Dear IAWBH member

As the seasons turn, with the Northern hemisphere bidding goodbye to the summer and Southern hemisphere looking forward to greeting it, we present you with another issue of the IAWBH newsletter. You will be delighted to know that the next IAWBH Summer School will be organized by Ria Deakin and Frances Louise-McGregor at the University of Huddersfield, UK, from 26th to 28th July 2017…and the focus is on the bully. An aspect to which attention is long overdue, I am sure you will agree. Well, do read more on the 2017 IAWBH Summer School in the newsletter and we hope you will attend and participate in this important and stimulating activity.

We, on the IAWBH Board, have introduced a new column to our newsletter – Methodology Matters – the brainchild of Carlo Caponecchia and Adrienne Hubert. Methodology is undeniably the key to meaningful research and, through the findings such inquiries throw up, to effective practice. We have no doubt you will welcome and benefit from such a column. To flag off this initiative, we have Guy Notelaers, one of the best known methodology experts in the field, highlighting his perspectives. Our regular columns on ‘The 3 most influential works’ and ‘Who is…?’ continue.

From the President

Premilla D’Cruz
President of IAWBH
Annie Hogh (former IAWBH President) and I have just returned from a visit to Bordeaux where we met up with Marie-France Hirigoyen and Loic Lerouge and their team who are organizing the 2018 IAWBH Conference (5-8 June 2018). Marie-France and Loic are busy with the various preparations involved in putting the conference together and, from the looks of it, the event is certainly going to be enriching intellectually and culturally. You would not want to miss it! In the meanwhile, the Board is planning ahead for the 2020 conference and we look forward to your bids to host it...please read more about the call inside the newsletter and get in touch with me for additional information.

Apart from the update on new literature, links to upcoming events and reports from various SIGs on their 2016 pre-conference meetings, the newsletter shares the minutes of the 2016 IAWBH General Assembly, held on 21st April 2016 in Auckland, New Zealand. We would be happy to hear your feedback on the minutes – do pass on your comments to me and Shayne Mathieson, IAWBH Secretary.

In closing, on behalf of the Board, I invite you to send in contributions to our newsletters. Adrienne has signaled the guidelines at the end of this issue. Moreover, it would be wonderful to have you participate in our SIGs with their discussion fora available via the IAWBH website as well as in our LinkedIn discussion group. To learn more about the SIGs, please visit our website and/or contact Carlo. To be part of the LinkedIn group, please go to ‘Group Directory’ and search for ‘IAWBH’ on the LinkedIn site and/or check with Adrienne.

Best wishes,

Premilla D’Cruz
President
IAWBH General Assembly

10th International Conference on Workplace Bullying and Harassment,
Auckland, New Zealand
21 April 2016, 4.30 to 6.15 pm Auckland time

Present: Elected officers: Annie Hogh (President), Premilla D’Cruz, Stale Einarsen, Nils Mageroy, Shayne Mathieson (but with apologies from Elfi Baillien and Adrienne Hubert)
Around 62 members were present and signed the attendance register

Minuted by Premilla D’Cruz, Secretary

1. Election of a chair for the General Assembly (GA) meeting: Katherine Lippel was nominated by Annie Hogh, approved by acclaim, was elected Chair.

2. Minutes of the previous GA 19 June 2014: had been earlier circulated to the members through the December 2014 newsletter. These were approved by acclaim.

3. The President’s report: had been circulated via email to all members prior to the General Assembly and so was taken as read. The key items in the President’s report are listed below and Annie Hogh briefly reported on each of these:

⇒ Roles of the Board members
⇒ The number of board meetings (12 by Skype and 3 face-to-face – one on 20 June 2014 after the last conference, one in Oslo after the 2015 EAWOP conference, one on 18 April 2016 in Auckland);
⇒ 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
⇒ E-archives
⇒ Actions from the previous General Assembly relating to:
  - Diagnostic issues of the DSM and ICD
  - Closure of LinkedIn SIG sub-groups
  - Amendment to the IAWBH constitution item 16
  - Welcoming first time delegates at the conference

At the close of her report, Annie spoke of the new initiative of webinars to be undertaken by the IAWBH henceforth, which would be explored and actioned by the new Board. She also emphasized the importance of face-to-face meetings to facilitate the Board’s work, linking this to an earlier suggestion from the Governance committee, and indicated that though the international composition of the new Board would entail higher costs in conducting such meetings, they were well worth it in enhancing Board effectiveness.
4. Treasurer’s report

Nils Mageroy, Treasurer, reported a stable economic situation for the IAWBH, with a balance of approximately £30,000 (GBP) as of early April 2016.

Nils read out in full the financial audit (main document of 12 March 2016 and supplementary document of 16 April 2016, also available on the IAWBH website) performed gratis by Christoph Seydl and explained the detailed balance sheet of the IAWBH. Nils went on to share the financial planning/budgetary document for 2015-2017 (appendix 1).

Nils then clarified the point in the President’s report to emphasize that due to the registration of the IAWBH in Norway and the associated Norwegian Bank Account (DNB), the IAWBH Treasurer’s role has to be undertaken by a Board member who hailed from the European Economic Zone (and not the European Union as had been earlier indicated). He further shared that the IAWBH was not tax liable as it was registered in Norway. He informed members that a bookkeeper had been appointed to look over the financial transactions of the IAWBH and this arrangement was working out satisfactorily – he thanked the membership for approving of this requirement in the last GA.

The Board answered queries from members about the differences in expenses for 2015-2016 compared to 2014-2015, indicating that (a) not having to provide the 2014 Milan conference organizers a subsidy, and (b) costs pertaining to open access for the *Aggression and Violent Behaviour* article on PTSD and workplace bullying, the 2015 Summer School and 2015 Board meeting in Oslo, accounted for this. Members suggested a lower caution balance to be included in future budgets.

