Personality and Social Sciences

The occurrences and correlates of bullying and harassment in the restaurant sector

GRO ELLEN MATHISEN,[1] STÅLE EINARSEN[2] and REIDAR MYKLETUN[1]

[1]*University of Stavanger, Norway*
[2]*University of Bergen, Norway*

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

The aim of this study was to explore the occurrence of bullying in the restaurant sector and its potential consequences. The sample consisted of 207 superiors and employees in 70 restaurants. The findings indicated that bullying prevails in the restaurant industry, with apprentices as a risk group. Bullying was negatively related to job satisfaction, commitment, employees' perceptions of creative behavior, and external evaluations of restaurant creativity level, and positively related to burnout and intention to leave the job. Some support was found for a mediation hypothesis, where bullying was the predictor, job satisfaction, commitment and burnout were mediators, and intention to leave was dependent variable. One implication of this study is that there is a need to challenge the attitude, common in this sector, that aggression and bullying is a natural and even necessary part of the work environment.

Key words: Harassment, bullying, restaurant, intention to leave, creativity, job satisfaction, burnout, commitment.

Gro Ellen Mathisen, University of Stavanger, Norwegian School of Hotel Management, 4036 Stavanger, Norway. E-mail: gro.e.mathisen@uis.no

INTRODUCTION

Restaurants have been portrayed as aggressive and hectic workplaces where psychological and physical abuse prevail (Johns & Menzel, 1999). A basic assumption that employees must accept mistreatment as part of the job also seems to exist in the sector. Thus, restaurant cultures appear to accept, and even expect, bullying and harassment as a natural part of the work environment. The recognized UK chef Gordon Ramsay even claimed that "a kitchen has to be an assertive, boisterous, aggressive environment, or nothing happens" (Hollweg, 2001). Furthermore, in an interview study with chefs in UK upscale restaurants, Johns and Menzel (1999) found that violence myths were powerful and persistent in kitchen cultures, a dominant myth being that "violence is a characteristic of the work and the workplace, not of the individuals involved" (p. 106), removing any individual responsibility for these conditions among chefs and managers. Recently, however, some have begun to question such a "truth", discussing possible negative aspects of these tough working conditions in restaurants (Hoel & Einarsen, 2003; Pratten, 2003; Tidemann & Mykletun, 2005). Hence, the aim of the present study is to investigate the existence of bullying and harassment in restaurants and potential consequences associated with such treatment. Restaurants are of particular theoretical interest, as this specific sector differs from other sectors in that bullying and other negative behaviors seem to be embedded in the work culture of these organizations (Johns & Menzel, 1999). An interesting question in this regard is whether the effects of bullying in restaurants are as harmful as has been documented in other sectors, or whether bullying may actually be beneficial in this milieu, as is often claimed by the industry itself.

Bullying and harassment at work

Brodsky (1976) described harassment as repeated and persistent attempts by a person to torment, wear down, frustrate, or get a reaction from another person, and as treatment that persistently provokes, pressures, frightens, intimidates or otherwise causes discomfort to another person at work. Hence, the core dimension in bullying is about exposure to repeated and enduring negative acts from coworkers, superiors or subordinates (Einarsen, 2000). Often, a real or a perceived power imbalance between the parties is involved, making it difficult for the target to defend and guard him or herself in the actual situation. Typically, a victim is constantly teased, badgered and insulted and is unable to effectively retaliate. Although often considered to occur in a single, overt attack, bullying has been found to be a gradually evolving situation, where the target is treated in increasingly harsh ways, which leads to stigmatization of the victim as a "deserving" target (Leyman, 1996). Bullying may take many forms, from open verbal or physical attacks, to rather indirect and subtle acts of aggression, such as excluding or isolating the person from his or her peer group, or talking behind his or her back. The common denominator is that these aggressive behaviors or activities are used with the aim, or at least the effect, of persistently humiliating, intimidating, or frightening the target. In the context of the

present study, the concepts of bullying and harassment are used interchangeably.

To what extent does bullying and harassment exist in restaurants?

The physical conditions in restaurants are often uncomfortable, with many kitchens being cramped, hot and noisy (Fine, 1996; Johns & Menzel, 1999; Pratten, 2003). Moreover, working hours in restaurants are antisocial, and wages are usually low (Pratten, 2003). The work pressure is often high or extremely varied, depending on the number of guests, and employees must be able to work at full capacity on a moment's notice. Often, conflicting interests exist, particularly between cooks and servers. While cooks are product oriented and have high public status, the servers are mainly service oriented, possess lower public status but may earn substantially more than cooks due to the tips (Fine, 1996).

These unfavorable aspects of the working conditions may promote feelings and attitudes of hostility and aggression amongst employees, constituting a breeding ground of harassment and bullying. A study on bullying, which investigated the prevalence of bullying in 12 sub-samples from different industries in Norway, found that bullying is particularly frequent in the hotel/restaurant industry in general (Einarsen & Skogstad, 1996). Findings from a survey of 3,044 respondents within the UK hospitality industry mirrored Einarsen and Skogstad's findings, with 13% reporting they had been physically abused by a work colleague (Anon, 1994). Kitchen workers and chefs were most often exposed to such abuse. Although this finding indicates that bullying is a problem in the restaurant sector, it does not provide information on non-physical kinds of harassment and abuse. A qualitative study among chefs in high quality restaurants confirmed that physical and verbal abuse is widespread in kitchens (Johns & Menzel, 1999). Examples of verbal abuse included humiliation and yelling, and examples of physical abuse were to hurt coworkers with kitchen utensils or to set fire to clothes. While being an important starting point for bullying research in restaurants, Johns and Menzel's study was based on only a few interviews and was presented as a discussion paper. Bullying and harassment in restaurants has, to our knowledge, not yet been studied more systematically with somewhat larger samples. In the present study, we therefore aim to investigate the occurrence of bullying in the sector and the kind of negative acts that exist. In light of the findings from studies of bullying in the broader service industry, the special working conditions in the restaurant sector, and the given qualitative descriptions of bullying in the restaurant sector, we expect a high frequency of bullying in this sector.

