WORKPLACE GASLIGHTING AND MANIPULATION: UNDERSTANDING, IMPACT, AND SOLUTIONS

Prof. (Dr.) Mahesh Sharma
Professor and Director, DSPSR

Ms. Eshita Kashyap
Assistant Professor, DSPSR

Ms. Yukta
Student, DSPSR.

Abstract

Manipulative behaviors such as gaslighting and psychological coercion create serious harm to both individual employees and entire organizations. When workplace cultures allow these toxic patterns to flourish, workers experience declining mental health while organizational performance suffers. This paper examines how gaslighting and manipulation manifest across various workplace settings, using a fictional company called "InnovateCorp" to illustrate how these destructive behaviors develop and spread. Through scenarios depicting a manipulative supervisor and a scheming colleague, this study demonstrates the negative effects on employee motivation, productivity, and interpersonal relationships. The paper concludes by presenting practical strategies for addressing these challenges. Individuals can protect themselves by learning to recognize manipulative tactics, maintaining detailed records, questioning false assertions, establishing firm boundaries, prioritizing self-care, and seeking appropriate support. Organizations must actively cultivate cultures of openness and safety, implement strict anti-manipulation policies, provide comprehensive staff training, create secure reporting mechanisms, and hold perpetrators accountable. Successfully combating workplace gaslighting requires combining individual coping strategies with systemic organizational reforms to improve employee wellbeing, ethical standards, and overall productivity.

Introduction

The concept of gaslighting derives from a 1938 theatrical production and subsequent film adaptations. At its core, gaslighting involves psychologically manipulating another person until they begin questioning their own perceptions and reality (Sarkis, 2024). Workplace manipulation encompasses a broad spectrum of subtle tactics that often go undetected in organizational settings. The consequences include deteriorating mental health, diminished self-confidence, stunted career advancement, and broader organizational problems like reduced productivity, poor morale, high turnover, and declining workplace culture.

This paper investigates the various forms gaslighting and manipulation take in professional environments, using the fictional "InnovateCorp" to demonstrate how these behaviors emerge and create widespread damage while proposing both personal and institutional countermeasures.

Corporate settings frequently become fertile ground for deceptive and emotionally harmful psychological games. Gaslighting—named after the classic play and film where a husband manipulates environmental details to convince his wife she is losing her sanity—now describes any emotional manipulation designed to make someone doubt their own judgment, perceptions, and sense of reality.

Some individuals employ gaslighting and manipulation to exercise illegitimate control over others for personal gain. Common tactics include emotional blackmail and triangulation, where a third party is drawn into conflicts to gain advantage. These behaviors are alarmingly prevalent in many workplaces, though they often remain hidden (Simon, 2025). Both those in authority and peers or subordinates may engage in these tactics, creating pervasive atmospheres of suspicion and instability.

The consequences operate on two levels. For individuals, effects can be severe: chronic stress, anxiety, depression, eroded self-worth, confusion, social isolation at work, and ultimately resignation or termination. For organizations, unchecked manipulation breeds widespread distrust that stifles creativity, increases absenteeism, drives frequent departures (with associated

recruitment and training expenses), destroys employer-employee trust, and poisons workplace culture. Unaddressed manipulation also creates significant legal exposure and reputational damage.

Literature Review

Theoretical Foundations of Gaslighting

Psychological research identifies several mechanisms underlying gaslighting: cognitive dissonance, power imbalances, and narcissistic traits in perpetrators. Gaslighters typically employ strategies including denial, contradiction, dismissal, and systematic questioning of the target's perceptions (Durvasula, 2024). These tactics often follow predictable cyclical patterns.

Theoretical Foundations of Workplace Manipulation

Beyond gaslighting, manipulators deploy various techniques: charm offensives, victim-playing, triangulation, strategic helplessness, and information control. Research examines what motivates workplace manipulation and how organizational culture either enables or discourages such behavior.

Impact on Victims

Psychological effects include anxiety, depression, trauma, decreased confidence, persistent self-doubt, confusion, and social isolation (Carroll, 2025).

Professional effects encompass damaged reputation, declining productivity, missed opportunities, burnout, and job loss (Abbasi & Hollman, 2025).

Organizational Consequences

Research documents significant organizational impacts: substantial employee departures with associated financial costs, toxic workplace cultures, deteriorating team cohesion, erosion of trust and collaboration, and potential legal and reputational risks.

Previous studies identify effective countermeasures at both individual and organizational levels:

- **Individual approaches**: Building resilience and establishing clear boundaries
- **Organizational approaches**: Policy development, training programs, and reporting systems

Understanding workplace gaslighting and manipulation requires integrating psychological theory, organizational behavior research, and workplace bullying literature (Einarsen et al., 2024). Gaslighting and manipulation represent particularly harmful forms of psychological abuse capable of causing severe, lasting damage (Hightower & Scott, 2024). Addressing them demands comprehensive understanding and coordinated strategies across all organizational levels.

