

# Cyberbullying: The New Face of Workplace Bullying?

Carmel Privitera, MPsych and Marilyn Anne Campbell, Ph.D.

## Abstract

While the subject of cyberbullying of children and adolescents has begun to be addressed, less attention and research have focused on cyberbullying in the workplace. Male-dominated workplaces such as manufacturing settings are found to have an increased risk of workplace bullying, but the prevalence of cyberbullying in this sector is not known. This exploratory study investigated the prevalence and methods of face-to-face bullying and cyberbullying of males at work. One hundred three surveys (a modified version of the revised Negative Acts Questionnaire [NAQ-R]) were returned from randomly selected members of the Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union (AMWU). The results showed that 34% of respondents were bullied face-to-face, and 10.7% were cyberbullied. All victims of cyberbullying also experienced face-to-face bullying. The implications for organizations' "duty of care" in regard to this new form of bullying are indicated.

## Introduction

THE INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY (ICT) revolution over the last decade has heralded a rapid growth in the number of people interacting using modern technologies such as the Internet and mobile phones. In 2005, there were over 1 billion Internet users and 2 billion mobile phone users worldwide.<sup>2</sup> This widespread access to modern communication devices has provided an alternative medium for bullies to target their victims.<sup>3</sup> Various terms are used to describe this new phenomenon, including *cyberbullying*, *electronic bullying*, *e-bullying*, *SMS bullying*, *mobile bullying*, *online bullying*, *digital bullying*, and *Internet bullying*.<sup>4</sup> As in the case of face-to-face bullying, this relatively new field of study has initially focused on children and adolescents, with investigations of cyberbullying in the workplace slow to commence.

## Definitions

Workplace bullying is repeated behavior that offends, humiliates, sabotages, intimidates, or negatively affects someone's work when there is an imbalance of power.<sup>5,6</sup> Both face-to-face bullying and cyberbullying are about relationships, power, and control.<sup>7</sup> Workplace bullying is considered to occur when one or more individuals perceive themselves to be the target of repeated and systematic negative acts on at least a weekly basis<sup>8</sup> over a period of 6 months or longer.<sup>8,9</sup> There is also an imbalance of power between the perpetrator and the target of bullying in addition to the victim's attribution of the perpetrator's intent to cause harm.<sup>10</sup> Because of this imbalance of power, victims' ability to cope with the exposure to systematic negative acts becomes severely im-

paired<sup>11</sup> because they may not perceive themselves to be in a position to effectively protect themselves or to be able to remove themselves from the negative situation.<sup>11</sup>

## Prevalence

Research in Scandinavian countries has reported workplace bullying prevalence rates from 3.5% to 16%.<sup>9,12</sup> However, studies conducted in the United Kingdom have found higher prevalence rates. Incidence rates have been estimated from international studies<sup>13</sup> to be between 400,000 and 2 million employees.

Large organizations with a higher ratio of male-to-female employees in the manufacturing sector have also been shown to have an increased risk of exposure to workplace bullying.<sup>9,12</sup> Furthermore, male workers and supervisors have been found to be exposed to higher frequencies of negative behavior<sup>14</sup> due to the often hostile and authoritarian culture of male-dominated work environments.

## Consequences

The experience of workplace bullying can have negative consequences on victims physical health and emotional well-being.<sup>15-18</sup> The impact of workplace bullying can also extend into the victim's social and family relationships.<sup>16,19-22</sup> In addition, future career advancements such as job promotion can be threatened or damaged<sup>21</sup> because of victims taking long-term or recurring sick leave as a result of ill health from being bullied at work.<sup>22</sup>

The psychological well-being of employees who witness bullying in the workplace can also be compromised,<sup>16,23-26</sup>

producing low staff morale,<sup>21,27</sup> reduced commitment,<sup>21,27,29</sup> lowered job satisfaction,<sup>21,28</sup> and the breakdown of work relationships and teams.<sup>25</sup>

The impact at the organizational level is an increased rate of absenteeism,<sup>16,21,30,31</sup> which in turn negatively impacts efficiency, productivity, and profitability.<sup>21,27,32</sup> High staff turnover due to low workplace morale and the resignation of staff is costly and time consuming, requiring recruitment and the retraining of new staff.<sup>16,21,27</sup> The reputation of the organization may also suffer because of a poor public image as a difficult place to work.<sup>16</sup> These consequences could be exacerbated even more by the new form of workplace cyberbullying.