The descriptions of bullying referred to so far are mainly derived from high quality upscale restaurants (Johns & Menzel, 1999). The strong pressure to achieve excellence in

these restaurants may result in an even more hectic atmosphere and thereby giving rise to more physical and verbal abuse than in less upscale restaurants. Additionally, descriptions of work environments in high quality restaurants give an impression that verbal and physical abuse is accepted as an inevitable part of the work culture (Crawford, 1997). If bullying is actually necessary, as is sometimes claimed, these restaurants may show a particularly elevated level of bullying.

Hypothesis 1a: There is a relatively high frequency of bullying in the restaurant sector compared to other industries, and especially so in high quality, upscale, restaurants.

Restaurants are known for authoritarian leadership and several episodes, in which chefs have abused their subordinates psychologically or physically, have been exemplified (Johns & Menzel, 1999). In particular, apprentices seem to suffer from such abuse. In Johns and Menzel's (1999) study, one of the respondents claimed that bullying was a part of the socialization process of young workers: "to learn the best stuff, you've got to take the s**t that comes with it" (p. 106). Apprentices are also lowest in the social hierarchy with few means to defend or retaliate, compared to chefs or other older and more experienced colleagues. Hence, being in an apprentice position may be a particular risk factor for exposure to bullying. Studies in other industries have also revealed that younger employees are exposed to more bullying behavior than are older workers (Hoel, 2002), while Salin (2001) found less bullying at higher levels of organizations.

Hypothesis 1b: Apprentices experience more bullying than do other employees in restaurants.

Consequences of bullying and harassment in restaurants

Research has provided convincing evidence that exposure to harassment and bullying may have severe negative effects on the victims' health and well-being. Numerous studies have reported that bullying is associated with psychological distress and psychosomatic complaints (see Einarsen & Mikkelsen, 2003, for a review), including experiences of burnout (Einarsen, Matthiesen & Skogstad, 1998; Savicki, Cooley & Gjesvold, 2003). Negative associations have also been found between bullying and organizational effects such as decreased job satisfaction (Einarsen *et al.*, 1998; Quine, 1999, 2001; Stebbing *et al.*, 2004), increased intention to leave (Keashly & Jagatic, 2000; Quine, 1999, 2001), and decreased job commitment (Savicki *et al.*, 2003). Even if restaurant workers may expect bad treatment as a part of the job, we assume that exposure to systematic negative acts may lead to negative consequences also in this occupational group. These negative effects may, in turn, result in stronger intentions to leave and subsequently high turnover rates. In support of this expectation, studies from other sectors have demonstrated a link between intention to leave and burnout

(e.g., Leung & Lee, 2006; Weisberg & Sagie, 1999), job satisfaction and commitment (e.g., Lum, Kervin, Clark, Reid & Sirola, 1998; Tett & Meyer, 1993). As turnover seems to be a widespread phenomenon in the restaurant industry, it is of particular interest to examine possible links between bullying and intention to leave in this sector.[1] As bullying may be seen as an inevitable part of the industry, bullying may even cause workers to leave the industry entirely. While some turnover may be healthy for restaurants, bringing in fresh ideas and expertise, high rates of turnover may have serious implications for the quality, stability and consistency of work within the restaurants. Additionally, high turnover entails high costs of training new employees (Dermody, Young & Taylor, 2004).

Hypothesis 2a: There is a negative association between bullying and both commitment and job satisfaction, and a positive relationship between bullying and burnout, intention to leave the job, and intention to leave the profession amongst restaurant workers.

Hypothesis 2b: Job satisfaction, commitment and burnout will mediate the relationship between bullying and intention to leave the job and intention to leave the profession.

Negative individual effects of bullying may also be linked to decreased performance and reduced productivity within the organization. Raver and Gelfand (2005) found support for this notion in a study on sexual harassment within restaurants, showing that the general level of sexual harassment was significantly negatively associated with restaurants' financial performance. Another particularly relevant performance criterion in the restaurant sector may be creativity in the goods and services offered to guests. Restaurants face strong competition, and continuous renewal and adaptation, characterized by creativity, seems to be a requirement to stay in business. Moreover, many restaurant workers and guests perceive the esthetics of restaurant meals almost as pieces of art. Cooks sometimes consider themselves artists, and customers expect to be served innovative meals (Fine, 1996; Johns & Menzel, 1999). Results from numerous studies indicate that a safe and supportive work environment is essential for creativity to occur (e.g., Amabile, Conti, Coon, Lazenby & Herron, 1996; Cummings, 1965). Thus, in restaurants where ideas are received in attentive and receptive ways, and evaluated in fair and supportive manners, creativity is possibly promoted. On the other hand, in restaurants characterized by internal strife, insecurity, distrust, and lack of support, creativity will probably be obstructed (see Amabile *et al.*, 1996). We therefore assume that high levels of bullying will be negatively related to creativity in restaurants.

Hypothesis 3a: There is a negative association between restaurant bullying and restaurant creativity.

METHOD

Procedure

The collection of data was administered by regional representatives of the Norwegian Association for Training in the Hotel and Food Industry (NATF) in seven counties, who visited restaurants and delivered questionnaires, returning after approximately one week to collect the questionnaires. Additionally, restaurant creativity was assessed by persons working in public agencies responsible for organizing and following up apprentices in restaurants (external evaluations) as part of their routine visits to these workplaces. They knew the restaurants fairly well but had the advantage of being outsiders. The number of external evaluators for each restaurant varied from one to four with a mean of two. To prevent external assessments differing as an artifact of raters' individual standards, the same evaluators appraised all restaurants within each of the seven counties included in the study.

