

WORKPLACE HOSTILITY: DEFINING AND MEASURING THE OCCURRENCE OF
HOSTILITY IN THE WORKPLACE

by

MERIDITH PEASE SELDEN

B.A., Pacific Lutheran University, 1999
M.S., Kansas State University, 2002

AN ABSTRACT OF A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Psychology
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2006

Abstract

The harmful workplace behavior field, although relatively new, is fragmented. Despite a few collaborative efforts (Fox & Spector, 2005; Keashly & Jagatic, 2003; etc.) there is no agreement on the correct terminology to employ. The current paper seeks to correct this by developing a new scale that is a combination of similar, but previously distinct, variables and concepts. This new scale is comprehensive and based off of an intensive review of the literature.

WORKPLACE HOSTILITY: DEFINING AND MEASURING THE OCCURRENCE OF
HOSTILITY IN THE WORKPLACE

by

MERIDITH PEASE SELDEN

B.A., Pacific Lutheran University, 1999
M.S., Kansas State University, 2002

A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Psychology
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2006

Approved by:

Major Professor
Ronald G. Downey, Ph.D.

Abstract

The harmful workplace behavior field, although relatively new, is fragmented. Despite a few collaborative efforts (Fox & Spector, 2005; Keashly & Jagatic, 2003; etc.) there is no agreement on the correct terminology to employ. The current paper seeks to correct this by developing a new scale that is a combination of similar, but previously distinct, variables and concepts. This new scale is comprehensive and based off of an intensive review of the literature.

Table of Contents

List of Tables.....	vi
CHAPTER 1 - Workplace hostility: Defining and measuring the occurrence of hostility in the workplace.....	1
Construct Confusion: What is aggression?	4
A Response to O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin, & Glew (1996)	5
Aggressive Behaviors	7
CHAPTER 2 - Workplace Hostility	7
Intentionality.....	8
Persistence	8
Nonphysical Nature	9
Organizational Affiliation	9
Violation of Organizational and/or Social Norms	10
Perception of the Target.....	10
CHAPTER 3 - Developing the Workplace Hostility Inventory (WHI).....	13
Workplace Aggression (Neuman & Keashly, 2004)	16
Abusive Supervision (Tepper, 2000; Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002).....	18
Workplace Deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Bennett & Robinson, 2000).....	19
Social Undermining (Duffy, Ganster & Pagon, 2003)	20
Workplace Incivility (Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001)	21
Perceptions of Fair Interpersonal Treatment (Donovan, Drasgoa, & Munson, 1998)..	22
Negative Social Exchange (Ruehlman & Karoly, 1991)	23
CHAPTER 4 - Hypotheses.....	24
CHAPTER 5 - Method.....	27
Norm Pilot Study	27
Instrument Pilot Study	29
Main Study	31
CHAPTER 6 - Results	32
Norm Pilot Study	32

Instrument Pilot Study	37
Main Study	44
Factor Analysis	47
Hypothesis 1	52
Hypothesis 2a.....	53
Hypothesis 2b.....	54
Hypothesis 3	56
Hypothesis 4	59
Testing the Model	61
CHAPTER 7 - Discussion.....	65
Practical Implications.....	78
Study Limitations.....	79
CHAPTER 8 - References.....	82
Appendix A - WHI Inventory.....	91
Appendix B - WHI Items	94
Appendix C - Letter Soliciting Participation.....	96
Appendix D - Norms Survey.....	97
Appendix E - Instrument & Main Survey.....	100

List of Tables

Table 3.1 Measures, Definitions, and References	15
Table 6.1 Norm Pilot Survey, Demographic Variables	34
Table 6.2 Norms Pilot Survey; Counts and percentages of response to whether each behavior is a violation of a social norm	35
Table 6.3 Norms Pilot Survey; Counts and percentages of response to whether each behavior is a violation of a organizational norm	36
Table 6.4 Instrument Pilot Study, Overall Work Experience.....	37
Table 6.5 Instrument Pilot Study, Specific Work Experience	38
Table 6.6 Instrument Pilot Survey, Overall Frequency of Hostile behaviors	39
Table 6.7 Instrument Pilot Study, Level of Upset at the Hostile Behaviors	41
Table 6.8 Instrument Pilot Survey, Intent of the Perpetrator	43
Table 6.9 Main Study, How many years of experience do you have in the workforce?	44
Table 6.10 Main Study, How many years of experience do you have at your current job?	45
Table 6.11 Main Study, Into which of the following categories does your current job best fit? ..	46
Table 6.12 Main Survey; Items removed from the Factor Analysis.....	47
Table 6.13 Main Study, Mean upset score for behaviors included in the Factor Analysis.....	49
Table 6.14 Main Study, Pattern Matrix for the Promax PAF.....	51
Table 6.15 Main Study, Means and Standard Deviations for WH by Level of the Perpetrator....	52
Table 6.16 Main Study, Coefficients for Denigration, Exclusion, & Interference Predicting the Occurrence of WH	53
Table 6.17 Main Study, Means and Standard Deviations for WH by Level of the Perpetrator....	53
Table 6.18 Main Sample - Stepwise Regression Coefficients for Denigration, Exclusion, & Interference Predicting the Intent to Stay at Current Job (N = 309).....	55
Table 6.19 Main Study - Stepwise Regression Coefficients for Denigration, Exclusion, & Interference Predicting the Satisfaction with Current Job.....	56
Table 6.20 Main study - Means and Standard Deviations for WH by Level of the Perpetrator & Gender of the Perpetrator	56

Table 6.21 Main Study - MANOVA & Discriminant Function Analysis for WH by Gender of the Perpetrator.....	58
Table 6.22 Main Study. MANOVA & Discriminant Function Analysis for WH by Number of Perpetrators.....	60
Table 6.23 Main Study - Outcome variable "Job Satisfaction/Intent to Leave"*	61
Table 6.24 Main Study- Outcome variable "Feelings about Supervisor".....	62
Table 6.25 Main Study- Outcome variable "Feelings about Supervisor".....	62
Table 6.26 Main Study - Outcome variable "Job Clarity"*	63
Table 6.27 Main Study - Hierarchical Regression Coefficients for Predicting the Satisfaction with Current Job.....	64
Table 6.28 Main Study - Hierarchical Regression Coefficients for Predicting the Satisfaction with Current Job.....	65

CHAPTER 1 - Workplace hostility: Defining and measuring the occurrence of hostility in the workplace.

In recent years, there has been an increased focus on the examination of harmful workplace behaviors (Einarsen, Heol, Zapf, & Cooper, 2003; Fox & Spector, 2004). Harmful workplace behavior is a broad field that includes sub-areas such as: workplace aggression (Neuman & Baron, 1997; Glomb & Liao, 2003; Bjorkvist, Osterman, & Hjelt-Back, 1994; Greenberg & Barling, 1999; Harvey & Keashly, 2003; Schat & Kelloway, 2005), deviant workplace behaviors (Robinson & Bennet, 1995), abusive supervision (Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002; Tepper, 2000), social undermining (Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002), interpersonal conflict (Price Spratlen, 1995), mobbing (Leymann, 1990), workplace violence (Glomb, Steel, & Arvey, 2003; Barling, 1996), incivility (Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001; Pearson, Andersson, & Wegner, 2001), bullying (Hoel, Einarsen, & Cooper, 2003; Namie & Namie, 2003; Hoel, Einarsen, Keashley, Zapf, & Cooper, 2003), antisocial work behavior (O’Leary, Duffy, & Griffin, 2000). Although this research field can be traced back to the mid-1970s (Inkson & Simpson, 1975; Spector, 1975), it was not until the early 1990s that it really began to gain global importance. Leyman (1990) published a seminal paper on mobbing in Sweden that essentially introduced the new field to Europe. However, it was not until a few years later, in the mid-1990s to early 2000s, that the field began to receive attention in the research literature in America. In fact, according to Fox and Spector (2004), the majority of the papers in the field, especially those written and researched in America, have been published after the year 2000.

In 2003 Keashly and Jagatic published a book containing a review of studies conducted by researchers in the United States involving workplace bullying. They begin the review by discussing the increase of research in the field and the potential problems associated with the increase. Keashly and Jagatic (2003) state that in their research efforts they have “found some duplication of effort both conceptually and empirically has occurred that may have been alleviated by familiarity with each other’s work and thinking” (p. 32). The purpose of the current study is to extend beyond Keashly and Jagatic’s (2003) goal of education and familiarity to define a construct that encompasses the many behaviors identified in the workplace aggression

fields and develop a scale that adequately measures the construct. This purpose is rooted in the idea that the contextual features that are used to distinguish between current behaviors (namely frequency of occurrence, perceived intent of the perpetrator, power differential between perpetrator and target, and the extent of the norm violation) serve to differentiate between similar behaviors as opposed to completely unique behaviors. In other words, the narrow definitions of each minute behavior impose limitations that exclude acts that may be related. To better understand the field, it is the belief of the current author that a more inclusive construct needs to be developed and examined.

With the rapid rise of a new research area, there are usually problems, ranging from minor to major, associated with the growth. One of the most perilous problems, a problem to which the study of harmful work behaviors has fallen prey, is the lack of integrative work that can often be attributed to the simultaneous development of similar, although different, perspectives. This particular issue has been acknowledged as a shortcoming by numerous researchers within the harmful work behaviors field. This was illustrated in a 2001 interactive paper session at the annual Academy of Management conference (as cited by Fox & Spector, 2004). Participants in this session agreed that there was a substantial amount of overlap in the constructs being measured and that an effort at integration should be made.

One of the first steps in a successful integration is a review of the current state of things. As such, the current paper aims to present a thorough review of the current literature, highlighting previous attempts at integration and definitional dilemmas faced by the field. Because the scope of the harmful workplace behaviors field is so large, the current paper will develop a new definition that is created by combining ideas within the field. This definition will be comprehensive, combining several smaller concepts into one inclusive measure.

In a relatively immature field such as harmful workplace behavior, it is paramount to have integration. However, instead of being an integrated field, the harmful workplace behaviors field is fragmented, fitting within a number of literatures (i.e., public health, sociological, legal, etc) and employing a variety of terms (Keashly & Jagatic, 2003). Further, even when common terminology is used (i.e., aggression) the meaning and exact operational definitions often vary from article to article (Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002). A narrow focus on empirical research, as opposed to a general examination of a variety of constructs, has lead to a surplus of broadly defined concepts that cover numerous negative workplace behaviors. These concepts, which are

often nominally similar, tend to differ in fundamental ways. Namely, they differ in terms of the central object of study, the actor or the target.

In an attempt to address the problem of fragmentation, Fox and Spector (2004) edited a book with contributions from leading scholars in the harmful workplace behaviors field. The emphasis of this book was to initiate the development of an integrative understanding of a complex and splintered field. Acknowledging the strength gained by including different perspectives, Fox and Spector (2004) brought together the study of two different central objects, the actor and the target.

In addition to compiling the studies, Fox and Spector introduced a global term, “Counterproductive Work Behavior” (CWB). This umbrella term was loosely defined as study of mild forms of workplace violence and encompassed “systematic, openly abusive bullying to milder, ambiguous episodes of incivility” (Fox & Spector, 2004; pg. 3). Fox and Spector believed that CWB was broad enough to include all of the behaviors, which varied from revenge in the workplace (Bies & Tripp, 2004) to mobbing (Zapf & Einarsen, 2004), presented in the book. In large part, the authors in the first half, the actor-oriented portion, adopted and/or agreed with the CWB term. The second half, the target-oriented portion, typically retained their original terminology. However, it is worth noting that even in the actor-oriented portion not all of the scholars agreed with this terminology. Most notably, Bies and Trip (2004) expressed a preference for the term “workplace aggression.” According to Bies and Trip (2004) CWB contains an implied pro-management bias due to the inclusion of the value-laden use of “counterproductive.” Instead of CWB, Bies and Trip (2004) advocate the use of the more value-neutral term such as “workplace aggression”.

Although the dichotomy in the literature discussed by Fox and Spector (2004) is not the focus of the current paper, their book is important to the current paper because of its struggle to unite the fragmented field. In their own words, Fox and Spector (2004, p. 5) endeavor to not to force every study into predetermined perspective, but instead to “build bridges among the different perspectives, showing where they overlap and where they are different.” They go on to note that one of the strengths of CWB is that so many perspectives contribute to the overall concept that it leads to an enhanced understanding of the concept. That is to say, each perspective contributes something unique and elaborates on the concept of CWB.

The recent effort of collaboration by Fox and Spector (2004) is the exception in the field, not the norm. There have been a few reviews of different studies conducted within the field, one of which will be discussed in detail below, but the call for collaboration has been largely ignored or overlooked by most researchers. The struggle the field faces is described in a review chapter written by Keashly and Jagatic (2003) and exemplified in a series of papers aiming to define aggression. At the most basic level, the problems associated with defining aggression stems from a disagreement about what aggression is. As will be discussed below, the field has not yet developed a commonly accepted construct for aggression.

Construct Confusion: What is aggression?

In attempting to define and measure work place hostility, two different research views of aggression will be explored. Before turning to academic research typologies and theories, one should have an understanding of what the basic terms involve. That is to say, before asking how aggression can be categorized and documented, it is important to know what researchers and non-researchers mean when they use the term “aggression.” The following is an example of an examination into commonly used terminology. It is also a good illustration of the potential downside of a narrowing the focus.

In an early article, O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin, and Glew (1996) took on the task of attempting to narrow the focus of the state of the occupational aggression research field. Accordingly, they presented a theoretical framework, a typology, and anticipated future research. As would become the trend in papers written in the occupational aggression field, prior to presenting their definitions, O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin, and Glew (1996) lamented the lack of consistency and precision in the terminology employed by researchers. They believed that the solution to the lack of precision was to differentiate between two commonly used terms: Violence and aggression. This differentiation proved to be somewhat contentious.

Using Bandura’s (1973; p.8) definition of aggression, “an injurious and destructive behavior that is socially defined as aggressive,” as a starting point O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin, and Glew (1996) define the construct of aggression as an act that can be potentially destructive. [It is worth noting that while O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin, and Glew (1996) presented Bandura’s (1977) definition of aggression as “one of the most widely accepted” (p. 227) and used it as a starting point when deriving their own definition, Bandura (1977) did not differentiate between

aggression and violence.] Violence, on the other hand, was defined as a consequence. That is to say, aggression was considered a process that is intended to result in an outcome, namely violence. With this distinction, it is possible to have aggression (albeit unsuccessful) without violence. It is not however, possible to have violence without aggression.

The definitions of aggression and violence put forth by O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin, and Glew (1996) differ somewhat from the common usage of the words. This is important to consider because modifying a definition of a word can, especially if not adopted by all or even most of the researchers in a field, lead to construct/terminology confusion.

The primary difference in the way O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin, and Glew (1996) conceptualize aggression when compared to the “common” usage is the narrow scope they have adopted. Even the narrowest “common” usage of aggression includes actions (e.g., hostile) and intent (e.g., frustration) that O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin, and Glew (1996) would not consider necessary for aggression.

Likewise, the “common” usages for violence fail to completely capture even the narrowest “common” usage. The idea of aggression as a consequence is, to some extent, implied in the discussion of injury or abuse. Defining aggression completely in terms of the outcome of aggression effectively ignores all other aspects and oversimplifies the issue.

Understanding and agreeing with the terms employed is of critical importance to construct clarity and an expanded knowledge base. Without understanding and agreement, it is not possible to advance the field beyond what the researcher or set of researchers providing the definitions. Thus, the workplace aggression field has had tremendous trouble arriving at accepted terminology to describe phenomenon that occur in the workplace, thereby inhibiting the growth of the field. In many ways, the workplace aggression field has been inhibited in this manner.

A Response to O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin, & Glew (1996)

Shortly after O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin, & Glew ‘s (1996) article was published, Howard and Voss (1996) published a critique. Although allowing for the possibility of their argument to merely be semantics, they support the assignment of the definition of a “potentially destructive act” to aggression and openly disagree with the assignment of the definition of “the consequence of the act” to violence. The reason for their disagreement is threefold.

First, they disagree on the grounds of the “common” usage differing from the proposed “research” usage. Accordingly, they believe that not having the “research” usage closely align with the “common” usage will decrease the effectiveness of communication. Second, and closely related to the first point, the lack of agreement between the “research” and “common” usage is likely to not only limit the effectiveness of communication, but also confuse researchers thereby potentially limiting the value and utility of future research. Finally, they believe that the use of the word violence would be redundant for the subset of the field that already uses the “workplace violence” label. Further, Howard and Voss (1996) believe the redundancy to be unnecessary, instead promoting the use of “damages” to refer to the consequences of aggressive acts.

In a response to the critique written by Howard and Voss (1996), O’Leary-Kelly, Griffin, and Glew (1996b) dismiss the semantics argument saying it is instead an issue of construct validity. The fact that aggression and violence have been treated as interchangeable terms in academic and common language, makes their distinction and definition modification imperative. That is to say, they believe that without their modifications that the two terms will never be seen as distinct and therefore will result in significant construct confusion. Further, they state that even if they were to adopt the suggestions of Howard and Voss (1996) to use “damages” instead of “violence” then a major goal of their paper would go unaddressed, namely that the question of whether violence and aggression are actually different and if so, how.

Although published in direct contrast with each other, it would seem that the two sets of researchers actually have similar goals. Both sides want a clear and concise definition of the phenomenon surrounding aggression. While this is certainly an admirable goal neither side was able to adequately address the complexity of the construct and offer a reasonable solution.

For the purposes of the current paper, the definition of aggression put forth by O’Leary, Kelly, Griffin, and Glew (1996a, 1996b) is adequate although the idea of violence as the desired result of aggression is too prohibitive. Instead, the current paper will follow the example set by Howard and Voss (1996) and support the use of a “potentially destructive act” to broadly define aggression and disagree with, and subsequently not support, the assignment of “the consequence of the act” to violence. However, defining aggression is only the first step. It is also necessary to examine some of the current typologies and theories of aggression.

Aggressive Behaviors

Although there are potentially many typologies and/or theories of aggression that could relate to the study of harmful workplace behaviors, a commonly cited typology in the field is Buss's typology of aggressive behaviors (Buss, 1961).

According to Buss (1961), aggression is an instrumental response (or attack) that administers punishment (noxious stimuli) to another organism. More specifically, all aggressive responses involve the delivery of (or attempt to deliver) noxious stimuli in an interpersonal context. However, it is possible for the delivery of noxious stimuli to occur without aggression, if the noxious stimuli have socially desirable, long-term consequences and they are delivered within the context of recognized social role. For example, one boxer (A) can hit another boxer (B) while in the ring and this behavior, although violent is not necessarily aggressive. On the other hand, if the first boxer (A) were to get in a fight with and hit a random stranger (C) on the street the behavior would be considered both violent and aggressive.

An important part of trying to classify a behavior is to attempt to try to understand the behavior. Buss (1961) explained why people engage in aggressive behaviors by offering two major classes of reinforcement for aggression. The first major reinforcement class involves what Buss (1961) called "angry aggression." In angry aggression, the stimulus of the victim suffering injury and/or being in pain serves as reinforcement for an aggressive act, the reward of an angry aggression is the pain or suffering inflicted on another person. In the second major reinforcement class, "instrumental aggression," extrinsic rewards such as food, water, sex, money, approval, dominance, removal or escape from aversive stimuli serve as the reinforcement for an aggressive act. With instrumental aggression the victim's injuries (emotional or physiological) are not the crucial consequences. The two classes of reinforcement, although conceptually distinct, are not mutually exclusive in action. In fact, there are many situations in which both angry and instrumental aggression are operating.

CHAPTER 2 - Workplace Hostility

The construct to be explored in the current paper will be called workplace hostility (WH). WH is different from other constructs in general, and counter productive workplace behavior in particular, in that it only includes unambiguous episodes of hostility that occur repeatedly at the

hands of the same person or group of people. The intricacies of the definition of WH and the behaviors included therein will be explored in detail below.

WH is a purposeful and persistent set of non-physical behaviors undertaken by an individual or group of individuals with an individual in the same organization perceiving these behaviors as intending to harm the individual. There are few key characteristics of WH that differentiate it from other behaviors measured in the harmful workplace behaviors field. The key characteristics meriting further examination are as follows: Intentionality, persistence, nonphysical nature, organizational affiliation, violation of organizational and/or social norms, and perception of the target.

