From the President

Dear IAWBH member

Happy New Year and welcome to the IAWBH Newsletter with news from the board as well as from members.

I am happy to announce that that we are going to have our first IAWBH summer school in August 2015 in Canada. Members from three continents, Canada, Australia and Europe have joined forces and are organizing a summer school on treatment of targets of workplace bullying. The organizers are Pat Ferris, Evelyn Field and Marie-France Hirigoyen of the Therapeutic Practitioners SIG and the summer school will be held between 24th and 27th at Mount Royal University in Calgary, Canada. Please mark the dates in your calendar and read more in the Newsletter.

In this Newsletter we are also making a call for a group of researchers and practitioners who would like to organize the IAWBH conference in 2018. Please read more about this on page 11.
We have included the summary of the General Assembly 2014 in the Newsletter, so that those of you who attended can have an update and those who were not able to attend can read about what took place.

In the members’ corner Angela Landsbury questions whether bystander intervention is advisable even if it is possible based on a survey she has done in the UK. And she calls for future research into what actually takes place when bystanders intervene in a bullying incident at work. In the members’ corner you can also read an interesting abstract of a dissertation on alleged perpetrators experience and coping by Lisa DeSanti.

Many new members have joined the IAWBH. I welcome you all and I hope that it will prove worthwhile for you to be members. Among other things you may find new knowledge and inspiration in our literature updates in the newsletter and the literature bank on our website.

Finally, I want to thank the board members for working so well on their different tasks in 2014 making good progress and the members for supporting the IAWBH, their contributions to the Newsletter and the discussion fora and not least the 2014 conference.

Happy New Year to all of you and I hope that 2015 will be a fruitful year in generating new knowledge on how to prevent and combat workplace bullying.

Best wishes,

Annie Hogh
IAWBH General Assembly
19 June 2014, 5.00 pm Milan time
9th International Conference on Workplace Bullying and Harassment, Milano, Italy

Present: Elected officers, Annie Hogh (President), Ståle Einarsen, Nils Magerøy, Adrienne Hubert, Elfi Baillien, Shayne Mathieson, but with apologies from Premilla D’Cruz
Around 60 members signed the attendance register, although around 80 members were counted as present

1. Election of a chair for the GA meeting: Carlo Caponecchia was nominated by Annie Hogh, seconded Shayne Mathieson, elected Chair

2. Minutes of the previous General Assembly June 14 2013; moved to be accepted Darcy McCormack/Evelyn Field; accepted

3. President’s report – this was circulated to all members prior to the General Assembly (and subsequently published in the newsletter - see July 2014 newsletter) so was taken as read. The key items in the President’s report included:
   ⇒ Roles of the Board members
   ⇒ The number of board meetings (16 by Skype and 2 face-to-face – one after the last conference and one in Munster after the EAWOP conference);
   ⇒ Communication with members through newsletters and LinkedIn messages;
   ⇒ Special Interest Group activity;
   ⇒ Events, literature data base and summer school report;
   ⇒ The biennial conference preparations;
   ⇒ The healthy state of the finances;
   ⇒ Election information;
   ⇒ Actions from the previous General Assembly relating to:
     ◊ Research into bullying as a precursor to PTSD
     ◊ The inclusion of treatment protocol guidelines on the IAWBH website and
     ◊ E-archives
4. Treasurer’s report

Nils Magerøy, Treasurer reported a stable economic situation for IAWBH, with a balance of approximately £24,000 (GBP) as at mid March 2014. For the first time, IAWBH has had a financial audit, performed by Christoph Seydl and presented to the Board at its meeting on 16 June 2014. The full audit is posted on the website. The Board accepted the findings of the audit, which highlighted a few technical issues, but no financial issues. The technical issues will be addressed by the Board in the coming financial year. This will include the employment of a bookkeeper as the workload of maintaining the accounts has grown and is considered by the Board to be too great a time commitment for the Treasurer to maintain alone.

