

**S5 Table. Individual Study Outcomes**

Knowledge of or Attitudes to Workplace Bullying/Incivility					
Study	Bingham, 2001[1]				
Overall Results	The intervention significantly improved attitudes to sexual harassment, though there were significant interactions with gender				
Tool or Scale	Questionnaire on knowledge and attitudes to sexual harassment				
Effect measure	Mean (SD): Higher score indicates stronger agreement with statement				
Outcome	Attitude That Sexual Behavior Is Inappropriate				
	Intervention		Control		Between Groups Comparison
Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]		Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]	
Total: 195	3.77 (0.81)		Total: 319	3.64 (0.82)	
	ANOVA (Intervention status): F(1, 510) = 4.96, p<0.05				
Outcome	Attributions of blame for sexual harassment				
	Intervention		Control		Between Groups Comparison
Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]		Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]	
Male: 99	Male: 2.71 (SD)		Male: 141	Male: 2.52 (0.52)	
Female: 97	Female: 2.32 (0.5)		Female: 178	Female: 2.44 (0.55)	
	ANOVA (Intervention status x gender): F(1, 511) = 9.17, p<0.01				
Outcome	Knowledge That Sexual Behavior is Inappropriate				
	Intervention		Control		Between Groups Comparison
Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]		Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]	
Total: 197	4.33 (0.81)		Total: 319	3.94 (0.99)	
	ANOVA (Intervention status): F(1, 512) = 21.53, p<0.0001				
Outcome	Perceptions of potential sexual harassment				
	Intervention		Control		Between Groups Comparison
Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]		Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]	
Male: 100	Male: 2.78 (0.75)		Male: 141	Male: 2.90 (0.42)	
Female: 97	Female: 2.98 (0.14)		Female: 178	Female: 2.89 (0.49)	
	ANOVA (Intervention status x gender): F(1, 512) = 6.49, P<0.01				
Outcome	Willingness to Report Sexual Harassment				
	Intervention		Control		Between Groups Comparison
Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]		Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]	
Male: 100	Male: 1.25 (0.76)		Male: 141	Male: 1.52 (0.66)	
Female: 97	Female: 1.45 (0.68)		Female: 178	Female: 1.48 (0.66)	
	ANOVA (Intervention status x gender): F(1, 512) = 3.87, P<0.05				

<b>Study</b>	<b>Ceravolo, 2012[2]</b>			
<b>Overall Results</b>	Positive trends in awareness of workplace bullying and culture in the workplace (no formal statistical comparison was conducted)			
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Verbal Abuse Survey			
<b>Effect measure</b>	n (%): proportion of respondents who agree or strongly agree with statement			
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Believed that verbal abuse would influence their overall delivery of nursing care</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	
				<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	
Pre: 703 Post: 485	Pre: 276 (42%) Post: 204 (63%)	-	-	NA
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Work is a safe environment to express my opinions</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	
				<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	
Pre: 703 Post: 485	Pre: 317 (65%) Post: 408 (52%)	-	-	NA
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Peers respect my opinion</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	
				<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	
Pre: 703 Post: 485	Pre: 512 (65%) Post: 356 (74%)	-	-	NA
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Feel respected by peers</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	
				<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	
Pre: 703 Post: 485	Pre: 430 (88%) Post: 616 (78%)	-	-	NA
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Feel supported by peers</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	
				<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	
Pre: 703 Post: 485	Pre: 590 (75) Post: 423 (87)	-	-	NA

	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Have good working relationships</b>				
		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	
	Pre: 703 Post: 485	Pre: 510 (65) Post: 378 (78)		-	-	
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Feel high levels of control over practice</b>				
		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	
	Pre: 703 Post: 485	Pre: 276 (40) Post: 204 (42)		-	-	
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Have high levels of self-esteem</b>				
		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	
	Pre: 703 Post: 485	Pre: 348 (49) Post: 208 (43)		-	-	
	<b>Study</b>	<b>Chipps, 2012[3]</b>				
	<b>Overall Results</b>	Positive trends in the awareness of causes/contributors to workplace bullying (not tested)				
	<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Participant Survey				
	<b>Effect measure</b>	n (%): proportion of respondents who agree or strongly agree with statement				
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Believed near errors occurred because of negative behaviours</b>				
		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	
	Pre: 16 Post: 16	Pre: NR (13%) Post: NR (19%)		-	-	
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Believed patient safety was compromised secondary to negative acts</b>				
		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>

		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	
		Pre: 16 Post: 16	Pre: NR (6%) Post: NR (13%)	-	-	NA
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Job Satisfaction</b>				
		<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	
		Pre: 16 Post: 16	Pre: NR (81%) Post: NR (81%)	-	-	NA
	<b>Study</b>	<b>Dahlby, 2014[4]</b>				
	<b>Overall Results</b>	Positive trends in understanding of causes/contributors to workplace bullying (non-significant)				
	<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Lateral and Vertical Violence in Nursing Survey				
	<b>Effect measure</b>	N (%): proportion of respondents who agree or strongly agree with statement				
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Fear of retaliation: I feel safe from retaliation when reporting an episode of lateral violence</b>				
		<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	
		Pre: 29 Post: 25	Pre: 11 (37.93%) Post: 12 (50%) Pre v Post: p=0.38	-	-	NA
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Inadequate staff or resources to handle the workload contributes to lateral violence in my work unit</b>				
		<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	
		Pre: 29 Post: 25	Pre: 24 (82.76%) Post: 22 (88%) Pre v Post: p=0.59	-	-	NA
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Job stress leading to loss of control over behaviour contributes to lateral violence in my work unit</b>				
		<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	

Pre: 29 Post: 25	Pre: 19 (65.52%) Post: 16 (64%) Pre v Post: p=0.91	-	-	NA
---------------------	--	---	---	----

**Outcome Leaders not willing to intervene contributes to lateral violence in my work unit**

<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	

Pre: 29 Post: 25	Pre: 24 (82.76%) Post: 19 (76%) Pre v Post: P=0.54	-	-	NA
---------------------	--	---	---	----

**Outcome Major personality clashes contribute to lateral violence in my work unit**

<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	

Pre: 29 Post: 25	Pre: 17 (58.62%) Post: 20 (80%) Pre v Post: p=0.09	-	-	NA
---------------------	--	---	---	----

**Outcome Misunderstandings related to cultural differences contribute to lateral violence in my work unit**

<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	

Pre: 29 Post: 25	Pre: 5 (17.24%) Post: 5 (20%) Pre v Post: p=0.79	-	-	NA
---------------------	--	---	---	----

**Outcome Misunderstandings related to gender contribute to lateral violence in my work unit**

<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	

Pre: 29 Post: 25	Pre: 2 (6.9%) Post: 5 (20%) Pre v Post: p=0.15	-	-	NA
---------------------	--	---	---	----

**Outcome Peers not willing to intervene contributes to lateral violence in my work unit**

<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>	

Pre: 29 Post: 25	Pre: 20 (68.97%) Post: 14 (56%) Pre v Post: p=0.33	-	-	NA
---------------------	--	---	---	----

	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Power and control issues contribute to lateral violence in my work unit</b>				
		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>		<i>Results [n (%)]</i>
	Pre: 29 Post: 25	Pre: 20 (68.97%) Post: 18 (72%) Pre v Post: p=0.81		-	-	NA
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Rude behaviour contributes to lateral violence in my work unit</b>				
		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>		<i>Results [n (%)]</i>
	Pre: 29 Post: 25	Pre: 16 (55.17%) Post: 13 (52%) Pre v Post: p=0.82		-	-	NA
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Targeted nurse not willing to stand up to perpetrator contributes to lateral violence in my work unit</b>				
		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [n (%)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>		<i>Results [n (%)]</i>
	Pre: 29 Post: 25	Pre: 19 (65.52%) Post: 12 (48%) Pre v Post: p=0.19		-	-	NA
	<b>Study</b>	<b>Dompierre, 2008[5]</b>				
	<b>Overall Results</b>	Intervention participants demonstrated less positive perceptions of the workplace (significant), indicating greater awareness of workplace violence				
	<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Participant Survey				
	<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean (SD): higher score indicates a more positive perception/stronger agreement with the statement				
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Global index of the perception of the collectivity</b>				
		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>		<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>
	Pre: 103 Post: 51	Pre: 62.51, (NR) Post: 62.43, (NR) Pre v. Post [t(df)]: 0.06 (152), p=NS		Pre: NA Post: 39	Pre: NA, (NA) Post: 65, (NR)	Intervention v. Control [t-test (df)]: -2.01 (88), p<0.01
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>The perception of putting in place measures of security: “it takes too long to resolve problems”</b>				

