THE IMPACT OF WORK PLACE BULLYING PRACTICES AND JOB SATISFACTION AMONG EMPLOYEES OF RETAIL STORES

Dhyanesh Revi
Faculty of Business, Raffles University, Malaysia
dhyanesh532@gmail.com

Article history:	Abstract:
	Workplace bullying consider very crucial issue in this modern era. Today, many people have been neglected this issue as they think bullying at workplace is minor issue that can be avoid. However, if this keep prolong it can lead to negative impact to the people and also organization. A satisfied employee would have good performance in the firm and increase the productivity. Therefore, workplace bullying and job satisfaction become very popular research topic and to ensure that all the employee feel satisfied. The main purpose of this study is to investigate the impact of work place bullying acts on job satisfaction among the employees of retail sector. This study is a descriptive research and survey approach that used to observe the relationship among workplace bullying and job satisfaction. Work place bullying acts is the independent variable and job satisfaction is the dependent variable. This study uses 5-point Likert scale questionnaire to analyse the independent variable and dependent variables. Multiple regression is the data analysis technique that used to assess the relationship between independent and dependent variables. Findings from the study revealed that verbal bullying, cultural differences and gender bias have negative relationship on job satisfaction among the employees of retail sector.

INTRODUCTION

Commonly, the practices of bullying are a sign of a characteristic abuse of power and it is considered a manifestation of violence within the workplace. Takaki and Yano, (2006) published a paper in which they mentioned that the WHO (World Health Organization), the International Labor Office (ILO), the Public Services International (PSI) and International Council of Nurses (ICN) conversely, defined bullying (Or attacking) as a "repeated and prolonged aggressive behavior that includes malice, Unkind or malevolent efforts to embarrass or demoralize individuals or groups Employees 'harassment is defined as' any behavior based on age, disability, and HIV status, household conditions, gender, sexual orientation, gender change, ethnicity, color, language, religion, political situation or any other condition that is not reciprocal or undesirable and that impact on the dignity of employees at work. Nowadays, may be bullying, violence, intimidation and threat in the workplace is not as common in Malaysia as it is elsewhere in the developed world. This is possible because Malaysian labor laws currently do not provide distinct protection against bullying in the workplace (Malo, 2014). However, it has been identified as an important safety aspect at work when observed on the European Continent and the United States.

In Malaysia, violence has been defined in the workplace by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (DOSH) in Their handbook is titled "Stress Guidelines and Prevention." Violence in the workplace "in 2001 (Martino & Mohtar, 2001). In this policy books, it is stated that violence is an incident in which workers are exposed to abuse, threat, attack, or a victim of bad behavior in the work environment. The company is a form of organization established

by individuals or groups or other entities that carry out their activities production of goods and services. Einarsen (2004) defines workplace bullying as a situation where a worker is systematically persecuted and sacrificed by coworkers or supervisor repeatedly negative. The tendency of workplace bullying as violence in the work environment, which includes verbal violence, threats, exclusion, insults, giving harsh criticism, eliminating opportunities, insinuating, being evil, cover up information, and interfere in personal interests (Shangar & Yazdanifard, 2014).

The impact of workplace bullying is broadly classified into two, which is the impact on the psychological target and the impact on organization. Psychologically, victims of bullying tend to experience symptoms of stress and trauma that have an impact on headaches, disorders eating, and sleeping, depression, and excessive anxiety (Yeow, 2010). When someone experiences bullying, they will tend to withdraw friendship environment in the office, anxious for fear of making fatal error. Bullying at work has an impact not only towards individuals but also has an impact on organizations. For individuals, workplace bullying has been proven to have an impact psychological and physiological harms of bullying employees (Hoel & Copper 2000).

Werther and Davis (1986) in Prabowo (2003) and Munandar et al. (2004) submitted that job satisfaction is a condition likes or dislikes by the sight of employees for their work that they do. Dole and Schroeder (2001) in Koesmono (2005), proposed that job satisfaction can be defined as individual feelings and reactions to the environment work. Testa (1999) and Locke (1983) in Koesmono (2005) suggested that job satisfaction is a joy or an expression of emotion positive results from the evaluation of one job or work experiences. Moreover, Koesmono (2005) suggested that job satisfaction is judgment, feeling or attitude of a person or employee for his or her work and in relation to the work environment, type employment, compensation, relationship between coworkers, social relations at work and so on. Hence, it can be said that job satisfaction is fulfilling some desire and needs through task or work activities.

