Comparing Victim Attributions and Outcomes for Workplace Aggression and Sexual Harassment

M. Sandy Hershcovis
University of Manitoba

Julian Barling
Queen's University

In 2 studies, we investigated victim attributions (Study 1) and outcomes (Study 2) for workplace aggression and sexual harassment. Drawing on social categorization theory, we argue that victims of workplace aggression and sexual harassment may make different attributions about their mistreatment. In Study 1, we investigated victim attributions in an experimental study. We hypothesized that victims of sexual harassment are more likely than victims of workplace aggression to depersonalize their mistreatment and attribute blame to the perpetrator or the perpetrator's attitudes toward their gender. In contrast, victims of workplace aggression are more likely than victims of sexual harassment to personalize the mistreatment and make internal attributions. Results supported our hypotheses. On the basis of differential attributions for these 2 types of mistreatment, we argue that victims of workplace aggression may experience stronger adverse outcomes than victims of sexual harassment. In Study 2, we compared meta-analytically the attitudinal, behavioral, and health outcomes of workplace aggression and sexual harassment. Negative outcomes of workplace aggression were stronger in magnitude than those of sexual harassment for 6 of the 8 outcome variables. Implications and future directions are discussed.

Keywords: attributions, incivility, meta-analysis, sexual harassment, workplace aggression

Supplemental materials: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020070.supp

The past 2 decades of research have shown that workplace aggression and sexual harassment have significant negative consequences for employees' job attitudes (e.g., satisfaction and commitment), performance, and psychological and physical well-being (see Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Willness, Steel, & Lee, 2007). Further, both forms of mistreatment are highly prevalent in their "lower intensity" forms. For instance, researchers have found that 71% of employees have experienced incivility (Cortina, Magley, Williams, & Langhout, 2001), 58% of women have experienced sexual harassment (Ilies, Hauserman, Schwochau, & Stibal, 2003),[1] and 72% of female respondents reported experiencing gender harassment at work (Piotrkowski, 1998). Though a considerable body of research has investigated both forms of mistreatment (workplace aggression and sexual harassment), researchers know little about how victims perceive and attribute blame for these two forms of mistreatment.

In the present research, we draw on social categorization theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987) to posit that victims of workplace aggression and sexual harassment may make different attributions about their mistreatment experiences. In particular, we suggest that victims of workplace aggression may be more likely to make internal and personal attributions than victims of sexual harassment. In contrast, victims of sexual harassment may be more likely to make gender and external attributions than victims of workplace aggression. In turn, these differential attributions may yield differential outcomes for victims of workplace aggression and sexual harassment, with internal and personal attributions by victims of workplace aggression resulting in stronger adverse outcomes than the gender and external attributions by victims of sexual harassment.

To test our hypotheses, we conducted two studies. In Study 1, we investigated the comparative attributions made by victims of workplace aggression and sexual harassment. In Study 2, we meta-analytically compared these two forms of mistreatment to determine whether they yield different outcome magnitudes. In addition to testing our theoretically derived predictions, the meta-analysis contributes to research beyond existing meta-analyses (e.g., Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Lapierre, Spector, & Leck, 2005; Willness et al., 2007) by comparing a broader range of outcomes than those examined previously (i.e., job satisfaction; Lapierre et al., 2005) and by accounting for the intensity of sexual harassment and workplace aggression.

[1] The 58% incidence rate reported by Ilies et al. (2003) reflects sexual harassment over an unspecified period. The standard wording of the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ) assesses sexual harassment over a 2-year period.

Comparing the Nature of Sexual Harassment and Workplace Aggression

Legal attention to sexual harassment has created significant awareness of and policy aimed at preventing workplace sexual harassment; workplace aggression has not received the same level of attention. Yet, workplace aggression may have adverse outcomes that are at least as strong as those of sexual harassment. Lapierre et al. (2005) found little difference in the magnitude of the relationship between these two forms of interpersonal mistreatment and job satisfaction. Further, in subanalyses of all-female samples, Lapierre et al. found that victims experienced lower job satisfaction from workplace aggression than from sexual harassment.

Sexual harassment has been described in terms of its three subcomponents: gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and quid pro quo. Gelfand, Fitzgerald, and Drasgow (1995) suggested that gender harassment consists of a range of verbal and nonverbal behaviors that convey insulting, hostile, or degrading attitudes toward women. Unwanted sexual attention includes a variety of offensive, unwanted, and unreciprocated sexual behaviors, whereas quid pro quo harassment reflects the extortion of sexual cooperation in return for job-related considerations. We borrow from the definition proposed by Neuman and Baron (2005) to define interpersonal workplace aggression (in contrast to workplace violence) as nonviolent negative acts perpetrated against organizational members, which organizational members are motivated to avoid. These acts include verbal and psychological behaviors such as yelling, spreading lies or rumors, ostracism, and withholding information.

There are several similarities between sexual harassment and workplace aggression. Researchers in both areas (e.g., Barling, 1996; Fitzgerald, Hulin, & Drasgow, 1995; Keashly, Hunter, & Harvey, 1997; Schat & Kelloway, 2003) have argued that these behaviors are organizational stressors that relate to attitudinal (e.g., job satisfaction, affective commitment), behavioral (e.g., work withdrawal), and health consequences (e.g., psychological and physical well-being). Both sexual harassment and workplace aggression are conceptualized as unwanted behaviors, which is what characterizes them as stressors. In addition, both sexual harassment and workplace aggression can be communicated through nonverbal (i.e., facial expressions and gestures), verbal, and physical behaviors.

Despite these similarities, we posit that workplace aggression may have stronger adverse outcomes for victims than sexual harassment. First, sexual harassment is experienced differently by women and men (e.g., Berdahl, 2007a, 2007b; Berdahl, Magley, & Waldo, 1996; Gutek, 1985). With respect to women, sexual harassment is likely to symbolize an attack on a representative of a group (i.e., gender), whereas for men, at a minimum it is less likely to threaten their organizational status and may even reinforce their gender identity.[2] In contrast, workplace aggression for both women and men is likely to be perceived as a personal attack on oneself. Thus, as we discuss in more detail below, workplace aggression may be perceived as more personal than sexual harassment.

Social Identity and Self-Categorization Theories: Attacking Individuals or Collectives?

Sexual harassment by men toward women has dominated the sexual harassment research, the findings of which show that such harassment occurs more frequently in male-dominated organizations (Berdahl & Moore, 2006; Fitzgerald, Drasgow, Hulin, Gelfand, & Magley, 1997; Glomb, Munson, Hulin, Bergman, & Drasgow, 1999). Although researchers initially believed that the reason for this was that more men in the company of fewer women would naturally lead to higher levels of harassment, recent research has shown that sexual harassment occurs more frequently in these organizations because male-dominated organizations generally involve careers that are traditionally held by men (e.g., construction workers, military). Maass, Cadinu, Guarnieri, and Grasselli (2003) argued that men sexually harass women because women threaten men's social identity by working in traditionally male roles. In their experiments, they manipulated social identity threat by pairing men with women who expressed either traditionally feminine (nonthreatening) gender roles or feminist (threatening) gender roles. Men then had an opportunity to send a range of images, including pornographic pictures, to women. Men in the threatening condition were more likely to send pornographic material to "feminist" women. Berdahl (2007a) extended this research by conducting a series of field studies to determine whether sexual harassment is motivated by sexual desire or a wish to punish gender-role deviants. She reasoned that if sexual harassment is motivated by sexual desire, then women who meet feminine ideals should be sexually harassed more often than women who possess masculine traits. Berdahl found that women who possess masculine traits experienced more sexual harassment. Taken together, this body of research suggests that a key underlying motivation for sexual harassment from men toward women is the threat to male social identity.

Although this argument addresses a key underlying motivation for sexual harassment, it does not speak to whether female victims perceive this underlying motivation. We draw on self-categorization theory to argue that female victims of sexual harassment may be more likely than victims of workplace aggression to depersonalize their experience of mistreatment and attribute it to the perpetrator's prejudice toward their gender group. When individuals self-categorize, they accentuate similarities among members of their ingroup and depersonalize their self-perception; that is, the individual becomes an interchangeable exemplar of the larger group or social category (Turner, Oakes, Haslam, & McGarty, 1994). Research has shown that people are more likely to self-categorize when the act of categorizing oneself in an ingroup fits the social context or when one's social category becomes salient (Turner et al., 1994). For example, Hogg and Turner (1987) showed that gender emerged as a salient category for participants in an experiment only when discussion groups were set up so that men disagreed with women. When discussion

---

[2] We focus on sexual harassment as measured by the SEQ, which was designed for women. Research has shown that men identify different behaviors as harassing than women (Berdahl et al., 1996). However, to date, few studies have investigated sexual harassment toward men using measures consistent with male definitions. Therefore, we limit our discussion to traditionally defined and measured forms of sexual harassment.

groups consisted of men and woman in agreement about an issue, participants did not self-categorize based on gender.

