Dear IAWBH member,

Greetings from all of us on the IAWBH Board! As you have noticed, the Association’s new logo now headlines this issue. And when you visit the IAWBH website (www.iawbh.org), you will experience its new contemporary feel. Carlo Caponecchia has been – and is still – working hard on developing the website, a task involving lots of precision and time. Many thanks to him for his stupendous efforts! The website is functional and you will find modifications, refinements and so on, being added over time.

The call for abstracts (for presentations and workshop proposals) and registrations, including information about student scholarships, for the upcoming biennial 2018 IAWBH conference (Bordeaux, France, 5-8 June) is now open. Do visit https://bullying2018.sciencesconf.org/ to submit abstracts and workshop proposals and to register. You can also find more details of what is in store at the conference – keynotes, symposia, social events, student scholarships, pre-conference activities and so on. Do make a note of the important dates...We look forward to seeing all of you at the conference – it would be lovely to meet again after two years!

There are two important announcements from the Board. Following our discussions with you during the 2016 General Assembly in Auckland, New Zealand, we have re-worked the annual membership fees (details in the table below), being mindful not to go beyond the earlier upper limit of £60 per year. You will soon find the new fee structure on the IAWBH website when you visit it to renew your membership.
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The IAWBH Summer School is to be called the IAWBH Masterclass henceforth. We hope you like the new name. The Board considered this nomenclature to be more appropriate as it does not distinguish between the two hemispheres of the globe and hence is more inclusive and representative of our worldwide membership.

This issue of the newsletter, painstakingly put together by Adrienne Hubert, has a detailed report on the IAWBH Summer School (now IAWBH Masterclass), held 27-28 July 2017 at Huddersfield, UK. Our deep appreciation to Ria Deakin and Frances-Louise McGregor for organizing such an enriching event on ‘Time to rethink the bully in bullying?’, a very important topic in the substantive area. You will no doubt enjoy reading all about the 2017 IAWBH Summer School (henceforth IAWBH Masterclass) as you leaf through the pages. In another piece, Dr. Sheila White puts across her view of the event.

### Membership Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership Category</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular member – waged (developed country)</td>
<td>£60 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular member – unwaged (developed country)</td>
<td>£30 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular member from developing or transitioning country*</td>
<td>£30 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student member</td>
<td>£30 per year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As defined by UN country list.

IAWBH Board members Adrienne Hubert and Nils Mageroy

thanking the organizers of the IAWBH Summer school:

Frances-Louise McGregor and Ria Deakin
Our regular columns make stimulating reading: We have Declan Fahie in Methodology Matters (In-Depth Interviews in Qualitative Workplace Bullying Research), Işıl Karatuna sharing her choice of ‘The 3 Most Influential Works’ and Linda Tilley on ‘Who Is...?’ Upcoming events and a link to the latest list of research output as well as a list of new members follows.

Several announcements from the Board feature in the initial pages of the newsletter. There is a note about the use of the name and logo of the IAWBH, apart from an invitation to be a part of the committee which evaluates applications for student scholarships to the 2018 Bordeaux conference. The Election Committee puts out a call for the 2018 elections, encouraging members to stand for available posts.

With best wishes from all of us on the Board,

Premilla D’Cruz
Using the name and logo of IAWBH

Some recent events have made it necessary to make clear once more the arrangements for the appropriate use of the IAWBH name and brand.

Members are encouraged to identify that they are a member of the IAWBH when publishing work, when giving presentations, or in email signatures. However, members should not give the impression, explicit or implied, that the IAWBH is endorsing their opinion, methodology, findings, practice or work generally, in any publication, presentation or speech.

The logo of the IAWBH remains the property of the association and cannot be used without the written permission of the IAWBH Board. The IAWBH logo may only be used to market officially sanctioned IAWBH events such as the IAWBH Conference and Summer School (henceforth termed Masterclass), or for purposes expressly approved by the Board.

In all other instances, written permission for using the name or logo of the IAWBH must be sought from the Board.

We would also like to remind our members of the purpose and scope of the IAWBH (the details may be found here https://iawbh.org/Purpose-IAWBH/). In brief...

