A CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON AND EXAMINATION OF WORKPLACE

BULLYING IN SINGAPORE AND THE UNITED STATES

_____

A Master's Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Jack J. Valenti School of Communication

University of Houston

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

_____

By

Jingpei Jillian Claire Lim

December, 2011

A CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON AND EXAMINATION OF WORKPLACE

BULLYING IN SINGAPORE AND THE UNITED STATES

_____

An Abstract of a Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Jack J. Valenti School of Communication

University of Houston

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

_____

By

Jingpei Jillian Claire Lim

December, 2011

ABSTRACT

This study explored the levels of exposure to workplace bullying in Singapore and the United States and investigated how victims in the two countries coped with the bullying. Furthermore, this study assessed the extent to which face concerns (self-face and other-face) relate to the use of coping strategies.

A questionnaire was administered to employees from Singapore and the United States. In order to participate in this study, participants had to have previous working experiences or they had to be currently working in a full-time or a part-time position. The sample size had a total of 721 participants, of which, 295 participants were Singaporeans and 369 participants were Americans.

The results of this study supported the proposed hypothesis, whereby employees from United States reported that they experienced higher levels of exposure to workplace bullying than employees from Singapore. Moreover, a factor analysis revealed that there were three types of coping strategies used by both Singaporeans and Americans: negative reactance, indirect/passive fielding, and active solution.

Results further showed that both Singaporeans and Americans tend to use indirect/passive fielding most frequently, followed by negative reactance, and then active solution. Self-face needs were directly and significantly correlated to the use of negative reactance and indirect/passive fielding for both Singaporeans and Americans.

However, correlation analyses indicated that there were no significant differences between self-face concerns and active solution for employees in the two countries. Additionally, results revealed that other-face needs were not related to the use of any of

the three coping strategies for Singaporeans but there was a significant negative

correlation between other-face needs and negative reactance for Americans only.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to take the time to acknowledge the people who helped to make the completion of this thesis possible.

I am eternally grateful to Dr. Lee for his guidance, patience, extensive knowledge and support throughout this tedious, exhausting, yet rewarding and fulfilling journey.

I am also extremely thankful to have both Dr. Xiao and Dr. Atwater on my committee. My special thanks to Dr. Xiao who listened to all of my concerns and for providing her insights into my study. I would also like to sincerely thank Dr. Atwater for her ideas on how to improve my thesis and for sharing with me her knowledge and wisdom on the topic. All of my committee members have contributed in various ways to help make my thesis a better study and for that, I feel very blessed and lucky to have them on my committee.

My deepest gratitude goes to my family for giving me the opportunity to pursue my dreams. My sincerest thanks to my dad for his support and to my mom, I would like to say that your endless stream of tears is worth it! Not forgetting my brother, who calls almost every night to talk about his favorite hobbies just so that I can take my mind of my thesis.

In addition, I am also grateful to all of my friends, who cheered and supported me, especially to H for your prayers. Finally, I would like to thank "Touma" for listening to all of my worries and for going through the ups and downs of this entire process with me. Thank you everyone for being a part of my life, your existence has touched in my life in many precious ways. To all of the professors and participants, your help and input just simply made my day.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<div align="right">Page</div>

LIST OF TABLES

Page

To my family and to him, for inspiring and believing in me

Chapter One

Introduction

Workplace bullying is an on-going phenomenon (Agervold, 2007), and it is a growing problem in organizations (Loh, Restubog, & Zagenczyk, 2010). According to the Workplace Bullying Institute (2010), 34.5% of employees in America reported that they were currently suffering from workplace bullying or have been bullied in the workplace. Additionally, the Institute (2010) further reported that there were 40.2% of Hispanics who had either been bullied before or are currently experiencing workplace bullying, followed by 38.6% of African-Americans, 33.6% of Whites, and, lastly, 13.5% of Asians.

Henrik Leymann (1996) was perhaps one of the first few individuals to introduce the concept of bullying and defined it as "a social interaction through which one individual is attacked by one or more individuals almost on a daily basis and for periods of many months, bringing the person into an almost helpless position with potentially high risk of expulsion" (p. 168). In order for the bullying to exist, the victim has to be exposed to such interactions for the duration of at least once a week and it should at least persist for up to six months (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2003). However, it seemed that Leymann (1990, 1996) argued that in order to measure the duration of the bullying in an operational manner, the bullying has to occur for more than six months.

In work settings, bullying can occur when an individual is constantly being harassed by another member who is in the same organization, when he or she does not get invited to group or social events, and/or even when he or she is publicly humiliated by his or her perpetrator (Zapf & Gross, 2001). For instance, the perpetrator who can

1

either be the victim's supervisor or co-worker may insult or ridicule the victim's work performance or simply scream at him or her for no apparent reason.

Other researchers used the term workplace bullying in an "expansive" manner, incorporating concepts such as "emotional abuse" (e.g., Keashly, 2001), "ethnic harassment" (e.g., Schneider, Hitlan, & Radharisknan, 2000), "workplace incivility" (e.g., Andersson & Pearson, 1999), "harassment" (e.g., Björkqvist, Österman, & Hjelt-Bäck, 1994), "victimization" (e.g., Einarsen & Raknes, 1997) and "psychological terror" (e.g., Leymann, 1990). Although different researchers from different countries may use different definitions and terminology to describe the concept of bullying, it generally refers to the same phenomenon (Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2010). Furthermore, some researchers, especially select scholars from Europe, prefer to use the term "bullying" (e.g., Einarsen, 1996; Salin, 2001; Vartia, 1996) over "mobbing" (e.g., Leymann, 1996; Zapf, Knorz & Kulla, 1996). However, Leymann (1996) argued that the term "mobbing" should be used instead of "bullying" due to the fact that the notion of bullying involves physical violence and threat, whereas the term mobbing does not involve physical aggression but instead displays behaviors such as social exclusion. However, in this thesis, the concept "bullying" will be used in a broad sense that includes physical and non-physical behaviors instead of the term "mobbing" since it is more readily recognized in the literature than mobbing.

There are some important consequences to consider when individuals are subjected to bullying in the workplace. For example, when an individual is being bullied, he or she will experience high levels of stress (Einarsen & Raknes, 1991; Leymann, 1996; Zapf et al., 1996). It seems that if a unit in an organization experiences stress, it will also

affect the rest of members in the organization (Einarsen et al., 2003). This is further illustrated in Frese and Zapf's (1987) study, where they indicated that the stress levels experienced by members in one work group were almost identical to the level of stress that members from another work group experienced.

Moreover, because of stress in the workplace due to the effects of bullying, victims may experience depression, anxiety and even suicidal thoughts (Einarsen, Raknes, Matthiesen, & Helleøy, 1994b; O'Moore, Seigne, McGuire, & Smith, 1998). This would in turn lead to a decrease in the levels of job satisfaction as indicated in a study done by Einarsen, Matthiesen and Skogstad (1998) where they indicated that the Norwegian assistant nurses who were exposed to bullying were more likely to suffer from greater health consequences and lower levels of job satisfaction than those individuals who were not exposed.

Studies have shown that victims of workplace bullying tend to use different coping strategies to cope with the bullying. Keashly, Trott and MacLean (1994) reported that 13.6% of the victims who were exposed to bullying chose to leave their job as a way to cope with the bullying. This is further reinforced in Cox's (1987) study, where approximately 18% of American nurses chose to leave their job when they were being bullied. Additionally, Djurkovic, McCormack and Casimir (2005) conducted a study to investigate whether there was a link between the categories of bullying in which individuals were exposed to and the types of strategies that they used to cope with the bullying. In one of their hypotheses, they predicted that workplace bullying victims will use aggressive coping behavior such as directly confronting the perpetrator more than avoidance or seeking help from a third party in order to cope with the bullying

(Djurkovic et al., 2005). However, results indicated that victims used avoidance coping strategies more than aggression. It seems that only when victims were exposed to job-related bullying, then, did they use aggressive coping strategies. Conversely, when victims felt that they were physically threatened, they preferred to seek help from a third party to help them deal with the bullying (Djurkovic et al., 2005).

Several researchers have reported that there is an extremely low probability that victims of workplace bullying would choose to use problem-solving strategies as their method to cope with the bullying. This can be seen in Hogh and Dofradottir's (2001) study where they compared the coping strategies used by those who were being bullied and those who were not targets of the bullying. All respondents were given hypothetical situations and were told to respond accordingly. They found that those who were targets of the bullying seldom used problem-solving strategies as their coping strategies in comparison to those who were not targets of the bullying. Moreover, they mentioned that the targets of the bullying were more likely to choose avoidance strategies than their non-bullied counterparts (Hogh & Dofradottir, 2001). This pattern of behavior is further reinforced in Niedl's (1996) study, where he found that as the conflict between the victim and the bully escalates, they were less likely to use problem-solving strategies.

One potential factor that may affect the victim's use of coping strategies would be the victim's self-face concern, other-face concern (offender) and the mutual relationship involved. However, it should be noted that since mutual-face concerns refers to the face concern for both parties (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998), if the bully was concerned about the face of his or her target, he or she would not have bullied his or her target in the first place. Ting-Tommey and Oetzel (2001) illustrated in their study how face-

negotiation theory can be used to explain how and why different individuals prefer to use different styles to manage the conflict depending on their cultural orientations and power distance (Ting-Toomey, 1988, 1997; Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998).

For example, members from individualistic countries tend to exhibit greater self-face needs or concerns in contrast to individuals from collectivistic countries (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). Ting-Toomey and Kurogi (1998) also noted that members from high power distance countries preferred to use more vertical face work, whereas members from low power distance countries tend to use horizontal face work. Hwang (1987) explained that the idea of horizontal face work is when an individual adheres to the notion of saving face of the other party. On the other hand, vertical facework refers to when an individual is concerned only with his or her face and he or she wants to make a good impression on his or her boss.

Therefore, researchers have noted that members from individualistic countries will often use self-protection, control and domineering strategies to cope or manage conflicts in the workplace (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001). On the other hand, members from collectivistic countries are more inclined to use "integrating" and "compromising" strategies to deal with the conflict than their individualistic counterparts (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001, p. 49). Members of individualistic countries usually perceive themselves to exhibit behaviors of independence and they place the upmost importance on achieving their own goals rather than the goals of the other members (Triandis, 1995). Conversely, members of collectivistic countries tend to be dependent on other members and unlike members of the individualistic countries, the goals of the other members take precedence over their own goals (Triandis, 1995).

There has been very little research done on the cross-cultural nature of workplace bullying (Anderson & Busman, 2002; Loh et al., 2010) and several researchers have projected the need to conduct research on cross-cultural comparisons of workplace bullying so as to prevent it from happening (e.g., Hoel & Salin, 2003; Lutgen-Sandvik, Tracy, & Alberts, 2007). Thus, this study aimed to further pursue a cross-cultural comparison of workplace bullying. In particular, I concentrated on the cross-cultural comparisons on the exposure to workplace bullying and the types of coping behavior used by victims from Singapore and the United States.

Chapter Two focused on the literature review of workplace bullying, including the concept, definition and antecedents of workplace bullying. In Chapter Three, I described the research designs used in this study, and Chapter Four presented the results section. I then discussed in detail, the findings from this study in Chapter Five.

Chapter Two

Literature Review

In this chapter, I first describe the concept and definition of workplace bullying, followed by the organizational outcomes of bullying and the antecedents of workplace bullying. Using the concept of face-negotiation theory, I then developed my research questions to find the extent to which Americans and Singaporeans victims used each of the coping strategies and whether the need for self-face concern or other-face concern played a role in their choice of choosing which strategies to use to cope with the bullying. I also hypothesized that that because Singapore is a high power distance country and the United States is a low power distance country, employees in the United States are more likely to experience higher levels of exposure to workplace bullying than employees in Singapore.

Concept of Workplace Bullying

Workplace bullying occurs when a supervisor, subordinate or even peer co-worker exhibits negative behavior towards another member in the same organization (Einarsen, 2000). As aforementioned, there are several definitions of workplace bullying. Einarsen and colleagues (2003) defined workplace bullying as the following:

> Bullying at work means harassing, offending, socially excluding someone or negatively affecting someone's work tasks. In order for the label bullying to be applied to a particular activity, interaction or process has to occur repeatedly and regularly (e.g., weekly) and over a period of time (e.g., about six months). Bullying is an escalating process in the course of which the person confronted ends up in an inferior position and becomes the target of systematic negative

social acts. A conflict cannot be called bullying if the incident is an isolated event or if two parties of approximately equal "strength" are in conflict (p.15).

Other researchers used the term "workplace incivility" to refer to the same phenomenon. For instance, Andersson and Pearson (1999) developed the term "workplace incivility" and defined it as "low intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect" (p. 457). Moreover, they claimed that behaviors that are considered to be rude and disrespectful towards the target can also be classified under the definition of "workplace incivility" (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Tepper (2000) also developed the term "abusive supervision" to explain hostile behaviors in the workplace. However, he defined it as based on the subordinates' opinion as to whether they perceive their supervisor to be displaying aggressive behaviors. Moreover, according to him, in order to consider the behavior as abusive supervision, the aggression has to be in the form of either verbal or nonverbal behavior (Tepper, 2000). Keashly (2001) used the term "emotional abuse at work" to define workplace bullying. Just like the term "emotional" suggests, Keashly (2001) defined bullying as nonverbal or verbal behaviors or actions aimed at making the target feel as if he or she is unable to perform well at the workplace, thus severely affecting his or her state of mind or emotions.

Several conceptual issues have been recognized, including power, intention, and objective vs. subjective measures. One important issue is power. Einarsen (2000) noted that bullying occurs when the individual involved is unable to defend and protect himself or herself from his or her perpetrator. This is most probably due to either the victim's lack of ability to defend himself or herself or it could possibly be because of the

imbalance of power (Björkqvist, Österman, & Lagerspetz, 1994; Hoel, Rayner, & Cooper, 1999; Niedl, 1995). The notion of imbalance of power first came about due to school bullying (Olweus, 1978, 1991, 1993) where the bully would pick on someone who is unable to defend himself or herself. Therefore, following the same idea, the imbalance of power in the workplace, usually occurs when the victim is someone who is of lower position than his or her perpetrator. For instance, when a subordinate is being bullied by his or her supervisor, he or she is unable to defend himself or herself because of the fact that his or her supervisor is someone of higher position and power than him or her. On the contrary, Cleveland and Kerst (1993) also suggested that the idea of power imbalance is not limited to only supervisor-subordinate aggression, but it could also be in the form where co-workers may bully one another just so that they can gain power or colleagues may come together and therefore have enough power to bully their supervisor.

Other than Tepper's (2000) abusive supervision, there are some researchers who focused more on power in the form of control rather than power imbalance (e.g., Andersson & Pearson, 1999; Keashly & Jagatic, 2003; Namie & Namie, 2000). In a study conducted by Namie (2000), he found that workplace bullying occurs because of the need to control the other party. He indicated in his study that about 60% of the victims reported that they were being bullied because they were reluctant to demonstrate any form of submissive behavior towards the other party (Namie, 2000). The need to control or the importance for the target to be dependent on the perpetrator is also explored in Keashly's (2001) study, where she conducted an interview with her participants and found that they felt that their perpetrators did not treat them like adults. Keashly and

9

Jagatic (2003) mentioned in their study that this relationship is known as the "dominant-subordinate relationship" (p. 48).

The second issue is intention (Agervold, 2007; Einarsen et al., 2003; Rayner, Hoel, & Cooper, 2002). It seems that an individual may feel like as if he or she is being bullied but in fact, the perpetrator has no intention of bullying them (Agervold, 2007). Therefore, in Rayner and colleagues' (2002) study, they stated that the concept of intention should not be used to define workplace bullying. However, according to several researchers, they noted that as long as an individual perceives himself or herself as being bullied by some other individual in the organization, then he or she is considered a victim despite the fact that he or she may not display any psychological symptoms or consequences of being bullied (Einarsen, 2000; Salin, 2003). Additionally, Salin (2003) argued that by occasionally giving subordinates tasks they have to complete within a given deadline or being socially excluded to events may not be perceived as bullying but in part as a normal procedure of the working life. But she also expressed in her research that if this act were to continue for a long period of time, then it could be perceived as bullying (Salin, 2003).

Tepper (2000) also noted that an abusive supervisor may display aggressive behaviors to his or her subordinate not because he or she has the intention to harm him or her but rather because of personality differences. Moreover, Keashly and Jagatic (2000) indicated the need to know the difference between intention and motive. It seems that although the perpetrator may have the intent to harm his or her target but the motive behind his or her action or behavior may be different from that of another perpetrator (Keashly & Jagatic, 2000).

The third issue is the objective versus subjective measure of workplace bullying. It seems that the definition of workplace bullying can either be subjective or objective as indicated by Leymann (1996) where he tried to examine bullying in an objective manner, rather than looking at it based on the subjective insight of the victim (e.g., perceptions and opinions of the victim). Researchers do not use a common operational method. For instance, some researchers preferred to measure bullying by asking victims if they have been exposed to bullying for 6 months or more (e.g., Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996; Leymann, 1992; Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2001; Salin, 2001) and other researchers prefer to measure exposure to bullying by providing participants with a list of negative acts (e.g., Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996; Hoel, Cooper, & Faragher, 2001; Leymann 1992). There are also some researchers who preferred to use a combination of both measurements (e.g., Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996; Leymann, 1992).

Leymann's (1996) suggestion of examining bullying in an objective manner is further enhanced by Tersptra and Baker's (1991) proposition that behaviors perceived by one individual to be offensive may not necessarily be perceived by another individual to be offensive. According to Agervold (2007), he noted that there are many advantages of defining workplace bullying in an objective manner. Because of the stigma of bullying, there is a higher tendency that people will not report their bullying based on subjectivity and they may only accept that they are victims of bullying after being exposed to the bullying behavior for a long period of time. Moreover, it seems that if bullying were to be measured in a subjective manner, victims might under report the frequency of the bullying and over report on the extent to which the negative behavior occurred (Agervold, 2007).

However, since in order for bullying to occur, there is a need for the individual to perceive that he or she is being bullied and in order to do so, he or she relies heavily on his or her emotions and feelings. Thus it is based at least in part on the subjectivity of the individual (Agervold, 2007). This is also reinforced in Aquino and Bradfield's (2000) thinking when they noted that a victim's perception of being bullied is largely related to his or her psychological responses.

Types of Workplace Bullying

There are many different categories of bullying behavior (Zapf et al., 1996) and some categories of workplace bullying behavior may overlap one another (Einarsen & Raknes, 1997). Victims of workplace bullying tend to be excluded from social events; they may be given the "silent treatment" (Einarsen et al., 2003) or they may even be sent to the "Coventry" (Williams, 1997). Einarsen (2000) also noted that although physical abuse may be a rarity, victims often have to endure verbal abuse from their perpetrators.

Brodsky (1976) identified five types of harassment: "scapegoating," "name-calling," "physical abuse," "pressures at work," and "sexual harassment." Several researchers examined bullying amongst school children and they found that there are two different categories of bullying: "direct bullying" and "indirect bullying." Direct bullying refers to the idea where the perpetrator attacks his or her victim verbally or may even use physical force. Indirect bullying refers to the situation where the victim is socially excluded by his or her peers from events (Bjökqvist, Lagerspetz, & Kaukiainen, 1992; Lagerspetz, Björkqvist, & Peltonen, 1988; Olweus, 1993).

Leymann (1990) defined the term mobbing as "psychological terror" or "ganging up on someone" (p.119). Psychological terror refers to the notion where one or more

perpetrators have the tendency to communicate aggressively with the same victim (Leymann, 1990). He classified bullying behavior and psychological terror in the workplace into five different categories based on the idea of manipulation: the target's reputation, such as spreading rumors that will tarnish the target's reputation; the social circumstances of the target, such as not inviting the target to social events; the target's ability to have a two-way communication with anyone in the workgroup; the type of tasks that are being assigned to the target and the target may also experience threats or even be coerced to do something that is against his or her wishes (Leymann, 1990).

Zapf (1999) also identified five different types of bullying behavior. The first type is when the perpetrator assigns difficult and even impossible- to- handle tasks to his or her victim. In other words, the perpetrator may assign tasks that may not be in the description of the victim's job responsibilities. The second type is to make judgmental and personal attacks on the victim's life such as making rude remarks or attacking the way he or she looks. The third type is to publicly humiliate the victim such as screaming, yelling or even criticizing him or her in public, the fourth type is to gossip and spread rumors about the victim, and the last type is that the bully may purposely exclude the victim from attending any social events.

Some other common categories of bullying include: "social isolation," "attacking the private person," "verbal abuse," "spreading rumors," and "giving difficult to handle tasks" (Leymann, 1992; Niedl, 1995; Vartia, 1993; Zapf et al., 1996). On the other hand, it seems that physical aggression only happens occasionally. This is illustrated in Einarsen and Raknes (1997) shipyard study, where they noted that victims reported physical aggression occurred only 2.4 percent of the time and reinforced in Zapf's (1999)

study when his victims reported that physical violence happened about 3.6 to 9.1 percent of the time. And therefore, it seems that bullies would prefer to use verbal and nonverbal strategies rather than physical aggression to bully their victims. In addition, when Einarsen and colleagues (1994a) conducted a study on bullying behaviors in Norwegians, they found that the victims reported that they felt lonely at work due to social exclusion, that they were often exposed to public humiliation and had to endure insinuating insults. They also felt like as if their work was not being appreciated (Einarsen, Raknes, & Mathhiesen, 1994a).

