

The role of emotional intelligence in abating the workplace exposure to bullying among managers

Panguluri Pallavi

* Assistant Professor in Psychology, KL (Deemed to be University).

Abstract: Workplace bullying is an indicator of an unhealthy organizational climate. The victims and the targets of workplace bullying will experience degeneration of their physical and psychological health. In order to avoid this unwanted bullying, it is imperative for the targets to behave diplomatically by using interpersonal and intrapersonal skills which are otherwise called emotional intelligence. The aim of the present study was to find out the difference in the levels of being bullying among high, low and medium levels of emotionally intelligent employees. The study consists of 100 middle level and lower level managers. NAQ-R questionnaire and Schutte emotional intelligence questionnaire were administered to measure workplace bullying exposure and emotional intelligence respectively. From the results, it was concluded that 33 % of the managers were reported as being never bullied, 46 percent reported as being occasionally bullied, and 21 percent reported as being severely bullied. Gender was not found to be associated with exposure to bullying and its subscales. Managers with high and average emotional intelligence showed low levels of bullying exposure compared to low emotionally intelligent managers.

Keywords: Emotional Intelligence, Interpersonal skills, Intrapersonal skills, Exposure to Bullying, Work-related bullying, Person-related bullying, and Physically intimidating bullying.

INTRODUCTION: In the present scenario, the prevalence of bullying in the workplace has become an open issue globally, and the topic took the attention of many researchers from the past two and a half decades. In India, the research on bullying is in its grass root level. Workplace bullying might be prevalent in India as it is a multicultural society with different customs and norms followed by different cultures and societal groups. Organization climate acts as a propelling force for various behaviours (positive and negative) among the individuals in the organisation. Among these behaviours' workplace bullying is the one which is significantly overlooked phenomenon.

Workplace bullying:

Workplace bullying is defined as a "status-blind interpersonal hostility that is deliberate, repeated and sufficiently severe, so as to harm the targeted person's health or economic status" (Namie, 2003). The need for the perpetrator to control another person for the benefit of their interest propels such illegal undermining acts of the bullying behaviours. As per Einarsen and Hoel, (2001), workplace bullying is embodied with negative behaviours such as spreading false rumours, giving unmanageable workloads, assigning unreasonable deadlines, excessive monitoring of ones' work, revoking one from essential tasks and delegating with a trivial one. Personal bullying consists of behaviours such as excessive teasing, playing practical jokes, spreading gossip or rumours, persistent criticism, excessive remarks and intimidation.

Workplace Bullying is not merely an interpersonal issue but impacts the whole organization (Sperry, 2009; Hutchinson et al., 2010). High impulsivity was found to manifest in all forms of bullying among males and females (Jolliffe, & Farrington, 2011). Bullied were not aware of the harm that they put on others. In general, bullies may lack the ability to differentiate appropriate or inappropriate behaviours, as well as conventional or unconventional behaviours of them (Pallavi, 2018a). Exposure to these behaviours causes debilitating effects on physical and psychological health and also found to be one of the predictors of drug abuse among the targets (Bartlett, & Bartlett, 2011).

Emotional Intelligence:

Since two decades, emotional intelligence had become a reigning topic (especially in the field of industrial psychology) from when the researchers (e.g., Schutte et al., 2007; Brackett, Rivers, & Salovey, 2011) started believing it as the promoter of growth and wellbeing of an individual in all aspects. Earlier, job satisfaction was reigning topic of study and very little research went beyond it (Cartwright, & Pappas, 2008). However, in later years researchers (e.g., Jordan, & Troth, 2004; Sy, Tram, & O'Hara, 2006) believed that emotional intelligence occupies a predominant role in problem-solving, mitigating conflicts, and

increasing job satisfaction. Emotional intelligence in the language of measurement and evaluation stands for a pool of one's interpersonal and intrapersonal abilities, (i.e. social skills and emotional skills respectively). In daily life, emotionally intelligent persons are labelled as 'street smarts.'

