

“Mimetic desire and mirror neurons: the consciousness of workplace bullying”

Christian Lebreton  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5272-5877>

 <http://www.researcherid.com/rid/C-5218-2017>

Damien Richard  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8353-542X>

 <http://www.researcherid.com/rid/X-5946-2018>

Helene Cristini  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5770-9075>

 <http://www.researcherid.com/rid/X-8188-2018>

AUTHORS

ARTICLE INFO

Christian Lebreton, Damien Richard and Helene Cristini (2019). Mimetic desire and mirror neurons: the consciousness of workplace bullying. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 17(1), 103-116. doi:[10.21511/ppm.17\(1\).2019.10](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.17(1).2019.10)

DOI

[http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.17\(1\).2019.10](http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.17(1).2019.10)

RELEASED ON

Thursday, 21 February 2019

RECEIVED ON

Tuesday, 11 December 2018

ACCEPTED ON

Wednesday, 06 February 2019

LICENSE



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

JOURNAL

"Problems and Perspectives in Management"

ISSN PRINT

1727-7051

ISSN ONLINE

1810-5467

PUBLISHER

LLC "Consulting Publishing Company "Business Perspectives"

FOUNDER

LLC "Consulting Publishing Company "Business Perspectives"



NUMBER OF REFERENCES

81



NUMBER OF FIGURES

3



NUMBER OF TABLES

3

© The author(s) 2025. This publication is an open access article.



BUSINESS PERSPECTIVES



LLC "CPC "Business Perspectives"
Hryhorii Skovoroda lane, 10, Sumy,
40022, Ukraine

www.businessperspectives.org

Received on: 11th of December, 2018

Accepted on: 6th of February, 2019

© Christian Lebreton, Damien
Richard, Hélène Cristini, 2019

Christian Lebreton, Doctoral
Candidate, International University
of Monaco, Monaco.

Damien Richard, Assistant Professor,
INSEEC School of Business and
Economics, 25 rue de l'Université
Lyon, France.

Hélène Cristini, Associate Professor,
International University of Monaco,
Monaco.



This is an Open Access article,
distributed under the terms of the
[Creative Commons Attribution 4.0
International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits
unrestricted re-use, distribution,
and reproduction in any medium,
provided the original work is properly
cited.

Christian Lebreton (Monaco), Damien Richard (France), Hélène Cristini (Monaco)

MIMETIC DESIRE AND MIRROR NEURONS: THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF WORKPLACE BULLYING

Abstract

Workplace bullying is important to business and government, because it has a real impact on unfortunate casualties' wellbeing and organizations' benefits. Studies into the causes and outcomes of workplace bullying with a focus on the key psychodynamic factors underlying harassment and the subsequent results are rare. This paper applies René Girard's mimetic desire theory to clarify the elements and non-cognizant components associated with "interindividual" connections prompting aggression for the victim by the harasser. The disclosure of mirror neurons affirms that mimetic desire grows unwittingly through a mediator of the mimetic brain. Mimetic desire theory helps to recognize and understand that the destructive patterns of behavior and emotional responses to situations leading to moral harassment is a direct consequence of the mimetic rivalry between the bully and the victim. The unconscious mechanism is then brought up to the consciousness. The bully and the victim can avoid becoming entrapped within dysfunctional and toxic relationships such as bullying. The use of the mimetic desire concepts also enables human resources managers, bystanders, and practitioners to better deal with protagonists. This can help minimize or eliminate workplace bullying.

Keywords

workplace bullying, mimetic desire theory, mirror
neurons, René Girard

JEL Classification

M14, M54, Z1, Z22

INTRODUCTION

The SUMMER survey (medical surveillance of exposures to occupational risks) was based on 47,983 interviewees and showed that violence at work between 2003 and 2010 grew in terms of hostile behavior (+6%), scornful behavior (+5%), denial of recognition of work (+3%), and degrading attacks (+1%) (DARES, 2012, p. 6). Workplace bullying (WPB) is an important consideration because of its serious consequences for victims' mental and physical health (Nielsen & Einarsen, 2012; Hirigoyen, 2016) and for companies' profits (Sheehan, McCarthy, Barker, & Henderson, 2001).

Any workplace situation including WPB that alters the physical, mental, and social well-being of employees must be avoided (Glendinning, 2001) or at least be terminated in the early stages regardless of their causes (Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2009). Thus, Vveinhardt (2015) proposed a customized questionnaire for the timely diagnosis of such phenomena in the early stages.

Since the pioneering work of Leyman (1990), the WPB has received increasing scholarly attention. A large body of research has scrutinized the negative and severe outcomes of WPB on victims and society at large (Branch, Ramsay, & Barker, 2013; Einarsen & Nielsen,

2015; Nielsen & Einarsen, 2012; Pihl, Albertsen, Hogh, & Andersen, 2017; Samnani & Singh, 2012). Empirical research has focused on the behavior of the harasser, the consequences for the victim, the identification of hazard factors related to harassment, the personality of the bullied person, and the group dynamic characteristics of the organization (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2011; Faulx, Delvaux, & Brun, 2009). As noted by Faulx et al. (2009), the current status of logical learning of WPB portrays the primary appearances of harassment and, to a specific degree, an inventory of the conditions under which there is a possibility that WPB will occur. By only looking at WPB prevalence, antecedent or outcome, the community has not yet scrutinized what Faulx (2007) calls the “blind box” of harassment: the deep understanding of the psychological mechanisms at work between the bully and the victim.

Robinson (2008) imagines bullying as a dynamic procedure that unfurls in a constellation of exchange relationship with suggestions for the business relationship overall. Faulx et al. (2009) suggest a lack of understanding of the psychodynamic processes in place during these situations. Parzefall and Salin (2010) affirm that constrained endeavors have been made to comprehend the procedure through which workplace bullying develops and converts into negative responses from the victims and, most importantly, from bystanders. The lack of studies examining the underlying mechanism that explains the antecedent-WPB-outcome relationship motivates this study.

Only a few theories of workplace bullying are available to look inside the “blind box”. Rai and Agarwal (2016) point out the shortcomings of existing WPB literature concerning its conceptual clarity, process, theoretical underpinning and underlying mechanisms. They suggest focusing on the theoretical underpinnings of WPB.