Frequency and Prevalence of Bullying

Workplace bullying can occur in any kinds of organizations, such as in universities (Björkqvist et al., 1994), shipyards (Einarsen & Raknes, 1997), steelmaker companies (Leymann & Tallgren, 1989), and even in hospitals (Matthiesen, Raknes, & Rökkum, 1989; Niedl, 1996). Although workplace bullying was initially recognized and explored in Scandinavian organizations (Einarsen, 2000), it seems that the recognition of this problem is fast spreading to other countries (Agverold, 2007). Based on the Scandinavian literature, Einarsen and Skogstad (1996) conducted a study on 7,986 Norwegian employees and found that 8.6% of them reported that they had experiences with workplace bullying. Moreover, the duration of the bullying lasted for approximately up to 18 months (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996). Therefore, Einarsen (2000) claimed that, when bullying occurs, it has to last for the duration of 6 months or more and it should consist of multiple incidences.

In another survey study, Björkqvist and colleagues (1994) reported that 24% of females and 17% of males of Finnish University employees were victims of harassment.

They also noted an increase in the levels of depression. Moreover, it seems that bullying in hospitals occurs quite frequently. Matthiesen and colleagues (1989) conducted a study in a Norwegian psychiatric ward and discovered that out of the 99 nurses and assistant nurses in their sample size, 10% of them felt that they were being bullied. The study also displayed significant positive correlations between bullying and exhaustion at work, health complaints and signs of poor health (Matthiesen et al., 1989).

As further research shows, it seems that there was an increase in the percentage of victims who were exposed to workplace bullying. For example, Leymann (1992) conducted a study based on the Swedish working population and found that 3.5% of them were victims of workplace bullying. Hansen, Hogh, Persson, Karlson, Garde and Ørbaek, (2006) then pointed out in a more recent study that there was an increase of 1.5% in the number of victims of who reported that they were being bullied in the workplace.

The prevalence of worldwide workplace bullying is depicted in several studies. For instance, in a number of Danish studies, Agervold and Mikkelsen (2004) measured bullying based on the operational and subjective criteria. Subjective measurement is based on the victim's perception that he or she is being bullied and therefore it is measured in terms of self-reports. Operational measurement is based on the frequency and duration to which the victim is exposed to bullying. When they used the operational criteria, the number of victims exposed to bullying based on frequency and duration was 13%. Mikkelsen and Einarsen (2001) also conducted a study based on four Danish samples, they found that about 2.7% to 8% of the victims reported being exposed to workplace bullying. In another study done in Austria, Niedl (1996) indicated that 27% of victims or employees reported that they were being bullied at work. Moreover, in a study

done by Cortina, Magley, Williams and Langhout (2001) on workplace incivility in the United States, they found that 71% of the employees experienced incivility in the workplace.

Additionally, it should be noted that although bullying may occur between supervisors, subordinates, and even co-workers, it appears that due to the emphasis of having good customer service so as to increase customer satisfaction, there is a possibility that employees are now being bullied by customers too (Ortega, Høgh, Pejtersen, & Olsen, 2009). Based on the findings from several researchers, it appears that about 50% to 70% of supervisors and managers were involved in workplace bullying (Cowie et al., 2001; Hoel et al., 2001; Niedl, 1996). This is reinforced in studies indicated by Scandinavian researchers where they found that majority of the bullies are usually supervisors or managers (Einarsen, 2000; Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996; Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2001). And Namie (2000) reported in his findings that 81% of the bullies were bosses. Moreover, Hogh and Dofradottir (2001) reported that based on the Danish study that they did, they noted that 82.8% of the victims indicated that they were being bullied by their colleagues, 48.6% of them were bullied by their supervisor, 25.7% of them reported that they were bullied by their subordinates and 42.8% of them reported that their perpetrators were either customers, clients or students.

Demographic of Bullying

Gender

There are inconsistent findings on workplace bullying based on gender. Some researchers indicated in their study that men are more likely to be the perpetrators and females are usually the victims as mentioned in the study done by Leymann (1996) where

he noted that about 76% of the male victims reported that their perpetrators were mostly males and 3% of the male victims reported that their perpetrators were females and 21% of the victims reported that they were bullied by both males and females. As for the females, the study indicated that 40% of the female victims were bulled by females, 30% of them were bullied by males and about another 30% of them were bullied by both females and males (Leymann, 1996). Leymann (1996) also suggested in his study that the reason as to why there were more males who reported being bullied by males than males who were being bullied by females was due to the fact that in Sweden, male subordinates tend to work with male supervisors and vice-versa. Additionally, he also argued that perhaps due to the nature of glass-ceiling at that time, there were more male supervisors than female supervisors in the workplace (Leymann 1996).

However, when Einarsen and Skogstad (1996) conducted their study based on the Norwegian workers in the 13 organizations, they found that there were an equal number of perpetrators in terms of gender. This finding is consistent with findings from Namie's (2000) study, where he conducted a web-based study and discovered that 50% of the perpetrators were women and 50% were men. He also indicated that there is a higher tendency for women to be bullying other women in the workplace; that is, 84% of women tend to bully other women and 69% of the time, men tend to bully women. And therefore, he concluded that 77% of women were targets of bullying. This assertion is also consistent with Cortina and colleagues' (2001) argument that the majority of the targets who were subjected to workplace incivility were women. On the other hand, Keashly and colleagues (1994) indicated in their findings that there were an equal number of men and women who were subjected to workplace bullying.

Additionally, Vartia and Hyyti (2002) mentioned in their study that females are more likely to be bullied by their co-workers and males are more likely to be bullied by their supervisors or higher ups. Rayner and Keashly (2005) also suggested that there is a higher tendency for female supervisors to be bullied than their male counterparts and it seems that males are at a higher risk of getting bullied especially when they are working in the service industry (Niedhammer, David, & Degioanni 2007). Einarsen (2000) also noted that bullying is more prevalent in an organization where majority of the employees are males. This is also reinforced in Einarsen and Skogstad's (1996) findings, where they indicated that bullying occurs 11.5% of the time in an environment where males consist of majority of the employees.

Age

Age also appears to be a factor of workplace bullying. Einarsen and Skogstad (1996) reported in their findings that there is a greater tendency of older employees to be exposed to workplace bullying than the younger employees. But according to several other researchers it seems that the younger employees were the ones who were more likely to be verbally attacked than their older counterparts (Einarsen & Raknes, 1997; Leymann, 1996). Additionally, younger employees tend to exhibit behaviors of that of the bully as well as the victim (Felson, 1992), and it seems that the perception of bullying differs according to age (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996). In other words, because some senior employees demand respect in the workplace, what is perceived as harassment to them may not be seen as harassment to the younger employees. In fact, the younger employees may perceive it to be a form of behavior that is to be endured (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996).

Individual and Organizational Outcomes Due to Bullying

Due to the exposure of workplace bullying, there is a high probability that victims will suffer from various health consequences as a result of social stress (Vartia, 2001; Zapf, 1999). The most common forms of health consequences are experiences of mental and emotional distress, aggravations, and symptoms of depression (Einarsen & Mikkelsen, 2003). This is also reinforced in Agervold and Mikkelsen's (2004) study, where they noted that victims who were frequently subjected to workplace bullying displayed negative health behaviors such as psychological stress and mental distress and they were also more likely to be absent from work than those who were not bullied. It should also be noted that on the extreme end of the spectrum, victims may suffer from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder if they are exposed to the bullying for a long period of time (Leymann & Gustafsson, 1996; Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2002).

Researchers have also indicated in their studies that there are organizational outcomes due to bullying (Hoel, Einarsen & Cooper, 2003). Leymann (1990) explained that because of workplace bullying, victims are less motivated to work and therefore there will be a decrease in the levels of productivity which could be potentially costly to the company. Several researchers have indicated that workplace bullying can lead to a decrease in the level of job satisfaction (Hoel & Cooper, 2000; Keashly & Jagatic, 2000; Price-Spratlen, 1995) as well as a decrease in the level of commitment towards the organization (Hoel & Cooper, 2000) and also a decrease in the levels of job performance and productivity (Hoel et al., 2003).

Victims of bullying have the tendency to be absent from work, thus, leading to the reduction in organizational effectiveness (Hoel et al., 2003). Hoel and Cooper (2000)

pointed out that victims tend to take an estimated number of seven more sick days in comparison to those who were not exposed to bullying or were not witnesses of the bullying. This is further reinforced in Quine's (2001) study when she indicated in her study that 8% of nurses took time off due to workplace bullying. Hoel and colleagues (2003) noted that taking time off from work may not necessarily reduce the bullying behavior, but in fact elevates the bullying behavior. This finding is also illustrated in Zapf and Gross's (2001) study where they found that victims who took less time off were more successful in coping with the bullying behavior than those who took more time off.

It seems that workplace bullying is often linked with the intention to leave the organization (Hoel & Cooper, 2000; Keashly & Jagatic, 2000; Quine, 1999, 2001). There is a difference between having the intention to leave and actually leaving the organization. Keashly and Jagatic (2000) found in their study that there is a stronger relationship between the victim's intention to leave the organization and workplace bullying rather than the relationship between looking for a new job and workplace bullying, which is also reinforced in Vartia's (1993) study when she indicated in her study that 43% of victims had the intention of leaving the organization. The reason as to why turnover is strongly linked to workplace bullying is because of the fact that victims of workplace bullying will offer the same advice to other victims that they should leave the organization in order to escape from the bullying (Zapf & Gross, 2001). Einarsen and colleagues (1994b) also mentioned that organizations may employ bullying tactics to drive employees out of the organization. On the other hand, researchers have reported that there were a large number of victims who refused to leave the organization before

making sure that justice is done to their perpetrators (Kile, 1990) and also because they have to take into account the possibility of them finding another job (Tepper, 2000).

Bystanders can also be affected by bullying behaviors as victims of bullying have a tendency to disclose or discuss about their feelings in regards to being bullied (Hoel and Cooper, 2000) and therefore it becomes difficult for bystanders to simply remain detached from the entire situation (Einarsen, 1996). Vartia (2001) noted that bystanders reported experiencing a higher level of stress in comparison to those who were not observers of the bullying. The idea whereby bystanders are also affected by bullying behaviors despite the fact that they are simply observers of it is called the ripple effect (Hoel et al., 1999; Rayner, 1999).

Antecedents/Causes of Bullying

The Victims and Perpetrators and Social System as a Cause of Bullying

There are three causes of bullying: individual (perpetrator and victim), the group, and the organization. Although Coyne, Seigne and Randall (2000) indicated in their study that bullying occurs because of the personality traits of both the victims and the perpetrators, Leymann (1993, 1996) argued that bullying occurs because of leadership behavior in the workplace and not because of the personality or characteristics of an individual. However, Zapf and Einarsen (2003) noted that the workplace bullying model should include the personality and individual characteristics of the victims and the perpetrators.

Olweus (1993) indicated in his study that victims of school bullying usually exhibit feelings of anxiety, low self-esteem and are often perceived by others as shy, submissive and reserved which is in contrast to perpetrators of school bullying, who tend

to exude confidence and are more aggressive and compulsive by nature. Similarly, when Einarsen and colleagues (1994a) conducted a study on Norwegian workers, they found that the employees were being bullied because of their lack of confidence in the workplace and also in conflict management. Furthermore, Zapf (1999) indicated that even before the bullying occurred, victims of bullying displayed symptoms of depression. Olweus's study (1993) is consistent with the findings from Coyne, Chong, Seigne and Randall's (2003) study where they conducted research focusing on white-collar and blue-collar employees from two different organizations and they found that the victims from both companies tend to be submissive and they usually exhibit behaviors similar of that of a loner.

Moreover, Niedl (1995) suggested that bullies are more likely to pick their targets based on whether they are able to defend themselves or not, which is also consistent with the findings from Einarsen (1999) and Zapf (1999). In addition to the submissive personality trait, an aggressive victim may also become a target of bullying (Olweus, 1993). Zapf's research findings (cited in Einarsen, 1999) noted that workers, who are honest, organized and always arrive on time may be targets of bullying as the rest of the workforce or their teammates may be intimidated by their behavior or attitude.

Little is known about the personalities of the bullies as it seems that most of the data collected about them were based on their victims' perspective (Zapf & Einarsen, 2003). But Coyne and colleagues (2003) mentioned that 19.3% of organizational members from different workgroups reported that they were the perpetrators of workplace bullying. Researchers have also indicated that based on the data collected from the victims' perspective, it appears that they were often subjected to workplace bullying

more frequently by males than females and by managers than their co-workers (Zapf & Einarsen, 2003; Zapf, Einarsen, Hoel, & Vartia, 2003).

Bullying may also occur as a way for the perpetrators to protect their self-esteem (Zapf & Einarsen, 2003). Baumeister, Heatherton and Tice (1993) noted that the importance to protect one's self-esteem in any social interaction situation. Zapf and Einarsen (2003) suggested that individuals with low self-esteem tend to display higher levels of aggressive and bullying behavior. However, there seem to be inconsistent findings as to whether self-esteem is the cause of bullying. Parkins, Fishbein and Richey (2006) argued that self-esteem is not related to workplace bullying. But they reported in their findings that their hypothesis was not supported. On the other hand, Baumeister, Smart and Boden (1996) stressed that individuals with high levels of self-esteem tend to be more aggressive than individuals with low self-esteem because they are more confident in themselves.

Bullying can also occur because of the perpetrator's lack of social competencies (Zapf & Einarsen, 2003). The idea of the lack of social competence is when perpetrators appear to be insensitive towards the feelings of others and therefore they are unable to understand and comprehend the emotions of the other party (Frey, Hirschstein, & Guzzo, 2000), and because of that, the perpetrators are not aware of the harm that they are bringing upon their victims (Zapf & Einarsen, 2003). Jenkins, Winefield, Zapf and Sarris (2010) conducted a study based on managers who were being accused of workplace bullying. They discovered that the perpetrators were unaware of the consequences that their behavior had on the victims. Moreover, the researchers attributed this finding to the

fact that the victims did not communicate about their feelings to the perpetrators (Jenkins et al., 2010).

Organizations as a Cause of Bullying

Leymann (1996) argued that bullying occurs not because of the personality traits of both the victims and the perpetrators, but because of the poor work environment and poor leadership behavior. Following this finding, several researchers have also indicated in their studies that because of the poor work conditions in which victims were working in, they were subjected to workplace bullying (Baillien, Neyens, & De Witte, 2008; Einarsen et al., 1994a; Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2007) and those who worked in extremely poor work conditions reported higher degrees of workplace bullying (Zapf et al., 1996) than those who were just working in a poor environment. Researchers mentioned that there was an association between workplace bullying and a lack of clarity on objectives, role conflict and role ambiguity (Einarsen et al., 1994a; Vartia, 1996). This is also reinforced in several researchers' recent findings where they indicated that there was a strong association between workplace bullying and role conflict and role ambiguity (Baillien et al., 2008; Baillien & De Witte, 2009; Hauge et al., 2007). And therefore, it seems that workplace bullying is more likely to occur when employees experience uncertainty in the workplace and when they are unsure of their goals.

Having a huge amount of workload and pressure can also be a contributing factor to workplace bullying (Baillien et al., 2008; Baillien & De Witte, 2009; Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Hauge et al., 2007). Einarsen and colleagues (1994a) suggested that bullying occurs when employees are given extremely little control over their work and when employees are pressured to perform well in an extremely demanding situation.

Unfortunately, there seem to be inconsistent findings on this matter. For example, Zapf and colleagues (1996) did not find any significant differences between employees' low control over decision making and high degrees of pressure and workplace bullying. Additionally, it appears that when workers worked in either a hot or cold climate condition, there seemed to be an increase in the levels of aggression and hostility (Anderson, Anderson, & Deuser, 1996; Einarsen, 1996). Because of the hot climate environment in restaurants, researchers reported that there were higher levels of bullying (e.g., Einarsen & Stogstad, 1996; Mathisen, Einarsen, & Mykletun, 2008).

The culture that the organization instills in its employees is also another reason as to why the organization is the cause of bullying in the workplace. Einarsen (1999) noted that when managers do not say anything even when they see it happening or if they fail to notice the bullying, perpetrators perceive it to be that they have the support of their managers to continue with the aggressive behavior. Furthermore, it seems that when new, incoming managers see this act of bullying, they immediately assume that it is an acceptable behavior in which they should also follow (Rayner et al., 2002). Jokes and humor in the workplace can also lead to bullying (Salin & Hoel, 2011), especially when the victim is unable to defend himself or herself or when he or she does not perceive the comment made to be a joke (Einarsen & Raknes, 1997).

The different leadership styles of managers can also create an impact on workplace bullying (Salin & Hoel, 2011), and in one of the studies done by Hauge and colleagues (2007) on the Norwegian workforce, they found that when managers used tyrannical and laissez-faire leadership styles, there were a higher number of victims who reported being exposed to workplace bullying. Additionally, Skogstad, Einarsen,

Torshiem, Aasland and Hetland (2007) mentioned that they found a direct link between laissez-faire leadership and workplace bullying and this could due to the notion whereby subordinates feel rejected by their supervisor because of their laid back management style (Salin & Hoel, 2011).

Feelings of being neglected or to experience disdain from one's supervisor corroborates the idea of being bullied in the workplace (Einarsen & Hoel, 2001). Other than tyrannical and laissez-faire leadership styles, it seems that authoritarian leadership style is another predictor of bullying (Seigne, 1998) as leaders portraying authoritarian styles tend to instill fear in their subordinates and they generally do not listen to the complaints made by them(Salin & Hoel, 2011). Moreover, it appears to be that when leaders exhibit aggressive behavior due to stress in their organization, it can lead to co-workers bullying each other so as to ensure job stability (Kelloway, Sivanathan, Francis, & Barling, 2005).

Processes of Bullying and Coping Strategies

There are many different definitions pertaining to the notion of conflict (Thomas, 1992). Thomas (1992) defined it as "the process that begins when one party perceives that an individual has negatively affected or is going to negatively affect something or something that he or she cares about" (p. 653). On the other hand, Putnam and Poole (1987) defined conflict as the interdependence between two individuals whereby each one of them are able to interfere with one another; when an individual perceives that he or she is not able to agree with the other party; and lastly, in order for conflict to take place, it has to occur based on an interaction between two or more individuals. Conflict occurs in the workplace because of the idea of power imbalance and also when a victim

perceives that he or she is going to be or is being harmed by the perpetrator (Einarsen, 1999; Keashly, 1998; Rayner, Sheehan, & Barker, 1999).

Leymann (1993, 1996) came up with a model that is similar to Glasl's (1994) escalation model to describe the bullying process. According to Leymann (1993, 1996), the first stage of bullying is "critical incidents" where it might not necessarily be in form of bullying, but it is definitely a conflict between two individuals. The second stage of bullying is "bullying and stigmatizing," and this is where the individual becomes the victim of bullying and becomes stigmatized by the perpetrator (Leymann, 1993, 1996).

The third stage is "personnel management" and just like the term suggests the organization or company steps in to deal with the conflict. Unfortunately, it seems that management is more likely to take the side of the perpetrator rather than the victims. Zapf (1999) noted that this is because it is generally easier for management to expel the victims rather than the perpetrator especially when there is more than one perpetrator involved in the bullying process. The last stage is "expulsion," and this is when the victim (or the perpetrator) becomes expelled from the organization. It seems that the notion of expulsion can be so severe, thus leading to health consequences (Groeblinghoff & Becker, 1996; Leymann, 1996) and causing them to seek help but in return are being misdiagnosed because of the fact that the medical experts may not necessarily believe them. In other words, victims try to cope with the bullying behavior by simply seeking help, but instead they are faced with distrust from medical experts.

The idea of the escalation model by Glasl (1994) is that conflict escalates to the extent that victim attempts to commit suicide. This could be seen in the tragedies faced by employees from Foxconn (a Taiwanese electronics firm operating assembly plants in

China) where due to the severe working conditions, drove them to commit suicide (Telegraph, 2010). Despite the fact that Glasl's model (1994) was developed before workplace bullying was first introduced by researchers, Zapf and Gross (2001) still adopted this model in their research. Glasl (1994) came up with four phases to describe the "levels of escalation" and how it escalates and differentiates between phases.

The first phrase is the "rationality and control," where conflicts are seen to be impossible to prevent in organizations. Because of conflicts in organizations, it may actually lead to an increase in the work performance of the employees and motivate them to come up with new and innovative ideas (de Dreu, 1997). However, conflicts that are actually good for the organizations are extremely low (Zapf & Gross, 2001). It seems that in the first phase all parties involved in the conflict are willing to come up with solutions to deal with the problems they are currently experiencing (Glasl, 1994).

