INVESTIGATION OF PSYCHO-DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS, WORKPLACE CYBER-HARASSMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE AMONG HEALTHCARE WORKERS

Mayungbo, O.A., Akingbade, R. & Osamika, B.E.
Department of Psychology, Lead City University, Ibadan, Nigeria

ABSTRACT: *Most modern day organizations are characterized by cyber harassment in the workplace which is considered detrimental to the psychological well-being of victims. However, most studies on cyber bullying have mainly been conducted among adolescents, while the issue of work place cyber bullying which affects adults and their working life has just recently began to attract interest from researchers. This study investigates the influence of age, gender, marital status, organizational climate and personality characteristics on work place bullying among health care workers in Nigeria. Using a survey design, 152 health workers were purposively selected from both private and public hospitals. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, t- test analysis, regression analysis and one way analysis of variance at 0.05 level of significance. Four hypotheses were tested. The results revealed that age, gender differences and marital status independently influenced work place bullying. Organisational climate and personality factors also jointly influenced workplace bullying. Investigation of the association between the psycho-demographic factors and bullying in the work place is necessary to determine the needed intervention to ensure employees job satisfaction and well-being.*

INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon of workplace cyber-harassment or bullying has generated a lot concerns in the literature in the recent times. Most modern day organizations are characterized by workplace bullying which has long lasting negative consequences on both the victims of bullying and the organizations (Hutchinson,Vickers, Jackson, & Wilkes, 2005). Bullying in the workplace means to harass, offend or exclude individuals socially or affect people's work in a negative manner (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf & Cooper, 2011). Bullying involves psychological maltreatment of individuals which is done repeatedly and continuously. It may also include criticizing people in an unjustified manner, withholding relevant information from them, gossiping about them, spreading offensive and insulting information about their attitudes or their political or religious beliefs. Bullying in the workplace has been made effective by the popular use of computers, smart phones and other devices. Kowalski, Limber, Limber, & Agatston (2012) noted that work place bullying has resulted from the regular use of e-mails, text messages and other social media sites in

19

the workplace. Workplace bullying can appear in two forms. Branch, Ramsay, & Barker (2007) suggested there can be downwards bullying in which a senior employee such as the manager is the bully and horizontal bullying which is bullying between peers. Einarsen (1999) also identified two kinds of workplace bullying such as predatory bullying in which the victims are bullied because they are easy to defeat and dispute-related bullying which is linked to work-related conflicts. Baron & Neuman (1998) observed that despite the serious impact of workplace bullying on victims, it is usually not reported because the victims feel humiliated and so many victims of bullying suffer in silence.

Many theories have been suggested in an attempt to explain bullying behaviour of individuals. Some theories according to Rigby and Smith (2011) suggested that bullying may result due to the influence of the type of culture which individuals find themselves. If individuals belong to cultures which permit bullying, then such individuals may be at risk of becoming bullies. Some theories attribute bullying behavior to lack of parental care on the part of bullies while some theories indicate that bullying behaviour is due to lack of social support to bullies (Rigby & Smith, 2011). Other theories on the causes of workplace bullying have suggested that there is no particular reason why people should engage in bullying behaviour (Einarsen, 1999; Zapf, 1999). However, Skogstad, Matthiesen, & Einarsen (2007) noted that the root causes of workplace bullying can be attributed to both organizational and individual factors.

Workplace bullying has been linked to several negative outcomes such as experience of low job satisfaction, negative attitudes to work, low job performance, low work engagement, low organizational commitment and higher intention to leave the organization (Hoel, Sheehan, Cooper & Einarsen, 2011; Nielsen & Einarsen, 2012). Salin (2013) indicated that workplace bullying has negative effects on physical, psychological health and job satisfaction of victims of bullying (Hogh, Mikkelsen, & Hansen (2011). Bullying is also regarded as a severe social stressor which may result to greater personnel turnover, absenteeism, health problems, depression, lost productivity, psychological stress and poor well-being (Hoel, et al. 2011; Dehue, Bolman, Völlink, & Pouwelse (2012). It has also been suggested that the negative health effects of workplace bullying on victims may continue for a long period of time, even after the act of bullying has stopped (Bonde, Gullander, Hansen, Grynderup, Persson, Hogh & Kolstad (2016). In extreme cases, either the perpetrator of bullying or the victim may commit suicide (Namie & Namie, 2003).