The budget for the following two years was presented as in the table below. Helge Hoel / Denise Salin proposed that the shortfall be taken from the funds in hand; accepted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Income</th>
<th>Proposed Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference year</td>
<td>Conference year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership renewals (100 members X £ 60.00 per year)</td>
<td>6 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-conference year</td>
<td>Non-conference year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership renewals (100 members X £60.00 per year)</td>
<td>6 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUM</td>
<td>12 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUTION BALANCE (constant)</td>
<td>3 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 (a) **Doctoral Workshop:** Ståle Einarsen reported that the tradition of doctoral workshops started in Cardiff with Helge Hoel. They have been, (including this year’s) a successful gathering of up to 25 people sharing their research. There were three lectures this year, with the workshop lasting from 9.00 am – 4.00 pm. This year there were Ph.D. surgeries with groups of 5 – 6 with a senior researcher facilitating each group. It is proposed to keep this successful event for 2016.

(b) **Special Interest Groups:** there are 9 Special Interest Groups (SIGs) in IAWBH, Dynamics of Power, Emotions and Personality, Legal Issues, Organisational Influences and Bystanders, Organisational Practitioners, Risk Management, Therapeutic Practitioners, Trade Unions and Research Collaboration (the last one being renamed from Quantitative Research Methods). A further SIG proposed by Sheila White of the Psychodynamics of Power has not evinced specific interest from the website, but anyone at the Assembly who was interested was invited to let the Board member responsible for SIGs (Shayne Mathieson) know.

There has been little interconference activity except for the Therapists SIG, but there has been strong and growing interest at the conference, with more than half of the conference participants (about 120) attending pre-conference SIG meetings, ranging from 2 hours – 7 hours; approximately 60 people continued their discussions over SIG dinners on Tuesday or Wednesday evenings. After sober reflection at their dinner meeting, the Therapeutic Practitioners SIG changed the name to Therapists SIG.

All convenors and co-convenors were thanked for their time and expertise that they have put into running the SIG meetings and maintaining contact in between conferences. Lynn Landsbury and Susan Johnson are the new convenors for the Organisational Influences and Bystanders SIG.

(c) **Governance:** Helge Hoel and Maarit Vartia reported that the Board has been operating effectively with 18 meetings, 2 of those face-to-face. The face-to-face meeting between conferences was seen as particularly useful and is recommended to maintain in the future. The issue of whether there should be a vice-president was commented on as having not been taken forward as it would require a change in the constitution, and therefore was not an issue for the Board to implement. The governance audit noted in its overall assessment that: the Board operates clearly within the parameters and the confines of the IAWBH Constitution and seems to represent the interests of the membership in every sense, having collectively put a lot of effort into their working and contributed to the strengthening and further professionalizing IAWBH. The Board appears to have covered a broader range of issues than was the case in previous periods where a considerable amount of time had to be given over to organisation building and establishment of a viable infrastructure on which to build, from which the current Board has benefited. In conclusion, the Board and its members have undertaken their role very competently, consolidating and further strengthening IAWBH operating within the Constitution.
(d) **2016 Conference:** The Board has developed a bid document so that there are clear terms of references (TOR) between the Board and the Conference Committee, which will ensure quality, good financial and practical arrangements. There were many criteria to consider for the next conference, which will be held in Auckland, New Zealand 18 – 20 April 2016. Tim Bentley, Bevan Catley and Stephen Teo gave a video presentation for the next conference, and answered a few questions.

6. **Biennial Summer School:** Elfi Baillien gave information about the concept of the Summer School, which provides the opportunity for any member to apply for funding if they are interested in hosting or organising a Summer School. The website has further information on this. We invite anyone who want to contribute to the development of research or good evidence-based practice to apply for a maximum of £1,500. We hope to be able to support more initiatives in the future.

7. **Election results:** Denise Salin outlined the election process whereby nominations were sought in February / March for the President’s position and two other Board members (Adrienne Hubert and Nils Magerøy) which were ending. There were also 2 reserve Board positions available, 1 governance audit position and 2 election committee positions. In no instances were more nominations received than positions available. Accordingly no election was held and the following were confirmed in their positions:
   President: Annie Hogh
   Board members: Adrienne Hubert and Nils Magerøy
   Board Reserves: Denise Salin & Karen Harlos
   Governance: Maarit Vartia.

