



Research Article

The Impact and Dynamics of Psychological Warfare in the Workplace: Understanding Manipulation and Coercion

Abhinandita Chakraborty

Postgraduate Student, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.

Email: abhinandita@student.unimelb.edu.au

ABSTRACT: *Psychological warfare in the workplace involves subtle forms of manipulation and coercion that can have profound effects on individuals, teams, and the overall work environment. This paper investigates various tactics used in organizational settings to undermine confidence, distort reality, and create a toxic atmosphere. Through an exploration of gaslighting techniques, scapegoating, microaggressions, and passive-aggressive behavior, we examine how these tactics impact employee well-being, team dynamics, and organizational culture. The study underscores the importance of recognizing signs of psychological warfare and implementing strategies to mitigate its detrimental effects. Drawing on research and practical insights, we propose education and awareness programs, leadership accountability, and promotion of psychological safety as key approaches for creating a safe and respectful work environment. By fostering a culture where manipulation tactics are recognized, addressed, and prevented, organizations can promote employee well-being, enhance team cohesion, and foster a positive organizational culture.*

KEYWORDS: *Psychological warfare, Manipulation, Coercion, Workplace, Gaslighting, Scapegoating, Microaggressions, Passive-aggressive behavior, Psychological safety, Organizational culture.*

INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary workplace, psychological warfare, often insidious and subtle, manifests in various forms of manipulation and coercion, significantly impacting employee well-being and organizational dynamics. Understanding and addressing these issues are crucial for fostering a healthy work environment conducive to productivity, collaboration, and employee satisfaction. Psychological warfare encompasses a spectrum of tactics aimed at exerting control, inducing fear, and influencing behaviors within the workplace. These tactics may include gaslighting, where individuals are made to doubt their perceptions and reality; scapegoating, where blame is unfairly placed on certain individuals or groups; and microaggressions, subtle but harmful verbal or non-verbal behaviors that convey derogatory messages. Such tactics can erode trust, undermine morale, and contribute to a toxic work culture.

Identifying the signs of psychological warfare requires sensitivity to behavioral patterns, power dynamics, and communication styles within the organization. It often involves recognizing subtle cues such as dismissive language, exclusionary behavior, and disproportionate criticism directed at certain individuals or groups. Additionally, understanding the underlying

motivations behind these behaviors, such as competition for power, insecurity, or unresolved conflicts, can provide valuable insights into addressing the root causes of psychological warfare. Creating a safe and respectful work environment involves implementing strategies that promote transparency, accountability, and mutual respect among employees. This may include establishing clear communication channels, providing avenues for feedback and grievance redressal, and fostering a culture of empathy and support. Training programs on conflict resolution, emotional intelligence, and inclusive leadership can equip employees and managers with the skills needed to navigate complex interpersonal dynamics and diffuse tensions effectively.

Moreover, organizational policies and practices should align with principles of fairness, equity, and ethical conduct. Leaders play a pivotal role in setting the tone for workplace culture by modeling respectful behavior, promoting diversity and inclusion, and addressing instances of psychological warfare promptly and decisively.

SUBTLE FORMS OF MANIPULATION AND COERCION IN THE WORKPLACE

Gaslighting Techniques

Gaslighting, a term derived from the 1944 film "Gaslight," refers to a form of psychological manipulation aimed at making individuals question their perceptions, memories, and sanity. In the workplace, gaslighting can manifest in various subtle ways, exerting significant emotional and psychological tolls on employees (Sarkar, 2020).

Invalidating Experiences and Emotions:

Gaslighters often invalidate the experiences and emotions of their targets, dismissing their concerns as unfounded or exaggerated. This manipulation tactic undermines the victim's confidence and self-esteem, leading to feelings of self-doubt and inadequacy (Simon, 2018). Research suggests that invalidation of emotions can contribute to emotional distress and interpersonal conflicts in the workplace (Rosenberg & Pace, 2006).