	<i><b>Intervention</b></i>		<i><b>Control</b></i>		<i><b>Between Groups Comparison</b></i>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Pre: 103 Post: 51	NR	Pre: NA Post: 39	NR	Intervention v. Control [t-test (df)]: 2.17 (NR), p=0.033
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Response to statement: “violence is considered to be part of the job”</b>				
	<i><b>Intervention</b></i>		<i><b>Control</b></i>		<i><b>Between Groups Comparison</b></i>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Pre: 103 Post: 51	NR	Pre: NA Post: 39	NR	Intervention v. Control [t-test (df)]: 3.44 (NR), p=0.0009
<b>Study</b>	<b>Embree 2013[6]</b>				
<b>Overall Results</b>	Post-survey responses showed improved individual awareness of and responses to lateral violence and less feelings of oppression, these changes were not reflected in overall group scores				
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Nurse Workplace Behaviour Scale (NWS)				
<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean (SD): Higher scores indicate greater perceptions of self-empowerment				
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Total Nurse Workplace Behaviour Scale (NWS)</b>				
	<i><b>Intervention</b></i>		<i><b>Control</b></i>		<i><b>Between Groups Comparison</b></i>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Pre: 44 Post: 33	Pre : 27.98, (NR) Post : 28.73, (NR)	-	-	NA
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>NWS - 'Internalized Sexism' subscale</b>				
	<i><b>Intervention</b></i>		<i><b>Control</b></i>		<i><b>Between Groups Comparison</b></i>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Pre: 44 Post: 33	Pre : 8.95, (NR) Post : 8.67, (NR)	-	-	NA
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>NWS - 'Minimization of Self' subscale</b>				
	<i><b>Intervention</b></i>		<i><b>Control</b></i>		<i><b>Between Groups Comparison</b></i>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	

Pre: 44  
Post: 33

Pre : 19.02, (NR)  
Post : 20.06, (NR)

-

-

NA

<b>Study</b>	<b>Frisbie, 2002[7]</b>			
<b>Overall Results</b>	The intervention significantly increased knowledge of sexual harassment, ability to perceive sexual harassment behaviours, and significantly decreased tolerance for sexual harassment behaviours.			
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Harassment Sensitivity Inventory (HSI)			
<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean (SD): Higher scores indicate increased awareness of sexual harassment			
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Harassment Sensitivity Inventory (HSI) – Total</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>	<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>
	Group 1: total- 44; female- 21; male- 23 Group 2: total- 43; female- 21; male- 22	Group 1: total- 5.22 (0.62); female- 5.27 (0.54); male- 5.18 (0.69) Group 2: total- 5.34 (0.53); female- 5.21 (0.59) male- 5.46 (0.44)	Total: 45 Female: 25 Male: 20	Total : 4.93 (0.71) Female : 5.13 (0.61) Male : 4.69 (0.77)
				Group 1 v Group 2 v Control [F-test (df)]: 5.77, p=0.004 Group 1 total v Group 2 total [Mean Difference]: 0.12, p=1.00 Group 1 total v Control total [Mean Difference]: 0.29, p=0.084 Group 2 total v Control total [Mean Difference]: 0.41, p=0.007
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Harassment Sensitivity Inventory (HSI) – Hostile Subscale</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>	<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>
	Group 1: total- 44; female- 21; male- 23 Group 2: total- 43; female- 21; male- 22	Group 1 : total- 5.14 (0.71); female- 5.2 (0.61); male- 5.08 (0.8) Group 2 : total- 5.25 (0.61); female- 5.13 (0.63) male- 5.36 (0.57)	Total: 45 Female: 25 Male: 20	Total : 4.71 (0.79) Female : 4.94 (0.65) Male : 4.42 (0.88)
				Group 1 v Group 2 v Control [F-test (df)]: 8.807, p<0.001 Group 1 total v Group 2 total [Mean Difference]:NR Group 1 total v Control total [Mean Difference]: 0.43, p=0.014 Group 2 total v Control total [Mean Difference]: 0.54, p=0.001
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Harassment Sensitivity Inventory (HSI) – Interfering Subscale</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>	<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>



Group 1: total- 44; female- 21; male- 23 Group 2: total- 43; female- 21; male- 22	Group 1 : total- 5.16 (0.66); female- 5.24 (0.59); male- 5.08 (0.73) Group 2 : total- 5.34 (0.56); female- 5.15 (0.67) male- 5.52 (0.37)	Total: 45 Female: 25 Male: 20	Total : 5.02 (0.78) Female : 5.17 (0.7) Male : 4.84 (0.84)	Group 1 v Group 2 v Control [F-test (df)]: 2.78, p=0.066 Group 1 total v Group 2 total [Mean Difference]: NR Group 1 total v Control total [Mean Difference]: NR Group 2 total v Control total [Mean Difference]: NR
--	---	-------------------------------------	--	---

**Outcome Harassment Sensitivity Inventory (HSI) – Intimidating Subscale**

<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
Group 1: total- 44; female- 21; male- 23 Group 2: total- 43; female- 21; male- 22	Group 1 : total- 5.29 (0.61); female- 5.32 (0.53); male- 5.27 (0.68) Group 2 : total- 5.4 (0.51); female- 5.31 (0.59) male- 5.49 (0.42)	Total: 45 Female: 25 Male: 20	Total : 5.1 (0.69) Female : 5.31 (0.58) Male : 4.84 (0.75)	Group 1 v Group 2 v Control [F-test (df)]: 3.37, p<0.038 Group 1 total v Group 2 total [Mean Difference]: NR Group 1 total v Control total [Mean Difference]: NR Group 2 total v Control total [Mean Difference]: NR

**Outcome Harassment Sensitivity Inventory (HSI) – Offensive Subscale**

<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
Group 1: total- 44; female- 21; male- 23 Group 2: total- 43; female-21; male- 22	Group 1 : total- 5.3 (0.63); female- 5.31 (0.58); male- 5.29 (0.68) Group 2 : total- 5.37 (0.52); female- 5.25 (0.58) male- 5.47 (0.44)	Total: 45 Female: 25 Male: 20	Total : 4.9 (0.78) Female : 5.1 (0.61) Male : 4.65 (0.91)	Group 1 v Group 2 v Control [F-test (df)]: 7.54, p<0.001 Group 1 total v Group 2 total [Mean Difference]: NR Group 1 total v Control total [Mean Difference]: 0.4, p=0.012 Group 2 total v Control total [Mean Difference]: 0.47, p=0.003

**Tool or Scale** Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale  
**Effect measure** Mean (SD): Higher scores indicate more tolerant attitudes to sexual harassment

**Outcome Sexual Harassment Attitude Scale**

<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	

		Group 1 : total- 2.92 (0.79); female- 2.81 (0.6); male- 3.01 (0.93)	Total: 45 Female: 25 Male: 20	Total : 3.25 (0.94) Female : 3.1 (0.85) Male : 3.45 (1.04)	Group 1 v Group 2 v Control [F-test (df)]: 5.24 (2), p=0.007 Group 1 total v Group 2 total [Mean Difference]: 0.19, p=0.821 Group 1 total v Control total [Mean Difference]: 0.34, p=0.158 Group 2 total v Control total [Mean Difference]: 0.53, p=0.008
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Sexual Harassment Knowledge				
<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean (SD): Higher scores indicate more knowledge of sexual harassment behaviours				
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Sexual Harassment Knowledge</b>				
		<i>Intervention</i>	<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>
		Group 1 : total- 14.45 (2.43); female- 14.05 (2.44); male- 14.83 (2.41)	Total: 45 Female: 25 Male: 20	Total : 12.62 (2.72) Female : 11.92 (3.01) Male : 13.5 (2.06)	Group 1 v Group 2 v Control [F-test (df)]: 16.61 (2), p<0.0001 Group 1 total v Group 2 total [Mean Difference]: 1.15, p=0.074 Group 1 total v Control total [Mean Difference]: 1.83, p<0.001 Group 2 total v Control total [Mean Difference]: 2.98, p<0.0001
<b>Study</b>	<b>Goldberg, 2007[8]</b>				
<b>Overall Results</b>	NR (no results were reported for this specific outcome)				
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Sexual Experiences Questionnaire				
<b>Study</b>	<b>Hoel, 2006[9]</b>				
<b>Overall Results</b>	The interventions did not appear to have any significant impact on psychological fulfillment or satisfaction at work				
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Measure of psychological contract fulfillment				
<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean (SD): Higher scores indicate higher levels of fulfillment				
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Psychological contract – (Minimum score on scale = 7)</b>				
		<i>Intervention</i>	<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>