We suggest that gender becomes a salient category for a woman when she is the target of sexual harassment. That is, sexual harassment highlights and degrades some aspect of the victim's gender (e.g., crude sexual remarks, seductive behavior, sexist comments) and reinforces low status (Berdahl et al., 1996). Therefore, female victims are likely to activate their gender category when they are sexually harassed, and may perceive the harassment as an attack on their collective gender rather than on some aspect of themselves. Crocker and Major (1989) theorized that members of a minority or stigmatized group can enhance their self-concept by attributing negative interpersonal feedback from outgroup members to prejudiced perceptions about the group. They noted that although much theory posits that members of lower status groups may develop negative self-esteem due to the negative perceptions of others, empirical evidence does not lend support to this hypothesis. Crocker and Major suggested that one way in which members of oppressed groups may protect their self-concept is by questioning whether the negative incident is a result of their own personal inadequacies or whether it occurred because of the perpetrators' attitude toward the broader group.

Thus, Crocker and Major (1989) suggested that ambiguity about the reason for mistreatment may protect victims by offering a plausible external attribution. In contrast, subsequent research found that ambiguity about the reason for mistreatment may lead victims to blame themselves. Ruggiero and Taylor (1995) found that victims of discrimination attributed their failures to discrimination. However, contrary to Crocker and Major's argument, Ruggiero and Taylor found that when the mistreatment was ambiguous (i.e., not clearly discrimination), victims attributed their failures to themselves. Further, Dardenne, Dumont, and Bollier (2007) found that "benevolent sexism" (i.e., the portrayal of women as warm but incompetent) led victims to experience self-doubt, whereas hostile sexism was more likely to result in victims' discounting of the opinions of harassers as discriminatory. Separately, Crocker, Voelkl, Testa, and Major (1991) found that participants who received negative feedback from a male evaluator, and who were in the experimental condition that enabled them to make an attribution of prejudice, reported a more positive mood than individuals who could not make an attribution of prejudice. Therefore, to the extent that victims are able to perceive sexual harassment as gender related, they may attribute the mistreatment to the perpetrator's prejudice toward their gender.[3]

Experiences of Sexual Harassment by Men

The preceding arguments relate to the experiences of women only. Research that has studied sexual harassment toward men has found that men perceive sexual harassment as less threatening than women (Berdahl, 2007a, 2007b; Berdahl et al., 1996; Garlick, 1994; Gutek, 1985). For example, Gutek (1985) found that women described sexual harassment as unwanted sexual attention initiated by someone else, whereas men described the same behaviors as mutually initiated and leading to positive outcomes. Berdahl et al. (1996) argued that sexual harassment is less threatening to men than it is to women because for women it reinforces their low relative status by demeaning their gender roles. In contrast, for men, sexual harassment poses little or no threat to their higher

relative status and may even reinforce their masculine gender role.[4] Further, in an investigation of discrimination more broadly, Schmitt, Branscombe, Kobrynowicz, and Owen (2002) found that women, but not men, experienced harmful consequences when they experienced discrimination. These authors argued that members of a privileged group are less likely to perceive discrimination as pervasive across contexts than members of a disadvantaged group. Together, these findings suggest that men are likely to be less threatened by sexual harassment than women, and as we argue in the next section, they may also be less threatened by sexual harassment than by workplace aggression. Thus, key to our present argument is the notion that female victims of sexual harassment may (a) perceive that their group rather than their personal characteristics is under attack and (b) depersonalize their experience of harassment. In contrast, male victims of sexual harassment are less threatened by the experience than women.

Victim Reactions to Workplace Aggression

In contrast to sexual harassment, workplace aggression, as it is typically defined, is not overtly specific to race, gender, or any other social group. That is, even if the perpetrator's motivation for victimization is related to the victim's race, gender, or other minority characteristic, victims do not necessarily *perceive* this motivation. If victims perceived that aggression was based on minority status, they would perceive it as discrimination, not aggression; and if they perceived that it was based on gender, they would perceive it as sexual harassment, not aggression. Therefore, because of the general way in which aggression is enacted, it is less likely than sexual harassment to be perceived as an attack on a minority characteristic. Consequently, victims of workplace aggression are less able than victims of sexual harassment to invoke a social categorical buffer to protect their self-concept. Workplace aggression often manifests itself in forms of social exclusion, gossiping, yelling, and rude behaviors, all of which signal that the victim is of low status, is not liked, does not belong to the work group, and/or is not welcome in the work environment. These behaviors are likely to be equally threatening to men and women because they pose a threat to belongingness and status that is not associated (outwardly) with gender. Research has demonstrated that individuals have a fundamental need to belong and that threats to such belongingness have significant adverse effects on individuals' health, attitudes, and behaviors (see Baumeister & Leary, 1995, for a comprehensive review). Although both sexual harassment and workplace aggression may signal a lack of belongingness, the former signals the lack of belongingness in a workplace based on gender, whereas the latter signals lack of belongingness in a workplace based on one's personal characteristics.

The argument that workplace aggression is not specific to a particular gender or group may appear inconsistent with research (e.g., Cortina, 2008) that suggests that minorities, including

---

[3] When sexual harassment is extremely subtle, it may operate in a similar manner to workplace aggression in that victims may not be aware of its gendered nature.

[4] We assume heterosexual sexual harassment from women toward men. It is likely that male-on-male sexual harassment will threaten a masculine gender role; however, given the lack of explicit research in this area, we focus on heterosexual sexual harassment in this study.

women, are more likely to be targeted more often than others. Cortina (2008) argued that because of increased legal attention to sexual harassment and discrimination, overt sexual harassment and discrimination has declined. However, Cortina convincingly theorized that these formerly overt behaviors may now manifest themselves, either consciously or unconsciously, in the form of incivility toward minorities and women. Though our argument might seem contradictory, we clarify why this is not the case. Our argument in this article is about the attributions that victims make about their experience, and not about the nature of the perpetrators' "true" underlying motivations for mistreating victims. We suggest that because sexual harassment is gender based, female victims perceive the behavior as gender related and therefore may attribute the mistreatment to their gender category. That is, even in its most subtle form (e.g., a subtle look), the act conveys to the victim that the behavior is gender based. In contrast, victims cannot readily identify workplace aggression as an attack on their collective because the content of the behavior does not offer any such cues. As such, workplace aggression likely poses a more significant threat to one's identity, leading to greater self-blame and self-doubt, and we expect this form of mistreatment to affect men and women equally.

In summary, research has demonstrated that men do not perceive sexual harassment to be as threatening as women and are not as likely to see this form of behavior as a significant threat to their gender or work status. In contrast, drawing on social categorization theory, we predict that women are likely to perceive sexual harassment as an attack on their gender, and therefore to see it as less of a personal attack in comparison to workplace aggression. Consequently, we posit that victims of workplace aggression and sexual harassment will make different attributions, which in turn may influence the magnitude of adverse outcomes.

We conducted two studies to test the arguments in the present article. In Study 1, we examined victim attribution processes, and in Study 2, we investigated meta-analytically the comparative outcomes of sexual harassment and workplace aggression.

Study 1

Attributions for Mistreatment

In the preceding section, we drew on self-categorization theory to reason that victims of workplace aggression may be more likely than victims of sexual harassment to question their own personal inadequacies as an explanation for the mistreatment, and therefore to make internal attributions. We also suggested that victims of workplace aggression may be more likely to personalize the mistreatment because they are unable to self-categorize as part of a group toward which the mistreatment is being directed; therefore, victims are left to assume that the aggression is targeted personally against them. In contrast, we posited that victims of sexual harassment may be more likely than victims of workplace aggression to blame the perpetrator's attitudes toward their gender because of the gendered nature of this form of mistreatment.

> *Hypothesis 1:* Victims of workplace aggression will be more likely to make an internal attribution for the mistreatment than will victims of sexual harassment.

> *Hypothesis 2:* Victims of workplace aggression will be more likely to take the mistreatment personally than will victims of sexual harassment.

> *Hypothesis 3:* Victims of sexual harassment will be more likely than victims of workplace aggression to blame the mistreatment on the perpetrator's attitudes toward their gender.

> *Hypothesis 4:* Victims of sexual harassment will be more likely than victims of workplace aggression to blame the perpetrator for the mistreatment.

Gender-dominant versus gender-neutral environment. Self-categorization theory posits that people self-categorize when gender becomes salient. We suggest that gender will be more salient in instances of sexual harassment than in instances of workplace aggression because of the nature of the mistreatment. Moreover, we posit that a gender imbalance may make gender more salient to victims. That is, in a context in which the opposite sex is more prevalent, gender will be more salient for victims of both forms of mistreatment than in gender-neutral contexts. That is, in gender-dominant environments, victims of both forms of mistreatment may be more likely to self-categorize. Therefore, we anticipate that victims of workplace aggression and sexual harassment in a gender-dominant environment will be more likely to blame the perpetrator's attitudes toward their gender than victims in a gender-neutral environment.

As previously noted, Cortina (2008) argued that incivility is a new form of sexual harassment or discrimination. We suggest that gender-dominant environments are one context in which victims may perceive that aggression is gender related even when the content of the aggression is not gender based.

> *Hypothesis 5:* Victims of both forms of mistreatment in a gender-dominant environment will be more likely to blame the perpetrators' attitudes toward their gender than will victims in a gender-neutral environment.

