Managing Workplace Bullying in New Zealand: Perspectives from Occupational Health and Safety Practitioners

ABSTRACT

Research has typically focused on establishing the prevalence of workplace bullying and has only recently begun to investigate preventative measures. This paper continues that emphasis by examining the management of bullying in a sample of New Zealand organisations. In this study, the results of a survey of 252 occupational health and safety practitioners were analysed to examine how bullying is understood and managed, along with factors that predict organisational efforts to prevent bullying. Results indicate that workplace bullying was perceived to impact significantly on organisations, although the organisations represented in this study had limited preventative measures in place. The results confirm the importance of leadership and the establishment of an effective bully-free environment in the prevention of workplace bullying.
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THE PROBLEM OF WORKPLACE BULLYING

Workplace bullying is a widespread problem in contemporary working life (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf & Cooper, 2011; Nielsen, Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2010). International and industry comparisons, however, are notoriously difficult due to a variety of definitions, their operationalisation, and the use of different measuring tools. A meta-analysis by Nielsen et al. (2010) of the prevalence rates published in 86 different sources indicated that the mean prevalence rates of workplace bullying varied between 11% and 18%. By comparison, there are only a handful of New Zealand studies although these do indicate that New Zealand workplaces are not immune to the problem of workplace bullying.

In the largest study to date of workplace bullying in New Zealand, Bentley, Catley, Gardner, O’Driscoll, Trenberth & Cooper-Thomas (2009) examined responses from 1,728 people from across four industries – health, education, hospitality and travel. Using the Negative Acts Questionnaire to measure bullying, Bentley et al. (2009) reported that 17.8% of the sample had been bullied in the last six months. Consistent with international research (e.g. Agervold & Mikkelsen, 2004; Djurkovic, McCormack & Casimir, 2008; Einarsen et al., 2011), Bentley et al. (2009) reported that workplace bullying had negative effects for the target of bullying, and the organisation. Targets were found to
have significantly higher levels of strain and lower emotional wellbeing, take more days off, and have reduced job satisfaction, organisational commitment and work motivation than non-targets. Targets were also more likely than non-targets to express an intention to leave the organisation. Finally, there were the opportunity costs of time and effort being displaced to help targets cope with bullying incidents, and the costs associated with investigations and potential court action.

Borrowing from Lutgen-Sandvik, Tracy & Alberts (2007), this paper defines workplace bullying as a situation where a person feels they have repeatedly experienced negative actions from one or more other people persistently over a period of time, in a situation where it is difficult for the target to defend themselves against these actions. These negative actions could be physical or non-physical (e.g. verbal abuse). A one-off incident is not defined as bullying. While variants of this definition are often cited, researchers have used a wide range of definitions for workplace bullying, depending on their research perspective or professional interest (Rayner & Cooper, 2006). A common feature, however, is that bullying at work is about systematic, interpersonal abusive behaviour which may cause severe social, psychological and psychosomatic problems in the target (Einarsen et al., 2011). Bullying behaviours may be work-related or person-related, and enacted either overtly or covertly. Work-related behaviours include imposing unreasonable deadlines and/or unmanageable workloads, excessive work monitoring and assigning meaningless or degrading tasks (Einarsen et al., 2011). Person-related bullying includes insulting remarks, excessive teasing, gossip and/or rumours, persistent criticism, practical jokes and intimidation (Einarsen et al., 2011). However, leading reviews emphasise that it is the persistent exposure to unwanted behaviours, as well as the nature of the behaviour, that are key components of bullying and demarcate it from similar constructs such as (general) conflict and workplace violence (Einarsen et al., 2011; Leymann, 1996; Rayner & Cooper, 2006).

Given the individual and organisational costs, implementing effective organisational measures for the prevention of workplace bullying are important. Examples of key primary intervention measures include establishing an anti-bullying culture with strong commitment and role modelling from senior
managers (Duffy, 2009; Needham, 2003; Yamada, 2008), and having a clear organisational policy on workplace bullying with a well considered complaints procedure and reporting system (Pate & Beaumont, 2010; Rayner & Lewis, 2011; Vartia & Leka, 2011). These initiatives must be integrated with a range of Human Resource (HR) practices undertaken in the organisation such as selection, induction, training, performance management and promotion (Blackman & Funder, 2002; Fodchuk, 2007; Vartia & Leka, 2011).

