



From the President

Welcome to our December 2020 newsletter. This has been a year like no other, and I know we have all faced a range of different challenges in our work and personal lives. Disruption to travel, health and the economy brought by COVID-19 has meant that our landmark IAWBH event, our bi-annual conference, had to be postponed. We held our General Assembly in June virtually, and I want to thank all of you who attended. It is important to see silver linings, and in this vein, our General Assembly was better attended than usual, and all members were able to take part because of the virtual format.

Similarly, our postponed conference will be more accessible to more people than ever before. We are still working very hard to confirm the details of the event, and will have these details to you as soon as possible (hopefully before the end of 2020!). There will be lots of ways to be involved in the event, and I really look forward to seeing you all there. Much more on that soon.

It has been a very busy year for the Board – with several outgoing Board members, as well as new ones confirmed at our General Assembly. In addition to welcoming Susan Johnson and Margaret Hodgins to the Board at our General Assembly, the final Board vacancy was filled with a special election. I'm really happy to announce that Ngao Motsei from South Africa was the successful candidate. Welcome to Ngao, and thank you to the other 5 members who were nominated. Our Association only works by people volunteering, so I look forward to seeing some of these members, and others, in roles into the future.

We haven't been as active this year in terms of events, but rest assured we have been very busy behind the scenes, including planning the additional election, developing our strategic vision, and making plans both before the conference was postponed, and after. We're also looking forward to some exciting new events in 2021 in which everyone will be able to take part!

In this newsletter you can read some reflections from me on the General Assembly, meet the new Board members, and read about the use of interpretive phenomenological analysis.

Meanwhile, do keep an eye on your emails for all the details of our virtual conference in the coming weeks!

As we move into 2021, I hope that you and all your family, friends and colleagues stay safe and well, and have a renewed sense of hope for the coming year.

Carlo



IAWBH President, Carlo Caponecchia.

Content

From the Board

- ◆ From the President (p. 1)
- ◆ Summary of the General Assembly, 2018 (p. 2)
- ◆ New board members (p.3)

Members' corner

- ◆ New member activities in 2021 (p.4)
- ◆ Methodology Matters (p. 5-7)
- ◆ Member article –Bullying in UK Government (p.8—10)
- ◆ Upcoming events (p. 11)
- ◆ Literature update (p. 12)
- ◆ Next newsletter and guidelines (p. 13)

General Assembly Update

Carlo Caponecchia

Our General Assembly was held on 18 June 2020 and for the first time, was held via Zoom. It was important for us to have a General Assembly, as this meeting marks the start and end of Board member terms and enables members to make decisions for our association that only members can make. It is a really important part of our association's life and development. Thank you to everyone who attended. The minutes of the meeting are available on the IAWBH website https://iawbh.org/resources/GENERAL%20ASSEMBLY%202020/Minutes%20of%20General%20Assembly%20%20June%202020_FINAL.pdf

The video of the meeting has also been available to view there since the meeting was held.

I'd like to record a few reflections here as well. Firstly, thank you to Jane Murray, who was elected by the membership as Chairperson for our General Assembly. It was a long meeting in a new format, and Jane did an amazing job keeping us all on track and observing protocol.

All the motions proposed at the meeting were carried by the relevant majority. The outcomes of these votes cover some really important issues, including that:

- We will move to a consistent membership renewal period for all members
- The constitution will now include a clause enabling removal of the President or Board members
- The potential role of President-elect (or similar) will be considered
- The President will no longer have to hold a full-time academic position.

Some of these matters were the subject of divergent views, and debate. Being able to express views openly is what characterises a healthy organisation. However, I also understand that some of our members may have felt disappointed in some of the views expressed. A range of views is to be expected in an association such as ours, I know this is common in other similar associations that bring together researchers and practitioners to deal with complex and important problems. I hope we all see these discussions as a step forward in the development of IAWBH.

For the record, one of the things I've most enjoyed while being a member of our association since 2008 has been learning from people with very different skills to me. That is the true value of our network, and this value lies at the very heart of the IAWBH rationale.