### Cyberbullying

Cyberbullying techniques use modern communication technology to send derogatory or threatening messages directly to the victim or indirectly to others, to forward personal and confidential communication or images of the victim for others to see, and to publicly post denigrating messages.<sup>7,33,34</sup> The two main electronic devices through which bullying from a distance occurs are online computers, providing access to e-mail and Web sites, and mobile phones, including calls and Short Message Service (SMS).

The emerging literature on research with children and adolescents indicates that cyberbullying is a serious and escalating concern at a global level.<sup>10,33–36</sup> Cases have also emerged of bullying at work via e-mail.<sup>16,37</sup> While cyberbullying in school and at work has become a recent topic in the media,<sup>39</sup> research into workplace cyberbullying is still in progress.

### Research aims

The primary aim of this exploratory study was to ascertain the prevalence of face-to-face bullying and cyberbullying in the manufacturing workplace. In addition, organizational size (small, medium, large), type of organization (private or public sector), and hierarchical job status (worker or supervisor) were investigated to ascertain whether there were any differences in types of negative acts used to bully. Both a behavioral inventory and a self-report measure of workplace bullying were used.

## Methodology

### Participants

Participants were male employees belonging to the Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union (AMWU), Queensland, Australia. A total of 145 questionnaires were returned, of which 84 (57.9%) were from the mail-out and 61 (42.1%) were from the online survey, an overall response rate of 7.3%.

However, 42 (29%) of these respondents were excluded from the analysis on the basis of missing data. The total sample for analysis consisted of 103 individuals, of whom 63.1% were recruited via mail-out and 36.9% via e-mail.

The average age for the sample was 43.2 ( $SD = 9.81$ ), ranging from 20 to 60 years. All respondents were employed on a full-time basis. Two respondents did not indicate the type of organization for which they worked. Table 1 presents the main characteristics of the respondents included in the sample.

Although there was a significant difference in age between the sample obtained from mail-out and the online survey ( $t = 2.55$ ,  $df = 101$ ,  $p = 0.012$ ), with the Internet responders being younger, on average, than the mail responders, there were no significant differences in regard to size of organization ( $\chi^2 = 1.03$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $p = 0.599$ ), employment sector ( $\chi^2 = 0.43$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = 0.510$ ), or hierarchical status at work ( $\chi^2 = 0.07$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = 0.797$ ). It was therefore decided to combine the data of the two groups.

### Procedure

Participants were randomly selected by computer from the AMWU Queensland members' register comprising of approximately 13,000 individuals from within four divisions (Metal & Engineering; Technical, Supervisory and Administrative (TSA); Printing; and Vehicle). Initially, a paper version of the questionnaire was posted to the home address of 1,000 participants. Included with the questionnaire was a letter from the Union endorsing the research, an information sheet informing voluntary participation and confidentiality of responses, and a self-addressed stamped envelope to facilitate the return of the questionnaire. Due to a low response rate, another 1000 members, selected on the basis of having an e-mail address on the AMWU Queensland member's register, were e-mailed. The e-mail contained the hyperlink to an online version of the survey, an electronic version of the Union-endorsed letter, and the information sheet.

### Measure of workplace bullying

The Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised (NAQ-R)<sup>1</sup> comprises 22 items referring to particular behaviors in the workplace that may be perceived as bullying as well as a self-report item on victimization. The behaviors or negative acts are descriptive without labeling the actions as bullying. The behaviors include being shouted at, being humiliated, having opinions ignored, being excluded, repeated reminders of errors, intimidating behavior, excessive monitoring of work, and persistent criticism of work and effort. The researchers modified the NAQ-R to also incorporate cyberbullying modalities of e-mail, SMS, and mobile or landline telephone calls in addition to the original face-to-face modality.