	Group 1: Baseline- NR; Post- NR	Group 1: Baseline- 21.96 (NR); Post- 21.16 (NR)			
	Group 2: Baseline- NR; Post- NR	Group 2: Baseline- 22.02 (NR); Post- 21.78 (NR)	Baseline: NR Post-intervention: NR	Baseline: 21.17 (NR) Post-intervention: 20.95 (NR)	NR
	Group 3: Baseline- NR; Post- NR	Group 3: Baseline- 23.15 (NR); Post- 22.86 (NR)			
	Group 4: Baseline- NR; Post- NR	Group 4: Baseline- 20.86 (NR); Post- 21.17 (NR)			
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Bullying Risk Assessment Tool (BRAT)				
<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean change (SD): Higher scores indicate more satisfaction with workplace				
<b>Outcome</b>	Satisfaction with atmosphere at work compared with six months ago				
	<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Group 1: Baseline- NR; Post- NR	Group 1: Baseline -0.13 (NR); Post -0.20 (NR)			
	Group 2: Baseline- NR; Post- NR	Group 2: Baseline -0.10 (NR); Post -0.29 (NR)	Baseline: NR Post-intervention: NR	Baseline: -0.12 (NR) Post-intervention: -0.14 (NR)	NR
	Group 3: Baseline- NR; Post- NR	Group 3: Baseline -0.01 (NR); Post -0.17 (NR)			
	Group 4: Baseline- NR; Post- NR	Group 4: Baseline -0.18 (NR); Post -0.22 (NR)			
<b>Study</b>	Hultman, 2012[10]				
<b>Overall Results</b>	The intervention significantly increased knowledge of unprofessional behaviour, identify attributes of a professional, integrate concepts of professionalism into practice, and understand the importance of professionalism				
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Participant Survey				
<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean (SD): Higher scores indicate stronger agreement with the statement				
<b>Outcome</b>	The course significantly improved their ability to define professionalism				
	<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Pre: NR Post: 24	Pre : 3.46 (NR) Post : 4.29 (NR) Pre v Post: P<0.01	-	-	NA
<b>Outcome</b>	The course significantly improved their ability to identify attributes of the professional				

	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Pre: NR Post: 24	Pre : 3.75 (NR) Post : 4.5 (NR) Pre v Post: P<0.01	-	-	NA
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>The course significantly improved their ability to integrate these concepts into practice</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Pre: NR Post: 24	Pre : 3.71 (NR) Post : 4.49 (NR) Pre v Post: P<0.01	-	-	NA
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>The course significantly improved their ability to understand the importance of professionalism</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Pre: NR Post: 24	Pre : 4.17 (NR) Post : 4.67 (NR) Pre v Post: P<0.01	-	-	NA
<b>Study</b>		<b>Kennedy, 2010[11]</b>			
<b>Overall Results</b>		Significant increase in knowledge of workplace bullying			
<b>Tool or Scale</b>		Demographic inventory and workplace bullying survey			
<b>Effect measure</b>		Mean (SD): Higher score indicates increase in knowledge			
<b>Outcome</b>		<b>Total Knowledge Score</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Pre: 26 Post: 26	Pre: 106.85 (10.06) Post: 121.24 (8.02) Pre v Post [Mean difference (SD)]: -14.47 (8.78) Pre v Post [t]: -8.41, p<0.05	-	-	NA
<b>Study</b>		<b>Lansbury, 2014[12]</b>			
<b>Overall Results</b>		Results were largely non-significant with only one intervention resulting in significant increase in participants' willingness to intervene in verbal bullying			

<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB)			
<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean (SD): Higher score indicates stronger agreement with statement			
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Audience Variable - 'Other people think verbal bullying is unacceptable'</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
Group 1: Pre- 72; Post- 76 Group 2: Pre- 69; Post- 191 Group 3: Pre- 74; Post- 54 Group 4: Pre- 68; Post- 56 Group 5: Pre- 57; Post- 40 Group 6: Pre- 145; Post- 115	Group 1: Pre- 4.07 (1.30); Post- 3.82 (1.40) Group 2: Pre- 4.01 (1.37); Post- 3.90 (1.19) Group 3: Pre- 3.82 (1.13); Post- 3.93 (1.36) Group 4: Pre- 3.78 (1.33); Post- 3.97 (1.25) Group 5: Pre- 4.32 (1.00); Post- 4.22 (1.07) Group 6: Pre- 4.14 (1.33); Post- 4.07 (1.32)	-	-	NR
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) – Power sub-scale</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
Group 1: Pre- 85; Post- 90 Group 2: Pre- 80; Post- 211 Group 3: Pre- 79; Post- 57 Group 4: Pre- 74; Post- 64 Group 5: Pre- 63; Post- 42 Group 6: Pre- 165; Post- 131	Group 1: Pre- 13.70 (4.06); Post- 13.66 (3.74) Group 2: Pre- 13.66 (4.51); Post- 14.33 (4.13) Group 3: Pre- 13.74 (4.25); Post- 13.30 (4.54) Group 4: Pre- 13.41 (4.43); Post- 14.09 (3.79) Group 5: Pre- 15.11 (4.21); Post- 14.95 (3.92) Group 6: Pre- 14.40 (4.27); Post- 14.67 (3.96)	-	-	NR
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB) – Process sub-scale</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
Group 1: Pre- 85; Post- 90 Group 2: Pre- 80; Post- 211 Group 3: Pre- 79; Post- 57 Group 4: Pre- 74; Post- 64 Group 5: Pre- 63; Post- 42 Group 6: Pre- 165; Post- 131	Group 1: Pre- 16.24 (5.07); Post- 16.80 (4.11) Group 2: Pre- 16.70 (4.85); Post- 17.42 (4.66) Group 3: Pre- 15.73 (4.64); Post- 15.37 (4.91) Group 4: Pre- 16.86 (4.77); Post- 17.87 (4.99) Group 5: Pre- 18.35 (4.91); Post- 17.41 (5.04) Group 6: Pre- 18.33 (4.92); Post- 18.71 (4.96)	-	-	NR
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Willingness to intervene - 'If I see verbal bullying I will intervene'</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>

<i>Sample size</i>		<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Comparison</i>
Group 1: Pre- 74; Post- 85 Group 2: Pre- 79; Post- 202 Group 3: Pre- 77; Post- 57 Group 4: Pre- 71; Post- 59 Group 5: Pre- 63; Post- 41 Group 6: Pre- 153; Post- 125		Group 1: Pre- 3.86 (1.24); Post- 3.37 (1.43); Group 1 Pre v Post: t= 2.17, p=0.03 Group 2: Pre- 3.97 (1.29); Post- 3.79 (1.17); Group 2 Pre v Post: t= 1.12, p= 0.27 Group 3: Pre- 3.81 (1.38); Post- 4.00 (1.34); Group 3 Pre v Post: t= -0.75, p= 0.48 Group 4: Pre- 3.79 (1.21); Post- 3.94 (1.27); Group 4 Pre v Post: t= -0.66, p= 0.51 Group 5: Pre- 4.21 (1.02); Post- 4.37 (0.81); Group 5 Pre v Post: t= -0.84, p= 0.40 Group 6: Pre- 3.87 (1.38); Post- 3.91 (1.43); Group 6 Pre v Post: t= -0.23, p= -0.82		-	-	NR

Study	Leiter, 2011[13]				
Overall Results	The intervention significantly improved civility scores, commitment, employee satisfaction, trust in management, and significantly decreased measures of cynicism				
Tool or Scale	CREW Civility Scale				
Effect measure	Mean (SD): higher scores indicate perceptions of greater civility in the workplace				
Outcome	Civility				
	Intervention		Control		Between Groups Comparison
	Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]	Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]	
	Time 1: 262 Time 2: 181	Time 1: 3.58 (0.73) Time 2: 3.82 (0.52)	Time 1: 911 Time 2: 726	Time 1: 3.72 (0.70) Time 2: 3.76 (0.58)	Time x CREW Intervention [t-test (df)]: 1.95 (1634), p<0.05
Tool or Scale	Affective Commitment Scale				
Effect measure	Mean (SD): Higher scores indicate greater commitment to the workplace				
Outcome	Commitment				
	Intervention		Control		Between Groups Comparison
	Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]	Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]	