The research questions below are posed in the context of WPB situations between manager/employee and/or between peers with an unbalanced power between the bully(ies) and the employee(s):

- RQ1: Is there a general theory applicable to all human beings regardless of the social or cultural context that could simultaneously explain:
 - 1) why the bully starts to attack his targeted victim?
 - 2) why and how does the employee become a victim?
 - 3) why and how is harassment a process whose violence increases over time?
- RQ2: Does this theory make it possible to analyze and understand concurrently the evolving behaviors and reactions of the bully and the victim?

This paper presents a theoretical model for the study of WPB based on the mimetic desire theory (MDT) of René Girard (Girard, 1965). Existing literature on theories of WPB is analyzed followed by a description and scientific empirical validation of the mimetic theory as a new tool to better understand the origins and the process of WPB at the interpersonal level. The expected results and outcome are then discussed. We compare our findings to the results obtained by other researchers. The MDT is proposed as a mean for consciousness improvement for the victim, bully, as well as bystanders, management, HR managers and practitioners.

1. LITERATURE ON WPB THEORIES

The theories can be classified into three groups: the group of applicable theories on “Antecedent-Bullying Relationship”, the group of applicable theories on “Bullying-Outcome Relationship”, and the group of applicable theories on “Bullying Antecedent and Outcome Relationship”.

1.1. The four Antecedent-Bullying Relationship theories (Table 1)

The Job Demand-Control Model (Karasek, 1979) concluded that high job demand associated with low job control creates a negative working environment favorable to WPB genesis (Baillien, De Cuyper, & De Witte, 2011; Baillien & De Witte, 2009a; Francioli et al., 2016; Goodboy, Martin, Knight, & Long, 2017; Notelaers, Baillien, De Witte, Einarsen, & Vermunt, 2013). A negative management style has a direct negative link with WPB in light of the Dual Concern Theory of De Dreu, Van Dierendonck, and Dijkstra (2004) applied by Baillien, Rodriguez-Munoz, De Witte, Notelaers, and Moreno-Jimenez (2011) and Baillien, De Cuyper, and Witte (2011). The Job Demand Resource Model of Bakker and Demerouti (2007) was applied to WPB by Broeck, Baillien, and Witte (2011) who show that work requests relate positively – and work resources relate negatively – to work-related strain. This prompts workers’ feeling of WPB in line with the Work-Environment Hypothesis of Leymann and Gustafsson (1996).

The causes of WPB are not found in the target’s psychological profile, but rather as a consequence of organizational factors (Agervold & Mikkelsen, 2004; Balducci, Fraccaroli, & Schaufeli, 2011; Einarsen, Raknes, & Matthiesen, 1994; Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen, 2007). Nielsen, Glasø and Einarsen (2017) underline the genuine greatness of the connections among harassment and targets’ identity. They performed a meta-analysis of the quantitative data with the Big Five personality traits. The outcomes identify identity characteristics that correspond to workplace bullying in line with prior findings from practitioners such as White (2004).

1.2. The four Bullying-Outcome Relationship theories (Table 2)

In the Social Exchange Theory (SET) (Blau, 1964), WPB negatively affects the victims; their consequent behavior is then detrimental to the organization or to the management (Djurkovic, McCormack, & Casimir, 2008; Parzefall & Salin, 2010). The Conservation of Resource Theory (COR) of Hobfoll (1989, 2001) explains bullying situations where the victim loses resources and attempts to protect his remaining resources and even tries to enhance his resources (Lee & Brotheridge, 2006; Tuckey & Neall, 2014; Wheeler, Halbesleben, & Shanine, 2010). The Affective Events Theory (AET) of Weiss and Cropanzano (1996) demonstrates that the work environment influences the employees’ attitudes and behaviors via affective ways (Branch et al., 2013; Glasø, Bele, Nielsen, & Einarsen, 2011; Glasø & Notelaers, 2012; Glasø,

Table 1. Theories of WPB: the four Antecedent-Bullying Relationship theories

Theories	Outcome	Studies	Answer RQ1	Answer RQ2
Job Demand-Control Model: Karasek (1979)	High job demand associated with low job control creates a negative working environment favorable to WPB genesis	Baillien and De Witte (2009), Baillien, De Cuyper, and De Witte (2011), Notelaers, Baillien, De Witte, Einarsen, and Vermunt (2013), Francioli et al. (2016), Goodboy, Martin, Knight, and Long (2017)	No	No
Dual Concern Theory: De Dreu, Van Dierendonck, and Dijkstra (2004)	Negative management style has a direct negative link with WPB	Baillien, Rodriguez-Munoz, De Witte, Notelaers, and Moreno-Jimenez (2011), Baillien, De Cuyper, and Witte (2011)	No	No
Work-Environment Hypothesis: Leymann (1996)	Consequences of WPB are not found in the target’s psychological profile, but rather as a consequence of the organizational factor	Einarsen, Raknes, and Matthiesen (1994), Agervold and Mikkelsen (2004), Johan Hauge, Skogstad, and Einarsen (2007), Balducci, Fraccaroli, and Schaufeli (2011)	No	No
Five Factor Model (FFM): McCrae and Costa (1987)	The discoveries give proof to identity attributes that correlate exposure to workplace bullying	Nielsen et al. (2017)	No	No

Table 2. Theories of WPB: the four Bullying-Outcome Relationship theories

Theories	Outcome	Studies	Answer RQ1	Answer RQ2
Social Exchange Theory (1964)	Bullied employees withhold their behaviors or attitudes beneficial for the supervisors or organizations. Whereas POS (Personal Organization Support) will enhance their perceived ability to cope with bullying	Djurkovic, McCormack, and Casimir (2008), Parzefall and Salin (2010)	No	No
Conservation of Resource Theory: Hobfoll (2001)	Bullying leads to a loss of resources and is an attempt to prevent further resource loss – employees may withdraw themselves from the behaviors that are resource-consuming. This may involve behaviors that are resource-enhancing	Lee and Brotheridge (2006), Wheeler, Halbesleben, and Shanine (2010), Tuckey and Neall (2014)	No	No
Cognitive Activation Theory of Stress: Ursin and Eriksen (2004)	Drawn out span of harassing knowledge forms into rehashed and ceaseless subjective attestation that could prompt hindered wellbeing and health	Moreno-Jimenez et al. (2009), Nielsen and Einarsen (2012), Vie, Glasø, and Einarsen (2012), Magee et al. (2015)	No	No

Vie, Holmdal, & Einarsen, 2010). The Cognitive Activation Theory of Stress (CATS) (Ursin & Eriksen, 2004) addresses the way in which a human can cope with different forms of stress; CATS proposes that continued arousal comprises a potential wellbeing hazard – WPB is one of them. Indeed, WPB evolves through cognitive activation into impaired health and wellbeing (Magee et al., 2015; Moreno-Jiménez, Rodríguez-Muñoz, Pastor, Sanz-Vergel, & Garrosa, 2009; Nielsen & Einarsen, 2012; Vie, Glasø, & Einarsen, 2012).

