

Workplace Bullying in Construction Organization

Mastura Jaafar* Norziani Dahalan** and Nur 'Izzati Hidzir**

*School of Housing, Building and Planning, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800, Penang, Malaysia

**School of Distance Education, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800 Penang, Malaysia

ABSTRACT

Since the early 1990s, many studies have investigated workplace bullying in various environments and industries. However, workplace bullying in construction organizations has not been examined. Thus, this study analyzes the prevalence of workplace bullying in construction organizations, the types of negative behavior, the effects of such behavior on individuals and the organization, and the relationship between workplace bullying and the culture of the construction organization. A quantitative research method was used to statistically compare different employees from different organizations in the construction industry. Unreasonable work demands; inappropriate criticism of an individual's work, personality, or background; and verbal abuse are the most common bullying behavior in construction organizations. The greatest effects of workplace bullying on victims are a decline in job satisfaction and morale, and the greatest effects on the organization are work disruption, a decline in productivity, and damage to the organization's reputation.

Keywords workplace bullying, construction organisation, Malaysia

Authors emails

masturaj@usm.my

norziani@usm.my

izzatihidzir@hotmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Workplace bullying is the repeated behavior of harassing, offending, or socially excluding a person and thus negatively affecting the person's work tasks (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf and Cooper, 2003). Such negative behavior occurs almost every day in every country. Workplace bullying not only brings targets psychological distress but also harms the organization (Mikkelsen and Einarsen, 2001; Namie and Namie, 2009). Thus, many studies on workplace bullying have attempted to solve this problem (Leymann, 1990; Zapf, Knorz and Kulla, 1996; Khalib and Ngan, 2006; Salin and Hoel, 2011; Duffy and Sperry, 2012). Such a solution has become a national agenda in many countries, such as Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Ireland, the UK, Korea, Japan, Germany, Italy, Australia, New Zealand, Mexico, and the US (Heames and Harvey, 2006).

In the US, 37% of workers are bullied at their workplace. Of these bullying targets, 45% report that

the stress caused by getting bullied affects their health (US Workplace Bullying Survey: September, 2007). In Denmark, 10.8% of respondents experience workplace bullying. Among these respondents, 1.4% experience bullying at least once a week, and 9.4% experience bullying occasionally. In Japan, workplace bullying increased from 5.8% in 2002 to 17% in 2012 (Ministry of Health and Welfare, 2013). Moreover, the number of suicides and industrial accidents caused by workplace bullying has increased. The Workplace Power Harassment Survey in Japan (2012) found that 25.3% of all respondents have experienced bullying in the past three years.

Studies on workplace bullying have also focused on various environments and industries, such as health care (Leymann, 1990; Quine, 2002; Hoosen, 2004; Khalib and Ngan, 2006; ANA, 2011), education (Leymann, 1992; Sutela and Lehto, 1998; Paoli and Merllie, 2000, Hoel and Cooper, 2000; Keashly and Neuman, 2010), public services (Ismail, 2009), and blue-collar professions (Einarsen and Raknes, 1997;

Incolink, 2011). However, no study has investigated construction organizations in particular even though the culture of the construction industry is prone to workplace bullying.

The construction industry is a client- and project-oriented industry. For a construction project, a team of construction professionals are selected to deliver the project in a short period of time, with excellent quality, and at low cost (Egan, 1998; Cabinet Office, 2011). Given this aim, construction employees are usually forced to work long hours to meet deadlines and handle excessive workloads (Sutherland and Davidson, 1993). This culture of working extra-long hours is normal and common in the construction sector according to the Australian Centre for Industrial Relations Research and Training (1999), which revealed that the occurrence rate of construction professionals' working more than 49 hours per week is approximately 20%. Gunning and Cooke (1996) found that construction professionals are exposed to working with impossible deadlines, unrealistic demands from clients, a lack of staff, working on multiple projects, and conflicts within the organization and thus suffer undue stress.

The construction industry is also associated with a macho culture characterized by arguments, conflict, and crisis (Bagilhole, Dainty and Neale, 2000). Professor Michael Romans, a former president of the Chartered Institute of Building (2006), confirmed this observation and noted that the construction industry overtly adopts hostile language and behavior. Thus, most construction professionals often find themselves in an extremely hostile environment. Furthermore, the construction industry is a male-dominated industry (Feilden et al., 2000; Amartunga et al., 2010), which is often associated with discrimination against women. In Australia, young women observe that this industry is male-dominated and perceive sexism, discrimination, and harassment to be widespread in the industry.