Rewriting History and Altering Facts:

Gaslighters may rewrite history or alter facts to suit their narrative, creating a distorted version of reality that serves their interests. This tactic is particularly damaging as it erodes trust and creates confusion among employees, making it difficult for them to discern truth from fiction (Lundberg & Klinth, 2019). Studies have shown that misinformation and manipulation of facts can undermine organizational trust and cohesion (Chen & Hwang, 2019).

Projecting Insecurities and Faults:

Gaslighters often project their insecurities and faults onto others, deflecting attention away from their own shortcomings and creating a scapegoat for workplace issues. By blaming others for their mistakes or shortcomings, gaslighters undermine the credibility and morale of their targets, creating a toxic work environment characterized by fear and anxiety (Dorpat, 1996).

Real-World Examples:

Examples of gaslighting in the workplace include situations where employees are subjected to constant criticism and blame for problems that are beyond their control, or where their achievements are downplayed or appropriated by others (Sarkar, 2020). The cumulative effect

of these manipulative tactics can lead to stress, burnout, and diminished job satisfaction among employees (Schaufeli & Taris, 2014).

Addressing Gaslighting:

Addressing gaslighting requires a multifaceted approach that involves raising awareness, promoting transparency, and fostering a culture of trust and respect in the workplace. Organizations can implement training programs to educate employees about gaslighting behaviors and provide channels for reporting and addressing instances of manipulation (Menzies & Menzies, 2019). Additionally, fostering open communication and encouraging feedback can help create an environment where employees feel empowered to challenge gaslighting tactics and assert their boundaries (Sarkar, 2020).

SCAPEGOATING AND BLAME-SHIFTING IN THE WORKPLACE

Scapegoating and blame-shifting are pervasive phenomena in organizational settings, where individuals or groups are unfairly targeted for mistakes or failures, often to deflect attention from the real issues or responsibilities (Kruglanski *et al.*, 2013).

Identification of Scapegoats

Scapegoating typically occurs when a team or organization faces challenges or setbacks. Instead of addressing the underlying issues, individuals or groups are singled out and held responsible, even if they bear minimal or no culpability for the situation. Scapegoats may be chosen based on factors such as perceived vulnerability, minority status, or lack of power within the organization (Van Vugt *et al.*, 2014).

Psychological Impact

The psychological impact of being scapegoated can be profound and long-lasting. Scapegoats often experience feelings of betrayal, injustice, and helplessness, leading to increased stress, anxiety, and depression (Schlenker & Weigold, 1992). Moreover, being scapegoated can damage one's reputation and credibility within the organization, making it difficult to regain trust and respect from colleagues and supervisors (Castano *et al.*, 2002).

Implications for Employee Well-Being

The scapegoating of individuals or groups can have detrimental effects on employee morale, job satisfaction, and overall well-being. Employees who are unfairly blamed for failures or mistakes may become disengaged, demotivated, and disillusioned with their work (Bartlett & Bartlett, 2011). Furthermore, the pervasive culture of scapegoating can create a toxic work environment characterized by fear, resentment, and mistrust, undermining teamwork and collaboration (Van Dyne *et al.*, 2015).

Addressing Scapegoating

Addressing scapegoating requires a concerted effort to promote accountability, transparency, and fairness in the workplace. Organizations can implement policies and procedures that encourage open communication, constructive feedback, and shared responsibility for outcomes (Parker, 2019). Additionally, fostering a culture of psychological safety, where employees feel empowered to speak up and challenge unfair practices, can help prevent scapegoating and promote a positive work environment (Edmondson, 1999).

MICROAGGRESSIONS AND PASSIVE-AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR IN THE WORKPLACE

Microaggressions and passive-aggressive behaviors are subtle forms of hostility or discrimination that can occur in the workplace, often undermining the well-being and productivity of employees (Sue *et al.*, 2007).

Definition of Microaggressions

Microaggressions are everyday slights, insults, or negative messages directed at marginalized individuals or groups, often based on their race, gender, ethnicity, or other aspects of identity (Sue, 2010). These behaviors may be unintentional or unconscious but can still have significant psychological and emotional impact on recipients.