8. **Follow-up actions:** Before the follow-up actions were discussed, Annie Hogh reminded the Assembly that the President’s role is for a maximum of 4 years, so IAWBH will need a new President in 2016, and she invited members to consider this role if they were interested.

(a) **Diagnostic issues and ICD - report from Nils Magerøy**

⇒ At the Cardiff 2010 General Assembly, the Therapeutic Practitioners SIG requested that the Board of the IAWBH consider submitting a position statement on behalf of the Association to the American Psychiatric Association – which proposes that bullying be included within Criterion A of the new Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM-5) which is used in diagnosing trauma. In the meeting an approach to the ICD committee was also suggested.

⇒ It was also suggested that IAWBH should put up a comprehensive proposal which included summaries of the relevant literature as the ICD committee was not in a position to read each paper.

⇒ Nils Magerøy should function as the mediator between the Board and a group of researchers making a literature search to see what research evidence exists regarding the matter.
A group of five Norwegian researchers, Tone Tangen, Stig Berge Matthiesen, Morten Birkeland Nielsen, Thormod Idsøe and Unit leader/researcher Nils Magerøy met frequently in Bergen to fulfil the task.

The preliminary conclusions were presented in Copenhagen in 2012, which were
- that there is a lack of clinical studies on harassment/bullying and PTSD with two existing studies suggesting such a link
- There is some evidence for the association between harassment/bullying and PTSD symptoms. However, longitudinal studies do not yet exist
- However, targets of harassment/bullying may also suffer from other after-effects than PTSD/PTSD symptoms
- Symptoms occurring in association with non qualifying (possibly stressful, but not classifiable traumatic) events (i.e. bullying) might alternatively be subsumed under the diagnosis of adjustment disorder, depressive or anxiety disorders, distress that is not part of a recognizable psychiatric disorder

There is a need for large studies of representative samples of persons bullied at work where the subjects get a comprehensive assessment of:
- risk factor (personality, earlier psychopathology, family disposition, other life-stress, social support, and current psychiatric disorders)
- and are assessed by validated structured clinical interviews (SCID)

The research group has finished their work on studying scientifically published literature on workplace bullying/harassment and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) or PTSD symptoms. A scientific paper has been submitted and is under review. The research group’s conclusions are in line with the preliminary conclusions presented to the GA in Copenhagen:

- Although there is evidence for an association between bullying and PTSD, longitudinal and clinical studies are needed to assess whether bullying at work leads to PTSD.
- The DSM-5 does not include bullying as an A-criterion for PTSD. The ICD-11 is still under revision.
- The IAWBH board recommends that the ICD committee encourages more research on the mental health consequences of bullying related to PTSD based on the submitted article when published.
- The Board intuitively and anecdotally accepts and strongly believes that PTSD is a probable outcome of bullying. However, according to the submitted article there is insufficient scientific studies to back up this belief at this point.
There was significant discussion about the report, with many of the practising therapists believing that there was sufficient information to take to the DSM, and that more people would be harmed before any concrete action was taken. Evelyn Field proposed that the following was added to the recommendation for further study “Although DSM diagnoses have not been statistically sufficiently researched in relation to workplace bullying, practice-based evidence and early research indicate that workplace bullying is associated with major symptoms of depression, anxiety disorder and PTSD.”

Moira Jenkins and Tim Bentley both preferred the Board direction which indicated the need for further research to be fully scientifically acceptable. Pat Ferris reminded the Assembly that the therapists recognise that an associated factor correlation is not a causal factor; the group is not taking a correlational analysis. Katherine Lippel recommended that if any member published an article in the area, to make sure that the article did not make it difficult for employees to claim worker’s compensation.

Ståle Einarsen reiterated the view of the Board that the aim of the IAWBH is to stimulate research. An article is under review at the moment, but the review is still not available to us. We have to accept what the researchers have identified, and that it would be problematic for the IAWBH to say anything different. The Board is bound to follow the constitution. Eva Gemsoe-Mikkelsen stated that unfortunately we are at a point where we have to accept further suffering and continue with some more research, but to be happy that we are moving forward.

Pat Ferris proposed Ståle Einaresen seconded that the minutes note that there was some discussion and disagreement and that as research becomes increasingly available that the matter is still open for discussion; that researchers would work collaboratively with the Board to narrow the differences. Proposal carried by the Assembly.