The diversity of our perspectives is ultimately our strength – and together we are getting stronger. This was again demonstrated by how immediately following our General Assembly, six members were nominated for the additional Board member position. I don't think we've ever had that many nominations, or a need for elections on that scale. It was a showcase of talent, and a testament to how our people are motivated to work together our association's benefit. Thank you to the nominees: Allison Ballard, Austin Tay, Annabelle Neall, Linda Shallcross and Dorothy Suskind.

Implementation of some decisions made by members may take a little time – you'll hear more about them over the course of 2021. There is a lot more exciting work to do too.

Thanks to everyone who participated in this important part of our Association's governance and development.

Board Membership

Board Update

Information about the new board is available on the website with full Bios and information on all board members. We have provided a snapshot of the three board members below:

Dr. Susan Johnson is an Associate Professor in the School of Nursing and Healthcare Leadership at the University of Washington Tacoma (United States). She has been doing research on workplace bullying and incivility, with a focus on healthcare settings since 2008. She has published articles in international nursing journals, contributed chapters to several books on workplace bullying, and presented at numerous conferences. Prior to obtaining her PhD in 2013, Susan worked as a staff nurse in various hospital settings, where she witnessed many incidents of workplace bullying.



Dr. Susan Johnson



Dr. Margaret Hodgins is a member of the Discipline of Health Promotion and a Principal Investigator with the Health Promotion Research Centre. She is currently Director of the MA in Health Promotion, and also worked as Head of the School of Health Science between 2013 and 2017. She led on the 'Irish Workplace Behaviour Study' a national study on workplace bullying, violence and incivility, and has published on the topic of workplace bullying in public sectors organisations, SMEs and Universities. Margaret was Project Lead on the development of a blended learning CPD module, 'Workplace Wellness', 2017-2018.

Dr. Margaret Hodgins

Dr. Ngao Motsei has had an extensive corporate career in the Organisation and People Management functions, culminating in being appointed Executive Director responsible for Human Resources and Transformation and the Board of Directors in a Johannesburg Stock Exchange (JSE)-listed Financial Services company. Ngao founded Leadership Emporium, a Leadership Development Consultancy where she continues her work as a practitioner in the areas of leadership development and human resources management, as well as team and strategy development facilitation. She also serves on several boards as Independent Non Executive Director. Ngao is also a faculty member at the University of Pretoria's Gordon Institution of Business Science (GIBS)



Dr. Ngao Motsei

Bios of former Board Members are also available on our Website.

New member activities to look forward to in 2021

We are looking ahead to starting some projects and activities in 2021 that members might be interested in participating and being involved with:

Experiences of being a practitioner during times of COVID-19

We are looking to share stories and experiences from practitioners on what their work has been like over the last year. This is something we would like to focus on to allow practitioner members to share their experiences during the backdrop of COVID-19. This would take the form of some content appearing in the newsletter in 2021 and we could look at opportunities for some virtual gatherings. If you would be interested in getting involved in this, please email Neill: neill.thompson@northumbria.ac.uk



Examining sexual harassment behaviours and the impact of #Metoo



We are looking to develop a group of member who might be interested in coming together to share their expertise (practice and research) in the important area of sexual harassment and discrimination. If this is an area that you currently work in, or are interested in - please email Eva: egmikkelsen@health.sdu.dk

2021 Journal Club

We have had members interested in launching an informal journal club in 2021, which will provide members time and space and opportunity to discuss important evidence and writing in our field. This we hope would be a nice networking opportunity in an informal setting while having time to focus on developing our knowledge base or widening our existing interests. We will be developing this for launching and running in the new year. If anyone is interested in getting involved please get in contact and we can start to plan this. Please email Neill: neill.thompson@northumbria.ac.uk



Methodology Matters

Using Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) in workplace bullying research

Introduction

Dr. Mary O'Neill is a counsellor in private practise in East Lothian, Scotland. When working as a counsellor in an occupational health scheme, she observed many clients presenting with work related stress including bullying. She found clients responded well to Transactional Analysis (TA) counselling and as a result it became the topic for her MSc. thesis in TA Counselling in 2015.



Dr. Mary O'Neill

She took that work further with an Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA), done in conjunction with her colleague Dr. Denise Borland (O'Neill & Borland, 2018).