Organizational factors have been identified as playing important roles in either increasing or decreasing the risk of workplace bullying behaviour (Reknes, Einarsen, Knardahl & Lau, 2014; Jonsson, Muhonen, Denti, & Chen, 2015). Organizational culture and climate have both been implicated as significant factors in workplace bullying (Powell, Powell, & Petrosko (2015). A negative organizational climate and culture can be directly related to bullying or indirectly related through a competitive work environment, which promotes bullying (Salin, 2003: Bowling & Beehr, 2006). Bowling and Beehr (2006) indicated that workplace bullying is the consequence of organizational climate. Giorgi (2012) argued that workplace bullying can be the cause rather than the consequence of organizational climate. However, Hauge, Skogstad, & Einarsen (2010) have

20

queried the claim that workplace bullying is the cause of organizational climate. Furthermore, Baillien and De Witte (2009) and Nielsen (2013) revealed that workplace bullying is linked to factors such as, poor leadership, role ambiguity, role conflict, stress, and a poor organizational climate with poor information flow. On the contrary, Zapf (1999) contended that workplace bullying has multiple causes and so its cause can not be automatically attributed to organizational factors. Therefore, there are inconsistencies on the findings relating to the association between organizational climate and workplace bullying

Personality factors have also been associated with workplace bullying. Coyne, Seigne and Randall (2000) noted that there are a few studies on the personality of victims of workplace bullying. Research evidence also revealed that researchers are divided on their conclusions regarding the relationship between personality and bullying in the workplace. Some researchers found bullying victims to be similar in personality while some others found no personality differences between bullying victims and non-victims. Einarsen, et al. (2003) observed that the personality characteristics of bullying victims are important in understanding bullying behaviour. Balducci, Cecchin and Fraccaroli, (2012) also argued that workaholic employees are likely to exhibit aggressive behaviour. However, Davenport, Schwartz and Eliot (1999) are not in agreement with the assertion. Glaso, Matthiesen, Nielsen & Einarsen (2007) contended that there is no general personality factors for bullying victims. Many researchers have described the personality of bullying victims differently. Vartia (1996) views bullying victims as conscientious, paranoid, rigid, and compulsive while Coyne, Seigne, and Randall (2000), reported victims of bullying as being less extroverted and independent compared to non-bullying victims. Victims of workplace bullying have also been documented to show a poor self-image and anxiety in social situations (Matthiesen, Einarsen, 2001).

Research evidence has also implied the possibility of socio-demographic factors influencing whether individuals will be bullied or becoming bullies (Zapf & Einarsen, 2011). Gender for example, has been identified as a factor that may influence workplace bullying. Hutchinson & Eveline (2010) noted that workplace bullying is a gender based phenomenon. Salin & Hoel (2013) supported the claim that bullying in the workplace is not gender neutral. Barreto, Ryan and Schmitt (2009) observed that given that greater number of men are in superior positions in work places across several organizations than women, gender differences are bound to arise. Forssell (2016) also confirmed the issue of gender differences regarding organizational positions. In contrast, many scholars have reported no significant gender differences in workplace bullying between men and women (Einarsen & Skogstad 1996; Hoel & Cooper 2000; Vartia,1996).

However, researchers are not in agreement regarding the influence of age on workplace bullying. Ortega et al. (2009) indicated that age was associated with workplace bullying. In contrast to that, Cortina et al. (2001) reported no association between age and workplace bullying. Einarsen and Rakness (1997) revealed that younger employees in the workplace are more likely to be bullied than older employees. Einarsen and Skogstad (1996) observed that older employees reported the highest incidence of bullying. Many other studies have indicated that older employees are more

often subjected to workplace harassment (Einarsen et al. 1994; Vartia 2003). Marital status of bullies is another socio-demographic variable of interest in this study which has not been well explored in literature.

Extensive review of literature revealed that not much attention has been given to the phenomenon of workplace bullying by researchers. Forssell (2016) noted that studies on cyber bullying has mainly been carried out among adolescents, while the issue of workplace bullying which affects adults and their working life has only recently began to attract the interest of researchers (Dooley, Pyzalski & Cross, 2009; Farley, Coyne, Sprigg, Axtell, & Subramanian (2015). In addition to that, the relationship between workplace bullying and some socio-demographic variables such as, age, gender differences and marital status has not been well explored. Most studies on workplace bullying have focused on its prevalence. Brack and Caltabiano (2014) noted that because the issue of workplace bullying is relatively new, most researchers have concentrated on studying its prevalence. A few studies have considered the association of workplace bullying with organizational climate and personality factors but these studies are conducted outside the Nigerian culture. In addition to that, workplace bullying is of great concern among healthcare workers. A report by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (2016) shows that Twenty one percent of registered and student nurses reported being physically abused, more than Fifty percent reported being verbally abused, twelve percent of emergency nurses reported experiencing physical violence and Fifty nine percent reported experiencing verbal abuse within a one week period. The present study hypothesized that age, gender, marital status, organizational climate and personality factors will significantly influence workplace bullying among health care workers.