The second phase is the "severing ties of the relationship." This is where hostility and distrust arise between the parties involved in the conflict and because of the fact that there is tension, the parties will tend to isolate each other from one another. In other words, in this stage, as parties are unable to solve their conflict, they will choose to terminate their relationship with one another. The last stage is the "aggression and destruction" stage, and this is where individuals involved in the conflict are willing to risk their lives just to destroy the other party. But Glasl (1994) noted that it is very rare for individuals in an organization to reach this stage.

Previous studies identified a number of coping strategies or tactics that victims of workplace bullying enacted (e.g., Keashly, Trott, & MacLean, 1994; Zapf & Gross, 2001). **Table 2.1** shows a list of the coping strategies.

Table 2.1 List of Coping Strategies

Talked with the bullies	(Zapf & Gross, 2001)
Supervisors called in	(Zapf & Gross, 2001)
Worker's representatives called in	(Zapf & Gross, 2001)
Situation with bullies avoided	(Zapf & Gross, 2001)
Ignored situation at work	(Zapf & Gross, 2001)
Trade union called in	(Zapf & Gross, 2001)
Psychotherapy	(Zapf & Gross, 2001)
Fought back with similar means	(Zapf & Gross, 2001)
Frequent absence from work	(Zapf & Gross, 2001)
Long-term sick leave	(Zapf & Gross, 2001)
Employee's notice	(Zapf & Gross, 2001)
Drugs	(Zapf & Gross, 2001)
Transfer to another job	(Zapf & Gross, 2001)
Applied for early pension	(Zapf & Gross, 2001)
Made a joke of the behavior	(Keashly et al., 1994)
Went along with the behavior	(Keashly et al., 1994)
Behaved extra nice to the person	(Keashly et al., 1994)

Einarsen and Mikkelsen (2003) noted that there is a vast difference in the way employees claimed as to how they will confront the problem of workplace bullying and how the victims actually confronted the problem. Rayner (1998, 1999) reported that there were only a small number of victims who actually confronted the perpetrator or raised the problem to their respective supervisor or manager. This is in contrast to what non-victims mentioned that they would do when they are placed in a situation whereby they were being bullied. In a similar vein, Ólafsson and Jóhanndóttir (2004) noted that employees who reported that if they were being bullied, were more likely to use coping strategies such as seeking support from the union or from their co-workers and it turns out that the number of victims who actually used that method as their coping strategy is lower than what the employees initially reported. Ideally, it seems that victims would prefer to use "exit strategy" in order to cope with the bullying which is once again in contrast to the

reports from the non-victims. It seems that even though 7% of non-victims reported that they would leave the organization if they were being bullied, it turned out that approximately 14% to 36% of the victims actually left their job (Cox, 1987; Keashly et al., 1994; Ólafsson & Jóhanndóttir, 2004; Rayner, 1998). And, therefore, victims are more likely to use non-confrontational and exit strategies as their way of coping with the bullying.

Zapf and Gross (2001) wanted to find if there were any differences in the ways in which victims and non-victims chose their coping strategies. In a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods, they found that victims tend to use avoidance strategies more frequently than the non-victims in the control group. In the same study, Zapf and Gross (2001) also wanted to find whether there were any differences in the coping strategies used by successful and unsuccessful victims. Successful victims refer to those victims who were able to successfully cope with the bullying behavior and unsuccessful victims refer to those who were unable to successfully cope with the bullying (Zapf & Gross, 2001). It seems that the reason as to why the victims were unsuccessful was because they were more likely to use direct strategies such as confronting with the bullies than those who were successful. On the other hand, victims who were able to successfully cope with the bullying tend to make as few mistakes as possible, and they were unwilling to engage in the conflict so as to prevent it from escalating any further (Zapf & Gross, 2001). In other words, they chose to use avoidance strategies as a way to cope with the bullying.

Cross-cultural Comparison of Workplace Bullying

Up to date, there has been very little research done on cross-cultural comparison of workplace bullying (e.g., Anderson & Busman, 2002; Loh et al., 2010). As mentioned in the introduction chapter, several researchers have even emphasized the importance of examining cross-cultural differences on workplace bullying in terms of finding out what instigates the bullying so as to prevent it from happening (e.g., Hoel & Salin, 2003; Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2007). Additionally, by conducting a cross-cultural comparison study of workplace bullying, researchers can use the findings to conduct intervention or create campaigns so as to raise awareness of the bullying as well as to prevent workplace bullying (Escartín, Zapf, Arrieta, & Rodríguez-Carballeira, 2011)

Different countries have different cultural values. This can be seen in Hofstede's (2001) study where he offered several dimensions in a useful framework to see cultural differences across nations, including power distance, individualism-collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity versus femininity, and long-term orientation versus short-term orientation.

The idea of power distance is when power is distributed unequally in the organization and among organizational members (Hofstede, 2001). It should also be noted that based on Hofstede's (2001) cultural model, Singapore is a country that is characterized by high power distance. Therefore in a study done by Loh and colleagues (2010), they suggested that because of the nature of workplace bullying, it is going to be generally more accepted in high power distance countries. On the other hand, because the United States is a low power distance country, workplace bullying might not be accepted

as subordinates will expect that their supervisors or managers to include their opinions in the decision making process (Hofstede, 2001).

However, using Hofstede's cultural model, several researchers demonstrated in their studies that collectivistic countries such as Spain, which are characterized by high power distance and high uncertainty avoidance tend to experience higher levels and rates of workplace bullying (Moreno-Jimènez, Rodriguez-Muñoz, Salin, & Benadero, 2008) in comparison to countries such as the UK, Australia and even the United States which are characterized by individualism and low power distance (Escartín et al., 2011). This is probably due to the fact that employees working in countries with low power distance tend to voice their opinions about workplace bullying in regards to their counterparts from high power distance countries (Einarsen, 2000).

Face Negotiation Theory

There are three types of face concerns: self-face, other-face, and mutual-face concerns (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). Self-face concern refers to the concern for the individual's face. Other-face concern refers to the concern for the other parties face, and mutual-face concern refers to the concern for the face or image of the two parties (Oetzel et al., 2001). Ting-Toomey (2007) also suggested that face loss can happen when an individual's identity or a group's identity is being confronted or challenged. Moreover, it seems that when an individual is being placed in a situation where he or she experiences face-loss or face-threat for a long period of time, it could potentially lead to an escalation in conflict management.

As aforementioned, bullying occurs due to interpersonal conflicts (Zapf & Gross, 2001). Ting-Toomey (1988) introduced the idea of face-negotiation theory to explain how cultures deal with or manages conflict differently. She asserted that when interacting with one another, individuals take into consideration certain face needs. For example, she noted that in accordance with the Chinese culture, they normally use two types of face: "lian" or "mianzi" (Chang & Holt, 1994; Gao, 1998). "Lien" refers to the face of the individual, whereas "mienzi" refers to the face of the entire group (Oetzel et al., 2001). As for the Americans, they tend to exhibit higher levels of concerns towards their own face (Oetzel et al., 2001). And therefore, they are more likely to use direct strategies when it comes to conversing with other individuals, which is unlike the Chinese culture where they are concerned with the notion of protecting and saving face of the other party and as well as the faces of both parties (Ting-Toomey, 1988). The reason as to why members from China are more concerned with the protection of face of the other party and the faces of one another and members from the United States are more concerned with protecting their own face is because of the notion of collectivism and individualism (Ting-Toomey, 1988, 2005). Individualism refers to members in individualistic countries where they usually perceive themselves to exhibit behaviors of independence and they place the upmost importance on achieving their own goals rather than the goals of the other members (Triandis, 1995). Conversely, collectivism refers to members in collectivistic countries whereby they tend to be dependent on other members and unlike members of the individualistic countries, the goals of the other members take precedence over their own goals (Triandis, 1995).

Power distance can also be used to explain why members from high power distance countries prefer to use vertical-based facework and why members from low power distance countries prefer to use horizontal-based facework (Ting-Tommey, 1988, 2005). Hwang (1987) explained that the idea of horizontal face work is when an individual adheres to the notion of saving face of the other party. On the other hand, vertical facework refers to when an individual is concerned only with his or her face and he or she wants to make a good impression on his or her boss.

Oetzel and colleagues (2001) did a study on the cross-cultural comparison of facework based on members from China, Germany Japan and the United States, and they discovered that members from individualistic and low power distance countries were more involved in the practice of self-face concerns whereas members from collectivistic and high power distance countries tend to display other-face concerns. Moreover, it seems that members in individualistic and collectivistic (Triandis, 1995, 2002) culture tend to handle conflict differently. Members in individualistic culture have a greater tendency to use direct confrontational methods to handle the conflict than members in collectivistic cultures who are more likely to remain calm during the conflict (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998).

However, it should be noted that when Oetzel and colleagues (2001) did a comparison between Germany and the United States, both of which are individualistic cultures, they reported that the Germans were more confrontational and direct than the Americans and had higher self-face and mutual-face needs than their American counterparts. On the other hand, the Americans had a greater tendency to remain calm than their German counterparts (Oetzel et al., 2001). Oetzel and colleagues (2001) also

noted that their findings were consistent with the findings by Clarkworthy (1996) and Hall and Hall (1990). Additionally, when Oetzel and colleagues (2001) did a comparison on collectivistic cultures, between the Japanese and Chinese, they found that the Chinese displayed higher levels of direct confrontational styles than their Japanese counterpart, who had a greater tendency to remain calm during conflicts. Oetzel and colleagues (2001) pointed out that the Chinese had a higher self-face concern than their American counterparts and they attributed this finding to that of Gao and Ting-Tommey's (1998) study where both self-face and other-face is a huge concern for the Chinese.

Moreover, it seems that members from individualistic countries are more likely to use self-protection, control and domineering strategies to cope or manage the conflict than their collectivistic counterparts (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001). On the other hand, members from collectivistic countries tend to use "integrating" and "compromising" strategies to deal with the conflict (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001, p. 49).

And therefore, based on our understanding of the face-negotiation theory, my intention would be to investigate how victims of workplace bullying in Singapore and the United States differ in their use of face concerns or needs in relation to their use of coping strategies.

Hypothesis and Research Questions

In light of the above discussion, one hypothesis (H) and five research questions (RQs) are advanced. According to Loh and colleagues (2010), employees living in low power distance countries have a greater tendency of experiencing workplace bullying than employees living in high power distance countries. They attributed this to the fact that employees in high power distance countries tend to perceive bullying as a result of

mistakes that they made in the workplace and therefore are more likely to accept bullying as part of the working environment (Hofstede, 2001). Based on this finding, I hypothesize that:

H: Employees in the United States will report higher levels of exposure to workplace bullying than employees in Singapore.

RQ1a: Which types of coping strategies did victims use?

RQ1b: To what extent did victims in Singapore use each of the coping strategies?

RQ1c: To what extent did victims in the United States use each of the coping strategies?

RQ2: To what extent did victims in Singapore and the United States differ in their use of coping strategies?

RQ3: To what extent did face concerns relate to the use of the coping strategies?

Chapter Three

Methodology

This chapter described the procedure that was utilized to collect data to test the hypothesis and answer research questions. I first presented the procedure and the participants followed by the measurement and the operationalization of the variables.

Procedure

The recruited sample represented employees from Singapore and the United States. A pilot test was first conducted with 29 students from the University of Houston. Participants of the pre-test were asked for their feedback at the end of the survey, for instance, time taken to complete the survey, clarity on the instructions and ways to improve the survey. Based on the feedback, I changed the term "bullying" to "socially negative acts," as it seems that when participants saw the word "bullying," they tended to have a negative association with the term. Additionally, several wordings of the instructions were also changed to improve clarity in the writing.

Both a web-based survey which was hosted via SurveyMonkey.com and paper-and-pencil questionnaire was then developed. The reason as to why I chose to do a web-based survey is twofold. First, it is due to the difficulty in gaining access to Singaporeans. Second, it is because of the cost-effective nature of creating a web-based survey (Alessi & Martin, 2010). I also utilized the network sampling or snowballing technique (Frey, Botan & Kreps, 2000), where participants were asked to send the link of my web-based survey to two additional participants.

Upon approval from the University of Houston's Committees for the Protection of Human Subjects (CHPS), emails containing the link to my web-based survey were sent

out to instructors of various universities and organizations in Singapore, professors from the University of Houston as well as to my friends and acquaintances. The survey was also placed on social networking sites and flyers/posters were distributed or posted on bulletin boards. Participants who were interested were provided with clear and easy-to-follow instructions on how to access the survey. After clicking on the link of the web-based survey, participants were then directed to the cover letter of the research study where they were told to click onto the "next" button if they agree to participate in the study.

The paper-and-pencil questionnaire was given out, upon request, from the professors from the University of Houston. All students were also informed that in order to fulfill the requirements of the study, they had to have either current or previous working experiences, if they did not, they had the option of inviting their family members or friends who were working either as a full-time or part-time employee to complete the questionnaire. The questionnaire was written in English. This is because English is the first language in Singapore and it is often used in both work and non-work settings (Chew, 2007; Pakir, 2004).

Furthermore, so as to encourage or to increase the response rate of the survey, students were sometimes offered extra credit in their course and all participants also had a chance of winning one out of the four $25 gift cards by simply entering in a drawing.

Participants

A total of 778 respondents from Singapore and the United States participated in this study. However, 16 participants were removed due to either random writings that were not related to the study or they had filled out the survey more than once. An

additional 41 participants' responses were also excluded because they had indicated that they had never been employed before. And therefore, this study had a final sample of 721 participants, of which 31.8% were males ($n = 229$) and 67.8% were females ($n = 489$). There were 0.4% ($n = 3$) of the participants who did not state his or her gender. As many as 63.1% ($n = 455$) and 23.8% ($n = 172$) of the participants reported that they were in the age range from 18 to 25 years old and 26 to 35 years old respectively. There were also 40.6% ($n = 293$) of the participants who indicated that they were currently employed in a full-time position. 34.1% ($n = 246$) of them reported that they were currently part-time employees and 25% ($n = 180$) stated that they were currently unemployed.

The sample consisted of 23.3% ($n = 168$) European Americans, 8.7% ($n = 63$) African Americans, 10.4% ($n = 75$) Hispanic Americans, and 6.9% ($n = 50$) Asian Americans. Additionally, 1.8% ($n = 13$) of them indicated that they were of mixed or other American ethnicities (e.g., African American and European Americans, Hispanic American and European Americans). There were also 38.1% ($n = 275$) of Singaporean Chinese, 0.7% ($n = 5$) Singaporean Malays, and 1.5% ($n = 11$) Singaporean Indians. Only 0.6% ($n = 4$) of the participants specified that they were mixed or other Singaporeans (e.g., Singaporean Filipinos) and 7.8% ($n = 56$) also reported that they belonged to the "others" category.

Additionally, 25.7% ($n = 185$) of the participants hold a Bachelor's degree, 17.9% ($n = 129$) indicated that they graduated from Some College and 13.9% ($n = 100$) were Junior College alumni. Participants stated that they had worked for their current supervisor for an average of 27.42 months ($SD = 38.73$) and had a mean average of 8.74 co-workers ($SD = 10.81$). They also reported their hierarchical level in their company to be a mean of

2.76 (*SD* = 1.45). **Tables 3.1** to **3.14** present all of current and previous demographic characteristics of the participants.

Table 3.1 Gender Distribution

Gender	*f*	*%*
Male	229	31.8
Female	489	67.8
Missing	3	0.4

Table 3.2 Age Distribution

Age	*f*	*%*
18 - 25	455	63.1
26 - 35	172	23.8
36 - 45	43	6.0
46 - 55	26	3.6
55 – 60+	22	3.1
Missing	3	0.4

Table 3.3 Employment Distribution

Employment Status	*F*	*%*
Full-time	293	40.6
Part-time	246	34.1
Not employed	180	25.0
Missing	2	0.3

Table 3.4 Ethnicity Distribution

Ethnicity	*f*	*%*
European American	168	23.3
African American	63	8.7
Hispanic American	75	10.4
Asian American	50	6.9
Singaporean Chinese	275	38.1
Singaporean Malay	5	0.7
Singaporean Indian	11	1.5
Mixed Americans and American Others	13	1.8
Mixed Singaporeans and Singaporean Others	4	0.6
Others	56	7.8
Missing	1	0.1

Table 3.5 Educational Distribution

Educational Background	*F*	*%*
High School	83	11.5
Secondary School	14	1.9
Junior College	100	13.9
Polytechnic	54	7.5
Some College	129	17.9
Associate	80	11.1
Bachelor	185	25.7
Master	49	6.8
Doctoral	17	2.4
Other	9	1.2
Missing	1	0.1

Table 3.6 Current Job Industries Distribution

Job industries	*N*
Accommodation and Food Services	50
Administrative and Support and Waste Management and Remediation Services	2
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	2
Arts. Entertainment, and Recreation	16
Construction	1
Education Services	76
Finance and Insurance	43
Health Care and Social Assistance	21
Information	21
Management of Companies and Enterprises	1
Manufacturing	20
Marine	20
Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction	16
Non Profit	11
Other Services	47
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	78
Public Administration	28
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	10
Retail Trade	44
Transportation and Warehousing	10
Utilities	1
Wholesale	1
Missing	202

Table 3.7 Length of Employment for Current Supervisor Distribution (in months)

Length of Current Employment	*F*	*%*
<12	198	27.5
<24	125	17.3
<36	75	10.4
<48	51	7.1
<60	30	4.2
<72	8	0.9
<84	12	1.5
<96	9	1.1
≥96	22	2.4
Missing	191	26.5

Note. *Mean* = 27.42, *SD* = 38.73

Table 3.8 Current Co-worker Distribution

Current Co-worker	*F*	*%*
<10	360	50.1
<20	99	13.7
<30	31	4.3
<40	16	2.0
<50	8	1.1
≥50	6	0.7
Missing	201	27.9

Note. *Mean* = 8.74, *SD* = 10.81

Table 3.9 Current Hierarchical Level Distribution

Current Hierarchy	*f*	*%*
1	138	19.1
2	110	15.3
3	115	16.0
4	89	12.3
5	62	8.6
6	16	2.2
Missing	191	26.5

Note. *Mean* = 2.76, *SD* = 1.45

Table 3.10 Previous Employment Distribution

Previously employed	*f*	*%*
Yes	273	37.9
No	14	1.9
Missing	434	60.2

Table 3.11 Previous Job Industries Distribution

Job industries	N
Accommodation and Food Services	35
Administrative and Support and Waste Management and Remediation Services	3
Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting	--
Arts. Entertainment, and Recreation	10
Construction	9
Education Services	24
Finance and Insurance	22
Health Care and Social Assistance	12
Information	16
Management of Companies and Enterprises	2
Manufacturing	5
Marine	7
Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction	5
Non Profit	2
Other Services	21
Professional, Scientific and Technical Services	40

Public Administration	22
Real Estate and Rental and Leasing	1
Retail Trade	32
Transportation and Warehousing	2
Utilities	--
Wholesale Trade	--
Missing	451

Table 3.12 Length of Employment for Previous Supervisor Distribution (in months)

Length of Employment for Previous Supervisor	f	%
<12	434	60.1
<24	75	10.5
<36	56	7.8
<48	30	4
<60	18	2.4
<72	14	1.8
<84	6	0.8
<96	9	1.2
≥96	17	2.0
Missing	62	8.6

Note. *Mean* = 14.91, *SD* =30.39

Table 3.13 Previous Co-worker Distribution

Previous Co-worker	F	%
<10	233	32.2
<20	72	10.0
<30	36	5.0
<40	7	1.0
<50	1	0.1
≥50	8	1.0
Missing	364	50.5

Note. *Mean* = 10.73, *SD* = 21.89

Table 3.14 Previous Hierarchical Level Distribution

Previous Hierarchy	f	%
1	132	18.3
2	82	11.4
3	78	10.8
4	47	6.5
5	25	3.5
6	9	1.2
Missing	348	48.3

Note. *Mean* = 2.40, *SD* = 1.38

Measurement of Variables

Demographics. Participants were asked to fill out demographic information such as age, gender, ethnicity, and whether they were currently employed or unemployed. They were also asked about their relative position in their organizational hierarchy. Appendix A presents the background information.

Exposure to Workplace Bullying. To measure the amount of exposure to workplace bullying, I used the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised (NAQ-R). This measure is based on the Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ) developed by Einarsen and Raknes (1997) and has been used by several researchers to measure the exposure to workplace bullying (e.g., Einarsen & Hoel, 2001; Hoel & Cooper, 2000; Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2001; Salin, 2001). The NAQ-R was introduced so as to create a reliable and valid instrument to measure bullying in various occupational industries (Einarsen, Hoel & Notelaers, 2009). Additionally, the NAQ-R was developed to replace the NAQ as there were several limitations pertaining to that instrument such as the notion of cultural biases

as the instrument was developed mainly for the use of measuring bullying in Nordic countries (Einarsen et al., 2009).