Despite a number of interventions posited as being effective there are serious barriers to their implementation and potential effectiveness. As bullying can be subtle, procedural and open to debate around interpretation and meaning, it is less amenable to regulation and workplace intervention than more overt forms of harassment, discrimination and violence (McCarthy & Barker, 2000). HR and Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) professionals may also have considerable difficulties managing workplace bullying when bullies are senior to them in the organisation, resulting in targets being left to deal with bullies alone or resorting to other solutions such as leaving the organisation (Hoel & Beale, 2006; Rayner, 1998, 1999). Management may be reluctant to address workplace bullying when bullies are otherwise effective and productive, and bullies may even be rewarded with promotion (Leck & Galperin, 2006). Consequently, targets may resort to grievance procedures, exposing themselves to lengthy and uncertain processes with possibilities of further victimisation and stress (McCarthy & Barker, 2000). Finally, and perhaps most disturbingly, management may not understand the nature of bullying nor how it should be prevented with the inevitable result that employers are failing in their duty of care towards employees.

While many studies have described the extent of the workplace bullying, relatively few have focused on the management of bullying in organisations. In the New Zealand context, Bentley et al. (2009) interviewed senior managers and individuals responsible for human resources and/or OHS. Bentley et al.’s (2009) key findings included that organisations commonly had no formal bullying policy although a number included bullying in their harassment policy, and that many had no reporting system for bullying – key primary intervention strategies (Vartia & Leka, 2011). Moreover, the
concept of bullying was not well communicated and understood in some organisations, while managers’ perceptions of the extent of workplace bullying were inconsistent with employees’ (from the same organisations) reports of bullying.

Building on the insights of Bentley et al. (2009) and the extant literature, Figure 1 depicts the hypothesized relationships explored in the present investigation of the occurrence of workplace bullying and the perceptions of the preventive actions taken by the organisation and their perceived outcomes. Management activity or inactivity to control workplace bullying was hypothesised to be related to a number of potential determinants: the perceived extent of bullying in the organisation (most respondents believed that their organisation had no bullying problem); the perceived impacts of bullying on the organisation (costs to the organisation); and the work environment in relation to bullying (including understanding of bullying, tolerance of bullying, HR response to bullying, top management attitudes to bullying).

Figure 1 about here

As Figure 1 suggests, preventative actions may be more likely where a bullying problem is perceived and thought to have negative impacts on the organisation. The work environment of the organisation is a further factor in whether or not prevention practices are in place and whether bullying is experienced within the organisation. Finally, bullying outcomes in the organisation may themselves influence preventive action as they raise awareness of the problem amongst management. The present study builds on the earlier work of Bentley et al. (2009) to examine how bullying is understood and managed in New Zealand organisations, and the role of possible predictor variables (as shown in Figure 1) in relation to whether organisations are taking steps to reduce workplace bullying. The aims of the study were to: i) determine the perceived extent and nature of workplace bullying within participating organisations; ii) understand the perceived impacts of bullying on the organisation; iii) determine the nature of workplace bullying prevention activities within organisations. The study also sought to explore the relationship between these variables and prevention activity levels.
METHOD

Sample and Procedure
A sample of 252 participants was obtained from approximately 400 attendees at a series of four industry workshops held for OHS practitioners and others with a responsibility for OHS in organisations in New Zealand. With the agreement of the workshop organisers, the researchers invited participants to complete a paper-based survey questionnaire at the conclusion of each workshop. Two hundred and fifty two individuals provided useable completed survey forms. While all respondents had some level of responsibility for occupational health and safety, many were employed in non-managerial roles (n=91; 36%). The remainder of the sample were employed as first-line supervisors (45; 18%), middle managers (85; 34%), and senior managers (28; 11%). Respondents were relatively experienced, having occupied their current role for a mean duration of 4.7 years (sd=5.3), with 77% in an OHS role for two years or more and 27% for five years or more. Respondents had worked for their current organisation for a mean period of 6.6 years (SD=6.7). A wide range of industry sectors were represented in the study with the largest representation of respondents from the health sector (30%) followed by agriculture, forestry and fishing (15%), administration and support services (13%), and manufacturing (10%).

Respondents were told that the survey was confidential and that there was no obligation to participate. They were also given an information sheet providing details of the study, along with a verbal explanation of the purpose of the study and some background information on the nature of workplace bullying. The questionnaire took approximately 15 minutes to complete, and all participants completed the survey in the room where the workshop had taken place.

