

Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2014

Group Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment: A Meta-Analysis

Mallory McCord
University of Central Florida

 Part of the [Industrial and Organizational Psychology Commons](#)
Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd>
University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Masters Thesis (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation

McCord, Mallory, "Group Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment: A Meta-Analysis" (2014).
Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019. 4654.
<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/4654>

GROUP DIFFERENCES IN PERCEIVED WORKPLACE MISTREATMENT:
A META-ANALYSIS

by

MALLORY ANNE MCCORD
B.A. The American University, 2007
M.B.A. University of Massachusetts, 2011

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science
in the Department of Psychology
in the College of Sciences
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term
2014

© Mallory McCord 2014

ABSTRACT

Workplace mistreatment, such as discrimination, bullying, and incivility, affect thousands of individuals annually and cost U.S. organizations up into the billions of dollars each year in settlement costs, lost employee productivity, and poor employee health. Given the pervasive cost and prevalence of workplace mistreatment, research on this subject remains important. The purpose of the current research is to provide academics, practitioners, and policy makers with a comprehensive understanding of the nature of perceived workplace mistreatment by determining if subgroups (e.g. men versus women) within individual difference groups (sex, race, age, and organizational tenure) differ in magnitude of perceived workplace mistreatment. Meta-analytic methods were used to determine if and to what degree subgroups differences in perceived workplace mistreatment exist. Mistreatment type (e.g. bullying, harassment, incivility), source of mistreatment, and measurement item type and response scale were examined as potential moderators of these differences. The results suggest that there are minimal differences between subgroups of individual difference groups in the perception of workplace mistreatment, regardless of mistreatment type, mistreatment source, or mistreatment measure. Theoretical and practical implications of this research are discussed in addition to limitations and suggestions for future research.

This thesis is dedicated to my mom
for her unwavering support.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Dana Joseph, for her expertise, time, and support throughout the thesis process. I would also like to thank the other members of my thesis committee, Dr. Jeremy Beus and Dr. Robert Dipboye, for their time and valuable comments. Finally, thank you to my lab mates who have had to watch me mutter in frustration over a huge, rainbow colored spreadsheet and my friend Chris for listening to me talk through theory even though he did not usually know what I was talking about.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	5
Exploring Potential Subgroup Differences	5
Sex Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment	5
Race/Ethnicity Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment	9
Age Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment	11
Organizational Tenure Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment	12
Moderator Variables	14
Mistreatment Type	14
Source of Mistreatment.....	16
Measurement Type.....	18
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHOD	21
Literature Search.....	21
Inclusion Criteria	21
Data Coding Procedures	22
Meta-Analytic Procedures	22
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	25
Sex Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment	25
Race Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment	27
Age Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment	29

Tenure Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment.....	30
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION.....	32
APPENDIX: TABLES.....	39
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	52

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Sex and Race Differences in Mistreatment.....	40
Table 2 Age and Tenure Differences in Mistreatment.....	40
Table 3 Sex Differences and Type of Mistreatment	41
Table 4 Age Differences and Type of Mistreatment	41
Table 5 Tenure Differences and Type of Mistreatment.....	42
Table 6 Race Differences and Type of Mistreatment	42
Table 7 Source as a Moderator of Sex and Race Differences in Mistreatment	43
Table 8 Source as a Moderator of Age Differences in Mistreatment	44
Table 9 Moderator Analyses of Measurement Type on Sex Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment	44
Table 10 Moderator Analyses of Measurement on Age Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment	46
Table 11 Moderator Analyses of Measurement Type on Tenure Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment.....	48
Table 12 Moderator Analyses of Measurement Type on Race Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment.....	49

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Perceived workplace mistreatment is a stream of research that examines many types of negative acts against a person as perceived by the recipient, including harassment, discrimination, bullying, abusive supervision, incivility, ostracism, aggression, and violence. While each of these types of mistreatment can be considered negative behaviors, they can differ in terms of severity, perpetrator source, and motive and as such, workplace mistreatment is not necessarily a single latent construct. In addition, the term “perceived mistreatment”, which will be used throughout the paper, implies that an individual who endorses the behavioral items common in mistreatment scales actually feels mistreated. However, this may not be the case, meaning an individual may endorse a mistreatment item as something he or she has experienced, but may not associate said behavior with mistreatment. For example, the item “Have you ever been in a situation where a supervisor or coworker told suggestive stories” (Sexual Experiences Questionnaire-Revised [Fitzgerald, Gelfland, & Drasgow, 1995]) may be a behavior the respondent experienced, but he or she may view this behavior as camaraderie rather than harassment. Despite this issue, self-report measures of perceived mistreatment typically have strong psychometric properties (e.g. Negative Acts Questionnaire [NAQ, Einarsen, Hoel, & Notelaers, 2009]) and serve as the best available proxy for experiences of perceived mistreatment in the workplace due to the difficulty of capturing mistreatment in the act and recording the incidents.

All types of workplace mistreatment appear to have a negative impact on the employee and the organization (e.g. Hershcovis & Barling, 2010; Nielsen & Einarsen, 2012; Willness, Steel, & Lee, 2007). For example, in 2011 over 11 thousand sexual harassment cases were filed

with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC, 2013) at a cost of over \$52 million in settlements. Additional costs include employee work withdrawal, ill health, and decreased organizational commitment (Willness, Steel, & Lee, 2007). Discrimination is also associated with negative mental and physical health effects (Jones, Peddie, Gilrane, King, & Gray, 2013; Pascoe & Richman, 2009) and 2012 saw over 22 thousand age discrimination cases (at costs of \$91.6 million) and over 30 thousand sex discrimination cases (\$137.8 million; EEOC, 2013). Similarly, workplace bullying has an estimated global prevalence rate ranging from 11% to 18% (Nielsen, Matthiesen, & Einarsen, 2010) and is associated with numerous negative effects for the employees, organizations, and society as a whole (Hoel, Sheehan, Cooper, & Einarsen, 2011; Høgh, Mikkelsen, & Hansen, 2011). In the United States, abusive supervision is reported to affect about 13.6% of workers (Tepper, 2007) which costs organizations \$23.8 billion per year due to negative effects such as higher absenteeism, increased turnover, and decreased productivity (Tepper, Duffy, Henle, & Lambert, 2006). It is obvious that workplace mistreatment is a pervasive and costly occurrence in organizations worldwide. Despite attempts to curtail these behaviors (e.g. Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967), various forms of workplace mistreatment still occur to the detriment of the employee and organization.

In light of these negative consequences associated with mistreatment, it is paramount for organizations to make efforts to reduce employees' experiences of perceived mistreatment. As such, further research into the intricacies of mistreatment is important. Just as taking medication which targets specific symptoms is more effective than broad spectrum medication, mistreatment interventions which target antecedents and consequences unique to specific groups will likely be more effective than overarching interventions. However, it is currently unclear how workplace

mistreatment is perceived differently between such groups. This study is a first step to determine if differences in the perception of workplace mistreatment exist between subgroups of several individual difference groups (sex, race, age, and organizational tenure). This data may be beneficial in the design of targeted organizational interventions, in the development of more valid mistreatment measures, and in future studies in general which focus on mistreatment from the perspective of a particular group. It is also important to note that if a particular group, such as women, perceives more workplace mistreatment, these employees are more likely to experience negative consequences, such as ill health (e.g. Jones, Peddie, Gilrane, King, & Gray, 2013), in comparison to men. The long term effect of this difference for the organization could include higher turnover and absenteeism (e.g. Tepper, Duffy, Henle, & Lambert, 2006) for women in particular. This disparate impact could have legal implications for the organization in the case of sex, race, and age differences. Finally, if the data supports the proposition that particular subgroups experience more perceived mistreatment, this suggests discrimination is occurring despite laws and regulations to prevent it (i.e. if more women experience perceived mistreatment than men this would support the notion that discrimination occurs in the workplace because it implies that treatment differs based on group membership [EEOC, 2013]). However, this meta-analysis may demonstrate that subgroup differences in perceived workplace mistreatment are negligible. In this scenario, research may benefit from a more broad approach to perceived workplace mistreatment rather than a focus on specific subgroup differences.

This research contributes to the literature in three ways. First, this is the only comprehensive meta-analytic examination of subgroup differences in workplace mistreatment as perceived by the recipient. Numerous meta-analyses exist that examine specific types of mistreatment (e.g. harassment, discrimination, bullying) and related workplace outcomes (e.g.

well-being, performance; e.g. Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Jones et al., 2013; Nielsen & Einarsen, 2012; Schyns & Schilling, 2013), although this work has ignored subgroup differences in perceived workplace mistreatment. Moreover, three prior meta-analyses have specifically examined sex subgroup differences in the extent to which individuals identify hypothetical behaviors as sexual harassment (Blumenthal, 1998; O'Connor, 1998; Rotundo, Nguyen, & Sackett, 2010), but this work has not examined whether sex differences exist in experiences of perceived sexual harassment. In contrast to these meta-analyses, the focus of the current study is to examine subgroup differences in *experiences* of perceived workplace mistreatment rather than identification of whether certain hypothetical behaviors are or are not mistreatment. Second, I seek to examine the extent to which subgroup differences in workplace mistreatment exist within four individual difference groups (i.e., sex, race, age, and organizational tenure) and the extent to which these differences may vary across many types of mistreatment (e.g., harassment, discrimination, bullying, incivility). Finally, the current paper examines several moderators that may influence the magnitude of subgroup differences including type of mistreatment, source of mistreatment, and mistreatment measurement type.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Exploring Potential Subgroup Differences

Power is undeniably one of the largest factors that influences the experience of perceived workplace mistreatment: the instigator is often a person in a position of higher power who is attempting to inflict damage on the victim or the mistreatment is used as means to meet a goal (Keashley, 2007; Hershcovis & Barling, 2010; Leymann, 1996; Olweus, 1993). For example, abusive supervision is marked by the instigator's misuse of his or her authority to influence others and achieve his or her aims (Schyns & Schilling, 2013). This power differential is not restricted to formal organizational power (i.e. supervisor-subordinate relationships) but can also occur informally. The role of power will be the main focus of the discussion of subgroup differences below, with the addition of several alternative explanations.

Sex Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment

It is important to clarify that for any of the subgroup differences discussed in the current paper, potential differences may exist for two reasons: a particular group (e.g. women) may actually experience more of a particular type of mistreatment, or a group may perceive more mistreatment (i.e. the group will endorse more items of a mistreatment measure regardless of whether the mistreatment actually occurred). Either justification may result in subgroup differences, but it should be noted that the particular reason cannot be parsed out with current measurement methods (i.e., it is impossible to disentangle actual mistreatment from perceived

mistreatment). As such, I will discuss each group difference in terms of both rationales, when possible.

Upon considering sex differences in mistreatment, literature suggests that harassing behaviors such as sexual harassment, bullying, and incivility, are based on learned social roles (Terpstra & Baker, 1986) and their associated status and power differentials (Keashley, 2007). Despite decades of social and legal efforts, men still typically hold positions of higher power in the workplace compared to women (Adler, 1994). This naturally occurring higher status may allow men to mistreat those with less power (i.e. women) and expect these lower status individuals to submit to the mistreatment. There may also be an underlying motivational factor tied to power, in that the higher power group desires to retain their status, and as such will use harassing behaviors as a way to defend and protect that status (Terpstra & Baker, 1986; Yamada, 2000). While women undoubtedly engage in harassing behaviors as well, the literature supports the more frequent occurrence of women being the target of mistreatment from men (Aggarwal & Gupta, 2000; Morris, 1996). This status differential may explain potential subgroup differences in that women likely report higher perceived workplace mistreatment because they actually have experienced mistreatment more frequently and in wider forms than men.

An alternative perspective is that individuals in groups who experience more mistreatment are likely to become sensitive to and endorse those types of behaviors when responding to mistreatment measures. Past experiences are not restricted to only behaviors that have been directly experienced by an individual, but may also come about from witnessing mistreatment or hearing about mistreatment. Expectations of mistreatment may also be supported by women's typical social role as a lower power group. As a member of this group, the norm is endurance of potential mistreatment at the hands of the higher status group. This subjective

judgment process, (McKinney, 1994) based on social norms and expectations derived from past experiences, may mean that women are more likely to endorse particular items in a measure as being mistreatment in comparison to the powerful majority group (men). Men, in contrast, most likely experience less mistreatment overall and perceive some forms of mistreatment as acceptable behavior that women would not perceive as acceptable (Phinney, Madden, & Santos, 1998). This suggests that items like the following may be interpreted differently by men and women, which can influence whether or not a particular sex indicates that such mistreatment occurred: “touched you (for example, put an arm around you) in a way that made you feel uncomfortable” (Sexual Experiences Questionnaire; Fitzgerald et al., 1988).

This supposition is supported by further research which indicates that women are more likely than men to identify a broader range of behaviors as harassing ($d = .30$, Rotundo et al., 2001; Blumenthal 1998; O’Connor, 1998), although this difference depends on the type of behavior (e.g. physical nonsexual contact $d = .14$, impersonal derogatory attitudes $d = .34$; Rotundo et al., 2001). In addition, women tend to have a broader definition of harassment in comparison to men, in that more types of behaviors are seen as harassing (e.g. Fitzgerald & Omerod, 1991; Kenig & Ryan, 1986) and women are more likely to perceive a scenario as sexual harassment and unwelcome in comparison to male workers (Ohse and Stockdale, 2008). These sex differences in identifying behaviors that are considered to be harassing are likely to extend into sex differences in experiences of perceived harassment and other types of workplace mistreatment (i.e. if women find a broader range of behaviors harassing, they are more likely to indicate they have been harassed on harassment measures). In other words, because sexual harassment research suggests that men find fewer behaviors to be harassing than women (Blumenthal, 1998; O’Connor, 1998; Rotundo et al., 2001), men are less likely to report that they

have experienced items in which they must have evaluated a behavior as uncomfortable/offensive/etc. However, other researchers have found differing results for additional forms of mistreatment: for example, negligible sex differences were found in regards to abusive supervision ($d = -.06$, Harris, Kacmar, & Zivnusku, 2007) but more incivility was experienced by men ($d = -.41$, Lim & Lee, 2011).

A final explanation of potential sex group differences in perceived workplace mistreatment is natural aggressive tendencies: women may experience more perceived workplace mistreatment simply because men are more aggressive by nature (Geen, 1990; McFarlin, Fals-Stewart, Major, & Justice, 2001). As such, men may be more likely to instigate rather than be a target of mistreatment (Dupre & Barling, 2006; Eagley & Steffan, 1986) although the target may be male or female. Also, who the instigator is may be dependent on the type of mistreatment under examination: it may be that men are more often aggressive towards other men, and that men engage in physical aggression rather than emotional aggression (Barling, Dupre, & Kelloway, 2009). Altogether, this suggests that while men are more likely instigators of mistreatment due to natural aggressive tendencies, this difference may be moderated by the type of mistreatment under examination.

In summary, theory suggests that subgroup differences in perceived workplace mistreatment between men and women may come about for three reasons: first, social norms and their associated power differentials suggest that women may more often be a target of mistreatment. Second, the tendency of women to be the more frequent victim of mistreatment may sensitize this group to be more likely to endorse mistreatment items as behaviors she has endured. Finally, men may naturally be more aggressive and hence are more likely to be the instigator than the target of mistreatment. Further examination of the extent of sex differences in

the perception of various types of workplace mistreatment is merited and theory suggests that women may be more likely to experience perceived workplace mistreatment in comparison to men. Therefore,

H1: Women will experience more perceived workplace mistreatment than men.

Race/Ethnicity Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment

Potential race group differences in perceived workplace mistreatment may be due to very similar reasons as sex differences in perceived workplace mistreatment: social norm-based power differentials and past experiences likely cause race differences in perceived workplace mistreatment. That is, the concept of harassing behaviors occurring due to status and power differentials (Keashley, 2007; Terpstra & Baker, 1986) is highly relevant to racial groups as well. It may be that the group with typically less status and power (minority racial groups) are seen as easier to take advantage of and mistreat by the higher status group (majority racial group). This points to the possibility that minority groups experience more mistreatment, which suggests race differences in the reported perception of workplace mistreatment between Whites and minorities. In addition, past experience with mistreatment (direct or indirect) may influence the minority individual's perceived future encounters with mistreatment in that they will be more sensitive to and more likely to perceive a wide variety of behaviors as mistreatment (Pinel, 1999).

