UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

March 04, 2003

I, Irina Sumajin,

hereby submit this as part of the requirements for the degree of:
Master of Arts

in Psychology

It is entitled The Influence of Personality and Social Motivation on Workplace Bullying and Discrimination

Approved by:
Harold D. Fishbein
P. Neal Ritchey

THE INFLUENCE OF PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL MOTIVATION ON WORKPLACE BULLYING AND DISCRIMINATION

A thesis submitted to the

Division of Graduate Studies and Research
of the University of Cincinnati

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Psychology
of the College of Arts and Sciences

2003

by

Irina C. Sumajin

B.S., Bowling Green State University, 2000

Committee Chair: Harold D. Fishbein, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

This study explored prejudice-based discrimination, workplace bullying and workplace victimization in relation to social motives. The social motives explored were: the need to belong to a social group, the need to understand socially effective interactions, the need to control the environment, and the need to enhance self (Fiske, 2000). Personality traits of social dominance orientation, right-wing authoritarianism, self-esteem, social anxiety, anger, verbal aggression, and perspective taking were assured to reflect the social motives of interest and were hypothesized to affect discrimination, bullying, and victimization. Three hundred and thirty one undergraduate students completed self-report questionnaires that assessed their behaviors, attitudes, and personality traits. Participants reported the frequency of their bullying and victimization experiences in the workplace in the last six months, the frequency of discrimination against African-Americans, homosexuals, and obese in the last year, and their level of agreement with items on scales measuring personality traits and attitudes.

For the first set of analyses, ordinary least squares regressions were conducted with each behavior as a separate dependent variable and personality and control variables as independent variables. Social dominance orientation was directly related to the frequency of bullying and discrimination, while perspective taking was inversely related to the frequency of bullying; right-wing authoritarianism was directly related to the frequency of discrimination. Both bullying and discrimination were reported more frequently by men than women, were less influenced by social norms, and were mainly driven by the need to control the social environment. Victimization was mainly

influenced by a higher need for self-enhancement and a low need to understand socially effective interactions.

For the second set of analyses, a four category classification was formed to identify bullies, victims, bully/victims, and non-bully/non-victims. A binary logistic regression was then performed to predict group membership in each category using personality traits and control variables. These results indicated that bullies, victims, bully/victims, non-bully/non-victims were distinct categories of individuals, influenced by different personality traits and social motives. Findings from both sets of analyses must be considered together to enable a clear understanding of bullying.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table

The Influence of Personality and Social Motivation on Workplace Bullying and Discrimination

The primary goal for this study was to explore the underlying social motives of workplace bullying and prejudice-based discrimination. The social motives investigated included belonging, controlling, understanding, and enhancing the self. Bullying and discriminatory behaviors were viewed as a continuum of mild to extreme behaviors, varying according to the frequency of self-reported acts committed against others. Several self-reported personality traits were used as vehicles for uncovering the possible motives related to these behaviors. Perspective-taking, social dominance orientation, right-wing authoritarianism, self-esteem, social anxiety, anger, and verbal aggression were selected based on previously found relationships between them and either bullying or prejudice-based discrimination. Social motives and personality traits were also explored in relation to being victimized in the workplace. It is believed that studying bullying and discrimination within the same context would contribute new knowledge to both research areas.

The second goal for this study was to explore the motives and personality characteristics related to the likelihood of being a bully, a victim, a bully/victim, and a non-bully/non-victim. When studying bullying behavior with regard to personality traits, the results may be confounded by the correlation between being bullied and bullying others. Therefore, based on that possible correlation in the first part of this study, it is likely that social motives and personality traits related to bullying and victimization will differ from those that are related to each the categories of bully, victim, and bully/victim.

Workplace Bullying.

Bullying is defined as a physical, verbal, or psychological intimidation that is intended to cause fear, distress, or harm to the victim (Baldry & Farrington, 2000). Bullying behavior often occurs without apparent provocation, and can be carried out by several means such as physical contact, verbal aggression, making faces or mean gestures, and intentionally excluding from the group (Smith, Cowie, Olafsson, & Liefooghe, 2002). Harming and controlling people through physical means is referred to as physical bullying, while harming through attempts to damage or control people's relationships with others is referred to as relational bullying (Crick, Casas, & Ku, 1999).

The majority of bullying research occurs with children or adolescents; however, it has recently become apparent that bullying is also an adult issue. The workplace appears to be an important context for adult bullying. Workplace bullying can occur between superiors and subordinates as well as between peers or colleagues (Hoel, Rayner, & Cooper, 1999). In a sample of 1137 part-time students in an English university, 50% reported that they were bullied at work (Rayner, 1997). In an American study of mistreatment at work among 59 young workers attending college courses, all respondents reported exposure to some kind of mistreatment at their current workplace. Approximately 14% reported experiencing at least 10 different types of abusive events in their current work situation (Keashly, Trott, & MacLean, 1994). Bullying behaviors may have serious consequences for the victims, affecting their psychological and/or physical health.

Prejudice-Based Discrimination.

Prejudice-based discrimination also has serious consequences for its victims. "Prejudice is defined as an unreasonable negative attitude toward others because of their membership in a particular group" (Fishbein, 2002, p. 5). Typically, prejudice refers to the affective or emotional component of intergroup relations. Two different types of prejudice have been determined, traditional and symbolic. Traditional prejudice is overt and is expressed through approval of observable actions such as white supremacy or racial segregation. Symbolic prejudice is not overt and recognizable, but is expressed through resistance to change or negative affect toward the targeted group. The measure of prejudice in this study assesses both traditional and symbolic attitudes. As distinctions are made between two different types of prejudice, two different types of discrimination exist as well.

Discrimination is defined as harmful actions towards others because of their membership in a particular group (Fishbein, 2002). Two types of discrimination exist, discrimination based on institutional practices and discrimination based on prejudiced attitudes. In the former type, discriminatory behaviors are carried out based on societal norms and values. For example, some employment managers may not hire women for particular jobs, such as those in construction, because of cultural norms indicating that women do not have the physical capacity to do the work (Fishbein, 2002). In the latter type, discriminatory behaviors are carried out based on personal preconceived beliefs or stereotypes about the members of a specific group. For example, if an employer holds a personal belief that African-Americans are not as intelligent as Whites, he/she is less likely to hire an African-American person. It is possible to determine whether

discrimination is prejudice-based by examining its correlation with prejudiced attitudes. If a moderate to strong correlation exists, it is safe to assume that the discriminatory acts are at least partially based on prejudice.

As in workplace bullying, there are many different types of discriminatory behavior. Physical attacks, verbal threats, avoidance, and exclusion are only a few instances of prejudice-based discrimination. In intergroup behavior, a large aspect of discrimination consists of the members of the ingroup verbally harassing members of the outgroup (Graumann, 1998). As discriminatory acts are becoming more subtle and difficult to observe, it is crucial to explore their underlying antecedents.

Part I.

Motivation, Workplace Bullying, and Discrimination.

Several theories have been developed to explain bullying and discrimination; however, none of them has attempted to link these two types of behaviors. Reasons to bully or discriminate against another human being still remain unclear. According to Hoyenga and Hoyenga (1984), any theory that claims to explain the reasons for people's actions should be able to answer questions about the motives for those actions. Motives involve wishes, desires, or goals -- states of affairs that individuals would like to bring about or would like to prevent (Winter, John, Stewart, Klohnen, & Duncan, 1998). Motives may be either conscious or unconscious intentions and are defined as dispositionally stable. Particular actions associated with any motive may vary according to the situation and circumstances associated with it. The concept of motives has been utilized within many different theories. One such theory, the social adaptation perspective, emphasizes motives for social interactions (Stevens & Fiske, 1995).

Underlying the social adaptation perspective is the notion that people depend upon their interactions with others. Human beings live in groups and their social interactions affect one another's behaviors and attitudes (Hoyenga & Hoyenga, 1984). Therefore, human actions should reflect the motive to be accepted and gain approval from the social group. A group of social motives – motives that affect interpersonal behaviors (Hoyenga & Hoyenga, 1984) – may be useful to explain bullying and discriminatory behaviors. Stevens and Fiske (1995) identify five core social motives that underlie many interpersonal behaviors: *belonging*, or getting along in one's own group, *understanding* shared social interactions, *controlling* socially effective interactions, *enhancing* self, and *trusting* ingroup others (Fiske, 2000).

Personality Traits and Social Motives.

Belonging, understanding, controlling, and enhancing self may be the core motives that underlie bullying and discriminatory behaviors and allow individuals to meet their individual and group needs. These motives in turn are components of to individuals' personality traits, defined as "generalized and personalized determining tendencies -- consistent and stable modes of an individual's adjustment to his/her environment" (Allport & Odbert, 1936, p.26). Personality traits include thoughts, feelings, motives and overt behaviors (Pervin, 1994). For example, the personality trait, extraversion, has a motivational component of affiliation and contributes to individuals' seeking out the company of others (Winter, John, Stewart, Klohnen, & Duncan, 1998). Motivational components of traits influence individuals' patterns of actions across situations and over time. Different strengths of personality traits may be related to different strengths of motives as they are related to the behavior that is carried out.

Personality traits that reflect social motives of belonging, understanding, controlling, and enhancing and have been previously studied in relation to bullying and discrimination may include social anxiety, perspective-taking, social dominance orientation, verbal aggression, anger, self-esteem, and right-wing authoritarianism. It is important to consider how each of these motives is reflected by each trait and how they might influence workplace bullying and prejudice-based discrimination.

Belonging Motive.

The human desire for social approval is directly related to the need to belong. Social anxiety, defined as discomfort in the presence of others (Fenigstein, Scheier, & Buss, 1975), is a personality trait related to the motive of belonging. The degree of comfort that a person feels around other individuals may determine how well he/she is accepted. High social anxiety reflects a high need to belong to a social group: seeking out others for emotional support reduces such anxiety (Reeve, 2001). In addition to emotional and physical support, people desire to affiliate in order to see whether others experience the same anxiety and how they handle it. Being more anxious increases the need to be accepted by an individual's ingroup and may lead to resorting to unconventional behaviors such as bullying or discriminating against outgroup members.

Olweus (1978) demonstrated that bullies in grades one through nine are low in feelings of maladjustment and inadequacy, a concept related to anxiety. However, in a sample of college students, Sumajin, Fishbein, and Ritchey (2001) demonstrated that bullies report relatively high feelings of inadequacy and anxiety. Being insecure or anxious increases categorization and prejudice in intergroup interactions (Greenland & Brown, 1999). Holding negative attitudes about others may contribute to the ability to

commit negative acts toward them. Therefore, high levels of social anxiety are predicted to lead to higher levels of workplace bullying and prejudice-based discrimination.

Understanding Motive.

A need to understand the environment and other people may be related to individuals' behavior toward others. Perspective-taking, which is defined as the attempts by one individual to understand another by imagining the other's perspective (Davis, 1996), reflects the underlying motive of understanding. Perspective-taking is a component of empathy that includes recognizing feelings of others and sympathizing with them (Kaukiainen, Bjorkvist, Lagerspetz, Osterman, Salmivalli, Rothberg, & Ahlbom, 1999). Empathy has been demonstrated to have a negative correlation with aggressive behavior. Being able to experience another's point of view may serve as an inhibitor of aggressive behavior such as bullying and discrimination. Higher perspective taking ability reflects the higher motive to understand socially effective interactions. Individuals' motive to understand is reinforced by their ability to relate to others' feelings and thoughts, which result in positive social interactions.

Richardson (1992) demonstrated that perspective-taking instructions given to participants in an experiment had the anticipated effect of decreasing their aggression toward an opponent (Davis, 1996). Crick and Dodge (1999) report evidence demonstrating an inverse relationship between perspective-taking and aggressive behavior. Based on the assumption that bullying and discrimination are aggressive behaviors, it is likely that low levels of perspective-taking may be associated with higher levels of workplace bullying and discrimination.

Controlling Motive.

At the interpersonal level, people express a core social motive to be effective and to exert control over their social environment (White, 1959), that is, other individuals and interactions occurring among them. A high desire for control may undermine cooperative group life (Fiske, 2000). Individuals' efforts to establish control in their own lives while trying to remain accepted and receive approval by their ingroup should be reflected in their interpersonal behaviors.

