VITA

CHRISTINE D. LOVE

EDUCATION

Ph.D.   **Indiana State University**
Major: Counseling Psychology
Expected Graduation Date: August 2012
APA-Accredited Program
Terre Haute, Indiana

M.A.   **Western Michigan University**
Major: Counseling
Graduated June 2005
CACREP-Accredited Program
Kalamazoo, Michigan

B.A.   **Michigan State University**
Major: Advertising
Graduated May 2003
East Lansing, Michigan

CLINICAL EXPERIENCE

University of Nebraska-Lincoln Counseling & Psychological Services Lincoln, NE
Nebraska Internship Consortium in Professional Psychology   08/11 – 07/12
APA-Accredited Internship
Pre-doctoral Psychology Intern

Indiana State University Student Counseling Center   Terre Haute, IN
Pre-doctoral Counselor   01/09 – 06/11

Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology Counseling Office   Terre Haute, IN
Psychologist-in-Training/Graduate Assistant   08/10 – 05/11

Hamilton Center, Inc. Access Center   Terre Haute, IN
Crisis Specialist Therapist   07/08 – 07/11

Hartwick College Student Counseling Center   Oneonta, NY
Staff Counselor   02/06 – 06/08

A.O. Fox Hospital Emergency Department   Oneonta, NY
Crisis Counselor   06/06 – 08/07

BULLYING, CYBERBULLYING, INCIVILITY, AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT:

A SPECTRUM OF INTERPERSONAL MISTREATMENT

_____

A dissertation

Presented to

The College of Graduate and Professional Studies

Department of Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology

Indiana State University

Terre Haute, Indiana

_____

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

_____

by

Christine D. Love

August 2012

Keywords: bullying, cyberbullying, incivility, sexual harassment, contrapower harassment

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Committee Chair: Christine D. MacDonald, Ph.D.

    Professor of Educational and School Psychology

    Indiana State University

Committee Member: Eric Hampton, Ph.D.

    Associate Professor of Educational and School Psychology

    Indiana State University

Committee Member: Bridget Roberts-Pittman, Ph.D.

    Associate Professor of Counseling

    Indiana State University

ABSTRACT

With the growing occurrence of deadly shootings on college campuses (Jenson, 2007), campus administrators have placed emphasis on early detection of potentially dangerous students. One indicator of possible violence is perpetration of uncivil or aggressive behaviors (Clark, 2008a; Kolanko et al., 2006). Placing behaviors on a spectrum of interpersonal mistreatment can provide cues to behaviors that could escalate into greater violence. The main purpose of this study was to determine whether bullying, cyberbullying, incivility, and sexual harassment directed at faculty members occurs on such a spectrum and as separate or overlapping constructs. Factor analyses were conducted on frequency of occurrence and level of upset data collected for 49 behaviors included on the Faculty Experience Survey. Both analyses resulted in three-factor solutions that demonstrated a great deal of overlap of the following categories: (a) Poor Student Behaviors, (b) Direct Incivility, and (c) Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors. These categories appear to create a spectrum of interpersonal mistreatment ranging from the most common and least upsetting to the least common and most upsetting behaviors. This study also sought to determine who was most likely to be the target of interpersonal mistreatment based on personal, academic, and institutional characteristics. Age and sexual orientation affected the report of Direct Incivility behaviors, while characteristics indicating longevity in academia increased the likelihood of having experienced Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors. Differences were seen in the frequency of Poor Student and Aggressive, Threatening

Behaviors in certain regions of the country. Strategies for preventing and responding to interpersonal mistreatment are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first like to thank my committee chairperson, Dr. Chris MacDonald, for working so closely with me on this project since the very beginning. I have appreciated her guidance and support each step of the way, even when I did not express it, and I recognize that I would not have nearly as strong of a finished product if not for her. I would also like to thank Dr. Eric Hampton for his assistance with my statistical analyses. I appreciated his willingness to coach me through the process and explain the concepts to me in a way that I could understand.

I am also especially grateful for the support I received from Dr. Kenneth Chew, who has been a true mentor to me during my doctoral studies. Without him to keep me calm amidst the chaos of my journey through this program, I'm not sure where I would be today. He helped me to keep things in perspective when things got rough and consistently reminded me that I have what it takes to earn this degree and to be a great clinician.

Last, but not least, I want to thank my wonderful parents John and Linda Love, who have provided constant love and support throughout my life. Although they haven't always agreed with the path I have chosen in life, they have always been willing to take the journey with me and to help keep me on track. I know I haven't been the easiest child to handle over the years, so I appreciate even more that they never gave up on me and have continued to believe in me. I love you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

More than twelve major shootings have taken place on college campuses since the infamous bell tower shooting at the University of Texas at Austin in 1966 (Smith, 2007). The frequency of such violent attacks has increased in the past two decades, with the deadliest university shooting in U.S. history occurring at Virginia Tech in April 2007 (Jenson, 2007). In that incident, the gunman, a student who was known to have behaved bizarrely on campus and to have received psychiatric treatment, killed 32 fellow students and professors before committing suicide (Smith, 2007). Several shootings specifically involving professors as the targets of students' violent rages have also occurred over the years, including one at the University of Arizona in which a 41-year old nursing student killed three of his professors over what he perceived as unfair treatment (Lenckus, 2002). In response to such tragedies, emphasis has been placed on early detection of college student distress that may lead to dangerous behaviors.

One potential indicator of violence is uncivil or aggressive behavior (Clark, 2008a; Kolanko et al., 2006) displayed in the classroom and in one-on-one interactions. Furthermore, experts have come to the conclusion that being the victim of bullying is an indicator of potential violence, as has been found in the majority of investigations of school shootings over the past twenty years (Bulach, Fulbright, & Williams, 2003; Twemlow, 2008). According to Twemlow (2008), rejection by peers can damage self-esteem or challenge narcissistic attitudes, which can

cause violence to erupt. Patterns of intimidating or bullying others and having difficulty controlling anger (Bulach et al., 2003) are clear outward signs that an individual may be prone to using violent means in order to express their feelings. This inability to inhibit intense emotions may result in exhibiting rude, disrespectful, aggressive, and even sexual behaviors in the college classroom. This can lead to an atmosphere of hostility in which violence is more likely to erupt (Clark, 2008a). It is important to study negative behaviors, namely bullying, cyberbullying, incivility, and sexual harassment, in educational settings so policies and procedures can be put into place to reduce such behaviors and prevent acts of violence.

Aggressive Behaviors

Previous research on aggressive behaviors has focused on two main areas: bullying and sexual harassment. More recently, researchers have begun to examine cyberbullying, an electronic means of bullying, and general forms of incivility, which are thought to lead to more severe forms of violence.

Bullying

The bulk of the literature on bullying has focused on this behavior occurring among school children. A child is said to be bullied when he or she experiences some type of harm as a result of repeated negative behaviors inflicted over time by a child or group of children who have power over him or her (Olweus, 1993). This power is typically in the form of physical strength, age, and in some cases, social status. Bullying can include both direct and indirect behaviors, such as hitting, kicking, punching, spreading rumors, and social exclusion (Olweus, 1993, 1994). Researchers have studied a variation of bullying in the workplace as well, for which a new definition has been applied. Leymann (1996) proposed that workplace bullying is more sophisticated, less physical, and involves a person or group repeatedly perpetrating behaviors

that bring an individual into a helpless position in which termination is possible. In addition to the traditional bullying behaviors listed above, workplace bullying may also involve withholding information, making it difficult for a person to perform one's job duties, as well as unwarranted criticism of one's performance (Agervold, 2007).

In recent years, researchers have questioned the traditional criteria for bullying, particularly the necessity for a power imbalance between bully and victim. In one study by Saunders, Huynh, and Goodman-Delahunty (2007), only 15% of a sample of 1,095 working adults viewed power imbalance as a necessary characteristic of workplace bullying. Similar findings in other studies have prompted researchers to begin examining instances in which individuals may be bullied by peers or even subordinates. A study by Salin (2001) showed that employees were bullied at almost equal rates by superiors and colleagues (40% and 33%, respectively), and 17% were bullied by subordinates. Another 10% reported having been bullied by individuals at various levels within the organization. In one of the few studies of bullying in higher education, McKay, Arnold, Fratzl, and Thomas (2008) found that 27% of instances of bullying reported by a sample of 100 college faculty members were perpetrated by students.

Cyberbullying

Cyberbullying is a subset of bullying that has developed as a result of technological growth. Cyberbullying involves the use of electronic devices, such as computers and cellular phones, as means for perpetrating a negative act (Ševčíková & Šmahel, 2009). Electronic attacks can include sending threatening messages, spreading rumors, or sending negative messages about someone to a number of recipients (Campbell, 2005). In an online forum, it is particularly easy to post information about a person in a virtual space where it will be seen by a large number

of people. Electronic devices can also be used to socially isolate an individual by intentionally excluding him or her from group communication (Wolak, Mitchell, & Finkelhor, 2007).

Because cyberbullying is a form of bullying, intention, repetition, power imbalance, and resulting harm are viewed as necessary components to the behavior. With electronic expression, whether a power imbalance exists could be difficult to ascertain. However, researchers have established that this power stems from the anonymity of electronic interactions (Ševčíková & Šmahel, 2009). Additionally, Wolak et al. (2007) found that of adolescents who had been harassed online in the past year, 43% were harassed by known peers. These authors suggested that when harassment is done by known peers, a power imbalance is established within the face-to-face relationship.

Beyond the age of adolescence, which is the group found to participate most in cyberbullying behaviors (Ševčíková & Šmahel, 2009), researchers have found online harassment to be used by college students (Finn, 2004) and union workers (Privitera & Campbell, 2009) as well. Additionally, the cyberbullying of college professors by students has been described anecdotally (Dickerson, 2005) and studied by a few researchers (McKay et al., 2008; Reigle, 2007). McKay et al. (2008) found that 44% of severe forms of bullying reported by a sample of 100 faculty members had taken place through e-mail. In Reigle's (2007) small sample of distance education instructors, almost half had experienced a student purposely posting controversial opinions in an online class forum to incite negative reactions.

Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment has been clearly defined as any unwelcome physical or verbal sexual conduct, advances, or favors requested as a condition of employment, which interfere with an individual's work performance or create a hostile work environment (U.S. Equal Employment

Opportunity Commission, 2009). Sexual harassment has been shown to affect up to 75% of adult workers in certain work settings (Ilies, Hauserman, Schwochau, & Stibal, 2003). Given that sexual harassment is illegal under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2009), the large incidence of behaviors is a major problem for society as well as the legal system.

Sexual harassment behaviors have been broken into three categories: gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion. Gender harassment involves discrimination based on gender, which is typically intended to subordinate women and maintain traditional gender roles within the workplace (Gruber & Fineran, 2008). Additional forms of discrimination based on race, class, sexual orientation, and religion are also prohibited by the Civil Rights Act. This form of harassment does not contain sexual content and therefore is often not recognized as sexual harassment.