(b) IAWBH on LinkedIn: Report from Adrienne Hubert: An IAWBH LinkedIn group was established to meet a suggestion from a member at the General Assembly in 2012; 64 members joined the IAWBH LinkedIn group so far. About 10 discussions were started over the past two years. At the request from some of the SIG convenors the Board also created subgroups on LinkedIn for each SIG. However, these subgroups have hardly been used and may distract the attention from the main LinkedIn group and from the SIG discussion fora at our website. Adrienne Hubert asked the General Assembly whether anyone would be against closing the SIG subgroups on LinkedIn. There were no opponents.
(c) E-archives: Annie Hogh reported on behalf of Premilla D’Cruz that all IAWBH information has been e-archived and is available on the website.

9. Proposed change to the Constitution: Moira Jenkins/ Alison Thurwall proposed accepting a minor change to the Constitution relating to governance where all committees were for four years duration rather than two. The amendment reads: The Board is in charge and accountable for the financial resources of the association. The General Assembly elects two members, each for a four year period, to view and without prejudice comment on the governance of the Board, and they must deliver an oral report at each General Assembly. Carried.

10. Election of Election Committee member: Helge Hoel recommended that there be a reserve Election Committee member to take effect immediately after the last election. This was accepted and Annie Hogh proposed Eva Gemsoe Mikkelsen for this role. Elfi Baillien seconded; carried by general agreement.

11. Suggestions from the Board and membership: this item was noted from the original agenda, but the Board have nothing to propose to the membership at this stage.

12. Any other business:
   a. Pat Ferris commented that she hopes IAWBH can move to a science-practitioner model, not an either/or model. She reminded researchers that they need to consider practical implications.
   b. A suggestion for 2016 that there is value in a label which identifies first time attendees so that they can be especially welcomed by other participants
   c. 2018 conference: the offers for the bid for the 2018 conference will be out before Christmas 2014, closing end 2015, with a decision made either end 2015, or early 2016. Anyone who is interested, please contact Ståle Einarsen.

The General Assembly closed at 6.25 pm.
Announcement
IAWBH Summer school 2015

Premilla D’Cruz, Secretary and Summer School

The Board of the IAWBH is delighted to announce that the 2015 IAWBH Summer School titled ‘Formulating Evidence Based Practice in the Treatment of Targets of Workplace Bullying’ is being organized by Pat Ferris, Evelyn Field and Marie-France Hirigoyen of the Therapeutic Practitioners SIG and will be held between 24th to 27th August 2015 at Mount Royal University, Calgary, Canada. Being the first IAWBH Summer School, this is another milestone for the Association.

The purpose of the ‘Formulating Evidence Based Practice in the Treatment of Targets of Workplace Bullying’ Summer School is to provide participants with therapeutic insights to the diagnosis and treatment of targets of workplace bullying, to engage in discussion of international experiences and to explore research opportunities. The focus will be on understanding what psycho-social and other treatment strategies are effective in treating targets of workplace bullying and how this relational trauma is best diagnosed to support effective return from work absence when symptoms warrant such absences. The outcome will be the provision of effective therapy to targets of workplace bullying as well as the development of research projects.

We are sure that there will be an enthusiastic response to and participation in the 2015 IAWBH Summer School. Please check future newsletters and the IAWBH website as well as get in touch with Pat (pferris@janusassociates.ca) for more details.

As you know, the IAWBH Summer School is a new initiative to be held biennially during the non-conference year. We welcome our members to consider organizing the IAWBH Summer School in the future (next 2017) and point you to http://www.iawbh.org/summer for more details.
Who will host the 2018 IAWBH Conference?

The IAWBH are now searching for organizers of the 11th International Conference on Workplace Bullying and Harassment following our very successful conferences in London (2002), Bergen (2004), Dublin (2006), Montreal (2008), Cardiff (2010), Copenhagen (2012) and Milan (2014). In 2016 the conference will be held on 18-20 of April in Auckland, New Zealand.

The 2018 conference will last three days, preferable in May, June or July 2018 and will normally run from Wednesday to Friday, with pre-conference meetings arranged on Tuesday (Special Interests Group and Phd-seminar).

