

Spillover and crossover of sex-based harassment from work to home: Supervisor gender harassment affects romantic relationship functioning via targets' anger

ANGELA M. DIONISI^{*,†} AND JULIAN BARLING

Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada

Summary

We investigate how gender harassment affects the romantic relationships (i.e., romantic relationship adjustment and romantic relationship efficacy) of female targets (spillover effects) and their romantic partners (crossover effects), and what role targets' anger in response to their gender harassment plays in these relationships. We explored these questions using two US samples. Sample 1 comprised 206 females, all of whom provided data on their gender harassment experiences, feelings of anger, and romantic relationship functioning. Sample 2 consisted of 60 romantic dyads. Females once again provided data on their gender harassment experiences and feelings of anger; their romantic partners reported on their own romantic relationship functioning. Full support emerged for hypothesized spillover effects: supervisor gender harassment indirectly and negatively influenced targets' romantic relationship adjustment and romantic relationship efficacy through target anger (Sample 1). Full support also emerged for hypothesized crossover effects: supervisor gender harassment indirectly and negatively influenced the romantic relationship adjustment and romantic relationship efficacy of targets' romantic partners through target anger (Sample 2). Implications for theory, research, and practice are considered. Copyright © 2014 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Keywords: gender harassment; sex-based harassment; spillover; crossover; work–family

Sex-based harassment in the workplace harms employees and organizations. Whether expressed as gender harassment (GH; e.g., verbal/nonverbal behavior conveying hostile or degrading attitudes), unwanted sexual attention (e.g., repeated and unreciprocated requests for dates), or sexual coercion (e.g., sexual bribes or threats) (Fitzgerald, Gelfand, & Drasgow, 1995), sex-based harassment adversely affects psychological, physical, and job-related well-being (e.g., Dionisi, Barling, & Dupré, 2012; Willness, Steel, & Lee, 2007). Sex-based harassment is also costly to organizations, for example by reducing employee productivity (e.g., Faley, Knapp, Kustis, & Dubois, 1999). Research on sex-based harassment has focused mainly on consequences occurring within the organizational context, on direct harassment–outcome relationships, and on direct targets. Our goals in this study were to expand our understanding of sex-based harassment's extra-organizational consequences (i.e., on romantic relationship functioning), indirect effects (i.e., through target anger), and indirect victims (i.e., targets' romantic partners). To do so, we explore the following: (i) how sex-based harassment's negative consequences spillover (i.e., intrapersonal effects) and crossover (i.e., interpersonal, between-partner effects) into one's personal life and (ii) the role of targets' negative emotional responses in these relationships.

Exploring the far-reaching and indirect consequences of sex-based harassment at work is important for several reasons. First, more research highlighting the diverse ways that workplace phenomena can impact one's personal life is needed. Previous research on the intersection between the professional and personal realms has focused almost exclusively on the conflict between these roles (e.g., how work (family) life is made more difficult by family (work)

*Correspondence to: Angela M. Dionisi, Sprott School of Business, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada. E-mail: angela.dionisi@carleton.ca

†Angela M. Dionisi is now at the Sprott School of Business, Carleton University.

life; Grzywacz & Butler, 2008). However, more fully understanding how the intersection between work and family is experienced (i.e., through its impact on romantic relationship quality and cognitions), and how discrete workplace stressors (i.e., sex-based harassment) in addition to more generalized workplace stress (Westman, 2001; Westman & Vinokur, 1998) impact the personal lives of employees and their romantic partners, is important for theory and practice. From a theoretical perspective, such knowledge could contribute to the development of even more complex and relevant work–family models, and to the growing body of research on the family-based, relational outcomes of workplace phenomena. From a practical perspective, should sex-based harassment affect employees' home lives, significant questions will confront organizations regarding their responsibility for those affected by such workplace events.

Second, while many employees experience sex-based harassment (Berdahl & Raver, 2010; Ilies, Hauserman, Schwochau, & Stibal, 2003), determining if this form of mistreatment impacts individuals' private lives remains a research priority for workplace mistreatment scholars; previous research has shown that other sources of workplace victimization such as abusive supervision (e.g., Hoobler & Brass, 2006) can spillover into the personal lives of employees. By examining the impact of sex-based harassment on targets' romantic relationships, this study will reveal more about the nature and scope of sex-based harassment and its consequences. Moreover, if sex-based harassment does impact romantic relationships, better decisions about how to address the effects of this mistreatment (e.g., relationship counseling) can be made.

Third, examining the mechanisms responsible for sex-based harassment's negative consequences will reveal more about the process-based nature of this phenomenon. By focusing on the mediating role of emotions, a better understanding of *why* this form of mistreatment affects interpersonal relationships will emerge—a question that has received scant empirical attention but would advance our understanding of this form of workplace mistreatment.

Last, it is imperative that researchers develop a comprehensive understanding of *who* is being harmed by sex-based harassment. While studies have demonstrated the negative impact that sex-based harassment in the workplace has on direct targets (e.g., Dionisi et al., 2012; Willness et al., 2007) and third parties within the organizational context (e.g., Miner-Rubino & Cortina, 2007), little is known about how third parties external to the organization are affected. Practically speaking, understanding who else might be impacted by sex-based harassment is critical to the development of appropriate and sufficient interventions, enabling more informed choices about where (and to whom) to direct organizational supports.

Sex-based Harassment in the Workplace

Sex-based harassment refers to “behavior that derogates, demeans, or humiliates an individual based on that individual's sex” (Berdahl, 2007a, p. 644) and in line with psychological conceptualizations is best represented by at least three distinct dimensions—GH, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion (Fitzgerald et al., 1995; Fitzgerald, Swan, & Magley, 1997). While the term *sexual harassment* has traditionally been used to describe conduct of this nature, such terminology may create the false impression that all such behavior is rooted in sexual desire, rather than power or identity-based concerns (Berdahl, 2007a). Thus, mistreatment of this sort is now increasingly referred to as *sex-based harassment*, drawing attention to the potentially non-sexual nature of this mistreatment (e.g., Berdahl & Raver, 2010; Leskinen, Cortina, & Kabat, 2011). In essence, sex-based harassment assumes that perpetrators mistreat other people based on their sex, to protect or enhance their own sex-based social status when it is threatened (Berdahl, 2007a).

While many different expressions of sex-based harassment (i.e., GH, unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion) at work are damaging to targets and their organizations (e.g., Cortina & Berdahl, 2008; Dionisi et al., 2012), GH occurs most frequently (Leskinen et al., 2011) and can itself threaten the personal and job-related well-being of employees (Hershcovis & Barling, 2010a; Holland & Cortina, 2013; Leskinen et al., 2011). As a form of sex-based harassment, GH is motivated by hostility toward individuals who violate traditional gender ideals (e.g., women who challenge male dominance and women who possess stereotypically “masculine” personality traits; Berdahl, 2007a,

2007b), and conveys insulting, hostile, and degrading attitudes through any number of verbal or nonverbal behaviors. As such, this psychological conceptualization of GH would fall under the legal definition of hostile environment sexual harassment—“verbal or physical conduct that has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual’s work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment” (US Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2011). Specific examples of gender harassing behaviors would include gender-based slurs or taunts (e.g., anti-female jokes), the use of rude terms that denigrate women (e.g., referring to a coworker as a “slut”), the display or distribution of obscene or pornographic materials, or otherwise threatening and intimidating acts that have the effect of policing gender roles and performances within the workplace (Berdahl, 2007a; Fitzgerald et al., 1995; Leskinen et al., 2011). Given that GH represents the most broadly defined and common form of sex-based harassment (Berdahl & Raver, 2010), and consistent with calls for more research examining non-sexual forms of workplace harassment (Holland & Cortina, 2013; Leskinen et al., 2011), we focus on the workplace GH experiences of female employees. Further, given that supervisor mistreatment results in greater adverse effects for targets than mistreatment enacted by coworkers (Hershcovis & Barling, 2010b), we explore the effects of GH enacted by supervisors.