An alternate explanation involves the victim precipitation model of social interactions. This model suggests that certain individuals or groups are more likely to be victims of mistreatment because they are perceived to possess characteristics that make them vulnerable to or deserving of mistreatment (Felson & Steadman, 1983; Hepburn, 1973). It is possible that a

pervasive group stereotype, such as perceived aggressiveness or submissiveness, may result in more frequent mistreatment being targeted at individuals who belong to the stereotyped group. This theory is also supported by Hodson, Roscigno, and Lopez (2006) who suggest that ethnicity is a visible marker of perceived vulnerability. This perceived vulnerability is most likely caused by the lower power associated with minority groups (Keashley, 2007; Terpstra & Baker, 1986).

Race differences in perceived workplace mistreatment have not been the primary focus of extant research, and any such differences are typically found in the form of control variable correlates. However, a substantial amount of research has included such variables, and suggests that racial differences are small. For example, Raver and Nishii (2010) found minorities reported slightly more harassment than whites ($d = .14$), more bullying was reported by minorities than Whites ($d = .21$; Quine 2002), and Blacks perceived more discrimination in the workplace in comparison to Whites ($d = .16$; Deitch et al., 2003).

Altogether, there are three reasons as to why racial subgroup differences in perceived workplace mistreatment may occur. Again, social norm based power differentials may put racial minorities in a position of vulnerability that results in minorities being a more frequent target of mistreatment. Second, past experiences with mistreatment may sensitize minority groups in that they are more likely to endorse mistreatment items as behaviors they have encountered at work. Third, the victim precipitation model of social interactions suggests that a pervasive minority group stereotype may result in more frequent mistreatment targeted at minority individuals. Research and theory suggest that minority racial groups may experience more perceived workplace mistreatment than the White majority group. In other words,

H2: Minority racial groups will experience more perceived workplace mistreatment than the majority White group.

Age Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment

There is a paucity of research that examines potential differences in the extent to which various age groups have experienced perceived workplace mistreatment, although some research suggests that age differences in perceived mistreatment may come about for two reasons: life experience and power differentials. A first explanation for potential age group differences is that as people age and have more life experiences, what they have learned from those experiences (such as mistreatment) are incorporated into their schemas (Nelson & Keith, 1990). This means that older individuals perhaps have a more narrow view of what behaviors can be called mistreatment whereas younger workers, who likely have had fewer encounters with mistreatment, will have a broad definition of and categorize various behaviors as mistreatment more often. In a similar sense, research suggests that as people age, they develop a more conservative stance on social issues (Furnham, 1985; Truett, 1993). In this case, it may be that older, more conservative employees have a less open-minded perspective on what behaviors they consider to be mistreatment. Therefore, younger workers will have a more inclusive definition of mistreatment and be more likely to report an experience of perceived workplace mistreatment. Second, the concept of social norms and power differentials (Terpstra & Baker, 1986; Keashley, 2007) may cause younger workers to be exposed to more mistreatment due to their lower relative power. Older, more experienced workers will likely have higher expertise in comparison to younger workers, which creates an expert power differential (French & Raven, 1959). This indicates that younger, less powerful workers may experience and report more mistreatment. However, research again typically focuses on age differences as a control variable and tends to find small group differences: Sliter (2013; incivility) and Gerrity (2000; sexual harassment) both

found a small difference where younger individuals experienced slightly more mistreatment than older individuals ($r = -.24$). Also, Ferris (2008) found negligible differences in terms of ostracism ($r = .01$).

In summation, age differences in perceived workplace discrimination may result for the following reasons: first, life experience may cause older individuals to have a narrow definition of mistreatment. This suggests that older and/or more conservative victims are less likely to endorse mistreatment items as being behaviors they have experienced at work. Second, the increased expertise of older individuals may create a power differential in that younger employees are more likely to experience mistreatment. Altogether, it appears that younger individuals may be more likely to experience perceived workplace mistreatment in comparison to older workers:

H3: Younger workers will experience more perceived workplace mistreatment than older workers.

Organizational Tenure Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment

It should be noted that the current paper seeks to examine workplace mistreatment differences in organizational tenure rather than job tenure or supervisor tenure because tenure with the organization is more indicative of socialization (i.e., those who are new to the organization – as opposed to those who are new to their current position – will experience a power differential that may result in more experiences of workplace mistreatment).

In accordance with the previously discussed influence of social norms and group status, group differences in length of organizational tenure may impact perceived workplace

mistreatment. Those who have been with an organization longer may feel that they are in a higher position of power based on time seniority, which entitles them to mistreat colleagues with shorter tenure and less experience (Keashley, 2007; Terpstra & Baker, 1986). Individuals with longer tenure may also have become accustomed to the culture/climate of the organization and know what is acceptable behavior. This may result in a more narrow definition of what mistreatment entails for these individuals, leading them to endorse fewer mistreatment items as constituting mistreatment. The phenomenon of expert power also applies in the case of organizational tenure: typically an individual who has been with an organization longer will have more knowledge and proficiency in organizational tasks and hold expert power over individuals who have a shorter tenure (French & Raven, 1959). This power differential may result in the higher tenured individuals being perpetrators of mistreatment rather than targets of mistreatment.

Extant literature has not directly examined subgroup differences for organizational tenure in terms of perceived workplace mistreatment: tenure is considered a control variable. This research suggests relatively small differences: Beaver (1999) found that people with less tenure reported more workplace violence in comparison to workers with more tenure ($r = -.12$), Harris et al. (2007) found negligible tenure differences for abusive supervision ($r = .03$), and Glomb and Liao (2003) found that workers with longer tenure reported slightly more workplace aggression than workers with shorter tenure ($r = .20$).

In review, the length of an employee's organizational tenure may impact the employee's perceived workplace mistreatment in two ways. First, power differentials based on seniority or the perceived increase in knowledge and proficiency of the longer tenured employee may cause these individuals to be the instigator of mistreatment rather than the target. Second, individuals with longer tenure may have grown more accustomed to the organizational climate and as such,

may have a better understanding of acceptable behavior. Therefore, they are more likely to endorse a narrower list of mistreatment items as behaviors they have experienced in comparison to shorter tenured individuals. Further examination is needed for a better understanding of potential differences between individuals with shorter and longer organizational tenure. However, theory suggests that individuals with a shorter tenure are more likely to experience perceived workplace mistreatment in comparison to their higher tenured coworkers.

H4: Employees who have less tenure will experience more perceived workplace mistreatment than employees who have longer tenure.

Moderator Variables

Several moderators will be examined in an effort to account for additional variance in subgroup differences in the perception of workplace mistreatment. These moderators include the type of mistreatment, the source of mistreatment, and the type of measure used in the study.

Mistreatment Type

Potential subgroup differences in the perception of workplace mistreatment may be impacted by the type of mistreatment involved. This moderation may occur for two main reasons: perceived workplace mistreatment depends on the level of behavior ambiguity and mistreatment types differ in their tie to group identity. First, Rotundo et al. (2001) found in the case of sexual harassment that differences in perception between men and women varied depending on what type of sexually harassing behavior was involved. That is, behaviors that can

be classified as contributing to a hostile work environment (less severe and more ambiguous behaviors in comparison to extreme forms of mistreatment) tend to have larger subgroup differences in the perception of sexual harassment (Frazier, Cochran, & Olson, 1995; Gutek & O'Connor, 1995). In parallel, this suggests that more ambiguous types of mistreatment may be related to higher subgroup differences. This is likely because lower power groups (e.g. women, Morris, 1996), who typically experience more mistreatment than the higher power group and become sensitive to mistreating behaviors (Pinel, 1999), interpret ambiguous behaviors to be mistreatment because they expect mistreatment. For example, ostracism is ambiguous because the behavior can be attributed to various motives and as such, ostracizing behaviors may be more often interpreted and reported as mistreatment by lower power groups which would result in larger subgroup differences in comparison to the experience of less ambiguous forms of mistreatment such as violence. However, clearly differentiating between more and less ambiguous types of mistreatment is difficult due to the variety of definitions that exist and overlap among mistreatment types, but examination of subgroup differences at the mistreatment type level may reveal a clearer pattern in relation to ambiguity.

On a similar note, the construct of general workplace harassment is quite broad and encompasses many forms of mistreatment including incivility, bullying, and emotional abuse (Raver & Nishii, 2010). The motivations of the perpetrators of these behaviors are often varied and vague. However, a different point of view suggests that group differences for mistreatment will not appear unless the mistreatment is discriminatory or group specific. In that case, one group will report more mistreatment than other groups (Cortina, 2008; Rowe, 1990). Social identity harassment, or harassing behaviors that target an individual's membership in a group that is integral to their social identity (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Tajfel & Turner, 1985), could

also explain why ambiguous behaviors may result in smaller group differences in the perception of mistreatment. This alternate view of ambiguity indicates that mistreatment which is not related to group membership, such as abusive supervision or bullying, may result in negligible group differences.

In summary, subgroup differences in the perception of workplace harassment may be moderated by the type of mistreatment for two reasons: first, mistreatment that is more ambiguous is more likely to result in larger subgroup differences. Second, mistreatment that is targeted at a subgroup's identity (i.e. less ambiguous) may also be more likely to result in larger subgroup differences in perceived workplace mistreatment. These opposing explanations lead to the following research question: Does the magnitude of subgroup differences vary across the type of mistreatment?

Source of Mistreatment

Hershcovis et al. (2007) suggest that if researchers do not examine the source of mistreatment, they may miss the true effect of workplace mistreatment. This is because the magnitude of effect sizes in relation to workplace mistreatment varies depending on the source of the mistreatment. Individuals most likely respond differently to mistreatment from supervisors, coworkers, and organizational outsiders and as such, each source may require different attention from and prevention by the organization (Hershcovis and Barling, 2010).

Difference in status is thought to be the main reason behind the differing effects of mistreatment source. Mistreatment from an instigator who has formal authority over the victim is seen differently from the victim's perspective (Rotundo et al., 2001) than an instigator who is of

equal or lesser authority. This may occur because the victim feels that an instigator of higher authority has the right to mistreat the victim. In other words, social norms may prescribe an expectation of mistreatment from supervisors such that different subgroups more easily agree as to what behaviors falls under mistreatment. The opposite perspective may occur when the instigator is of equal or lower status (Fitzgerald, Weitzman, Gold, & Ormerod, 1988) since social norms would promote respect or mutual support rather than mistreatment from subordinates or peers. Research suggests that there may even been no group differences if the source is of equal status, but that there is typically more agreement as to what constitutes mistreatment from a superior than for a peer ($d = .26$ versus $.42$; Rotundo et al., 2001).

Mistreatment from outsiders may also be impacted by a power differential. In the case of individuals whom the employee serves, such as customers, clients, the public, and students, it is possible that these organizational outsiders are given higher (informal) power over the employee. This may occur due to social norms (e.g. the customer is always right) or authorized by the organization and so is perceived as part of the job by employees (Fullerton & Punj, 2004). This creates a common scenario where outsiders are the higher power group and results in relatively high agreement among subgroups as to what constitutes mistreatment from this group (Yagil, 2008).

Altogether, research and theory suggest that the source of mistreatment will affect the magnitude of subgroup differences in perceived workplace mistreatment. This is largely due to status differences between the target and the instigator: an instigator of higher authority will most likely result in smaller subgroup differences whereas mistreatment by a peer will result in larger subgroup differences. Organizational outsiders hold informal authority over employees, although

the extent of subgroup differences is unknown. This leads to the following research question:
Does the magnitude of subgroup differences vary across the source of mistreatment?

Measurement Type

The type of measure used to assess perceived workplace mistreatment may affect the strength of subgroup differences. Typical mistreatment measures involve the use of either a behavioral checklist or direct questions. For example, Chan, Lam, Chow, and Cheung (2008) found in their meta-analysis that studies which used a behavioral checklist (respondents are given a list of offensive behaviors and asked if these have been experienced) measure showed a significantly stronger relationship between sexual harassment and job satisfaction in comparison to a direct question measure (e.g. "Have you ever been sexually harassed?"). Differences were also found by Nielsen and Einarsen (2010) who uncovered that reported experiences of workplace bullying using the behavioral checklist method were significantly higher than a self-labeling method using a definition. In addition, mistreatment literature indicates that few people will self-label as a victim of mistreatment when directly asked (Fitzgerald, 1987; Munson, Miner, & Hulin, 2001). In comparison, a behavioral checklist is considered a multiple-indicator method and often accounts for more variance in responses and has higher reliability than a single item measure, such as a direct question (Cooper & Richardson, 1986). This is likely due to the complex nature of mistreatment which can be better captured within multiple items and an increased likelihood of responses to items that do not explicitly mention the type of mistreatment under study. The restriction of range in responses to direct questions could mask possible

subgroup differences in the perception of workplace mistreatment. Therefore, I posit the following:

H4: The magnitude of subgroup differences in perceived workplace mistreatment will be moderated by the measurement type such that subgroup differences for studies using behavioral checklists will be larger than studies which use direct question measures.

Measures of workplace mistreatment also vary in the response scale. These scales include a frequency Likert scale (e.g. 5-point Likert scale, ranging from (1) never to (5) always), an intensity Likert scale (e.g. 5-point Likert scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree), and a yes/no response scale. Extant research has not examined this particular aspect of measurement as a moderator, however, it is expected that each type of scale may elicit different respondent mindsets and responses. First, a frequency scale is more explicit and behaviorally based than an intensity scale: the respondent can think back and count occurrences of a behavior in the given time frame. In comparison, intensity refers to the degree of severity experienced by the respondent overall, rather than explicit behavioral counts. An intensity scale is more likely to result in group differences because first, mistreatment is a fairly rare occurrence which may cause range restriction in the responses to the number of experiences in a time frame and suppress group differences. Second, subgroups may perceive mistreatment differently in terms of overall severity in that one major incident is enough to cause a one group to endorse “strongly agree” when asked about that type of incident where the other group may not endorse such strong severity. As previously mentioned, yes/no responses to direct questions in particular tend to be endorsed less frequently (Fitzgerald, 1987) which suggests a yes/no response scale may elicit the weakest subgroup differences. In accordance with the above line of thought, I propose hypothesis five:

H5: The magnitude of subgroup differences in perceived workplace mistreatment will be moderated by the response scale such that subgroup differences will be largest for studies using intensity scales, second largest for frequency scales, and smallest for yes/no scales.

In summary, this meta-analysis examines potential subgroup differences within individual difference groups (sex, race, age, and tenure) in the experience of perceived workplace mistreatment. Although these differences are most likely in large part due to power differentials, alternative theories and explanations were explored. Finally, the potential moderating effects of mistreatment type, mistreatment source, and mistreatment measure were examined. Altogether, this meta-analysis aims to a more comprehensive understanding of perceived workplace mistreatment which would be useful in guiding researchers and practitioners in a direction which targets specific antecedents and consequences of mistreatment unique to particular subgroups.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHOD

Literature Search

A search for empirical studies that examined workplace mistreatment was conducted in PsycINFO and Dissertations Abstracts International for all available years through 2013. The past five years of available conference proceedings for three professional organizations (Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Academy of Management, and Society for Personality and Social Psychology) were searched as well. The following key words and relevant permutations were used to search for mistreatment studies: harassment, discrimination, aggression, hostility, violence, deviance, bullying, incivility, mistreatment, ostracism, assault, abuse, and victimization. A search was also conducted for meta-analyses that examined these types of mistreatment. The reference sections of these 14 meta-analyses were examined for additional eligible studies.