Survey Measures
The questionnaire comprised three main sections. The first section contained 17 Likert-type items that sought respondents’ perceptions in relation to the extent and direction of bullying in their organisations and the perceived organisational impacts. Items were derived from the literature, and
considered management perceptions and responses to workplace bullying (as shown in Figure 1). The second section contained five questions related to organisational activities to manage bullying (measured on a “yes”/“no”/“unsure scale”). The questions in this section were designed to elicit respondents’ perceptions and understanding of workplace bullying in relation to ‘best practice’ interventions as articulated in the research literature, and focused on organisational policy, hazard management, training and personnel selection. This second section also contained a Likert-type item concerning the degree to which participants thought that bullying was a problem for their organisation. The final section asked for basic demographic information.

Data Analysis

Means and standard deviations were calculated for all items in Section 2 of the questionnaire, and frequency distributions were produced for all categorical variables. Factor analysis was performed on the 17 perceptual items contained in Section 1, and logistic regression analyses were conducted with the three new sub-factors produced from the factor analysis included as independent variables, along with ‘tenure in role’ and ‘role’. The criterion variables for the two logistic regression analyses were: incidents of bullying within the organisation over the previous 2 years (Yes/No) and prevention active (Yes/No).

RESULTS

Perceptions of the Extent and Nature of Workplace Bullying

Twenty nine percent of respondents either ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ (Likert scale descriptors) with the statement that workplace bullying was a problem in their organisation. Furthermore, responses to a subsequent question asking about whether actual cases of bullying had been experienced, indicated some 70% of organisations represented in the survey had had cases of bullying in the past two years. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the proportion of respondents who ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ with each of the 17 survey items described above, along with the results of the factor analysis (discussed below).
The Work Environment

Items 1-6 in Table 1 related to the organisational environment in relation to bullying. Of concern is the report from respondents of a low perceived understanding (27%) of the concept of workplace bullying within their organisation in relation to the ability to effectively manage the problem. Responses also suggested a lack of confidence in the organisation’s HR response to bullying, or that effective reporting systems were in place. Furthermore, only 41% of respondents indicated that leaders in their organisation were willing to confront bullies.

The Direction of Bullying in the Organisation

In terms of who is being bullied (items 7-10 in Table 1), respondents perceived workplace bullying by managers to staff and peer-to-peer bullying to be the major concerns. Bullying of managers by staff or employees by outsiders (e.g. customers or clients) was of less concern.

Impacts of Workplace Bullying

In relation to the perceived impacts of bullying, ratings of items 11-17 were relatively high. In particular respondents noted the perceived negative impact on staff morale, motivation and productivity. Many respondents (40%) also felt that bullying in their organisation contributed to an increase in associated administration, suggesting both employee and management productivity are likely to be impacted by workplace bullying.

Preventive Activity to Control Workplace Bullying

Respondents were asked four questions that related to the management and prevention of workplace bullying in their organisation (Table 2).
Almost two-thirds of respondents reported the presence of a formal policy for workplace bullying, although it is not known whether this policy was specific to bullying or part of a wider harassment policy or some other form of general OHS policy in the organisation. Only 41% of respondents reported that their organisation recognised bullying as a hazard, and just 19% reported that their organisation had any form of training for management or staff on the topic of bullying.

### Factors Best Predicting Workplace Bullying Prevention Active Organisations

Factor analysis (principal component analysis with varimax rotation) was applied to the 17 perception items, revealing three sub-factor scales: 1) perceived bullying environment; 2) perceived level of concern in relation to bullying; 3) perceived negative impact of bullying (Table 1). Based on this factor analysis, regression weighted, summed composite ‘scores’ were calculated for each of these three factors.

These three composite variables along with tenure in role and role were entered into 2 separate logistic regressions (forward stepwise entry), with the two dichotomous criterion variables being: *bullying in the organisation in the past two years* (yes/no); and *prevention active/inactive* (active = two or more of the four preventive activities in place). Table 3 presents the significant findings for the two logistic regression models.

The only significant predictor of whether the organisation had experienced workplace bullying was perceived level of concern in relation to bullying. Specifically, the odds ratio demonstrates that when participants perceived level of concern in relation to bullying increases, they were 2.6 times more likely to have reported incidents of bulling in their organisation in the past two years. Significant predictors of whether the organisation was prevention active or inactive were ‘perceived bullying environment’ and, to a lesser extent, the role tenure of the respondent (longer tenure associated with more reporting of preventive activity). Again, the odds ratio demonstrates that when participants’
perceptions of the environment increased, that is, the environment was more focused towards reducing/managing bullying, these participants were 2.5 times more likely to be from an organisation which was reported to be ‘prevention active’

DISCUSSION

It is well established internationally that bullying in the workplace has a significant negative impact on the individual exposed to bullying and on the organisation in which bullying takes place (Einarsen et al., 2011). As a result, workplace bullying has commanded the attention of employers, labour organisations and regulatory agencies as a problem of significant concern (Beale & Hoel, 2010). In line with Bentley et al.’s (2009) recent survey of New Zealand workers which indicated relatively high levels of workplace bullying (17.8%), this study found that New Zealand OHS personnel also perceived workplace bullying to be a problem in their organisations. Indeed, the majority of respondents reported cases of bullying during the past two years and therefore providing further evidence that workplace bullying is a pervasive problem in New Zealand.