Emotional skills reflect one's ability in utilizing their emotions appropriately according to the need of the situation such as when to laugh, persuade, praise, and show sympathy. Emotions have the tendency to establish either a healthy or a conflicting interpersonal relationship between people. At times, venting of appropriate emotions determines the strength of social and interpersonal relationships of an individual. Utilization of the appropriate emotions may have the possibility to turn a conflicting interpersonal relationship into a sturdy and healthy one. If the person did not utilize the emotions appropriately, the healthy relationship may even turn into a conflict (Pallavi & Mohan, 2018). So, emotions are the dynamic aspects that affect the social relations of an individual either in a positive or negative way. Emotional Intelligence occupies a predominant role in guiding one's behaviour and also in maintaining an integrated self (Damasio, 2000).

Workplace bullying vs emotional intelligence:

Workplace bullying has detrimental effects on the target's health and wellbeing. Victims of bullying lack social support from their colleagues because others might be afraid that the bullies will retaliate and they may tend to face the same. Authorities in the organisation may also overlook or condone these behaviours in the name of tough management. No scope of getting social support will make their condition worse. Victims will experience trauma which may cause various emotional reactions such as irritability, helplessness, fear, anxiety. Austin et al., (2005) proposed that peer acceptance can be gained only by utilising emotional skills and appropriate behaviours during problematic situations like bullying. When a person is exposed to bullying at the workplace, it is imperative to perceive the emotions of the self and to manage their emotions diplomatically otherwise it would lead to emotional entanglement.

Ayoko et al., (2008) found that the groups with a less well-defined climate of emotional intelligence were significantly positively associated with relationship conflict, increased conflict intensity and increased task. In a study by Qureshi, Rasli, & Zaman (2014) workplace bullying was found to be negatively associated with favourable organizational climate. The promotion of emotional intelligence at the workplace may induce favourable organizational climate by enhancing quality and by influencing interpersonal interactions in a positive way whereas the existence of workplace bullying has the reverse effect. When the targets of bullying respond with appropriate emotions and behaviour, they can manipulate those instances towards the positive end. Victims of the bullying might lack emotional skills and hence they react ineffectively during problematic situations which further propagate more instances of bullying. The bullying and emotional intelligence were two phenomena having contradictory effects on the environment and hence, one phenomenon can be predicted to have the tendency to suppress other phenomena.

Sheehan (1999) suggested that the development of co-operative workplaces by focusing more on problem-solving rather than on a punitive framework is helpful in dealing with workplace bullying. Implementing emotional intelligence training programmes would help in reducing the incidents of bullying at work.

The rationale of the study:

Ensuring the wellbeing of the employees is necessary for an organization, to retain their skilled employees and also for its survival. Hence, it is imperative for an employer or the head of an organisation to provide a more co-operative and healthier working environment to their employees irrespective of the other factors (like bullying) that inevitably exists and disturbs the harmony of the organization. Workplace bullying would lead to disrupting the concordance amongst their people and also damage their wellbeing. Theoretically, it is true that providing the employees with an opportunity to promote their emotional skills would be helpful in dealing with the hurdles that they may face by being bullied. Hence, practically there is a need to understand the relationship between workplace bullying and emotional intelligence.

METHOD:

Objectives: The objectives of the study were to:

1. To find if there was a significant difference in the levels of exposure to bullying with respect to gender among the managers.
2. To find the relationship between emotional intelligence and the levels of being bullied among the managers.

Sample: Data for the project was collected by using convenient sampling method from 104 (78 male and 26 female managers) middle-level and low-level managers from an industry located in Gajuwaka (Surrounding Visakhapatnam industrial area) through administering questionnaires. The questionnaires

were distributed to a total of 189 managers, who were available and willing to provide information. A total of 116 questionnaires were returned, in which some were discarded as they were incomplete.

Instrument:

Two standardized questionnaires were used to measure workplace exposure to bullying and emotional intelligence

1. Negative Acts Questionnaire by Einarsen et al., (2009) was administered to measure the levels of bullying. It contains 22-items with a five-point Likert scale. Person-related bullying, Work-related bullying and Physically intimidating bullying were the subscales of this scale. Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the scale and its every subscale measuring internal consistency reliability was ranged between 0.90 and 0.95 (Einarsen, Hoel, & Notelaers, 2009).
2. To assess emotional intelligence, Schutte Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire by Schutte, Malouff and Bhullar (2009) was administered to the managers. It contains 33 Likert scale items from strongly disagree to strongly agree. It includes four subscales: mood regulations, appraisal of emotions, social skills and utilisation of emotions. The alpha coefficient of the scale and its subscales were high and it ranges from 0.9 to 0.95 (Nel, 2019).

