

Submission Number: 185
Date Received: 11/7/2012



Diversity Council Australia Ltd
Level 25, 133 Castlereagh
Street
Sydney, NSW, 2000
www.dca.org.au

Phone: (02) 9035 2852
Fax: (02) 8988 2852
ACN 006 898 406
ABN 64 421 748 342

29 June 2012



**DIVERSITY
COUNCIL
AUSTRALIA**

The Committee Secretary
House of Representatives Standing Committee on
Education and Employment
PO Box 6021
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600
AUSTRALIA

By email: workplacebullying.reps@aph.gov.au

Dear Sir/Madam

**House Of Representatives Standing Committee On Education And Employment Inquiry Into
Workplace Bullying**

Please find enclosed Diversity Council Australia's submission in response to the Committee's Inquiry into Workplace Bullying.

DCA is the independent, non-profit workplace diversity advisor to more than 170 organisations – many of whom are among Australia's largest and leading diversity employers.

DCA and its members welcome this Inquiry. DCA members recognise the benefits of pro-actively preventing workplace bullying, as well as unlawful discrimination and harassment, by effectively managing issues and complaints when they arise. This commitment is driven by social and legal imperatives, as well as good business practice.

We look forward to seeing report of the Committee in due course and the Government's on-going initiatives in this important area.

Yours sincerely,

Nareen Young
Chief Executive Officer

DCA Submission
House Of Representatives Standing Committee
On Education And Employment
Inquiry Into Workplace Bullying

29 June 2012

Expert contributors:

Jo Tilly, DCA Research & Policy Manager

Jane O'Leary, DCA Research Director

Nareen Young, DCA CEO

Diversity Council Australia Limited

Level 25, 133 Castlereagh St, Sydney, NSW, 2000
Phone: 02 9035 2852

Materials contained in this document are the ©Copyright of DCA Ltd, 2012.
If you wish to use any of the materials contained herein, please contact DCA Ltd at the
address above for consent and direction on appropriate acknowledgment.

CONTENTS

1. ABOUT DIVERSITY COUNCIL AUSTRALIA	4
2. ABOUT DCA's SUBMISSION	4
3. THE PREVALENCE OF WORKPLACE BULLYING IN AUSTRALIA AND THE COSTS TO BUSINESS OF WORKPLACE BULLYING.....	4
4. POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NATIONAL EVIDENCE BASE ON WORKPLACE BULLYING.....	9
5. ADDRESSING WORKPLACE BULLYING	9
6. THE ROLE OF WORKPLACE CULTURES IN PREVENTING AND RESPONDING TO BULLYING AND THE CAPACITY FOR WORKPLACE-BASED POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO INFLUENCE THE INCIDENCE AND SERIOUSNESS OF WORKPLACE BULLYING .	13

1. ABOUT DIVERSITY COUNCIL AUSTRALIA

Diversity Council Australia (DCA) provides diversity advice and strategy to over 170 organisations, many of whom are Australia's biggest employers.

In partnership with our member organisations, our mission is to:

1. Lead public debate;
2. Develop leading diversity research, thinking and practice;
3. Enable diversity management in a dynamic environment; and
4. Drive business improvement through successful diversity programs.

We have been the advisor to Australian business on diversity issues for more than 25 years, driving business improvement through successful diversity programs.

2. ABOUT DCA'S SUBMISSION

DCA is pleased to be able to make this submission on behalf of our members and commends the Committee on its work on this important issue facing Australian workplaces.

DCA members have long recognised the benefits of pro-actively preventing workplace discrimination, harassment and bullying, and effectively managing issues and complaints when they arise. This commitment is driven by social and legal imperatives, as well as good business practice. Appropriate and effective action in this area:

- Minimises costs associated with unnecessary staff absenteeism,
- Reduces avoidable costs associated with turnover, recruitment and re-training,
- Positions organisations to receive positive rather than adverse publicity in relation to its people management practices,
- Provides a safe and healthy work environment,
- Generates productivity benefits through retention of valued staff,
- Improves staff morale, and
- Minimises legal exposure and risk.