Ambiguity of mistreatment. Do victims perceive workplace aggression as more ambiguous in its intent than victims of sexual harassment? Earlier, we suggested that the gendered nature of sexual harassment may make the perpetrator's intent more clear (i.e., "this has to do with my gender"). However, it is also possible that victims of sexual harassment perceive this form of mistreatment as equally ambiguous as workplace aggression. Particularly in its most subtle forms, victims may wonder whether they misunderstood a sexual behavior (e.g., a look or touch) and may question whether the perpetrator was merely being playful or friendly. In more extreme forms, victims may perceive the behavior as hostile rather than sexual. Therefore, we conducted an exploratory analysis to determine whether victims of workplace aggression perceive this form of mistreatment to be more ambiguous than sexual harassment. Results of this research question will help inform future research investigating victim attributions of mistreatment.

Method

The present study used a 2 (sexual harassment vs. workplace aggression) × 2 (gender dominant vs. gender neutral) between-

subjects design, in which participants read a vignette scenario and then answered questions related to their attributions.

Participants. We recruited participants through Study Response, an online recruiting system operated by Syracuse University that has a large database of individuals who have agreed to be contacted to participate in surveys. We solicited only participants who were currently employed, and limited our sample to North America to minimize extraneous variance. Each respondent received a $5 gift certificate from Amazon.com in exchange for participation. Surveys were sent to 175 respondents, and we received 117 complete responses for a response rate of 67% (sexual harassment, gender dominant, $n = 34$; sexual harassment, gender neutral, $n = 30$; workplace aggression, gender dominant, $n = 29$; workplace aggression, gender neutral, $n = 24$).

The mean age of respondents (45% women) was 42 years ($SD = 10.38$), and their average job tenure was 8 years ($SD = 7.78$). Respondents held a wide range of jobs (e.g., construction, consulting, government, telecommunications, customer service). There were no significant differences between conditions on the gender or age of participants, but participants in the workplace aggression, gender-neutral category had lower job tenure than those in the other conditions, $F(3, 112) = 3.92$, $p = .01$.

Procedure. Respondents were sent one of four online links to a survey; assignment to the particular condition was random. The four surveys were identical, but the initial story (i.e., vignette) differed along two dimensions: (a) gender dominant versus gender neutral and (b) workplace aggression versus sexual harassment. The vignettes presented a story and asked participants to imagine themselves in the scenario. The vignettes read as follows, with the italicized wording reflecting the changes between scenarios:

> Imagine the following scenario:
>
> You work as a data entry clerk at a local insurance company. There are many clerks at this company *(both men and women/most are the opposite sex)* who you work with closely every day. You have been at this company for three years and you work full time.
>
> Over the last few months, one of your colleagues has been engaging in some unwanted behaviors towards you. For instance, last week, you saw your co-worker *glaring/leering* at you in a *hostile/sexual* way. When you looked at your colleague as if to say "leave me alone," your colleague gave you a *scowl/wink*.
>
> This morning, your colleague walked by you in the photocopy room and seemed to *elbow/touch* you somewhat *aggressively/suggestively* while walking by. It could have been an accident, but you don't think so.
>
> Later in the day, while you were picking up some papers you dropped on the floor, your colleague just watched you pick them up without even offering to help. You had a feeling your colleague was enjoying the moment. Then you thought you heard your colleague rudely whisper, "*dumb ass/nice ass.*"

To test our manipulation that participants distinguished between gender-dominant and gender-neutral conditions, we asked them to rate whether their workplace consisted of mostly men, mostly women, or men and women. To check the aggression versus sexual harassment manipulation, we included two questions. First, we defined each form of mistreatment, and then asked to what extent on a scale from 1 to 5 the scenario was descriptive of sexual harassment and workplace aggression. Second, we asked, "If you

had to pick only one based on the definitions provided, do you think the behavior described in the scenario is workplace aggression or sexual harassment?"

Measures. Studies assessing attributions have used multiple approaches that are largely dependent on the nature of the attribution being assessed. For instance, Bowman, Kitayama, and Nisbett (2009) assessed participant attributions by using a scenario and asking participants the extent to which disposition versus the situation influenced the actions of those depicted in the scenario. Given that we were interested in scenario-specific attributions, we developed two types of measures. First, we developed and pilot-tested four scales to measure internal, personal, gender, and external (i.e., perpetrator-blame) attributions (described below). Unless otherwise indicated, all scale anchors were 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Second, as a check on the internal and external measure, we asked participants to allocate 100 points between themselves and the perpetrator, with more points representing more blame.

Internal attribution. We developed four items to assess internal attributions. Sample items include "I may have done something to deserve this behavior from my colleague" and "I am to blame for my colleague's behavior towards me." Internal consistency of these items was .80.

Personal attribution. We developed four items to assess personal attributions. Sample items include "This is personal" and "Your colleague has it out for you personally." The internal consistency of these items was .85.

Gender attribution. We developed five items to measure gender attribution. Sample items include "This has nothing to do with my gender" (reverse coded) and "My colleague probably behaves this way only towards members of my gender." Internal consistency of these items was .86.

External attribution. We developed three items to assess the extent to which participants blamed the perpetrator: "My colleague is to blame for this," "My colleague is responsible for what happened," and "My colleague is at fault for this behavior." Despite the low number of items, the internal consistency of these items was still acceptable at .68.

Aggression ambiguity. Aggression ambiguity was measured in two ways. First, we developed four items to measure the extent to which participants perceived the reason for the mistreatment to be ambiguous. Sample items include "The reason why my colleague would treat me this way is unclear" and "I think I know why my colleague would treat me this way" (reverse coded). The internal consistency of these items was .76. Second, we included a single item that asked participants "On a scale of 1 (*extremely uncertain*) to 10 (*extremely certain*), how certain are you about the reason your colleague acted this way towards you?" This latter item was not combined with the four-item scale; instead, it was used as a second test of our ambiguity research question.

Severity check. We asked participants to rate the severity of the form of mistreatment on a scale from 1 (*least severe*) to 10 (*most severe*) to ensure that participants across all scenarios perceived the situation to be equal in its level of severity.

Control variable. Given the possibility that men and women may differ in their attributions, we controlled for gender.

Results

Measure validation. We conducted an exploratory factor analysis on the 20 items used to assess attributions and ambiguity using an oblique (direct oblimin) rotation. The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) measure verified sampling adequacy for the analysis (KMO = .71), with all KMO values for individual items above the acceptable limit of .50 (Field, 2009). The initial analysis indicated that five factors could be extracted; all had eigenvalues greater than KMO's criterion of 1, which explain 55.56% of the variance. The scree plot showed inflections that justify retaining all five factors. Table 1 presents the eigenvalues and factor loadings from the pattern matrix. The items that load on the same factors suggest that Factor 1 represents gender attribution, Factor 2 internal attribution, Factor 3 personal attribution, Factor 4 ambiguity, and Factor 5 external attribution.

Manipulation checks. Before testing our hypotheses, we checked the validity of the manipulations. For the workplace aggression versus sexual harassment manipulation, participants in the sexual harassment scenario were significantly more likely to agree that the incident represented sexual harassment ($M = 4.25$, $SD = 0.95$) than they were to agree that it represented workplace aggression ($M = 3.06$, $SD = 1.29$), $t(62) = 7.77$, $p < .001$. Likewise, participants in the workplace aggression scenario were more likely to agree that the incident represented workplace aggression ($M = 4.27$, $SD = 0.95$) than they were to agree that it represented sexual harassment ($M = 2.12$, $SD = 1.35$), $t(51) = 9.55$, $p < .001$. Further, when forced to choose between sexual

Table 1

Study 1: Factor Loadings and Eigenvalues for Exploratory Factor Analysis

Item	1	2	3	4	5
Internal attribution					
1	.10	**.70**	.16	−.18	−.21
2	−.06	**.71**	−.07	−.03	−.08
3	−.15	**.69**	−.14	.11	.09
4	−.01	**.78**	.04	.08	.09
Personal attribution					
1	−.07	.13	**.63**	.22	.03
2	−.05	−.04	**.90**	.14	−.10
3	.01	.01	**.55**	−.13	.00
4	.02	−.06	**.56**	−.04	.09
Gender attribution					
1	**.58**	−.04	−.01	.05	.25
2	**.55**	−.04	−.07	−.11	.12
3	**.92**	−.03	−.06	−.04	−.05
4	**.86**	.07	.10	.12	−.09
5	**.85**	−.05	−.04	.01	−.05
External attribution					
1	.13	.13	.06	−.02	**.80**
2	.06	−.10	.02	−.13	**.56**
3	−.09	−.42	−.04	.03	**.48**
Ambiguous					
1	−.05	.02	.04	**.83**	−.05
2	−.05	.04	−.10	**.59**	−.22
3	.08	.35	−.04	**.58**	.13
4	−.01	−.19	.13	**.61**	.00
Eigenvalue	4.05	2.56	2.13	1.36	1.01
% variance explained	20.27	12.82	10.63	6.79	5.05

Note. Data in bold type indicate dominant factor loadings.

harassment and workplace aggression as a description of the incident in the vignette, 89% of those in the sexual harassment condition agreed that the experience was sexual harassment, and 89% of those in the workplace aggression condition agreed that the experience was workplace aggression.