Examples of Microaggressions

Examples of microaggressions include comments or actions that perpetuate stereotypes, invalidate experiences, or marginalize individuals' identities. These can range from subtle gestures and facial expressions to more overt forms of discrimination, such as exclusion from conversations or opportunities for advancement (Nadal *et al.*, 2014).

Definition of Passive-Aggressive Behavior

Passive-aggressive behavior involves indirect expressions of hostility, resentment, or opposition, often characterized by avoidance, procrastination, or intentional inefficiency (Tafrate & Kassinove, 2002). In the workplace, passive-aggressive behaviors can create tension, conflict, and mistrust among colleagues, hindering collaboration and productivity.

Cumulative Effects of Microaggressions

The cumulative effects of repeated microaggressions can be detrimental to employee morale, engagement, and overall well-being. Research suggests that experiencing frequent microaggressions can lead to feelings of isolation, self-doubt, and diminished self-esteem among targeted individuals (Nadal *et al.*, 2015). Over time, these experiences can contribute to increased stress, burnout, and turnover rates within organizations (Sue *et al.*, 2007).

Addressing Microaggressions and Passive-Aggressive Behavior

Addressing microaggressions and passive-aggressive behavior requires proactive measures to promote awareness, education, and accountability within the workplace. Organizations can implement diversity training programs, bystander intervention strategies, and inclusive policies to prevent and address instances of discrimination and hostility (Cortina *et al.*, 2013). Additionally, fostering a culture of open communication, empathy, and respect can empower employees to speak up against microaggressions and passive-aggressive behaviors, creating a more inclusive and supportive work environment for all.

IMPACT ON INDIVIDUALS, TEAMS, AND WORK ENVIRONMENT

Individual Well-being

The psychological toll of manipulation and coercion on individual employees is profound and multifaceted. Research suggests that individuals subjected to gaslighting, scapegoating, and microaggressions experience heightened levels of stress, anxiety, and self-doubt (Stout, 2007).

Gaslighting, for instance, can erode an individual's sense of reality and self-worth, leading to feelings of confusion, helplessness, and emotional distress (Sarkis, 2018).

Moreover, targeted individuals often experience diminished job satisfaction and increased turnover intentions as a result of ongoing manipulation and coercion. The toxic work environment created by subtle forms of manipulation can undermine morale, motivation, and engagement, ultimately driving talented employees to seek opportunities elsewhere (Tepper *et al.*, 2017). Studies have shown that individuals who perceive themselves as victims of workplace mistreatment are more likely to contemplate quitting their jobs and actively search for alternative employment options (Aryee *et al.*, 2007).

Furthermore, the pervasive effects of psychological warfare extend beyond individual well-being to impact team dynamics and organizational culture. High levels of interpersonal conflict, mistrust, and disengagement can disrupt teamwork, communication, and collaboration, hindering organizational performance and effectiveness (LePine *et al.*, 2005).

Team Dynamics

Psychological warfare in the workplace can have detrimental effects on team cohesion, communication, and collaboration. When individuals within a team experience manipulation or coercion, it can lead to increased tension, reduced trust, and impaired performance. Research indicates that teams subjected to psychological warfare often experience heightened levels of conflict and interpersonal tension (Zhang & Bednall, 2016). Gaslighting, scapegoating, and passive-aggressive behaviors can create a toxic atmosphere where team members feel insecure and mistrustful of one another (Pearson *et al.*, 2015). As a result, communication channels may become strained, inhibiting open dialogue and information sharing essential for effective teamwork (Barsness & Hesterly, 2010).

Moreover, the presence of psychological warfare can erode trust within the team, leading to a breakdown in collaboration and cooperation (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). Team members may become reluctant to share ideas, express concerns, or seek assistance from colleagues, fearing judgment or retaliation (Stout, 2007). This lack of trust can undermine the collective efficacy of the team, impeding its ability to achieve common goals and objectives (Edmondson, 1999).