She is interested in promoting the voice of the researcher and is keen to encourage research in counselling, particularly in her field of TA. She has a previous career as a research scientist in the field of molecular biology

What was the research question you sought to answer?

The aim of this study was to document the experiences of people who are subjected to workplace bullying and to interpret their experiences using TA.

While there is a wealth of documented evidence in the literature regarding the experience of targets of bullying, (Lutgen-Sandvik, 2013), we were aware that there was little information in the TA literature about this phenomenon. It was our intention to provide some insight into the experiences of people who have been bullied for that group. Our data would hopefully give the TA counsellor/ psychotherapist an understanding of this phenomenon that they could use when working with clients who were being bullied.

This was a small-scale study focusing on the experience of four people; the four individuals were invited to describe in detail, their experiences in regard to their bullying and to reflect on their situation. They were asked to describe their situation, how did they feel towards themselves, towards the perpetrator, and towards their organisation. Their responses were then analysed for themes; three were identified with seven sub-themes.



What prompted your use of the research methodology and methods?

As counsellor doing independent research and operating outside the academic environment, certain types of large-scale study are not feasible. However small qualitative studies such as case studies and thematic analyses (such as IPA) can be employed to good effect provided that the researcher adheres to their ethical code regarding client recruitment and research protocols as well as having access to academic feedback and critique (Hefferon & Gil-Rodriguez, 2017).

It was proposed to use Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) (Smith et al., 2009; McLeod, 2011), where participants would be able to describe their experiences focusing on their feelings and beliefs. IPA invites the individual to talk about and reflect on their experiences and how they have made meaning of their experience. This in turn is interpreted by the researcher creating a double hermeneutic (Smith et al., 2009; Macleod 2011). More simply, IPA researchers try to understand what it is like from the participant's perspective, (Pietkiewicz & Smith, 2012).

Sample sizes are small, interviews are semi structured, and the analysis is determined in terms of already established psychological constructs (in this case TA), (McLeod, 2011).

Consequently, we did not start with a preconceived TA theory that would be applied to the data, but rather we let what emerged from the data guide us to an appropriate TA interpretation (McLeod, 2011).

What were the advantages/disadvantages of using the methodological approach?

The advantage of this methodology is the focus on detail: it allows us to hear the lived experiences of these targets of bullying (Pietkiewicz & Smith, 2012, Hefferon & Gil-Rodriguez, 2017). Attention is paid to the commonalities in the accounts and includes how the story is told, the coherence of the narrative, use of euphemisms and turns of phrase that specifically capture and encapsulate the experience of the individual. This detail helps us to understand very specifically what it was like for these participants.

But therein lies the disadvantage; the specific experience of these individuals might not be applicable to other targets of bullying. Indeed, the data is so detailed and specific it could be seen as too subjective even in comparison with other qualitative studies. Lack of a control group, lack of corroboration means we do not know for certain that there was not confused or misunderstood communication in the situations described or if other individuals would have handled the situation differently.

Possibly unconscious bias on our part could influence both the interpretation and the narrative. Our approach as counsellors/psychotherapists may have an impact on the interview process, where we may have tended to be biased in favour of participants who were also perceived as counselling clients, (even if not our own) such that we may have sought to minimise distress and not challenge on certain points.



How well was the research question answered?

We found overwhelming evidence of a process called Discounting. This is an unconscious process where the individual fails to account for the other, the self, or a situation in an effort to maintain a specific “Frame of Reference”, (Schiff et al, 1975; Stewart & Jones, 1986). This phenomenon is well documented in TA (and will be familiar under other terminology in psychology studies). It is frequently observed and challenged in the counselling room, but it was startling to see it so powerfully displayed in the narratives of the participants.

We observed hesitation, confused syntax and mixed up tenses (present and past) when participants related their stories. All indicators of being discounted and concurs with other qualitative studies (Tracey et al, 2006). Participants also experienced feelings of low self-worth, lost confidence and experienced breach of personal boundaries as described by Keashley (2001). We concluded that for those impacted by bullying, their feelings of anger and worthlessness, their loss of trust, and the symptoms of depression and anxiety were the result of their being discounted by the perpetrators and their organisations.