The antecedents and outcomes of WPB are well explored and documented through both the Antecedent-Bullying Relationship and the Bullying-Outcome Relationship theories. Rai and Agarwal (2016) note that the mechanisms generating WPB consequences, as well as moderators/mediators that can alleviate/aggravate the ante-

cedent-bullying-outcome relationship, are not fully explored.

1.3. The three Bullying Antecedent Outcome Relationship theories (Table 3)

Faulx et al. (2009) proposed a Processual, Integrative, and Dynamic Approach. These address situations of workplace bullying in all their diversity and complexity by not defining the harassment relationship as only a strict victimization of one person against another. Faulx et al. (2009) have some definite strengths in explaining how harassment occurs at work between the bully and the victim. They identified four different and innovative levels (personal, interpersonal, group, and organizational) of psychological harassment along with the dynamic interactions be-

Table 3. Theories of WPB: the three Bullying Antecedent Outcome Relationship theories

Theories	Outcome	Studies	Answer RQ1	Answer RQ2
Processual, Integrative, and Dynamic Approach	Depict the unpredictability of circumstances of WPB. Mirror the manner in which the distinctive procedures entwine and the manner in which forms including the association, the gathering, and the people affect the connection between the victim and the assumed harasser. Goes for depicting the association among victimization and struggle forms including a request to portray how they all collaborate with one another	Faulx et al. (2009)	No	No
Grounded Theory Approach	Offers voice to the unfortunate employee viewpoint of workplace bullying and builds a model dependent on their encounters. Recognizes 1) the precursors, bullying practices, results, and self-adapting techniques embraced by the victims, 2) the connection between POS, organizational commitment, and turnover expectation of the victims of working environment harassment	Ciby and Raya (2014)	No	No
Life Cycle Theory of Bullying	Concentrate the psychodynamic point of view of workplace bullying in light of two related psychoanalytical ideas: containment and boundaries. Depicts both inside and outside of the advancing connection between a bully and an injured individual. Proposals are made for restorative change	White (2004)	Partly	Partly




Figure 1. The “blind box” (adapted from Faulx (2007))

tween these different processes. However, the explanations for psychological harassment are still fragmented and compartmentalized. Ciby and Raya (2014) explore the victim’s experience and feelings from an interpretive perspective. Their analysis of qualitative interviews with victims using a Grounded Theory Approach led to an applied model that clarifies the precursors, bullying behaviors, consequences and self-coping tactics of the victims. White (2004) scrutinized the psychodynamic perspective of workplace bullying in an interpretivist approach. The Life Cycle Theory can explore the origins, as well as the evolvement, of toxic relationships between the bully and the bullied.

None of the above theories answer the research questions posed above. A clear vision *Teoria* explaining why harassment occurs besides the usual scapegoat reasoning is missing. It is clear that none of the existing WPB theories can look inside the “blind box” (Figure 1).

An explanation via the underlying unconscious brain mechanisms is still lacking. The encompassing psychological phenomenon fails to uncover the internal and deepest motivations of a bully to harass his or her victim and for the victim to fall into the victimization process.

One exception is the Life Cycle Theory of Bullying, which explores a psychodynamic perspective of workplace bullying. The emotional responses are clues that can explain the unconscious processes that occur within interpersonal relationships. This hypothesis appears top to bottom and explains how the connection between the harasser and the victims develops towards viciousness when people move towards becoming holders of one another’s sentiments (White, 2004). Life Cycle Theory based

on Freud’s theory is a useful tool to answer Research Questions 1 and 2; however, it does have three limitations:

- 1) its practice is reserved to highly trained psychoanalysts;
- 2) Freud’s theory is based on the individual unconscious and is limited to object desire and sexual motivation. It may not be the best tool to understand a non-neurotic person who habitually courts disaster. The concept of imitation is present in Freud’s theory. He does not recognize mimetism, because his vision focuses on psychologism and pansexualism. Psychoanalysis is willing to recognize that human beings are autonomous; thus, every desire is object-oriented. Freud explains the jealousy of the child towards the father via the Oedipal complex: The child has an innate sexual desire towards his mother, and his father is an obstacle to satisfy this desire. Girard claims that this rivalry has nothing to do with sexual desire. The rivalry takes his roots in the imitation by the son of the father’s sexual desire for the mother. The child’s desire is a desire of imitation of the father’s desire and is not a desire for the object (the mother). The father then becomes his model/rival;
- 3) the two sources of desire for the mother according to Freud are identifications with the father and libido directed towards the mother. Freud almost ignores the first source. In doing this, Freud removes the relationship between the Oedipus complex and mimesis. Cowdell (2013, p. 51) notes: “Freud’s theory is surpassed – effectively made redundant – by Girard’s account of mimesis, of desire according to the desire of another, and of sexuality under mimetic control”.

2. THE MIMETIC THEORY

“In Leif’s case, the real reason was envy over his wages”. Here, Leymann (1990, p. 121) identifies the link between mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces: envy (in the sense of being envious of...). Envy is a synonym of desire in the situational context of WPB. Jealousy is caused by the fear of losing someone or something to which an individual is attached or that another individual possesses. Envy is a resentment caused by another person with something that the affected individual does not possess but desires. It is actually two opposing passions: the envy of coveting the good of a rival and the jealousy of not wanting to share or lose that good. Thanks to the work of Leymann (1990, 1992, 1996), Leymann and Gustafsson (1996), Zapf and Leymann (1996), there is a consensus on the fact that envy, desire, and jealousy form the three pillars of WPB. Nevertheless, a question remains: What is the link between these feelings and mimetic desire?