Inclusion Criteria

A study was included if it examined a sample of individuals who were employed at the time of the mistreatment and experienced mistreatment in the workplace. Studies that used laboratory experiments or hypothetical vignettes were not included. A study was also included if it published an effect size for a subgroup difference in received mistreatment (i.e., instigated mistreatment was excluded), including Cohen's d , Pearson's r , and any effect sizes that could be converted to d or r . It was also required that the study examined and measured experiences of

perceived workplace mistreatment, which excluded studies using an objective measure of mistreatment (e.g. number of sexual harassment cases filed with the EEOC for an organization). Effect sizes were only included if they represented individual level mistreatment; any group-level mistreatment effect sizes were excluded. Both published and unpublished data were included if it met the above requirements. This yielded 222 studies ($N = 185,441$) eligible to be included in the meta-analysis. The included studies are marked with an asterisk in the reference section.

Data Coding Procedures

All included studies were coded first for sample characteristics including sample size, publication status, and publication year. Sample demographics were coded where possible and included sex ratio, age, organizational tenure, race, annual income, marital status, sexual orientation, disability status, body mass index, education level, and national origin. Relevant information in regards to group differences was coded as well: mistreatment source, type, and reliability, group difference type, and effect size. The author independently coded all studies included in this meta-analysis.

Meta-Analytic Procedures

Meta-analyses were conducted using the Hunter and Schmidt's (2004) procedures. d and r were corrected for unreliability in the mistreatment measure using artifact distributions (internal consistency only). The d statistic was used to compare the differences between

subgroups for sex and race. The r statistic was used to examine differences in age and organizational tenure subgroups, as these variables are continuous. When examining the effect sizes, a d of .20, .50, and .80 is considered, small, moderate, and large, respectively (Cohen, 1988) with a positive d suggesting that women or minorities experience more perceived workplace mistreatment, and a negative d suggesting that men or Whites experience more perceived workplace mistreatment. In terms of age and tenure, an r of .10, .30, and .50 is considered small, moderate, and large, respectively (Cohen, 1988) with a positive value indicating that older or more tenured individuals experience more perceived workplace mistreatment and a negative value indicating younger or less tenured workers experience more perceived workplace mistreatment.

d statistics were converted to r in order to correct for unreliability in the mistreatment measure and also to calculate the confidence and credibility intervals. These data were then transformed back into d for data reporting (Hunter & Schmidt, 2004). Of the 155 studies which reported sex differences, 80% used r and 0% used d . Of the 51 studies which reported race differences, 70.59% used r and 3.92% used d .

The following statistics were converted from their original form to d or r for subgroup comparisons: means and standard deviations, t tests, one way ANOVA F tests, and chi square statistics. Composites were calculated in the case where subtests of a mistreatment type were reported rather than differences for the mistreatment overall (e.g. group differences for personal derogation, social exclusion, and physical abuse were reported rather than bullying overall). In the scenario where intercorrelations between the subtests were not available, an average was used. Composite alpha reliabilities were calculated using the Spearman Brown formula. In the scenario where no reliability was reported for any of the effect sizes included in given meta-

analysis, the mean reliability of all studies included in the overall subgroup difference meta-analysis was imputed as the artifact distribution.

To determine accuracy and generalizability, the 95% confidence intervals and 95% credibility intervals for each effect size were calculated. A confidence interval reflects the accuracy of and an index of sampling error for a given effect size estimate. In this sense, the confidence interval indicates if the effect size is significant; i.e. a confidence interval which does not include zero indicates that the effect size is significantly different from zero. A credibility interval, on the other hand, gives information about whether or not the included studies represent one population or subpopulations; i.e. a credibility interval which includes zero suggests that we should search for moderators due to variability across the studies (Whitener, 1990). Theoretical moderators were examined through the use of subgroup meta-analyses.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

Sex Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment

The first hypothesis proposed that women would be more likely to experience perceived workplace mistreatment in comparison to men. In regard to mistreatment overall, we can see in Table 1 that sex differences are minimal ($\delta = .07$; $k = 155$; $N = 130,881$), although in the predicted direction and the 95% confidence interval suggests this difference is significantly different from zero [.05, .09]. However, the 95% credibility interval crosses zero [-.21, .35], which is an indication that we should search for moderators that are affecting this subgroup difference.

A meta-analysis of mistreatment type (Table 3) reveals similar results to overall mistreatment: subgroup differences between men and women in the perception of workplace mistreatment are minimal. Of the mistreatment types analyzed, two are not in the predicted direction, meaning men experiences slightly more mistreatment than women: (ostracism: $\delta = -.06$; $k = 6$; $N = 989$ and abusive supervision: $\delta = -.13$; $k = 30$; $N = 10,583$) although only the abusive supervision effect size is significantly different from zero (95% CI [-.18, -.08]). Additionally, harassment is the only other mistreatment type which demonstrates significant differences between men and women ($\delta = .17$; $k = 25$; $N = 58,679$; 95% CI [.03, .22]). Of the eight types of mistreatment analyzed (see Table 2), all credibility intervals cross zero, which merits a search for moderators.

Unfortunately, due to limited number of samples which included source information, moderator analyses of the influence of mistreatment source on differences between all subgroups

of the four individual difference groups were largely unable to be determined. However, a comparison of insiders (supervisors and coworkers) versus outsiders (customers, clients/patients, and the public) was conducted for sex, age, and Minority/White differences. This information is a valuable first step in itself because research suggests that not only do employees tend to experience more mistreatment from organizational outsiders (Grandey, Kern, & Frone, 2007), but the response to mistreatment from insiders versus outsiders likely differs. Insiders tend to have a greater impact on the employee's work experience, such as job security and sense of belonging. In comparison, outsiders typically do not impact an employee's place in the organization, and the interaction is often short and easy to evacuate (Hershcovis & Barling, 2010).

Interestingly, a comparison of insider mistreatment versus outsider mistreatment shows sex differences in opposing directions (Table 3): overall mistreatment experienced by insiders was reported more often by men ($\delta = -.09$; $k = 25$, $N = 8,158$) but overall mistreatment experienced by outsiders was reported more often by women ($\delta = .07$; $k = 9$, $N = 2,356$). Both of these differences are significantly different from zero, although the credibility interval for insiders suggests additional moderators, and again, the strength of these differences is minimal. The only mistreatment type with k 's large enough to analyze across sources was incivility, although the k 's are small. In terms of incivility, sex subgroup differences are negligible and insignificant (insiders $\delta = .00$; $k = 2$, $N = 259$ outsiders $\delta = .04$; $k = 4$, $N = 395$).

Further analyses of the influence of the mistreatment measure revealed similar results: differences were negligible between men and women (Table 9). In regards to the type of item, behavioral checklists are used most often across types of mistreatment and typically have slightly stronger effects in comparison to a direct question measure (e.g. harassment: direct question $\delta =$

.07; $k = 4$; $N = 3,688$ versus behavioral checklist $\delta = .18$; $k = 19$, $N = 51,750$) although sometimes in the opposite direction (e.g. discrimination: direct question $\delta = -.02$; $k = 14$; $N = 10,873$ versus behavioral checklist $\delta = .04$; $k = 30$, $N = 22,005$; psychological aggression: direct question $\delta = .06$; $k = 4$; $N = 3,624$ versus behavioral checklist $\delta = -.12$; $k = 12$; $N = 5,800$). No consistent differences among the three types of response scales were found. Overall, regardless of type of items or response scale, the difference between men and women remains negligible with no consistent pattern of differences between moderator levels, and the largest subgroup difference being $\delta = .22$ ($k = 2$; $N = 518$; harassment measures that used an intensity Likert scale).

Race Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment

The second hypothesis anticipated that minorities would experience more perceived workplace mistreatment than the majority White group. In Table 1 we can see that racial differences are minimal, even at the level of specific racial groups, although these differences are in the predicted direction. Minority/White differences ($\delta = .05$; $k = 51$, $N = 59,051$; 95% CI [.03, .08]) and Black/White differences ($\delta = .06$; $k = 24$; $N = 40,408$; 95% CI [.02, .10]) for overall mistreatment were significantly different from zero, with the smallest difference found between Hispanics and Whites ($\delta = .02$; $k = 6$; $N = 10,927$) and the largest between Asians and Whites ($\delta = .08$; $k = 4$; $N = 7,720$). A search for moderators was warranted due to the fact that the credibility intervals for all four racial group differences crossed zero.

Subsequent meta-analyses of the type of mistreatment revealed similar results to overall mistreatment: differences between minorities and Whites are minimal (Table 6). A limited

number of analyses could be conducted on specific racial groups due to a lack of relevant studies. An interesting finding within harassment is a significant difference in the predicted direction between Hispanics and Whites ($\delta = .24$; $k = 2$; $N = 340$) that is relatively larger than the differences between Minorities and Whites ($\delta = .02$; $k = 16$; $N = 19,189$) or Blacks and Whites ($\delta = -.01$; $k = 6$; $N = 9,057$). However, the Hispanic/White analysis is based on only two samples so should be interpreted with caution. In comparison, the difference between Hispanics and Whites within discrimination was non-significant ($\delta = .02$; $k = 4$; $N = 10,587$; 95% CI [-.11, .14]). Significant Minority/White ($\delta = .08$; $k = 22$; $N = 31,058$; 95% CI [.07, .14]) and Black/White ($\delta = .08$; $k = 16$; $N = 29,547$; 95% CI [.03, .13]) differences were found for discrimination, although the differences remain small. The only effect sizes that were not in the predicted direction are Black/White differences in perceptions of harassment ($\delta = -.01$; $k = 6$; $N = 9,057$) and Minority/White differences in perceptions of violence ($\delta = -.03$; $k = 2$; $N = 1,227$), although these are each based on only two studies and remain negligible effect sizes.

Limited analyses could be conducted on the influence of mistreatment source on racial group differences in the perception of workplace mistreatment. In Table 7 we see that the effect sizes for both insiders and outsiders are in the predicted direction for Minority/White differences in perceptions of overall mistreatment. However, the effect size for outsiders is relatively larger ($\delta = .14$; $k = 3$; $N = 3,840$; 95% CI [.06, .22]) than the effect size for insiders ($\delta = .02$; $k = 2$; $N = 622$; 95% CI [-.04, .09]). This analysis is based on limited samples, so the results should be interpreted with caution, and the effect sizes are consistent with overall minimal group differences.

Analyses of measurement item type and response scale found similar overall results: differences between Minorities and Whites in the perception of workplace mistreatment are

minimal (Table 12; largest $\delta = .14$; $k = 11$; $N = 17,331$; Minority/White differences in discrimination using an intensity response scale). In terms of overall mistreatment, behavioral measures have consistently larger effect sizes among racial groups in comparison to direct question measures (behavioral: $\delta = .07$; $k = 30$; $N = 40,155$ for Minority/White, $\delta = .08$; $k = 11$; $N = 29,052$ for Black/White, and $\delta = .08$; $k = 3$; $N = 5,476$ for Hispanic/White versus direct: $\delta = -.01$; $k = 14$; $N = 15,542$ for Minority/White, $\delta = .00$; $k = 10$; $N = 10,349$ for Black/White, and $\delta = -.03$; $k = 2$; $N = 5,341$ for Hispanic/White). Overall, among the types of mistreatment behavioral checklists also had slightly larger effect sizes than direct question measures. In terms of the response scale, among the types of mistreatment, yes/no response scales most often had an effect size close to zero or negative, whereas intensity scales typically had the largest effect sizes and frequency scales fell in the middle. However, all effect sizes remain minimal.

Age Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment

Age differences in the perception of workplace mistreatment followed a similar pattern as sex and race differences. In Table 2 we can see that the results are in the predicted direction of hypothesis three. In terms of overall mistreatment, younger individuals experience slightly more mistreatment in comparison to older individuals, yet the differences are negligible ($\rho = -.05$, $k = 145$; $N = 84,804$; 95% CI [-.07, -.04]) and the credibility interval overlaps zero, which indicates we should search for moderators.

Follow up meta-analyses on mistreatment types found a narrow range of effect sizes across mistreatment types (Table 4, $\rho = -.01$; $k = 11$; $N = 4,822$ for violence to $\rho = -.08$, $k = 13$; $N = 6,582$ for psychological aggression). All effect sizes for the various types of mistreatment are

in the predicted direction but minimal. Of the eight types of mistreatment, only three have insignificant differences between older and younger workers (violence 95% CI [-.05, .03]; incivility 95% CI [-.10, .04]; ostracism 95% CI [-.07, .02]).

Moderator analyses of the source of mistreatment could only be conducted on overall mistreatment (Table 8). Insiders were found to have a smaller effect size ($\rho = -.04$; $k = 32$; $N = 10,248$) in comparison to outsiders ($\rho = -.19$; $k = 6$; $N = 1,850$), although both are in the predicted direction and significant. In regards to the measurement moderator, effect sizes have minimal range and are largely consistent with the predicted direction, regardless of type of item or response scale (Table 10). The largest effect size is $\rho = -.27$ ($k = 3$; $N = 1,359$: psychological aggression as measured with an intensity Likert scale), although this is still a small difference. Similarly, the largest difference between moderator levels is for psychological aggression and type of response scale (frequency $\rho = -.06$; $k = 9$; $N = 4,672$ versus intensity $\rho = -.27$; $k = 3$; $N = 1,359$) although neither are significant. Effect sizes rarely change direction based on measurement (e.g. bullying, direct question $\rho = .01$; $k = 2$; $N = 3,791$ versus behavioral question $\rho = -.08$; $k = 15$; $N = 4,292$) and even so, overall effect sizes remain minimal.

Tenure Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment

The fourth hypothesis posited that workers with shorter tenure are more likely to experience perceived workplace mistreatment. The meta-analytic results suggest there are minimal differences in this regard. An examination of overall mistreatment and tenure differences found a significant effect in the predicted direction, but the effect size is negligible

(Table 2, $\rho = -.09$; $k = 48$; $N = 37,663$; 95% CI [-.12, -.07]). The credibility interval includes zero, so a moderator search is warranted.

Analyses of the type of mistreatment and tenure differences were restricted to six types of mistreatment due to limited samples (Table 5). Additionally, several meta-analyses have small k 's and should be interpreted with caution. Again, the effect sizes indicate minimal differences between workers with shorter tenure and workers with longer tenure with most effect sizes in the predicted direction. Harassment has the largest subgroup difference ($\rho = -.15$; $k = 4$; $N = 11,168$; 95% CI [-.25, -.05]), followed by bullying ($\rho = -.10$; $k = 6$; $N = 2,178$; 95% CI [-.16, -.05]) and discrimination ($\rho = -.09$; $k = 20$; $N = 18,031$; 95% CI [-.13, -.09]). The remaining effect sizes are closer to zero, although overall the effect sizes are minimal.

Source could not be analyzed as a moderator of tenure differences in mistreatment due to a lack of relevant samples. Analyses of measurement as a moderator of tenure differences could only be conducted on overall mistreatment, harassment, and discrimination (Table 11). Across all three, behavioral checklists have stronger effect sizes in the predicted direction and are significant whereas direction question measures have effect sizes much closer to zero. Effect sizes within moderator level of response scale are inconsistent, although effect sizes for intensity Likert scales for both overall mistreatment and discrimination are zero.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

The results of this meta-analysis do not coincide with theory and popular belief, and suggest that there are minimal subgroup differences in the perception of workplace mistreatment for each individual difference group examined (sex, race, age, and tenure). As the effect sizes are usually minimal, and the few small to moderate effect sizes are often based on small k 's, interpretation and comparison of the effect sizes at varying levels of moderators is difficult. However, I will briefly discuss the results before delving more thoroughly into potential explanations and implications.