Procedure: To conduct a study and to seek permission from the industrial organisation, the proposal was submitted to four organisations. Out of them, only one industry showed interest to give permission. Remaining industries were not willing because they do not like to unveil their confidential data. Permission from that one industry became possible only with pretty hard efforts. The managers were told about the purpose of the study and gave written and verbal statements about the confidentiality of their personal information. They were also told that they can voluntarily quit the study whenever they need. All the questionnaires filled by the managers were collected and coded to facilitate analysis. An interpretation was drawn from the results obtained using statistical software.

Limitations:

1. The sample is limited only to a single private industry.
2. Only the middle level and low-level managers from an organization were included in the study.
3. This study does not go beyond finding the prevalence of bullying and comparing those levels with emotional intelligence and vice-versa.
4. The size of the female sample was less compared to the male sample

Results and Discussions:

Table-1
The t-values for gender and exposure to bullying

	Gender	Mean	SD	t-value
Bullying	Male	47.82	15.12	1.23
	Female	53.45	15.07	
WRB	Male	16.7	4.58	1.4
	Female	14.8	3.72	
PRB	Male	25.77	8.05	1.11
	Female	22.52	7.43	
PIB	Male	7.36	2.55	1.45
	Female	6.42	2.25	

Note: WRB=Work Related Bullying, PRB= Person Related Bullying, PIB= Physical Intimidating Bullying

In terms of exposure to bullying (female=53.45, male= 47.82), work-related bullying (WRB) (female=16.7, male=14.8), person related bullying (PRB) (female=25.77, male= 22.52) and physically intimidating bullying (PIB) (female=7.36, male=6.42), female managers had higher mean score compared to male managers. The t-values of the manager's exposure to bullying, WRB, PRB and PIB with respect to their gender were 1.23, 1.4, 1.11 and 1.45 respectively, were not statistically significant. The results indicate that was no significant mean difference in the levels of bullying, WRB, PRB and PIB among the male and female managers. The result may not be generalized because the size of the female sample was less compared to the male sample.

Males had the highest probability of using assertive strategies and analysing their own behaviours to find whether they are appropriate or not then did the females (Johannsdottir, & Olafsson, 2004). Hence, males may tend to have low exposure to bullying compared to females. The results of Vartia, & Hyyti (2002) also supported the above phenomenon. Salin (2005) emphasized that males were usually bullied by the superiors

whereas women were bullied by their colleagues, subordinates and by their superiors in almost equal proportions. Studies by Ortega, et. al. in 2009; Einarsen, & Skogstad in 1996; Rayner in 1997; Johannsdottir, & Olafsson in 2004 supported the current results by stating no significant difference between male and female in terms of their exposure to bullying. Overall, few researchers stated higher exposure to bullying among female employees than male employees and few researchers stated no significant difference in the levels of being bullied with respect to their gender.

Table-2 Prevalence of bullying

	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Never Bullied	33	33.0	33.0
Occasionally Bullied	46	46.0	79.0
Severely Bullied	21	21.0	100.0
Total	100	100.0	

From the above table-1, 21% of the managers reported as being bullied severely at work and 46% of the managers reported as being bullied at least occasionally. Only 33 percent of the respondents reported that they were never bullied. Similar kind of result was also found in the previous study (Pallavi, 2018b). The present study was conducted in a large-scale industry that mostly constitutes more female employees. People working in male and female dominated occupations reported more exposure to bullying than those who work with customers or symbols (Ortega, et. Al., 2009). Female-dominated occupations were likely seen in the workplaces that need to deal with patients/ clients, and male-dominated occupations were likely seen in occupations related to working with things. Johannsdottir, & Olafsson (2004) demonstrated that using avoidance and passive response during the incidents of bullying increases the probability of these incidents. He also emphasized that passive coping strategies will incite more incidents of bullying and suggested using active coping strategies during the initial stages of bullying would be helpful in reducing the incidents.