The French anthropologist René Girard (1965) proposed an interesting hypothesis of human culture called Mimetic Desire Theory (MDT). Girard hypothesizes that desire is constantly mimetic, i.e., duplicated, propelled, created, proposed and generated by the other person’s desire. Mimetic desire starts from the minute that one mimics a person’s

desire for an object. Following Girard’s MDT hypothesis, desire is constitutive of oneself. To separate desire from instinct, we should include imitation and, in this manner, create the mimetic desire that makes us human. Mimetic want enables us to learn and to adjust to our way of life. Desire and learning are indivisible (Girard, de Castro Rocha, & Antonello, 2007). In Girard’s MDT, desire is “triangular” and drastically unstable: the subject (envious), the mediator-model (jealousy), and an object (Figure 2).

The mediator can turn into a rival by blocking (or seeming to obstruct) the subject’s access to the object. The MDT uncovers the connection between desire and the imitation of the core of human conduct. The hypothesis groups mimetic desire as the principle wellspring of forcefulness and viciousness describing people (Girard, Oughourlian, & Lefort, 1978, p. 9). It safeguards the postulation of a person’s desire for the desire of another individual (Girard & Chantre, 2007, p. 72). It determines desire as an imitation of the desire of the other; desire is proportionate to the alternate. Through this appropriation, desire modulates the other’s own being and foreseen qualities (Girard, 1965). The attributes of human connections are in this way a corresponding apportionment of an “ontological” nature (“all desire is a desire to be”), which, on a fundamental level, cannot achieve its goal.




Figure 2. Triangle of the mimetic desire

Identity is not the issue of a conceivable complementary acknowledgment, but rather is the plain impetus of a deadlock struggle (Girard et al., 2007). Following MDT, the difficulty of fulfilling the desire of the protagonists can radicalize a contention powered by their positions and their targets. Clashes must be broken up by establishing an arrangement of contrasts fit for rendering the objects controlled by the actors as equally unwanted notwithstanding their own being. Mimetic conflicts – when they are not defused by proper institutional courses of action – can impersonate overbidding making them ruinous on a fundamental level (Girard et al., 2007). Girard considers modernity to be tormented and needing redemption (Girard & Treguer, 1994). For him, the ontological illness of modern man has been expanding since the Reformation and the breakdown of conventional society – notwithstanding the devastation of the significance of rituals. The Enlightenment proposed an all-powerful self-governing subject free from any guardianship prompting an inexorably fragile individual. For Girard, the cutting-edge world curves individualistic. It is a world in which desire must be individual and unique. When the withering away of state sovereignty and the competitive logic of the market economy overlap with the multiplication of conflicts, then this rivalry of equals becomes a relevant paradigm (Bourdin, 2016, p. 4).

2.1. Mimetic desire and violence

The idea of imitation contains two inverse components: the co-present viewpoints of the prohibited and imitating subject. The imitator's emptiness of being vanishes when he feels alike to the mediator. To do this, he should take the property of the object and emulate the mediator whose distinction is presented by the demonstration of prohibition according to the subject. The subject sees the mediator as getting a charge out of self-rule of his own longing and ownership of the ideal object. The subject mirrors the desire of the mediator for the object to win the situation of the mediator. He should turn into the mediator and make it suitable for his being and properties. The estimation of the object and the mediator develops as an element in the obstruction experienced by the subject in a self-creating and expanding way. Incomprehensibly, the subject mirroring the me-

diator likewise mimics the dismissal of the mediator in his place. He rejects himself from what he has in order to identify himself with the mediator. The recognizable proof incomprehensibly incorporates the basis of non-identification (Girard, 1977). The imitating subject is on obligation to get away from the logical inconsistency among need and self-prohibition without staying alert that this logical inconsistency originates from the mimetic desire – and not from the object or the mediator.

Next, the rivalry between the imitator and the mediator leads the latter to confront a similar logical inconsistency. The mirroring subject turns into the potential mediator according to the mediator. To maintain his status, the potential mediator wants the object considerably more seriously. He copies the mirroring subject. Fortifying one's desire for the object by emulating the subject heightens this competition. The two mediator-subjects are in an opposition bolstered by an indistinguishable system in which the competition appears without birthplace. The mimetic desire that bolsters that objective makes them progressively comparable as the adversaries progressively endeavor to separate themselves by possessing the mediator's position. The opponents turn out to be progressively comparative not in light of their individual or social property, but rather in view of their indistinguishable lead and situation dependent on aggressive impersonation. All people are mediator and subject to numerous interceding connections; subsequently, they will fit their particular arbiter's characteristics.

Rivalries have developed through a social virus from age-old social orders to the current day. This can escalate and prompt violence. The estimation of the mediator's object increases in extent to the obstruction experienced by the subject to appropriate the object (Girard et al., 1978; Girard & Treguer, 1994).

An imperative idea in Girard's hypothesis is that the mediation can be internal or external. In internal mediation, the subject advances in a world not quite the same as the go between (e.g. Don Quichotte and his mediator Amadis de Gaulle). External mediation does not cause struggle in light of the fact that the object of desire is distant to the subject (Girard, 1965). With regards to in-




Figure 3. The relationship between distance and rivalry in external or internal mediation

ternal mediation, the subject lives in the proximity condition from the arbiter (e.g., a bully and his/her unfortunate victim). The object of the mediator is open to the desiring subject and competition emerges: a closer separation leads to a more noteworthy fight (Figure 3).

External mediation attempts to anticipate rivalry and all types of internal mediation. To be powerful, the forbiddance of external mediation must shroud certain disclosures. This is the means by which external mediation worked in archaic societies. Interestingly, denials in present day society have lost their power, and internal mediation has assumed control (Girard & Barberi, 2001). This clashing vitality is socially infectious, and the mimetic crisis can grow and strengthen. When two opponents battle for a similar object, the estimation of the object increases according to the different people who watch this contention and are mimetically sullied. The quantity of twin rivals may increase, and along these lines, stepwise reduce the object's fascination.

