

January 2012

Gender Differences in Subtypes of Workplace Aggression

Zhiqing Zhou

University of South Florida, zhiqing@mail.usf.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Scholar Commons Citation

Zhou, Zhiqing, "Gender Differences in Subtypes of Workplace Aggression" (2012). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*.
<http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/4423>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

Gender Differences in Subtypes of Workplace Aggression

by

Zhiqing Zhou

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Masters of Arts
Department of Psychology
College of Arts & Sciences
University of South Florida

Major Professor: Paul Spector, Ph.D.
Michael Brannick, Ph.D.
Jennifer Bosson, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:
August 31, 2012

Keywords: physical, verbal, direct, indirect, active, passive, interpersonal, organizational

Copyright © 2012, Zhiqing Zhou

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my family who has supported me in every way they could. Without their trust and encouragement, I couldn't overcome all the difficulties with unchanging hope.

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Paul Spector, who has supported and guided me not only on my education, skill development, and research, but also in my career preparation. He has provided me valuable feedback and help throughout this project and on many other projects. I would also like to thank Dr. Michael Brannick and Dr. Jennifer Bosson for their suggestions and advice throughout the thesis process. Thank you!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	ii
Abstract	iii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Definition of Workplace Aggression	4
Subtypes of Workplace Aggression.....	6
Gender Differences in Workplace Aggression	8
Workplace Aggression in General	8
Physical/ Verbal Workplace Aggression	10
Direct/ Indirect Workplace Aggression	12
Active/ Passive Workplace Aggression	16
Relational Workplace Aggression	16
Interpersonal/ Organizational Workplace Aggression.....	18
Gender Differences in Reporting	19
Chapter 2: Method	21
Step 1	21
Step 2	21
Step 3	22
Participants.....	22
Measures	23
Procedure	24
Chapter 3: Results	25
Descriptive	25
Hypothesis Testing.....	25
Additional Analysis	29
Chapter 4: Discussion	30
Limitations and Future Research Directions.....	36
Conclusions.....	37
Tables	48
Appendixes	63

List of Tables

Table 1. Proposed Taxonomy of Workplace Aggression (Snyder et al., 2005)	49
Table 2. Categories of Items	50
Table 3. Demographics Overall and By Gender	52
Table 4. Employee- Supervisor Matching	53
Table 5. Descriptive Statistics of Employee Data	53
Table 6. Comparison on Descriptive Statistics between Matched and Unmatched Employees	54
Table 7. Descriptive Statistics of Matched Employees and Supervisors.....	55
Table 8. Correlations among Variables of Interest	56
Table 9. Comparisons on Prevalence of Subtypes of Workplace Aggression.....	57
Table 10. Comparison between Correlations.....	58
Table 11. Comparison of Supervisor-rating and Self-rating on Females’ Workplace Aggression	59
Table 12. Comparison of Supervisor-rating and Self-rating on Males’ Workplace Aggression.....	60
Table 13. Comparison between Male and Female Supervisors’ Ratings on Subordinates’ Workplace Aggression	61
Table 14. Correlations of Employee Gender with Self-reports and Supervisor Reports of Workplace Aggression using Matched Data	62

Abstract

The purpose of the current study was to categorize workplace aggression into nine subtypes based on human aggression and workplace aggression literature, and to examine gender differences in engaging in these subtypes of workplace aggression. Data collected from 366 employed students showed that a significant gender difference was found only in direct workplace aggression and there were no gender differences in the other eight workplace aggression subtypes; verbal, direct, and passive workplace aggression was more frequently used than physical, indirect and active workplace aggression, respectively. Data collected from 83 employee-supervisor pairs showed that compared to supervisors' reports, female employees' self-reports tended to be higher in all eight subtypes of workplace aggression (relational workplace aggression was excluded), while male employees' self-reports were only higher in passive workplace aggression than their supervisors' reports. Male supervisors were found to report more subordinates' verbal, direct, active, and interpersonal workplace aggression than female supervisors, and male employees were reported by their immediate supervisors to engage in more active workplace aggression. Implications, limitations and conclusions were discussed.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Workplace aggression has drawn considerable public attention (Barling, Dupre, & Kelloway, 2009) and it has been found to have important negative impact on employees' attitudes, behaviors and well-being. For example, in a recent meta-analysis, Hershcovis and Barling (2010b) reported that employees' exposure to workplace aggression from different sources (supervisors, coworkers, and outsiders) was related to their increased intent to turnover, emotional exhaustion, depression, interpersonal and organizational deviance, and also related to decreased job satisfaction, affective commitment, as well as psychological and physical well-being. All the outcomes are negative to either employees or organizations, and they should be avoided if possible. To better understand the sources of workplace aggression, recent meta-analyses also summarized its critical predictors, such as trait anger, negative affectivity, distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal conflict, situational constraints, and job satisfaction (Hershcovis et al., 2007), as well as predictors of workplace aggression against supervisors, such as self-esteem or abusive supervision (Innes, Barling, & Turner, 2005). These meta-analyses on one hand addressed the importance of studying workplace aggression, and on the other hand provided sources of directions for future research. One issue in the purview of workplace aggression that has drawn relatively less attention is gender differences.

It seems natural to believe that women are less aggressive than men, and researchers didn't pay much attention to female aggression in the early stages of aggression research. For example, Buss (1961) did not think female aggression was worth

studying since women are hardly aggressive. However, with related knowledge and empirical research findings accumulating, people began to realize that women can also be aggressive. Eagly and Steffen (1986) concluded that men are more aggressive than women on average; however, while men were more likely to engage in physical aggression, women were more likely to engage in psychological aggression. This finding raised the question of whether women are also aggressive, but just in a different way. Consistent with this notion, it was further argued that women should not be assumed to be less hostile than men; instead, due to the fact that women are physically weaker, they tend to develop other strategies to reach their goals, and indirect aggression becomes more popular among women (Bjorkqvist, 1994). Hence, it would be hasty to conclude that men are engaging in more aggression than women; gender difference in different types of aggression should be addressed.

Gender differences in human aggression in general has been empirically reported since the 1920s (Archer, 2004) and has been the subject of several meta-analyses since then (Archer, 2004; Card, Stucky, Sawalani, & Little, 2008; Eagly & Steffen, 1986; Hyde, 1984; Knight, Guthrie, Page, & Fabes, 2002). Although there has been extensive research in the social and developmental psychology fields showing that males tend to be more aggressive than females, most of the research was using child and adolescent samples (e.g., Archer, 2004), and those studies using adult samples were not carried out in workplace settings (e.g., Eagly & Steffen, 1986). There has been limited research conducted to explore gender differences in workplace aggression.

The limited existing literature on gender differences in workplace aggression has not reached a consistent conclusion: while most studies found that male employees

engaged in more workplace aggression (e.g., Baron, Neuman, & Geddes, 1999; Dupre & Barling, 2006; Haines, Marchand, & Harvey, 2006; McFarlin, Fals-Stewart, Major, & Justice, 2001), some did not find significant gender differences (e.g., Douglas & Martinko, 2001; Innes et al., 2005). In addition, one important issue worth pointing out is that in workplace aggression research, gender has been considered as a control variable (Spector, 2010) and has never been the focus of the studies. Therefore, even studies that reported significant gender differences did not provide complete detailed information. Further, most researchers have studied workplace aggression only in terms of interpersonal aggression and organizational aggression (e.g., Hershcovis et al., 2007), or in terms of physical and psychological aggression (e.g., Dupre & Barling, 2006). Yet, workplace aggression has been rarely classified into more specific subtypes with Neuman and Baron (1998) as an exception which categorized workplace aggression into expression of hostility, obstructionism, and overt aggression. In contrast, gender differences in human aggression outside of the workplace has been extensively studied in more detailed subtypes using child and adolescent samples (Archer, 2004; Card et al., 2008). Therefore, the present study will look at gender differences in specific subtypes of workplace aggression and will provide additional insight into both human and workplace aggression.

To sum up, although there has been extensive research on potential predictors (e.g., Barling et al., 2009; Hershcovis et al., 2007) and outcomes of workplace aggression (e.g., Hershcovis & Barling, 2010a; Hershcovis & Barling, 2010b), none of them has explored gender differences in different subtypes of workplace aggression. Since women today comprise almost half of the workforce in developed countries (United Nations,

2007), research looking into whether women and men engage in different subtypes of workplace aggression in the same frequency will be helpful for making effective interventions or organizational policies. Hence, the current study aims to categorize workplace aggression into different subtypes and explore gender differences in these subtypes. In the following sections, I will give the definition of workplace aggression, summarize the subtypes of workplace aggression on which gender differences will be explored, and propose my hypotheses and research questions.

Definition of Workplace Aggression

There has been a lack of consensus on the definition of aggression (Spector, 2010), and the main argument is whether actors' intent should be included or not. For example, Buss (1961) defined aggression as "a response that delivers noxious stimuli to another organism" (p. 1), and he explicitly excluded the concept of intent from his definition of aggression. Loeber and Hay (1997) shared the same idea of rejecting intent as part of the definition. In contrast, Bettencourt, Talley, Benjamin, and Valentine (2006) defined aggression as behaviors tending to harm another person who wants to avoid the harm. In their definition, just intent to harm can be considered as aggression even when no action is taken. Anderson and Bushman (2002) had a similar definition by including intent as part of the definition while considering accidental harm not to be aggression. In the present study, intent is considered an important part of the definition of human aggression and workplace aggression, and it should be followed by actual actions.

Compared to aggression in general, workplace aggression is a relatively narrower concept since it only focuses on aggressive behaviors taking place in workplace settings. Meanwhile, it can also be considered a broader concept because researchers are interested

in not only harm to individuals, but also harm to organizations (e.g., Barling et al., 2009; Neuman & Baron, 1998; Schat & Kelloway, 2005; Spector, 1975). Definitions of workplace aggression varied in terms of perpetrators, intended targets, actions, intentionality, and consequences (Snyder et al., 2005), and a list of construct dimensions of workplace aggression was summarized by Snyder et al. (2005) in Table 1 (Please refer to the review for detailed differences between varied definitions on the four dimensions). Consistent with the review, the current study uses Neuman and Baron's (1998) definition of workplace aggression: "efforts by individuals to harm others with whom they work, or have worked, or the organizations in which they are presently, or were previously, employed" (p. 395). The reason to choose this definition was well explained by Snyder et al. (2005): "This conception of workplace aggression is supported by O'Leary-Kelly et al.'s (2000) analysis of construct confusion in the realm of antisocial work behavior. Their analysis concludes that the construct of workplace aggression consists of those behaviors perpetrated by organizational insiders, directed toward organizational insiders or the organization itself, and caused by either organizational or non-organizational factors." (p. 7). As indicated in the definition, actors of workplace aggression need to have the intent, and the behaviors can be other individual- and/or organization-targeted. The definition is parallel to another similar concept- counterproductive work behavior (CWB; Spector & Fox, 2005), which has also been proposed to be categorized as CWB against individuals (CWB-I) and CWB against organizations (CWB-O) (Robinson & Bennett, 1995). Therefore, in the current study, CWB and workplace aggression are used as interchangeable terms.