TABLE 1. MAIN CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS INCLUDED IN THE SAMPLE ( $N = 103$ )

Job tenure (%)		Organizational size (number of employees)			Sector (%)		Hierarchical status1 (%)*	
< 5 yrs	> 5 yrs	Small	Medium	Large	Private	Public	Worker	Supervisory
43.69	56.31	< 101	101–500	> 500	58.25	39.81	62.14	37.86

\*The last two categories were aggregated to form one supervisory role category for the purposes of analysis.

Participants were asked to complete a 5-point Likert scale on how often they had been subjected to these behaviors over the last 6 months: 1, *never*; 2, *now and then*; 3, *monthly*; 4, *weekly*; and 5, *daily*. To estimate the frequency of exposure to both face-to-face and cyberbullying, Leymann's<sup>8</sup> operational definition of workplace bullying of one incident per week over a period of at least 6 months was employed.

In addition to indicating the frequency of any negative act experienced in the workplace face to face, by e-mail, by SMS, and/or by phone over the previous 6 months, respondents were asked to report if they had been bullied, according to the following definition of workplace bullying, modified from the NAQ-R, to include both face-to-face bullying and cyberbullying:

We define bullying as: a situation where one or several individuals persistently over a period of time perceive themselves to be on the receiving end of negative actions (whether in person, by email, by SMS and/or by phone), from one or several persons, in a situation where the target of bullying has difficulty in defending him or herself against these actions. We will not refer to a one-off incident as bullying.

Participants indicated, according to this definition, if they had been subjected to bullying over the past 6 months. The six possible responses were (a) *no*; (b) *yes, very rarely*; (c) *yes, now and then*; (d) *yes, several times per month*; (e) *yes, several times per week*; and (f) *yes, almost daily*.

In this study, the internal consistency of the NAQ-R, as measured by Cronbach's  $\alpha$ , was found to be 0.94 overall.

## Results

### *Perceived exposure to negative behaviors in the workplace*

Of the 103 respondents, 89.3% ( $n = 92$ ) reported experiencing at least one negative act either face-to-face or by

e-mail, SMS, or telephone on at least a "now-and-then" basis over the previous 6 months. Of these respondents, 5.8% ( $n = 6$ ) reported experiencing a single type of negative act, while 83.5% ( $n = 86$ ) reported two or more types of negative acts. On average, participants reported exposure to 8.9 ( $SD = 6.6$ ) different types of negative acts on a now-and-then or more frequent basis. The incidence of negative acts on a now-and-then basis via modern technology was 8.7% ( $n = 9$ ) by e-mail, 8.7% ( $n = 9$ ) by SMS, and 34% ( $n = 35$ ) by telephone.

In accordance with Leymann's<sup>8</sup> criterion of bullying, 34% ( $n = 35$ ) of all respondents could be classified as victims of bullying behavior because they reported experiencing at least one negative behavior on at least a weekly basis in the last 6 months. Furthermore, 25.2% ( $n = 26$ ) of these respondents reported weekly exposure to multiple negative acts. Of all the respondents who experienced negatives acts via modern technology (10.7% [ $n = 11$ ]), 7 participants were from the online survey sample and 4 were from the mail-out sample. All respondents who perceived themselves as having been exposed to negative behaviors via modern technology also perceived that they were exposed to face-to-face victimization. This consisted of 8.7% ( $n = 9$ ) by e-mail, 7.8% ( $n = 8$ ) by telephone, and 5.8% ( $n = 6$ ) by both e-mail and telephone. No respondents had experienced at least one negative act on a weekly basis by SMS.

### *Bullying and type of negative acts*

Table 2 presents the prevalence of perceived exposure to negative acts, bullying, and victimization for each negative act as per Leymann's<sup>8</sup> operational definition.

Using Leymann's<sup>8</sup> operational definition of workplace bullying of one negative behavior on at least a weekly basis in the last 6 months, all 22 acts were reported by one or more respondents, who could identify then as victims of

TABLE 2. PREVALENCE OF PERCEIVED EXPOSURE TO NEGATIVE ACTS, BULLYING, AND VICTIMIZATION FOR EACH NEGATIVE ACT AS PER LEYMAN'S (1996) OPERATIONAL DEFINITION