Intentionality

For a behavior to be classified as WH, it must be a purposeful act voluntarily undertaken by the perpetrator. If a behavior is mandated by an organization or a person acting as representative of an organization (for example, the perpetrator's supervisor) then it cannot be considered WH. Likewise, if a behavior occurs as a result of an obvious accident (for example, a coffee spill resulting from a clearly unintentional stumble) and/or cannot be attributed to one person (for example, a printer malfunction) then it cannot be considered WH. This is true regardless of the impact the behavior has on the target.

However, intentionality is, to some extent, contingent upon the perception of the target. If the target does not perceive intent, then, for the purposes of WH, there was not intent, regardless of the perpetrator's goal. The opposite, if the target perceives intent then there was intent, is also true except in the most blatantly accidental cases. In sum, even if a behavior results in WH-like consequences (for example, an employee's progress is greatly slowed or a deliverable was not delivered on time) it cannot be considered WH unless the target believes that the perpetrator was acting with a clear and voluntary intent to harm. In other words, WH is judged in part by how it is perceived by the target.

It is also worth noting that the current study is only measuring the intent with regards to the perpetrator and target. That is to say, the current study is not assessing whether a behavior (i.e., sabotage) intended to harm the organization as opposed to an individual. For a behavior to be WH the intent needs to be perceived as harmful to the participant.

Persistence

Another important characteristic of WH is the persistence of the behaviors. Although it is not necessary for a specific behavior to be repeated, it is necessary to have repeated poor treatment at the hands of the same perpetrator and/or same group of perpetrators. More specifically, a perpetrator and/or a group of perpetrators must perform enough behaviors that fall within the scope of WH to create a decipherable pattern of mistreatment from the perspective of the target.

Nonphysical Nature

Only behaviors that do not involve physical violence can be classified as WH. Without fail, the act of physical violence escalates a behavior and/or a pattern of behaviors to outside the scope of WH. If a pattern of nonphysical mistreatment has been established, the moment it advances to physical violence it ceases to be WH. Additionally, once it has progressed to something other than WH due an act of physical violence, it cannot go backward and once again become WH when the physical act has stopped. That is to say, a perpetrator's use of physical behavior always escalates to something beyond WH and, once that escalation has occurred, it cannot be undone.

The decision to exclude physical behaviors limits the WH construct but does so constructively. For example, physical violence, in or out of the workplace, is a legal matter. WH type behaviors are rarely a legal matter. Likewise, physical violence happens relatively rarely but receives a large amount of press and research coverage (Schat & Kelloway, 2005). WH type behaviors happens quite frequently, with the specific number of occurrence contingent upon the specific scale being used. The exclusion of physical violence from the current definition is not meant to downplay the severity of physical violence in the workplace. Physical violence can have extreme effects and merits research attention. However, it is the belief of the current author that it is too extreme to be included in the current study.

Organizational Affiliation

If a behavior does not occur between two employees of the same organization, it cannot be considered WH. The specifics of the relationship between the two employees are inconsequential, however the relationship itself is paramount. More specifically, it does not matter if the perpetrator is a subordinate, a supervisor, or a CEO of the company. Likewise, it

does not matter if the target is a subordinate, supervisor, or a CEO of the company. WH is blind to hierarchy within an organization, with employees at any level being susceptible to experiencing it. Thus, it is possible for a subordinate to exhibit WH toward a supervisor or a coworker. Likewise, it is possible for a supervisor to exhibit WH toward subordinate or a coworker.

Violation of Organizational and/or Social Norms

This characteristic is important to consider because although WH is largely something that is perceived to occur by the target of the behaviors, it cannot be researched if it does not exist outside of the mind of the target and cannot be objectively measured. Thus, the behaviors that are within the scope of WH include behaviors that are violations of social and/or organizational norms. It is important to include both social and organizational norms when defining WH because although often if one norm is violated (i.e., social) the other norm (i.e., organizational) is also violated, this is not always the case. For example, there might be a company that condones an abusive culture and encourages its “higher-ups” to yell at their subordinates in an attempt to motivate them. Although this does not violate the specific organizational norms, it does violate the social norm of how people should treat other people.

Additionally, organizational norms are not always explicitly stated or conveyed. However, in most organizations there are certain acts (for example, intentionally excluding someone from work related events) that would most likely be seen as a violation of organizational norms in that organization. To be completely certain for a particular organization, it would be necessary to analyze the organizational norms of that organization.

Perception of the Target

As discussed previously, the target must feel perceive that he or she was the target of mistreatment. If this condition is not met, then regardless of the perceived intent of the perpetrator, WH has not occurred. This characteristic is somewhat similar to the parameters of sexual harassment where a victim must feel as though he/she was a victim for sexual harassment to have occurred.

With the exception of unambiguous characteristics (i.e., physical vs. non-physical and occurring between members of the same organization vs. unrelated people) all of the key

characteristics are considered from the target's perspective. That is to say, the perceived intent of the perpetrator is more important than the actual intent of him/her. Likewise, the perception of a behavior being voluntary undertaken is more important than the actual voluntary nature of the behavior. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, if a target feels as though the perpetrator intends his/her actions to be harmful, this is more important in defining WH than if the perpetrator would classify his/her behaviors in the same manner.

To better illustrate WH, a few examples will be provided:

Example 1. John (J) and Adam (A) are coworkers. John is the unofficial "social chair" at the office. When he/she organizes work-related social events, he/she includes everyone but Adam. Adam feels that John intentionally excludes him/her from these activities.

To determine if WH has occurred, it is necessary to look at the key characteristics. First, although Adam feels excluded, John's actual intention is not clear. However, since Adam feels that John has intentionally excluded him, this is the more important than John's true intention, whether it was to intentionally exclude or not.

Second, although the specific organizational norms of John and Adam's organization are not explicitly stated, excluding a peer from peer group activities without a reason and/or explanation most likely violates an organizational norm and definitely violates a social norm. An example of coworker exclusion that would not violate organizational norms would be excluding support staff from social events for office professionals. However, since Adam and John are coworkers, it is reasonable to assume that John's behavior also violates an organizational norm.

Third, it is reasonable to assume that because John's decision to exclude a coworker violates an organizational norm it is a voluntary (i.e., not mandated by the position) behavior. That is to say, John most likely made the decision to exclude Adam as opposed to someone within the organization requiring him/her to do so.

Fourth and fifth, it is necessary to look at the actual person who perpetrated the harmful behavior. That is to say, for this act to be considered WH, the perpetrator must perform the behavior more than once and must be a member of the same organization as the target. Both of

these conditions are satisfied as John and Adam are coworkers and reference was made to similar behaviors over multiple activities.

Finally, John has excluded Adam from more than one event thereby creating a pattern of behaviors and/or indicating the persistence of the behavior in question. In summation, by examining the six key characteristics one comes to the conclusion that John's behavior is an example of workplace hostility enacted against Adam.

Example 2. Suzy is Rachel's boss. Rachel feels Suzy treats her poorly and unfairly by doing things like, frequently ignoring her contributions at meetings, yelling at her in the office, blaming her for the mistakes of others, and putting her down in front of others.

Example 2 is very similar to example 1. However, example 2 is important for two reasons; it highlights the fact that WH is not limited to incidences that occur between coworkers and it emphasizes the need to differentiate between organizational and social norms. In the above example, although not likely, it is possible that Suzy and Rachel's organization supports (explicitly or implicitly) subordinate mistreatment. If this is the case, then Suzy's behavior does not violate organizational norms. However, ignoring a person, yelling at her, putting her down in public, and blaming her for the mistakes of others clearly violate social norms. It is not socially acceptable to treat another person that way even if a particular company supports, or turns a blind eye towards, such behavior.

Example 3. Megan, Chris, and Todd all work under the supervision of Frank. Together the three of them have subjected Frank to a variety of persistent behaviors, ranging from spreading malicious rumors about Frank to intentionally sabotaging Frank's work (i.e., interrupting important meetings, deliberately including errors in his presentations, removing his items from the printer, etc.). Frank feels like Megan, Chris, and Todd are "out to get him".

Again, in order to determine if there was WH, the key characteristics should be examined. First, as with the previous examples, the intent of the actors was not clear. However, the important aspect to consider is the fact that Frank feels like a target. Next, as before, in most

companies it would be the case that the group of people was acting voluntarily and violating organizational and/or social norms. Finally, the behaviors were persistent, non-violent, and involved employees who worked for the same organization. Therefore, example 3 does in fact demonstrate an instance of WH.

The three examples, all of which embody WH, differ in two ways. Namely, the organizational level of the target and the perpetrator was different in each of the examples. Although, WH can occur at any organizational level and can involve targets or perpetrators at any level, research has indicated that it most commonly occurs at the hands of a supervisor/boss to a subordinate (Tepper, 2000). Additionally, the three examples differed in terms of the number of people involved in perpetrating the acts. The final example involved three individuals who happened to be a part of the same workgroup and therefore at the same organizational level. WH can occur at the hands of only one person or at the hands of a group of people. The key to this distinction is that if WH occurs at the hands of a group of people then the target has to feel as though all of the people within the group were involved in the act and acted as a cohesive unit. As discussed above, the groups can be composed of people at any organizational level. That is to say, WH can occur at the hands of an individual or a group of people and, if it occurs at the hands of a group of people, the members of the group can represent any to all level(s) of the organization (i.e., coworker and/or supervisor).

Although the above establishes a working definition of WH, this is not beneficial without a strong operational definition. As previously discussed, the goal of the current paper is to develop, define, and measure a facet of harmful workplace behavior. Therefore, it is necessary to develop a measurement instrument that adequately encompasses the concept of WH. The measurement instrument being developed and used in the current study is the Workplace Hostility Inventory (WHI).

CHAPTER 3 - Developing the Workplace Hostility Inventory (WHI)

The Workplace Hostility Inventory (WHI) was developed after doing an extensive review of the literature. As was mentioned previously, the field examining harmful workplace

behaviors, although relatively new, is fragmented. To combat this fragmentation and produce a cohesive scale, Workplace Hostility was defined using a combination of existing variables and concepts. With literally dozens of variables to choose from, seven measures were selected due to their prominence in the field and/or their relevance to the operational definition of Workplace Hostility. The following contains a list of the measures selected including the definitions, references, and total number of items for each measure:

Table 3.1 Measures, Definitions, and References

Measure	Definition	Reference	Number of Items	
			Original	Total used in the WHI
Workplace Aggression (WAR-Q)	“Any form of behavior directed by one or more persons in a workplace toward the goal of harming one or more others in that workplace (or the entire organization) in ways the intended targets are motivated to avoid” (Neuman, 2003/2004, p. 11)	Neuman & Keashly 2003/2004	60	20
Abusive Supervision	“Subordinates perceptions of the extent to which supervisors engage in the sustained display of hostile verbal and nonverbal behaviors, excluding physical contact”	Tepper (2000, p. 178)	15	6
Workplace Deviance	“Voluntary behavior that violates significant organizational norms, and in doing so threatens the well-being of the organization or its members, or both”	Bennett & Robinson (1995; 2000, p. 349)	45	3
Social Undermining	“Behavior intended to hinder, over time, the ability to establish and maintain positive interpersonal relationships, work-related success, and favorable reputation”	Duffy, Ganster & Pagon (2003, p. 332)	13**+13** = 26	4
Workplace Incivility	“Low-intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect. Uncivil behaviors are characteristically rude and discourteous, displaying a lack of regard for others” (Anderson & Pearson. 1999. p. 457)	Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout -2001	7	2
Perceptions of Fair Interpersonal Treatment (PFIT)	Assessment an “employee’s perceptions of how employees, in general, are treated by supervisors and coworkers in an organization”	Donovan, Drasgoa, & Munson (1998, p. 684)	18	4
Negative Social Exchange (TENSE)	Interactions that are “affectively unpleasant, resistive, conflictual, hostile, or hurtful transactions rather than reflecting either the mere absence of aid or the act of bestowing assistance on unwilling or unreceptive recipients”	Ruehlman & Karoly (1991, p. 97)	18	3

Although the above concepts are similar in many ways, they each represent a slightly different concept and inclusion of each enriches the Workplace Hostility Inventory (WHI). See Appendix A for a copy of the complete WHI and see Appendix B for a copy of the source for each item selected for the WHI. Since each of the concepts served as a source and/or an inspiration to the development of the WHI, it is important to take a closer look at each of them.

Workplace Aggression (Neuman & Keashly, 2004)

Neuman and Keashly (2004) are currently in the process of developing a comprehensive questionnaire of workplace aggression (WAR-Q). Although the questionnaire is still in the preliminary stages, Neuman and Keashly (2004) have collected and analyzed a significant amount of data. To test the overall reliability of the questionnaire and the reliability of the subscales, data were obtained from a large sample (approximately 8,500) of respondents over a three-year period. In this case, Neuman and Keashly (2004) identified subscales by using Buss's (1960) typology of aggression. More specifically, each behavior was categorized in each of the three dichotomies presented by Buss (1960), passive/active, verbal/physical, and direct/indirect. Overall, the reliability alpha and the subscale reliabilities were very high, ranging from .82 to .95.

More than any other instrument, the WAR-Q is represented in the workplace hostility questionnaire. This is in part due to the fact the WAR-Q is one of the more comprehensive measures that exists to date. Additionally, because the WAR-Q is relatively new, Neuman and Keashly (2004) had a large body of research from which to draw when creating the items and/or deciding on the behaviors to be included than previous studies (i.e., Robinson & Bennet, 1995). However, although the WAR-Q is a comprehensive assessment of workplace aggression, it is not a comprehensive assessment of workplace hostility. WH is more targeted than workplace aggression, acts that can include physical violence and do not need to originate from one person and/or one group of people. Neuman and Keashly (2004) do not differentiate between acts experienced at the hands of the same person (i.e., "bullying") or acts experienced at the hands of many different people acting as individual agents. Although there may be overlap between the occurrence of workplace aggression and workplace hostility, the two constructs are quite different and presumably would be experienced in quite different ways. This idea is represented in the fact that many items from the WAR-Q are included, after slight wording modifications, in

the WHI. Of the 40 items in the WHI, 20 can be attributed in some way to the WAR-Q (taken from and/or resemble items on the WAR-Q). The items that were included on WHI from the WAR-Q represented the items on the WAR-Q that fit into the definition of WH. In other words, items on the WAR-Q that mentioned physical violence were excluded from the WHI because the WH construct did not include physical violence.

It is worth noting that although the items in the WHI resemble the items listed above from the WAR-Q, none of them were used without at least slight modifications. The most important modifications to the items were done in response to the fact that the WAR-Q was designed in a way that did not allow a participant to select more than one perpetrator and that there was no place to indicate whether the respondent viewed him/her or herself as a target of workplace aggression. The WHI on the other hand asks participants to first identify a person or a group of people who has exhibited hostile behaviors in the work place and then, thinking only of the person or group of people identified, to indicate whether certain behaviors have occurred. When asked to think of the person or the group of people, the participant is given the following list from which he/she can choose all that are appropriate: Subordinate, Coworker, Supervisor, or Other.

While developing the WAR-Q, one area Neuman and Keashly (2004) focused on was the difference between persistent and less frequent behaviors. They found that persistent aggression is different than aggression that occurs less frequently. This finding serves to further differentiate between similar constructs on the basis of the frequency of the negative behavior. Specifically related to persistent behaviors, Neuman and Keashly (2004) looked at a variety of variables, ranging from the amount of stress experienced by the target to the intent of the target to leave the organization. Accordingly, they found many significant negative effects of being a target of persistent aggression. Employees who experienced persistent workplace aggression experienced higher levels of stress, were more bothered by the general work environment, lower levels of job satisfaction, lower levels of organizational satisfaction, and higher intent to leave the organization when compared to employees who had experienced no aggression or far less frequent aggression.

In addition to the general negative effects reported by Neuman and Keashly (2004) there were two specific relevant findings. Namely, Neuman and Keashly (2004) found that the greatest adverse impact of aggressive behavior comes at the hands of an employee's supervisor.

In other words, participants reported more distress when they were bullied by their supervisor than by any other source. Also, it was found that the effects of aggression are cumulative and that participants reported more stress when they were bullied by multiple actors. This finding is relevant to the current study although it is worth noting that Neuman and Keashly (2004) did not look into whether the perpetrators acted as a group or acted as an individual. The potential impact of this distinction will be discussed later in the paper.

Abusive Supervision (Tepper, 2000; Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002)

In response to a perceived lack of theory-based studies of abusive supervision, Tepper (2000) developed and tested a model of abusive supervision. Tepper's (2000) conceptualization of abusive supervision is important because, in many ways, workplace hostility resembles it. Namely, abusive supervision is characterized by the fact that it involves subjective judgment, must be a sustained activity, and does not include physical contact. More specifically, if the "target" does not feel as though he/she is the victim of abusive supervision then for all intents and purposes, he/she has not been the victim of abusive supervision. Likewise, if an abusive act has only occurred once or if it involves physical contact then it is not considered abusive supervision.

Six of the items from the Abusive Supervision scale are included in the WHI. The reason for this is due to the fact that the definitional similarities between abusive supervision and workplace hostility would indicate a fair amount of construct overlap. As such it is appropriate to include some items from the abusive supervision scale on the workplace hostility inventory.

In Tepper's (2000) initial study of abusive supervision, it was found that subordinates who were subjected to abusive behavior from their supervisors were more likely to quit their jobs than those who were not subjected to the same behavior. For the abused subordinates who did not leave their positions, there were many negative effects of remaining with an abusive supervisor. Namely, these employees were found to have lower job satisfaction and life satisfaction levels, conflict between work and family life, and to suffer from psychological distress.

According to Tepper (2000), employers should view abusive supervision as a threat to the organization. He/she attributes this to the fact the employees' view of abusive supervision can affect their attitudes and overall well-being, resulting in poor morale. Poor morale has been

show to be linked to higher rates of absenteeism, turnover, and reduced organizational citizenship behaviors (Tepper, 2000; Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy, 2002). The reduction in OCBs by abused subordinates when compared to their non-abused counterparts is believed to be a deliberate effort to “even the score” and achieve what Bies, Tripp, and Kramer (1997) refer to as type of low intensity revenge. The implication of this finding is that an abused subordinate holds the organization at least partly responsible for the abusive behavior and acts accordingly.

Workplace Deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995; Bennett & Robinson, 2000)

Forerunners in the study of harmful workplace behaviors, Robinson and Bennett (1995) developed a typology of deviant behavior in the mid-1990s. Their typology was one of the early studies of harmful workplace behaviors conducted in the United States and was undertaken in response to a lack of research attention being paid to the nature of deviant workplace behaviors. Prior to the development of their typology, the research within the field had a tendency to be isolated attempts to explain specific phenomenon and/or answer specific questions.

Robinson and Bennett (1995) defined employee deviance as a behavior undertaken voluntarily that violates organizational norms and poses a threat to the organization, its members, or both. A behavior that does not violate organizational norms but that is threatening is not considered to be deviant. If, for example, an organization condones extreme verbal reprimands, then yelling at a subordinate would not represent employee deviance within an organization. This is important because it means the occurrence of employee deviance is completely reliant upon and unique to the organization in which it occurs. In other words, a behavior seen as deviant in one organization may not be deviant in a different organization. Robinson and Bennett (1995) address this issue citing the need to avoid defining employee deviance in absolute moral standards.

The individualized nature of employee deviance can present operational definition and measurement difficulties. To combat this weakness, WH expands the norm violation to include social as well as organizational norms. Expanding the concept in this manner reduces the subjectivity and individuality of the construct. Additionally, in the development process of the WHI there will be verification of the fact that all of the included behaviors actually represent a violation of a social or organizational norm. This will further reduce the subjectivity and individuality of the construct.

Because employee deviance is a broader concept than WH, many of the behaviors included in the typology were not appropriate to include in the WHI. In fact, only one subset of the behaviors, those directed towards an employee within the organization as opposed to the organization itself, related to the current scale. There were only 3 items from the typology included in the WHI. Even these behaviors that were included, the subset that related to the current study, needed to be significantly revised. More specifically, the behaviors listed by Robinson and Bennett (1995) were written from the perspective of the company (i.e., “Employee blaming co-worker for mistakes” or “Employee sabotaging equipment”) as opposed to the perspective of the target (i.e., “The perpetrators sabotaged equipment that you needed to do your job” or “The perpetrator intentionally made errors that affected your job”).