Spillover and Crossover Effects of Workplace Gender Harassment

Research has consistently shown that harassment is a pervasive interpersonal stressor (e.g., Berdahl & Raver, 2010) with attitudinal (e.g., organizational commitment), behavioral (e.g., work withdrawal), and health-related (e.g., anxiety and depression) strain outcomes (Dionisi et al., 2012; Raver & Nishii, 2010). With that said, far less attention has been paid to how GH affects targets’ relationship-based strain, particularly with respect to their romantic relationships. The possibility that romantic relationships are affected by workplace GH is strongly suggested by decades of research exploring the intersection of work and family roles (e.g., Barling, 1990; Grzywacz & Butler, 2008). However, most of this previous research has focused on the concepts of “conflict” or “balance” to understand how employees experience the intersection of their work and family lives. In this study, we pose different questions with regard to the intersection of work and family: (a) does the GH of female employees impact their own romantic relationship functioning (i.e., spillover)?; (b) does the GH of female employees impact their romantic partners’ romantic relationship functioning (i.e., crossover)?; and (c) does target anger mediate the relationship between GH and romantic relationship functioning?

Gender Harassment and Romantic Relationship Functioning

A primary goal of our research is to understand how GH impacts romantic relationships. To do so, we investigate two different aspects of romantic relationship functioning. First, *romantic relationship adjustment* remains one of the most widely studied variables in the marital/romantic relationship literature, reflecting subjective evaluations of relationship quality. Romantic relationship adjustment includes assessments of satisfaction with activities such as the amount of time partners spend together, regrets about their partnership, levels of happiness, and perceived levels of disagreement about issues such as family finances and sexual relations (Locke & Wallace, 1959). While this construct has traditionally been referred to as *marital adjustment*, we refer more generally to romantic relationships as our sample consists of married, common-law, and long-term romantic partnerships.

Second, since Bandura (1977) outlined the nature and consequences of self-efficacy beliefs, research has consistently shown their pervasive impact across a wide range of contexts (e.g., clinical, educational, child, and organizational). Within the romantic relationship context, *romantic relationship efficacy* highlights a cognitive facet of romantic relationship functioning, namely, the extent that romantic partners believe they can control or effectively deal with inter-partner conflicts (Fincham, Harold, & Gano-Phillips, 2000). Individuals with high levels of romantic

relationship efficacy are more likely to initiate, maintain, and persist in attempts to resolve romantic relationship conflicts (Doherty, 1981).

As research focusing on sex-based harassment at work has predominately explored work-based consequences for direct targets, little is known about how this form of mistreatment impacts romantic relationships generally, or these specific facets of romantic relationship functioning. However, several factors suggest that GH will adversely affect these two romantic relationship variables. First, work stressors more generally (e.g., high pressure for output, job insecurity; Hughes & Galinsky, 1994), and more importantly given the interpersonal nature of GH, *interpersonal* workplace stressors, predict the quality of romantic relationships. For example, Story and Repetti's (2006) daily diary study showed that spouses report greater marital anger and withdrawal following negative social interactions with coworkers and supervisors. Moreover, being the target of workplace incivility or abusive supervision is positively associated with work–family conflict (Lim & Lee, 2011), family undermining (Wu, Kwan, Liu, & Resick, 2012), and negative perceptions of one's marital relationship (Ferguson, 2012).

Second, GH itself is associated with outcomes that would impede targets' ability to engage in positive and fulfilling interactions with romantic partners. For example, the compromised psychological and physical health associated with GH (e.g., Dionisi et al., 2012; Holland & Cortina, 2013; Leskinen et al., 2011) may make it difficult for targets to engage in enjoyable activities with their spouse or romantic partner. Similarly, the psychological distress associated with gender-based harassment (e.g., Raver & Nishii, 2010; Silverschanz, Cortina, Konik, & Magley, 2008) could impede relational contentment and positive affect within one's romantic relationship (Rowa & Antony, 2008). Studies exploring stress-reactive rumination (e.g., Robinson & Alloy, 2003) also suggest that persistent self-focus can be a response to stressful life events—a cognitive pattern that may limit the care and compassion devoted to one's partner and romantic relationship for those distracted by victimization. Finally, feelings of self-blame and diminished self-esteem accompanying mistreatment (Harned & Fitzgerald, 2002) may also leave targets of GH feeling that they are unable to cope with, or resolve, relational problems.

While previous empirical research suggests a plausible link between the experience of GH and impaired romantic relationship functioning, understanding the *process* through which this occurs is an important, but unexplored, empirical question. As discussed in the following, we suggest that targets' negative emotional responses (i.e. anger) to their mistreatment will be central to explaining the spillover and crossover of GH's consequences into the personal realm.

Emotional Reactions to Workplace Gender Harassment

While little is known about the processes underlying sex-based harassment's negative outcomes, its derogating, demeaning, and humiliating nature (Berdahl, 2007a) suggests that negative emotional reactions may play a role in producing this mistreatment's negative effects. Affective events theory (AET; Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) argues for the importance of organizational events as the proximal cause of employees' affective experiences, which in turn, produce secondary outcomes. According to AET, when employees are exposed to stressful workplace events such as aggression or mistreatment, they experience any number of emotions in response, which then affect their personal and workplace attitudes and behaviors. Research findings generally support this notion. For example, Fuller et al. (2003) showed that stressful work events affected current and future negative mood, which then influenced employees' job satisfaction, while MacEwen and Barling (1991) demonstrated that workplace stressors influence mother–child interactions through their effects on mood. The fit of AET within a stressor–stress–strain framework (Pratt & Barling, 1988) is consistent with a long history of research demonstrating that one of the primary characteristics of organizational stressors is their proximal impact on negative mood and emotion (e.g., Caspi, Bolger, & Eckenrode, 1987; Repetti, 1993).

Some studies have focused on how emotions might mediate the link between workplace aggression specifically, and its consequences. For example, Ayoko, Callan, and Härtel (2003) show how being bullied at work predicts specific negative emotional reactions (e.g., anger and frustration), which then predict employees' counterproductive

workplace behaviors (e.g., wasting company materials and damaging company property). Barling et al. (1996) also showed that negative work-related mood mediates the experience of sexual harassment on turnover intentions, psychosomatic problems (e.g., headaches and gastric problems), and coworker/supervisor dissatisfaction. Thus, in line with AET, we suggest that as a stressful organizational event (e.g., Fitzgerald et al., 1997), workplace mistreatment taking the form of GH will result in a negative emotional response among targets, which will then impact romantic relationship functioning.

As a key tenet of AET is its focus on discrete emotions, we further suggest that anger specifically will mediate any effects of GH on negative romantic relationship-based consequences. As a social emotion, anger typically manifests in response to another's actions (often wrongdoing) and is usually directed toward others (Weiner, 1995). In fact, being attacked, being treated unfairly by others, or perceiving that another's behavior is unjust (e.g., Clore, Ortony, Dienes, & Fujita, 1993) are among the primary causes of anger. Attacks on one's identity—which can include insults, teasing, condescension, and public ridicule or embarrassment—are also anger evoking (e.g., Canary, Spitzberg, & Semic, 1998; Fitness, 2000).

As behavior that derogates, demeans, and humiliates individuals and is motivated by the desire to punish those who violate gender stereotypes (Berdahl, 2007a), GH is a personal and unfair attack on another, and an assault on one's (gender) identity. Moreover, GH unjustifiably communicates to women that they are inadequate, undeserving, and unwelcome in the workplace. As a result, GH should incite feelings of anger among its female targets.

While previous research supporting the link between sex-based harassment and anger is generally scarce (see Wright & Fitzgerald, 2007, for an exception), anger has been shown to be associated with other forms of interpersonal mistreatment such as bullying (Ayoko et al., 2003); disrespectful, humiliating, or unjust treatment (e.g., Fitness, 2000); and sexist behavior (e.g., anti-female jokes and comments reflecting gender stereotypes; Schneider, Tomaka, & Palacios, 2001; Swim, Hyers, Cohen, & Ferguson, 2001). Experimental research on sexual harassment also shows that individuals exposed to the harassment of *other* women report greater levels of anger toward men in general (Chaudoir & Quinn, 2010) and toward the perpetrators of harassment (Williams, Brown, Lees-Haley, & Price, 1995). Thus, when taken together, we predict the following:

Hypothesis 1: Workplace GH will be positively related to the experience of anger among targets.

Gender Harassment Spillover to Romantic Relationship Dysfunction

Affective events theory also proposes that affect-driven behaviors and attitudes will follow affective reactions to workplace events (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). While negative emotional responses to workplace circumstances have been shown to produce secondary *work-based* consequences (e.g., intentions to quit and counterproductive workplace behavior; Rogers & Kelloway, 1997; Sakurai & Jex, 2012), this theoretical framework does not exclude possible consequences *outside* of the organization. Restubog, Scott, and Zagenczyk (2011) showed that abusive supervision produces emotional distress (i.e., anxiety, fear, and depression) among subordinates, which then resulted in family undermining. In a different study, subordinates' negative affect mediated the link between abusive supervision and work–family conflict (Hoobler & Hu, 2012). The process through which work-based experiences impact one's own home life, and in this case, their romantic relationships, is called *spillover*.