In the current study, effect sizes are typically in the predicted direction, yet a corrected d can only be considered moderate in one scenario: Hispanic/White differences in the perception of harassment ($\delta = .24$; $k = 2$; $N = 340$), although this effect was analyzed with only two samples. All other effect sizes for sex and race were less than $\delta = .20$ (a small effect size). In the case of age and tenure, corrected r 's are rarely larger than $\pm .10$ (a small effect size) and never larger than $\pm .30$ (a moderate effect size) when analyzing potential differences between older versus younger workers and workers with shorter versus longer tenure. However, one interesting case is sex differences for abusive supervision ($\delta = -.13$; $k = 30$; $N = 10,583$, 95% CI [-.18, -.08]). This effect size, while small, is fairly robust in the number of studies included and is significantly different from zero; it suggests that men experience more perceived abusive supervision than women. This is in contrast to the other mistreatment types and sex differences which are typically close to zero and indicate women experience slightly more mistreatment than men. This curious outcome may come about due to a male perspective of abusive supervision. First, supervisors are likely to be male: according to Adler (1994), men more often hold positions of

higher power and the Grant Thornton International Business Report (Grant Thornton, 2013) indicates that only 24% of senior management positions are held by women. In addition, research suggests that men may report more instances of abusive supervision type behaviors, but do not consider such behaviors to be mistreatment (Johannsdottir & Olafsson, 2004). This is likely due to the exchanges between men that can include behaviors that seem abusive to an observer but the involved parties consider the behaviors to be a form of camaraderie. Overall, this means that abusive supervision effects are biased due to the majority of supervisors being men who exchange more frequent “abusive” behaviors with fellow men than with women.

Further examination of moderators found nominal differences in estimates: regardless of mistreatment type, source, and measurement, subgroup differences remain negligible and not practically significant. Analyses of the impact of mistreatment source on the magnitude of subgroup differences were restricted to sex, race, and age due to a lack of samples. The influence of source at the sub-level of mistreatment type could only be conducted for sex differences and incivility. However, the k 's for incivility are small and the effect sizes remain negligible regardless of source. In terms of sex differences and overall mistreatment, a notable yet still very small difference was found in that the effect size for insiders ($\delta = -.09$; $k = 25$; $N = 8,158$) is in the opposing direction to outsiders ($\delta = .07$; $k = 9$; $N = 2,356$). Since the majority of insiders for this analysis are supervisors, this suggests that men perceive more workplace mistreatment from supervisors, whereas women perceive more mistreatment from outsiders such as customers. A minority/white comparison could be made for overall mistreatment and found that the lower power group (minorities) reported more perceived mistreatment from outsiders ($\delta = .14$; $k = 3$; $N = 3,840$) than insiders ($\delta = .02$; $k = 2$; $N = 622$). However, these effects should be interpreted with caution due to the small k 's. Finally, age revealed a similar pattern in that the lower power

group (younger workers) reported more perceived mistreatment from outsiders ($\rho = -.18$; $k = 6$; $N = 1,850$) than insiders ($\rho = -.04$; $k = 32$; $N = 10,248$). The results for age and race differences suggest that mistreatment from outsiders is varied and may be more difficult to agree upon among groups.

Moderator analyses of the measurement item type and response scale reveal no clear pattern in the magnitude of subgroup differences. However, among sex and tenure subgroup differences, behavioral checklists typically have larger effect sizes than direct question methods. These results may suggest stronger effect sizes when a behavioral checklist is used to measure perceived workplace mistreatment, but the magnitude of differences is small and overall effect sizes remain negligible.

Unfortunately, moderator analyses were often restricted to an examination of mistreatment at the overall level. However, we should refrain from interpreting the results of overall mistreatment too closely, as this composite encompasses differing types of mistreatment which, while all negative behaviors, can differ in terms of severity, perpetrator source, and motive. Therefore, effect sizes based on overall mistreatment cannot be considered representative of an overarching construct which encompasses all forms of mistreatment. Nevertheless, effect sizes within mistreatment types are not fundamentally different than overall mistreatment.

In light of the results, there are several perspectives we can take in moving forward. First, by and large, the effect sizes for group differences in perceived workplace mistreatment were in the predicted direction: women, minorities, younger workers, and less tenured workers tend to report slightly more perceived mistreatment in comparison to men, Whites, older workers, and more tenured workers. While these effect sizes are minimal, even very small subgroup

differences can be meaningful. The negative consequences associated with workplace mistreatment are not minimal (e.g. Nielsen, Matthiesen, & Einarsen, 2010; Willness, Steel, & Lee, 2007) and any data that can help reduce these consequences is important. While the cutoffs for small, moderate, and large effect sizes as posed by Cohen (1988) might be fairly standard, other researchers may disagree with these particular cutoffs. In addition, the concept of the magnitude for group differences may be better viewed as a relative matter: research on sex differences in other streams of research indicate small differences are the norm (Eagly, 1995). This means that the minimal differences uncovered in this study are not abnormal and may still have practical implications for mistreatment interventions.

A second explanation is that perhaps larger group differences exist, but we have yet to statistically uncover them. In spite of some research which suggests some types of mistreatment are common (up to 18% of the global workforce experience bullying; Nielsen, Matthiesen, & Einarsen, 2010), it may be that mistreatment for the most part is rare. In a similar way to measuring safety incidents, it is more difficult to reliably measure experiences which do not frequently occur (Wallace, Paul, Landis, & Vodanovich, 2012). People are prone to forget such incidents over time and mistreatment is not a phenomenon easily measured in real time. In this sense, it may be that mistreatment measures are deficient and currently unable to capture mistreatment as seen from the perspective of varying groups. There is also the possibility that groups will deny mistreatment of themselves personally even if they believe their group as a whole experiences mistreatment (Taylor, Wright, & Porter, 1994). This can deflate the rate at which these individuals report the experience of mistreatment during research studies and make it appear that group differences do not exist.

Similarly, it may be that subgroup differences occur in boundary conditions not examined in this study. First, group membership plays a large role in many types of mistreatment (Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Cortina, 2008; Rowe, 1990; Tajfel & Turner, 1985), so a comparison between mistreatment based on group identity versus non group identity may parse out stronger group differences. Second, a combination of different types of discrimination and harassment may hide true subgroup differences, hence, specific types of discrimination and harassment may further delineate group differences. For example, race differences for racial discrimination will likely be larger than for gender discrimination, just as sex differences for gender discrimination will likely be larger than for racial discrimination because each particular type of mistreatment is directly related to the group identity of the group under analysis. More extensive moderator analyses may uncover larger and more specific subgroup differences.

Finally, it is possible that subgroup differences in perceived workplace mistreatment are in fact close to zero. This could be a reflection of a cultural shift toward equality and the enforcement of laws and regulations by the EEOC that are required of many organizations. In this scenario, occurrences of mistreatment are so rare and can happen to anyone, regardless of group membership or level of power. This seems counterintuitive considering the number of harassment and discrimination cases filed with the EEOC every year, but it may be that most of these cases do not consist of mistreatment in the legal sense and are dismissed. It is also possible that overall group differences do not exist and instead the difference lies at the individual level. According to the attributional perspective (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) stable individual differences rather than group membership or level of power will determine how a person will interpret a situation as either mistreatment or not (Kobynowicz & Brancombe, 1997, e.g. self esteem). Altogether, if it is true that subgroup differences are close to zero, researchers and

practitioners should continue to take a broad approach to mistreatment rather than focusing interventions and research on particular subgroups.

Like any study, this meta-analysis has limitations. First, data was limited in the extent to which the moderators could be examined. Mistreatment source could only be examined in terms of insiders versus outsiders, and differences may be more apparent at a deeper level such as comparing mistreatment by coworkers, supervisors, customers, and patients. Analyses of measurement as a moderator were also limited in that not all types of mistreatment could be examined within the four individual difference groups (sex, race, age, and tenure), and comparisons between moderator levels could often not be made due to a paucity of studies. Second, as previously mentioned, the measures of mistreatment included in this study are meant to measure mistreatment as perceived by the recipient. However, some items may be endorsed by individuals who experienced the specified behavior but did not consider the behavior to be mistreatment. This has the potential to mask true subgroup differences. However, psychometric properties of the majority of mistreatment measures are strong which suggests that these measures serve as a pertinent proxy for perceived mistreatment. Third, judgment calls had to be made for including and coding more ambiguous types of mistreatment that were not explicitly labeled as one the eight types of mistreatment examined. However, these instances were rare.

This study is the first comprehensive meta-analytic examination of subgroup differences in workplace mistreatment as perceived by the recipient. However, the current study reveals that minimal differences exist in these perceptions between subgroups of four individual difference groups (sex, race, age, and tenure). Moderator analyses also indicate that these differences remain marginal regardless of mistreatment type, source of mistreatment, or measurement.

Further research is merited to explicitly measure subgroup differences and to more clearly delineate the boundary conditions of these differences.

**APPENDIX:
TABLES**

Table 1
Sex and Race Differences in Mistreatment

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>d</i>	δ	<i>SD_δ</i>	95% <i>CI-L</i>	95% <i>CI-U</i>	95% <i>CR-L</i>	95% <i>CR-U</i>	% <i>Var</i>
Sex Differences	155	130,881	.07	.07	.14	.05	.09	-.21	.35	6.31
M/W Differences	51	59,051	.05	.05	.11	.03	.08	-.16	.27	7.46
B/W Differences	24	40,408	.06	.06	.10	.02	.10	-.50	.28	5.79
H/W Differences	6	10,927	.02	.02	.08	-.04	.08	-.12	.17	9.77
A/W Differences	4	7,720	.08	.08	.23	-.14	.30	-.37	.53	0.99

Note. *k*: number of effect sizes in the meta-analysis; *N*: total sample size in the meta-analysis; *d*: sample-size weighted mean *d* value; δ : *d* value corrected for attenuation; *SD_δ*: standard deviation of corrected *d* value; 95% *CI-L/U*: lower/upper bound of confidence interval; 95% *CR-L/U*: lower/upper bound of credibility interval; % *Var*: percent of variance accounted for by sampling error. M/W Differences: Minority/White differences; B/W Differences: Black/White Differences; H/W Differences: Hispanic/White Differences; A/W Differences: Asian/White Differences.

Table 2
Age and Tenure Differences in Mistreatment

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>r</i>	$\hat{\rho}$	<i>SD_ρ</i>	95% <i>CI-L</i>	95% <i>CI-U</i>	95% <i>CR-L</i>	95% <i>CR-U</i>	% <i>Var</i>
Age Differences	145	84,804	-.05	-.05	.09	-.07	-.04	-.22	.12	19.89
Tenure Differences	48	37,663	-.09	-.09	.09	-.12	-.07	-.27	.09	14.39

Note. *k*: number of effect sizes in the meta-analysis; *N*: total sample size in the meta-analysis; *r*: sample-size weighted mean correlation; $\hat{\rho}$: correlation corrected for attenuation; *SD_ρ*: standard deviation of corrected correlation; 95% *CI-L/U*: lower/upper bound of confidence interval; 95% *CR-L/U*: lower/upper bound of credibility interval; % *Var*: percent of variance accounted for by sampling error.

Table 3
Sex Differences and Type of Mistreatment

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>d</i>	δ	<i>SD_δ</i>	95% <i>CI-L</i>	95% <i>CI-U</i>	95% <i>CR-L</i>	95% <i>CR-U</i>	% <i>Var</i>
Harassment	25	58,679	.16	.17	.12	.03	.22	-.06	.41	3.21
Discrimination	45	33,412	.02	.02	.09	-.01	.05	-.6	.20	15.39
Violence	9	4,238	.01	.01	.08	-.05	.06	-.14	.16	30.77
Bullying	22	14,360	.00	.00	.09	-.04	.04	-.17	.17	18.59
Incivility	15	4,767	.02	.02	.08	-.03	.07	-.14	.85	34.00
Ostracism	6	989	-.05	-.06	.04	-.13	.01	-.14	.03	78.95
Abusive Supervision	30	10,583	-.12	-.13	.13	-.18	-.08	-.38	.13	14.92
Psychological Aggression	16	9,424	.02	.02	.07	-.02	.05	-.10	.15	32.68

Note. *k*: number of effect sizes in the meta-analysis; *N*: total sample size in the meta-analysis; *d*: sample-size weighted mean *d* value; δ : *d* value corrected for attenuation; *SD_δ*: standard deviation of corrected *d* value; 95% *CI-L/U*: lower/upper bound of confidence interval; 95% *CR-L/U*: lower/upper bound of credibility interval; % *Var*: percent of variance accounted for by sampling error.

Table 4
Age Differences and Type of Mistreatment

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>r</i>	$\hat{\rho}$	<i>SD_ρ</i>	95% <i>CI-L</i>	95% <i>CI-U</i>	95% <i>CR-L</i>	95% <i>CR-U</i>	% <i>Var</i>
Harassment	24	18,489	-.06	-.06	.06	-.09	-.04	-.18	.05	32.03
Discrimination	36	25,974	-.03	-.03	.07	-.06	-.01	-.18	.11	23.08
Violence	11	4,822	-.01	-.01	.05	-.05	.03	-.10	.08	58.66
Bullying	23	11,496	-.05	-.05	.04	-.07	-.03	-.13	.03	57.34
Incivility	15	3,850	-.03	-.03	.13	-.10	.04	-.28	.22	20.93
Ostracism	7	1,204	-.02	-.02	.00	-.07	.02	-.02	-.02	100.00
Abusive Supervision	34	11,966	-.07	-.07	.14	-.12	-.02	-.35	.21	13.01
Psychological Aggression	13	6,582	-.08	-.08	.10	-.14	-.03	-.28	.11	19.12

Note. *k*: number of effect sizes in the meta-analysis; *N*: total sample size in the meta-analysis; *r*: sample-size weighted mean correlation; $\hat{\rho}$: correlation corrected for attenuation; *SD_ρ*: standard deviation of corrected correlation; 95% *CI-L/U*: lower/upper bound of confidence interval; 95% *CR-L/U*: lower/upper bound of credibility interval; % *Var*: percent of variance accounted for by sampling error.

Table 5
Tenure Differences and Type of Mistreatment

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>r</i>	$\hat{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	95% <i>CI-L</i>	95% <i>CI-U</i>	95% <i>CR-L</i>	95% <i>CR-U</i>	% <i>Var</i>
Harassment	4	11,168	-.13	-.15	.11	-.25	-.05	-.36	.06	3.52
Discrimination	20	18,031	-.08	-.09	.09	-.13	-.09	-.26	.08	14.54
Violence	3	880	.01	.01	.08	-.09	.11	-.14	.16	41.88
Bullying	6	2,178	-.10	-.10	.04	-.16	-.05	-.90	-.02	59.94
Incivility	4	1,016	.02	.02	.06	-.06	.10	-.10	.14	55.05
Abusive Supervision	11	4,591	-.01	-.01	.00	-.03	.02	-.04	.00	99.24

Note. *k*: number of effect sizes in the meta-analysis; *N*: total sample size in the meta-analysis; *r*: sample-size weighted mean correlation; $\hat{\rho}$: correlation corrected for attenuation; *SD ρ* : standard deviation of corrected correlation; 95% *CI-L/U*: lower/upper bound of confidence interval; 95% *CR-L/U*: lower/upper bound of credibility interval; % *Var*: percent of variance accounted for by sampling error.