METHOD

Design and Participants
Survey research design was used to examine the influence of age, gender, marital status, organizational climate and personality factors on work place bullying. Study samples were 152 purposively selected healthcare workers from both private and public hospitals. Healthcare workers were purposively selected because higher prevalence of bullying had been reported in healthcare sector (Leymann, 1996). Participants were 152 health care workers. Fifty five (34.9%) males and 97 (65.1%) females participated in the study. Married participants were 81(53.3) while the singles were 68(44.7). Those who were separated were 2(1.3%) and others were 1 (.7%). The study took place at both private and public hospitals in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria.

Measures
Demographic variables: Information on age, gender, and marital status were gathered under the demographic section. **Big Five Personality Inventory** is a 44 item scale developed by Neugarten and Soto (2008). It measures 5 trait dimensions of personality such as neuroticism, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness. It uses a 5-point Likert scoring scale. The Cronbach alphas were as follows: extraversion .66, agreeableness .68, conscientiousness .70,

neuroticism .68, and openness .74. The mean obtained in this study is extraversion 22.17, agreeableness 26.71, conscientiousness 25.40, neuroticism 21.78 and openness 31.59. Participants who scored above the mean were considered to be high on the particular variable while participants who scored below the mean were regarded as low on the variable.

Organizational Culture Scale (OCS) was adapted to measure organizational climate. Glission and James (2002) have shown that both organizational climate and culture can be used interchangeably. The 17 item scale was developed by Tang et al. (2000). The scale measures four dimensions such as: family orientation and loyalty, open communication and consensual decision-making, team approach and knowledge of managers. It uses a 5-point Likert scoring scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The coefficient alpha reliabilities for the scale was .92.

Workplace Bullying was assessed with a 22 item scale that measures bullying acts. It has five dimensions such as: threat to professional status, example of scale items include: persistent attempts to belittle and undermine your work: threat to personal standing, example of scale items includes ; making inappropriate jokes about you, isolation, example of scale items include: withholding necessary information from you, overwork, example of items include: undue pressure to produce work, and destabilisation, sample item: shifting of goal posts without consulting you). It uses a four-point rating scale (0 = never, 1 = Now and Then 2 = Monthly, 3 = Weekly or More. Its Cronbach's alpha of .922 indicated a good internal consistency for the measure.

Procedure

The data used for the current study was obtained from healthcare workers in both private and public hospitals. Having obtained the authorization from the hospital management, the researcher was introduced to some relevant staff members of the hospital. Study participants were approached individually and informed of the purpose of the study with the content of the questionnaire clearly explained to them. Informed consent was sought and obtained from each respondent before the administration of questionnaires. Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the Social Sciences Ethics Committee, University of Ibadan. The participants were not given any incentive for participation. All questionnaires were administered in English. Some health workers declined their participation in the study while eight of the total 160 questionnaires administered were not well filled and therefore discarded. The researcher and one research assistant were available during the process to attend to any questions that may be posed by the participants. The adequately completed questionnaires were collected, scored and analyzed.

RESULTS

Table 1. Summary table of Pearson Product Moment Correlation showing the Relationship among Gender, Age, Marital Status, Organizational Climate and Work place bullying

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	$\overline{X}$	SD
1. Gender	1						
2. Age	-.34**	1				30.41	7.41
3. Marital Status	.25**	-.59**	1				
4.Organizational Climate	.23	-.04	.66	1		35.22	17.45
5. Workplace Bullying	-.32**	.27**	-.21**	.07	1	51.63	14.43

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). N=152

The table above reveals that gender of participants (r(152) = -.32, P<.01) is negatively related to work place bullying, age of participants (r(152) =.27, P<.01) is positively related to work place bullying, this implies that the older the health workers the more their tendency to engage in workplace bullying. However, marital status of participants (r(152)=-.21, P<.01) is negatively associated with work place bullying. This signifies that the status of their marital relationship in terms of social relation is significantly responsible for their low tendency to engage in workplace bullying. However, organizational climate of the health workers (r(152) = .07, P>.01) is not significantly associated with their tendency to engage in work place bullying.