In this study, the impacts of workplace bullying on job satisfaction among the employees of retail sector examined. The purpose of this study is to determine the impacts of workplace bullying practices on job satisfaction among the employees of retail sector and identify which workplace bullying practices affect most to the job satisfaction among the employees of retail sector.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Symptoms of bullying are not something that can be overlooked. It happens everywhere every day and believe it or not, it can kill! This issue should be viewed from a broader perspective from a variety of perspectives. Today's focus is more on bullying in schools, but the truth of the virus has spread to the workplace in many forms.

But what can be said, bullying in the workplace is not yet the main focus of the day so that it can attract national attention. After all, is it worth paying attention to? Of course, because half of the country's population is workers. It is impossible that 50 percent of you who read this article are also employees. And from that percentage it may also be among those who are reading that they are victims of bullying at work.

Workplace bullying is basically an abuse of power in the workplace. It's a psychological operation or physical repetition of the weak individual by the individual or more powerful groups. It is the will or desire to harm someone and put the victim in a stressful situation (Tattum, 1988). It is directed at individuals who are unable to defend themselves in a real situation.

According to Smith and Thompson (1991), bullying is defined as a set which behaviours are intentionally inflicted and cause harm physically and psychologically the recipient. Bullying behaviours include teasing behaviour, social isolation and hitting.

Bullying can be defined as a desire to harm or put someone in a situation under pressure. Namely, Banks (2000) describe bullying acts as contempt, threatening, beating, stealing and direct attacks initiated by one or more attackers. Bullying is an aggressive behaviour categorized as power imbalance between bully and victim. Moreover, the treatment of bullying also combines a broad range of behaviours such as name calling humiliation, intimidation, violent acts, slander, exclusion from the group, damage to other people's property and verbal threats.

According to Olweus (2007), bullying is one form of the act with intent and intentionally. The treatment of bullying is intentional causing injury, discomfort and shed tears or shame the employees who are often weaker than or more 'powerful' than the employee (Vlachaou et al., 2011; Baldry, 2004). There are three types of bullying which is physically bullying, verbal bullying and relational bullying (Vlachou et al., 2011; Paluck & Shepherd, 2012 & Duffy & Nesdale, 2008).

The definition of workplace bullying according to Branch (2008) stating that workplace bullying is a repetition or negative act that involves unbalanced power and hostility in the workplace. Negative acts directed at one or more employees with the intention of physically harming, hurting, or insulting. (Einarsen, 2014). Bullying is usually defined as part of aggressive behaviour, where aggression is repeated, and where there is a power imbalance that makes it difficult for victims to defend (Cowie et al., 2002). According to Namie (in Razzaghian and Ghani, 2014) defining workplace bullying is a repetitive, harmful treatment that has an impact on an employee's mental health. Randall's

definition (in Randall, 2002) that Bullying is a deliberate aggressive behaviour that causes physical and psychological discomfort to others. Thus, workplace bullying is a deviant behaviour exhibited by someone at work such as rude, abusive, impatient behaviour, lack of respect for others, physical or psychological violence.

THEORY OF WORKPLACE BULLYING

There are several theories that can be used for further research for the purpose of discussion on this topic. The theory covers sociological and psychological aspects. Robinson and Greenberg (1998), state that negative behaviour should not be committed by someone as a deviant. But the meaning of this deviant behaviour is varied. Despite the similar concept, there may still be some differences between the meanings of deviant behaviour. These include organizational misconduct, disobedience, antisocial behaviour, unprofessional conduct, unproductive behaviour, workplace aggression, and organizational aggression (Peterson, 2002; Robinson & Greenberg, 1998). However, each activity is the same in that they violate organizational norms that can adversely affect the organization and its members (Kidwell & Kochanowski, 2005).