Like bullying, sexual harassment often describes repetitive, unwelcome, one-sided behaviors that occur in the context of a power imbalance (James, 1981). However, if gender harassment is a form of discrimination that can be used against women, then men at any level of an organization should be able to perpetrate the behavior. Furthermore, over 40 years of research in the workplace and in secondary and postsecondary education settings have shown that sexual harassment can and does occur between individuals at all organizational levels. Benson (1984) termed harassment between colleagues "peer sexual harassment" and the occurrence of harassment when the victim has more formal power than the harasser "contrapower sexual harassment" (p. 517). Grauerholz's (1989) findings support this theory, with almost half of a sample of 208 female college instructors reporting experiencing at least one of 10 sexual harassment behaviors with students as the perpetrators.

Incivility

One possible reason for the lack of research on bullying in the college environment in general could be the recent explosion of research on incivility in higher education. This concept overlaps with bullying in many ways (Jones, 2006), but generally refers to more nonverbal and verbal expressions of disrespect, whereas bullying is generally thought of as more physical in nature. Additionally, the definition of incivility maintains that intent to cause harm is ambiguous to either the perpetrator or the victim of the behavior (Andersson & Pearson, 1999).

Given that incivility research only began about a decade ago, the known prevalence of uncivil behaviors in the workplace, school, and college environments is limited and little is actually known about the characteristics of the targets of such behavior. In Reio and Ghosh's (2009) study of workplace incivility, 54% of workers engaged in interpersonal incivility, mainly rudeness toward coworkers, and 46% admitted to perpetrating organizational incivility, such as talking badly about their company or taking long breaks. Uncivil behaviors were even more prevalent in a sample of college faculty members, with up to 99% experiencing student incivility in the classroom (Lampman, Phelps, Bancroft, & Beneke, 2009).

Current Study

To date, only two studies have examined the co-occurrence of bullying, cyberbullying, sexual harassment, and incivility (Lampman et al., 2009; McKay et al., 2008). Lampman et al. (2009) and other researchers have demonstrated some statistical overlap of sexual harassment, incivility, and bullying behaviors. Lim and Cortina (2005) found incivility and sexual harassment to co-occur at high rates in a large sample of court employees, with 23% experiencing incivility alone, 22% experiencing incivility and gender harassment, and 21% experiencing incivility, gender harassment, and sexualized harassment. The term *sexual bullying*

has even been introduced in the literature (Gruber & Fineran, 2008, p. 1) to describe adolescents' perceptions of bullying and sexual harassment as similar issues (deLara, 2008; Shute, Owens, & Slee, 2008). Furthermore, Land's (2000) factor analysis of student responses to a questionnaire addressing teasing, bullying, and sexual harassment behaviors found a sexual harassment factor that correlated highly with a combined factor of teasing and bullying. Similarly, Lampman et al.'s factor analysis of 30 student behaviors resulted in two factors: a combined incivility-bullying scale and a sexual attention scale. It is necessary to expand on these findings by including cyberbullying behaviors and providing more statistical evidence of construct overlap.

Sexual harassment behaviors are illegal according to the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Because of this, every workplace has a policy for handling complaints of harassment. Likewise, all educational institutions within the United States are bound by Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 which prohibit all forms of discrimination against students (Strauss, 2003). However, it is not illegal to act uncivilly or to bully someone until an actual law is broken, such as assault or destruction of property. Although workplaces, including colleges and universities, may have codes of conduct that take action against individuals who physically or verbally abuse, threaten, or otherwise endanger others, less severe forms of harassment are not generally explicitly prohibited and are, therefore, more difficult to punish.

The purpose of this study was to show that sexual harassment, bullying, cyberbullying, and uncivil behaviors are largely overlapping categories that fall under a broader category of interpersonal mistreatment. Furthermore, this study sought to show that all interpersonal mistreatment can be serious and harmful. These behaviors have historically been studied less in the college population than in workplace and K-12 settings. However, recent major acts of violence perpetrated by one person, such as the Virginia Tech shooting, have taken place on

college campuses and have generally been perpetrated by students. Therefore, it is important to determine the prevalence of interpersonal mistreatment behaviors, which may be precursors to more violent actions, as they are experienced by college faculty members. The hope is that upon demonstrating the high prevalence of these behaviors and the seriousness of seemingly minor behaviors as they are found to overlap with illegal sexual harassment behaviors, those in institutions of higher education will be more sensitive to how students are treating faculty and be more willing to create policies to protect employees from such abuse. Additionally, such policies would establish campus procedures for reporting potentially dangerous students and for punishing behaviors that are disruptive on campus and personally damaging to the victims.

This study also examined which professors were more likely to be the targets of interpersonal mistreatment perpetrated by students. Little information is known about the characteristics of victims of bullying and incivility on college campuses, because research in these areas is relatively new. However, research on sexual harassment has found that both men and women faculty members are the targets of inappropriate student behaviors (DeSouza & Fansler, 2003; Fitzgerald, Weitzman, Gold, & Ormerod, 1988; Grauerholz, 1989; Matchen & DeSouza, 2000; McKinney, 1990). An integrated model of contrapower harassment proposed by Rospenda, Richman, and Nawyn (1998) identifies organizational, sociocultural, and informal sources of power that allow individuals to harass those who have authority over them. Some of these sources of power include majority status based on gender, race, sexual orientation, and disability status. Organizationally and socioculturally, students who possess a consumer mentality may perceive themselves as having power over professors at lower academic ranks, with less experience, and who are untenured (Lampman et al., 2009). Additionally, social identity theory (see Korte, 2007 for a review) posits that individuals retaliate when their social

identities are challenged. Lampman et al. (2009) found that professors teaching subjects such as general education requirements and women's studies classes that challenge students' beliefs on controversial topics also resulted in greater contrapower harassment.

Last, this study examined organizational differences that may contribute to greater levels of interpersonal mistreatment on college campuses. Specifically, the current study observed the effects of type of institution (i.e., public, private, community college) and geographic region on the rates of different types of interpersonal mistreatment behaviors. These factors have not been previously studied in the college population, although the effects of public versus private organizations have been observed in workplace and K-12 settings. Findings have been mixed regarding the influence of private versus public sector organizations on workplace bullying (Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2007; Salin, 2001). However, the U.S. Department of Education's (2009) statistics on crime in K-12 schools for the 2007-2008 school year clearly indicated higher rates of crime in public and urban schools over private and rural or suburban schools. To my knowledge, the effect of geographic region of the U.S. on prevalence of aggressive behaviors has not been previously studied.

The questionnaire that was used in the current study, the Faculty Experience Survey (Appendix A), was created through content analysis of measures used in recent studies on bullying, cyberbullying, incivility, and sexual harassment (Clark, 2008b; Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Grauerholz, 1989; Lampman et al., 2009; MacDonald & Roberts-Pittman, 2009; McKay et al., 2008). Results of a pilot study by Love and MacDonald (2010) were also used to make changes to this questionnaire, including eliminating one behavioral item and redesigning the rating scales. For this study, the survey included 49 interpersonal mistreatment behaviors and asked participants to rate how often they had experienced each of the behaviors perpetrated by students

and how upset they were or would be by the behavior, each on a 5-point rating scale. Love and MacDonald's pilot study was conducted on a sample of 107 faculty members employed at a mid-size Midwestern university. The data on how often each of the behaviors was experienced were factor analyzed, resulting in four factors: (a) poor student behavior, (b) direct incivility, (c) cyberbullying behaviors, and (d) illegal, threatening behaviors. Strong internal consistency was found for each of the four factors, indicating a valid measure (Love & MacDonald, 2010). The current study also included a factor analysis of the results of how upsetting the behaviors are perceived by faculty members. Additionally, for the current study, demographic and organizational information was obtained from each participant. From the analyses of the data collected, the following research questions were addressed:

1. Are bullying, cyberbullying, incivility, and sexual harassment overlapping constructs that make up a continuum of interpersonal mistreatment? Specifically, what factor structures emerge based on (a) frequency of occurrence and (b) how upsetting the behaviors are perceived to be?

2. In a national sample of college instructors, what is the prevalence of interpersonal mistreatment perpetrated by students?

3. What behaviors are perceived to be the most upsetting for faculty members?

4. Who is most likely to be the target of interpersonal mistreatment by students based on personal characteristics (i.e., gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability status) and academic characteristics (i.e., level of education, academic rank, tenure, discipline, years of experience)?

5. Are there differences in the types of behaviors or frequency of interpersonal mistreatment based on type of institution (i.e., community college, public, private) or region of the country?

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In today's society, everyday interactions are often punctuated by rudeness and disrespect. In the worst cases, uncivil behaviors erupt into violence and mass terror. Recent incidents of mass violence have occurred on college campuses, with the deadliest university shooting occurring at Virginia Tech in 2007 (Jenson, 2007). It is important to understand early signs of potential violence, such as incivility and inappropriate sexual behavior, that are observed by bystanders. In the case of violence on college campuses, these bystanders are peers and, more importantly, college faculty and staff members who interact with students on a daily basis and have typical student behavior as a basis for comparison. Few researchers have examined aggressive behaviors within the college population, so it is first important to examine the prevalence and characteristics of such behaviors in other settings.

Bullying and sexual harassment are types of aggressive behaviors that have been studied extensively in workplace and school settings. Incivility and cyberbullying are newer phenomena, which have gained attention by researchers and are starting to be studied in different contexts. In order to build a better understanding of how these behaviors combine into a broader category of interpersonal mistreatment, which can act as a predictor of violence, this overview will first examine each topic separately. The few studies that have begun to link these behaviors will then be discussed. Additionally, multiple theories that explain contrapower harassment, in

which an individual in a position of less perceived power mistreats an individual in a position of authority, such as occurs when students harass professors, are presented.

Bullying

According to Harper (2001), the negative origins of the word *bully* can be dated back to the late 1600s when it was used to describe a "harasser of the weak" (para. 1). Olweus (1993), the leading researcher of bullying in schools, offered this definition of bullying: "A student is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other students" (p. 9). The main components that have been used to classify bullying behaviors include (a) negative actions; (b) intent to cause harm, either physically or psychologically; (c) repetition of the behavior; and (d) an imbalance of power such that the target is viewed as weaker than the bully (Olweus, 1993). Power can be achieved by use of physical size, social standing, or psychological strength or through numbers, with more than one bully teaming up against a victim (Menesini & Nocentini, 2009). Bullying has been further identified as a form of unprovoked aggression, which the bully uses to obtain a social goal. This is in contrast to reactive aggression, in which an individual acts out based on frustration, anger, or other negative emotions (Beran, 2006).

Bullying Behaviors

Researchers largely acknowledge two separate forms of bullying: direct and indirect. Direct bullying constitutes open attacks on the victim through physical or verbal means. These behaviors may include hitting, pushing, kicking, pinching, threatening, teasing, calling names, or making faces or other inappropriate gestures. Indirect or relational bullying is done with the intent to harm the victim's relationships with others through means of social exclusion and

isolation (Olweus, 1994). This can be done by purposely excluding an individual from a group, spreading rumors, or otherwise humiliating an individual in front of his or her peers.