For the gender composition manipulation (Hypothesis 5), results showed that 68% of participants in the gender-dominant scenario perceived that their organization consisted mostly of members of the opposite gender, 20% that the company consisted of men and women, and the remaining 12% that they were of the same gender. Of those in the gender-neutral scenario, 61% perceived that the organization consisted of both men and women, 28% that the organization consisted mostly of men, and 11% that the organization consisted mostly of women.[5]

To check that participants perceived the scenarios as equally severe, we computed a 2×2 analysis of variance (ANOVA) on participants' perceptions of severity. Results showed no differences in terms of perceptions of severity (Ms = 5.12, 5.20, 4.93, 5.17), $F(3, 112) = 0.187$, $p > .05$.

Hypothesis testing. Means, standard deviations, and correlations are reported in Table 2. To test Hypotheses 1–5 and the ambiguity research question, we computed a full factorial multivariate ANOVA on the dependent variables (i.e., internal attribution, personal attribution, gender attribution, external attribution, ambiguity, and certainty about intent), with type of mistreatment (workplace aggression vs. sexual harassment) and gender composition (gender neutral vs. gender dominant) as the independent variables.[6] Our directional tests showed significant multivariate effects for type of mistreatment (i.e., workplace aggression vs. sexual harassment), Wilks's $\lambda = .53$, $F(6, 98) = 14.80$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .48$. We found a main effect for mistreatment type on participants' internal attributions, $F(1, 108) = 11.82$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .10$; however, this was qualified by a significant interaction between type and gender composition. Follow-up univariate ANOVAs showed partial support for Hypothesis 1; specifically,

[5] Because of the somewhat weak success rate for our gender composition manipulation, we reran our analyses for Hypotheses 1–5 using only those participants who correctly responded to the manipulation check ($n = 72$). All main-effect hypotheses for Hypotheses 1–4 remained significant at $p < .01$ except Hypothesis 1, which was significant at $p = .02$. In terms of the interaction between type and gender composition on internal attributions (Hypothesis 1), the interaction remained significant, $F(1, 72) = 4.32$, $p = .04$, with participants in the gender-dominant scenario more likely to make an internal attribution in the workplace aggression condition ($M = 2.55$) than those in the sexual harassment condition ($M = 1.70$). The means differences for workplace aggression ($M = 2.25$) and sexual harassment ($M = 2.21$) do not differ in the gender-neutral scenario. Similarly the interaction between type and gender composition on gender attribution (Hypothesis 5) remained significant, $F(1, 72) = 6.34$, $p = .014$, with the relationship between workplace aggression and gender attribution significantly stronger in the gender-dominant scenario ($M = 3.10$) than the gender-neutral scenario ($M = 2.43$). Consistent with the main analysis, the means do not differ for sexual harassment in the gender-dominant ($M = 3.55$) and gender-neutral ($M = 3.51$) scenarios.

[6] We computed our analyses with women and men combined. Running the analyses only with women yielded the same main effects except that internal attribution was nonsignificant ($p > .05$) and significance levels changed for some outcomes. Further, there were no significant interactions between type of mistreatment and gender composition for women.

Table 2
Study 1: Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Gender	1.54	0.50	—						
2. Internal attribution	2.13	0.86	−.12	*.80*					
3. Personal attribution	3.28	0.88	−.04	.05	*.85*				
4. Gender attribution	3.19	0.82	−.25**	−.20*	−.11	*.86*			
5. External attribution	4.35	0.65	.05	−.34**	.05	.30**	*.68*		
6. Ambiguity	3.12	0.87	.08*	.20*	.30*	−.19*	−.16	*.76*	
7. Certainty	5.85	2.56	−.07	−.04	−.23*	.11**	.05	−.71**	—

Note. $N = 117$. Cronbach's alphas are shown in italics along the diagonal.
* $p < .05$.   ** $p < .01$.

participants in the gender-dominant scenario were significantly more likely to make an internal attribution in the workplace aggression condition ($M = 2.72$) than in the sexual harassment condition ($M = 1.67$). The mean differences for workplace aggression ($M = 2.13$) and sexual harassment ($M = 2.10$) were nonsigtificant for participants in the gender-neutral scenario. In support of Hypothesis 2, participants in the workplace aggression condition were significantly more likely to take the experience personally, $F(1, 108) = 32.03$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .24$, than participants in the sexual harassment condition. In support of Hypotheses 3 and 4, participants in the sexual harassment condition were significantly more likely to blame the perpetrator's attitudes toward their gender, $F(1, 108) = 19.01$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .16$, and to attribute blame to the perpetrator, $F(1, 108) = 8.92$, $p = .002$, $\eta^2 = .08$, than their workplace aggression counterparts. Means and standard deviations and results for Hypotheses 1–4 are reported in Table 3.

To corroborate findings for Hypotheses 1 and 3, we conducted an independent-sample *t* test using the point allocation item, which asked participants to allocate 100 points between self-blame and perpetrator blame. In support of both hypotheses, these results showed that participants in the workplace aggression scenario allocated more blame to themselves ($M = 14.40$, $SD = 20.61$), and therefore less blame to the perpetrator, than participants in the sexual harassment scenario ($M = 5.89$, $SD = 10.69$), $t(1, 114) = 2.86$, $p < .01$.

Finally, we found a significant main effect of gender composition on participants' blame of the perpetrator's attitudes toward their gender, $F(1, 108) = 4.02$, $p = .024$, $\eta^2 = .04$; however, this was qualified by a significant interaction between type and gender composition, $F(1, 108) = 2.77$, $p = .05$. Follow-up univariate ANOVAs showed partial support for Hypothesis 5; specifically, participants in the workplace aggression scenario were significantly more likely to make a gender attribution in the gender-dominant scenario ($M = 3.06$) than in the gender-neutral scenario ($M = 2.59$). The mean differences for gender dominant ($M = 3.57$) and gender neutral ($M = 3.49$) were nonsignificant for participants in the sexual harassment conditions.

In terms of our exploratory analysis related to ambiguity, participants in the workplace aggression condition were significantly more likely than participants in the sexual harassment condition to perceive this form of mistreatment as ambiguous in its intent, $F(1, 108) = 23.19$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .18$, and participants in the sexual harassment condition were significantly more likely than participants in the workplace aggression condition to express certainty behind the reason for the mistreatment, $F(1, 108) = 14.11$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .12$.

Discussion

In Study 1, we investigated the attributions made by victims of workplace aggression and sexual harassment. Consistent with our predictions, those in the workplace aggression condition were more likely to make internal attributions (in the gender-dominant context) and to take the mistreatment personally than participants in the sexual harassment condition. In contrast, participants in the sexual harassment condition were more likely to blame their mistreatment on the perpetrator's attitudes toward their gender,

Table 3
Study 1: Means, Standard Deviations, and Multivariate Results for Hypotheses 1–4

Variable	Sexual harassment		Workplace aggression		F	η^2
	M	SD	M	SD		
Internal attribution	1.90	0.77	2.47	0.88	11.82**	.10
Personalization	2.94	0.71	3.74	0.76	32.03***	.24
Gender attribution	3.49	0.77	2.85	0.76	19.01***	.16
External attribution	4.52	0.55	4.13	0.72	8.92**	.08
Ambiguous intent	2.83	0.78	3.49	0.77	23.19***	.18
Certainty about intent	6.57	2.21	4.94	2.61	14.11***	.12

** $p < .01$.   *** $p < .001$.

and therefore more likely to blame the perpetrator than participants in the workplace aggression condition. It is worth highlighting, however, that these are comparative hypotheses. In absolute terms, victims of both forms of mistreatment were more likely to make an external attribution than any other type of attribution.

These findings suggest that, to the extent that participant perceptions align with actual experience, victims may engage in different sense-making processes to understand their experience with different forms of mistreatment. In particular, consistent with research on belongingness (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), workplace aggression sends a cue to victims that they do not belong or are not wanted, which has significant consequences for attitudes, behavior, and well-being (e.g., Twenge, Baumeister, Tice, & Stucke, 2001; Twenge & Campbell, 2003). In contrast, the gender content of sexualized forms of mistreatment seems to make salient a social identity cue by which victims categorize themselves as part of a group, and minimize any harm to themselves by viewing the perpetrators' actions as an attack on their gender. Though it is not optimal to perceive one's own ingroup as being under attack, it is likely less damaging than perceiving oneself personally to be the target of an attack.

It is interesting that victims of workplace aggression in a gender-dominant environment were more likely to blame the mistreatment on the perpetrator's attitudes toward their gender than victims of aggression in a gender-neutral environment. However, the same pattern of findings did not emerge for victims of sexual harassment. These findings suggest that victims may experience the same mistreatment differently, depending on contextual factors (Langhout et al., 2005), such as the gender composition of their work group. This also might help in assessing the perceptual nuances of Cortina's (2008) argument that minorities and women are more likely to be victimized. Our finding suggests that in environments in which one's gender is dominant, victims may in fact perceive incivility as an attack on their gender, and therefore experience incivility in the same way as they might experience gender harassment or discrimination.