References:

- Hefferon, K., and Gil-Rodriguez, E. (2017) Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis.
- Keashley, L., (2001) Interpersonal and Systemic Aspects of Emotional Abuse at Work: The Target’s Perspective, Violence and Victims, 16 (3) 233-68
- Lutgen-Sandvik, P. (2013) Adult Bullying – A Nasty Piece of Work: Translating a decade of Research on Non-Sexual Harassment, Psychological Terror, Mobbing and Emotional Abuse on the Job. Pennsylvania. ORCM Academic Press
- McLeod, J. (2011) Qualitative Research in Counselling and Psychotherapy (2nd Ed.), Sage Publications Ltd.
- O’Neill, M. and Borland, D. (2018) Interpretive Phenomenological Analysis of Experiences of Four Individuals Reporting Exposure to Workplace Bullying in the UK. International Journal of Transactional Analysis Research and Process, 9(1), pp 23-41
- Pietkiewicz, I., & Smith, J.A., (2012). A Practical Guide to Using Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis in Qualitative Research Psychology. *Psychological Journal*, 20 (1) 7-14
- Schiff, J., Schiff, A., Mellor, K., Schiff, E., Fishman J., Wolz, L., Fishman, C., and Momb, D., 1975. *The Cathexis Reader: Transactional Analysis Treatment of Psychosis*, New York, Harper and Row
- Smith, J.A., Flowers, P., and Larkin, M. (2009) *Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: Theory, Method and Research*. Sage
- Stewart, I., and Joines, V. (2000) *TA Today, A New Introduction to Transactional Analysis*, Nottingham And Chapel Hill, Lifespace
- Tracy, S.J., Lutgen-Sandvik, P., Alberts, J.K. (2006) Nightmares, Demons and Slaves: Exploring the Powerful Metaphors of Workplace Bullying., *Management Communication Quarterly*, 20 (2) 148-85

When is a bully not a bully? When your boss doesn't care?

Members' corner

Dr Ian Durrant, a Senior Lecturer at Canterbury Christ Church University in the UK provides a commentary on recent UK media reporting of bullying allegations within government .



Ian Durrant

In March 2020 a Cabinet Office inquiry was launched into the conduct of the Home Secretary Priti Patel. The report written by UK government Standards Chief Sir Alex Allen concluded that the minister had breached the ministerial code that governs the behaviour between ministers and civil servants in government. The response from UK Prime Minister Boris Johnson was to support the Home Secretary and reject the report findings, leading to Sir Allen taking the decision to resign from his role.



Priti Patel

UK Home Secretary

The civil service defines bullying as '*offensive, intimidating, malicious or insulting behaviour, an abuse or misuse of power through means intended to undermine, humiliate, denigrate or injure the recipient*' (Civil Service HR, 2020, p.3). It was reported that the Home Secretary's behaviour included repeated incidence of shouting and swearing. Such behaviour aligns with both the civil services' and academic definitions of bullying.

Following this report being published, Priti Patel, denied the allegations of bullying civil servants: '*The home secretary says that she puts great store by professional, open relationships. She is action orientated and can be direct*' (BBC News, 21/11/20). Does being 'action orientated' mean that her civil servants have just confused a robust management style for workplace bullying?

In an interview broadcast on the 20th November the Home Secretary claimed her behaviour was not intentional. The report itself examined the Home Secretary's behaviour in three different departments. However, it has been claimed that the impact of the Home Secretary's behaviour was not drawn to her attention and therefore does not constitute bullying. Sir Alex Allen disagreed with this position as he suggests '*Her approach on occasions has amounted to behaviour that can be described as bullying in terms of the impact felt by individuals. To that extent her behaviour has been in breach of the Ministerial Code, even if unintentionally*' (Sir Alex Allen, 2020). The question of intent remains controversial and sometimes contested, with the extent that this should be considered in both research and practice (Einarsen et al 2011; SHARP, 2008).

It does send out alarming messages about the attitude of the UK Prime Minister, who not only publicly supports his Home Secretary, but has stated that the matter is now 'closed'.