Members noted that the IAWBH had a large balance and the Board indicated anticipated expenses in the near future. The Board informed members that based on the initial feedback received from the local organizing committee of the 2016 Auckland conference, a decision had been made to provide future conference organizers with seed money of £5,000 (GBP) against a written agreement, in order to facilitate the initial stages of conference preparations. Board also informed members that given the international composition of the incoming Board, the face-to-face meeting held during the non-conference year would cost more. Both these were in addition to the proposed 2017 Summer School which involved an amount of £3,000 (GBP) from the IAWBH.

The various proposals made above in relation to the IAWBH finances were proposed by Evelyn Field, seconded by Duncan Lewis and accepted by the membership.

A member suggested that, in the light of available funds, the Board could consider instituting some scholarships to facilitate members’ attendance at the biennial conference.

5    a) 2015 Summer School: Pat Ferris, organizer of the 2015 Summer School, held between 24th -27th August 2015 in Calgary, Canada, made a short presentation. The 2015 Summer School, attended by 25 people, focused on ‘formulating evidence based treatment for targets of workplace bullying’, and was organized by Pat Ferris and the Therapist SIG. Keynote speakers were Dr. Kipling Williams – expert in ostracism – and Dr. Janine D’Annaballe – expert in psychological trauma. Members of the Therapist SIG also participated in an expert panel discussion on the impact and treatment of workplace bullying on the conference day. Members of the panel included: Dr. Kip Williams, Dr. Janine D’Annaballe, Dr. Marie France Hirigoyen, Dr. Evelyn Field and Dr. Nils Mageroy. Dr. Pat Ferris moderated the panel. Pat Ferris and Linda Crockett also conducted a half day seminar for organizational representatives in the afternoon of the conference day. Speakers at the summer school included: Pat Ferris, Evelyn Field, Marie France Hirigoyen, Christiane Kreitlow, Nils Mageroy, Lori Singer, Sarah Sultan and Miwako Wakui.

B) Doctoral Workshop: Stale Einarsen reported that the 4th pre-conference PhD workshop was held on 19 April 2016 from 9 am to 4 pm at the AUT, with 15 doctoral students from across the world (Australia, New Zealand, Europe and Africa) and 6 facilitators. Cohosted by Stale and Nick Djurkovic,
the staff included Annie Hogh, Ernesto Noronha, Kate van Heugten and Premilla D’Cruz. Two talks (by Premilla and Nick) and group work (3 groups of 5 students) where the participants shared their work and received feedback as well as a closing session by Stale were held.

(c) Special Interest Groups: Shayne Mathieson, SIGs co-ordinator, said that there are 9 Special Interest Groups (SIGs) in the IAWBH, namely, Dynamics of Power, Emotions and Personality, Legal Issues, Organisational Influences and Bystanders, Organisational Practitioners, Risk Management, Therapists, Trade Unions and Research Collaboration.

Despite little interconference activity and LinkedIn traffic except for the Therapists SIG, pre-conference SIG meetings were well attended (around 60 members in total) and much appreciated. The Therapists SIG and Risk Management SIG had full-day meetings while the Legal Issues, Trade Unions, Organizational Influences/Bystanders, and Dynamics of Power SIGs had half-day meetings. Research Collaboration and Emotions and Personality SIGs did not meet. SIG (self-funded) dinners, held 20 April 2016, were even better attended and allowed for informal interactions between members with similar interests.

A few members pointed out that they had been unable to access the IAWBH LinkedIn and Shayne requested them to meet her following the GA to sort this out.

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.

(d) Governance: Helge Hoel (also representing Maarit Vartia who was not present at the conference) reported that the Board has been operating effectively. The governance audit noted in its overall assessment that: the Board, having held 15 meetings where quorum was never an issue, 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 its working and contributed to the strengthening and further professionalizing IAWBH. Following the initial phases of setting up the IAWBH between 2008-2012, the Board has of late focused on various activities of relevance to the membership. The governance audit noted that the Board and its members have undertaken their role very competently, consolidating and further strengthening IAWBH operating within the Constitution.

(d) 2018 Conference: Before informing members who had won the bid for the 2018 IAWBH conference, Stale Einarsen presented the membership with the steps involved in the bidding and selection process, highlighting the relevance of these points in ensuring high quality and good financial and practical arrangements. Based on the various requirements, the bid from a group in Bordeaux, France, was selected. Marie-France Hirigoyen, Chair of the 2018 Conference, then made a short presentation including slides and video, inviting members to the next conference. Stale also reminded members to consider putting in a bid for the 2020 conference.

6. Call for the 2017 Summer School: Premilla D’Cruz, standing in for Elfi Baillien, read out the latter’s note (below) inviting proposals for the next summer school (SS). The relevant webpage to be checked and email address for queries/submission was put up on a slide for the convenience of members.
Following the success of the first SS, we would like to call for submissions for the SS 2017! Again, this SS would include a small-scale research or practice-oriented meeting with the explicit aim to stimulate knowledge regarding important aspects in the workplace bullying and harassment field. The IAWBH provides a sponsorship of (max) GBP 3000. Those interested in organizing such a Summer School may consult the guidelines on our IAWBH website. Proposals are to be emailed to Summer-school@iawbh.org before June 1st 2016. We are looking forward to your contributions!

7. Election results: Eva Gemzoe Mikkelsen (also representing Roelie Mulder who could not be present) outlined the election process whereby nominations were sought in September/October 2015 for the President's position and three other Board members' positions. 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 and hence no election was held. The following positions were accordingly filled and approved by acclaim by the GA:

- President: Premilla D'Cruz
- Board members: Elfi Baillien, Maryam Omari and Carlo Caponecchia
- Reserves: Bevan Catley and Karen Harlos
- Governance: Annie Hogh
- Election committee: Eva Gemzoe Mikkelsen and Mieneke Pouwelse

The existing office-bearers with continuing terms were Adrienne Hubert, Nils Mageroy and Shayne Mathieson for the Board and Maarit Vartia for governance.