Spillover describes the process whereby feelings, attitudes, and/or behaviors are transferred from one role or context to another (Bolger, DeLongis, Kessler, & Wethington, 1989) for the same individual. Spillover has been used as a mechanism to explain the impact of numerous job-related demands on one's personal life (e.g., Barling, 1990; Edwards & Rothbard, 2000), as well as how workplace aggression and mistreatment impact the family (e.g., Ferguson, 2012; Wu et al., 2012). The role of emotion or mood in this spillover process has also been identified—daily stressors such as negative interactions with supervisors or coworkers generate negative emotions in

employees that are then brought home at the end of the day, ultimately contributing to a conflictive familial relationship climate (Larson & Almeida, 1999; Repetti, 1994). In Story and Repetti's (2006) study, wives' job stressors were linked to negative marital interactions through negative mood—a finding that is consistent with other research (e.g., Schulz, Cowan, Cowan, & Brennan, 2004).

That anger in particular would be linked to impaired romantic relationship functioning is suggested most strongly by its impact on cognitions. According to the appraisal tendency framework (Lerner & Keltner, 2000), discrete emotions predispose people to evaluate the environment in particular ways. By creating a perceptual lens through which events are assessed, the “appraisal tendencies” associated with each emotion direct the judgments and choices that individuals make. Research has shown that anger in particular, is associated with aggressive and hostile thought patterns (e.g., Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Tiedens, 2001) and increased attention to provocative events (e.g., Cohen, Eckhardt, & Schagat, 1998). Moreover, anger is related to punitiveness (e.g., Lerner, Goldberg, & Tetlock, 1998) and heuristic processing (i.e., reliance on stereotypes/superficial cues when processing messages; Tiedens, 2001; Tiedens & Linton, 2001).

Of particular relevance to this research is anger's diffuse effects on judgment and perception; this emotion is linked to (i) perceptions that others' ambiguous behaviors are hostile; (ii) higher levels of other-directed blame and punishment for mistakes; and (iii) attributing the negative outcomes of an unrelated event to personal as opposed to situational factors (Lerner et al., 1998; Lerner & Tiedens, 2006; Loewenstein & Lerner, 2003). Thus, workplace GH may result in anger among targets, which in turn could influence targets' perceptions of, and interactions with, their romantic partners. Experiencing anger may increase targets' propensity to interpret the actions of a spouse or romantic partner in a negative or confrontational way and increase attributions that their partner is to blame for problems they encounter. Anger may also limit GH targets' optimism about their ability to resolve conflicts with romantic partners.

The positive relationships between anger and aggression (e.g., Anderson & Bushman, 2002), antisocial conduct (e.g., Chow, Tiedens, & Govan, 2008), uncooperative behavior, and decreased regard for others' interests (e.g., Allred, Mallozzi, Matsui, & Raia, 1997) further explain why GH targets may struggle to engage in positive and affirming interactions with their romantic partners. Moreover, research shows that anger and hostility are linked to poor marital quality, marital separation, and romantic relationship dissolution (e.g., Baron et al., 2007; Newton & Kiecolt-Glaser, 1995). Thus, in line with AET and the appraisal tendency framework, we suggest the following:

Hypothesis 2a: Target anger will mediate the relationship between supervisor GH and targets' romantic relationship adjustment.

Hypothesis 2b: Target anger will mediate the relationship between supervisor GH and targets' romantic relationship efficacy.

Gender Harassment Crossover to Romantic Relationship Dysfunction

While most research exploring the work–family interface has focused on the *intrapersonal* experience of work–family conflict (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000), more recent studies have turned to *interpersonal* consequences. Unlike *spillover*—where stress produced in one context (e.g., work) results in the experience of stress in another (e.g., home) for the same individual—*crossover* occurs when stress experienced by one individual at work (or at home) leads to negative consequences for other family members (Westman, 2001). In essence, one person's stress has an effect on another, given the resulting interaction patterns and emotional responses that occur within the dyad following a triggering stressor (Haines, Marchand, & Harvey, 2006; Westman & Vinokur, 1998). Abusive supervision, for instance, is a stressor for subordinates, who transmit resulting strain to their romantic partners through tense and conflict-ridden interactions (Hoobler & Brass, 2006).

Empirical support for the crossover effect is increasing. For example, one partner's job demands and levels of work–family conflict predict the other partner's home demands, degree of exhaustion, withdrawal behavior, and

family–work conflict (Bakker, Demerouti, & Dollard, 2008; Hammer, Bauer, & Grandey, 2003). Even more pertinent to the current study, incivility influences both the marital satisfaction and the family-to-work conflict of targets' partners via work-based stress (Ferguson, 2012), while the psychological distress resulting from workplace aggression increases the psychological distress of victims' romantic partners (Haines et al., 2006). Similarly, abusive supervision contributes to relationship tension, which in turn, diminishes the perception of family functioning for targets' partners (Carlson, Ferguson, Perrewé, & Whitten, 2011). Thus, understanding how GH crosses over from female targets to their romantic partners is an important research avenue to pursue.

As suggested earlier, one of the primary explanations for crossover is negative social interactions between parties (Westman, 2001): Workplace stressors and associated strain encountered by one partner trigger or exacerbate a negative and/or conflictual interaction style with the other partner at home (Westman & Vinokur, 1998). This connection becomes particularly important when considering the anger that targets of GH may experience following mistreatment. As anger provokes attributions of blame, aggressiveness, mistrust, and punishment (e.g., Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Dunn & Schweitzer, 2005; Lerner et al., 1998; Tiedens, 2001), social interactions between romantic partners could be hampered. When engaging with a disgruntled and angry mate, romantic partners may struggle to confide in, be less motivated to spend time with, and feel less content about their partnership—experiences fostering poorer assessments of romantic relationship quality. Similarly, efforts to initiate and willingness to persist in conflict resolution with an angry romantic partner may be compromised, once again resulting in decreased romantic relationship functioning.

These notions are supported by previous research pinpointing negative mood as central to social interactions involved in the crossover process (e.g., Jones & Fletcher, 1996), and studies showing that partners' negative affect can detrimentally impact each others' conflict levels, marital satisfaction, and work–family interference (e.g., Baron et al., 2007; Hoobler & Hu, 2012). Moreover, research documenting the link between anger specifically, and aggression, antisocial behavior, and selfishness (e.g., Allred et al., 1997; Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Chow et al., 2008) affirms the *interpersonal* manifestation and impact of this discrete emotion. Thus, we suggest the following:

Hypothesis 3a: Target anger will mediate the relationship between targets' GH experiences and their romantic partners' romantic relationship adjustment.

Hypothesis 3b: Target anger will mediate the relationship between targets' GH experiences and their romantic partners' romantic relationship efficacy.

Methods

Samples

We used two separate samples in the United States to assess spillover (Sample 1) and crossover (Sample 2). We recruited participants through ClearVoice—an online database comprised of individuals who have agreed to be contacted for survey research. Participants (i.e., employed females) were each sent an online questionnaire. Prior to completing this questionnaire, participants were asked to provide the contact information of their romantic partner so that a separate online survey could be sent to these individuals. Responses were initially obtained from a total of 317 females and 71 of their romantic partners. To ensure the integrity of our data, we omitted participants who had completed less than 25% of the questionnaire items, showed blatant signs of fake responding (i.e., provided the same response to virtually all questions), took less than 5 minutes to complete their survey (as such a short duration raises concerns about the accuracy of review and response to questions), or took longer than 2 hours to complete the survey (as such a long duration may be an indication of participant distraction or interruption). To reduce the possibility that focal participants completed both their own and their romantic partners' questionnaires, we also verified that the time stamp on each survey was separated by several days. After doing so, we were left with a sample of 66 couples for the

Table 1. Comparison of female participants' data: spillover and crossover samples.

	Spillover sample ($N=206$)		Crossover sample ($N=60$)		t
	M	SD	M	SD	
Age (years)	39.71	10.57	42.14	10.57	-1.43
Relationship length (years)	14.63	11.02	14.86	10.94	-0.15
Supervisor gender harassment	1.24	0.67	1.33	0.87	-0.80
Anger	26.66	10.47	28.53	12.47	-1.18
Romantic relationship adjustment	102.98	24.21	111.12	26.30	-2.26
Romantic relationship efficacy	5.23	1.37	4.93	1.50	1.49

M = mean; SD = standard deviation.

crossover analyses (Sample 2). The remaining 261 females for whom no romantic partner data were received were used for the spillover analyses (Sample 1). Final analyses reflect 206 cases in the spillover sample and 60 dyads in the crossover sample as a result of missing data on one or more of the key variables.