Subtypes of Workplace Aggression

After reviewing different existing taxonomies of aggressive work behaviors at work (Buss, 1961; Dubois, 1979; Griffin, O'Leary-Kelly, & Collins, 1998; O'Leary-Kelly, Griffin, & Glew, 1996; Robinson & Bennett, 1995), Snyder et al. (2005) proposed a taxonomy of workplace aggression including three dimensions: direct/ indirect, active/ passive, interpersonal/ organizational. This taxonomy overlaps with Buss (1961) in that two dimensions are shared (direct/ indirect, and active/ passive), whereas there are also some departure in that the physical/verbal dimension is excluded by Snyder et al. (2005) and interpersonal/ organizational dimension is added. A careful review of the current literature on human aggression suggests that this taxonomy is not complete enough to include all possible subtypes of workplace aggression. Hence, the current study will include more subtypes of workplace aggression based on their taxonomy.

First of all, human aggression in general has been divided into different subtypes, and the most widely used framework to distinguish different forms of aggression was suggested by Buss (1961), according to whom aggression can be divided based on three dimensions while some behaviors may overlap across the dimensions: physical (e.g., attacking with a weapon)/ verbal (e.g., threats), active (performance of certain behaviors, e.g. insulting)/ passive (not performing certain actions, e.g., not passing on important information), direct (target is directly harmed, e.g., pushing someone)/ indirect (target is harmed indirectly through intermediary, e.g., spreading a rumor). Based on this framework, any aggressive behavior can be categorized on each of the three dimensions. For example, pushing someone can be considered as direct physical active aggression, while spreading a rumor about someone is indirect verbal active aggression. Additionally,

Buss's (1961) framework has been also used on workplace aggression research (e.g., Baron & Neuman, 1998). Therefore, this framework will be also used in the present study to compare gender differences in each of the three dimensions, such as in physical and verbal, active and passive, and direct and indirect workplace aggression. Further, the prevalence of subtypes will also be compared within each dimension, such as physical vs. verbal, active vs. passive, and direct vs. indirect.

In addition, relational aggression, a relatively new concept, consists of behaviors that harm or threaten to harm friendships or relationships, such as spreading rumors and lies, intentionally ignoring someone, or excluding a person from an activity or group interaction (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995). It sometimes was used as another name of indirect aggression (Card et al., 2008), but it is actually beyond the indirect aggression scope because one of the initial items developed by Crick and Grotpeter (1995) included direct confrontation. Therefore, relational aggression is studied independent of indirect aggression in the current study. Moreover, although relational aggression has drawn much attention recently, almost all relevant studies used children or adolescent samples (e.g., Bailey & Ostrov, 2008; Henington, Hughes, Cavell, & Thompson, 1996; Skara et al., 2008; Zimmer-Gembeck, Geiger, & Crick, 2005), with a few exceptions (e.g., Basow, Cahill, Phelan, Longshore, & McGillicuddy-Delisi, 2007; Burton, Hafetz, & Henninger, 2007; Lento-Zwolinski, 2007) using adult college students. No published study has been conducted in workplace settings and no information about gender differences have been reported on relational workplace aggression. Therefore, in the current study, relational aggression will be studied for the first time in workplace settings and gender difference on workplace relational aggression will be explored.

Furthermore, workplace aggression (or counterproductive work behaviors) has been studied in terms of its interpersonal and organizational targets (Hershcovis et al., 2007; Robinson & Bennett, 1995) and workplace aggression towards different targets were found to be related to the same predictors in significantly different magnitude (Hershcovis et al., 2007). Hence, looking at workplace aggression on these two dimensions will also be informative. Therefore, in addition to the previous frameworks, gender differences will be also examined in these two subtypes of workplace aggression.

To sum up, the current study will apply all the frameworks mentioned above to workplace aggression, and explore gender differences in all the subtypes of aggression. It should be noticed that the frameworks are not necessarily mutually exclusive as one certain behavior can be categorized into more than one subtype of workplace aggression.

Gender Differences in Workplace Aggression

Workplace Aggression in General

Two major theories in social psychology and developmental psychology - sexual selection theory (SST) and social role theory (SRT) - have been used to explain sex differences in human aggression (Archer, 2004; Campbell, 1999; Daly & Wilson, 1988; Eagly & Steffen, 1986; Eagly & Wood, 1999; Morales-Vives & Vigil-Colet, 2010). It is conceivable that gender differences in workplace aggression can also be explained by these theories since workplace aggression are still within the human aggression scope.

As an important part of evolutionary theory, Sexual Selection Theory (SST) was used to explain sex differences in human behaviors (Eagly & Wood, 1999), and particularly human aggression (Archer, 2004). According to SST, women invest more resources to parenting by gestating, bearing and nursing children than men, and women

seem to be limited resources for reproduction. Men tend to compete for access to women, and women chose the one with more available resources for parenting children. Due to this, men have evolved to possess dispositions favoring violence, competition, and risk taking (Eagly & Wood, 1999), which makes men more likely to challenge other men and risk injury for successful reproduction (Daly & Wilson, 1988). Archer (2004) applied sexual selection theory to explain sex differences on aggression, and proposed that men tend to engage in more intense competition when the risks are high. On the other hand, women tended to be less engaged in risky and violent aggression to stay alive and to parent children (Campbell, 1999). Therefore, it was expected that men tended to be more aggressive in general, and sex differences in aggression will be the greatest on physical aggression, and the results by Archer (2004) supported this prediction by finding that that there was the biggest sex difference on physical aggression in the direction of men, and there was either no difference in indirect aggression or the difference was in the direction of women. In addition, he also found smaller differences in verbal aggression but still in the male direction.

According to social role theory (SRT) (Archer, 2004; Eagly & Steffen, 1986; Eagly & Wood, 1999), people take different social roles and their behaviors are regulated by the norms attached to their social roles. Gender roles are among the important types of social roles. For example, men tend to occupy masculine roles involving agentic behaviors, resource acquisition behaviors, or dominant behaviors. On the other hand, women tend to take feminine roles involving communal behaviors, domestic behaviors, or subordinate behaviors. The male gender role consists of norms that encourage many forms of aggression and men are stereotyped to be tough and aggressive (Eagly & Steffen,

1986). In contrast, the traditional female gender role does not encourage aggressiveness and it emphasizes avoiding physical harm that might happen. Therefore, women tend not to engage in physical aggression because it may result in physical retaliation. In addition, women have less power and occupy lower societal status than men and have fewer resources to control (Eagly & Wood, 1999), whereas men tend to occupy more managerial roles in business and industry that include the element of aggressiveness (Eagly & Steffen, 1986).

Based on the two theories and previous findings, a parallel assumption of men being more aggressive in general can be applied to gender difference in workplace aggression, which has also been supported by some empirical studies (e.g., Baron et al., 1999; Dupre & Barling, 2006; Haines et al., 2006; McFarlin et al., 2001).

Hypothesis 1: Men will engage in more workplace aggression in total than women.

Physical/ Verbal Workplace Aggression

Neuman and Baron (1998) argued that verbal aggression is less dramatic than physical aggression, and verbal aggression would predominate in the workplace because it brings a larger effect/danger ratio than does physical aggression (Bjorkqvist, Osterman, & Lagerspetz, 1994). Their results supported this idea by finding that verbal aggression was used more frequently than physical aggression in the workplace. Therefore, in the current study, verbal aggression is also predicted to be more likely utilized in general.

Empirical studies have reported that males engaged in more physical aggression than females with consistent results across different age stages. For example, using children and adolescent samples, Bailey and Ostrov (2008), Kim, Kamphaus, Orpinas,

and Kelder (2010), Peets and Kikas (2006), Skara et al. (2008), Toldos (2005), Verona, Sadeh, Case, Reed II, and Bhattacharjee (2008), and Zimmer-Gembeck et al. (2005) have all found that boys were reported or self-reported to engage in more physical aggression than girls. Several other studies (e.g., Basow et al., 2007; Burton et al., 2007; Campbell & Muncer, 2009; Reinisch & Sanders, 1986; Verona et al., 2008) collected data from adult college students and found the same pattern. Morales-Vives and Vigil-Colet (2010) and Schreiner (2001) extended the results to relatively older samples (aged from 65 to 96 in Morales-Vives & Vigil-Colet, 2010), and both studies have found that men engaged in higher levels of physical aggression than women. Although a few studies (e.g., Hines & Saudino, 2003) reported no gender difference in physical aggression, it is reasonable to assume that the pattern will also be consistent in workplace; that is, men will engage in more physical workplace aggression than women.

Previous studies regarding gender differences in verbal aggression have not reached a conclusion that is as strong as with physical aggression. Consistent with the general idea that males are more aggressive than females, most researchers have found that men also engage in more verbal aggression than women (e.g., Campbell & Muncer, 2009; Kim et al., 2010; Peets & Kikas, 2006; Toldos, 2005; Verona et al., 2008), while fewer researchers found that females are more likely to engage in verbal aggression than males. Meanwhile, Reinisch and Sanders (1986) and Schreiner (2001) reported no gender difference in verbal aggression. To extend the results to the workplace, based on the previous findings, the current study argues that men will be engaging in more verbal workplace aggression than women.

As mentioned in previous sections, it has been believed that men tend to engage in more aggressive behaviors that will cause physical harm to targets (Archer, 2004). Previous literature has supported this notion. For example, Eagly and Steffen (1986) found that adult men engaged in and also received more aggression than women, and the difference was even larger when the aggression would cause physical harm to the targets than when psychological or social harm might be caused. Archer (2004) also compared gender differences in both physical and verbal aggression with most of the studies included in the analysis focusing on samples in the age range of 15 to 40. Similar results were found: gender difference in physical aggression was bigger than in verbal aggression. Further, K. J. Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist, and Peltonen (1998) also found that gender difference in verbal aggression was less than gender difference in physical aggression. Therefore, gender difference in physical workplace aggression is predicted to be bigger than it is in verbal workplace aggression in the current study.

Hypothesis 2a: Verbal workplace aggression will be more frequently used than physical workplace aggression.

Hypothesis 2b: Men will engage in more physical and verbal workplace aggression than women. Gender difference will be larger in physical workplace aggression than in verbal workplace aggression.

Direct/ Indirect Workplace Aggression

Past research about aggression has mostly focused on direct aggression and physical aggression in particular (Card et al., 2008). However, direct aggression also includes verbal aggression that is performed when people are confronting each other.

Hence, in the current study, direct workplace aggression takes both physical and verbal forms.

On the other hand, there have been varied terms to describe indirect aggression. Firstly introduced by Feshbach (1969), indirect aggression was used to describe behaviors that harm another person by rejection or exclusion. Extended by K. M. J. Lagerspetz, Björkqvist, and Peltonen (1988), indirect aggression refers to a broader range of both physical and verbal behaviors such as gossiping, or making friends with somebody else to enact revenge. Relational aggression (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995) has been studied as a relatively new type of indirect aggression (Card et al., 2008) to refer to behaviors harming others by purposefully manipulating or damaging peer relationships. However, among the four original items developed by Crick and Grotpeter (1995) to measure relational aggression, one item “Tells friends they will stop liking them unless friends do what they say” is of direct aggression scope. Therefore, in the current study relational aggression will not be used as the same concept as indirect aggression and will be discussed separately later. To summarize, indirect aggression will also include physical and verbal forms.

Baron and Neuman (1998) proposed that to maximize effect/danger ratio, indirect aggression is more likely to be used than direct aggression because the source will be harder to identify. Their results supported this proposition by finding that indirect aggression was more frequently used than direct aggression. Similar results were also reported by Forbes, Zhang, Doroszewicz, and Haas (2009) that both men and women reported to use more indirect aggression than direct aggression. Therefore, in the current

study, indirect workplace aggression is expected to be more frequently used by both genders than direct workplace aggression.