Broader Organizational Effects

Productivity and Efficiency: Persistent anxiety, tension, and self-doubt undermine employee focus and output. Workers waste valuable time navigating manipulation and office politics instead of completing their actual work.

Absenteeism and Presenteeism: Manipulation targets often miss more work. Even when physically present, they struggle to maintain concentration and engagement.

Morale and Culture: These behaviors damage relationships and trust among colleagues and between staff and leadership, creating environments characterized by anxiety, suspicion, and cynicism.

Collaboration and Innovation: Teams only reach their full potential when members feel psychologically safe. Fear of manipulation or attack prevents people from sharing ideas, taking risks, or working effectively together.

Legal and Reputational Risks: Serious incidents may result in legal action, including constructive dismissal or harassment claims. Organizations known for tolerating bullying and manipulation face significant damage to their reputation and recruitment capabilities.

Methodology

This paper employs a qualitative approach centered on developing and analyzing a detailed fictional case study. The "InnovateCorp" case study serves as an illustrative example combining common characteristics and experiences of workplace gaslighting and manipulation. Case study methodology allows researchers to examine complex social phenomena like gaslighting in nuanced, contextual ways, providing opportunities to analyze intricate relationships, organizational culture, and the psychological experiences of participants within specific settings.

Although entirely fictional, the InnovateCorp scenarios, characters, and organizational responses draw on recurring themes from scholarly research, professional observations, and firsthand accounts of workplace manipulation. The characters—Garima, Dinesh, Rahul, and Parth—represent roles and dynamics commonly observed when employees face psychological exploitation. This approach illustrates how these behavioral patterns manifest in realistic work contexts.

Case Study: InnovateCorp

Company Background

InnovateCorp is a fictional technology firm once celebrated for its innovative culture and employee-centered approach. Its reputation for creativity and collaborative work environment attracted top talent and made it a desirable employer. However, over eighteen months, gradual changes occurred. Intensifying market competition created pressure to accelerate product delivery and increase revenue targets. A major leadership transition saw several long-tenured executives depart, replaced by new leaders adopting a more aggressive, results-focused management style. This shifting environment allowed dysfunction to infiltrate previously healthy teams.

Key Characters

Garima: A highly capable, dedicated project manager in her late thirties. With five years at InnovateCorp, she had established a strong track record and earned respect from colleagues for her work ethic and team-oriented approach.

Dinesh: Garima's direct supervisor, recently hired. Despite a charming exterior, Dinesh harbored insecurities and engaged in gaslighting behaviors.

Rahul: A senior colleague who had worked at InnovateCorp longer than Garima. Rahul employed covert manipulation tactics to advance his position through sabotage.

Parth: A junior developer recently assigned to Garima's team. Intelligent, enthusiastic, and quick-learning, Parth lacked experience navigating complex workplace dynamics.

Human Resources: Once responsive and supportive, HR had become increasingly preoccupied with administrative tasks and detached from employee concerns.

Gaslighting Incidents: Dinesh's Behavior

Scenario 1: Denial and Public Humiliation

A critical project deadline approached. During a meeting, Dinesh verbally instructed Garima to reprioritize certain features, delaying less essential ones. Trusting her manager, Garima followed these instructions without obtaining written confirmation. When the client complained about a delayed feature, Dinesh—in a team meeting with his own supervisor present—feigned surprise: "Garima, I'm shocked you deprioritized Feature X. We discussed how important it was. This is a serious error."

When Garima attempted to explain his earlier verbal instructions, Dinesh interrupted: "You must have misheard me. My directions were very specific about avoiding exactly this kind of costly

mistake." Garima was left stunned and humiliated, beginning to question her memory of the conversation.

Scenario 2: Moving Targets and Questioning Competence

Dinesh developed a pattern of changing project parameters and deadlines. He would make informal comments during casual conversations, then contradict himself days later with contradictory written communications. When Garima raised these inconsistencies, Dinesh turned the situation against her.

"Garima, that deadline hasn't changed. You need to keep up."

"Why are you bringing this up now? We're flexible—you need to be adaptable."

He sometimes added: "Are you feeling overwhelmed? Perhaps this project is too much for you right now." This persistent questioning of Garima's memory and capability created enormous stress as she struggled to track constantly shifting, undocumented expectations.

Scenario 3: Undermining Parth's Confidence and Isolating Him

Parth, eager to prove himself, submitted code he was proud of. Dinesh responded privately that it was "fundamentally flawed" and "not up to InnovateCorp standards" without providing specific, constructive feedback. A week later, another senior developer presented a similar solution that Dinesh publicly praised.