Specifically, a strong desire for control decreases the need for individuated attention to others and disposes one to rely on stereotypic categories (Fiske, 2002). Using stereotypic information maintains power hierarchies and contributes to higher levels of social dominance orientation (SDO). SDO refers to the extent to which an individual desires that one's ingroup dominate and be superior to outgroups (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). A high level of SDO reflects the high motive for control. According to Levin and Sidanius (1993), high SDO subjects who belonged to artificially high-status groups denigrate out-group members. Case, Fishbein, and Ritchey (2000) found that SDO was the only personality trait to directly affect prejudice and discrimination against women. This particular personality characteristic has not been studied with respect to bullying. However, in a pilot study conducted prior to the present project, Sumajin et al. (2001) found that social dominance orientation had a direct positive effect on self-reported high-school and workplace relational bullying. Being more socially dominant and supporting the idea that certain groups deserve unfair treatment increases the likelihood of aggression toward those groups. Therefore, higher

social dominance orientation is predicted to lead to higher workplace bullying and prejudice-based discrimination.

People may also use anger and verbal aggression as instrumental means to channeling their high need for control over the social environment. Anger and verbal aggression are readily construed as parts of aggressive behavior. Anger is the emotional or affective component of aggressive behavior, while verbal aggression represents a motor component (Buss & Perry, 1992). Individuals with a need for high control may feel frustrated when a loss of control is perceived. They may utilize anger and verbal aggression to restore and maintain control over their social environment. Therefore, higher levels of anger and verbal aggression are assumed to reflect a strong motive for control.

Individuals' level of aggression has been previously studied in relation to bullying and discriminatory behaviors. According to Olweus (1978), an aggressive response is defined as "any act or behavior that involves, might involve, and/or to some extent can be considered as aiming at the infliction of injury or discomfort; also manifestations of inner reactions such as feelings or thoughts that can be considered to have such aim are regarded as an aggressive response" (p.17). In a pilot study referred to above, Sumajin et al. (2001) found that individuals who bully and discriminate scored higher on aggression than non-bullies and non-discriminators. Therefore, it is predicted that higher anger and verbal aggression will be related to higher workplace bullying and prejudice-based discrimination.

Self-Enhancing Motive.

The self-enhancing motive constitutes the motive to maintain and possibly improve self-esteem (Fiske, 2000). Feeling good and confident in oneself is important in being able to contribute to healthy group life. Having too little personal self-esteem may lead to the constant need to inflate it at the expense of other individuals. For example, if these individuals are given an opportunity to discriminate, their feelings of self-esteem increase (Lemyre & Smith, 1985). Olweus (1978) reported that bullies do not tend to have problems with self-esteem or self-confidence. Sumajin et al. (2001) demonstrated that those individuals who indicated higher levels of self-confidence, assessed by a single item stating "Generally, I'm fairly sure of myself," engaged in more frequent bullying behaviors. However, this relationship remains debatable. O'Moore and Kirkham (2001) found that bullies had lower global self-worth than children who did not bully. In relation to prejudice and discrimination, Fein and Spencer (1997) demonstrated that self-image-threatening information led participants to negatively evaluate an individual if he/she appeared to be a member of a stereotyped group, and these negative evaluations in turn were particularly effective in restoring the participants' self-esteem. Therefore, lower self-esteem reflects the higher need to self-enhancement. Individuals who are characterized by more negative attitudes of themselves are motivated to create a positive identity through external means. Therefore, lower self-esteem is predicted to lead to higher workplace bullying and prejudice-based discrimination.

In addition, lacking personal self-esteem and submitting oneself to the social group may be related to denigrating the mental processes and behaviors of others. Right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) reflects intense and insecure attachment to one's own

group, demands rigid group cohesion, and completely subordinates the individual to the group (Fiske, 2000). Similar to self-esteem, higher right-wing authoritarianism also reflects individuals' higher need for self-enhancement, but through positive group identity. The motive to maintain a positive social identity provides a mechanism through which identification with a particular social group generates discrimination and bias against outgroups (Duckitt, 1994). The stronger one's subordination to the group is, the more that viewing the group as an extension of oneself may predict negative intergroup behaviors. Inflated collective self-esteem, when threatened, can lead to discrimination.

Duckitt and Farre (1994) demonstrated a strong correlation between right-wing authoritarianism and anti-Black prejudice ($r = 0.60$). Their results supported Altemeyer's (1981, 1988) previous findings reflecting positive correlations between right-wing authoritarianism and prejudice against minority groups for North American student and community samples (Duckitt & Farre, 1994). Although these findings reflect the relationship of authoritarianism to prejudiced attitudes, authoritarianism has been found to be indirectly related through prejudice to discrimination (Case, 2000). The relationship between authoritarianism and bullying has not been investigated; however, it is possible that individuals who bully are more likely to submit themselves to their social group and attempt to inflate their self-esteem through actions reflecting their group identity. Hence, higher right-wing authoritarianism is predicted to lead to higher workplace bullying and prejudice-based discrimination.

Part II.

In the preceding part of this study, bullying behavior was viewed as a continuum of mild to extreme behaviors, varying according to the frequency of self-reported bullying behaviors committed toward others. This conceptualization of bullying allowed us to identify which motives and personality traits are likely contribute to the presence of the overall behavior. But, previous literature has distinguished between different participant roles in the bullying process, namely, bully, victim, bully/victim, and non-bully/non-victim. It has been shown that psychological characteristics of these participant types are different from one another, with bully/victims experiencing the largest number of psychological difficulties (Kaltiala-Heino, Rimpela, Rantanen, & Rimpela, 2000).

Social motives of these participants may also be different from the overall motives for bullying behavior. The relation between social motives and the occurrence of bullying behavior may be affected by the correlation between bullying others and being a victim. By exploring participant roles, it becomes possible to minimize the effects of that correlation.

In this section of the study, we explored bullying in a more detailed fashion by identifying four participant roles: bully, victim, bully/victim, and non-bully/non-victim. The goal for this part of the study was to explore and compare these groups with respect to previously noted personality traits and social motives.

Bullies are defined as individuals who often victimize others, but are not often victimized themselves. Victims are defined as individuals who are often bullied but do not often bully others. Bully/victims comprise a separate group from bullies and victims.

This group of individuals victimizes others and is also often referred to as "provocative victims" – victims who play an active role in inviting or perpetuating the bullying behavior (Smith et al., 2002). Non-bullies/non-victims are individuals who do not often bully others and who are not often victimized themselves.

Workplace Bully Status.

Previous literature has suggested that bullies, victims, and bully/victims demonstrate substantial personality and physical differences. In children and adolescents, bullies as defined earlier are described as physically stronger, less anxious (Olweus, 1993), more extroverted, and having higher self-esteem (Rigby & Slee, 1993) than their victims (Rigby, Cox, & Black, 1997). Bullies are also aggressive, dominant, and feel little empathy for their victims (Olweus, 1994). According to Brodsky (1976), adult bullies are seen as manipulating for power or privilege. Bullies may have the need to dominate and exert power over other individuals who are weaker than they.

Workplace Victim Status.

Victims are characterized as passive and submissive, typically introverted, and showing low self-esteem and loneliness (Kaltiala-Heino, Rimpela, Rantanen, & Rimpela, 2000). Among children and adolescents, those who do not belong to peer network are most often victims (Salmivalli, Huttunen, & Lagerspetz, 1997); although, some victims have been shown to be members of a peer group. Victims may frequently be mistreated largely because they lack basic social skills associated with cooperativeness, such as making friends (Rigby, Cox, & Black, 1997).

In the workplace, victims of bullying and harassment have also been shown to have low self-esteem and to be anxious in social settings (Einarsen et al., 1994).

According to Gandolfo (1995), victims of harassment are oversensitive, suspicious, and angrier than other individuals (Einarsen, 2000).

Workplace Bully/Victim Status.

The Bully/Victim group has been shown to demonstrate substantial differences from either bullies or victims. In a sample of 14- to 16-year olds, bully/victims were seen as more ambivalent about themselves than bullies, victims, or controls, characterizing themselves both as powerful and as possessing numerous negative characteristics (Kaltiala-Heino et al., 2000). "These individuals are highly emotional and 'hot tempered.' Rather than using aggression in instrumental ways, they seem to use it after losing control in response to provocation. Unlike bullies and victims, bully/victims are rejected by nearly all peers and have few if any friends in any particular clique" (Pelligrini et al., 1999).

Research on workplace bullying has not specifically addressed personality characteristics of the bully/victim participant role. However, it has addressed the topic of victim precipitation. Aquino and Bradfield (2000) state that some victims either knowingly or unknowingly participate in the sequence of events that lead to their becoming a target of others' aggressive actions. For example, employees who are highly aggressive are at a higher likelihood of becoming victims of bullying. "This will occur because the cognitive and behavioral tendencies of highly aggressive persons make them more prone to respond aggressively to threatening stimuli which, in turn, can invite frequent retaliatory responses from others" (Aquino & Bradfield, 2000).

The theory of victim precipitation may be useful in examining the social motives of the four participant roles. Individuals who bully others but are not victimized

themselves may have very different motives for their behavior than those who both bully and are victimized.

Non-bully/Non-Victim Status.

Specific research has not been conducted to explore the motives and personality characteristics of non-bully/non-victims. However, this particular group has been used in previous research as a comparison to the bullies, victims, and bully/victims. In a school setting, non-bully/non-victims have been shown to be less anxious, less insecure, more popular, and more positive in their view of themselves than bullying victims (Olweus, 1994). Children and adolescents in this group have demonstrated higher self-esteem than victims, bullies, and bully/victims (O'Moore & Kirkham, 2001). Non-bully/non-victims have also been shown to hold more negative attitudes toward violence and use violence less than school bullies (Olweus, 1994). They have also demonstrated more empathy toward their peers and less impulsivity in their actions than bullies.

Present Study.

In the present study, participants were asked to complete a questionnaire, which consisted of scales concerned with workplace bullying, victimization, discrimination, prejudice, and personality traits. Psychometric properties of each scale were examined, and higher-order factors of prejudice and discrimination were determined. For the first part of this study, three linear regression analyses were conducted, with workplace bullying, discrimination, and victimization as dependent variables and personality traits, which were used as measures for social motives, as independent variables. For the second part of the study, a four category classification was formed to identify the participant roles of bully, victim, bully/victim, and non-bully/non-victim. Binary logistic

regression was used to predict group membership in these categories with regard to personality traits and control variables. Finally, results were discussed and recommendations for future research were made.

METHOD

Participants

Participants consisted of 331 undergraduate introductory psychology students at a large Midwestern university. Fifty-seven percent of participants were male and approximately 83% of participants identified themselves as White, 8% as Black, 2% as Hispanic, 4% as Asian/Pacific-Islander, and 3% as Other. Age of the participants ranged from 18 to 22 years old. Ninety-five percent of the participants identified themselves as being heterosexual, 2 % homosexual, and 3% bisexual. Only participants with self-reported current and previous work experience were allowed to take part in this study. In accordance with the IRB, subjects completed informed consent forms prior to participating.

Procedure

Participants were asked to complete a 197-item self-report questionnaire that consisted of scales assessing participants' personality traits, attitudes, and behaviors. Completing the questionnaire took about forty-five minutes. In return for participating in this study, students received course credit. Participants completed the questionnaire in groups of 10 to 25 at a time. Two forms of the questionnaire were created in order to control for order effects. An alternative form of the questionnaire was developed by reversing the order of scales, where the first scale on Form A was the last scale on Form B, and so on. All participants were informed that their responses would be kept

completely confidential because the researchers did not possess any identifying information.

Instruments.

For all behavior measures, participants were asked to indicate whether they had performed a specific behavior or whether a certain behavior was directed at them: never (a score of 0), 1 time (1), 2 times (2), 3 times (3), or 4 or more times (4). Participants reported the frequency of bullying others as well as being victimized by others in the current workplace within the last six months. Discrimination measures assessed discriminatory behavior toward three different groups -- obese people, homosexuals, and African-Americans. Participants were asked to self-report the occurrence of their discriminatory behavior in the last year.

For all personality and attitude measures, participants were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each item. A Likert scale was used for these items -- strongly disagree, mildly disagree, mildly agree, and strongly agree. Many items were reverse-scored such that a higher score indicated more agreement with the concept being assessed.

Psychometric properties of each scale were determined. Each scale was submitted to confirmatory factor analysis to assess whether all of the items on each scale measured the desired concept. After a desired fit was determined, Cronbach's alpha for each scale was calculated as an indicator of scale reliability. Items in each scale were summed and their average was determined to serve as an indicator of each concept.

Dependent Variables.