<i>Negative act</i>	<i>Face-to-face (N = 35)</i>	<i>Via modern technology (N = 11)</i>
Ordered to do work below your level of competence.	17 (48.6%)	4 (36.4%)
Information withheld affecting your performance.	14 (40.0%)	6 (54.5%)
Opinions and views ignored.	14 (40.0%)	2 (18.2%)
Being ignored, excluded, or being "sent to Coventry."	11 (31.4%)	2 (18.2%)
Key areas of responsibility removed.	10 (28.6%)	2 (18.2%)
Excessive monitoring of your work.	10 (28.6%)	2 (18.2%)
Insulting/offensive remarks.	10 (28.6%)	1 (9.1%)
Exposed to an unmanageable workload.	9 (25.7%)	3 (27.3%)
Given tasks with unreasonable targets/deadlines.	9 (25.7%)	1 (9.1%)
Spreading of gossip and rumors about you.	8 (22.9%)	3 (27.3%)
Humiliated/ridiculed in connection with your work.	6 (17.1%)	1 (9.1%)
Being shouted at/the target of anger or rage.	6 (17.1%)	1 (9.1%)
Ignored/facing a hostile reaction when you approach.	6 (17.1%)	0
Persistent criticism of your work and effort.	6 (17.1%)	0
Repeated reminders of your errors or mistakes.	5 (14.3%)	1 (9.1%)
Pressure not to claim your entitlements.	5 (14.3%)	1 (9.1%)
Intimidating behavior.	5 (14.3%)	0
Allegations made against you.	4 (11.4%)	3 (27.3%)
Hints/signals from others to quit your job.	3 (8.6%)	1 (9.1%)
Practical jokes from people you don't get on with.	3 (8.6%)	0
Threats of violence or physical abuse.	2 (5.7%)	0
Excessive teasing and sarcasm.	1 (2.9%)	0

face-to-face bullying. However, only 16 of the 22 items presented in the NAQ-R were reported by victims of cyberbullying.

The most frequently reported negative act via modern technology was "someone withholding information" by e-mail 55.6% ( $n = 5$ ) and/or by telephone 37.5% ( $n = 3$ ) (this included 2 respondents reporting both methods). The spreading of gossip by telephone was reported by 37.5% ( $n = 3$ ) of respondents cyberbullied. Being subjected to allegations made against them by e-mail and being exposed to an unmanageable workload by e-mail were each reported by an equal number of cyberbullied respondents, 37.5% ( $n = 3$ ). As mentioned earlier, no respondents indicated experiencing cyberbullying by SMS as per Leymann's criteria.

#### *Bullying and organizational demographics*

To analyze whether the size (small, medium, or large), type of organization (public or private), and hierarchical status of the employee (worker or supervisory role) impacted bullying (bullied or not bullied), Chi-square tests were applied. There were no significant relationships found between the size or type of organization and being a victim of workplace bullying:  $\chi^2 = 0.688$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $p = 0.709$  and  $\chi^2 = 1.413$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = 0.234$  respectively. This suggests that there exists an equal chance of being bullied regardless of whether respondents were employed in small, medium, or large organizations or within the private or public sectors. Similarly, there were no statistically significant relationships found between the employees' hierarchical status in the organization and the reporting of face-to-face bullying ( $\chi^2 = 1.946$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p = 0.163$ ). Therefore, those in supervisory roles as general workers were as likely to report perceived exposure to face-to-face bullying.

Due to the small sample size, it was not possible to statistically test whether an association existed for the same variables and cyberbullying.

#### *Comparing reported perceived negative acts and self-reported bullying*

After indicating the frequency of negative acts experienced in the workplace on the behavior inventory section of the NAQ-R, respondents were asked to report, according to the given definition, if they considered themselves to have been subjected to face-to-face bullying and/or cyberbullying. The frequency of respondents reporting experiencing victimization in the workplace in the total sample is shown in Table 3.

By combining the frequencies in the "Yes, several times per week" with the "Yes, almost daily" categories, 18.7% (6) respondents could be classified as victims of workplace bullying according to Leymann's<sup>8</sup> criteria.

Of the 35 respondents who reported being subjected to negative acts on a daily or weekly basis on the behavior inventory section of the NAQ-R, only 17.1% ( $n = 6$ ) self-

reported being subjected to victimization according to the given definition. However, all of the respondents who self-reported experiencing victimization also indicated via the NAQ-R that they had experienced bullying. Therefore, all respondents who identified themselves as being victimized fit Leymann's<sup>8</sup> criteria used in the operational definition.