Table 6
Race Differences and Type of Mistreatment

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>d</i>	δ	<i>SDδ</i>	95% <i>CI-L</i>	95% <i>CI-U</i>	95% <i>CR-L</i>	95% <i>CR-U</i>	% <i>Var</i>
Harassment										
M/W Differences	16	19,189	.02	.02	.10	-.02	.07	-.17	.21	10.07
B/W Differences	6	9,057	-.01	-.01	.08	-.06	.08	-.16	.14	13.40
H/W Differences	2	340	.21	.24	.15	.04	.45	-.04	.53	25.11
Discrimination										
M/W Differences	22	31,058	.08	.09	.13	.07	.14	-.17	.34	4.89
B/W Differences	16	29,547	.07	.08	.12	.03	.13	-.15	.31	4.84
H/W Differences	4	10,587	.02	.02	.06	-.04	.08	-.11	.14	9.76
A/W Differences	3	6,793	.09	.10	.24	-.17	.37	-.37	.57	0.76
Violence										
M/W Differences	2	1,227	-.03	-.03	.06	-.13	.07	-.15	.09	31.26
Bullying										
M/W Differences	3	1,768	.03	.03	.05	-.04	.10	-.06	.12	45.05
Incivility										
M/W Differences	3	1,034	.14	.15	.07	.06	.24	.02	.28	42.49

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>d</i>	δ	<i>SD_δ</i>	95% <i>CI-L</i>	95% <i>CI-U</i>	95% <i>CR-L</i>	95% <i>CR-U</i>	% <i>Var</i>
B/W Differences	2	868	.18	.19	.00	.16	.22	.19	.19	100.00
Abusive Supervision										
M/W Differences	2	1929	.07	.08	.00	.06	.10	.08	.08	100.00
Psychological Aggression										
M/W Differences	6	7,133	.01	.01	.07	-.05	.07	-.34	.16	15.25

Note. *k*: number of effect sizes in the meta-analysis; *N*: total sample size in the meta-analysis; *d*: sample-size weighted mean *d* value; δ : *d* value corrected for attenuation; *SD_δ*: standard deviation of corrected *d* value; 95% *CI-L/U*: lower/upper bound of confidence interval; 95% *CR-L/U*: lower/upper bound of credibility interval; % *Var*: percent of variance accounted for by sampling error. M/W Differences: Minority/White differences; B/W Differences: Black/White Differences; H/W Differences: Hispanic/White Differences; A/W Differences: Asian/White Differences.

Table 7
Source as a Moderator of Sex and Race Differences in Mistreatment

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>d</i>	δ	<i>SD_δ</i>	95% <i>CI-L</i>	95% <i>CI-U</i>	95% <i>CR-L</i>	95% <i>CR-U</i>	% <i>Var</i>
Sex Differences										
Insiders	25	8,158	-.09	-.09	.11	-.14	-.04	-.31	.13	20.64
Outsiders	9	2,356	.07	.07	.03	.03	.12	.01	.14	82.13
Incivility and Sex Differences										
Insiders	2	259	.00	.00	.00	-.03	.03	.00	.00	100.00
Outsiders	4	395	.03	.04	.11	-.11	.18	-.17	.24	44.87
M/W Differences										
Insiders	2	622	.02	.02	.00	-.04	.09	.02	.02	100.00
Outsiders	3	3,840	.13	.14	.07	.06	.22	.01	.28	14.94

Note. *k*: number of effect sizes in the meta-analysis; *N*: total sample size in the meta-analysis; *d*: sample-size weighted mean *d* value; δ : *d* value corrected for attenuation; *SD_δ*: standard deviation of corrected *d* value; 95% *CI-L/U*: lower/upper bound of confidence interval; 95% *CR-L/U*: lower/upper bound of credibility interval; % *Var*: percent of variance accounted for by sampling error. M/W Differences: Minority/White differences.

Table 8
Source as a Moderator of Age Differences in Mistreatment

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>r</i>	$\hat{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	95% <i>CI-L</i>	95% <i>CI-U</i>	95% <i>CR-L</i>	95% <i>CR-U</i>	% <i>Var</i>
Age Differences										
Insiders	32	10,248	-.04	-.04	.08	-.07	-.01	-.20	.12	33.14
Outsiders	6	1,850	-.18	-.19	.06	-.25	-.13	-.31	-.08	50.58

Note. *k*: number of effect sizes in the meta-analysis; *N*: total sample size in the meta-analysis; *r*: sample-size weighted mean correlation; $\hat{\rho}$: correlation corrected for attenuation; *SD ρ* : standard deviation of corrected correlation; 95% *CI-L/U*: lower/upper bound of confidence interval; 95% *CR-L/U*: lower/upper bound of credibility interval; % *Var*: percent of variance accounted for by sampling error.

Table 9
Moderator Analyses of Measurement Type on Sex Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>d</i>	δ	<i>SDδ</i>	95% <i>CI-L</i>	95% <i>CI-U</i>	95% <i>CR-L</i>	95% <i>CR-U</i>	% <i>Var</i>
Mistreatment										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	22	25,499	-.01	-.01	.08	-.04	.02	-.16	.14	15.31
Behavioral	111	93,106	.08	.09	.15	.06	.12	-.21	.39	5.41
Response Scale										
Frequency	84	80,812	.09	.10	.15	.07	.13	-.19	.39	4.88
Intensity	43	11,292	.02	.03	.19	-.03	.08	-.34	.39	11.04
Yes/No	8	14,446	-.01	-.01	.05	-.04	.02	-.01	.08	24.87
Harassment										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	4	3,688	.07	.07	.11	-.04	.19	-.15	.30	8.09
Behavioral	19	51,750	.17	.18	.12	.13	.23	-.05	.42	2.76
Response Scale										
Frequency	16	49,160	.18	.19	.12	.14	.25	-.04	.42	2.63
Intensity	2	518	.21	.22	.00	.21	.23	.22	.22	100.00
Yes/No	2	3,453	-.04	-.04	0	-.07	-.01	-.04	-.04	100.00
Discrimination										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	14	10,873	-.01	-.02	.04	-.04	.01	-.10	-.06	48.47

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>d</i>	δ	<i>SD_δ</i>	95% <i>CI-L</i>	95% <i>CI-U</i>	95% <i>CR-L</i>	95% <i>CR-U</i>	% <i>Var</i>
Behavioral Response Scale	30	22,005	.04	.04	.11	-.00	.08	-.17	.25	12.18
Frequency	6	8,794	-.01	-.01	.00	-.02	.00	-.01	-.01	100.00
Intensity	29	8,035	.07	.08	.16	.02	.13	-.23	.38	14.26
Yes/No	4	9,995	-.01	-.01	.04	-.05	.03	-.09	.07	25.82
Violence										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	2	2,696	.06	.06	.01	.02	.10	.05	.07	96.29
Behavioral	7	1,542	-.09	-.10	.00	-.14	-.06	-.10	-.10	100.00
Bullying										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	2	6,585	-.05	-.05	.06	-.13	.04	-.17	.07	8.14
Behavioral	16	5,369	.04	.04	.10	-.01	.09	-.15	.23	25.45
Abusive Supervision										
Response Scale										
Frequency	19	7,856	-.11	-.11	.11	-.17	-.06	-.33	.10	17.03
Intensity	10	2,271	-.17	-.18	.17	-.29	-.07	-.51	.16	13.27
Psychological Aggression										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	4	3,624	.06	.06	.03	.02	.10	.01	.12	60.63
Behavioral	12	5,800	-.01	-.12	.06	-.05	.03	-.14	.11	38.43

Note. *k*: number of effect sizes in the meta-analysis; *N*: total sample size in the meta-analysis; *d*: sample-size weighted mean *d* value; δ : *d* value corrected for attenuation; *SD_δ*: standard deviation of corrected *d* value; 95% *CI-L/U*: lower/upper bound of confidence interval; 95% *CR-L/U*: lower/upper bound of credibility interval; % *Var*: percent of variance accounted for by sampling error.

Table 10
Moderator Analyses of Measurement on Age Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>r</i>	$\hat{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	95% <i>CI-L</i>	95% <i>CI-U</i>	95% <i>CR-L</i>	95% <i>CR-U</i>	% <i>Var</i>
Mistreatment										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	24	24,892	-.04	-.05	.09	-.08	-.01	-.27	.13	12.30
Behavioral	98	43,321	-.05	-.05	.09	-.07	-.03	-.24	.13	22.28
Response Scale										
Frequency	71	31,816	-.06	-.07	.07	-.09	-.05	-.21	.07	32.64
Intensity	40	13,650	-.03	-.03	.53	-.08	.02	-.33	.27	12.38
Yes/No	11	17,371	-.06	-.06	.06	-.10	-.03	-.18	.05	19.61
Harassment										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	6	3,802	-.05	-.05	.08	-.17	.01	-.21	.10	23.56
Behavioral	16	12,431	-.06	-.07	.06	-.10	-.04	-.18	.04	33.33
Response Scale										
Frequency	18	12,920	-.07	-.08	.05	-.11	-.05	-.18	.03	37.31
Yes/No	2	2,551	-.00	-.00	.05	-.08	.08	-.0	.10	24.11
Discrimination										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	16	16,074	-.05	-.05	.05	-.08	-.03	-.16	.05	29.63
Behavioral	19	9,854	.00	.00	.09	-.04	.04	-.17	.17	22.25
Response Scale										
Intensity	23	9,326	.02	.02	.08	-.02	.06	-.14	.18	31.52
Yes/No	8	14,749	-.07	-.08	.05	-.11	-.04	-.18	.03	20.86
Violence										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	3	2,729	-.01	-.01	.05	-.08	.05	-.12	.09	33.39
Behavioral	8	2,093	-.01	-.01	.03	-.06	.04	-.07	.06	81.38
Bullying										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	2	3,791	.01	.01	.04	-.06	.06	-.07	.08	26.08

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>r</i>	$\hat{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	95% <i>CI-L</i>	95% <i>CI-U</i>	95% <i>CR-L</i>	95% <i>CR-U</i>	% <i>Var</i>
Behavioral Abusive Supervision Response Scale	15	4,294	-.08	-.08	.00	-.10	-.06	-.08	-.08	100.00
Frequency	21	8,442	-.06	-.07	-.06	-.10	-.03	-.19	.06	39.27
Intensity	11	2,698	-.12	-.12	.27	-.28	.04	-.65	.40	5.61
Psychological Aggression Type of Item										
Direct Question	2	768	-.06	-.07	.00	-.09	-.06	-.07	-.07	100.00
Behavioral Response Scale	11	5,814	-.08	-.08	.11	-.15	-.02	-.30	.13	16.22
Frequency	9	4,672	-.06	-.06	.11	-.13	.01	-.27	.15	16.04
Intensity	3	1,359	-.11	-.27	.03	-.19	-.07	-.19	-.07	74.68

Note. *k*: number of effect sizes in the meta-analysis; *N*: total sample size in the meta-analysis; *r*: sample-size weighted mean correlation; $\hat{\rho}$: correlation corrected for attenuation; *SD ρ* : standard deviation of corrected correlation; 95% *CI-L/U*: lower/upper bound of confidence interval; 95% *CR-L/U*: lower/upper bound of credibility interval; % *Var*: percent of variance accounted for by sampling error.

Table 11
Moderator Analyses of Measurement Type on Tenure Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>r</i>	$\hat{\rho}$	<i>SDρ</i>	95% <i>CI-L</i>	95% <i>CI-U</i>	95% <i>CR-L</i>	95% <i>CR-U</i>	% <i>Var</i>
Mistreatment										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	7	5,325	.00	.00	.06	-.05	.05	-.11	.11	33.36
Behavioral	38	31,458	-.10	-.11	.09	-.40	-.08	-.28	.06	14.85
Response Scale										
Frequency	26	21,612	-.10	-.11	.09	-.14	-.07	-.29	.08	13.50
Intensity	13	4,024	.00	.00	.09	-.06	.06	-.18	.18	31.07
Yes/No	4	6,699	-.07	-.08	.09	-.15	-.00	-.25	.09	10.05
Harassment										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	2	2,450	.02	-.02	0	-.00	.04	.02	.02	100
Behavioral	2	8,718	-.18	-.20	.07	-.29	-.10	-.34	-.06	4.80
Response Scale										
Frequency	2	8,718	-.18	-.20	.07	-.29	-.10	-.34	-.06	4.80
Yes/No	2	2450	.02	.02	0	-.00	.04	.02	.02	100
Discrimination										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	6	3,214	-.01	-.01	.07	-.07	.06	-.15	.14	29.37
Behavioral	14	14,817	-.10	-.10	.08	-.15	-.06	-.26	.05	14.66
Response Scale										
Frequency	6	5,496	-.07	-.08	.08	-.14	-.01	-.23	.08	16.06
Intensity	8	3,133	.00	.00	.11	-.07	.08	-.21	.21	20.84
Yes/No	2	4,249	-.12	-.14	.06	-.21	-.06	-.25	-.02	15.32

Note. *k*: number of effect sizes in the meta-analysis; *N*: total sample size in the meta-analysis; *r*: sample-size weighted mean correlation; $\hat{\rho}$: correlation corrected for attenuation; *SD ρ* : standard deviation of corrected correlation; 95% *CI-L/U*: lower/upper bound of confidence interval; 95% *CR-L/U*: lower/upper bound of credibility interval; % *Var*: percent of variance accounted for by sampling error.

Table 12
Moderator Analyses of Measurement Type on Race Differences in Perceived Workplace Mistreatment

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>d</i>	δ	<i>SD_δ</i>	95% <i>CI-L</i>	95% <i>CI-U</i>	95% <i>CR-L</i>	95% <i>CR-U</i>	<i>% Var</i>
Mistreatment and M/W										
Differences										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	14	15,542	-.01	-.01	.08	-.05	.04	-.17	.16	12.66
Behavioral	30	40,155	.06	.07	.09	.03	.10	-.11	.24	9.54
Response Scale										
Frequency	23	27,161	.03	.03	.08	-.01	.06	-.11	.14	12.41
Intensity	14	17,829	.12	.13	.12	.07	.19	-.10	.36	6.08
Yes/No	9	12,362	-.01	-.01	.08	-.06	.04	-.17	.15	11.16
Mistreatment and B/W										
Differences										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	10	10,349	.00	.00	.04	-.06	.07	-.20	.21	9.19
Behavioral	11	29,052	.08	.08	.10	.03	.38	-.11	.28	4.38
Response Scale										
Frequency	7	13,338	.02	.02	.08	-.03	.08	-.13	.17	9.79
Intensity	5	15,820	.12	.13	.09	.06	.20	-.04	.30	4.69
Yes/No	8	10,141	-.00	-.00	.09	-.06	.06	-.18	.17	9.86
Mistreatment and H/W										
Differences										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	2	5,341	-.03	-.03	.02	-.07	.00	-.07	.01	49.66
Behavioral	3	5,476	.08	.08	.07	.01	.16	-.05	.21	12.58
Response Scale										
Frequency	3	4,134	.05	.06	.06	-.02	.13	-.07	.18	17.16
Yes/No	2	5,341	-.03	-.03	.02	-.07	.00	-.07	.01	49.66
Harassment and M/W										
Differences										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	5	3,405	-.04	-.04	.06	-.10	.01	-.16	.08	35.64

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>d</i>	δ	<i>SD_δ</i>	95% <i>CI-L</i>	95% <i>CI-U</i>	95% <i>CR-L</i>	95% <i>CR-U</i>	% <i>Var</i>
Behavioral Response Scale	11	15,784	.03	.03	.10	-.02	.09	-.15	.22	8.27
Frequency	12	16,212	.03	.03	.10	-.03	.08	-.16	.22	9.04
Yes/No	3	2,605	-.03	-.03	.07	-.17	.05	-.17	.10	21.91
Harassment and B/W Differences										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	3	799	-.04	-.04	.14	-.19	.11	-.32	.23	21.89
Behavioral	3	8,258	-.00	-.01	.07	-.07	.06	-.14	.13	9.89
Response Scale										
Frequency	4	8,673	-.01	-.01	.07	-.06	.05	-.13	.12	13.14
Yes/No	2	384	-.05	-.06	.18	-.32	.20	-.41	.30	14.80
Discrimination and M/W Differences										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	10	9,728	.01	.01	.12	-.06	.08	-.22	.24	7.69
Behavioral	9	18,975	.09	.10	.08	.05	.15	-.06	.26	8.21
Response Scale										
Frequency	2	4,108	.04	.05	.05	-.02	.12	-.05	.15	20.60
Intensity	11	17,331	.13	.14	.12	.07	.20	-.09	.36	5.03
Yes/No	7	9,381	-.00	-.00	.10	-.07	.07	-.19	.19	7.95
Discrimination and B/W Differences										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	10	9,725	.01	.01	.12	-.06	.08	-.22	.24	7.62
Behavioral	6	19,822	.10	.12	.09	.05	.18	-.007	.30	4.18
Response Scale										
Frequency	2	4,108	.03	.04	.06	-.04	.11	-.07	.15	18.08
Intensity	5	15,820	.12	.13	.09	.06	.20	-.04	.30	4.69
Yes/No	7	9,381	.00	.00	.10	-.07	.07	-.19	.19	7.81
Discrimination and H/W Differences										