Table 2. Summary table of simple regression analysis showing the prediction of age on workplace bullying

Variables	β	B	F	R	R^2	P
Age	.270	.525	11.74	.270	.073	<.01

The table above reveals that age (β =.270; B=.525; R=.270, R^2= .073; p<.01) independently predicted workplace bullying. Participants' age significantly contributed .270 (27%) degree of relationship to workplace bullying and accounted for 7.3% of variance that occur in worker's workplace bullying.

Table 3. Summary table of t-test for independent samples showing gender differences on workplace bullying.

Gender	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	Df	T	P
Male	53	57.88	14.94			
				150	4.115	<.01
Female	99	48.27	13.30			

The table above indicates that there is a significant gender difference on work place bullying [t (150) = 4.115, p<.01]. Male participants [$\overline{X}$= 57.88, SD= 14.94] scored significantly higher than female participants [$\overline{X}$=48.27, SD= 13.30] on work place bullying scale. This result shows that male health workers engaged more in work place bullying than their female counterparts.

Table 4. Summary of one way analysis of variance showing the influence of marital status on work place bullying

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P
Between Groups	1452.650	2	726.325	3.608	<.05
Within Groups	29996.975	149	201.322		
Total	31449.625	151			

The table 4 above demonstrates the significant influence of marital status (F[2,151]=3.61; p<.05) on workplace bullying. This implies that, the levels of health workers' marital status significantly difference on their tendency to engage in work place bullying.

Table 5. Summary table showing post hoc analysis of the influence of marital status on work place bullying.

(I) Marital Status	(J) Marital Status	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Married	**Single**	**5.17574**[*]	2.33368	**.028**	.5644	9.7871
	Separated	14.90123	8.34223	.076	-1.5831	31.3856
Single	**Married**	**-5.17574**[*]	2.33368	**.028**	-9.7871	-.5644
	Separated	9.72549	8.37066	.247	-6.8150	26.2660
Separated	Married	-14.90123	8.34223	.076	-31.3856	1.5831
	Single	-9.72549	8.37066	.247	-26.2660	6.8150

*. *The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.*

The above table shows that participants who were married were significantly different from those who were single or separated ($\overline{X}$difference =-5.17, Std Error=2.33, p<.05) on the their tendency to engage in work place bullying at the time of the study. However, participants who were separated ($\overline{X}$difference=14.90, Std Error=8.34, p>.05), were not significantly different from those who were single or married.

25

Table 6. showing the descriptive analysis of the differences in marital status on workplace bullying.

Groups of marital status	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Married	81	54.23	14.90	22.00	78.00
Single	68	49.06	13.42	22.00	76.00
Separated	3	39.33	9.24	34.00	50.00
Total	152	51.63	14.43	22.00	78.00

The table above shows that married participants [$\bar{X}$=54.23, SD=14.90] obtained the highest mean score compared with participants who were single [$\bar{X}$=49.06, SD=13.42] and those who were separated [$\bar{X}$=39.33, SD=9.24]. Therefore, the above results indicated a significant influence of marital status on workplace bullying. Health workers who were married were significantly different from those who were single and separated. Therefore, health workers who were married were more engaged in workplace bullying than their single and separated counterparts.

Table 7. Summary of multiple regression analysis showing the independent and joint prediction of organizational climate and the Big Five Factors on workplace bullying

Variables	β	B	P	F	R	R²	P
Organizational Climate	-.06	-.07	>.05				
Neuroticism	.22	.48	**<.05**				
Agreeableness	.19	.43	**<.05**				
Extraversion	-.08	-.20	>.05	2.30	.30	.09	**<.05**
Openness to Experience	-.11	-.26	>.05				
Consciousness	-.06	-.14	>.05				

The table above reveals that organizational climate (β =-.061; B=-.069; P>.05) did not significantly independently predict workplace bullying. However, neuroticism (β =.208; B=.479; P <.05) and agreeableness (β =.187; B=.427; P<.05) significantly independently predicted workplace bullying. However, extraversion (β =-.075; B=-.204; P>.05), openness to experience (β =-.106; B=-.257; P>.05) and consciousness (β=-.057; B=-.143; P>.05) did not significantly independently predict workplace bullying among health workers. Moreover, organizational climate and the Big Five Factors (R=.295; R²=.087; P<.05) jointly predicted workplace bullying among health workers. The combination of organizational culture and the Big Five personality factors contributed .295(29.5%) degree of relationship to workplace bullying. Similarly, organizational culture and the Big Five Factors accounted for 8.7% of the variance in workplace bullying.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study indicate that age of participants significantly predicted workplace bullying among healthcare workers. Healthcare workers who were older were more involved in workplace bullying than those who were younger. Hoel and Cooper (2000) arrived at a similar conclusion by asserting that younger people experienced bullying more than older employees. Rayner (1997), reported that workers who experienced bullying were usually less than 25 years of age. Similarly, Mageroy (2009) observed higher workplace bullying among younger participants than older participants.