Local organisers of the 2018 conference must be a group of researchers and practitioners associated with a University or a research institution.

Are you and your group interested in hosting the 2018 conference, please be in contact with Professor Ståle Einarsen (stale.einarsen@psysp.uib.no). The Board will decide on the 2018 conference by the 1st of June 2015. A bid document has been developed to guide your application, which must be sent to the Board by May 1st the latest.
Literature update

In the newsletter we publish titles of research publications that have recently been published. The complete publication list can be found at our website: http://www.iawbh.org. Denise Salin is updating the literature list during Elfi Baillien’s maternity leave.

The list focuses on international publications in English or providing an English abstract. Is there a publication missing from the list? We kindly ask our members to complete the list with published work regarding workplace bullying and harassment. Your suggestions will be published in our next newsletter and on the webpage.

Please send you suggestions to Denise; e-mail: Literature-events@iawbh.org

Latest research publications

Articles


Books
Upcoming events


Intervention strategies for the reduction of bullying may exist in the workplace but reports are in short supply (Illing, Carter, Thompson, Crampton, Morrow, Howse, Cooke, & Burford, 2013). No published reports of bystander interventions in workplace bullying could be found by the current researcher. Bystanders, the witness or observers who are present when the event occurs, are in a good position to immediately intervene to stop or defuse the situation and this has been employed as a strategy in other fields. Examples of bystander programmes can be found in school bullying (Olweus, 1994; Twemlow, Fonagy, & Sacco, 2004); and sexual violence (O’Leary-Kelly, Tiedt, & Bowes-Sperry, 2004; Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2005).

A theoretically based bystander intervention strategy was designed to model responsible assertive intervention. Aggressive intervention by bystanders must be avoided as it is likely to continue the negative culture. Verbal bullying had been identified as a particular issue by the participating organisation and therefore this was the focus for the field work. The new Responsible Intervention Decision Strategy (RIDS) was implemented and measured in a large mainland UK organisation (Lansbury, 2014a).

Employees (N=1501; M=71%) worked in factory-type tasks with 24 hours a day, 7 days a week operations. Shifts were fixed and included nights and weekends. The employees participated in one of six geographically separated conditions, two of which were controls. Pre and post-intervention surveys incorporating the Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) metric were completed (Lansbury, 2014b). As no intervention strategy is likely to result in immediate cessation of all bullying both intervention and willingness to intervene were measured.

The results evidenced that a bystander’s willingness to intervene responsibly in workplace verbal bullying could be improved. Willingness to intervene positively correlated with actual intervention but an increase in actual intervention was not seen over the short duration (one month) between training and the post-intervention survey. The duration was a limitation of the study as was the non-random allocation of conditions. The single page survey and a 45 minute training session for the new strategy enabled testing in a challenging environment in which employees were not easily released from their duties.

Bystander intervention may be possible but is it advisable?

Lynn Lansbury
University of Portsmouth
This research illustrated the potential for bystander training to increase responsible intervention in workplace verbal bullying.

Unexpectedly it also revealed that it is those who have been recently bullied themselves who are most likely to intervene. However they did not score highly for responsible intervention, thus they may be perpetuating a negative culture with inappropriate interventions. This raises many interesting questions, not least, whether or not it is advisable to encourage intervening bystanders. Future research into what actually takes place when bystanders intervene in a bullying incident at work is recommended.

This research was supervised by Professor Charlotte Rayner and was funded by a studentship from Portsmouth Business School, University of Portsmouth, UK.
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Workplace Bullying, Cognitive Dissonance & Dissonance Reduction: Exploring the Alleged Perpetrator's Experience & Coping

By Lisa DeSanti, Ph.D.
Fielding Graduate University, 2014

Abstract of dissertation

Workplace bullying is recognized as a global phenomenon and its impacts can be devastating. Much of what is known about this dynamic is largely the result of victim and bystander accounts. Missing from our understanding of workplace bullying is a vital perspective—that of the bully. Applying a phenomenological approach, this study captured the experience of those accused of workplace bullying, from the time of the accusation to the present day. The focus of this research was to assess to what extent those accused of workplace bullying experience cognitive dissonance and to examine the dissonance-reduction strategies employed: 14 alleged bullies provided responses to a qualitative online questionnaire and 1 participant also engaged in an interview.