Two expert cooks at the Culinary Institute of Norway and the manager of the Norwegian Chefs Association individually indicated on a questionnaire which of the participating restaurants they considered to be exclusive upscale restaurants based on the definition: "Exclusive restaurants stress the importance of high quality ingredients and a nice presentation of the meal on the plate, have particularly good knowledge about food in combination with wine, have a broad wine selection, are rather expensive, strive to give excellent service, with serving personnel educated as waiters." There was considerable agreement between the three raters on 85% of the restaurants. In the few cases where there was disagreement, we classified the restaurant according to the decision that received the majority (two of the three) of votes. After this procedure, 26% of the restaurants were evaluated as exclusive.

Subjects

Data were obtained from questionnaires completed by 207 employees in 70 Norwegian restaurants all members of the NATF. The response rate for restaurants in each of the seven counties varied from 43% to 55% with a mean of 49%. The regional representatives of the NATF were requested to collect at least three questionnaires from each restaurant, which was achieved in 39 out of the 70 restaurants (55.7%). The number of respondents in each restaurant ranged from one to 11, with an average of three respondents (median = 3) per restaurant. The mean age was 26, and the sample included 81 females and 124 males; 32% were apprentices, 35% were cooks or waiters, and 33% were chefs or restaurant managers.

Questionnaire

Exposure to bullying behavior was measured with the Negative Act Questionnaire (NAQ, Einarsen & Raknes, 1997; Hoel, Cooper & Faragher, 2001), which consists of 27 items that measure exposure to specific negative acts typical of bullying. The items refer to both direct and indirect behavior (see Table 1 for an overview of items), but do not require respondents to self-label as a target of bullying. Respondents indicate on a five-point scale (1 = never, 2 = now and then, 3 = monthly, 4 = weekly, 5 = daily) whether they experience the negative acts in their job. No specific time span was demanded in which the negative acts should have been occurred. Cronbach's alpha in the present sample was $\alpha = 0.91$.

Witnessing bullying was measured with the item: "Have you observed bullying taking place at your workplace during the last six months?" (response alternatives were "no, never", "yes, but seldom", "now and then", and "often") from QPS-Nordic (Dallner *et al.*, 2000).

Table 1. *Mean negative behavior scores perceived by employees in restaurants (*n = 207*)*

	Workers (*n* = 72)	Supervisors (*n* = 68)	Apprentices (*n* = 67)	Exclusive restaurants	Non-exclusive restaurants
1. Someone withholding information which affects your performance	1.90	2.00	1.78	1.98	1.93
2. Unwanted sexual attention	1.27	1.05	1.27	1.14	1.26
3. Being humiliated or ridiculed in connection with your work	1.27	1.24	1.67	1.46	1.39
4. Being ordered to do work below your level of competence	1.68	1.64	2.00	1.75	1.82
5. Having key areas of responsibility removed or replaced with more trivial or unpleasant tasks	1.43	1.24	1.63	1.46	1.46
6. Spreading of gossip and rumors about you	1.49	1.58	1.45	1.54	1.53
7. Being ignored, excluded, or being "sent to Coventry"	1.13	1.11	1.23	1.15	1.18
8. Having insulting or offensive remarks made about your person (i.e., habits and background), your attitudes, or your private life	1.27	1.24	1.35	1.43	1.26
9. Being shouted at or being the target of spontaneous anger	1.37	1.38	1.50	1.61	1.34
10. Intimidating behavior such as finger pointing, invasion of personal space, shoving, blocking/barring the way	1.27	1.02	1.19	1.22	1.14
11. Hints or signals from others that you should quit	1.19	1.06	1.08	1.16	1.08
12. Threats of violence or physical abuse	1.15	1.06	1.05	1.08	1.08
13. Repeated reminders of your errors and mistakes	1.47	1.33	1.73	1.63	1.48
14. Being ignored or facing hostility when you approach	1.21	1.20	1.39	1.43	1.22
15. Persistent criticism of your work and effort	1.44	1.35	1.57	1.47	1.47
16. Having your opinions or views ignored	1.49	1.39	1.51	1.49	1.48
17. Insulting messages, telephone calls, or e-mails	1.08	1.04	1.12	1.14	1.06
18. Practical jokes carried out by people you don't get on with	1.33	1.19	1.42	1.49	1.30
19. Systematically being required to carry out tasks which clearly fall outside your job description, e.g., private errands	1.36	1.17	1.27	1.39	1.25
20. Being given tasks with unreasonable or impossible targets or deadlines	1.34	1.35	1.47	1.45	1.35
21. Having allegations made against you	1.20	1.11	1.34	1.24	1.21
22. Excessive monitoring of your work	1.21	1.07	1.34	1.39	1.15
23. Pressure not to claim something which, by right, you are entitled to, e.g., sick leave, holiday entitlement, travel expenses	1.11	1.13	1.10	1.27	1.11
24. Being the subject of excessive teasing and sarcasm	1.15	1.02	1.20	1.24	1.11
25. Threats of making your life difficult, e.g., overtime, night work, unpopular tasks	1.10	1.04	1.14	1.12	1.11
26. Attempts to find fault with your work	1.23	1.15	1.58	1.37	1.32
27. Being exposed to unmanageable workload	1.34	1.52	1.36	1.59	1.36
Mean score total scale	1.31	1.25	1.40	1.40	1.31

Notes: Judgements were made on five-point scales (1 = never, 2 = now and then, 3 = monthly, 4 = weekly, 5 = daily).