*The purpose of the IAWBH is to stimulate, generate, integrate and disseminate research and evidence based practice in the field of workplace bullying and harassment, and to promote fairness, justice and dignity at work for all.*

It is important to note that the IAWBH is not a certifying professional association. This means that we do not evaluate the work of our membership, or develop standards of practice, or subject members to disciplinary action.

As such, it is not within our aims to comment on the work of specific individuals, organisations or issues. Should members consider that specific issues require comment, they should do so in their private capacity on their own behalf, not on behalf of the IAWBH or of an IAWBH Special Interest Group.
Accordingly, the IAWBH will not endorse any particular practices, guidelines or methodologies related to the treatment of workplace bullying and harassment. Our association exists to build connections, and facilitate the sharing of information and ideas.

Examples of appropriate text for using the IAWBH name and referring to IAWBH SIGS are being developed. In the meantime, we ask members to be mindful of the issues raised above when promoting their activities.

If you have any questions regarding these issues, please contact a member of the Board.

IAWBH Board
Dear IAWBH Member,

On behalf of the electoral committee, we would like to encourage IAWBH members to stand for one of the available positions for the 2018 IAWBH elections. Next year, we will be electing:

- one president
- two board members (one practitioner and one academic)
- two reserve board members
- one person for the governance audit
- two persons for the electoral committee

We kindly invite you to think about whether you would be interested in standing for any of these positions. We will initiate further calls later in 2017 or the beginning of 2018, however we are putting out this call now so that you may ponder over these possibilities and consider standing.

With respect to elections of members to the Board, the IAWBH constitution says that at least 5 board members must be employed full time by an academic institute or recognized research establishment (It also stipulates that the President must be employed full time by an academic institute or a recognized research establishment).

We hope that some of you will be interested in standing for the available posts as this would be an excellent chance to work for our association and to support and influence the future of bullying research and practice.

For the moment, we leave you with these thoughts... and do contact either of us if you have any questions or wish to have any more information.

Yours sincerely,
Mieneke Pouwelse and Eva Gemzøe Mikkelsen
Call for nominations
committee scholarships

Those members present at the IAWBH General Assembly in Auckland, New Zealand, in April 2016, would recall discussions around the provision of funding support to a select number of PhD students to attend the next IAWBH conference in Bordeaux, France, in 2018. The Board noted this request and has worked to put in place a small number of scholarships for this initiative.

The Board would like to invite nominations from the general membership to join the assessment panel for the scholarships; the panel will comprise two Board members and one IAWBH member. The main tasks of the panel are anticipated to take place in the first quarter of 2018, and will involve reviewing and evaluating scholarship applications against criteria developed by the Board.

If you are interested in serving on the panel as the IAWBH member, please email the following information to Professor Maryam Omari (m.omari@ecu.edu.au) by November 30, 2017.

- Full Name and Title
- Affiliation/Institution
- A supporting statement not exceeding 200 words to describe your previous experience on selection panels, or with scholarship/funding applications.

The nominations will be assessed by the IAWBH Board towards the end of the year. It is anticipated that the successful applicant will be advised by December 2017. Should sufficient or appropriate nominations not be received, a sub-committee of the Board will assess the applications for funding support.

The IAWBH Board
Call for abstracts 2018 IAWBH Conference

now open!

The abstracts submission begins from September 15th, 2017 to December 3rd, 2017. The results will be sent the first week of February 2018.

Abstracts have to be written in English only.

You can submit an oral presentation, a poster or a workshop.

More details on the modalities of deposits:

- Oral presentation or poster
- Workshop

More information about abstract submission:
https://bullying2018.sciencesconf.org/resource/page/id/3
Time to rethink ‘the bully’ in bullying? Yes! But how?

Report from the 2017 IAWBH summer school

By Ria Deakin

The IAWBH 2017 Summer School took place on the 26th, 27th and 28th July and, in line with the British summer, the weather was, for the most part rather dull and wet... Thankfully, however, the weather didn’t serve to dampen spirits or debate, resulting in a lively and engaging event. Over the three days, there were 10 speakers, enjoyed by around 35 academics and practitioners from a variety of different countries.

Our speakers posed and addressed a number of interesting – and at times controversial – propositions around our core focus of considering the (in)adequacies of current approaches to dealing with ‘the bully’.