DCA reviews of the available research highlight that preventing workplace discrimination, harassment and bullying has demonstrable benefits to businesses through appropriate and effective management of issues and complaints.

Many DCA members are already putting in place actions to address bullying in the workplace. Some of these programs represent Australian, and indeed international, leading practice to deal with these issues.

3. THE PREVALENCE OF WORKPLACE BULLYING IN AUSTRALIA AND THE COSTS TO BUSINESS OF WORKPLACE BULLYING

As the Committee would be aware, estimates of the proportion of the Australian workforce subject to bullying/harassment and the costs it imposes vary considerably.

With no comprehensive surveys having yet been conducted of Australian workplaces on the incidence of bullying, researchers in this country have used survey findings from other countries to estimate the numbers of people subjected to bullying. Estimates of annual prevalence rates range from a low of 3.5% in Sweden¹ to 21.5%² in the USA.

The prevalence in Australia has been modeled using both a low and a high rate.³ The more conservative prevalence rate of 3.5% was applied to the working population of 10 million in Australia, to estimate that 350,000 persons were bullied in Australia in 2000. A higher prevalence rate of 15% was derived by using the approximate mid point of two international estimates — a survey of 5,300 employees in over 70 organisations in the United Kingdom which provided a bullying prevalence rate of 10.5%⁴ and the US survey⁵ conducted on the population of the state of Michigan which estimated a prevalence rate of 21.5%. Applied in Australia, this would give an outcome of 1,500,000 employees estimated to be the victims of bullying in 2000.

DCA Research

DCA's 2010 research *Working for the Future: A National Survey of Employees*, asked respondents a number of questions specifically about bullying. The survey consisted of a national random representative sample survey of employed Australians (with a total sample size of 2,100).

In all, 19% had experienced bullying by a manager, with an incident in the previous twelve months, and 15% had experienced bullying from a work mate.

Importantly, the survey found that Indigenous Australians were up to six times more likely to experience inappropriate workplace behaviour than non-Indigenous Australians. In particular, Indigenous Australians were more likely to report experiencing discrimination in last twelve months (30% vs 10%) and bullying by co-workers (27% vs 14%).

In relation to resolving bullying complaints, across all discrimination/harassment/bullying complaint types, respondents were more likely than not to know what to do to get assistance (between 61% and 72% respondents depending on the incident type).

But considerably fewer respondents reported the incident to someone (between 36% and 57%, depending on incident type). People were more likely to report bullying and victimisation complaints (48% to 57% depending on incident type) than other

¹ Leymann H, 1997, *Explanation of the operation of the LIPT Questionnaire (Leymann Inventory of Psychological Terror)*, translated from the original German by Zimmermann H, Griffith University, Brisbane.

² Jagatic K, and Keashly L, 2000, *The nature, extent, and impact of emotional abuse in the workplace: Results of a statewide survey*, Paper presented at the Academy of Management Conference, Toronto.

³ Sheehan MJ, McCarthy P, Barker MC, and Henderson M, 2001, *A model for assessing the impact and costs of bullying*, Paper presented at the Standing Conference on Organizational Symbolism (SCOS), Trinity College Dublin. 30th June to 4th July 2001, Griffith University, Brisbane.

⁴ Cooper C and Hoel H, 2000, cited in Government Agencies Employee Relations Network Bulletin 2000, *Survey of workplace bullying*, Bulletin, 23, p. 5.

⁵ Jagatic K, and Keashly L, 2000, *The nature, extent, and impact of emotional abuse in the workplace: Results of a statewide survey*, Paper presented at the Academy of Management Conference, Toronto.

complaints (36% to 41% depending on incident type). When people did report it, few were happy with how the incident was dealt with (between 18% and 32% depending on the incident).