Bjorkqvist (1994) argued that women should not be assumed to be less hostile than men. Instead, due to the fact that females are physically weaker, they tend to develop other strategies to achieve their goals, and indirect aggression tended to be more utilized by women (K. M. J. Lagerspetz et al., 1988). This notion has been supported by some empirical studies and meta-analyses across different age ranges (Archer, 2004; Card et al., 2008; K. M. J. Lagerspetz et al., 1988). For example, Bjorkqvist, Lagerspetz, and Kaukiainen (1992) found that girls used greater indirect aggression while boys tended to use more direct aggression, and he concluded that at least during adolescence, gender differences in direct and indirect aggression is a definite phenomenon. His argument was supported by several following empirical studies reporting men engaging in more direct aggression and women engaging in more indirect aggression (e.g., Green, Richardson, & Lago, 1996; Hess & Hagen, 2006; Toldos, 2005). In addition, Campbell and Muncer (2008) used a college student sample and found that men scored significantly higher than women on direct aggression even in a hypothetical scenario. Moreover, Richardson and Green (1999) found that although males and females did not differ in the frequency of use of indirect aggression, females reported more usage of indirect than direct aggression.

In contrast, some studies found no gender differences in engaging in direct and indirect aggression. For example, Forbes et al. (2009) found that both Chinese and U.S. college students reported no gender differences in indirect and direct aggression. Forrest, Forrest, Eatough, and Shevlin (2005) also reported that no gender difference was found in indirect aggression or in being victims of indirect aggression in adulthood. Richardson

and Green (1999) found men reported almost the same level of indirect and direct aggression as women did. Additionally, Peets and Kikas (2006) found that boys are more both directly and indirectly aggressive than girls.

Two relevant meta-analyses were conducted regarding gender difference of indirect and direct aggression. Archer (2004) meta-analyzed 78 studies and found that direct aggression was more frequent in males, and females tended to engage more in certain forms of indirect aggression than males (e.g., self-reports, peer reports, and peer rating), but no gender difference was found in other types of indirect aggression (e.g., teacher report). Card et al. (2008) conducted another meta-analytic review of 148 studies in direct and indirect aggression among children and adolescents. Their results were generally consistent with Archer (2004): boys were found to engage in more direct aggression than girls; girls tended to engage in statistically more indirect aggression than boys, but gender differences varied depending on types of reporters.

Although no definite conclusion can be drawn from existing literature, conceptual expectation argues that females enact more indirect aggression than males (Bjorkqvist, 1994; Card et al., 2008). Therefore, in the current study, the same expectation is predicted in terms of gender difference in direct and indirect workplace aggression.

Hypothesis 3a: Indirect workplace aggression will be more frequently used than direct workplace aggression.

Hypothesis 3b: Men will engage in more direct workplace aggression than women; women will engage in more indirect workplace aggression than men.

Active/ Passive Workplace Aggression

The major difference between active aggression and passive aggression is whether the perpetrator is intentionally performing certain behaviors (e.g., insulting) or intentionally withholding certain behaviors (e.g., not telling someone necessary information). Since passive aggression is more efficient in terms of maximizing the effect/danger ratio (Bjorkqvist et al., 1994) and less likely to be noticed (Baron & Neuman, 1998) than active aggression which always involves direct contact, it is reasonable to believe that passive aggression is utilized more than active aggression in the workplace. Empirical research supported this notion by finding that both genders reported using passive aggression more frequently than active aggression in the workplace. Therefore, in the current study, passive aggression is expected to be used more frequently than active aggression in workplace.

Hypothesis 4: Passive workplace aggression will be more frequently used than active workplace aggression.

There has been limited literature focusing on gender difference in terms of active and passive aggression. Therefore, no specific prediction is proposed in the current study.

Research Question 1: Are there gender differences in engaging in active workplace aggression and passive workplace aggression?

Relational Workplace Aggression

Most of the previous studies on relational aggression focused on gender differences among children and adolescents (e.g., Bailey & Ostrov, 2008; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Henington et al., 1996; Skara et al., 2008; Zimmer-Gembeck et al., 2005). However, researchers have noticed that adults can also engage in relational

aggression and a few recent studies have been conducted using adult college student sample (e.g., Basow et al., 2007; Burton et al., 2007; Lento-Zwolinski, 2007). Yet, I could find no study conducted in a workplace setting on relational aggression.

Empirical results of gender difference in relational aggression were not consistent. Since the first study of relational aggression (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995), most researchers have found that girls engaged in more relational aggression than boys in middle childhood (see a complete review in Murray-Close, Ostrov, Nelson, Crick, & Coccaro, 2010). However, a few other studies have found no gender difference in relational aggression (e.g., Bailey & Ostrov, 2008; Basow et al., 2007; Burton et al., 2007; Murray-Close et al., 2010; Skara et al., 2008; Zimmer-Gembeck et al., 2005) or that males engaged in more relational aggression than females (Lento-Zwolinski, 2007). Since relational workplace aggression has never been studied, no specific prediction will be made regarding gender difference in relational workplace aggression. Instead, a general research question is proposed.

Research Question 2: Is there gender difference in engaging in workplace relational aggression?

Further, it was argued that one possible reason why research on workplace relational aggression is rare might be a lack of reliable and valid measures of relational aggression in the workplace (Murray-Close et al., 2010). Murray-Close et al. (2010) developed the first relational aggression measure for adults, but a more specific scale suitable for organizational research is necessary and valuable. Therefore, in the current study, a workplace relational aggression scale will be developed based on Murray-Close

et al.'s (2010) adult relational aggression measure and the original relational aggression scale from Crick and Grotpeter (1995).

Interpersonal/ Organizational Workplace Aggression

Robinson and Bennett (1995) proposed that deviant behaviors varied in two dimensions: deviant behaviors harming individuals/ deviant behaviors harming the organization, and minor/ serious. Neuman and Baron (1998) also suggested that workplace aggression be divided as interpersonal and organizational. Since then, research on both workplace aggression (Hershcovis et al., 2007) and counterproductive work behavior (e.g., Dalal, 2005; Miles, Borman, Spector, & Fox, 2002) have looked at interpersonal workplace aggression/ CWB against individuals (CWB-I) and organizational workplace aggression/CWB against organizations (CWB-O) separately.

In their meta-analysis, Hershcovis et al. (2007) found that sex was a significant predictor of both interpersonal and organizational aggression, with women engaging in less of both interpersonal and organizational workplace aggression. As previously proposed, men will engage in more workplace aggression in general. Thus, it is also possible that men will be more likely to engage in both interpersonal and organizational workplace aggression. However, since interpersonal aggression is more likely to be direct and noticeable while organizational aggression is more likely to be indirect and less noticeable, it is predicted that gender difference in organizational aggression is smaller than in interpersonal aggression.

Hypothesis 5a: Men will engage in more interpersonal and organizational workplace aggression.

Hypothesis 5b: Gender difference will be larger in interpersonal aggression than in organizational aggression.

Gender Differences in Reporting

Gender differences may not only exist in engaging in different levels of aggression, but also in reporting engagement in aggressive behaviors. For example, men tend to see aggression as part of their gender role and manhood (Weaver, Vandello, Bosson, & Burnaford, 2010), and overestimate peers' approval of aggression and how attractive aggression is to women (Vandello, Ransom, Hettinger, & Askew, 2009). Therefore, men seem to be more motivated to admit engaging in aggressive behaviors, or even exaggerate it by over-reporting. On the other hand, women might view aggressive behaviors less acceptable and under-report their engagement.

Another factor that may influence people's reporting of engagement in aggression is social desirability because people of higher social desirability may be more likely to deny engaging in socially undesirable behaviors (Wang & Wong, 2011), such as aggression. Since women have significantly higher social desirability score than men (Wang & Wong, 2011), it is possible that women are more likely than men to under-report their engagement in workplace aggression.

To address this issue, in the present study, both self-report and supervisor-report of workplace aggression were collected. By comparing two reports, it is predicted that women will under-report their engagement in workplace aggression.

Hypothesis 6: Compared to supervisor-report, women will under-report their engagement in workplace aggression.

Although men tend to see aggression as more acceptable, aggression is generally undesirable in the workplace. Due to the conflicting assumptions, no specific prediction will be made regarding men's self-report against supervisor-report. Instead, a research question is proposed.

Research Question 3: Is there a difference between self-report and supervisor-report of engagement in workplace aggression for men?

In the end, it is also interesting to see whether the gender of supervisors will play a role in reporting the aggression of others.

Research Question 4: Do male and female supervisors differ in reporting their subordinates' engagement in workplace aggression?

The Current Study

To sum up, the purpose of the current study is to explore whether there are gender differences in engaging in workplace aggression in general and in different subtypes of workplace aggression (physical/ verbal, direct/ indirect, active/ passive, relational, and interpersonal/ organizational). By collecting data from both incumbents and supervisors, the current study will also address whether men and women differ in reporting their engagement in workplace aggression compared to their supervisors' ratings.

Chapter 2: Method

Data collection of the current study involved three steps. In Step 1, the researcher reviewed previous literature in both human aggression and workplace aggression to select appropriate aggressive behaviors that could happen in workplace settings. In Step 2, six subject matter experts (SMEs) were asked to categorize each of the workplace aggressive behaviors into all the subtypes of workplace aggression that it could fit in, and the scale was finalized based on SMEs' feedback. In Step 3, data were collected from employees and supervisors using the final scale from Step 2. Details in each step are described as follows.

Step 1

Participants and Procedure

The researcher reviewed 170 items from previous workplace aggression and human aggression literature covering all subtypes of workplace aggression mentioned in the preceding sections except for relational aggression (Berry, Carpenter, & Barratt, 2012; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Fox, Spector, Goh, & Bruursema, 2007; Fox, Spector, & Miles, 2001; Greenberg & Barling, 1999; LeBlance & Kelloway, 2002; Neuman & Baron, 1998; Snyder et al., 2005), and 43 items were selected and edited to describe aggressive behaviors that might happen in workplace settings. Six more items were adapted from previous literature to measure relational workplace aggression.

Step 2

Participants and Procedure

Since most of the items could be categorized into multiple subtypes of workplace aggression, six doctoral students in Industrial and Organization Psychology were asked to serve as SEMs to categorize each of the 43 items into all possible subtypes from the following four dimensions: physical/verbal, direct/indirect, active/passive, and interpersonal/organization. Since relational aggression items were time to be used for the first time in a workplace setting, they were not categorized into any of the four dimensions. A few wordings were changed based on SMEs' suggestions. Based on SMEs' responses, the numbers of items of all 8 subtypes were distributed as follows: physical workplace aggression (25), verbal workplace aggression (18), direct workplace aggression (25), indirect workplace aggression (18), active workplace aggression (27), passive workplace aggression (16), interpersonal workplace aggression (38), organizational workplace aggression (11), and relational workplace aggression (6). Please see Appendix A for the items. Table 2 presents the categories each of the item belongs to. The psychometric properties of the scale are reported in the results section.