Another form of bullying, which has grown in recent years with the advancement of technology, is online harassment or cyberbullying. Online harassment is defined as "an overt, intentional act of aggression toward another person online" (Ševčíková & Šmahel, 2009, p. 227), whereas the term cyberbullying is assumed to align with the main criteria of bullying, including repetition and a power imbalance stemming from anonymity (Ševčíková & Šmahel, 2009). One person can attack another online through a verbal assault, by posting negative comments or images about someone on a public website, or by sending threatening e-mails (Campbell, 2005). Electronic devices can also be used as a tool for indirect bullying by intentionally excluding an individual from group communication or isolating him or her from others through gossiping and spreading rumors (Wolak et al., 2007).

Roles in Bullying

The bully. In 1978, Olweus conducted the first in-depth study on bullying in grade schools, offering detailed descriptions of factors contributing to bullying behaviors and the characteristics of bullies and their targets. At that time he chose to examine only boys' involvement in bullying behaviors. Based on his findings, Olweus described bullies as aggressive against peers and teachers, with an overall positive attitude toward violence. Additionally, bullies tend to be physically stronger than their peers. Although a common belief is that bullies experience low self-esteem and act aggressively to feel better about themselves, Olweus's studies have consistently found that bullies feel self-confident and have positive perceptions of themselves. They tend to enjoy average popularity among their peers, although popularity decreases with age, and bullying others provides a feeling of superiority and social

status (Olweus, 1978, 1993). Home conditions tend to affect individuals who fulfill the bully role, and Olweus (1978) found these students to have weaker and more negative relationships with their parents than students who do not bully others.

At times neutral students also take part in bullying behaviors. Olweus (1978) explained that witnessing bullying behaviors arouses an aggressive instinct in these boys, which leads them to imitate the actions of bullies. This may raise social status among peers as well. Bullying can also occur as a sort of social contagion, since engaging in group bullying diffuses personal responsibility for the behavior, reducing feelings of guilt. Over time the victim is seen as worthless and deserving of bullying, which also reduces guilt over the mistreatment (Olweus, 1978).

The victim. In contrast to bullies, the victims of bullying tend to be the least popular among their peers. These students tend to be anxious and view themselves and their situations negatively, resulting in low self-esteem. Victims are generally physically weaker than bullies and have nonaggressive demeanors. When attacked, these children tend to cry and withdraw socially. They often have close relationships with their parents, which may be viewed as overprotection and could actually lead to being bullied (Olweus, 1978, 1993).

Theriot, Dulmus, Sowers, and Johnson (2005) found that students who labeled themselves as victims experienced more frequent bullying behaviors by peers than those who did not label themselves as victims. Also, younger students, in Grades 3 through 5, were more likely to report being bullied. The authors explained that this indicates fewer coping strategies among younger victims and the desire of older victims to maintain independence and avoid being seen as weak.

The bully-victim. Another type of victim is the provocative victim or bully-victim (Olweus, 1978). These students take part as both the bully and the victim. Olweus (1978) described these students as irritating to their peers and active in creating tension in the classroom. When bullied, the bully-victim gets angry and fights back. These individuals are more aggressive, yet still unpopular among peers, and are frequent targets of bullying. Bully-victims are similar to victims in terms of lacking self-esteem and exhibiting anxiety (Olweus, 1993).

Bullying in K-12 Schools

Most of the research examining bullying has occurred in grade schools. However, these studies have yielded inconsistent rates of bullying based on varying age groups, the methods used, and potentially the country in which the research was conducted. Based on studies of more than 130,000 children, Olweus (1994) estimated that one out of every seven Norwegian students ages 7 to 16 are involved in bullying. Specifically, he reported that 9% of students were victims of bullying, 7% bullied others, and less than 2% played the role of the bully-victim. He also reported a trend for boys to be exposed to bullying more often than girls, particularly direct bullying methods (Olweus, 1994). One study conducted within the United States on fifth, sixth, and 10th grade students found similar rates (11% of boys and girls equally involved in bullying; Smith & Gross, 2006), and studies in other countries have reported much higher rates. In a retrospective study of Swedish adolescents ages 15 to 20 (Frisen, Jonsson, & Persson, 2007), 20% admitted to bullying others, 39% reported being bullied, and 13% said they had both bullied others and been bullied at some time during their grade school years. Bond, Wolfe, Tollit, Butler, and Patton (2007) reported higher rates yet, with up to 61% of eighth grade students in Australia identifying as the victims of bullying. Frequent bullying was reported by 17% of the sample (Bond et al., 2007).

Age trends. Olweus (1991) has provided evidence that the prevalence of bullying decreases with age, citing that students in lower grades reported being bullied most often and more than half reported being bullied by older students. Frisen et al. (2007) found support for these findings and further reported that the majority of bully-victims bully others at a later age than when they were bullied themselves. However, Smith and Gross (2006) observed an increase in bullying behavior between fifth and sixth grades, which the authors attributed to the transition involved with advancing from elementary school to middle school. The authors then saw a decrease in bullying from sixth to 10th grades, supporting previous findings. It has also been found that bullying becomes less physical and more relational among older students (Olweus, 1991).

Gender differences. Forms of bullying used have been found to vary based on gender. Boys have repeatedly been found to engage in more overt, physical bullying behaviors than girls (Olweus, 1994; Smith & Gross, 2006). Although some researchers (Elinoff, Chafouleas, & Sassu, 2004) have reported that girls tend to engage in more covert acts of bullying, such as social exclusion and gossiping, others have found similar rates of these behaviors among male and female students (Olweus, 1994; Smith & Gross, 2006).

Bullying by teachers. Although most research on bullying within K-12 schools addresses the issue of peer-to-peer aggression, a few studies have examined the potential for teachers to bully students. Whitted and Dupper (2008) found that 86% of 50 students at alternative schools for behavioral problems reported having been physically maltreated by an adult at school. The most common maltreatment involved not being allowed to go to the bathroom or being grabbed, pinched, pushed, or shaken. Additionally, 88% of the sample said an adult had psychologically abused them in such ways as yelling at them, isolating them from

others, or ignoring them (Whitted & Dupper, 2008). In Twemlow, Fonagy, Sacco, and Brethour's (2006) sample of elementary school teachers, 41% admitted to having bullied students in their class. Further, Twemlow and Fonagy (2005) found that teachers who admitted to bullying students were more likely to teach in schools with high rates of suspensions, suggesting that higher rates of behavioral problems drive teachers to bully students.

Bullying of teachers. To date, no research has been devoted to examining the bullying of grade school teachers by students, perhaps due to the necessary power imbalance in order for such behaviors to be considered bullying. However, the U.S. Department of Education (2009) reports the occurrence of some related behaviors annually. During the 2007-2008 school year, 7% of teachers reported being threatened with injury, and 4% were physically attacked by a student. More teachers in urban versus rural or suburban schools and public versus private schools were more likely to report threats and attacks by students. Furthermore, secondary school teachers were more likely to receive threats of injury, but elementary teachers reported experiencing more physical attacks (U.S. Department of Education, 2009). Additionally, in Twemlow et al.'s (2006) study, teachers who admitted to bullying students were more likely to also report feeling as though students inside and outside of class have tried to bully them. Fifty-seven percent of this sample reported that at least one student had tried to bully them in the classroom, a much higher percentage than was reported in the Department of Education's report (Twemlow et al., 2006).

Workplace Bullying

Bullying was once viewed as an act of aggression occurring mainly in relationships between school-aged children (Kolanko et al., 2006). However, in recent years researchers have begun to examine instances of bullying and other forms of aggression in a variety of workplace

settings. In 1996, Leymann described the differences between bullying among children and mobbing, as he prefers to call it, among adults in the workplace. He explained that although the term bullying is often associated with physical violence, workplace mobbing is often done in much more sophisticated ways. Leymann offers a definition of mobbing as "a social interaction through which one individual . . . is attacked by one or more . . . individuals almost on a daily basis and for periods of many months, bringing the person into an almost helpless position with potentially high risk of expulsion" (p. 168). In addition to typical bullying behaviors already described, workplace bullying may further include purposely withholding information that makes it difficult for a person to fully perform his or her job and unwarranted criticism of performance (Agervold, 2007).

Workplace bullying criteria. The Leymann criteria (1996) highlight frequency and repetition as the main factors involved in workplace bullying. Other researchers have considered intent to cause harm, an imbalance of power, and the reaction of the victim to be important indicators of bullying as well (Agervold, 2007). However, in a worldwide study of laypersons' definitions of workplace bullying (Saunders et al., 2007), almost the entire sample endorsed only two of the five classic criteria: (a) that bullying involves negative actions (98%), and (b) that these actions cause some form of harm to the target of the behavior (86%). In this sample of 1,095 working adults, only 21% specified that the negative behavior had to be intentional on the part of the perpetrator, 15% acknowledged a necessary power imbalance, and 15% saw a need for repetition and high frequency of negative behaviors in workplace bullying (Saunders et al., 2007). Therefore, the average person may not agree with researchers regarding what behaviors constitute bullying.

Environmental differences. Due to the different definitions and criteria used by researchers, prevalence rates are largely discrepant at this time. Research findings show rates ranging from 1% in a large Danish sample (Agervold, 2007) to 37% among nurses in England (Edwards & O'Connell, 2007). Occurrence of workplace bullying seems to vary based on workplace setting and discipline as well. Gunnarsdottir, Sveinsdottir, Bernburg, Fridriksdottir, and Tomasson (2006) compared rates of bullying, physical violence, and threats among female nurses, teachers, and flight attendants. The authors found significantly more bullying of nurses (19%) than flight attendants (12%) and similar rates among teachers (16%) and nurses. In Salin's (2001) study of business professionals, almost 2% reported being bullied at least weekly. Mikkelsen and Einarsen (2001) reported that among graduate students in education studies, 14% identified as the victims of bullying compared to 16% of hospital employees, 8% of manufacturing employees, and 25% of department store employees.

Other organizational factors may also have an effect on rates. Salin (2001) suggested that because private sector organizations are characterized by higher levels of competition and internal pressure and have less security, their employees would be more likely to experience workplace bullying. Whereas her findings showed that public sector employees actually reported experiencing more bullying (Salin, 2001), Matthiesen and Einarsen (2007) found that most victims and bully-victims in their study were employed in the private sector. Matthiesen and Einarsen also found that both victims and bullies were overrepresented in companies employing 100 or more individuals or with a significantly skewed gender distribution toward either men or women. Additionally, these authors reported that individuals experiencing more role conflict in the work environment, meaning that their positions involve often contradictory expectations and demands, were more likely to experience bullying, and individuals who

experienced high role ambiguity, in which individuals view their position as unpredictable and unclear, were more likely to bully others. Both victims and bullies tended to experience higher levels of stress at work (Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2007). Similarly, Skogstad, Einarsen, Torsheim, Aasland, and Hetland (2007) found that in organizations utilizing a laissez-faire leadership style, in which there is a general lack of leadership, no feedback is given, and decisions are delayed, increased role conflict and interpersonal conflict among employees led to workplace bullying.