That victims of sexual harassment in a gender-dominant environment were not more likely to blame the perpetrator's attitude toward their gender may suggest that the nature of sexual harassment may provide a sufficient cue for victims to focus on their gender category. That is, when the form of mistreatment is not clearly related to gender, victims may seek and draw on more information—in this case gender composition of their work context—to self-categorize. However, when the mistreatment is targeted at a group characteristic such as gender (as is the case with many sexual harassment behaviors), victims may need no additional information to attribute blame to the perpetrator's attitudes toward their gender.

We also found an interaction between mistreatment type and gender context with respect to internal attributions. Consistent with our expectations, participants were more likely to make an internal attribution for workplace aggression than for sexual harassment; however, only in the gender-dominant scenario. The means indicate that participants in the sexual harassment, gender-dominant condition were much less likely to make an internal attribution than those in any other scenario. One possible interpretation of this finding is that this scenario represents the least ambiguous situation for victims; that is, if one experiences sexual harassment and is in an environment in which gender is dominant, such victims are

the least likely to blame themselves for the mistreatment, as the harassment is most clearly related to gender.

In conclusion, Study 1 showed that victims were comparatively more likely to make internal and personal attributions for workplace aggression, and gender and external attributions for their experience of sexual harassment. In Study 2, we investigated the differential outcomes of workplace aggression and sexual harassment.

Study 2

Our theoretical arguments and Study 1 findings suggest that, in comparison to victims of sexual harassment, victims of workplace aggression are more likely to take the experience personally and turn blame inward. Perceived personal attacks may damage victims' sense of self (e.g., efficacy, worth, and esteem), resulting in negative well-being, attitudinal, and behavioral consequences. Further, personal attacks threaten belongingness needs, which lead to a host of adverse consequences for victims (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). In contrast, victims of sexual harassment were more likely to self-categorize according to their gender and to attribute blame to the perpetrator's attitudes toward the victim's gender. To the extent that victims at least partially blame perpetrators' attitudes toward their gender, sexual harassment victims may be able to buffer their experience of mistreatment and protect their self-concept.

Thus, in Study 2, we compared meta-analytically a broad range of outcomes of sexual harassment and workplace aggression. In keeping with other research (e.g., Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Lapierre et al., 2005), we combined workplace aggression measures (e.g., incivility, bullying, interpersonal conflict) into one broad aggression category and compared the outcomes of workplace aggression against the outcomes of sexual harassment. However, whereas Lapierre et al. (2005) examined only global job satisfaction as the outcome variable, we examined attitudinal, behavioral, and health outcomes, and included variables that have been consistently examined in both sexual harassment and workplace aggression studies (viz. job satisfaction, coworker satisfaction, supervisor satisfaction, job stress, turnover intent, affective commitment, psychological well-being, and work withdrawal; see Bowling & Beehr, 2006, and Willness et al., 2007, for in-depth treatment of these outcomes).

> *Hypothesis 1:* Workplace aggression will have stronger adverse effects than sexual harassment on attitudinal, health, and behavioral outcomes.

We also separately compared the gender harassment subcomponent of sexual harassment to workplace incivility. Doing so enabled us to contrast arguably less intense manifestations of sexual harassment and workplace aggression, respectively. Although categorizing these behaviors as "less severe" based on type is overly simplistic (Langhout et al., 2005), our objective in this subanalysis was to render these two distinct forms of mistreatment as comparable as possible. Both gender harassment and incivility include only nonphysical mistreatment, such as derogatory remarks and being put down in the case of incivility, and crude remarks and insults in the case of gender harassment. As argued by Langhout et al. (2005), severity is not only a function of type of

behavior but also a function of factors such as pervasiveness of the behavior. Though we cannot determine the extent to which incivility and gender harassment are pervasive in the present set of studies, research has found comparable levels of pervasiveness in prior research. For example, Cortina et al. (2001) reported that 71% of participants experienced incivility, and Piotrkowski (1998) reported that 72% of participants had experienced gender harassment, providing some evidence that these behaviors occur with similar levels of frequency within organizations. Comparing constructs of similar intensity that occur with comparable frequency allows for a fair comparison (Cooper & Richardson, 1986). Both gender harassment and incivility consist of a range of verbal and nonverbal behaviors that convey insulting and hostile attitudes; however, the former is gender specific, whereas the latter is not. Therefore, in line with our first hypothesis, we expected incivility to have stronger adverse effects on outcomes than gender harassment.

> *Hypothesis 2:* Incivility will have stronger adverse effects than gender harassment on attitudinal, health, and behavioral outcomes.

Method

Data and sample. We searched for both published and unpublished studies on sexual harassment and workplace aggression using several methods. First, we performed an electronic literature search of the PsycINFO and ProQuest databases up to and including September 1, 2009, using variations on the following search terms: *bully*, *abuse*, *incivility*, *mobbing*, *social undermining*, *victimization*, *workplace aggression*, *petty tyranny*, *mistreatment*, *sexual harassment*, *sexual abuse*, *gender harassment*, *sexual coercion*, and *quid pro quo*. Second, we conducted a manual search of the reference lists of recent sexual harassment and workplace aggression studies to identify any studies that did not appear in our database search. Third, we examined the recent conference programs for the two largest management and industrial and organizational psychology annual conferences (i.e., Academy of Management and Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology). Fourth, we contacted researchers in the field of sexual harassment and workplace aggression to inquire about any unpublished studies on workplace aggression. Finally, we sent e-mail to the organizational behavior listserv for the Organizational Behavior Division of the Academy of Management requesting any unpublished or in-press articles. We retained only the studies that (a) included (or had obtainable) correlations, (b) had at least one independent and dependent variable, and (c) were at the individual level of analysis. The final sample consisted of 112 studies and 134 independent samples. In total, there were 53 sexual harassment and 81 workplace aggression samples. To avoid double-counting data, we excluded any data that had been used in a previous study unless different variables were measured (e.g., Bergman, Langhout, Cortina, & Fitzgerald, 2002; Fitzgerald et al., 1997; Glomb et al., 1997).[7]

Further, because one of our objectives was to examine the gender harassment subscale of sexual harassment, we e-mailed all authors of the studies that used the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ) to measure sexual harassment and asked them to reanalyze their data using only this subcomponent of the SEQ.

After follow-up e-mail to study authors, we were able to obtain these data for 27 of the 33 samples (82%) that used the SEQ.

Meta-analytic procedures and analysis. It was first necessary to create composite measures for some of the individual study correlations, as several studies used multiple measures of one or more variables of interest. We followed Hunter and Schmidt's (1990) recommendation for dealing with this issue by calculating composite correlations, which takes into account the average correlation between the multiple measures of the same underlying construct. In addition, the SEQ is often used to measure sexual harassment; however, some studies did not use the SEQ, and either used another behavioral measure (e.g., Barling et al., 1996) or more often used a labeling measure such as "Have you been sexually harassed at this institution?" (e.g., Dey, Korn, & Sax, 1996, p. 155). This latter type of measure has been critiqued (Magley, Hulin, Fitzgerald, & DeNardo, 1999; Munson, Miner, & Hulin, 2001) because it forces respondents to label themselves as sexual harassment victims; therefore, we conducted a subanalysis comparing studies that used a behavioral measure with those that did not and repeated the analyses described below.

We followed Hunter and Schmidt's (1990) method for calculating weighted average reliabilities (when reliabilities were not available), correcting for sampling error, and calculating confidence intervals. To test for differences between the weighted average effect sizes of the relationship between sexual harassment and the outcome variables, and workplace aggression and the outcome variables, we conducted a z test to compare independent correlations.

Results

Table 4 presents the estimated average reliabilities used when the alpha coefficient was not provided for a given variable, which were estimated based on the average alpha coefficients of the remaining studies for that variable. Table 5 presents the weighted average corrected and uncorrected correlations, standard deviations, confidence intervals, and Q statistics for the relationships between the combined measure of sexual harassment and the outcome variables. Sexual harassment was negatively related to job satisfaction ($r_c = -.29$), coworker satisfaction ($r_c = -.35$), supervisor satisfaction ($r_c = -.34$), affective commitment ($r_c = -.29$), and psychological well-being ($r_c = -.28$), and positively related to intent to turnover ($r_c = .21$), job stress ($r_c = .21$), and work withdrawal ($r_c = .29$). All correlations are significant ($p < .01$).

Table 6 presents the weighted average corrected and uncorrected correlations, standard deviations, confidence intervals, and Q statistics for the relationships between the combined measures of workplace aggression and the outcome variables. Workplace aggression was negatively related to job satisfaction ($r_c = -.46$), coworker satisfaction ($r_c = -.37$), supervisor satisfaction ($r_c = -.49$), affective commitment ($r_c = -.40$), and psychological well-being ($r_c = -.40$), and positively related to intent to turnover

---

[7] Some studies (e.g., Kath, Swody, Magley, Bunk, & Gallus, 2009; Lim & Cortina, 2005; Schneider, Swan, & Fitzgerald, 1997) included in our meta-analysis overlapped with one of the samples in another study. In those instances, only nonoverlapping samples or variables from the study were included.

Table 4
Study 2: Average Reliability Estimates for Study Variables

Variable	α
Job satisfaction	.85
Supervisor satisfaction	.87
Coworker satisfaction	.86
Job stress	.83
Intent to turnover	.80
Affective commitment	.84
Psychological well-being	.84
Work withdrawal or neglect	.73

($r_c = .39$), job stress ($r_c = .32$), and work withdrawal ($r_c = .19$). All correlations are significant ($p < .01$) except work withdrawal, which was significant at $p < .05$.