Step 3

Participants

The sample of step 3 of the current study consisted of 366 employed students who worked at least 20 hours per week, and 83 supervisors, resulting in 83 employee-supervisor pairs and 284 employees without supervisor responses. Supervisors' response rate was 23%. Employed students were recruited from an undergraduate participant pool and various lectures in a southeastern public university in the U.S. Those recruited from the undergraduate participant pool were compensated with extra credit for their participation. Seventy-four percent of the sampled employees were female. The mean

age of the employees was 21.8 years ($SD = 4.4$), and the average number of their working hours per week was 26.2 ($SD = 7.2$). The average tenure of employees was 2.2 years ($SD = 2.7$). The ethnicity distribution of employees was as follows: Asian (8.5%), Black (19.9%), Hispanic (15.6%), White (51.4%) and other (3%). The self-reported job titles of participants were mainly servers (15.3%), customer service (14.5%), assistants (12.9%), cashier (1.0%) and sales (10.1%). Table 3 includes detailed demographic information for each gender and for the total sample. Fifty-seven percent of responding supervisors were female, and the mean age of supervisors was 37.8 years ($SD = 12.7$). Table 4 presents the matching of genders between employees and supervisors.

Measures

Workplace Aggression Scale.

The items resulting from step 1 and step 2 were used to collect data from both employees and supervisors. The wordings were changed when the items were presented to supervisors in the way that supervisors were asked to rate the behaviors of the subordinate that brought the survey to him or her.

Employees were asked to describe how often they had engaged in each of the 49 aggressive behaviors at work. Response options range from 1 (never), 2 (once or twice), 3 (once or twice per month), 4 (once or twice per week), to 5 (everyday), and the average score of all the items of each subtype were used as a score of that subtype.

Participants' immediate supervisors were asked to describe how often this particular subordinate has engaged in each of the behaviors at their present jobs. Response options also ranged from 1 (never), 2 (once or twice), 3 (once or twice per

month), 4 (once or twice per week), to 5 (everyday), and scores were also be calculated as described above.

Demographics. Gender (male = 0, female = 1), age (in years), tenure (in years), ethnicity (Asian, Black, Hispanic, White and other), and job titles (self-description) were collected.

Procedure

Participants from the undergraduate participant pool meeting the requirements were asked to come to a research lab and finish a survey consisting of all the scales. A supervisor survey was brought back to their supervisors with pre-stamped envelopes.

The researcher also went to lectures to collect data with lecture instructors' permission. Self-report surveys were handed out to students meeting the requirements and collected after participants finished them or after class. Participants needing more time were given pre-stamped envelopes and they mailed the self-report surveys back. Participants were also given a copy of supervisor survey which was brought back to their supervisors with pre-stamped envelopes.

In both methods, every participant had to create a secret code consisting of 3 random letters and 3 random numbers and write the code on both self-report survey and supervisor survey. Self-report responses and supervisor ratings were matched by the secret codes. It took around 20 and 15 minutes to finish the self-report survey and supervisor survey, respectively.

Chapter 3: Results

Descriptive

Table 5 shows the descriptive information of all employee data on the variables of interest, including mean, standard deviation, possible score range, actual score range as well as Cronbach's alpha. Table 6 further compares the information between employees with supervisor responses (matched) and without supervisor responses (unmatched). It showed that there were significant difference on the mean gender (percentage of female participants), number of working hours per week, age and tenure between the two groups. However, no difference was found on the nine subtypes of workplace aggression that further analysis focused on.

Table 7 shows that descriptive information of matched employees and supervisors, including mean, standard deviation, possible score range, actual score range, as well as Cronbach's alphas.

Hypothesis Testing

To test Hypothesis 1 through 5 (a & b) and Research Question 1 and 2, only employee data ($N= 366$) were used for analysis. To test Hypothesis 6 and Research Question 3 and 4, employee-supervisor matched data ($N=83$) were used for analysis.

The following analyses were conducted with employee data. First, zero-order correlations were computed and presented in Table 8 among gender, nine subtypes of workplace aggression, and total workplace aggression. Second, dependent sample t-tests were conducted to compare the prevalence of subtypes of workplace aggression on the

following dimensions: physical vs. verbal, direct vs. indirect, active vs. passive, and interpersonal vs. organizational. Results are presented in Table 9. Third, the "Hotelling-Williams test" recommended by Bobko (1995) was conducted to compare the dependent correlations of gender with different subtypes of workplace aggression on the same dimension (e.g., gender-physical vs. gender-verbal). Results are presented in Table 10.

Hypothesis 1 proposed that men would engage in more workplace aggression in total than women. The correlation between gender and total workplace aggression was in the predicted direction, but the correlation was not significant ($r = -.09, n.s.$). Thus, Hypothesis 1 was not supported.

Hypothesis 2a proposed that verbal workplace aggression would be used more frequently than physical workplace aggression. As shown in Table 9, the mean score of verbal workplace aggression (1.31) was significantly higher than the mean of physical workplace aggression (1.23), $p < .01$. Thus, Hypothesis 2a was supported.

In Hypothesis 2b, it was proposed that men would engage in more physical and verbal workplace aggression than women, and that gender difference would be larger in physical workplace aggression than in verbal workplace aggression. As shown in Table 8, the relationships of gender with physical and verbal workplace aggression were both in the predicted direction but were not significant (physical: $r = -.09, n.s.$; verbal: $r = -.10, n.s.$). Further, Hotelling-Williams test results (Table 10) indicated that the correlations of gender with physical (-.09) and verbal workplace aggression (-.10) were not significantly different from each other. Thus, Hypothesis 2b was not supported.

Hypothesis 3a proposed that indirect workplace aggression would be more frequently used than direct workplace aggression. Although there was significant mean

score difference between direct (1.31) and indirect (1.21) workplace aggression, the direction was opposite to the prediction. Results showed that direct workplace aggression was used more often than indirect workplace aggression, $p < .01$. Thus, Hypothesis 3a was not supported.

The correlations of gender with both direct and indirect workplace aggression were negative (direct: $r = -.11$, $p < .05$; indirect: $r = -.05$, *n.s.*). However, only the relationship of gender with direct workplace aggression was significant. Therefore, Hypothesis 3b was only partially supported.

Hypothesis 4 was fully supported by the significant higher mean score of passive workplace aggression (1.34) than the mean score of active workplace aggression (1.22), $p < .01$ (Table 9).

It was proposed that men would engage in more interpersonal and organizational workplace aggression than women (5a) and that gender difference would be larger in interpersonal workplace aggression than in organizational workplace aggression (5b). Correlational results were in the predicted direction for both interpersonal ($r = -.08$, *n.s.*) and organizational ($r = -.10$, *n.s.*) workplace aggression, but the differences were not significant, failing to support Hypothesis 5a. Comparison of the two correlations showed that the two correlations were not significantly different from each other either ($t = .49$, *n.s.*). Thus, Hypothesis 5b was not supported.

To answer Research Question 1 and 2, correlations of gender with active, passive and relational aggression were computed. Results that gender was negatively related to all three subtypes of workplace aggression ($r = -.09$, $-.08$, and $-.09$, respective), but all

three correlations were not significant, indicating that the results failed to find significant gender difference in engaging in these three subtypes of workplace aggression.

The following analyses results were conducted with the data from the 83 matched supervisor-employee pairs. Hypothesis 6, as well as Research Question 3 and 4 were examined based on these results.

To examine Hypothesis 6, the mean scores of supervisor reports and self-reports on female employees' engagement in eight subtypes of workplace aggression and workplace aggression in total (Table 11). Relational workplace aggression was excluded because employees' engagement in relational workplace aggression was not collected from supervisors. As shown in Table 11, mean scores of supervisors' reports of female employees' engagement in all eight subtypes of workplace aggression were significantly lower than the mean scores of female employees' self-report in these eight subtypes of workplace aggression, thus failing to support Hypothesis 6.

Table 12 presents comparisons of mean scores of supervisors' reports of male employees' engagement in all eight subtypes of workplace aggression with employees' self-reports. Only supervisor reports of passive workplace aggression was significantly lower than employees' self-reports. There were no significant differences on the other seven subtypes of workplace aggression and workplace aggression in total.

To address Research Question 4, mean scores of female and male supervisors' reports on their subordinates' engagement in nine subtypes of workplace aggression and workplace aggression in total were compared. Table 13 shows that mean scores of male supervisors' reports on their subordinates' engagement in verbal, direct, active, and interpersonal workplace aggression, as well as in workplace aggression in total were

significantly higher than mean scores of female supervisors' reports on their subordinates' engagement in these workplace aggression subtypes.

Additional Analysis

An additional correlational analysis was conducted to examine the relationship of gender with both self-reports and supervisor reports on employees' workplace aggression using the matched data. As shown in Table 14, employee gender was only significantly related to supervisor reports of active workplace aggression ($r = -.22, p < .01$), indicating supervisors tended to report more active workplace aggression of male employees. The significant gender- direct workplace aggression relationship in employee data was not significant in this analysis.

Chapter 4: Discussion

The current study aimed to categorize workplace aggression into nine subtypes and to examine gender differences in engaging in these subtypes of workplace aggression, as well as in total workplace aggression. Data collected using employees' self-reports showed that although men scored higher on workplace aggression, significant gender differences were found only in direct workplace aggression. Further, results showed that verbal, direct, and passive workplace aggression was more frequently used than physical, indirect and active workplace aggression, respectively; no difference was found between the prevalence of interpersonal and organizational workplace aggression. The relationships of gender with physical, direct, active, and interpersonal workplace aggression was not significantly different from the relationships of gender with verbal, indirect, passive, and organizational workplace aggression on the magnitude, respectively. Data from employee-supervisor pairs showed that compared to supervisors' reports, female employees' self-reports tended to be higher in all eight subtypes of workplace aggression, while male employees' self-reports were higher in passive workplace aggression than their supervisors' reports. Further, male supervisors were found to report more subordinates' verbal, direct, active, and interpersonal workplace aggression. Lastly, male employees were reported by their immediate supervisors to engage in more active workplace aggression.

Compared to human aggression that has been categorized into multiple subtypes (e.g., Archer, 2004), workplace aggression has been examined either as an overall or as a

two-dimensional construct (e.g., Hershcovis et al., 2007). This to certain extent limits our understanding on the differential relationships of different subtypes of workplace aggression with their antecedents and consequences, as well as gender differences in engaging in each subtype of workplace aggression. Thus, the first contribution of the current study was to integrate past human aggression and workplace aggression literature by selecting and editing aggressive behavior items that fit in workplace settings and then categorizing them into nine subtypes on which gender differences were explored. Subject matter experts' efforts and feedback in the process helped to ensure that every item was properly categorized into the right subtype(s). This categorization of workplace aggression served as the first step to broaden our understanding on different subtypes of workplace aggression.

Based on the theoretical background and previous literature in both human aggression (Eagly & Steffen, 1986) and workplace aggression (Hershcovis et al., 2007), it was first proposed that men would engage in more workplace aggression than women in general. Although results showed that men tended to report more workplace aggression than women, the difference was not significant. This finding is not consistent with most of previous results (Baron et al., 1999; Dupre & Barling, 2006; Haines et al., 2006; McFarlin et al., 2001), but is also not uncommon (Douglas & Martinko, 2001; Innes et al., 2005). This finding on the other hand further suggests that gender differences in workplace aggression might not be as simple as we thought, and more empirical studies are needed to explore whether men and women engage in the same amount of workplace aggression at work or if some potential situational or individual variables might moderate the relationships.

Consistent with Neuman and Baron (1998), it was found in the current study that verbal workplace aggression was more frequently used than physical workplace aggression. As suggested by Neuman and Baron (1998), verbal aggression has a larger effect/danger ratio than physical aggression and aggressive acts in workplace settings are more likely to be in verbal form instead of physical form. The significantly higher prevalence of verbal workplace aggression than physical workplace aggression further supported this notion.