Each human being has his or her own personal values. Personality, also known as personality, can be broadly defined as the embodiment of the personality traits of an individual that bring characteristics of differentiation to another. According to Mahmood (1992), personality is the trait of an individual such as the way of thinking, acting, feeling, perception and so on that makes it different from others. The findings of psychological studies on personality traits in humans are numerous, for example Allport (1936) who discovered 17,953 traits of human personality. Some of these factors such as locus of control, achievement motivation, authoritarianism, Machiavellianism and self-esteem are personality traits that influence work behaviour (Isaac, 2004). The types of personality traits that exist in every human being are multifaceted and this is reflected in various studies of human personality traits. Allport (1936) viewed human personality as the result of a combination of biological and environmental, while inherited traits were shaped by the experience of an individual. According to Eysenck (1981) personality is the organization of character, temperament, intellect, relatively stable body shape and that determines its unique adaptation to its environment.

Erikson's Psychological Theory

Erik Erikson's Psychosocial Theory states that each individual goes through 8 stages of development called psychosocial stages. Each stage is represented by a variety of psychological crises that must be resolved before the individual moves on to the next level. If an individual deals with a particular crisis in an inappropriate situation, then the individual will have difficulty coping with the crisis in the future. The crisis of adolescent identity (identity level and role confusion) is the most important crisis (Erikson, 1963). The body undergoes biological and hormonal changes that produce self-consciousness. Adolescents gain a renewed awareness of themselves as capable individuals, sexual partners, employees and parents and as new individuals. Attractions against the opposite sex began to reappear. New expectations of self are adopted. These self-portraits initially tend to be flexible, often changing with time, place, and situation.

The development of ego at this point prepares adolescents to bear the burden of self-identity. Teachers' parents, friends, and those closest to the individual have a strong influence on adolescent identity formation. Teenagers at the time were trying to solve their identity crisis by testing different roles, values and relationships. Adolescent development is synonymous with the task of forming a unique self-identity selection. If adolescents fail to develop this identity, there will be confusion and frustration. Teenagers who cannot judge for themselves what is bad or good, will start to commit various kinds of misconduct such as bullying, gangsterism and bullying. Adolescents may not have the social intention to achieve a positive image through good ability and achievement. They will direct their self-esteem within the physical power of others. Threatening others may be one way of strengthening one's identity to meet or cope with frustration in other fields.

During elementary school, when a teacher is confronted with a student with distrust, the teacher should establish regular and regular classroom routines. Students should be treated with warmth so that they feel safe and secure in their surroundings. Therefore, at an early age and adolescence, parents should form their identities and identify the problems that arise in their children. During the process of identity formation, parents should not allow children to find their own identity instead of directing the formation of their identity towards good because according to Erikcson himself, the process of identity distortion from positive causes bad symptoms such as bullying

Freud's Psychoanalytic Theory and Bullying Behavior

The psychoanalytic theory of aggression is the natural instinct of man and it is inevitable from the reality of human life (Glassman,1995). According to the theory of psychoanalysis, the individual's personality structure consists of id, ego and superego. The impetus for the behavior and nature of aggression is id. The ego acts as a thought, perception and motor control that will accurately assess the state of the environment. Ego is a balance between id and superego. In order to fulfill this function of adaptation, the ego must be able to strengthen the delayed gratification of the instinctive impulse of the id. In order to defend itself against unexpected impulses, the ego needs to develop a

special mechanism known as the self-defense mechanism. These mechanisms include repression, removal and reinforcement of behavior patterns that are directly opposite to the unconscious. Personality development occurs through the gradual placement of `libido 'which empowers the body to convert it to stimulation. It serves as a major cause of human mental and behavioral activity in the pursuit of pleasure and tension. Conflicts in life create anxiety. These concerns will be addressed by individuals using the self-defense mechanism.

Bullying usually comes from children or students who have a troubled family background. Farrington (1993) stated that bullying may exist in families that have a father who is a bully. According to Stevens (2002), Family background with various problems such as, lack of prosocial interactions, reinforcement of aggressive behavior, insecurity and poor disciplinary methods influence children's behavior to be bullied. Past experiences as victims of bullying will cause the child to act as bullying to others as a defense mechanism for his or her feelings he is a powerful individual. From the very beginning of the child's development, parents should show a positive attitude and allow the child to see their tolerance and love. Therefore, the balance between id, ego and superego is important for individuals, especially teenagers, as adolescence is a stage full of conflict, stress and challenge.