Despite the many studies on workplace culture in construction organizations, none of them has focused on workplace bullying. Thus, the present study aims to provide an insight into workplace bullying in construction organizations in Malaysia to achieve the following objectives:

1. To identify the type of workplace bullying in construction organizations in the country
2. To examine the effect of workplace bullying on employees and the organization
3. To investigate the relationship of the culture of construction organizations with workplace bullying

The next section reviews literature on workplace bullying, the types of workplace bullying, the effect of workplace bullying on the target and organization, and the relationship of organizational culture with workplace bullying. The research methodology is then described, and the findings of the study are analyzed and discussed. Finally, the conclusion section identifies the implications of the findings and the contributions of the research.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Workplace Bullying

Workplace bullying has attracted considerable attention. The concept of bullying was introduced by Heinmann in 1972 (as "mobbing") to describe a definite type of aggression among students in Scandinavia. The concept was later adopted to signify a specific type of negative behavior among adults in the workplace. Research on workplace bullying was first formally recognized in the early 1980s through a study conducted by Swedish therapist Heinz Leymann. Leymann examined workplace conflict through case studies of nurses who had committed or tried to commit suicide because of unfortunate events in their workplace (Zapf and Einarsen, 2005).

Since then, research on workplace bullying in many countries has evolved. Many terms have been used to describe bullying in the workplace. These terms include "mobbing" in France and Germany (Leymann, 1990; Zapf, Knorz, and Kulla, 1996), "harassment" in Finland (Bjorkqvist et al., 1994), "aggression" in the US (Baron and Neuman, 1996), "emotional abuse" (Keashly, 2001), and "workplace bullying" in Australia (Sheehan, 1999), the UK (Rayner, 1997), and Northern Europe (Einarsen and Skogstad, 1996). These differences in terms or labels are likely due to the type of negative behavior that occurs in the respective countries

Type of Workplace Bullying

Workplace bullying occurs in various forms and situations. Such behavior may be exhibited by an individual or a group of people. It occurs as subtle actions, such as gossiping between employees and personal jokes about the target, or as aggressive and overt conduct, such as physical threats and violence (Ayoko *et al.*, 2003). Workplace bullying is often work-related and is usually done by managers or senior staff in the organization. The target of workplace bullying is usually given excessive workloads, subjected to excessive monitoring of work, and unfairly criticized about their work (Baillien *et al.*, 2011).

Effect of Workplace Bullying

Workplace bullying may result in extensive health injuries, such as physical and psychological illness, to its targets. Vartia (2001) reported that the targets of workplace bullying experience more general stress and mental stress reactions than those from a bullying-free workplace. Targets also exhibit low self-confidence and use sleep-inducing drugs and sedatives more often than non-target individuals.

Namie and Namie (2009) argued that an organization suffers a highly negative effect because of workplace bullying. Similarly, Johnston (2010) found that more than 80% of victims of workplace bullying immediately leave their jobs and thus cost organizations an estimated \$180 million in lost productivity each year. Furthermore, organizations suffer from a tarnished professional reputation and reduce their productivity as a result of reduced efficiency, an unsafe work environment, increased absenteeism, poor morale, increased compensation claims from workers, and civil action.

Fisher-Blando (2008) argued that workplace bullying positively affects individuals and the organization because it develops many positive qualities for a professional career. These qualities include competence, intelligence, creativity, integrity, accomplishment, and dedication to the job. Theoretically, targets of workplace bullying learn how to solve problems, examine their own behavior, and independently correct their mistakes.

Organizational Culture in Relation to Workplace Bullying

Every organization has its own culture, which serves as a guideline for its members on how they should adapt and behave within the organization. Tambur and Vaadi (2012) noted that the organization's culture and members have a mutual relationship: organizational culture affects the performance of members, who in turn influence the development of organizational culture. Idealistic theory would suggest that an excellent workplace exhibits an organizational culture that reflects understanding of goals, freedom of activity, and changes in the organization.

By contrast, an undesirable organization encourages bullying in the workplace (Agervold, 2009; Einarsen *et al.*, 1994; Hoel and Cooper, 2000). Baucus and Near (1991) showed that negative employee behavior occurs in large firms with great resources and that such behavior may be attributed to a desire for social acceptance within the organization. These unfavorable conditions in organizations increase workplace bullying (Batur and Wistom, 2012).