2.2. Mimetic desire, mirror neurons, and workplace bullying

We propose a new psychology based on Girard's mimetic idea and the disclosure of mirror neurons by Gallese (2009), Oughourlian and Merrill (2016), Rizzolatti, Fadiga, Gallese, and Fogassi (1996): mimetic brain research – a meta-brain research dependent on imitation. In expressing, “I structure myself by imitating the other”, Girard, Oughourlian, and Lefort (1978) have supplanted between individuality by interdividuality to accentuate that people are not

confined. Desire is mimetic, and hence the desire framing oneself is the reflection or the duplicate of another's desire. Oughourlian presented the idea of the “mimetic brain” (Cyrulnik et al., 2014). As indicated by Oughourlian and Merrill (2016), mimetic conduct is first produced through enactment of a system of mirror neurons, i.e., the mimetic brain is amid a scene in between individuals' mimetic desire. The mimetic connection is first settled at any minute between two individuals, and the connection is adequately essential and critical to cerebral capacity. Research on mirror neurons has given mimetic components a beginning in the intellectual movement. They actuate the limbic framework. The mirror neuron system's organization comprises the framework by which people go into associations with one another and acquaint people with friendliness, to associations with others, to interdividual connections, and to hominization. When these neurons are actuated, the interdividual relationship initiates regions of feelings and sentiments in the limbic cerebrum (Lebreton, Kawa, d'Arc, Daunizeau, & Pessiglione, 2012). The cognitive mind at that point includes moral, ethical, consistent, philosophical, and rational justifications of mimetically-prompted activities (Oughourlian, 1991).

These discoveries lead to other human studies and comprehensions of psychic and psychopathological constitutions that arise because of cooperation and harmony between the three systems of the human brain. Desire makes people move like a pendulum, which sways persistently between two clearly opposing attitudes: 1) rivalry when we desire what the other de-

sires; and 2) empathy when we consider the other as a mediator (Oughourlian et al., 2016). Oughourlian (1991) notes that neurotic or psychotic patients – as well as the general population – make a twofold demand: The demand of the self to the property for desire and the demand by desire of its anteriority and antecedence regarding the other's desire. This has actually engendered its own desire through mimetic suggestions (Oughourlian, 1991).

Finally, Lebreton et al. (2012) unraveled the mechanisms underpinning mimetic desire using functional neuroimaging. They discovered that the initialization of mimetic desires through action scrutiny involves the modulation of the brain valuation system (BVS) activity through the mirror neuron system (MNS) activity. The MNS/BVS association is a key instrument clarifying how nonverbal conduct spreads desire without the need for unequivocal, deliberate communication. Furthermore, the authors conclude: a drawback could be that motivational contagion may lead to rivalry, which would make problematic the distribution of resources, and it may lead to herding, which would result in irrational mob behaviors (Lebreton et al., 2012, p. 7156).

Today, the theory of mimetic desire tends to be validated by empirical demonstration of the underpinning brain mechanism.

In light of the MDT, the beginning and evolution of bully conduct can be examined by means of distinguishing proof of mimetic desire, its beginning and evolvement toward the mimetic fight and one of its results: WPB. The Mimetic Theory is a valuable tool for investigating the inceptions and advancement of individual conduct as it rises up out of the otherness of desire. Applying MDT to the understanding of a WPB situation leads us to develop a three-step methodology. The WPB situation of the victim first has to be validated before any interview. This is achieved via the Leymann Inventory of Psychological Terror (LIPT) questionnaire (Leymann, 1992) or the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised (Einarsen, Hoel, & Notelaers, 2009). The second step of MDT process analysis is to perform a semi-structured

qualitative interview with the participants. The final step is data interpretation in light of the MDT – searching for the mimetic desire, which is seen as the source of WPB violence.

3. MDT APPLIED TO WPB: WHAT OUTCOME CAN WE EXPECT?

The MDT process can take the victim position viewpoint and complaints into consideration in an interpretivist approach. Analysis of this narrative reveals not only the present situation, but also the entire WPB process over time.

In light of MDT, the “Mediator”, “Subject”, and “Object of desire” are identified. The mimetic desire “game” is scrutinized through circumstances that unfurl over a significant amount of time. This allows to analyze and explain the origin and the evolution of the WPB situation. From the original critical incident (Leymann, 1990) – and throughout the entire bullying period – the mimetic theory sheds light on the genesis and the process of WPB. Here, it is critical to stress that the mimetic desire process is triangular (mediator, subject, object). The bully and the victim's behaviors are both unconsciously managed by the mimetic desire. One can understand the situation from the bully's perspective by scrutinizing the mimetic desire in place during the bullying process (Stoupe, 2010).

Our desires are inspired by others from birth to death (Meltzoff & Moore, 1977). The verbal and even nonverbal behavior of others propagates desires in our self via our mirror neuronal network without the need for explicit or intentional communication. All human brains have the same anatomy, and the mimetic desire is equally identified regardless of the social, cultural, religious, or ethnic differences. The MDT is applicable to all human beings and can be explained via RQ1:

- 1) the bully starts to attack her/his targeted victim when she/he realizes or believes, unconsciously, that the victim has an equal desire for the same object;

- 2) the employee becomes a victim when she/he unconsciously realizes that the mediator forbids her/him to access the desired object;
- 3) harassment is a process whose violence increases over time because of the simultaneous increase in desire of the subject and the mediator via the “mirror effect”. increased mimetic desire can lead to more violence.

Qualitative analysis of the victim’s verbatim contains the entire conscious and unconscious events of her/his bullying process. It reveals the “identity” of the mimetically “object” (physical or virtual) desired by both the victim and the bully. The MDT allows one to analyze and understand the evolving behaviors and reactions of the bully and the victim at the same time (RQ2), because they are in a triangular mimetic desire relationship with the object.

4. DISCUSSION

A large part of the WPB research mirrors a functionalist approach (quantitative methodology) (Samnani & Singh, 2012). WPB is a subjective phenomenon based on an individual’s beliefs. Values and personality likely influence the victim’s perception, as well as the effects of WPB on her/him. The accentuation inside interpretivism can clarify the social world at the dimension of the person’s significance and experience (McKenna, Singh, & Richardson, 2008; Romani, Primecz, & Topçu, 2011). An interpretivist approach, as applied with the MDT, captures an understanding of the individual’s perceptions and reactions toward WPB (Samnani, 2013). This can clarify participants’ understandings, encounters, and sense-making forms as opposed to estimating explicit builds. Thus, the spotlight is solidly fixated on the participant and digging further into occasions through the participant’s particular and personal encounters.