The results also revealed gender differences in workplace bullying. It was demonstrated that male participants were more engaged in workplace bullying than their female counterparts. This outcome is in line with the findings of Zapf, Escartin, Einarsen, Hoel & Vartia, 2011) who contended that women face a higher risk of being bullied than men. Berdahl and Moore (2006) have also suggested that women are more likely to face bullying than men. Bashir, Hanif and Nadeem (2014) did not find a significant gender difference but they reported male workers having higher mean scores than female workers on workplace bullying experience. Ariza-Montes, Muniz, Montero-Simo & Araque-Padilla (2013) noted that female physicians were more likely to experience bullying when compared to male physicians. A Survey Report (2014) also revealed that 69 percent of those who perpetrate bullying were men while 57 percent of bullying victims were women, it was reported that 68 percent of female perpetrators of bullying targeted other women.

Several other scholars have similarly identified women as being more vulnerable to bullying than men (Khubchandani & Price 2014 ; Moreno-Jimenez et al. 2007 ; Shannon, Rospenda, & Richman, 2007). Gender differences in the workplace has been explained in terms of the gender ratio of the employees in a given organization and the manner the occupation is gender-typed. According to Eriksen & Einarsen (2004), a male employee in the female-dominated and female gender-typed nursing profession is likely to experience workplace bullying just like a female employee in the male-dominated and male gender-typed police force (Nuutinen, Kauppinen & Kandolin, 1999) is likely to experience workplace bullying.

The current study found significant influence of marital status on workplace bullying. It was revealed that healthcare workers who were married scored significantly higher on the bullying scale than their unmarried counterparts. This result is in agreement with Ariza-Montes, Muniz, Montero-Simo & Araque-Padilla. (2013) who noted that the unmarried female workers were more likely to experience workplace bullying compared to their married counterparts. The findings of the current study is contrary to the earlier conclusion reached by Bashir, Hanif and Nadeem (2014) which suggested that there was no significant difference between married employees and single employees on workplace bullying behaviour.

The results also demonstrated the interaction effect of organizational climate and the Big Five personality factors on workplace bullying. This outcome corroborates the conclusions of other existing studies. Stenhammar, Ehrsson & Akerud (2015) found strong support for the influence of work environment on workplace bullying (Hauge et al., 2007; Salin & Hoel, 2011). These researchers argued that workplace bullying is largely influenced by the quality of the work environment. According to them, a poor work environment may increase the risk of bullying through several different methods. Baillien, Neyens, De Witte and De Cuyper (2009) identified three different ways in which a poor work environment can result to workplace bullying. One of such ways is increased frustration which affects the behaviours of both bullies and victims. The second way is through badly managed conflicts which may result to bullying and even lead to negative interpersonal relationship. The third way is through the various performance-based pay systems which are operated in organizations. This system has both its advantages and disadvantages. Gerhart, Rynes & Fulmer (2009) suggested that this compensation style may increase employees performance while Samnani & Singh (2014) noted that some reward systems may contribute to workplace bullying in the manner of giving an employee an incentive to bully a colleague. This is because a bully may improve his/her rating by sabotaging the performance of a colleague.

The findings on the influence of personality factors on workplace bullying is consistent with Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, Cooper (2003) who observed that bullying is mainly caused by the psychopathic personality of the bullies. Randall (1997) averred that certain personality characteristics within individuals may expose them to being bullied. Some individuals become victims of bullying because of their personality (Varita, 1996) while some experience bullying because they lack social skills and because of their inability to avoid conflict (Zapf, 1999). Vertia (1996) reported that bullying victims are emotionally unstable, less dominant but are more anxious and sensitive when compared to non-victims. Similarly, Zapf (1999) concluded that victims of bullying are anxious and lack social skills compared to non-victims.