Awareness about and satisfaction with complaint resolution overall (i.e. knowing who to report incidents to, preparedness to report issue, satisfaction with outcome) appeared lowest in relation to victimization and discrimination and highest in relation to harassment and bullying.

DCA does not intend to canvass the direct experience of victims of bullying in this submission as supporting victims is not the core business of this organisation, and there will undoubtedly be many other individuals and groups providing evidence to the Committee on this point. However, suffice to say DCA and our members are well aware that the cost to both individuals and businesses of bullying in the workplace is substantial.

Costs to individuals

Victims of workplace bullying suffer significant personal costs including: isolation and withdrawal; dismissal or loss of job promotion opportunities; stress and anxiety; low self esteem; other mental health symptoms; and often physical symptoms of stress.

Workplace bullying exacts a financial as well as emotional toll on complainants and their families. It is extremely difficult to precisely quantify the economic cost of this.

However, some similarities can be drawn between the costs of workplace bullying and the costs of workplace discrimination. Available research demonstrates that discrimination in employment has a range of psychological, physical, and financial consequences. For example, VicHealth research indicates that the health impacts of discrimination include higher rates of depression and other forms of mental illness.⁶ As a specific example, recent Australian research indicates pregnancy discrimination has a measurable detrimental effect on women's emotional and psychological health.⁷ In this research women who were discriminated against in their workplace, and/or had no access to maternity leave reported higher levels of distress, anxiety, anger and fatigue than women who were not experiencing these difficulties at their workplace during pregnancy. This finding is consistent with an emerging consensus that discrimination and stigmatization are major causal factors of ill health, including higher anxiety, depression, worsened quality of life, a sense of loss of control and difficulty coping.⁸

In addition to adverse psychological consequences, individuals experiencing discrimination face a range of financial hardships. There is often a financial toll associated with loss of employment, with Australian Human Rights Commission (AHRC) statistics indicating that three out of four complainants are no longer

⁶ VicHealth, 2007, *More than tolerance: Embracing diversity for health*. Available at: [http://www.vichealth.vic.gov.au/assets/contentFiles/DCA_Sv2%20\(4\)%20-%20FINAL%20060907.pdf](http://www.vichealth.vic.gov.au/assets/contentFiles/DCA_Sv2%20(4)%20-%20FINAL%20060907.pdf)

⁷ Cooklin A, Rowe H & Fisher J, 2007, *Workplace discrimination continues for women*. Available at: <http://www.onlineopinion.com.au/view.asp?article=6656>

⁸ Lynch P, 2005, 'Homelessness, poverty and discrimination: Improving public health by realising human rights', *Deakin Law Review*. Available at: <http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/journals/DeakinLRev/2005/11.html#fn46>

employed with the organisation when they lodge their complaint.⁹ While these complaints primarily relate to unlawful discrimination not bullying per se, it is not unreasonable to assume that similar patterns of breakdown in employment would be seen in the case of bullying. Added to this, in the process of seeking legal redress and otherwise pursuing formal complaints, complainants often incur significant legal costs.

Other costs to the economy include public sector costs such as the health and medical services needed to treat bullied individuals; income support and other government benefits provided to victims of bullying who become unemployed.

Costs to business of bullying

The Productivity Commission in its 2010 report examining Performance Benchmarking of Australian Business Regulation in relation to Occupational Health and Safety, found that bullying and harassment had significant costs to employers.¹⁰

Estimating the actual cost to Australian business depends in large part on the bullying prevalence rate that is assumed. While definitive figures are not available, an Australian study has estimated that the cost to businesses is somewhere between \$6 billion and \$13 billion.¹¹ If the higher estimated rates of prevalence are used costs to businesses would be somewhere between \$17 and \$36 billion.¹²

Further, individual workers' compensation claims for work-related bullying and harassment across all jurisdictions had a median cost of \$13 500 with a median time taken off work of 12.0 weeks.¹³

Indirect costs to businesses include declines in labour productivity and intra sector opportunity costs. Intra sector costs of bullying include: the costs of victims not taking up training or promotion opportunities due to stress; negative impacts on worker innovation and creativity which reduces company growth and profits; and the negative impact of publicised cases of bullying on the brand name and goodwill of a company.