A negative and poor social and politicized climate inclines an organization to bullying (Salin, 2003; Vartia, 1996). For instance, poor information, a lack of conversations about tasks and goals, and a poor communication climate correlate with bullying (Vartia, 1996).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Sample and Data Collection

Fifty sets of questionnaires were distributed to construction organizations (seven to eight sets each) across peninsular Malaysia. The construction organizations were randomly chosen regardless of their position, years of experience, and type of profession (quantity surveyors, architects, or contractors). The questionnaires, together with self-addressed and stamped envelopes, were distributed by hand and through mail. Only 33 questionnaires were returned, a response rate of only 66%.

Measures

Ninety-eight percent of the questions were close-ended and thus quick to answer. The questionnaires were divided into four sections: (a) the respondent's background, (b) the type of workplace bullying in the construction organization, (c) organizational culture in relation to workplace bullying, and (d) the effect of workplace bullying on employees and the organization.

Section A consisted of five questions regarding the background of the respondent. The questions were self-designed based on Douglas (2001) and Fisher-Blando (2008).

The six questions in section B were asked to identify who are involved in workplace bullying, what type of bullying is exhibited in construction organizations, and whether the organizational environment promotes bullying behavior. This section aims to determine the type of workplace bullying in construction organizations.

Section C consisted of three questions designed to identify the effects of workplace bullying on the job satisfaction and performance of employees in the organization. The questions were modified from Douglas (2001) and Fisher-Blando (2008).

In section D, a Likert scale was used to help respondents quickly select among several alternatives: 1 for "totally disagree," 2 for "disagree," 3 for "neutral," 4 for "agree," and 5 for "totally agree." This section aims to determine the organizational culture with respect to workplace bullying. The questions were gathered from Douglas (2001), Fisher-Blando (2008), Salin (2001), Vartia (2001), and Salin (2003).

Analysis

The demographic data showed that most of the respondents were male (58% vs. 42% female) and employees of quantity surveying firms (45.5%). The other respondents were employees of architect firms (21.2%), contractor firms (18.2%), other firms (9.09%), interior design firms (3.03%), and planning firms (3.03%). Most of the respondents had working experience of 0 to 5 years (66.67%), 6 to 10 years (27.27%), and more than 11 years (6.06%).

Eighty-eight percent of the respondents experienced workplace bullying in the construction industry. However, only 41.9% of the respondents experienced mistreatment in the workplace several times, and 58.1% experienced only a single incident. The negative behaviors experienced by most of the respondents were unreasonable work demands (48.48%), unfair criticisms of their work (42.42%), verbal abuse (30.3%), putdowns, interference of performance, threats to job security, non-approval of leaves, attribution of their work to someone else, isolation, and physical abuse.

Most of the respondents agreed that few employees took sick leaves annually ($m = 3.68$). The organization encouraged and acknowledged employee initiative, creativity, and diversity ($m = 3.58$); provided many opportunities for career enhancement and development ($m = 3.48$); exhibited a stable workforce and low turnover ($m = 3.48$); maintained a working environment enjoyed by every employee ($m = 3.32$); never required the same or a greater amount of work in fewer hours or for less money ($m = 3.32$); was supportive and fostered an environment where people trusted each other ($m = 3.32$); had employers who were always aware of what went on at work ($m = 3.29$); cultivated no “them” or “us” culture, particularly among the senior management ($m = 2.97$); and ensured open communication between juniors or newcomers and higher-level management ($m = 2.87$).

Most of the respondents (54.8%) experienced a decline in morale as a result of workplace bullying. The respondents also exhibited a drop in productivity (32.3%), experienced work team disruptions (25.8%), avoided bullies (16.1%), worried about incidents (12.9%), and manifested absenteeism (9.7%).