Perpetrators of workplace bullying. Who perpetrates bullying behavior at work also varies by setting. In Mikkelsen and Einarsen's (2001) study, manufacturing employees only reported being bullied by their colleagues, hospital employees reported colleagues and immediate superiors as perpetrators, and department store employees further reported being bullied by subordinates as well. In this sample, department store employees, who reported being bullied by individuals on three different levels within the organization, had the highest rates of bullying (25%), followed by hospital employees (16%), who reported being bullied by individuals on two different levels (Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2001). Edwards and O'Connell (2007) reported that within the nursing profession patients are the most common perpetrators of bullying, harassment, and abuse toward nurses, with relatives of patients, doctors, supervisors, and colleagues also contributing. Of the self-reported victims in Salin's (2001) study, about 40% were bullied only by superiors, 33% were bullied only by colleagues, 17% were bullied only by subordinates, and about 10% were bullied by individuals on more than one level within the organization. Based on responses of employees in these studies, adults in the workplace do at times consider themselves to be bullied by individuals in equal or subordinate positions, particularly by those receiving services.

Cyberbullying

As described earlier, cyberbullying is the perpetration of a negative act through the use of electronic devices (Ševčíková & Šmahel, 2009), such as a computer or cell phone. Research in cyberbullying has increased in the past few years largely due to the suicides of several adolescents in response to online harassment. One such case involved a 13-year-old girl who hanged herself after being teased mercilessly on MySpace by a former friend and the friend's mother (Barrientos, 2010).

Some researchers dispute whether online harassment actually constitutes bullying since power imbalance is difficult to determine due to the anonymous nature of the behavior (Menesini & Nocentini, 2009). However, other researchers have argued that online harassment does fit the definition of bullying in that behaviors are repeated with ease (Wolak et al., 2007) and can be perpetrated in public forums where many individuals are able to view the harassment and gang up on a single victim, such as in a chat room or on a social networking website (e.g., Facebook, MySpace, Twitter). In a sample of 1,500 10 to 17 year olds, Wolak et al. (2007) found that 9% had been harassed online in the past year, and of those 43% were harassed by known peers. The authors suggested that when online harassment is done by known peers, this constitutes bullying because the power imbalance has been defined within face-to-face relationships (Wolak et al., 2007).

Despite disagreement as to the classification of this behavior as cyberbullying or online harassment, it has increased in frequency as technology has continued to advance, offering new ways to harass others. In Mesch's (2009) sample of 935 American 12 to 17 year olds, 40% of the sample reported having ever experienced at least one cyberbullying behavior. Additionally, Katzer, Fetchenhauer, and Belschak (2009) examined chat room use among 1,700 fifth to 11th

grade students in Germany. They found that of the 39% of students who reported ever being abused or insulted in chat rooms, more than 17% had been slandered, 13% were teased, 10% had been purposely excluded, over 8% had been threatened, and almost 5% were blackmailed at least once during a chat session (Katzer et al., 2009). In a study by Li (2006), about 25% of 264 Canadian middle school students reported having been cyberbullied, 17% admitted to cyberbullying others, and almost half knew someone who had been cyberbullied. The differences in prevalence in these studies may represent geographic differences in use of cyberbullying behaviors. Furthermore, when 761 ninth grade students in Austria were asked whether they were the perpetrators or victims of cyberbullying rather than being asked about specific cyberbullying behaviors, only 8% of boys and 3% of girls admitted to cyberbullying others, and 7% labeled themselves as victims (Gradinger, Strohmeier, & Spiel, 2009). This demonstrates the discrepancy in reported rates of cyberbullying based on how the information is obtained.

Age trends. Although it has been assumed that cyberbullying is most common among adolescents, some researchers have begun to examine prevalence rates among various age groups. Ševčíková and Šmahel (2009) compared the prevalence of cyberbullying among 1,520 residents of the Czech Republic ranging in age from 12 to 88. The authors found that adolescents (12 to 19 years old) and young adults (20 to 26 years old) were more likely to be targets of online harassment than older respondents, and adolescents were also most likely to bully others online. The rates of those who admitted to being an online bully or bully-victim decreased steadily with age, with the exception of bully-victims in the 36 to 49 age group, in which the rates were close to those of older adolescents (16 to 19 years old). Rates of those in the victim role were lowest among 36 to 49 year olds and were surprisingly highest in 16 to 26 year olds and those who were 50 and older. Last, adolescents were significantly more likely to

know their online harassers in person than all other age groups. Ševčíková and Šmahel concluded that cyberbullying does appear to be a bigger issue among adolescents during a time in life when the development of healthy relationships is particularly important.

Gender and Internet usage differences. Among adolescents, Wolak et al. (2007) found that girls who are known peers are about as likely as male known peers to harass others online. However, among those who are online friends only, girls made up only 16% of harassers. Gradinger et al. (2009) and Li (2006) found that boys perpetrated both traditional bullying and cyberbullying more than girls. However, Mesch (2009) found that whereas only 39% of boys reported being harassed online, 61% of girls had been victimized at least once. Youths who participated on social networking sites, in public chat rooms, and on YouTube were also more likely to be harassed online. Not surprisingly, stricter parental rules for Internet use and filters on online activity were associated with lower rates of cyberbullying (Mesch, 2009). Additionally, researchers have found that students who are the victims of cyberbullying are generally bullied at school as well (Gradinger et al., 2009; Katzer et al., 2009).

Varying contexts. Researchers have also examined cyberbullying within specific other contexts. In a sample of 339 undergraduate students at the University of New Hampshire, Finn (2004) found that 10% to 15% of students reported being harassed, threatened, or insulted online by an acquaintance, a significant other, or an unknown person. Most reported harassment was perpetrated by an unknown person through e-mail (16%) and instant messages (19%). Because of the anonymity of cyberbullying, it is possible that these unknown persons are not actually strangers, however. Love, MacDonald, and Roberts-Pittman (2010) found somewhat higher rates, with 22% of a sample of 357 college students reporting having been cyberbullied and another 9% admitting to having cyberbullied someone else. The rates of being the victim and the

perpetrator of cyberbullying were higher for men, ethnic minorities, and students of minority sexual orientation in this sample (MacDonald & Roberts-Pittman, 2009).

Cyberbullying has also been examined in the workplace environment. In Privitera and Campbell's (2009) sample of 103 male employees belonging to the Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union, 11% had been harassed through the use of e-mail, telephone, or both. All of these individuals also reported themselves as having been bullied face-to-face as well. Overall, researchers have found rates of cyberbullying in adult environments comparable to rates among adolescents (MacDonald & Roberts-Pittman, 2009).

Bullying in College

To date, few researchers have examined bullying behaviors in the college environment. McDougall (1999) studied 16 year old to 18 year old students at a college of further education in England. In her sample of unreported size, McDougall found that 9.6% of students reported being bullied in college, compared to 80.7% who reported being bullied at some point during their entire academic career, indicating that rates decrease with age. In a sample of 119 undergraduate students from a large university, Chapell et al. (2006) found that although rates of bullying decreased with age, the roles of bully, victim, or bully-victim were stable across time. The findings indicated that 6.7% of the sample had been bullied in college, while another 2.5% admitted to bullying others in college (Chapell et al., 2006). In a larger sample of 1,024 university students (Chapell et al., 2004), 6% of the sample reported repeated bullying by another student and 61% had witnessed a student being bullied by another student. Both studies also asked about the experience of being bullied by faculty in college, to which 2.4% to 4.7% of the samples reported occurring on a repeated basis (Chapell et al., 2004; Chapell et al., 2006).

Love et al. (2010) found similar rates of bullying in a sample of 439 college students when a definition of bullying was provided and students were asked if they had ever been bullied by a student or professor. About 14% of students reported having been bullied by another student, and 4.3% reported being bullied by a professor. However, when specific bullying behaviors were asked about, 83.4% of the sample had experienced at least one behavior representative of bullying by another student, and 21.4% had experienced at least one bullying behavior by a professor (Love et al., 2010). Additionally, MacDonald and Roberts-Pittman (2009) found that female college students reported higher rates of being bullied, and male students were more likely to report bullying others. Students of minority racial and sexual orientation groups were also more likely to be both the victims and perpetrators of bullying. Because victims of bullying tend to remain victims over time (Chapell et al., 2006) and may additionally be abused by teachers with power over them (Chapell et al., 2004), it is possible that feelings of anger and hostility build within these students, sometimes resulting in outward violence.

Bullying of professors. More recently, the issue of workplace bullying within the context of academia, or in other words, the case of university professors being the targets of bullying, has begun to be addressed. Qualitative descriptions and anecdotal stories of college faculty being bullied by superiors and colleagues have been recorded (Fogg, 2008; Lewis, 2004). McKay et al. (2008) reported rates of such occurrences among 100 professors at one Canadian university. They found that 64% of bullying of professors was done by peers, 45% was perpetrated by a superior, and 27% of reported instances were initiated by students. Behaviors initiated by colleagues and superiors included not taking concerns seriously (48%), overlooking scholarly contributions (48%), gossiping or spreading rumors (41%), making belittling remarks

(41%), and making unprofessional comments (41%). In this sample, the most common behaviors perpetrated by students included purposely interrupting class to communicate lack of respect (24%), challenging authority (21%), gossiping or spreading rumors about the instructor (19%), questioning a professor's decision excessively (15%), and making unprofessional comments (15%). McKay et al. found that the student perpetrators were most often undergraduates, and the faculty respondents cited lack of maturity and accountability and the perception of the student as a client of the university as factors that seem to promote student bullying. Although the behaviors described in this study included bullying, uncivil, and sexual harassment behaviors, the authors considered them to be representative of workplace bullying in general and did not report separate rates for each type of behavior.

Cyberbullying of professors. Bullying of faculty at the hands of students has also been described in the context of cyberbullying or online harassment. McKay et al. (2008) found that 44% of severe forms of bullying reported by faculty in their sample had taken place through e-mail. Since there is a growing trend toward distance education among higher education institutions, Reigle (2007) chose to examine online bullying in this context. Of 78 online instructors, 45% had experienced a student posting controversial opinions to a discussion forum for the purpose of rousing negative reactions within other students or the instructor. About a third of respondents reported having a student post lewd or vulgar remarks, and another third of the sample experienced students posting responses with the intent of humiliating other students (Reigle, 2007).

In an article published in the *University of Toledo Law Review*, Dickerson (2005) described acts of cyberbullying she witnessed and endured as a vice president and dean at Stetson University College of Law. Such behaviors included a student impersonating her

through e-mail, the badmouthing of professors on public websites and blogs, and posting disrespectful remarks during an online course that inhibited other students' participation. Dickerson called attention to the need for faculty to be aware that the use of technology allows bullies round-the-clock access to their victims, creates an atmosphere that is harder for the victim to escape, allows instantaneous action on impulses, can offer a large public audience, and provides anonymity and therefore less fear of being caught.