Members' corner

This position is inconsistent with the Ministerial Code that states that '*harassing, bullying or other inappropriate or discriminating behaviour wherever it takes place is not consistent with the Ministerial Code*' (Ministerial Code, 2019, para 1.2.) and the Prime Minister's own forward to the code, which states 'There must be no *bullying and no harassment*'. Is this simply political expediency from a beleaguered Prime Minister desperate to retain those loyal to him, or a more fundamental malaise at the heart of the UK public sector?

Surprisingly bullying, although unethical and described in the codes of conduct of many organisations, it is not illegal in Britain. However, harassment; '*the act of systematic and/or continued unwanted and annoying actions of one party or a group, including threats and demands*' (Hill & Hill, 2005), is illegal in Britain as 'causing alarm or distress' are offences under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 (CPS, 2018).

The events around this report also raises a further question about considering of bullying which coalesce around organisational culture and what might be called institutionalised bullying where bullying might be allowed to thrive (Lawrence, 2016; Black, 2007; Samnani, Boekhorst & Harrison, 2016; Lewis, Sheehan & Davies, 2008). The cause of institutionalised bullying tends to be attributed to vindictive or laissez-faire management practices (Lawrence, 2016; Samnani, Boekhorst & Harrison, 2016) or indicative of high-pressure environments , where there is a culture of high demands and 'robust management? (Archer, 1999; Alexander, MacLaren, O'Gorman, & Taheri 2012).

What are we to make of these behaviours? Are they just genuine differences of opinion or indicative of a deeper malady at the heart of a modern government, namely the lack of interest in the behaviour of elected officials toward their staff? Is this situation an issue specific to government or generalisable and typical of the wider workplace and CEO behaviour? Sir Alex Allen's report has exposed a Home Secretary who repeatedly shouts and swears at staff and a Prime Minister who apparently does not consider the matter serious enough to act, and indeed considers the matter closed, even after the author of the report resigns. This would appear to show evidence of a toxic leader who herself is managed by a laissez-faire one or a wider organisational culture that enables it.

What is happening in your country? Write and let us know!

We are keen to hear from members interested in writing about bullying and harassment occurrences in their country. These can be topical events, high profile cases in the media, legal developments, or a short country overview.

We hope that this can become a regular feature of the newsletter, so please get in touch if you would like to write a 1-2 page submission in 2021.

Contact: neill.thompson@northumbria.ac.uk



Boris Johnson

UK Prime Minister

Members' corner

References

- Alex, A (2020) Findings of the independent adviser. Ministerial Code investigation. <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/ministerial-code-investigation> (Accessed 25/11/20)
- Alexander, M, McLaren, A, O’Gorman, K, & Taheri, B (2012) “He just didn’t seem to understand the banter”: Bullying or simply establishing social cohesion? *Tourism Management* 33 (2012) 1245e1255
- Archer, D. (1999). Exploring “bullying” culture in the para-military organisation. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20,1/2
- BBC Priti Patel: Summary of official report into bullying claims news <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-55015488> (Accessed 22/11/21)
- Black, J. (2007). Corporate bullying—a virulent organism. *Kai Tiaki Nursing New Zealand (KAI TIAKI NURS NZ)*, Apr2007; 13(3): 20-21. (2p)
- Cabinet Office. August, 2019. Ministerial Code. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ministerial-code> (accessed 24/11/21)
- Citizens Advice (2018). Claiming constructive dismissal. <https://www.citizensadvice.org.uk/work/leaving-a-job/dismissal/claiming-constructive-dismissal/>. (Accessed 17/5/18)
- Civil Service HR (2020) Review of Arrangements for Tackling Bullying, Harassment and Misconduct in the Civil Service. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/744907/TacklingBullyingHarassmentMisconduct-CivilService.pdf. (Accessed 24/11/21)
- Crown Prosecution Service (CPS) (2018) Stalking and Harassment. <https://www.cps.gov.uk/legal-guidance/stalking-and-harassment>
- Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D. and Cooper, C. (Eds) (2011), Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.
- Hill, G.N. & Hill, K.T. (2005). <http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/harassment> (Accessed 13/12/16)
- Lewis, D., Sheehan, M. & Davies, C. (2008). Uncovering Workplace Bullying. *Journal of Workplace Rights*. Vol. 13(3) 281-301, 2008
- Lawrence, F. (2016). Work Safety: how to risk-manage institutionalised workplace bullying. *SHP Safety and Health Practitioner* <https://www.shponline.co.uk/48677-2/> (Accessed 5/6/18)
- Mintz, S. (2014). Identifying the Signs of Workplace and Corporate Bullying. <http://www.workplaceethicsadvice.com/2014/12/identifying-the-signs-of-workplace-and-corporate-bullying.html> (Accessed 5/6/18)
- Salin, D. (2003). Ways of explaining workplace bullying: A review of enabling, motivating and precipitating structures and processes in the work environment. *Human Relations*. Volume 56(10): 1213–1232: 039826
- Samnani, A.K (2013). The Early Stages of Workplace Bullying and How It Becomes Prolonged: The Role of Culture in Predicting Target Responses. *Journal of Business Ethics* (2013) 113:119-13.