#### **Discussion**

The aim of the present study was to ascertain the prevalence of face-to-face bullying and cyberbullying in the manufacturing workplace. The results suggest that negative acts via technology are emerging alongside those enacted face-to-face in the workplace and may represent the new form of bullying, though to a much more limited extent.

Overall, the results revealed that one third of the respondents reported being recipients of at least one negative act weekly over the previous 6 months. Using Leymann's<sup>8</sup> operational definition of workplace bullying, these respondents could be considered to have experienced workplace bullying. A quarter of these respondents reported having experienced more than one negative act toward them weekly with the average number of negative acts experienced weekly being nearly nine. Furthermore, the majority of respondents reported experiencing some form of negative act on a now-and-then basis over the same period.

All 34% of victims of workplace bullying had been subjected to face-to-face bullying. Nearly one third of these respondents also experienced negative acts via modern technologies, by e-mail, telephone, or both, on at least a weekly basis. This represented 1 in 10 of all respondents, suggesting that when applying Leymann's<sup>8</sup> operational definition of workplace bullying, 11% of all respondents could be considered to have experienced some form of cyberbullying. This figure increased to over half of all respondents when the criteria for cyberbullying were relaxed to include respondents who were subjected to a negative act on a now-and-then basis. Every respondent who reported negative acts by e-mail had been subjected to cyberbullying as per Leymann's criteria of workplace bullying. The negative acts reported by SMS were not experienced frequently enough to fit Leymann's criteria of workplace bullying. It is interesting to note that at this time, victims who were considered to have experienced cyberbullying were also bullied face-to-face, contrary to recent preliminary findings with children who reported experiencing cyberbullying without face-to-face bullying.<sup>37</sup>

There were no significant differences found when the prevalence of face-to-face bullying was compared across several organizational types. This demonstrated an equal risk of exposure to face-to-face bullying regardless of the size and type of organization and the hierarchical status held within the workplace by the respondent. Because cyberbullying could not be statistically analyzed in this sample, it was

TABLE 3. FREQUENCY OF RESPONDENTS' SELF-REPORTING HAVING EXPERIENCED BULLYING IN THE WORKPLACE

	No	Yes, very rarely	Yes, now and then	Yes, several times per month	Yes, several times per week	Yes, almost daily	Total bullied
N	71	12	10	4	5	1	32
%	68.9%	37.5	31.3%	12.5%	15.6%	3.1%	31.1%

not possible to determine whether this held true for cyberbullying.

The self-report question on the NAQ-R asking participants to respond to the given definition of bullying provides an opportunity to capture respondents who identify themselves as victims of workplace bullying even though they were not identified as such due to the limits of the operational definition in the behavior inventory section of the NAQ-R. Nonetheless, all respondents who self-reported as victims of workplace bullying were also identified in the behavioral inventory. Of the 35 workers who reported being subjected to negative acts on a daily or weekly basis, 29 did not self-report as victims of bullying.

The higher prevalence rates found using the behavioral inventory compared with the self-report of being a victim of workplace bullying confirms the findings of previous studies.<sup>12</sup> This disparity may be explained by factors relating to culture. Shopfloor culture, especially in male-dominated organizations, may impact on self-reporting of workplace bullying if negative behaviors are accepted as the norm.<sup>38</sup> Awareness that negative acts may constitute bullying behaviors may therefore be low among respondents who were subjected to negative acts, and/or men may be reticent to label themselves as victims. This may be due to male stereotypes within the wider culture.

This exploratory study was limited by several factors. The sample size was small with a response rate of only 7.3%, and it was Queensland based, which prevents the findings being generalized to the overall experience of members of the AMWU or extended to include all employees working in manufacturing as a whole. Additionally, only males participated, which also limits these results. It is also possible that individuals who had experienced negative acts in the workplace may have been more motivated to respond and were subsequently overrepresented.

