I am critical about others' privacy
- I am concerned about others' work

3. When my working relationships exert pressure on me:

                              always   often   sometimes   rarely   never

- I use verbal threats against others
- I use written threats against others
- I harass others on the telephone
- I give derogatory looks

4. In my working relationships:

                              always   often   sometimes   rarely   never

- I deny others the opportunity to express themselves
- I constantly interrupt others
- I prevent others from expressing themselves

5. I change others' job duties as punishment by:

                              always   often   sometimes   rarely   never

- avoiding giving tasks to them
- giving others tasks they are not
- interested in giving tasks below others' skill level
- giving assignments that are above others skill level

6. I attack others by:

                              always   often   sometimes   rarely   never

- judging work unfairly and hurtfully
- questioning their decisions
- using insulting terms that are obscene and degrading
- making verbal sexual references or suggestions
- speaking ill of them behind their back

- suspecting others of being mentally ill
- trying to force others' to have a psychiatric evaluation
- making fun of others' disabilities
- spreading fake rumors
- openly ridiculing others
- mimicking others' appearance, voice, and gestures
- attacking others' political and/or religious views

- acting in ways that hurt my conscious

7. As a person in charge, I assign job duties to certain others:

always often sometimes rarely   never

- above their skill levels
- that are humiliating assignments
- by constantly them giving new tasks
- below their skill levels
- of little interest to them

8. In order to systematically isolate someone:

always often sometimes rarely   never

- I avoid speaking to them
- I avoid touching them
- I encourage certain people to work in solitude
- I treat others as if they do not exist

Instructions: Please tell us as honestly as possible how you feel about the following by

checking the appropriate button.

9. Please answer this group of questions about yourself:

 I would provide inaccurate information to

always often   sometimes rarely   never

- a person who has been hostile or unfair
  to me
- If someone intentionally treats me
- unfairly, I would spread rumors about him or her
- I might "forget" to relay information to a

25

- person who has been hostile or unfair to me
- I would work "behind the scenes" to keep an enemy from gelling what he or she wants
- If someone is a real jerk, I would harm
- his or her chances for success if given the chance
- I would facilitate the failure of
- people who have mistreated me
- Given the chance, I would keep a person who has mistreated me from getting a job or promotion that he or she really wants
- I would not warn a person who has mistreated me about a problem situation even though my information would allow him or her to avoid trouble
- I have destroyed one or more of another's belongings because he or she mistreated me
- I would try to keep information from people who have been hostile toward me

Instructions: Please help assess this final dimension by answering the following statements as honestly as possible. Check the appropriate blank to describe whether you strongly agree or disagree about the statement.

10. Please answer these questions honestly about yourself:

always often sometimes rarely never
- I often act nervous in conversations

- I am often concerned with other's impressions of me.
- I have trouble concentrating on the topic of conversation.
- I avoid saying things in conversations because I may regret them later.
- I am more a follower than a leader.
- I often have trouble thinking of things to talk about.
-

Please answer some general information about yourself.

11. What is your race?
- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Black/African-American
- Caucasian
- Hispanic
- Native American/Alaska Native
- Other/Multi-Racial
- Decline to Respond

26

12. What is your year in school?
- freshman
- sophomore
- junior
- senior
- graduate student

13. How old were you on your last birthday?

14. What is your sex?

                          Male   Female

Thank You!

This is the end of the survey. Your response is very important to us and will help us achieve our goal of understanding communication in working relationships. Thank you for sharing your time to help us make this study a success!

References

Arnett, J.J. (2004). *Emerging Adulthood: The winding road from late teens through the twenties*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Ashforth, B. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human Relations*, 47, 755-78.

Beatty, M. J., Valencia, K. M., Rudd, J. E. & Dobos, J. A. (1999). A dark side of communication avoidance: Indirect interpersonal aggressiveness. *Communication Research Reports*, 16, 103-109.

Becker, J. A., & O'Hair, H. D. (2007). Machavellians motives in organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 35, 246-267.

BjoÈrkqvist, K., ésterman, K. & Hjelt-Back, M. (1994). *Aggression among university employees*. Aggressive Behavior, Vol. 20, pp. 173-84

Björkqvist, K. (1997). Learning aggression from models: From a social learning toward a cognitive theory of modeling. In S. Feshbach&J. Zagrodzka (Eds.), *Aggression: Biological, developmental, and social perspectives* (pp. 69–81). New York: Plenum Press.

Booth, B., Van Hasselt, V.B. & Pvecchi, G.M. (2013). FBI law enforcement bulletin: Addressing school violence. *Federal Bureau of Investigation.* Retrieved May 10, 2013 from http://www.fbi.gov/stats-services/publications/law-enforcement-bulletin/may_2011/school_violence

Brodsky, Carroll M. *The harassed worker*. Lexington: Lexington Books, 1976.

Burgoon, J., Johnson, M. L., & Koch, P.T. (1998). The nature and measurement of interpersonal dominance. *Communication Monographs*, 65, 308-334.

Coleyshaw, L. (2010). The power of paradigms: A discussion of the absence of bullying research in the context of the university experience. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 15, 377-386.

DiPaola, B. M., Roloff, M. E., & Peters, K. M. (2010). College students' expectations of

conflict intensity: A self-fulfilling prophecy. *Communication Quarterly*, 58(1),
59-76.

Dunbar, N. E. (2004). Dyadic power theory: Constructing a communication-based theory.
Journal of Family Communication, 4(3&4), 235-248.

Dunbar, N. E., & Abra G. (2010). Observations of dyadic power in interpersonal
interaction. *Communication Monographs* 77(4), 657-684.