Einarsen et al. (2011) noted that WPB is a time-sensitive phenomenon that intensifies over time. It is important to explore WPB as a process that is mandatory to provide a voice

to the participants and for them to sufficiently describe their experiences. Interviews and/or narratives as proposed by the MDT allow the researcher to achieve this goal. Branch (2013) recognized holes in the comprehension of the wonder itself and its related procedure. Analysis of the victim’s verbatim in the light of the MDT can fulfill these gaps.

To date, MDT has not yet been applied to empirically scrutinize the genesis and development of the WPB process. Research on the bully is relatively non-existent. Stoupe (2010) introduced the mimetic desire dimension to his understanding of the bullies. Exploring the bullying phenomenon from the perspective of the perpetrator when possible can lead to many new interesting insights in WPB research (Rai et al., 2016). The MDT proposes possible access to this exploration by looking at the perpetrator and the victim as a part of the same mimetic desire triangle. There is an empirical link between conflict and WPB (Baillien, De Cuyper, & De Witte, 2011; Baillien & De Witte, 2009a; Francioli et al., 2016; Skogstad, Matthiesen, & Einarsen, 2007).

Baillien and De Witte (2009b) found three causes of WPB: individuals’ ability to deal with frustration, escalating conflict, and team and organizational cultures. A conflict will develop where an individual’s desires are not met or are frustrated. In Girardian terms, this would be identified as a mimetic rivalry. Baillien et al. (2009b) support the Oughourlian’s understanding that escalating conflict will lead to bullying (Oughourlian, 1996). To understand what is happening in WPB, we need to discern the desires that drive an individual to behave in a certain manner either from his/her personal background or from his/her working environment. These mimetic desires can lead to violence and WPB. Few theories have been examined in the context of bullying. Theories that can explain the onset, tolerance and outcomes of bullying are missing from the literature (Rai et al., 2016). The MDT is actually a powerful tool to examine the underpinnings of WPB and its interactional processes.

CONCLUSION

Mimetic desire is neither good nor bad. Gallese (2009) emphasizes that it can prompt mimetic violence additional to the most imaginative parts of human insight. Traditional ways to deal with compromise neglect to address this mimetic dynamic and wrongly expect there to be a target proportion of desire that must be filled to fulfill the contenders. The introduction of desire and of human brain research runs inseparably with obliviousness and misconception of the mimetic components – driven by the mirror neurons – that give birth to them (Oughourlian, Webb, & Ebrary Inc., 2010). The MDT clearly demonstrates that the solution of the predicament includes the intelligent capacity of the humans involved in a fight to address the (mimetic) roots of their hostility (Farneti, 2009).

The MDT is simple to explain and easy to understand and apply by anyone involved in WPB. Both bully and the victim can avoid becoming entrapped within dysfunctional and toxic relationships such as bullying by being better equipped to recognize the destructive patterns of behavior and emotional responses to situations. The use of mimetic desire concepts also enables human resources managers, bystanders and professionals to better deal with the protagonists. This research might also help prevent and reduce workplace bullying.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many thanks to Marie-France Hirigoyen, M.D., Maria Kreuzer, Ph.D., Jean-Michel Oughourlian, M.D. and Hans Mühlbacher, Ph.D. for their support.

REFERENCES

- Agervold, M., & Mikkelsen, E. G. (2004). Relationships between bullying, psychosocial work environment and individual stress reactions. *Work & Stress*, 18(4), 336-351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370412331319794>
- Baillien, E., De Cuyper, N., & De Witte, H. (2011). Job autonomy and workload as antecedents of workplace bullying: A two-wave test of Karasek's Job Demand Control Model for targets and perpetrators. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 84(1), 191-208. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/096317910X508371>
- Baillien, E., & De Witte, H. (2009a). The relationship between the occurrence of conflicts in the work unit, the conflict management styles in the work unit, and workplace bullying. *Psychologica Belgica*, 49(4), 207-226. <https://doi.org/10.5334/pb-49-4-207>
- Baillien, E., & De Witte, H. (2009b). Why is organizational change related to workplace bullying? Role conflict and job insecurity as mediators. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 30(3), 348-371. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X09336557>
- Baillien, E., Rodriguez-Munoz, A., De Witte, H., Notelaers, G., & Moreno-Jimenez, B. (2011). The Demand-Control model and target's reports of bullying at work: A test within Spanish and Belgian blue-collar workers. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 20(2), 157-177. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320903271929>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(3), 273-285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056>
- Balducci, C., Fraccaroli, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2011). Workplace bullying and its relation with work characteristics, personality, and post-traumatic stress symptoms: An integrated model. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping*, 24(5), 499-513. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2011.555533>
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Social exchange theory*. Retrieved from <http://garfield.library.upenn.edu/classics1989/A1989CA26300001.pdf>
- Bourdin, J.-M. (2016). *La rivalité des égaux. La théorie mimétique, un paradigme pour l'anthropologie politique?* Paris 8. Retrieved from <https://www.theses.fr/2016PA080047>
- Branch, S., Ramsay, S., & Barker, M. (2013). Workplace bullying, mobbing and general harassment: A review. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 15(3), 280-299. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2012.00339.x>
- Broeck, A. D., Baillien, E., & Witte, H. D. (2011). Workplace bullying: A perspective from the Job Demands-Resources model. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 37(2), 40-51. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v37i2.879>