METHODS

The design of this study is in the form of descriptive surveys and quantitative approaches. According to Majid (1998), descriptive research is a research that aims to explain an emerging phenomenon. In addition, in this study researchers have also used quantitative approaches to conduct the study. Through quantitative approach, the research question can be explained in numerical form. This research study is used to study the research questions especially the relationship between workplace bullying and job satisfaction. According to Sabitha Marican (2007), survey research is a method of collecting information using a set of questions on a sample of individuals selected from a population to be tested.

Among the advantages of using this method is that it allows researchers to use questionnaires as the main procedure in the data collection process. In addition, this method also helps researchers to collect more accurate data, avoid bias elements and improve the quality of data collected (Cresswell, 2008; Sekaran & Bougie, 2010). In addition, according to John W. Cresswell (2008), quantitative studies are a type of research where researchers decide what to look for, ask specific questions, diminish the scope of questions, collect data that can be quantitative from participants, analyze those numbers using statistics and conduct inquiries in an objective and unbiased manner. This study uses a questionnaire as a research instrument to including demographic aspects such as gender, age, marital status, monthly income, education level and working experience. According to Chua (2011) survey is one of the most popular non-experimental research methods used in various fields, especially in the field of social science. It is usually used to get the public's view of a current issue. This type of study is commonly used as it has the full range of features, the preferred way of handling, the fast data collection, the large sample size usage, the continuing information and generalized decision research capabilities.

The questionnaire consists of two main parts: first, the demographic background, second is the bullying aspect that occur in workplace and affect job satisfaction. For this study, the questionnaire design will apply Likert scale as a measurement tool. The Likert scale is a universally applicable scale that comprises of negative to positive dimensions, which allows the researcher to analyse the data clearly through comparisons and through reporting how negatively or positively a respondent was inclined to the element in the questionnaire (Johns, 2010). Therefore, Johns (2010) also mentioned that the foundation or Likert scale is that the data gathered can be summed or averaged to obtain in indication of each respondent's whole positive or negative positioning toward the study. The study adapted 5 Likert scale and its meanings are shown in Table 3.1. The interval scale is at 3 which indicates neutral, while if the score is between 1 to 2, it specifies low for the statement in the questionnaire. If the score is in the range of 4 to 5, it indicates high for the particular statement in the questionnaires. Table 3.1: Likert Scale and Meaning

Description	Score
Strongly Disagree (SD)	1
Disagree (D)	2
Neutral (NS)	3
Agree (S)	4
Strongly Agree (SA)	5

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 4.3 illustrates the results of the overall demographic profile of respondents which were extracted from the answered questionnaires. It contains the respondents' gender, age, race, education level and monthly income.

It can be concluded that there is a total of 47.5% of male respondents and 52.5% of female respondents for this research which means most of the respondents for this research are male according to Table 4.3. Furthermore, majority of the respondents are aged between 26-35 years old which contributed 58.6% among the respondents, followed by the age of 20-25 years old (19.2%), between 36-40 years' old (15.2%) and lastly those who are 46 years' old and above (7.1%). In addition, most of the respondents are Malay (53.5%), followed by Indian (25.3%), Chinese (17.2%) and other races (4.0%). income is between the range of RM4000 to RM5999 (57.6%), between RM1000 to RM1999 amounted to (23.2%) among the respondents, followed by an equal percentage (8.1%) from 2 other different groups of respondents who have incomes of RM2000 – RM3999 and RM6000 – RM7999 respectively, and lastly 3.0% of respondents each has an income of more than RM8000.

Table 4.3: Demographic Profile of Respondents

Demographic Constructs	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	47	47.5
	Female	52	52.5
Age	20 – 25 years' old	19	19.2
	26 – 35 years' old	58	58.6
	36 – 40 years' old	15	15.2
	46 years' old and above	7	7.1
Race	Malay	53	53.5
	Chinese	17	17.2
	Indian	25	25.3
	Others	4	4.0
Education Level	Secondary School	21	21.2
	Diploma	13	13.1
	Degree	65	65.7
Income	RM1000 – RM1999	23	23.2
	RM2000 – RM3999	8	8.1
	RM4000 – RM5999	57	57.6
	RM6000 – RM7999	8	8.1
	>RM8000	3	3.0

A construct is considered acceptable if it has a Cronbach's Alpha value of more than 0.70, thus making the combination of items used to measure the construct to be reliable (Nunnally, 1978). In order to produce a robust result for subsequent data analysis, certain items were removed from each construct to produce a higher value of Cronbach's Alpha that will aid in realising the aforementioned. Subsequently, table below reveals the result of Cronbach's Alpha

for each variable. As presented in table 4.4, the Cronbach's Alpha value for job satisfaction is 0.879, verbal bullying is 0.795, cultural differences is 0. 835, gender bias is 0.836.