Furthermore, the performance of teams exposed to psychological warfare may suffer due to diminished morale and motivation among members (Tepper *et al.*, 2007). When individuals feel targeted or undermined, their commitment to team goals may wane, leading to decreased productivity and effectiveness (LePine *et al.*, 2008).

In summary, psychological warfare undermines team dynamics by fostering conflict, eroding trust, and impairing performance, ultimately hindering organizational success and effectiveness.

Organizational Culture

The impact of manipulation and coercion on organizational culture extends far beyond individual interactions, permeating the core values and dynamics of the workplace environment. The erosion of trust, transparency, and ethical standards can have profound implications for employee engagement, innovation, and the long-term success of the organization. Manipulation and coercion breed a culture of distrust within the organization, where employees become wary of their colleagues and superiors (Brown, 2018). This lack of

trust undermines collaboration, stifles communication, and creates an environment where individuals are reluctant to share ideas or voice concerns openly (Schein, 2010). Consequently, innovation and creativity suffer as employees feel constrained by fear of reprisal or marginalization (Eisenberger *et al.*, 2010).

Moreover, the erosion of transparency and ethical standards compromises the integrity of organizational processes and decision-making (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). When employees perceive that leaders prioritize personal interests or engage in unethical behavior, it undermines their confidence in the organization's values and mission (Treviño *et al.*, 2014). This disillusionment can lead to decreased motivation, disengagement, and ultimately, decreased productivity (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017).

Furthermore, the negative impact of manipulation and coercion on organizational culture reverberates in the long term, affecting recruitment, retention, and organizational reputation (Robbins & Judge, 2019). High-performing employees are more likely to seek opportunities elsewhere if they feel undervalued or marginalized, leading to talent drain and increased turnover rates (Denison, 1996). Additionally, the erosion of trust and integrity tarnishes the organization's brand image, making it less attractive to prospective employees, clients, and investors.

In summary, the insidious effects of manipulation and coercion on organizational culture undermine employee engagement, inhibit innovation, and threaten the long-term viability of the organization. Addressing these issues requires a concerted effort to promote transparency, accountability, and ethical leadership at all levels of the organization.

STRATEGIES FOR CREATING A SAFE WORK ENVIRONMENT

Education and Awareness

Creating a safe work environment through education and awareness involves advocating for training programs and workshops to raise awareness about manipulation tactics and their impact (Detert & Burris, 2016). Comprehensive training programs should cover various aspects of manipulation tactics, including gaslighting, scapegoating, microaggressions, and passive-aggressive behavior (Edmondson, 2018). These sessions should delve into the psychological mechanisms behind these tactics, their effects on individuals and teams, and strategies for identifying and addressing them effectively (Edmondson, 1999). Interactive workshops, case studies, and role-playing exercises can help employees understand the nuances of psychological warfare in the workplace (Eisenberger *et al.*, 2001).

Beyond formal training, ongoing awareness-building initiatives are essential. Utilize internal communication channels such as newsletters, intranet portals, and team meetings to disseminate information about manipulation tactics (Detert & Burris, 2016). Provide examples, testimonials, and expert insights to illustrate how these behaviors manifest in the workplace and their detrimental effects on employee well-being and organizational culture (Baumeister & Leary, 1995).

Encourage employees to actively engage in recognizing and addressing manipulation tactics. Foster a culture where speaking up against toxic behaviors is not only encouraged but also celebrated (Edmondson, 2018). Provide forums for open dialogue and feedback, ensuring that

employees feel empowered to voice their concerns without fear of retribution or marginalization (Detert & Burris, 2016).

Leadership should actively participate in and endorse these initiatives. Senior leaders should set the tone by attending training sessions, communicating the importance of creating a psychologically safe work environment, and demonstrating zero tolerance for manipulation tactics (Edmondson, 2018). When employees see leadership commitment, they are more likely to engage and take these matters seriously (Eisenberger *et al.*, 2001).