In addition, the survey did not include information about the respondents' levels of access to e-mail or to fixed-line or mobile telephones. Workers in manufacturing may not have continual access to modern technologies, which may have impacted on the frequency of cyberbullying. Subsequently, it could not be verified that every respondent was at equal risk of exposure to cyberbullying or whether cyberbullying by telephone was on a fixed-line telephone or a mobile telephone. It remains for future research to undertake further study with a different population. Another limitation could be that some negative acts are easier to imagine happening face-to-face than by technology.

There are significant benefits, however, in incorporating online surveys into future research on workplace cyberbullying, such as the potential to improve response rates, eliminate missing data, minimize human data-input error, and maximize cost effectiveness.

## Conclusion

The present study contributes to the literature of workplace bullying through the exploration of prevalence rates of both face-to-face bullying and cyberbullying in the workplace, particularly in the manufacturing sector in Queensland, Australia. The results suggest that the ICT revolution has the potential to change the face of bullying, which now includes victims being subjected to negative behaviors via

modern communication technologies such as e-mail and telephones.

As many countries impose a duty of care to protect the health, safety, and welfare of employees, organizational management need to be aware that cyberbullying exists in the workplace. Codes of practice need to be updated to ensure that workplaces implement policies and procedures to address this issue. Future research into this relatively new field of study, cyberbullying, is essential in order to further understand the extent of the phenomenon and impact on employees, organizations, and society, as well as to establish preventative measures for cyberbullying in the workplace.

## Disclosure Statement

No competing financial interests exist.

## References

1. Einarsen S, Hoel H. The Negative Acts Questionnaire: development, validation and revision of a measure of bullying at work. Paper presented at the 10th European Congress on Work and Organizational Psychology, Prague, Czech Republic, May 2001.
2. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). (2007) *The world fact book*. [www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/as.html#Comm](http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/as.html#Comm) (accessed April 10, 2007).
3. Keith S, Martin M. Cyberbullying: creating a culture of respect in a cyberworld. *Reclaiming Children & Youth* 2005; 13:224–8.
4. Hinduja S, Patchin J. (2007) Cyberbullying. [www.cyberbullying.us](http://www.cyberbullying.us) (accessed February 16, 2007).
5. Barron O. (2003) *Workplace violence and bullying: your rights, what to do and where to go for help*. Melbourne, Australia: Jobwatch & WorkSafe Victoria.
6. Zapf D, Einarsen S. Bullying in the workplace: recent trends in research and practice—an introduction. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology* 2001; 10: 369–73.
7. Belsey B. (n.d.) Cyberbullying: an emerging threat to the “always on” generation. [www.cyberbullying.ca](http://www.cyberbullying.ca) (accessed March 10, 2007).
8. Leymann H. The content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology* 1996; 5:165–84.
9. Einarsen S, Skogstad A. Bullying at work: epidemiological findings in public and private organisations. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology* 1996; 5:185–201.
10. Hinduja S, Patchin J. (2005) Cyberbullying: factsheet. [www.cyberbullying.us](http://www.cyberbullying.us) (accessed February 16, 2007).
11. Einarsen S. Harassment and bullying at work: a review of the Scandinavian approach. *Aggression & Violent Behaviour* 2000; 5:379–401.
12. Mikkelsen E, Einarsen S. Bullying in Danish work-life: prevalence and health correlates. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology* 2001; 10:393–43.
13. Beyond Bullying Association (BBA). (n.d.) Bullying facts & figures. [www.connectqld.org.au/asp/index.asp?pgid=19973](http://www.connectqld.org.au/asp/index.asp?pgid=19973) (accessed June 9, 2007).
14. Hoel H, Cooper C, Faragher B. The experience of bullying in Great Britain: the impact of organizational status. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology* 2001; 10:443–65.
15. Hoel H, Faragher B, Cooper C. Bullying is detrimental to health, but all bullying behaviours are not necessarily