Table 4.4: Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Test

Constructs	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
Job Satisfaction	4	0.879
Verbal Bullying	2	0.795
Cultural Differences	3	0.835
Gender Bias	2	0.836

According to Messick (1995), in order to first determine the effectiveness of the Fornell-Larcker criterion for convergent validity, a simulation was conducted as it requires the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) not to be less than 0.5, and the Hair et al. (2010) criteria for convergent validity, which require the AVE of each construct to be larger than 0.5, every item's loading to be larger than 0.5, and composite reliability of each construct to be larger than 0.7. Based on the table 4.5, it is found that the AVEs for all constructs are acceptable as they are all greater than 0.5. Evidently, the loadings for job satisfaction are between a range of 0.686 to 0.965, verbal bullying is between a range of 0.629 to 0.900, cultural differences is between a range of 0.832 to 0.968, gender bias is between a range of 0.812 to 1.138; AVE for job satisfaction is 0.602, verbal bullying is 0.805, cultural differences is 0.977, and gender bias is 0.511; Composite Reliability for job satisfaction is 0.862, verbal bullying is 0.746, cultural differences is 0.925, and gender bias is 0.988. Ultimately, it is obvious that all 3 criteria for convergent validity are met.

Table 4.5: Results of Measurement Model for Convergent Validity

Constructs	Items	Loadings	AVE	Composite Reliability (CR)
Job Satisfaction	JS1	0.686	0.602	
	JS2	0.965		
	JS3	0.800		0.862
	JS4	0.661		
Verbal Bullying	VB1	0.629	0.805	0.746
	VB2	0.900		
Cultural Differences	CD1	0.968	0.977	
	CD2	0.886		0.925
	CD3	0.832		
Gender Bias	GB1	0.812	0.511	0.998
	GB2	1.138		

The table below illustrates each construct's discriminant validity based on the Fornell-Larcker Criterion. Specifically, discriminant validity of a construct is met when the value of its variance shared with its own construct is larger than when it is shared across other constructs (Compeau et al., 1999). Similarly, as shown in the table below, discriminant validity is present for each construct as the variance for each construct meets the Fornell-Larcker Criterion.

Table 4.6: Fornell-Larcker Criterion for Discriminant Validity				
Constructs	**Job Satisfaction**	**Verbal Bullying**	**Cultural Differences**	**Gender Bias**
Job Satisfaction	**0.715**			
Verbal Bullying	-0.712	**0.776**		
Cultural Differences	-0.598	0.554	**0.897**	
Gender Bias	-0.706	0.719	0.516	**0.989**

Reportedly, as illustrated in the table 4.7, it was found that job satisfaction was negatively affected by verbal bullying (β= -0.562, p < 0.001), cultural differences (β= -0.179, p < 0.05), and gender bias (β= -0.210, p < 0.05). Moreover, it is reported that verbal bullying, cultural differences, and gender bias have significant effects on job satisfaction. Hence, it is concluded that all H1, H2, and H3 are supported.

Meanwhile, 0.712 is reported as this study's R-square value and thereby implying a moderate effect size. Evidently, Henseler, Ringle, & Sinkovic (2009) suggested that R-square value is acceptable above 0.75 (substantial), 0.50 (moderate), and 0.25 (weak).