Respondents in this survey perceived workplace bullying by a supervisor or colleague as being of most concern. Upwards bullying (i.e. staff to managers) was of least concern to the respondents in this sample. While this concern about the direction of bullying may fit with a ‘common sense’ understanding where a superior bullies a weak and defenceless target, we would exercise caution that this is the only way a bullying interaction is played out. Studies investigating the relationship between bullying and organisational status indicate that bullying can involve people from throughout the organisational hierarchy. Hoel et al. (2001) found little difference in prevalence rates when comparing across different status groups, but did find that gender had an important interaction effect. According to Hoel et al. (2001), British male workers and their supervisors were more likely to be bullied than their female counterparts, but female senior managers reported being bullied more than male senior managers. In terms of the status of the bully, Hoel et al. (2001) reported that majority (74.7%) of respondents reported that the bully was a superior while a substantial minority (36.7%) reported that
they had been bullied by a colleague. Similar results have been reported by O’Moore et al. (1998) and Rayner (1998) while Einarsen & Skogstad (1996) found that superiors and colleagues equally bullied employees. On the basis of a meta-analysis of 40 published samples, Zapf, Escartín, Einarsen, Hoel & Vartia (2011) concluded that bullying is not simply a top-down process but occurs across all organisational levels.

A major focus of this study was the preventive activity management directed to control workplace bullying and factors that predict whether this activity occurred. The work of Bentley et al. (2009) had indicated that a number of factors might determine whether strategies for bullying prevention are put in place. In this study the role of a number of potential predictor variables from this model (Figure 1) were examined in relation to whether prevention activity was undertaken. This study found no support for the proposition that preventive activity is likely to be determined by perceptions of managers of the extent of the problem or the perceived impact of bullying on the organisation. However, the perceived level of concern in relation to bullying was a significant predictor of whether the organisation had experienced bullying during the past two years. This is possibly due to the impact of experiencing bullying on levels of concern rather than the reverse. Indeed, it might be expected that an organisation that had experienced incidents of bullying would be more concerned about this problem. However, this factor did not appear to be related to the likelihood that bullying prevention activity was in place.

The perceived work environment was a factor that was significantly related to prevention activity. Thus, factors such as staff and management understanding of what is acceptable behaviour, an effective reporting system and an effective HR response, and leadership intolerance of bullying appear to be related to the likelihood of preventive action. It is therefore a concern that respondents expressed relatively low levels of agreement with statements attesting to the effectiveness of these factors. While much has been written about the role of the work environment in preventing and reducing bullying (for an overview see Skogstad, Torsheim, Einarsen & Hauge, 2011), particular attention is being paid to the role of leadership. It is therefore a further concern that only 41% of the sample in this study indicated that they perceived leaders to be prepared to confront bullying behaviour.
The concept of leadership is emerging as an important factor in understanding the prevention and tolerance of workplace bullying (Einarsen, Raknes & Matthiesen, 1994; Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2007; Skogstad et al., 2011). Hoel, Glasø, Hetland, Cooper & Einarsen (2010) report that a leadership style where punishment was meted out independent of a target’s behaviour was the strongest predictor of self-perceived exposure to workplace bullying. The absence of a participative leadership style and the presence of laissez-faire leadership were also associated with perceptions of bullying (Hoel et al., 2010). Hoel et al.’s (2010) findings are not an isolated case with autocratic, tyrannical and laissez-faire leadership styles common leadership deficiencies associated with bullying (Nielsen, Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2005). Subordinates can feel directly bullied by autocratic leadership that is authoritarian, rule-based and inflexible (Agervold & Mikkelsen, 2004; Vartia, 1996) but also indirectly through perceptions of injustice or betrayed expectations (Agervold & Mikkelsen, 2004; Strandmark & Hallberg, 2007). Laissez-faire leadership may be seen as bullying in itself (Hoel et al., 2010) but perhaps, more importantly can be seen as providing the conditions in which bullying can flourish.