Table-3 ANOVA

		N	Mean	SD	F	Sig.
TB	LOW EI	23	53.4870	9.21418	18.319	.000
	AVG EI	40	51.1500	11.35432		
	HIGH EI	37	36.5946	15.90328		
	Total	100	46.6700	14.92206		
WRB	LOW EI	23	15.6522	3.03927	13.858	.000
	AVG EI	40	16.8000	3.52427		
	HIGH EI	37	14.8351	4.86005		
	Total	100	12.1100	4.46919		
PRB	LOW EI	23	26.5043	5.26942	18.248	.000
	AVG EI	40	26.3000	6.48865		
	HIGH EI	37	17.8108	8.07891		
	Total	100	23.2400	7.99889		
PIB	LOW EI	23	7.9130	1.62125	16.070	.000
	AVG EI	40	6.9000	2.04814		
	HIGH EI	37	5.0811	2.61808		
	Total	100	6.6300	2.50920		

TB= Total bullying, WRB=Work Related Bullying, PRB= Person Related Bullying, PIB= Physical Intimidating Bullying, EI= Emotional Intelligence.

In the above table-2, the mean score of exposure to bullying, WRB, PRB and PRB were high among the managers with low emotional intelligence and low among the managers with high emotional intelligence. The F-values of the managers' exposure to bullying (18.32), work-related bullying (13.86), person related bullying (18.25) and physically intimidating bullying (16.07) with respect to their levels of emotional intelligence were statistically significant at 1% level. Hence, we can depict that there was a significant

difference in the levels of exposure to bullying and its subscales among the managers with high, low and average levels of emotional intelligence.

Table-4 Correlation between bullying and emotional intelligence

	TB	WRB	PRB	PIB	EI	MR	AE	SS	UE
TB	1								
Sig	.931(**)	.977(**)	.900(**)	-.541(**)	-.579(**)	-.417(**)	-.533(**)	-.390(**)	
N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
WRB	.931(**)	1	.854(**)	-.456(**)	-.499(**)	-.337(**)	-.456(**)	-.318(**)	
Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001	
N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
PRB	.977(**)	.854(**)	1	-.560(**)	-.585(**)	-.450(**)	-.547(**)	-.407(**)	
Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
PIB	.900(**)	.810(**)	.838(**)	1	-.487(**)	-.536(**)	-.474(**)	-.367(**)	
Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
EI	-.541(**)	-.456(**)	-.560(**)	-.487(**)	1	.934(**)	.852(**)	.932(**)	.903(**)
Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
MR	-.579(**)	-.499(**)	-.585(**)	-.536(**)	.934(**)	1	.689(**)	.839(**)	.821(**)
Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
AE	-.417(**)	-.337(**)	-.450(**)	-.347(**)	.852(**)	.689(**)	1	.724(**)	.703(**)
Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
SS	-.533(**)	-.456(**)	-.547(**)	-.474(**)	.932(**)	.839(**)	.724(**)	1	.792(**)
Sig	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
UE	-.390(**)	-.318(**)	-.407(**)	-.367(**)	.903(**)	.821(**)	.703(**)	.792(**)	1
Sig	.000	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
N	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

TB= Total bullying, WRB=Work Related Bullying, PRB= Person Related Bullying, PIB= Physical Intimidating Bullying, EI= Emotional Intelligence, MR= Mood Regulations, AE= Appraisal of Emotions, SS= Social Skills, and UE= Utilization of Emotion

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

In terms of emotional intelligence, the correlation value of being bullied among the managers was - 0.541 (p<0.01). The levels of Mood regulations (r= -0.579), Appraisal of emotions (r= -0.417), social skills (r= -0.533), utilization of emotions (r= -0.390) among the managers were significantly negatively correlated with their levels of exposure to bullying at 1% level. From this, we can construe that emotional intelligence and its domains were significantly negatively related to the levels of exposure to bullying among the managers.

The managers with high levels of emotional intelligence, mood regulation, appraisals of emotions, social skills and utilization of emotions tend to show lower levels of exposure to bullying.