- equally damaging. *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling* 2004; 32:367–87.
16. Kiesecker R, Marchant T. Workplace bullying in Australia: a review of current conceptualisations and existing research. *Australian Journal of Management & Organisational Behaviour* 1999; 2:61–75.
  17. Leymann H, Gustafsson A. Mobbing at work and the development of post-traumatic stress disorders. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology* 1996; 5:251–75.
  18. Sheehan M. (1998) Restructuring—rhetoric versus reality. In McCarthy P, Sheehan M, Wilkie S, et al, eds. *Bullying—causes, costs and cures*. Nathan, Australia: Beyond Bullying Association, pp. 153–66.
  19. Adams A (1992) *Bullying at work: how to confront it and overcome it*. London: Virago Press.
  20. Bennett E. Commentary II. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* 1997; 7:245–7.
  21. Richards H, Freeman S. (2002) *Bullying in the workplace: an occupational hazard*. Pymble, Australia: Harper Collins.
  22. Thomson C. (1997) *Workplace bullying project*. Adelaide, South Australia: Working Women's Centre.
  23. Hoel H, Cooper C. (2000) *Destructive conflict and bullying at work*. Unpublished report. University of Manchester, Institute of Science & Technology. [www.csren.gov.uk/UMIST/reporttHelgelHoel1.pdf](http://www.csren.gov.uk/UMIST/reporttHelgelHoel1.pdf) (accessed December 19, 2005).
  24. Björkqvist K, Osterman K, Hjelt-Bäck M. Aggression among university employees. *Aggressive Behavior* 1994; 20: 173–84.
  25. Lewis SE, Orford J. Women's experiences of adult workplace bullying: a process model of changes in social relationships. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* 2005; 15:29–47.
  26. Vartia M. Consequences of workplace bullying with respect to the well-being of its targets and the observers of bullying. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health* 2001; 27:63–9.
  27. Gandolfo R. MMPI-2 profiles of worker's compensation claimants who present with complaints of harassment. *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 1995; 51:711–5.
  28. Quine L. Workplace bullying in NHS community trust: staff questionnaire survey. *British Medical Journal* 1999; 318: 228–32.
  29. Niedl K. Mobbing and well-being: economic and personnel development implications. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology* 1996; 5:239–50.
  30. Kivimäki M, Elovainio M, Vahtera J. Workplace bullying and sickness absence in hospital staff. *Occupational & Environmental Medicine* 2000; 57:656–60.
  31. O'Moore M, Seigne E, McGuire L, et al. Victims of bullying at work in Ireland. *Journal of Occupational Health & Safety, Australia & New Zealand* 1998; 14:569–74.
  32. The State of Queensland Department of Employment, Training & Industrial Relations (DETIR). (2004) Prevention of workplace harassment code of practice. [www.detir.qld.gov.au/hs/legisl/whsact/d7056r03.pdf](http://www.detir.qld.gov.au/hs/legisl/whsact/d7056r03.pdf) (accessed December 19, 2005).
  33. Bamford A. (2004) Cyberbullying. AHISA Pastoral Care National Conference. Melbourne, Australia. [www.coc.edu.au/site/\\_documents/ahisaconferencebamfordcyberbullying.Pdf](http://www.coc.edu.au/site/_documents/ahisaconferencebamfordcyberbullying.Pdf) (accessed September 22, 2005).
  34. Campbell MA. Cyber bullying: an old problem in a new guise? *Australian Journal of Guidance & Counseling* 2005; 15:68–76.
  35. Dyrli OE. (2005) Cyberbullying: online bullying affects every school district. The Online Edge. [www.districtadministration.com](http://www.districtadministration.com) (accessed September 22, 2005).
  36. Covell K. (2005) *Violence against children in North America*. North American Regional Consultation for the United Nations Secretary-General's Study on Violence. Toronto, Canada: UNICEF.
  37. Joseph R. (1998) Electronic mail and petty tyranny. In McCarthy P, Sheehan M, Wilkie W, et al. eds. *Bullying: causes, costs and cures*. Nathan, Australia: Beyond Bullying Association, pp. 115–31.
  38. Salin D. Prevalence and forms of bullying among business professionals: a comparison of two different strategies for measuring bullying. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology* 2001; 10:425–41.
  39. Meadows B, Bergal J, Helling S, et al. The Web: the bully's new playground. *People* 2005; 63:152.

Address correspondence to:

Dr. Marilyn Anne Campbell  
 School of Learning and Professional Studies  
 Queensland University of Technology  
 Kelvin Grove  
 Brisbane, Queensland 4059  
 Australia

E-mail: [ma.campbell@qut.edu.au](mailto:ma.campbell@qut.edu.au)