On the first day, Laura Crawshaw, PhD, (Boss Whispering Institute) considered how perspectives on perpetrators may be classified, for example as criminal or clueless, and how these differing perspectives influence the interventions chosen. Ruth Brenner Unger (BullyingUK) offered suggestions around the similarities and differences between the nature and responses to school and workplace bullying. There was also an energetic panel discussion between Katherine Graham (CMP Resolutions) and Bill Adams (Trade Unions Congress (Yorkshire and Humber)), about the strengths and weaknesses of current approaches to dealing with bullies and bullying.
On the second day, Miwako Wakui (Office Prism LLC) provided insight into the role of toxic cultures in facilitating and perpetuating ‘power harassment’ in Japan; followed by Evelyn Field, OAM, who drew assistance from the animal kingdom to illustrate her discussion evaluating the ways we currently classify and explain bullies and bullying behaviour, and the way individuals and organisations respond to bullying.

We then moved into a series of parallel workshop sessions and tough choices were made about where to go! Neill Thompson (Northumbria University), spoke about an innovative approach of using video to analyse the language those accused of bullying use to help us better understand the perspective of ‘bullies’; while in the room next door, Dr Sheila White (Birkbeck, University of London), delivered a workshop introducing the value of adopting a psychodynamic approach to bullies. In the last slots of the day, Laura Crawshaw spoke further about what it takes to change abrasive leaders and the essential role an employer plays; while Anne Lee (Oxford University) spoke about the challenges of dealing with bullies in toxic cultures, especially in situations where there was a question over who had the authority and responsibility to address it.

The last day saw Dr Karen Niven, University of Manchester speak about the role of third parties in bullying, suggesting the potentially contentious proposition that failure on the part of third-party bystanders to intervene may lead to them being considered as ‘bullies by proxy’.

The purpose of the Summer School was to explore the question: Is it time to rethink the ‘bully’ in bullying? The relatively small number of delegates allowed us to seize the opportunity to have in-depth discussions around the complexities and nuances involved in answering this question. The programme was therefore designed to facilitate understanding and learning not only through key note presentations and workshops, but also through ‘collaborative dialogue’. Collaborative dialogue encourages debate and the exploration of contradictions and opposing perspectives and experiences through respectful and shared discussion – and there was certainly plenty of that!
The willingness to question and converse was evident, not only in response to the various speakers, with some fantastic debates emerging from the post-talk question and answer opportunities, but also through the use of World Cafés. At the Summer School we had two World Café sessions – one on the first day to identify the issues, and one on the last day to crystallise thoughts about the way forward.

The first Café posed the question: To what extent do you think it is necessary to rethink ‘the bully’ in bullying? Here the consensus was that it was, indeed, necessary to rethink ‘the bully’ in bullying. Key themes in the discussions were that it’s not so much a need to rethink, but a need to address it in the first place; conceptual and practical ambiguity over the word ‘bully’; uncertainty over the effectiveness of policies; and the need to recognise the role played by an organisation. Given the problems, we also discussed who, or what, is a bully. This lead to conversations over the importance of the nature and extent of harm, the role of organisational actions, and the need to move away from a focus on personality traits.

In light of the preceding presentations, workshops and discussions, the Summer School closed with a second Café. These discussions began by asking: Should we stop using the terms ‘bully’ and bullying? If yes, what are the alternatives? There was a great deal of debate in relation to the question, with some strong views that we should indeed stop using the term ‘bully’ in relation to workplace bullying due to its connotations with school and children, rather than adults. In contrast to this, others felt its familiarity provided a way for individuals to help understand their experiences. Some alternatives were suggested, including ‘workplace mistreat-
ment’. There was an interesting discussion around the adequacy and utility of alternative terms, for example in facilitating research access to organizations, and in providing a common language across cultural and disciplinary contexts.

Given the persistent challenges, the next question asked what the three biggest weaknesses in current understandings and approaches to dealing with ‘bullies’ and bullying are, and what could be done to overcome these. Here the weaknesses focused around the dominance of quantitative, rather than qualitative methodologies in bullying research; too great a focus on bullying as an individual, rather than collective problem; and organizational perceptions of bullying. Approaches for dealing with these included embracing more qualitative research and insight, and recognizing the role of the organization in the bullying dynamic, as well as interpersonal dimensions.