The z-test comparisons of workplace aggression and sexual harassment outcomes (see Table 7) show that workplace aggression has stronger adverse outcomes in terms of job satisfaction ($z = 23.63$, $p < .01$), supervisor satisfaction ($z = 12.53$, $p < .01$), affective commitment ($z = 11.68$, $p < .01$), psychological well-being ($z = 15.31$, $p < .01$), intent to turnover ($z = 21.99$, $p < .01$), and job stress ($z = 6.56$, $p < .01$). There was no significant difference between sexual harassment and workplace aggression for coworker satisfaction ($z = 1.04$, *ns*), and work withdrawal was more strongly associated with sexual harassment than workplace aggression ($z = -5.18$, $p < .01$). These results provide partial support for Hypothesis 1.

To control for potential measurement problems associated with self-labeling measures, we repeated our analysis using only studies that measured sexual harassment with the SEQ. Magley et al. (1999) argued that self-labeling measures of sexual harassment might understate the relationship between sexual harassment and its consequences because individuals may not label some behaviors as sexual harassment even though these behaviors have adverse outcomes. Because our analyses include both self-labeling and behavioral measures of sexual harassment, the relationship between sexual harassment and the outcomes in this study may be understated. Therefore, we conducted a second comparison between sexual harassment and workplace aggression using only studies that measured sexual harassment with the SEQ or another behavioral measure (see Table 8). Results show that although the effect sizes with the SEQ are slightly stronger than those that

combine the SEQ and other measures (from Table 7), the pattern of results is largely unchanged.

To account for the differing levels of intensity that may be present in the overall measures of sexual harassment and workplace aggression, we compared a less intense form of aggression (i.e., incivility) with a less intense form of sexual harassment (i.e., gender harassment; see Table 9). Consistent with our main findings, incivility had significantly stronger negative outcomes than gender harassment in relation to seven of the eight outcome variables examined. Incivility was more strongly related to job satisfaction ($z = 10.18$, $p < .01$), coworker satisfaction ($z = 2.28$, $p < .05$), supervisor satisfaction ($z = 6.51$, $p < .01$), affective commitment ($z = 8.49$, $p < .01$), psychological well-being ($z = 10.25$, $p < .01$), intent to turnover ($z = 18.96$, $p < .01$), and job stress ($z = 7.60$, $p < .01$) than gender harassment. There were no significant difference for the relationship between gender harassment and incivility regarding work withdrawal ($z = -0.98$, *ns*). These results largely support Hypothesis 2.

Discussion

The goal of Study 2 was to compare meta-analytically the outcomes of sexual harassment and workplace aggression. Our results show that although the outcomes of both are significant, workplace aggression has stronger adverse relationships than sexual harassment with six or seven of the eight outcome variables (depending on the analysis), with no significant difference (in the main analysis) between workplace aggression and sexual harassment in relation to coworker satisfaction. Only work withdrawal had a stronger negative relationship with sexual harassment than workplace aggression, and this effect was no longer significant when we compared incivility with gender harassment.

To control for different levels of intensity in sexual harassment and workplace aggression behaviors, we conducted a subanalysis comparing gender harassment with incivility. Results showed that incivility has stronger adverse effects than gender harassment with respect to all outcomes except work withdrawal, for which there was no significant difference. Finally, to control for potential problems with the measurement of sexual harassment (i.e., labeling measures), we compared the outcomes of workplace aggression with the outcomes of sexual harassment measured using only behavioral measures (e.g., the SEQ) and found parallel results.

Table 5
Study 2: Relationship Between Sexual Harassment and Each Outcome Variable

Variable	K	N	r	r_c[a]	$SD\ r_c$	95% CI	Q
Job satisfaction	32	53,470	−.25	−.29	.07	[−.31, −.26]	201.10**
Coworker satisfaction	15	26,616	−.29	−.35	.06	[−.38, −.32]	64.61**
Supervisor satisfaction	14	26,349	−.31	−.34	.04	[−.36, −.32]	43.12**
Affective commitment	10	24,981	−.26	−.29	.04	[−.32, −.26]	30.85**
Psychological well-being	26	35,500	−.24	−.28	.06	[−.31, −.26]	120.63**
Intent to turnover	24	34,383	.17	.21	.10	[.16, .24]	261.21**
Job stress	12	13,448	.17	.21	.08	[.16, .26]	70.59**
Work withdrawal	11	4,347	.23	.29	.06	[.26, .33]	12.60

Note. K = number of studies; N = total sample size; r = uncorrected correlation; r_c = corrected correlation; CI = confidence interval.
[a] All correlations are significant at $p < .01$.
** $p < .01$.

Table 6
Study 2: Relationship Between Workplace Aggression and Each Outcome Variable

Variable	K	N	r	r_c[a]	SD r_c	95% CI	Q
Job satisfaction	44	31,807	−.38	−.46	.11	[−.49, −.42]	323.57**
Coworker satisfaction	8	3,023	−.32	−.37	.12	[−.45, −.29]	41.03**
Supervisor satisfaction	10	9,495	−.42	−.49	.05	[−.52, −.46]	23.94**
Affective commitment	23	20,527	−.33	−.40	.13	[−.45, −.35]	298.12**
Psychological well-being	48	30,542	−.34	−.40	.09	[−.43, −.38]	227.41**
Intent to turnover	37	26,367	.33	.39	.09	[.37, .42]	175.74**
Job stress	12	4,841	.26	.32	.14	[.23, .40]	82.79**
Work withdrawal	8	5,252	.15	.19	.14	[.10, .28]	67.20**

Note. K = number of studies; N = total sample size; r = uncorrected correlation; r_c = corrected correlation; CI = confidence interval.
[a] All correlations are significant at $p < .01$ except work withdrawal, which is significant at $p < .05$.
** $p < .01$.

Although the results largely support our findings, sexual harassment and workplace aggression showed no differences for coworker satisfaction (in the main analysis) or work withdrawal. The weaker differential effect in relation to coworker satisfaction may be due to the nonspecific nature of this variable. Hershcovis and Barling (2010) found that reactions to organizational mistreatment depend on the specific source of mistreatment. Further, Hershcovis et al. (2007) showed that victims hold specific people responsible for mistreatment. Together, these findings suggest that victim attitudes toward coworkers are likely to be much stronger, and in the predicted direction, if the coworker in question is explicitly identified as the perpetrator of the mistreatment. In terms of withdrawal, regardless of the nature of or reason for mistreatment, victims may view withdrawal as a viable avoidance strategy. In addition, withdrawal was the only behavioral measure, and the relationship between attitudes and behaviors is often quite low (Wicker, 1969). The formal and social rules of the workplace may constrain the range of behaviors a victim can display in response to mistreatment (Mowday & Sutton, 1993). It will therefore be important to investigate directly the extent to which attitudes and attributions toward mistreatment influence victim behaviors.

Table 7
Study 2: z-Test Differences Between the Outcomes of Sexual Harassment and Workplace Aggression

	r_c		
Variable	Workplace aggression	Sexual harassment	z
Job satisfaction	−.46	−.29	23.63**
Coworker satisfaction	−.37	−.35	1.04
Supervisor satisfaction	−.49	−.34	12.53**
Affective commitment	−.40	−.29	11.68**
Psychological well-being	−.40	−.28	15.31**
Intent to turnover	.39	.21	21.99**
Job stress	.32	.21	6.56**
Work withdrawal	.19	.29	−5.18**

Note. r_c = corrected correlation.
** $p < .01$.

General Discussion

Research Implications and Future Directions

Research to date has focused on the predictors and outcomes of mistreatment at work; however, researchers know little about the sense-making processes of victims. The present study suggests that different forms of mistreatment may result in different attribution processes among victims. Further, it suggests that the same behavior may lead to different attributions depending on the context. These results highlight a need for further research examining the contextual factors and types of behavior that may influence victim attributions. These cognitive processes are important because they may influence not only victim well-being, attitudes, and behaviors but also victim coping responses. For example, to the extent that victims blame mistreatment on a perpetrator's attitudes toward their gender, they may be more likely to take formal action (e.g., legal action, union grievance) against the company. Therefore, companies may need to pay closer attention to seemingly less intense forms of mistreatment, such as incivility (Andersson & Pearson, 1999), because in the context of a work environment that is male dominated, such mistreatment may be perceived as—and may indeed be—a hidden form of sexual harassment (Cortina, 2008).