The Productivity Commission has pointed out that direct costs to business result from absenteeism, staff turnover, legal and compensation costs, and redundancy and early retirement payouts. Hidden direct costs include management time consumed in addressing claims for bullying, investigating allegations of bullying through formal grievance procedures and workplace support services such as counselling. Other costs include the loss of productivity resulting from: reduced performance of victims who continue to work; replacing victims with initially less experienced and so less productive staff; and internal transfers, and loss or absenteeism of co-workers.

⁹ Australian Human Rights Commission, 2003, *A bad business: Review of sexual harassment in employment complaints 2002*. Available at:

http://www.hreoc.gov.au/sex_discrimination/workplace/bad_business/media/fact_cost.html

¹⁰ Productivity Commission 2010, *Performance Benchmarking of Australian Business Regulation: Occupational Health & Safety*, Research Report, Canberra.

¹¹ Sheehan MJ, McCarthy P, Barker MC, and Henderson M, 2001, *A model for assessing the impact and costs of bullying*, Paper presented at the Standing Conference on Organizational Symbolism (SCOS), Trinity College Dublin. 30th June to 4th July 2001, Griffith University, Brisbane.

¹² Cooper C and Hoel H, 2000, *Ibid* and Jagatic K, and Keashly L, 2000, *Ibid*

¹³ Productivity Commission 2010, *Performance benchmarking of Australian business regulation: Occupational health & safety*, Research Report, Canberra.

Organisations incur a range of costs associated with bullying. Readily quantifiable costs of such complaints to the organisation may take the form of negotiated damages (known to have reached \$225,000 in individual unlawful discrimination matters), awarded damages (known to have exceeded \$100,000), and legal fees (quotes of more than up to \$100,000 to defend complex complaints are not uncommon). DCA member experiences indicate that legal costs can regularly exceed \$100,000 in more complex cases and it would not be uncommon for legal fees to exceed double this amount.

Less easy to quantify are the “hidden” costs, including, for example unplanned absenteeism, reduction in work team cohesion and productivity, reduction in staff morale, lost management/employee time (investigations, hearings etc.), resignations and staff replacement costs, workplace accidents, stress and illness claims, damage to the company's reputation, and/or political and industrial relations impacts.

The following provides a general indication of these costs:

- The New South Wales Anti-Discrimination Tribunal (NSW ADT) has estimated the cost of resolving the average ‘in-house’ serious or complex complaint to be \$35,000. This includes wages and lost productivity for all parties involved – that is, those involved in the allegations and those involved in resolving the complaint. This estimate was made over ten years ago so, allowing for inflation, it is likely this amount would now exceed \$45,000. The recent experiences of DCA members suggest that the cost of resolving the average serious claim would be consistently higher than the \$45,000 estimated by the NSW Anti-Discrimination Tribunal – commonly at least \$90,000.
- DCA has estimated the average cost for a serious external grievance to be \$125,000. This allows for costs associated with managing the complaint, including possible settlement costs. It does not consider more indirect costs associated with lost productivity and turnover.
- Significant costs have been awarded in relation to severe cases of bullying - as an example, the NSW Court of Appeal held a company to be vicariously liable for the harassment and extreme bullying perpetrated on a labour hire employee by its Fire and Safety Officer. The trial judge had found that the perpetrator's conduct was “so brutal, demeaning and unrelenting that it was reasonably foreseeable that, if continued for a significant period of time ... it would be likely to cause significant, recognizable psychiatric injury”. A damages award of \$1,946,189.40 was upheld.¹⁴
- Turnover associated with complaints is common: As previously mentioned, at least three out of four complainants are no longer actively working for the organisation where the allegations occurred by the time they reported it to AHRC. As the AHRC points out, this represents a considerable cost to employers in recruitment, training and development, in addition to the indirect cost associated with loss of staff morale inevitably arising from unresolved