Eva exhorted members to consider standing for Board posts and other offices in the next round of elections scheduled for 2018.

8. Follow-up actions:
   a. Diagnostic issues and ICD - Annie informed members that following the paper published in Aggression and Violent Behaviour by the five Norwegian researchers (Tone Tangen, Stig Berge Matthiesen, Morten Birkeland Nielsen, Thormod Idsøe and Nils Magerøy - who had been requested by earlier GAs to study the link between PTSD and workplace bullying through available literature, in order to make a representation to the ICD and APA about diagnostic issues), she had written to the ICD about the matter. Annie read out the letter she had sent the ICD committee and said that it would be published in the next IAWBH newsletter.
   b. Shayne Mathieson reported on behalf of Adrienne Hubert that the SIGs LinkedIn sub-groups had been closed. The LinkedIn connection for overall membership is still available.
   c. Premilla D'Cruz reported that the Constitutional amendment for item 16, approved of at the 2014 GA, had been incorporated.
   d. Shayne Mathieson reported that first-time delegates to the conference had been provided with special identification. Feedback indicated that this was a good icebreaker for new delegates meeting with “old hands”.

9. Constitutional amendment item 23: Annie Hogh informed the membership that since the Board sometimes received queries from those interested in joining the IAWBH but unable to pay the current fees, it had favourably considered flexibility in setting the association fees. This called for a Constitutional amendment which was being proposed as follows:
Our current constitution reads...

Membership fees are £60 (GBP) per year (2008 rates), to be paid in advance. Student rate, including PhD students is £40 (GBP) per year. The Board have the discretion to reduce membership fees for applications from developing economies.

A proposed change to the constitution is:

Membership fees will be set by the Board on an annual basis, taking effect from 1 July in each year. In setting fees the Board will ensure that there is a separate, lower rate for enrolled students. The Board may also create differential membership fees based on the residence of members in developing, transitional or developed economies as classified by the United Nations.

In response to the Board’s proposal, members cautioned against sudden increases in the fees to very high rates, that too after the GA, and suggested that perhaps a percentage limit be included in the amended clause. Board members, in highlighting the sentiment underlying the proposed amendment, indicated that they were not considering an increase at the current moment given the funds available, they would consult the GA about increases in the fee and they were considering a lower rate for transitional and developing economies in response to queries received. Members responded favourably to the clarifications. The amendment was then put to a vote: Moira Jenkins proposed, Karen Grogan seconded, the majority were in favour, 1 member voted against and 1 member abstained.

Duncan Lewis suggested that the Board consider a membership fee category for retired members.

10. AOB: Board asked members’ feedback about the 2016 conference. Members reported positive feedback about the workshops, the panel discussion and the slot for poster sessions. Members requested that abstracts be sent around earlier since hard copies were not being provided (this was recommended for future conferences) and that a list of contact details of delegates be provided.

Bevan Catley, Chair of the 2016 conference, said that a list of delegates’ contact details would be sent around after the conference.

The General Assembly closed at 6.15 pm.

11. At the conference dinner, Premilla D’Cruz thanked Annie Hogh and Stale Einarsen, outgoing Board members, for their commitment and services to the Board and to the IAWBH. On behalf of the Board, Shayne Mathieson presented Annie with a gift. Premilla also thanked Nils Mageroy for his commendable efforts as Treasurer, a role that entailed several challenges due to the international composition of the Board and the association.
### Appendix 1

#### 2015-2017 Financial Planning for IAWBH

(all currency in British Pounds)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected Income</th>
<th>Available Funds from Income (as of 24-5-2015)</th>
<th>Proposed Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-conference year 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Non-conference year 2015</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From direct membership renewals from June 2015 onwards (100 regular members X £60.00 per year + 20 student members X £40.00)</td>
<td>6800</td>
<td>Summer school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bookkeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MISC/CONTINGENCY – for payment of PayPal or Wild Apricot as well as tokens of appreciation (annual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conference year 2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Conference year 2016</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From direct membership renewals (100 regular members X £60.00 per year + 20 student members X £40.00)</td>
<td>6800</td>
<td>Doctoral workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Member fee subsidy (160 members X 100.00 euros – now converted to British pounds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SIGs meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SIG convenors drinks reception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Board meeting and dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bookkeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Audit meeting in Copenhagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MISC/CONTINGENCY – for payment of PayPal or Wild Apricot as well as tokens of appreciation (annual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-conference year 2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Non-conference year 2017</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From direct membership renewals (70 members X £60.00 per year; 30 members X £45.00 per year + 20 student members X £30.00)</td>
<td>6150</td>
<td>Summer school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Board meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bookkeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MISC/CONTINGENCY – for payment of PayPal or Wild Apricot as well as tokens of appreciation (annual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>19,750</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAUTION BALANCE (constant)</strong></td>
<td>3950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPECTED INCOME</strong></td>
<td>47,750</td>
<td><strong>EXPECTED EXPENSES (including caution money)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Announcement

2017—IAWBH Summerschool

Elfi Baillien
Board member (Literature Database and Summer School)

The Board of the IAWBH is delighted to announce that the second IAWBH Summer School focuses on another important aspect in our field, being “Time to rethink the ‘bully’ in workplace bullying”. It is being organized by Ria Deakin and Frances-Louise McGregor of the University of Huddersfield (UK). This Summer School follows from the success of our very first Summer School organized by Pat Ferris and Evelyn Field from the Therapist SIG in August 2015 at Mount Royal University, Calgary, Canada.