The NAQ-R consisted of 22 items that represented three types of workplace bullying: work-related bullying, person-related bullying and physically intimidating bullying (Einarsen et al., 2009). 7 items belong to work-related bullying, 12 items belong to person-related bullying and 3 items belong to physically intimidating bullying. Participants were told that the following items describe situations that may happen in any workplace and were asked to consider their experiences of such situations. They were then asked to circle or mark the answer category or number that best reflects their circumstances on a 5-point scale, ranging from "never = 1" to "daily = 5." It should be noted that the higher the score, the more frequent or greater the exposure to workplace bullying. Sample questions include: (a) "Someone withholding information that affects your performance;" (b) "Being ignored or excluded from social events;" (c) "Repeated reminders of your errors or mistakes;" and (d) "Being the subject of excessive teasing and sarcasm." All items in the NAQ-R had no reference to the term "bullying" (Einarsen et al., 2009).

The frequency mean for the work-related bullying exposure was 1.94 ($SD = 0.79$) and had a reliability score of Cronbach's Alpha = 0.84; the mean for person-related bullying was 1.58 ($SD = 0.69$) with a reliability score of Cronbach's Alpha = 0.92; and for physically intimidating bullying, the mean was 1.40 ($SD = 0.67$) with Cronbach's Alpha = 0.72.

In order to measure the "self-labeling" victimization, the subjective criteria of workplace bullying (Einarsen et al., 2009), a definition of socially negative acts was

given after participants completed the NAQ-R. The definition of socially negative acts was adapted from an earlier study (e.g., Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996; Salin, 2001). Participants were told that the definition of socially negative acts were as follows:

> Negative acts occur when an individual perceives himself or herself to be subjected to persistent hostile behavior from one or more individuals. Additionally, the individual may also have the difficulty in defending himself or herself against such acts.

Participants were then asked to answer a series of related questions such as how frequent and how long they were subjected to the socially negative acts and who were the main offenders or bullies (Einarsen et al., 2009). According to Einarsen and colleagues (2009), a vague definition of bullying or in this case, socially negative acts was given so that the participants were able to perceive workplace bullying based on their own judgment and experiences. There were 30.1% ($n = 217$) of the participants who reported that they have been subjected to socially negative acts and the mean for the number of times or the frequency with which they were exposed to the socially negative acts was 1.39 ($SD = 2.60$). Frequency of the socially negative acts was measured on an 11-point scale, ranging from "0 = 0" to "11 = 10+". The severity of the socially negative acts was on the whole 1.43 ($SD = 2.21$) on a 10-point scale, ranging from "not severe at all = 0" to "extremely severe = 10." The average length that participants were subjected to the negative behaviors was 4.44 in months ($SD = 14.19$). **Tables 3.15** to **3.23** present the frequency distribution in regards to the self-labeling victimization of socially negative acts. Appendix B presents the measurement of the specific items.

Table 3.15 Subjected to Socially Negative Acts (SNA) Distribution

Subjected to SNA	F	%
Yes	217	30.1
No	445	61.7
Missing	59	8.2

Table 3.16 Frequency of Socially Negative Acts (SNA) Distribution

Frequency of SNA	F	%
<5	531	73.7
<10	44	6.1
≥10	22	3.1
Missing	124	17.2

Notes: $Mean = 1.39$, $SD = 2.60$

Table 3.17 Severity of Socially Negative Acts (SNA) Distribution

Severity of SNA	F	%
<5	474	65.8
<10	60	8.3
≥10	2	0.3
Missing	185	25.7

Note. $Mean = 1.43$, $SD = 2.21$

Table 3.18 Length of Socially Negative Acts (in months) Distribution

Length of SNA	f	%
<12	583	80.7
<24	37	5.1
<36	12	1.6
<48	15	1.9
<60	8	1.1
<72	2	0.2
<84	3	0.4
<96	1	0.1
≥96	3	0.3
Missing	57	7.9

Note. $Mean = 4.44$, $SD = 14.19$

Table 3.19 Main Offenders- Boss Distribution

Main Offenders	f	%
Boss	159	22.1
Missing (Boss)	562	77.9
Boss Male	101	14.0
Missing (Boss Male)	620	86.0
Boss Female	77	10.7
Missing (Boss Female)	644	89.3

Table 3.20 Main Offenders- Peer/Co-worker Distribution

Main Offenders	*f*	*%*
Peer/Co-worker	160	22.2
Missing (Peer/Co-worker)	561	77.8
Peer/Co-worker Male	96	13.3
Missing (Peer/Co-worker Male)	625	86.7
Peer/Co-worker Female	106	14.7
Missing (Peer/Co-worker Female)	615	85.3

Table 3.21 Main Offenders- Subordinates Distribution

Main Offenders	*f*	*%*
Subordinates	28	3.9
Missing (Subordinates)	693	96.1
Subordinates Male	26	3.6
Missing (Subordinates Male)	695	96.4
Subordinates Female	23	3.2
Missing (Subordinates Female)	698	96.8

Table 3.22 Main Offenders- Client/Customer Distribution

Main Offenders	*f*	*%*
Client/Customer	91	12.6
Missing (Client/Customer)	630	87.4
Client/Customer Male	73	10.1
Missing (Client/Customer Male)	648	89.9
Client/Customer Female	69	9.6
Missing (Client/Customer Female)	652	90.4

Table 3.23 Main Offenders- Others Distribution

Main Offenders	*f*	*%*
Others	20	2.8
Missing (Others)	701	97.2
Others Male	12	1.7
Missing (Others Male)	709	98.3
Others Female	16	2.2
Missing (Others Female)	705	97.8

Coping Strategies. Coping strategies were observed by 24 questions on a 5-point scale, ranging from "never = 1" to "very often = 5." Participants were instructed to

indicate the extent to which they used the 24 various coping behaviors. The 22 behaviors were drawn from studies that examined how victims coped with bullying (Einarsen, Matthiesen, & Mikkelsen, 2000; Keashly et al., 1994; Salmivalli, Karhumen, & Lagerspetz, 1996). Lee and Brotheridge (2001) used the same 22 items that I used in this study. I added two more items to my questionnaire: (a) "Sought help from a counselor or professional;" (Ólafsson & Jóhannsdóttir, 2004) (b) "Fought back with similar means or behavior" (Zapf & Gross, 2001). Appendix C presents the 24 items. The results section presents the outcomes (identification of strategies such as negative reactance, active solution and indirect/passive fielding).

The frequency mean for negative reactance was 1.95 ($SD = 0.85$) with a reliability score of Cronbach's Alpha = 0.87. As for active solution, it had a frequency mean of 1.77 ($SD = 0.70$) with a relatively high reliability score of Cronbach's Alpha = 0.82. Indirect/passive fielding had a frequency mean of 2.78 ($SD = 0.90$) with a reliability test score of Cronbach's Alpha = 0.81.

Face Concerns.   Two types of face concerns were also examined in this study: self-face and other-face concerns. Ting-Toomey and Oetzel (2001) developed a face concern instrument that were designed to measure all face concerns - self-face, other-face, and mutual-face. The validity and reliability of this face concern instrument are well established (e.g., Oetzel et al., 2001). Thus, face concerns (self-face and other-face) were measured by the items from Ting-Toomey and Oetzel (2001) and since the rest of the other items were used to measure mutual-face concerns, it was not included in the questionnaire. 7 items were used to measure self-face concerns and 11 items were used to measure other-face concerns.

Participants were asked to recall the last time where they were in a serious conflict with either their supervisor or co-worker and how they responded to it. They were then told to indicate how they felt about the statements or items. The face concern items were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from "strongly disagree = 1" to "strongly agree = 5." Sample questions include: (a) "Maintaining humbleness to preserve the relationship was important to me;" (b) "I didn't want to embarrass myself in front of the other person;" (c) "I was concerned with not appearing weak in front of the other person." Appendix D presents the 18 items.

Self-face had a mean of 3.73 ($SD = 0.82$) with a reliability score of Cronbach's Alpha = 0.90; and other face had a mean of 2.89 ($SD = 0.90$) with a rather high reliability test score of Cronbach's Alpha = 0.94.

Affective Organizational Commitment. There were 6 items which were used to measure affective organizational commitment. Out of the 6 items, 5 items were derived from the Meyer and Allen's Affective Commitment scale (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993) and 1 item from the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979), which was used to measure self-satisfaction towards the organization. Rhoades, Eisenberger and Armeli (2001) also used the same 6 items to measure affective organizational commitment in their research. The affective organizational commitment items were measured on a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from "strongly disagree = 1" to "strongly agree = 5." Sample questions include (a) "I feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization;" (b) "Working at my organization has a great deal of personal meaning to me;" (c) "I would be happy to work at my organization until I retire." The affective organizational commitment measurement had a mean of 3.27

(*SD* = 0.95) with a high reliability score of Cronbach's Alpha = 0.90. Appendix E
presents the 6 items.

   Job Satisfaction.   Job satisfaction was measured by 1 item on a 5-point Likert-
type scale, ranging from "strongly disagree = 1" to "strongly agree = 5." The item for job
satisfaction item was (a) "I am satisfied with my job." The job satisfaction measurement
had a mean of 3.48 (*SD* = 1.11).

   Open-ended Question.   At the end of the survey, an open-ended question was
given, in which it asked the participants to write about their bullying experiences or if
they have witnessed any negative or hostile bullying behavior in their workplace.

**Table 3.24 Descriptive Statistics of Major Variables: Frequency Mean, Standard
Deviation, and Cronbach's Alpha.**

Variable	*Mean*	*SD*	*Cronbach's Alpha*	*Cronbach's Alpha based on Standardized Items*
1. Work-related Bullying	1.94	.079	0.84	0.84
2. Person-related Bullying	1.58	0.69	0.92	0.93
3. Physically Intimidating Bullying	1.40	0.67	0.72	0.73
4. Negative Reactance	1.95	0.85	0.87	0.87
5. Active Solution	1.77	0.70	0.82	0.82
6. Indirect/passive Fielding	2.78	0.90	0.81	0.81
7. Self-face	3.73	0.82	0.90	0.90
8. Other-face	2.89	0.90	0.94	0.94
9. Affective Commitment	3.27	0.95	0.90	0.90

Table 3.25 Correlations among Major Variables

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Education Level-Diploma										
2. Length of Work for Current Supervisor (in months)	0.09									
3. Number of Coworkers	0.05[1]	0.17								
4. Hierarchy	0.09	0.29	0.07							
5. Length of Work for Previous Supervisor (in months)	0.05	0.31	0.15	0.14						
6. Number of Coworkers in Previous Employment	0.08[1]	0.03	0.40	0.09[1]	0.12					
7. Hierarchy in Previous Employment	0.15	0.23	0.15	0.53	0.35	0.12				
8. Frequency of Socially Negative Acts (SNA)	0.11	0.01	0.10	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.09[1]			
9. Severity of SNA	0.18	-0.02	0.04	0.01	0.05	-0.01	0.10[1]	0.71		
10. Length of SNA (in months)	0.12	0.23	0.15	0.04	0.16	0.05	0.10[1]	0.46	0.42	
11. Work-related Bullying	0.15	-0.03	0.07	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.10[1]	0.53	0.52	0.27
12. Person-related Bullying	0.08	-0.02	0.09[1]	0.01	0.07	0.03	0.12	0.57	0.54	0.34
13. Physically Intimidating Bullying	0.05	-0.03	0.10	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.11	0.42	0.40	0.22
14. Negative Reactance	0.13	-0.02	0.03	-0.06	0.10	-0.05	0.02	0.46	0.53	0.27
15. Active Solution	-0.02	0.01	0.10	0.08[1]	0.07	0.01	0.13	0.22	0.19	0.19
16. Indirect/passive Fielding	0.05	-0.02	0.11	-0.09[1]	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.36	0.33	0.18
17. Self-face	0.03	-0.08[1]	-0.08[1]	0.02	-0.04	0.08[1]	-0.06	0.05	0.12	0.06
18. Other-face	-0.02	-0.01	-0.02	0.05	-0.05	0.08[1]	0.00	-0.09	-0.13	-0.01
19. Affective Commitment	0.02	0.12	0.02	0.28	0.09	0.09[1]	0.20	-0.28	-0.26	-0.07
20. Job Satisfaction	-0.11	.04	-0.02	0.18	-0.02	0.40	0.07	-0.39	-0.41	-0.19

Table 3.25 Correlations among Major Variables continued

Variables	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
12. Person-related Bullying	0.82									
13. Physically Intimidating Bullying	0.66	0.76								
14. Negative Reactance	0.54	0.58	0.43							
15. Active Solution	0.32	0.42	0.34	0.42						
16. Indirect/passive Fielding	0.34	0.31	0.22	0.51	0.32					
17. Self-face	0.09	0.01	-0.08[1]	0.16	0.01	0.29				
18. Other-face	-0.11	-0.12	-0.07	-0.07	0.00	0.02	0.32			
19. Affective Commitment	-0.34	-0.30	-0.26	-0.28	-0.10	-0.13	0.09	0.20		
20. Job Satisfaction	-0.45	-0.40	-0.36	-0.35	-0.10	-0.11	0.08[1]	0.10	0.65	

Note. ($p < 0.05$), two- tailed test
Between 0.08 - 0.10 in their absolute value are significant at the 0.05 level
Between 0.11 - 0.13are significant at the 0.01 level
Larger than 0.14 significant at the 0.001 level
A few exceptions are marked by the superscript 1= exception (not significant at 0.05)

Data Analysis

Raw data/responses from the paper-and-pencil questionnaire were manually coded into an excel file and raw data from SurveyMonkey.com were combined. I then used the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software (version 19) to analyze the data. A MANVOA procedure was used to answer my hypothesis and statistical techniques such as t-test, correlations, and additional MANVOA procedures were used to answer my research questions.

As for the open-ended question, I gave all participants pseudonyms and if the participants mentioned the names of their organizations, pseudonyms were also assigned

to them. Using the constant comparison method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), I conducted a thematic analysis (Kellehear, 1993; Miles & Huberman, 1994) where I looked for similar themes and recurring patterns based on the written narratives of the participants. Moreover, I also corrected the grammatical mistakes made by the participants and changed some of the wordings in order to make the sentences flow and to sound coherent. The constant comparison method allowed me to gain insight into the victims' experiences of workplace bullying and also to discover the strategies that they used to cope or to deal with the bullying. However, it should be noted that the qualitative section of this current study is only meant for as a supplementary attempt to explore workplace bullying.

Chapter Four

Results

This chapter presents the results gathered from the data. It first describes the results pertaining to the hypothesis followed by those relating to the research questions. Additional findings from the post-hoc analysis are also presented.

H 1: Differences in Exposure to Workplace Bullying between Employees in the United States and Singapore

Hypothesis 1 predicted that employees in the United States will report significantly higher levels of exposure to bullying at work than employees in Singapore. The multivariate one-way two-group test (Hotelling's T^2) was used to detect any significant differences in bullying exposure between Americans and Singaporeans. Stevens (2009) suggested that the multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) is useful as it is able to control Type 1 error (i.e., falsely finding a significant outcome) with multiple t-tests. Results of the analysis of a MANOVA procedure indicated that there was an overall significant difference between Americans and Singaporeans across all types of bullying exposures (dependent variables), *Pillai's Trace* = 0.03, *Multivariate F*(3, 574) = 4.82, $p < 0.005$, partial η^2 = 0.03. Box's test of equality of covariance matrices was significant, *Box's M* = 68.79, *F*(6, 1980788.94) = 11.40, $p < 0.001$. This indicates that the equality of covariance cannot be assumed. Therefore, Pillai's Trace instead of Wilk's Lambda was used. The partial η^2 (eta squared) refers to a measure of the effect size, the amount of total variance explained by the independent variables. Results of the post-hoc univariate F-tests indicated that there were significant differences between the two groups (Americans vs. Singaporeans) for all 3 types of bullying experiences: work-related

bullying, $F(1, 576) = 12.93$, $p < 0.001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.02$, person-related bullying, $F(1, 576) = 12.60$, $p < 0.001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.02$, and physically intimidating bullying, $F(1, 576) = 9.95$, $p < 0.005$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.02$, respectively. As predicted, an inspection of mean scores indicated that Americans reported significantly higher levels of exposure in all types of bullying than Singaporean counterparts. **Table 4.1** presents the mean scores, standard deviations, and number of respondents across the three types of bullying.

Table 4.1 Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and Number of Respondents across 3 Types of Bullying for Americans and Singaporeans

	Recoded ethnicity	*Mean*	*Std. Deviation*	*N*
Work-related Bullying*	American	2.03	0.86	329
	Singaporean	1.80	0.66	249
	Total	1.93	0.79	578
Person-related Bullying*	American	1.68	0.81	329
	Singaporean	1.47	0.50	249
	Total	1.59	0.70	578
Physically Intimidating Bullying*	American	1.47	0.74	329
	Singaporean	1.29	0.54	249
	Total	1.39	0.67	578

Note. * indicates significance at $p < 0.01$ or less

Hypothesis 1 was further probed with respect to the frequency, severity, and length of bullying at work. Results of the analysis of a MANOVA procedure indicated that there was an overall significant difference between Americans and Singaporeans in terms of their experience of workplace bullying (i.e., the frequency, severity, and length), *Pillai's Trace* = 0.07, *Multivariate F*(3, 462) = 10.91, p < 0.001, partial $\eta^2 = 0.07$. Results of the post-hoc univariate F-tests indicated that there were significant differences between the two groups (Americans vs. Singaporeans) for all measures of workplace bullying exposures: frequency, $F(1, 464) = 28.48$, $p < 0.001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.06$, severity, $F(1, 464)$

= 22.26, $p < 0.001$, partial $\eta^2 = 0.05$, and length, $F(1, 464) = 14.64$, $p < 0.001$, partial η^2 = 0.03, respectively. An inspection of mean scores indicated that Americans reported significantly higher levels of exposure with respect to the frequency, severity and length of workplace bullying than Singaporeans. Results of these additional examinations are consistent with hypothesis 1. **Table 4.1-2** presents the mean scores, standard deviations, and number of respondents, frequency, severity, and length of the socially negative acts.

Table 4.1-2 Mean, Standard Deviations, Number of Respondents, Frequency, Severity, and Length of SNA across Americans and Singaporeans

	Nationality	*Mean*	*Std. Deviation*	*N*
	American	2.27	3.27	256
Frequency of SNA*	Singaporean	0.92	1.84	210
	Total	1.67	2.80	466
	American	1.94	2.53	256
Severity of SNA*	Singaporean	0.97	1.71	210
	Total	1.50	2.25	466
	American	8.68	20.12	256
Length of SNA in months*	Singaporean	2.88	9.66	210
	Total	6.06	16.50	466

Note. * indicates significance at $p < 0.001$ level

RQ1a: Which Types of Coping Strategies did Victims Use?

RQ1a asked about the types of coping strategies that victims used. As noted, the literature review indicated up to 24 different specific coping behaviors when faced with bullying. A factor analysis was conducted to identify the potential underlying dimensions of coping behaviors. Due to the exploratory nature of the analysis, 24 items were subjected to the principal component analysis with varimax rotation (Stevens, 2009). Five factors with the initial eigen value of more than 1.0 emerged with Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sample adequacy of 0.876 and Bartlett's test of sphericity $\chi^2 = 5844.00$, $df =$

276, $p < 0.001$. However, the scree test suggested a 3-factor solution. Thus, a principal component analysis with 3 factors specified was conducted. Results showed that three factors accounted for 51.39% of the total variance. The first factor with the eigen value of 4.83 consisted of 9 items, accounting for 20.10% of the total variance. This factor primarily involved negative behaviors in nature in the way that employees handled bullying behaviors. It included taking sick days or time off, lowering productivity, feeling bad, helpless or worthless, and quitting or leaving the organization. Thus, this factor was labeled as "negative reactance."

The second factor with the eigen value of 4.11 explained 17.14% of the total variance. It had 8 items, primarily centering on behaviors or attempts designed to resolve the situation actively. This factor included asking and telling the bully to stop, threatening the bully to tell others, informing the boss about the bullying, having someone speak with the bully, seeking help from counselors or professionals, and fighting back with similar behaviors. Overall, this factor was named "active solution."

The third factor with the eigen value of 3.40 explained 14.15% of the total variance. It had 7 items. It primarily described passive and indirect maneuvers to deal with the bullying. This factor included avoiding the bully, ignoring the behavior, speaking with someone about the bullying, behaving extra nice to the bully, acting like as if the bullying did not matter, not taking the bullying seriously, and staying calm. This factor was named "indirect/passive fielding." **Table 4.2** lists the items, factors, and loadings for the strategies the participants used to cope with workplace bullying.

Table 4.2 Coping with Workplace Bullying, Items, Factors, and Loadings.