Results indicating that targets of workplace bullying evaluate their work environment more negatively than non-targets are common in the literature (Skogstad et al., 2011). Along with leadership, targets have reported negatively on such indicators as: role ambiguity, job insecurity and job satisfaction (Hauge, Skogstad & Einarsen, 2007); lack of control over work tasks, time and behaviour (Agervold & Mikkelsen, 2004; Ferris, Zinko, Brourer, Buckley & Harvey, 2007); and high workloads, negative social relationships, and a negative organisational climate (Agervold & Mikkelsen, 2004; Branch, Ramsay & Barker, 2007; Hauge et al., 2007). However, the extent to which all employees in the workplace share this negative assessment of the work environment is often not clear (Skogstad et al., 2011). That is, the extent to which perceptions of bullying are linked to a poor work environment or vice versa (Skogstad et al., 2011). While this study does not provide a clear answer to this important question, it does indicate that a negative assessment of the environment is also likely to be held by key organisational members who are not themselves targets of workplace bullying.
CONCLUSION

This study reinforces that workplace bullying in the New Zealand context is not “harmless fun” or “tough management” but a series of acts that have a negative impact on the targets of bullying, and the organisation where the bully is employed. Given the high rating of bullying impacts on a range of factors – notably productivity and morale – it is clear that investment in creating ‘bully-free’ workplaces is a small price to pay in relation to the negative human and financial outcomes of inactivity in this area. This study has also added to the very limited literature on the prevention of workplace bullying. Clearly, organisations represented in this study had limited prevention measures in place, despite relatively high levels of reported bullying and high perceived impact on the organisation of such behaviours. A factor in determining whether such activity takes place appears to be a supportive work environment, although further work is required to better understand this relationship. Most importantly, research is necessary to identify the efficacy of interventions to manage workplace bullying in different industry and organisational contexts, if this costly workplace problem is to be controlled effectively.

Future research should further investigate the anti-bullying measures organisations put in place, and how these relate to other organisational systems. Research should also consider further the role of individual, environmental, cultural and structural factors in determining whether organisations will take effective preventive activity. Barriers to preventive activity should also be explored further with this study suggesting that an unsupportive work environment being one important factor.
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Table 1: Agreement with the 18 Perceptions of bullying items and factor analysis of the 17 perceptions of bullying items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Agreement %</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Your organisation understands the problem of workplace bullying well enough to manage the problem effectively</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. People in your organisation are accepting of bullying behaviours</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Your organisation’s HR response has been effective in cases of bullying</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Your organisation has an effective reporting system that allows employees and management to report cases of bullying</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. People in your organisation understand what is acceptable in terms of bullying and the consequences for such behaviour</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Leaders in your organisation are willing to stand up to bullies</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Workplace bullying of staff by managers is a concern</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Workplace bullying of managers by staff is a concern</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Workplace bullying of employees from outside sources (e.g. customers, clients) is a concern</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Workplace bullying between peers (employees at the same level) is a concern</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Bullying in your organisation has a negative impact on productivity</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Bullying in your organisation contributes to increased absenteeism</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Bullying in your organisation has a negative impact on staff motivation</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Bullying in your organisation has a negative impact on staff morale</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Bullying in your organisation results in a need to reorganise employees’ work arrangements</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Bullying in your organisation has a negative effect on staff retention</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Bullying in your organisation contributes to an increase in associated administration</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. Factor loadings less than 0.4 were suppressed. Note item 3 was reversed for the factor analysis.

Table 2: Perceived Bullying Prevention Activity in Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Response (yes) (n)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace bullying policy</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying recognised as hazard</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for management or staff</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent employing bullies</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Results of the Two Logistic Regression Analyses Predicting Bullying in the Organisation in the Past Two Years (yes/no) and whether the Organisation was Prevention Active or Inactive (active = two or more of the four preventive activities in place)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable associated with bullying in the last two years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived concern factor</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model variance (R²)</td>
<td>0.118 (Cox &amp; Snell)</td>
<td>0.177 (Nagelkerke)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variables associated with a ‘prevention active’ organisation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived bullying environment</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role tenure</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model variance (R²)</td>
<td>0.178 (Cox &amp; Snell)</td>
<td>0.237 (Nagelkerke)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model X² (1) = 25.386, p <.001

Model X² (2) = 44.240, p <.001

Figure 1: Hypothesised Relationship Between Perceptions of Bullying and Preventive Action in Organisations