Finally, with a view to future action, we finished by considered where we, as researchers and practitioner could go from here. There were some great, proactive and practically-focused suggestions, for example around ways to try and facilitate collaboration and partnership between academics and practitioners, and how the IAWBH may be able to facilitate this. Other ideas included the need for more narrative research, particularly from the perpetrator perspective.

Just in case that wasn’t quite enough, on the Wednesday evening we also had a bullying-themed film and tv clip evening at the nearby Lawrence Batley Theatre where we discussed the portrayal of bullies in popular culture. This was followed on Thursday by a relaxed evening of tapas and drinks at a lovely local restaurant and bar, The Corner.
We had a few challenges along the way but on behalf of myself and Frances, we would like to say thank you to all those who supported the Summer School along the way and during the event itself. A special thank you also goes to those who came along, whether to present, host a workshop and/or just to attend. It was a risk to make the programme so dependent on participation and contributions from delegates but we couldn’t have asked for a better group, and were absolutely thrilled with how it turned out.

As a shared resource for IAWBH members and a means of helping to continue and move the debate forward, a more detailed report on the main themes of the Summer School discussions is being prepared. If you were unable to attend but would like a copy, please email r.deakin@hud.ac.uk.
Methodology Matters

In-Depth Interviews in Qualitative Workplace Bullying Research

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 the Board invited: Declan Fahie from Ireland discussing “In-Depth Interviews in Qualitative Workplace Bullying Research”

Introduction

A primary school teacher for almost twenty years, Declan now works in the School of Education, University College Dublin (UCD), Ireland where he lectures in Sociology of Education, Pedagogy and Research Methodologies. Declan publishes and researches in school effectiveness (Devine, Fahie and McGillicuddy, 2014), queer issues in education (Fahie, 2017; Fahie, Quilty and DePalma Ungaro, 2017), workplace bullying and harassment in schools (Fahie and Devine, 2014; Fahie, 2014a&b and 2015) and the experiences of LGBT teachers in Ireland (Fahie, 2016). A former recipient of the Irish Research Council’s two-year post-doctoral fellowship, Declan was previously a Visiting Scholar at the Centre for Lesbian and Gay Studies, City University of New York (CUNY). Declan is lead guest editor of the recent special edition of the indexed journal Irish Educational Studies entitled “Queer Teaching – Teaching Queer”, which explores queer themes in education nationally and internationally. This Methodologies Matters discussion draws upon his own contribution to the journal (Fahie, 2017), as well as other related research.

What was the question you had to answer?

My most recent research, and the resultant publications (see below), consider the experiences of Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual (LGB) teachers who work, or worked, within the overwhelmingly denominational/religious primary school system in Ireland. For many of these teachers, fear and vulnerability shaped their professional lives, and instances of harassment and discrimination were common. However, there remains a dearth of theoretically-informed research which formally documents and analyses the experiences of this vulnerable cohort. My ongoing research seeks to address this lacuna and, in so doing, provide a voice for a hithertofore silent group.
What were important factors in your research design?

Until recently, Irish legislation provided denominational organizations (like the vast majority of Irish primary schools, some hospitals, nursing homes and charities, for example) a derogation in respect of the relevant employment equality legislation which otherwise offers protection to Irish workers against harassment and discrimination in the workplace. As a result, many Irish lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) primary teachers found themselves “Spectacularly exposed and vulnerable” (Fahie, 2016) in their professional lives, as they feared negative professional and personal repercussions should their sexual identity be revealed. This marginalized group had never had their stories told (or heard), and neither had their experiences been documented or analyzed within the context of national and international research. This study presented considerable methodological challenges. Unsurprisingly, sample access was a significant issue, as many potential interviewees were reluctant to engage with the research as to do so could, they believed, reveal their identities and, consequently, compromise their standing within the school community. These legitimate concerns had to be balanced with the fundamental need on the part of the researcher for a diverse sample which would reveal rich data for analysis, as well as facilitate a robust and thorough examination of the complex socio-sexual dynamics at play.

What other methods did you consider using, and why did you choose in-depth interviews?