Workplace Bullying. A 15-item scale was developed specifically for this study based on the work of Einarsen and Raknes (1997). Two of the scale items are "I ridiculed or teased another coworker" and "I purposefully excluded a coworker from work-group activities." Confirmatory factor analysis was performed and six items were retained. Item loadings on a single factor (χ=20.99. p>0.01, GFI=0.981, AGFI=0.955) ranged from 0.45 to 0.69. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.70.

Workplace Victimization. Items used on this scale were the exact same 15 items used for the Workplace Bullying scale, revised to reflect the behaviors were directed at the respondent. The scale items include "I was ridiculed or teased by another coworker" and "I was purposefully excluded from work-group activities." Confirmatory factor analysis was performed and seven items were retained. These seven items fit on a single factor (χ=23.59. p>0.05, GFI=0.980, AGFI=0.960), with item loadings ranging from 0.41 to 0.70. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.79.

Discrimination against the Obese. This scale consisted of seven items used by Case et al. (2001). The scale items include "I treated obese people as if they were lazier than others" and "I valued the opinions of thin people more than the opinions of obese people." After confirmatory factor analysis was performed, five items were retained. Their loadings on a single factor (χ=5.64, p>0.05, GFI=0.994, AGFI=0.981) ranged from 0.38 to 0.75. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.68.

Discrimination Against Homosexuals. This scale consisted of six items used by Case et al. (2001). The scale items include "I avoided an area where I knew homosexuals hung out" and "In talking with peers I used terms that put homosexuals down." After

confirmatory factor analysis, all six items were retained. The items loaded on two factors (χ=4.83. p>0.05, GFI=0.995, AGFI=0.988), but based on the correlation of 0.65 between the factors, the six items were used as a single scale. Item loadings ranged from 0.50 to 0.86. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.78.

Discrimination Against African-Americans. This scale consisted of seven items used by Case et al. (2001). The sample items include "In talking with peers, I used insulting names when referring to African-Americans" and "I locked my car doors when driving through an African-American neighborhood." After confirmatory factor analysis, six items were retained. The items loaded on two factors (χ=18.73. p>0.01, GFI=0.983, AGFI=0.955), but based on the correlation of 0.71 between the factors, were used as a single scale. Item loadings ranged from 0.42 to 0.82. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.75.

Prejudice Against the Obese. This scale consisted of nine items used by Case et al. (2001). The items include "Obese people make me somewhat uncomfortable" and "Some people are obese because they have no will power." After confirmatory factor analysis was performed, five items were retained. Their loadings on a single factor (χ=11.91. p>0.01, GFI=0.987, AGFI=0.960) ranged from 0.51 to 0.79. The Cronbach alpha for this scale was 0.80.

Prejudice Against Homosexuals. This scale consisted of seven items used by Case et al. (2001). The items include "I feel safe around gays or lesbians" and "I feel that it's okay if gays or lesbians are being treated badly." After confirmatory factor analysis was performed, five items were retained. Their loadings on a single factor (χ=14.43, p>0.05,

GFI=0.984, AGFI=0.952). ranged 0.68 from to 0.87. The Cronbach alpha for this scale was 0.83.

Prejudice Against African-Americans. This scale consisted of seven items used by Case et al. (2001). The items include "African-Americans are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights" and "African-Americans should not push themselves where they are not wanted." After confirmatory factor analysis was performed, four items were retained. Their loadings on a single factor (χ=1.21 p>0.05, GFI=0.998, AGFI=0.992) ranged from 0.67 to 0.87. The Cronbach alpha for this scale was 0.84.

Discrimination and Prejudice.

After confirmatory analyses were carried out on measures of discrimination and prejudice, some additional analyses were conducted. A higher-order factor of discrimination was determined, combining discriminatory behaviors against all three target groups: African-Americans, homosexuals, and obese people. As expected with a just-identified model in which there is an equal number of knowns and unknowns (Case, 2000), three individual discrimination scales loaded perfectly on one higher-order factor of discrimination (χ=0.00, p=1.00), with loadings ranging from 0.73 to 0.76. Moderately high loadings on the higher-order factor indicated the unidimensional fit of the discrimination scales on this single factor.

A higher-order factor of prejudice was also determined, combining prejudiced attitudes against all three target groups. Again as expected, three individual prejudice scales loaded perfectly on one factor Prejudice (χ=0.00, p=1.00) with loadings ranging from 0.51 to 0.67. Even though the loadings of each scale on the higher-order factor were not optimally high, it has been shown in the past that prejudice against different

target groups may be combined in a higher-order factor. For example, Ritchey and Fishbein (2000) were able to determine a single factor of intolerance combining sex-role stereotyping with racial, gay, HIV/AIDS, and obese prejudice.

It is important to mention that prejudice was not used in the regression analyses. It merely served as a measurement tool in order to examine the nature of higher-order discrimination. The moderately high correlation between prejudice and discrimination (r=0.58) allowed us to conclude that the concept of discrimination is prejudice-based.

Independent Variables.

Social Dominance Orientation . This scale consisted of seven items previously used by Case et al. (2001), as well as Sumajin et al. (2001). This scale was extracted from the 16-item Social Dominance Orientation Scale developed by Pratto et al. (1994). Scale items include "Some groups of people are simply inferior to others" and "To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups." As a result of confirmatory factor analysis, six items were retained and fit on a single factor ($\chi = 20.03$, $p > 0.01$, GFI =0.982, AGFI=0.952). Item loadings ranged from 0.42 to 0.66. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.70.

Perspective Taking. This scale consisted of the original seven-item scale from Davis's Interpersonal Reactivity Index (1996). The fitted model had correlated errors among the reversed items, and confirmatory factor analysis indicated a single factor fit for all items (χ=7.33, p>0.05, GFI=0.993, AGFI=0.982). The items include "I try to look at everybody's side of disagreement before I make a decision" and "I believe that there are two sides to every question and I try to look at them both." Item loadings for this scale ranged from 0.35 to 0.69. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.69.

Self-Esteem. Self-esteem was assessed using a 10-item Self-Esteem Scale developed by Rosenberg (1965). After confirmatory factor analysis was performed, five of the original items were retained, and a good single fit was determined (χ=5.53, p>0.05, GFI=0.994, AGFI=0.981). Item loadings for this scale ranged from 0.48 to 0.86. The items include "I am able to do things as well as most other people" and "I take a positive attitude toward myself." Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.80.

Social Anxiety. Anxiety was assessed using a six-item Revised Social Anxiety Subscale of the Self-Consciousness Scale (Scheier & Carver, 1985). After conducting confirmatory factor analysis and after examining the content of the items, two factors were determined based on five of the original items. The factors were correlated and by virtue of their correlation of 0.88, the five items were used as a single scale (χ=6.11, p>0.05, GFI=0.993, AGFI=0.974). The items included "It takes me time to get over my shyness" and "I get embarrassed very easily." Item loadings ranged from 0.64 to 0.76. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.82.

Right-Wing Authoritarianism. This seven-item scale was used by Case et al. (2001) and Sumajin et al. (2001). This scale originated from Altemeyer's (1996) 32-item Right-Wing Authoritarianism. The items included "What our country needs is a strong, determined leader who will crush our enemies and take us back to our true path" and "Obedience and respect for authority are two of the most important virtues children should learn." When subjected to confirmatory factor analysis, five items were retained. Item loadings on a single factor (χ=6.94, p>0.05, GFI=0.992, AGFI=0.977) ranged from 0.49 to 0.72, and Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.70.

Verbal Aggression. This four-item scale was developed as one factor of the original four-factor Aggression Scale by Buss and Perry (1992). After submitting the scale to confirmatory factor analysis and after examining the content of the items, three items were retained. The items include "I often find myself disagreeing with people" and "I can't help getting into arguments when people disagree with me." Confirmatory factor analysis indicated a perfect single-factor fit (χ=0.00. p=1.00), with item loadings ranging from 0.58 to 0.77. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.74.

Anger. This seven-item scale was developed as another factor of the original four-factor Aggression Scale by Buss and Perry (1992). After submitting the scale to confirmatory factor analysis and after examining the content of the items, six items were retained. The items include "Some of my friends think I'm a hothead" and "Sometimes I fly off the handle for no reason." Confirmatory factor analysis indicated a good single-factor fit (χ=15.84. p>0.01, GFI=0.985, AGFI=0.962) with item loadings ranging from 0.48 to 0.71. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.76.

Controls. Participants' race, sex, self-reported sexual orientation, weight, age, work responsibility, and social desirability were used as control variables. Social desirability was defined as the tendency to attempt to present oneself in a favorable light while answering the items on the questionnaire. This concept has been related to a general motive of the need for social approval (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964 cited in Paulhus, 1991). The five-item Social Desirability Scale was used by Case et al. (2001) and Sumajin et al. (2001) and was based on the scale of Hays, Hayashi, and Stewart (1989). While social desirability was used as a control in this particular study, it may also be interpreted as another personality trait.

Sex was coded as male (1) and female (0). One dummy variable was created for race. The variable labeled "white" was coded as white (1), and non-white as (0). One dummy variable was created also for sexual orientation. The variable labeled "heterosexual" was coded as heterosexual (1) and homosexual or bisexual (0). In addition to sex, race, and sexual orientation, self-reported weight, age, and work responsibility were originally used as controls; however, when excluded from the analyses, the results were not altered. Thus, weight, age, and work responsibility were not significant factors in this study.

Procedure of Analysis.

Part 1. A model was designed where seven personality traits and control variables, social desirability, sex, race, and sexual orientation, were treated as independent variables, while three behavioral variables of workplace bullying, victimization, and discrimination served as dependent variables. Using ordinary least squares regression, the dependent variables were individually regressed on all seven personality traits and the four control variables.

Part 2. A four category classification was formed to identify participant roles in the bullying process: bully, victim, bully/victim, and non-bully/non-victim. A bully was defined as someone who scored in the top 40% of the workplace bullying scale and in the bottom 60% of the victimization scale. A victim was defined as someone who scored in the top 40% of the workplace victimization scale and in the bottom 60% of the bullying scale. For the categories of bully and victim, the bottom 60% of the respective scale was used in order to increase the sample size. When restricting the range to the bottom 40% in addition to the top 40% of the opposing scale, the sample was decreased significantly,

thereby decreasing the power in the regression analyses. A bully/victim was defined as someone who scored in the top 40% of both the bullying and the victimization scales; while, non-bully/non-victim scored in the bottom 40% of both the bullying and the victimization scales. Even when using the bottom 40% of each scale for this particular category, we were able to achieve moderately good sample size and that allowed us to explore the extreme ends of both scales. As a result of this classification, only 249 of the original participants were included in this analysis. After the four categories were formed, membership in each category was dummy coded and used as a dichotomous dependent variable (e.g., bully – coded as 1; victim, bully/victim, non-bully/non-victim – coded as 0, etc.) in the binary logistic regression analysis.

Binary logistic regression describes the relationship between a dichotomous response variable and a set of explanatory variables. The explanatory variables may be continuous or (with dummy variables) discrete (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2002). Binary logistic regression was used to predict group membership in the aforementioned categories using personality traits and control variables.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics.

Descriptive statistics for each scale used in this study are provided in Table 1. These include each measure's mean, standard deviation, observed minimum, and observed maximum. For all personality measures, scores of 2.5 or higher indicate agreement with the concept measured, whereas scores below 2.5 indicate disagreement. For all workplace bullying, victimization, and discrimination measures, a higher score indicates a higher frequency of each type of behavior. For example, a score of 2 indicates

that on average, each individual act of bullying or discrimination was committed or experienced twice in the time period assessed. For the higher-order factor of discrimination, all of the components were weighted equally and the mean of the higher-order factor equals the mean of the composites.

The correlation matrix between the dependent variables and each predictor and control variable is presented in Table 2. This table also shows correlations among the dependent variables. It is notable that for many of the predictor variables, their correlations with each dependent variable were either all positive or all negative. For example, social dominance orientation was positively correlated with workplace bullying, workplace victimization, and prejudice-based discrimination. For some of the predictor variables, the correlations with each dependent variable were very close in magnitude. For example, the correlation between anger and all three dependent variables are in the range of 0.179 to 0.182. This similarity in correlations between dependent and independent variables suggests that many of the personality traits have similar effects on workplace bullying, workplace victimization, and prejudice-based discrimination.

Part1: Causal Model.

Table 3 shows standardized regression coefficients from the regressions of discrimination, workplace bullying, and workplace victimization, respectively, on personality traits and control variables. We discuss the findings below.

Discrimination.