Time 1: 262 Time 2: 181	Time 1: 3.16 (0.92) Time 2: 3.49 (0.88)	Time 1: 911 Time 2: 726	Time 1: 3.30 (0.90) Time 2: 3.43 (0.82)	Time x CREW Intervention [t-test (df)]: 2.41 (1634), p<0.05
----------------------------	--	----------------------------	--	--

**Tool or Scale** Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey (MBI-GS)

**Effect measure** Mean (SD): higher scores indicate more experiences of cynicism at work

**Outcome** Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey (MBI-GS) – Cynicism subscale

<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
Time 1: 262 Time 2: 181	Time 1: 1.89 (1.41) Time 2: 1.36 (1.27)	Time 1: 911 Time 2: 726	Time 1: 1.65 (1.26) Time 2: 1.55 (1.28)	Time x CREW Intervention [t-test (df)]: -2.47 (1634), p<0.05

**Outcome** Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey (MBI-GS) – Efficacy subscale

<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
Time 1: 262 Time 2: 181	Time 1: 4.57 (0.98) Time 2: 4.71 (0.95)	Time 1: 911 Time 2: 726	Time 1: 4.74 (0.89) Time 2: 4.73 (0.94)	Time x CREW Intervention [t-test (df)]: 0.52 (1634), p=NS

**Outcome** Maslach Burnout Inventory-General Survey (MBI-GS) – Exhaustion subscale

<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
Time 1: 262 Time 2: 181	Time 1: 3.21 (1.57) Time 2: 2.76 (1.49)	Time 1: 911 Time 2: 726	Time 1: 2.73 (1.42) Time 2: 2.65 (1.42)	Time x CREW Intervention [t-test (df)]: -1.53 (1634), p=NS

**Tool or Scale** Effort-Reward Imbalance Questionnaire (Esteem Reward section)

**Effect measure** Mean (SD): Higher scores indicate greater satisfaction with the workplace

**Outcome** Satisfaction

<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
Time 1: 262 Time 2: 181	Time 1: 5.06 (1.07) Time 2: 5.62 (0.89)	Time 1: 911 Time 2: 726	Time 1: 5.32 (0.97) Time 2: 5.47 (0.93)	Time x CREW Intervention [t-test (df)]: 4.12 (1634), p<0.05

<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Interpersonal Trust at Work Scale				
<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean (SD): Higher scores indicate greater trust in managers and greater faith in manager competence				
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Trust in management subscale</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Time 1: 262 Time 2: 181	Time 1: 2.98 (0.94) Time 2: 3.34 (0.78)	Time 1: 911 Time 2: 726	Time 1: 3.19 (0.79) Time 2: 3.33 (0.79)	Time x CREW Intervention [t-test (df)]: 2.12 (1634), p<0.05
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Turnover Intentions Measure				
<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean (SD): higher scores indicate a stronger intention to quit				
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Turnover intention</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Time 1: 262 Time 2: 181	Time 1: 2.44 (1.00) Time 2: 2.18 (0.94)	Time 1: 911 Time 2: 726	Time 1: 2.15 (0.93) Time 2: 2.08 (0.90)	Time x CREW Intervention [t-test (df)]: -0.67 (1634), p=NS
<b>Study</b>	<b>Mallette, 2011[14]</b>				
<b>Overall Results</b>	Participation in the workbook, e-learning, and e-learning + virtual world interventions significantly increased knowledge related to horizontal violence. Participation in all interventions significantly increased self-confidence in responding to horizontal violence				
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Confidence questionnaire based on Bandura 2006				
<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean change (SD): higher scores indicate increased self-confidence				
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Change in confidence (pre-post) in responding to a situation involving horizontal violence</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean change (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean change (SD)]</i>	
	Group 1: 30 Group 2: 34 Group 3: 31 Group 4: 31	Group 1: 18.3 (15.77) Group 2: 17.9 (15.96) Group 3: 17.0 (17.20) Group 4: 20.8 (15.39)	NR	NR (NR)	Group 1 v Group 2 v Group 3 v Group 4: F=0.31, p=0.82
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Questionnaire on knowledge of horizontal violence				



<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean change (SD): higher scores indicate increased knowledge of horizontal violence				
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Change in pre-to-post knowledge test scores</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean change (SD)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean change (SD)]</i>	
Group 1: 33	Group 1: 1.5 (2.21)		NR	NR (NR)	Group 1 v Group 2 v Group 3 v Group 4: F=4.41, p=.006
Group 2: 35	Group 2: 1.6 (1.65)				
Group 3: 31	Group 3: 0.0 (1.51)				
Group 4: 33	Group 4: 1.3 (2.41)				
<b>Study</b>	<b>Meloni, 2011[15]</b>				
<b>Overall Results</b>	The intervention increased employee engagement and raised awareness of workplace bullying (significance was not tested).				
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Employee satisfaction survey				
<b>Effect measure</b>	Percentage of respondents who strongly agreed or agreed with the statement				
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Employee engagement</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [%]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [%]</i>	
Pre: 421	Pre: Engaged- 28; Swinging voters- 45; Disengaged- 27		-	-	NA
Follow-up Time 1: 660	Follow-up Time 1: Engaged- 32; Swinging voters- 42; Disengaged- 26				
Follow-up Time 2: 710	Follow-up Time 2: Engaged- 37; Swinging voters- 43; Disengaged- 20				
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>There has been significant improvement in the last 12 months in management’s preparedness to eliminate bullying and harassment</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [%]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [%]</i>	
Pre: 421	Pre: NA		-	-	NA
Follow-up Time 1: 660	Follow-up Time 1: 58				
Follow-up Time 2: 710	Follow-up Time 2: 69				
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>If I observed or experienced bullying or harassment I would trust that, if such behaviour was reported, then it would be appropriately managed</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [%]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [%]</i>	

	Pre: 421 Follow-up Time 1: 660 Follow-up Time 2: 710	Pre: 44 Follow-up Time 1: 53 Follow-up Time 2: 64	-	-	NA
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>If I observed or experienced bullying or harassment I would know how to go about reporting such behaviour</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [%]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [%]</i>	
	Pre: 421 Follow-up Time 1: 660 Follow-up Time 2: 710	Pre: 67 Follow-up Time 1: 79 Follow-up Time 2: 84	-	-	NA
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>If I observed or experienced bullying or harassment I would report this behaviour</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [%]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [%]</i>	
	Pre: 421 Follow-up Time 1: 660 Follow-up Time 2: 710	Pre: 73 Follow-up Time 1: 77 Follow-up Time 2: 86	-	-	NA
<b>Study</b>	<b>Osatuke, 2009[16]</b>				
<b>Overall Results</b>	The intervention significantly increased civility scores				
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	8-item civility scale (Meterko et al., 2008)				
<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean (SD): Higher scores indicate greater perceptions of civility in the workplace				
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Civility index scores</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [SD]</i>	
	Baseline: 1113 Post: 975	Baseline: 3.46 (0.99) Post: 3.70 (0.93)	Baseline: 843 Post: 1087	Time 1: 3.46 (1.00) Time 2: 3.46 (1.01)	ANOVA (Intervention status x time) [F-test (df)]: 13.35 (1), P<0.001
<b>Study</b>	<b>Stagg, 2011[17]</b>				
<b>Overall Results</b>	The training program significantly increased knowledge of workplace bullying				
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Testing of the training program				
<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean (SD): Higher scores indicate increased knowledge of workplace bullying				

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Knowledge Test Score</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
Pre: 15 Post: 15	Pre: 15.47 (1.06) Post-test: 19.73 (1.10) Pre v Post [t (df)]: -12.91 (14), p<0.01		-	-	NA