Self-perceived victimization from bullying was measured with the item: "Have you been subjected to bullying at your workplace during the last six months?" (response alternatives were "no", "yes, to some extent", and "yes, to a great extent").

Burnout was assessed with the General Burnout Questionnaire (GBQ), developed by Schaufeli, Leiter and Kalimo (1995). It measures exhaustion, cynicism or active disengagement from work, and professional efficacy with a focus on work-related efficacy expectations, as consequences of stress in occupations without direct contact with service recipients (Leiter & Schaufeli, 1996). The GBQ was renamed the Maslach Burnout Inventory–General Survey, MBI-GS (Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001). The GBQ includes 16 items that are scored on a seven-point scale ranging from 0 (never) to 6 (every day). Cronbach's alpha in the present study was: exhaustion $\alpha = 0.79$, cynicism $\alpha = 0.67$, and efficiency $\alpha = 0.83$.

Commitment was measured with an adjusted version of the Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972) commitment scale including four items concerning whether one would leave the organization under different conditions (e.g., with a slight increase in pay, or with a slight increase in status). The measure is based on a calculative definition of commitment, which considers commitment to be a behavioral investment in the job; individuals become bound to their workplace when they have invested in their job and it will cost them too much to leave (see Mathieu & Zajac, 1990). Items were scored on a five-point scale ranging from 0 (disagree completely) to 4 (totally agree). Cronbach's alpha was $\alpha = 0.76$.

Job satisfaction was measured with the global item: "Overall, how satisfied are you with your job?" with five response categories ranging from 1 = "very dissatisfied" to 5 = "very satisfied". Several studies have concluded that global measures of job satisfaction are better predictors of job outcomes than facet measures that include several items (Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Petty, McGee & Cavender, 1984; Scott & Taylor, 1985).

Intention to leave the profession and *intention to leave the job* were measured with one item each: "How long do you think you will stay in this occupation?" and "How long do you think you will work in the present restaurant?" with four response options "up to one year", "1–2 years", "2–5 years", and "more than 5 years".

Organizational consequence variables were assessed in different ways. To enhance the validity of the study, *restaurant creativity* was assessed both by employees in the restaurants and by the external raters, who were familiar with restaurants but did not work there. Two forms of creativity were evaluated: *creative behavior* and *creative output*. *Creative behavior* in the restaurants was measured with

a revised version of a scale developed by Scott and Bruce (1994), consisting of six items that describe behavior in different stages of an innovative process. Examples of items are "we generate new ideas or proposals" and "we accomplish our new ideas or proposals". Responses were made on a five-point scale ranging from "never" to "very often". Both internal and external raters responded to these questions. To be feasible for use with external raters, the items were reformulated from "we" to "they" (e.g., *they* generate new ideas and proposals). Cronbach's alphas on the internal and external raters' versions were 0.85 and 0.94, respectively. The interrater agreement within each restaurant was calculated using James, Demaree, and Wolf's (1993) formula, $r_{wg(j)}$. The $r_{wg(j)}$ for the creative behavior scale ranged from 0.94 to 0.99, indicating a high level of agreement about restaurant creative behavior among the external raters. *Creative output* measures were slightly different for external and internal evaluators. In the internal evaluators' scale, respondents were asked to state whether actual changes and improvements had occurred within the restaurant during the last 6 months in 11 areas such as food composition, menu, uses of ingredients, and selection of wines. Items were scored on a five-point scale ranging from 0 (no changes) to 4 (big changes). Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.87. A similar questionnaire, developed for the external evaluators, asked them to evaluate to what extent the restaurant was considered as creative according to 10 different areas (e.g., menu, food composition, how the meal looks, use of ingredients, selection of wines) compared with other restaurants they were familiar with. Before these items were presented, a definition of creativity was provided as "something that is new, at least in the actual context and industry, and differs in a positive way from other products, ideas or services". Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.96. The interrater agreement ($r_{wg(j)}$) within each restaurant ranged from 0.93 to 0.99, indicating high levels of agreement about restaurant creativity among the external raters.

Data analysis

Data were analyzed with SPSS version 13.00. As the bullying and NAQ variables were not normally distributed, non-parametric statistics were used. The Mann–Whitney U test was used for all single variable comparisons of groups. To examine the degree of association between two measurements, we applied the non-parametric Spearman's rank correlation (r). Logistic regression was used to test the mediation hypothesis regarding individual consequences of bullying. The predictors were standardized in order to make interpretable comparisons of the odds ratios. In order to run logistic regression, the intention to leave variables were dichotomized into "intention to leave within a year" and "intention to leave after a year or more". To be able to test relationships between bullying and the external evaluations of creativity, the dataset was first aggregated to the restaurant level by calculating mean scores of the respondents at each restaurant. The aggregation was done in order to fit the external restaurant evaluations, which were conducted at restaurant level. Only restaurants with three or more respondents were included in the analysis on aggregated data ($n = 39$). Correlation analysis was then run at this level, again using Spearman's rank correlations.

RESULTS

Occurrence of bullying in restaurants

A total of 4% of the respondents reported that they had often witnessed others being bullied in the workplace during the last 6 months, while 24% had witnessed bullying now

and then. When calculated at restaurant level, 6% of the restaurants reported that bullying had been witnessed often during the last 6 months, while bullying was seen now and then in 25% of the restaurants. A total of 0.5% of respondents indicated that they to a large extent had been bullied while 6.4% had to some extent been bullied during the last 6 months. When calculated on the restaurant level, individuals in 14.4% of the restaurants reported that they had been bullied. Results from the NAQ showed that 12% of the respondents had been exposed to one negative act weekly or daily, and a further 12% had been exposed to more than one negative act. In 50% of the restaurants, one or more respondents reported one or more negative acts daily or weekly, and 66% reported two or more negative acts. The highest mean score for both workers and superiors was on Item 1: someone withholding information that affects performance (Table 1). Apprentices had the highest mean score on Item 4: the perception of being ordered to do work below one's level of competence (Table 1).