Before conducting any focal analyses, we assessed whether there were any significant differences between female participants in the spillover versus crossover samples on any of the relevant variables. To control for the number of comparisons made, the Bonferroni correction factor was implemented. Results revealed no significant differences between females in the spillover versus crossover samples (Table 1).

For Sample 1 (M age = 39.86 years, SD = 10.61, range = 22–64 years; 73% Caucasian, 96% heterosexual), female participants provided data on their GH experiences, feelings of anger, and ratings of romantic relationship functioning. For Sample 2 (females: M age = 41.36 years, SD = 10.22, range = 25–68 years, 75% Caucasian, 97% heterosexual; romantic partners: M age = 43.5 years, SD = 11.00, range = 24–71 years, 72% Caucasian, 97% heterosexual), female participants provided data on their GH experiences and feelings of anger; their romantic partners reported on their own levels of romantic relationship adjustment and romantic relationship efficacy. Consistent with ClearVoice procedures, all focal participants were awarded 50 cents for completing the survey and entered into a daily sweepstakes for \$100, a weekly sweepstakes for \$250, and a monthly sweepstakes for \$1000.

Measures

Gender harassment

Females' workplace GH experiences were measured with the five-item GH subscale of the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (Fitzgerald et al., 1995). Focal participants reported how often they had been the target of gender harassing behaviors from a supervisor within the last year, from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*many times*). Sample items include "...tell suggestive stories or offensive/'dirty' jokes," and "make sexist remarks (e.g. suggesting that women are too emotional to be leaders)." Higher scores on this measure indicate more GH victimization.

Anger

Focal participants' anger was assessed using the 15-item State-Trait Anger scale (Spielberger, 1999). Participants responded to questions, such as "I have felt furious" and "I have felt like yelling at someone,"¹ with respect to things that had happened *at work* over the last 12-month period on a scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 4 (*very much so*). Higher scores on this measure indicate greater work-induced anger.

¹Reproduced by special permission of the Publisher, Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc., 16204 North Florida Avenue, Lutz, FL 33549, from the STAXI-2 by Charles D. Spielberger, PhD, Copyright 1979, 1986, 1988, 1995, 1998, 1999, by Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc. Further reproduction is prohibited without permission from PAR, Inc.

Romantic relationship functioning

Focal participants' and romantic partners' perceptions of *romantic relationship adjustment* were collected using Locke and Wallace's (1959) Short Marital Adjustment Test—one of the most reliable and valid measures in marital research (Freeston & Pléchaty, 1997). As this scale has traditionally been used to assess the quality of participants' marriages, some items were changed to reflect our focus on varied types (i.e., marriage, common-law relationships, engaged to be married, and long-term romantic partnerships) of romantic relationships. The measure includes 16 questions (e.g., “Do you confide in your mate?” and “Do you ever wish you had not married/gotten into a relationship with your romantic partner?”). Items are scored differently and are assessed using a variety of scales (for more information on scoring this measure, see Locke & Wallace, 1959). Scores can range from 2 to 158 points, with higher scores indicating better romantic relationship adjustment.

Romantic relationship efficacy was evaluated using the seven-item measure of Fincham et al. (2000). Participants rated the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with statements such as “I often feel helpless in dealing with the problems that come up in my romantic relationship” and “I am able to do the things needed to settle our conflicts” in reference to the last year, on a scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Once again, changes were made to some items to reflect our focus on various types of romantic relationships. Higher scores indicate higher romantic relationship efficacy.

Control variables

Given (i) that trait affectivity affects how people respond to situations of aggression (e.g., Aquino, Grover, Bradfield, & Allen, 1999; Douglas & Martinko, 2001) and (ii) the need to ensure that context-specific emotion mediates proposed relationships between GH and romantic relationship functioning, focal female participants completed the Life Orientation Test (Scheier & Carver, 1985) to control for trait affectivity. This eight-item measure assesses generalized expectancies for positive versus negative outcomes. Female participants reported the extent to which statements such as “In uncertain times, I usually expect the best” and “Things never work out the way I want them to (R)” generally applied to them on a scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Higher scores indicate more positive trait affectivity. Romantic relationship length was also controlled as (i) responses to and perceptions of romantic partners and romantic relationships change over time (e.g., Sprecher, 1999) and (ii) to ensure that reports of romantic relationship functioning were not influenced by a “honeymoon” effect.

Results

Descriptive statistics, intercorrelations, and reliabilities for all study variables in Sample 1 appear in Table 2, and those in Sample 2 appear in Table 3. Mediation analyses were conducted using ordinary least squares regression analysis as implemented in the Hayes (2013) SPSS PROCESS modeling macro.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics, reliabilities, and correlations for all study variables for Sample 1 (spillover; $N=206$ females).

Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Female age (years)	39.71	10.57	—						
2. Relationship length (years)	14.63	11.02	.77**	—					
3. Female positive affect	4.68	1.04	.11	.03	.85				
4. Female gender harassment	1.24	0.67	-.10	-.05	-.12	.94			
5. Female anger	26.66	10.47	-.13	-.06	-.24**	.20**	.96		
6. Female romantic relationship adjustment	102.98	24.21	-.01	.03	.32**	-.14*	-.26**	.72	
7. Female romantic relationship efficacy	5.23	1.37	.07	.05	.43**	-.26**	-.34**	.61**	.90

Internal consistency (α) data appear in boldface on the diagonal.

M = mean; *SD* = standard deviation.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics, reliabilities, and correlations for all study variables for Sample 2 (crossover; *N* = 60 dyads).

Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Female age (years)	41.36	10.22	—							
2. Partner age (years)	43.50	11.00	.90**	—						
3. Relationship length (years)	14.68	10.74	.75**	.75**	—					
4. Female positive affect	4.70	0.89	.11	.21	.05	.81				
5. Female gender harassment	1.43	1.00	-.15	-.27*	-.25	-.30*	.98			
6. Female anger	57.47	7.58	-.13	-.09	-.12	-.22	.36**	.97		
7. Partner romantic relationship adjustment	113.29	24.38	.05	.06	.10	.35**	-.23	-.41**	.77	
8. Partner romantic relationship efficacy	4.97	1.20	.22	.19	.20	.52**	-.37**	-.36**	.73**	.90

Internal consistency (*α*) data appear in boldface on the diagonal.
M = mean; *SD* = standard deviation.
 p* < .05; *p* < .01.

Spillover analysis: Sample 1

Supervisor GH indirectly influenced targets’ romantic relationship functioning through its effects on target anger. Female employees who experienced GH from a supervisor were more likely to experience anger (*b* = 2.49; lower limit confidence interval (LLCI) = 0.55, upper limit confidence interval (ULCI) = 4.43), thereby supporting Hypothesis 1 (Table 4). Moreover, anger was negatively associated with romantic relationship adjustment (*b* = -0.41; LLCI = -0.73, ULCI = -0.08) and romantic relationship efficacy (*b* = -0.03; LLCI = -0.05, ULCI = -0.02) for targets. A bias-corrected bootstrap confidence interval based on 5000 bootstrap samples confirmed the indirect effect of GH on romantic relationship adjustment via target anger, as it did not include zero (*b* = -1.01; LLCI = -2.89, ULCI = -0.09). Thus, support was found for Hypothesis 2a. There was no evidence that GH influenced romantic relationship adjustment independent of its effects on anger (*b* = -2.43; LLCI = -7.01, ULCI = 2.16; Table 5). In line with Hypothesis 2b, the indirect effect of GH on romantic relationship efficacy via target anger was also supported; a bias-corrected bootstrap confidence interval based on 5000 bootstrap samples did not include zero (*b* = -0.08; LLCI = -0.20, ULCI = -0.02). GH was also directly associated with romantic relationship efficacy independent of its effects on anger (*b* = -0.32; LLCI = -0.56, ULCI = -0.08; Table 5).

Crossover analysis: Sample 2

Supervisor GH indirectly influenced partners’ romantic relationship functioning through its effects on target anger. More specifically, female employees who experienced GH from a supervisor were more likely to experience anger

Table 4. Direct effect of supervisor gender harassment on target anger: Sample 1 (spillover).