Consequences of bullying. Overall, faculty members have reported that being the target of bullying by either colleagues or students affects their personal well-being and productivity at work. In McKay et al.'s (2008) study, faculty reported a change in the amount of work and the quality of work they completed. Thirteen percent had reportedly considered leaving their job due to the bullying. The majority of those who had been bullied reported a change in their view of the institution (71%), lack of interest in their work (56%), and a change in their ability to cope with challenges (42%). Additionally, faculty reported feelings of stress, anger, demoralization, powerlessness, and anxiety as a result of the bullying. Fifty-three percent of the sample reported sleep difficulties and 40% said they had trouble concentrating (McKay et al., 2008). This study provides some evidence that bullying has negative effects on college personnel that are similar to the more well-known effects of bullying on school-aged children.

Incivility

Bullying is said to occur in the context of a relationship defined by a power imbalance such that the bully has more physical, psychological, or social power over the victim (Olweus, 1993). Although some researchers have challenged this definition, bullying may not be an accurate term to define negative behaviors that occur in the context of students behaving aggressively toward teachers or in the context of adult workplaces. Therefore, researchers

coined the term incivility, which Feldmann (2001) defined as "any action that interferes with a harmonious and cooperative learning atmosphere in the classroom" (p. 137). Uncivil behaviors exist along a continuum, ranging from passive disrespect to intentional physical harm (Clark & Springer, 2007; Kolanko et al., 2006), and it has been shown that violence often stems from uncivil and rude encounters (Andersson & Pearson, 1999).

Feldmann (2001) described four categories comprising a spectrum of severity of incivility as seen in college classrooms. The first category represents annoyances, such as arriving late or leaving early; answering a cell phone; or participating in non-class-related activities, such as reading the newspaper or doing homework for another course during class. The second category, termed "classroom terrorism" (Feldmann, 2001, p. 137), represents actions that interrupt the class or make classroom instruction difficult for the professor. Behaviors in this category may include students talking to each other during class, being disrespectful of others' viewpoints during discussion, or monopolizing class time by being overly vocal or discussing material that is irrelevant to the class. Feldmann's third category, intimidation, involves direct pressure through threats to jeopardize an instructor's authority by writing a negative course evaluation or by complaining to someone in a position of authority over the instructor. The final category, attacks, represents all behaviors in which violence has been threatened or perpetrated and the instructor fears for his or her well-being (Feldmann, 2001).

Incivility in K-12 Schools

Cultures of disrespect and incivility within secondary schools are reported as major problems by the popular media (Duarte & Bodfield, 2009). Since a large display of school violence erupted with the massacre at Columbine High School in 1999, a close watch has been placed on uncivil behaviors due to their ability to indicate potential school violence (Clark,

2008a; Kolanko et al., 2006). The majority of research focused on violence in K-12 schools addresses physical bullying, however. Kauffman and Burbach (1997) offered an anecdotal account of four response patterns they believe lead to incivility and eventually school violence, making this an important topic to research. First is the "Exquisite Sensitivity to the Personal" (Kauffman & Burbach, 1997, para. 5) disposition, in which almost anything can be viewed as a personal attack regardless of malicious intent. The authors pointed out that teachers as well as students can respond in this way. The second response pattern is "Group Offense Patrol" (Kauffman & Burbach, 1997, para. 7), which involves defensiveness when group identity is threatened. These first two dispositions contribute to what Kauffman and Burbach referred to as "Slight Trigger Disease" (Kauffman & Burbach, 1997, para. 10). This response involves an impulsive reaction to a perceived slight, often in a vengeful and violent way. Last, the phrase "Heavy into Violence" (Kauffman & Burbach, 1997, para. 12) was used to describe the more serious and violent crimes being committed by youths with a vicious and casual attitude. What these dispositions have in common is an increased social sensitivity and tendency toward violence, which makes schools potentially dangerous places (Kauffman & Burbach, 1997).

Uncivil behaviors in K-12 settings may vary somewhat from those observed in the workplace or in university classrooms. In Skiba et al.'s (2004) assessment of students' perceptions of school safety and climate, data from 2,465 middle and high school students were factor analyzed, resulting in four factors: (a) Student Connectedness, (b) Incivility and Disruption, (c) Feelings of Personal Safety, and (d) Delinquency and Major Safety Concerns. Items contained within the incivility and disruption factor included behaviors such as name calling and teasing, arguing, threatening, physically fighting, and cheating among students. All of these items pertained to student peer interactions. Rusby, Taylor, and Foster's (2007) review

of the school discipline referrals received by a sample of 717 first grade students found that the behaviors disciplined most often were behaviors aimed at the teacher or were disruptive to the class in general. Specifically, they found that the majority of referrals were given for physical aggression (46%), disruptive behavior (12%), potentially dangerous behaviors such as wrestling or throwing things (10%), defiance or insubordination (10%), and breaking classroom rules (7%). In general, the uncivil behaviors described by these studies tend to fall into the more severe categories of Feldmann's (2001) spectrum of incivility. This suggests that children and adolescents potentially act out in more verbally and physically aggressive ways than college students or that these are the behaviors researchers have tended to focus on in the K-12 environment.

Student perceptions of incivility. In a study that took place in Israel (Romi & Freund, 1999), 201 teachers, students, and parents of students attending an alternative high school rated their perceptions of severity of 38 disruptive student behaviors. Students were significantly less likely than teachers and parents to view perpetrating vandalism, speaking rudely to a teacher, arriving late to class, not paying attention, breaking school rules, using abusive language, damaging or stealing school property, and cheating as serious problems. Additionally, teachers were significantly more likely than students and parents to perceive lying to a teacher, verbal aggression, and physical violence among students as serious problems. Romi and Freund suggested that because of the perceptual differences of severity, mainly between teachers and students in this sample, and the tendency for teachers to be strict, behavioral problems may escalate as students realize they cannot meet teacher expectations. In essence, this may create a culture of incivility in the classroom.

Age trends. Although it could be expected that as students age and mature, their expressions of anger in uncivil ways would decrease, Andersen, Andersen, and Mayton (1985) found a somewhat stable display of anger from students in kindergarten through 12th grade. In their study, 901 grade school teachers estimated the percentage of students in their classes who displayed each of several verbal and nonverbal communications. Students in kindergarten and eighth grade exhibited the most expressions of anger as reported by teachers, with 11th, 12th, and sixth graders following close behind. Additionally, Andersen et al. reported that only half of high school students were perceived by their teachers as being able to communicate emotions clearly. It seems plausible that if adolescents have difficulty expressing a range of emotions, they may resort to angry expression as a form of communication.

Consequences of incivility. According to May and Dunaway (2000), students may perceive the potential dangers at school and become fearful of the school environment. In their study of 742 high school students, May and Dunaway found that students who perceived their neighborhoods as more uncivil, including the presence of drugs, gangs, and crime, and who perceived their school as unsafe were more fearful of being victimized at school. In Mayer's (2010) analysis of data from the National Crime Victimization Survey, School Crime Supplement from 1995-2005, school incivility was based on items related to having been bullied, called a derogatory name, exposed to hate language, or rejected. Findings showed that being a witness to uncivil behaviors was a better predictor of students' fear of victimization at school and avoidance of areas around school where they feared an attack than having actually experienced a personal attack or theft. Likewise, Skiba et al. (2004) found that students' perceptions of a hostile school environment and lack of connection to their school were more crucial factors in predicting students' feelings of school safety than more severe behaviors of delinquency, such as

drug and alcohol use, presence of weapons, and theft at school. Mayer suggested that these findings highlight the need for the attention to issues of lesser forms of violence, which can result in a poor school climate and negative effects on school performance.

Incivility in the Workplace

Andersson and Pearson (1999) defined workplace incivility as "low-intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target, in violation of workplace norms for mutual respect. Uncivil behaviors are characteristically rude and discourteous, displaying a lack of regard for others" (p. 457). In a qualitative study examining definitions of incivility among individuals in various professions, Pearson, Andersson, and Wegner (2001) found common themes related to a sense of immorality and a description of uncivil behaviors as similar to, but also distinct from, aggressive and violent behaviors in the workplace. A few behaviors that Martin and Hine (2005) included on their Uncivil Workplace Behavior Questionnaire were spoke to you in an aggressive tone of voice, took items from your desk without permission, read communications addressed to you, avoided consulting with you when expected, failed to pass on information you should have been made aware of, and talked about you behind your back. In analyzing this measure, four factors emerged: (a) Hostility, (b) Privacy Invasion, (c) Exclusionary Behavior, and (d) Gossiping (Martin & Hine, 2005). This indicates certain themes that may be seen in workplace incivility.

Few studies have attempted to determine the prevalence of such workplace incivility. Reio and Ghosh's (2009) study of 402 workers in a variety of professions, including retail, manufacturing, education, government, and non-profit, revealed that 54% of workers engaged in interpersonal incivility, and 46% admitted to perpetrating organizational incivility, in which the target is a group or the organization as a whole. The most frequently occurring interpersonally

uncivil behavior was making fun of or being rude toward someone, and organizational incivility perpetrated daily by 4% of the sample included taking long breaks, daydreaming too much, and talking badly about the company (Reio & Ghosh, 2009).

Perpetrators and victims. In Reio and Ghosh's study (2009), those most likely to behave uncivilly at work were men who reported experiencing more negative emotions toward their jobs, less socialization and adaptation within their workplaces, and fewer positive relationships with coworkers. Additionally, Blau and Andersson (2005) found that lack of satisfaction at work, belief that one has not been rewarded fairly based on job performance, work exhaustion, and negative attitude toward work were all predictive of workplace incivility.

Personal characteristics of victims also play a role in workplace incivility. Milam, Spitzmueller, and Penney (2009) found that self-report and coworker-report of low agreeableness and high neuroticism were related to an individual's perception of self as the target of uncivil behavior at work. Those who expressed feeling more distress related to workplace incivility reported more varied forms of uncivil behavior, higher frequency of occurrence, and more incivility at the hands of their superiors (Cortina & Magley, 2009). Lim, Cortina, and Magley (2008) found, as would be expected, that individuals who experienced workplace incivility reported less satisfaction with their jobs and their coworkers and supervisors. Furthermore, uncivil work experiences were related to poorer mental health, which in turn affected the employees' physical health. Being the target of such behaviors was also correlated with intentions to leave the organization. In this study, Lim et al. also found that although women reported experiencing more uncivil behaviors at work than men, outcomes of the behaviors were similar among individuals of both genders.