### Behaviours Related to Workplace Bullying/Incivility

<b>Study</b>	<b>Ceravolo, 2012[2]</b>				
<b>Overall Results</b>	Positive trends in behavioural responses to verbal abuse, e.g., fewer nurses reported gossiping after the intervention				
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Verbal Abuse Survey				
<b>Effect measure</b>	N (%): Proportion of respondents who agree or strongly agree with statement				
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Were determined to solve the problem (in response to a verbally abusive incident)</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	
Pre: 703 Post: 485	Pre: 194 (29) Post: 170 (37.9)		-	-	NA
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>I have not gossiped in the past month</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	
Pre: 703 Post: 485	Pre: 312 (40) Post: 227 (47)		-	-	NA
<b>Study</b>	<b>Embree, 2013[6]</b>				
<b>Overall Results</b>	Reduction in both self-silencing behaviours at work				
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Silencing the Self-Work Scale (STSS-W)				
<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean(SD): Higher scores indicate behaviour congruent with self-silencing and conflict avoidance				

	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Silencing the Self-Work Scale (STSS-W)</b>			
		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	
		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>
		Pre: 44 Post: 33	Pre: 67.03(NR) Post: 65.19(NR)	-	-
					NA
	<b>Study</b>	<b>Goldberg, 2007[8]</b>			
	<b>Overall Results</b>	NR (no results reported for this outcome)			
	<b>Study</b>	<b>Leiter, 2011[13]</b>			
	<b>Overall Results</b>	Non-significant decrease in self-reports of instigating incivility.			
	<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Researcher defined scale			
	<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean (SD): "Using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 7 (daily), participants rated their own behavior"			
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Instigated incivility</b>			
		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	
		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>
		Time 1: 262 Time 2: 181	Time 1: 0.51 (0.49) Time 2: 0.42 (0.43)	Time 1: 911 Time 2: 726	Time 1: 0.54 (0.54) Time 2: 0.50 (0.55)
					Time x CREW Intervention [t-test (df)]: -1.12 (1634), p=NS
	<b>Study</b>	<b>Sanderson, 2014[18]</b>			
	<b>Overall Results</b>	Positive trends in the overall civility score and each item on the scale; only two items reached significance (Anti-discrimination and Co-operation)			
	<b>Tool or Scale</b>	All Employee Survey - Civility Scale			
	<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean (SD): higher scores indicate greater workplace civility [respondents rated agreement on 5-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree)]			
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Civility Scale - total score</b>			
		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	
		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>
		Pre: NR Post: NR	Pre: 3.30 (NR) Post: 3.57 (NR) Pre v Post [t-test]: F=3.74, t=1.496 (167), p=0.055	-	-
					NA
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Anti-Discrimination: "This organization does not tolerate discrimination."</b>			

		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Pre: 62 Post: 104	Pre: 3.45 (1.45) Post: 3.62 (1.20) Pre v Post [t-test]: F=4.95, t=-0.79 (164), p=0.027	-	-	NA
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Conflict Resolution: "Disputes or conflicts are resolved fairly in my work group."</b>				
		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Pre: 60 Post: 101	Pre: 3.12 (1.43) Post: 3.36 (1.21) Pre v Post [t-test]: F=2.39, t=-1.13 (159), p=0.124	-	-	NA
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Cooperation: "A spirit of cooperation and teamwork exists in my work group."</b>				
		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Pre: 62 Post: 105	Pre: 3.26 (1.41) Post: 3.66 (1.18) Pre v Post [t-test]: F=5.27, t=-1.96 (165), p=0.023	-	-	NA
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Diversity Acceptance: "Managers/supervisors/team leaders work well with employees of different backgrounds in my work group."</b>				
		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Pre: 59 Post: 106	Pre: 3.53 (1.28) Post: 3.70 (1.11) Pre v Post [t-test]: F=1.67, t=-0.94 (163), p=0.198	-	-	NA
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Personal Interest: "The people I work with take a personal interest in me."</b>				
		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Pre: 57 Post: 104	Pre: 3.04 (1.21) Post: 3.39 (1.07) Pre v Post [t-test]: F=0.45, t=-1.95 (159), p=0.504	-	-	NA
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Reliability: "The people I work with can be relied on when I need help."</b>				
		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	

	Pre: 61 Post: 106	Pre: 3.44 (1.13) Post: 3.70 (1.16) Pre v Post [t-test]: F=0.37, t=-1.39 (165), p=0.543	-	-	NA
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Respect: "People treat each other with respect in my work group."</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Pre: 63 Post: 104	Pre: 3.16 (1.46) Post: 3.54 (1.30) Pre v Post: F=3.43, t=-1.75 (165), p=0.066	-	-	NA
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Value Differences: "Differences among individuals are respected and valued in my work group."</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Pre: 58 Post: 104	Pre: 3.47 (1.30) Post: 3.61 (1.20) Pre v Post [t-test]: F=0.77, t=-0.69 (160), p=0.382	-	-	NA
<b>Study</b>	<b>Stagg, 2011[17]</b>				
<b>Overall Results</b>	Significant increase in the number of respondents that reported observing or engaging in bullying behaviour, possibly due to increased awareness of bullying, and that felt adequately trained to manage workplace bullying.				
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Testing of the training program				
<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean (SD): respondents rated agreement on 5-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree)				
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>"I have observed other nurses being bullied"</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Pre: 15 Post: 15	Pre: NR Post: NR Pre v Post[ Z-score]: -2.64, P<0.01	-	-	NA
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>"I have bullied others"</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Pre: 15 Post: 15	Pre: NR Post: NR Pre v Post[ Z-score]: -2.45, P<0.05	-	-	NA

## Skills to Cope With Workplace Bullying/Incivility

<b>Study</b>	<b>Ceravolo, 2012[2]</b>				
<b>Overall Results</b>	Increased use of skills to resolve workplace issues				
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Verbal Abuse Survey				
<b>Effect measure</b>	N (%): Proportion of respondents who agree or strongly agree with statement				
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>"I resolve conflict through direct conversation"</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	
Pre: 703 Post: 485	Pre: 381 (49) Post: 277 (57)		-	-	NA
<b>Study</b>	<b>Stagg, 2011[17]</b>				
<b>Overall Results</b>	Perceived self-efficacy of skills significantly increased post-intervention				
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Testing of the training program				
<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean (SD): respondents rated agreement on 5-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree)				
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>"I am adequately trained to manage a workplace bully"</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
Pre: 15 Post: 15	Pre: NR Post: NR Pre v Post[ Z-score]: -3.36, P<0.01		-	-	NA
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>"I feel confident in defending myself against bullies"</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
Pre: 15 Post: 15	Pre: NR Post: NR Pre v Post[ Z-score]: NR, P=NS		-	-	NA

## Results of Incivil Behaviour and Outcomes of Workplace Bullying

<b>Study</b>	Anderson, 2006[19]			
<b>Overall Results</b>	Significant reduction in the number of emotional-verbal workplace violence events following training			
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Workplace Violence Questionnaire and Demographics tool			
<b>Effect measure</b>	N (%): number of events over the study period			
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Total number of workplace violence events</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>
	Pre: 22 Post: Complete training- 10; Incomplete training- 5	Pre: 135 (67.5) Post: Complete training- 29 (44.6); Incomplete training- 15 (23) Complete training Pre v Post [M, t-test (df)]: 2.100, 2.272 (9), p=0.49	Pre: 21 Post: 13	Pre: 65 (32.5) Post: 21 (32.4)
	Pre Intervention v Control [t-test (df)]: -2.721 (41), p=0.01			
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Emotional-verbal workplace violence events</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>
	Pre: 22 Post: Complete training- 10; Incomplete training- 5	Pre: 106 (78.5) Post: Complete training- 21 (72.5); Incomplete training- 10 (67)	Pre: 21 Post: 13	Pre: 49 (75.5) Post: 19 (90.4)
	Pre Intervention v Control [t-test (df)]: -3.032 (41), p=0.004 Post Complete training v Control [M, F-test (df)]: -4.323, 5.508 (2), p=0.01			
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Physical workplace violence events</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>
	Pre: 22 Post: Complete training- 10; Incomplete training- 5	Pre: 5 (4) Post: Complete training- 0 (0); Incomplete training- 2 (13)	Pre: 21 Post: 13	Pre: 1 (1.5) Post: 1 (4.8)
	-			
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Physical workplace violence events</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>
	Pre: 22 Post: Complete training- 10; Incomplete training- 5	Pre: 23 (17.5) Post: Complete training- 8 (27.5); Incomplete training- 3 (20)	Pre: 21 Post: 13	Pre: 15 (23) Post: 1 (4.8)
	-			