There was a slightly higher score on the NAQ and on witnessed bullying at exclusive upscale restaurants compared to non-exclusive restaurants. Nevertheless, results from the Mann–Whitney U test showed that the differences were not significantly different (Table 2).

Apprentices scored significantly higher on the NAQ than did other employees in the restaurant (Table 2). No significant group differences were found on any of the other bullying variables. Thus, Hypothesis 1b, that apprentices are exposed to more bullying behaviors than other employees working in the restaurant, was supported, even if apprentices did not necessarily label such experiences as bullying.

Individual correlates of bullying

Table 3 presents correlations of all the included variables. All correlations between NAQ and individual consequence variables were significant and in the predicted direction except "intention to leave the profession". Significant negative associations existed between having witnessed bullying and both job satisfaction and commitment. There was a significant positive association between being a self-labeled victim of bullying and the burnout factor "cynicism" and intention to leave the job respectively. Thus, while exposure to negative acts was significantly associated with nearly all other variables, self-labeling as a victim of bullying was predominantly related to emotional factors and witnessing bullying was predominately related to job attitude. Hence, the hypothesized relationship between bullying and individual consequences was supported, although the relationships between the different bullying variables and individual consequences were more nuanced than predicted (Hypothesis 2a).

To test the proposed mediating effects with bullying as the predictor, job satisfaction, commitment and burnout as mediators, and intention to leave as the dependent variable (Hypothesis 2b), data were analyzed based on the criteria

Table 2. *Means, Mann–Whitney* U *and* p *values for exclusive versus non-exclusive restaurants and apprentices versus other employees*

Variable	Group	Mean	Mann–Whitney U	Z	p
NAQa	Exclusive	1.40	3287.5	−0.977	0.329
	Non-exclusive	1.31			
Observed bullying[b]	Exclusive	1.71	3557.5	−0.837	0.402
	Non-exclusive	1.54			
Subjected to bullying[c]	Exclusive	1.08	3766	−0.190	0.849
	Non-exclusive	1.08			
NAQ[a]	Apprentices	1.40	3410.5	−1.998	<0.05
	Other employees	1.23			
Observed bullying[b]	Apprentices	1.64	4197.5	−0.729	0.466
	Other employees	1.57			
Subjected to bullying[c]	Apprentices	1.11	4116.0	−1.550	0.121
	Other employees	1.04			

[a] Judgements were made on five-point scales (1 = never, 2 = now and then, 3 = monthly, 4 = weekly, 5 = daily).
[b] Judgements were made on a three-point scale (1 = no, 2 = yes, to some extent, 3 = yes, to a great extent).
[c] Judgements were made on a four-point scale (1 = no, never, 2 = yes, but seldom, 3 = now and then, 4 = often).

Table 3. *Spearman's rank correlations between the studied variables*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. NAQ	–											
2. Observed bullying	0.41**	–										
3. Subjected to bullying	0.31**	0.36**	–									
4. Job satisfaction	−0.30**	−0.16*	−0.07	–								
5. Burnout exhaustion	0.33**	0.09	0.13	−0.38**	–							
6. Burnout cynicism	0.31**	0.12	0.16*	−0.36**	0.43**	–						
7. Burnout efficiency	0.19**	−0.01	0.08	−0.18**	0.27**	0.33**	–					
8. Commitment	−0.32**	−0.16*	−0.09	0.52**	−0.31**	−0.20**	0.11	–				
9. Creative behavior	−0.27**	−0.23**	−0.16*	0.31**	−0.20**	−0.25**	−0.37**	0.31**	–			
10. Creative changes	−0.17*	−0.09	−0.12	0.16*	−0.12	−0.17*	−0.17*	0.28**	0.45**	–		
11. Intention to leave profession	0.00	0.06	0.13	−0.16*	0.17*	0.20**	0.06	−0.16*	−0.11	−0.14	–	
12. Intention to leave the job	0.21**	0.02	0.21**	−0.30**	0.16*	0.25**	0.16*	−0.37**	−0.16*	−0.06	0.24**	–

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$.

proposed by Baron and Kenny (1986). First, before a mediation hypothesis may be tested, there must be a relationship between the independent and the dependent variable. Second, a relationship should exist between the independent variable and the mediator variable. The third criterion is that there is a significant relationship between the mediator variable and the dependent variable. The fourth step for establishing mediation effects requires a reduction in the correlation between the predictor and the dependent variable after controlling for the mediator. Results from all possible mediation analyses are reported in Table 4. Both job satisfaction, the burnout variable of cynicism, and commitment partially mediated the relation between NAQ and intention to quit the job. Thus, being exposed to bullying was associated with lower job satisfaction, higher levels of cynicism and lower commitment, which again resulted in stronger intention to quit the job. Nevertheless, as there were no full mediation relationships, there was also a direct effect of perception of negative acts on intention to quit the job.

For self-perceived victimization from bullying, cynicism partially mediated the relationship between self-labeling as a victim of bullying and intention to quit the job, indicating that victimized employees become more cynical, which again results in a wish to quit one's job.

Relationships between bullying and restaurant creativity
Significant negative correlations were found between all bullying variables and internal evaluations of creative behavior (Table 3). Furthermore, a significant negative correlation was found between being exposed to bullying behaviors (NAQ) and internal evaluations of change in the restaurant. Thus, when bullying prevails in the restaurants, the employees perceived the creativity and change levels to be low, indicating that bullying is negatively related to creativity.