We suggest several potential future research questions. First, a field study investigating attributions should replicate the present vignette study. Though vignette studies are useful for initial investigations to assess internal validity, they are limited in ecological validity because perceptual studies do not perfectly align with experiential studies. Before we can make firm conclusions about whether different forms of mistreatment yield different attributions, it will be important to investigate real (as opposed to imagined) instances of mistreatment. Second, though we examined victims' outcomes and attributions, research needs to consider directly whether different attributions mediate the relationship between different forms of mistreatment and outcomes. Third, as stated previously, an assessment of the contextual factors that influence victim attributions may yield important findings. In the present study, perceptions of the gender context influenced whether victims attribute blame for the mistreatment to perpetrator attitudes toward the victim's gender. This may have implications for other forms of mistreatment, such as discrimination, in that

Table 8
Study 2: Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ) Versus Behavioral Measures of Aggression

Variable	Sexual harassment (SEQ and behavioral measures)			Workplace aggression (behavioral measures)			z-test difference
	K	N	r_c	K	N	r_c	
Job satisfaction	19	30,902	−.31	44	31,807	−.46	18.78**
Coworker satisfaction	13	25,879	−.36	8	3,023	−.37	0.52
Supervisor satisfaction	12	25,574	−.34	10	9,545	−.49	12.51**
Affective commitment	5	23,564	−.29	23	20,527	−.40	11.52**
Psychological well-being	20	29,311	−.30	40	30,542	−.40	12.23**
Intent to turnover	13	6,009	.23	37	26,367	.39	11.19**
Job stress	8	6,616	.26	12	4,841	.32	3.17**
Work withdrawal	9	3,817	.28	8	5,252	.19	−4.23**

Note. K = number of studies; n = total sample size; r_c = corrected correlation.
** $p < .01$.

victims of discrimination (e.g., ethnic discrimination) who work in an environment dominated by members of a different ethnicity may be more likely to attribute ambiguous mistreatment to the perpetrators' attitudes toward their ethnic background. Fourth, if victims of sexual harassment blame the perpetrator's attitude toward their collective gender, sexual harassment might have less of an effect on individual self-esteem than workplace aggression. Surprisingly, few studies have examined the effects of sexual harassment and workplace aggression on self-esteem. Fifth, though Study 2 showed a pattern of stronger adverse outcomes for sexual harassment, it is possible that patterns may differ for behavioral responses. For instance, to the extent that victims turn blame inward, they may be more active in trying to change their own behavior to help reduce mistreatment. In contrast, if victims place blame for mistreatment on the perpetrator, they may be more likely to exact revenge, confront or report the perpetrator, or engage in other perpetrator-oriented strategies to eliminate mistreatment. Further investigation of victim attributions as a mediator between mistreatment and behavioral outcomes may yield important insights into victim coping choices.

Finally, although we argued that social categorization theory offers one explanation for our Study 2 results, other explanations remain to be assessed. For example, given that sexual harassment has received comparatively more legal attention than workplace

aggression, victims of sexual harassment may perceive more opportunities to cope with sexual harassment. Victims may report the mistreatment, seek out union support, or even sue the organization. Although research has shown that reporting mistreatment can lead to severe retaliation (Cortina et al., 2001), perceptions of control enabled through available voice mechanisms, even if not activated, may buffer the adverse effects of sexual harassment. In contrast, because workplace aggression is not legally prohibited in most jurisdictions, victims may perceive fewer solutions and therefore less control over eliminating the aggression. Future research could investigate whether perceived control mediates the relationship between forms of mistreatment and their outcomes.

Study Limitations

As with all research, there are several limitations of this research. With respect to Study 1, vignette studies have limited ecological and external validity. The examples of workplace aggression and sexual harassment used in the vignette were explicit, whereas in real instances of mistreatment, some of the behaviors may be more subtle. To the extent that subtle mistreatment leads sexual harassment victims to perceive the intent as ambiguous, victim attributions for sexual harassment may not follow the pattern in the present study. Thus, conclusions from Study 1 must

Table 9
Study 2: Comparing the Outcomes of Incivility and Gender Harassment

Variable	Gender harassment			Incivility			z-test difference
	K	N	r_c	K	N	r_c	
Job satisfaction	9	12,623	−.29	11	5,002	−.46	10.18**
Coworker satisfaction	9	3,466	−.32	3	1,528	−.39	2.28*
Supervisor satisfaction	9	3,466	−.30	3	1,528	−.52	6.51**
Affective commitment	8	11,679	−.20	6	3,704	−.36	8.49**
Psychological well-being	16	9,808	−.21	11	5,782	−.38	10.25**
Intent to turnover	10	13,207	.15	9	5,221	.46	18.96**
Job stress	6	3,695	.21	3	1,551	.44	7.60**
Work withdrawal	8	3,388	.29	3	2,034	.26	−0.98

Note. K = number of studies; N = total sample size; r_c = corrected correlation.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

remain tentative pending replication from further laboratory and field studies. Further, in Study 1, we used scales developed specifically for this research. Some support for the validity of the scales derives from the results of the exploratory factor analysis and the use of multiple dependent variables. Nevertheless, this is a first effort to assess these differential attributions, and future research should seek to replicate the present findings.

With respect to Study 2, individuals who experience sexual harassment have frequently experienced workplace aggression as well (e.g., Lim & Cortina, 2005); in contrast, those who experience workplace aggression are less likely also to experience sexual harassment. Any overlap in the experience of sexual harassment and workplace aggression may limit the likelihood of a fair comparison between their outcomes (Barling, Rogers, & Kelloway, 2001).

Second, differences between workplace aggression and sexual harassment might be due to different frequencies or perceived severity between these two behaviors. Frequency is unlikely to explain our findings because existing studies suggest similar prevalence rates (see Cortina et al., 2001; Piotrkowski, 1998; Rospenda, 1999). Further, Study 1 provides some evidence that victims make different attributions despite equivalent perceived severity. However, future research should attempt to make a more direct comparison using parallel measures.

Third, in Study 2, the workplace aggression samples generally included mixed-gender samples, whereas the sexual harassment samples mainly studied women (though several mixed-gender samples were also included). To the extent that men and women experience sexual harassment or workplace aggression differently from each other, results may be affected. For example, Schmitt et al. (2002) found that women reacted more strongly to sex discrimination than men. To limit the possibility that gender confounded the meta-analytic results, we conducted a subanalysis that compared the female-only samples for sexual harassment with the mixed-gender samples of workplace aggression (there were no anticipated gender differences for workplace aggression). The pattern of findings was the same as that in our main analysis with two exceptions. First, turnover intent was slightly higher in the female-only sample, with a correlation with sexual harassment of .27 instead of .22; however, the correlation between workplace aggression and turnover (.39) was still significantly higher. Second, the correlation with sexual harassment for withdrawal was significantly lower in the female-only sample at .23 instead of .28 in the mixed-gender sample. This was the only outcome variable for which sexual harassment showed a stronger effect than workplace aggression in the main analysis (see Table 7); however, in the all-female sample, this difference was nonsignificant. Similarly, in the incivility versus gender harassment analysis reported in Table 9, this difference was nonsignificant. Findings from this subanalysis offer greater confidence that these results are not affected by possible gender effects.

Fourth, though men and women perceive sexual harassment differently, sexual harassment toward men has yet to receive substantial empirical attention. In addition, adequate measures that are appropriate for men have yet to be developed. Further, we considered only heterosexual mistreatment in this study, though it is likely that heterosexual men may be threatened differentially by sexual harassment from men and women.

Practical Implications

Although both workplace aggression and sexual harassment represent significant problems, with few exceptions, only sexual harassment has received legislative attention in North America. The reasons for the relative lack of policy directed to nonsexualized workplace aggression are not immediately obvious. Our theoretical framework presents one reason for this imbalanced legislative attention: Sexual harassment is targeted at a gender group, and legislation aims to protect individuals who are treated inappropriately on the basis of group membership (e.g., gender, race, color, age, sexual orientation).

In contrast, workplace aggression is not explicitly targeted at a member of a protected group. Perpetrators may act aggressively toward a victim for any number of reasons (e.g., victim personality, perpetrator trait anger or job stress; Bowling & Beehr, 2006). Establishing legal sanctions that would allow perpetrators to be sued for excluding a coworker from coming to lunch, ignoring coworkers in meetings, or casting a menacing look would be complex at best. Yet the findings of the present study and prior research show that these seemingly minor behaviors yield harmful effects, and more so than those of gender harassment, making the case for some form of protection. Nevertheless, it would be difficult indeed to develop legislation to protect individuals who experience these behaviors.[8]

Responsibility for protecting employees against workplace aggression falls to the organization. This becomes especially important when one considers that victims of aggression may, in some instances, perceive their mistreatment to be a function of their sex, race, or other protected characteristic, as this could lead victims to take legal action against the organization. Organizations must make greater efforts to create policies that prohibit workplace aggression (Dupré & Barling, 2006), to ensure that such policies are communicated and understood, and that appropriate investigation and enforcement ensues (Hershcovis & Barling, 2006). Doing so would benefit both organizations and their members.

Conclusion

The results of our two studies showed that being the victim of workplace aggression is associated with more harmful outcomes than is being the victim of sexual aggression. Moreover, these differential outcomes might be a function of the attributions made by victims of workplace aggression and sexual harassment. More research on victim attributions for both forms of mistreatment will yield useful insights into the psychological processes of victims and may help explain victim reactions to mistreatment.

---

[8] In Canada, the provinces of Québec (2004), Saskatchewan (2007), and Ontario (2010) have passed legislation protecting employees from psychological harassment. In the United States, a number of state legislatures have proposed bills, though none have yet been passed.

References

References marked with an asterisk indicate studies included in the meta-analysis that are discussed in the text. For a complete list, go to http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020070.supp

Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review, 24,* 452–471.