Social dominance orientation and right-wing authoritarianism had significant direct effects on discrimination. Those who scored higher on social dominance orientation ($\beta = 0.283$) and on right-wing authoritarianism ($\beta = 0.112$) were more likely

to discriminate against the obese, African-Americans, and homosexuals. Social dominance orientation was more predictive of discriminatory behavior than right-wing authoritarianism. Perspective-taking, self-esteem, anxiety, anger, and verbal aggression did not significantly affect discrimination.

Three control variables, social desirability, sex, and race influenced discrimination. Lower social desirability ($\beta = -0.239$) was related to higher frequency of discrimination. Male ($\beta = 0.210$) and White ($\beta = 0.092$) participants engaged in higher levels of higher-order discrimination. Social desirability and sex show stronger association with discriminatory behavior than sex, with social desirability being the strongest predictor. Social dominance orientation, right-wing authoritarianism, social desirability, sex, and race explain 36% of variation in higher-order discrimination.

Workplace Bullying.

Of the predictor variables, only perspective taking and social dominance orientation had significant direct effects on workplace bullying. As perspective taking decreased, frequency of bullying increased ($\beta = -0.234$) and as social dominance orientation increased, the frequency of bullying also increased ($\beta = 0.122$). Notably, perspective taking was more predictive of workplace bullying than was social dominance orientation. Right-wing authoritarianism, self-esteem, anxiety, anger, and verbal aggression did not yield significant influences on workplace bullying.

Two control variables influenced workplace bullying. Lower levels of social desirability were associated with higher levels of bullying ($\beta = - 0.149$), and males bullied more frequently than females ($\beta = 0.153$). Perspective taking, social dominance

orientation, social desirability, and sex explain 21% of the variation in workplace bullying.

Workplace Victimization.

Only perspective-taking and self-esteem had a significant direct effect on workplace victimization. As perspective taking ability decreased, the frequency of victimization increased (β = -0.168), and as self-esteem decreased, the frequency of victimization also increased (β = -0.164). Perspective taking and self-esteem were equally predictive of workplace victimization. Social dominance orientation, right-wing authoritarianism, anxiety, anger, and verbal aggression did not yield significant effects on workplace victimization.

Of the control variables, only sex influenced workplace victimization. Males (β = 0.130) were more likely to be victimized. Perspective taking, self-esteem, and sex explain 15% of variation in workplace victimization.

Part 2.

The correlation matrix of the participant roles with each predictor and control variable is presented in Table 4. The odds ratios from the binary logistic regression for each participant role are presented in Table 5. Each odds ratio in this table yields the odds of membership in each category relative to that of being in all other categories in relation to the personality traits (e.g., probability of being a bully in relation to social anxiety as opposed to being a victim, a bully/victim, or a non-bully/non-victim). If an odds ratio is less than 1, it indicates a decrease in the odds of a membership in the respective category; whereas, if an odds ratio is greater than 1, it indicates an increase in the odds of a membership in the category. For example, the odds ratio of being a bully

per unit change in verbal aggression is 0.553; with a unit increase in verbal aggression (e.g., from its mean of 2.38 to 3.38), the odds of being a bully as opposed to being a victim, a bully/victim, or a non-bully/non-victim are decreased by 45% ((0.553-1)*100%). Another example is the odds ratio of being a victim in relation to social anxiety; the odds ratio of 2.23 indicates that with a unit increase in social anxiety (e.g., from its mean of 2.48 to 3.48), the odds of being a victim, as opposed to being a member of the other three categories, are increased by 123% ((2.231-1)*100%).

Bully Status.

Two personality traits were found to significantly predict the odds of being a bully (N=60), as opposed to being a victim, a bully/victim, and non-bully/non-victim. Logistic regression analysis showed that scoring higher on right-wing authoritarianism increased the odds of being a bully by 94%. Scoring lower on verbal aggression increased the odds of being a bully by 45%. That is, as right-wing authoritarianism increases and verbal aggression decreases, the individual is more likely to be a bully. These results are distinctly different from the regression analysis in the first part of this study. In the linear regression analysis, higher social dominance orientation predicted higher frequency of bullying, and lower perspective taking also predicted higher bullying. These results suggest that the correlation between bullying and victimization influenced the results in Part I of this study.

One control variable, social desirability, also significantly predicted the odds of being a bully. A decrease in social desirability increased the odds of being a bully as opposed to being a member of the remaining three groups by 53%. Right-wing

authoritarianism, verbal aggression, and social desirability explain 8% (Cox & Snell R^2 = 0.087) of the odds of being a bully.

Victim Status.

Two personality traits were found to predict significantly the odds of being a victim (being a victim, as opposed to being a bully, a bully/victim, or a non-bully/non-victim) (N=35). Logistic regression analysis showed that scoring higher on perspective-taking increased the odds of being a victim by 144%. Scoring higher on anxiety (exp[β] = 2.231) increased the odds of being a victim by 123%. Perspective-taking, and anxiety explain 8% (Cox & Snell R^2=0.083) of the variation of being a victim.

These results are also distinctly different from the regression analysis in the Part I. In the initial analysis, being victimized in the workplace was associated with lower perspective taking ability and lower feelings of self-esteem. However, in this analysis, the likelihood of being a victim increased as perspective taking and social anxiety increased. This may also indicate that the correlation between bullying and victimization influenced the results in the initial regression analysis.

Bully/Victim Status.

Four personality traits were found to significantly predict the odds of being a bully/victim (as opposed to being a bully only, a victim only, or neither) (N=78). Logistic regression analysis showed that scoring lower on perspective taking increased the odds of being a bully/victim by 68.5%; scoring lower on social anxiety increased the odds of being a bully/victim by 36%; scoring lower on self-esteem also increased the odds of being a bully/victim by 49%; and scoring higher verbal aggression increased the odds of being a bully/victim by 70%.

One control variable, sex, predicted being a bully/victim. Females were more likely to be bully/victims than males by 66%. Perspective-taking, anxiety, self-esteem, verbal aggression, and sex explain 20% (Cox & Snell R^2=0.202) of the variation of being a bully/victim.

Non-Bully/Non-Victim Status.

One personality trait significantly predicted the odds of being a non-bully/non-victim (N=76) as opposed to being a bully only, a victim only, or a bully/victim. As self-esteem increased, the odds of being a non-bully/non-victim increased by 90%.

Two control variables, sex and social desirability, had a significant effect on the odds of being a non-bully/non-victim. Higher social-desirability increased the odds of being a bully/victim by 164%. Males were more likely to be bully/victims by 106%. Self-esteem, social desirability, and sex explain 16% (Cox & Snell $R^2 = 0.158$) of the variation in being a non-bully/non-victim.

Additional Analyses.

Alternate Model. An alternative model was estimated with errors of the dependent variables covarying with each other. An advantage of this model is that covarying errors of dependent variables controls for the influence of any relevant variables that would simultaneously affect bullying, discrimination, and victimization that are not included in the model. Therefore, if any of the dependent variables are actually causally related, that relationship will contribute to the correlation between their error terms, without biasing the regression coefficients (Case, 2000). This alternate model allows us to analyze the dependent variables simultaneously without specifying any causal relationships among them. However, after comparing the results of the

alternate model with the results of the ordinary least squares regression, no differences were found in the final results.

Multicollinearity.

In order to assess the multi-collinearity among personality measures, each individual personality trait was regressed on all other personality traits. There were no major problems of multicollinearity present except between anger and social desirability. In the regression equation for workplace bullying, anger and social desirability affected each other's direct influence on the dependent variable. Leaving social desirability out of the equation appreciably increased the significance level of anger on workplace bullying. This suggests that participants were giving socially desirable responses to items assessing anger; therefore, the concept of anger may not be a true representation of their feelings. It is likely that participants were attempting to be seen in a more socially acceptable light when providing answers to anger related questions. Therefore, any results related to anger and its relationship to other variables should be interpreted with caution.

DISCUSSION

Part I.

This study explored the underlying social motives and personality traits of workplace bullying and prejudice-based discrimination and revealed some similarities and differences among these behaviors. The three major findings of the first part of this study were: social dominance orientation affects bullying and discrimination in a similar manner, perspective taking affects bullying but not discrimination, and right-wing authoritarianism affects discrimination but not bullying. Both bullying and discrimination are influenced by low social desirability, and men are more likely than

women to bully and discriminate against others. Whites are more likely to discriminate than are non-Whites, but not to bully others.

Personality, Social Motives, and Workplace Bullying.

In this section, the specific findings regarding personality, social motives, and workplace bullying are discussed. Personality traits with direct influences on workplace bullying included social dominance orientation and perspective taking. Social dominance orientation contains the motive to control the social environment, while perspective taking includes the motive to understand socially effective interactions. These findings support the argument that certain social motives and personality traits influence individuals' predisposition to bully others.

Social Dominance Orientation. As hypothesized, higher social dominance predicted the higher frequency of bullying behaviors. This finding replicates the results of the pilot study conducted prior to this project (Sumajin et al., 2001). This personality trait represents an acceptance of inequality with one's in-group occupying dominant status and one's out-groups occupying subordinate status (Case, 2001). The influence of social dominance ($\beta = 0.122$) on workplace bullying may partly be a result of the group nature of the bullying behavior. For example, school class bullies belong to social clusters and are supported by their peer group (Salmivalli, Huttunen, & Lagerspetz, 1997). The same may be true in the workplace; bullies may belong to a "bully" social crowd. Members of that group may be more likely to endorse hierarchy-enhancing beliefs toward their victims. For example, a bully may be more likely to believe that individuals who are victimized deserve to be treated unfairly.

Social dominance orientation is a personality trait that reflects the need for high control and influences the behaviors associated with it. Individuals who bully exert asymmetrical control over their environment in order to feel effective. Social dominance orientation provides the resources to implement the goals specified by the motive to control. In accordance with social dominance theory, the controlling person does not treat others as individuals, but instead as category members who satisfy the need to exert personal influence (Fiske & Emery, 1998). Therefore, bullying others reflects the need to control.

Perspective Taking. Perspective taking had a moderate effect on workplace bullying (β = -0. 234). Lower perspective taking ability is related to higher frequency of workplace bullying. These results support the previous literature linking perspective taking with bullying behaviors in children (Crick & Dodge, 1999). Perspective taking is a component of empathy that refers to the ability to assume and experience another's point of view. High empathy and high perspective-taking ability reflect the high motive to understand and thus act as inhibiting mechanisms of aggression. Therefore, if perspective taking skills are lower, the inhibitor of aggression is decreased, thereby increasing the likelihood of bullying behavior.

Low ability to assume the perspective of another person reflects a low need to understand socially effective interactions. Bullying behavior is then influenced by this low motivation and the personality trait reflecting it. If an individual is not empathic towards others and is not driven by the need to understand socially effective interactions, he/she is more likely to engage in behaviors that are harmful to others. In our study,

individuals are more likely to bully in accordance with their low motivation to understand others' points of view and their respective low perspective-taking ability.

Controls. The modest effect of sex ($\beta = 0.153$) on workplace bullying revealed that men are more likely to bully others than women. Women probably bully less because they are socialized differently than men (Case, 2001). As members of the dominant group, men are socialized to have access to power and feel more comfortable utilizing it. By contrast, women may be less likely to bully others.

Social desirability also had a modest effect ($\beta = -0.149$) on workplace bullying. Individuals who reported more bullying behaviors were less likely to provide socially acceptable responses. This may reflect that individuals who are willing to bully others are less likely to be concerned with the socially approved norms.

Personality, Social Motives, and Discrimination.

As previously mentioned, if a moderate to strong correlation exists between prejudice and discrimination, it is safe to assume that the discriminatory acts are at least partially based on prejudice. The moderate correlation ($r = 0.58$) between prejudice and discrimination in this study allows us to assume the prejudicial basis of our measure of discrimination. In this section, the specific findings regarding personality, social motives, and discrimination are discussed. Personality traits with direct influences on workplace bullying included social dominance orientation and right-wing authoritarianism.

Social Dominance Orientation. As predicted, social dominance orientation had a moderate effect ($\beta = 0.283$) on discrimination. Those who scored higher on social dominance orientation were more likely to discriminate against others. These results are consistent with the pilot study as well as with other previous research. Case (2001)

demonstrated that social dominance orientation was the only personality trait to have a direct effect on discrimination against women. Individuals who score higher on social dominance orientation tend to favor intergroup relations that are hierarchical, or ordered along a superior-inferior dimension (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 2000). Therefore, these individuals use discriminatory behaviors to maintain the dominance of their in-group.