Variables	Anger			
	Coefficient	SE	LLCI	ULCI
Supervisor gender harassment	2.49**	0.98	0.55	4.43
Trait affect	-2.02**	0.66	-3.32	-0.72
Relationship length (years)	-0.02	0.06	-0.14	0.10
<i>R</i> ²	.08			
<i>F</i>	6.13**			

SE = standard error; LLCI = lower limit confidence interval; ULCI = upper limit confidence interval.
 p* < .05; *p* < .01.

Table 5. Direct and indirect effects of gender harassment on targets' romantic relationship functioning: Sample 1 (spillover).

Variables	Romantic relationship adjustment				Romantic relationship efficacy			
	Coefficient	SE	LLCI	ULCI	Coefficient	SE	LLCI	ULCI
Anger	-0.41**	0.16	-0.73	-0.08	-0.03**	0.01	-0.05	-0.02
Supervisor gender harassment	-2.43	2.33	-7.01	2.16	-0.32**	0.12	-0.56	-0.08
Trait affect	6.26**	1.57	3.17	9.35	0.46**	0.08	0.30	0.62
Relationship length (years)	0.02	0.14	-0.26	0.31	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.02
R^2	.14				.28			
F	8.05**				19.70**			
Direct effect	-2.43	2.33	-7.01	2.16	-0.32	0.12	-0.56	-0.08
Indirect effect	-1.01	0.67	-2.89	-0.09	-0.08	0.04	-0.20	-0.02

SE = standard error; LLCI = lower limit confidence interval; ULCI = upper limit confidence interval.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

($b = 2.95$; LLCI = 0.72, ULCI = 5.19; Table 6), and targets' anger was significantly and negatively associated with romantic partners' romantic relationship adjustment ($b = -1.32$; LLCI = -2.11, ULCI = -0.53) and romantic relationship efficacy ($b = -0.04$; LLCI = -0.07, ULCI = -0.00). In support of Hypothesis 3a and the indirect effect of GH on romantic partners' romantic relationship adjustment via target anger, a bias-corrected bootstrap confidence interval based on 5000 bootstrap samples did not include zero ($b = -3.90$; LLCI = -8.21, ULCI = -1.53). Moreover, GH was not directly associated with partners' romantic relationship adjustment independent of its effects on target anger ($b = 1.06$; LLCI = -6.00, ULCI = 8.12; Table 7). Finally, in line with Hypothesis 3b, the indirect effect of GH on romantic partners' romantic relationship efficacy via target anger was supported; a bias-corrected bootstrap confidence interval for this indirect effect based on 5000 bootstrap samples did not include zero ($b = -0.11$; LLCI = -0.29, ULCI = -0.01). There was no evidence that GH influenced partners' romantic relationship efficacy independent of its effects on target anger ($b = -0.11$; LLCI = -0.42, ULCI = 0.20; Table 7).

Discussion

We investigated the spillover and crossover effects of workplace GH onto female employees' own and onto their romantic partners' romantic relationship functioning, respectively. Supervisor GH was negatively related to targets' anger, which in turn was negatively related to their own romantic relationship adjustment and romantic relationship

Table 6. Direct effect of supervisor gender harassment on target anger: Sample 2 (crossover).

Variables	Anger			
	Coefficient	SE	LLCI	ULCI
Supervisor gender harassment	2.95**	1.12	0.72	5.19
Trait affect	-0.97	1.12	-3.21	1.27
Relationship length (years)	-0.02	0.09	-0.20	0.15
R^2	.17			
F	3.83**			

SE = standard error; LLCI = lower limit confidence interval; ULCI = upper limit confidence interval.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 7. Direct and indirect effects of gender harassment on partners' romantic relationship functioning: Sample 2 (crossover).

Variables	Romantic relationship adjustment				Romantic relationship efficacy			
	Coefficient	SE	LLCI	ULCI	Coefficient	SE	LLCI	ULCI
Anger	-1.32**	0.40	-2.11	-0.53	-0.04*	0.02	-0.07	-0.00
Supervisor gender harassment	1.06	3.52	-6.00	8.12	-0.11	0.15	-0.42	0.20
Trait affect	8.05*	3.35	1.33	14.76	0.64**	0.15	0.35	0.93
Relationship length (years)	0.16	0.26	-0.37	0.68	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.04
R^2	.30				.43			
F	5.97**				10.17**			
Direct effect	1.06	3.52	-6.00	8.12	-0.11	0.15	-0.42	0.20
Indirect effect	-3.90	1.74	-8.21	-1.53	-0.11	0.07	-0.29	-0.01

SE = standard error; LLCI = lower limit confidence interval; ULCI = upper limit confidence interval.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

efficacy (consistent with spillover theory) and their partners' romantic relationship adjustment and romantic relationship efficacy (consistent with crossover theory). Our research thus supports the far-reaching and indirect consequences of GH and highlights the mediating role of anger in these spillover and crossover processes.

Theoretical implications

A primary contribution of this research is the conceptualization and testing of GH's spillover and crossover effects. While the permeability of work and family roles has long been recognized (e.g., Barling, 1990) and our results support previous research showing other forms of workplace mistreatment can cross the boundaries of one's professional life (e.g., Haines et al., 2006; Hoobler & Brass, 2006), until now little has been known about the extra-organizational outcomes of sex-based harassment. Further, most work-family research has focused on how people experience the intersection between work and family roles (Grzywacz & Butler, 2008), and in particular, the negative outcomes when the demands of work and family are in conflict. Our research expands this focus as well as our understanding of the mediating role that negative work-induced emotion plays in the intersection of work and family, providing an important contribution to the work-family literature.

The spillover and crossover effects uncovered in this study also contribute to the harassment literature. Identifying unique relational consequences of GH that go beyond the psychological, physical, and job-related effects typically studied extends our understanding of the nature and scope of GH, as well as who is harmed by this form of mistreatment. While existing research has focused on the impact of harassment for direct targets, our findings support the notion that third parties also suffer as a result of this workplace aggression, which they do not experience personally and over which they have no direct control.

By isolating the mediating role of anger in the relationship between GH and romantic relationship functioning, the current findings also provide more insight into *why* GH exerts its negative effects. While researchers have long speculated about the possible role of emotion in workplace mistreatment (e.g., Barling, 1996; Miner-Rubino & Cortina, 2007), empirical research now exists to support this link. Moreover, while previous research has revealed sex-based harassment's adverse consequences, our findings show that much is still to be learned about the processes involved in GH's outcomes, and the role of targets' affective experience in these processes. Our findings also lend support to the important role of AET in explaining not only *intra*-organizational but also *extra*-organizational outcomes.

Finally, our results underscore the seriousness of GH given its spillover and crossover effects, and the importance of taking a multidimensional approach, conceptualizing and operationalizing sex-based harassment's various forms (i.e., GH, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion) separately. While researchers often examine this

phenomenon as a global construct (i.e., aggregating across its sub-types; Fitzgerald, Drasgow, & Magley, 1999; Munson, Hulin, & Drasgow, 2000), doing so ignores important conceptual and qualitative differences between forms (Dionisi et al., 2012) and may obscure the experiences of those who encounter one but not all forms of sex-based harassment. Based on our findings, we recommend that researchers continue to investigate experiences of GH fully and separately, and consider how this less often studied form of sex-based harassment may be damaging not just to employees themselves but also to their families.

Practical implications

The findings of this study have several implications for organizations and their leaders. First, much like other forms of psychological mistreatment that have not elicited the same attention and protection as more extreme forms of aggression (i.e., violence; Hershcovis & Barling, 2010b), GH has similarly been downplayed by the public, organizational stakeholders, and the legal system (Leskinen et al., 2011; Schultz, 2006). By highlighting the negative impact of workplace GH, the findings of this study underscore the need for organizations to recognize the damage of this non-sexual form of sex-based harassment and to implement policies accordingly. This is especially important, as prior research suggests sexual harassment in particular (Dekker & Barling, 1998) and workplace aggression more generally (Dupré & Barling, 2006) are diminished in the presence of organizational policies designed to prohibit and/or punish this behavior.