It is worth noting that Bennett and Robinson (2000) later published a scale of workplace deviance. This scale was developed using many of the behaviors examined when developing the typology. Each behavior was placed into one of two categories, interpersonal deviance and organizational deviance. As noted previously, the concept of organizational deviance is only slightly related to the current study. However, the concept of interpersonal deviance, or deviance directed at members of the organization, is far more relevant and therefore better represented on the workplace hostility inventory.

Social Undermining (Duffy, Ganster & Pagon, 2003)

According to Duffy, Ganster, and Pagon (2003), social undermining is a series of work related behaviors designed to hinder the target’s ability to maintain a positive standing within his/her work environment. More specifically, social undermining is designed to interfere with the target’s reputation, chances for success, and interpersonal relationships. There are three key dimensions to social undermining. First, as with workplace hostility, there must be malicious intent from the perpetrator. Second, social undermining is designed to weaken by degrees. In fact, when looked at out of context, the individual acts that make up social undermining are usually not too insidious, it is only when looked at in sum that the acts begin to have the desired effect on the target. The repeated nature of each act contributes greatly to its impact. Third, the target must perceive the actions of the perpetrator to be malicious. It is not enough that the target intends to act maliciously the perpetrator must also feel that there was malicious intent. The idea

of perceived intent is present in a lot of harassment research (i.e., sexual harassment) and is also a key component of workplace hostility.

In their research, Duffy, Ganster, and Pagon (2003) found that social undermining had a negative effect on many individual and organizational variables, with a more pronounced negative effect when the undermining occurred at the hands of a supervisor. More specifically, there was a significant relationship between the presence of undermining at any level and both active and passive counterproductive behaviors. However, there were also significant negative relationships between undermining and both self-efficacy and organizational commitment when the undermining was acted out by a supervisor against a subordinate. Looking at the three findings together, it would be logical to assume that undermining is a negative event to experience but the negative experience is exacerbated when the undermining occurs at the hands of someone who has (organizational) power over the target.

On the surface, social undermining is quite similar to workplace hostility. That is to say, the three primary components of social undermining are all components of workplace hostility. However, the focus of workplace hostility is in the persistent nature of the acts by the same person and/or group of people. As discussed above, social undermining is defined in part by its ability to weaken by degrees. This is similar to the idea of persistent behavior enacted by one person and/or a group of people but is not necessarily assigned to one person and/or groups of people. However, the fact that social undermining does not differentiate between different perpetrators, instead lumping all negative acts into the same “malicious acts” category means that there can be no “bullying” aspect. With workplace hostility a target will most likely feel as though an individual or a group of people is out to get them. With social undermining a target will most likely feel as though they are in an unsupportive work environment or that they are universally disliked. Because of the differences between the two measures, only 4 items from the Social Undermining Scale were included in the WHI.

Workplace Incivility (Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001)

Although perhaps not as seemingly devastating as some of the harmful workplace behaviors being discussed, workplace incivility can still have a negative impact on the workplace environment (Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001, Pearson, Andersson, & Wegner, 2001). Incivility is a low intensity behavior with ambiguous intent. However, it is often viewed

as somewhat immoral, connoting breaches of both personal and professional etiquette (Pearson, Anderson, & Wegner, 2001). It also conspicuously violates formal and informal cooperation and norms. That is to say, although there is not a universal civil principle, we hold a common understanding that the type of behaviors that typify workplace incivility are disruptive and undermine mutual respect in the workforce (Pearson, Anderson, & Wegner, 2001). There were 2 items from this scale included in the WHI.

There are numerous potential negative consequences to workplace incivility but perhaps the most detrimental are the effects it can have on a target. Namely, workplace incivility can intimidate a target, isolating him/her by making him/her feel ashamed and responsible. Cortina, Magley, Williams, and Langhout (2001) found that uncivil acts occurred at even the higher levels of an organization and that they had a negative effect on job satisfaction, job withdrawal, and career salience. Although the potential ramifications of the negative effect uncivil behaviors can have on the target is self-evident, it is possible to overlook the potential negative effect that this could have on the organization as a whole, the most obvious of which are the loss of collaborative effort and sharing of others' creativity, ideas, and participation. It can also cause negative sentiments about the environment, something that is undoubtedly going to have a negative effect on many individual's productivity level.

Workplace Incivility is seen as a similar but yet distinct form of harmful workplace behavior. It can be conceptualized as a specific form of employee deviance (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). As with all of the other harmful behaviors discussed, workplace incivility is a voluntary behavior that violates some kind of norm, in this case organizational norms. However, workplace incivility is unique in that it is a low intensity behavior and ambiguous in its intent to harm. It is possible for the perpetrator, the target, or an external observer to be confused about the intent of the incivility. An uncivil behavior may be a reflection of an individual's intent to harm either the organization or an individual in the organization, an individual's desire to benefit directly from the act, or of a lack of intent.

Perceptions of Fair Interpersonal Treatment (Donovan, Drasgoa, & Munson, 1998)

Donovan, Drasgow, and Munson (1998) created a scale designed to assess how an employee viewed interpersonal treatment in the workforce. The scale and accompanying study

are slightly different than the previously discussed studies. The Perceptions of Fair Interpersonal Treatment (PFIT) scale was a broad scale that assessed two perceptions of a work environment, supervisor treatment and coworker treatment. Unlike the previous measures, these perceptions were assessed at the organizational level, not the individual level. That is to say, the PFIT measured an individual's perception of his workforce climate, not his perception of how he, as an individual, was treated by his supervisor and/or coworkers. Due to the global, as opposed to the individual, focus of the PFIT the items selected from it to be included as part of the WHI had to be modified to reflect the focus of the Inventory. Identifiers such as "employees" and "supervisors" were changed to personal identifiers such as "me" or "I". There were 4 items from the PFIT scale included on the WHI.

When investigated, there is evidence that indicates that interpersonal treatment in the workforce is related to critical attitudes including job satisfaction. For example, according to Keashly et al. (1994) the experience of hostile interpersonal treatment was related to lower levels of job satisfaction. Looking at it in a different way, it has been shown that positive interpersonal treatment is related to lower level of turnover intentions (Keashly et al., 1994) and actual turnover (Dittrich & Carrell, 1979). Finally, Donovan, Drasgow, and Munson (1998) found strong correlations between the PFIT scale and work and job withdrawal behaviors.

Negative Social Exchange (Ruehlman & Karoly, 1991)

Unlike the previous studies discussed, the Test of Negative Social Exchange (TENSE) was not designed to be used exclusively in the workforce. Instead, it was designed to assess potential negative interpersonal interactions wherever they may occur. However, the items taken from the TENSE are as appropriate and relevant as the other items. As with the PFIT though, items taken from the tense required modification to fit into the WHI. Three items from TENSE was included in the WHI.

It is important to include items from the TENSE because research related to negative social relationships suggests that they can act as a direct source of stress, potentially leading to numerous negative consequences (Fontana, Dowds, Marcus, and Eisenstadt, 1980). More importantly, negative social exchanges can interfere with goal-oriented activities, diminish one's self-efficacy, and threaten one's self esteem. Looking at the larger picture, a small number of studies have shown that there is a "significant inverse relationship between negative social

exchange and well-being, life satisfaction, personal mastery, and self-esteem, as well significant positive associations between negative social exchange and distress, depression, and anxiety” (Ruehlman & Karoly, 1991, p. 97).

When looked at in relation to the current study, negative social interactions can be seen as the umbrella under which WH resides. That is to say, WH is a specific subset of behaviors that, when looked at individually, fit within the parameters defined by negative social interactions. However, when looked at together, the behaviors that make up WH are more specialized than the broad categorization of negative social interactions.

As mentioned previously, the WHI scale is designed to differentiate between people who have experienced hostility in the workplace and those who have not and to explore the potentially negative consequences associated with experiencing WH. To adequately do this the WHI must effectively gather information related to the 6 key characteristics that make it a unique construct and examine how each relates to areas previously proven to have an effect on an employees perceptions and beliefs regarding themselves or their company after experiencing harmful workplace behaviors. As such, many of the variables discussed above and researched by previous research in the harmful workplace behavior field will be examined in relation to an individual’s experience with WH.

CHAPTER 4 - Hypotheses

There is a plethora of evidence that indicates that people experience hostile behavior in the workplace. It is expected that this will be the case with the current study. However, based off of a review of the literature, it is expected that not all of the behaviors will contribute equally to predicting the occurrence of WH. That is to say, it is believed that the current study will aid in the identification of factors to which the experience of WH can be attributed. It is further believed that theses factors will differ in the role that they play and the impact that they have on an individual’s experience with WH. The first hypothesis is as follows:

Hypothesis 1: The construct of WH can be divided into subscales. These subscales will each make contribution to understanding a target’s level of upset associated with the

experience of WH, with some of the subscales making a larger contribution to understanding said level than others.

Based off of the findings presented by Tepper (2000), Zellars, Tepper, & Duffy (2002), and Duffy, Ganster, and Pagon (2003), and Neuman & Keashly (2004) indicating both that abuse at the hands of a supervisor occurs more frequently than abuse at the hands of a coworker but also that the negative effect of the abuse is worse when enacted by a supervisor instead of a coworker, it is expected that the WH will occur more often from the top down (i.e., a supervisor to a subordinate). It is also believed that the target's level of upset will be greater when the WH occurs from the top down. This belief is primarily derived from the research of Duffy, Ganster, and Pagon (2003) and Neuman and Keashly (2004), where it was found that social undermining and aggression had a more pronounced negative effect when they occurred at the hands of a supervisor than when it occurred at the hands of a coworker. As such, the following two hypotheses were formulated:

Hypothesis 2: WH is more likely to occur from the top down. Namely, a subordinate or coworker is more likely to be a target than a supervisor within the organization in which the acts occur.

Hypothesis 2a: When the perpetrator of WH is in a position of power over the target, the target will express being more upset with WH than when the perpetrator is not in a position of power over the target.

Finally, in their research into power differentials between the target and the perpetrator, Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon (2003) and Donovan, Drasgow, & Numson (1998) found negative relationships between the treatment by supervisors and a variety of personal and organizational variables, including a significant negative relationship between organizational commitment and a positive correlation between job withdrawal behaviors. Additionally, Neuman and Keashly (2004) found that employees who experienced persistent workplace aggression were more bothered by the general work environment, had lower levels of job satisfaction and organizational satisfaction, and higher intent to leave the organization when compared to

employees who had experienced no aggression or far less frequent aggression. Thus, the following is believed to be true:

Hypothesis 2b: When the perpetrator of WH is in a position of power over the target, the likelihood of the target expressing a desire to leave the organization and disliking the job is greater than when the perpetrator is not in a position of power over the target.

Although there is not a lot of theoretical support for the next hypothesis, it merits examination due to the widely held stereotypical beliefs that males and females behave quite differently in the workplace and display anger and aggression differently. While there are not that many studies that have found (or examined) gender differences in hostile behaviors, Namie (2003) found that men and women were likely to commit different kinds of behaviors. For example, Namie (2003) found that men were likely to commit the following behaviors: screaming in public, intentional sabotage, withholding resources, and name calling. On the other hand, women were more likely to use the silent treatment and encourage other people to also turn against the target. Thus, based off of previous research and commonly held beliefs, it is believed that there will be differences between the type of behaviors enacted by males and females in the workplace.

Hypothesis 3: Males and females will instigate different hostile behaviors and this will be magnified when there is a power differential between the target and perpetrator. That is to say, the target will report experiencing different behaviors if the perpetrator is male than if the perpetrator is female.

Neuman and Keashly (2004) found that the effects of aggression were cumulative and that participants reported higher stress levels when bullied by multiple actors. Although Neuman and Keashly (2004) did not look into whether the perpetrators acted as a group or acted as an individual when bullying the target, they did find that numerous people bullying a target was viewed as worse than a lone bully. Unfortunately, based off of the findings by Neuman and Keashly (2004), it is the belief of the current author that the negative effects of WH

will be more pronounced when the WH occurs at the hands of multiple perpetrators instead of at the hands of a single perpetrator.

Hypothesis 4: WH that occurs at the hands of multiple individuals (i.e., a group) will be perceived as more upsetting than WH that occurs at the hands of a lone perpetrator.

CHAPTER 5 - Method

The hypotheses were tested using data collected at three points in time from three samples. The first two data collections were pilot samples used to refine the measurement instrument being developed and will be called the “Norm Pilot Study” and the “Measurement Pilot Study”, respectively. The final data collection occurred after changes were made to the instrument based off of the results of the pilot studies and will be called the “Main Study.”

Norm Pilot Study

Forty-two participants participated in the norm pilot study. The participants came from three different locations. The first location was a community college in Northern Virginia. Students enrolled in an introductory Psychology class were asked to complete the survey. Although the students were informed that participation was not compulsory and that there was no penalty for choosing to not participate, all of the students in attendance opted to complete the survey. There were sixteen students, approximately half of all of the students enrolled in this particular section of introductory psychology, who participated from this location. In return for their time, students were given three bonus points that were applied to the next exam.

The second location was a large state school in Maryland. Students enrolled in a social science statistics evening course were asked to complete the survey. Again, students were asked to complete the survey but were informed that participation was not compulsory and that there would be no penalty for those who chose not to participate. As with the introductory class, all of the students in attendance chose to complete the survey. There were thirteen students, 100% of those enrolled, who participated from this location. In return for their time, students were given three bonus points that were applied to the next exam.

The third location was a non-profit organization located in the Midwest. Unlike the previous two locations, the third location did not contain students, instead being composed of people out in the workforce. A letter written by the researchers but sent on company letterhead and officially coming from the President of the organization was sent to the employees soliciting participation (See Appendix C for a copy of the letter). The letter informed the employees that participation was completely voluntary and that survey was only concerned thoughts about behaviors that occur in the workplace. Thirteen employees of the non-profit organization, approximately half of those who received the letter, decided to participate in the study.

All three locations were informed of the general purpose of the study, were ensured complete anonymity, and told that the responses to the questions would only be analyzed as part of group data. Additionally, all of the participants were given the researcher's contact information in case any questions/problems arose or if they were interested in seeing the results of the study. Since three different locations were used, it was important to test for any differences between the locations. Testing was conducted and it was determined that the three samples were similar enough to combine into one larger sample. The tests performed and the conclusions drawn will be discussed in more detail in the results section of this paper.

The norm pilot study participants were asked to complete a survey that contained four main parts. First, participants were asked to think about how he/she would feel if a person (or a group of people) at his work performed a variety of behaviors, all of which were directed toward the participant. For example, participants were asked to indicate on a Likert-type scale (1 = Not at all and 5 = Very) how they would feel if a person or a group of people "defaced, damaged, or stole your personal property." There were forty behaviors included on the survey.

Second and third, after indicating how they would personally feel if a particular act was enacted against themselves, participants were asked to indicate whether they believed each act was a violation of social norms and organizational norms. Social norms were defined as "public/community" norms and organizational norms were defined as general "workplace" norms. Detailed and elaborate definitions of types of norms were intentionally excluded from the survey because the idea of norms is easily understood and too much detail had the potential to alter the participants' beliefs.

Finally, participants were asked to answer a series of basic demographic questions. Prior to completing the demographic section, participants were reminded that the information they

provided would not be used to identify participants; instead it would only be used for making statistical comparisons. (See Appendix D for a complete copy of the norms pilot survey.)

This norm pilot study was important to conduct prior to the other two surveys because the definition of WH specifically excludes behaviors that are not violations of organizational or social norms. Thus, it was necessary to collect the data and ensure that there was no subjectivity in this parameter. Behaviors in which less than 50% of the participants indicate are violations of organizational or social norms were excluded from further study. The liberal cut-off value of 50% was selected for a few reasons. First, since this is a preliminary study, it was important to include as many behaviors as possible. Second, the sample was very diverse, representing very different work experiences. Thus, it was possible that those in management viewed violations different than those in facilities. A relatively liberal cut-off allow for these differences. Third, the norm definitions were intentionally ambiguous so as to encompass numerous social and organizational settings. In other words, some ambiguity was to be expected. Finally, the behaviors were, for the most part, violations of both social and organization norms. Usually if a behavior was not viewed as a violation of one norm then it was viewed as a violation of the other norm. For example, preventing you from expressing yourself was seen as a clear violation of an organizational norm but not as clearly a violation of a social norm.

Instrument Pilot Study

The instrument pilot study was conducted at a small non-profit organization in northern Virginia. The data was collected at an all-hands meeting/retreat. Due to the fact that the survey was administered at an all-hands activity where everyone, from all levels, of the organization would be present, the participants ranged from the Executive Director to the more traditional “working class” positions such as staff electrician or cook. In other words, the participants were varied in their work experiences as well as their standing within the organization.

Approximately an hour of the meeting/retreat was set-aside for the researcher to come and solicit participation. Employees of the non-profit organization were told that there participation was voluntary but that in exchange for the willingness to complete the survey, the employees were offered a chance to enter a drawing to win one of four gift certificates (worth \$25, \$25, \$50, and \$75 respectively) to Target. The drawing was held directly after the surveys were completed and everyone who completed a survey had an equal chance of being selected.

As with the norm pilot study, everyone present decided to participate. There were 35 participants for the instrument pilot study.

As was mentioned previously, the instrument pilot study sample was drawn from all ranks of the organization. This meant that there was not a consistent education level and there were some concerns about the ability of everyone present to be able to complete the survey without help. (The point of contact in the organization knew of at least one participant who did not have the level of literacy required to complete the survey on his own.) To ensure that everyone could participate and that the administration was fair, the researcher read the survey aloud to the participants, asking them to fill out the survey as a group. Although this method required more time, it was the only way to ensure that everyone could participate without having to reveal his or her literacy status, a potentially difficult and embarrassing thing to do. It took approximately 45 minutes to complete the survey.

The instrument pilot survey participants were asked to complete the workplace hostility inventory as revised from the norm pilot sample. (For a complete copy of the survey, see Appendix E.) Prior to participating, participants were informed that their anonymity would be ensured and the nothing they personally said would be reported back to the leaders of their company. This was particularly important because the data had the potential to contain volatile or incriminating data.

The purpose of the instrument pilot survey was twofold. First, the survey assessed whether a participant who experienced the behaviors on the inventories felt as though he/she was a victim of a damaging act. That is to say, previous research has more or less assumed that the acts themselves were damaging. Very little attention has been paid to whether the participant feels the acts were damaging. For example, Neuman & Keashly (2004) ask participants only if they have experienced any of a series of behavior. There is no assessment of whether the participant felt as though the acts he/she experienced were harmful. Second, it was necessary is to ensure that WHI is a balanced measure of the construct. If, for example, a behavior received little to no support in this instrument pilot survey, it will be excluded from the main survey. The results of these two items will be explored in the results section of this paper.

Main Study

The data for the main study was collected using an alternative method. The method chosen is an established method within the workplace bullying field, with some of the frontrunners (Namie & Namie, 2003; Namie, 2001; Namie, 2003; Namie, 1998) in the field having used it. The data for the main study was collected from an anonymous and confidential online survey posted at workplacehostility.org. Although somewhat unorthodox, this data collection method was deemed to be appropriate for a variety of reasons which will be discussed further in the discussion section of this paper.

A website was created (www.workplacehostility.org) and participants were solicited. The existence of the survey was spread by word of mouth. Additionally, the survey could be located through a variety of search engines. The first page of the website was titled "Have you experienced workplace hostility?" and contained the following information:

If you have been a victim of non-physical hostility at work, I want to know about your experience. I need your help! Please take 5 - 10 minutes and complete the following survey. Your responses will be completely confidential. Beyond general demographics, you will not be asked to provide any personal details.

Additionally, people were informed that after completing the survey they would have a chance to enter a random drawing for a 1 gig iPod Nano.

There were 438,401 of which were received in time to be included in subsequent analyses, volunteer respondents. For the purposes of this study, a respondent was defined as someone who completed the survey. If a person started the survey and did not finish the survey his answers were not included and he/she was not considered a participant. The survey was "live" online for approximately 3 weeks. After the number of respondents tapered off, a drawing for an iPod was held. A random number generator was used to select a participant based off of his placement within the sample.

The main survey was identical to the instrument survey with the exception of upgrades based off of the method of administration discussed above and the addition of outcome measures. (Appendix E contains a complete copy of the survey.)

CHAPTER 6 - Results

Norm Pilot Study

The first study, the norm pilot study, was conducted to ensure that measurement instrument met the definition of WH which specifies that the behaviors being measured need to be a violation of organizational or social norms. Previously, it has been assumed that behavior, which seems to violate norms, do in fact violate norms. To ensure that all of the behaviors being measured do violate a social norm, an organizational norm, or both, the norm pilot study was conducted.