The emotional intelligence and its subscales were negatively correlated with the levels of exposure to work-related bullying (EI= -0.46, MR= -0.49, AE= -0.34, SS= -0.46 and UE= -0.32), person related bullying (EI= -0.56 MR= -0.59, AE= -0.45, SS=-0.55 and UE=-0.41) and physically intimidating bullying (EI= -0.49, MR= -0.54, AE= -0.35, SS= -0.47 and UE= -0.37) among the manager at 1% level of significance. It means the managers with high levels of emotional intelligence and its subscales tend to show lower exposure to work-related bullying, person related bullying and physically intimidating bullying and vice versa. Overall, the levels of exposure to bullying and its subscales were significantly negatively correlated with their levels of emotional intelligence and its subscales.

The previous studies by Sutton, et al. (1999), Kokkinos & Kipritsi (2012); Sutton, Smith, & Swettenham (1999); Garcia-Sancho, et. al. (2014); Ayoko et al (2008); Seaman (2012) and Schokman et al. (2014) supported the current findings stating negative relationship between emotional intelligence and workplace exposure to bullying. Although, the finding of the previous researchers supported the current results, still, they were scattered and scanty, needed more studies to prove the phenomenon.

Conclusion:

It was concluded that from the results that out of 100 managers, 46% of the managers were bullied at least occasionally, and 21% were bullied severely during the past 6 months at work. Only 33% of them were never bullied. Higher mean values of exposure to bullying and its subfactors were found among female managers than male managers but there were not statistically significant.

Emotional intelligence and its subscales were significantly negatively correlated with the levels of exposure to bullying, work-related bullying, person-related bullying and physically intimidating bullying. The managers with low emotional intelligence had a higher mean score of exposure to bullying, work-related bullying, a person related to bullying and physical intimidating bullying. Managers with high emotional intelligence had a lower mean score of exposure to bullying and its subscales. A significant difference was found in their levels of exposure to bullying, person-related bullying and work-related bullying with respect to their levels of emotional intelligence.

From the results, we can understand that emotional intelligence might have the propensity to reduce one's exposure to bullying. Future investigation will be focused on implementing emotional intelligence training programmes to the bullied to observe the changes in their levels of being bullied during the post and pre-training periods.

References:

- Austin, E. J., Saklofske, D. H., & Egan, V. (2005). Personality, well-being and health correlate of trait emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 38(3), 547-558.
- Ayoko, O. B., Callan, V. J., & Härtel, C. E. (2008). The influence of team emotional intelligence climate on conflict and team members' reactions to conflict. *Small Group Research*, 39(2), 121-149.
- Bartlett, J. E., & Bartlett, M. E. (2011). Workplace bullying: An integrative literature review. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 13(1), 69-84.
- Bennett, K., & Sawatzky, J. A. V. (2013). Building emotional intelligence: a strategy for emerging nurse leaders to reduce workplace bullying. *Nursing administration quarterly*, 37(2), 144-151.
- Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., & Salovey, P. (2011). Emotional intelligence: Implications for personal, social, academic, and workplace success. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5(1), 88-103.
- Cartwright, S., & Pappas, C. (2008). Emotional intelligence, its measurement and implications for the workplace. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 10(2), 149-171.
- Damasio, A. R. (2000). A second chance for emotion. *Cognitive neuroscience of emotion*, 12-23.
- Einarsen, S., & Hoel, H. (2001). The Negative Acts Questionnaire: Development, Validation and Revision of a Measure of Bullying at Work. 10th European Congress on Work and Organizational Psychology, Prague, 16-19 May 2001.
- 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.
- 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 and Stress*, 23(1), 24-44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370902815673>