When Parth cautiously questioned this inconsistency, Dinesh replied: "It's a matter of nuance, Parth. Something you'll develop with experience—or perhaps not."

Dinesh also began subtly isolating Parth, telling Garima privately that "several team members have mentioned Parth isn't contributing equally and struggles with complex tasks." This was fabricated, but it made Garima wary and left Parth feeling increasingly incompetent and alone.

Manipulation Incidents: Rahul's Behavior

Scenario 1: Creating Discord Through Triangulation

Rahul cultivated an image as a friendly ally to multiple team members. He would confide in Garima: "Dinesh seems very frustrated with you lately. I defended you, but I thought you should know."

Separately, he told Dinesh: "Garima seems overwhelmed. She mentioned feeling stressed and unsupported by current decisions."

This manufactured an undercurrent of distrust while positioning Rahul as a neutral mediator, even as he manipulated both parties' perceptions for personal advantage.

Scenario 2: Stealing Credit and Subtle Undermining

During a brainstorming session, Garima proposed an innovative solution. Rahul initially dismissed it: "That's an interesting idea, Garima. Maybe we should explore other directions."

Days later, Rahul restated Garima's central concept with minor modifications, presenting it as his own evolved thinking. When the idea gained traction, credit went to Rahul while Garima's contribution was forgotten. He also habitually interrupted her in meetings or finished her sentences, subtly positioning himself as more knowledgeable.

Scenario 3: Strategic Helplessness and Task Dumping

Rahul excelled at appearing perpetually busy with "other priorities" or claiming unfamiliarity with specific areas. "I've never really worked with that system. Maybe Parth could give it a try—it would be good experience for him."

This allowed Rahul to delegate undesirable or difficult tasks to less experienced colleagues like Parth. If outcomes were poor, Rahul maintained distance; if successful, he positioned himself to share credit.

Combined Impact

The cumulative effect of Dinesh's gaslighting and Rahul's manipulation proved devastating:

Garima's Decline: Previously confident and energetic, Garima became anxious, withdrawn, and self-doubting. She spent excessive time verifying her work and communications, terrified of making mistakes. Her stress levels soared, affecting her sleep and health. She began compulsively documenting everything for self-protection rather than productivity. She seriously considered leaving the company she had once loved.

Parth's Demoralization: The capable junior developer grew quiet and isolated. His initial enthusiasm gave way to confusion and genuine fear of expressing opinions or making errors. Ironically, his work quality declined as his confidence collapsed.

Team Dysfunction: Meetings that once fostered collaboration became tense and unproductive. Trust evaporated. Team members avoided sharing ideas or asking questions, fearing public criticism from Rahul or subtle sabotage from Dinesh. Factions formed, and adversarial attitudes spread.

Project Deterioration: Despite Garima's best efforts, her project began missing deadlines and developing quality issues. Constant changes, unclear direction, and low morale directly impacted deliverables.

Organizational Perception: Rumors about "Garima's struggling team" and "that troubled project" spread to other departments and senior management. The root causes—Dinesh's destructive leadership and Rahul's manipulative behavior—remained invisible to outsiders or were misattributed.

Failed Initial Responses

Garima's Direct Approach: When Garima attempted to discuss unclear instructions and shifting targets with Dinesh, he responded defensively, telling her she was "too focused on

problems rather than solutions" and "perhaps not suited to management pressures." He suggested she needed "communication coaching."

Seeking Peer Advice: Desperate, Garima consulted a veteran colleague from another department. Unfamiliar with the situation's specifics, the colleague advised her to "be stronger" and "try to understand Dinesh's perspective."

HR's Response: When an anonymous complaint about team morale eventually reached Human Resources, their response was recommending a generic "team-building workshop" and "communication training" without investigating specific allegations of manipulative management or peer behavior. The focus remained on superficial fixes rather than addressing underlying toxic dynamics.

InnovateCorp, once exemplifying healthy workplace culture, had become—at least for Garima's team—an environment where psychological manipulation was destroying the company's greatest asset: its people. Systems for detecting and correcting these subtle behaviors had clearly broken down.

Analysis

Examining Dinesh's actions through established gaslighting frameworks (denial, countering, dismissal) reveals classic patterns of psychological manipulation (Stern, 2024). Similarly, analyzing Rahul's tactics demonstrates textbook manipulation techniques: triangulation, credit theft, strategic helplessness, and subtle undermining.

The case illustrates how the absence of organizational safeguards enables skilled manipulators to inflict significant harm on targets like Garima and Parth. The broader organizational impact demonstrates how individual toxic behaviors can spread dysfunction throughout teams and eventually affect company-wide outcomes.