Table 4.7: Path Coefficients and Hypotheses Testing

Hypotheses	Relationship	Std. Beta	T Value	P Value	Decision	R Square
H1	Verbal Bullying → Job Satisfaction	-0.562	-6.753	0.000	Supported	
H2	Cultural Differences → Job Satisfaction	-0.179	-2.645	0.010	Supported	0.712
H3	Gender Bias → Job Satisfaction	-0.210	-2.588	0.011	Supported	

In a nutshell, the results of data analysis are presented in this chapter. It is reported that all 3 constructs (verbal bullying, cultural differences, and gender bias) are found to have negative and significant relationships with job satisfaction among employees of retail sector.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS
H1: The relationship between Verbal Bullying and Job Satisfaction

H1 is supported in this research where there was a negative and significant relationship found between verbal bullying and job satisfaction (β= -0.562, p < 0.001). This result is consistent with past studies (Olsen et al., 2017; Valentine et al., 2015). Other than that, in an Asia country like Malaysia, there is an existence of a high-power distance culture as there is a clear difference in terms of authoritative power and influence between the higher and lower-ranking employees (Hofstede et al., 2005). Besides, compared to the Western culture, Asians are also unlikely to oppose or doubt the requests of their superiors as a form of respect. Hence, although such high-power distance culture implies that the participants of this study may be less sensitive towards verbal bullying, the result of this study is expected since the aggregate results of verbal bullying that take place gradually may seem exceptionally difficult (Nielsen & Einarsen, 2012). Specifically, verbal bullying may lead to serious stress at work and is deemed to be one of the most notable societal stress (Devonish, 2013). Subsequently, stress is indeed an obstacle when it comes to career as it can adversely affect the employees of an organization, and psychologically drain their mental health (Nielsen & Einarsen, 2012). As a result, work stress may certainly prompt to lowered job amusement and pleasure (Adebayo & Ogunsina, 2011). Ultimately, the results of this study imply that although positive behaviours (respectful behaviours) tend to incline in a high-power distance country like Malaysia, cumulative effects of verbal bullying will still decrease job satisfaction.

_____

H2: The relationship between Cultural Differences and Job Satisfaction

H2 is supported in this research where there was a negative and significant relationship found between cultural differences and job satisfaction (β= -0.179, p < 0.05). This result is logical where it is consistent with past studies (Doede, 2017; Stoermer et al., 2019). Often, people aim to maintain a positive social personality in any social settings. Having said that, discrimination that stems from cultural differences threatens the ability to uphold a positive social personality and reduces the social group(s) a person resonates with. Similar, an employee who is discriminated just because he or she is culturally different will discourage him or her to be committed to the organization. Specifically, such employees may protect themselves by decreasing their emotional attachment towards their respective jobs (Crocker & Lawrence, 1999). Furthermore, empirical evidence has suggested that low levels of job satisfaction is also caused by emotional job detachment, especially among employees who are perceived as people from low social status groups (Deitch et al., 2003). Ultimately, such empirical evidence supports the finding of this study where employees of retail sector, Malaysians tend to experience low job satisfaction when they are discriminated due to them being culturally different.

H3: The relationship between Gender Bias and Job Satisfaction

H3 is supported in this research where a negative and significant relationship was discovered between gender bias and job satisfaction (β= -0.210, p < 0.05). This result is consistent with majority of previous research whereby a negative relationship is expected given the growing awareness on the notion of feminism in the recent years (Memon & Jena, 2017; Sharma, 2017; Webber & Rogers, 2018). Specifically, those that include raising gender inequality concerns in the workplace. Namely, such inequality has created a sense of stress and frustration thus reducing employees' job performances. Subsequently, such circumstance decreases their job satisfaction and gradually weaken their marginal efficiency; thus, resulting them to be considered human capital that does not benefit the organization. Ultimately, an employer will gain benefit for his or her organization when he or she treats his or her employees from a gender-neutral perspective. Specifically, such effort may cause all employees to feel that they are appreciated and thereby resulting in a circumstance where the organization will be shaped towards having favourable human capital from a psychological perspective (Memon & Jena, 2017)

CONCLUSION

In a nutshell, the objective of this research is to investigate the impacts of workplace bullying acts on job satisfaction among the employees of retail sector. Reportedly, it is logical to find that workplace bullying acts like verbal bullying, cultural differences, and gender bias have negative impacts on job satisfaction. Consequently, these empirical evidences further emphasize the fact that government, labour policy makers, employers and other related parties should raise awareness and educate employees about healthy and toxic workplace bullying acts so that they can distinguish between the good and the bad. Moreover, such awareness and education efforts are expected to ensure a safe, sustainable, and most importantly, a mentally healthy working environment for all employees