	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>d</i>	δ	<i>SD_δ</i>	95% <i>CI-L</i>	95% <i>CI-U</i>	95% <i>CR-L</i>	95% <i>CR-U</i>	% <i>Var</i>
Type of Item										
Direct Question	2	5,341	-.03	-.03	.02	-.07	.00	-.07	.01	49.66
Behavioral	2	5,246	.06	.07	.04	.01	.13	-.01	.15	19.39
Psychological Aggression and M/W Differences										
Type of Item										
Direct Question	2	2,587	-.01	-.01	0	-.02	.00	-.01	-.01	100.00
Behavioral	3	3,094	.02	.03	.10	-.08	.14	-.18	.23	10.10

Note. *k*: number of effect sizes in the meta-analysis; *N*: total sample size in the meta-analysis; *d*: sample-size weighted mean *d* value; δ : *d* value corrected for attenuation; *SD_δ*: standard deviation of corrected *d* value; 95% *CI-L/U*: lower/upper bound of confidence interval; 95% *CR-L/U*: lower/upper bound of credibility interval; % *Var*: percent of variance accounted for by sampling error. M/W Differences: Minority/White differences; B/W Differences: Black/White Differences; H/W Differences: Hispanic/White Differences.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- *Abe, K. (2007). *Hierarchical models of workplace bullying among Japanese hospital workers*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN.
- Adler, M. A. (1994). Male-Female power differences at work: A comparison of supervisor and policymakers. *Sociological Inquiry*, 64(1), 37-55.
- Aggarwal A.P. & Gupta M.M. (2000). *Sexual harassment in the workplace*, (3rd ed). Vancouver, BC: Butterworths.
- *Aquino, K., & Bommer, W. H. (2003). Preferential mistreatment: How victim status moderates the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and workplace victimization. *Organization Science*, 14(4), 374–385. doi:10.1287/orsc.14.4.374.17489
- *Aryee, S., Chen, Z. X., Sun, L.-Y., & Debrah, Y. A. (2007). Antecedents and outcomes of abusive supervision: Test of a trickle-down model. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 191–201. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.191
- *Aryee, S., Sun, L.-Y., Chen, Z. X. G., & Debrah, Y. A. (2008). Abusive supervision and contextual performance: The mediating role of emotional exhaustion and the moderating role of work unit structure. *Management and Organization Review*, 4(3), 393–411. doi:10.1111/j.1740-8784.2008.00118.x
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 20–39.
- *Balducci, C., Cecchin, M., & Fraccaroli, F. (2012). The impact of role stressors on workplace bullying in both victims and perpetrators, controlling for personal vulnerability factors : A longitudinal analysis. *Work & Stress*, (May 2013), 37–41.

- *Balducci, C., Cecchin, M., Fraccaroli, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2012). Exploring the relationship between workaholism and workplace aggressive behaviour: The role of job-related emotion. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 53(5), 629–634.
doi:10.1016/j.paid.2012.05.004
- *Balducci, C., Fraccaroli, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2011). Workplace bullying and its relation with work characteristics, personality, and post-traumatic stress symptoms: an integrated model. *Anxiety, stress, and coping*, 24(5), 499–513. doi:10.1080/10615806.2011.555533
- *Bamberger, P.A. & Bacharach, S.B. (2006). Abusive supervision and subordinate problem drinking : Taking resistance, stress and subordinate personality into account. *Human Relations*, 59(6), 723–752.
- Barling, J., Dupré, K. E., & Kelloway, E. (2009). Predicting workplace aggression and violence. *Annual Review Of Psychology*, 60(1), 671-692. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163629
- *Beaver, H. W. (1999). *Client violence against professional social workers: Frequency, worker characteristics, and impact on worker job satisfaction, burnout, and health*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR.
- *Berdahl, J. L., & Aquino, K. (2009). Sexual behavior at work: Fun or folly? *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 34–47. doi:10.1037/a0012981
- *Bergen, G. T., Aceto, R. T., & Chadziewicz, M. M. (1992). Job satisfaction of police psychologists. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 19(3), 314–329.
doi:10.1177/0093854892019003007

- *Bergman, M. E., Palmieri, P. A., Drasgow, F., & Ormerod, A. J. (2012). Racial/ethnic harassment and discrimination, its antecedents, and its effect on job-related outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 17*(1), 65–78. doi:10.1037/a0026430
- *Bjorkqvist, K., Osterman, K., & Hjeit-back, M. (1994). Aggression among university employees. *Aggressive Behavior, 20*, 173–184.
- Blumenthal, J. A. (1998). The reasonable woman standard: A meta-analytic review of gender differences in perceptions of sexual harassment. *Law and Human Behavior, 22*(1), 33–57.
- Bowling, N. A. & Beehr, T. A. (2006). Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: a theoretical model and meta-analysis. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(5), 998–1012. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.998
- *Bowling, N. A., Beehr, T. A., Bennett, M. M., & Watson, C. P. (2010). Target personality and workplace victimization: A prospective analysis. *Work & Stress, 24*(2), 140–158. doi:10.1080/02678373.2010.489635
- *Breux, D. M., Perrewe, P. L., Hall, A. T., Frink, D. D., & Hochwarter, W. A. (2008). Time to try a little tenderness? The detrimental effects of accountability when coupled with abusive supervision. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 15*(2), 111–122. doi:10.1177/1548051808321787
- *Brooks, L. & Perot, A. R. (1991). Reporting sexual harassment: Exploring a predictive model. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15*, 31–47.
- *Brough, P. & Frame, R. (2004). Predicting police job satisfaction and turnover intentions: The role of social support and police organisational variables. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 33*(1), 8–16.

- *Brough, P. (2005). Workplace violence experienced by paramedics: Relationships with social support, job satisfaction, and psychological strain. *The Australasian Journal of Disaster and Trauma Studies*, 1–12.
- *Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. a. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97(2), 117–134. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002
- *Buchanan, N. T., Settles, I. H., & Woods, K. C. (2008). Comparing sexual harassment subtypes among black and white women by military rank: Double jeopardy, the jezebel, and the cult of true womanhood. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 32(4), 347–361. doi:10.1111/j.14716402.2008.00450.x
- *Burriss, E. R., Detert, J. R., & Chiaburu, D. S. (2008). Quitting before leaving: The mediating effects of psychological attachment and detachment on voice. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(4), 912–22. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.93.4.912
- *Cadiz, D. M. (2010). *The effects of ageism climates and core self-evaluations on nurses' turnover intentions, organizational commitment, and work engagement*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Portland State University, Portland, OR.
- *Carlson, D., Ferguson, M., Hunter, E., & Whitten, D. (2012). Abusive supervision and work–family conflict: The path through emotional labor and burnout. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(5), 849–859. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.05.003
- *Cemaloglu, N., & State, B. (2007). The exposure of primary school teachers to bullying: An analysis of various variables. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 35(6), 789–802.

- Chan, D.K-S., Lam, C.B., Chow, S.Y., & Cheung, S.F. (2008). Examining the job-related, psychological, and physical outcomes of workplace sexual harassment: A meta-analytic review. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 32, 362-376.
- *Chang, C., Eatough, E. M., Spector, P. E., & Kessler, S. R. (2012). Violence-prevention climate, exposure to violence and aggression, and prevention behavior: A mediation model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33, 657–677. doi: 10.1002/job.776
- *Chang, C.S. & Jex, S. M. (2013, April). The effect of coworker and customer incivility on organizational outcomes. Paper presented at the annual meeting for the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Houston, TX.
- *Chen. Y., Ferris, D.L., Kwan, H.K., Yan, M., Zhou, M., & Hong, Y. (2010). Self-love's lost Labor : A self-enhancement model of workplace incivility. *Academy of Management Journal*. 56(4), 1199-1219.
- *Chi, S.C.S., & Liang, S.G. (2013). When do subordinates' emotion-regulation strategies matter? Abusive supervision, subordinates' emotional exhaustion, and work withdrawal. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 125–137. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.08.006
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cortina, L. M. (2008). Unseen injustice: Incivility as modern discrimination in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 33, 55–75.
- 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.

- *Courtney, L., Bibby, C. L., Lago, B., & Club, C. (2008). Should I stay or should I leave? Perceptions of age discrimination, organizational justice, and employee attitudes on intentions to leave. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, *13*(2), 63–86.
- *Cronin, T. & Smith, H. (2011). Protest, exit, or deviance: Adjunct university faculty reactions to occupational rank-based mistreatment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *41*(10), 2352–2373.
- *Crouter, A. C., Davis, K. D., Updegraff, K., Delgado, M., & Fortner, M. (2006). Mexican American fathers' occupational conditions: Links to family members' psychological adjustment. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *68*(4), 843–858. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2006.00299.x
- *Cunningham, G.B. & Sagas, M. (2007). Examining potential differences between men and women. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *37*(12), 3010–3024.
- *De Castro, A. B., Gee, G. C., & Takeuchi, D. T. (2008). Workplace discrimination and health among Filipinos in the United States. *American journal of public health*, *98*(3), 520–6. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2007.110163
- *De Haas, S., Timmerman, G., & Höing, M. (2009). Sexual harassment and health among male and female police officers. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *14*(4), 390–401. doi:10.1037/a0017046
- *Deery, S., Walsh, J., & Guest, D. (2011). Workplace aggression: the effects of harassment on job burnout and turnover intentions. *Work, Employment & Society*, *25*(4), 742–759. doi:10.1177/0950017011419707

- *Deitch, E. A., Barsky, A., Butz, R. M., Chan, S., Brief, A. P., & Bradley, J. C. (2003). Subtle yet significant: The existence and impact of everyday racial discrimination in the workplace. *Human Relations*, *56*(11), 1299–1324. doi:10.1177/00187267035611002
- *DelCampo, R. G., Jacobson, K. J. L., Van Buren, H. J., & Blancero, D. M. (2011). Comparing immigrant and US born Hispanic business professionals: Insights on discrimination. *Cross Cultural Management: An International Journal*, *18*(3), 327–350. doi:10.1108/13527601111152851
- *deMayo, R. A. (1997). Patient sexual behavior and sexual harassment: A national survey of female psychologists. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, *28*(1), 58–62. doi:10.1037//0735-7028.28.1.58
- *Detert, J. R., Treviño, L. K., Burris, E. R., & Andiappan, M. (2007). Managerial modes of influence and counterproductivity in organizations: a longitudinal business-unit-level investigation. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(4), 993–1005. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.993
- *Dettinger, S. M. (2005). *Effects of personal and collective self-esteem on conflict in the workplace*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.
- *Dickson, C. E. (2008). Antecedents and consequences of perceived family responsibilities discrimination in the workplace. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, *11*(1), 113–140. doi:10.1080/10887150801967399
- *Din-Dzietham, R., Nembhard, W. N., Collins, R., & Davis, S. K. (2004). Perceived stress following race-based discrimination at work is associated with hypertension in African-Americans. The metro Atlanta heart disease study, 1999–2001. *Social Science & Medicine*, *58*(3), 449–461. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(03)00211-9

- *Djurkovic, N. & McCormack, D. (2006). Neuroticism and the psychosomatic model of workplace bullying. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *21*(1/2), 73–88.
- *Dormann, C., & Zapf, D. (2004). Customer-related social stressors and burnout. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *9*(1), 61–82. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.9.1.61
- *Duffy, M. K., Ganster, D. C., Shaw, J. D., Johnson, J. L., & Pagon, M. (2006). The social context of undermining behavior at work. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *101*(1), 105–126. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2006.04.005
- Dupré K.E., Barling, J. (2006). Predicting and preventing supervisory workplace aggression. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *11*, 13–26.
- *Dupré, K. E., Inness, M., Connelly, C. E., Barling, J., & Hopton, C. (2006). Workplace aggression in teenage part-time employees. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(5), 987–997. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.987
- Eagly, A.H. (1995) The science and politics of comparing women and men. *American Psychologist*, *50*(3), 145-158.
- Eagly A., Steffan V.J. (1986). Gender and aggressive behavior: a meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, *100*, 309–330.
- *Einarsen, S. (1996). Bullying at work: Epidemiological findings in public and private organizations. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *5*(2), 185–201.
- Einarsen, S. Hoel, H. & Notelaers, G. (2009). Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure, and psychometric properties of the Negative Acts Questionnaire-Revised. *Work & Stress*, *23*(1), 24-44.

- *Einarsen, S., & Raknes, B. (1997). Harassment in the workplace and the victimisation of men. *Violence and Victims, 12*, 247–263.
- *Enchautegui de Jesus, N. (2001). *Relationships between normative and race/ethnic-related job stressors and marital and individual well-being among Black and Latino/a workers*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation): New York University, New York, NY.
- *Ensher, E. A., Grant-Vallone, E. J., & Donaldson, S. I. (2001). Effects of perceived discrimination on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, and grievances. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 12*(1), 53–72.
- *Eriksen, W., & Einarsen, S. (2004). Gender minority as a risk factor of exposure to bullying at work: The case of male assistant nurses. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 13*(4), 473–492. doi:10.1080/13594320444000173
- *Evers, W., Tomic, W., & Brouwers, A. (2001). Effects of aggressive behavior and perceived self-efficacy on burnout among staff of homes for the elderly. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 22*(4), 439–54.
- Felson, R.B. & Steadman, H.J. (1983). Situational factors in disputes leading to criminal violence. *Criminology, 21*, 59–74.
- *Ferguson, M. (2012). You cannot leave it at the office: Spillover and crossover of coworker incivility. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 58*(98006), 571–588.
doi:10.1002/job.774
- *Ferris, D. L., Brown, D. J., Berry, J. W., & Lian, H. (2008). The development and validation of the Workplace Ostracism Scale. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(6), 1348–66.
doi:10.1037/a0012743

- Fitzgerald, L.F., Gelfand, M.J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment: theoretical and psychometric advances. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 17*(4), 425-445.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., & Ormerod, A. J. (1991). Perceptions of sexual harassment: The influence of gender and academic context. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15*, 281-294.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Shullman, S. L., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, A., et al. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 32*, 152-175.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Weitzman, L. M., Gold, Y., & Ormerod, M. (1988). Academic harassment: Sex and denial in scholarly garb. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12*, 329-340.
- *Fitzgerald, L., Drasgow, F., & Magley, V. (1999). Sexual harassment in the armed forces: A test of an integrated model. *Military Psychology, 11*(3), 329–343.
- Fitzgerald, L.F. (1987). Sexual harassment: The definition and measurement of a construct. In M.A. Paludi (Ed.), *Ivory power: Sexual harassment on campus* (pp. 21-44). Albany, NY SUNY Press.
- *Fitzpatrick, K. M., & Wilson, M. (1999). Exposure to violence and posttraumatic stress symptomatology among abortion clinic workers. *Journal of traumatic stress, 12*(2), 227–42. doi:10.1023/A:1024768207850
- *Foley, S, Hang-Yue, N., & Wong, A. (2005). Perceptions of discrimination and justice: Are there gender differences in outcomes? *Group & Organization Management, 30*(4), 421–450.
- *Foley, S., Kidder, D. L., & Powell, G. N. (2002). The perceived glass ceiling and justice perceptions: An investigation of Hispanic law associates. *Journal of Management, 28*(4), 471–496. doi:10.1177/014920630202800401