As previously mentioned, social dominance orientation reflects the motive to control the social environment. When trying to establish control, people use categorization to organize the environment and fall vulnerable to stereotyping (Fiske, 2000). Too much control reinforces hierarchies, contributing to higher levels of social dominance orientation, which in turn leads to higher levels of discriminatory behaviors.

Right-Wing Authoritarianism. Right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) had a modest effect ($\beta = 0.112$) on discrimination. Individuals who scored higher on RWA were more likely to discriminate against African-Americans, homosexuals, and the obese. In previous research, RWA has been explored in relation to prejudice (Altemeyer, 1996; Case, 2001), but, not to discrimination. RWA reflects an intense identification with the in-group and consequent emphasis on and demand for group cohesion (Duckitt, 1994). Those individuals who completely subordinate themselves to their social group are more likely to discriminate against members of the out-group. Any threat to the in-group may beget anger and later lead to the dehumanization of the out-group (Fiske, 2000), which contributes to discriminatory behaviors.

According to Fiske (2000), attachment to the in-group and perceived danger from the out-group fit well with the motive of self-enhancement. Individuals who submit

themselves to the group have a need to maintain their own positive social identity through group membership. Therefore, the intense identification with the in-group reflects individuals' need for self-enhancement and is further reflected through their discriminatory behaviors.

Controls. The moderate effect of sex ($\beta = 0.210$) on discrimination revealed that men are more likely to bully others than women. Women may discriminate less because historically women have been targets of discrimination. Therefore, they are more aware of the effects of discrimination and are less likely to commit discriminatory acts against others.

Race had a small effect ($\beta = 0.092$) on discrimination. Whites are more likely to discriminate against others than non-Whites. Whites are currently members of a dominant group in the United States; therefore, they are more likely to discriminate against others to maintain their status in the society. Having experience discrimination, non-whites are less likely themselves to commit such acts. However, in addition to African-Americans, target groups in this study included homosexual and obese individuals. Being a member of racial minority does not guarantee being less discriminatory against homosexuals and obese; this finding needs to be researched further.

Social desirability also had a moderate effect ($\beta = -0.239$) on discrimination. Individuals who reported more discriminatory behaviors were less likely to provide socially acceptable responses on the social desirability measure. As in bullying, this result may indicate that individuals who are willing to discriminate against others are less likely to be concerned with the socially sanctioned norms. Moreover, based on the long

history of institutionalized discrimination in this country (Fishbein, 2002), some individuals may not recognize discrimination as a socially undesirable behavior.

Workplace Bullying and Discrimination

Several similarities emerge among workplace bullying and discrimination. One major common finding was reflected in the influence of social dominance orientation on bullying and discriminatory behaviors. As previously mentioned, social dominance orientation reflects the need to control by contributing to individuals' hierarchy-enhancing beliefs. The common influence of social dominance orientation indicates that individuals who are likely to bully or discriminate against others are partly driven by the need to control. They are more likely to endorse unequal treatment and, therefore, are more likely to gain or maintain their feelings of control by exerting influence over those with less status than they.

It is important to consider that social dominance orientation has a stronger influence on discriminatory behaviors than on bullying behaviors. This is partly due to the widely known group nature of discrimination. Discriminatory acts are mostly committed for the benefit of the in-group, not just the individual committing the act. Bullying behaviors are often committed in a group context; however, their primary purpose may be to exert individual control.

In addition to social dominance orientation, social desirability has a similar effect on bullying and discrimination. Individuals who are more likely to bully or discriminate are less likely to provide socially desirable responses. This finding may indicate that when bullying or discriminatory acts occur, individuals committing those acts are unconcerned with social norms. Hence, they are also relatively less influenced by the

need to create a favorable impression of themselves. It is also possible that individuals who bully or discriminate are less aware of the inappropriate or harmful nature of their behavior.

Men were also more likely to bully and discriminate against others than women. As previously discussed, men in our society are socialized differently from women (Case, 2001); leading them to feel more comfortable exerting physical or psychological force toward others to gain individual and social control. For the same reasons, men are also more likely than women to admit to bullying and discriminatory acts.

Several differences emerge among workplace bullying and discrimination. Lower perspective taking contributed to higher frequency of bullying behaviors, but did not influence the occurrence of discrimination. It is possible that the group nature of discrimination may again be the source of this difference. Discriminatory acts are committed to gain or maintain the dominant status of one's in-group; therefore, it is less likely that feelings or thoughts of each individual target may be relevant to the perpetrator. Targets are chosen on the basis of their group membership, and their individual characteristics may not be considered. Therefore, in the occurrence of discriminatory acts, the targets are seen as homogeneous members of a group, rather than as individuals. Bullying acts, however, are often committed toward individuals who share similar characteristics but do not necessarily belong to one target group. Therefore, victims' individual characteristics become more salient in the bullying process.

Higher right-wing authoritarianism contributed to higher frequency of discriminatory behaviors, but did not influence the occurrence of bullying behaviors. Right-wing authoritarianism partly reflects one's complete submission to the in-group

and reflects the need for self-enhancement through creating a positive social identity. Being a part of a group and behaving to maintain one's positive image is possibly at the base of both discriminatory and bullying behaviors; however, in discrimination, self-enhancement is group-based. Individuals who commit discriminatory acts are motivated to create a positive identity for themselves through affiliation with their in-group. In bullying, the motive for personal self-enhancement is achieved through individual means, rather than through group membership. Therefore, while both bullying and discrimination are group-based, self-enhancement is dependent on the positive group identity in discrimination only.

Overall, bullying and discrimination appear to be behaviors committed more frequently by men than women, relatively less influenced by socially approved norms, and mainly driven by the need to control the social environment. Bullying and discrimination appear to be influenced by group submission, with only discrimination reflecting the motive for self-enhancement through group affiliation.

Workplace Victimization

For exploratory purposes, the occurrence of workplace victimization was studied with respect to the personality traits and social motives. In this section, the findings related to that goal are discussed. Personality traits with direct influences on workplace victimization included perspective-taking and self-esteem.

Self-Esteem. Self-esteem had a modest influence ($\beta = -0.164$) on the frequency of workplace victimization. Those who had lower self-esteem were more likely to be victimized. These findings are consistent with previous research indicating that victims are characterized by low self-esteem (Leymann, 1990; O'Moore & Kirkham, 2001).

However, it is not clear whether victims have negative views of themselves prior to being bullied or as a consequence of bullying behavior. If the latter is true, it is extremely important to investigate what makes individuals who are victimized susceptible to being bullied by others. However, if the former is true, individuals with lower self-esteem may be relatively less assertive and have lower social skills, leaving them more prone to be victimized by others.

Low self-esteem reflects a strong motive for self-enhancement. While victims have the desire to increase their positive identity, they have difficulties acting in ways that reflect that need. They may spend time by themselves or lack the necessary social skills to identify with a positive in-group. Therefore, they sometimes remain isolated and become easy targets for bullying behavior. Victims may also seek out social interactions that increase the salience of submissive nature and thereby, their susceptibility to bullying.

Perspective-Taking. Perspective taking had a modest influence on workplace victimization ($\beta = -0.168$). Individuals with lower perspective-taking ability were more likely to be victimized. Previous research has not explored the relationship between perspective taking and victimization. However, this finding may be related to the previously mentioned relationship between self-esteem and perspective taking. Individuals who are victimized may lack the necessary social skills to interact with others and, as a result, become more prone to being victimized. Perspective taking is an element of social competence, and the decreased ability to understand others' points of view may be related to the increased risk of being ostracized.

Perspective taking ability reflects the motive to understand socially effective interactions. Victims' decreased ability to assume another's point of view affects their social interactions that likely contribute to their negative view of themselves. While bullying victims are still driven to understand the social interactions, they lack the ability to participate in behaviors that satisfy that particular motive.

Another hypothesis can be offered about the relationship of lower perspective taking and higher frequency of being a victim of bullying acts: it is possible that the results in this particular portion of the study are affected by the high ($r = 0.701$) correlation between bullying and victimization. Such a high correlation between two dependent variables is likely to affect their relationship with several predictor variables. In that light, this high correlation between bullying and discrimination serves as the rationale for the analyses performed in Part II of this study.

Part II.

The main goal of this part of the study was to explore personality traits and motives of bullies, victims, bully/victims, and non-bully/non-victims. By isolating these four major categories, we were able to minimize the effect of the correlation between bullying and victimization. It was thus expected that the results of Part II would differ from those of Part I. The major findings of this portion of the study included: being a bully was influenced by higher right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) and lower verbal aggression, being a victim was influenced by higher perspective-taking and higher anxiety, being a bully/victim was influenced by lower perspective-taking, lower anxiety, lower self-esteem, and higher verbal aggression, and being a non-bully/non-victim was influenced by higher self-esteem. Lower social desirability influenced being a bully, and

more women than men were likely to be categorized as bully/victim. Finally, higher social desirability and being male predicted being a non-bully/non-victim.

Personality, Social Motives, and Bullies.

Right-wing authoritarianism was related to being a bully, as opposed to being a victim, a bully/victim, or a non-bully/non-victim. High RWA reflects the motive for self-enhancement through group submission. These results serve as evidence for the group nature of bullying. Salmivalli, Huttunen, and Lagerspetz (1997) demonstrated that bullies associate with other bullies; therefore, their behavior may be more influenced by their submission to their in-group. School bullies, for example, choose as their friends others who have a positive attitude towards bullying and who provide the bullies with positive feedback and reinforcement (Salmivalli et al., 1997). Therefore, being a bully is influenced by the submission to the in-group and creating a positive self-identity through victimizing others in accordance with in-group norms.

Lower verbal aggression was also related to being a bully as opposed to being a victim, a bully/victim, and a non-bully/non-victim. Low verbal aggression, an expressive motor component of aggressive behavior (Buss & Perry, 1992), reflects a low need for control over the social environment. This finding is contradictory to the previous findings by Olweus (1978), which demonstrated that aggression is part of bullying behavior.

However, the discrepancy in findings may partly be attributed to an important difference in the samples. Olweus investigated children in elementary and middle schools, whereas the present study used undergraduate students. Based on these results, it is possible to assume that being a bully is not influenced by a high need for personal

control. However, this finding may be also misleading and should be researched further. Individuals classified as bullies in this study endorsed a moderate frequency of bullying acts that involved components of verbal aggression; therefore, it is not clear why the decrease in this personality trait influences the increase in the likelihood of being a bully. Many bullying acts in the workplace are indirect such as excluding the victim from work-related activities, withholding important information, and devaluing the other's efforts (Einarsen, 2000); however, verbal acts still remain a part of bullying behavior.

Lower social desirability had an influence on being a bully, rather than being a victim, a bully/victim, and a non-bully/non-victim. This may once again reveal that individuals who are willing to bully others are less likely to be concerned with socially approved norms.

Personality, Social Motives, and Victims.

Higher perspective taking was related to being a victim, as opposed to being a bully, a bully/victim, and a non-bully/non-victim. High perspective-taking reflects a high need to understand socially effective interactions. Surprisingly, victims' high need to understand and relate to others as well as their high perspective taking ability is related to their reports of being victimized. The correlation between high school and workplace bullying (Sumajin et al., 2001) serves as evidence of an extended history of victimization for these individuals. As a result, victims of bullying may develop an enhanced understanding of others' feelings and experiences. A similar finding occurs in the prejudice literature; women and minority members are less likely to be prejudiced against others based on their personal experiences of prejudice (Case, 2001). However, this heightened ability to understand others around them may interfere with victims' ability to

retaliate when they are bullied, leaving them more prone to further attacks. This may serve as a plausible explanation for the relationship between high perspective taking ability and being a victim; however, these results should be researched further.

It is interesting to note that the results in this portion of the study contradict the findings in Part I, which indicated that lower perspective-taking was related to higher frequency of being victimized. It is likely that the results in the first portion were confounded by the previously noted correlation between bullying and victimization. However, these contradictory findings warrant further research to gain a clear understanding of the relationship between perspective taking ability and victimization in the workplace.

Higher social anxiety was also related to being a victim, as opposed to being a bully, a bully/victim, and a non-bully/non-victim. Social anxiety is defined as individuals' discomfort in social interactions (Fenigstein et al., 1975). High social anxiety reflects a high need to belong to a social group. These results are consistent with previous research that has demonstrated high levels of anxiety in victims (Olweus, 1978), who also tend to be relatively more quiet and socially withdrawn (Aquino & Bradfield, 2000). Being socially isolated often renders victims easy targets of bullying; therefore, their desire to belong to a social group is heightened. It is not clear, however, whether victim's anxiety and the need to belong are a consequence or a precursor of being bullied.