¹⁴ Nationwide New Pty Ltd v Naidu & Anor; ISS Security Pty Ltd v Naidu and Anor [2007] NSWCA 377 (21 December 2007). Accessed at: <http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/cases/nsw/NSWCA/2007/377.html>

disputes within workplaces¹⁵. Turnover costs have been variously estimated at between 50 and 150% of the person's annual salary.

- Research indicates that when employers have a diversity complaint that goes public their share price will drop within 24 hours, while when employers win a diversity award their share price will increase within 10 days.¹⁶

It is also pertinent to note that Beyond Blue estimates that depression costs the Australian economy \$3.3 billion in lost productivity each year. Six million working days are lost, with another 12 million days of reduced productivity and economic studies indicate that each employee with untreated depression and related conditions will cost their organisation nearly \$10,000 a year.¹⁷ While clearly, depression is not only associated with workplace bullying or discrimination, there are clear financial imperatives for businesses to minimize the impact of depression where possible.

4. POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE NATIONAL EVIDENCE BASE ON WORKPLACE BULLYING.

Given the current gaps in the evidence base around the extent and costs of workplace bullying in Australia, as discussed above, DCA would recommend to Government that more detailed evidence base be developed to inform leading practice interventions to prevent workplace bullying.

This would further provide an evidence base from which education materials for individuals and businesses about their rights and responsibilities could be developed and effectively targeted.

5. ADDRESSING WORKPLACE BULLYING

The Inquiry terms of reference include whether there are regulatory, administrative or cross-jurisdictional and international legal and policy gaps that should be addressed in the interests of enhancing protection against and providing an early response to workplace bullying, including through appropriate complaint mechanisms. There is a further question raised about whether the existing regulatory frameworks provide a sufficient deterrent against workplace bullying.

Legal framework

In general, DCA is concerned that workplace bullying is an issue that is poorly understood in the community and the variety of approaches and definitions in different jurisdictions make it difficult for both employers and individual workers to understand their rights and responsibilities. Further, the overlap and distinction between workplace bullying, employment law (via the *Fair Work Act, 2009*) and unlawful discrimination (in all jurisdictions) adds to complexity.

¹⁵ Australian Human Rights Commission, 2003, *A bad business: Review of sexual harassment in employment complaints 2002*. Accessed at:

http://www.hreoc.gov.au/sex_discrimination/workplace/bad_business/media/fact_cost.html

¹⁶ Wright PM, Ferris SP, Hiller JS & Kroll M, 1995, Competitiveness through management of diversity: Effects on stock price valuation, *Academy of Management*, 88: 272-287.

¹⁷ beyondblue, *National depression in the workplace program*. Available at: http://www.beyondblue.org.au/index.aspx?link_id=4.1028

In our recent submission to the Commonwealth Attorney General's Department in relation to the proposal to consolidate Australia's anti-discrimination law, DCA recommended that the new Act attempt to better clarify the difference between discrimination, harassment and bullying in order to reduce community confusion about these behaviours and their legal definitions. It is DCA's experience that the differences between these behaviours are not well understood in the general community, nor are the respective legal jurisdictions that cover each. The development of a new anti-discrimination framework offers a unique opportunity to clarify for individuals and the business community their rights and responsibilities with regard to workplace bullying. This view has been strongly supported by DCA members.

The responsibility to detect and manage psychosocial hazards, including bullying, which contribute to mental stress in the workplace is implied in the occupational health and safety legislation of all jurisdictions by the duty of care held by employers to provide a healthy and safe working environment for their employees at the workplace.