Results from correlation analyses between bullying variables and external evaluations of restaurant creativity are reported in Table 5. All correlations were negative or near

Table 4. *Logistic regression results for testing whether job satisfaction, commitment and burnout mediated the relationship between bullying and intention to leave the job*

| | | Wald | | | Odds | 95% C.I. for odds ratio | |
Variable	*B*	test	df	*p* <	ratio	Lower	Upper
Position in restaurant (apprentice or other position)	0.87	7.18	1	0.01	0.42	0.22	0.79
Negative acts direct effect	−0.06	11.43	1	0.001	1.06	1.02	1.10
Negative acts effect, controlling for job satisfaction	−0.05	5.60	1	0.05	1.04	1.01	1.09
Position in restaurant (apprentice or other position)	−0.85	6.83	1	0.01	0.43	0.23	0.81
Negative acts direct effect	0.06	11.15	1	0.00	1.06	1.03	1.10
Negative acts effect, controlling for burnout exhaustion	0.06	10.02	1	0.00	1.06	1.02	1.10
Position in restaurant (apprentice or other position)	−0.86	7.00	1	0.01	0.42	0.23	0.80
Negative acts direct effect	0.06	11.30	1	0.001	1.06	1.03	1.10
Negative acts effect, controlling for burnout cynicism	0.05	6.22	1	0.01	1.05	1.01	1.09
Position in restaurant (apprentice or other position)	−0.89	7.46	1	0.01	0.41	0.22	0.78
Negative acts direct effect	0.06	11.08	1	0.001	1.06	1.03	1.10
Negative acts effect, controlling for burnout efficiency	0.06	10.84	1	0.001	1.06	1.02	1.10
Position in restaurant (apprentice or other position)	−0.90	7.51	1	0.01	0.41	0.22	0.78
Negative acts direct effect	0.06	9.60	1	0.001	1.06	1.02	1.10
Negative acts effect, controlling for commitment	0.04	4.11	1	0.05	1.04	1.00	1.08
Position in restaurant (apprentice or other position)	−0.86	7.06	1	0.01	0.43	0.23	0.80
Subjected to bullying direct effect	1.57	6.71	1	0.01	4.79	1.46	15.68
Subjected to bullying effect, controlling for burnout cynicism	1.29	4.56	1	0.05	3.65	1.11	11.95

Table 5. *Spearman's rank correlations between bullying variables and external evaluation of creativity*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5
1. NAQ	–				
2. Observed bullying	0.54**	–			
3. Subjected to bullying	0.38**	0.45**	–		
4. External evaluation of restaurant creative behavior	−0.06	−0.06	−0.04	–	
5. External evaluation of restaurant creative output	−0.03	−0.16	−0.28*	0.74**	–

Note: The dataset was aggregated to the restaurant level (*n* = 39).
* *p* < 0.05, ** *p* < 0.01.

zero, but only the relation between self-labeling as a victim of bullying and external evaluations of restaurant creativity was statistically significant (*r* = −0.28, *p* < 0.05). Thus, there were generally not strong relationships between reported bullying levels in the restaurant and evaluations of restaurant creativity conducted by persons who were external to the restaurant. Yet, when the level of self-labeled victims of bullying was high, the external ratings of creativity were low. Hence, Hypothesis 3a was partially supported.

DISCUSSION

The present study explored the occurrence of bullying in the restaurant sector, and its potential consequences. According to Zapf, Einarsen, Hoel and Vartia (2003), prevalence in studies of self-labeled bullying typically ranges from 1 to 4%, as opposed to 6.9%, observed in the present study. Exposure

to at least one negative act weekly show typically ranges from 3% to 7%, as opposed to 12% in this study. Thus, bullying and negative acts seem to occur more often in restaurants than in other sectors, although some caution is needed when comparing prevalence of bullying, due to differences between studies regarding definitions of bullying, measurement instruments, and time spans of reported bullying.

Apprentices were more exposed to bullying behaviors than were other employees in the restaurants, confirming findings from qualitative studies in restaurants as well as anecdotal evidence. Furthermore, bullying seems to be an overall problem in the sector, not limited to a few luxury restaurants, and is not a necessary condition in the creation of high quality restaurants, which seems to be a prevailing belief among restaurant employees (Johns & Menzel, 1999).

We examined individual and organizational consequences of bullying in the restaurant sector. The results showed a positive association between exposure to bullying behavior and individual burnout. Thus, employees who are exposed to bullying felt more exhausted, were more cynical towards their job, and perceived that they were less efficient as a worker. Furthermore, a negative relationship existed between exposure to bullying behaviors and both job satisfaction and commitment. Although somewhat weaker, similar patterns of relationships were found for observed bullying and for being subjected to bullying. Thus, even though restaurant employees may accept and even expect aggression and harassment at the job, this kind of working condition does have negative individual consequences for both targets and bystanders, independently of whether or not one has self-labeled as a victim, and, in turn, has a

negative impact on the restaurants. Employees who suffer emotional exhaustion show less effort in their work (Parker & Kulik, 1995; Wright & Cropanzano, 1998). Furthermore, negative relationships have been documented between job satisfaction and commitment on the one hand and work effort on the other (Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985; Lee, Carswell & Allen, 2000; Petty *et al.*, 1984).