Second, our findings that negative consequences of GH can extend beyond the workplace and impact both victims and their romantic partners raise important and controversial questions given that organizations have historically shied away from any involvement in employees' family lives. Should organizations be required to provide support not only to employees who are targeted with harassment but to their family members as well? Given the personal and private nature of the relational outcomes concerned, how can organizations respond most appropriately to GH (e.g., offering couples therapy through employee assistance programs)? Aside from the controversial nature of these suggested approaches, both also represent tertiary forms of intervention. Thus, we further suggest that leadership development initiatives (Kelloway & Barling, 2010) aimed at reducing the occurrence of GH in the first instance, should be a priority for organizations. Such interventions could include education about the nature and consequences of sex-based harassment and be targeted not just at perpetrators of GH but also at all leaders and their employees.

Research strengths and directions for future research

Several research strengths and directions for future studies can be identified. First, a primary conceptual strength of this study was identifying how anger mediates any spillover and crossover effects of GH onto romantic relationship functioning. Our use of matched employee–romantic partner data (Sample 2) was critical in enabling these analyses, which provide a more comprehensive picture of the process-oriented consequences of supervisor GH and the effects of GH at home. Our between-romantic partner findings suggest that any effects of GH and target anger on romantic relationship functioning are unlikely to be influenced by the common method variance threatening such a relationship where single-source data were solely collected.

Second, conceptualizing mistreatment as an emotion-laden process and identifying anger as one variable through which GH is linked to romantic relationship functioning highlight the central role of emotions in understanding the effects of workplace GH. However, we do not suggest that anger is the only emotion that may ensue following sex-based harassment, and we call for more research and theorizing on other emotions that may serve similar (i.e., mediating) roles. One possibility is that targets of GH experience fear following their victimization (Barling, Rogers, & Kelloway, 2001). While damaging in and of itself, fear of victimization is associated with cognitive distraction, feelings of helplessness, and avoidance behavior, and thus might also interfere with romantic relationship dynamics (Barling et al., 2001; Rachman, 1990). GH may likewise lead to feelings of guilt and shame (emotions that result from other

forms of victimization such as domestic violence and sexual abuse; Gibson & Leitenberg, 2001; Kubany et al., 1995), and in turn, to avoidant coping behaviors (e.g., self-distraction, denial, alcohol and drug use, and behavioral disengagement; Street, Gibson, & Holohan, 2005; Tangney & Fischer, 1995) that could negatively affect romantic relationships. By identifying the importance of at least one emotion in the experience of sex-based harassment, our findings set the stage for future research into even more complex harassment–emotion–outcome processes.

Third, while diverse adverse consequences have been linked to workplace sexual harassment (e.g., Dionisi et al., 2012; Willness et al., 2007), our findings showing a negative association between GH and romantic relationship functioning for both targets and their romantic partners suggest that much can still be learned about the broad scope of sex-based harassment's adverse outcomes. Future research should continue to investigate previously unexplored or under-explored consequences of workplace GH (e.g., leadership, parenting) and account for an even broader array of romantic relationship outcomes, for example, the intensity, frequency, or resolution of conflict between partners (Grych, Seid, & Fincham, 1992)—any of which could be associated with anger. In line with theories of displaced aggression (e.g., Hoobler & Brass, 2006; Miller, Pedersen, Earleywine, & Pollock, 2003), the impact of workplace GH on psychologically and physically aggressive behaviors at home, could also be investigated.

Fourth, research should continue to explore individual and contextual factors that moderate the relationship between GH and romantic relationship functioning. A number of personal characteristics within both targets (e.g., resilience) and their romantic partners (e.g., emotional intelligence) warrant consideration. Spouse and familial support have also been shown to alleviate the negative effects of work stress on marital functioning (Aryee, Luk, Leung, & Lo, 1999; Griggs, Casper, & Eby, 2013) and positively affect responses to mistreatment (e.g., Scarpa, Haden, & Hurley, 2006). Given our focus on the spillover and crossover effects of workplace GH, the amount and type (e.g., instrumental vs. emotional) of support provided by those residing within the personal realm may be particularly relevant and important to pursue in future studies. Support from supervisors and coworkers may also help targets of GH effectively cope with their victimization (i.e., by offering emotional, informational, or instrumental support) and combat the negative effects of workplace aggression (e.g., Schat & Kelloway, 2003). Last, as employees who believe their organizations are tolerant of harassment experience more severe outcomes (Williams, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1999) and respond to mistreatment with more counterproductive coping behaviors (Cortina & Wasti, 2005; Malamut & Offermann, 2001), examining how sexual harassment climate (e.g., Kath, Swody, Magley, Bunk, & Gallus, 2009) may impact the negative affective and relational consequences of GH is a promising research avenue.

Research limitations

Several limitations of this study also warrant attention. First, our data are cross-sectional, thus precluding causal inferences. It remains possible that poor romantic relationship quality at home leads to feelings of anger among women, which in turn, makes them more vulnerable to victimization at work. However, because our focus was on work-induced anger, the hypothesized causal ordering remains plausible. Nonetheless, future research should replicate these findings with a longitudinal methodology.

Second, we relied solely on self-report data in Sample 1. While the personal nature of the questions and variables explored necessitated obtaining data from focal participants themselves, common method bias remains a concern (e.g., Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). However, we followed recommendations for reducing common method bias (e.g., respondents' anonymity was protected, trait affectivity was controlled statistically, and different scale endpoints were used; Podsakoff et al., 2003), and our results were replicated using between-partner data in Sample 2. Thus, the likelihood that the relationships uncovered in Sample 1 are inflated by such threats to validity is somewhat reduced. Similarly, although the two aspects of romantic relationship functioning were highly correlated in Sample 2, they were not affected to the same extent by focal participants' anger. Thus, concerns regarding the distinctness of these constructs and that both were derived from self-reports are somewhat minimized.

Third, heterosexual, White employees were overrepresented in both samples. Thus, the findings of this study need to be replicated using more racially diverse participants and participants characterized by a wider range of sexual identities. Doing so is important given the higher rates of sexual harassment that those belonging to such minority groups experience (e.g., Berdahl & Moore, 2006; Konik & Cortina, 2008) and the fact that GH, sexual orientation, and racial harassment often co-occur and may have additive effects (Konik & Cortina, 2008; Raver & Nishii, 2010). Moreover, while obtaining data using online computer surveys eases data collection and enhances accessibility to a larger pool of participants, it also limits samples to those who have access to such technologies. As such, coverage bias may have affected the findings obtained using this convenience sample and should be addressed in future research.

Fourth, given the difficulty in obtaining data from both romantic partners in a romantic relationship, the sample size of Sample 2 was relatively low, limiting the power of any statistical tests and the generalizability of our crossover findings. Future research examining crossover effects of GH should use larger samples to allow for more rigorous conclusions.

Finally, exploring the generalizability of these findings to male targets of GH remains a priority. Research showing that men experience gender-based mistreatment and are adversely affected by it (e.g., de Haas, Timmerman, & Höing, 2009; Street, Gradus, Stafford, & Kelly, 2007) speaks to the need for additional research exploring sex-based harassment and this demographic. However, as previous research suggests that male-targeted and female-targeted sex-based harassment are qualitatively different (e.g., Berdahl, Magley, & Waldo, 1996; Donovan & Drasgow, 1999), we limited the focus in this study to female targets. Future research should now examine whether the GH of men adversely impacts their own romantic relationship functioning and that of their romantic partners. Studies should also determine whether similar effects to those found here emerge when GH is perpetrated by coworkers, subordinates, or customers (who hold less formal power over targets than do leaders) and among targets of other forms of sex-based harassment (i.e., unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion).

Conclusion

This study shows how workplace GH detrimentally impacts the romantic relationships of targets and their romantic partners. While we know that employees who personally encounter GH experience detrimental health, behavioral, and attitudinal outcomes, our findings show how GH spans the boundary between work and family, negatively affecting employee's own and their romantic partners' romantic relationship functioning. We also identified the mediating role of target anger in these processes. While the need to replicate these findings with longitudinal data and extend the focus to a broader range of romantic relationship functioning and emotion-based variables remains, important conceptual, empirical, and practical contributions for both harassment and work-family research have been identified.

Acknowledgement

We acknowledge the financial assistance of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada to both authors.

Author biographies

Angela M. Dionisi is an Assistant Professor of Management at the Sprott School of Business, Carleton University in Canada. She currently conducts research on workplace sexual harassment and aggression, as well as issues pertaining to leadership, power, and status.

Julian Barling holds the Borden Chair of Leadership at the Queen's School of Business, Canada. His current research interests lie in the areas of the nature and development of leadership, leaders' mental health and illness, and counterproductive behaviors in organizations.