The conflict theory has been used in providing some explanations to the association between organizational climate and workplace bullying. The conflict theory according to Karl Marx suggests that in any organization there are people at the top of the ladder who are considered the upper class and there are others who are at the bottom of the ladder considered as the lower class or losers. The people at the top of the ladder intends to remain there to maintain their status and distant themselves from those at the bottom while the ones at the bottom intends to climb up the social ladder, so that they can be more recognized. The conflict theory indicates that workplace bullying occur because of the conflict between these two social levels in organizations. Workplace bullying is viewed as a result of the unresolved social conflict and power imbalance between the two groups. Given that those groups at the top of the ladder will do whatever is necessary for them to retain their status at the top, bullying may be employed. Conflicts in organizations appear to occur when employees status and power are not evenly distributed. In explaining workplace bullying therefore, the conflict theory emphasizes the factor of power imbalance, inequality and some level of oppression among workers in an organization (Hutchinson, 2011). Bullying in the

workplace can be viewed as a political tactic which is employed for the purpose of achieving personal or organizational goals. It is a form of political game which is designed to influence or have an edge over the lower positioned workers (Hutchinson et al., 2010).

Implication and Recommendation

The current study suggests that workplace bullying is a widespread phenomenon and that socio-demographic factors, organizational climate and personality characteristics can influence workers' experience of bullying. These findings have provided insight into the seriousness of the phenomenon of workplace bullying. Considering the negative consequences of workplace bullying on victims job satisfaction and psychological well-being, the findings revealed the importance of the need for preventive measures to protect employees from experiencing bullying and interventions for existing victims. It is therefore recommended that adequate measures are taken to ensure that the labour laws are made to address the challenges of workplace bullying and those laws or policies should be adequately implemented in order to protect all categories of employees in the workplace, particularly the lowly positioned ones and all those who are vulnerable in organizations. Also, all employees should be made aware of the psychological effects of bullying and be encouraged to report such experiences for the purpose of reducing its occurrence in organizations. Moreno, Rodriguez, Garrosa, & Morante, (2005) noted that workplace bullying is lower in organizations with anti-bullying policies and adequate information about bullying to employees. Regular monitoring of the organizational climate should be carried out in order to have an up to date knowledge through regular research and meetings with both senior and junior employees. This exercise may assist in detecting any impending crisis at the early stage. Attention should be focused on the vulnerable groups of workers such as the young and junior workers, the women and the singles in order to detect early signs of bullying for the purpose of protecting them.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Studies

Despite the immense contributions of the current study to the existing research on workplace bullying, there are some limitations. Workplace bullying may be as a result of many other factors aside from the ones considered in the present study, therefore additional Independent variables should be considered in order to explore other factors that could contribute to workplace bullying. Given the nature of the experience of workplace bullying future studies may consider a mixed methods approach in other to explore the individual interpretation from the perspectives of victims. Future studies may also consider a larger sample size in multiple workplace settings.

REFERENCES

Agervold, M., & Mikkelsen, E. G. (2004). Relationships between bullying, psychosocial work environment and individual stress reactions. *Work & Stress,18*(4), 336–351.

Ariza-Montes, A., Muniz, N. M., Montero-Simo, M. J., Araque-Padilla, R. A. (2013). Workplace bullying among healthcare workers. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health.* 10(8);3121-3139.

Baillien, E. & De Witte, H. (2009). Why is organizational change related to workplace bullying? Role conflict and job insecurity as mediators. *Economic and Industrial Democracy,* 30, 348–371.

Barreto, M. E., Ryan, M. K., & Schmitt, M. T. (2009). *The glass ceiling in the 21st century: Understanding barriers to gender equality*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.10.1037/11863-000

Baron, R.A., Neuman, J.H. (1998). Workplace aggression--the iceberg beneath the tip of workplace violence: Evidence of its forms, frequency, and targets. *Public Administration Quarterly*, *21*(4), 446-464

Bashir, A., Hanif, R., and Nadeem, M. (2014). Pakistan. *Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences.* Vol 8 (3), 817-829

Bonde, J.P., Gullander, M., Hansen, Å.M., Grynderup, M., Persson, R., Hogh, A. and Kolstad, H.A. (2016). Health correlates of workplace bullying: a 3-wave prospective follow-up study. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health,* Vol. 42 No. 1, pp. 17-25.

Bowling, N.A. and Beehr, T.A. (2006), "Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: a theoretical model and meta-analysis", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 91 No. 5, pp. 998-1012.

Brack, K., & Caltabiano, N. (2014). Cyberbullying and self-esteem in Australian adults. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace*, *8* (2).

Branch, S., Ramsay, S., & Barker, M. (2007). Managers in the firing line: Contributing factors to workplace bullying by staff–an interview study. *Journal of Management and Organization, 13*(3), 264–281.