In total, 74.2% of the respondents experienced a negative effect on their job satisfaction, whereas 22.6% experienced a positive effect. The remaining 3.2% claimed that workplace bullying had no effect on their job satisfaction at all. Most of the respondents (54.8%) agreed that workplace bullying disrupted their work. The other respondents observed a significant drop in

Table 1: Organizational culture in relation to workplace bullying

| | <i>N</i> | <i>Rank</i> | <i>Mean</i> |
|--|----------|-------------|-------------|
| 1. The organization is very supportive, and people trust each other at work and are cooperative. | 31 | 7 | 3.32 |
| 2. Initiative, creativity, and diversity are acknowledged and encouraged in the organization. | 31 | 2 | 3.58 |
| 3. There is no “them” or “us” culture in the organization, particularly among senior management. | 31 | 9 | 2.97 |
| 4. There are plenty of opportunities for career advancement and development as well as for empowering the workforce. | 31 | 3 | 3.48 |
| 5. The organization has a stable workforce, with very low turnover. | 31 | 4 | 3.48 |
| 6. Every employee enjoys the working environment in the organization. | 31 | 5 | 3.32 |
| 7. Employers are always aware of what goes on in the organization. | 31 | 8 | 3.29 |
| 8. You and your colleagues have never been instructed to do the same or a greater amount of work in fewer hours or for less money. | 31 | 6 | 3.32 |
| 9. There is a low number of employees taking sick leaves. | 31 | 1 | 3.68 |
| 10. Juniors/newcomers never have any difficulty in communicating with higher-level management. | 31 | 10 | 2.87 |
| Valid <i>N</i> (listwise) | 31 | | |

Scale: >1.49 = totally disagree; 1.5 to 2.49 = disagree; 2.5 to 3.49 = neutral; 3.5 to 4.49 = agree; 4.5 to 5.0 = totally agree

productivity (38.7%), a damaged reputation (19.4%), reduced profitability (16.1%), increased discrimination complaints (16.1%), excessive absenteeism (12.9%), and disproportionate turnover (6.5%).

Among all the respondents, 80.6% claimed that workplace bullying negatively affected their organization, whereas only 6.45% noted a positive effect. The remaining 12.9% indicated that workplace bullying had no effect at all on the organization. Most of the respondents (25.8%) agreed that they became more competitive after being bullied. The other respondents found a better job (22.6%) and became more resilient after being bullied (12.9%). However, 38.7% of the respondents revealed that workplace bullying did not have a positive effect on them.

DISCUSSION

More than half of the respondents were male, with the majority working in a quantity surveying firm. The majority of the respondents agreed on receiving mistreatment in their workplace, with almost half receiving mistreatment several times during their work.

Most of these respondents were junior executives, who had working experience ranging from 0 to 5 years in the construction organization. This finding supports that of Incolink (2011). Similarly, Nor Azimah and Anizan (2012) found that the apprentices and juniors of the organization are the most common groups targeted by bullies because they are new and have yet to form any strong relationship with other colleagues. Baucus and Near (1991) also pointed out that workplace bullying are more likely to involve employees who are young, new to their job, work part-time, and have low-paying positions. According to Chappell and Di Martino (2006), the reason of why these focus group are been mistreated are because their insignificant status of age and ranking. The workplace bully in construction organizations is often a solo type of bully, and females are often the bully in these organizations. This finding is supported by Dina (2012), who highlighted that women are the predominant bullies in the workplace.

A majority of the respondents picked upper management personnel as the bully, indicating that workplace bullying in construction organizations is done in a hierarchical manner. According to Douglas (2001), hierarchical bullying is a bullying behavior that occurs between different ranges of position and power, such as between a manager and his staff and between senior and junior executives. However, workplace bullying in construction organizations may also be committed by other colleagues and people outside the organization, such as clients and other professions. This phenomenon is called horizontal bullying, which refers to bullying among workers who are at the same level but hold different amounts of power. This power imbalance may be created by years of working, popularity, and ability to influence higher management (Salin, 2003). Given that construction involves many professionals and individuals, construction organizations may also be prone to the relationship type of bullying. Therefore, employees should always note that bullying may not always be committed within the organization but may be done by a client, a person in position of authority, or other professionals in the construction team (Government of South Australia, 2005).

Giving piles of unreasonable workloads and unfair criticism are the most common types of workplace bullying in construction organizations. This type of workplace bullying is considered as work-based bullying (Hoel *et al.*, 2001) and is the most common type of bullying among seniors in an organization toward juniors or newcomers in the UK (Lewis, 2006). Another common bullying behavior in construction organizations is verbal abuse, which is also one of the

most common bullying behaviors in medical organizations (Gaffney *et al.*, 2012). Verbal abuse may be regarded as a small and unimportant aspect in workplace bullying, but it negatively affects the mental health and daily life of employees. Thus, the victim of workplace bullying might have suffered many negative impacts like psychomatic symptoms and physical illness (Leymann, 1996; Vartia, 2001; Ayoko *et al.*, 2003; Bjorkqvist *et al.*, 1994; Einarsen&Raknes, 1997; Leymann, 1990). The symptoms are anxiety and stress about work (Quine 2001), depression, nervousness, fearfulness, loss of self-confidence (Randle 2003).