Efe, S. Y., & Ayaz, S. S. (2010). Mobbing against nurses in the workplace in Turkey.
International Nursing Review, 57, 328-334.

Einerson, S. (2000). Harassment and bullying at work: A review of the Scandinavian
approach. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 5(4), 379-400.

Escartin, J., Rodriguez-Caraballeira, R., Zapf, D., Porrua, C., & Martin-Pena, J. (2009).
Perceived severity of various bullying behaviours at work and the relevance of
exposure to bullying. *Work and Stress*, 23 (3), 191-205.

Faul, F. Erfelder, E., Lang, A.G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible
statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical
sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 39*, 175-191

Forbes, G. Zhang, X., Doroszewicz, K. & Haas, K. (2009). Relationships between
individualism-collectivism, gender, and direct or indirect aggression: A study in
China, Poland and the US. *Aggressive Behavior*, 35, 24-30.

Hauge, L. J., Skogstad, A., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Relationships between stressful work
environments and bullying: Results of a large representative study. Work and
Stress, 21(3), 220-242.

Kaukiainen, A., Salmivalli, C., Bjorkqvist, K., Osterman, K., Lahtinen, A., Kostamo, A.,
& Lagerspets, K. (2001). Overt and covert aggression in work settings in relation
to the subjective well-being of employees. *Aggressive Behaviors*, 27, 360-371.

Lagerspetz, K. J., Bjökqvist, K., & Peltonen, T. (1988). Is indirect aggression typical of

females? *Aggressive Behavior*, 14, 403-414.

Lane, A. & Averbeck (2012, November). *Strategies used by emerging adults vying for leadership.* Paper selected for presentation at the annual convention of the National Communication Association, Orlando, Florida

Leymann, H. (1990). Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces. *Violence and Victims.* 5, 119-26.

Lincoln, M.G. (2001). Conflict resolution education: A solution for peace. *Communications & the Law,* 23(1). 29. Retrieved October 13, 2011 from EBSCOhost.

Lutgen-Sandvick, P. (2008). Intensive remedial identity work: Responses to workplace bullying, trauma and stigmatization. *Organization*, 15(1), 97-119.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. ˆPsychological Review 50(4), 370-396. Doi: 10.1037/h0054346.

Matthiesen, S. B., Raknes, B. I., & Røkkum, O. (1989). Mobbing på arbeidsplassen. *Tidsskrift for Norsk Psykologforening*.

Matsunaga, M. (2010). Testing a mediational model of bullied victims' evaluation of received support and post bullying adaption: A Japan-US cross-cultural comparison. *Communication Monographs,* 77(3), 312-340   .

Matsunaga, M. (2008). Bully for the bullied victims: A Japan-U.S. cross-cultural test of mediational model of appraisal, social support, and adaption (MASA). Conference papers—National Communication Association, 1. Retrieved October 13, 2011 from EBSCOhost

Mostafa, M. M. (2007). A study of Machiavellian orientation among marketing students in Egypt. *College Student Journal*, 41(1), 223-228.

Mudrack, P. & Mason, E. (1995). Extending the Machiavellianism construct: A brief

measure and some unexplored relationships. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 10, 187-200.

Niedhammer, S., Degionni D. S., & 143 doctors (2006). Leymann inventory of psychological terror (LIPT). (Translated). Epidemiol Rev Public Healthn, 54, 245-262.

Nelson, D.A., Springer, M.M., Nelson, L.J., & Bean, N.H. (2008). Normative beliefs regarding aggression in emerging adulthood. *Social Development*, 17(3), 638-660. Doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2007.00442.x

Ojwang, B. Matu, P., and Ogutu, E. (2010). Face attack and patients response strategies in a Kenyan hospital. Journal of sociolinguistics, 14(4), 501-523. Retrieved October 13, 2011 from EBSCOhost. Doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9841.2010.00449.x

Roscigno, V.J., Lopez, S.H., & Hodson, R. (2009). Supervisory bullying, status inequalities and organizational context. Social forces, 87(3) 1561-1589. Retrieved October 13, 2011 from Project Muse. doi: 10.1353/sof.0.0178

Shelton, T. L.. (2011). Mobbing, bullying, & harassment: A silent dilemma in the workplace. *Research Papers.* Paper 149. http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/gs_rp/149

Strandmark, K.M., & Hallberg, L.M. (2007). The origin of workplace bullying: Experiences from the perspective of bully victims in the public service sector*Journal of Nursing Management*, 15(3), 332-341. Doi: 10.1111/j/1365-2834.2007.00662.x. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Thylefors, I. (1987). *Syndbockar (scapegoats), natur og kultur*. Stockholm.

Valencic, K. M., Beatty, M. J., Rudd, J. E., Dobos, J. A. & Heisel, A. D. (1998). An empirical test of a communibiological model of trait verbal aggressiveness. *Communication Quarterly*, 46(3), 327-34I.

Westhues, K. (2002). At the mercy of the mob. *Canada's Occupational Health & Safety Magazine*, 18, 30-36.

Wilson, C. (1991). US businesses suffer from workplace trauma. *Personnel Journal*, 47-50

Workplace bullying and disruptive behavior: what everyone needs to know. (2011).

Washington State Department of Labor and Industries. Retrieved November 4,

2011 from http://www.lni.wa.gov/Safety/Research/Files/Bullying.pdf

Yamada, D.C. (2004). Crafting a legislative response to workplace bullying. *Employee*

Rights and Employment Policy Journal, 8, 475-521.

Young, E. L., Nelson, D. A., Hottle, A. B., Warburton, B. & Young, B. K. (2011).

Relational aggression among students. *Education Digest*, 76, 24-29.