Below, Ria and Frances provide you with some further information about the 2017 IAWBH Summer School. We are sure that there will be an enthusiastic response to and participation. Please check future newsletters and the IAWBH website as well as get in touch with Ria (r.deakin@hud.ac.uk.) 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 2019) and point you to http://www.iawbh.org/summer for more details.
2017—IAWBH Summerschool

A word from the organizers:
Time to rethink the ‘bully’ in bullying?

We’re delighted to announce the details of the IAWBH 2017 Summer School: “Time to rethink the ‘bully’ in bullying?” Join us at the University of Huddersfield in wonderful West Yorkshire, UK on the 26th, 27th and 28th July 2017 for a stimulating programme designed to examine the way we understand and approach the ‘bully’ in research and practice.

It is undoubtedly a complex debate, and for some may be a contentious idea. Nevertheless, after over 25 years’ worth of research and active interventions, workplace bullying remains highly problematic, and the summer school would pose the question: is this because we’re missing a key part of the puzzle – an adequate understanding of ‘the bully’?

Through a combination of key note speakers, panel sessions and workshops, we will explore how far our current understandings and approaches to workplace bullying can be extended to accommodate a more prominent and nuanced concept of ‘the bully’ and, if they cannot, to discuss the changes and developments required. The three day programme is designed to move the discussion from identifying the problem, to addressing it and setting an agenda for moving forward.

So it’s not all work and no play, we’ll also be holding an informal and relaxed film clip evening, considering the portrayal of bullies in film and TV with supper and refreshments, and will be arranging a conference dinner at one of the many great local restaurants.

We’re currently working on firming up speakers and will provide details of the programme and the local delights of Huddersfield in the December newsletter. If you’re interested in speaking or taking part on a panel let us know!

We hope to see you there!
Ria and Frances
11th International Conference on Workplace Bullying and Harassment
Bordeaux, France
5-8 June 2018
The 2020 IAWBH Conference...Will You Host It?

The IAWBH is now looking for organizers for its 12th biennial conference planned for 2020. This will follow the very successful previous conferences of London (2002), Bergen (2004), Dublin (2006), Montreal (2008), Cardiff (2010), Copenhagen (2012), Milan (2014) and Auckland (2016)...and the upcoming 2018 conference to be held in Bordeaux, France, between 5th to 8th June.

The 2020 conference will last three days, preferably in May, June or July 2020, and will normally run from Wednesday to Friday, with pre-conference meetings (Special Interests Group/SIGs and PhD workshop) arranged on Tuesday. The local organizers of the 2020 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 12th IAWBH conference in 2020? Please write to Premilla D’Cruz (pdcruz@iima.ac.in) for the conference bid document. The conference bid proposal must be received by the IAWBH Board no later than 1 April 2017. A decision will be made by 1 June 2017.

We look forward to hearing from you soon...
Literature update

In the newsletter we publish titles of research publications that have recently been published. The complete list of publications can be found at our website: http://www.iawbh.org. The list focuses on international publications in English or providing an English abstract. By searching on Google [using for example the title and name of authors as your search terms] you will find the abstracts for most of the articles.

Elfi Baillien

Is there a publication missing from the list? We kindly ask our members to complete the list with new published work regarding workplace bullying and harassment. Your suggestions will be published in our next newsletter and on the webpage. Please send any new publications of yours that you wish to include to Elfi; e-mail: <Elfi.Baillien@kuleuven.be>

Recent research publications


Upcoming Events

The 3rd Int’l Conference on Educational Psychology and Applied Social Psychology (EPASP 2016)
22-24 September 2016
Xi’an, China
www.engii.org/conf/epasp/2016Sep/

The 22nd IAMB conference
28 – 30 September 2016
London, UK
www.IAMB.net

XXI Workshop on Aggression 2016
17- 19 November 2016
Oradea, Romania
Website to be announced

IAWBH Summer School: Time to rethink the ‘bully’ in bullying?
26-28 July 2017
Huddersfield, the United Kingdom
Website to be announced

IAWBH Conference 2018
5-8 June 2018
Bordeaux, France
Website to be announced
Methodology matters
Latent Class Modeling

In this column we ask one of our members to describe an interesting methodology or approach to analysis that was important to answering a particular research question. This time: Guy Notelaers from Norway, discusses: Latent Class Modeling

Introduction
I work as a full Professor Work and Organizational Psychology at the Faculty of Psychology at the University of Bergen in Norway. My focus in my research is measuring, understanding and explaining workplace bullying as a process. Quite early the ‘founding fathers’ of our research area, such as Leymann, Björkvist, Hoel, Zapf, Rayner and Einarsen, agreed that bullying must be seen as a gradually escalating process where in the end there is a victim of bullying. The latter is still not been studied in dept. While my attention has been mainly been in identifying victims and explaining their occurrence, my aim has moved towards capturing the development or process of workplace bullying.

What is the research question you had to answer?
Can we distinguish different phases in the process of workplace bullying and explain both escalation and de-escalation?

What were important factors to design a study to study such a process?
In the first instance, we have to think clearly about how such a process looks and in particular, how a population is distributed over such a process. We can start by relying on previous workplace bullying research. This tells that there are relatively few victims (1-10%), a few more respondents being sometimes confronted with negative social behaviours (10-25%), a large group of respondents who are very rarely exposed to negative social behaviors (30-50%) and finally, perhaps the largest group who are not exposed at all (59% - 40 %). Hence, we are dealing with a process that is not normally distributed at all. Next, we need to imagine the shape of the process. Is it a continuous or discontinuous process? Is it a process with a single end (i.e. victims) or different end stations (for instance victims and sometimes bullied)? Is it a linear or a non-linear process? Here there is not much theory to
guide us. But eminent scholars agree largely that there are phases in the process; and they agree on what type of social interaction qualifies as bullying. At the definitional core lies the repeated nature of negative social behaviours. This may imply that before a certain point the social interaction does not warrant the label ´bullying´. This means that there may be a qualitative difference between at least two phases: a bullying phase and a phase that isn´t bullying. Finally, scholars agree that such a process will (probably) take half a year to develop.