Due to the fact that the norm pilot study data was collected in multiple locations, it was first necessary to test the different locations to ensure that they were not significantly different from each other. To that end, two ANOVAs were run examining group views on the violation of social and organizational norms respectively.

The first test examined the social norms differences between the three locations. For this test, the dependent variable was a composite score composed of the number of hostile behaviors each respondent believed was a violation of a social norm. In other words, each participant could receive a score between 0 and 40, with 0 indicating that they believed none of the behaviors were violations of social norms and 40 indicating that they believed all of the behaviors were violations of social norms. The average overall social norm composite score was 25.60 with a $SD = 10.94$. The independent variable was the location of the data collection, with three possible locations; the community college, the state college, and the non-profit organization. The results revealed that the locations were not significantly different in their social norms composite ratings of the behaviors, $F(2, 39) = .118, p > .05$. Put a different way, the groups' composite ratings with respect to violation of social norms were similar enough to support treating them as one larger sample.

The second test was very similar to the first test except that the dependent variable composite score was composed of an individual's response with regards to whether the behavior was a violation of organizational norms. As with the first test, the independent variable was the participants' location, again with three possible locations. The average overall organizational norm composite was 25.81 with a $SD = 11.50$. The results again revealed that the locations were not significantly different in their organizational composite ratings of the behaviors, $F(2, 39) =$

.478, $p > .05$. Put a different way, the group composite ratings with respect to violation of organizational norms were similar enough to support the combining the three groups thereby treating them as one larger sample.

In addition to examining the norm ratings, two key demographic variables were examined; the amount of work experience the participants had and whether they liked or disliked the current job. Due to the inherent differences between the locations (i.e., school setting and workforce setting), a difference between the amounts of work experience was expected. The expected difference was found, $F(2, 38) = 20.40$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .52$. To examine the main effect, a Tukey HSD post hoc test was run. The results from this test indicated that the community college ($M = 3.53$, $SD = .915$) and the state school ($M = 4.46$, $SD = .88$) were not significantly different from each other but that both were significantly different from the nonprofit organization ($M = 6.38$, $SD = 1.67$). (Work experience was measured on a discrete Likert-type scale. The response options were grouped into categories that reflected, on average, three years time. Thus, the mean score for the non-profit organization, 6.38, indicated an average of 11 to 15 years of work experience and the mean scores for the two colleges, 3.53 and 4.46, indicated an average of 3 to 5 years and 5 to 7 years for the community and state college, respectively in the workforce.) Again, this difference is essentially a difference between people functioning within the full-time workforce and those who were, for the most part, preparing to enter the full-time workforce. As such, this difference is neither surprising nor especially noteworthy.

The second key demographic variable that was examined was how much each participant liked his current job. It is important to note that this analysis only included individuals who indicated that they currently held a job. Thus, four participants were excluded from the community college sample and two participants were excluded from the state college sample. Unlike with the previous demographic variable, there is no inherent reason to believe that one sample should be different from the other samples. And, a lack of difference between the three samples was exactly what was found, $F(2, 33) = .586$, $p > .05$. The three samples were similar in their feelings about their current position. When looked at as one sample, the overwhelming majority of the participants ($N = 27$ or 75%) indicated that they liked their current job. The remaining 25% of participants indicated that they either did not like their current job ($N = 5$ or 13.9%) or that they were unsure how they felt about their current job ($N = 4$ or 11.1%). The

following table contains means and standard deviations by data collection location for the demographic variables discussed above.

Table 6.1 Norm Pilot Survey, Demographic Variables

		Where the data was collected		
		State School	Community College	Non-Profit Organization
Work Experience				
	M	4.46	3.53	6.38
	SD	0.88	0.92	1.66
Age of the Participant				
	M	22.15	20.19	38.77
	SD	4.43	2.17	14.91
Do you like your current job?				
	M	1.55	1.25	1.31
	SD	0.82	0.62	0.63
Do you plan to stay at your current job?				
	M	2.00	2.08	1.69
	SD	1.34	1.00	1.11

Therefore the data will be treated (and discussed) as one sample for the remainder of the paper. Thus, although the data was collected at three separate times and at three separate locations; there is enough evidence to support combining the data into one larger sample.

The purpose of the norm pilot survey was to determine if the behaviors included in the WHI all violated a social or organizational norm. Prior to administering the survey, it was decided that a behavior would be viewed as a violation of a social norm if at least half of the respondents indicated that they believed that it was a violation of social norms. The same was true for organizational norms. To be included on the WHI an act only needed to violate a social or an organizational norm. However, thirty-five of the forty behaviors were found to be considered violations of both social and organizational norms. Thirty-nine behaviors were judged to violate organizational norms (the exception being "...refused your requests for assistance"). Thirty-six behaviors were judged to violate social norms (the exceptions being the following: "...broke promises he/she/they made to you," "prevented you from expressing yourself," "did not defend you when people spoke poorly of you," and "excluded you from work-related social gatherings").

Thus, every behavior was found to either violate a social norm, an organizational norm, or (as in most cases) both kinds of norms. That is to say, every behavior satisfied the condition of norm violation stipulated in the definition of WHI and will therefore be included in the WHI. For a complete break down of how participants judged each of the behaviors, see Tables below for social norms judgments and organizational norms respectively.

Table 6.2 Norms Pilot Survey; Counts and percentages of response to whether each behavior is a violation of a social norm

	Yes		No		Not Sure	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Do you think the following behavior violates SOCIAL norms of behavior?						
A person or group of people...						
delayed work to make you look bad or slow you down	34	80.95	6	14.29	2	4.76
defaced, damaged, or stole your personal property	33	78.57	6	14.29	2	4.76
attempted to turn other employees against you	33	78.57	7	16.67	2	4.76
intentionally made errors that affected your job	33	78.57	6	14.29	3	7.14
subjected you to obscene or inappropriate gestures	32	76.19	8	19.05	2	4.76
took credit for your work or ideas	32	76.19	8	19.05	2	4.76
sabotaged equipment you needed to do your job	32	76.19	7	16.67	3	7.14
swore at you in a hostile manner	31	73.81	8	19.05	2	4.76
deliberately invaded your privacy	31	73.81	9	21.43	2	4.76
subjected you to negative comments about your intelligence or competence	30	71.43	7	16.67	5	11.90
interfered with your work activities	30	71.43	9	21.43	3	7.14
consistently showed up late to meetings you hosted	30	71.43	10	23.81	1	2.38
reprimanded you in front of others	29	69.05	9	21.43	4	9.52
put you down in front of others	29	69.05	10	23.81	3	7.14
held or attended meetings about your work without your presence	29	69.05	9	21.43	3	7.14
unnecessarily transmitted damaging information to higher levels in the organization	29	69.05	7	16.67	4	9.52
subjected you to derogatory name calling	28	66.67	10	23.81	4	9.52
blamed you for other peoples' mistakes	28	66.67	9	21.43	4	9.52
deliberately invaded your privacy	28	66.67	7	16.67	7	16.67
doubted your judgment on a matter over which you have responsibility	27	64.29	11	26.19	4	9.52
excluded you from professional camaraderie	27	64.29	9	21.43	5	11.90
yelled or shouted at you	26	61.90	7	16.67	8	19.05
spread rumors or gossiped about you	26	61.90	12	28.57	4	9.52
subjected you to excessively harsh criticism about your work	26	61.90	13	30.95	3	7.14
belittled you or your ideas	26	61.90	12	28.57	4	9.52
stormed out of a public work area when you entered	25	59.52	11	26.19	5	11.90
ignored your contributions	25	59.52	13	30.95	4	9.52
ridiculed you	25	59.52	11	26.19	6	14.29
prevented you from interacting with your (other) coworkers	25	59.52	12	28.57	5	11.90
took advantage of you	25	59.52	11	26.19	5	11.90
gave you the 'silent treatment'	24	57.14	14	33.33	4	9.52
refused your requests for assistance	24	57.14	15	35.71	3	7.14
showed favoritism to other employees	24	57.14	14	33.33	4	9.52
talked down to you	24	57.14	16	38.10	2	4.76
lied to you	22	52.38	15	35.71	5	11.90
laughed in your face	22	52.38	14	33.33	4	9.52
broke promises he/she/they made to you	20	47.62	17	40.48	5	11.90
prevented you from expressing yourself	19	45.24	18	42.86	4	9.52
did not defend you when people spoke poorly of you	17	40.48	21	50.00	4	9.52
excluded you from work-related social gatherings	15	35.71	13	30.95	12	28.57

Table 6.3 Norms Pilot Survey; Counts and percentages of response to whether each behavior is a violation of an organizational norm

	Yes		No		Not Sure	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Do you think the following behavior violates ORGANIZATIONAL norms of behavior?						
A person or group of people...						
deliberately invaded your privacy	36	87.80	5	12.20	0	0.00
took advantage of you	32	78.05	8	19.51	2	4.88
swore at you in a hostile manner	32	78.05	5	12.20	5	12.20
subjected you to negative comments about your intelligence or competence	32	78.05	7	17.07	3	7.32
put you down in front of others	31	75.61	9	21.95	0	0.00
deliberately invaded your privacy	31	75.61	8	19.51	1	2.44
defaced, damaged, or stole your personal property	31	75.61	8	19.51	3	7.32
belittled you or your ideas	31	75.61	10	24.39	1	2.44
subjected you to obscene or inappropriate gestures	30	73.17	10	24.39	2	4.88
laughed in your face	30	73.17	10	24.39	2	4.88
prevented you from expressing yourself	29	70.73	11	26.83	2	4.88
delayed work to make you look bad or slow you down	29	70.73	12	29.27	1	2.44
took credit for your work or ideas	28	68.29	11	26.83	1	2.44
talked down to you	28	68.29	13	31.71	1	2.44
subjected you to derogatory name calling	28	68.29	9	21.95	3	7.32
spread rumors or gossiped about you	28	68.29	12	29.27	0	0.00
lied to you	28	68.29	10	24.39	1	2.44
broke promises he/she/they made to you	28	68.29	11	26.83	2	4.88
stormed out of a public work area when you entered	27	65.85	11	26.83	3	7.32
showed favoritism to other employees	27	65.85	13	31.71	2	4.88
sabotaged equipment you needed to do your job	27	65.85	11	26.83	4	9.76
intentionally made errors that affected your job	27	65.85	11	26.83	3	7.32
yelled or shouted at you	26	63.41	11	26.83	4	9.76
unnecessarily transmitted damaging information to higher levels in the organization	26	63.41	9	21.95	6	14.63
ridiculed you	26	63.41	11	26.83	2	4.88
interfered with your work activities	26	63.41	11	26.83	4	9.76
held or attended meetings about your work without your presence	26	63.41	13	31.71	3	7.32
subjected you to excessively harsh criticism about your work	25	60.98	13	31.71	2	4.88
reprimanded you in front of others	25	60.98	11	26.83	3	7.32
ignored your contributions	25	60.98	13	31.71	4	9.76
consistently showed up late to meetings you hosted	25	60.98	14	34.15	2	4.88
blamed you for other peoples' mistakes	25	60.98	11	26.83	2	4.88
attempted to turn other employees against you	25	60.98	12	29.27	3	7.32
gave you the 'silent treatment'	24	58.54	12	29.27	5	12.20
excluded you from work-related social gatherings	23	56.10	12	29.27	6	14.63
excluded you from professional camaraderie	23	56.10	16	39.02	3	7.32
did not defend you when people spoke poorly of you	22	53.66	16	39.02	4	9.76
prevented you from interacting with your (other) coworkers	21	51.22	16	39.02	4	9.76
doubted your judgment on a matter over which you have responsibility	21	51.22	16	39.02	5	12.20
refused your requests for assistance	20	48.78	17	41.46	5	12.20

Instrument Pilot Study

As was mentioned previously, the point of the instrument pilot study was to determine if the instrument had any errors and was ready to be administered to the main study group. As such, the analyses conducted on the data collected from the instrument pilot study dealt primarily with examining the demographics of the sample and testing the soundness of the measures.

The first step in the analyses of the instrument pilot study was to determine the make-up of the group. The instrument pilot study participants had more general work experience ($M = 6.31$, $SD = 1.69$) than specific work experience ($M = 4.66$, $SD = 2.014$) where specific work experience was experience in their current position. See Tables below for the frequencies related to overall work experience and job specific work experience respectively.

Table 6.4 Instrument Pilot Study, Overall Work Experience

How Many Years of Work Experience Do You Have?		
	Count	%
1-2 yrs	3	9%
3-5 yrs	3	9%
6-10 yrs	5	14%
11-15 yrs	6	17%
16-20 yrs	5	14%
> 20 yrs	13	37%

Table 6.5 Instrument Pilot Study, Specific Work Experience

	Count	%
< 1 yr	5	14%
1 yr	4	11%
2 yrs	2	6%
3-5 yrs	10	29%
6-10 yrs	7	20%
11-15 yrs	1	3%
> 16 yrs	4	11%

For both general and specific work experience, the sample was relatively diverse, with participants spread throughout the possible range. The same was also true for the ages of the participant. The mean age was 39.23, with a range of 22 to 66 years and SD = 12.29. There were almost twice as many female respondents (N=23) as male respondents (N=12).

The survey contained a total of 39 hostile behaviors. Thus, each participant could report that he/she had been a victim of any (or all) of the 39 behaviors. The behaviors were intended to encompass a variety of non-physical aggressive behaviors. Participants were asked to answer 3 questions about each behavior. First, each participant was asked to indicate whether he/she was a victim of each of the specific behaviors listed. If the participant indicated that the behavior had not occurred then he/she was instructed not to answer the remaining 2 questions. On the other hand, if participants indicated that the behavior had occurred then they were instructed to rate their personal level of upset and the perceived intent of the perpetrator.

First, of the thirty-five respondents, thirty-two (91%) of the respondents indicated that they had experienced hostile behavior in the workplace. The following Table contains the frequency of “yes” responses from participants when asked if a behavior included on WHI had occurred to them.

Table 6.6 Instrument Pilot Survey, Overall Frequency of Hostile behaviors

Number of Respondents Who Reported Experiencing Each Behavior			
	Frequency	% of those who experienced ANY hostility	% of total
The perpetrator:			
...doubted your judgment on a matter over which you have responsibility	29	91%	83%
...showed favoritism to other employees	26	81%	74%
...talked down to you	26	81%	74%
...belittled you or your ideas	25	78%	71%
...yelled or shouted at you	24	75%	69%
...gave you the 'silent treatment'	22	69%	63%
...ignored your contributions	22	69%	63%
...blamed you for other peoples' mistakes	22	69%	63%
...subjected you to excessively harsh criticism about your work	22	69%	63%
...did not defend you when people spoke poorly of you	22	69%	63%
...refused your requests for assistance	21	66%	60%
...spread rumors or gossiped about you	21	66%	60%
...subjected you to negative comments about your intelligence or competence	19	59%	54%
...reprimanded you in front of others	19	59%	54%
...put you down in front of others	19	59%	54%
...lied to you	18	56%	51%
...attempted to turn other employees against you	18	56%	51%
...interfered with your work activities	16	50%	46%
...ridiculed you	15	47%	43%
...prevented you from expressing yourself	15	47%	43%
...held or attended meetings about your work without your presence	15	47%	43%
...unnecessarily transmitted damaging information to higher levels in the organization	15	47%	43%
...took advantage of you	14	44%	40%
...swore at you in a hostile manner	13	41%	37%
...broke promises he/she/they made to you	12	38%	34%
...excluded you from professional camaraderie	12	38%	34%
...subjected you to obscene or inappropriate gestures	11	34%	31%
...took credit for your work or ideas	11	34%	31%
...excluded you from work-related social gatherings	10	31%	29%
...deliberately invaded your privacy	10	31%	29%
...laughed in your face	10	31%	29%
...subjected you to derogatory name calling	9	28%	26%
...intentionally made errors that affected your job	8	25%	23%
...delayed work to make you look bad or slow you down	8	25%	23%
...stormed out of a public work area when you entered	7	22%	20%
...prevented you from interacting with your (other) coworkers	7	22%	20%
...consistently showed up late to meetings you hosted	7	22%	20%
...defaced, damaged, or stole your personal property	3	9%	9%
...sabotaged equipment you needed to do your job	3	9%	9%

The frequency of “yeses” for the behaviors ranged from only three (or 9% of the people who reported experiencing any hostility) participants reporting having experienced the behavior to 29 (or 91% of the people who reported any hostility). The average number of participants who reported experiencing a particular behavior was 17.84, $SD = 6.26$.

Next, participants were asked to indicate how upset they were when the behavior occurred. Only participants who reported experiencing a behavior were asked to respond to this question. In other words, the number responding for each behavior was different from the next behavior, contingent upon the participant’s particular experiences. The Table below contains the average upset rating scores for each of the behaviors. The higher the mean value for a behavior, the higher the level of upset reported by participants.

Table 6.7 Instrument Pilot Study, Level of Upset at the Hostile Behaviors

Mean Level of Upset (1 = Not at all to 5 = Very) at the Behaviors		
	Mean	N
How Upset were you when the perpetrator:		
... sabotaged equipment you needed to do your job	5.00	2
... defaced, damaged, or stole your personal property	5.00	1
... deliberately invaded your privacy	4.67	4
... held or attended meetings about your work without your presence	4.58	14
... unnecessarily transmitted damaging information to higher level	4.50	15
... deliberately invaded your privacy	4.50	9
... subjected you to derogatory name calling	4.40	6
... blamed you for other peoples' mistakes	4.31	18
... reprimanded you in front of others	4.25	18
... swore at you in a hostile manner	4.22	11
... put you down in front of others	4.20	17
... intentionally made errors that affected your job	4.20	6
... consistently showed up late to meetings you hosted	4.17	6
... took credit for your work or ideas	4.13	10
... prevented you from expressing yourself	4.08	14
... did not defend you when people spoke poorly of you	4.06	21
... doubted your judgment on a matter over which you have resp	4.04	27
... talked down to you	4.00	25
... subjected you to negative comments about your intelligence	4.00	16
... lied to you	4.00	15
... delayed work to make you look bad or slow you down	4.00	8
... stormed out of a public work area when you entered	4.00	5
... interfered with your work activities	3.92	14
... ridiculed you	3.92	13
... refused your requests for assistance	3.88	18
... attempted to turn other employees against you	3.88	17
... took advantage of you	3.85	13
... subjected you to excessively harsh criticism about your work	3.84	21
... belittled you or your ideas	3.82	24
... ignored your contributions	3.79	20
... yelled or shouted at you	3.76	21
... spread rumors or gossiped about you	3.76	18
... showed favoritism to other employees	3.68	25
... broke promises he/she/they made to you	3.64	11
... excluded you from professional camaraderie	3.63	10
... laughed in your face	3.50	9
... gave you the silent treatment	3.44	19
... subjected you to obscene or inappropriate gestures	3.43	9
... prevented you from interacting with your (other) coworkers	3.20	5
... excluded you from work-related social gatherings	2.71	8

Finally, participants were asked to indicate the perceived intent of the person who perpetrated the behavior. As with the previous question, only those who experienced a behavior were asked to complete this question. The following Table contains the intent frequencies for each of the behaviors. The table contains three columns, the first of which contains the number of people indicating that they thought the behavior was intended to be hostile. The second column contains the count of everyone who experienced the behavior. The third column contains the percent of the participants experiencing the behavior that found it be harmful. Participants' experience related to the behaviors varied, with the values in column three ranging from 13% to 94%, $M = 53\%$ and $SD = 17.98\%$.