	Factor Loadings		
Items	Negative Reactance	Active Solution	Indirect/passive Fielding
15. Felt worthless	**0.849**	0.032	0.079
16. Felt helpless to do anything	**0.844**	0.012	0.168
14. Felt bad about myself	**0.840**	0.015	0.165
17. Lowered my productivity	**0.681**	0.212	0.224
18. Thought about quitting	**0.649**	0.223	0.212
13. Took sick days or time off	**0.587**	0.380	-0.019
9. Went along with the behavior	**0.486**	0.048	0.333
8. Left/quit the organization	**0.456**	0.389	-0.099
19. Thought about getting revenge	**0.415**	0.340	0.216
4. Threatened to tell others	0.089	**0.750**	0.004
6. Requested an investigation by a person senior to my supervisor	0.176	**0.747**	-0.092
5. Told my supervisor/boss	-0.071	**0.725**	0.198
10. Got someone to speak to the person about the behavior	0.102	**0.701**	0.153
3. Asked or told the person to stop	-0.062	**0.669**	0.245
7. Requested a temporary assignment elsewhere	0.228	**0.644**	-0.048
24. Fought back with similar means or behavior	0.190	**0.486**	0.109
23. Sought help from a counselor/professional	0.369	**0.398**	0.000
21. Acted as if you didn't care	0.131	0.040	**0.791**
22. Stayed calm	0.055	0.067	**0.781**
20. Didn't take the behavior seriously	-0.069	0.119	**0.744**
1. Ignored the behavior or did nothing	0.414	-0.110	**0.672**
2. Avoided the person	0.432	0.129	**0.548**
11. Talked with others about the behavior	0.293	0.385	**0.459**
12. Behaved extra nice to the person	0.298	0.109	**0.416**

RQ 1b: To What Extent did Victims in Singapore Use each of the Coping Strategies?

RQ1b asked about the extent to which Singaporean victims used each of the coping strategies. There were 3.5% of the respondents who reported that they had never been subjected to bullying ($n = 25$). For the ease and convenience of this study, the non-victims were also included in the study. A series of paired t-tests were conducted to see if there were any significant differences with respect to use of the coping strategies. Results indicated that the strategy of indirect/passive fielding was enacted significantly more frequently than negative reactance which, in turn, was used significantly more frequently than active solution. This pattern indicates that Singaporean victims were somewhat reluctant to actively manage the bullying. **Table 4.3** summarizes the mean scores, standard deviations, number of respondents, and paired t-tests.

Table 4.3 Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, Number of Participants, and Paired t-tests

		Mean	*N*	*SD*	*t Score*	*p*
Pair 1	Negative Reactance	1.94	204	0.78		
	Active Solution	1.71	204	0.63	4.28	0.001
Pair 2	Negative Reactance	1.93	207	0.76		
	Indirect/passive Fielding	2.73	207	0.85	-14.47	0.001
Pair 3	Active Solution	1.70	205	0.63		
	Indirect/passive Fielding	2.73	205	0.85	-16.64	0.001

RQ 1c: To What Extent did Victims in the United States Use each of the Coping Strategies?

RQ 1c asked about the extent to which American victims used each of the coping strategies. A series of paired t-tests were conducted to see if there were any significant differences with respect to use of the coping strategies. Results indicated that American victims followed the same pattern of coping strategies as their Singaporean counterparts.

The strategy of indirect/passive fielding was practiced significantly more frequently than negative reactance which, in turn, was used significantly more frequently than active solution. This pattern indicates that American victims were somewhat reluctant to actively manage the bullying. **Table 4.4** summarizes the mean scores, standard deviations, number of respondents, and paired t-tests.

Table 4.4 Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, Number of Participants, and Paired t-tests

		Mean	*N*	*SD*	*t Score*	*p*
Pair 1	Negative Reactance	1.96	279	0.92		
	Active Solution	1.80	279	0.74	2.99	0.005
Pair 2	Negative Reactance	1.96	289	0.91		
	Indirect/passive Fielding	2.81	289	0.95	-15.94	0.001
Pair 3	Active Solution	1.80	288	0.74		
	Indirect/passive Fielding	2.82	288	0.95	-17.28	0.001

RQ 2: To What Extent did Victims in Singapore and the United States Differ in their Use of Coping Strategies?

RQ2 was concerned with about the extent to which Singaporean and American victims differ in their use of coping strategies. The multivariate one-way two-group test (Hotelling's T^2) was again used to detect any significant differences in the use of coping strategies between Americans and Singaporeans. Results of the analysis of a MANOVA procedure indicated that there was no overall significant difference between Americans and Singaporeans across all types of coping strategies (dependent variables) together, *Pillai's Trace* = 0.01, *Multivariate F*(3, 474) = 0.98, *ns*, partial η^2 = 0.01. Box's test of equality of covariance matrices was significant, *Box's M* = 14.60, *F*(6, 1277277.59) = 2.42, $p < 0.05$. This indicates that the equality of covariance cannot be assumed. Therefore, Pillai's Trace instead of Wilk's Lambda was used. Results of the post-hoc

univariate F-tests indicated no significant differences between the two groups (Americans vs. Singaporeans) for all 3 types of coping strategies: negative reactance, $F(1, 476) = 0.10$, *ns*, partial $\eta^2 = 0.00$, active solution, $F(1, 476) = 2.16$, *ns*, partial $\eta^2 = 0.01$, and indirect/passive fielding, $F(1, 476) = 0.97$, *ns*, partial $\eta^2 = 0.00$, respectively. **Table 4.5** presents the mean scores, standard deviations, and number of participants across the three coping strategies.

Table 4.5 Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, Number of Participants, and the 3 Coping Strategies used across Americans and Singaporeans

	Recoded ethnicity	*Mean*	*Std. Deviation*	*N*
Negative Reactance	American	1.95	0.91	277
	Singaporean	1.93	0.77	201
	Total	1.94	0.85	478
Active Solution	American	1.80	0.74	277
	Singaporean	1.70	0.63	201
	Total	1.76	0.69	478
Indirect/passive Fielding	American	2.81	0.95	277
	Singaporean	2.73	0.86	201
	Total	2.78	0.92	478

RQ3: To What Extent did Face Concerns Relate to the Use of Coping Strategies?

RQ3 asked about the extent to which extent face concerns/needs relate to the use of coping strategies. Face concerns were first grouped into two types: self-face concern and other-face concern. Results of Pearson's correlations analyses indicated that self-face needs were significantly directly correlated with the use of negative reactance ($r = 0.16$, $p < 0.01$) and indirect/passive fielding ($r = 0.29$, $p < 0.001$), but not with the use of active solution ($r = 0.01$, *ns*). Both Singaporean and American employees showed the identical pattern. On the other hand, for Singaporeans, none of the coping strategies were significantly related to other-face needs. But for the American employees, other-face needs were significantly negatively related to use of negative reactance only, $r = -0.13$, p

< 0.05. **Table 4.6** presents the correlations between face concerns and the three coping strategies.

Table 4.6 Correlations between Face Concerns and Coping Strategies

		Negative Reactance	Active Solution	Indirect/passive Fielding
Self-face	Pearson Correlation	0.163	0.008	0.287
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.852	0.000
	N	519	516	527
Other-face	Pearson Correlation	-0.072	-0.003	0.022
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.105	0.951	0.612
	N	513	508	521

Post-Hoc Analysis

Gender Differences

There were no gender differences with respect to the amount of exposure to different types of workplace bullying, *Pillai's Trace* = 0.005, *Multivariate F*(3, 617) = 0.94, *ns* or with respect to use of coping strategies, *Pillai's Trace* = 0.01, *Multivariate F*(3, 515) = 1.88, *ns*.

Employment Status

There were also no differences in terms of employment status (full-time, part-time, and not-employed) for the amount of exposure to different types of workplace bullying, *Pillai's Trace* = 0.02, *Multivariate F*(6, 1234) = 1.56, *ns*. On the other hand, there were an overall significant difference with respect to employment status and the use of coping strategies, *Pillai's Trace* = 0.04, *Multivariate F*(6, 1034) = 3.13, $p < 0.005$, partial eta squared = 0.02. An examination of ANOVA tests' results indicated that full-time and unemployed individuals used negative reactance significantly more than part-time counterparts, $F(2, 518) = 5.24$, $p < 0.01$ and unemployed individuals used

indirect/passive fielding significantly more than part-time counterparts, $F(2, 518) = 3.19$, $p < 0.05$.

Educational Level

Educational level was grouped into 3 levels: High School or less, (High School, Secondary School, and Polytechnic) Some College or more (Some College, Junior College, and Associate Degree), and Bachelor's Degree or higher (Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctorate). A multivariate analysis procedure indicated that there was a significant overall difference for education with respect to the types of bullying, *Pillai's Trace* = 0.04, *Multivariate F*$(6, 1034) = 4.34$, $p < 0.001$, partial eta squared = 0.02. A follow-up with a ANOVA procedure indicated the difference was significant for the work-related bullying, $F(2. 612) = 4.57$, $p < 0.001$, partial eta-squared = 0.02. An inspection of mean scores revealed that people with High School diplomas or less (*Mean* = 1.69, *SD* = 0.60) reported a significantly lower exposure to work-related bullying than people with Some College (*Mean* = 1.97, *SD* = 0.87) and Bachelor's degrees or more (*Mean* = 2.01, *SD* = 0.75). It appears the more educated an individual, the more likely he or she will be exposed to work-related bullying.

Likewise, a multivariate analysis procedure indicated that there was a significant overall difference for education with respect to the different strategies that were enacted so as to cope with workplace bullying, *Pillai's Trace* = 0.03, *Multivariate F*$(6, 1018) = 2.35$, $p < 0.05$, partial eta squared = 0.01. A follow-up with a ANOVA procedure indicated the difference was significant for negative reactance strategy, $F(2. 510) = 4.29$, $p < 0.01$, partial eta-squared = 0.02. An inspection of mean scores revealed that people with High School diplomas or less (*Mean* = 1.78, *SD* = 0.76) reported a significantly less

use of negative reactance strategy than people with Bachelor's degrees or more (*Mean =* 2.07, *SD* = 0.86). People with Some College did not differ from either group. And therefore, it seems to be that the more educated an individual is, the more likely he or she will use negative reactance in order to cope with the bullying.

Hierarchical Level

Hierarchical positions were grouped into 3 categories of low (bottom 2 levels), mid (middle two levels), and high (top 2 levels). A MANOVA procedure did not indicate any overall significant difference for the amount of exposure to all types of bullying, *Pillai's Trace* = 0.008, *Multivariate F*(6, 902) = 0.60, *ns*. Likewise, there were no overall significant differences for use of the strategies all together, *Pillai's Trace* = 0.03, *Multivariate F*(6, 760) = 1.96, *ns*.

Self-face and Other-face Concerns

Self-face and other-face needs were classified into three groups: low, mid, and high. Then, a MANOVA procedure was used to explore the potential moderating effects of nationality/culture (Americans vs. Singaporeans) on the relationship between face needs and use of any strategies. Results of MANOVAs and ANOVAs indicated no significant moderating effects at all.

Qualitative Analysis

In the open-ended question of the survey, participants were asked to describe their bullying experiences and if they had witnessed any negative or hostile bullying behavior in their workplace. As I analyzed my data, two themes emerged with 7 subthemes.

Exposure to Workplace Bullying

Based on the narratives from the participants, it seems that most of them were exposed to verbal abuse, gossip, excessive workload, being made as scapegoats and even physical abuse. There were also a number of bystanders who mentioned that they were witnesses to similar bullying situations in their workplace.

Verbal Abuse

A large number of participants reported that they were the subjects of verbal abuse in the workplace. For example, Yvonne (European American) explained the difficulty in working with a boss who frequently abused her verbally:

> Early after joining the company, I was subjected to unnecessary and direct verbal abuse about 3 times by the owner. I have seen and/or heard the owner verbally abusing one or more individual in the company every single day, from condescending sarcasm to outright screaming insults. It is a horrible thing to worry every single day about the mood in which your employer will be in. It is like being in an extremely abusive relationship.

Likewise, Jessica (European American) also mentioned that when her supervisor becomes moody, he will not "hesitate to scream at employees over small things." There is an intense need to feel comfortable in the organization as noted by Blair (European American) when she explained that: "At a previous job, I was the victim of very mild, verbal and sexual harassment." Comparably, Rose (Hispanic American) also stated that: "I have been bullied by my supervisor for the last three months, she yells and screams and throws people under the bus when she is under pressure. I don't feel comfortable and feel alone." April (Singaporean Chinese) also reported that:

One particular senior manager, whom I used to report to, used to bang tables, raised voices, making threats. Big bully. Although, currently, I do not have to report directly to him, he is still passing bad remarks whenever there is an opportunity to do so.

Similarly, Nate (European American) also indicated that:

I had one supervisor who would seem to get very angry at me for the smallest mistakes. She would become very loud and antagonistic every time I made a mistake and yelled at me in front of my co-workers on several occasions.

It should be noted that Violet (European American) reported that she was subjected to verbal abuse by her students:

In my department, my co-workers and I have been bullied by students to the point where we had to call security several times during my employment. Furthermore, we would receive phone calls in which students yell and curse at us. We are under staffed and receive no support from the college dean or from the president.

In addition, it seems that there were several participants who mentioned that they have witnessed verbal abuse as noted by Chad (Singaporean Chinese): "I have seen a supervisor shouting at his staff for the slightest mistake made. The staff has since resigned." Likewise, Erin (Singaporean Chinese) observed that: "Constant shouting at another colleague. I spoke up at the point of time that the comment was not necessary." Eva (European American) also disclosed that: "I have seen the CEO of an advertising agency treat individuals as inept. He would verbally point out employees' mistakes in front of the entire company. This made all of his employees very nervous and frightened of him."

Gossip

The idea of gossiping in the workplace seems to play an important role in the participants' bullying experiences. Most of the participants defined gossiping as talking behind another person's back. This can be seen in the way where Nicole (African American) decided to leave her organization after 3 years of working there when she felt unhappy in the workplace where she was being bullied: "A previous co-worker was an office bully, this behavior soured the workplace for me with her taunting, gossiping, lying, over exaggeration, abuse of power and long tenure." Likewise, Olivia (Singaporean Chinese) also mentioned that:

I was bullied by my co-worker, but I was magnanimous and forgave the person who spoke ill of me and told others not to support me in my work. My boss was blind and believed her. Hence, it affected my productivity at work.

Rebecca (Asian American) wrote that:

I work at Riverdale. There are a lot of negative gossips that one particular assistant manager is always starting and spreading. She is mean and rude. Also, the store manager, who is very pleasant with me, is a very vindictive person. She gives people she doesn't like bad schedules and is not friendly with them at all. She has also started rumors about her co-managers.

According to Stella (Asian American), she reported that she was subjected to verbal abuse as well as gossips by her colleagues:

I work in a university and I have two co-workers who are horrible and they are bullies. They are always doing things their way regardless of what the department says or how we vote. They would yell and scream at the rest of us in person and

via email and spread lies and rumors to the students about us in which the

students will then report back to us. They also lied to the students about the

decisions they agreed to and blamed us for them. Our supervisor does nothing

about this because it is often easier to side with the bully than to side with the

bullied because it means you have to stand up to a bully. This adds incredible

amount of stress and discomfort to the work environment and definitely makes me

less productive. I definitely have no concerns for their face since they are so

obviously rude to the rest of us.

Taylor (Hispanic American) mentioned that she knows that her co-workers and a co-manager have been talking behind her back and at times, directly in front of her. She attributes this bullying behavior due to the lackadaisical environment that she works in as she always "try to get stuff done."

There were a number of bystanders who also witnessed gossiping in the workplace and attributed that behavior to a form of bullying. An example of a bystander is Amanda (Singaporean Chinese), she commented that: "I witnessed negative behavior by higher management to my co-worker. They were constantly reminding her about her mistakes and talking behind her back." Willow (Singaporean Chinese) stated that she has seen her co-workers gossiping about another co-worker:

It was often some people talking bad about another person behind his or her back.

It was not always a face-to-face confrontation. Usually the person who was

gossiped about did not know anything and even if he or she did, the individual

will usually pretend like he or she didn't know.

Another observer or bystander who witnessed bullying in the workplace is Abrielle (Singaporean Chinese) noted that she has seen: "Colleagues of higher ranks badmouthing other lower- ranked colleagues, accusing them of being lazy even though they were just taking a quick break."

Excessive Workload and Scapegoat

Several participants stated that they have been given an excessive amount of workload and there were times where they were blamed for their supervisors' mistakes. Cassie (Singaporean Chinese) suggested that there were times where she had to take on more job responsibilities than she was required to: "Asked to do jobs that were not within my job scope, constantly being rushed to finish things but the things that has to be done should actually be done by more than 1 person." Justin (Singaporean Chinese) also noted that he had to deal with "unreasonable deadlines" and "increasing number of quotas" in his workplace. Similarly, Darren (Singaporean Chinese) mentioned that whenever his supervisor is unable to complete his work, he will assign it to his subordinates for them complete on his behalf. Kathy (European American) also wrote that: "I was constantly forced to do tasks that were not part of my job description."

In addition to be given excessive amount of work, some participants have also mentioned that they were made to take the fall or rather the blame for their supervisors. Kathleen (Singaporean Chinese) revealed that whenever there were mistakes in workplace, her supervisors would put the blame on her: "Some of the superiors have the tendency to pin the blame on me publicly when things go wrong even though they had a shared responsibility in the tasks at hand." Likewise, Thomas (Singaporean Chinese) mentioned that: "In my previous job, I was blamed unfairly for boss's failing. A

convenient scapegoat." Russell (Singaporean Chinese) also described a situation that he has been in as: "My boss would blame me when things go wrong, but would put herself in the spotlight when things goes well."

Physical Abuse

It appears that accordingly to a number of participants, they have witnessed physical abuse in the workplace. For instance, Daisy (European American) mentioned that she has seen co-workers pulling each other's hair in her workplace. And Robert (Hispanic American) reported that he saw two of his co-workers in a fight because: "One belittled the other, and the other did not like the way he or she was being treated. There was a 20 seconds tussle until the other co-workers had to intervene by pulling them apart."

In a similar vein, Shayna (African American) was a witness to one of the store manager slapping his or her employee. She also revealed that there were two other managers who were witnesses to this incident but during the investigation, they claimed that they did not see it.

Coping Strategies

There were a number of coping strategies used by participants to deal with the bullying. However, it should be noted that based on the narratives, a large number of them chose to deal with the bullying situation by simply leaving the organization, especially when they felt that their health was at risk.

Transfer to another Department/Sought Help from Upper Management

Rebecca (Asian American) chose to transfer to another department because of the situation in her workplace where as aforementioned, the store manager was spreading

rumors about her co-managers. There were a number of participants who chose to seek help from upper management or from human resources in order to cope with the bullying situation. Aden (Asian American) mentioned that he was subjected to bullying before but spoke with upper management so as to help him to solve the problem. Moreover, Geraldine (European American) also noted that:

At a previous job, I was singled out for harassment because I did not respond in a subservient way to this person in light of a promotion. I also disagreed with her bestowing favors on those who did bow to her. Eventually, it was resolved because HR was utilized as mediators and my project lead supported me.

Penelope (Hispanic American) mentioned that her perpetrator was a male colleague and he would yell at her in front of the customers or in the hallways. She revealed the difficulty in trying to get help from upper management with the bullying situation:

I went to the supervisor, she ignored me completely. I then went to the Director who listened to me, what had happened was wrong, and proceeded to tell all my co-workers I was overreacting. I will never trust my boss again, and do not feel safe or happy at my job.

Interestingly, Shelia (African American) wrote that her bully tried to deal with the situation by simply transferring her to another school:

When I worked at another high school in the same district last year, I attempted to enroll my younger brother at the same school so I could help him stay focused and successfully finish high school. Although, I went through all the proper avenues, change of address and even to the point of speaking to my principal directly, he declined my brother's admission. One year prior to this, there was a

misunderstanding and I felt that this was his way to retaliating against me. After an entire school year of not talking (not even a "good morning"), my name was on the chopping board and I was "coincidentally" moved to another school.

Left/Quit the Organization

On the other hand, a large number of participants chose to leave the organization as they either felt vexatious at their workplace or they felt that their physical and mental health was at risk.

As aforementioned, Blair reported that because she was subjected to verbal abuse, she felt that the best way to cope with the situation was to leave the organization as she "did not feel comfortable working there." Avery (European American) also chose to leave the organization because she felt that she sexually harassed and by her supervisor whom she "let herself become too comfortable with." She went on to further reveal that she made the final decision to resign from the organization when her supervisor started to yell and scream at her. Additionally, Hester (European American) wrote:

> I was subjected to excessive scrutiny of my work and was ostracized by co-workers whom I believe, feared that they will experience similar negative bullying just by associating with me. I was eventually forced to quit my job at the worst possible economic time. I was able to get unemployment, but I will soon lose my house. I am devastated and suffer from depression, for which I am medicated.

Similarly, Blake (European American) stated that because he felt abused in his workplace, the best way for him to cope with it would be to resign. He also goes on to further reveal that he is currently suffering from the psychological and financial difficulty

due to the bullying behavior despite dealing with it for the past 3 years: "My bullying experience was unbearable, insidious and traumatic. Personally, I felt like I was the office punching bag and after 4 years of abuse, resignation was the only option."