Incivility in College

Incivility has become a hot topic in higher education, specifically in nursing education, which has been identified as a stressful discipline with heavy student–professor contact (Clark, 2008a; Clark & Springer, 2007). Within the college context, incivility has mainly been studied within the classroom in terms of students as perpetrators and faculty members as the victims. A portion of the literature on incivility has focused on how the concept is defined differently among students and faculty members. In 2008, Clark studied perceptions of incivility among 194 nursing faculty and 306 nursing students using the Incivility in Nursing Education (INE) survey. Faculty members were asked to what extent they considered each of 16 behaviors to be uncivil. The top behaviors to be considered usually or always uncivil included holding distracting conversations (76%); demanding make-up exams, extensions, or grade changes (75%); using a computer during class for unrelated activities (72%); making sarcastic remarks or gestures (70%); and being unprepared for class (65%). However, faculty ratings of incivility differed from student perspectives. Three behaviors were viewed as significantly more uncivil by faculty than by students: leaving class early, dominating classroom discussion, and cheating on exams. In addition, five behaviors were viewed more uncivil by students than professors: skipping class, being unprepared, arriving late, sleeping, and using a computer for unrelated activities during class. Furthermore, three of the behaviors that occurred most frequently in this sample—arriving late, leaving early, and acting bored during class—were only considered to be uncivil by 56%, 41%, and 38% of the total sample of students and faculty, respectively (Clark, 2008b).

Rowland and Srisukho's (2009) study of American dental students found even greater discrepancy in the views of students and faculty, with 11 of 18 behaviors rated significantly

differently in this sample. For example, the majority of faculty members believed that use of a cell phone and surfing the Internet during class were uncivil behaviors, whereas the majority of students did not. On the other hand, students were much more likely than instructors to view missing a course deadline as an act of incivility (Rowland & Srisukho, 2009). It is easy to see that both parties do not view student–teacher interactions in the same way, which can lead to increased rates of the behaviors and difficulty managing and preventing incivility.

Clark's (2008a) review of four open-ended questions at the end of the INE survey, which were answered by nursing faculty and students, may have provided some clarity to the issue. She uncovered four main themes in uncivil student behaviors: (a) disrupting class by misuse of cell phones and computers, talking, or dominating classroom discussion; (b) using cyberbullying behaviors, profanity, and sarcasm and making rude comments; (c) intimidating faculty into succumbing to student demands; and (d) badmouthing faculty, peers, and their program in general. These themes somewhat match the categories presented by Feldmann (2001). However, violent behaviors are not present in any of the themes uncovered by Clark (2008a), which may be due to the fact that these behaviors occur rarely.

Uncivil student behaviors were reported by Clark (2008b) to be experienced or witnessed by up to 87% of college nursing students and faculty. The most common uncivil student behaviors reported in her sample by faculty members and students were arriving late for class (87%), holding distracting conversations (86%), being unprepared (75%), leaving early (68%), and skipping class (62%; Clark, 2008b).

Contributing factors. Student stress and an attitude of entitlement were perceived as the main contributing factors to student incivility in Clark's (2008a) sample. The biggest perceived sources of stress included burnout due to heavy workloads; demands related to juggling multiple

roles at work, school, and home; and competition for grades, scholarships, and rank within a program. Clark's (2008a) sample described student entitlement as an unwillingness to accept personal responsibility, assuming a consumer orientation toward college, feeling owed an education, making excuses for failures, and displaying a know-it-all attitude. Other researchers have confirmed that a positive attitude toward uncivil classroom behavior, a consumer orientation toward college, and higher levels of narcissism predict students acting in uncivil ways (Nordstrom, Bartels, & Bucy, 2009). Additionally, Luparell's (2004) qualitative descriptions of incivility within nursing education identified student failure to perform adequately such as by failing a course and constructive criticism of student performance, which was perceived as negative, to be common triggers leading to uncivil behavior.

Faculty incivility. According to Clark (2008a), it is behaviors and attitudes arising on both sides of the faculty–student relationship that lead to a "dance of incivility" (p. 1) within a classroom or academic department. In addition to identifying uncivil student behaviors, Clark (2008b) also obtained prevalence rates of faculty incivility in nursing education. Up to 53% of the total sample of nursing faculty and students reported having experienced or witnessed faculty incivility. Faculty behaviors considered to be the most uncivil by nursing students were making condescending remarks or put-downs (82%), rude gestures or behaviors (81%), being distant and cold (77%), exerting rank or superiority over others (76%), and punishing the entire class for one student's behavior (76%). These behaviors were among the least often experienced behaviors in this sample, however. The most frequently occurring uncivil faculty behaviors included ineffective teaching style (54%); arriving late for scheduled activities (42%); changing the syllabus, assignments, and due dates (42%); being inflexible, rigid, and authoritarian (41%); and ignoring disruptive behaviors (36%; Clark, 2008b).

Clark (2008a) also discovered five basic themes of uncivil faculty behaviors in her qualitative review of four questions at the end of the INE survey: (a) intimidating students, (b) having poor teaching and classroom management skills, (c) demeaning or belittling students through comments or gestures, (d) labeling and gossiping about students, and (e) showing favoritism or bias toward students. Furthermore, Clark's (2008a) sample expressed beliefs that stress and an attitude of superiority on behalf of faculty members contribute to these uncivil faculty behaviors. Specifically, faculty stress was attributed to (a) demanding workloads, high faculty turnover and lack of qualified educators; (b) pressure to fill multiple roles at school, work, and home; and (c) exposure to students', colleagues', and administrators' uncivil behaviors. Superior attitudes were defined as exerting power by intimidating and disrespecting students, threatening to fail or dismiss students, devaluing students' experiences, having unrealistic expectations of students, and adopting a know-it-all attitude (Clark, 2008a).

Faculty variables affecting student incivility. Additional faculty variables, such as teaching style and warmth, may affect the perception of and sensitivity to uncivil behaviors. Summers, Bergin, and Cole (2009) discovered that university instructors who were emotionally supportive, allowed students to have more control over their learning, and utilized formal and informal group work in class were more sensitive to students displaying distracting or disrespectful behaviors. The authors speculated that by giving students more choice and control in the classroom, instructors may perceive a loss of control when groups become uncivil (Summers et al., 2009). Professors may also take uncivil behaviors more personally when they feel students take advantage of their supportive nature and interactive learning style.

Consequences of incivility. Researchers have demonstrated that classroom incivility by students has devastating effects on faculty members and the learning environment as a whole.

Luparell's (2004) interviews with 21 faculty members about critical incidents of uncivil student behavior described feelings of fear and panic as most common among faculty members perceiving threat of harm by students. In a more in-depth analysis of the data, Luparell (2007) found the following themes of the effects of student incivility on instructors: (a) physical symptoms such as sleep difficulty; (b) damage to self-esteem and confidence; (c) posttraumatic symptoms such as reliving the emotions felt during the original encounter; (d) loss of time spent documenting the event, attending meetings, and seeking supervision; (e) financial costs due to travel and legal expenses; and (f) departure from academia altogether. Additionally, faculty admitted that other students suffered due to loss of enthusiasm of the professor, changes to class format, and modifications made to grading criteria in order to avoid conflict with students (Luparell, 2007). Uncivil students disrupting class and dominating discussion can hinder others from expressing their opinions or receiving the attention they deserve (D. Lee, 2005) and can certainly prevent the instructor from meeting the learning objectives of the course (Morrissette, 2001).

Sexual Harassment

In 2010, 11,717 cases of sexual harassment were filed under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission [EEOC], 2010). In 1980 the EEOC finalized guidelines that defined sexual harassment in the workplace as

> unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature . . . when: 1) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment, 2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions affecting such individual, or 3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of

unreasonably interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an

intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment. (James, 1981, p. 402)

Similar to the criteria for bullying, sexual harassment has been said to almost always describe

repetitive behaviors that are unwelcome, one-sided, and occur in the context of a relationship in

which the harasser has some power over the victim of the harassment. Additionally, the harassed

individual cannot stop the behavior and is unable to enlist support from a superior to do so

(James, 1981).

Sexual Harassment in the Workplace

High rates of sexual harassment in the workplace led to a need for the above definition

and policies for handling such harassment. Rates have been found to vary widely from 28% to

75% among workers (Ilies et al., 2003). In a meta-analysis of 71 studies reporting prevalence

rates, Ilies et al. (2003) found a significant difference in rates based on sampling technique and

method of measurement. The average rate of reported sexual harassment in studies utilizing

probability sampling was 58% versus 84% in convenience samples. In probability samples only,

upon direct inquiry about individuals' perceptions of having been sexually harassed at work,

24% of women reported harassment, compared to 58% of women who reported experiencing

specific behaviors regarded as sexual harassment (Ilies et al., 2003). Gruber's (2003) analysis of

U.S. military data from 1988, 1994, and 1995 found that 78% of women and 38% of men

experienced one or more of five forms of sexual harassment behaviors measured. Fifty-two

percent of women and 9% of men actually defined these experiences as sexual harassment

(Gruber, 2003). In both studies, high rates of workers did not consider the behaviors they

experienced to constitute sexual harassment, indicating that laypeople view harassment

differently than the guidelines the government has provided.

Environmental differences. Workplace setting and occupation are factors that may affect prevalence of sexual harassment. Ilies et al. (2003) found that among women, 36% of military employees, 31% of government employees, 23% of private sector employees, and 16% of women working in academia reported harassment upon direct query. When asked about specific behaviors, these rankings changed and rates rose to 69% of military personnel, 58% of academicians, 46% of private sector employees, and 43% of government employees (Ilies et al., 2003). In Richman et al.'s study (1999), 2,492 urban university employees rated how frequently they experienced each of 19 behaviors on the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire. The authors found that rates of sexual harassment varied based on gender and occupational group. Specifically, whereas female faculty members were harassed significantly more than male faculty, men working in clerical and service positions experienced more harassment than women in these positions. Male and female student workers experienced comparable rates of sexual harassment (Richman et al., 1999).

Additional organizational factors have been found to contribute to incidents of sexual harassment. A meta-analysis of 41 studies conducted by Willness, Steel, and Lee (2007) found organizational climate to have the largest effect as a precursor for sexual harassment. Specifically, individual perceptions of one's workplace as tolerant of sexual harassment, lacking policy, and rarely implementing procedures for addressing harassment appeared to contribute to prevalence (Willness et al., 2007).

Targets of sexual harassment. As reported by Lundberg-Love and Marmion (2003) based on their comprehensive review of the literature, risk factors for sexual harassment at work include female gender, younger age (less than 34 years old), single status, homosexuality, employment in blue-collar jobs or positions that typically employ men, and positions of less

power within an organization. Willness et al.'s (2007) meta-analysis of antecedents and outcomes of sexual harassment confirmed that working with fewer women or in a job that is considered stereotypically male are risk factors for sexual harassment among women. Results of Berdahl and Moore's (2006) survey of 238 American union employees of five different organizations showed that women were harassed more than men and ethnic minorities were harassed more than Caucasians. Furthermore, ethnic minority women were sexually harassed more than any other group, indicating a dual threat for this group (Berdahl & Moore, 2006). Additionally, women who exhibit stereotypical femininity, often lacking assertiveness, and women who are more masculine, which may present a threat to some men, have been hypothesized to experience sexual harassment at higher rates (Lundberg-Love & Marmion, 2003).