Most of the respondents agreed that workplace bullying affected their job satisfaction. Salin (2003) argued that workplace bullying negatively affects not only the performance of individuals but also that of the organization as a whole. The statistical data in Table 1 show that most of the respondents experienced a significant decline in their morale and productivity after being bullied, consistent with Fisher-Blando (2008). Moreover, more than half of the respondents agreed that workplace bullying negatively affected the organization and indicated that work disruption had the most significant effect on construction organizations, consistent with Bar-David (2012). Bar-David explained that bullying behavior directly or indirectly harms the performance of the organization by affecting working teams. Aside from work disruption, a drop in organizational productivity, damage to the organization's reputation, a drop in profitability, and discrimination complaints are caused by bullying.

Interestingly, several respondents indicated that workplace bullying positively affected their job satisfaction and organization. This finding is supported by Rigby (2002), who found that bullying induces a positive response to a temporary stressor and commonly makes the targeted person resilient. However, whether bullying indeed results in a positive outcome has not been empirically investigated. Although several respondents agreed that bullying had a positive effect, most of the respondents still indicated that it had a negative effect.

The culture of construction organizations is separated into two categories because of its different functions as a key player in the industry. The first category is the culture of professional organizations (i.e., architecture and quantity surveying firms), and the second one is that of contracting organizations (i.e., contracting firms). Rameezdeen and Gunarathna (2003) revealed that the culture of professional organizations is clan-dominated, whereas that of contractor organizations is market-dominated. The culture of

professional organizations is characterized by the development of human resources to achieve specific goals, which emphasize loyalty, traditional values, and a conducive and participative working environment. By contrast, the culture of contracting organizations is characterized by the maximization of profits and output. Contracting organizations encourage their employees to be competitive and emphasize goal accomplishment. Interestingly, regardless of the high percentage of workplace bullying in the organization, this study found that few employees took sick leaves. This finding provides an insightful remark on Malaysian construction organizations. Construction organizations in Malaysia are also supportive in terms of the development of creativity, diversity, and initiative among employees. These organizations also provide many opportunities for career advancement and a platform for empowering their workforce. However, the traditional culture of seniority in construction organizations remains: several forms of bullying involve employees who are young, new to their job, work part-time, and have low-paying positions (Baucus and Near, 1991).

CONCLUSION

The prevalence of workplace bullying is difficult to identify because its occurrence takes months to recognize and it is sometimes already too late to mend it. However, workplace bullying in the construction industry has not been extensively explored. This study was conducted to gain an insight into workplace bullying in construction organizations in Malaysia.

The behaviors associated with workplace bullying in construction organizations in Malaysia are (in order of frequency) unreasonable work demands; inappropriate criticism of the individual's work, personality, or background; and verbal abuse. However, workplace bullying in construction organizations in Malaysia is related to internal politics and psychological matters compared with that in other countries, where many physical abuse cases are reported because of workplace bullying.

Workplace bullying negatively affects the performance of employees and the organization. The greatest negative effects of workplace bullying on employees and the organization are a decline in morale, work team disruption, low productivity, damaged reputation, and wasted time worrying about future incidents of bullying. On the other hand, workplace bullying also positively affects its targets. It develops the resilience and toughness of bullied targets and increases their competitiveness in their job. However, these favorable effects are minimal compared with the

damaging effects.

With regard to organizational culture in relation to workplace bullying, the construction organizations promote a healthy environment for employees according to the small number of employees taking sick leaves. Moreover, construction organizations in Malaysia vigorously support the development of creativity, diversity, and initiative among their employees and provide many opportunities for career advancement and a platform for empowering their workforce. This positive workplace environment or culture may explain the low prevalence of workplace bullying in construction organizations in Malaysia.

Acknowledgements

The funding for this project is made possible through the research grant obtained from the the Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE), Malaysia.