Coping and Intervention Strategies

Individual Strategies for Employees

Recognition and Education: Learning to identify manipulative behaviors and their warning signs. Understanding common tactics helps potential targets recognize what's happening.

Documentation: Maintaining detailed, timestamped records of incidents, conversations, and instructions. Written evidence provides protection against gaslighting attempts.

External Validation: Discussing experiences with trusted friends, family members, therapists, or colleagues outside the workplace to gain perspective and confirm perceptions.

Boundary Setting: Practicing assertive responses and limiting engagement with manipulative discussions. Referencing written communications: "Let's refer to what the email thread documented."

Emotional Regulation: Remaining calm during interactions, avoiding emotional reactions that manipulators can exploit.

Strategic Communication: Speaking clearly and factually, using "I" statements, and avoiding emotional language that can be turned against you.

Building Alliances: Quietly identifying trustworthy colleagues who can serve as witnesses or support.

Escalation Planning: Approaching higher management with written documentation focused on specific behaviors and their impacts.

Exit Strategy: Recognizing when situations become untenable and preparing for departure while protecting oneself.

Organizational Interventions

Leadership Commitment: Senior leadership must clearly and publicly declare that manipulation and gaslighting will not be tolerated. Leaders must model accountable, transparent, respectful behavior.

Comprehensive Policies: Organizations should develop, publicize, and enforce explicit policies defining prohibited behaviors, including specific examples and clear consequences.

Training Programs: All employees should receive training on recognizing manipulation tactics, understanding reporting procedures, and responding appropriately. Managers need additional training on identifying warning signs within their teams. HR and investigators require specialized training on detecting sophisticated manipulation during investigations.

Multiple Reporting Channels: Organizations must provide various confidential reporting options: anonymous hotlines, designated HR contacts, independent ombudspersons. Investigation processes should be transparent, impartial, and include strong protections against retaliation. Investigators must be capable of seeing beyond surface explanations.

Psychological Safety Culture: Organizations should promote open communication where employees feel comfortable expressing themselves, respectfully challenging ideas, acknowledging mistakes, and raising concerns without fear of blame or retaliation. Empathy and respect should be embedded in communications, incentive systems, and leadership behavior. Transparency at all levels reduces ambiguity that manipulators exploit.

Consistent Accountability: All perpetrators must face appropriate consequences regardless of their position or perceived value to the organization.

Conclusion

Gaslighting and workplace manipulation are insidious forces that inflict substantial psychological damage on individuals while undermining the foundations of healthy, effective organizations. As the InnovateCorp scenario demonstrates, these behaviors—whether a manager repeatedly causing employees to question their reality or a colleague secretly undermining others

for personal advantage—result in diminished self-esteem, chronic stress, reduced creativity, damaged trust, and significant organizational costs.

Addressing these challenges effectively requires action at multiple levels. Individuals must develop coping mechanisms: recognizing tactics, consistently documenting incidents, seeking external validation, establishing firm boundaries, prioritizing self-care, and understanding when to escalate concerns or exit toxic environments. These individual actions are essential for personal survival and recovering a sense of control.

However, individual strategies alone are insufficient. Organizations bear responsibility for creating environments where manipulation cannot flourish. This requires genuine leadership commitment, clear policies with meaningful enforcement, comprehensive training, accessible and protected reporting mechanisms, cultures of psychological safety, and consistent accountability for perpetrators regardless of their status.

Only by combining individual resilience with systemic organizational change can workplaces successfully combat gaslighting and manipulation. The result will be improved employee wellbeing, stronger ethical standards, and enhanced organizational performance. Creating such environments is both a moral imperative and a business necessity.

References

Abbasi, S., & Hollman, K. (2025). Organizational consequences of workplace manipulation. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*.

Carroll, L. (2023). Gaslighting at work: A qualitative study of emotional manipulation and its impact on employee well-being. *Journal of Workplace Psychology*.

Durvasula, R. (2024). *Understanding gaslighting: Psychological mechanisms and responses*. Clinical Psychology Press.

Einarsen, S., et al. (2024). Workplace bullying and incivility: Theoretical foundations and organizational impacts. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*.

Hightower, J., & Scott, K. L. (2024). Manipulation tactics in professional settings: Patterns, motivations, and outcomes. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 54*(3), 291-311.

Sarkis, S. (2024). *Gaslighting: Recognize manipulative and emotionally abusive people*. Da Capo Press.

Simon, G. (2025). *In sheep's clothing: Understanding and dealing with manipulative people*. Parkhurst Brothers.

Stern, R. (2024). *The gaslight effect: How to spot and survive the hidden manipulation others use to control your life*. Harmony Books.