**What does this mean for the design and the analysis of the study?**
The four factors mentioned here above guide the design of the study and tool boxes (statistics) that are at our disposal. The assumption of different phases in the bullying process and relative low frequency of victims, prescribes the need of very large samples. Furthermore, we need to investigate how many phases there are in this process. We also need to study the shape of the process: how respondents move over time between the phases. Is there a single process that fits all respondents or are there different processes? Next, we must test whether there are qualitative differences between the phases. Consequently, next to a large sample, longitudinal data spanning over four to five or even more waves should also be collected. These factors demand quite a lot of flexibility from statistical models that challenge traditional statistics. To a large extent, Latent Class Modelling may offer us tools to deal with the aforementioned challenges.

**What were the advantages and disadvantages of such a study design and Latent Class Modeling?**
Collecting multiple waves among thousands of respondents contributes clearly to the power of the study. However, it is not easy. First, it is rather costly. This is an important argument because most often public money funds such research. Secondly, collecting such data is complex. In a changing world where internal and external job mobility increases more rapidly than ever, researchers must take into account that both colleagues and leaders move internally and externally. This may very well influence movement of respondents between the different phases of the bullying process. To safeguard statistical power the need for a even larger sample increases. In addition non-responses over time must be followed up, to be in a position to discern systematic errors. These are sources of error related to the phenomenon under investigation.
The standard Latent Class Model does not suffice to answer these important research questions. With Latent Markov Models, the number of phases existing in a process can be discerned. With Latent Class Markov Models, we may investigate whether different transition processes describe the bullying process. By extending With Latent (Class) Markov Models, with dual processes, we can investigate whether other processes contribute to the escalation or de-escalation of the bullying process. With Latent Class Growth Models a researcher can discern in depth whether different shapes exist. In order to move the science forward, this asks researchers to walk on a more slippery surface and to leave the traditional modelling framework behind. Most of us have not even heard of this framework and many of the Latent Class Modelling advanced features are constantly developing at a high rate.

What could you do alternatively to collecting multiple waves of data and answer your research with the help of Latent Class Analysis

Well my response may come as a surprise. Given the costs, the complexity of the design and the difficulties of these statistical models, I would suggest using qualitative study designs. Of course, qualitative study designs may not facilitate researchers to answer precisely these research questions and the research hypotheses that follow. However, they may shed light on different aspects of the bullying process that are relatively untouched. Like for instance the number of phases that we may expect in such a process, what happens in these phases with targets and bystanders, the shape that escalation and de-escalation may take, the events that ignited escalation or de-escalation. There are many research questions about the process of workplace bullying that have, at least in my opinion, received little attention. Such qualitative research may not only contribute to theory development; it also has the potential to contribute to future quantitative approaches that can use such qualitative information actively. I am thinking here about Bayesian Statistics. In the Bayesian world, the use of informed priors has the potential to help us to design more economical studies.

Please choose another scholar from the membership list for the next ‘Methodology matters’ column
I chose Jordi Escartin, Universitat de Barcelona, Spain.

Thank you very much Guy Notelaers for discussing some of the challenges to investigate the process of workplace bullying for us.
The 3 most influential works

In this column members of IAWBH may present the three works that influenced them the most. After presenting these works the member may pick up another member from the membership list (they don’t know too well and who is working in another field of bullying) for the ‘The 3 most influential works column’ in the next newsletter. Denise Salin who presented the 3 most influential works in the last newsletter chose Morten Birkeland Nielsen for this column in the current newsletter.

Introduction

Thanks to Denise for the invitation to contribute to this column. My research on workplace bullying started in the early 2000s during the work on my master’s thesis. With Stig Berge Matthiesen as the supervisor, workplace bullying was an obvious topic for the thesis. I defended my PhD thesis on methodological issues in research on workplace bullying in 2009. At the present I am employed as a senior researcher at the National Institute of Occupational Health in Norway and as professor at the University of Bergen. My main research interests include occupational health and safety, workplace bullying and harassment, leadership, personality, and research methodology I have chosen the following papers as the three most influential works.


In this excellent article Ståle Einarsen summarises the first ten years of research on workplace bullying and provides several suggestions for future studies. Among several helpful suggestions, Einarsen highlights that theoretical models and theoretically driven designs must be developed in future research on workplace bullying. Sixteen years later I would say that this is still the case. Although we know about the nature, prevalence, antecedents, and consequence of bullying, and have substantially improved our research methodology and designs, we still lag behind with regard to theory. There is a need for stronger theoretical perspectives on the phenomenon we are studying and we can learn a lot from social psychology. The lack of theories within the research field is probably one of the main reasons for why
there are so few studies on workplace bullying in the high impact journals (Academy of Management, Journal of Applied Psychology and so on). In his research, including this paper, Einarsen has continuously emphasized the social interactionist perspective of Felson and Tedeschi and this has always been the basic starting point of my own research.


This paper is a hidden gem within the field and is probably the most obscure publication presented in this column. Being published in 1991 as a Norwegian language report from a small district college in western Norway it has been read by a handful of people only. In the paper, Tor-Johan Ekeland uses theories on attribution and social psychology in conjunction with clinical experiences to explain workplace bullying. The paper is elegantly written and presents some excellent thoughts about workplace bullying. This paper was incredibly important for me during my work on my master’s thesis and the following quote from the conclusion is especially noteworthy (my translation): To analyze social interactions is like making a movie, picture by picture. Using knowledge from various studies within social psychology we have put together some pictures which may provide insight into bullying as a process. However, a danger with this kind of ‘microscoping’ is that the outcome may not be relevant or that the selection does not say anything about the whole. We do therefore also need a macroperspective on bullying”. While attribution theory certainly is a fruitful perspective on bullying there are hardly any studies which have continued this line of research. Fun fact: In the introduction of the paper, Ekeland summarizes all the existing studies on workplace bullying at the time using only one single sentence and three references.