Promoting Psychological Safety

Emphasizing the importance of creating a culture of psychological safety within the workplace is crucial for fostering an environment where employees feel empowered to express concerns and seek support without fear of retaliation or judgment (Edmondson, 1999). Psychological safety entails creating a climate where individuals feel comfortable taking interpersonal risks, sharing their perspectives, and admitting mistakes without the fear of negative consequences (Kahn, 1990).

Leadership plays a critical role in promoting psychological safety by modeling open communication, active listening, and vulnerability (Edmondson, 2018). Managers and supervisors should encourage candid feedback, acknowledge the validity of diverse viewpoints, and demonstrate empathy and understanding in their interactions with employees (Newman *et al.*, 2017). By creating opportunities for dialogue and collaboration, leaders foster a sense of trust and mutual respect that underpins psychological safety within teams and across the organization (Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009).

Furthermore, providing accessible resources for reporting instances of manipulation and coercion confidentially is essential for ensuring that employees feel supported and heard (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Establishing channels for anonymous reporting, such as hotlines or online platforms, allows employees to raise concerns without the fear of reprisal and enables organizations to investigate and address issues promptly (Eisenberger *et al.*, 2001).

By promoting psychological safety and providing avenues for confidential reporting, organizations demonstrate their commitment to fostering a culture of transparency, accountability, and well-being for all employees (Detert & Burris, 2016).

Leadership Accountability

The pivotal role of leadership in promoting a safe and respectful work environment cannot be overstated. Leaders are responsible for setting clear expectations, modeling respectful behavior, and holding perpetrators of manipulation and coercion accountable for their actions (Einarsen *et al.*, 2007). By establishing a culture of accountability, leaders send a powerful message that toxic behaviors will not be tolerated and that employee well-being is a top priority. Leadership accountability begins with the establishment of clear policies and procedures that outline expected standards of conduct and consequences for violating organizational norms (Robinson *et al.*, 2013). Leaders must communicate these expectations regularly and ensure that employees understand their rights and avenues for recourse in the event of misconduct (Hershcovis *et al.*, 2007).

Moreover, leaders must lead by example by demonstrating integrity, empathy, and fairness in their interactions with employees (Schaubroeck *et al.*, 2012). They should actively listen to

employee concerns, validate their experiences, and take swift and decisive action to address issues of manipulation and coercion (Tepper *et al.*, 2007). This proactive approach not only prevents the escalation of toxic behaviors but also fosters trust and confidence in leadership (Leiter & Maslach, 2011).

Leadership accountability also entails providing support and resources for employees who have been affected by manipulation or coercion (Glomb *et al.*, 2011). This may involve offering counseling services, facilitating conflict resolution processes, or implementing targeted interventions to address systemic issues within the organization (Pinder & Harlos, 2001).

By prioritizing employee well-being and intervening proactively to address toxic workplace dynamics, leaders demonstrate their commitment to creating a culture of respect, trust, and psychological safety for all members of the organization (Hauge *et al.*, 2009).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the discussion underscores the pervasive nature and detrimental impact of psychological warfare in the workplace. Through an exploration of manipulation tactics such as gaslighting, scapegoating, microaggressions, and passive-aggressive behavior, it becomes evident that these subtle forms of coercion erode trust, undermine morale, and create a toxic work environment. The psychological toll on individuals, teams, and organizational culture cannot be overstated, as stress, anxiety, diminished job satisfaction, and increased turnover intentions become commonplace. The urgency of addressing psychological warfare in the workplace cannot be ignored. It requires collective action, from individual employees to organizational leaders, to create a culture of respect, trust, and psychological safety. Education and awareness programs, coupled with leadership accountability and support mechanisms, are essential in combating toxic behaviors and fostering a healthy work environment (Pinder & Harlos, 2001). By prioritizing employee well-being and intervening proactively to address workplace dynamics, organizations can cultivate a culture of inclusivity, fairness, and mutual respect (Hauge *et al.*, 2009).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author appreciates all their family members, friends, and colleagues who supported writing this review article and helped facilitate the process.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aryee, S., Sun, L. Y., Chen, Z. X., & Debrah, Y. A. (2007). Antecedents and outcomes of abusive supervision: Test of a trickle-down model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 191-201.
- [2] Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273-285.
- [3] Barsness, Z. I., & Hesterly, W. S. (2010). The antecedents and performance consequences of relational insecurity: Evidence from CEO turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(1), 103-120.
- [4] Bartlett, D., & Bartlett, C. (2011). How scapegoating is toxic in organizations. *Strategy & Leadership*, 39(3), 5-11.
- [5] Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497-529.
- [6] Brown, M. E. (2018). Leading morally: Challenges for ethical leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 47(2), 118-126.