- *Foley, Sharon, Ngo, H., & Loi, R. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of perceived personal gender discrimination: A study of solicitors in Hong Kong. *Sex Roles, 55*(3-4), 197–208. doi:10.1007/s11199-006-9073-4
- *Foulis, D., & McCabe, M. (1997). Sexual harassment: Factors affecting attitudes and perceptions. *Sex Roles, 37*, 773-798.
- Frazier, P. A., Cochran, C. C., & Olson, A. M. (1995). Social science research on lay definitions of sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues, 51*, 21-37.
- French, J., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in Social Power* (pp. 150– 167). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Fullerton, R. A., & Punj, G. (2004). Repercussions of promoting an ideology of consumption: Consumer misbehavior. *Journal of Business Research, 57*, 1239–1249.
- Furnham, A. (1985). The determinants of attitudes towards social security recipients. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 24*, 19–27.
- *Garcia, L.M. (2009). *The hidden injuries of racial employment discrimination: A qualitative analysis of depression and psychological distress*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Geen, R. G. (1990). *Human aggression*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- *Gerrity, D. A. (2000). Male university employees' experiences of sexual harassment-related behaviors. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 1*(2), 140–151. doi:10.1037//1524-9220.1.2.140
- *Gettman, H. J., & Gelfand, M. J. (2007). When the customer shouldn't be king: Antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment by clients and customers. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(3), 757–70. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.3.757

- *Glasø, L., Bele, E., Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2011). Bus drivers' exposure to bullying at work: An occupation-specific approach. *Scandinavian journal of psychology*, 52(5), 484–93. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9450.2011.00895.x
- *Glasø, L., Vie, T. L., Holmdal, G. R., & Einarsen, S. (2011). An application of affective events theory to workplace bullying. *European Psychologist*, 16(3), 198–208. doi:10.1027/1016-9040/a000026
- *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. doi:10.2307/30040640
- *Goldenhar, L.M., Williams, L. J., & G. Swanson, N. (2003). Modelling relationships between job stressors and injury and near-miss outcomes for construction labourers. *Work & Stress*, 17(3), 218–240. doi:10.1080/02678370310001616144
- *Goussinsky, R. (2011). Does customer aggression more strongly affect happy employees? The moderating role of positive affectivity and extraversion. *Motivation and Emotion*, 35(2), 220–234. doi:10.1007/s11031-011-9215-z
- *Grandey, A. A., Kern, J. H., & Frone, M. R. (2007). Verbal abuse from outsiders versus insiders: Comparing frequency, impact on emotional exhaustion, and the role of emotional labor. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12(1), 63–79. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.12.1.63
- *Grandey, A. A., Dickter, D. N., & Sin, H.P. (2004). The customer is not always right: Customer aggression and emotion regulation of service employees. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 397–418. doi:10.1002/job.252

- Grant Thornton (2013). *Women in senior management: Setting the stage for growth*. Retrieved from http://www.gti.org/files/ibr2013_wib_report_final.pdf
- Gutek, B. A., & O'Connor, M. (1995). The empirical basis for the reasonable woman standard. *Journal of Social Issues, 51*, 151-166.
- *Gutek, B. A., Cohen, A. G., & Konrad, A. M. (1990). Predicting social-sexual behavior at work: A contact hypothesis. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(3), 560–577.
doi:10.2307/256581
- *Gutek, B., Cohen, A., & Tsui, A. (1996). Reactions to perceived sex discrimination. *Human Relations, 49*(6).
- *Haines, V. Y., Marchand, A., & Harvey, S. (2006). Crossover of workplace aggression experiences in dual-earner couples. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 11*(4), 305–14. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.11.4.305
- *Hang-yue, N., Foley, S., & Loi, R. (2006). The effects of cultural types on perceptions of justice and gender inequity in the workplace. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 17*(6), 983–999.
- *Harris, K. J., Kacmar, K. M., & Zivnuska, S. (2007). An investigation of abusive supervision as a predictor of performance and the meaning of work as a moderator of the relationship. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(3), 252–263. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.007
- *Harvey, P., Stoner, J., Hochwarter, W., & Kacmar, C. (2007). Coping with abusive supervision: The neutralizing effects of ingratiation and positive affect on negative employee outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(3), 264–280. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.008
- *Hassell, B. L. (1991). *The effects of ageism and age discrimination on older workers: A field study*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL.

- Hepburn, J.R. (1973). Violent behavior in interpersonal relationships. *The Sociological Quarterly, 14*, 419–29.
- *Herres, D. (2013). *Working in the gay front line : A model of workplace heterosexual harassment*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT.
- *Hershcovis, M. S., Parker, S. K., & Reich, T. C. (2009). The moderating effect of equal opportunity support and confidence in grievance procedures on sexual harassment from different perpetrators. *Journal of Business Ethics, 92*(3), 415–432. doi:10.1007/s10551-009-0165-2
- Hershcovis, M. S., Turner, N., Barling, J., Arnold, K. A, Dupré, K. E., Inness, M., et al. (2007). Predicting workplace aggression: A meta-analysis. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(1), 228–38. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.228
- Hershcovis, M.S. & Barling, J. (2010). Towards a multi-foci approach to workplace aggression: A meta-analytic review of outcomes from different perpetrators. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31*, 24–44. doi:10.1002/job.621
- Hodson, R., Roscigno, V.J., & Lopez, S.H. (2006). Chaos and the abuse of power: Workplace bullying in organizational and interactional context. *Work and Occupations, 33*, 382-416.
- Hoel, H., Sheehan, M., Cooper, C. L., & Einarsen, S. (2011). Organisational effects of workplace bullying. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace. Developments in theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 129-148). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- *Hogh, A., & Mikkelsen, E. V. A. G. (2005). Is sense of coherence a mediator or moderator of relationships between violence at work and stress reactions? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 46*, 429–437.

- *Høgh, A., Henriksson, M. E., & Burr, H. (2005). A 5-year follow-up study of aggression at work and psychological health. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 12(4), 256–65. doi:10.1207/s15327558ijbm1204_6
- Høgh, A., Mikkelsen, E. G., & Hansen, A. M. (2011). Individual consequences of workplace bullying/mobbing. In S. Einarsen, H. Hoel, D. Zapf, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Bullying and harassment in the workplace. Developments in theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed., pp. 107-128). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- *Hoobler, J. M., & Hu, J. (2013). A model of injustice, abusive supervision, and negative affect. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 256–269. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.11.005
- *Houshmand, M., O'Reilly, J., Robinson, S., & Wolff, A. (2012). Escaping bullying: The simultaneous impact of individual and unit-level bullying on turnover intentions. *Human Relations*, 65(7), 901–918. doi:10.1177/0018726712445100
- *Hughes, D., & Dodge, M. A. (1997). African American women in the workplace: relationships between job conditions, racial bias at work, and perceived job quality. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 25(5), 581–99.
- Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (2004). *Methods of meta-analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- *Inness, M., Barling, J., & Turner, N. (2005). Understanding supervisor-targeted aggression: A within-person, between-jobs design. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(4), 731–9. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.4.731
- *Jacob, M. A. (2009). *Perceived discrimination and cumulative disadvantage: Women's mental health in retirement*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Illinois, Chicago, IL.

- *Jones, J., Ni, J., & Wilson, D. (2009). Comparative effects of race/ethnicity and employee engagement on withdrawal behavior. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 21(2).
- Jones, K.P., Peddie, C.I., Gilrane, V.L., King, E.B., & Gray, A.L. (2013). Not so subtle: A meta analytic investigation of the correlates of subtle and overt discrimination. *Journal of Management*. 1-26. DOI: 10.1177/0149206313506466
- Keashley, L. (1997). Emotional abuse in the workplace. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 1, 85–117. doi:10.1300/J135v01n01
- Keltner, D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Anderson, C. (2003). Power, approach, and inhibition. *Psychological Review*, 110, 265–284.
- Kenig, S., & Ryan, J. (1986). Sex differences in levels of tolerance and attribution of blame for sexual harassment on a university campus. *Sex Roles*, 15, 535-549.
- *Kern, J. H., & Grandey, A. A. (2009). Customer incivility as a social stressor: The role of race and racial identity for service employees. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14(1), 46–57. doi:10.1037/a0012684
- *Kiazad, K., Restubog, S. L. D., Zagencyk, T. J., Kiewitz, C., & Tang, R. L. (2010). In pursuit of power: The role of authoritarian leadership in the relationship between supervisors' Machiavellianism and subordinates' perceptions of abusive supervisory behavior. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44(4), 512–519. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2010.06.004
- *Kissman, K. (1990). Women in blue-collar occupations: An exploration of constraints and facilitators. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 17(3), 139–149.
- Kobynewicz, D. & Branscombe, N. R. (1997). *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 347–363.

- *Konik, J. A. (2005). *Harassment as a system for policing traditional gender norms in the workplace: The structure and process of sexual harassment and heterosexist harassment*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.
- *Konrad, A. M., & Gutek, B. A. (1986). Impact of work experiences on attitudes toward sexual harassment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *31*, 422–438.
- *Kwesiga, E. N. (2006). *Antecedents and effects of perceived age discrimination against employees under 40*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington, TX.
- *Landrum, T. L. (2000). *Major concerns of workers at three stages of life*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Arizona State University, Phoenix, AZ.
- *Law, R., Dollard, M. F., Tuckey, M. R., & Dormann, C. (2011). Psychosocial safety climate as a lead indicator of workplace bullying and harassment, job resources, psychological health and employee engagement. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, *43*(5), 1782–93.
doi:10.1016/j.aap.2011.04.010
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. New York: Springer.
- *Leiter, M. P., Frizzell, C., Harvie, P., & Churchill, L. (2001). Abusive interactions and burnout: Examining occupation, gender, and the mediating role of community. *Psychology & Health*, *16*(5), 547–63. doi:10.1080/08870440108405526
- Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *5*, 165-184.
- *Lim, S., & Lee, A. (2011). Work and nonwork outcomes of workplace incivility: Does family support help? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *16*(1), 95–111.
doi:10.1037/a0021726

- *Liu, J. U. N., Kwan, H. O. K., Lee, C., & Hui, C. (2013). Work-to-family spillover effects of workplace ostracism: The role of work-home segmentation preferences. *Human Resource Management, 52*(1), 75–93. doi:10.1002/hrm
- *Loh, J., Restubog, S. L. D., & Zagencyk, T. J. (2010). Consequences of workplace bullying on employee identification and satisfaction among Australians and Singaporeans. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 41*(2), 236–252. doi:10.1177/0022022109354641
- *Løkke Vie, T., Glasø, L., & Einarsen, S. (2010). Does trait anger, trait anxiety or organisational position moderate the relationship between exposure to negative acts and self-labelling as a victim of workplace bullying? *Nordic Psychology, 62*(3), 67–79. doi:10.1027/1901-2276/a000017
- *Lyons, B.J. & Leong, F.L. (2010, January). Applying a racial lens to workplace bullying: Antecedents and outcomes. Paper presented at the annual meeting for the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Las Vegas, NV.
- *Mansfield, P. K., Koch, P. B., Henderson, J., Vicary, J. R., Cohn, M., & Young, E. W. (1991). The job climate for women in traditionally male blue-collar occupations. *Sex Roles, 25*(1-2), 63–79. doi:10.1007/BF00289317
- *Marrs, M. E. M. (1999). *Antecedents and outcomes of verbal aggression in the workplace*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, MO.
- *Matteson, A. V. (2008). *Role of work climate in job satisfaction and organizational commitment of women in a nontraditional career field: The case of women in the military*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.

- *Mawritz, M. B., Mayer, D. M., Hoobler, J. M., Wayne, S. J., & Marinova, S. V. (2012). A Trickle-Down Model of Abusive Supervision. *Personnel Psychology*, *65*(2), 325–357. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2012.01246.x
- *McCormack, D., Casimir, G., Djurkovic, N., & Yang, L. (2006). The concurrent effects of workplace bullying, satisfaction with supervisor, and satisfaction with co-workers on affective commitment among schoolteachers in China. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *17*(4), 316–331.
- *McFarlin, S. K., Fals-Stewart, W., Major, D. A., & Justice, E. M. (2001). Alcohol use and workplace aggression: An examination of perpetration and victimization. *Journal of Substance Abuse*, *13*, 303–321.
- *McGowan, H. (2010). *Relationships among perceived ethnic discrimination, job attitudes, and behaviors*. (Unpublished master's thesis). San Jose State University, San Jose, CA.
- *McKinney, K. (1990). Sexual harassment of university faculty by colleagues and students. *Sex Roles*, *23*(7-8), 421–438. doi:10.1007/BF00289230
- McKinney, K. (1994). Sexual harassment and college faculty members. *Deviant Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, *15*, 171-191.
- *McLendon, C., Bergman, M.E., & Thompson, R.J. (2013, April). Sexual harassment, incivility, and academia. Poster presented at the annual meeting for the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Houston, TX.
- *Merwin, C., & Mitchell, M. C. (1998). Sexual harassment in casinos: Effects on employee attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, *14*(4), 381–400.

- *Mezuk, B., Kershaw, K. N., Hudson, D., Lim, K. A., & Ratliff, S. (2011). Job strain, workplace discrimination, and hypertension among older workers: The health and retirement study. *Race and Social Problems, 3*(1), 38–50. doi:10.1007/s12552-011-9041-7
- *Mikkelsen, E. G., & Einarsen, S. (2002). Relationships between exposure to bullying at work and psychological and psychosomatic health complaints: the role of state negative affectivity and generalized self-efficacy. *Scandinavian journal of psychology, 43*(5), 397–405.
- *Miner-Rubino, K. N. (2004). *Beyond targets: Vicarious exposure to hostility towards women in the workplace*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.
- *Mitchell, M. S., & Ambrose, M. L. (2007). Abusive supervision and workplace deviance and the moderating effects of negative reciprocity beliefs. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(4), 1159–68. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1159
- *Moore, M. E., Konrad, A. M., Yang, Y., Ng, E. S. W., & Doherty, A. J. (2011). The vocational well-being of workers with childhood onset of disability: Life satisfaction and perceived workplace discrimination. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 79*(3), 681–698. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2011.03.019
- *Morris, A. (1996). Gender and ethnic differences in social constraints among a sample of New York City police officers. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 1*(2), 224–35.
- *Morrow, R. (210). *The effects of three types of harassment on male and female public servants*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario
- Munson, L. J., Miner, A. G., & Hulin, C. (2001). Labeling sexual harassment in the military: an extension and replication. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(2), 293.

- *Negi, N. J. (2013). Battling discrimination and social isolation: Psychological distress among Latino day laborers. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *51*(1-2), 164–74.
doi:10.1007/s10464-012-9548-0
- Nelson, C. & Keith, J. (1990). Comparison of female and male early adolescent sex role, attitude, and behavior development. *Adolescence*, *25*, 183-204.
- Nielsen, M. B., & Einarsen, S. (2012). Outcomes of exposure to workplace bullying: A meta analytic review. *Work & Stress*, *26*(4), 309–332. doi:10.1080/02678373.2012.734709
- *Nielsen, M. B., Matthiesen, S. B., & Einarsen, S. (2008). Sense of coherence as a protective mechanism among targets of workplace bullying. *Journal of occupational health psychology*, *13*(2), 128–36. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.13.2.128
- Nielsen, M. B., Matthiesen, S. B., & Einarsen, S. (2010). The impact of methodological moderators on prevalence rates of workplace bullying. A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *83*(4), 955–979.
doi:10.1348/096317909X481256
- *Niven, K., Sprigg, C. A., & Armitage, C. J. (2013). Does emotion regulation protect employees from the negative effects of workplace aggression? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *22*(1), 88–106.
- *O’Connell, C. E., & Korabik, K. (2000). Sexual harassment: The relationship of personal vulnerability, work context, perpetrator status, and type of harassment to outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *56*(3), 299–329. doi:10.1006/jvbe.1999.1717
- O’Connor, M. A. (1998). *Gender and the definition of sexual harassment: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona.