A thematic analysis of the responses indicated that participants tended to represent a self-centric and work-centric form of perspective taking; many also justified their behaviors as warranted for the work they were hired to perform. Most not only denied engaging in bullying behaviors, they interpreted the allegation as a form of punishment resulting in a range of distress, injury, and cognitive dissonance. Although participants indicated pursuing a variety of reduction strategies, it is especially interesting that despite the denial, most also sought out coaching, new skills, and/or self-development—along with the desire to pursue other career options. This suggests that participants did not intentionally bully others, and it also points to the enduring injury and dissonance related to the allegation as well as the limited effectiveness of cognitive dissonance reduction strategies.

These findings offer new insights into the alleged perpetrator’s experience, challenge what we think we know about workplace bullying and the notion of intentionality, and present a unique application of the study of cognitive dissonance and dissonance reduction in the “real world” that can be used to further inform mitigations and interventions into workplace bullying.

Key Words: Workplace Bullying, Workplace Abuse, Hostile Work Environment, Mobbing, Cognitive Dissonance, Dissonance Reduction, Abrasive Leaders, Abusive Managers, Perpetrators
Review seminar on managing bullying in the workplace

As part of European Safety Week 2014, the Health and Safety Authority in Ireland and ABC, the National Anti-Bullying Research and Resource Centre, Dublin City University hosted a seminar on managing bullying in the workplace.

The seminar was presented by Genevieve Murray a researcher from the Anti-Bullying Centre in DCU and Patricia Murray a psychologist with the Health and Safety Authority.

This seminar gave HR Managers, managers, supervisors and employers the opportunity to discuss the problem of workplace bullying and the difficulties they encountered when handling complaints. What emerged from this seminar was the lack of awareness training that existed in handling conflict among staff in the workplace. Consequently, such conflict was allowed to escalate resulting in complaints of workplace bullying.

Many of the attendees spoke of the confusion surrounding the behaviours linked to workplace bullying. They referred to the difficulties they encountered when addressing the non-performing employee. In several cases they were accused of bullying. They realised that many managers were employed as they were the expert for the position. However, very little training and discussion took place at management level on ‘how to manage human beings’.

Several of the attendees maintained they had policies and procedures in place however, there appeared to be a lack of awareness as to the manner in which the policies should be implemented. Attendees spoke of employees involving their trade union representatives in the complaints process, resulting in the complaints becoming an industrial relations issue. According to the attendees this process ended in a length dispute with very unsatisfactory outcomes for all.

The seminar included workshops on workplace bullying scenarios with the attendees being divided into groups of 5/6. The overall feedback from these groups highlighted the need for more awareness training by management/supervisors/hr personnel on how to manage complaints of conflict with individuals which can escalate into workplace bullying. Furthermore, attendees realised the need for discussion and communication with both management and employees on workplace practice.

In concluding, the seminar highlighted that workplace bullying is occurring in workplaces in Ireland. Attendees referred to their concerns about the misunderstanding of what constituted bullying and the lack of awareness training regarding the handling of conflict. However, on a positive note, management are interested in the intervention and prevention of this problem.

Prepared by: Genevieve Murray
In Memoriam: Carroll Brodsky, MD, PhD

Friday, August 22, 2014
Source: University of California, San Francisco, Department of Psychiatry

Long-time faculty member Carroll M. Brodsky, MD, PhD, died peacefully at his home in San Francisco on August 12, 2014, at the age of 91.

After serving in the U.S. Army Air Force during World War II, Brodsky earned a BA, MA, and PhD in Anthropology from the Catholic University of America. He later moved to San Francisco, earning an MD at UCSF and specializing in psychiatry with a residency at the then-Langley Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute. In 1960, he joined the UCSF Department of Psychiatry as a clinical instructor, rising to the rank of full professor in 1972. He created a course on the social and cultural basis of illness behavior, a subject that drew on his training in anthropology and medicine, and regularly taught courses on interviewing skills and occupational psychiatry. Brodsky also served as a dissertation advisor on medical anthropology at both UCSF and UC Berkeley. Upon his retirement from UCSF, he was named professor emeritus in 1991.