<b>Study</b>	<b>Barak, 1994[20]</b>			
<b>Overall Results</b>	No reported serious events of sexual harassment after training (may be due to small follow-up sample size); no other evident trends			
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Sexual Experiences Questionnaire			
<b>Effect measure</b>	N (%): number of people reporting exposure to the behaviour			
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Verbal sexual harassment</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>
Pre: 25 Post: 6	Pre: 13 (6) Post: 6 (100)		-	-
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Sexually suggestive behaviours</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>
Pre: 25 Post: 6	Pre: NR (33) Post: 3 (50)		-	-
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Attempts of sexual bribery</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>
Pre: 25 Post: 6	Pre: 2 (9) Post: (0)		-	-
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Sexual blackmail</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>
Pre: 25 Post: 6	Pre: 2 (8) Post: 0 (0)		-	-
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Sexual assault</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>

Sample size		Results [N (%)]		Sample size	Results [N (%)]
Pre: 25 Post: 6		Pre: 2 (8) Post: 0 (0)		-	-
Study	Ceravolo, 2012[2]				
Overall Results	Overall reduction in the amount of verbal bullying and negative emotional responses (no formal test of significance)				
Tool or Scale	Verbal Abuse Survey				
Effect measure	N (%): number of participants reporting event				
Outcome	Verbally abused at work				
	Intervention		Control		Between Groups Comparison
Sample size	Results [N (%)]		Sample size	Results [N (%)]	
Pre: 703 Post: 485	Pre: 634 (90) Post: 370 (76)		-	-	-
Outcome	Felt confused in response to verbal abuse				
	Intervention		Control		Between Groups Comparison
Sample size	Results [N (%)]		Sample size	Results [N (%)]	
Pre: 703 Post: 485	Pre: 116 (17.3) Post: 98 (21.8)		-	-	-
Outcome	Felt embarrassed in response to verbal abuse				
	Intervention		Control		Between Groups Comparison
Sample size	Results [N (%)]		Sample size	Results [N (%)]	
Pre: 703 Post: 485	Pre: 275 (41) Post: 193 (43)		-	-	-
Outcome	Felt fearful in response to verbal abuse				
	Intervention		Control		Between Groups Comparison
Sample size	Results [N (%)]		Sample size	Results [N (%)]	
Pre: 703 Post: 485	Pre: 63 (9.4) Post: 116 (13.8)		-	-	-
Outcome	Felt harassed in response to verbal abuse				
	Intervention		Control		Between Groups Comparison

		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	<i>Comparison</i>
		Pre: 703 Post: 485	Pre: 272 (40.6) Post: 174 (38.8)	-	-	-
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Felt hostility in response to verbal abuse</b>				
		<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	
		Pre: 703 Post: 485	Pre: 96 (14.3) Post: 59 (13.1)	-	-	-
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Felt powerless in response to verbal abuse</b>				
		<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	
		Pre: 703 Post: 485	Pre: 121 (26.9) Post: 238 (35.5)	-	-	-
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Turnover rate</b>				
		<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	
		NR	Pre: NR (8.9) Post: NR (6)	-	-	NA
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Vacancy rate</b>				
		<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>		<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	
		NR	Pre: NR (8.9) Post: NR (3)	-	-	NA
	<b>Study</b>	<b>Chipps, 2012[3]</b>				
	<b>Overall Results</b>	Non-significant increases in both reported bullying frequency and intensity after awareness/education training				
	<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised (NAQ-R)				
	<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean (SD): number of negative acts experienced weekly or daily				

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Bullying frequency score</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
Pre: 16 Post: 16	Pre: <1 (NR) Post: 1.6 (NR) Pre v Post [ $\chi^2$ ]: 0.56, p=0.13		-	-	-
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Bullying intensity score (based on cumulative number of negative acts reported)</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
Pre: 16 Post: 16	Pre: 7.6 (NR) Post: 8.3 (NR) Pre v Post [ $\chi^2$ ]: NR, p=0.66		-	-	-
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised (NAQ-R)				
<b>Effect measure</b>	N (%): proportion of respondents that answered positively				
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Have been witness to any bullying in the workplace</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	
Pre: 16 Post: 16	Pre: 12 (75) Post: 15 (88)		-	-	-
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Self-identified as a target of bullying</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	
Pre: 16 Post: 16	Pre: 3 (13) Post: 4 (25)		-	-	-
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Self-identifying as having experienced bullying at least weekly</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>		<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	
Pre: 16 Post: 16	Pre: 6 (37) Post: 1 (6)		-	-	-

<b>Study</b>	<b>Dahlby, 2014[4]</b>			
<b>Overall Results</b>	Significant reduction in the degree of seriousness of lateral violence post intervention, no other significant results or evident trends			
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Lateral and Vertical Violence in Nursing Survey			
<b>Effect measure</b>	N (%): proportion of respondents that agree with each option			
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Degree of seriousness of lateral violence in my work area: Lateral violence toward peer</b>			
	<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>	<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	
Pre: 29 Post: 25	Not Serious: Pre- 12 (41.38); Post- 8 (33.33) Serious: Pre- 8 (27.59); Post- 1 (4.17) Somewhat Serious: Pre- 6 (20.69); Post- 13 (54.17) Very Serious: Pre- 3 (10.34); Post- 2 (8.33) Pre v Post [ $\chi^2$ ]: NR, p=0.02	-	-	-
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Experience with lateral violence in my work area: I observe lateral violence behaviours</b>			
	<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>	<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	
Pre: 29 Post: 25	Daily: Pre- 5 (17.24); Post- 2 (8) Weekly: Pre- 16 (55.17); Post- 12 (48) Monthly: Pre- 7 (24.14); Post- 10 (40) Never: Pre- 1 (3.45); Post- 1 (4) Pre v Post [ $\chi^2$ ]: NR, p=0.29	-	-	-
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Experience with lateral violence in my work area: Recipient of lateral violence behaviours</b>			
	<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>	<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	
Pre: 29 Post: 25	Daily: Pre- 2 (6.9); Post- 0 (0) Weekly: Pre- 12 (41.38); Post- 12 (48) Monthly: Pre- 4 (13.79); Post- 3 (12) Never: Pre- 11 (37.93); Post- 10 (40) Pre v Post [ $\chi^2$ ]: NR, p=0.45	-	-	-
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Experience with lateral violence in my work area: Use lateral violence behaviours</b>			
	<i>Intervention</i>		<i>Control</i>	<i>Between Groups Comparison</i>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	

	Pre: 29 Post: 25	Daily: Pre- 0 (0); Post- 0 (0) Weekly: Pre- 4 (13.79); Post- 3 (12) Monthly: Pre- 7 (24.14); Post- 12 (48) Never: Pre- 18 (62.07); Post- 10 (40) Pre v Post [ $\chi^2$ ]: NR, p=0.17	-	-	-
Study	Dompierre, 2008[5]				
Overall Results	Significant reduction in physical violence in intervention arm before and after intervention, significantly more psychologically violent events reported in intervention arm compared to control				
Tool or Scale	Participant questionnaire				
Effect measure	N (%): proportion of respondents that answered positively				
Outcome	Had been a victim of psychological violence				
	Intervention		Control	Between Groups Comparison	
Sample size	Results [N (%)]	Sample size	Results [N (%)]		
Pre: 97 Post: 51	Pre: 41 (41.2) Post: 19 (37.25) Pre v Post [ $\chi^2$ (df)]: 0.22 (1), p=NS	Pre: NA Post: 39	Pre: NA (NA) Post: 8 (20.51)	Pre Intervention v Control [ $\chi^2$ (df)]: NA Post Intervention v Control [ $\chi^2$ (df)]: 2.95 (1), p=NS	
Outcome	Had been a victim of physical violence				
	Intervention		Control	Between Groups Comparison	
Sample size	Results [N (%)]	Sample size	Results [N (%)]		
Pre: 96 Post: 51	Pre: 9 (9.4) Post: 0 (0) Pre v Post [ $\chi^2$ (df)]: 5.09 (1), p<0.05	Pre: NA Post: 39	Pre: NA (NA) Post: 2 (5.13)	Pre Intervention v Control [ $\chi^2$ (df)]: NA Post Intervention v Control [ $\chi^2$ (df)]: 2.67 (1), p=NS	
Tool or Scale	Participant questionnaire				
Effect measure	Mean (SD): number of events over the study period				
Outcome	Physically violent events				
	Intervention		Control	Between Groups Comparison	
Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]	Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]		