Table 6.8 Instrument Pilot Survey, Intent of the Perpetrator

Do you think the Intent of the Behavior was to Harm?			
	Yes	Count of ALL of who Experienced the Behavior	% of All who Experienced the Behavior & Thought it was Harmful
The intent was to HARM when the perpetrator:			
...attempted to turn other employees against you	16	17	94%
...spread rumors or gossiped about you	16	19	84%
...belittled you or your ideas	20	24	83%
...subjected you to excessively harsh criticism about your wo	19	24	79%
...laughed in your face	9	12	75%
...put you down in front of others	13	18	72%
...talked down to you	20	28	71%
...gave you the silent treatment	15	23	65%
...ridiculed you	11	17	65%
...reprimanded you in front of others	13	21	62%
...subjected you to negative comments about your intelligence	14	23	61%
...ignored your contributions	13	22	59%
...prevented you from expressing yourself	10	17	59%
...blamed you for other peoples' mistakes	11	19	58%
...yelled or shouted at you	16	28	57%
...doubted your judgment on a matter over which you have resp	16	28	57%
...lied to you	10	18	56%
...subjected you to obscene or inappropriate gestures	5	9	56%
...refused your requests for assistance	12	22	55%
...unnecessarily transmitted damaging information to higher l	13	24	54%
...did not defend you when people spoke poorly of you	16	30	53%
...excluded you from professional camaraderie	9	17	53%
...showed favoritism to other employees	13	25	52%
...held or attended meetings about your work without your pre	12	24	50%
...swore at you in a hostile manner	7	14	50%
...delayed work to make you look bad or slow you down	7	14	50%
...deliberately invaded your privacy	6	12	50%
...subjected you to derogatory name calling	5	10	50%
...broke promises he/she/they made to you	8	17	47%
...interfered with your work activities	6	16	38%
...took credit for your work or ideas	6	16	38%
...deliberately invaded your privacy	3	8	38%
...took advantage of you	7	19	37%
...prevented you from interacting with your (other) coworkers	4	12	33%
...intentionally made errors that affected your job	4	13	31%
...excluded you from work-related social gatherings	4	14	29%
...stormed out of a public work area when you entered	3	11	27%
...defaced, damaged, or stole your personal property	1	4	25%
...consistently showed up late to meetings you hosted	4	18	22%
...sabotaged equipment you needed to do your job	1	8	13%

When asked about their current job, participants indicated that, for the most part, they liked their job (“Do you like your current job?” Yes N = 29 or 83%) and either intended to stay at their current job (N = 17 or 49%) or had no plans to leave (N = 14 or 40%). In others words, in spite of a relatively high amount of reported experience with hostile behaviors, the majority of the participants reported being relatively satisfied in their current position with no clear intent to leave.

Main Study

As with the previous two samples, it is important to first examine the make-up of the current sample before discussing the results of the analyses. The ages of the main sample were roughly equivalent to the ages in the instrument pilot study sample, with M = 36.51 and SD = 12.39. As with the instrument pilot study sample, the main sample was composed of far more female respondents (N = 275 or 70%) than male respondents (N = 118 or 30%). The general and specific experience level of the respondents was varied as can be seen below.

Table 6.9 Main Study, How many years of experience do you have in the workforce?

	Frequency	%
I have never had a job	1	0.25%
Less than 1 yr	6	1.53%
1 to 2 yrs	16	4.07%
3 to 5 yrs	50	12.72%
6 to 10 yrs	98	24.94%
11 to 15 yrs	60	15.27%
16 to 20 yrs	48	12.21%
More than 20 yrs	114	29.01%

Table 6.10 Main Study, How many years of experience do you have at your current job?

	Frequency	%
I have never had a job	1	0.25%
Less than one yr	69	17.56%
1 to 2 yrs	90	22.90%
3 to 5 yrs	97	24.68%
6 to 10 yrs	63	16.03%
11 to 15 yrs	30	7.63%
16 to 20 yrs	18	4.58%
More than 20 yrs	25	6.36%

It is worth noting that one participant indicated that he/she had not worked at all. Due to the nature of the data collection method, it was possible to get a respondent who had not worked at all. However, his experiences are not really relevant to the current study and he/she was not included in any subsequent analyses. In addition to being diverse in terms of the amount of work experience each participant possessed, the sample was diverse in terms of the field of employment.

Table 6.11 Main Study, Into which of the following categories does your current job best fit?

	Frequency	%
Education-Training	35	8.93%
Other	35	8.93%
Government-Military	30	7.65%
Technology	29	7.40%
Clerical-Administrative	29	7.40%
Human Resources	26	6.63%
Healthcare	25	6.38%
Accounting-Finance	22	5.61%
Non-Profit-Volunteer	16	4.08%
Retail	15	3.83%
Arts-Entertainment-Publishing	11	2.81%
Legal	11	2.81%
Engineering-Architecture	11	2.81%
Manufacturing-Operations	10	2.55%
Customer Service	10	2.55%
College	9	2.30%
Sales	9	2.30%
Defense-Aerospace	8	2.04%
Restaurant-Food Service	6	1.53%
Insurance	6	1.53%
Advertising-PR	5	1.28%
Marketing	5	1.28%
Pharmaceutical-Biotech	4	1.02%
Internet-New Media	3	0.77%
Law Enforcement-Security	3	0.77%
Banking-Mortgage	3	0.77%
Management Consulting	3	0.77%
Construction-Facilities	3	0.77%
Hospitality-Travel	3	0.77%
Transportation-Logistics	3	0.77%
Real Estate	2	0.51%
Telecommunications	2	0.51%

Of the 393 respondents in the main study sample, 309 (or 78.6%) reported experiencing hostile behaviors at work. This particular study is interested in the experiences of those who have experienced hostility in the workplace, not those that have not. For that reason, except when specifically noted, the subsequent analyses will only include the participants who reported experiencing hostility. In other words, the N for most of the remaining analyses was 309, not 393. The remaining results will relate specifically to the goals and hypotheses of the current study and will be presented accordingly.

Factor Analysis

The first analysis that was conducted was an exploratory factor analysis. For this factor analysis, the forty behaviors were examined on the basis of the upset score (i.e., How upset were you when the event occurred?) for each behavior provided by the participant. Prior to running the analyses, two things were done: first some behaviors were excluded and the remaining variables were recoded. First, the individual N for each question varied greatly. Some of the questions had fewer than 90 respondents (i.e., less than 30% of the people who reported experiencing WH). Using questions that were so poorly represented was not deemed prudent and 10 questions (all of which had Ns less than 90) were excluded from factor analysis. The excluded behaviors can be seen in the table below.

Table 6.12 Main Survey; Items removed from the Factor Analysis

How upset were you when the perpetrator(s):

- ... excluded you from work-related social gatherings
 - ... stormed out of a public work area when you entered
 - ... defaced, damaged, or stole your personal property
 - ... subjected you to obscene or inappropriate gestures
 - ... spread rumors or gossiped about you
 - prevented you from interacting with your (other) coworkers
 - ... sabotaged equipment you needed to do your job
 - ... intentionally made errors that affected your job
 - delayed work to make you look bad or slow you down
 - consistently showed up late to meetings you hosted
-

Second, any participant who did not experience the behavior was assigned a value of one, a value that indicated that there was no level of upset associated with a particular behavior. Thus, the range of possible responses for the level of upset associated with a behavior included 1 = Not at all to 6 = Very upset. The higher a score was, the more upsetting it was reported to have been. See the following Table for the mean upset scores for each behavior.

Table 6.13 Main Study, Mean upset score for behaviors included in the Factor Analysis

	M	SD	N
How upset were you when the perpetrator(s):			
... swore at you in a hostile manner	2.90	1.51	278.00
... gave you the silent treatment	3.66	1.49	280.00
... refused your requests for assistance	3.75	1.66	277.00
... yelled or shouted at you	3.69	1.76	245.00
... subjected you to negative comments about your intelligence or competence	3.93	1.74	217.00
... ignored your contributions	4.33	1.58	255.00
... interfered with your work activities	3.88	1.68	260.00
... lied to you	3.55	1.73	244.00
... subjected you to derogatory name calling	2.74	1.43	272.00
... blamed you for other peoples' mistakes	3.43	1.72	246.00
... spread rumors or gossiped about you	3.29	1.66	257.00
... attempted to turn other employees against you	3.62	1.70	238.00
... subjected you to excessively harsh criticism about your work	3.49	1.77	243.00
... took credit for your work or ideas	3.00	1.59	263.00
... reprimanded you in front of others	3.13	1.63	241.00
... ridiculed you	3.38	1.70	243.00
... put you down in front of others	3.57	1.70	228.00
... deliberately invaded your privacy	2.54	1.23	259.00
... broke promises he/she/they made to you	2.78	1.41	276.00
... showed favoritism to other employees	3.44	1.59	263.00
... doubted your judgment on a matter over which you have responsibility	3.79	1.73	231.00
... belittled you or your ideas	3.71	1.77	251.00
... did not defend you when people spoke poorly of you	3.08	1.52	279.00
... talked down to you	4.30	1.65	225.00
... took advantage of you	2.97	1.57	255.00
... prevented you from expressing yourself	3.06	1.61	272.00
... laughed in your face	2.86	1.45	277.00
... excluded you from professional camaraderie	3.05	1.48	280.00
... held or attended meetings about your work without your presence	2.73	1.43	274.00
... unnecessarily transmitted damaging information to higher levels in the organization	2.63	1.32	248.00

It was expected that the factors identified by the factor analysis would be correlated, therefore Principle Axis Factoring (PAF) with Promax (oblique) rotation was used. Examining the pattern matrix indicated that there were three clear factors. To be included in the final subscales, an item needed a loading of at least .3. Additionally, if an item was cross-loaded, it was included only in scale on which it most highly loaded. See below for the pattern matrix and loading for each variable.

Table 6.14 Main Study, Pattern Matrix for the Promax PAF

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Perpetrator(s) spread rumors or gossiped about you	0.78		
Perpetrator(s) attempted to turn other employees against you	0.69		
Perpetrator(s) lied to you	0.63		
Perpetrator(s) did not defend you when people spoke poorly of you	0.56		
Perpetrator(s) unnecessarily transmitted damaging information to higher levels in the organization	0.55		
Perpetrator(s) held or attended meetings about your work without your presence	0.46		
Perpetrator(s) showed favoritism to other employees	0.45		
Perpetrator(s) interfered with your work activities	0.45		
Perpetrator(s) refused your requests for assistance	0.42		
Perpetrator(s) excluded you from professional camaraderie	0.39		
Perpetrator(s) took advantage of you	0.37		
Perpetrator(s) broke promises he/she/they made to you	0.37		
Perpetrator(s) took credit for your work or ideas	0.36		
Perpetrator(s) deliberately invaded your privacy	0.35		
Perpetrator(s) gave you the silent treatment	0.35		
Perpetrator(s) ignored your contributions		0.47	
Perpetrator(s) blamed you for other peoples' mistakes		0.37	
Perpetrator(s) prevented you from expressing yourself		0.40	
Perpetrator(s) doubted your judgment on a matter over which you have responsibility		0.62	
Perpetrator(s) belittled you or your ideas		0.63	
Perpetrator(s) subjected you to excessively harsh criticism about your work		0.66	
Perpetrator(s) subjected you to negative comments about your intelligence or competence		0.52	
Perpetrator(s) talked down to you		0.64	
Perpetrator(s) reprimanded you in front of others		0.70	
Perpetrator(s) yelled or shouted at you		0.47*	
Perpetrator(s) put you down in front of others			0.43*
Perpetrator(s) laughed in your face			0.48
Perpetrator(s) subjected you to derogatory name calling			0.71
Perpetrator(s) ridiculed you			0.51
Perpetrator(s) swore at you in a hostile manner			0.61

* Cross loading occurred, the variable was associated with the

The three factors were identified and labeled as follows: interference with work, exclusion, and denigration. The coefficient alphas for each scale are interference with work .83, . exclusion 77, and denigration .57. The summated items scores for three factors identified in the above factor analysis will be used in subsequent analyses.

Hypothesis 1

This hypothesis will assess the subscales identified in the exploratory factor analysis. This was accomplished using a regression analysis where the scores on the WH subscales were be the predictors and the occurrence of hostile behaviors (i.e., Have you been subject to hostile behaviors at work?) will be the criterion. The criterion variable was recoded to ease in interpretation and understanding. After the recode, the higher value (2) indicated the occurrence of hostility in the workplace, whereas the lower value (1) indicated that hostility had not occurred. The Table below contains the condition means and standard deviations.

Table 6.15 Main Study, Means and Standard Deviations for WH by Level of the Perpetrator

	M	SD	N
Interference	2.88	1.53	391.00
Exclusion	2.43	1.36	391.00
Denigration	2.31	1.36	391.00

Standard multiple regression was conducted to determine the accuracy of the factors identified in the previous factor analysis (interference with work, denigration, and exclusion) in predicting the occurrence of hostility in the workplace. Regression results indicate that the overall model significantly predicts the occurrence of hostility in the workplace, $R^2 = .42$, $F(3, 387) = 94.68$, $p < .05$. This model accounts for 42% of the variance in the occurrence of hostility in the workplace.

Table 6.16 Main Study, Coefficients for Denigration, Exclusion, & Interference Predicting the Occurrence of WH

	β	95% CI	a	R	R^2	ΔR^2
DV: Hostile behaviors at work			1.26	0.65**	0.42**	.42**
Interference	0.13*	-0.19 , 0.16				
Exclusion	0.05*	-0.08 , 0.12				
Denigration	0.01	-0.02 , 0.06				

Note. CI = Confidence Interval; DV = Dependent Variable
 **p<.01

An examination of the regression coefficients indicates that two of the factors, interference with work and exclusion, significantly contributed to the model. Denigration did not make a significant contribution to the overall model.

Hypothesis 2a

The possibility of a power differential between the targets and perpetrators was first examined using a MANOVA where the WH subscales were the dependent variables and the perpetrator’s level within the organization (Non-Supervisory, Supervisory, Mixed) was the Independent variable. See the Table below for the means and standard deviations for each condition.

Table 6.17 Main Study, Means and Standard Deviations for WH by Level of the Perpetrator

WH Scale	Non-Supervisory		Supervisory		Other/Mixed	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
DV: Perpetrator Level						
Interference	2.95	1.25	2.72	1.15	2.22	1.00
Exclusion	3.84	1.25	2.93	1.33	3.11	1.45
Denigration	3.19	1.33	2.69	1.45	2.57	1.31

The results of the MANOVA indicated that the perpetrators level within the organization significantly affect the combined dependent variable of the WH subscales, Wilks’ $\Delta = .837$, $F(6, 304) = 9.6$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .085$. Of the three subscales, two were found to be significant in differentiating between the levels of the perpetrators, namely interference and denigration. In other words, participants with a combination of high denigration and high interference scores are

more likely to be classified as having experienced hostility at the hands of a supervisor than those without high scores in the two areas.

Although only two of the three subscales were found to be significantly related to the perpetrator's level, it is worth noting that the subscales were related to each other in this analysis. Examining the pooled within-group correlations among the predictors indicates that even though exclusion was not found to significantly contribute to identifying the perpetrator's level, that it was related to both interference and denigration. In other words, there is some redundancy in the predictors and the fact that the explained variance has been assigned to one variable does not mean that other variables do not also explain some of the same variance.

Hypothesis 2b

The targets' desire to leave the organization and their level of dislike for the position was assessed by conducting two regressions, one where the criterion is target's expressed desire to leave and the other where the criterion is the target's expressed dislike for the position. For both of the regression equations, the WH subscale scores were the predictors.

The first regression analysis was a stepwise regression and it examined the participant's expressed desire to leave. The desire to leave was measured based off of the participant's response to the following question: "Do you intend to stay at you current job?" Participants could respond to the question with "Yes," (N = 113) "No," (N = 86) "Not sure, no plans to leave," (N = 66) and "Not sure, tentative plans to leave" (N = 44). For this analysis, "Yes" and "Not sure, no plans to leave" were combined into one category that represented at the very least a willingness (as opposed to the intent) to stay at their current job. Thus, it was judged that lacking a plan to leaving indicated, on some level, a desire to stay. After the categories were combined, the Ns were as follows: N = 179, 86, and 44 for "Yes/No plans to leave," "Tentative plans to leave", and "No" respectively. Additionally, the intent to stay variable was recoded so that the lower the value, the less likely it was that a person wanted to leave. Therefore, 1 = "Yes/No plans to leave," 2 = "Tentative plans to leave," and 3 = "No."

Prior to running the regression, a chi-square test was conducted to verify if there was a difference between the responses based on the perpetrator's level (non-supervisory or non-supervisory). A difference was found, $\chi^2(2, N = 256) = 6.15, p < .05$. Participants who were

subjected to hostility at the hands of supervisor were more likely to indicate that they planned to leave their current job or had tentative plans to leave.

Regression results indicate that the stepwise model significantly predicts a participant's desire to leave, $R^2 = .05$, $F(1, 307) = 14.60$, $p < .05$. Only one of the three subscales, interference with work, significantly contributed to the model which accounts for 5% of the variance in the desire to leave the current job. The remaining two subscales, denigration and exclusion, did not significantly account for any of the variance in a participant's desire to leave. See below for the complete regression results.

Table 6.18 Main Sample - Stepwise Regression Coefficients for Denigration, Exclusion, & Interference Predicting the Intent to Stay at Current Job (N = 309)

	<i>Step</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Included Variable							
Interference	1.00	0.21	0.05	0.05	0.14	9.15	0.00
Excluded Variables							
Exclusion	--	--	--	--	0.07	1.12	0.26
Denigration	--	--	--	--	0.09	1.32	0.19

The second regression analysis was also a stepwise regression and it examined the participant's dislike for their current position. The dislike of the current position was measured using the response to the following question: "Do you like your current job?" As with the previous regression, this variable was recoded so that the lower a value, the more the participant liked their position. That is to say, 1 = "Yes" (N = 109), 2 = "Not sure" (N = 44), and 3 = "No" (N = 66).

As with the previous regression, prior to running it, a chi-square test was conducted to verify if there was a difference between the responses based on the perpetrator's level (non-supervisory or non-supervisory). A difference was found, $\chi^2(2, N = 256) = 7.4$, $p < .05$. Participants who were subjected to hostility at the hands of supervisor were more likely to indicate that they disliked their current job or were not sure if they liked their current job.

The regression results indicate that the stepwise model significantly predicts a participant's desire to leave, $R^2 = .02$, $F(1, 307) = 7.65$, $p < .05$. Again, only one of the three subscales, interference with work, significantly contributed to the model that accounted for 2% of the variance in satisfaction with the current job. The remaining two subscales, denigration

and exclusion, did not significantly account for any of the variance in a participant's desire to leave. See the Table below for the complete regression results.

Table 6.19 Main Study - Stepwise Regression Coefficients for Denigration, Exclusion, & Interference Predicting the Satisfaction with Current Job

	<i>Step</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Included Variable							
Interference	1.00	0.16	0.02	0.02	0.10	2.77	0.01
Excluded Variables							
Exclusion	--	--	--	--	0.06	0.83	0.41
Denigration	--	--	--	--	0.01	0.10	0.92

Hypothesis 3

To determine if the instigation of certain behaviors varied by the gender of the perpetrator and the level of a perpetrator, a MANOVA was conducted. See below for the mean breakdown by gender and rank within the organization.

Table 6.20 Main study - Means and Standard Deviations for WH by Level of the Perpetrator & Gender of the Perpetrator

WH Scale	Non-Supervisory		Supervisory		Other/Mixed	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
	Males					
Interference	3.09	1.05	3.87	1.18	2.52	1.02
Exclusion	2.59	1.16	2.78	1.22	1.79	1.00
Denigration	2.21	0.92	2.93	1.33	1.98	0.81
	Females					
Interference	2.87	1.35	3.81	1.35	2.75	1.26
Exclusion	2.80	1.14	3.10	1.43	2.18	1.52
Denigration	2.22	1.05	3.32	1.56	2.05	1.42
	Mixed					
Interference	--	--	--	--	3.58	1.35
Exclusion	--	--	--	--	3.18	1.40
Denigration	--	--	--	--	2.94	1.34

This MANOVA included gender (male, female, or mixed) and level of the perpetrator (supervisory, non-supervisory, mixed) as the independent variables and the WH subscale scores as the dependent variables. The results of the MANOVA indicated that the perpetrator's gender within the organization significantly affected the combined dependent variable of the WH subscales, Wilks' $\Delta = .96$, $F(6, 600) = 2.32$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .02$ and the same was true for the perpetrator's level within the organization, Wilks' $\Delta = .88$, $F(6, 600) = 6.83$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .02$. Both the perpetrator's gender and the level were found to be related to at least one subscale. However, the combination of the two independent variables was not related to any of the subscales (See table below).