Although physical workplace aggression might not be popular at work (Neuman & Baron, 1998), it still happens from time to time. The majority of the past literature has reported that men tend to engage in more physical aggression than women across different age stages (Bailey & Ostrov, 2008; Kim et al., 2010; Peets & Kikas, 2006; Skara et al., 2008; Toldos, 2005; Verona et al., 2008; Zimmer-Gembeck et al., 2005). However, evidence on gender difference in physical workplace aggression was scarce. In the current study, it was found that the difference was not significant. One reason for the non-significant difference might be the low frequency of physical workplace aggression. Although no significant difference was found, the current study was among a few studies to explore gender difference in engaging in physical workplace aggression, and future research could build on this by providing more empirical evidence to conclude whether men are more physically aggressive than women in workplace as they do in human aggression in general.

Literature on gender differences in verbal aggression has reported inconsistent results. Consistent with Reinisch and Sanders (1986) and Schreiner (2001), it was found that there was no significant gender difference in engaging in verbal workplace

aggression, which was against the significant gender differences reported by Campbell and Muncer (2009), Kim et al. (2010), Peets and Kikas (2006), Toldos (2005) and Verona et al. (2008). It might be possible that in workplace settings verbal aggression towards someone at work is less common than in non-work settings, thus gender difference in verbal workplace aggression won't be as prominent as in human aggression in general.

Contradictory to the prediction, direct workplace aggression was found to be more frequently used than indirect workplace aggression, which is against the effect/danger ratio principle (Bjorkqvist et al., 1994; Neuman & Baron, 1998). Since interactions in the workplace are mainly related to work, it is possible that the effect that perpetrators want to achieve might be easier to be achieved through direct confrontation, such as yelling at someone for not speeding up on a deadline, instead of through indirect media which might take longer to have effects.

The significant gender difference in direct workplace aggression is consistent with the general findings that males tend to engage in more direct workplace aggression (e.g., Card et al., 2008), while the non-significant gender difference in indirect workplace aggression is consistent with the conclusion in Archer (2004) that there was no gender difference in indirect aggression for adults, although against the prediction in the current thesis. Although Bjorkqvist (1994) argued that females are more likely to utilize indirect aggression because they are physically weaker, Archer (2004) suggested that when in workplace settings men also tend to use more indirect means to reduce potential cost of their acts. Thus, the non-significant gender difference in indirect workplace aggression is not implausible.

The significant higher prevalence of passive workplace aggression than of active workplace aggression is consistent with Baron and Neuman (1996) and Neuman and Baron's (1998) proposition that the majority of workplace aggression is passive rather than active. Further, for the first time the current study explored gender differences in engaging in active and passive workplace aggression, finding the differences were not significant. Thus, it seems that men and women are similarly likely to use more passive workplace aggression than active workplace aggression, and don't differ in the magnitude in each subtype.

For the first time gender differences in relational workplace aggression was examined. Although most studies have reported that girls engaged in more relational aggression than boys (Murray-Close et al., 2010), the current study failed to find significant gender difference with employed adults. Several possible reasons might contribute to this finding. First, it is possible that with girls growing up, they tend to engage less and less relational aggression. Second, it is also plausible that relational aggression is more likely to happen in personal relationships outside of the workplace. In workplace settings, it is less likely for women to aggressively target relationships to achieve certain goals. Third, on the other hand, it is also possible that men have learned to use more relational workplace aggression to damage other's relationships to gain more benefits at work. Due to the lack of empirical evidence on gender differences in relational workplace aggression, more studies are needed to better understand the phenomenon.

Failing to support the predictions, it was found that there was no significant gender difference in either interpersonal or organizational workplace aggression, and there was no significant difference between gender's relationships with interpersonal and

organizational workplace aggression. This finding is a bit unexpected since Hershcovis et al. (2007) reported significant relationships between gender and both interpersonal and organizational workplace aggression across various studies.

Self-reports of counterproductive work behavior/ workplace aggression has been criticized and reports from others (e.g., supervisors) has been suggested (Berry et al., 2012; Fox et al., 2007). Thus, to better understand how men and women differ in reporting their own behaviors compared with their supervisors' reports, both male and female participants' reports on eight subtypes of workplace aggression (except for relational workplace aggression) were compared with their immediate supervisors' reports. It was found that female participants' self-reports on all eight subtypes of workplace aggression were significantly higher than their immediate supervisors' reports. In contrast, male participants' self-reports were significantly higher than their immediate supervisors' reports only on passive workplace aggression, but not in the other seven subtypes. These finds are partially in line with Berry et al.'s (2012) finding that self-reports of CWB was higher than other-reports of CWB. It is highly possible in the current study that immediate supervisors' reports are not as accurate as expected. Since immediate supervisors couldn't observe all the behaviors of their subordinates (Berry et al., 2012), especially the negative behaviors, it is not surprising that self-reports of aggression were higher than supervisors' reports. In addition, the less significant difference between male participants' reports compared to their supervisors' report might be due to the relatively small sample size, or the possibility that men tend not hide their behaviors to demonstrate their manhood (Weaver et al., 2010).

Results also showed that gender of the immediate supervisors plays a more significant role in reporting their subordinates' engagement in verbal, direct, active and interpersonal workplace aggression with male supervisors reporting higher scores than female supervisors. Several potential reasons might explain this finding. First, it is possible that male supervisors tend to pay more attention to their subordinates' behaviors than female supervisors and thus observe more aggressive behaviors of their subordinates. Second, it is likely that male supervisors are more likely to be the targets of supervisor-targeting workplace aggression, thus reporting more observed workplace aggression than female supervisors. Third, it might be possible that men tend to assume others are engaging in more aggressive behaviors, while on the other hand women tend to assume others are engaging in less aggressive behaviors. Thus, supervisors' reports are likely to be distorted.

Male employees were reported by their immediate supervisors to engage in more active workplace aggression, while no gender differences were found in other seven subtypes. It is possible that male employees' engagement in active workplace aggression are more observable to their supervisors, or that supervisors tend to assume that their male subordinates are more likely to engage in these active behaviors. Given the small sample size and the fact that no gender difference was found with self-reported data on active workplace aggression, this finding should be interpreted with caution.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

The current study bears several limitations that can be addressed in future research. First, due to the small number of paired samples, most of the hypotheses were examined based on self-reports of workplace aggression, which might cause reporting

bias such as under-reporting. However, as shown with the paired samples, it is supervisors' reports that were lower instead of employees' self-reports. Berry et al. (2012) also concluded that others' (supervisors or coworkers) reports are underreported. Thus, having more data with supervisors' reports may influence the significance of some analyses, but it is not certain.

Second, the current study only examined gender difference in engaging in different subtypes of workplace aggression, but didn't examine whether gender differences exist in being the target of different subtypes of workplace aggression, and whether the combination of perpetrators' gender with victims' gender influence the frequencies of workplace aggression between them. Future research can address this issue by recording dynamic interactions among a group of coworkers using diary study.

Third, the current study used employed students who were mainly in the early stage of their career in customer service and retail industries. It is possible that they have more interactions with customers and less interactions with coworkers and supervisors, thus engage in less aggressive behaviors towards other people at work. Thus, if a different sample were used, the results might be different. Further, it might be informative to examine gender difference in different workplace aggression subtypes toward different targets such as supervisors, coworkers, and customers.

Conclusions

The current study for the first time categorized workplace aggression into specific subtypes, and then explored gender differences in these specific subtypes. The prevalence of subtypes of workplace aggression was also compared on the following four dimensions: physical/ verbal, direct/ indirect, active/ passive, and interpersonal/

organization. Furthermore, among the first few attempts, gender difference on relational workplace aggression was addressed in workplace settings. The present study found that verbal, direct, and passive workplace aggression was more frequently used than physical, indirect, and active workplace aggression, respective, and that men reported to engage in more direct workplace aggression than women. Further, supervisors tended to under-report female subordinates' engagement in workplace aggression more than they did to male subordinates. Finally, male supervisors tended to report more subordinates' workplace aggression than did female supervisors. To sum up, although some subtypes of workplace aggression were more frequently used than others, men and women tend to not differ much in engagement in most subtypes of workplace aggression in both self-reports and supervisor reports.

References

- Anderson, C. A., & Bushman, B. J. (2002). Correlates of aggressive and delinquent conduct problems in adolescence. *Aggressive Behavior, 31*, 24-39.
- Archer, J. (2004). Sex differences in aggression in real-world settings: A meta-analytic review. *Review of General Psychology, 8*(4), 291-322. doi:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.8.4.291>
- Bailey, C., & Ostrov, J. M. (2008). Differentiating forms and functions of aggression in emerging adults: Associations with hostile attribution biases and normative beliefs. *Journal of Youth Adolescence, 37*, 713-722.
- Barling, J., Dupre, K. E., & Kelloway, E. K. (2009). Predicting workplace aggression and violence. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*, 671-692.
- Baron, R. A., & Neuman, J. H. (1996). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Aggressive Behavior, 22*(3), 161-173.
- Baron, R. A., & Neuman, J. H. (1998). Workplace aggression-The iceberg beneath the tip of workplace violence: Evidence on its forms, frequency, and targets. *Public Administration Quarterly, 44*6-464.
- Baron, R. A., Neuman, J. H., & Geddes, D. (1999). Social and personal determinants of workplace aggression: Evidence for the impact of perceived injustice and the type A behavior pattern. *Aggressive Behavior, 25*, 281-296.

- Basow, S. A., Cahill, K. F., Phelan, J. E., Longshore, K., & McGillicuddy-Delisi, A. (2007). Perceptions of relational and physical aggression among college students: Effects of gender of perpetrator, target, and perceiver. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31*, 85-95.
- Berry, C. M., Carpenter, N. C., & Barratt, C. L. (2012). Do other-reports of counterproductive work behavior provide an incremental contribution over self-reports? A meta-analytic comparison. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(3), 613-636. doi: 10.1037/a0026739
- Bettencourt, B., Talley, A., Benjamin, A. J., & Valentine, J. (2006). Personality and aggressive behavior under provoking and neutral conditions: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 132*, 751-777.
- Bjorkqvist, K. (1994). Sex differences in physical, verbal and indirect aggression: A review of recent research. *Sex Roles, 30*, 177.
- Bjorkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K. M. J., & Kaukiainen, A. (1992). Do girls manipulate and boys fight? Developmental trends in regard to direct and indirect aggression. *Aggressive Behavior, 18*, 117-127.
- Bjorkqvist, K., Osterman, K., & Lagerspetz, K. M. J. (1994). Sex differences in covert aggression among adults. *Aggressive Behavior, 20*, 27-33.
- Burton, L. A., Hafetz, J., & Henninger, D. (2007). Gender differences in relational and physical aggression. *Social Behavior and Personality, 35*(1), 41-50.
- Buss, A. H. (1961). *The psychology of aggression*. New York: Wiley.
- Campbell, A. (1999). Staying alive: Evolution, culture and women's intra-sexual aggression. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 22*, 203-252.