However, the differences in the jurisdictions' occupational health and safety legislation, codes of practice and guidance material contribute to the divergence in how these hazards are treated and understood by business. Further, for businesses operating in multiple jurisdictions, these can have significant information and training costs and difficulties in terms of developing risk management plans to manage psychosocial hazards.

To add to this, as the Productivity Commission has pointed out, there is no nationally accepted definition of psychosocial hazards such as bullying across Australia.¹⁸ As of 2010, individual jurisdictions had developed their own definitions of workplace bullying and, as a result, there is no single nationally accepted statutory definition which has been adopted by all jurisdictions. Notwithstanding the number of different definitions, all jurisdictions, except Queensland, South Australia and Tasmania, use reasonably consistent definitions embodying the words 'repeated unreasonable behaviour ... that creates a risk to health and safety'. The following table¹⁹ highlights the difficulties that these differing definitions have the potential to create.

¹⁸ Productivity Commission 2010, *Performance benchmarking of Australian business regulation: Occupational health & safety*, Research Report, Canberra.

¹⁹ Table sourced from Productivity Commission 2010, *Performance benchmarking of Australian business regulation: Occupational health & safety*, Research Report, Canberra.

Source	Definition of bullying
Cwlth Guidance note	'repeated, unreasonable behaviour directed towards a person or group of persons at a workplace, which creates a risk to health and safety'. ^a
NSW Guidance note	'repeated unreasonable behaviour directed towards a worker or group of workers that creates a risk to health and safety.'
Vic Guidance note	'repeated unreasonable behaviour directed towards a worker or group of workers that creates a risk to health and safety.'
Qld Code of practice	'repeated behaviour, other than behavior amounting to sexual harassment, by a person, including the person's employer or a co-worker or group of co-workers of the person that: (a) is unwelcome and unsolicited (b) the person considers to be offensive, intimidating, humiliating or threatening (c) a reasonable person would consider to be offensive, humiliating, intimidating or threatening.'
SA s. 55 (A) of OHS Act	'any behaviour that is repeated, systematic and directed towards an employee or group of employees that a reasonable person, having regard to the circumstances, would expect to victimise, humiliate, undermine or threaten and which creates a risk to health and safety'. ^b
WA Code of practice	'repeated, unreasonable or inappropriate behaviour directed towards a worker, or group of workers, that creates a risk to health and safety'
Tas Guidance note	'persistent and repeatedly aggressive behaviour (that) goes beyond a one-off disagreement, ... increases in intensity and becomes offensive or harmful to someone,...can include psychological and physical violence'
NT Guidance note	'repeated, unreasonable behaviour directed towards a person or group of persons at a workplace, which creates a risk to health and safety'
ACT Guidance note	'repeated unreasonable or inappropriate behaviour directed towards a worker, or group of workers, that creates a risk to health and safety.'

^a 'Repeated' refers to the persistent or ongoing nature of the behaviour, not the specific type of behaviour, which may vary. 'Unreasonable behaviour' means behaviour that a reasonable person, having regard to the circumstances, would expect to victimise, humiliate, undermine or threaten. 'Risk to health and safety' includes the risk to the emotional, mental or physical health of the person(s) in the workplace.

^b Repeated refers to the persistent or ongoing nature of the behaviour and can refer to a range of different types of behaviour over time. Systematic refers to having, showing or involving a method or plan.

Source: OHS Acts, codes of practice and guidance notes.

DCA shares the view of the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ACCI) that it is important that a consistent definition of bullying must provide a clear delineation between a person feeling aggrieved and what is systematic and systemic inappropriate behaviour.²⁰ It is crucial that normal managerial conduct must be differentiated from bullying. It is important to tease out the complexities involved to determine if behaviour is workplace bullying and importantly, that it impacts on occupational health and safety.