Table 6.21 Main Study - MANOVA & Discriminant Function Analysis for WH by Gender of the Perpetrator

Predictor Variable	Correlation Coefficients with Sig. Discriminant Functions	Standardized Function Coefficients	Correlation Coefficients with Sig. Discriminant Functions	Standardized Function Coefficients	<i>Wilk's Lambda (6, 600)</i>	Pooled Within-Group Correlations among Predictors		
	<i>Perpetrator's Gender</i>	<i>Perpetrator's Gender</i>	<i>Perpetrator's Level</i>	<i>Perpetrator's Level</i>		<i>Interference</i>	<i>Exclusion</i>	<i>Denigration</i>
Interference	-0.22	0.47	0.72	0.58		1.00	0.55	0.56
Exclusion	-0.91	-0.95	0.26	-0.57			1.00	0.60
Denigration	-0.68	-0.34	0.83	0.88				1.00
Canonical R	0.21		0.34		0.96			
Eigenvalue	0.05		0.13					

*p < .05

With regards to the perpetrator's gender, of the three subscales, two subscales were found to be related to gender of the perpetrator, exclusion and denigration. There was a stronger relationship between exclusion and the perpetrator's gender than with denigration and the perpetrator's gender. Thus, two scales were related in such a way so that participants with low denigration ratings and also with low exclusion ratings were most likely to have been classified as having experienced hostility at the hands of a man.

Due to the fact that the perpetrator's level was previously discussed and did not significantly interact with the perpetrator's gender, this analysis will not be discussed again.

However, as with the previous MANOVA, it is worth noting that the pooled within group correlations were relatively high and therefore it is possible that the individual scales accounted for redundant variance.

Hypothesis 4

To examine the effects of multiple perpetrators when compared to a lone perpetrator, a MANOVA was conducted where the number of perpetrators (one versus more than one) was the independent variable and the WH subscale scores will be the dependent variable. The results of the MANOVA indicated that the number of perpetrators significantly affected the combined dependent variable of the WH subscales, Wilks' $\Delta = .85$, $F(3, 305) = 17.83$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .149$. Thus, participants with high Exclusion ratings, high Denigration ratings, and lower Interference with work scores are most likely to be classified as having experienced hostility at the hands of a group of perpetrators as opposed to at the hands of a lone perpetrator. (See Table below).

Table 6.22 Main Study. MANOVA & Discriminant Function Analysis for WH by Number of Perpetrators

Predictor Variable	Correlation Coefficients with Sig. Discriminant Functions	Standardized Function Coefficients	<i>Wilk's Lambda (6, 608)</i>	<i>Univariate F (2, 306)</i>	Pooled Within-Group Correlations among Predictors		
					<i>Interference</i>	<i>Exclusion</i>	<i>Denigration</i>
Interference	0.50	-0.11			1.00	0.51	0.53
Exclusion	0.95	0.78		13.69*		1.00	0.55
Denigration	0.78	0.41		48.14*			1.00
Canonical R	0.39		.85*	32.78*			
Eigenvalue	0.18						

*p < .05

Testing the Model

In addition to the previous analyses, a preliminary model was tested using hierarchical regression. Two hierarchical regressions were run, both of which used job satisfaction as the criterion measure. This study defined job satisfaction as a combination of independent outcome measures related to a participants' intent to leave (long and short term), and desire to continue employment. The Table below contains the means and standard deviations of the individual items combined to create the job satisfaction measure. The coefficient alpha of the job satisfaction measure was .84.

Table 6.23 Main Study - Outcome variable "Job Satisfaction/Intent to Leave"*

	α	M	SD	N
Overall (Job Satisfaction/Intent to Leave)	0.85			
...I will be working for my current org 5 years from now -- Reverse		3.31	1.39	309.00
I probably will be in this job for some time to come -- Reverse		2.95	1.34	309.00
Do you like your current job?		1.50	0.73	309.00
Do you intend to stay at you current job		2.13	1.07	309.00
I expect to leave for another company within the next year.		2.84	1.38	309.00
I expect to change my job in the next few months.		2.64	1.39	309.00

* Response scale: 1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree, Higher scores indicate higher disagreement

The first regression included three steps and five predictor variables. In the first step, the three WH scales were entered. In the second step, two measures related to the participants' feelings about their coworkers and supervisors respectively. As with the job satisfaction measure, the measures related to feelings about coworkers and supervisors were created by combining a number of individual items related to the measure.

With regard to the feelings about supervisors, participants responded to a series of questions about how they felt about the supervisory (i.e., "I have a helpful supervisor") and how they perceived their supervisor to feel about them (i.e., "My supervisor is concerned about me"). See the Table below for the means and standard deviations of the individual items combined to make the feelings about coworkers scale. The coefficient alpha of the feelings about supervisor scale was .85.

Table 6.24 Main Study- Outcome variable "Feelings about Supervisor"

	α	M	SD	N
Overall (Feelings about Supervisor)	0.87			
My supervisor is concerned about me -- Reverse		2.86	1.27	309.00
My supervisor pays attention to me -- Reverse		2.61	1.15	309.00
I have a helpful supervisor -- Reverse		2.74	1.32	309.00
I have a hostile supervisor		2.50	1.39	309.00

* Response scale: 1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree, Higher scores indicate higher disagreement

The feelings about coworkers scale was similar to the feelings about supervisor scale in that participants responded to questions about how they felt about their coworkers (i.e., “My coworkers are competent” and “My coworkers are helpful”) and how they perceived their coworkers to feel about them (i.e., “My workers are interested in me” and “I have hostile coworkers”). See the table below for the means and standard deviations of the individual items combined to make the feelings about coworkers scale. As with the previous two scales, there was high coefficient alpha, $\alpha=.84$.

Table 6.25 Main Study- Outcome variable "Feelings about Supervisor"

	α	M	SD	N
Overall (Feelings about Coworkers)	0.85			
My coworkers and I work together -- Reverse		2.23	0.86	309.00
My coworkers are competent -- Reverse		2.25	0.89	309.00
My coworkers are interested in me -- Reverse		2.49	0.88	309.00
I have friendly coworkers -- Reverse		2.12	0.82	309.00
My coworkers are helpful -- Reverse		2.27	0.88	309.00
I have hostile coworkers		2.63	1.17	309.00

* Response scale: 1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree, Higher scores indicate higher disagreement

In the final step, a measure related to the participant’s job clarity was entered. This measurement was compiled using individual items related to participants’ feeling about their goals and objectives, what people expect of them, and their level of certainty about their authority. See below for the means and standard deviations of the individual items combined to make the job clarity scale. The coefficient alpha for the job clarity scale was .85.

Table 6.26 Main Study - Outcome variable "Job Clarity"*

	α	M	SD	N
Overall (Job Clarity)	0.85			
Are you clear about what needs to be done on your job -- Reverse		2.10	0.82	309.00
Do you know exactly what is expected of you -- Reverse		2.37	0.93	309.00
Do you feel certain about how much or how little authority you have -- Reverse		2.59	1.12	309.00
Do clear, planned goals and objectives exist for your job -- Reverse		2.64	1.07	309.00
Are you unsure about what people expect of you?		2.59	0.98	309.00
Are you confused about exactly what you are supposed to do?		2.42	0.93	309.00

* Response scale: 1 = Strongly Agree to 5 = Strongly Disagree, Higher scores indicate higher disagreement

The results of this regression indicated that in the first step interference with work, exclusion, and denigration did significantly predict WH, with interference with work explaining the bulk of the variance. Based off of the results of previous analyses, this was the expected result. However, in the second step this changed. When the feelings about coworkers and feelings about supervisor were entered, the three WH scales changed to non-significant. Feelings about supervisor explained the largest part of the variance but feelings about coworkers was also significant. In the final step, the WH scales remained non-significant while the feelings scales remained significant. The addition of job clarity, explained additional variance and significantly enhanced the model.

Table 6.27 Main Study - Hierarchical Regression Coefficients for Predicting the Satisfaction with Current Job

	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Step 1	0.27	0.07				
Interference				0.17	12.30	0.01
Exclusion				0.09	0.83	0.20
Denigration				0.05	0.10	0.49
Step 2	0.55	0.30	0.23			
Interference				0.10	1.70	0.09
Exclusion				0.06	0.88	0.38
Denigration				-0.02	-0.35	0.73
Feelings about Supervisor				0.37	6.81	0.00
Feelings about Coworkers				0.22	4.14	0.00
Step 3	0.56	0.32	0.02			
Interference				0.08	1.31	0.19
Exclusion				0.08	1.26	0.21
Denigration				-0.02	-0.33	0.74
Feelings about Supervisor				0.31	5.49	0.00
Feelings about Coworkers				0.19	3.61	0.00
Job Clarity				0.16	3.05	0.00

The second regression was very similar to the first regression however there was one additional step. This step was the second step and it included an item assessing the type of perpetrator, an individual or a group. The addition of this item did not significantly enhance the model. In other words, whether the person was subjected to WH at the hands of a group or individual did not significantly affect his job satisfaction ratings.

Table 6.28 Main Study - Hierarchical Regression Coefficients for Predicting the Satisfaction with Current Job

	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Step 1	0.27	0.07				
Interference				0.17	12.30	0.01
Exclusion				0.09	0.83	0.20
Denigration				0.05	0.10	0.49
Step 2	0.29	0.82	0.01			
Interference				0.18	2.55	0.01
Exclusion				0.07	0.87	0.38
Denigration				0.04	0.49	0.63
Group VS Individual Perp				0.09	1.56	0.12
Step 3	0.55	0.30	0.22			
Interference				0.10	1.66	0.10
Exclusion				0.07	0.99	0.32
Denigration				-0.02	-0.28	0.78
Group VS Individual Perp				-0.03	-0.59	0.56
Feelings about Supervisor				0.37	6.83	0.00
Feelings about Coworkers				0.23	4.16	0.00
Step 4	0.57	0.32	0.02			
Interference				0.08	1.29	0.20
Exclusion				0.09	1.32	0.19
Denigration				-0.18	-0.28	0.78
Group VS Individual Perp				-0.24	-0.45	0.66
Feelings about Supervisor				0.31	5.50	0.00
Feelings about Coworkers				0.20	3.61	0.00
Job Clarity				0.16	3.02	0.00

CHAPTER 7 - Discussion

The first two studies, the norm pilot study and the instrument pilot study, were both conducted to ensure that the instrument being developed possessed the desired characteristics. To that end, the norm pilot study was designed to assess each behavior and determine if it was a violation of an organizational norm, a social norm, or both norms. Every behavior included on the WHI violated either an organizational norm or a social norm, and most of the behaviors violated both behaviors. Thus, there was ample evidence to support the assertion that the behaviors being included were norm violations. Additionally, the fact that the sample data was

collected from three distinct populations at three separate locations and members of all of the locations were found to hold similar beliefs about whether behaviors were violations or not, lends support to the idea of the norms being generally held by most people. All of the behaviors included in the norm pilot study were also included in the instrument pilot study.

The instrument pilot study was a preliminary version of the main study. The one exception to this was the fact that the pilot study included an open-ended question asking the participants to list any behaviors that he/she thought might be missing from the WHI. Very few participants chose to complete this section, and the participants who did all included physical aggressive behaviors. Since the WHI intentionally excluded physical acts due to the relatively rarity of the acts and the profound difference between physical and non-physical acts, none of the behaviors listed by the participants in the instrument pilot study were included in the main study.

The first issue examined in the pilot study was whether people were experiencing the behaviors included, or not. Previous research (Namie, 2003; Neuman & Baron, 1997; Neuman & Keashly, 2004; Namie & Namie, 2003) has indicated that people experience a large amount of hostile behavior in the workforce, but it was still important to determine if people experience the variety of hostile behaviors included on the WHI. More than 90% of the participants responded affirmatively when asked if they had experienced workplace hostility. When looking at the behaviors separately, every behavior was experienced by at least one respondent, with 19 of the 39 behaviors being experienced by more than half of the people (most of whom had experienced some hostility). In other words, not only were people experiencing hostility, but they were experiencing a large number of the listed events. The average number of “yeses” (i.e., a participant indicating that he/she had experience a particular behavior) for the behaviors was almost 18, more than half of the sample.

The next two issues examined were whether the behaviors being included were viewed as upsetting to the participants and viewed as intentionally harmful. The participants who responded affirmatively to the question about experiencing a specific behavior were also asked to indicate how upsetting they found the event. All of the behaviors were found to be upsetting, ranging from “somewhat upsetting” to “very upsetting.” The final issue was related to the perceived intent of the perpetrators. Most definitions of WH include reference to the perceived intent of the perpetrator, therefore making intent an important construct to measure. Without fail, every behavior included on the WHI was perceived as harmful by at least one person, with

on average more than half of the people who experienced the behavior reporting that it was perceived as intending to be harmful.

However, it is interesting to note that a few behaviors were found to be harmful but the intent was somewhat ambiguous. For example, sabotage was found to harmful but almost no one found that there was purposeful harm. One possible explanation for this is the fact that the current study only measured intent as it was directed at the target. It is possible that the intent was to slow down or damage the organization, as opposed to an individual. Likewise, it is possible that perpetrator sabotaged equipment for his/her own gain (i.e., to have an afternoon off) and therefore the behavior was viewed as harmful but the intent was not to specifically harm the target (even if it did end up harming the target).

Based on the examination of the three issues discussed above, it was decided that all of the behaviors possessed the desired characteristics. Therefore all items were included in the main analysis.

Data collection for the main study was conducted online. This untraditional method of data collection was chosen for a variety of reasons. First, there were tremendous difficulties locating a large company that would allow research on such a potentially volatile topic and with the perceived possibility of harm to the organization. Numerous companies and labor unions were approached by the researcher. In order to make participation in the study seem more attractive to the companies being approached, the researcher offered the following incentives: allowing the company to include five of their own questions, providing the company an opportunity to obtain an executive report tailored to the results of their organization (in the case of the inclusion of multiple organizations), and leaving open the option of conducting a follow-up study if there was a need for one. Despite a few of the companies approached initially expressing an interest, all of the companies eventually declined to participate.

Second, the nature of the current study required a large number of respondents who have experienced hostility in the workplace. That is to say, the current study is less interested in those who have not experienced hostility when compared to those who have. Therefore, an unknown, but certainly significant, percentage of respondents would have been automatically excluded from the analyses since they did not experience WH. The decision to solicit participation from people who have experienced hostility in the workplace made sense from this perspective.

Third, during the instrument pilot study, it was discovered that the way the survey was set up was redundant. If, for example, a participant said he/she had not experienced a behavior, he/she still encountered subsequent questions about how he/she felt about the behavior. Because it was not possible to know ahead of time which behaviors an individual had experienced, it was not possible to tailor a paper copy of the survey to each individual. This was not the case with an online survey. With an online survey, conditional branching could be used. In other words, if a person said he/she had not experienced a certain behavior then he/she would not be presented any more questions about that behavior. With an online survey, it was possible to tailor the survey to the specific respondent's answers. This decreased the amount of redundancy experienced by participants.

Finally, there is a precedent within the field to use an open call on the Internet to solicit participants. Dr.s Namies, from The Workplace Bullying & Trauma Institute, have used this method in their research numerous times (Namie & Namie, 2003; Namie, 2001; Namie, 2003; Namie, 1998). The research conducted by them is well-respected both within the academic and non-academic circles, and has been presented at a NIOSH/APA conference (1999).

After the data from the main study were collected, they were examined to determine the make-up of the sample. Of the 393 participants selected for inclusion in this study (i.e., those not eliminated due to incomplete and/or inconsistent data), exactly 30% (or 118) were men and 70% (or 275) women. The discrepancy between the number of women and men respondent is interesting due to the fact that the survey was open to anyone was not designed to specifically attract females. The fact that there was such a marked difference between the number of women and men who responded lends validity to the idea that gender differences in the workplace experiences should be explored. Without further exploration, it is not possible to say if there were more women than men because women are more likely to fill out online surveys; search online for items related to workplace hostility; or experience workplace hostility. The difference between the women and men who chose to respond will be explored later, but it is important to note that it is not possible to examine the people who chose not answer the survey or the people who never even saw the survey.

The sample was composed of a relatively experienced group of working individuals, with almost 30% of the sample (N = 114) reported being in the workforce for more than 20 years. Only slightly less than 2% (N = 7) reported being in the workforce for less than 1 year. There

was one participant who reported never having had a job so he/she was excluded from all of the analyses. When participants were asked to report their tenure in their current job, the amount of experience decreased greatly, with almost 50% (N = 187) of the participants reporting being in their current position for 1 to 5 years. An interesting issue is if the shorter tenure in their current positions was related to workplace hostility factors in prior jobs.

Participants were also asked to indicate the job category into which they best fit, selecting the best option from a list of 32 standard job categories. The responses were extremely varied, with only 7 categories having 25 or more respondents. In order of frequency, the most commonly selected categories were; education/training, other, government/military, technology, clerical/administrative, human resources, and healthcare. In terms of job category, the sample was diverse, including people from almost every possible job category. The variety of positions represented in this sample suggests that workplace hostility is not related to any specific type of work. Rather, it did or can occur in most situations.

When asked if they felt mistreated at their current and/or previous jobs, many participants indicated that they had been mistreated. One hundred and forty, or 36%, of all of the respondents indicated that they felt they had been mistreated in their current job. Of those 140 respondents, 56, or 40%, indicated that they felt they had also been mistreated at previous jobs. Looking at the entire sample, more than 50%, or 198 participants, indicated that they had been mistreated at a previous job.

Interestingly, when asked if they had ever experienced workplace hostility (i.e., “Have you been subject to hostile behaviors at work?”) 309 of the 393 participants responded affirmatively. However, when looking only at those who reported experiencing hostile behaviors at work, 34 (11% of those who reported experiencing hostility) reported that they had not been mistreated at a previous or current job. This discrepancy is unexpected and merits attention in a later study. It is possible that some people feel hostile behavior is such a normal part of their work day that they no longer consider it mistreatment. It is also possible some people do not view hostile behaviors and mistreatment as comparable experiences.

When the discrepancy is looked at from the other direction, examining those who indicated that they had not experienced hostile behaviors at work, only one person reported being mistreated at his current and previous jobs. However, 17 (20% of those who reported not experiencing hostility) participants indicated that they had been mistreated at a previous job.

This discrepancy is also intriguing but perhaps may be due to the fact that the participants were thinking about their current job when they started the survey. The survey did not indicate that participants should only consider their current position when answering the questions, but it may have occurred due to the fact that their current job is the first thing that comes to mind. This explanation is supported by the availability heuristic which states that people will overestimate or overvalue events that are easily recalled, or “available.” Accordingly, a person’s thoughts about his current job would be more easily recalled than thoughts about previous positions (Tversky & Kahneman, 1973).

Also, it is worth noting that despite a relatively large number of respondents indicating that they had been mistreated at work, the current sample reported, for the most part, enjoying their job. 266, or 68%, of the respondents said “Yes” when asked if they liked their current job. The disconnect between mistreatment and how people feel about their jobs will be further explored later in the discussion.

The first step in the analysis process was to examine if the WH construct could be divided into coherent subsets of items. It was believed that dividing WH into subscales would help to better understand the experience associated with WH. An exploratory factor analysis was run and three subscales were identified. All of the subscales were found to be reliable and the validity of each one is supported by the overall validity of the WHI.

It is important to note that the subscales were created using only the participants who responded affirmatively to the question about whether they had been subject to hostile behaviors or not. That is to say, there were 309 participants included in the initial subscale analyses. Additionally, the subscales were created by examining the participant’s responses to the level of upset they experience as a result of each hostile behavior. Thus, there had to be a decipherable pattern of responses related to the level of upset for a scale to emerge.

The first subscale, interference with work, included a variety of behaviors ranging from active betrayal (i.e., lying) to more passive actions (i.e., did not defend you when others spoke poorly of you). Some of the acts included in the interference subscale could result in public embarrassment such as, spread rumors about you or unnecessarily transmitted damaging information about you to higher levels in the organization. On the other hand, some of the acts included in the interference with work subscale could, without a previous pattern of behavior, be brushed off as accidental, such as showed favoritism to other employees, or refused your

requests for assistance. However, when looked at together, as a subscale, the individual acts all encompass behaviors that were perceived to substantially reduced the abilities of individuals to effective perform or be seen as performing their jobs. Thus, endangering a person's continued employment. This outcome can be potentially tied to the prior finding of short job tenure for many of the participants.