Biographical Notes

Mastura Jaafar is currently a Lecturer in the Programme of Quantity Surveying at the Universiti Sains Malaysia for the School of Housing, Building and Planning. She has working experience as a Project Manager for contracting firms before pursuing her PhD in Strategic Management. She is currently involved in several research projects and consultancies related to project and procurement management for public sector. She has presented her research papers in international and national conferences. She also has published research articles in international and local journals.

Norziani Dahalan @ OMAR is a senior lecturer in the Management Section in School of Distance Education, Universiti Sains Malaysia. She teaches organizational behavior, organization theory and development, entrepreneurship, and research methodology. Her major interest of research involves learning organization, learning, organization behavior, entrepreneurship, distance education, e-learning and e-mentoring.

Nur 'Izzati Hidzir is a PhD student in Universiti Sains Malaysia under School of Housing, Building and Planning. She holds a Bachelor's degree in Quantity Surveying from International Islamic University Malaysia and Master's degree in Construction Contract Management from Universiti Teknologi Malaysia. Her current research focus on workplace bullying in the construction industry.

References

- [1] Agervold, M. (2009), The significance of organizational factors for the incidence of bullying. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 50, Issue 3, pp. 267–276.
- [2] Amartunga, D., Haigh, R., Lee, A., Shanmugam, M. and Elvitigala, G. (2010). *Construction Industry and Women: A Review of the Barriers*. Proceedings of the 3rd International SCRI Research Symposium, Delft University, Netherlands.

- [3] American Nurses Association (ANA). (2011). *Bullying and Workplace Violence*. Retrieved from <http://www.nursingworld.org/MainMenuCategories/WorkplaceSafety/Healthy-Nurse/bullyingworkplaceviolence>.
- [4] Australian Centre for Industrial Relations Research and Training (1999), *Australia at Work—Just Managing?*, Prentice-Hall, Sydney.
- [5] Ayoko, O. B., Callan, V. J., and Hartel, C. E. (2003). Workplace conflict, bullying and counterproductive behaviours. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*. 11 (4), 283–302.
- [6] Bagilhole, B. M., Dainty, A. R. J., and Neale, R. H. (2000) Women in the construction industry in the UK: A cultural discord?, *Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering*, Vol 6, pp. 73-86.
- [7] Baillien, E., Rodriguez-Munoz, A., De Witte, H., Notelaers, G. and Moreno-Jimenez, B. (2011). The Demand-Control Model and target's reports of bullying at work: A test within Spanish and Belgian blue-collar workers. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 20, Issue 2, pp. 157-177.
- [8] Bar-David, S. (2012), *Incivility, Harassment and Bullying: The Business Case*. Retrieved from <http://www.sharonebardavid.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Business-Case-Respect-Website-Version-Dec-2011-2.pdf>
- [9] Baron, R. A., and Neuman, J. H. (1996). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Aggressive Behavior*, Vol 22, Issue 3, pp. 161–173.
- [10] Batur, M. and Wistrom, E. (2012), *Workplace Bullying: A Study about Awareness, Preparedness and Implementation*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Universiti of Gothenburg, Sweden.
- [11] Baucus, M. and Near, J. (1991), Can illegal corporate behavior be predicted? An event history analysis. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 9-36.