Known for his wonderful sense of humor and deep insight into the human condition, Brodsky was a popular teacher who inspired his students to achieve their best. He was in high demand as a lecturer and frequently delivered invited lectures to national organizations. He was a prolific author, publishing numerous articles on long-term work stress and other areas of academic research. His 1976 book, The Harassed Worker, was a ground-breaking analysis which helped establish the concept of harassment in the workplace, with its sub-fields based on sex, race, sexual orientation, age, and disability.

Brodsky practiced psychiatry for over 50 years, retiring shortly before his 90th birthday. He had a marvelous way of making everyone with whom he talked feel special, and his professional contributions live on in the lives of his patients, students, and colleagues.

He is survived by his wife of 39 years, Herma, and by three sons and four grandchildren. His family is planning a memorial service to be held in San Francisco during Columbus Day weekend.
Who is....?

In this column members of IAWBH may present themselves in a snowballing manner. After answering some questions about themselves, their work and developments in their country, the presented member may pick up another member from the membership list (they don’t know yet) for the ‘Who is...?’ column in the next newsletter.

Shino Naito from Japan who presented herself in the last newsletter chose Bevan Catley from New Zealand as the member to be interviewed in this newsletter.

Tell us something about yourself

I work and live on Auckland’s North Shore in the suburb of Albany; minutes from beaches, bush land and big city living. Outside work, my two young daughters (aged 6 and 4) keep me busy and (in)sane. I love my sport especially cricket, rugby league and football. I continue to play football for my local club – Albany United – as the goalkeeper for our Senior Men’s Fourth Division side.

How did you become interested in workplace bullying?

I completed my PhD on the topic of workplace violence so had an interest in employee well-being when I joined Massey University. Cases of workplace bullying began to hit the media in the late 2000’s and we were struck by its disruption and devastating impact on targets. Around 2008, the NZ Government offered a contestable research grant to investigate workplace bullying. I was part of the team that were fortunate to be awarded the grant, which started our work stream.

What can you tell us about the development of the workplace bullying field in your country?

While it is now apparent that a number of New Zealand industries have been grappling with workplace bullying, scholarly, regulatory and media attention is much more recent. The government’s funding provided significant impetus to research as prior to that point there were only 2 or 3 studies examining workplace bullying in the NZ context. Our report and findings generated significant industry and media interest. In response, the government agency responsible for Health and Safety developed and released ‘best practice’ guidelines targeted at employers and employees. While many organisation no doubt continue to struggle to prevent and manage workplace bullying, public awareness of the problem has greatly increased and a number of organisations are putting in place strong anti-bullying measures but my impression is that we are well behind other countries. There is currently no law against workplace bullying but individuals do have the ability to seek legal redress through our employment laws.
What can you tell us about your work?

I am currently the director of the Healthy Work Group, which is based on the Albany Campus of Massey University. The group was founded by Professor Tim Bentley and our focus is on workplace health, safety and wellbeing. Our research typically investigates the barriers to healthy work focusing on the work environment and drawing on a systems perspective. Our research strategy is to be question driven and then draw on the appropriate research method. To date, we have conducted projects that have consisted of prevalence studies, interviews with line managers, interviews with OH&S managers, interviews with employees, a textual analysis of legal cases, and an analysis of employment legislation as it relates to workplace bullying. Our aim is to try and establish a more holistic understanding of the dynamics of workplace bullying in New Zealand. While academic outputs are our main currency we are also very conscious of engaging a practitioner audience through industry publications, presentations and workshops.

What do you hope to achieve in the field of workplace bullying in the future?

Ultimately, we would like to see healthy, meaningful work as the norm with workplace ill treatment an infrequent aberration.

Question from Shino Naito: ‘What kind of legislative approach do you think is effective for workplace bullying?’

This is a great but tricky question! Firstly I think that what may well work in the New Zealand context might not be the best for all jurisdictions. Secondly, we need to have a clear idea of the outcome we are seeking when we talk about legislation being effective.