Personality Traits, Social Motives, and Bully/Victims.

Bully/Victims are a distinct group from either bullies or victims. These individuals victimize others, while they are bullied themselves. It is important to consider all of the findings related to this particular group before interpreting them.

Lower perspective-taking was related to being a bully/victim, as opposed to being a bully, a victim, and a non-bully/non-victim. As previously mentioned, lower perspective-taking reflects a low need to understand socially effective interactions. Lower anxiety, which reflects a low need to belong, was also related to being a bully/victim. Lower self-esteem reflects a high need for self-enhancement and was related to being a bully/victim. Finally, higher verbal aggression, which reflects a high need for control, was related to being a bully/victim.

Overall, these individuals appear to have low needs to understand socially effective interactions and to belong to a social group, but high needs to self-enhance and to gain or maintain personal control. These individuals appear to be driven by their personal needs and have little concern for others. These results appear consistent with previous research that has found that bully/victims or aggressive victims display a "hostile style" of interaction, are highly emotional, and "hot tempered" (Pellegrini et al., 1999). Based on these characteristics, this group of bully/victims participates in some degree to their own victimization. They may provoke attacks in response to their hostile or threatening behaviors (Aquino & Bradfield, 2000).

In addition, women were more likely to be bully/victims than men. As stated previously, it is possible that women are socialized differently from men to be more passive; therefore, they are less likely to bully others unprovoked. However, at the same time, they may be more reactive, more likely to provoke a bullying act by trying to defend themselves.

Personality Traits, Social Motives, and Non-Bully/Non-Victims.

Higher self-esteem was related to being a non-bully/non-victim, as opposed to being a bully, a victim, and a bully/victim. Higher self-esteem reflects a low need for self-enhancement, and these findings are consistent with previous research demonstrating that non-bully/non-victims are more positive in their views of themselves than bullies, victims, and bully/victims (O'Moore & Kirkham, 2001). These individuals do not bully others and are not targeted themselves. Therefore, their non-offending behavior with respect to bullying is consistent with their already established high self-esteem and the low need to increase it.

Men were more likely to be non-bully/non-victims than women. It is possible that men are less likely than women to admit to being victimized. It is also possible that the responses of members of this group were influenced by their desire for their behaviors to appear socially-approved. Specifically, higher social desirability was related to being a non-bully/non-victim. It is likely that individuals who do not bully others and are not victimized themselves are concerned with socially-approved norms and follow them appropriately. They may appreciate the potential harmful effects of their behavior and therefore act according to their beliefs. However, it is also possible that their responses were influenced by the need to present themselves in a favorable light.

Bullies, Victims, Bully/Victims, and Non-Bully/Non-Victims.

Based on these results, it is clear that bullies, victims, bully/victims, and non-bully/non-victims are distinct categories of individuals. Bullies appear to be driven mainly by the need to self-enhance through being part of group and creating a positive personal social identity by bullying others. Victims appear to be driven mainly by the

need to understand others and to belong to a social group. Bully/Victims seem to be motivated by their personal need to self-enhance and gain personal control over their environment, without having to belong to a social cluster or to understand others around them. Non-bully/Non-victims appear to be motivated by a low need to self-enhance, and therefore, do not target others and are not targeted themselves. These results are consistent with previous research that speculates that bully/victims are the most complex of the four aforementioned groups. Results of this part of the study indicate that people with certain personality traits may be perceived by others as being either vulnerable or deserving targets for mistreatment (Aquino & Bradfield, 2000).

As expected, several differences emerged in the results between Parts I and II of this study. Based on the high correlation between bullying and victimization, it is most useful to compare the results from Part I to the results related to the bully/victim category in Part II. Differences between these portions of this study were expected because forming the category of bully/victims eliminated several bully/non-victims and non-bully/victims, who were included in the Part I analyses. However, similarities between the findings were also expected since bully/victims participate in both bullying and victimization.

Lower perspective-taking ability was related to bullying, victimization, and being a bully/victim, while lower self-esteem was related to victimization and being a bully/victim. These results serve as evidence that bully/victims share characteristics that increase the likelihood of bullying and being victimized. Lower social anxiety and higher verbal aggression were related to being a bully/victim, whereas these personality traits were not significantly related to bullying or victimization. Higher social dominance

orientation and lower social desirability were related to bullying, but not to being a bully/victim. These differences may serve as evidence for the distinct characteristics of bully/victims. They may share some traits with others involved in bullying acts; however, they also contain several qualities that set them apart from the rest of the participants. Men were more likely to bully, whereas women were more likely to be bully/victims. This finding may be related to the relationship between bullying and victimization inherent in the bully/victim category: women may be more likely to aggress in response to an attack.

It may not be reasonable to compare the results between bullying and victimization and being a bully only or being a victim only. Bullying and victimization were highly related in Part I, whereas bully and victim categories were created to minimize that correlation. When the categories were created, the sample size was significantly decreased in comparison to the analyses in Part I. Therefore, significant findings were limited due to lowered power in the statistical analyses in Part II. In addition, when limiting the sample size in the categories of bullies and victims, we restricted the range of their responses on the bullying and victimization scales to the top 40 percent. This may have limited the number of significant findings in the analyses of Part II.

However, one finding that should be emphasized is the relationship between right-wing authoritarianism with workplace bullying and being in the bully only category. Right-wing authoritarianism did not significantly affect bullying; however, its higher levels significantly increased the odds of being in the bully only category. This difference in findings may be reflective of the correlation between bullying and

victimization in Part I. It was previously noted that bullying acts are often committed in groups, whereas victims are often isolated. Right-wing authoritarianism only significantly affected being in the bully category when the presence of victims in the sample was decreased and the range of frequency of bullying acts was restricted to the top 40 %. Because RWA partly reflects submission to the in-group, this discrepancy in findings may indicate that more frequent bullying occurs in the group context.

It is clear that differences were found between the two portions of this study. However, it must be emphasized that conducting both analyses is crucial to understanding the behaviors such as bullying and discrimination. These findings should be considered complementary to each other. It is important to consider the findings from both sections of the study to be able to understand the bullying process more clearly.

Limitations

There were five main limitations to this study. First, the sample for this study consisted of undergraduate college students, limiting the generalizability of the results. Many of these students have not been employed for an extended period of time, and many have only held entry-level positions. Second, the reported level of the frequency of bullying and discriminatory acts was modest. Therefore, it may be difficult to explain what occurs in individuals who engage in these behaviors frequently. Third, we utilized self-report measures in this study. Self-report has been questioned in its usefulness since individuals' perceptions of their attitudes and behaviors may not be a true representation of their actions. However, individuals are usually the only ones who are able to report their thoughts, attitudes, and behaviors. Fourth, we assessed previous behaviors, but present personality traits and attitudes; this may pose a problem in trying to predict past

acts. However, some evidence indicates that personality traits are stable and only change significantly during large developmental milestones (Pervin, 1994). Lastly, we did not have a measure of motives independent of personality traits. However, motives are often implicit, and there is no guarantee that individuals are capable of the insight that is required to provide information about their needs.

Conclusions.

The major findings of this study support the claim that personality and social motivation affect individuals' predisposition to discriminate against and bully others, as well as to be victimized. Social dominance orientation leads to more bullying and discrimination, whereas low perspective taking ability leads to more bullying, and high right-wing authoritarianism leads to more discrimination. Victimization is influenced by low perspective-taking and low self-esteem. This study supports the claim that distinct groups of bullies, victims, and bully/victims participate in bullying acts. Social motives to belong to a group, to control the environment, to understand socially effective interactions, and to self-enhance are important components of personality traits that influence discrimination, workplace bullying, and workplace victimization.

Further research should use additional personality traits as predictors of discrimination, bullying, and victimization within the same motivational model. Moreover, research on these issues should include independent measures of social motives and should include further analysis of the relations among motives, personality traits, and behaviors. Categories of bullies, victims, and bully/victims should be further explored in relation to each other and to bullying and victimization.

REFERENCES

Aquino, K., & Bradfield, M. (2000). Perceived victimization in the workplace: The role of situational factors and victim characteristics. *Organization Science, 11(5),* 525-537.

Allport, G.W., & Odbert, H.S. (1936). *Trait-names: A psycho-lexical study.* Psychological Monographs, 47, No.211.

Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The authoritarian spector.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Baldry, A.C., & Farrington, D.P. (2000). Bullies and delinquents: Personal characteristics and parental styles. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 10(1),* 17-31.

Brodsky, C. (1976). *The harassed worker.* Lexington, MA.: Lexington Books.

Buss, A.H., & Perry, M. (1992). The aggression questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63(3),* 452-459.

Case, K. (2001). *The influence of personality on prejudice and discrimination against women and homosexuals.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Case, K., Fishbein, H.D., & Ritchey, P.N. (2000). *The personality of prejudice and discrimination against four target groups.* Poster presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Cohen, P., Cohen, J., West, S.G., & Aiken, L.S. (2002). *Applied multiple regression: Correlation analysis for behavioral science.* Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Crick, N.R., Casas, J.F., & Ku, H.-C. (1999). *Relational and physical forms of peer victimization in preschool. Developmental Psychology, 35(2),* 376-385.

Crick, N.R., & Dodge, K.A. (1999). Superiority is in the eye of the beholder: A comment on Sutton, Smith, and Swettenham. *Social Development, 8(1),* 128-132.

Crowne, D.P, & Marlowe, D. (1964). *The approval motive.* New York: Wiley.

Davis, M.H. (1996). *Empathy: A social psychological approach.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Duckitt, J. (1994). *The social psychology of prejudice.* Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Duckitt, J., & Farre, B. (1994). Right-wing authoritarianism and political intolerance among whites in the future majority-rule South Africa. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 134(6),* 735-739.

Einarsen, S. (2000). Harassment and bullying at work: A review of the Scandinavian approach. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 5(4),* 379-401.

Einarsen, S., & Raknes, B.I. (1997). Harassment in the workplace and the victimization of men. *Violence and Victims, 12(3),* 247-263.

Fein, S., & Spencer, S.J. (1997). Prejudice as self-image maintenance: Affirming the self through derogating others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73(1),* 31-44.

Fenigstein, A., Scheier, M.F., & Buss, A. H. (1975). Public and private self-consciousness: Assessment and theory. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43(4),* 522-527.

Fishbein, H.D. (2002). *Peer prejudice and discrimination: The origins of prejudice* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Fiske, S.T. (2000). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination at the seam between the centuries: Evolution, culture, mind, and brain. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 30,* 299-322.

Fiske, S.T., & Emery, E.J. (1993). Lost mental control and exaggerated social control: Social-cognitive and psychoanalytic speculations. In D.M. Wegner & J.W. Pennebaker (Eds.), *Handbook of mental control* (pp. 171-199). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gandolfo, R. (1995). MMPI-2 profiles of workers' compensation claimants who present with complaints of harassment. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 51(5),* 711-715.

Graumann, C.F. (1998). Verbal discrimination: A neglected chapter in the social psychology of aggression. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 28(1),* 41-61.

Greenland, K., & Brown, R. (1999). Categorization and intergroup anxiety in contact between British and Japanese nationals. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 29,* 503-521.

Hays, R.D., Hayashi, T., & Stewart, A.L. (1989). A five-item measure of socially desirable response set. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 49(3),* 629-636.

Herring, C., Thomas, M.E., Durr, M., & Horton, H.D. (1998). Does race matter? The determinants and consequences of self-reports of discrimination victimization. *Race and Society, 1(2),* 109-123.

Hoel, H., Rayner, C., & Cooper, C.L. (1999). Workplace bullying. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 14,* 195-230.

Hoyenga, K.B., & Hoyenga, K.T. (1984). *Motivational explanations of behavior: Evolutionary, physiological, and cognitive ideas.* Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Kaltiala-Heino, R., Rimpela, M., Rantanen, P., & Rimpela, A. (2000). Bullying at school – an indicator of adolescents at risk for mental disorders. *Journal of Adolescence, 23,* 661-674.

Kaukiainen, A., Bjorkvist, K., Lagerspetz, K., Osterman, K., Salmivalli, C., Rothberg, S., & Ahlbom, A. (1999). The relationship between social intelligence, empathy, and three types of aggression. *Aggressive Behavior, 25,* 81-89.

Keashly, L., Trott, V., & MacLean, L.M. (1994). Abusive behavior in the workplace: A preliminary investigation. *Violence and Victims, 9(4),* 341-357.