Through a systematic analysis of the idiosyncratic personal testimonies of a group of LGB teachers, my research aims to offer a better understanding of the impact of denominational ethos and values on the professional and personal lives of LGB teachers who work in religious-run schools in Ireland. Given the sensitive nature of the topic under consideration, as well as the subtleties and nuances in the experiences of those involved, in-depth semi-structured qualitative interviews were considered the most appropriate means of answering the research question. The sample population proved quite hard-to-reach and a variety of strategies were employed to maximise sample size, scope and representativeness. These included purposive sampling, snowballing, personal contacts, advertising and trade union support. Each of these methodological approaches contributed successfully to the aim of increasing sample size. As with all qualitative samples, making definitive claims to representativeness and generalizability would be both professionally unsound and morally inappropriate. Addressing these concerns highlights the crucial role of theoretical or conceptual frameworks (for example, queer theory, feminist theory, grounded theory, behavioral or cognitive psychological perspectives, Foucauldian conceptualization of power etc.) in the critical analysis of the data and the resulting findings.
What were the advantages and disadvantages of using in-depth interviews?

There are obvious benefits to the use of quantitative methodologies/surveys in workplace bullying research and some of our seminal and most influential studies have been informed and shaped by this methodological approach. However, I would argue that a variety of methodological approaches serve to enrich and deepen our understanding of the complex interpersonal interaction that is workplace bullying and harassment. In addition, the use of qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods paradigms offers targets of workplace bullying a broad platform on which to articulate their personal experiences and, in so doing, contribute further to our knowledge of the negative dynamics at play. In-depth semi-structured interviews work well when researching sensitive topics (Fahie, 2014a). This methodological approach facilitates a degree of flexibility which allows the interviewer to (re)act as the interview progresses; adapting the interview schedule as different pertinent issues are raised by the interviewee. It also affords the interviewee a degree of agency, providing them with some control over the pace and scope of their storytelling. This factor is key in crafting an ethical and moral relationship with the interviewee. However, in-depth interviews are costly in terms of time, and transcription fees can prove significant. While technology has facilitated the use of Skype or Faceetime to interview research participants who are far away, many interviewers would argue that face-to-face interviews are particularly important when researching sensitive topics and that the critical relationship between the interviewer and interviewee is dependent on that human proximity.

What would you do differently next time if using in-depth interviews?

The nature of the research question will always determine the scope and profile of the sample population. As a tool, in-depth, semi-structured interviews will always be an appropriate means of revealing and examining the experiences of vulnerable and hard-to-reach sample populations. However, the dilemma for the researcher who is working with sensitive groups is always whether or not their sample is “big enough” for the study. As someone who has published using just three interviews (Fahie, 2014b), I would argue strongly that case studies or vignettes/exemplars offer depth and richness to the discourses which surround and inform our understanding of workplace bullying. The alternative is not to engage in research with these hard-to-reach groups unless we have large populations upon which to draw. Using in-depth interviews and, most importantly, underpinning the analysis of the data with an appropriate theoretical or conceptual framework strengthens the research and scaffolds the analysis against any potential criticism in respect of its validity and generalizability.
How has your research question been answered?

I believe that my research question has been answered but, like all research, in so doing, other questions and issues have been raised, particularly in respect of the role of organizational cultures in bolstering and shaping discriminatory policies and practices. My work is ongoing and, in conjunction with national and international colleagues, we are tentatively discussing funding opportunities for comparative, theoretically-informed research across different jurisdictions which will focus on how, or if, ethos (both denominational and/or secular) impacts upon those who work or study within different educational organizations or sectors.
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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. Shayne Mathieson from New Zealand who presented the 3 most influential works in the last newsletter chose Işil Karatuna from Turkey for this column in the current newsletter.

Introduction

I would like to thank Shayne Mathieson for inviting me to contribute to this column. I am currently an assistant professor of Management and Work Psychology in the department of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations at Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey. My interest in workplace bullying started in 2005 when I planned to work on this topic for my PhD thesis. This was the time when the research and discussion on workplace bullying in Turkey primarily started. My doctoral thesis investigated the prevalence, antecedents and outcomes of victims’ responses to bullying in a public health care setting using both quantitative and qualitative measures. Since then, my main research has focused on workplace bullying and particularly on how organizational measures and targets’ and bystanders’ responses influence the course of workplace bullying. Below, I have chosen the three works that have influenced me the most.