	Pre: 101 Post: 49	Pre: 0.15 (NR) Post: 0 (NR) Pre v Post [t-test (df)]: 2.78 (148), p<0.01	Pre: NA Post: 39	Pre: NA (NR) Post: 0.05 (NR)	Pre Intervention v Control [t-test (df)]: NA Post Intervention v Control [t-test (df)]: -1.43 (86), p=NS
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Psychologically violent events</b>			
		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Pre: 100 Post: 49	Pre: 0.72 (NR) Post: 0.84 (NR) Pre v Post [t-test (df)]: -0.41 (147), p=NS	Pre: NA Post: 39	Pre: NA (NR) Post: 0.26 (NR)	Pre Intervention v Control [t-test (df)]: NA Post Intervention v Control [t-test (df)]: 2.17 (86), p<0.05
	<b>Study</b>	<b>Embree, 2013[6]</b>			
	<b>Overall Results</b>	Continuing reduction in employee turnover post-intervention			
	<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Human Resources data			
	<b>Effect measure</b>	N (%): Defined as the total number of fulltime and part-time staff voluntarily separating from an organization during a calendar year			
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Employee Turnover</b>			
		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	
	Pre: NR Year 1: NR Year 2: NR	Pre: NR (7.84) Year 1: NR (1.42) Year 2: NR (0.00)	-	-	NA
	<b>Study</b>	<b>Hoel, 2006[9]</b>			
	<b>Overall Results</b>	Little to no changes on any measure, no evident trends			
	<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Participant survey			
	<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean (SD): higher scores indicate increased levels of the specified behaviour			
	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Bullied within the last six months</b>			
		<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	

	Group 1: Pre- NR; Post- NR Group 2: Pre- NR; Post- NR Group 3: Pre- NR; Post- NR Group 4: Pre- NR; Post- NR		Group 1: Pre- 1.33 (NR); Post- 1.31 (NR) Group 2: Pre- 1.23 (NR); Post- 1.27 (NR) Group 3: Pre- 1.32 (NR); Post- 1.31 (NR) Group 4: Pre- 1.46 (NR); Post-1.43 (NR)		Pre: NR Post: NR	Pre: 1.25 (NR) Post: 1.23 (NR)	-
	Outcome	Considered quitting last six months					
	Intervention		Control		Between Groups Comparison		
	Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]		Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]		
	Group 1: Pre- NR; Post- NR Group 2: Pre- NR; Post- NR Group 3: Pre- NR; Post- NR Group 4: Pre- NR; Post- NR		Group 1: Pre- 2.46 (NR); Post- 2.56 (NR) Group 2: Pre- 2.45 (NR); Post- 2.47 (NR) Group3: Pre- 2.42 (NR); Post- 2.41 (NR) Group 4: Pre- 2.49 (NR); Post- 2.49 (NR)		Pre: NR Post: NR	Pre: 2.46 (NR) Post: 2.52 (NR)	-
	Outcome	Witnessed bullying over the last six months					
	Intervention		Control		Between Groups Comparison		
	Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]		Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]		
	Group 1: Pre- NR; Post- NR Group 2: Pre- NR; Post- NR Group 3: Pre- NR; Post- NR Group 4: Pre- NR; Post- NR		Group 1: Pre- 1.66 (NR); Post- 1.69 (NR) Group 2: Pre- 1.62 (NR); Post- 1.49 (NR) Group 3: Pre- 1.69(NR); Post- 1.59 (NR) Group 4: Pre- 1.73 (NR); Post- 1.67 (NR)		Pre: NR Post: NR	Pre: 1.63 Post: 1.63	-
	Tool or Scale	Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised					
	Effect measure	Mean (SD): higher scores indicate increased negative behaviour					
	Outcome		Negative Acts Questionnaire				
	Intervention		Control		Between Groups Comparison		
	Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]		Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]		
	Group 1: Pre- NR; Post- NR Group 2: Pre- NR; Post- NR Group 3: Pre- NR; Post- NR Group 4: Pre- NR; Post- NR		Group 1: Pre- 29.29 (NR); Post- 28.96 (NR) Group 2: Pre- 28.13 (NR); Post- 29.23 (NR) Group 3: Pre- 27.76 (NR); Post- 27.89 (NR) Group 4: Pre- 30.25 (NR); Post- 29.30 (NR)		Pre: NR Post: NR	Pre: 28.57 Post: 28.63	-
	Tool or Scale	Bullying Risk Assessment Tool (BRAT)					
	Effect measure	Mean (SD): time off work in the last 6 months					



Outcome		Self-reported absenteeism				
		Intervention		Control		Between Groups Comparison
Sample size		Results [Mean (SD)]		Results [Mean (SD)]		
Group 1: Pre- NR; Post- NR		Group 1: Pre- 4.00 (NR); Post- 4.01 (NR)				-
Group 2: Pre- NR; Post- NR		Group 2: Pre- 4.19 (NR); Post- 3.61 (NR)		Pre: NR		
Group 3: Pre- NR; Post- NR		Group 3: Pre- 4.56 (NR); Post- 3.25 (NR)		Post: NR		
Group 4: Pre- NR; Post- NR		Group 4: Pre- 3.67 (NR); Post- 3.56 (NR)				
Study	Keashly, 2009[21]					
Overall Results	NR (no results reported for this outcome)					
Study	Lansbury, 2014[12]					
Overall Results	Significant increase in reports of exposure to verbal bullying in intervention group 5, no other evident trends					
Tool or Scale	Responsible Bystander Intervention in Verbal Bullying (RBI-VB)					
Effect measure	Mean (SD): higher scores indicate greater exposure to verbal bullying					
Outcome	Self-reported exposure to workplace verbal bullying					
		Intervention		Control		Between Groups Comparison
Sample size		Results [Mean (SD)]		Results [Mean (SD)]		
Group 1: Pre- NR; Post- NR		Group 1: Pre- 0.16 (0.373); Post- 0.18 (0.383); Pre v Post [t-test]: 0.195, p=0.846				-
Group 2: Pre- NR; Post- NR		Group 2: Pre- 0.09 (0.281); Post- 0.11 (0.31); Pre v Post [t-test]: 0.563, p=0.574				
Group 3: Pre- NR; Post- NR		Group 3: Pre- 0.11 (0.316); Post- 0.17 (0.378); Pre v Post [t-test]: 0.965, p=0.337				
Group 4: Pre- NR; Post- NR		Group 4: Pre- 0.12 (0.329); Post- 0.05 (0.213); Pre v Post [t-test]: 1.604, p=0.111				
Group 5: Pre- NR; Post- NR		Group 5: Pre- 0.02 (0.125); Post- 0.14 (0.354); Pre v Post [t-test]: 2.64, p=0.03				
Group 6: Pre- NR; Post- NR		Group 6: Pre- 0.07 (0.249); Post- 0.08 (0.266); Pre v Post [t-test]: 0.317, p=0.751				
Outcome	Self-reports of witnessing verbal bullying					
		Intervention		Control		Between Groups Comparison
Sample size		Results [Mean (SD)]		Results [Mean (SD)]		

Group 1: Pre- NR; Post- NR	Group 1: Pre- 0.27 (0.447); Post- 0.23 (0.424); Pre v Post [t-test]: 0.607, p=0.545			
Group 2: Pre- NR; Post- NR	Group 2: Pre- 0.12 (0.329); Post- 0.14 (0.343); Pre v Post [t-test]: 0.308, p=0.758			
Group 3: Pre- NR; Post- NR	Group 3: Pre- 0.17 (0.38); Post- 0.19 (0.393); Pre v Post [t-test]: 0.206, p=0.837	-	-	-
Group 4: Pre- NR; Post- NR	Group 4: Pre- 0.19 (0.394); Post- 0.11 (0.315); Pre v Post [t-test]: 1.322, p=0.189			
Group 5: Pre- NR; Post- NR	Group 5: Pre- 0.08 (0.27); Post- 0.12 (0.328); Pre v Post [t-test]: 0.700, p=0.486			
Group 6: Pre- NR; Post- NR	Group 6: Pre- 0.14 (0.353); Post- 0.09 (0.289); Pre v Post [t-test]: 1.445, p=0.150			