During the last years I have been involved in several meta-analyses on bullying. This 2006 study by Nathan Bowling and Terry Behr is where it all started. There was a steadily increase in primary studies on bullying around 2006, something which made me realise, after reading the Bowling and Beehr paper, that we quite soon should be able to conduct similar meta-studies on workplace bullying.
In 2010 we published a meta-analysis on the prevalence rates of bullying, which I think was the first meta-analysis which dealt with bullying as a unique form of workplace aggression. By 2016, we have published altogether six meta-analyses on bullying, all thanks to the inspiration we got from Bowling and Beehr’s seminar paper.

You may pick another member from the membership list for the ‘My 3 most influential works... column’ in the next newsletter. Who do you choose?

Nikola Djurkovic, Swinburne University of Technology, Australia.

Thank you very much Morten Birkeland Nielsen for sharing with us the 3 works that influenced you the most.
Report on SIG meetings
at the 2016 IAWBH conference in Auckland

Special interest groups met once again before the conference in Auckland, and below are some brief accounts of the various meetings:

- Organizational Influences and Bystanders SIG,
- Dynamics of Power SIG,
- Risk Management SIG,
- Therapist SIG,
- Trade Union SIG.

The legal issues SIG (convened by Katherine Lippel) also met in Auckland.

Descriptions of the SIGs can be found at the IAWBH website, and contact can be made through the discussion forums. Access the discussion forums by logging into the website, and going to the “Member area”, then “Sig area”.

SIG convenors are keen to welcome new members and encourage contributions and involvement from all members on SIG communications and activities.

Please get in touch with me at the following email address
Board_SIGs_Coordinator@iawbh.org if I can help with any SIG issues.

Carlo Caponecchia
IAWBH Board SIG Co-ordinator
Organizational Influences and Bystanders SIG
Meeting 2016

Held April 19, 2016 at the 10th International Conference of IAWBH
SIG convenor: Susan Johnson

Summary:

Our group was formed to allow a venue for the discussion of the role of situational and contextual factors in bullying and harassment in the workplace. These factors may include, but are not limited to, organizational antecedents such as the nature of work, the organizational culture or climate, and leadership. We recognize that such organization-level antecedents may interact with other group or individual-level factors in influencing bullying and harassment. We hope that this SIG will help us gain a deeper understanding of what organizations can do to minimize bullying in the workplace.

Bystanders to workplace bullying (mobbing) are people present at an event who are neither the target nor the bully. They are in a good position to intervene but often they do not. There are many roles a bystander can take, all of which influence the bullying process. The Bystander Special Interest Group (SIG) is a forum for interested practitioners and academics to explore bystanders through examination and knowledge sharing. Together we can support and motivate each other to achieve a greater understanding of positive bystander roles and how these can contribute to anti-bullying strategies.

There were 7 people (including myself) at the pre-conference meeting of the Organizational Influences and Bystanders SIG in Auckland. None of the participants had attended a pre-conference meeting at prior conferences, and for most of the attendees, this was their first IAWBH conference. Attendees came from the United States, Canada, The Netherlands, New Zealand, and Japan, and included several people who work in academic disciplines, some organizational and union consultants, and a public sector employee who works with organizations to tackle workplace bullying.

The agenda for an informal discussion can be seen below. We had a fruitful discussion, and the meeting was a great opportunity to learn about the work that others are doing. While this is not one of the more active SIGs, and only seems to generate interest at the conferences (attempts at stimulating on-line discussions have not met with success), I believe it provides a valuable service to members.
Dynamics of Power SIG meeting 2016

19 April 2016; 2 hour meeting at the Auckland 2016 conference
Attendees: 3
SIG Convenor: Hadyn Olsen

Summary
Although this was only attended by three people, those attending stated that it was valuable to be able to discuss the issue and take away information that was useful for them.

We discussed the idea of power and what that meant for people. Power itself is a constructed notion that is often associated with positional roles, age, knowledge, social relationships and standing, personal power, charisma and self-confidence.

We also discussed the analysis of power that has been developed in the Family Violence field and the relevance of this in terms of workplace bullying. In particular we examined the background of the “Power and Control” wheel and the “Equality” wheel models used as part of the Duluth project and how this was used in work with targets and perpetrators. This model describes behaviour that is conducted by a person to develop a “power-over” relationship that is at the heart of abusive relationships. The model also explains a “power-with” relationships and the difference in behavioural dynamics to meet the needs of those in relationship.

Our discussions focused on how organisations might use this analysis to support culture development and how this might be useful in working with perpetrators and targets of workplace bullying.

Hadyn Olsen
Risk Management SIG meeting

Attendees: 20-25
19 April 2016; Full day meeting at the Auckland 2016 conference
SIG convenor: Carlo Caponecchia

Summary
We had an interesting and interactive meeting with 3 main components:

- info sharing - where each participant shared some information, such as a case study, research development, thought to be of interest to other participants;
- mini-workshops - delivered by Danielle Carney and Julie-Anne McDougall regarding investigations, and Anne Wyatt regarding Return to Work issues; and
- a panel discussion - where panelists Catherine Burr, Eva Gemzøe Mikkelsen and Oonagh Barron responded to thought provoking questions written down by participants throughout the session.

Feedback from participants
Feedback was solicited from attendees after the conference by email.

Overall feedback on the meeting was very positive, with participants noting that it was an informative session which allowed for more in-depth discussion and interaction. Several commented that it was a good entrée to the conference as it helped identify focal issues and the perspectives of other attendees.