Work 1:


This book has been a lifeline for me many a time while writing my PhD dissertation. It is very informative and contains a range of articles that point out the key characteristics of the phenomenon. The authors are all experts on the topic of workplace bullying and clarify the concept by differentiating it from other forms of aggression, identify its antecedents and outcomes and give information on how to manage bullying or to intervene in it effectively both at the individual and organizational level. Overall, it does an excellent job of explaining the basics and details of the workplace bullying phenomenon.
Work 2:


This special issue of the European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology was one my earliest readings in workplace bullying literature. It was a gem for me at the time when there was very limited awareness of and research on workplace bullying in Turkey. This issue contains articles of the pioneers in the field and covers many topics relating to the development, prevalence, sources and outcomes of bullying at work. The articles present theoretical and empirical investigations of workplace bullying as well as a variety of case studies. The articles in this issue, notably Leymann’s article on the content and development of mobbing at work, have been some of the most cited articles in the field of related Turkish literature. Following this special issue, a second one which included equally important and comprehensive articles, was published in the European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology in 2001. The next influential work of mine was published in this issue.

Work 3:


This article presents workplace bullying from a conflict perspective and highlights the role of conflict management strategies in coping with bullying combining both quantitative and qualitative methods. With this article I was introduced to the idea of a mixed methods approach in gaining a broader understanding of workplace bullying factors like victims’ coping strategies. It also inspired me to consider the literature on bullying from the perspective of conflict management research and think how coping strategies could influence the course of workplace bullying and could be affected by the escalating nature of the bullying process itself.

Zapf and Gross’s interview and questionnaire based study is an excellent resource in the study of coping with workplace bullying.

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?

I choose Tuija Muhonen from the Malmö University, Sweden.

*Thank you very much İşil Karatuna for sharing with us the 3 works that influenced you the most*
In re-thinking ‘the bully’ in bullying, this workshop explored what lies behind the behaviour of bullies at unconscious levels. The first part of the workshop introduced theories, specifically two psychoanalytical defences, splitting and projective identification. In the second part, participants looked at quotations from a bully and his team members, taken from an organisational case study, to see how these defences were used in practice.

Psychoanalysis is essentially about understanding our emotional states, so the workshop began with a brief time of silence. This was an opportunity for participants to settle their thoughts and reflect on, and engage with, their own emotions.

The unconscious mind usually remains hidden from us and is only fleetingly revealed through reflections and dreams. Although hidden, neurological studies have proved that much of our activity is unconsciously, or subconsciously, determined.

The unconscious consists mainly of repressed thoughts and feelings many of which have their foundations in early childhood. These feelings get lodged into our unconscious but they don’t disappear. They are part of us. All we can do is to try to defend ourselves against them. Bullies use lots of defences including denial and fantasy. The workshop focussed on splitting and projective identification, and explained the dynamics underlying these e.g. ‘life and death’ and ‘love and hate’.

Splitting is known as a primitive defence against anxiety as it is the very first defence we all use. A baby’s feelings oscillate between being very, very good, when he or she is fed and contented, to being very, very bad when hunger pangs return and a baby feels that it is going to die. Over time, when a baby is nurtured and loved, these extremes, of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ lessen and the young child develops a more stable ego. However, if a child’s upbringing is emotionally unhealthy or traumatic, he, or she, is likely to regress to splitting when particularly anxious.

Most of us have moments when we defend ourselves through splitting, perceiving ourselves as ‘good’ and others as ‘bad’ but have the capacity to work through these feelings. Bullies however defend themselves further by projecting their unacknowledged and unwanted ‘bad’ feelings on to others, testing the boundaries to find a suitable ‘container’.

In the workshop, projection was illustrated by throwing a foam ball, containing imaginary ‘bad’ feelings, to participants. No one seemed particularly interested in catching it!
If a target introjects the projections i.e. takes in the 'bad' feelings of a bully such as fear of failure, he or she becomes a victim. The bully appears to have 'won'. However, projection does not solve a bully's problems. Because of the nature of the unconscious, those 'bad' feelings will return and, another victim will have to be found. Splitting, over many years, impacts on the mind diminishing its capacity to reflect, to play with ideas, to make associations and to maintain a sense of reality.