- [12] Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., and HjeltBäck, M. (1994). Aggression among university employees. *Aggressive Behavior*, Vol. 20, Issue 3, pp 173-184.
- [13] Cabinet Office. (2011), *Government Construction Strategy*. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/government-construction-strategy>
- [14] Chappell, D. and Di Martino, V. (2006), *Violence at work*. Third Edition. Geneva, Switzerland.
- [15] Chartered Institute of Building, (2006), *Occupational Stress in the Construction Industry*. Berkshire: CIOB. Retrieved from http://www.ciob.org/sites/default/files/CIOB%20research%20%20Occupational%20Stress%20in%20the%20Construction%20Industry%202006_0.pdf
- [16] Dina, Z. (2012, April 19), *The Rise of Female Bullies*. The Star. Malaysia. Retrieved from <http://www.thestar.com.my/Story/?file=%2F2012%2F4%2F19%2Ffocus%2F11125010&sec=focus>
- [17] Douglas, E. (2001), *Bullying In the Workplace*. England, Gower Publishing Limited.
- [18] Duffy, M. and Sperry, L. (2012), *Mobbing: Causes, consequences, and solutions*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [19] Egan, J. (1998), *Rethinking Construction: Report of the Construction Task Force*, London: HMSO.
- [20] Einarsen, S. and Skogstad, A. (1996), Bullying at work: Epidemiological findings in public and private organizations. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 5, Issue 2, pp. 185-201.
- [21] Einarsen, S. Raknes, B. I. and Matthiesen, S. B. (1994), Bullying and harassment at work and their relationships to work environment quality: An exploratory study. *European Work and Organizational Psychologist*, Vol 4. Issue 4, pp. 381–401.
- [22] Einarsen, S., and Raknes, B. I. (1997), Harassment in the workplace and the victimization of men. *Violence and Victims*, Vol 12, Issue 3, pp. 247-263.
- [23] Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D. and Cooper, C. L. (2003). The concept of bullying at work: The European tradition. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in research and practice* (pp. 3–30). London: Taylor and Francis.
- [24] Fielden, S. L., Davidson, M. J., Gale, A. W. and Davey, C. L. (2000), Women in construction: the untapped resource, *Construction Management and Economics*, Vol 18, Issue 1, pp. 113 – 121.
- [25] Fisher-Blando, J. L. (2008), *Workplace Bullying: Aggressive Behavior and Its Effect on Job Satisfaction and Productivity Doctor Of Management In Organizational Leadership*. United States, University Of Phoenix.
- [26] Gaffney, D., DeMarco, R.F., Hofmeyer, A., Vessey, J.A., and Budin, W.C. (2012), Making Things Right: Nurses' Experiences With Workplace Bullying—A Grounded Theory. *Nursing Research and Practice*, Vol 12, pp. 1-10.
- [27] Government of South Australia (2005), *Dealing with Workplace Bullying - A Practical Guide for Employees*. Interagency Round Table on Workplace Bullying. Australia.
- [28] Gunning, J.G. and Cooke, E. (1996), The influence of occupational stress on construction professionals. *Building research and information*, Vol 24, Issue 4, pp. 213-221.
- [29] Heames, J. and Harvey, M. (2006), Workplace bullying: a cross-level assessment. *Management Decision*, Vol. 44, Issue 9, pp.1214 - 1230
- [30] Heinemann, P. P. (1972), *Mobbning-Gruppväld bland barn och vuxna*. Stockholm: Natur & Kultur.
- [31] Hoel, H. and Cooper, C. L. (2000), *Destructive conflict at work*. Manchester: Manchester School of Management.
- [32] Hoel, H., Cooper, C. L., and Faragher, B. (2001), The experience of bullying in Great Britain: The impact of