- García-Sancho, E., Salguero, J. M., & Fernández-Berrocal, P. (2014). Relationship between emotional intelligence and aggression: A systematic review. *Aggression and violent behaviour, 19*(5), 584-591.
- Hutchinson, M., & Hurley, J. (2013). Exploring leadership capability and emotional intelligence as moderators of workplace bullying. *Journal of Nursing Management, 21*(3), 553-562.
- Hutchinson, M., Vickers, M. H., Jackson, D., & Wilkes, L. (2010). Bullying as circuits of power: An Australian nursing perspective. *Administrative Theory & Praxis, 32*(1), 25-47.
- Johannsdottir, H. L., & Olafsson, R. F. (2004). Coping with bullying in the workplace: The effect of gender, age and type of bullying. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 32*(3), 319-333.
- Jolliffe, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2011). Is low empathy related to bullying after controlling for individual and social background variables? *Journal of Adolescence, 34*(1), 59-71.
- Jordan, P. J., & Troth, A. C. (2004). Managing emotions during team problem solving: Emotional intelligence and conflict resolution. *Human Performance, 17*(2), 195-218.
- Kokkinos, C. M., & Kipritsi, E. (2012). The relationship between bullying, victimization, trait emotional intelligence, self-efficacy and empathy among preadolescents. *Social psychology of education, 15*(1), 41-58.
- Namie, G. (2003). Workplace bullying: Escalated incivility. *Ivey Business Journal, 68*(2), 1-6.
- Nel, E. C. (2019). The impact of workplace bullying on flourishing: The moderating role of emotional intelligence. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 45*, 9.
- Ortega, A., Høgh, A., Pejtersen, J. H., & Olsen, O. (2009). Prevalence of workplace bullying and risk groups: a representative population study. *International archives of occupational and environmental health, 82*(3), 417-426.
- Pallavi, P. (2018a). The role of educational background on the employee's exposure to bullying. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts, 6*(2), 1193-1197.
- Pallavi, P. (2018b). Bullying pervaded at different organizational cultures. *Journal of emerging technologies and innovative research, 5*(5), 939-945.
- Pallavi, P., & Mohan, D. N. (2012). Conceptual paper on Emotional Intelligence. *International Journal of Research and Analytical Review, 5*(4), 47-64.
- Qureshi, M. I., Rasli, A. M., & Zaman, K. (2014). A new trilogy to understand the relationship among organizational climate, workplace bullying and employee health. *Arab Economic and Business Journal, 9*(2), 133-146.
- Rayner, C. (1997). The incidence of workplace bullying. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 7*(3), 199-208.
- Salin, D. (2005). Workplace bullying among business professionals: Prevalence, gender differences and the role of organizational politics. *Perspectives interdisciplinaires sur le travail et la santé, 7*(3).
- Schokman, C., Downey, L. A., Lomas, J., Wellham, D., Wheaton, A., Simmons, N., & Stough, C. (2014). Emotional intelligence, victimisation, bullying behaviours and attitudes. *Learning and Individual Differences, 36*, 194-200.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., & Bhullar, N. (2009). The assessing emotions scale. In C. Stough, D. Saklofske, & J. Parker (Eds.), *The assessment of emotional intelligence* (pp. 119–135). New York: Springer.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Thorsteinsson, E. B., Bhullar, N., & Rooke, S. E. (2007). A meta-analytic investigation of the relationship between emotional intelligence and health. *Personality and individual differences, 42*(6), 921-933.
- Seaman, M. (2012). BEYOND Anti-Bullying Programs: Learn How to Foster Empathy within Your Curriculum to Increase the Emotional Intelligence of Middle Schoolers. *The Education Digest, 78*(1), 24.
- Sheehan, M. (1999). Workplace bullying: Responding with some emotional intelligence. *International journal of manpower, 20*(1/2), 57-69.
- Sperry, L. (2009). Mobbing and bullying: The influence of individual, workgroup, and organizational dynamics on abusive workplace behaviour. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 61*(3), 190.
- Sutton, J., Smith, P. K., & Swettenham, J. (1999). Bullying and 'theory of mind': A critique of the 'social skills deficit' view of anti-social behaviour. *Social development, 8*(1), 117-127.
- Sy, T., Tram, S., & O'Hara, L. A. (2006). Relation of employee and manager emotional intelligence to job satisfaction and performance. *Journal of vocational behaviour, 68*(3), 461-473.
- Vartia, M., & Hyyti, J. (2002). Gender differences in workplace bullying among prison officers. *European journal of work and organizational psychology, 11*(1), 113-126.