In re-thinking the bully in bullying, I suggest that bullies are individuals who have a greater propensity, than others, to use splitting and projective identification i.e. the dynamic of regression, splitting, projection, testing of boundaries and making someone feel the way they are feeling, at unconscious and subconscious levels. The repetitive nature of bullying can be likened to a form of addiction.

In looking at how the theory works in practice, participants were asked to find evidence of splitting and projection in quotes by an overt bully. Some participants attempted drawings of the bully’s perception of his team. Then, given quotes from his team members, they explored how they would feel about being in this team and how they would defend themselves.

The workshop gave a brief introduction to one aspect of the psyche of bullies. Psychoanalysis can also be used to understand group dynamics and the hidden life of organisations. There is more information on the website www.whybulliesbully.com and in my book 'An Introduction to the Psychodynamics of Workplace Bullying' www.karnacbooks.com.

Dr Sheila White
Honorary Research Fellow,
Birkbeck, University of London, UK.
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.

Sara Branch from Australia who presented herself in the last newsletter chose Linda Tilley from Canada as the member to be interviewed in this newsletter.

Tell us something about yourself

I have been counselling for over 25 years, mostly working with trauma (both victims and perpetrators of abuse). I began working with sexual offenders, and I am often struck by the similarity between WB trauma and that of sexual violence. I live in Alberta, Canada, a very geologically diverse province. Temperature ranges are extreme (from highs of 35° to lows in the -30s) so we self-identify as being tough, hardy people. When not counselling, I enjoy woodworking, gardening, travelling, and playing music (percussion). I recently had the experience of playing with members of the Edmonton Symphony Orchestra in their concert hall, which was one of the most amazing experiences in my life!

How did you become interested in workplace bullying?

My first client that I actually knew was a workplace bullying client spurred me to start learning. She was so devastated by her experience that I absolutely had to find out the best way I could to help her. That led me to begin reading and talking to people. I sadly recognized how many people I’d worked with in the past who had been in similar situations (but I didn’t fully understand their experiences). As I learned more, I also recognized my own personal experiences in the descriptions of bullying. As I saw how damaging bullying was to targets, it made me determined to understand as much as I can so I can better help people who have been touched by this problem.

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

As a therapist, I did not hear any mention of the phrase “workplace bullying” until I started doing the research I mentioned above (which was in 2008). I was surprised to learn how much work had been done in other parts of the world, and how much further behind Canada was. Having that “tough” identity in Alberta means that in many ways it is even more challenging to deal with this
I have heard people in the media describe targets as "crybabies" who should just confront their bullies and make them back down. People are just beginning to become aware of how absolutely damaging WB can be.

Some provinces in Canada have specific legislation against WB. In Alberta there currently are efforts being made to have legislation enacted, which some IAWBH members are actively involved (thank you, Linda Crockett!). However, most targets in Alberta probably just leave their jobs, since pursuing legal action (in civil court) is a risky venture.

From a therapeutic perspective, I think most therapists are still working a bit in isolation, although organizations like IAWBH are providing more opportunities for connection and education. The members of the Therapist SIG have been generous and fertile sources of support and information.

**What can you tell us about your work?**

I am a Registered Psychologist working in Private Practice. One particular area of interest is neurodevelopmental disorders, especially ADHD and Asperger’s Syndrome (AS). My work in this area informs my work in WB partly because people with "invisible disabilities" are particularly vulnerable to being bullied. I think there are a number of reasons for this, but poor understanding of the rules of social politics plays a big role. The second way this interest informs my work is that studying the neurology of these disorders (at least what we know so far) provides insight into some of the challenges that WB targets may face. For example, people with ADHD and AS experience difficulties with cognitive flexibility, or "stuckness"; targets of bullies also get stuck in their sense of outrage and injustice, and feel very powerless. So I wonder to what degree the neurological impact of social ostracism (e.g., see Kipling Williams’ work) in the context of threat contributes to the profile that we see in many targets in terms of neurotransmitter functioning and the resulting cognitive inflexibility. I also wonder if we understood these factors with more precision, could we then develop more specific treatments in terms of both medications and psychological therapy to address the problems.

By personality, I prefer to work one-on-one with individuals rather than to take a public stand against bullying. I am very interested in social dynamics, and mostly want to help targets who have been bullied to recover from their trauma, and to gain skills to prevent future bullying situations. Since there is no research guiding this, I have had to rely on my own clinical experiences and those of the Therapist SIG to guide me.