Study	Leiter, 2011[13]			
Overall Results	Overall reduction in reports of supervisor and coworker incivility, increase in reports of respect in the workplace (no formal comparison made); significant decrease in self-reported absenteeism post-intervention			
Tool or Scale	Workplace Incivility Scale			
Effect measure	Mean (SD): Participants rated the extent to which they experienced incivility from others (0=never to 6=daily)			
Outcome	Co-worker incivility			
	Intervention		Control	
	Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]	Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]
	Time 1: 262	Time 1: 0.78 (0.84)	Time 1: 911	Time 1: 0.8 (0.85)
	Time 2: 181	Time 2: 0.58 (0.74)	Time 2: 726	Time 2: 0.76 (0.87)
	-			
Outcome	Supervisor incivility			
	Intervention		Control	
	Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]	Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]
	Time 1: 262	Time 1: 0.74 (0.99)	Time 1: 911	Time 1: 0.57 (0.85)
	Time 2: 181	Time 2: 0.49 (0.8)	Time 2: 726	Time 2: 0.57 (0.85)
	-			
Tool or Scale	Effort-Reward Imbalance Questionnaire (Esteem Reward section)			
Effect measure	Mean (SD): Participants rated agreement with statements (1=strongly disagree)			
Outcome	Respect (e.g., I receive the respect I deserve from my supervisors/colleagues)			
	Intervention		Control	
	Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]	Sample size	Results [Mean (SD)]

	Time 1: 262 Time 2: 181	Time 1: 3.21 (0.79) Time 2: 3.62 (0.69)	Time 1: 911 Time 2: 726	Time 1: 3.42 (0.76) Time 2: 3.51 (0.75)	-
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Researcher developed questionnaire				
<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean (SD): number of self-reported absences per month				
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Self-reported absences: “In the past month, on how many occasions have you missed work due to illness or disability?”</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
	Time 1: 262 Time 2: 181	Time 1: 0.88 (2.31) Time 2: 0.54 (1.07)	Time 1: 911 Time 2: 726	Time 1: 0.86 (2.04) Time 2: 0.83 (2.00)	Time x CREW Intervention [t-test (df)]: -4.32 (1554), p<0.05
<b>Study</b>	<b>Leon-Perez, 2012[22]</b>				
<b>Overall Results</b>	NR (no results reported for this outcome)				
<b>Study</b>	<b>Meloni, 2011[15]</b>				
<b>Overall Results</b>	General increase in proportion of respondents that feel workplace is free from bullying and harassment				
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Employee satisfaction survey				
<b>Effect measure</b>	N (%): proportion of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed with the statement				
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>"My workplace is free from bullying and harassment from my manager"</b>				
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>		<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [N (%)]</i>	
	Pre: 421 Time 1: 660 Time 2: 710	Pre: 295 (70) Time 1: 449 (68) Time 2: 525 (74)	-	-	-
<b>Study</b>	<b>Pate, 2010[23]</b>				
<b>Overall Results</b>	Significant reduction in perception of bullying as a problem in the organization after intervention				
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Employee attitude survey				

<b>Effect measure</b>	Mean (SD): higher scores indicate stronger agreement with the statement			
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>"I feel bullying is a problem within the organisation"</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	
Pre: 126 Post: 120	Pre: 3.51 Post: 2.66 Pre v Post [t-test]: 6.10, p=0.00	-	-	-
<b>Tool or Scale</b>	Employee attitude survey			
<b>Effect measure</b>	N (%): proportion of respondents who selected each option			
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Level of trust in senior management</b>			
	<b>Intervention</b>		<b>Control</b>	<b>Between Groups Comparison</b>
<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results [Mean (SD)]</i>	<i>Sample size</i>	<i>Results</i>	
Pre: 126 Post: 120	Very Good: Pre- 5 (4); Post- 4 (3) Good: Pre- 26 (21); Post- 26 (22) Neutral: Pre- 30 (24); Post- 24 (20) Adequate: Pre- 30 (24); Post- 26 (22) Poor: Pre- 32 (25); 38 (32)	-	-	-

## References

1. Bingham SG, Scherer LL. The unexpected effects of a sexual harassment educational program. *J Appl Behav Sci.* 2001;37(2):125-53.
2. Ceravolo DJ, Schwartz DG, Foltz-Ramos KM, Castner J. Strengthening communication to overcome lateral violence. *J Nurs Manag.* 2012;20(5):599-606. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2834.2012.01402.x>.
3. Chipps EM, McRury M. The development of an educational intervention to address workplace bullying: a pilot study. *J Nurses Staff Dev.* 2012;28(3):94-8. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/NND.0b013e31825514bb>.
4. Dahlby MA, Herrick LM. Evaluating an educational intervention on lateral violence. *J Contin Educ Nurs.* 2014;45(8):344-50; quiz 51-2. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3928/00220124-20140724-15>.
5. Dompierre J, Laliberte D, Girard S, Gignac S. A qualitative and quantitative evaluation of an experiment for preventing violence in the workplace. *Eur Rev Appl Psychol.* 2008;58(4):275-83. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.erap.2008.09.010>.
6. Embree JL, Bruner DA, White A. Raising the Level of Awareness of Nurse-to-Nurse Lateral Violence in a Critical Access Hospital. *Nurs Res Pract.* 2013;2013:207306. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2013/207306>.
7. Frisbie SH. Sexual harassment: A comparison of online versus traditional training methods. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering.* 2002;62(10-B):4837. PubMed PMID: 2002-95008-310.
8. Goldberg CB. The impact of training and conflict avoidance on responses to sexual harassment. *Psychol Women Q.* 2007;31(1):62-72. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00331.x.
9. Hoel H, Giga SI. Destructive interpersonal conflict in the workplace: The effectiveness of management interventions. *Destructive Interpersonal Conflict in the Workplace: The Effectiveness of Management Interventions.* 2006.
10. Hultman CS, Connolly A, Halvorson EG, Rowland P, Meyers MO, Mayer DC, et al. Get on your boots: preparing fourth-year medical students for a career in surgery, using a focused curriculum to teach the competency of professionalism. *J Surg Res.* 2012;177(2):217-23. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2012.06.019>.
11. Kennedy M. Workplace bullying: The enculturated group behavior of nurses Southern Nazarene University.
12. Lansbury L. The development, measurement and implementation of a bystander intervention strategy: A field study on workplace verbal bullying in a large UK organisation: University of Portsmouth; 2014.
13. Leiter MP, Laschinger HKS, Day A, Oore DG. The impact of civility interventions on employee social behavior, distress, and attitudes. *J Appl Psychol.* 2011;96(6):1258-74. doi: 10.1037/a0024442.
14. Mallette C, Duff M, McPhee C, Pollex H, Wood A. Workbooks to virtual worlds: a pilot study comparing educational tools to foster a culture of safety and respect in Ontario. *Nurs Leadersh (Tor Ont).* 2011;24(4):44-64.
15. Meloni M, Austin M. Implementation and outcomes of a zero tolerance of bullying and harassment program. *Aust Health Rev.* 2011;35(1):92-4. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/AH10896>.
16. Osatuke K, Moore SC, Ward C, Dyrenforth SR, Belton L. Civility, respect, engagement in the workforce (CREW): Nationwide organization development intervention at veterans health administration. *J Appl Behav Sci.* 2009;45(3):384-410. doi: 10.1177/0021886309335067.
17. Stagg SJ, Sheridan D, Jones RA, Speroni KG. Evaluation of a workplace bullying cognitive rehearsal program in a hospital setting. *J Contin Educ Nurs.* 2011;42(9):395-401; quiz 2-3. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3928/00220124-20110823-45>.

18. Sanderson L. Improving civility in the mental health nursing workplace through assertiveness training with role-play. Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering. 2014;74(11-B(E)):No Pagination Specified. PubMed PMID: Dissertation Abstract: 2014-99100-313.
19. Anderson C. Training efforts to reduce reports of workplace violence in a community health care facility. J Prof Nurs. 2006;22(5):289-95.
20. Barak A. A cognitive-behavioral educational workshop to combat sexual harassment in the workplace. J Couns Dev. 1994;72(6):595-602. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.1994.tb01688.x>.
21. Keashly L, Neuman JH. Building a constructive communication climate: The Workplace Stress and Aggression Project. Destructive organizational communication: Processes, consequences, and constructive ways of organizing. New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group; US; 2009. p. 339-62.
22. Leon-Perez JM, Arenas A, Griggs TB. Effectiveness of conflict management training to prevent workplace bullying. Workplace bullying: Symptoms and solutions. New York, NY: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group; US; 2012. p. 230-43.
23. Pate J, Beaumont P. Bullying and harassment: A case of success? Employee Relations. 2010;32(2):171-83. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01425451011010113>.