Attendees who had been at previous SIG meetings noted that there has been development in our meeting over the years. Some feedback was also received about moving the SIG forward, perhaps towards having some kind of tangible outcome (such as jointly developed books, book chapters or article(s)). Some feedback indicated that the SIG meeting could have a different theme each meeting, or questions or issues could be raised for consideration by attendees in advance. Part of this may involve moving towards more of a working group model rather than just having meetings every two years. Different views and experience with what constitutes risk management; the breadth of issues relevant to risk management (eg. measurement, risk controls/interventions, intervention follow-up); and the value of specifying what risk management means within the workplace bullying context were noted. In addition, a list of key risk management resources and publications was requested for circulation, which we are currently developing.

We are seeking further feedback on possible ways forward from those members who attended.
The 10th International Conference on Workplace Bullying and Harassment in Auckland, New Zealand was preceded by the third, full day Therapist SIG on the 19th April, at Auckland University, followed a week later in Melbourne, Australia on the 26th April at the Epworth Hospital, Camberwell with another full day devoted to diagnosis and treatment.

On both occasions, Evelyn M Field convened the day with the assistance of her co–convenor Dr Pat Ferris. Participants were privileged to hear and participate in professional, evidence-based discussions around the diagnosis and treatment of bullied employees.

The pre-conference Therapist SIG included presentations by Christiane Kreitlow on hypnosis, Marie France Hirgoyen on pathology, Miwako Wakui on mergers and bullying, Linda Tilley on ADHD and bullying and a few hours were dedicated to the World Café Model, conducted by Linda Tilley around Pat Ferris’s model of diagnosis, (mild, moderate or severe). This was a most interesting, energising experience, which will provide Pat with further information to develop her model. Due to time constraints Evelyn left out her paper on the therapeutic relationship.

There was discussion about those who attended and where they worked. This included a psychologist working in rural areas of Australia, to one working with clergy in the USA! We also discussed the organisation and leadership of the Therapist SIG. Although Evelyn believes that it is time for someone else to lead the group, no one else is ready to assume the baton! We have also decided that in Bordeaux we will begin the day earlier and convene the evening prior, to manage the introductions and leave more room for papers on the SIG day.

A week later, in Melbourne, the fourth full day on diagnosis and treatment of bullied employees took place at the Epworth Hospital, Camberwell. Although Evelyn was unsure how many therapists could travel to Melbourne after Auckland and had been unwell following her recent heart attack, this day was a great success for the visitors, (who are hoping for a summer school) and for the local psychologists who attended. In fact, they want to meet again regularly to discuss the treatment of workplace bullying!
Christiane Kreitlow spoke about ethics, Evelyn Field spoke about diagnosis and treatment based upon the IAWBH, Therapist SIG website, (which now need to be updated,) Dr Pat Ferris spoke about mild, moderate and severe reactions to bullying, Dr Marie France Hirigoyen spoke about pathology, paranoid personalities and bullies, Miwako Wakui presented a variety of cases, from Japan, Singapore, Rumania, Serbia, and Linda Tilley spoke about social status and bullies.

After a lovely lunch for most at the “Baker’s Wife”, Dr George Halasz, a psychiatrist with a special interest in Holocaust and relational trauma, spoke for over two and half hours on Bullying and Trauma. Not only did he provide a background for understanding trauma, but he also provided pathways for therapists to consider treating their traumatised clients, repairing their injured personalities, while simultaneously caring for themselves. This intensive day ended with Dr Graham Wong, Director of Psychiatry, Epworth Camberwell, presenting on the Frustrations and Dilemmas of a Private Psychiatrist and one of his cases.

Upon reflection, the Therapist SIG is comprised of a small, informal group of dedicated international mental health professionals. These four full days are the first ever and only internationally, where therapists have focused on treating bullied employees! Hopefully this group can raise standards of diagnosis and treatment, in order that bullied people who have been injured and traumatised, obtain “A Fair Go” medically, legally and in all other ways that influence their treatment following a bullying injury.

Evelyn M Field OAM, Dr Pat Ferris.
Trade Unions SIG Meeting

- Joan Jessome, President of Nova Scotia Govt & Gen Employees union (NSGEU), discussed the Working Toward Bully-Free Workplaces Awareness Program to provide Bully-free workplaces.
- Doug Clark, New Zealand Post Primary Teachers Association (NZPPTA), discussed the Worksafe Best Practice Guidelines for responding and preventing workplace bullying and presented a PowerPoint of a seminar he had presented at the launch of these guidelines.

Doug Clark
Who is....?

In this column members of IAWBH may present themselves in a snow-balling 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.

Evelyn M Field OAM, FAPS from Australia who presented herself in the last newsletter chose Pat Ferris from Canada as the member to be interviewed in this newsletter.

Tell us something about yourself

I live in Calgary, Alberta, Canada at the base of the Rocky Mountains in the west part of the country. I feel so grateful to live in a kind and gentle country with all my freedoms. I enjoy the outdoors and gardening as well as sports: running, biking and soccer in the summer and snowshoeing in the winter. I also love music, having grown up in a musical family singing, playing piano and guitar. The activities fill my spare time with happiness and adventure.

How did you become interested in workplace bullying?

In the mid-1990s while working in the Employee Assistance Program field as a therapist, I began to notice numerous clients telling stories about mistreatment at work. The extent and nature of their experiences surprised me as did the extent of the psychological, social and physical symptoms they experienced. Moreover, I often found these clients hard to treat as they did not respond to usual therapies well. As I researched these types of experiences, I began to discover the terms mobbing and bullying and the associated ill health. I read every book I could find and started corresponding with Ruth and Gary Namie, then started attending the bullying conferences starting in London in 2002. When I returned to graduate school in 2001 to study Industrial Organizational Psychology, I started a program of research that examined professional faculty students experiences of bullying in their training.