As turnover rates in the restaurant industry are high, we investigated relationships between bullying and intention to leave the job or the industry. A relationship was found between bullying and intention to leave the job. We then found support for a mediation hypothesis in that bullying may lead to lower job satisfaction and commitment, and elevated levels of burnout, which in turn may lead to an intention to leave the job. Hence, interventions in restaurants may be needed to reduce levels of negative acts and bullying, in order to reduce the problem of turnover in the industry. However, an unexpected finding was that no relationship existed between bullying and intention to leave the *profession*, which may indicate that employees exposed to bullying are not disillusioned to the extent that they want to change profession, believing that better work conditions may exist in other restaurants. Alternatively, restaurant employees may have difficulties in finding jobs in other sectors.

In the introduction of this paper, we argued that creativity is an important aspect of working processes, as well as for outcomes, in many restaurants. We further hypothesized that bullying would have detrimental effects on creativity. To some extent, this hypothesis was supported, although the relationships were generally not strong. Many factors influence creativity in workplaces, including psychosocial work environment, access to central resources, and the creativity level of employees (see Shalley & Gilson, 2004). Consequently, only a moderate to weak association should be expected between bullying and lack of creativity in restaurants. Nevertheless, a strong point of the present study is that a negative relationship existed between external evaluations of creative outputs and levels of perceived victimization of bullying in the restaurant, which strengthens the assumption that bullying is negatively related to creativity in restaurants. Thus, a basic assumption in restaurant cultures that harassment and aggression is necessary in order to achieve creative results is contradicted by this study. To promote creativity, bullying behaviors should be prevented in restaurants, in accordance with numerous studies on creative environments concluding that trust, safety and idea support, recognition and rewards are essential factors for creativity (e.g., Amabile *et al.*, 1996; Anderson & West, 1998; see also Tesluk, Farr & Klein, 1997).

Some caution must be exercised in the interpretation of the results from this study. Given that the data were cross-sectional, strictly speaking, we cannot draw conclusions about causal relationships. Thus, there is a possibility that low job satisfaction, low commitment and high levels of burnout cause high levels of bullying in the restaurant. A reciprocal relationship between the variables may of course also exist in that bullying leads to lower job satisfaction and commitment and higher levels of burnout, which in turn lead to even more bullying behavior. Longitudinal studies should be conducted to attain more knowledge on causal relationships.

The present study was conducted in a Norwegian setting. Cultural differences probably exist between restaurants in different countries. In Norway, there is generally a particularly strong focus on promoting healthy work environments and preventing bullying, which may also influence bullying levels in the restaurant sector. Furthermore, most knowledge of existing working conditions in restaurants is based on restaurants in England, France and the USA. Hence, the levels of bullying may be higher if the sample studied was drawn from any of these cultures. For example, the prevalence of bullying in France and England is generally higher than that normally found in Scandinavian studies (Hoel *et al.*, 2001; Niedhammer, David, Degioanni & 143 occupational physicians, 2007). Therefore, further studies are needed in order to achieve more accurate information about the prevalence of bullying in the restaurant industry across cultures. Whether bullying actually may have beneficial effects in restaurants in other cultures is doubtful, although the issues is still open. In Norway, work environment qualities are thoroughly regulated by the Work Environment Act, and employees may, in general, have an expectation of being treated with dignity and respect. In principle, they may therefore react more negatively to bullying behaviors than in cultures where such expectations do not exist. Yet bullying research in other sectors indicates that this is not the case, as bullying has been found to have grave negative effects across many national cultures (Bowling & Beehr, 2006).

CONCLUSION

Taken together, the results from this study indicate that bullying prevails in the restaurant industry, and that bullying is negatively related to the well-being of both employees and restaurants. The finding that apprentices are exposed to the highest levels of bullying behavior is particularly important, considering that apprentices are in a socialization situation. When exposed to bullying, they may learn that bad treatment is a natural part of the job as an apprentice, and might repeat the behavior towards their own apprentices later in their career. In this way, bullying behavior may be reinforced and institutionalized, which, as illustrated in this study, may lead to negative consequences for both individuals and the restaurant. Possibly, interventions to prevent bullying of both apprentices and other employees would have positive effects on individual well-being, and, in turn, prevent high levels of workforce turnover and increase restaurants' productivity. Finally, given that the results from this study indicate that bullying behavior in restaurants has harmful

effects on both individual employees and the employing restaurant, the time now seems to be right to challenge the general attitude common in this sector, that aggression and bullying is a necessary part of the work environment in this industry.

NOTE

[1] It must be noted that intention to leave was selected as the outcome variable as it is the most consistent single predictor of actual turnover and is easily accessible for empirical investigation in cross-sectional studies (George & Jones, 1996).

REFERENCES

Amabile, T. M., Conti, R., Coon, H., Lazenby, J. & Herron, M. (1996). Assessing the work environment for creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 1154–1184.

Anderson, N. R. & West, M. A. (1998). Measuring climate for work group innovation: Development and validation of the team climate inventory. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, 235–258.

Anon (1994). Lifestyle survey part 1: The painful truth. *Caterer and Hotelkeeper*, 30/06, 60–62.

Ashforth, B. (1994). Petty tyranny in organizations. *Human Relations*, 47, 755–778.

Baron, R. M. & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173–1182.

Bowling, N. A. & Beehr, T. A. (2006). Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: A theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 9, 998–1012.

Brodsky, C. M. (1976). *The harassed worker*. Toronto: Lexington Books, DC Heath & Company.

Crawford, N. (1997). Bullying at work: A psychoanalytic perspective. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 7, 219–225.

Cummings, L. L. (1965). Organizational climates for creativity. *Journal of the Academy of Management*, 3, 220–227.

Dallner, M., Elo, A. L., Gamberale, F., Hottinen, V., Knardahl, S., Lindström, K., Skogstad, A. & Ørhede, E. (2000). *Validation of the General Nordic Questionnaire (QPS Nordic) for Psychological and Social Factors at Work*. Nord, 12. Copenhagen: Nordic Council of Ministers.