- Campbell, A., & Muncer, S. (2008). Intent to harm or injure? Gender and the expression of anger. *Aggressive Behavior, 34*, 282-293.
- Campbell, A., & Muncer, S. (2009). Can 'risky' impulsivity explain sex differences in aggression? *Personality and Individual Differences, 47*, 402-406.
- Card, N. A., Stucky, B. D., Sawalani, G. M., & Little, T. D. (2008). Direct and indirect aggression during childhood and adolescence: A meta-analytic review of gender differences, intercorrelations, and relations to maladjustment. *Child Development, 79*(5), 1185-1229. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2008.01184.x>
- Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development, 66*, 710-722.
- Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analytic of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 1241-1255.
- Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1988). *Homicide*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- 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.
- Dubois, P. (1979). *Sabotage in industry*. New York: Penguin.
- Dupre, K. E., & Barling, J. (2006). Predicting and preventing supervisory workplace aggression. *Journal of Occupational and Health Psychology, 11*, 13-26.
- Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1986). Gender and aggressive behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin, 100*(3), 309-330. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.100.3.309

- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behavior: Evolved dispositions versus social roles. *American Psychologist, 54*(5), 408-423.
- Feshbach, N. D. (1969). Sex differences in children's modes of aggressive responses toward outsiders. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 15*, 249-258.
- Forbes, G., Zhang, X., Doroszewicz, K., & Haas, K. (2009). Relationships between individualism-collectivism, gender, and direct or indirect aggression: A study in China, Poland, and the USA. *Aggressive Behavior, 35*, 24-30.
- Forrest, S., Eatough, V., & Shevlin, M. (2005). Measuring adult indirect aggression: The development and psychometric assessment of the indirect aggression scales. *Aggressive Behavior, 31*, 84-97.
- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., Goh, A., & Bruursema, K. (2007). Does your coworker know what you're doing? Convergence of self- and peer-reports of counterproductive work behavior. *International Journal of Stress Management, 14*(1), 41-60.
- Fox, S., Spector, P. E., & Miles, D. E. (2001). Counterproductive work behavior (CWB) in response to job stressors and organizational justice: Some mediator and moderator tests for autonomy and emotions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 59*, 291-309.
- Green, L. R., Richardson, D. R., & Lago, T. (1996). How do friendship, indirect, and direct aggression relate? *Aggressive Behavior, 22*, 81-86.
- Greenberg, L., & Barling, J. (1999). Predicting employee aggression against coworkers, subordinates and supervisors: The roles of person behaviors and perceived workplace factors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20*, 897-913.

- Griffin, R. W., O'Leary-Kelly, A., & Collins, J. (1998). Dysfunctional work behaviors in organizations. . In C. L. Cooper & D. m. Rousseau (Eds.), *Trends in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 5, pp. 65-82).
- Haines, V. Y., Marchand, A., & Harvey, S. (2006). Crossover of workplace aggression experiences in dual-earner couples. *Journal of Occupational and Health Psychology, 11*, 305-314.
- Henington, C., Hughes, J. N., Cavell, T. A., & Thompson, B. (1996). The role of relational aggression in identifying aggressive boys and girls. *Journal of School Psychology, 96*(4), 457-477.
- Hershcovis, M. S., & Barling, J. (2010a). Comparing victim attributions and outcomes for workplace aggression and sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- Hershcovis, M. S., & Barling, J. (2010b). 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., Dupre, K. E., Innes, M., . . . Sivanathan, N. (2007). Predicting workplace aggression: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(1), 228-238.
- Hess, N. H., & Hagen, E. H. (2006). Sex differences in indirect aggression: Psychological evidence from young adults. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 27*, 231-245.
- Hines, D. A., & Saudino, K. J. (2003). Gender differences in psychological, physical, and sexual aggression among college students using the revised conflict tactics scales. *Violence and Victims, 18*(2), 197-217.

- Hyde, J. S. (1984). How large are gender differences in aggression? A developmental meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology, 20*, 722-736.
- Innes, M., Barling, J., & Turner, N. (2005). Understanding supervisor-targeted aggression: A within-person, between-jobs design. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(4), 731-739.
- Kim, S., Kamphaus, R. W., Orpinas, P., & Kelder, S. H. (2010). Change in the manifestation of overt aggression during early adolescence. *School Psychology International, 31*(1), 95-111.
- Knight, G. P., Guthrie, I. K., Page, M. C., & Fabes, R. A. (2002). Emotional arousal and gender differences in aggression: A meta-analysis. *Aggressive Behavior, 28*, 366-393.
- Lagerspetz, K. J., Bjorkqvist, K., & Peltonen, T. (1998). Is indirect aggression typical of females? Gender differences in aggressiveness in 11- to 12-year-old children. *Aggressive Behavior, 14*, 403-414.
- Lagerspetz, K. M. J., Björkqvist, K., & Peltonen, T. (1988). Is indirect aggression typical of females? [Article]. *Aggressive Behavior, 14*(6), 403-414.
- LeBlance, M. M., & Kelloway, E. K. (2002). Predictors and outcomes of workplace violence and aggression. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(2), 444-453.
- Lento-Zwolinski, J. (2007). College students' self-report of psychological factors in reactive forms of relational and physical aggression. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 24*(3), 407-421.
- Loeber, R., & Hay, D. (1997). Key issues in the development of aggression and violence from childhood to early adulthood. *Annual Review of Psychology, 48*, 371-410.

- McFarlin, S. K., Fals-Stewart, W., Major, D. A., & Justice, E. M. (2001). Alcohol use and workplace aggression: An examination of perpetration and victimization. *Journal of Substance Abuse, 13*, 303-321.
- Miles, D. E., Borman, W. E., Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2002). Building an integrative model of extrarole work behaviors: A comparison of counterproductive work behavior with organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 10*, 51-57.
- Morales-Vives, F., & Vigil-Colet, A. (2010). Are there sex differences in physical aggression in the elderly? *Personality and Individual Differences, 49*, 659-662.
- Murray-Close, D., Ostrov, J. M., Nelson, D. A., Crick, N. R., & Coccaro, E. F. (2010). Proactive, reactive, and romantic relational aggression in adulthood: Measurement, predictive validity, gender differences, and association with Intermittent Explosive Disorder. *Journal of Psychiatric Research, 44*, 393-404.
- Neuman, J. H., & Baron, R. A. (1998). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence concerning specific forms, potential causes, and preferred targets. *Journal of Management, 24*(3), 391-419.
- O'Leary-Kelly, A., Griffin, R. W., & Glew, D. J. (1996). Organizational-motivated aggression: A research framework. *Academy of Management Review, 21*, 225-253.
- Peets, K., & Kikas, E. (2006). Aggressive strategies and victimization during adolescence: Grade and gender difference, and cross-informat aggression. *Aggressive Behavior, 32*, 68-79.

- Reinisch, J. M., & Sanders, S. A. (1986). A test of sex differences in aggressive response of hypothetical conflict situations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *50*(5), 1045-1049.
- Richardson, D. R., & Green, L. R. (1999). Social sanction and threat explanations of gender effects on direct and indirect aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, *25*, 425-434.
- Robinson, S. L., & Bennett, R. J. (1995). A typology of deviant workplace behaviors: A multidimensional scaling study. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*(2), 555-572.
- Schat, A. C. H., & Kelloway, E. K. (2005). Workplace violence. In J. Barling, E. K. Kelloway & M. Frone (Eds.), *Handbook of Work Stress* (pp. 189-218). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Schreiner, A. S. (2001). Aggressive behaviors among demented nursing home residents in Japan. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, *16*, 209-215.
- Skara, S., Pokhrel, P., Weiner, M. D., Sun, P., Dent, C. W., & Sussman, S. (2008). Physical and relational aggression as predictors of drug use: Gender differences among high school students. *Addictive Behaviors*, *33*, 1507-1515.
- Snyder, L. A., Chen, P. Y., Grubb, P. L., Roberts, R. K., Sauter, S. L., & Swanson, N. G. (2005). Workplace aggression and violence against individuals and organizations: Causes, consequences, and interventions. In P. L. Perrewe & D. C. Ganster (Eds.), *Exploring Interpersonal Dynamics* (Vol. 4): Elsevier.
- Spector, P. E. (1975). Relationships of organizational frustration with reported behavioral reactions of employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *60*(5), 635-637.

- Spector, P. E. (2010). The relationship of personality to counterproductive work behavior (CWB): An integration of perspectives. *Human Resource Management Review*.
- Spector, P. E., & Fox, S. (2005). A model of counterproductive work behavior. In P. E. Spector & S. Fox (Eds.), *Counterproductive workplace behavior: Investigations of actions and targets* (pp. 151-174). Washington, DC: APA.
- Toldos, M. P. (2005). Sex and age differences in self-estimated physical, verbal and indirect aggression in Spanish adolescents. *Aggressive Behavior, 31*, 13-23.
- Vandello, J. A., Ransom, S., Hettinger, V. E., & Askew, K. (2009). Men's misperceptions about the acceptability and attractiveness of aggression. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*, 1209-1219.
- Verona, E., Sadeh, N., Case, S. M., Reed II, A., & Bhattacharjee, A. (2008). Self-reported use of different forms of aggression in late adolescence and emerging adulthood. *Assessment, 15*(4), 493-510.
- Wang, J., & Wong, C.-k. (2011). Understanding organizational citizenship behavior from a cultural perspective: An empirical study within the context of hotels in Mainland China. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 30*(4), 845-854. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2011.01.005
- Weaver, J. R., Vandello, J. A., Bosson, J. K., & Burnaford, R. M. (2010). The proof is in the punch: Gender differences in perceptions of action and aggression as components of manhood. *Sex Roles, 62*(241-251).
- Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., Geiger, T. C., & Crick, N. R. (2005). Relational and physical aggression, prosocial behavior, and peer relations: Gender moderation and bidirectional associations. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 25*(4), 421-452.

Tables

Table 1. Proposed Taxonomy of Workplace Aggression (Snyder et al., 2005)

	Aggression Against Individual	Aggression Against Organization
Direct		
Active	Threats	Theft
	Assault	Destruction of property
	Glaring/ dirty looks	Pull fire alarm
	Obscene gestures	Call in bomb threats
	Verbal abuse	Falsify timecard
	Insulting jokes	Altruistic deviance
	Criticize in front of others	Wasting resources
	Interrupt when speaking	Arson
	Belittle opinion	Embezzlement
Passive	Silent treatment	Work slowdowns
	Failure to return calls	Absenteeism
	Leave work area when target arrives	Leaving work early
	Refuse work-related request from the target	Taking excessive breaks
		Pass on defective work
Indirect		
Active	Spread rumors	Deviant whistle-blowing
	Remove or hide needed resources	Breach of confidentiality
	Talk behind target's back	Alter company records
	Steal from others	Insult customers
	Assign work overload	Harm relationships with other organizations
	Assign unreasonable deadlines	Poison products
Passive	Failure to communicate information	Failure to den false claims made
	Failure to defend	against organization
	Show up late for meetings	
	Failure to protect target target's welfare	
	Failure to warn of impending danger	
	Deliberately exclude target	
	Cause others to delay on matters of importance to target	