However, Jocelyn (European American) described the several occasions where she was the victim of bullying. She mentioned that in one of her jobs, she chose not quit the organization despite being exposed to bullying and because of that, her health was severely affected. But as she revealed in her narrative, she ended up getting fired:

My former boss was a verbal abuser. It started small and became more prevalent over time. He would call me every day to talk for at least 15 minutes to tell me that I was worthless, was not trying hard enough, didn't care about the organization and needed to work harder. After I was fired for not working hard enough (80 hours a week was not enough), it took over 2 years to recover medically and now I have a permanent illness due to that job.

Furthermore, it appears that Jocelyn is also subjected to bullying in her current job and it seems that like Penelope, despite the fact that she tried to get help from upper management, they refused to solve the existing problem:

My current boss is more of manipulative abuser. She often lies and cheats and works around issues to try and belittle me. As I did with my previous boss, I have proof and witnesses to this abuse, but no one in management will do anything to change the behavior. They say it is a communication issue and I need to become more mature and learn to deal with it. It is amazing that even with proof of abuse, no one seems to care.

Like Jocelyn's previous boss, Cameron (Hispanic American) noted that she left the organization because:

My boss was horrible! He harassed me until the situation was so bad that I had to quit. He would constantly call me up to his office to tell me what I was doing wrong and to tell me not to be defensive. He ruined the workplace for me.

Although, Declan (European American) did not establish how he managed to cope with the bullying situation, but it is worth noting the effects of bullying on his health. Declan disclosed that he was bullied by both his supervisors and co-workers and that they:

Degrade, backstab and destroy any good work I do. They also destroyed my friendships and relations with customers for their benefit and it turned into group obsession with me isolated out. My profession, loyalty, character, integrity, health and family have been totally destroyed with absolutely no chance of recovery. Complete psychological terrorism for almost 16 years has placed me at an end. PTSD has made my life in the workforce over and it is non-repairable.

Sadie (European American) revealed that she was bullied by female superiors in three of her previous jobs. In all three of her jobs, she said that she was "forced to resign" and she has "sought counseling in all three situations." Similarly, Victoria (European American) also mentioned that she was the subject of bullying in three different organizations:

My current job is the only one where I have not been subjected to severe bullying. I was pushed into leaving three organizations due to bullying, belittling and cruelty by superiors. It seems that the better I was at my job, the meaner certain

people became. My current job is the first where I have not been terribly bullied. In the last year though, a new co-worker joined our group and is a terrible bully. I have sought counseling over it.

Despite the fact that Victoria mentioned that she has gained respect for the work she has contributed in her field, she wrote that the "bullying has left permanent scars." Morgan (African American) reported that she left her company because she felt that her boss was "verbally and emotionally abusive." She also indicated that: "There was no one to talk to about this problem and therefore I quit and filed unemployment." Vienna (Singaporean Chinese) revealed that she was the victim of bullying when her organization hired a new supervisor, although she said that she has "lodged" a complain to human resources, it seems that she too, also did not receive any help and therefore, she chose to resign even though she got along well with the rest of her co-workers. Bailey (Hispanic American) mentioned that:

> My supervisor did not really like me from the beginning and if I did something wrong, she would threaten to write me up. And she would never include me in her reunions with my other group peers. I ended up quitting because of the hostile treatment I was receiving from her.

Sydney (European American), a bystander, revealed that she has witnessed co-workers getting bullied and in order to cope with the situation, some of them chose to take sick leave and some of them chose to transfer to another department.

Standing up/Confronting the Bully

Participants such as Austin (Asian American) mentioned that he tried to cope with the bullying situation by standing up to the bully or even confronting them. He mentioned

that: "I was cursed and yelled at, but did retaliate verbally and also with the accordance with the Texas State Laws on Discrimination and Labor Laws." Likewise, Tonya (African American) revealed that: "When I used to work with a certain male associate, he would constantly do or say things to or about me that were inappropriate and rude. He was constantly talking about my looks, name or heritage in a negative way." Tonya continued to disclose that she stood up to the bully:

> After several subtle attempts of letting him know that I do not appreciate him talking to me like that. I finally stooped to him level of bluntness but in a less humorous way. I let him know everything I did not like about him and why and suggested that he does not have anything more to do with me unless it was absolutely necessary.

On the other hand, based on the participants' narratives, it may seem to be only a one-time incident, it should be noted that they could potentially be at risk of being bullied by the same perpetrator in the future. Two of participants mentioned that they dealt with the perpetrator's behavior by standing up for themselves. Ramona (Hispanic American) also described how she managed to deal with her bully:

> A peer verbally attacked me in front of 5 to 6 others because he mistakenly thought that I had insulted him (it was a misunderstanding, I was not even talking to him or about him). He insulted me, demeaned my intelligence, gloated and padded his own ego while others stood around and watched. When I looked to others for help, I saw one co-worker turn his head down towards the ground. The attacker kept a smile and I was so nervous my facial muscles were shaking. I told him he was in the wrong to attack me in front of our peers and that we have to

77

come to work every day and see each other, so he needed to control himself because I was not going to let him make me feel uncomfortable. I left so terrified, I was sick.

Gabriel (European American) described his bully as such:

A co-worker who is larger attempted to physically intimidate me last week in front of the other co-workers. He yelled and pointed and told me to "walk away, walk away!" Dismissing me as if I were a puppy dog. This made me angry and I lashed out. I made eye contact until he looked away and then I went back to my office. He told our boss and I had a meeting with him. My boss began his meeting with me by saying, "you have a bad attitude." I pointed out that he has yet to hear my side of the story. He let me talked and said that that was not how he heard it but he believed my story.

Chapter Five

Discussion

This chapter presents a discussion based on the findings from the current research. It first offers a brief summary, followed by both the theoretical and practical implications pertaining to this study. In this chapter, I also describe the limitations of this study and future research directions. A conclusion of this research study is described at the end of the chapter.

Summary of the Study

This research addressed the call from other researchers to conduct a study on the cross-cultural comparison of workplace bullying so as to raise awareness about the growing problem (Anderson & Busman, 2002; Loh et al., 2010). By alerting organizations about this on-going phenomenon (Agervold, 2007), hopefully, the organizations will take the necessary precautions to prevent workplace bullying from happening and also help victims cope with the aftermaths of workplace bullying (e.g., Hoel & Salin, 2003; Lutgen-Sandvik et al., 2007).

More specifically, the main purpose of this study was to explore: (a) the extent to which Americans and Singaporeans experience workplace bullying; (b) the types of coping strategies used and how victims coped with the bullying; and (c) the extent to which how face concerns (self-face and other-face) relate to the use of coping strategies. Overall, this study aims to contribute to the growing body of knowledge and understanding on workplace bullying.

Exposure to Workplace Bullying in Employees from the United States and Singapore

Employees in the United States were found to be more likely to experience higher levels of exposure to workplace bullying in all areas (work-related bullying, person-related bullying and physically intimidating bullying) than their Singaporean counterparts. Moreover, American employees also reported that they experienced higher levels of workplace bullying in terms of frequency, severity and length of the bullying than Singaporeans. These findings are consistent with the report from Loh and colleagues' (2010) research study, where they suggested that because of the nature of workplace bullying, it is generally more accepted in countries with high power distance than countries with low power distance.

Hofstede (2001) offered several dimensions of culture to show cultural differences across nations. Power distance is one of the dimensions in his framework explaining the consequences when power is distributed unequally or when inequality of power is easily accepted organization among organizational members. Khatri (2009) mentioned that countries with low power distance tend to be more involved in the decision making process in organizations than their high power distance counterparts. And they are less likely to accept workplace bullying as part of the workplace environment (Loh et al., 2010). It seems that if subordinates in high power distance countries were to partake in the decision making process, supervisors may come across as being a weak leader in the organization (Francesco & Chen, 2000). Interestingly, Khatri (2009) also tried to tie in the notion of face concerns in high power distance countries, whereby she mentioned that the main reason as to why subordinates might refuse to

challenge the decisions made by their supervisors or by upper management is because of the idea of "saving face."

Coping Strategies

The aim of the first research question was to explore which types of coping strategies were used and to find out the extent to which both victims in Singapore and the United States used each of the coping strategies. Results from a factor analysis reported that there were three types of strategies victims of bullying were most likely to use: negative reactance, active solution and indirect/passive fielding. An example of negative reactance is when the individual blames himself or herself for the bullying and active solution is when the victim tries to solve the bullying. Indirect/passive fielding refers to when the individual tries to avoid the bully or refuses to acknowledge the behavior. Moreover, as a whole, it should be noted that the mean score for negative reactance used by both Americans and Singaporeans is 1.95, the mean score for active solution is 1.77, and the mean score for indirect/passive fielding is 2.78.

There was a similar pattern in the way both victims in Singapore and the United States chose to cope with the bullying. Victims in both countries were more likely to use indirect/passive fielding, followed by negative reactance and then active solution. This finding is consistent with findings from Ólafsson and Jóhanndóttir (2004) and Rayner (1998, 1999), where the studies noted the reluctance of victims to confront their bully about the problem or even to seek support from their co-workers.

However, it should be noted that Ólafsson and Jóhanndóttir (2004) indicated, that it was only in the later stages of the bullying that victims chose to use avoidance strategies. On the other hand, it seems that victims in the earlier stages of the bullying

mentioned that they preferred to use problem solving strategies to cope with the bullying. As suggested by Mirdal (1990), the reason as to why victims of bullying tend to deter from using active solution as their coping strategy is due to the fear of not being able to solve the problem. Moreover, Zapf and Gross (2001), indicated that if the victims were to confront their perpetrator, they might in turn be subjected to higher levels of bullying. This is further illustrated in the findings from Aquino (2000) and Rayner (1999) where both researchers demonstrated that by confronting the bully, it might create additional problems for the victims, such as the perpetrator might in fact choose to take revenge on the victims. However, for the resolution of handling the bullying, Keashly and colleagues (1994), argued that it is generally more effective for victims to use problem solving as their coping strategies rather than avoidance as it alerts their perpetrator about his or her behavior and therefore, alleviating the problem.

Results also suggested that victims were most likely to use indirect/passive fielding as their coping strategy. Folkman and Lazarus (1991) suggested that individuals tend to use avoidance as a form of coping strategy as it is relatively easier way for them to handle the stress. This also coincides with the findings from several researchers where they noted that when an employee's supervisor exhibits abusive behavior, he or she would rather use avoidance as a coping strategy as by avoiding his or her supervisors, it allows him or her to feel a sense of relief, even if it is only for a short period of time (Tepper & Lockhart, 2005; Tepper, Moss, Lockhart & Carr, 2007).

Additionally, findings from this study suggested that victims preferred to use negative reactance less than indirect/passive fielding but more than active solution. Lee (2000) suggested that victims will use negative reactance to cope with the bullying

whenever they feel that their work ability is being undermined. And therefore, it could

possibly mean that victims are more inclined to use negative reactance whenever they are

exposed to job-related bullying.

Although, the levels of exposure to workplace bullying is different in Americans

and Singaporeans, findings from this study indicated that there were no differences in the

way victims from the two countries coped with the bullying. Based on this finding, it can

be speculated that the reason as to why there were no differences could be because

victims of workplace bullying may have the tendency to use similar strategies to cope

with the bullying behavior. Further research needs to be conducted in order to explain the

similarity in the use of coping behaviors.

Face Concerns

Ting-Toomey (1988) presented face-negotiation theory to explain how cultures

manage conflict differently. As noted in the literature, there are three different types of

face concerns: self-face, other-face and mutual-face concerns (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi,

1998). According to Ting-Toomey's face-negotiation theory (1988) members of

individualistic countries have a greater tendency of using direct confrontational strategies

to manage conflict in comparison to the members of the collectivistic countries who are

more likely to use avoidance strategies.

The goal of the last research question is to determine the extent to which face

concerns relate to the use of coping strategies. Results of correlation analyses reported

that there was a significant direct correlation between the use of self-face concerns and

negative reactance as well as indirect/passive fielding, but not with active solution for

both Singaporean and American victims. Even though, there were no significant

correlations between other-face needs and the three coping strategies for Singaporean victims, there was a significant negative correlation between other-face concerns and negative reactance for American victims.

Findings are somewhat interesting as it partially supports Ting-Toomey's theory (1988). As noted, the theory suggests that members of collectivistic countries are more inclined to use avoidance strategies to deal with conflict in the workplace. This is in line with the current study's findings where there was a significant correlation between self-face needs and negative reactance and indirect/passive fielding for Singaporean victims. This is further illustrated in a study conducted by Chi-Ching (1998), where she stated the reason as to why Singaporeans might prefer to use avoidance strategies when it comes to dealing or managing with conflict is due to the fear of embarrassment.

Unfortunately, Ting-Toomey's theory (1988) is not consistent with the findings from the current study based on the results reported from the American victims. Just like the findings from the Singaporean victims, results indicated a similar pattern for the American victims for self-face concerns. Moreover, results reported that there was a significant negative correlation between other-face concerns and negative reactance. One potential explanation as to why American victims were more inclined to use negative reactance and indirect/passive fielding strategies in terms of self-face concerns instead of active solution could be due to organizational culture.

Brew and Cairns (2004) conducted a study to determine how Australians and East Asian Chinese manage conflict in terms of status and face concerns. In one of their hypotheses, they predicted that because Australians are known to be members of an individualistic country that they tend to use direct confrontational approach to manage the

conflict despite of the status of the individual whom they are dealing with in the organization. On the contrary in another of their hypotheses, they predicted that since the Chinese are members of a collectivistic country that on the whole, they are more likely to use indirect communication strategies to deal with the conflict. However, it should be noted that in that hypothesis, they predicted that the use indirect strategies varies according to the status of the individual whom they are dealing with as well as the face threat involved (Brew & Cairns, 2004). Unfortunately, their hypotheses were not supported, and they attributed this to the notion of supervisor-subordinate relationship rather than power distance. They explained that the main reason as to why their hypotheses were not supported was because of the way employees chose to deal with the conflict has got to do with working environment rather than the idea of power distance (Brew & Cairns, 2004). In other words, employees tend to manage conflict in their workplace based on certain social expectations they must adhere to.

Another potential reason to explain the correlation between self-face concerns and negative reactance and indirect/passive fielding in American victims could be due to the personality of the perpetrator. Several researchers have noted that subordinates who worked under supervisors portraying problematic and dangerous personalities were more susceptible to being exposed to bullying (e.g., Schaubroeck, Walumbwa, Ganster, & Kepes, 2007; Tepper, 2000; Tepper et al., 2007).

Another possible explanation as to why Americans chose not to use active solution to cope with the bullying, which is inconsistent to what the face-negotiation theory suggested (Ting-Toomey, 1988) is that in today's current economy, Americans are

afraid of losing their jobs (Gallup, 2011) and therefore, they might choose to use negative reactance and indirect/passive fielding to cope with the bullying instead.

Findings also suggested that there was a significant negative correlation between other-face concerns and negative reactance for the Americans. It can only be speculated that reason for this significant negative correlation could be that since the victims tend to exhibit other-face concerns, they are less likely to confront their perpetrators and therefore, as Aquino (2000) and Rayner (1999), suggested, the perpetrators will not execute vengeance on the victims and therefore, reducing the levels of self-reproach or the use of negative reactance as a coping strategy. Additional research is needed in order to explain this behavior.

Post-hoc Analysis

One interesting and consistent finding is related to the educational levels of the victims. Results from this study reported that there was a significant difference between education and work-related bullying. Findings indicated that employees with High School diplomas or less tend to experience lower levels of exposure to work-related bullying than those employees holding a diploma in Some College and above. In other words, the better educated the individual is, the more likely he or she will experience higher levels of exposure to work-related bullying. This finding coincides with the findings from a survey done by the Workplace Bullying Institute (2010), where 11% of the respondents holding a college degree and above reported that they were currently being bullied in comparison to the 7% of the respondents who reported that they do not have a college degree. Moreover, one potential explanation as why there was a significant difference between education and work-related bullying could be perhaps due to the

notion that victims tend to experience work-related bullying the most in comparison to the rest of the two other types of bullying. Notelaers, Vermunt, Baillien, Einarsen and De Witte (2011) noted in their study that 9.5% of the employees reported that they experienced job-related bullying and they are seldom exposed to person-related bullying. This is further enhanced in Salin's (2001) research, where she conducted a study on business professionals holding Bachelor's or Master's degree and found that they were exposed to higher levels of job-related bullying than non job-related bullying.

Additionally, findings also indicated that the more educated an individual is, the more likely he or she will use negative reactance to cope with the bullying. According to Lee (2000), distrust in one's self is often used as a coping strategy whenever victims find themselves being demeaned by their perpetrators. Lee and Brotheridge (2006) mentioned in their study that when victims start to doubt or lose confidence in themselves due to workplace bullying, it could potentially led to emotional distress. One potential reason as to why the higher educated an individual is, the more likely he or she will use negative reactance to cope with the bullying could be because when perpetrators start to look down on them, they might start to doubt their level of competence more than who are not as well-educated. Additional research is needed in order to validate this reasoning.

Implications

There are several theoretical and practical implications pertaining to this current study. First of all, findings of this study supplement those from Loh and colleagues (2010), where they argued that due to notion of high power distance in Singapore and low power distance in Australia, Singaporeans were less likely to be exposed to workplace bullying than Australians. Moreover, the findings of the current study are also in line with

87

Hofstede's (2001) cultural model of power distance, where employees working in high power distance societies tend to listen to authoritative figures (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004) and they are also taught not to question their decisions. In stark contrast, there is a high need for employees working in low power distance societies to be involved in the decision making process in addition to the equal allocation of power among employees in organizations.

Secondly, current findings further support the studies done by several other researchers where they indicated that the main reason as to why victims tend not to use active solution to deal with their bully is because of their fear that the bully might retaliate against them (Ólafsson & Jóhanndóttir, 2004; Rayner, 1998, 1999).

Thirdly, because findings on self-face and other-face concerns in relation to the victims' coping strategies partially support Ting-Toomey's face negotiation theory (1988), this strongly supports the need for researchers to investigate further into the concept of self-face and other-face concerns when it comes workplace bullying. Lastly, this study also contributed to the existing literature on the cross-cultural comparison of workplace bullying and it also demonstrated the fact that although Singaporeans may be less exposed to workplace bullying than their American counterparts, both cultures preferred to use the same type of coping strategies to deal with the bullying.

As for the practical implication of this study, findings proved that since workplace bullying does occur, there is a need for organizations to be aware of it and also to implement strategies to prevent it from happening. Sutton (2007) suggested that organizations should implement a zero-tolerance policy, whereby they should fire those perpetrators who refused to follow the policy. However, as Lian, Ferris and Brown (2011)

proposed that due to the severity of implementing the zero-tolerance policies in organizations, it is generally more effective for organizations to penalize the perpetrators, for instance, by forcing them to go on unpaid leave rather than firing them.

Organizations should also implement training programs so as to increase awareness on workplace bullying not only among managers but also among employees (Salin, 2008). Moreover, by providing training programs to employees, they can learn how to effectively manage conflict and the need to emphasize harmony in the workplace and with training programs, employees will also able to recognize the various types of bullying and to seek help once it occurs (Salin, 2008). Furthermore, organizations should also implement interventions that are tailored according to the needs of the victims (Notelaers et al., 2011). For example, a victim who is exposed to job-related bullying may use different coping strategies from another victim who is physically threatened by his or her perpetrator (Djurkovic et al., 2005). And this goes to show that organizations should implement interventions that are tailored according to the types of bullying in which the victims are exposed to.

Limitations and Future Research

There are several limitations which are evident in this study. First, because employees are afraid of tarnishing the reputation of their organization and also for the fear of losing their jobs, social desirability bias may have occurred. Social desirability bias simply refers to the fact that respondents or participants may simply answer the questions based on what they feel are the social norms or the expected answers (Frey, Botan et al., 2000).

Another limitation of this study is that a large number of the participants were Singaporean Chinese and only a few of them were Singaporean Indians and Singaporean Malays, therefore, the findings of this study should not be used to generalize and represent the population in Singapore. Moreover, it seems that since majority of the participants were from the age group ranging from 18 to 25 years and the mean of the length in which participants worked for their current supervisor was approximately 27 months, it could be a potential factor that they are probably not as exposed to workplace bullying as those who had been working there for a longer period of time. And therefore, future researchers should try to find out whether age and length of time spent working for the same supervisor or boss plays a role in workplace bullying. As noted in the literature review, there are inconsistent findings when it comes age. Einarsen and Skogstad (1996) indicated in their findings that older employees tend to experience higher levels of workplace bullying than the younger employees. Conversely, researchers found that there is a higher tendency for the younger employees to be verbally attacked than the older employees (Einarsen & Raknes, 1997; Leymann, 1996).

Because this current study did not take into consideration that bystanders may also experience the ripple effect when they witness their co-workers being bullied at work (Hoel et al., 1999; Rayner, 1999), there is a need for future researchers to investigate not only the coping strategies used by the observers but also to examine the extent to which they tried to help the victims.