- Ohse, D. M., & Stockdale, M. S. (2008). Age comparisons in workplace sexual harassment perceptions. *Sex Roles, 59*(3-4), 240–253. doi:10.1007/s11199-008-9438-y
- Jóhannsdóttir, H. L., & Ólafsson, R. F. (2004). Coping with bullying in the workplace: the effect of gender, age and type of bullying. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 32*(3), 319-333.
- Olweus, D. (1993). Bullies on the playground: The role of victimization. In C.H. Hart (Ed.), *Children on the playgrounds: Research perspectives and applications*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- *Parker, S. K., & Griffin, M. a. (2002). What is so bad about a little name-calling? Negative consequences of gender harassment for overperformance demands and distress. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 7*(3), 195–210. doi:10.1037//1076-8998.7.3.195
- Pascoe, E.A. & Richman, L.S. (2009). Perceived discrimination and health: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 135*(4), 531-554.
- *Peng, K. Z., Ngo, H.-Y., Shi, J., & Wong, C.-S. (2009). Gender differences in the work commitment of Chinese workers: An investigation of two alternative explanations. *Journal of World Business, 44*(3), 323–335. doi:10.1016/j.jwb.2008.08.003
- *Perry, E. L., Hendricks, W., & Broadbent, E. (2000). An exploration of access and treatment discrimination and job satisfaction among college graduates with and without physical disabilities. *Human Relations, 53*(7), 923–955. doi:10.1177/0018726700537002
- Pettigrew, T. F. and Meertens, R. W. (1995), Subtle and blatant prejudice in Western Europe. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 25*, 57–75. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2420250106

- Phinney, J.S., Madden, T., & Santos, L. J. (1998). Psychological variables as predictors of perceived ethnic discrimination among minority and immigrant adolescents. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 28*(11), 937–953.
- Pinel, E. C. (1999). Stigma consciousness: The psychological legacy of social stereotypes. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology, 76*(1), 114-128. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.76.1.114
- *Piotrkowski, C. S. (1998). Gender harassment, job satisfaction, and distress among employed white and minority women. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 3*(1), 33–43.
- *Prof, H. B., & Yagil, D. (2007). The relationship between empowerment, aggressive behaviours of customers, coping, and burnout. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 14*(1), 81–99.
- *Pyc, L. S. (2011). *The moderating effects of workplace ambiguity and perceived job control on the relations between abusive supervision and employees' behavioral, psychological, and physical strains*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York
- *Quine, L. (2002). Workplace bullying in junior doctors: Questionnaire survey. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.), 324*, 878–879.
- *Rabl, T. & Kuhlmann, T. M. (2002). Work-life balance and demographic change. *Zeitschrift fur Personalpsychologie, 8*(2), 88–99.
- *Rafferty, A. E., & Restubog, S. L. D. (2011). The influence of abusive supervisors on followers' organizational citizenship behaviours: The hidden costs of abusive supervision. *British Journal of Management, 22*(2), 270–285. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2010.00732.x

- *Rafferty, A. E., Restubog, S. L. D., & Jimmieson, N. L. (2010). Losing sleep: Examining the cascading effects of supervisors' experience of injustice on subordinates' psychological health. *Work & Stress*, 24(1), 36–55. doi:10.1080/02678371003715135
- *Ragins, B. R., & Cornwell, J. M. (2001). Pink triangles: Antecedents and consequences of perceived workplace discrimination against gay and lesbian employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(6), 1244–1261. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.86.6.1244
- *Ragins, B. R., Singh, R., & Cornwell, J. M. (2007). Making the invisible visible: Fear and disclosure of sexual orientation at work. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 1103–18. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1103
- *Ragins, B.R. & Scandura, T. A. (1995). Investigation of competing hypotheses. *Sex Roles*, 32(7/8), 429–455.
- *Rainey, D. W. (1999). Sources of Stress , Burnout , and Intention to Terminate Among Basketball Referees. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 22(4), 578–590.
- *Randle, N., Mathis, C., & Cates, D. (2012). Coping to repair the career dmanage of workplace weight discrimination. *Journal of Organizational Culture*, 16(1), 89–107.
- Raver, J. L., & Nishii, L. H. (2010). Once, twice, or three times as harmful? Ethnic harassment, gender harassment, and generalized workplace harassment. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(2), 236–54. doi:10.1037/a0018377
- *Raver, J.L. (2004). *Behavioral outcomes of interpersonal aggression at work: A mediated and moderated model*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

- *Raver, J.L., & Nishii, L. H. (2010). Once, twice, or three times as harmful? Ethnic harassment, gender harassment, and generalized workplace harassment. *The Journal of applied psychology, 95*(2), 236–54. doi:10.1037/a0018377
- *Redman, T., & Snape, E. (2006). The consequences of perceived age discrimination amongst older police officers: Is social support a buffer? *British Journal of Management, 17*(2), 167–175. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2006.00492.x
- *Regan, T. & Shin, H. (1988). *Minority journalists in Ohio: A study of their job satisfaction*. A paper presented for the annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication. Seattle, WA.
- *Reio, T. G. (2011). Supervisor and coworker incivility: Testing the work frustration-aggression model. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 13*(1), 54–68.
doi:10.1177/1523422311410648
- *Restubog, S. L. D., Scott, K. L., & Zagenczyk, T. J. (2011). When distress hits home: The role of contextual factors and psychological distress in predicting employees' responses to abusive supervision. *The Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(4), 713–29.
doi:10.1037/a0021593
- *Rodriguez, M. G. (2002). *Job stress and perceptions among Hispanic professionals of prejudice and discrimination in the workplace*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.
- *Rogers, R. R. (1998). *The impact of gay identity and perceived milieu toward gay employees on job involvement and organizational commitment of gay men*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Columbia University, New York, NY.

- *Rosen, L. N., & Martin, L. (1998). Incidence and perceptions of sexual harassment among male and female U.S. Army soldiers. *Military Psychology, 10*(4), 239–257.
doi:10.1207/s15327876mp1004_2
- *Rospenda, K. (1999). Workplace harassment, services utilization, and drinking outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 7*(2), 141–155.
- *Rospenda, K. M., Richman, J. a., & Shannon, C. a. (2009). Prevalence and mental health correlates of harassment and discrimination in the workplace: Results from a national study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*(5), 819–43. doi:10.1177/0886260508317182
- *Rospenda, K.M. (1998). *Sexual and non-sexual harassment as interpersonal conflict stressors in the workplace: Effects on job, mental health, and physical health outcomes.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). DePaul University, Chicago, IL.
- Rotundo, M., Nguyen, D.-H., & Sackett, P. R. (2001). A meta-analytic review of gender differences in perceptions of sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(5), 914–922. doi:10.1037//0021-9010.86.5.914
- Rowe, M. P. (1990). Barriers to equality: The power of subtle discrimination to maintain unequal opportunity. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 3*, 153–163.
- *Sanchez, J.I., & B. P. (1996). Outcomes of perceived discrimination among Hispanic employees: Is diversity management a luxury or a necessity? *Academy of Management Journal, 39*(3), 704–719.
- *Schat, A., & Frone, M. R. (2011). Exposure to psychological aggression at work and job performance: The mediating role of job attitudes and personal health. *Work and Stress, 25*(1), 23–40. doi:10.1080/02678373.2011.563133

- *Schneider, K. (2000). An examination of the nature and correlates of ethnic harassment experiences in multiple contexts. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(1), 3–12.
doi:10.1037//0021.9010.85.1.3
- *Schneider, K. T. (1996). *Bystander stress: The effect of organizational tolerance of sexual harassment on victims' coworkers*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL.
- Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 138–158.
doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.09.001
- *Settles, I. H., Cortina, L. M., Malley, J., & Stewart, A. J. (2006). The climate for women in academic science: The good, the bad, and the changeable. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 30(1), 47–58. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2006.00261.x
- *Shaffer, M. A., Joplin, J. R. W., Bell, M. P., Lau, T., & Oguz, C. (2000). Gender discrimination and job-related outcomes: A cross-cultural comparison of working women in the United States and China. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 57(3), 395–427.
doi:10.1006/jvbe.1999.1748
- *Shrier, D. K., Zucker, A. N., Mercurio, A. E., Landry, L. J., Rich, M., & Shrier, L. A. (2007). Generation to generation: Discrimination and harassment experiences of physician mothers and their physician daughters. *Journal of Women's Health*, 16(6), 883–94.
doi:10.1089/jwh.2006.0127
- *Sliter, K. A., Sliter, M. T., Withrow, S. A., & Jex, S. M. (2012). Employee adiposity and incivility: Establishing a link and identifying demographic moderators and negative

- consequences. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17(4), 409–24.
doi:10.1037/a0029862
- *Sliter, M., Sliter, K., & Jex, S. (2012). The employee as a punching bag: The effect of multiple sources of incivility on employee withdrawal behavior and sales performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 139(May 2011), 121–139. doi:10.1002/job
- *Sliter, M., Jex, S., Wolford, K., & McInnerney, J. (2010). How rude! Emotional labor as a mediator between customer incivility and employee outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(4), 468–81. doi:10.1037/a0020723
- *Sliter, M. (2013, April). *The relationship between victim incivility and employee outcomes in firefighters*. A poster presented at the annual meeting for the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Houston, TX.
- *Snape, E., & Redman, T. (2003). Too old or too young? The impact of perceived age discrimination. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 13(1), 78–89.
- *Soylu, A. (2007). *Causes and consequences of work stress: A comparison of foreign and American workers in the U.S.A.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.
- *Sulea, C., Filipescu, R., Horga, A., Ortan, C., & Fischmann, G. (2012). Interpersonal mistreatment at work and burnout among teachers. *Cognition, Brain, Behavior. An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 16(4), 553–570.
- *Sulea, C., Fischmann, G., & Filipescu, R. (2012). Conscientious, therefore engaged in work? Don't take it for granted: the moderating role of workplace mistreatment. *Human Resources Psychology*, 10(2), 23–32.

- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1985). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed., pp. 7–24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Taylor, D.M., Wright, S.C., & Porter, L.E. (1994). Dimensions of perceived discrimination: The personal/group discrimination discrepancy. In M.P. Zanna & J.M. Olson (Eds.), *The psychology of prejudice: The Ontario symposium* (Vol.7, pp.233-255). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- *Taylor, S. (2012). Linking workplace incivility to citizenship performance: The combined effects of affective commitment and conscientiousness. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33, 878–893. doi:10.1002/job.773
- Tepper, B. J. (2007). Abusive supervision in work organizations: Review synthesis, and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 33, 261–289.
- *Tepper, B. J., Carr, J. C., Breaux, D. M., Geider, S., Hu, C., & Hua, W. (2009). Abusive supervision, intentions to quit, and employees' workplace deviance: A power/dependence analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 109(2), 156–167. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2009.03.004
- Tepper, B. J., Duffy, M. K., Henle, C. A., & Lambert, L. S. (2006). Procedural injustice, victim precipitation, and abusive supervision. *Personnel Psychology*, 59, 101–123.
- Terpstra, D. E., & Baker, D. D. (1986). A framework for the study of sexual harassment. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 7(1), 17–34. doi:10.1207/s15324834basp0701_2
- *Thau, S., & Mitchell, M. S. (2010). Self-gain or self-regulation impairment? Tests of competing explanations of the supervisor abuse and employee deviance relationship through

- perceptions of distributive justice. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(6), 1009–31.
doi:10.1037/a0020540
- *Thau, S., Aquino, K., & Bommer, W. H. (2008). How employee race moderates the relationship between non-contingent punishment and organizational citizenship behaviors: A test of the negative adaptation hypothesis. *Social Justice Research*, 21(3), 297–312.
doi:10.1007/s11211-008-0072-1
- *Thau, S., Bennett, R. J., Mitchell, M. S., & Marrs, M. B. (2009). How management style moderates the relationship between abusive supervision and workplace deviance: An uncertainty management theory perspective. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108(1), 79–92. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2008.06.003
- *Triana, M., Garcia, M., & Colella, A. (2010). Managing diversity: How organizational efforts to support diversity moderate the effects of perceived racial discrimination on affective commitment. *Personnel Psychology*, 63, 817–843.
- Truett, K. R. (1993). Age differences in conservatism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 14(3), 405-411.
- *Tuckey, M. R., Dollard, M. F., Saebel, J., & Berry, N. M. (2010). Negative workplace behaviour: temporal associations with cardiovascular outcomes and psychological health problems in Australian police. *Stress and Health*, 26(5), 372–381. doi:10.1002/smi.1306
- U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2013). Laws and guidance. Retrieved from <http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/>
- *Van Dyck, S. H. (2012). *Horizontal workplace aggression and coworker social support related to work-family conflict and turnover intentions*. (Unpublished master's theses). Portland State University, Portland, OR.

- *Van Jaarsveld, D. D., Walker, D. D., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2010). The role of job demands and emotional exhaustion in the relationship between customer and employee incivility. *Journal of Management*, *36*(6), 1486–1504. doi:10.1177/0149206310368998
- *Vartia, M. (1996). The sources of bullying—psychological work environment and organizational climate. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *5*(2), 203–214. doi:10.1080/13594329608414855
- *Vartia, M., & Hyyti, J. (2002). Gender differences in workplace bullying among prison officers. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *11*(1), 113–126. doi:10.1080/13594320143000870
- *Vie, T. L., Glasø, L., & Einarsen, S. (2011). Health outcomes and self-labeling as a victim of workplace bullying. *Journal of psychosomatic research*, *70*(1), 37–43. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychores.2010.06.007
- *Volpone, S.D. & Avery, D.R. (2010, April). *Sexual orientation discrimination in the workplace: Examining the victims' perspectives*. A poster presented at the annual meeting for the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Atlanta, GA.
- *Wade-Golden, K. (2006). *Work and family conflict: Understanding the role of race, gender, racial discrimination, and sexual discrimination*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Wayne State University, Detroit, MI.
- Wallace, J.C., Paul, J.B., Landis, R.S., & Vodanovich, S.J. (2012). Occupational safety. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Personnel Assessment and Selection* (pp. 614–626). New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- *Wardell, M. (2011). *The effects of bullying on men and women in American workplaces*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Walden University, Minneapolis, MI.

- *Wated, G., & Sanchez, J. I. (2006). The role of accent as a work stressor on attitudinal and health-related work outcomes. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 13(3), 329–350. doi:10.1037/1072-5245.13.3.329
- *White, J. E. (1990). *Sexual harassment in the workplace*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS.
- Whitener, E. M. (1990). Confusion of confidence intervals and credibility intervals in meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(3), 315.
- Willness, C.R., Steel, P., & Lee, K. (2007). A meta-analysis of the antecedents and consequences of workplace sexual harassment. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 127-162.
- *Winstanley, S., & Whittington, R. (2002). Anxiety, burnout and coping styles in general hospital staff exposed to workplace aggression: A cyclical model of burnout and vulnerability to aggression. *Work & Stress*, 16(4), 302–315.
doi:10.1080/0267837021000058650
- *Wu, L.Z., Kwan, H. K., Liu, J., & Resick, C. J. (2012). Work-to-family spillover effects of abusive supervision. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 27(7), 714–731.
doi:10.1108/02683941211259539
- *Wu, L.Z., Yim, F. H., Kwan, H. K., & Zhang, X. (2012). Coping with workplace ostracism: The roles of ingratiation and political skill in employee psychological distress. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(1), 178–199. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6486.2011.01017.x
- *Wu, T.Y. (2009). Abusive supervision and employee emotional exhaustion: Dispositional antecedents and boundaries. *Group & Organization Management*, 34(2), 143–169.
doi:10.1177/1059601108331217

- *Wyatt, G. E., & Riederle, M. (1995). The prevalence and context of sexual harassment among African American and White American women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *10*(3), 309–321. doi:10.1177/088626095010003005
- Yagil, D. (2008). When the customer is wrong: A review of research on aggression and sexual harassment in service encounters. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *13*(2), 141–152. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2008.03.002
- Yamada, D. C. (2000, March). The phenomenon of “workplace bullying” and the need for status-blind hostile work environment protection. *Georgetown Law Journal*, *88*, 1-48.
- *Yang, L. Q. (2009). *Aggression and its consequences in nursing: A more complete story by adding its social context*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of South Florida, Tampa, FL.
- *Zellars, K. L., Tepper, B. J., & Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates’ organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(6), 1068–76.
- Zellars, K. L., Tepper, B. J., & Duffy, M. K. (2002). Abusive supervision and subordinates’ organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(6), 1068–76.