- organizational status. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol 10, pp. 443-465.
- [33] Hoosen I. A. (2004), A survey of workplace bullying of psychiatric trainees in the West Midlands. *Psychiatric Bulletin* 2004, Vol 28, pp. 225-227.
- [34] Incolink (2011), *Bullying And Harassment*. Retrieved March 2013, From <http://Www.Incolink.Org.Au/Bullying-And-Harassment.AspX>.
- [35] Ismail, M. A. (2009), *PerlakuanBuli di TempatKerja*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia.
- [36] Johnston, S. M. (2010), *Reacting to Abusive Managerial Behavior: A Qualitative Phenomenological Study*. Proquest, Umi Dissertation Publishing.
- [37] Keashly, L. and Neuman J. H. (2010), Faculty experiences with bullying in higher education: Causes, consequences and management. *Administrative Theory and Praxis*, Vol 32, Issue 1, pp. 48-70.
- [38] Keashly, L. (2001), Interpersonal and systemic aspects of emotional abuse at work: The target's perspective. *Violence & Victims*, Vol. 16, Issue 3, pp. 233-268.
- [39] Khalib, A. L., and Ngan, H. U. (2006), Workplace bullying: Time to understand its roots. *Malaysian Journal of Community Health*, Vol. 12, Issue 1, pp. 47-56.
- [40] Lewis, E. S. (2006), Recognition of Workplace Bullying: A Qualitative Study of Women Targets In The Public Sector. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, Vol 16, Issue 2, pp. 119-135.
- [41] Leymann, H. (1990), Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces. *Violence Victims*, Vol. 5, Issue 2, pp. 119-126.
- [42] Leymann, H. (1992), *Mobbing at Swedish Workplace: A study of 2428 individuals frequencies*. Stockholm: Arbetaskyddsstyrelsen.
- [43] Leymann, H. (1996), The Content and Development of Mobbing at Work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*. Vol. 5, Issue 2, pp.165-184.
- [44] Mikkelsen, E. G., and Einarsen, S. (2001), Bullying in Danish worklife: Prevalence and health correlates. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 10, Issue 4, pp. 393-414.
- [45] Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. (2012), *Workplace Power Harassment Survey*. Retrieved from http://www.jil.go.jp/english/reports/documents/jilpt-reports/no.12_japan.pdf
- [46] Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. (2013), *Enforcement Status of Individual Labour Dispute Resolution System in FY2012*. Retrieved from http://www.jil.go.jp/english/reports/documents/jilpt-reports/no.12_japan.pdf
- [47] Namie R. and Namie G. (2009), *The Bully at Work: What Can You Do to Stop The Hurt and Reclaim Your Dignity on The Job*. Sourcebook Inc.
- [48] Nor Azimah, C. A. and A. Anizan (2012), *Factors Contributing to Workplace Violence: A Study in the Fleet Supply Depots in Malaysia*. 3rd International Conference on Business and Economic Research Proceeding, Bandung Indonesia.
- [49] Paolo, P. and Merllie, D. (2000), *Third European survey on working conditions 2000*. Retrieved from <http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/pubdocs/2001/21/en/1/ef0121en.pdf>
- [50] Quine, L. (2002), Workplace bullying in junior doctors: Questionnaire survey. *BMJ* 324 (7342): 878-9.
- [51] Rameezdeen R. and Gunarathna N. (2003), Organization Culture in Construction: An Employee Perspective, *the Australian Journal of Construction Economics and Building*, Vol. 3, Issue 1, pp. 19-30.
- [52] Randle, J. (2003), Bullying in the nursing profession. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. Volume 43, Issue 4, pp. 395-401.
- [53] Rayner, C. (1997), The incidence of workplace bullying. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, Vol 7, Issue 1, pp. 199-208.
- [54] Rigby, K. (2002), *New perspectives on bullying*. London.
- [55] Salin, D. (2001), Prevalence and Forms of Workplace Bullying Among Business Professionals: A Comparison of Two Different Strategies for Measuring Bullying. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol 10, Issue 4, pp. 425 - 441.
- [56] Salin, D. (2003), *Workplace Bullying Among Business Professionals: Prevalence, Organizational Antecedents and Gender Differences*. Publication of the Swedish School of Economics And Business Administration.
- [57] Salin, D. and Hoel, H. (2011), Organizational causes of workplace bullying. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. Cooper (Eds.), *Workplace bullying: Development in theory, research and practice* (pp. 227-243). London: Taylor & Francis.
- [57] Sheehan, M. (1999), Workplace bullying: Responding with some emotional intelligence. *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 20, Issue 1/2, pp. 57-69.
- [58] Smithers, G. L. and Walker, D. H. T. (2010), The effect of the workplace on motivation and demotivation of construction professionals. *Construction Management and Economic*, Vol 18, Issue 7, pp. 833-841.
- [59] Sutela, H., Lehto, A. M. (1998), Henkinen väkivalta on kokotyöyhteisön ongelma. *Hyvinvointikatsaus*, Vol 3, pp. 18-24.
- [60] Sutherland, V. and Davidson, M. J. (1993), Using a stress audit: the construction site manager experience in the UK. *Work and Stress*, Vol 7, Issue 3, pp. 273-286.
- [61] Tambur, M. and Vaadi, M. (2012), Workplace bullying and organizational culture in a post-transitional country. *International Journal of Manpower*. Vol. 33 No. 7, 2012. pp. 754-768
- [62] Vartia M. (1996), The sources of bullying – Psychological work environment and organizational climate. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*. Vol. 5, Issue 2, pp. 203-217.

- [63] Vartia, M. (2001), Consequences of Workplace Bullying with Respect to the Well-Being of its Targets and the Observers of Bullying. *Scand Journal Work Environmental Health*, Vol. 1, Issue 27, pp. 7.
- [64] Zapf, D., & Einarsen, S. (2005), Mobbing at work: Escalated conflicts in organizations. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior* (pp. 237-270). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- [65] Zapf, D., Knorz, C., and Kulla, M. (1996), On the relationship between mobbing factors, and job content, social work environment and health outcomes. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 5, Issue 2, pp. 215-237.
- [66] Zogby International. (2007), *U.S Workplace Bullying Survey*. Retrieved from <http://workplacebullying.org/multi/pdf/WBIsurvey2007.pdf>