Although the hypothesis is largely supported with the findings from Loh and colleagues (2010), it contradicts the findings from various researchers where they indicated that workplace bullying is less rampant in low power distance countries than

90

high power distance countries (Moreno-Jiménez et al., 2008). This is also reinforced in Einarsen's (2000) study, where he argued the reason as to why workplace bullying in less prevalent in Scandinavia is because of low power distance. One potential explanation could be made based on the notion that the rest of the dimensions of the cultural model play an important function in predicting the prevalence of workplace bullying in a country. For instance, by comparing both the United States and Scandinavia, both countries exhibit low power distance but as noted in the findings in this study, Americans tend to experience higher levels of workplace bullying. However, Einarsen (2000) and Mikkelsen and Einarsen (2001) indicated in their studies, workplace bullying is less prevalent in Scandinavia. There is one particular disparity that can be seen in the two countries and is that the United States is more of a masculine country than their Scandinavian counterpart (Itim international, n.d.). Einarsen (2000) indicated in his study that because members of Scandinavia tend to portray feminine values, they are more to likely display caring qualities which are unlike countries with masculine values, whereby members are encouraged to be aggressive and competitive. Further research is needed in order to explain the differences.

An additional limitation of this study is that although the current study tried to investigate the coping strategies used by both countries, it did not demonstrate whether the coping strategies used by the victims were successful or not. In other words, there is a possibility that victims may initially choose to seek assistance from upper management but because upper management failed to deal with the bullying, victims may then decide to use a different coping strategy such as they could have left or quit the organization. Moreover, since this is a cross-sectional study, a longitudinal study can help to determine

if over time, whether the victims chose to cope with the bullying in a different manner. Additionally, by conducting a longitudinal study, future researchers will be able to establish whether there will be an increase or a reduction in the frequency and severity of the bullying.

Smith, Singer, Hoel and Cooper (2003) reported in their findings that there is a relationship between school bullying and workplace bullying. According to them, it seems that students who were unable to successfully cope with the school bullying, were at a higher risk of being subjected to workplace bullying. And therefore, future researchers should perhaps conduct more studies in order to determine whether there is indeed a relationship between school bullying and workplace bullying. If there is indeed a relationship, school bullying may possibly be a root of the problem and so future researchers should raise the issue of the need to implement anti-bullying programs in school to prevent school bullying from taking place.

Although this study did include a qualitative section as a supplementary material, it raises the issue that future researchers should conduct in-depth interviews with participants so as to gain further insights into the bullying process.

Conclusion

Workplace bullying generally occurs when a supervisor, subordinate or even peer co-worker displays hostility or negative behavior towards another member in the same organization (Einarsen, 2000). This study offers a cross-cultural view on the exposure to workplace bullying and the types of coping behavior enacted by employees from Singapore and the United States.

The findings from this current study generally supported the prediction that employees in the United States were more likely to be exposed to workplace bullying than employees in Singapore which is consistent to the notion of power distance and that there were three different types of coping strategies that victims from both countries were most likely to use. Moreover, findings demonstrated that victims from Singapore and the United States used similar patterns of coping strategies and that they were more inclined to use indirect/passive fielding strategies more frequently than negative reactance and active solution the least. Ting-Toomey's face-negotiation theory (1988) was also utilized to investigate how self-face and other-face concerns relate to the use of coping strategies by victims from the two countries.

By looking from the perspective of the two different cultures, it is hoped that this study raised the issue and importance that organizations should recognize and implement training programs to prevent workplace bullying from emerging and the need to understand what promotes bullying in order to reduce the occurrence of it. After all, the outcomes of workplace bullying do not just simply pertain to that of the individual but also to the organization as well.

References

Agervold, M. (2007). Bullying at work: A discussion of definitions and prevalence, based on an empirical study. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 48*(2), 161-172. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9450.2007.00585.x

Agervold. M., & Mikkelsen, E. G. (2004). Relationships between bullying, psychosocial work environment and individual stress reaction. *Work & Stress, 18*(4), 336-351. doi: 10.1080/02678370412331319794

Alessi, E., & Martin, J. (2010). Conducting an Internet-based survey: Benefits, pitfalls and lessons learned. *Social Work Research, 34*(2), 122-128.

Anderson, C. A., Anderson, K. B., & Deuser, W. E. (1996). Examining an affective aggression framework: Weapon and temperature effects on aggressive thoughts, affect, and attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22,* 366-376.

Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. (2002). Human aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53,* 27-51.

Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review, 24,* 452-471.

Aquino, K. (2000). Structural and individual determinants of workplace victimization. The effects of hierarchical status and conflict management style. *Journal of Management, 26,* 171-193.

Aquino, K., & Bradfield, M. (2000). Perceived victimization in the workplace: The role of situational factors and victim characteristics. *Organizational Science, 11*(5), 525-537. doi: 10.1287/orsc.11.5.525.1.5205

Baillien, E., & De Witte, H. (2009). Why is organizational change related to workplace

   bullying? Role conflict and job insecurity as mediators. *Economic and Industrial*

   Democracy, 30(3), 348-371. doi: 10.1177/0143831X09336557

Baillien, E., Neyens, I., & De Witte, H. (2008). Organizational, team related and job

   related risk factors for bullying, violence and sexual harassment in the workplace:

   A qualitative study. *International Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 13*(2),

   132-146.

Baumeister, R. F., Heatherton, T. F., & Tice, D. M. (1993). When ego threats lead to self-

   regulation failure: Negative consequences of high self-esteem. *Journal of*

   Personality and Social Psychology, 64(1), 141-156.

Baumeister, R. F., Smart, L., & Boden, J. M. (1996). Relation of threatened egotism to

   violence and aggression: The dark side of high self-esteem. *Psychological Review,*

   103(1), 5-33.

Björkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K. M. J., & Kaukiainen, A. (1992). Do girls manipulate and

   boys fight? Developmental trends in regard to direct and indirect aggression.

   Aggressive Behavior, 18(2), 117-127.

Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Hjelt-Bäck, M. (1994). Aggression among university

   employees. *Aggressive behavior, 20*(3), 173-184.

Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Lagerspetz, K. M. J. (1994). Sex differences in covert

   aggression among adults. *Aggressive Behavior, 20*(1), 27-33.

Bowling, N., & Beehr, T. (2006). Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: A

   theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(5), 998-

   1012.

Brew, F. P., & Cairns, D. R. (2004). Styles of managing interpersonal workplace conflict

    in relation to status and face concern: A study with Anglos and Chinese. *The*

    International Journal of Conflict Management, 15(1), 27-56.

Brodsky, C. M. (1976). *The harassed worker*. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Company.

Chang, H. C., & Holt, G. R. (1994). A Chinese perspective on face as inter-relational

    concern. In S. Ting-Toomey (Ed.), *The challenge of facework: Cross-cultural and*

    interpersonal issues (pp. 95-132). Albany, NY: State University of New York.

Chew, P. G. L. (2007). Remarking Singapore: Language, culture and identity in a

    globalized world. In A. B. M. Tsui & J. W. Tollefson (Eds.), *Language policy,*

    culture, and identity in Asian contexts (pp. 73-93). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence

    Erlbaum.

Chi-Ching, E. Y. (1998). Social-cultural context of perceptions and approaches to

    conflict: The case for Singapore. In K. Leung & D. Tjosvold (Eds.), *Conflict*

    management in the Asia Pacific: Assumptions and approaches in diverse cultures

    (pp. 123-145). Singapore: Wiley.

Clarkworthy, D. (1996). Training Germans and Americans in conflict management. In M.

    Berger (Ed.), *Cross-cultural team building: Guidelines for more effective*

    communication and negotiation (pp. 91-100). London: McGraw-Hill.

Cleveland, J. N., & Kerst, M. E. (1993). Sexual harassment and perceptions of power: An

    under articulated relationship. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42*(1), 49-67.

Cortina, L. M., Magley, V. J., Williams, J. H., & Langhout, R. D. (2001). Incivility in the

    workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology,*

    6(1), 64-80. doi: 10.1037/1076-8988.6.1.64

Cowie, H., Jennifer, D., Neto, C., Angulo, J C., Pereira, B., Del Barrio, C., & Ananiado, K. (2000). Comparing the nature of workplace bullying in two European countries: Portugal and UK. *Proceedings of the 2000 conference, Brisbane, Queensland*, 128-133.

Cox, H. (1987). Verbal abuse in nursing: Report of a study. *Nurse Management, 18,* 47-50.

Coyne, I., Chong, P. S.-L., Seigne, E., & Randall, P. (2003). Self and peer information of bullying: An analysis of incident rates, individual differences, and perceptions of the working environment. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 12*(3), 209-228.

Coyne, I., Seigne, E., & Randall, P. (2000). Predicting workplace victims status from personality. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 9*(3), 335-350.

de Dreu, C. K. W. (1997). Productive conflict: The importance of conflict management and conflict issue. In C. K. W. de Dreu & E. Van de Vliert (Eds.), *Using conflict in organizations* (pp. 9-22). London: Sage Publications.

Djurkovic, N., McCormack, D., & Casimir, G. (2005). The behavioral reactions of victims to different types of workplace bullying. *International Journal Organization Theory and Behavior, 8,* 439-460.

Education and Workplace Bullying: 2010 WBI Survey. (2011). *Workplace Bullying Institute.* Retrieved from http://www.workplacebullying.org/multi/pdf/ education_2010_wbi.pdf

Einarsen, S. (1996). *Bullying and harassment at work: epidemiological and psychosocial aspects*. PhD thesis, Department of Psychosocial Science, University of Bergen, Norway.

Einarsen, S. (1999). The nature and causes of bullying. *International Journal of Manpower, 20,* 16-27.

Einarsen, S. (2000). Harassment and bullying at work: A review of the Scandinavian approach. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 5*(4), 371-401.

Einarsen, S., & Hoel, H. (2001). *The Negative Acts Questionnaire: Development, validation and revision of a measure of bullying at work.* Oral presentation at the 10th European Congress on Work and Organizational Psychology, Prague, May.

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Notelaers, G. (2009). Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure and psychometric properties of the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised. *Work & Stress, 23*(1), 24-44. doi: 10.1080./026783770902815673

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (2003). The concept of bullying at work: The European tradition. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in research and practice* (pp. 3-30). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Einarsen, S., & Matthiesen, S. B., & Mikkelsen, E. (2000). *Short-and long-term effects of exposure to persistent aggression and bullying at work.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Toronto Canada.

Einarsen, S., Matthiesen, S. B., & Skogstad, A. (1998). Bullying, burnout and well-being among assistant nurses. *The Journal of Occupational Health and Safety-Australia and New Zealand, 14*(6), 563-568.

Einarsen, S., & Mikkelsen, E. G. (2003). Individual effects of exposure to bullying at work. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in research and practice* (pp. 127-143). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Einarsen, S., & Raknes, B. I. (1991). *Mobbing i arbeidslivet* [Bullying at work]. Research Center for Occupational Health and Safety: University of Bergen, Norway.

Einarsen, S., & Raknes, B. I. (1997). Harassment in the workplace and the victimization of men. *Violence and Victims 12*(3), 247-263.

Einarsen, S., Raknes, B. I., & Matthiesen, S. B. (1994a). Bullying and harassment at work and their relationships to work environment quality: An exploratory study. *European Work and Organizational Psychologist, 4,* 381-401.

Einarsen, S., Raknes, B. I., Matthiesen, S. B., & Hellesøy, O. H. (1994b). *Mobbing og Harde Personkonflikter: Helsefarlig samspill på arbeidsplassen* [Bullying and interpersonal conflict: Interaction at work with negative implications for health]. Bergen: Sigma Forlag.

Einarsen, S., & Skogstad, A. (1996). Bullying at work: Epidemiological findings in public and private organizations. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5*(2), 185-201.

Escartín, J., Zapf, D., Arrieta, C., & Rodríguez-Carbelleira, A. (2011). Worker's
perception of workplace bullying: A cross-cultural study. *European Journal of
Work and Organizational Psychology. 2*, 178-250. doi:
10.1080/13594320903395652

Felson, R. B. (1992). "Kick 'em when they're down": Explanations of the relationships
between stress and interpersonal aggression and violence. *Sociological Quarterly,
33,* 1-16.

Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1991). Coping and emotion. In A. Monat & R. S. Lazarus
(Eds.), *Stress and coping: An anthology* (3rd ed., pp. 207-227). New York:
Columbia University Press.

Francesco, A. M., & Chen, Z. X. (2000). Cross-cultural differences within a single
culture: Power distance as a moderator of the participation- outcome relationship
in the People's Republic of China, *BRC Papers on Cross-Cultural Management.*
Retrieved from http://net2.hkbu.edu.hk/~brc/CCMP200007.pdf

Frese, M., & Zapf, D. (1987). Eine Skala zur Erfassung von Sozialen Stressorenam
Arbeitsplazt [A scale for the assessment of social stressor at work] *Zeitschrift für
Arbeitswissenchaft, 41,* 134-141.

Frey, K. S., Hirschstein, M. K., & Guzzo, B. A. (2000). Second step: Preventing
aggression by promoting social competence. *Journal of Emotional and
Behavioral Disorders, 8*(2), 102-112.

Frey. L. R., Botan, C. H., & Kreps, G. L. (2000). *Investigating Communication: An
introduction to research methods.* (2nd ed.). Needham Heighs, MA: Ally and
Bacon.

Gao, G. (1998). An initial analysis of the effects of face and concern for "other" in

    Chinese interpersonal communication. *International Journal of Intercultural*

    Relations, 22, 467-482.

Geert Hofstede Cultural Dimensions. (n.d.). *Itim International.* Retrieved from

    http://www.geert-hofstede.com/hofstede_dimensions.php

Glaser, B., & Strauss, B. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for*

    qualitative research. Chicago, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glasl, F. (1994). *Konfliktmanagement. Ein Handbuch für Führungskräfte und Berater*

    [Conflict management: A handbook for managers and consultants] (4th ed.). Bern,

    Switzerland: Haupt.

Groeblinghoff, D., & Becker, D. (1996). A case study on mobbing and the clinical

    treatment of mobbing victims. *European Journal of Work and Organizational*

    Psychology, 5(2), 277-294.

Hall, E. T., & Hall, M. R. (1990). *Understanding cultural differences: Germans, French,*

    and Americans. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Hansen, A. M., Hogh, A., Persson, R., Karlson, B., Garde, A. H., & Ørbaek, P. (2006).

    Bullying at work, health outcomes, and physiological stress response. *Journal of*

    Psychosomatic Research, *60*(1), 63-72.

Hauge, L. J., Skogstad, A., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Relationships between stressful work

    environments and bullying: Results of a large representative study. *Work & Stress,*

    21(3), 220-242.

Hauge, L. J., Skogstad, A., & Einarsen, S. (2010). The relative impact of workplace bullying as a social stressor at work. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 51*(5), 426-433. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9450.2010.00813.x

Hoel, H., & Cooper, C. L. (2000). *Destructive conflict and bullying at work.* Unpublished report, UMIST.

Hoel, H., Cooper, C. L., & Faragher, B. (2001). The experience of bullying in Great Britain: The impact of organizational status. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10,* 443-465. doi: 10.1080/13594320143000780

Hoel, H., Einarsen, S., & Cooper, C. L. (2003). Organisational effects of bullying. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in research and practice* (pp.145-161). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Hoel, H., Rayner, C., & Cooper, C. L. (1999). Workplace bullying. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 14, pp. 195-230). Chichester: Wiley.

Hoel, H., & Salin, D. (2003). Organisational antecedents of workplace bullying. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace* (pp. 203-218). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations.* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications.

Hogh, A., & Dofradottir, A. (2001). Coping with bullying in the workplace. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10*(4), 485-495. doi: 10.1080/13594320143000825

House, J. R., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P.W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hwang, K. K. (1987). Face and favor: The Chinese power game. *American Journal of Sociology, 92*(4), 944-974.

Jenkins, M., Winefield, H., Zapf, D., & Sarris, A. (2010). *Listening to the bullies: An exploratory study of managers accused of workplace bullying*. Paper submitted for publication.

Jones, J. M. (2011, September 15). Unemployment re-emerges as most important problem in U.S. *Gallup*. Retrieved from http://www.gallup.com/poll/149453/ Unemployment-Emerges-Important-Problem.aspx

Keashley, L. (1998). Emotional abuse in the workplace: Conceptual and empirical issues. *Journal of Emotional Abuse, 1*(1), 85-117.

Keashley, L. (2001). Interpersonal and systematic aspects of emotional abuse at work: The target's perspective. *Violence and Victims, 16*(3), 233-268.

Keashly, L., & Jagatic, K. (2000, August 8). *The nature, extent and the impact of emotional abuse in the workplace: Results of a statewide survey.* Paper presented at the Academy of Management Conference, Toronto, Canada.

Keashly, L., & Jagatic, K. (2003). By any other name: American perspectives on

workplace bullying. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.),

Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in

research and practice (pp. 31-61). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Keashly, L., Trott, V., & MacLean, L. M. (1994). Abusive behavior in the work-place: A

preliminary investigation. *Violence and Victims, 9*(4), 341-357.

Kellehear, A. (1993). *The unobtrusive researcher*. St. Leonards, UK: Allen and Unwin.

Kelloway, E. K., & Sivanathan, N., Francis, L., & Barling, J. (2005). Poor leadership. In.

J. Barling, E. K. Kelloway, & M. R. Frone (Eds.), *Handbook of work stress.*

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Khatri, N. (2009). Consequences of power distance orientation in organisations. *Vision*

(09722629), 13(1), 1-9.

Kile, S. M. (1990). *Helsefarleg Leiarskap: Ein Explorerande Studie* [Leadership with

negative health implications: An exploratory study]. Report from the Norwegian

General Science Council, Bergen.

Lagerspetz, K. M. J., Björkqvist, K., & Peltonen, T. (1988). Is indirect aggression typical

of females? Gender differences in 11-to 12-year-old children. *Aggressive*

Behavior, 14(6), 403-414.

Lee, D. (2000). An analysis of workplace bullying in the UK. *Personnel Review, 29*(5),

593-612.

Lee, R. T., & Brotheridge, C. M. (2006). When prey turns predatory: Workplace bullying as a predicator of counteraggression/bullying, coping, and well-being. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 15*(33), 352-377. doi 10.1080/13594320600636531

Leymann, H. (1990). Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces. *Violence and Victims, 5,* 119-126.

Leymann, H. (1992). *Vuxenmobbing på svenska arbetsplastser. En rikstäckande undersökning med 2.438 intervjuer. Delrapport 1* [Mobbing at Swedish workplaces 1st Report]. Stockholm: Arbetarskyddsstyrelsen.

Leymann, H. (1993). *Mobbing-Psychoterror am Arbeitsplatz und wie sich dagegen wehren kann* [Mobbing-psychoterror in the workplace and how one can defend oneself]. Reinbeck, Germany: Rowohlt.

Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5*(2), 165-184.

Leymann, H., & Gustafsson, A. (1996). Mobbing at work and the development of post-traumatic stress disorders. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5,* 251-276.

Leymann, H., & Tallgren, U. (1989). Undersönking av frekvensen av vexenmobbning innom SSAB med en nytt fråformular [An investigation of the frequency of bullying at SSAB with a new questionnaire]. *Artbete, Människa, Miljö, 1,* 3-12.

Lian, H., Ferris, D. L., & Brown, D. J. (2011). Does power distance exacerbate or mitigate the effects of abusive supervision? It depends on the outcome. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 1-17 doi: 10.1037/a00241610

Loh, J., Restubog, S. L. D., & Zagenczyk, T. J. (2010). Consequences of workplace bullying on employee identification and satisfaction among Australians and Singaporeans. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 41*(2), 236-252. doi: 10.1177/0022022109354641

Lutgen-Sandvik, P., Tracy, S., & Alberts, J. (2007). Burned by bullying in the American workplace: Prevalence, perception, degree and impact. *Journal of Management Studies, 44*(6), 837-862. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6486.2007.00715.x

Mathisen, G. E., Einarsen, S., & Mykletun, R. (2008). The occurrence and correlates of bullying and harassment in the restaurant sector. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 49*(1), 59-68.

Matthiesen, S. B., Raknes, B. I., & Rökkum, O. (1989). Mobbing på arbeidsplassen [Bullying at work]. *Tidsskrift for Norsk Psykologforening, 26,* 761-774.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research and application.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J., & Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78,* 538-551.

Mikkelsen, E. G., & Einarsen, S. (2001). Bullying in Danish work life: Prevalence and health correlates. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10(*4), 393-413.

Mikkelsen, E. G., & Einarsen, S. (2002). Basic assumptions and symptoms of post-traumatic stress among victims of bullying at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 11*(1), 87-111.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mirdal, G. (1990). *Psykosomatik. Sårbarhed, stress og sygdom.* Copenhagen, Denmark: Munksgaard.