REFERENCES

1. Allport, G. W. (1936). Personality: A Psychological Interpretation. New York: Holt.
2. Baldry, A. C. (2004). What about bullying? An Experimental field study to understand student's   attitudes towards bullying and victimization in Italian middle school. British Journal of EducationalMPsychology,   74(10), 583-598. DOI: 10.1348/0007099042376391
3. Banks, R. (2000). Bullying in schools. Eric Review, 7(1), 12-14.
4. Branch, S. (2008). You say tomatoes and I say tomato: Can we differentiate between workplace bullying and other counterproductive behaviours? International Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 13(3), 4–18. DOI: 10.1.1.836.6688
5. Chua, W. F. (2011). In search of Successful Accounting Research. European Accounting Review, 20(1),   27-39. DOI: 10.1080/09638180.2011.559033
6. Compeau, D., Higgins, C. A., & Huff, S. (1999). Social cognitive theory and individual reactions to
7. computing technology: A longitudinal study. MIS quarterly, 145-158. DOI: 10.2307/249749
8. Cowie, H., Naylor, P., Rivers, I., Smith, P. K., & Pereira, B. (2002). Measuring workplace bullying. Aggression and violent behavior, 7(1), 33-51. DOI: 10.1016/S1359-1789(00)00034-3
9. Creswell, J. W. (2008). Differing perspectives on mixed methods research. DOI: 10.1177/1558689807306132
10. Dole, C. and Schroeder, R.G. (2001). The impact of various factors on the personality, job satisfaction And turnover intentions of professional accountants. Managerial Auditing Journal, 16(4),   234-245. DOI: 10.1108/02686900110389188
11. Duffy, A. L. & Nesdale, Drew. (2008). Peer Groups, Social Identity, and Children's Bullying Behaviour. Journal of Social Development, 18(1), 121-139. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2008.00484.x

_____

12. Einarsen, S. (2004). Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace. International perspectives in research and practice. London: Taylor & Francis. DOI: 10.1201/9780203164662

13. Einarsen, S. (2014). Harassment and bullying at work: A review of the Scandinavian approac\Aggression and Violent Behaviour: A Review Journal, 4(1), 371–401. DOI: 10.1016/S1359- 1789(98)00043-3

14. Erikson, E. H. (1963). Childhood and society (2nd ed.). New York: Norton.

15. Eysenck, M. W. (1981) Learning, memory and personality. In H. J. Eysenck (Ed.), A model for personality. Berlin: Springer-Verlag. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-67783-0

16. Farrington, D.P. (1993). Understanding and preventing bullying. In M. Tonry (Ed.), Crime and Justice, Chicago: University of Chicago, 17(6), 381-458. DOI: 10.1086/449217

17. Glassman, W. E. (1995). Approaches to Psychology 2nd Ed. Buckingham, Open University Press. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-349-14273-6_2

18. Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sinkovics, R. R. (2009). The use of partial least squares path modeling in

19. international marketing. In New challenges to international marketing. Emerald Group

20. Publishing Limited. DOI: 10.1108/S1474-7979(2009)0000020014\

21. Hoel, H., & Cooper, C. L. (2000). Destructive Conflict & Bullying at Work. Manchester: Manchester

22. School of Management, University of Manchester, Institute of Science and Technology.MJohns, R. (2010). Likert items and scales. Colchester: UK Data Archive. Survey Question Bank Methods Fact Sheet 1.

23. Kidwell Jr, R. E., & Kochanowski, S. M. (2005). The morality of employee theft: Teaching about ethics and deviant behavior in the workplace. Journal of management education, 29(1), 135-152.   DOI: 10.1177/1052562903261180

24. Koesmono H. (2005). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi terhadap Motivasi dan Kepuasan KerKinerja Karyawan pada Sub Sektor Industri Pengolahan Kayu Ekspor di Jawa Timur, Disertasi Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya. DOI: 10.9744/jmk.7.2.pp.%20171-188

25. Locke, E.A. (1983) The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette (ed.), Handbook of Industrial Psychology, New York: John Wiley and Sons.

26. Mahmood Nazar Mohamed (1992). Pengantar Psikologi: Satu Pengenalan Asas Kepada Jiwa dan   Tingkah Laku Manusia. Kuala Lumpur: DBP.