Levin, S.L., & Sidanius, J. (1993). *Intergroup biases of a function of social dominance orientation and in-group status.* Unpublished manuscript, University of California at Los Angeles.

Leymann, H. (1990). Mobbing and psychological terror at workplaces. *Violence and Victims, 5(2),* 119-126.

Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys.* Washington, DC: Hemisphere Publishing.

Olweus, D. (1994). Bullying at school: Long-term outcomes for the victims and an effective school-based intervention program. In L.R. Huesmann (Ed.), *Aggressive behavior: Current Perspectives* (pp. 91-130). New York: Plenum Press.

Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

O'Moore, M., & Kirkham, C. (2001). Self-esteem and its relationship to bullying behavior. *Aggressive Behavior, 27,* 269-283.

Paulhus, D.L. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In J.P Robinson, P.R. Shaver, & L.S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 17-60). San Diego, CA: Academic Press, Inc.

Pellegrini, A.D., Bartini, M., & Brooks, F. (1999). School bullies, victims, and aggressive victims: Factors relating to group affiliation and victimization in early adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91(2),* 216-224.

Pervin, L. A. (1994). A critical analysis of current trait theory. *Psychological Inquiry, 5(2),* 103-113.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L.M., & Malle, B.F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67(4),* 741-763.

Rayner, C. (1997). The incidence of workplace bullying. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 7,* 199-208.

Reeve, J. (2001). *Understanding motivation and emotion* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Harcourt College Publisher.

Richardson, D.R., Hammock, G.S., Smith, S. M., & Gardner, W. (1994). Empathy as a cognitive inhibitor of interpersonal aggression. *Aggressive Behavior, 20(4),* 275-289.

Rigby, K., Cox, I., & Black, G. (1997). Cooperativeness and bully/victim problems among Australian children. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 137(3),* 357-368.

Ritchey, P.N., & Fishbein, H.D. (2001). The lack of an association between friends' prejudices and stereotypes. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 47(2),* 188-206.

Salmivalli, C., Huttunen, A., & Lagerspetz, K.M.J. (1997). Peer networks and bullying in schools. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 38,* 305-312.

Scheier, M.F., & Carver, C.S. (1985). The Self-Consciousness Scale: A revised version for use with general populations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 15,* 687-699.

Slee, P.T., & Rigby, K. (1993). The relationship of Eysenck's personality factors and self-esteem to bully-victim behavior in Australian schoolboys. *Personality and Individual Differences, 14(2),* 371-373.

Smith, P.K., Cowie, H., Olafsson, R.F., & Liefooghe, A.P.D. (2002). Definitions of bullying: A comparison of terms used, and age and gender differences, in a fourteen-country international comparison. *Child Development, 73(4),* 1119-1133.

Stevens, L.E., & Fiske, S.T. (1995). Motivation and cognition in social life: A social survival perspective. *Social Cognition, 13(3),* 189-214.

Sumajin, I.C., Fishbein, H.D., & Ritchey, P.N. (2001). *The influence of personality on bullying and discriminatory behaviors.* Poster presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Vernberg, E.M., Jacobs, A.K., & Hershberger, S.L. (1999). Peer victimization and attitudes about violence during early adolescence. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 28(3),* 386-395.

White, R.W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. *Psychological Review, 66,* 297-333.

Winter, D.G., Stewart, A.J., John, O.P., Klohnen, E.C., & Duncan, L.E. (1998). Traits and motives: Toward an integration of two traditions in personality research. *Psychological Review, 105(2),* 230-250.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables (N=331)

	Mean	St. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Dependent Variables.				
Workplace Bullying	0.78	0.73	0.00	4.00
Workplace Victimization	0.83	0.81	0.00	4.00
Higher-Order Discrimination	1.23	0.80	0.00	4.00
Personality Factors.				
Social Dominance Orientation	1.92	0.58	1.00	4.00
Perspective Taking	2.85	0.52	1.00	4.00
Right-Wing Authoritarianism	2.37	0.62	1.00	4.00
Self-Esteem	3.15	0.65	1.20	4.00
Social Anxiety	2.47	0.75	1.00	4.00
Anger	2.23	0.64	1.00	4.00
Verbal Aggression	2.38	0.69	1.00	4.00
Controls.				
Social Desirability	1.82	0.53	1.00	3.00

Table 2

Correlations of Dependent Variables with Personality Traits and Control Variables (N=331)

	Workplace Bullying	Workplace Victimization	Discrimination
Dependent Variables.			
Workplace Bullying	1.000		
Workplace Victimization	0.701**	1.000	
Higher-Order Discrimination	0.463**	0.286**	1.000**
Personality Factors.			
Social Dominance Orientation	0.259**	0.121*	0.459**
Perspective Taking	-0.343**	-0.222*	-0.284**
Right-Wing Authoritarianism	0.060	-0.017	0.230**
Self-Esteem	-0.107	-0.187**	0.005
Anxiety	0.025	0.053	0.016
Anger	0.182**	0.170*	0.179**
Verbal Aggression	0.175**	0.189**	0.222**
Controls.			
Social Desirability	-0.326**	-0.250**	-0.399**
Sex (1=male, 0=female)	0.217**	0.161**	0.305**
Race (1=White, 0=Non-White)	0.011	0.100	0.196**
Sexual Orientation (1=Heterosexual, 0=Non-heterosexual)	0.021	-0.097	0.065

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

Table 3

Standardized Regression Coefficients from Regressions of Bullying, Victimization, and Discrimination on Personality and Control Variables (N=331)

	Workplace Bullying	Workplace Victimization	Discrimination
Predictors.			
Social Dominance Orientation	0.122*	0.032	0.283*
Perspective Taking	-0.234*	-0.168*	-0.018
Right-Wing Authoritarianism	-0.040	-0.056	0.112*
Self-Esteem	-0.079	-0.164*	0.029
Anxiety	-0.003	-0.031	0.072
Anger	0.007	0.004	-0.031
Verbal Aggression	0.048	0.094	0.085
Controls.			
Social Desirability	-0.149*	0.107	-0.239*
Sex	0.153*	0.130*	0.210*
Race	-0.060	-0.122	0.092*
Sexual Orientation	0.007	0.085	0.027
R^2	0.209*	0.149*	0.355*

*p<.05

Table 4.

Correlations of Participant Roles with Personality Traits and Control Variables (N=249)

	Bully Only	Victim Only	Bully/Victim	Non-Bully/ Non-Victim
Predictors.				
Social Dominance Orientation	0.169**	-0.114	0.088	-0.160*
Perspective Taking	-0.106	0.142*	-0.228**	0.222**
Right-Wing Authoritarianism	0.191**	0.005	-0.079	-0.102
Self-Esteem	0.036	-0.020	-0.141*	0.202*
Anxiety	-0.020	0.205**	-0.067	-0.107
Anger	-0.026	-0.010	0.208**	-0.180**
Verbal Aggression	0.125*	-0.003	0.247**	-0.133*
Controls.				
Social Desirability	-0.088	0.058	-0.256**	0.298**
Sex	0.022	-0.122	0.244**	-0.173*
Race	-0.006	-0.088	0.068	0.003
Sexual Orientation	0.081	-0.016	-0.086	0.025

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

Table 5:

Logistic Model: Odds Ratio of Each Participant Role in the Bullying Process

	Bully Only	Victim Only	Bully/Victim	Non-Bully/ Non-Victim
Predictors.				
Social Dominance Orientation	1.385	0.758	0.805	0.960
Perspective Taking	0.974	2.441*	0.315**	1.693
Right-Wing Authoritarianism	1.947*	1.497	0.631	0.734
Self-Esteem	1.151	0.824	0.509**	1.896*
Social Anxiety	1.203	2.231**	0.641*	0.825
Anger	0.810	0.786	1.419	1.021
Verbal Aggression	0.553*	1.140	1.696*	0.981
Controls.				
Social Desirability	0.473*	0.785	0.847	2.646**
Sex	1.078	1.523	0.341**	2.068*
Race	1.331	1.477	0.665	0.822
Sexual Orientation	0.407	1.621	1.847	0.723
N	60	35	78	76

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

Appendix A

Form A Questionnaire

DIRECTIONS:
Please read carefully.

This is a study about attitudes and behaviors concerning yourself and others. Please be serious and respond honestly to the questions you are asked. Your responses will assist us in finding answers to some very important interpersonal issues that deal with group relationships. While some of these items might be offensive to you, please remember that your honest answers are very important for scientific reasons. Please do not leave any questions blank; however, if you feel uncomfortable answering any of the items, you have a right not to respond without penalty. If you need to change an answer, erase your first response and then make another.

In order to ensure that you can answer all questions honestly, your responses are completely anonymous. Therefore, you can say exactly what you believe. **Do NOT put your name, social security number, or complete birth date on the answer sheet. On the answer sheet, fill in ONLY the year you were born, but NOT the month or day.**

If at any time during this study you feel uncomfortable, you have the right to stop. No one will penalize you for stopping. Should you wish to discuss the study or have any questions, please contact Dr. Fishbein at 556-5563. Please consult your course syllabus for alternatives to the research requirement.

Thank you for your participation,

Harold Fishbein, Professor of Psychology
Irina Sumajin, Graduate Student of Psychology

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE
Enter your answers on the Scantron sheet provided.

If you have any questions during this period, raise your hand and a proctor will come to answer your question.

Instructions:
Please indicate your feeling about each statement by indicating whether you (A) strongly disagree, (B) mildly disagree, (C) mildly agree, (D) strongly agree. Please fill in the appropriate circle on your sheet. ***There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions.***

A	***B***	***C***	***D***
Strongly Disagree	***Mildly Disagree***	***Mildly Agree***	***Strongly Agree***

<u>Section 1:</u> *This section deals with your emotional responses to other people. In this section we are interested in your opinions about the following statements. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions.*

1. I sometimes find it difficult to see things from the "other person's" point of view.

2. I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision.

3. I sometimes try to understand my friends better by imagining how things look from their perspective.

4. If I'm sure I'm right about something, I don't waste much time listening to other people's arguments.

5. I believe that there are two sides to every question and try to look at them both.

6. When I'm upset at someone, I usually try to "put myself in their shoes" for a while.

7. Before criticizing somebody, I try to imagine how I would feel if I were in their place.

<u>Section 2:</u> *In the next three sections, we are interested in your opinions about specific groups of people. Your responses are very important to us in finding answers to some very current social issues. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions.*

In the next seven questions, we are interested in your attitudes toward African-Americans.

8. Generally speaking, I favor full racial integration.

9. African-Americans have more influence on school desegregation than they ought to have.

10. African-Americans are getting too demanding in their push for equal rights.

11. African-Americans should not push themselves where they are not wanted.

A	*B*	*C*	*D*
Strongly Disagree	***Mildly Disagree***	***Mildly Agree***	***Strongly Agree***

12. Over the past few years, African-Americans have received more economically than what they deserve.

13. Over the past few years, the government and news media have shown more respect to African-Americans than they deserve.

14. African-Americans are generally not as smart as whites.

In the next seven questions, we are interested in your attitudes toward homosexuals.

15. I would avoid sitting at a location in the library if I knew lesbians or gays sometimes sat there together.

16. I feel safe around gays and lesbians.

17. I would try to be nice to a gay or lesbian if they were new in school and had few friends.

18. I would **not** mind being employed by a lesbian or gay individual.

19. I would **not** ask for a new study partner just because I found out mine was gay or lesbian.

20. I feel nervous around lesbian women and gay men.

21. I feel that it is okay if lesbians and gays are treated badly by others.

In the next nine questions, we are interested in your attitudes toward obesity.

22. Obese people make me somewhat uncomfortable.

23. Some people are obese because they have no will power.

24. I don't have many friends who are obese.

25. I tend to think people who are obese are a little untrustworthy.

26. Although some obese people are surely smart, in general, I think they tend not to be quite as bright as normal weight people.

27. I have a hard time taking obese people too seriously.

A	*B*	*C*	*D*
Strongly Disagree	***Mildly Disagree***	***Mildly Agree***	***Strongly Agree***

28. I really don't like obese people much.

29. If I were an employer looking to hire, I might avoid hiring an obese person.

30. Obese people are obese due to their own faults.

Section 3: In this section, we are interested in your thoughts and beliefs about people close to you. Remember that your true responses are extremely important to us and will be kept strictly confidential. There are no right or wrong answers.

31. People in my family really get on each other's nerves.

32. People in my family criticize each other.

33. People in my family solve problems by fighting.

34. There is a lot of yelling and fighting in my family.

35. People in my family can go on fighting for a long time.

36. People in my family get real mad about things that are really stupid.

Section 4: In this section, we are interested in your thoughts and beliefs about the following statements. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions.

37. Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups.

38. Our country will be great if we honor the ways of our forefathers, do what the authorities tell us to do, and get rid of those who are ruining everything.

39. No one group should dominate in society.

40. It is always better to trust the judgment of the proper authorities in society than to listen to the noisy rebels who are trying to create doubt in people's mind.

41. It's okay if some groups have more of a chance in life than others.

42. Obedience and respect for authority are two of the most important virtues children should learn.

43. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups.

A	*B*	*C*	*D*
Strongly Disagree	***Mildly Disagree***	***Mildly Agree***	***Strongly Agree***

44. What our country really needs is a strong, determined leader who will crush our enemies and take us back to our true path.

45. We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.

46. The real keys to "good life" are obedience, discipline, and sticking to the straight and narrow.

47. If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems.

48. Some of the best people in our country are those challenging our government, criticizing those in power and ignoring the "normal way" things are supposed to be done.

49. We would have fewer problems if we treated people more equally.

50. The facts on crime and public disorder show that we have to crack down harder on deviant groups and troublemakers if we are going to save our moral standards and preserve law and order.

Section 5: In this section, we are interested in how you relate to others. Please fill in the circle that best reflects your response to the following questions.

51. I think I would enjoy having authority over other people.

52. I must admit I often try to get my own way regardless of what others may want.

53. When I work on a committee, I like to take charge of things.

54. If given the chance, I would make a good leader of people.

55. I want to be an important person in the community.

56. I think I am usually a leader in my group.

57. I like to give orders and get things moving.

58. People seem naturally to turn to me when decisions have to be made.

A	*B*	*C*	*D*
Strongly Disagree	***Mildly Disagree***	***Mildly Agree***	***Strongly Agree***

Section 6: In this section, we are interested in your opinions about the following statements. Your honest responses are important to us. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions.

59. I find it difficult to speak up in class.

60. I am often afraid that something unpleasant will happen to me.

61. My situation is difficult and troublesome.

62. I have often wanted to be someone else.

63. I would like to change many things about myself.

64. It takes me time to get over my shyness in new situations.

65. It's hard for me to work when someone is watching me.

66. I get embarrassed very easily.

67. It's easy for me to talk to strangers.

68. I feel nervous when I speak in front of a group.

69. Large groups make me nervous.

70. I tell my friends openly when I disagree with them.

71. I often find myself disagreeing with people.

72. I can't help getting into arguments when people disagree with me.

73. My friends say that I'm somewhat argumentative.

74. I flare up quickly but get over it quickly.

75. When frustrated, I let my irritation show.

76. I sometimes feel like a powder keg ready to explode.

77. I am an even-tempered person.

A	*B*	*C*	*D*
Strongly Disagree	***Mildly Disagree***	***Mildly Agree***	***Strongly Agree***

78. Some of my friends think I'm a hothead.

79. Sometimes I fly off the handle for no good reason.

80. I have trouble controlling my temper.

81. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on equal basis with others.

82. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

83. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

84. I am able to do things as well as most other people.

85. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

86. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

87. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

88. I wish I could have more respect for myself.

89. I certainly feel useless at times.

90. At times I think I'm no good at all.

Section 7: In this section, we are interested in your opinions about the following statements. There are no right or wrong answers.

91. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.

92. I wouldn't be friends with people who let themselves be pushed around.

93. There have been many occasions when I took advantage of someone.

94. People who are weak are just asking for trouble.

95. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.

96. People should not complain about being bullied.

97. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.

A	*B*	*C*	*D*
Strongly Disagree	***Mildly Disagree***	***Mildly Agree***	***Strongly Agree***

98. Soft people make me sick.

99. No matter whom I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.

100. Nobody likes a wimp.

At this time, please put your pencil down and take a short break. You may begin the next section after 60 seconds.

IN THE REMAINING SECTIONS, YOUR RESPONSES SHOULD CORRESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING SCALE:

A	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*
Never	***1 time***	***2 times***	***3 times***	***4 or more times***

Section 8: In the next section, we are interested in some of ***YOUR BEHAVIORS TOWARDS OTHERS, AT YOUR CURRENT WORKPLACE WITHIN THE LAST 6 MONTHS.*** Please indicate how often you carried out the following behaviors: *(A) never, (B) 1 time, (C) 2 times, (D) 3 times, (e) 4 or more times.* If you are unsure, please give your best estimate. Fill in the appropriate circle on your answer sheet. There are no right or wrong answers. Please be completely honest in your reporting, and remember that your answers are strictly confidential.

101. I said bad things about a coworker to other coworkers.

102. I ridiculed or teased another coworker.

103. I made offensive remarks towards another coworker about his or her private life.

104. I called another coworker offensive names.

105. I repeatedly reminded another coworker about his or her mistakes.

106. I did not attribute as much value to a coworker's work as he or she deserved.

107. I ignored another coworker's opinions or views.

108. I have given a coworker silent treatment as a response to his/her questions or attempts at conversation.

109. I ordered a coworker to do work below his/her level of competence.

A	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*
Never	*1 time*	*2 times*	*3 times*	*4 or more times*

110. I deprived a coworker of responsibility or work tasks.

111. I withheld necessary information from another coworker to complicate his/her work.

112. I hinted to another coworker that he/she should quit his/her job.

113. I purposefully excluded a coworker from work-group activities.

114. I made an obscene gesture toward another coworker.

115. I threatened another coworker with physical harm.

Section 9: In the next section, we are interested in some of the behaviors of ***OTHERS DIRECTED TOWARDS YOU AT YOUR CURRENT WORKPLACE WITHIN THE LAST 6 MONTHS.*** Please indicate how often you experienced the following behaviors: *(A) never, (B) 1 time, (C) 2 times, (D) 3 times, (e) 4 or more times.* If you are unsure, please give your best estimate. Fill in the appropriate circle on your answer sheet. There are no right or wrong answers. Please be completely honest in your reporting, and remember that your answers are strictly confidential.

116. Another coworker said bad things about me to other coworkers.

117. I was ridiculed or teased by another coworker.

118. A coworker made offensive remarks towards me about my private life.

119. I was called offensive names by a coworker.

120. I was repeatedly reminded about my mistakes by a coworker.

121. A coworker did not attribute as much value to my work as I deserved.

122. A coworker ignored my opinions or views.

123. I was given silent treatment by a coworker as a response to my questions or attempts at conversation.

124. I was ordered to do work below my level of competence.

125. I was deprived of responsibility or work tasks.

126. Someone withheld necessary information from me to complicate my work.

A	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*
Never	*1 time*	*2 times*	*3 times*	*4 or more times*

127. Another coworker hinted to me that I should quit my job.

128. I was purposefully excluded from work-group activities.

129. Another coworker made an obscene gesture towards me.

130. I was threatened with physical harm by another coworker.

Section 10: In the next section, we are interested in behaviors that some families employ. Please indicate how often you have experienced or witnessed each behavior in your family: ***(A) never, (B) 1 time, (C) 2 times, (D) 3 times, (e) 4 or more times.*** *If you are unsure, please give your best estimate. Fill in the appropriate circle on your answer sheet. There are no right or wrong answers. Please be completely honest in your reporting, and remember that your answers are strictly confidential.*

131. I was beaten by a family member.

132. I witnessed a family member being beaten by someone else in the family.

133. I was threatened by a family member.

134. I witnessed a family member being threatened by someone else in the family.

135. I was slapped by a family member.

136. I witnessed a family member being slapped by someone else in the family.

Section 11: In the next three sections, we are interested in some of your behaviors in the past. Please indicate how often you have carried out the following behaviors in the ***LAST YEAR AND THE LAST 3 YEARS****:* ***(A) never, (B) 1 time, (C) 2 times, (D) 3 times, (E) 4 or more times.*** *If you are unsure, please give your best estimate. Fill in the appropriate circle on your answer sheet. There are no right or wrong answers. Please be completely honest in your reporting, and remember that your answers are strictly confidential.*
REMEMBER DO NOT WRITE ON THIS SURVEY AND REPORT THE FREQUENCY FOR BOTH TIME PERIODS.

In the next several questions, we are interested in your behaviors involving African-Americans.

I criticized a white friend or acquaintance for dating an African-American person.

137. ____ in the last year 138. _____ in the last 3 years

A	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*
Never	*1 time*	*2 times*	*3 times*	*4 or more times*

To his/her face, I called an African-American person a nigger, or some other derogatory name.

139. ____ in the last year 140. ____ in the last 3 years

In the cafeteria, I sat with clusters of white people because African-Americans make me uncomfortable.

141. ____ in the last year 142. ____ in the last 3 years

In general, I have given more weight to white people's opinions than African-American people's opinions.

143. ____ in the last year 144. ____ in the last 3 years

I locked my car doors when driving through an African-American neighborhood.

145. ____ in the last year 146. ____ in the last 3 years

I have treated African-Americans as if they were less intelligent than others.

147. ____ in the last year 148. ____ in the last 3 years

I avoided an area where I knew African-Americans hung out.

149. ____ in the last year 150. ____ in the last 3 years

In talking with peers, I used insulting names when referring to African-Americans.

151. ____ in the last year 152. ____ in the last 3 years

I laughed at or told a joke which was funny because it made fun of the characteristics of African-Americans.

153. ____ in the last year 154. ____ in the last 3 years

In the next several questions, we are interested in your behaviors involving homosexuals.

I stopped hanging out with someone after I found out he/she was homosexual.

155. ____ in the last year 156. ____ in the last 3 years

I told a homosexual that his/her lifestyle is wrong.

157. ____ in the last year 158. ____ in the last 3 years

A	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*
Never	*1 time*	*2 times*	*3 times*	*4 or more times*

To his/her face, I called a homosexual a fag or a dyke, or some other derogatory name.

159. ____ in the last year 160. ____ in the last 3 years

In general, I have given more weight to heterosexual people's opinions than a homosexual people's opinions.

161. ____ in the last year 162. ____ in the last 3 years

I complained to friends that homosexuals do not deserve the same protection against discrimination than others deserve.

163. ____ in the last year 164. ____ in the last 3 years

I called a homosexual names when I was with a group of friends.

165. ____ in the last year 166. ____ in the last 3 years

I avoided an area where I knew homosexuals hung out.

167. ____ in the last year 168. ____ in the last 3 years

I have accused a male friend of being gay because he were acting too much like a woman (or accused a female friend of being lesbian because she acted too much like a man).

169. ____ in the last year 170. ____ in the last 3 years

In talking with peers, I used terms that put homosexuals down.

171. ____ in the last year 172. ____ in the last 3 years

I laughed at or told a joke which was funny because it made fun of the characteristics of homosexuals.

173. ____ in the last year 174. ____ in the last 3 years

In the next several questions, we are interested in your behaviors involving obese people.

I treated obese people as if they were lazier than thin people.

175. ____ in the last year 176. ____ in the last 3 years

To his/her face, I insulted an obese person by using weight-sensitive terms.

177. ____ in the last year 178. ____ in the last 3 years

A	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*
Never	*1 time*	*2 times*	*3 times*	*4 or more times*

With a friend, I made fun of obese people behind their backs.

179. ____ in the last year 180. ____ in the last 3 years

I valued the opinions of thin people more than the opinions of obese people.

181. ____ in the last year 182. ____ in the last 3 years

In talking with peers, I criticized the food choices I observed an obese person making.

183. ____ in the last year 184. ____ in the last 3 years

I told an obese person to go on a diet.

185. ____ in the last year 186. ____ in the last 3 years

I avoided sitting too closely to obese people because of their obesity.

187. ____ in the last year 188. ____ in the last 3 years

I treated obese people less favorably than others because I respected them less.

189. ____ in the last year 190. ____ in the last 3 years

I laughed at or told a joke which was funny because it made fun of the characteristics of obese people.

191. ____ in the last year 192. ____ in the last 3 years

Section 12: In this section, we would appreciate some demographic information. Please fill in the appropriate circle on your answer sheet.

193. Race/Ethnic background: (A) Caucasian; (B) African-American; (C) Hispanic; (D) Asian/Pacific Islands; (E) Other

194. I am a (A) male; (B) female.

195. My sexual orientation is (A) heterosexual; (B) homosexual; (C) bisexual.

196. My weight would be considered: (A) very underweight; (B) underweight; (C) normal weight; (D) overweight; (E) very overweight.

197. At my workplace, I am responsible for the work of others. (A) True (B) False