Moore, M. (2010, May 27). *Inside Foxconn's suicide factory.* The Telegraph. Retrieved from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/china-business/7773011/ A-look-inside-the-Foxconn-suicide-factory.html

Moreno-Jimènez, B., Rodriguez-Muño, A., Salin, D., & Benadero, M. E. (2008). Workplace bullying in Southern Europe: Prevalence, forms and risk groups in a Spanish sample. *International Journal of Organisational Behavior, 13*(2), 95-109.

Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14,* 224-247.

Namie, G. (2000). *U.S. Hostile Workplace Survey 2000*. Paper presented at the New England Conference on Workplace Bullying, Suffolk University Law School, Boston, MA.

Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2000). *The bully at work: What you can do to stop the hurt and reclaim your dignity on the job.* Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks.

Niedhammer, I., David, S., & Degioanni, S. (2007). Economic activities and occupations at high risk for workplace bullying: Results from a large-scale cross-sectional survey in the general working population in France. *International Achieves of Occupational and Environmental Health, 80,* 346-353. doi: 10.1007/s00420-006-0319-y

Niedl, K. (1995). *Mobbing/Bullying am Arbeitsplatz. Eine empirische Analyse zum Phänomen sowie zu personalwirtschaftlich relevanten Effekten von systematischen Feindseligkeiten* [Mobbing/bullying at work. An empirical analysis of the phenomenon and of the effects of systematic harassment on human resource management]. Munich: Hampp.

Niedl, K. (1996). Mobbing and well-being: Eaconomic and personnel development implications. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5,* 150-239.

Notelaers, G., Vermunt. J. K., Baillien, E., Einarsen, S., & De Witte, H. (2011). Exploring risk groups workplace bullying with categorical data. *Industrial Health, 49,* 73-88.

Oetzel, J., Ting-Toomey, S., Masumoto, T., Yokochi, Y., Xiaohui, P., Takai, J., & Wilcox, R. (2001). Face and Facework in Conflict: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of China, Germany, Japan, and the United States. *Communication Monographs*, *68*(3), 235-257.

Ólafsson, R. F., & Jóhannsdóttir, H. L. (2004). Coping with bullying in the workplace: The effect of gender, age and type of bullying. *British Journal of Guidance and Counseling, 32*(3), 319-333. doi: 10.1080/03069880410001723549

Olweus, D. (1978). Bullying/victim problems among school children in Scandinavia. In. J. P. Myklebust & R. Ommundsen (Eds.), *Psykologprofesjonen mot ar 2000* (pp. 395-413). Olso: Universitetsforlaget.

Olweus, D. (1991). Bullying/victim problems among school children. In. I. Rubin & D.
Pepler (Eds.), *The development and treatment of childhood aggression* (pp. 411-
447). Hilsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at schools, what we know and what we can do.* Oxford, UK:
Blackwell.

O'Moore, M., Seigne, M., McGuire, L., & Smith, M. (1998). Victims of bullying at work
in Ireland. *Journal of Occupational Health and Safety-Australia and New Zealand,
14*(6), 569-574.

Ortega, A., Høgh, A., Pejtersen, J. H., & Olsen, O. (2009). Prevalence of
workplace bullying and risk groups: A representative population study.
International Achieves of Occupational Environmental Health, 82, 417-426. doi:
10.1007/s00420-008-0339-8

Pakir, A. (2004). Medium of instruction policy in Singapore. In J. W. Tollfson & A. B.
M. Tsui (Eds.), *Medium of instruction policies: Which agenda?* (pp. 117-133).
Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Parkins, I. S., Fishbein, H. D., & Ritchey, P. N. (2006). The influence of personality on
workplace bullying and discrimination. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36,*
2554-2577.

Price-Spratlen, L. (1995). Interpersonal conflict which includes mistreatment in a
university workplace. *Violence and Victims, 10*(4), 285-297.

Putnam, L. L., & Poole, M. S. (1987). Conflict and negotiation. In F. M. Jablin, L. L.
Putnam, K. H. Roberts, & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational
communication* (pp. 549-599). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Quine, L. (1999). Workplace bullying in NHS community trust: Staff questionnaire survey. *British Medical Journal, 318,* 228-232.

Quine, L. (2001). Workplace bullying in nurses. *Journal of Health Psychology, 6,* 73-84.

Race and workplace bullying: 2010 WBI survey. (2010). *Workplace Bullying Institute.* Retrieved from http://www.workplacebullying.org/ 2010/09/06/race_2010_wbi/

Rayner, C. (1998). Workplace bullying: Do something! *Journal of Occupational Health and Safety: Australia and New Zealand, 14*(6), 581-585.

Rayner, C. (1999). From research to implementation: Finding leverage for prevention. *International Journal of Manpower, 20,* 28-38.

Rayner, C. (1999). *Workplace bullying.* PhD thesis, University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology.

Rayner, C., Hoel, H., & Cooper, C. L. (2002). *Workplace bullying; what we know, who is to blame and what can we do?* London: Taylor & Francis.

Rayner, C., & Keashly, L. (2005). Bullying at work: A perspective from Britain and North America. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 271-296). Washington, DC US: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/10893-011

Rayner, C., Sheehan, M., & Barker, M. (1999). Theoretical approaches to the study of bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower, 20,* 11-15.

Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R., & Armeli, S. (2001). Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(5), 825-836. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.86.5.825

Salin, D. (2001). Prevalence and forms of bullying among business professionals: A

    comparison of two different strategies for measuring bullying. *European Journal*

    of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10(4), 425-441.

Salin, D. (2003). Ways of explaining workplace bullying: A review of enabling,

    motivating and precipitating structures and processes in the work environment.

    Human Relations, 56(10), 1213-1232.

Salin, D. (2008). The prevention of workplace bullying as a question of human resource

    management: Measures adopted and underlying organizational factors.

    Scandinavian Journal of Management, 24(3), 221-231. doi:

    10.1016/j.scaman.2008.04.004

Salin, D., & Hoel, H. (2011). Organisational causes of workplace bullying. In S. Einarsen,

    H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and emotional abuse in the*

    Workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice (2nd ed., pp. 227-243).

    Boca Raton, FL: Taylor & Francis.

Salmivalli, C., Karhunen, J., & Lagerspetz, K. M. J. (1996). How do the targets respond

    to bullying? *Aggressive Behavior, 22,* 99-109.

Schaubroeck, J., Walumbaw, F. O., Ganster, D. C., & Kepes, S. (2007). Destructive

    leader traits and the neutralizing influence of an "enriched" job. *The Leadership*

    Quarterly, 18, 236-251. doi: 10.1016/j. leaqua.2007.03.006

Schneider, K. T., Hitlan, R. T., & Radhakrishnan, P. (2000). An examination of the

    nature and correlates of ethnic harassment experiences in multiple contexts.

    Journal of Applied Psychology, 85(1), 3-12.

Seigne, E. (1998). Bullying at work in Ireland. In C. Rayner, M. Sheehan, & M. Barker (Eds.), *Bullying at work, 1998 research update conference: Proceedings.* Staffordshire University, Stafford.

Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland., & Hetland, H. (2007). The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12*(1), 80-92.

Smith, P. K., Singer, M., Hoel, H., & Cooper, C. L. (2003). Victimization in school and the workplace: Are there any links? *British Journal of Psychology, 94,* 175-188.

Stevens, J. P. (2009). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Sutton, R. I. (2007). *The no asshole rule: Building a civilized workplace and surviving one that isn't.* New York: Warner Business Books.

Tepper, B. J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43,* 178-190.

Tepper, B. J., & Lockhart, D. (2005, November). *Abused subordinates' upward maintenance communication: A coping perspective.* Paper presented at the 2005 Southern Academy of Management meeting, Charleston, SC.

Tepper, B. J., Moss, S. E., Lockhart, D. E., & Carr, J. C. (2007). Abusive supervision, upward maintenance communication, and subordinates' psychological distress. *Academy of Management Journal, 50,* 1169-1180.

Terpstra, D. E., & Baker, D. D. (1991). Sexual harassment at work: The psychosocial issues. In M. J. Davidson & J. Earnshaw (Eds.), *Vulnerable workers: Psychosocial and legal issues* (pp. 179-201). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Thomas, K. W. (1992). Conflict and negotiation processes in organizations. In M. D.

    Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial organizational psychology*, (2nd ed., Vol.

    3, pp. 651-718). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). Intercultural conflict styles: A face-negotiation theory. In Y. Y.

    Kim & W. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication* (pp. 213–

    235). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1997). Intercultural conflict competence. In W. R. Cupach & D.

    Canary (Eds.), *Competence in Interpersonal Conflict* (pp. 120-147). New York:

    McGraw-Hill.

Ting-Toomey, S. (2005). The matrix of face: An updated face-negotiation theory. In W.

    B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 71-92).

    Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ting-Toomey, S. (2007). Intercultural Conflict Training: Theory-Practice Approaches

    and Research Challenges. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*,

    36(3), 255-271. doi:10.1080/17475750701737199

Ting-Toomey, S., & Kurogi, A. (1998). Facework competence in intercultural conflict:

    An updated face-negotiation theory. *International Journal of International*

    Cultural Relations, 22(2), 187-225.

Ting-Toomey, S., & Oetzel, J. G. (2001). *Managing intercultural conflict effectively.*

    Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Triandis, H. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Triandis, H. (2002). Individualism and collectivism. In M. Gannon & K. Newman (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural management* (pp. 16-45). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Vartia, M. (1993). Psychological harassment (bullying, mobbing) at work. In K. Kauppinnen-Toropainen (Ed.), *OECD panel group on women, worth and health* (pp. 149-152). Helsinki: Ministry of Social Affairs and Health.

Vartia, M. (1996). The sources of bullying: Psychological work environment and organizational climate. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5*(2), 203-214.

Varita, M. (2001). Consequences of workplace bullying with respect to well-being of its targets and the observers of bullying. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment and Health, 27*(1), 63-69.

Vartia, M., & Hyyti, J. (2002). Gender differences in workplace bullying among prison officers. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 11*(1), 113-126. doi: 10.1080/13594320143000870

Williams, K. D. (1997). Social ostracism. In. R. M. Kowalski (Ed.), *Aversion interpersonal behaviors* (pp. 133-170). New York: Plenum Press.

Zapf, D. (1999). Mobbing in Organisationen. Ein Überlick zum Stand der Forschung [Mobbing in organizations. A state of the art review]. *Zeitschrift für Arbeits- and Organisationspsychologie, 43,* 1-25.

Zapf, D., & Einarsen, S. (2003). Individual antecedents of bullying: Victims and

    perpetrators. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying*

    and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in research and

    practice (pp. 165-184). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Zapf, D., Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Vartia, M. (2003). Empirical findings on bullying in

    the workplace. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying*

    and emotional abuse in the workplace (pp. 103-126). New York: Taylor &

    Francis.

Zapf, D., & Gross, C. (2001). Conflict escalation and coping with workplace bullying: A

    replication and extension. *European Journal of Work and Organizational*

    Psychology, 10(4), 497-522. doi: 10.1080/13594320143000834

Zapf, D., Knorz, C., & Kulla, M. (1996). On the relationship between mobbing factors,

    and job content, social work environment and health outcomes. *European Journal*

    of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5(2), 215-237.

APPENDIX A

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

INSTRUCTIONS: Please answer **each of the questions** below by **marking/circling** the appropriate answer category or by **writing in** the relevant information.

1. Gender (please circle):   Male   Female

2. Age (please circle):   Less than 18   18-20   21-25   26-30   31-35   36-40   41-45

       46-50   51-55   56-60   60+

3. Your ethnicity is: ___ European American ___ African American
                 ___ Hispanic American   ___ Asian American
                 ___ Singaporean Chinese ___ Singaporean Malay
                 ___ Singaporean Indian   _____Others (please state)

4. Your current employment status is: ____ Full-time ____ Part-time ____ Not employed

5. Your highest diploma is: ____High School   ____Secondary School
                 ____Junior College ____Polytechnic
                 ____Some college ____Associate
                 ____Bachelor   ____Master
                 ____Doctoral   ____Professional
                 ____Other

6. **If currently employed**, in what type of industry? _____

7. How long have you worked for your current supervisor? ____ Year(s) ____ Month(s)

8. How many co-workers do you work with on daily tasks? _____

9. **Your position** in your current organization's hierarchy is (Bottom level =1, Top level =6):

            1   2   3   4   5   6

10. **If not currently employed**, were you employed before? _____ Yes _____ No

11. If yes, in what type of industry? _____

12. How long did you work for your most recent previous supervisor?
       _____ Year(s) _____ Month(s)

13. How many co-workers did you work with on daily tasks? _____

14. **Your position** in your previous organization's hierarchy was (Bottom level =1, Top level =6):

<div align="center">

1   2   3   4   5   6

</div>

NEGATIVE ACTS QUESTIONNAIRE-REVISED (NAQ-R)

INSTRUCTIONS: The following items describe situations that may happen in any workplace. Consider **your experiences** of such situations. For each of the situations, please **circle/mark** the response category/number that best reflects your circumstances.

<u>N</u> **1** **Never**	<u>NT</u> **2** Now and Then	<u>M</u> **3** **Monthly**	<u>W</u> **4** Weekly	<u>D</u> **5** **Daily**		

		N	NT	M	W	D
1.	Someone withholding information that affects your performance	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Being humiliated or ridiculed in connection with your work	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Being ordered to do work below your level of competence	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Having key areas of responsibility removed or replaced with more trivial or unpleasant tasks	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Spreading of gossip and rumors about you	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Being ignored or excluded from social events	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Having insulting or offensive remarks made about your personality, attitudes or your private life	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Being shouted at or being the target of spontaneous anger	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Intimidating behaviors such as finger-pointing, invasion of personal space, shoving, blocking your way	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Hints or signals from others that you should quit your job	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Repeated reminders of your errors or mistakes	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Being ignored or facing a hostile reaction when you approach	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Persistent criticism of your errors or mistakes	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Having your opinions ignored	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Practical jokes carried out by people you don't get along with	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Being given tasks with unreasonable deadlines	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Having allegations made against you	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Excessive monitoring of your work	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Pressure not to claim something to which by right you are entitled (e.g., sick leave, holiday entitlement, travel expenses)	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Being the subject of excessive teasing and sarcasm	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Being exposed to an unmanageable workload	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Threats of violence or physical abuse or actual abuse	1	2	3	4	5

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read the following description of a social behavior at work. If you're subjected to such a behavior, please **write** in or **circle/mark** the relevant information/category.

Negative acts occur when an individual perceives himself or herself to be subjected to persistent hostile behavior from one or more individuals. Additionally, the individual may also have the difficulty in defending himself or herself against such negative acts.

1. Were you subjected to any socially negative acts? _____ Yes   _____No

2. How many times, overall, were you subjected to such acts? (within the last 6 months)
                0   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10   10+

3. How severe, overall, were such acts?
            Not severe at all   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   Extremely severe

4. How long have you been subjected to such negative acts at your current job?
        _____ Year(s) _____ Month(s)

5. Who were the main offender(s) to you? (Please circle/check all that apply to you, including gender)
        _____Boss (Male or Female)   _____Peer/co-worker (Male or Female)
        _____Subordinates (Male or Female)   _____Client/customer (Male or Female)
        _____Others

APPENDIX C

COPING STRATEGIES

INSTRUCTIONS: When you experienced the above negative situations, you might have said, done or felt something. For each of the following items, please **circle**/**mark** the response category/number that best reflects what you said, did or felt.

SD	R	S	O	VO
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Never	Rarely	**Sometimes**	Often	**Very Often**

		N	R	S	O	VO
1.	Ignored the behavior or did nothing	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Avoided the person	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Asked or told the person to stop	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Threatened to tell others	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Told my supervisor/boss	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Requested an investigation by a person senior to my supervisor	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Requested a temporary assignment elsewhere	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Left/quit the organization	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Went along with the behavior	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Got someone to speak to the person about the behavior	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Talked with others about the behavior	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Behaved extra nice to the person	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Took sick days or time off	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Felt bad about myself	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Felt worthless	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Felt helpless to do anything	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Lowered my productivity	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Thought about quitting	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Thought about getting revenge	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Didn't take the behavior seriously	1	2	3	4	5
21.	Acted as if you didn't care	1	2	3	4	5
22.	Stayed calm	1	2	3	4	5
23.	Sought help from a counselor/professional	1	2	3	4	5
24.	Fought back with similar means or behavior	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX D

FACE CONCERNS

INSTRUCTIONS: Please recall the last time when you were involved in a big conflict or a fight with either your supervisor or co-worker (e.g., differences in goals, priorities, objectives, work styles). How did you respond to the conflict? Please **circle/mark** the response category/number that best reflects what you felt or did.

SD	S	U	A	SA
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	**Undecided**	Agree	**Strongly Agree**

		SD	D	U	A	SA
1.	I was concerned with maintaining the poise of the other person.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Maintaining humbleness to preserve the relationship was important to me.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I was concerned with not bringing shame to myself.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Helping to maintain the other person's pride was important to me.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	I was concerned with protecting my self-image.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	My concern was to act humble in order to make the other person feel good.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	My concern was to help the other person maintain his/her dignity.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	I didn't want to embarrass myself in front of the other person.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	I wanted to maintain my dignity in front of the other person.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	My primary concern was helping the other person save face.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Preserving our mutual self-images was important to me.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Saving both of our faces was important to me.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	I was concerned with maintaining my own poise.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	I was concerned with helping the other person maintain his/her credibility.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	My primary concern was protecting both of our feelings.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	I was concerned with not appearing weak in front of the other person.	1	2	3	4	5

17. I was concerned with helping the other person preserve his/her self-image.

1   2   3   4   5

18. I was concerned with protecting my personal pride.

1   2   3   4   5

AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT

INSTRUCTIONS: Below are several statements about you which you may agree or disagree. Please **circle/mark** the response category/number that best reflects your feelings.

SD	S	U	A	SA
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	**Undecided**	Agree	**Strongly Agree**

		SD	D	U	A	SA
1.	I feel a strong sense of belonging to my organization.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	I feel personally attached to my work organization.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I am proud to tell others I work at my organization.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Working at my organization has a great deal of personal meaning to me.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	I would be happy to work at my organization until I retire.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	I really feel that problems faced by my organization are also my problems.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX F

LEADER-MEMBER EXCHANGE

INSTRUCTIONS: The following items seek to determine how you feel about your relationship with your boss. Please **circle/mark** the response category/number that best reflects your feelings.

SD	S	U	A	SA
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	**Undecided**	Agree	**Strongly Agree**

	SD	D	U	A	SA
1. I know how satisfied or dissatisfied my immediate supervisor is with what I do.	1	2	3	4	5
2. My immediate supervisor understands my work problems and needs.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I feel my immediate supervisor recognizes my potential.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Regardless of how much formal authority my immediate supervisor has built into his/her position, he/she will be inclined to use his/her available power to help me solve problems in my work.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Regardless of how much formal authority my immediate supervisor has, I can count on him/her to "bail me out" at his/her expense when I really need it.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I have confidence in my supervisor's decisions such that I would defend and justify them even if he or she were not present to do so.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I would characterize my working relationship with my supervisor as effective.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I am satisfied with my job.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX G

OPEN-ENDED QUESTION

If you have been subjected to or witnessed any negative or hostile bullying behavior in your workplace, please tell me about your experiences.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

LETTER OF INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE WEB-BASED SURVEY

Dear Participant:

I am conducting a research study as part of the requirements for the completion of my Master's program at the University of Houston. This study titled: "A Cross-Cultural Comparison and Examination of Workplace Bullying in Singapore and the United States." This survey is being sent to members of professional organizations and school institutions across Singapore and a link to the survey will be placed on online media and on flyers for anyone to fill out.

The purpose of this study is to see how employees from Singapore and the United States cope with workplace negative, hostile or bullying behaviors and how they differ in terms of face concerns and to measure the level of exposure of bullying in Singaporean and American employees.

I would like to invite you to participate in my study. Should you choose to participate, responses will remain anonymous and participation will be kept confidential. You may refuse to answer any question or quit the survey at any time. If you choose to participate, you will be one of the 300 participants.

It will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete the entire questionnaire. Participation is voluntary. There are no foreseeable risks associated with your participation in this project.

Please assist me in this project by completing the survey at:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/thesis-workplacebullying

This study is being conducted with the approval and under the direction of my thesis committee at the University of Houston. At the end of the survey, you will be asked to pass/forward the link of the survey together with this letter of invitation to 2 more people.

If you would like to participate in a drawing to win one of the four $25 gift cards, please type your email address at the end of the survey. You may also receive extra credit from your instructor for participating in this survey.

The results of this study may be published in professional and/or scientific journals. It may also be used for educational purposes or for professional presentations. However, no individual subject will be identified.

If you have any questions concerning this research study, you can email me at jillianclairelim@yahoo.com or at jlim8@uh.edu. You may also contact Dr. Jaesub Lee, faculty sponsor, at (+1)713-743-2885 or you can email him at jlee@uh.edu.

This project has been reviewed by the University of Houston Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (+1)713-743-9204.

Yours Sincerely,

Jillian Claire Lim