By way of an answer: I have yet to see a good, compelling argument for criminalising workplace bullying. While I appreciate the important symbolic value that enacting such a law is likely to have, I would need convincing on ‘how this would help’. However, I am not convinced that blanket self-regulation is the answer either. This is the current direction in New Zealand as evidenced by WorkSafe NZ’s ‘Best Practice Guidelines and any change in direction is unlikely in the foreseeable future. The is no compulsion to adopt the guidelines, and without industry by-in and ownership we wonder to what extent they will be adopted and initiate change. Our preference, as argued in our paper in the New Zealand Journal of Employment Relations is for an Approved Code of Practice.

Who is the member you pick from the membership list for the ‘Who is...? column’ in the next newsletter?

I choose Ernesto Noronha from the Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad.

What is your question for the member?

“Time and resources aside, what would be your ‘dream’ research project to investigate workplace bullying in your local context?”

Thank you very much Bevan Catley for taking part in this interview!
Adrienne Hubert (editor)
New Members

A warm welcome to our new members:
1. Ainsley, Darryl, Camosun College, Canada
2. Astrauskaite (Perminiene), Milda, Kaunas University of Technology, Lithuania
3. Beard, Grevis, Worklogic, Australia
4. Blackwood, Kate, Massey University, New Zealand
5. Bloisi, Wendy, London Metropolitan University, United Kingdom
6. Debelli, Andrea, University of Verona – Italy, Italy
7. DeSanti, Lisa, Insightment, United States
8. Einarsen, Kari, Business School at University of Stavanger, Norway
9. Ellison, Jennifer A, Axis Dynamics, Australia
10. Escartin, Jordi, University of Barcelona, Spain
11. Farley, Sam, University of Sheffield, United Kingdom
12. Forssell, Rebecka, Malmö University, Sweden
13. Gangwer, Monika, The Safe Spaces Project™, United States
14. Goosen, Suseth, Private student, South Africa
15. Guneri Cangarlı, Burcu Izmir University of Economics, Turkey
16. Habiba, Princess, Griffith University, Australia
17. Hansen, Åse Marie, University of Copenhagen, Denmark
18. Helmersen, Roy T, Scandinavian Airlines, Norway
19. Hewett, Rebecca, University of Greenwich, United Kingdom
20. Keller, Lise, branchearbejdsmiljørådene, Denmark
21. Kwan, Sharon, University of South Australia, Australia
22. O’Higgins Norman, James, Anti-Bullying Centre Dublin City University, Ireland
23. Rahm, GullBritt, Karlstad University, Sweden
24. Ryan, Lorraine, University of Limerick, Ireland
25. Schaming, Rachel, RachelSchamingCoaching, LLC, United States
26. Singer, Lori, TBA, Canada
27. Skakon, Janne, Department of Psychology, University of Copenhagen, Denmark
28. Strandmark, Margaretha, Karlstads universitet, Sweden
29. Sultan, Sarah, TBA, Canada
30. Tuckey, Michelle, University of South Australia, Australia
31. van Bockhoven, Daphne, Philips, The Netherlands
32. Van den Brande, Whitney, IDEWE, Belgium
33. Wawoe, Giovanni, Responsible Bizz, The Netherlands
Next newsletter and guidelines

We are delighted that a lot of our members contribute to the IAWBH newsletter. To ensure the quality of contributions, the Board of IAWBH has prepared some guidelines.

If you intend to write a contribution for the newsletter please first check the guidelines at our website: [http://www.iawbh.org/Newsletterguidelines](http://www.iawbh.org/Newsletterguidelines).

The next IAWBH newsletter will appear in March 2015. Please inform us about:

- your published work,
- international conferences on workplace bullying,
- special issues on workplace bullying and harassment,
- research breakthroughs,
- new research projects or challenging hypothesis,
- international cooperation and funding, and
- any news that may be relevant to a great deal of our members.

Please send your contribution for the newsletter before **the 1st of March 2015** to:

Adrienne Hubert, Board member (Communications),
a.hubert@hubertconsult.nl

**Disclaimer:**
The viewpoints in contributions other than those communicated by Board members in their capacity as office bearers do not reflect the position of the IAWBH or its Board but of the author. Authors must necessarily ensure accurate referencing and citations and the IAWBH and its Board are not responsible for plagiarism within contributions.