The second subscale, exclusion, was more targeted than the first subscale, including slightly fewer hostile behaviors. Of the behaviors that were included, there were two types of behaviors, ostracism and belittling, both of which resulted in exclusion. For example, ostracism was behaviors including being prevented from expressing themselves, contributions being ignored, and being reprimanded in front of others. On the other hand, the belittling behaviors included the belittling of the person or the person's ideas, being subjected to negative comments about the person's intelligence or competence, and being talked down to. When looked at together, all of the acts included in the exclusion scale had the same goal of exclusion, either by purposely failing to include them or by belittling to the point that they would neither seek to be included nor would others include them in normal work or social activities. This social isolation would be likely to also result in perceptions of lower job performance.

The third subscale, denigration, included the fewest number of items, 5. However, all five were clearly denigrating behaviors. The subscale included items such as ridicule, derogatory name calling, laughed in your face, and swore at you. When looked at together, the 5 behaviors definitely had the common goal of denigration. The most likely result would be a lowering of self concept and self-efficacy. Again, the potential connection to job performance is unavoidable and has already been addressed in previous studies.

It is interesting to note that the three factors discovered in this study do not map on to the scales used to develop the WHI. In other words, since the WHI was created using separate and established scales, it would be expected that the factor analysis would create subscales that closely align with the original scales. However, that was not the case. Instead, the factor analysis identified three subscales that had not been identified in the literature. These subscales represent a significant new finding in the field and represent one of the first times that a scale examining hostile workplace behaviors has been broken out into subscales.

Research has established a link between positive self-concept and job performance (Judge, Frez, & Bono, 1998). More specifically, in a meta-analysis, Judge, Frez, and Bono

(1998) found that the four specific traits of positive self-concept, self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and (low) neuroticism or emotional stability, were all linked to job performance. Using motivation theory, they argued that employees with a positive self-concept were more motivated to perform their jobs. It is also argued that, in some jobs, positive self-concept may be an ability factor. Likewise, the link between social isolation (or a lack of social isolation) and reduced job performance has also been previously established (Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006; Osca, Urien, Gonzalez-Camino, Martinez-Perez, & Martinez-Perez, 2005). Accordingly, social support, the opposite of social isolation, was found to be an important component positively related to in-role and extra-role performance (Shanock & Eisenberger, 2006), job involvement, and job satisfaction (Osca et al., 2005). Thus, the higher the amounts of social support, the more satisfied and more productive employees tend to be.

Thus, there are previously established links between the negative treatment included in the three WH scales and decreased job performance is clear. When exploring this phenomenon, it is important to also look at the relationship between the three scales. It was hypothesized that the three subscales would be related, and that was the case. The correlations between the subscales ranged from .54 to .60. When the three scales are thought of as catalysts leading to decreased job performance, it is not surprising that the three scales are related. That is to say, the behaviors included in the WHI encompassed negative behaviors that either directly reduced a person's ability to maintain continued employment, as is the case with the interference with work behaviors, or indirectly threaten job performance by removing or reducing components previously found to be related to job performance. Therefore, although the three scales refer to separate issues, there is a large amount of overlap in the outcome of the issues, with all three leading to a decreased likelihood of positive job performance.

Additionally, due to the fact that the all three scales were created using a participant's level of upset and the fact that the all of the behaviors being examined dealt with hostile behaviors, it is not surprising that the scales would be related. The three concepts represented in the three subscales, interference with work, exclusion, and denigration, are closely related and where one occurs, it is quite likely that the other occurs.

The subscales were created to be used to assess the main hypotheses of the study. As such, they were used in all of the subsequent analyses. After creating the subscales, Hypothesis 1 addressed if the subscales could be used to predict the occurrence of WH. Hypothesis 1 was

partly supported in that it was found that both interference with work and exclusion were positively related to the occurrence of WH. In other words, the more upset a person was at the work interference, the more likely he/she was to say that he/she had been a victim of WH. Also true, but to a lesser extent, the more a upset a person was with behaviors related to exclusion, the more likely he/she was to report experiencing hostility. In both cases, the opposite is also true, thus the lower the upset associated with interference and exclusion, the less likely the person is to report having experienced WH. The significant combination of the interference and exclusion explained slightly more than 40% of the variance in the responses to whether a person reported experiencing hostility in the workplace. Although this means that there are other factors at work besides interference and exclusion, knowing whether a person has experienced either behavior would allow for a more accurate prediction of whether he/she feels he/she has been the victim of WH.

Denigration did not significantly contribute to the overall prediction of whether a person experienced WH or not. However, denigration had a significant zero order correlation with experienced WH. Clearly, the overlapping nature of the three subscales suggests the fact that denigration plays a slightly lesser role in perception of WH than interference and exclusion. There are many possible reasons why this is the case. It is possible that people who are prone to behaving in a denigrating manner do so to everyone thereby leading people to not internalize the other person's actions (i.e., he/she did not treat just me poorly, he/she treats everyone that way).

The next hypothesis (Hypothesis 2) examined the possibility of a power differential existing between the target and the perpetrator. More specifically, the power differential was explored in relation to level of upset felt by the target (Hypothesis 2A), the level of like/dislike for the target's current position (Hypothesis 2B), and the target's expressed desire to leave his current organization (Hypothesis 2B).

Hypothesis 2A was examined by looking at the level of the perpetrator as reported by the participant (i.e., the target of the behavior). A power differential was found such that higher denigration upset scores and higher interference upset scores were more likely to occur if the perpetrator(s) was someone who had power over the target. In other words, the average amount of distress with regards to denigration and interference experienced by a person who was abused by a supervisor was greater than the average amount of distress experienced by a person who was abused by coworker. Thus, Hypothesis 2A was supported.

Hypothesis 2B was examined by conducting four separate tests, the first two of which looked at the level of the perpetrator as reported by the participant and the participant's expressed intent to stay in his current position. It was found that the perpetrator's level (supervisory or non-supervisory) affected the participant's desire to leave or remain in the current organization. If a participant experienced WH at the hands of a supervisor he/she was more likely to express a desire to leave or indicate that he/she had at least tentative plans to leave. This issue will be more fully explored later. This analysis indicated that the interference with work behaviors were related to the desire to leave an organization such that the higher the level of upset associated with the interference behaviors, the more likely the participant was to express a desire to leave the organization.

The second two tests examined a participant's like/dislike for his current position. Results from these two test indicated that people who experienced WH at the hands of a supervisor were more likely to express a dislike for their current position. It was also found that the type of hostility a participant was exposed to affected whether he/she reported liking or disliking his position. Again, participants who experienced interference behaviors were more likely to indicate that they disliked their job.

The two sets of analyses support Hypothesis 2B. The initial test indicate that there was a difference in what the participant expressed about his job based off of who treated him/her poorly. The secondary tests began to explore what type of behavior was most likely to predict the negative feelings expressed. The finding that WH at the hands of a supervisor is more damaging than WH at the hands of a coworker is something of which every supervisor should be aware. Additionally, the fact that the interference with work behaviors is the only significant predictors of a target's feeling about his current position is an important finding. Finding the behaviors that are most likely to lead to dissatisfaction and/or a desire to leave the organization is the first step in determining how to discourage dissatisfaction and high turnover. Due to the fact that the WH scales are correlated and therefore explain a lot the same things, it is hard to say exactly what minimizing one of the scales will do to the ratings of the remaining scales. That is to say, if the amount of interference with work an individual receives is minimized, that does not mean that overall ratings of WH from that person will decrease. Because the scales share a large amount of variance, minimizing one of the scales gives the remaining scales a chance to account for some of the now free variance. That is to say, some of the negative feelings that were

attributed to interference with work may transfer to denigration or exclusion as opposed to going away.

Therefore, it would appear that efforts should be made to first ensure that the treatment at the hands of a supervisor is minimized and then efforts should be made to ensure that all of the WH behaviors are minimized. Unfortunately, there is no quick fix to the problem of WH and minimizing the most “important” (i.e. statistically speaking) type of WH behaviors does not ensure that the other types will remain less “important.”

Hypothesis 3 received partial support. First, the idea that men and women would instigate different behaviors was explored. The results of this analysis indicated that men and women did instigate different behaviors. More specifically, women were found to have had more of an effect than men when they engaged in denigration and exclusion. That is to say, the difference in the amount of upset experienced by a target at the hands of women was significantly greater than the amount of upset experienced by target at the hands of a male. This finding supports previous findings (Namie, 2003) that indicate that men and women often chose different behaviors when bullying. For example, Namie (2003) found that women perpetrators were more likely than men to use the silent treatment. On the other hand, it was found that men were more likely to scream in public, intentionally sabotage another’s contribution, withhold resources and blame the target, and use name calling. These behaviors do not clearly fit into only one WH scale. However, looked at together they would appear to be a mix of denigration and interference with work.

It is interesting to note that while Namie (2003) found differences between the genders, they were not always the same differences as the current study found. For example, Namie (2003) found that women were more likely to use the silent treatment, an individual item that goes into the interference with work subscale. The interference with work subscale is the one subscale that women were not more likely than men to use. However, the difference in the current findings and previous finding can be attributed in part to the different analysis tactics. Namely, the current study created subscales and analyzed them while the previous study treated as individual items. The fact that the results in two different analyses do not perfectly match is not cause for concern but does merit closer examination in subsequent studies.

The idea that this gender difference would be magnified when the perpetrator was a supervisor (as opposed to a coworker) was not supported. There was not a significant

interaction between the gender and the level of the perpetrator. In other words, women supervisors and women coworkers were not found to upset their target's any more or less than their male counterparts.

Additionally, while there is not a plethora of research on gender differences in hostile workplace behaviors, there is some research pertaining to gender differences in support seeking behavior (Reevy & Maslach, 2001). According to this research, femininity is associated with seeking (and receiving) emotional support, and more specifically, receiving support from women. For all intents and purposes, denigration is the opposite of support and exclusion is opposite of receiving support. Based off of the gender differences between support seeking and receiving behaviors, it is not all that surprising to find WH differences in women and men. It is interesting to note that, if looked at together, the previous research and the current research indicate that women are more likely to give *and* to take away support.

The final hypothesis, Hypothesis 4, was supported. This hypothesis stated that WH hostility would be more upsetting if it occurred at the hands of a group of people than if it occurred at the hands of an individual perpetrator. The results of the analyses related to this hypothesis indicated that denigration and exclusion that occurred as the result of the actions of a group of perpetrators was more upsetting than when it occurred as the result of a single perpetrator. However, interference with work was more upsetting when it occurred due to one person than when it occurred due to a group of people. In other words, when a group decides to treat another person poorly by verbally denigrating him/her and purposively excluding him, this will be seen as more upsetting than if only one person decided to treat a person the same way. The opposite was true for interference with work which was found to be more upsetting when it occurred due to the actions of one person. This issue merits closer examination in future studies. Currently, there is not a lot of research pertaining to the difference between experiencing negative workplace behaviors at the hands of a group of individuals as opposed to at the hands of a group. The fact that a difference is noted here indicates that it is a potentially important area that should be further investigated.

The final analysis run was a preliminary test of a model of WH using hierarchical regression. This analysis indicated, as was expected, that initially the WH scales were significant predictors of an individual's job satisfaction level. However, it is interesting to note that the addition of the feelings about supervisors and coworkers completely removed this

significant effect, indicating that the experience of WH only contributes a minor amount of understanding to a person's level of job satisfaction. In other words, adding feelings about others completely altered the relationship between job satisfaction and the experience of WH.

This finding is important because it indicates that feelings about other people in the workplace have an effect on an individual's satisfaction. In fact, according to this model, feelings about others are the core factors in predicting job satisfaction. What this model cannot measure and therefore merits closer examination is the relationship between one's feelings about others and his experience of WH. With this current data, it is not possible to assess if participants who are indicating that they have negative feelings about others have those feelings due to being mistreated or if they are mistreated due to these negative feelings they possess. In other words, it is possible that individuals who report having negative feelings about others display those negative feelings in the workplace eliciting poor treatment in response. However, it is also possible that the negative feelings are developed as a result of mistreatment (perceived or real) at the hands of others. We know how people treat you is related to how you treat them. What we do not know is what the cause is and what the effect in the relationship. This issue of cause and effect between hostility and feelings about others is important and should be explored in future studies.

Also, as has been discussed previously, the current model reinforces the idea that the WH scales are not only related to each other but also related to other job related variables. More specifically, the model clearly demonstrates the overlap between WH and feelings about others (and to some degree job clarity). Much of the variance that had originally been allocated to the interference with work scale was reallocated to feelings about supervisors, and to a lesser extent feelings about coworkers, when they were entered into the equation. This means that there is a large amount of overlap between WH and feelings about supervisors, with the two concepts measuring at least some of the same things. By delving into the cause and effect relationship discussed above, it will become easier to decipher between the feelings measures and WH measures. That is to say, determining the cause and effect relationship will enable one to differentiate between what relates only to the feelings about supervisors and what relates only to the experience of WH.

The current study supports and extends many previous findings in the field of workplace mistreatment. For example, Neuman and Keashly (2004) found that employees who experienced

persistent workplace aggression were more bothered by the general work environment, had lower levels of job satisfaction and organizational satisfaction, and higher intent to leave the organization when compared to employees who had experienced no aggression or far less frequent aggression. This also relates to the findings of the current study. However, like the current study Neuman and Keashly (2004) did not explore the cause and effect relationship between the work environment and a variety of outcome variables. The direction of causality was assumed. The current study highlights the need to explore this further as it is possible that the people are experiencing hostility due to the negative work environment they have created for themselves (and others) as opposed to the other way around.

On the other hand, Duffy, Ganster, and Pagon (2003) and Neuman and Keashly (2004), found that social undermining and aggression had a more pronounced negative effect when they occurred at the hands of a supervisor than when it occurred at the hands of a coworker. The current study supported this finding. WH was found to have been more upsetting when it occurred at the hands of supervisor than when it occurred at the hands of subordinate or coworker. However, this finding does not mean that WH is not upsetting when it occurs at the hands of a coworker or subordinate, only that it was found to be more upsetting when it occurred at the hands a supervisor.

Finally, research into power a differential between the target and the perpetrator (Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2003; Donovan, Drasgow, & Numson, 1998) indicated that poor treatment by a supervisor can be very damaging, negatively affecting many different personal and organizational variables. This finding was supported. However, it was also found that there was a relationship between an individual's feeling about his supervisor and his upset with WH. This is a significant extension on the existing beliefs. It indicates that treatment by a supervisor may be even more important than was previously believed. It also implies that feelings about management may be at the root of many judgments made in regard to the workplace. Thus, the key to reducing hostility in the workplace may be in the determining how to mitigate feelings about others in the workplace.

Practical Implications

There are numerous practical implications to the current study. The first and most obvious is the potential to use the scale and the subscales to further explore the role that

managers/supervisors play in their employee's satisfaction with work. There is still work that needs to be done in regard to link between feelings about supervisors and job satisfaction but the potential ramifications of the findings can be applied to numerous workplace settings. If, for example, future research indicates that feelings about a supervisor causes an individual to feel as though he/she is working in a hostile workplace, then there can be training to help supervisors avoid "creating" a hostile workplace. On the other hand, if a hostile workplace leads to bad feelings about a supervisor, this scale can be used to determine if there is hostility in the workplace thereby allowing a supervisor to take corrective actions before the issue spreads and causes more damage.

Second, the identification of the interference subscale as the subscale that accounts for the most variance in the upset scores implies that people are particularly upset by other's taking actions that impeded their behaviors in the workplace. Knowing this allows managers/supervisors to take preventative steps to ensure that people's day-to-day progress is not impeded. This could presumably be accomplished many different ways, but perhaps the easiest would be one-to-one attention from the manager to the subordinate. (That is of course, if the supervisor is not the one doing the impeding.)

Finally, the practical implications of having a global scale that can be easily administered and measures whether the work environment is hostile or not is invaluable. The WHI removes the "gray" area in defining a hostile workplace and, if administered to an entire company, could be used to objectively assess whether a specific workplace is hostile or not. The determination of hostile versus not hostile workplaces could potentially be used by either company's or their employees in legal cases involving alleged hostile work environments.

Study Limitations

As with every study, there were some limitations with the current study. These limitations do not invalidate the results but are important to mention and address in subsequent studies.

First of all, the data collection method is a potential limitation. It is not known exactly what differences exist between a person who would seek out a website about WH as opposed to someone to sits back and passively experiences it. Likewise, it is not known if the gender gap in the respondents is due to an actual gender difference in the experience of WH or if it can be

attributed to some other factor. In subsequent studies, the difference between the current sample and other samples collected in a workplace setting should be compared.

Second, the results of this study are preliminary. The measurement instrument was developed and tested in the same sample. Subsequent studies should be conducted to ensure that the measurement instrument structure and reliability can be replicated.

Third, the current study took into account the perceptions of the target about the perpetrators intent but did not actually measure the perpetrator's intent. Therefore, targets may have been the victims of unintentional hostility that was perceived as intentional hostility. Although it would be difficult, it would be beneficial to conduct a 360 degree assessment where the target's perceptions of intent are measured and compared to the perpetrator's expressed intent and the intent perceived by others in the workplace. A 360 approach would highlight discrepancies, if there are any, between what is perceived and what is intended. It is possible that they are not the same thing.

If a 360 degree approach is used, inclusion of attribution theory (Weiner 1974; 1986) would be appropriate. Attribution theory examines how individual interpret events and how this interpretation has an effect on their thinking and behavior. Thus, a person seeking to understand why the perpetrator mistreated them may make certain attributions. According to Heider (1958) the target is likely to make one of two attributions: An internal attribution (i.e., the perpetrator is behaving a certain way due to an internal trait, such as attitude, character or personality) or an external attribution (i.e., the perpetrator is behaving a certain way due to the situation or some other circumstance). The attribution a target makes would be particularly valuable to know considering the relationship discovered between feelings about others and the experience of WH. Inclusion of the attribution theory in future studies will most certainly help clarify and understand this relationship.

Finally, the model needs to be explored further. More specifically, the model needs to be fit to additional samples to ensure that it is reliable. Additionally, the cause and effect relationship between WH and feelings about others needs to be measured in subsequent studies. This relationship appears to be at the root of an individual's job satisfaction but cannot adequately be assessed with the current sample.

The results of the current study are important and represent a significant advancement in the field of negative workplace behaviors. This is true for several reasons. First, the current

study replicated many previous findings, lending overall validity to the field. This is especially noteworthy considering the non-traditional method of data collection. The fact that many of the same issues are present in a self-selected sample as are present in a “normal” workplace sample indicates that, at least for studies of negative workplace behaviors, looking at a self-selected sample yields important and relevant results.

Second, the current study discovered a previously overlooked link between feelings about the workplace and the experience of WH. Further research into this finding will indicate how important this relationship actually is, but have the empirical evidence showing that the causality between the variables needs to be examined is a large step in the right direction.

Finally, the development of the WHI represents a collaboration of ideas from many respected constructs that had previously been treated as separate constructs (Neuman & Keashly, 2004; Tepper, 2000; Bennett & Robinson; 1995; 2000; Duffy, Ganster & Pagon 2003; Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout; 2001; Donovan, Drasgoa, & Munson 1998; Ruehlman & Karoly; 1991). As was discussed previously, a narrow focus on empirical research within the field has lead to a surplus of broadly defined concepts that cover numerous negative workplace behaviors. These concepts, which are often nominally similar, tend to differ slightly. The WHI is an inclusive scale, representing concepts from numerous negative workplace behaviors thereby creating a global term that includes many of the previous unique and narrowly defined terms. Previously there was an overlap in ideas but not an overlap in terminology. Now, with the WHI, there is a comprehensive and global measure that encompasses the overlap in ideas in previous research.

CHAPTER 8 - References

- Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. New York: General Learning Press.
- Bassman, E. A. (1992). *Abuse in the workplace*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Barling, J. (1996). The prediction, psychological experience, and consequences of workplace violence. In G. VandenBos and E. Q. Bulatao (eds), *Violence on the job: Identifying risks and developing solutions* (pp. 29-50). Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.
- Bennett, R. J., & Robinson, S. L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 349-360.
- Bies, R.J. & Tripp, T.M. (2004). The Study of Revenge in the Workplace: Conceptual, Ideological, and Empirical Issues. In S. Fox & P.E. Spector, (Eds.), *Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigations of Actors and Targets*. Washington DC: APA Press
- Bjorkvist, K., Osterman, K., & Hjelt-Back, M (1994). Aggression among university employees. *Aggressive Behavior*, 20, 173-184.
- Brodsky, C.M. (1976). *The harassed worker*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Health and Company.
- Buss, A. H. (1961). *The psychology of aggression*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Chen, P.Y., & Spector, P. E. (1991). Negative affectivity as the underlying cause of correlations between stressors and strains. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(3), 398-407.
- Cortina, L.M., Magley, V.J., Williams, J.H., & Langhout, R.D. (2001). Incivility in the workplace: Incidence and impact. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6, 64-80.