27. Malo, A. (2014). Predicting workplace victim status from personality. American Journal of Psychology, 6(3), 335-349. DOI: 10.1080/135943200417957\Martino, V.D., &Mohtar, M. (2001). Guidance for The Prevention of Stress And Violence At The   Workplace. Prepared for Department of Occupational Safety and Health Malaysia, ISBN: 983-2014 -18- 2.

28. Messick, S. (1995). Standards of validity and the validity of standards in performance assessment. Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 14(4), 5-8. DOI: 10.1111/j.1745- 3992.1995.tb00881.x

29. Mohd Majid Konting (1998), Kaedah Penyelidikan Pendidikan. c. 4. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

30. Munandar, A., Sjabadhyni, K. & Wutun, H. (2004). Peran Budaya Organisasi dalam Peningkatan Unjuk Kerja Perusahaan, PIO, Depok.

31. Nunnally, J. C. (1978). Psychometric theory (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

32. Olweus, Dan. (2007). Olweus Bullying Questionnaire: Standard School Report. USA: Minnesota.Hazelden Pub.: An ethical perspective. Journal of Business Ethics 85(21), 27–40. DOI: 10.1007/BF02195509

33. Paluck, E. L., & Shepherd, H. (2012). The salience of social referents: A field experiment on collective norms and harassment behavior in a school social network. Journal of personality and social psychology, 103(6), 899. DOI: 10.1037/a0030015

34. Peterson, D. K. (2002). Deviant workplace behavior and the organization's ethical climate. Journal of business and psychology, 17(1), 47-61. DOI: 10.1023/A:1016296116093

35. Prabowo, S. 2003. Pengaruh Kepuasan Kerja Dan Komitmen Organisasi Terhadap Keaktifan Gugus Kendali Mutu Pada Karyawan Pabrikasi. Tesis. Jakarta: Program Pascasarjana Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Indonesia.

36. Randall, P. (2002). Bullying in adulthood: Assessing the bullies and their victims. Routledge. DOI: 10.1080/16506070252959535

37. Razzaghian, M., & Ghani, U. (2014). Effect of workplace bullying on turnover intention of faculty members: A case of private sector universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. Business & Economic Review, 6(1), 40-51. DOI: 10.22547/BER/6.1.2

38. Robinson, S.L., & Greenberg, J. (1998). Employees behaving badly: Dimensions, determinants, and dilemmas in the study of workplace deviance. Trends in organization behaviour, 5 (1-30). New York: Wiley. DOI: 10.1023/A:1016296116093

39. Sabitha Marican (2007). Penyelidikan Sains Sosial Pendekatan Pragmatik. Kuala Lumpur: Edusystem Sdn. Bhd.

40. Sekaran, U., & Bougie (2010). Research methods for business: A skill building approach.

41. Shangar, U., & Yazdanifard, R. (2014). Workplace Bullying; Boundary for Employees and Organizational Development.

42. Stevens, V. (2002). Relationship of the family environment to children's involvement in bully/victim problems at school. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 31(6), pp. 419-428. DOI: 10.1023/A:1020207003027

43. Takaki, J., & Yano, E. (2006). The relationship between coping with stress and employment in patients receiving maintenance hemodialysis. Journal of occupational health, 48(4),276-283. DOI: 10.1539/joh.48.276

44. Testa, M. R. (1999). Satisfaction with Organizational Vision, Job Satisfaction and Service Efforts: An

45. Empirical   Investigation.   Leadership   &   Organization   Development   Journal,   154-161.   DOI: 10.1108/01437739910268424

46. Vlachou, Maria; Andreou, Eleni; Botsoglou, Kafenia & Didaskalou, Eleni. (2011). Bully/Victim Problems   Among Preschool Children: A Review of Current Research Evidence. Educational   Psychology Review, 23, 329358. DOI: 10.1007/s10648-011-9153-z

47. Werther, J. and Davis, K. (1986) Human Resources and Personnel Management. 5th Edition, McGraw-Hill, New York.

48. Yeow, J. A. (2010). The Causes of Workplace Bully in SMEs. In Global Conference on SME and Entrepreneurship, 1-8.