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

In my own way, I want to continue to help people who have been targeted, either directly or as bystanders, in my own little corner of the world. And as a thinker rather than a researcher, I have some ideas that I would love to share with some people who have more experience in the field, and to possibly examine these through research.
Question from Sara Branch:

I see you are interested in the Dynamics of Formal Knowledge, Power, and Professions SIG and Emotions and Personality SIG, two areas that are of interest to me. Do you see any cross over between these two SIGs eg. Is there a link between power and emotion?

I am very interested in power – both personal and social – and personality. Regarding targets, I wonder why some people seem constitutionally incapable of being "not nice", even if it means that they may be re-victimized. Is that genetic? Training? Social Class? And I wonder why other people feel justified in victimizing others – again, the same questions. I wonder why bullying seems more prevalent in some occupations, and whether it is because of the type of personality who is attracted to those occupations or whether other factors are involved.

I think it is very important to recognize that there are different types of bullying / bullies. Some may be psychopaths, but I believe many otherwise good people may end up in situations in which they engage in bullying behaviour. Some bullies may be people with poor ego strength who are placed in challenging situations, or people who are under immense stress and take it out on others. I also believe there is a particular social dynamic that can lead to bullying situations in just about any organization. So I question why one person in a particular situation becomes more aggressive or denigrating, while another becomes helpful or still another becomes passive and submissive. We know from research with “lower” primates that animals in positions of dominance have higher levels of dopamine, which leads to feeling a greater sense of power and reward in life. By extrapolation, we see similar results in human population. So I wonder then to what extent do bullies seek out situations in which they can increase their dopamine levels, and to what extent are targets more vulnerable to being undermined? And are these more genetically based differences, or are they learned? Can they be “unlearned”, and if so, how? I’m afraid I have way more questions than answers!

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?

I choose Katerina Zabrodska. Here is my question:

In a study that you published in 2014, you discussed the context of “sensemaking”, and noted that sensemaking processes can contribute to power differentials from the very beginning of hostile actions, and can thus contribute to escalation of bullying. This is very much in line with what I observe in some of my clients’ stories. Could you please describe this process in terms that are more accessible to those of us that are not familiar with Weick’s work? How would your findings inform interventions on organizational and individual levels?
New members

At the moment IAWBH consists of 223 members from all over the world.

A warm welcome to our new members:

- Baker, Louise; MSc Student; United Kingdom
- Highness, Nancy; Mediation First LLC;
- Kirsner, Kim; School of Medicine University of Notre Dame (Fremantle); Australia
- Ng, Kara; University of Manchester; United Kingdom
- Pooni, Ramneek; Queen's University Faculty Association; Canada
- Vaughan-Reid, Caroline; Advantage Mediation and Management Consultancy; Australia

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).
Upcoming events

The 24th International Academy of Management and Business (IAMB) Conference
9-11 October 2017
Dubai, United Arab Emirates
http://www.iamb.net/UAE/2017/UAE2017index.html

The Australian and New Zealand Academy of Management (ANZAM) Conference
6-8 December 2017
Melbourne, Australia (Hosted by RMIT University)
https://www.anzam.org/events/types/events-conference/

Society for Personality and Social Psychology’s (SPSP's) 19th Annual Convention
1-3 March 2018
Atlanta, Georgia
http://www.spsp.org/researcher

32nd International Congress on Occupational Health
29th April – 4th May 2018
Dublin, Ireland
http://www.icoh2018.org/ezines/icoh2018ezine2.html

The 11th Biennial International Association on Workplace Bullying and Harassment (IAWBH) Conference
5-8 June 2018
Bordeaux, France
https://bullying2018.sciencesconf.org/

The 13th European Academy of Occupational Health Psychology Conference
5-7 September 2018
Lisbon, Portugal
http://www.eaohp.org/conference.html
The list of literature on bullying and related issues is expanding. Between June and September 2017 Bevan Catley selected 65 new publications. They range from:

A


to

Z


From now on we publish the new list on the IAWBH website only. You may find the list at:

https://www.iawbh.org/respub.
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.

The next IAWBH newsletter will appear in December 2017. 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 2017 to:
Adrienne Hubert, Hubert Consult, editor IAWBH newsletter
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.