DCA notes the changes to legislation in Victoria via the *Crimes Amendment (Bullying) Bill 2011* ("Brodie's law", after a teenage victim) under which the amendments broaden the type of 'conduct' which can now be considered to be stalking under the Crimes Act to include a person who:

- makes threats to the victim
- uses abusive or offensive words to or in the presence of the victim
- performs abusive or offensive acts in the presence of the victim, and
- directs abusive or offensive acts towards the victim

Stalking now also includes acting in any other way that could reasonably be expected to -

- (i) to cause physical or mental harm to the victim, including self-harm, or
- (ii) to arouse apprehension or fear in the victim for his or her own safety or that of any other person.

To be convicted of stalking, an offender must have engaged in a "course of conduct" intended to:

- cause physical or mental harm to the victim, or
- arouse apprehension or fear in the victim for their own safety or that of another person.

While these changes in Victoria represent a new approach, the issue of bullying is still largely dealt with via the occupational health and safety framework.

DCA notes that the *Responding to Workplace Bullying* draft model Code of Practice developed by Safe Work Australia is currently being revised based on public comment feedback and that envisaged materials on this matter will be finalised in the second half of the year. In general, we would support this as assisting in developing a national definition that would assist with community and business education and compliance.

DCA does have some concerns however about the development of a Code of Practice as opposed to a Guidance. We note the view of the Productivity Commission that Codes of Practice provide guidance to duty holders about how to meet their obligations under occupational health and safety legislation and do not generally constitute legal obligations²¹, however the presence of compliance codes in Victorian and Queensland legislation confuse this situation.

Further, we share the concerns of other business organisations such as ACCI who have pointed out that a prescriptive Code of Practice will not in and of itself assist

²⁰ Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, 2011, *Public comment submission to Safe Work Australia nine second-stage codes*, ACCI, Canberra.

²¹ Productivity Commission 2010, *Performance benchmarking of Australian business regulation: Occupational health & safety*, Research Report, Canberra.

businesses to develop positive workplace cultures which prevent and address bullying. We share the view that what is required is Guidance that is positive and provides encouragement of reporting of, responsiveness to, consultation on, and communication about bullying.

In the interests of minimizing unnecessary regulatory impacts on business, it may be better to avoid the introduction of a national code and instead focus on assisting businesses and individuals to better understand their rights and responsibilities with regard to workplace bullying.

DCA also has concerns that the current (and proposed) framework does not sufficiently discourage employees from making vexatious, malicious or inappropriate claims. In an area such as bullying in which the interpretation of events by the parties may differ considerably, it is important that guidance information details what constitutes bullying as clearly and objectively as possible, and further that the consequences of making false claims are emphasised.

6. THE ROLE OF WORKPLACE CULTURES IN PREVENTING AND RESPONDING TO BULLYING AND THE CAPACITY FOR WORKPLACE-BASED POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO INFLUENCE THE INCIDENCE AND SERIOUSNESS OF WORKPLACE BULLYING

DCA believes it is crucial that the focus of the Government's response to workplace bullying is in the development of resources that support individuals and businesses to understand their rights and responsibilities.

Resources directed towards business should be in plain English, industry specific, prepared with detailed stakeholder input and provide straightforward information to organisations which provides clear and practical guidance about compliance. Resources must also take into account the diverse nature of workplaces, in particular small and medium sized businesses.

Providing clarity about the complaints mechanisms which can be used in cases of workplace bullying and guidance on how to develop simple yet robust individual workplace complaints mechanisms would be of particular assistance.

Likewise, resources should be developed for individuals that provide clear, concise information about their rights and how to resolve a complaint, both within their workplace and externally.

Showcasing the leading practices already being undertaken to address bullying in many Australian businesses would also assist in helping organisations to not unnecessarily reinvent the wheel, and also benefit from the experience of others.

The policies and procedures already being undertaken in these organisations demonstrate how other organisations can effectively prevent and manage bullying in the workplace.

Success in making workplaces safer starts with the workplace culture and attitude. The best workplaces are those that engender workplace cultures that focus on treating all employees with dignity and respect and ensuring that employees are encouraged to raise concerns if they arise.