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

Research on workplace bullying in Canada developed alongside that in the US with some academics writing on the topic in the 1980s and 1990s. Workplace bullying became known to the general public through popular press books as well as defining court cases. Increasingly now, provinces place workplace bullying under Occupational Health and Safety legislation but not all provinces have introduced such
legislation including my own province, Alberta. In the absence of specific legislation, workplace bullying is dealt with most frequently in civil courts under the tort of 'negligent infliction of psychiatric damage.' Employers in Canada now are including workplace bullying in their Codes of Conduct and will conduct investigations into allegations of workplace bullying and implement interventions and discipline. Nonetheless, in my experience, many organizations in Canada fail to take this issue seriously or provide proper management and processes for dealing with allegations of workplace bullying.

What can you tell us about your work?

I am a partner in a large psychological practice that has numerous streams of work including the provision of Employee Assistance Program counselling to organizations, private practice, training, and consulting in organizational issues. In addition to seeing general and bullied clients I have a long standing research program with a medical company that tests sex differences in a model of work and personal stress contributions to Coronary Heart Disease risk factors.

The major focus of my practice is on treating targets of workplace bullying. For the past 20 years, I have seen about 20 new cases of bullying each year for clinical treatment. I also consult to practitioners, lawyers, unions, and targets on impact, intervention and treatment strategies; conduct training at organizations, work with damaged teams and present at numerous conferences.

I also write on my clinical and consulting experiences. My first academic paper documented my clients’ experiences with reporting to HR and revealed three responses: a) ‘that’s the way we are here and it’s OK’, 2) ‘it’s a personality conflict for which you should seek counselling’, and c) ‘the behaviour described violates our values and we will provide support’. These insights have weathered the test of time and I continue to hear primarily the first two responses. It has been my experience that when companies do not provide support and resources, a target experiences a second injury: an existential affront to their sense of justice and morality in the world. The result of this injury can be even more debilitating than the experience of bullying itself. My recent research and clinical experience show that those severely impacted by workplace bullying experience a high degree of rumination that severely impairs their ability to function in the world. Many ruminate incessantly about achieving justice for their experiences and present as embittered. Many are unable to work, cannot relate to their families and friends because of this focus on justice.

I am currently conducting a study using Subject Matter Experts to map the clinical presentation of the impact of workplace bullying. Initial analysis shows symptoms consistent with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) as well as social pain and numerous somatic symptoms. While there is overlap with PTSD I believe that the clinical presentation most closely reflects the concept of Complex Trauma. The experience of betrayal of trust in a person in an organizational role and the secondary injury of institutional betrayal when there is a lack of support stand out in both target and therapist descriptions of target experiences.

I believe that the biggest challenge to preventing workplace bullying is the lack of understanding of the severity of impact these experiences have on an employee and the lack of organizational accountability. While there
have been high profile court cases, in general there has been little consequence to organizations in Canada for the damage done to employees on exposure to this workplace hazard. I believe that only through legislation under Occupational Health and Safety will this hazard be taken seriously and hazard mitigation and injury treatment be required.

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

My greatest mission/s in the field of workplace bullying is to demonstrate and explain the biopsychosocial damage created when people are exposed to workplace bullying and to develop treatment protocols unique to this injury. Along this line, my goal is to be able to provide evidence to support diagnoses that accurately reflect the trauma, symptoms, and functional impairment that exposure to workplace bullying can produce. Studies in school bullying have recently documented serious long term damage of exposure to school bullying emphasizing the serious nature of school bullying. I hope to bring the same focus to the serious impact of workplace bullying.

**Question from Evelyn Field:** ‘How can mental health professionals world-wide change the superficial manner with which bullied employees are currently regarded by the medical professions, the law and employers, in order that their injuries, including Posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and Workplace Bullying Trauma (WBT) are recognised when relevant?’

I find that language does not do justice to describing the experience and impact of workplace bullying. When we can talk about human needs and associated brain and neural pathways, when we talk about a trauma of betrayal and the essential human reaction to exclusion, rejection, ostracism and verbal abuse, we will capture attention. It is my opinion that when we can clearly describe the psychological, biological, and neurological impact of workplace bullying and propose valid associated diagnoses and treatment strategies targets will be taken seriously. I also believe that we must draw from overlapping research areas of social psychology, neuropsychology, embitterment and their associated treatments. When we can cite well conducted scientific studies that demonstrate damage and highlight pathways to damage, we will be taken seriously.

You may pick another member from the membership list for the ‘Who is...? column’ in the next newsletter. Who do you choose and what is your question for the member?

Dr Frances McGregor Chartered FCIPD, Fellow HEA, DBA, MA HRM, Senior Lecturer in HR Management and Development

My question: I am hearing more and more that people accused of bullying are surprised and injured. I find it hard understand that someone could not understand the impact of bullying and would not be conscious of it. Is the behaviour being reported truly bullying or something else?

Thank you very much Pat Ferris for taking part in this interview.
New Members

A warm welcome to our new members:

- Caroline Cole Power, Canadian HR Solutions Inc., Canada
- Peggy Flanigan, Athabasca University, Alberta Canada
- Yariv Itzkovich, Kinneret Academic College, Jordan Valley, Israel
- Daniella Mokhtar, University of Sheffield, South Yorkshire, United Kingdom
- Barb Nekich, City of Lethbridge, AB, Canada

Please don’t forget to join us on LinkedIn. If you have a profile on LinkedIn, go to 'Group directory' and search for 'IAWBH' (members only).
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 December 2016. 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 significant number of our members.

Please send your contribution for the newsletter before **the 1st of December 2016** to: a.hubert@hubertconsult.nl

Adrienne Hubert,
Board member (Communications),

---

**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.