- [7] Cameron, K. S., & Quinn, R. E. (2011). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [8] Cortina, L. M., Kabat-Farr, D., Leskinen, E. A., Huerta, M., & Magley, V. J. (2013). Selective incivility as modern discrimination in organizations: Evidence and impact. *Journal of Management*, 39(6), 1579-1605.
- [9] Denison, D. R. (1996). What is the difference between organizational culture and organizational climate? A native's point of view on a decade of paradigm wars. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(3), 619-654.
- [10] Detert, J. R., & Burris, E. R. (2016). Can your employees really speak freely? *Harvard Business Review*, 94(1), 80-87.
- [11] Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 611-628.
- [12] Dorpat, T. L. (1996). *Gaslighting, the Double Whammy, Interrogation, and Other Methods of Covert Control in Psychotherapy and Analysis*. Jason Aronson.
- [13] Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350-383.
- [14] Edmondson, A. (2018). *The fearless organization: Creating psychological safety in the workplace for learning, innovation, and growth*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [15] Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350-383.
- [16] Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (2001). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(5), 874-883.
- [17] Eisenberger, R., Stinglhamber, F., Vandenberghe, C., Sucharski, I. L., & Rhoades, L. (2010). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(1), 122-131.
- [18] Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. (2011). *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice*. CRC Press.
- [19] Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (2003). *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in research and practice*. Taylor & Francis.
- [20] Glomb, T. M., Liao, H., & Duffy, M. K. (2011). Understanding the psychology of workplace aggression: Insights from organizational justice, research justice, and social influence. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 245-271). American Psychological Association.
- [21] Hauge, L. J., Skogstad, A., & Einarsen, S. (2009). Individual and situational predictors of workplace bullying: Why do perpetrators engage in the bullying of others? *Work & Stress*, 23(4), 349-358.
- [22] Hershcovis, M. S., Turner, N., Barling, J., Arnold, K. A., Dupré, K. E., Inness, M., ... & Sivanathan, N. (2007). Predicting workplace aggression: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 228-238.
- [23] Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
- [24] Kruglanski, A. W., Chernikova, M., Rosenzweig, E., Kopetz, C., & Zakletskaia, L. (2013). On motivational readiness to support or challenge the status quo: The role of regulatory focus. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 43(5), 303-313.
- [25] Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2011). *Banishing burnout: Six strategies for improving your relationship with work*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [26] LePine, J. A., Piccolo, R. F., Jackson, C. L., Mathieu, J. E., & Saul, J. R. (2008). A meta-analysis of teamwork processes: Tests of a multidimensional model and relationships with team effectiveness criteria. *Personnel Psychology*, 61(2), 273-307.