Barling, J. (1996). The prediction, experience, and consequences of workplace violence. In G. R. VandenBos & E. Q. Bulatao (Eds.), *Violence on the job: Identifying risks and developing solutions* (pp. 29–49). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

*Barling, J., Dekker, I., Loughlin, C. A., Kelloway, E. K., Fullagar, C., & Johnson, D. (1996). Prediction and replication of the organizational and personal consequences of workplace sexual harassment. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 11,* 4–25.

*Barling, J., Rogers, A. G., & Kelloway, E. K. (2001). Behind closed doors: In-home workers' experience of sexual harassment and workplace violence. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6,* 255–269.

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117,* 497–529.

Berdahl, J. L. (2007a). The sexual harassment of uppity women. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 425–437.

Berdahl, J. L. (2007b). Harassment based on sex: Protecting social status in the context of gender hierarchy. *Academy of Management Review, 32,* 641–658.

Berdahl, J. L., Magley, V. J., & Waldo, C. R. (1996). The sexual harassment of men? Exploring the concept with theory and data. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 20,* 527–547.

Berdahl, J. L., & Moore, C. (2006). Workplace harassment: Double jeopardy for minority women. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91,* 426–436.

Bergman, M. E., Langhout, R. D., Cortina, L. M., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2002). The (un)reasonableness of reporting: Antecedents and consequences of reporting sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 230–242.

Bowling, N. A., & Beehr, T. A. (2006). Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: A theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91,* 998–1012.

Bowman, N. A., Kitayama, S., & Nisbett, R. E. (2009). Social class differences in self, attribution, and attention: Socially expansive individualism of middle-class Americans. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35,* 880–893.

Cooper, W. H., & Richardson, A. J. (1986). Unfair comparisons. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 71,* 179–184.

Cortina, L. M. (2008). Unseen injustice: Incivility as modern day 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.

Crocker, J., & Major, B. (1989). Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. *Psychological Review, 96,* 608–630.

Crocker, J., Voelkl, K., Testa, M., & Major, B. (1991). Social stigma: The affective consequences of attributional ambiguity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60,* 218–228.

Dardenne, B., Dumont, M., & Bollier, T. (2007). Insidious dangers of benevolent sexism: Consequences for women's performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93,* 764–779.

*Dey, E. L., Korn, J. S., & Sax, L. J. (1996). Betrayed by the academy: The sexual harassment of women college faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education, 67,* 149–173.

Dupré, K. E., & Barling, J. (2006). Predicting and preventing supervisory workplace aggression. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 11,* 13–26.

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3rd ed.). London, England: Sage.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Drasgow, F., Hulin, C. L., Gelfand, M. J., & Magley, V. J. (1997). The antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations: A test of an integrated model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82,* 578–589.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Hulin, C. L., & Drasgow, F. (1995). The antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations: An integrated model. In G. P. Keita & J. J. Hurrell Jr. (Eds.), *Job stress in a changing workforce: Investigating gender, diversity, and family issues* (pp. 55–73). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Garlick, R. (1994). Male and female responses to ambiguous instructor behaviors. *Sex Roles, 30,* 135–158.

Gelfand, M. J., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Drasgow, F. (1995). The structure of sexual harassment: A confirmatory analysis across cultures and settings. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 47,* 164–177.

*Glomb, T. M., Munson, L. J., Hulin, C. L., Bergman, M. E., & Drasgow, F. (1999). Structural equation models of sexual harassment: Longitudinal explorations and cross-sectional generalizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84,* 14–28.

Glomb, T. M., Richman, W. L., Hulin, C. L., Drasgow, F., Schneider, K. T., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1997). Ambient sexual harassment: An integrated model of antecedents and consequences. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 71,* 309–328.

Gutek, B. A. (1985). *Sex and the workplace: The impact of sexual behavior and sexual harassment on women, men, and organizations.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hershcovis, M. S., & Barling, J. (2006). Preventing insider-initiated workplace violence. In E. K. Kelloway, J. Barling, & J. Hurrell Jr. (Eds.), *Handbook of workplace violence* (pp. 607–632). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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.

Hershcovis, M. S., Turner, N., Barling, J., Arnold, K. A., Dupré, K. E., Inness, M., . . . Sivanathan, N. (2007). Predicting workplace aggression: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 228–238.

Hogg, M. A., & Turner, J. C. (1987). Intergroup behaviour, self-stereotyping, and the salience of social categories. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 26,* 325–340.

Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (1990). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ilies, R., Hauserman, N., Schwochau, S., & Stibal, J. (2003). Reported incidence rates of work-related sexual harassment in the United States: Using meta-analysis to explain reported rate disparities. *Personnel Psychology, 56,* 607–631.

*Kath, L. M., Swody, C. A., Magley, V. J., Bunk, J. A., & Gallus, J. A. (2009). Cross-level, three-way interactions among work-group climate, gender, and frequency of harassment on morale and withdrawal outcomes of sexual harassment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 82,* 159–182.

*Keashly, L., Hunter, S., & Harvey, S. (1997). Abusive interaction and role state stressors: Relative impact on student residence assistant stress and work attitudes. *Work & Stress, 11,* 175–185.

Langhout, R. D., Bergman, M. E., Cortina, L. M., Fitzgerald, L. F., Drasgow, F., & Williams, J. H. (2005). Sexual harassment severity: Assessing situational and personal determinants and outcomes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 35,* 975–1007.

Lapierre, L. M., Spector, P. E., & Leck, J. D. (2005). Sexual versus nonsexual workplace aggression and victims' overall job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10,* 155–169.

*Lim, S., & Cortina, L. M. (2005). Interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace: The interface and impact of general incivility and sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 483–496.

Maass, A., Cadinu, M., Guarnieri, G., & Grasselli, A. (2003). Sexual harassment under social identity threat: The computer harassment paradigm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85,* 853–870.

*Magley, V. J., Hulin, C. L., Fitzgerald, L. F., & DeNardo, M. (1999). Outcomes of self-labeling sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84,* 390–402.

Mowday, R. T., & Sutton, R. I. (1993). Organizational behavior: Linking individuals and groups to organizational contexts. *Annual Review of Psychology, 44,* 195–229.

Munson, L. J., Miner, A. G., & Hulin, C. (2001). Labeling sexual harassment in the military. An extension and replication. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86,* 293–303.

Neuman, J. H., & Baron, R. A. (2005). Aggression in the workplace: A social-psychological perspective. In S. Fox & P. E. Spector (Eds.), *Counterproductive work behavior: Investigations of actors and targets* (pp. 13–40). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

*Piotrkowski, C. S. (1998). Gender harassment, job satisfaction, and distress among employed White and minority women. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 3,* 33–43.

*Rospenda, K. M. (1999). *Sexual and non-sexual harassment as interpersonal conflict stressors in the workplace: Effects on job, mental health, and physical health outcomes* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). De-Paul University, Chicago, IL.

Ruggiero, K. M., & Taylor, D. M. (1995). Coping with discrimination: How disadvantaged group members perceive the discrimination that confronts them. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68,* 826–838.

Schat, A. C. H., & Kelloway, E. K. (2003). Reducing the adverse consequences of workplace aggression and violence: The buffering effects of organizational support. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 8,* 110–122.

Schmitt, M. T., Branscombe, N. R., Kobrynowicz, D., & Owen, S. (2002).

Perceiving discrimination against one's gender has different implications for well-being in women and men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28,* 197–210.

*Schneider, K. T., Swan, S., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1997). Job-related and psychological effects of sexual harassment in the workplace: Empirical evidence from two organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82,* 401–415.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. C. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory.* New York, NY: Basil Blackwell.

Turner, J. C., Oakes, P. J., Haslam, S. A., & McGarty, C. (1994). Self and collective: Cognition and social context. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20,* 454–463.

Twenge, J. M., Baumeister, R. F., Tice, D. M., & Stucke, T. S. (2001). If you can't join them, beat them: Effects of social exclusion on aggressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81,* 1058–1069.

Twenge, J. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2003). "Isn't it fun to get the respect that we're going to deserve?" Narcissism, social rejection, and aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29,* 261–272.

Wicker, A. W. (1969). Attitudes versus actions: The relationship of verbal and overt behavioral responses to attitude objects. *Journal of Social Issues, 25,* 41–78.

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.

Correction to Taras, Kirkman, and Steel (2010)

In the article "Examining the Impact of *Culture's Consequences*: A Three-Decade, Multilevel, Meta-Analytic Review of Hofstede's Cultural Value Dimensions," by Vas Taras, Bradley L. Kirkman, and Piers Steel (*Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2010, Vol. 95, No. 3, pp. 405–439), Tables 1 and 2 were printed incorrectly due to errors in the production process.

In Table 1 (p. 414), row 2 (vote count, data point count) the table incorrectly lists 0s for categories in which data points were not available; therefore the data cells should in fact be empty.

In Table 2 (pp. 416–423), due to formatting errors some of the columns were incorrectly shifted either one or two columns to the right (i.e., in row 1, the "4" should be aligned under the "k," not the "r"). The formatting errors in Tables 1 and 2, however, do not affect the values in the tables.

Corrected versions of both Table 1 and Table 2 can be found at http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020939 .supp