Consequences of sexual harassment. Sexual harassment in the workplace has been linked to numerous negative outcomes for the individual and the organization as a whole. Willness et al. (2007) found sexual harassment to be linked to dissatisfaction with one's job and relationships with coworkers and supervisors. Lack of commitment to the organization and withdrawal from work by missing work, neglecting certain tasks, and consequently lowering productivity were also established as negative outcomes of sexual harassment in the workplace. In terms of personal effects of harassment, Willness et al. found victims to experience more psychological conditions, particularly post-traumatic stress disorder, and to report more problems with their physical health. Surprisingly, overall life satisfaction was not affected much by sexual harassment at work. The authors speculated that this could be due to the fact that life satisfaction includes more than just satisfaction at work and that severity, frequency, and recency of the harassment may affect this measure (Willness et al., 2007).

Sexual Harassment in K-12 Schools

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 prohibits discrimination, including sex discrimination which is a form of sexual harassment, in all educational institutions receiving federal funding (Strauss, 2003). The U.S. Department of Education has defined sexual harassment in schools as

> unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal, nonverbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature by an employee, by another student, or by a third party, which is sufficiently severe, persistent, or pervasive to limit a student's ability to participate in or benefit from an education program or activity, or create a hostile or abusive educational environment. (Strauss, 2003, p. 107)

In general, the less severe the form of harassment, the more frequent and repetitive the behaviors need to be in order to meet legal standards for prosecution. In the case of more severe behaviors, such as attempted or completed sexual assault or rape, one incident is often sufficient to warrant criminal charges. It is the legal duty of schools to take immediate action to stop sexual harassment when they are made aware of it (Strauss, 2003).

As reported in a review by Pellegrini (2002), researchers have suggested that sexual harassment increases in early adolescence, when students become more interested in heterosexual relationships. In this age group, both boys and girls use strategies such as poking and pushing to show interest. This type of cross-gender harassment has been shown to increase from sixth to eighth grades in particular (McMaster, Connolly, Pepler, & Craig, 2002).

Harassment of students by peers. Several studies have examined the prevalence of peer-to-peer sexual harassment among adolescents. V. E. Lee, Croninger, Linn, and Chen (1996) found an overall prevalence rate of 76% in a sample of 1,632 eighth through 11th graders

across the United States. Girls in this sample were significantly more likely to be harassed than boys (83% versus 60%). Based on Witkowska's (2005) data obtained in 1983 from 980 17- and 18-year-old Swedish high school students, prevalence rates for specific sexually harassing behaviors ranged from 0.2% to 77% among girls and from 1% to 71% among boys. The most common behaviors reported by both male and female students were demeaning comments about gender (66%, 77%), sexualized conversations (71%, 77%), and being rated by others based on attractiveness (62%, 71%). Sexually assaultive behaviors were reported much less in this sample than either verbal or non-verbal displays of harassment, which included name calling, spreading rumors, and being brushed up against (Witkowska, 2005). Murnen and Smolak (2000) found much lower rates of victimization in their sample of 77 third through fifth grade American students, with rates ranging from 12% to 37% among girls and 6% to 42% among boys. Girls were most commonly stared at (32%) or had an entrance blocked by someone (37%), and boys received comments about their clothing (42%) and experienced girls whispering and giggling about them when they walked by (35%; Murnen & Smolak, 2000). Likewise, McMaster et al. (2002) reported rates ranging from 3% to 22% among girls and 5% to 26% among boys in a sample of 1,213 sixth through eighth grade Canadian students. In this sample, the most common behavior experienced by boys was being called a homophobic term and girls most commonly experienced sexual comments, jokes, gestures, or looks (McMaster et al., 2002). It appears that reported rates may be higher among high school students due to a better understanding of the nature of sexual harassment in this age group. However, rates may vary by country as well.

Harassment of students by adults. Researchers have also studied the prevalence of sexual harassment of students by teachers and other adults at school. V. E. Lee et al. (1996) reported rates of harassment by principals, teachers, and other school staff members to be 2%,

16%, and 44%, respectively. Female students were significantly more likely to be harassed by a teacher or staff member than male students were. Female and male students in Witkowska's (2005) study reported harassment by teachers, including demeaning comments about gender or sexuality (14%, 7%), inappropriate touching (12%, 9%), and propositions for sexual favors (2%, 2%). The difference in rates was significant for demeaning comments and inappropriate touching, indicating that female students are harassed more by teachers than male students (Witkowska, 2005).

Student perceptions of sexual harassment. Adolescent perceptions of what constitutes sexual harassment have been found to be influenced most highly by severity of the behavior and identity of the harasser as someone in a position of authority such as a teacher (Loredo, Reid, & Deaux, 1995; Witkowska, 2005). The status of the harasser has been shown to be less important as the behavior becomes more severe, however (Loredo et al., 1995). When the harasser was a teacher, minor offenses such as sexual comments or sexual pictures posted in a private place were viewed as more inappropriate and detrimental to the student, whereas these were excused when done by another student. Based on the qualitative responses obtained by Loredo et al. (1995), it became clear that these differences lie in students' expectations of teachers as role models and the belief that student-teacher relationships should be professional. In Murnen and Smolak's (2000) study of third, fourth, and fifth graders, girls were more likely to perceive harassment as harmless teasing. However, masculinity and femininity affected students' perceptions, with more feminine girls and more masculine boys being more likely to perceive harassment as intentionally hurtful on the part of the perpetrator (Murnen & Smolak, 2000).

Perpetrators and victims of sexual harassment. In McMaster et al.'s (2002) study, boys were significantly more likely to report being the perpetrator of sexually harassing

behaviors. However, as seen in many school studies, boys in this sample also reported being victimized at the same rate as girls. A significant overlap in the roles of victim and perpetrator, with 78% of perpetrators also identifying as victims and 56% of victims also perpetrating sexually harassing behaviors, may explain this finding (McMaster et al., 2002). This tendency to be both harasser and victim was also observed by V. E. Lee et al. (1996), with 53% of boys and girls describing themselves as both. Witkowska (2005) found that girls experienced harassment behaviors at higher rates than boys, except for homophobic name calling, showing pornography, and rougher forms of harassment, such as pulling clothing, grabbing, pinching, touching private parts, and brushing up against, which were reported more by boys. Additionally, V. E. Lee et al. found that girls and older students were more likely to report having been harassed. With regard to severity of harassment, girls, African Americans, students in higher grades, and those with lower GPAs had more severe harassment experiences (V. E. Lee et al., 1996).

Consequences of sexual harassment. Negative consequences of sexual harassment have been found to include lower self-esteem, poor view of self in social situations, and dissatisfaction with weight and body shape in girls but not boys. In Murnen and Smolak's (2000) study, both boys and girls reported feeling bad after being harassed, and girls reported being scared more than boys. In V. E. Lee et al.'s (1996) study, almost half of the students who reported experiencing sexual harassment indicated having academic problems following the incident. Over a quarter of harassed students also reported having psychological symptoms such as difficulty sleeping or loss of appetite, with the probability of having psychological problems increasing with the severity of sexual harassment behaviors. Most of the harassed students coped with the harassment by attempting to avoid people and places associated with the harassment (V. E. Lee et al., 1996).

Sexual Harassment in College

Within the higher education environment, sexual harassment has been found to create an intimidating environment, interfere with students' enjoyment of educational opportunities, and negatively affect academic performance (McCormack, 1995). McCormack (1995) compared the results of data collected in 1989 and 1993, examining sexual harassment among female seniors at one university. The author found that in 1989 and 1993 the incidents reported by participants were mostly perpetrated by other students (81% and 68%, respectively) and faculty members (32% and 36%, respectively). Across both years, female students who were younger and lived on campus were more likely to be harassed by peers, but older students who commuted to campus were more likely to be harassed by faculty members (McCormack, 1995). Lott, Reilly, and Howard's (1982) study of 927 university students and faculty found that although sexual assault was perpetrated most frequently by an acquaintance, male faculty most often exhibited behaviors of sexual intimidation or insults against female students. Later studies looked specifically at harassing behavior perpetrated by male professors against female students (e.g., Schneider, 1987).

In Schneider's (1987) study of 356 female graduate students, 60% of the sample reported experiencing "everyday harassment" (p. 47) by male faculty members. Everyday harassment behaviors included staring, comments about physical appearance, physical contact such as a touch or pinch, casual sexual remarks, and explicit sexual propositions. These behaviors were in contrast to more severe sexual harassment behaviors such as coercive dating or sexual experiences with male professors, which were reported by 9% of the sample. Approximately two-thirds of the cases involved faculty members who had the ability to influence the students' academic status such that the student was currently taking a course with or working as a teaching

or research assistant for that professor, or the professor was either the chairperson or a member of the student's thesis committee (Schneider, 1987).

Contrapower sexual harassment in college. In 1984, K. A. Benson commented on the power differential aspect of definitions of sexual harassment being used in the university setting. She coined the term "contrapower sexual harassment" (p. 517) to describe a situation in which the victim of harassment has formal power over the harasser. She highlighted the occurrence of this type of harassment between male students and female faculty, particularly when the behavior can be anonymous, such as in the context of written teacher evaluations or obscene phone calls (K. A. Benson, 1984). This sparked a flurry of research focused on college faculty as the victims of sexual harassment rather than the perpetrators. Grauerholz's (1989) study confirmed K. A. Benson's idea by showing that college faculty can be and are sexually harassed by students and view these behaviors as such. In her survey of 208 female faculty members, Grauerholz found that almost half of the sample reported having experienced at least one of the 10 behaviors provided, with undue attention (18%), obscene phone calls from someone believed to be a student (17%), and verbal sexual comments (15%) the most common behaviors. Male students were reported as perpetrators the majority of the time (82%).

Grauerholz (1989) concluded that because of the power associated with gender rather than organizational status, male students are able to sexually harass female faculty, whereas male faculty are unlikely to experience these behaviors. However, Fitzgerald et al. (1988) found differently in their study of 235 male faculty members' sexual relationships with students. Approximately 26% of the sample reported having dated a student and another 26% reported having had a sexual relationship with a student. Additionally, 6% of the faculty members surveyed felt they had been sexually harassed by a student, although higher percentages reported

experiencing specific sexual harassment behaviors, such as unsolicited touching (18%) or an offer of sexual favors for some reward (14%). Interestingly, the faculty members who reported dating or having sexual relationships with students more than once were more likely to feel as though they had been harassed (Fitzgerald et al., 1988).