Coyne, I, Seigne, E & Randall, P. (2000) "Predicting Workplace Victim Status from Personality, (335- 349), *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology,* vol. 9 (3).

Davenport, N, R Schwartz,D., Eliot, G.P. (2000). Mobbing: Emotional Abuse in the American Workplace, Ames, Iowa: Civil Society Publishing.

Dehue, F., Bolman, C., Völlink, T. and Pouwelse, M. (2012), Coping with bullying at work and health related problems. *International Journal of Stress Management,* Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 175-197.

Djurkovic, N., McCormack, D. and Casimir, G. (2004). The physical and psychological effects of workplace bullying and their relationship to intention to leave: a test of the psychosomatic and disability hypotheses, *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior,* Vol. 7 No. 4, pp. 469-497.

Dooley, J.J., Pyzalski, J. and Cross, D. (2009). Cyberbullying versus face-to-face bullying: a theoretic al and conceptual review. *Journal of Psychology,* Vol. 217 No. 4, pp. 182-188.

Einarsen, S, Raknes, B. & Matthiesen, S. (1994). Bullying and harassment at work and their relationships to work environment quality: an exploratory study, *European Work and Organizational Psychology,* 4 (4), 381-401

Einarsen, S., & Raknes, B. I. (1997). Harassment in the workplace and the victimization of men. *Violence and Victims, 12*(3)*,* 247-263.

Einarsen, S. (1999). The nature and causes of bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower, 20*(1/2), 16–27.10.1108/01437729910268588

Einarsen, S, Hoel, H., Zapf, D., Cooper,C.L. (2003). Bullying and Emotional Abuse in theWorkplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice, CRC Pres.

Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D. & Cooper, C. L. (2011). The concept of bullying and harassment at work: the European tradition. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf & C. Cooper (Eds.), Bullying and harassment in the workplace: *Developments in theory, research and practice* (pp. 3–39). London:

Einarsen, S. & Skogstad, A. (1996). Bullying at work: epidemiological findings in public and private organizations. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 5 (2), 185-201

Farley, S., Coyne, I., Sprigg, C., Axtell, C. and Subramanian, G. (2015). Exploring the impact of workplace cyberbullying on trainee doctors. *Medical Education*, Vol. 49 No. 4, pp. 436-443.

Forssell, R. (2016). Exploring cyberbullying and face-to-face bullying in working life – prevalence, targets and expressions, *Computers in Human Behavior,* Vol. 58, pp. 454-460.

Giorgi, G. (2012). Workplace bullying in academia creates a negative work environment: an Italian study, *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, Vol. 24 No. 4, pp. 261-275.

Glission, C., & James, L.R. (2002). The cross-level effects of culture and climate in human service teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *23*(6), 767−794.

Hauge, L. J., Skogstad, A. & Einarsen, S. (2007). Relationships between stressful work environments and workplace bullying: Results of a large representative study. *Work & Stress*, 21, 220–242.

Hauge, L.J., Skogstad, A. and Einarsen, S. (2010). The relative impact of workplace bullying as a social stressor at work. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 51 No. 5, pp. 426-433.

Hoel, H. & Cooper, C.L (2000). Destructive Conflict and Bullying at Work, Manchester School of Management, University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology (UMIST).

Hoel, H., Sheehan, M., Cooper, C. & Einarsen, S. (2011). Organisational effects of workplace bullying. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf & C. Cooper (Eds.), Bullying and harassment in the workplace: *Developments in theory, research and practice* (pp. 129–147).

Hogh, A., Mikkelsen, E.G. and Hansen, A.M. (2011), "Individual consequences of workplace bullying/mobbing", in Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D. and Cooper, C.L. (Eds), Bullying and Harassment in the Workplace: Developments in Theory, Research, and Practice, 2nd ed., CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, pp. 107-128.

Hutchinson, E.D. (2011). Dimensions of human behavior. (fourth ed.). Los Angeles, CA:Sage Publications, Inc.

Hutchinson, J. & Eveline, J. (2010). Workplace bullying policy in the Australian public sector: Why has gender been ignored? *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 69, 47–60.

Hutchinson, M., Vickers, M., Jackson, D., Wilkes, L. (2005). Like wolves in a pack: Stories of predatory alliances of bullies in nursing. *Health Care Management Review*, 30, 331-336.

Hutchinson, M., Vickers, M. H., Jackson, D., Wilkes, L. (2010). Bullying as circuits of power: An Australian nursing perspective. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 32, 25-47.