- Cox, H. (1991). Verbal abuse nationwide, part II: Impact and modifications. *Nursing Management, 22*, 66-69.
- Diaz, A. L., & McMillin, J. D. (1991). A definition and description of nurse abuse. *Western Journal of Nursing Research, 13*(1), 97-109.
- Dittrich, J. & Carrell, M. (1979). Organizational equity perceptions, employee job satisfaction, and departmental absence and turnover rates. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 24*: 29-40
- Donovan, M. A., Drasgow, F., & Munson, L. J. (1998). The perceptions of fair interpersonal treatment scale: Development and validation of measure of interpersonal treatment in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*(5), 683-692.
- Duffy, M.K., Ganster, D.C., & Pagon, M. (2002). Social undermining in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*, 331-351.
- Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C.L. Cooper (2003). *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Shullman, S. L. (1993). Sexual Harassment: A research analysis and agenda for the 1990s. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42*, 5-27.
- Folger, R. (1993). Reactions to mistreatment at work. In J.K. Murnighan (Ed), *Social psychology of organizations* (pp. 161-183). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Fontana, A. F., Marcus, J. L., Dowds, B. N., Hughes, L. A. (1980). Psychological impairment and psychological health in the psychological well-being of the physically ill. *Psychosomatic-Medicine, 42*(2), 279-288.

- Fox, S. & Spector, E. (2005). Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Glomb, T. M., & Liao, H. (2003). Interpersonal aggression in work groups: Social influence, reciprocal, and individual effects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(4), 486-496.
- Glomb, T.M, Steel, P.D.G., & Arvey, R.D. (2003). Office sneers, snipes, and stab wounds: Antecedents, consequences, and implications of workplace violence and aggression. In R. Lord, R. Klimoski & R. Kanfer (Eds.), *Emotions and Work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Greenberg, L. & Barling, J. (1999). Predicting employee aggression against coworkers, subordinates and supervisors: The roles of person behaviors and perceived workplace factors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20, 897-913.
- Harvey, S., Keashly, L. (2003). Predicting the risk for aggression in the workplace: Risk factors, self-esteem and time at work. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 31, 8, 807-814
- Heider, F. (1958). *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations*. New York: Wiley.
- Hoel, H., Einarsen, S. & Cooper, C.L. (2003). Organizational effects of bullying. In Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C.L. Cooper (Eds.) *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Hoel, H., Einarsen, S., Keashly, L., Zapf, D., Cooper, C. L. (2003). Bullying at work: The way forward. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C.L. Cooper (Eds.) *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice* (pp. 412-416). London: Taylor and Francis.

- Howard, J. L., & Voss, R. B. (1996). Workplace Violence and the Sector Ignored: A Response to O'Leary-Kelly, Griffin, and Glew. *Academy of Management Review*, 21 (4), 920-922.
- Inkson, K., & Simpson, D. (1975). The assembly line and alienation: A participant-observer study in the meat-freezing industry. *New Zealand Psychologist*, 4(2), 44-55.
- Judge, T. & Frez, A. & Bono, J. E. (1998). The power of being positive: The relation between positive self-concept and job performance. *Human-Performance*. 1(2-3), 167-18
- Keashly, L. (1998). Emotional abuse in the workplace: Conceptual and empirical issues. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 1, 85-117.
- Keashly, L., Harvey, S., & Hunter, S. (1997). Emotional abuse and role state stressors: Relative impact on residence assistants' stress. *Work & Stress*, 11(2), 175-185.
- Keashly, L., Jagatic, K. (2003). By any other name: American perspectives on workplace bullying. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. Cooper (Eds.) *Bullying and emotional abuse in the workplace: International perspectives in research and practice*. London: Taylor Francis.
- Keashly, L., Trott, V., & MacLean, L.M. (1994). Abusive behavior in the workplace: A preliminary investigation. *Violence and Victims*, 9(4), 125-141.
- Keenan, A., & Newton, T. (1985). Stressful events, stressors and psychological strains in young professional engineers. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 6, 151-156.
- Leymann, H. (1990). Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces. *Violence and Victims*, 5(2), 119-126.
- Lombardo, M. M., & McCall, M. W. (1984). *Coping with an intolerable boss*. Special Report. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Learning.

- Motowidlo, S. J., Packard, J. S., & Manning, M. R. (1986). Occupational stress: Its causes and consequences on job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71(4)*, 618-629.
- Namie, G. (2003). The Workplace Bullying & Trauma Institute (WBTI) 2003 Report on Abusive Workplaces. Retrieved: October 29, 2006, from Workplace Bullying Institute Web site: <http://www.bullyinginstitute.org/res/2003results.pdf>
- Namie, G. (2001). U.S. Hostile Workplace Survey 2000. Retrieved: October 29, 2006, from Workplace Bullying Institute Web site: <http://www.bullyinginstitute.org/res/2000wbti.pdf>
- Namie, G. (1998). WBI 1998 Survey Results. Retrieved: October 29, 2006, from Workplace Bullying Institute Web site: <http://www.bullyinginstitute.org/res/niosh99.html>
- Namie, R. & Namie, G. (2003) *The Bully at Work*. DoubleDoc Press.
- Neuman, J.H., & Baron, R.A. (2005). Aggression in the workplace: A social-psychological perspective. . In S. Fox & P.E. Spector, (Eds.), *Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigations of Actors and Targets*. Washington DC: APA Press
- Neuman, J.H., & Baron, R.A. (2003). Social antecedents of bullying: A social interactionist perspective. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C.L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: International Perspective in Research and Practice* (pp. 185-202). London: Taylor & Francis.
- Neuman & Baron (1997). Aggression in the workplace. In R. A. Giacalone and J. Greenberg (eds), *Antisocial behavior in organizations* (pp. 37-67). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Neuman, J. H., & Keashly, L. (2004, April 4). Development of the Workplace Aggression Research Questionnaire (WAR-Q): Preliminary data from the Workplace Stress and Aggression Project. In R. J. Bennett & C. D. Crossley (Chairs), *Theoretical advancements in the study of anti-social behavior at work*. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago, IL.

- Ney, P. G. (1987). Does verbal abuse leave deeper scars: A study of children and parents. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 32*(5), 371-378.
- O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Griffin, R. W., & Glew, D. J. (1996a). Organization-motivated aggression: A research framework. *Academy of Management Review, 21*, 225-253.
- O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Griffin, R. W., & Glew, D. J. (1996b). Response to Howard and Voss. *Academy of Management Review, 21*(4), 922-924.
- O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Duffy, M. K., & Griffin, R. W. (2000). Construct confusion in the study of antisocial work behavior. *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management, 18*, 275-303.
- Osca, A., Urien, B., Gonzalez-Camino, G., Martinez-Perez, M. D., & Martinez-Perez, N. (2005). Organisational support and group efficacy: A longitudinal study of main and buffer effects. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 20*(3-4), 292-311.
- Pearson, C.M., Andersson, L.M., & Wegner, J.W. (2001). When workers flout convention: A study of workplace incivility. *Human Relations, 54*, 1387-1419.
- Price Spratlen, L. (1995). Interpersonal conflict which includes mistreatment in a university workplace. *Violence and Victims, 10*(4), 285-297.
- Rayner, C. (1998). Workplace bullying: Do something! *Journal of Occupational Health Safety, 14*, 581-585.
- Rayner, C. (1997). The incidence of workplace bullying. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 7*, 199-208.
- Rayner, C., & Hoel, H. (1997). A summary review of literature relating to workplace bullying. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 7*, 181-191.

- Reevy, G. M. & Maslach, C. (2001). Use of social support : Gender and personality differences. *Sex roles*, 44, 7-8, 37-459.
- Robinson, S. L. & Bennett. R. J., (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 555-572.
- Rosenberg, D. A., & Silver, H. K. (1984). Medical student abuse: An unnecessary and preventable cause of stress. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 251(6), 739-742.
- Ruehlman, L. S. & Karoly, P. (1991). With a little flak from my friends: Development and Validation of the test of negative social exchange (TENSE). *A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 3(1), 97-104.
- Ryan, K. D., & Ostereich, D. K. (1991). *Driving fear out of the workplace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Schat, A. C. H., & Kelloway, E. K., (2005). Workplace Aggression. In J. Barling, E. K. Kelloway, & M. R. Frone (Eds.) *Handbook of Work Stress* (pp. 189-218). London: Sage Publications.
- Shanock, L. R. & Eisenberger, R. (2006). When Supervisors Feel Supported: Relationships With Subordinates' Perceived Supervisor Support, Perceived Organizational Support, and Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(3), 689-695.
- Sheehan, K. H., Sheehan, D. V., White, K., Leibowitz, A., & Baldwin, D. C., (1990). A pilot study of medical student abuse. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 263(4), 533-537.
- Silver, H. K., & Glicklen, A. D., (1990). Medical student abuse: Incidence, severity, and significance. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 263(4), 527-532.

- Spector, P. E., (1987). Interactive effects of perceived control and job stressors on affective reactions and health outcomes for clerical workers. *Work & Stress, 1*(2), 155-162.
- Spector, P. E., (1975). Relationships of organizational frustration with reported behavioral reactions of employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*(5), 635-637.
- Spector, P.E. & Fox, S. (2004). The Stressor-Emotion Model of Counterproductive Work Behavior (CWB). In S. Fox & P.E. Spector, (Eds.), *Counterproductive Work Behavior: Investigations of Actors and Targets*. Washington DC: APA Pres
- Tepper, B.J. (2000). Consequences of abusive supervision. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*, 178-190.
- Thacker, R. A., & Ferris, G. R. (1991). Understanding sexual harassment in the workplace: The influence of power and politics within the dyadic interaction of harasser and target. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*(1), 23-37.
- Tolman, R. M. (1989). The development of a measure of psychological maltreatment of women by their male partners. *Violence and Victims, 4*(3), 159-177.
- Tversky, A. & Kahneman, D. (1973). Availability: A heuristic for judging frequency and probability. *Cognitive Psychology, 5*(2), 207-232.
- Uhari, M., Kokkonen, J., Nuutiner, Vanionpaa, L., Rantala, H., Lautala, P., & Vayrynen, M. (1994). Mistreatment of medical students: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 271*(13), 1049-1051.
- Weiner, B. (1974). *Achievement motivation and attribution theory*. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press.
- Weiner, B. (1986). *An attributional theory of motivation and emotion*. New York: Springer-Verlag

- Wolf, T. M., Randall, H. M., Von Almen, K., & Tynes, L.L. (1991). Perceived mistreatment and attitude change by graduating medical students: A retrospective study. *Medical Education, 25*, 184-190.
- Zapf, D. & Einarsen, S. (2003). Individual antecedents of bullying: Victims and perpetrators. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C.L. Cooper (Eds.) *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice* (pp. 103-126). London: Taylor and Francis.
- Zapf, D., Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Vartia, M. (2003). Empirical findings on bullying. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C.L. Cooper (Eds.) *Bullying and Emotional Abuse in the Workplace: International Perspectives in Research and Practice* (pp. 103-126). London: Taylor and Francis.
- Zellars, K. L., Tepper, B. J., & Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(6) 1068-1076.

Appendix A - WHI Inventory

doubled your judgment on a matter over which you have responsibility

deliberately invaded your privacy

belittled you or your ideas

delayed work to make you look bad or slow you down

did not defend you when people spoke poorly of you

talked down to you

consistently showed up late to meetings you hosted

took advantage of you

prevented you from expressing yourself

laughed in your face

excluded you from professional camaraderie

held or attended meetings about your work without your presence

unnecessarily transmitted damaging information to higher levels in the organization

1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3

1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5
1	2	3	4	5

1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3
1	2	3

Appendix B - WHI Items

The perpetrators...

doubted your judgment on a matter over which you have responsibility

excluded you from professional camaraderie

belittled you or your ideas

delayed work to make you look bad or slow you down

did not defend you when people spoke poorly of you

talked down to you

consistently showed up late to meetings you hosted

unnecessarily transmitted damaging information to higher levels in the organization

excluded you from work-related social gatherings

stormed out of a public work area when you entered

swore at you in a hostile manner

gave you the "silent treatment"

defaced, damaged, or stole your personal property

subjected you to obscene or inappropriate gestures

refused your requests for assistance

yelled or shouted at you

subjected you to negative comments about your intelligence or competence

ignored your contributions or suggestions

interfered with your work activities

lied to you

subjected you to derogatory name calling

blamed you for other peoples' mistakes

spread rumors or gossiped about you

attempted to turn other employees against you

subjected you to excessively harsh criticism about your work

took credit for your work or ideas

reprimanded you in front of others

prevented you from expressing yourself

sabotaged equipment you needed to do your job

intentionally made errors that affected your job

showed favoritism to other employees

deliberately invaded your privacy

laughed in your face

took advantage of you

ridiculed you

put you down in front of others

deliberately invaded your privacy

broke promises he/she/they made to you

prevented you from interacting with your (other) coworkers

undermined your effort to be successful on the job

Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001

Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001

Duffy, Ganster, & Pagon, 2002

Neuman & Baron, 2005

Neuman & Baron, 2005

Neuman & Keashly, 2004

Donovan, Drasgoa, & Munson, 1998

Neuman & Keashly, 2004

Neuman & Keashly, 2004

Neuman & Keashly, 2004

Donovan, Drasgoa, & Munson, 1998

Neuman & Keashly, 2004

Bennett & Robinson, 1995

Bennett & Robinson, 1996

Bennett & Robinson, 1997

Ruehlman & Karoly, 1991

Ruehlman & Karoly, 1991

Ruehlman & Karoly, 1991

Tepper, 2000

Tepper, 2000

Donovan, Drasgoa, & Munson, 1998

Tepper, 2000

Tepper, 2000

Tepper, 2000

Appendix C - Letter Soliciting Participation

Dear _____,

The Crisis Center has been asked to assist a graduate student at K-State who is conducting a study of people's perceptions of behaviors in the workplace. The study involves a short survey that asks your perceptions of certain behaviors. The survey is not measuring what has or is happening in our organization. It is only concerned with your thoughts and feelings about behaviors that occur in the workplace.

As someone with work experience, your opinions are extremely valuable and would be very helpful in understanding the nature of workplace behaviors. As such, I'm asking that you take 5 – 10 minutes to complete the included short survey, consisting of six pages. The first four pages ask for your thoughts about a series of workplace behaviors, and the final two ask for basic demographic data. The demographic questions you are being asked to answer are important for making group comparisons. Your responses to these questions will only be analyzed as part of group data.

Although your participation would be greatly appreciate, it is completely voluntary. However, should you choose to participate, you are guaranteed complete anonymity of your responses. Nowhere on the questionnaire itself are you asked to provide any information that could be used to identify you.

If you have any questions, comments, or concerns, please do not hesitate to call (703 627-9139)/email (mpease@ksu.edu) Mrs. Meridith Pease or to call (785 532-5712)/email (downey@ksu.edu) Dr. Ronald G. Downey.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Appendix D - Norms Survey

Answer the following **two questions** for each of the behaviors by circling the appropriate numbers.

When answering the **questions**, think about general organizational (i.e., workplace) and social (i.e., public/community) norms of behavior.

A person or group of people...	Do you think the behavior violates ORGANIZATIONAL norms of behavior? 1 2 3 Yes No NotSure	Do you think the behavior violates SOCIAL norms of behavior? 1 2 3 Yes No NotSure
excluded you from work-related social gatherings	1 2 3	1 2 3
stormed out of a public work area when you entered	1 2 3	1 2 3
swore at you in a hostile manner	1 2 3	1 2 3
gave you the "silent treatment"	1 2 3	1 2 3
defaced, damaged, or stole your personal property	1 2 3	1 2 3
subjected you to obscene or inappropriate gestures	1 2 3	1 2 3
refused your requests for assistance	1 2 3	1 2 3
yelled or shouted at you	1 2 3	1 2 3
subjected you to negative comments about your intelligence or competence	1 2 3	1 2 3
ignored your contributions	1 2 3	1 2 3
interfered with your work activities	1 2 3	1 2 3
lied to you	1 2 3	1 2 3
subjected you to derogatory name calling	1 2 3	1 2 3
blamed you for other peoples' mistakes	1 2 3	1 2 3
spread rumors or gossiped about you	1 2 3	1 2 3
attempted to turn other employees against you	1 2 3	1 2 3
subjected you to excessively harsh criticism about your work	1 2 3	1 2 3
took credit for your work or ideas	1 2 3	1 2 3
reprimanded you in front of others	1 2 3	1 2 3
ridiculed you	1 2 3	1 2 3
put you down" in front of others	1 2 3	1 2 3
deliberately invaded your privacy	1 2 3	1 2 3
broke promises he/she/they made to you	1 2 3	1 2 3
prevented you from interacting with your (other) coworkers	1 2 3	1 2 3
sabotaged equipment you needed to do your job	1 2 3	1 2 3
intentionally made errors that affected your job	1 2 3	1 2 3
showed favoritism to other employees	1 2 3	1 2 3

doubted your judgment on a matter over which you have responsibility	1	2	3	1	2	3
deliberately invaded your privacy	1	2	3	1	2	3
belittled you or your ideas	1	2	3	1	2	3
delayed work to make you look bad or slow you down	1	2	3	1	2	3
did not defend you when people spoke poorly of you	1	2	3	1	2	3
talked down to you	1	2	3	1	2	3
consistently showed up late to meetings you hosted	1	2	3	1	2	3
took advantage of you	1	2	3	1	2	3
prevented you from expressing yourself	1	2	3	1	2	3
laughed in your face	1	2	3	1	2	3
excluded you from professional camaraderie	1	2	3	1	2	3
held or attended meetings about your work without your presence	1	2	3	1	2	3
unnecessarily transmitted damaging information to higher levels in the organization	1	2	3	1	2	3

Appendix E - Instrument & Main Survey

Have you been subject to hostile behaviors at work?

Yes

No

Who subjected you to the hostile behaviors?

**One
person**

**A group of
people**

If one person subjected you to hostile behavior, which of the following was the person?

Subordinate

Coworker

Supervisor

Other _____

Male

Female

Only answer the following if you HAVE been subjected to hostile behavior by a group of people (i.e., you answered "Yes" to the first question).

If a group of people subjected you to hostile behavior, which of the following was the group of people?

Circle as many as appropriate

Subordinate

Coworker

Supervisor

Other _____

Male

Female

Was there an identifiable leader of the group?

Yes

No

Which of the following was the leader?

Male

Female

Subordinate

Coworker

Supervisor

Other _____

Please take a few minutes to provide some background information about your job.
Remember, this information will in no way be used to identify you personally.
This data will be used for making statistical comparisons only. For each of the
questions below, circle your chosen response.

People in my work group generally stick together.

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Some of the time	Often	All of the time

People in my work group are expected to behave in a similar way

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Some of the time	Often	All of the time

When people in my work group act as they are expect to do, they are rewarded

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Some of the time	Often	All of the time

I want to feel accepted by members of my work group

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Some of the time	Often	All of the time

Not following the rules is punished in my work group

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Some of the time	Often	All of the time

New employees are expected to conform to the work groups' norms

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Some of the time	Often	All of the time

Think about your current job as you answer the following questions:

Are you unsure about what people expect of you?

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Some of the time	Often	All of the time

Are you confused about exactly what you are supposed to do?

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Some of the time	Often	All of the time

Do clear, planned goals and objectives exist for your job?

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Some of the time	Often	All of the time

Are you clear about what needs to be done on your job?

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Some of the time	Often	All of the time

Do you know exactly what is expected of you?

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Some of the time	Often	All of the time

Do you feel certain about how much or how little authority you have?

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Rarely	Some of the time	Often	All of the time

Think about your supervisor at your current job as you answer the following questions:

My supervisor is concerned about me

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

My supervisor pays attention to me

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

I have a hostile supervisor

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

I have a helpful supervisor

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

My supervisor is a good organizer

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

Think about your coworkers at your current job as you answer the following questions:

My coworkers are competent

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

My coworkers are interested in me

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

I have hostile coworkers

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

I have friendly coworkers

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

My coworkers and I work together

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

My coworkers are helpful

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Disagree Nor Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