Table 2. Categories of Items

Items	Subtypes of Workplace Aggression							
	P	V	D	I-D	A	P	I	O
Strike, shove, grab, hit, slap, or push someone	Y		Y		Y		Y	
Stare at someone or give a dirty looks or other negative eye-contacts with someone	Y		Y		Y		Y	
Belittle someone's opinions to others when that person is not present		Y		Y	Y		Y	
Give someone the silent treatment		Y	Y			Y	Y	
Make negative or obscene gestures toward someone	Y		Y		Y		Y	
Talk behind someone's back/ spread rumors		Y		Y	Y		Y	
Falsely report negative information about someone to higher levels in company		Y		Y	Y		Y	
Deliberately fail to return phone calls or respond to memos from work		Y	Y			Y		Y
Intentionally interfere with or block someone's work	Y		Y		Y		Y	
Intentionally fail to warn someone of impending danger or risk		Y		Y		Y	Y	
Intentionally consume excessive work-related resources needed by someone	Y			Y	Y		Y	
Steal someone's personal property	Y			Y	Y		Y	
Damage someone's personal property	Y			Y	Y		Y	
Threaten someone		Y	Y		Y		Y	
Interrupt someone when speaking		Y	Y		Y		Y	
Spit on someone	Y		Y		Y		Y	
Swear, shout or yell at someone		Y	Y		Y		Y	
Insult someone with a joke		Y	Y		Y		Y	
Purposely fail to meet someone's appropriate work-related requests		Y	Y			Y	Y	
Intentionally not pass important work-related information to someone		Y		Y		Y	Y	
Try to exclude someone from your social gatherings	Y		Y			Y	Y	
Threaten to share someone's private information		Y	Y		Y		Y	
Say something to purposely embarrass someone in front of other people		Y	Y		Y		Y	
Intentionally violate someone's personal space	Y		Y		Y			

Table 2. Categories of Items (Continued)

Intentionally leave a room when someone is still talking to you.	Y			Y		Y	Y	
Slam a door loud in someone's presence	Y			Y		Y	Y	
Throw an object at someone	Y		Y		Y		Y	
Start an argument with someone		Y	Y		Y		Y	
Purposely fail to provide needed resources to someone	Y		Y			Y	Y	
Delay your work to make someone look bad	Y			Y		Y	Y	
Purposely interfere with someone's important matters	Y			Y	Y		Y	
Purposely leave an area when someone enters	Y		Y			Y	Y	
Fail to deny false rumors about someone		Y		Y		Y	Y	
Show up late for work or meetings	Y			Y	Y			Y
Intentionally do your work incorrectly	Y			Y	Y			Y
Purposely worked slowly when things needed to get done	Y		Y			Y		Y
Damage or sabotage company's property	Y		Y		Y			Y
Deliberately harm relationships of your organization with other organizations		Y		Y	Y			Y
Demean your organization to people outside of the organization		Y		Y	Y			Y
Take longer breaks than you are allowed to take	Y		Y			Y		Y
Leave work earlier than you are allowed to	Y		Y			Y		Y
Purposely dirtied or littered your place of work	Y		Y		Y			Y
Purposely failed to follow instructions	Y			Y		Y		Y

Note: P= Physical, V=Verbal, D= direct, I-D=Indirect, A=Active, P=Passive, I=Interpersonal, O=Organizational, Y= Belonging to the specific category

Table 3. Demographics Overall and By Gender

		Male	Female	Overall
Age (Year)	Mean	22.24	21.63	21.81
	SD	1.07	4.37	4.35
Tenure (Month)	Mean	26.61	24.62	32.04
	SD	26.81	33.58	32.28
Working Hours	Mean	26.64	27.74	26.20
	SD	7.68	7.17	7.17
		N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Ethnicity	Asian	8 (8.3)	26 (9.5)	34 (8.5)
	Black	17 (17.70)	56 (20.7)	73 (19.9)
	Hispanic	12 (12.5)	47 (17.2)	59 (15.6)
	White	56 (58.3)	133 (48.7)	189 (51.4)
	Other	3 (3.1)	8 (2.9)	11 (3.0)
Job Title	Server	9 (9.4)	47 (17.2)	56 (15.3)
	Customer Service	12 (12.5)	41 (15)	53 (14.5)
	Sales	6 (6.3)	31 (11.4)	37 (10.1)
	Technician	10 (10.4)	12 (4.4)	22 (6.0)
	Clerk	6 (6.3)	6 (2.2)	12 (3.3)
	Cashier	7 (7.3)	33 (12.1)	40 (11.0)
	Crew Member	4 (4.2)	6 (2.2)	10 (2.7)
	Assistant	12 (12.5)	35 (12.8)	47 (12.9)
	Other	29 (30.2)	59 (21.6)	88 (24.2)

Table 4. Employee- Supervisor Matching

	Male-Supervisor	Female Supervisor
Male Employee	9	9
Female Employee	27	38

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics of Employee Data

	N	Possible Range	Actual Range	Mean	SD	Alpha
Physical Workplace Aggression	364	1-5	1-3.36	1.23	0.23	0.83
Verbal Workplace Aggression	365	1-5	1-3.89	1.31	0.31	0.82
Direct Workplace Aggression	364	1-5	1-3.76	1.31	0.30	0.86
Indirect Workplace Aggression	365	1-5	1-3.33	1.21	0.23	0.78
Active Workplace Aggression	364	1-5	1-3.48	1.22	0.25	0.86
Passive Workplace Aggression	365	1-5	1-3.75	1.34	0.31	0.80
Interpersonal Workplace Aggression	365	1-5	1-3.73	1.26	0.26	0.89
Organizational Workplace Aggression	364	1-5	1-3.1	1.27	0.29	0.66
Relational Workplace Aggression	366	1-5	1-3.17	1.12	0.31	0.82

Table 6. Comparison on Descriptive Statistics between Matched and Unmatched Employees

	Match Status	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Gender (% of Females)	Matched	281	0.73	0.45	4.41	0.036
	Unmatched	82	0.78	0.42		
Hour	Matched	280	25.94	6.71	10.38	0.001
	Unmatched	82	27.09	8.52		
Age (Year)	Matched	279	21.49	3.81	8.31	0.004
	Unmatched	81	22.94	5.72		
Tenure (Year)	Matched	275	1.98	2.10	6.10	0.014
	Unmatched	79	2.83	4.08		
Physical Workplace Aggression	Matched	281	1.23	0.24	0.83	0.362
	Unmatched	83	1.23	0.19		
Verbal Workplace Aggression	Matched	282	1.31	0.32	0.27	0.601
	Unmatched	83	1.29	0.27		
Direct Workplace Aggression	Matched	281	1.31	0.31	0.14	0.711
	Unmatched	83	1.29	0.26		
Indirect Workplace Aggression	Matched	282	1.21	0.24	2.64	0.105
	Unmatched	83	1.19	0.16		
Active Workplace Aggression	Matched	281	1.22	0.26	2.28	0.132
	Unmatched	83	1.20	0.19		
Passive Workplace Aggression	Matched	282	1.34	0.31	0.25	0.616
	Unmatched	83	1.34	0.30		
Interpersonal Workplace Aggression	Matched	282	1.27	0.28	0.57	0.452
	Unmatched	83	1.25	0.22		
Organizational Workplace Aggression	Matched	281	1.27	0.30	0.75	0.386
	Unmatched	83	1.26	0.25		
Relational Workplace Aggression	Matched	283	1.12	0.30	0.90	0.345
	Unmatched	83	1.14	0.35		

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics of Matched Employees and Supervisors

Variables	N	Possible Range	Actual Range	Mean	SD	Alpha
Supervisor Age (Year)	81	1-5	19-76	37.75	12.68	NA
Employee Age (Year)	81	NA	18-52	22.94	5.72	NA
Working Hours -Employee	82	NA	20-60	27.09	8.52	NA
Tenure-Employee	79	NA	0-2.67	2.83	4.08	NA
Physical Workplace Aggression	82	1-5	1-1.84	1.09	0.15	0.82
Verbal Workplace Aggression	83	1-5	1-2.22	1.10	0.23	0.86
Direct Workplace Aggression	83	1-5	1-2.2	1.11	0.21	0.88
Indirect Workplace Aggression	82	1-5	1-1.78	1.08	0.13	0.72
Active Workplace Aggression	83	1-5	1-2.04	1.00	0.18	0.88
Passive Workplace Aggression	82	1-5	1-2.19	1.12	0.19	0.79
Interpersonal Workplace Aggression	82	1-5	1-2.12	1.10	0.19	0.9
Organizational Workplace Aggression	83	1-5	1-1.80	1.08	0.17	0.65
Physical Workplace Aggression	83	1-5	1-1.72	1.23	0.19	0.75
Verbal Workplace Aggression	83	1-5	1-2.06	1.29	0.27	0.78
Direct Workplace Aggression	83	1-5	1-2.0	1.29	0.26	0.83
Indirect Workplace Aggression	83	1-5	1-1.72	1.19	0.16	0.59
Active Workplace Aggression	83	1-5	1-1.78	1.20	0.19	0.78
Passive Workplace Aggression	83	1-5	1-2.13	1.34	0.30	0.79
Interpersonal Workplace Aggression	83	1-5	1-3.0	1.14	0.35	.82
Organizational Workplace Aggression	83	1-5	1-1.85	1.25	0.22	0.85
Relational Workplace Aggression	83	1-5	1-2.0	1.26	0.25	0.53

Table 8. Correlations among Variables of Interest

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1 Gender											
2 Physical Workplace Aggression	-.09										
3 Verbal Workplace Aggression	-.10	.83**									
4 Direct Workplace Aggression	-.11*	.93**	.93**								
5 Indirect Workplace Aggression	-.05	.88**	.86**	.79**							
6 Active Workplace Aggression	-.09	.88**	.95**	.92**	.88**						
7 Passive Workplace Aggression	-.08	.93**	.82**	.90**	.82**	.75**					
8 Interpersonal Workplace Aggression	-.08	.93**	.95**	.96**	.88**	.96**	.86**				
9 Organizational Workplace Aggression	-.10	.83**	.74**	.78**	.78**	.71**	.86**	.70**			
10 Relational Workplace Aggression	-.03	.60**	.62**	.62**	.59**	.62**	.57**	.64**	.50**		
11 Workplace Aggression Total	-.09	.95**	.95**	.97**	.91**	.95**	.91**	.98**	.81**	.72**	

Note: $N = 366$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Table 9. Comparisons on Prevalence of Subtypes of Workplace Aggression

Compared Pairs	Mean	N	SD	t	df	<i>p</i>
Physical Workplace Aggression	1.23	363	0.23	-8.29	362	0.00
Verbal Workplace Aggression	1.31	363	0.31			
Direct Workplace Aggression	1.30	363	0.30	10.27	362	0.00
Indirect Workplace Aggression	1.21	363	0.23			
Active Workplace Aggression	1.22	363	0.25	-11.66	362	0.00
Passive Workplace Aggression	1.34	363	0.31			
Interpersonal Workplace Aggression	1.26	363	0.26	-0.42	362	0.67
Organizational Workplace Aggression	1.27	363	0.29			

Table 10. Comparison between Correlations

	r	t	sig.
Gender-Physical Workplace Aggression	-.09	0.32	n.s.
Gender-Verbal Workplace Aggression	-.10		
Gender-Direct Workplace Aggression	-.11*	-1.76	n.s.
Gender-Indirect Workplace Aggression	-.05		
Gender-Active Workplace Aggression	-.09	-0.27	n.s.
Gender-Passive Workplace Aggression	-.08		
Gender-Interpersonal Workplace Aggression	-.08	0.49	n.s.
Gender-Organizational Workplace Aggression	-.10		

Table 11. Comparison of Supervisor-rating and Self-rating on Females' Workplace Aggression