Upcoming events

13th International Conference on Emotions and Worklife. June 29– 30th, 2021. Lancaster, UK

<http://www.emotionsnet.org/conferences/emonet-xiii/emonet-xiii-call-for-papers/>

Academy of Management, 81st Annual Meeting. 30 July—3 August, 2021. Virtual Conference

<https://aom.org/events/annual-meeting/annual-meeting-theme>

ANZAM 2021 Conference, November 30—December 2nd, 2021. Perth, Australia.

<https://www.anzam.org/events/types/events-conference/>

EAWOP 2022 (Rescheduled 2021 conference) 11—14 January, 2022, Glasgow, UK. <https://eawop2022.org>

European Congress of Psychology (Rescheduled 2021 conference) 5-8 July, Ljubljana, Slovenia.

<https://www.ecp2022.eu>

Journal Special Issue, Call for Papers:

Group & Organization Management Special Issue Proposal Dynamic and Multi-Party Approaches to Workplace Mistreatment Research

<https://journals.sagepub.com/pb-assets/cmscontent/GOM/GOM%20Special%20issue%20call%20Mistreatment-1603306420867.pdf>

New Book written by IAWBH member.

How to Transform Workplace Bullies into Allies, by Jacqueline A. Gilbert, PhD., has been released.

More information is available here:

<https://www.infoagepub.com/products/How-to-Transform-Workplace-Bullies-into-Allies>



Literature update

The list of literature on bullying and related issues continues to be reviewed. Charl Emmerson has now volunteered to do this on behalf of the association. Between December 2019 and October 2020, 290 new publications were identified. They range from:



Charl Emmerson

A

Abbas, M., & Saad, G. B. (2020). An Empirical Investigation of Toxic Leadership Traits Impacts on Workplace Climate and Harassment. *Talent Development & Excellence*, 12, 2317-2333.

to

Z

Zhou, Z. E., Meier, L. L., & Spector, P. E. (2019). The spillover effects of coworker, supervisor, and outsider workplace incivility on work-to-family conflict: A weekly diary design. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(9/10), 1000-1012. doi:10.1002/job.2401

To access the whole new literature list, log-in to the IAWBH website.

Member PhD manuscript links

PhD manuscripts often do not appear on our literature searches but represent great achievements by our members and important bodies of knowledge. If you have published your thesis recently, or when you do in the future, and it is available on-line please get in contact and we can make our members aware of this.

Dr. Martin Goodman

Contemporary French Storytelling and Workplace Bullying: Narratives of Suffering—PhD Thesis:

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346627260_Contemporary_French_Storytelling_and_Workplace_Bullying_Narratives_of_Suffering-_PhD_thesis



Next newsletter and guidelines

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

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

The next IAWBH newsletter will appear in January 2021—deadline for contributions 15/1/21

Please inform us about:

- your published work,
- Local and national bullying in the media
- international conferences on workplace bullying,
- special issues on workplace bullying and harassment,
- research breakthroughs,
- new research projects or challenging hypothesis,
- international cooperation and funding, and
- any news that may be relevant to a significant number of our members.



Neill Thompson

If you would like to contribute or discuss ideas, please get in contact: neill.thompson@northumbria.ac.uk

Disclaimer:

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

Purpose of the IAWBH

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