References

- Allred, K. G., Mallozzi, J. S., Matsui, F., & Raia, C. P. (1997). The influence of anger and compassion on negotiation performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *70*, 175–187.
- Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2002). Human aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *53*, 27–51.
- Aquino, K., Grover, S. L., Bradfield, M., & Allen, D. G. (1999). The effects of negative affectivity, hierarchical status, and self-determination on workplace victimization. *Academy of Management Journal*, *42*, 260–272.
- Aryee, S., Luk, V., Leung, A., & Lo, S. (1999). Role stressors, interrole conflict, and well-being: The moderating influence of spousal support and coping behaviors among employed parents in Hong Kong. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *54*, 259–278.
- Ayoko, O. B., Callan, V. J., & Härtel, C. E. (2003). Workplace conflict, bullying, and counterproductive behaviors. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *11*, 283–301.
- Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Dollard, M. F. (2008). How job demands affect partners' experience of exhaustion: Integrating work–family conflict and crossover theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*, 901–911.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, *84*, 191–215.
- Barling, J. (1990). *Employment, stress and family functioning*. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons.
- 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.
- Baron, K. G., Smith, T. W., Butler, J., Nealey-Moore, J., Hawkins, M. W., & Uchino, B. N. (2007). Hostility, anger, and marital adjustment: Concurrent and prospective associations with psychosocial vulnerability. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *30*, 1–10.
- Berdahl, J. L. (2007a). Harassment based on sex: Protecting social status in the context of gender hierarchy. *Academy of Management Review*, *32*, 641–658.
- Berdahl, J. L. (2007b). The sexual harassment of uppity women. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 425–437.
- 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.
- Berdahl, J. L., & Raver, J. L. (2010). Sexual harassment. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial/organizational psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Bolger, N., DeLongis, A., Kessler, R. C., & Wethington, E. (1989). The contagion of stress across multiple roles. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *51*, 175–183.
- Canary, D. J., Spitzberg, B. H., & Semic, B. A. (1998). The experience and expression of anger in interpersonal settings. In P. A. Anderson & L. K. Guerrero (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and emotion: Research, theory, applications, and contexts* (pp. 189–213). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Carlson, D. S., Ferguson, M., Perrewé, P. L., & Whitten, D. (2011). The fallout from abusive supervision: An examination of subordinates and their partners. *Personnel Psychology*, *64*, 937–961.
- Caspi, A., Bolger, N., & Eckenrode, J. (1987). Linking person and context in the daily stress process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *52*, 184–195.
- Chaudoir, S. R., & Quinn, D. M. (2010). Bystander sexism in the intergroup context: The impact of cat-calls on woman's reactions towards men. *Sex Roles*, *62*, 623–634.
- Chow, R. M., Tiedens, L. Z., & Govan, C. L. (2008). Excluded emotions: The role of anger in antisocial responses to ostracism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *44*, 896–903.
- Clore, G. L., Ortony, A., Dienes, B., & Fujita, F. (1993). Where does anger dwell?. In R.S. Cooper Jr. & T.K. Srull (Eds.), *Advances in Social Cognition: Perspectives on anger and emotion* Vol. 6 (pp. 57–88). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

- Cohen, D. J., Eckhardt, C. I., & Schagat, K. D. (1998). Attention allocation and habituation to anger-related stimuli during a visual search task. *Aggressive Behavior* 24, 399–409.
- Cortina, L. M., & Berdahl, J. (2008). Sexual harassment in organizations: A decade of research in review. In L. Cooper & J. Barling (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational behavior* (pp. 469–497). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Cortina, L. M., & Wasti, S. (2005). Profiles in coping: Responses to sexual harassment across persons, organizations, and cultures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 182–192.
- Dekker, I., & Barling, J. (1998). Personal and organizational predictors of workplace sexual harassment of women by men. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3, 7–18.
- Dionisi, A. M., Barling, J., & Dupré, K. E. (2012). Revisiting the comparative outcomes of workplace aggression and sexual harassment. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17, 398–408.
- Doherty, W. J. (1981). Cognitive processes in intimate conflict: II. *Efficacy and learned helplessness*. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 9, 35–44.
- Donovan, M. A., & Drasgow, F. (1999). Do men's and women's experiences of sexual harassment differ? An examination of the differential test functioning of the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire. *Military Psychology*, 11, 265–282.
- Douglas, S. C., & Martinko, M. J. (2001). Exploring the role of individual differences in the prediction of workplace aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 547–559.
- Dunn, J. R., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2005). Feeling and believing: The influence of emotion on trust. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 736–748.
- Dupré, K., & Barling, J. (2006). Predicting and preventing supervisory workplace aggression. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11, 13–26.
- Edwards, J. R., & Rothbard, N. P. (2000). Mechanisms linking work and family: Clarifying the relationship between work and family constructs. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 178–199.
- Faley, R. H., Knapp, D. E., Kustis, G. A., & Dubois, C. L. (1999). Estimating the organizational costs of sexual harassment: The case of the US Army. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 13, 461–484.
- Ferguson, M. (2012). You cannot leave it at the office: Spillover and crossover of coworker incivility. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 33, 571–588.
- Fincham, F. D., Harold, G. T., & Gano-Phillips, S. (2000). The longitudinal association between attributions and marital satisfaction: Direction of effects and role of efficacy expectations. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 14, 267–285.
- Fitness, J. (2000). Anger in the workplace: An emotion script approach to anger episodes between workers and their superiors, co-workers and subordinates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 147–162.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Drasgow, F., & Magley, V. J. (1999). Sexual harassment in the armed forces: A test of an integrated model. *Military Psychology*, 11, 329–343.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Gelfand, M. J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment: Theoretical and psychometric advances. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17, 425–445.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Swan, S., & Magley, V. J. (1997). But was it really sexual harassment? Legal, behavioral, and psychological definitions of the workplace victimization of women. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp. 5–28). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Freeston, M. H., & Pléchaty, M. (1997). Reconsideration of the Locke–Wallace Marital Adjustment Test: Is it still relevant for the 1990s? *Psychological Reports*, 81, 419–434.
- Fuller, J. A., Stanton, J. M., Fisher, G. G., Spitzmuller, C., Russell, S. S., & Smith, P. C. (2003). A lengthy look at the daily grind: Time series analysis of events, mood, stress, and satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 1019–1033.
- Gibson, L. E., & Leitenberg, H. (2001). The impact of child sexual abuse and stigma on methods of coping with sexual assault among undergraduate women. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 25, 1343–1361.
- Griggs, T. L., Casper, W. J., & Eby, L. T. (2013). Work, family and community support as predictors of work-family conflict: A study of low-income workers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 82, 59–68.
- Grych, J. H., Seid, M., & Fincham, F. D. (1992). Assessing marital conflict from the child's perspective: The children's perception of interparental conflict scale. *Child Development*, 63, 558–572.
- Grzywacz, J. G., & Butler, A. B. (2008). Work–family conflict. *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Behavior*, 1, 451–468.
- de Haas, S., Timmerman, G., & Höing, M. (2009). Sexual harassment and health among male and female police officers. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 14, 390–401.
- Haines, III, V. Y., Marchand, A., & Harvey, S. (2006). Crossover of workplace aggression experiences in dual-earner couples. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11, 305.
- Hammer, L. B., Bauer, T. N., & Grandey, A. A. (2003). Work–family conflict and work-related withdrawal behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 17, 419–436.
- Harned, M. S., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2002). Understanding a link between sexual harassment and eating disorder symptoms: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 70, 1170.

- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *An introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Hershcovis, M. S., & Barling, J. (2010a). Comparing victim attributions and outcomes for workplace aggression and sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 874–888.
- Hershcovis, M. S., & Barling, J. (2010b). Toward a multi-foci approach to workplace aggression: A meta-analytic review of outcomes from different perpetrators. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31*, 24–44.
- Holland, K. J., & Cortina, L. M. (2013). When sexism and feminism collide: The sexual harassment of feminist working women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 37*, 192–208.
- Hoobler, J. M., & Brass, D. J. (2006). Abusive supervision and family undermining as displaced aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*, 1125–1133.
- Hoobler, J. M., & Hu, J. (2012). A model of injustice, abusive supervision, and negative affect. *Leadership Quarterly, 24*, 256–269.
- Hughes, D., & Galinsky, E. (1994). Work experiences and marital interactions: Elaborating the complexity of work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15*, 423–438.
- 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.
- Jones, F., & Fletcher, B. (1996). Taking work home: A study of daily fluctuations in work stressors, effects on mood and impact on marital partners. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 69*, 89–106.
- 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.
- Kelloway, E. K., & Barling, J. (2010). Leadership development as an intervention in occupational health psychology. *Work and Stress, 24*, 260–279.
- Konik, J., & Cortina, L. M. (2008). Policing gender at work: Intersections of harassment based on sex and sexuality. *Social Justice Research, 21*, 313–337.
- Kubany, E. S., Abueg, F. R., Owens, J. A., Brennan, J. M., Kaplan, A. S., & Watson, S. B. (1995). Initial examination of a multidimensional model of trauma-related guilt: Applications to combat veterans and battered women. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 17*, 353–376.
- Larson, R. W., & Almeida, D. M. (1999). Emotional transmission in the daily lives of families: A new paradigm for studying family process. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 5*–20.
- Lerner, J. S., Goldberg, J. H., & Tetlock, P. E. (1998). Sober second thought: The effects of accountability, anger, and authoritarianism on attributions of responsibility. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24*, 563–574.
- Lerner, J. S., & Keltner, D. (2000). Beyond valence: Toward a model of emotion-specific influences on judgment and choice. *Cognition and Emotion, 14*, 473–493.
- Lerner, J. S., & Tiedens, L. Z. (2006). Portrait of the angry decision maker: How appraisal tendencies shape anger's influence on cognition. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 19*, 115–137.
- Leskinen, E. A., Cortina, L. M., & Kabat, D. B. (2011). Gender harassment: Broadening our understanding of sex-based harassment at work. *Law and Human Behavior, 35*, 25–39.
- Lim, S., & Lee, A. (2011). Work and nonwork outcomes of workplace incivility: Does family support help? *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 16*, 95–111.
- Locke, H. J., & Wallace, K. M. (1959). Short marital-adjustment and prediction tests: Their reliability and validity. *Marriage and Family Living, 21*, 251–255.
- Loewenstein, G., & Lerner, J. S. (2003). The role of affect in decision making. In R. Davidson, K. Scherer, & H. Goldsmith (Eds.), *Handbook of affective science* (pp. 619–642). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- MacEwen, K. E., & Barling, J. (1991). Maternal employment experiences affect children's behavior via mood, cognitive difficulties and parenting behavior. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53*, 635–644.
- Malamut, A. B., & Offermann, L. R. (2001). Coping with sexual harassment: Personal, environmental, cognitive determinants. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 1152–1166.
- Miller, N., Pedersen, W. C., Earleywine, M., & Pollock, V. E. (2003). A theoretical model of triggered displaced aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 7*, 75–97.
- Miner-Rubino, K., & Cortina, L. M. (2007). Beyond targets: Consequences of vicarious exposure to misogyny at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 1254–1269.
- Munson, L. J., Hulin, C., & Drasgow, F. (2000). Longitudinal analysis of dispositional influences and sexual harassment: Effects on job and psychological outcomes. *Personnel Psychology, 53*, 21–46.
- Newton, T. L., & Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K. (1995). Hostility and erosion of marital quality during early marriage. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 18*, 601–619.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 879–903.

- Pratt, L. I., & Barling, J. (1988). Differentiating daily hassles, acute and chronic stressors: A framework and its implications. In J. R. Hurrell, L. R. Murphy, S. L. Sauter, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Occupational stress: Issues and developments in research* (pp. 41–53). London, UK: Taylor & Francis.
- Rachman, S. (1990). *Fear and courage* (2nd ed.). New York: W.H. Freeman and CO.
- Raver, J. L., & Nishii, L. H. (2010). Once, twice, or three times as harmful? Ethnic harassment, gender harassment, and generalized workplace harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 236–254.
- Repetti, R. L. (1993). Short-term effects of occupational stressors on daily mood and health complaints. *Health Psychology, 12*, 125–131.
- Repetti, R. L. (1994). Short-term and long-term processes linking job stressors to father–child interaction. *Social Development, 3*, 1–15.
- 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. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*, 713–729.
- Robinson, M. S., & Alloy, L. B. (2003). Negative cognitive styles and stress-reactive rumination interact to predict depression: A prospective study. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 27*, 275–291.
- Rogers, K. A., & Kelloway, E. K. (1997). Violence at work: personal and organizational outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 2*, 63–71.
- Rowa, K., & Antony, M. M. (2008). Generalized anxiety disorder. In W. E. Craighead, D. J. Miklowitz, & L. W. Craighead (Eds.), *Psychopathology: History, diagnosis, and empirical foundations* (pp 78–115). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Sakurai, K., & Jex, S. M. (2012). Coworker incivility and incivility targets' work effort and counterproductive work behaviors: The moderating role of supervisor social support. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 17*, 150–161.
- Scarpa, A., Haden, S. C., & Hurley, J. (2006). Community violence victimization and symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder: The moderating effects of coping and social support. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21*, 446–469.
- 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.
- Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1985). Optimism, coping, and health: assessment and implications of generalized outcome expectancies. *Health Psychology, 4*, 219.
- Schneider, K. T., Tomaka, J., & Palacios, R. (2001). Women's cognitive, affective, and physiological reactions to a male coworker's sexist behavior. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 31*, 1995–2018.
- Schultz, V. (2006). Understanding sexual harassment law in action: What has gone wrong and what we can do about it. *Thomas Jefferson Law Review, 29*, 1–53.
- Schulz, M. S., Cowan, P. A., Cowan, C. P., & Brennan, R. T. (2004). Coming home upset: Gender, marital satisfaction and the daily spillover of workday experience into couple interactions. *Journal of Family Psychology, 18*, 250–263.
- Silverschanz, P., Cortina, L. M., Konik, J., & Magley, V. J. (2008). Slurs, snubs, and queer jokes: Incidence and impact of heterosexist harassment in academia. *Sex Roles, 58*, 179–191.
- Spielberger, C. D. (1999). *STAXI-2: State–Trait Anger Expression Inventory-2: Professional manual*. Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources Inc.
- Sprecher, S. (1999). “I love you more today than yesterday”: Romantic partners' perceptions of changes in love and related affect over time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76*, 46–53.
- Story, L. B., & Repetti, R. (2006). Daily occupational stressors and marital behavior. *Journal of Family Psychology, 20*, 690.
- Street, A. E., Gibson, L. E., & Holohan, D. R. (2005). Impact of childhood traumatic events, trauma-related guilt, and avoidant coping strategies on PTSD symptoms in female survivors of domestic violence. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 18*, 245–252.
- Street, A. E., Gradus, J. L., Stafford, J., & Kelly, K. (2007). Gender differences in experiences of sexual harassment: Data from a male-dominated environment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 75*, 464–474.
- Swim, J. K., Hyers, L. L., Cohen, L. L., & Ferguson, M. J. (2001). Everyday sexism: Evidence for its incidence, nature, and psychological impact from three daily diary studies. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 31–53.
- Tangney, J. P., & Fischer, K. W. (1995). *Self-conscious emotions*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Tiedens, L. Z. (2001). The effect of anger on the hostile inferences of aggressive and nonaggressive people: Specific emotions, cognitive processing, and chronic accessibility. *Motivation and Emotion, 25*, 233–251.
- Tiedens, L. Z., & Linton, S. (2001). Judgment under emotional certainty and uncertainty: The effects of specific emotions on information processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 973–988.
- United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2011). Code of Federal Regulations: Part 1604—Guidelines on discrimination because of sex. Retrieved from <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2011-title29-vol4/xml/CFR-2011-title29-vol4-part1604.xml>
- Weiner, B. (1995). *Judgments of responsibility: A foundation for a theory of social conduct*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior: An annual series of analytical essays and critical reviews* (Vol. 18, pp. 1–74). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Westman, M. (2001). Stress and strain crossover. *Human Relations, 54*, 717–751.
- Westman, M., & Vinokur, A. D. (1998). Unraveling the relationship of distress levels within couples: Common stressors, empathic reactions, or crossover via social interaction? *Human Relations, 51*, 137–156.
- Williams, C. W., Brown, R. S., Lees-Haley, P. R., & Price, J. R. (1995). An attributional (causal dimensional) analysis of perceptions of sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 25*, 1169–1183.
- Williams, J. H., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Drasgow, F. (1999). The effects of organizational practices on sexual harassment and individual outcomes in the military. *Military Psychology, 11*, 303–328.
- 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.
- Wright, C. V., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2007). Angry and afraid: Women's appraisal of sexual harassment during litigation. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*, 73–84.
- 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*, 714–731.