	Source of rating	Mean	N	SD	t	df	<i>p</i>
Physical	Supervisor-rating	1.08	63	0.13	-6.227	62	0.00
	Self-rating	1.22	63	0.19			
Verbal	Supervisor-rating	1.08	64	0.14	-6.727	63	0.00
	Self-rating	1.28	64	0.26			
Direct	Supervisor-rating	1.09	64	0.14	-6.767	63	0.00
	Self-rating	1.29	64	0.25			
Indirect	Supervisor-rating	1.07	63	0.11	-6.653	62	0.00
	Self-rating	1.19	63	0.16			
Active	Supervisor-rating	1.06	64	0.11	-5.909	63	0.00
	Self-rating	1.19	64	0.18			
Passive	Supervisor-rating	1.12	63	0.18	-6.619	62	0.00
	Self-rating	1.34	63	0.30			
Interpersonal	Supervisor-rating	1.08	63	0.13	-6.289	62	0.00
	Self-rating	1.24	63	0.22			
Organizational	Supervisor-rating	1.07	64	0.14	-6.735	63	0.00
	Self-rating	1.25	64	0.26			
Total	Supervisor-rating	1.08	63	0.12	-7.267	62	0.00
	Self-rating	1.25	63	0.20			

Table 12. Comparison of Supervisor-rating and Self-rating on Males' Workplace Aggression

	Source of rating	Mean	N	SD	t	df	<i>p</i>
Physical	Supervisor-rating	1.13	18	0.21	-1.796	17	0.09
	Self-rating	1.26	18	0.21			
Verbal	Supervisor-rating	1.19	18	0.40	-1.039	17	0.31
	Self-rating	1.31	18	0.31			
Direct	Supervisor-rating	1.18	18	0.36	-1.349	17	0.20
	Self-rating	1.34	18	0.31			
Indirect	Supervisor-rating	1.11	18	0.19	-1.489	17	0.16
	Self-rating	1.21	18	0.18			
Active	Supervisor-rating	1.16	18	0.32	-0.749	17	0.46
	Self-rating	1.22	18	0.21			
Passive	Supervisor-rating	1.15	18	0.24	-2.257	17	0.04
	Self-rating	1.38	18	0.33			
Interpersonal	Supervisor-rating	1.16	18	0.32	-1.271	17	0.22
	Self-rating	1.29	18	0.25			
Organizational	Supervisor-rating	1.13	18	0.23	-1.800	17	0.09
	Self-rating	1.27	18	0.25			
Total	Supervisor-rating	1.15	18	0.29	-1.413	17	0.18
	Self-rating	1.28	18	0.24			

Table 13. Comparison between Male and Female Supervisors' Ratings on Subordinates' Workplace Aggression

	Supervisor Gender	N	Mean	SD	F	<i>p</i>	t	df
Total	Male	36	1.13	0.21	4.01	0.05	1.43	80
	Female	46	1.07	0.13				
Physical	Male	36	1.10	0.16	0.20	0.66	0.62	80
	Female	46	1.08	0.14				
Verbal	Male	36	1.16	0.30	11.22	0.00	2.07	81
	Female	47	1.06	0.12				
Direct	Male	36	1.15	0.27	7.24	0.01	1.57	81
	Female	47	1.08	0.14				
Indirect	Male	36	1.10	0.14	0.66	0.42	0.95	80
	Female	46	1.07	0.13				
Active	Male	36	1.12	0.25	12.09	0.00	1.95	81
	Female	47	1.05	0.10				
Passive	Male	36	1.13	0.18	0.00	0.97	0.36	80
	Female	46	1.12	0.20				
Interpersonal	Male	36	1.14	0.24	5.55	0.02	1.67	80
	Female	46	1.07	0.13				
Organizational	Male	36	1.09	0.17	0.01	0.91	0.09	81
	Female	47	1.08	0.16				

Table 14. Correlations of Employee Gender with Self-reports and Supervisor Reports of Workplace Aggression using Matched Data

	Employee Gender
Physical Workplace Aggression-Supervisor	-0.13
Verbal Workplace Aggression-Supervisor	-0.20
Direct Workplace Aggression-Supervisor	-0.18
Indirect Workplace Aggression-Supervisor	-0.13
Active Workplace Aggression-Supervisor	-.22*
Passive Workplace Aggression-Supervisor	-0.06
Interpersonal Workplace Aggression-Supervisor	-0.16
Organizational Workplace Aggression-Supervisor	-0.15
Physical Workplace Aggression-Employee	-0.09
Verbal Workplace Aggression-Employee	-0.05
Direct Workplace Aggression-Employee	-0.08
Indirect Workplace Aggression-Employee	-0.06
Active Workplace Aggression-Employee	-0.07
Passive Workplace Aggression-Employee	-0.07
Relational Workplace Aggression-Employee	-0.03
Interpersonal Workplace Aggression-Employee	-0.09
Organizational Workplace Aggression-Employee	-0.03
Workplace Aggression Total-Supervisor	-0.17
Workplace Aggression Total-Employee	-0.08

Note: $N = 83$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Appendixes

Survey Material

Appendix A: Employee Survey

<p>How often have you done each of the following things on your present job?</p>	Never	Once or Twice	Once or Twice per Month	Once or Twice per Week	Every day
1. Strike, shove, grab, hit, slap, or push someone	1	2	3	4	5
2. Stare at someone or give a dirty looks or other negative eye-contacts with someone	1	2	3	4	5
3. Belittle someone's opinions to others when that person is not	1	2	3	4	5
4. Give someone the silent treatment	1	2	3	4	5
5. Make negative or obscene gestures toward someone	1	2	3	4	5
6. Talk behind someone's back/ spread rumors	1	2	3	4	5
7. Falsely report negative information about someone to higher	1	2	3	4	5
8. Deliberately fail to return phone calls or respond to memos from	1	2	3	4	5
9. Intentionally interfere with or block someone's work	1	2	3	4	5
10. Intentionally fail to warn someone of impending danger or risk	1	2	3	4	5
11. Intentionally consume excessive work-related resources needed	1	2	3	4	5
12. Steal someone's personal property	1	2	3	4	5
13. Damage someone's personal property	1	2	3	4	5
14. Threaten someone	1	2	3	4	5
15. Interrupt someone when speaking	1	2	3	4	5
16. Spit on someone	1	2	3	4	5
17. Swear, shout or yell at someone	1	2	3	4	5
18. Insult someone with a joke	1	2	3	4	5
19. Purposely fail to meet someone's appropriate work-related	1	2	3	4	5
20. Intentionally not pass important work-related information to	1	2	3	4	5
21. Try to exclude someone from your social gatherings	1	2	3	4	5
22. Threaten to share someone's private information	1	2	3	4	5
23. Say something to purposely embarrass someone in front of other	1	2	3	4	5
24. Intentionally violate someone's personal space	1	2	3	4	5
25. Intentionally leave a room when someone is still talking to you.	1	2	3	4	5
26. Slam a door loud in someone's presence	1	2	3	4	5
27. Throw an object at someone	1	2	3	4	5
28. Start an argument with someone	1	2	3	4	5
29. Purposely fail to provide needed resources to someone	1	2	3	4	5
30. Delay your work to make someone look bad	1	2	3	4	5
31. Purposely interfere with someone's important matters	1	2	3	4	5

32. Purposely leave an area when someone enters	1	2	3	4	5
33. Fail to deny false rumors about someone	1	2	3	4	5
34. Show up late for work or meetings	1	2	3	4	5
35. Intentionally do your work incorrectly	1	2	3	4	5
36. Purposely worked slowly when things needed to get done	1	2	3	4	5
37. Damage or sabotage company's property	1	2	3	4	5
38. Deliberately harm relationships of your organization with other	1	2	3	4	5
39. Demean your organization to people outside of the organization	1	2	3	4	5
40. Take longer breaks than you are allowed to take	1	2	3	4	5
41. Leave work earlier than you are allowed to	1	2	3	4	5
42. Purposely dirtied or littered your place of work	1	2	3	4	5
43. Purposely failed to follow instructions	1	2	3	4	5
44. Tell someone at work that you won't help him/ her unless he/she	1	2	3	4	5
45. Tell someone at work that you won't socialize with him/her unless he/she does what you ask	1	2	3	4	5
46. Tell others not to talk to someone at work	1	2	3	4	5
47. Tell others not to help someone at work with a task	1	2	3	4	5
48. When angry at someone at work, try to get others to ignore him/	1	2	3	4	5
49. Try to get others to dislike someone at work	1	2	3	4	5

50. Are you? ____ Male ____ Female

51. Are you? ____ Asian ____ Black ____ Hispanic ____ White ____ Other

52. Your Age? _____ Years

53. How many hours do you typically work per week in a job? _____ hours

54. How long have you worked at this job ____ Months ____ Year

55. What is your job title? _____

Appendix B: Supervisor Survey

How often has this employee done each of the following things on his/her present job?	Never	Once or Twice	Once or Twice per Month	Once or Twice per Week	Every day
1. Strike, shove, grab, hit, slap, or push someone	1	2	3	4	5
2. Stare at someone or give a dirty looks or other negative eye-contacts with someone	1	2	3	4	5
3. Belittle someone's opinions to others when that person is not	1	2	3	4	5
4. Give someone the silent treatment	1	2	3	4	5
5. Make negative or obscene gestures toward someone	1	2	3	4	5
6. Talk behind someone's back/ spread rumors	1	2	3	4	5
7. Falsely report negative information about someone to higher	1	2	3	4	5
8. Deliberately fail to return phone calls or respond to memos	1	2	3	4	5
9. Intentionally interfere with or block someone's work	1	2	3	4	5
10. Intentionally fail to warn someone of impending danger or	1	2	3	4	5
11. Intentionally consume excessive work-related resources	1	2	3	4	5
12. Steal someone's personal property	1	2	3	4	5
13. Damage someone's personal property	1	2	3	4	5
14. Threaten someone	1	2	3	4	5
15. Interrupt someone when speaking	1	2	3	4	5
16. Spit on someone	1	2	3	4	5
17. Swear, shout or yell at someone	1	2	3	4	5
18. Insult someone with a joke	1	2	3	4	5
19. Purposely fail to meet someone's appropriate work-related	1	2	3	4	5
20. Intentionally not pass important work-related information to	1	2	3	4	5
21. Try to exclude someone from his/her social gatherings	1	2	3	4	5
22. Threaten to share someone's private information	1	2	3	4	5
23. Say something to purposely embarrass someone in front of	1	2	3	4	5
24. Intentionally violate someone's personal space	1	2	3	4	5
25. Intentionally leave a room when someone is still talking to	1	2	3	4	5
26. Slam a door loud in someone's presence	1	2	3	4	5
27. Throw an object at someone	1	2	3	4	5
28. Start an argument with someone	1	2	3	4	5
29. Purposely fail to provide needed resources to someone	1	2	3	4	5
30. Delay his/her work to make someone look bad	1	2	3	4	5
31. Purposely interfere with someone's important matters	1	2	3	4	5

32. Purposely leave an area when someone enters	1	2	3	4	5
33. Fail to deny false rumors about someone	1	2	3	4	5
34. Show up late for work or meetings	1	2	3	4	5
35. Intentionally do his/her work incorrectly	1	2	3	4	5
36. Purposely worked slowly when things needed to get done	1	2	3	4	5
37. Damage or sabotage company's property	1	2	3	4	5
38. Deliberately harm relationships of your organization with	1	2	3	4	5
39. Demean your organization to people outside of the	1	2	3	4	5
40. Take longer breaks than he/she is allowed to take	1	2	3	4	5
41. Leave work earlier than he/she is allowed to	1	2	3	4	5
42. Purposely dirtied or littered his/her place of work	1	2	3	4	5
43. Purposely failed to follow instructions	1	2	3	4	5

44. Are you? _____Male _____Female

45. Are you? _____Asian _____Black _____Hispanic _____White
 _____Other

46. Your Age? _____Years