12. Ciby, M., & Raya, R. (2014). Exploring victims' experiences of workplace bullying: A grounded theory approach. *Vikalpa: the journal for decision makers*, 39(2), 69-82. Retrieved from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0256090920140208>
13. Cowdell, S. (2013). *René Girard and Secular Modernity: Christ, Culture, and Crisis*. University of Notre Dame Press.
14. Cyrulnik, B., Bustany, P., Oughourlian, J.-M., André, C., Janssen, T., & Eersel, P. V. (2014). *Votre cerveau n'a pas fini de vous étonner*. Paris: Librairie générale française.
15. DARES (2012). L'Evolution des Risques Professionnel dans le secteur privé en 1994 et 2010. *DARES Analyses*, 023, 1-10. Retrieved from <https://travail-emploi.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/2012-023.pdf>
16. De Dreu, C. K., Van Dierendonck, D., & Dijkstra, M. T. (2004). Conflict at work and individual well-being. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 15(1), 6-26. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb022905>
17. Djurkovic, N., McCormack, D., & Casimir, G. (2008). Workplace bullying and intention to leave: the moderating effect of perceived organisational support. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 18(4), 405-422. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-8583.2008.00081.x>
18. Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Nøtelaers, G. (2009). Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure and psychometric properties of the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised. *Work & Stress*, 23(1), 24-44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370902815673>
19. Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (2011). The concept of bullying and harassment at work: The European tradition. *Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice*, 2, 3-40. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL USA. Retrieved from [https://www.scirp.org/\(S\(351jmbntvnsjt1aadkposzje\)\)/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=1984242](https://www.scirp.org/(S(351jmbntvnsjt1aadkposzje))/reference/ReferencesPapers.aspx?ReferenceID=1984242)
20. Einarsen, S., & Nielsen, M. B. (2015). Workplace bullying as an antecedent of mental health problems: a five-year prospective and representative study. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 88(2), 131-142. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-014-0944-7>
21. Einarsen, S., Raknes, B. R. I., & Matthiesen, S. B. (1994). Bullying and harassment at work and their relationships to work environment quality: An exploratory study. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 4(4), 381-401. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594329408410497>
22. Farneti, R. (2009). A mimetic perspective on conflict resolution. *Polity*, 41(4), 536-558. <https://doi.org/10.1057/pol.2009.2>
23. Faulx, D. (2007). *Psychosociologie clinique du harcèlement moral au travail et de ses liens avec l'hyperconflit*. Université de Liège: Thèse de doctorat en psychologie. Retrieved from <https://orbi.uliege.be/handle/2268/28347>
24. Faulx, D., Delvaux, S., & Brun, J.-P. (2009). Psychological harassment in the workplace: Case-study and building of a new analysis model. *Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations*, 64(2), 286-306.
25. Francioli, L., Høgh, A., Conway, P. M., Costa, G., Karasek, R., & Hansen, Å. M. (2016). Do personal dispositions affect the relationship between psychosocial working conditions and workplace bullying? *Ethics & Behavior*, 26(6), 451-469. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2015.1043367>
26. Gallese, V. (2009). Mirror neurons, embodied simulation, and the neural basis of social identification. *Psychoanalytic Dialogues*, 19(5), 519-536. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10481880903231910>
27. Girard, R. (1965). *Deceit, desire, and the novel: Self and other in literary structure*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
28. Girard, R. (1977). *Violence and the Sacred*. 1972. Trans. Patrick Gregory. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.
29. Girard, R., & Barberi, M. S. (2001). *Celui par qui le scandale arrive: Desclée de Brouwer Paris*.
30. Girard, R., & Chantre, B. (2007). *Achever Clausewitz: Carnets nord*.
31. Girard, R., de Castro Rocha, J. C., & Antonello, P. (2007). *Evolution and conversion: Dialogues on the origins of culture*. A&C Black.
32. Girard, R., Oughourlian, J.-M., & Lefort, G. (1978). *Things hidden since the foundation of the world*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press.
33. Girard, R., & Treguer, M. (1994). *Quand ces choses commenceront*: Arléa Paris.
34. Glasø, L., Bele, E., Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2011). Bus drivers' exposure to bullying at work: An occupation-specific approach. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 52(5), 484-493. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2011.00895.x>
35. Glasø, L., Vie, T. L., Holmdal, G. R., & Einarsen, S. (2010). An application of affective events theory to workplace bullying. *European Psychologist*, 16, 198-208. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000026>
36. Glendinning, P. M. (2001). Workplace bullying: Curing the cancer of the American workplace. *Public personnel management*, 30(3), 269-286. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009102600103000301>
37. Goodboy, A. K., Martin, M. M., Knight, J. M., & Long, Z. (2017). Creating the boiler room environment: The job demand-control-support model as an explanation for workplace bullying. *Communication Research*, 44(2), 244-262. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650215614365>
38. 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. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370903395568>
39. Hirigoyen, M.-F. (2016). *Le harcèlement moral, un symptôme de la société moderne*. An-