Jonsson, S., Muhonen, T., Denti, L. and Chen, K. (2015). Social climate and job control as mediators between empowering leadership and learning from a cross-cultural perspective. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management,* Vol. 15 No. 2, pp. 135-149.

Kowalski, R. M., Limber, S. E., & Agatston, P. W. (2012). Cyberbullying: Bullying in the digital age, (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Matthiesen, S B, Einarsen, S. (2001). MMPI–2 Configurations among Victims of Bullying atWork, (467–484), *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology,* vol. 10 (4).

Moreno,J. B., Rodriguez, M, A., Garrosa, E. & Morante, M.E. (2005). Organizational antecedents of mobbing: an exploratory study, Psicothema, 17, 648-653.

Moreno, J. B., Rodríguez, M. A., Martínez, G. M., & Gálvez, H. M. (2007). Assessing workplace bullying: Spanish validation of a reduced version of the Negative Acts Questionnaire. *Spanish Journal of Psychology 10*(2), 449-57.

Namie, G., & Namie, R. (2003). *The bully at work: What you can do to stop the hurt and reclaim your dignity on the job.* Naperville, IL: Sourcebooks.

Nielsen, M.B. and Einarsen, S. (2012). Outcomes of exposure to workplace bullying: a meta-analytic review, Work & Stress, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 309-332.

Nielsen, M. B. & Einarsen, S. (2013). Can observations of workplace bullying really make you depressed? A response to Emdad et al. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health,* 86, 717–721.

Notelaers, G. (2010). Workplace bullying: A risk control perspective. Doctoral dissertation. Bergen: University of Bergen.

Occupational Safety and Health Administration. (2016). Workplace Violence in Healthcare: Understanding the challenge.Available at: www.osha.gov/publications/OSHA3826.pdf.

Powell, J.E., Powell, A.L. and Petrosko, J.M. (2015). School climate as a predictor of incivility and bullying among public school employees: a multilevel analysis, *Journal of School Violence,* Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 217-244.

Randall, P. (1997). *Adult Bullying. Perpetrators and Victims*. London: Routledge.

Rayner, C. (1997). The incidence of workplace bullying. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology,* 7, (3), 199-208

Reknes, I., Einarsen, S., Knardahl, S. & Lau, B. (2014). The prospective relationship between role stressors and new cases of self-reported workplace bullying. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology,* 55, 45–52.

Rigby, K. & Smith, P.K. (2011). Is school bullying really on the rise? *Social Psychological Education*, (14), 4412-4415. Doi ;10.1007/s11218-011-9158-y

Salin, D. (2003). Ways of explaining workplace bullying: a review of enabling, motivating and precipitating structures and processes in the work environment. *Human Relations*, Vol. 56 No. 10, pp. 1213-1232.

Salin, D. (2013). Bullying and well-being. In R. Giacalone & M. Promislo (Eds.), Handbook of unethical work behavior: Implications for individual well-being (pp. 73–88). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Salin, D. & Hoel, H. (2013). Workplace bullying as a gendered phenomenon: A review of the literature, theoretical explanations and directions for further research. *Journal of Managerial Psychology,* 28, 235–251.

Skogstad, A., Matthiesen, S.B., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Organizational Changes: A Precursor of Bullying at Work. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior, 10*(1), 58 – 94.

Smith, P.K., Mahdavi, J., Carvalho, M., Fisher, S., Russell, S. and Tippett, N. (2008), Cyberbullying: its nature and impact in secondary school pupils. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry,* Vol. 49 No. 4, pp. 376-385.

Thylefors, I. (1987). *Syndabockar om utstötning och mobbning i arbetslivet*. Stockholm:Naturoch Kultur,.

Vartia, M. (1996). The sources of bullying–psychological work environment and organizational climate. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology,* 5, 203–214.

Vartia, M. (2003). Workplace bullying - a study on the work environment, well-being and health', Doctoral Dissertation. People and Work research reports 56, Helsinki: Finnish Institute of Occupational Health.

Workplace Bullying Institute.(2014). The Health Workplace Campaign. Healthy Workplace Bill Website. Available at; healthyworkplacebill.org/problem.

Zapf, D. (1999). Organisational, work group related and personal causes of mobbing/bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower, 20* (1/2), 70-85.

Zapf, D. & Einarsen, S. (2011). Individual antecedents of bullying: Victims and perpetrators. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf & C. Cooper (Eds.), Bullying and harassment in the workplace: Developments in theory, research, and practice (pp. 177–200). London: Taylor & Francis.