- [27] Lundberg, C., & Klinth, R. (2019). The consequences of managerial gaslighting on employee trust and engagement. *International Journal of Business Communication*, 56(4), 477-497.
- [28] Lutgen-Sandvik, P., Tracy, S. J., & Alberts, J. K. (2007). Burned by bullying in the American workplace: Prevalence, perception, degree and impact. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44(6), 837-862.
- [29] Menzies, R. E., & Menzies, R. G. (2019). The challenge of psychotherapy for post-traumatic stress disorder and complex post-traumatic stress disorder following military sexual trauma: A case study report of client-centred therapy with a transgender survivor. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, 10(1), 1611095.
- [30] Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2009). *The Bully at Work: What You Can Do to Stop the Hurt and Reclaim Your Dignity on the Job*. Sourcebooks, Inc.
- [31] Newman, A., Donohue, R., & Eva, N. (2017). Psychological safety: A systematic review of the literature. *Human Resource Management Review*, 27(3), 521-535.
- [32] Pinder, C. C., & Harlos, K. P. (2001). Employee silence: Quiescence and acquiescence as responses to perceived injustice. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 20(1), 331-369.
- [33] Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Wegner, J. W. (2015). When workers flout convention: A study of workplace incivility. *Human Relations*, 68(8), 1383-1406.
- [34] Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). *Organizational behavior* (18th ed.). Pearson.
- [35] Robinson, S. L., O'Reilly, J., & Wang, W. (2013). Invisible at work: An integrated model of workplace ostracism. *Journal of Management*, 39(1), 203-231.
- [36] Rosenberg, M., & Pace, R. (2006). Emotionally intelligent workplace facilitation: A model and its application. *Management Decision*, 44(10), 1319-1336.
- [37] Sarkar, J. (2020). Gaslighting: A study of its effects on organizational behavior. *Journal of Management Research*, 20(3), 317-333.
- [38] Sarkis, S. (2018). *Gaslighting: Recognize Manipulative and Emotionally Abusive People--and Break Free*. Da Capo Lifelong Books.
- [39] Schaufeli, W. B., & Taris, T. W. (2014). A critical review of the job demands-resources model: Implications for improving work and health. In *Bridging occupational, organizational and public health* (pp. 43-68). Springer.
- [40] Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
- [41] Schlenker, B. R., & Weigold, M. F. (1992). Interpersonal processes involving impression regulation and management. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 43(1), 133-168.
- [42] Stout, M. (2007). *The Sociopath Next Door: The Ruthless Versus the Rest of Us*. Broadway Books.
- [43] Sue, D. W. (2010). *Microaggressions in everyday life: Race, gender, and sexual orientation*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [44] Sue, D. W., Capodilupo, C. M., Torino, G. C., Bucceri, J. M., Holder, A. M., Nadal, K. L., & Esquilin, M. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical practice. *American Psychologist*, 62(4), 271-286.
- [45] Tafrate, R. C., & Kassinove, H. (2002). Anger episodes in high and low trait anger community adults. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 58(12), 1573-1590.
- [46] Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., Henle, C. A., & Lambert, L. S. (2007). Procedural justice, victim precipitation, and abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(1), 101-123.
- [47] Tepper, B. J., Moss, S. E., Lockhart, D. E., & Carr, J. C. (2007). Abusive supervision, upward maintenance communication, and subordinates' psychological distress. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(5), 1169-1180.
- [48] Tepper, B. J., Moss, S. E., Lockhart, D. E., & Carr, J. C. (2007). Abusive supervision, upward maintenance communication, and subordinates' psychological distress. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50(5), 1169-1180.

- [49] Treviño, L. K., Weaver, G. R., & Reynolds, S. J. (2014). Behavioral ethics in organizations: A review. *Journal of Management*, 40(1), 123-152.
- [50] Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L. L., & Parks, J. M. (2015). Extra-role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity (a bridge over muddied waters). *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 35, 41-60.
- [51] Van Vugt, M., De Cremer, D., & Janssen, D. P. (2007). Gender differences in cooperation and competition: The male-warrior hypothesis. *Psychological Science*, 18(1), 19-23.
- [52] Walumbwa, F. O., & Schaubroeck, J. (2009). Leader personality traits and employee voice behavior: Mediating roles of ethical leadership and work group psychological safety. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(5), 1275-1286.
- [53] Zhang, M., & Bednall, T. C. (2016). Antecedents and outcomes of workplace bullying: A meta-analytic test of integrated stressor-strain model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(4), 488-510.



This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons NC-SA 4.0 License Attribution—unrestricted use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, for any purpose non-commercially. This allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as the author is credited and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms. For any query contact: research@ciir.in