- nales Médico-psychologiques. *Revue Psychiatrique*, 174(7), 575-579. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amp.2016.05.004>
40. Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources. A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513-524. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2648906>
 41. Hobfoll, S. E. (2001). The influence of culture, community, and the nested-self in the stress process: advancing conservation of resources theory. *Applied Psychology*, 50(3), 337-421. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1464-0597.00062>
 42. Hocart, A. M., Needham, R., Kar-noouh, M., & Sabban, R. (1978). *Rois et courtisans*. Le Seuil, Paris.
 43. Johan Hauge, L., Skogstad, A., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Relationships between stressful work environments and bullying: Results of a large representative study. *Work & Stress*, 21(3), 220-242. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370701705810>
 44. Karasek, Jr. R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(2), 285-308. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392498>
 45. Lebreton, M., Kawa, S., d'Arc, B. F., Daunizeau, J., & Pessiglione, M. (2012). Your goal is mine: Unraveling mimetic desires in the human brain. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 32(21), 7146-7157. <https://doi.org/10.1523/JNEUROSCI.4821-11.2012>
 46. Lee, R. T., & Brotheridge, C. M. (2006). When prey turns predatory: Workplace bullying as a predictor of counteraggression/bullying, coping, and well-being. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 15(3), 352-377. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320600636531>
 47. Leymann, H. (1990). Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces. *Violence and Victims*, 5(2), 119-126. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2278952>
 48. Leymann, H. (1992). *Leymann inventory of psychological terror*. Violen: Karlskrona. Retrieved from www.inrs.fr/dms/inrs/CataloguePapier/DMT/TI-FRPS-21/frps21.pdf
 49. Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), 165-184. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594329608414853>
 50. Leymann, H., & Gustafsson, A. (1996). Mobbing at work and the development of post-traumatic stress disorders. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5(2), 251-275. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594329608414858>
 51. Magee, C., Gordon, R., Robinson, L., Reis, S., Caputi, P., & Oades, L. (2015). Distinct workplace bullying experiences and sleep quality: A person-centred approach. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 87, 200-205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.08.004>
 52. McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(1), 81-90. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3820081>
 53. McKenna, S., Singh, P., & Richardson, J. (2008). The drunkard's search: Looking for 'HRM' in all the wrong places. *Management International Review*, 48(1), 115-136. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11575-008-0006-z>
 54. Meltzoff, A. N., & Moore, M. K. (1977). Imitation of facial and manual gestures by human neonates. *Science*, 198(4312), 74-78. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/897687>
 55. Moreno-Jiménez, B., Rodríguez-Muñoz, A., Pastor, J. C., Sanz-Vergel, A. I., & Garrosa, E. (2009). The moderating effects of psychological detachment and thoughts of revenge in workplace bullying. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46(3), 359-364. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.10.031>
 56. Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2012). Outcomes of exposure to workplace bullying: A meta-analytic review. *Work & Stress*, 26(4), 309-332. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2012.734709>
 57. Nielsen, M. B., Glasø, L., & Einarsen, S. (2017). Exposure to workplace harassment and the Five Factor Model of personality: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 104, 195-206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.08.015>
 58. Notelaers, G., Baillien, E., De Witte, H., Einarsen, S., & Vermunt, J. K. (2013). Testing the strain hypothesis of the Demand Control Model to explain severe bullying at work. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 34(1), 69-87. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X12438742>
 59. Oughourlian, J.-M. (1991). *The puppet of desire: the psychology of hysteria, possession, and hypnosis*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
 60. Oughourlian, J.-M. (1996). Desire is mimetic: a clinical approach. *Contagion: Journal of Violence, Mimesis, and Culture*, 3(1), 43-49. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ctn.1996.0006>
 61. Oughourlian, J.-M., & Merrill, T. C. (2016). *The Mimetic Brain*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
 62. Oughourlian, J.-M., Webb, E., & Ebrary Inc. (2010). *The genesis of desire (studies in violence, mimesis, and culture)* (174 p.). Retrieved from <https://www.amazon.com/Genesis-Studies-Violence-Mimesis-Culture/dp/0870138766>
 63. Parzefall, M.-R., & Salin, D. M. (2010). Perceptions of and reactions to workplace bullying: A social exchange perspective. *Human Relations*, 63(6), 761-780. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709345043>
 64. Pihl, P., Albertsen, K., Hogh, A., & Andersen, L. P. S. (2017). Social capital and workplace bullying. *Work*, 57(4), 535-545. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-172589>
 65. Rai, A., & Agarwal, U. A. (2016). Workplace Bullying: A Review and Future Research Directions. *South Asian Journal of Manage-*

- ment, 23(3), 27-56. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/310604860_Workplace_Bullying_A_Review_and_Future_Research_Directions
66. Rizzolatti, G., Fadiga, L., Gallese, V., & Fogassi, L. (1996). Premotor cortex and the recognition of motor actions. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 3(2), 131-141. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0926-6410\(95\)00038-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0926-6410(95)00038-0)
67. Robinson, S. L. (2008). Dysfunctional workplace behavior. *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Behavior*, 1, 141-159. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781849200448.n9>
68. Romani, L., Primecz, H., & Topçu, K. (2011). Paradigm interplay for theory development: A methodological example with the Kulturstandard method. *Organizational Research Methods*, 14(3), 432-455. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428109358270>
69. Samnani, A.-K. (2013). Embracing new directions in workplace bullying research: A paradigmatic approach. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 22(1), 26-36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492612451653>
70. Samnani, A.-K., & Singh, P. (2012). 20 years of workplace bullying research: a review of the antecedents and consequences of bullying in the workplace. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17(6), 581-589. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.08.004>
71. Sheehan, M., McCarthy, P., Barker, M., & Henderson, M. (2001). A model for assessing the impacts and costs of workplace bullying. *Proceeding from the Standing Conference on Organisational Symbolism (SCOS)*. Trinity College, Dublin.
72. Skogstad, A., Matthiesen, S. B., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Organizational changes: a precursor of bullying at work? *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior*, 10(1), 58-94. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOTB-10-01-2007-B003>
73. Stoupe, D. A. (2010). *You're a bully!* University of Bristol. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.2033.3286>
74. Tuckey, M. R., & Neall, A. M. (2014). Workplace bullying erodes job and personal resources: Between-and within-person perspectives. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 19(4), 413-424. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037728>
75. Ursin, H., & Eriksen, H. R. (2004). The cognitive activation theory of stress. *Psycho-neuro-endocrinology*, 29(5), 567-592. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0306-4530\(03\)00091-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0306-4530(03)00091-X)
76. Vie, T. L., Glasø, L., & Einarsen, S. (2012). How does it feel? Workplace bullying, emotions and musculoskeletal complaints. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 53(2), 165-173. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2011.00932.x>
77. Vveinhardt, J., & Andriukaitienė, R. (2015). Questionnaire verification of prevention of mobbing/ bullying as a psychosocial stressor when implementing CSR. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 13(2), 57-70. Retrieved from <https://businessperspectives.org/journals/problems-and-perspectives-in-management/issue-46/questionnaire-verification-of-prevention-of-mobbing-bullying-as-a-psychosocial-stressor-when-implementing-csr>
78. Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 18, 1-74. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/record/1996-98665-001>
79. Wheeler, A. R., Halbesleben, J. R. B., & Shanine, K. (2010). Eating their cake and everyone else's cake, too: Resources as the main ingredient to workplace bullying. *Business Horizons*, 53(6), 553-560. Retrieved from <https://ideas.repec.org/a/eee/bushor/v53yi6p553-560.html>
80. White, S. (2004). A psychodynamic perspective of workplace bullying: Containment, boundaries and a futile search for recognition. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 32(3), 269-280. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03069880410001723512>
81. Zapf, D., & Leymann, H. (1996). *Mobbing and Victimization at Work: European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* (Psychology Press). Peter Herriot, UK.