Dermody, M. B., Young, M. & Taylor, S. L. (2004). Identifying job motivation factors of restaurant servers: Insight for the development of effective recruitment and retention strategies. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 5, 1–14.

Einarsen, S. (2000). Harassment and bullying at work: A review of the Scandinavian Approach. *Aggression and Violent behavior*, 4, 371–401.

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). London: Taylor & Francis.

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

Einarsen, S. & Mikkelsen, E. G. (2003). Individual effects of exposure to bullying at work. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace. International Perspectives in Research and Practice* (pp. 3–30). London: Taylor & Francis.

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

Einarsen, S. & Skogstad, A. (1996). Prevalence and risk groups of bullying and harassment at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5, 185–202.

Fine, G. A. (1996). *Kitchens: The culture of restaurant work*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

George, J. M. & Jones, G. R. (1996). The experience of work and turnover intentions: Interactive effects of value attainment, job satisfaction, and positive mood. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 318–325.

Hoel, H. (2002). *Bullying at work in Great Britain*. PhD thesis, University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology.

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, 443–466.

Hoel, H. & Einarsen, S. (2003). *A review of violence and stress in the hotel, catering and tourism industry*. Report commissioned by the International Labour Organization (ILO), Geneva.

Hollweg, L. (2001). In the hot seats. *Sunday Times Styles*, 25 November, p. 9.

Hrebiniak, G. & Alutto, J. A. (1972). Personal and role-related factors in the development of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 555–573.

Iaffaldano, M. T. & Muchinsky, P. M. (1985). Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 97, 251–273.

James, L. R., Demaree, R. G. & Wolf, G. (1993). r_{wg}: An assessment of within-group interrater agreement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 306–309.

Johns, N. & Menzel, P. J. (1999). If you can't stand the heat!: Kitchen violence and culinary art. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 18, 99–109.

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

Lee, K., Carswell, J. J. & Allen, N. (2000). A meta-analytic review of occupational commitment: Relations with person- and work-related variables. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 799–811.

Leiter, M. P. & Schaufeli, W. B. (1996). Consistency of the burnout construct across occupations. *Anxiety, Stress and Coping: An International Journal*, 9, 229–243.

Leung, D. Y. P. & Lee, W. W. S. (2006). Predicting intention to quit among Chinese teachers: Differential predictability of the components of burnout. *Anxiety Stress and Coping*, 19, 129–141.

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

Lum, L., Kervin, J., Clark, K., Reid, F. & Sirola, W. (1998). Explaining nursing turnover intent: Job satisfaction, pay satisfaction, or organizational commitment? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19, 305–320.

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B. & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397–422.

Mathieu, J. E. & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis

of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin*, *108*, 171–194.

Niedhammer, I., David, S., Degioanni, S. & 143 Occupational Physicians (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 Archives of Occupational and. Environmental Health*, *80*, 346–353.

Parker, P. A. & Kulik, J. A. (1995). Burnout, self-and supervisor-rater job performance and absenteeism among nurses. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *18*, 581–599.

Petty, M. M., McGee, G. W. & Cavender, J. W. (1984). A meta-analysis of the relationship between individual job satisfaction and individual performance. *Academy of Management Review*, *9*, 712–721.

Pratten, J. D. (2003). The training and retention of chefs. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, *15*, 237–242.

Quine, L. (1999). Workplace bullying in the 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.

Raver, J. A. & Gelfand, M. J. (2005). Beyond the individual victim: Linking sexual harassment, team processes, and team performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, *48*, 387–400.

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*, 425–441.

Savicki, V., Cooley, E. & Gjesvold, J. (2003). Harassment as a predictor of job burnout in correctional officers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *30*, 602–619.

Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P. & Kalimo, R. (1995). *The General Burnout Questionnaire: Cross-national development and validation*. Paper presented at the APA/NIOSH Congress Work, Stress and Health, Creating Healthier Workplaces, Washington, DC.

Scott, S. G. & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, *37*, 580–607.

Scott, K. D. & Taylor, G. S. (1985). An examination of conflicting findings on the relationship between job satisfaction and absenteeism: A meta-analysis. *Academy of Management Journal*, *28*, 599–612.

Shalley, C. E. & Gilson, L. L. (2004). What leaders need to know: A review of social and contextual factors that can foster or hinder creativity. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*, 33–53.

Stebbing, J., Mandalia, S. Portsmouth, S., Leonard, P., Crane, J., Bower, M., Earl, H. & Quine, L. (2004). A questionnaire survey of stress and bullying in doctors undertaking research. *Postgraduate Medical Journal*, *80*, 93–96.

Tesluk, P. E., Farr, J. L. & Klein, S. R. (1997). Influences of organizational culture and climate on individual creativity. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, *31*, 27–41.

Tett, R. P. & Meyer, J. P. (1993). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intention, and turnover: Path analysis based on meta-analytic findings. *Personnel Psychology*, *46*, 259–293.

Tidemann, T. & Mykletun, R. (Eds.) (2005). *Kokkens hverdag: Arbeidsmiljø, trivsel og commitment* (The working day of the cook: working environment, job satisfaction, and commitment). (RBL-report, October 2005), Oslo: Norwegian Association for Tourism.

Weisberg, J. & Sagie, A. (1999). Teachers' physical, mental, and emotional burnout: Impact on intention to quit. *Journal of Psychology*, *133*, 333–339.

Wright, T. A. & Cropanzano, R. (1998). Emotional exhaustion as a predictor of job performance and voluntary turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *83*, 486–493.

Zapf, D., Einarsen, S., Hoel, H. & Vartia, M. (2003). Empirical findings on bullying in the workplace. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in research and practice* (pp. 103–126). London: Taylor & Francis.