Gender differences. In comparisons of male and female faculty members' experiences with sexual harassment committed by students, researchers have found gender differences based on the type of behavior. Female faculty members have been found to report significantly higher rates of unwanted sexual attention than men (Matchen & DeSouza, 2000), and male faculty members have reported inappropriate body language, physical advances, and sexual propositions more often than women (McKinney, 1990). Overall rates of sexual harassment have not been found to differ based on gender (DeSouza & Fansler, 2003; Matchen & DeSouza, 2000). However, female professors have reported being bothered more by and having more negative attitudes toward overall sexually harassing behaviors (DeSouza & Fansler, 2003; McKinney, 1990), gender harassment, and unwanted sexual attention (DeSouza & Fansler, 2003; Matchen & DeSouza, 2000) than male professors. Also, female faculty members were bothered more by the experience of sexual harassment from a student in general than male faculty members (DeSouza & Fansler, 2003).

Faculty perceptions of sexual harassment. In terms of which behaviors are actually viewed as sexual harassment, Grauerholz (1989) reported that the majority of her sample of female professors expressed belief that all 10 behaviors included in the survey could be considered sexual harassment when perpetrated by a student against a professor. The more severe and less ambiguous behaviors, such as physical advances (91%), explicit sexual propositions (93%), sexual bribery (96%), and sexual assault (96%), were labeled sexual

harassment by almost the entire sample (Grauerholz, 1989). In comparing men's and women's attitudes toward sexually harassing behaviors committed by students, researchers' findings are mixed. DeSouza and Fansler (2003) found no gender differences in perceptions of harassing behaviors in the educational setting, but McKinney (1992) found women to be more likely than men to view behaviors as sexual harassment. In other studies (Matchen & DeSouza, 2000; McKinney, 1990), more severe behaviors, such as sexual coercion and bribery, earned higher agreement among men and women.

Other factors have also been shown to influence perceptions of sexual harassment in student–professor relationships. In a combined sample of 375 male and female professors, McKinney (1992) reported a greater likelihood to view a vignette as sexual harassment when it involved a male student harassing a female faculty member rather than a female student harassing a male faculty member. Respondents were also more certain a behavior represented sexual harassment when it involved explicit verbal or physical behavior or an obscene phone call over implicit behaviors and written evaluations. However, implicit behaviors were viewed more certainly as harassment when a female faculty member was the victim, whereas harassment of a male professor was more certain when it involved explicit verbal and physical behavior (McKinney, 1992).

Interpersonal Mistreatment

Incivility and Bullying

Researchers have begun to examine commonalities among bullying, incivility, and sexual harassment and to place the concepts along a continuum of interpersonal mistreatment (Lampman et al., 2009; Lim & Cortina, 2005; McKay et al., 2008). In general, the terms incivility and bullying have been used interchangeably in the literature (Jones, 2006). However,

the terms are differentiated mainly by the intent to cause harm, which is present in bullying but more ambiguous for uncivil behaviors. Despite possible ambiguity of intent, incivility, along with bullying, has been shown to have significant effects on victims in terms of mental and physical well-being (Edwards & O'Connell, 2007; Lim et al., 2008; Luparell, 2007; Mikkelsen & Einarsen, 2001). Furthermore, it has been theorized that incivility can begin to define the climate of a particular organization (Miner-Rubino & Cortina, 2007) and act as a precursor of more aggressive forms of mistreatment (DeSouza, 2008; Felblinger, 2008). Together, incivility and bullying have been categorized as milder forms of mistreatment compared to sexual harassment (DeSouza, 2008).

Incivility and Sexual Harassment

Although at different ends of the spectrum, incivility and a specific form of sexual harassment, referred to as gender harassment, have been found to correlate highly (Lim & Cortina, 2005). Gruber and Fineran (2008) described gender harassment as sex discrimination intended to subordinate women and maintain socially sanctioned gender roles within society. Researchers have drawn attention to the fact that the concept of sexual harassment has been associated with sexual behaviors more than the original definition intended (DeSouza, 2008). Several studies on sexual harassment have therefore broken the concept into three different factors—gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion—with the latter two sometimes combined into a sexualized harassment factor (Lim & Cortina, 2005).

Gender harassment, like incivility, is characterized as disrespectful and hostile behavior without sexual content. Lim and Cortina (2005) found these behaviors to happen together very often, with 23% of their sample of 833 female court employees reporting experiencing incivility alone and 22% reporting experiencing incivility and gender harassment together. Furthermore,

there was a moderate correlation between incivility and sexualized harassment, and 21% of the sample reported experiencing all forms of mistreatment at work, demonstrating a strong overlap of sexual and nonsexual aggressive behaviors (Lim & Cortina, 2005). Additionally, in DeSouza's (2011) study examining connections among incivility, sexual harassment, and ethnic harassment, having experienced incivility was a predictor of having experienced sexual harassment as well. Both incivility and sexual harassment have been shown to have negative effects on well-being, mental health, and physical health in both those personally mistreated (Lim & Cortina, 2005) and those who observed such harassing behaviors against female coworkers (Miner-Rubino & Cortina, 2007).

Bullying and Sexual Harassment

Comparisons have been drawn between bullying and sexual harassment as well, particularly within the secondary school environment. The term *sexual bullying* has even been introduced in the literature to describe the co-occurrence of these behaviors on a regular basis (Gruber & Fineran, 2008, p. 1). A qualitative analysis by deLara (2008) of interviews with 122 rural high school students found that adolescents viewed teasing, bullying, and sexual harassment as a continuum of behaviors. Land's (2000) study comparing teasing, bullying, and sexual harassment among high school students further determined that teasing and bullying displayed significant overlap in terms of making up a single factor. Sexual harassment, which was viewed in a strictly sexual context by students, was a separate but strongly correlated factor (Land, 2000). Additionally, Shute et al. (2008) held focus groups with a total of 72 ninth grade students, which yielded much sexual content in response to questions about physical, verbal, and indirect victimization despite the researchers' deliberate avoidance of the term sexual harassment. The authors proposed that students' description of sexual behaviors in the context

of bullying shows support for overlap between sexual harassment and bullying, at least as students experience and define it (Shute et al., 2008).

Gruber and Fineran (2008) found bullying to be more prevalent (52%) than sexual harassment (34%) among 522 middle and high school students. Both types of behavior had significant relationships with negative outcomes, such as physical health and experience of trauma symptoms, but sexual harassment was found to have stronger adverse effects (Gruber & Fineran, 2008). Similar findings were obtained in Richman et al.'s (1999) sample of university employees. Generalized workplace abuse occurred at higher rates than sexual harassment regardless of gender or occupational level separately. However, when the interaction of gender and occupational level was examined, female faculty members were likely to be sexually harassed and generally abused significantly more than men in the same position (Richman et al., 1999). In general, women were the targets of both bullying and sexual harassment much more than men, who are generally viewed as the perpetrators.

Incivility, Bullying, and Sexual Harassment

Only two known studies have examined all three types of behaviors as they occur together. McKay et al. (2008) justified inclusion of uncivil, bullying, and sexual harassment behaviors in their study of workplace mistreatment among university faculty members as necessary due to varying perceptions of the classifications of these behaviors. Of their 100 respondents, 52% felt they had been mistreated at work within the past five years, with the most frequent behaviors representing workplace incivility: not having concerns taken seriously (48%), being the subject of rumors (41%), being belittled (41%), and receiving unwarranted and unprofessional comments (41%). Over a quarter of those who reported experiencing mistreatment said the behavior had an impact on their productivity at work and 13% reported

considering leaving their job because of it. Additionally, over half of those who had been bullied reported a strong stress response, including feelings of frustration (49%), anger (47%), demoralization (39%), powerlessness (37%), and anxiety (35%). McKay et al. did not separately examine rates of bullying, incivility, or sexual harassment or whether certain behaviors led to more negative outcomes in this sample.

Lampman et al. (2009) measured how often 30 student behaviors were experienced by a sample of 399 faculty members at a large Alaskan university as well as how upsetting it was for faculty members who had experienced each behavior. The 30 behavior items were factor analyzed, resulting in two factors: an Incivility-Bullying scale containing 15 items, and a Sexual Attention scale containing three items. These analyses statistically support an overlap in bullying and uncivil behaviors. However, it was not reported by the authors which constructs the 12 behavior items that did not load on either factor represented and why these items did not load. Lampman et al. reported that 99% of female and 96% of male faculty members had experienced at least one uncivil or bullying behavior, and 26% of women and 37% of men experienced unwanted sexual attention. Women reported being significantly more upset by all behaviors and experiencing more negative consequences such as anxiety, difficulty sleeping, depression, and trouble concentrating at work than men. Behaviors categorized as incivility or bullying were more highly related to negative outcomes than sexual attention among both men and women in this sample (Lampman et al., 2009).

Love and MacDonald (2010) conducted a pilot study on a sample of 107 faculty members at a midsize Midwestern university (See Appendix B for a full description of the pilot study). Participants were asked to complete the Faculty Experience Survey (Appendix A), which included 50 bullying, cyberbullying, uncivil, and sexually harassing behaviors. Participants were

asked to indicate how often they experienced each of the behaviors perpetrated by students while teaching at their current institution on a 4-point rating scale. Additionally, if they had experienced a behavior at least once, participants were also asked to rate how upset they were by the behavior on a 4-point rating scale. A principle axis factor analysis with oblique promax rotation was conducted on the reported frequencies of each behavior, resulting in 45 items loading on four factors: (a) Poor Student Behavior (10 items); (b) Direct Incivility (21 items); (c) Illegal, Threatening Behaviors (eight items); and (d) Cyberbullying Behaviors (six items). These results seem to support the hypothesis that bullying, uncivil, and sexually harassing behaviors combine to create a spectrum of interpersonal mistreatment. The first three factors appeared to be separated into categories based on severity and frequency of behavior, ranging from poor student behaviors that were experienced by most faculty members (e.g., failed to meet assignment requirements, engaged in non-class activity during class, failed to read the syllabus; 99.1%) to direct incivility (e.g., made belittling or demeaning remarks about you, interrupted class on purpose, challenged your authority; 93.5%) to severe, illegal, and threatening behaviors that were less common (e.g., made hostile or threatening verbal remarks, made hostile or threatening phone calls; 59.8%). For the most part, cyberbullying behaviors (e.g., posted negative or embarrassing information about you online, harassed or threatened you through a social networking site), which occurred infrequently in this sample (21.5%), made up a separate factor. This may provide some evidence that these behaviors represent a unique construct (Love & MacDonald, 2010).

Based on the literature (DeSouza, 2008; Felblinger, 2008; Gruber & Fineran, 2008; Jones, 2006; Lampman et al., 2009; Lim & Cortina, 2005; McKay et al., 2008; Miner-Rubino & Cortina, 2007; Richman et al., 1999; Shute et al., 2008), bullying, incivility, and sexual

harassment are beginning to be seen as overlapping constructs in terms of definitions, prevalence, and negative outcomes. This has resulted in a perceived continuum of behavior. Further research is needed to confirm this theory. Therefore, the present study aimed to provide additional evidence of the overlap of these constructs.

Theories of Contrapower Harassment

Aggressive behaviors have been traditionally viewed as existing in the context of a relationship characterized by a power differential in that the perpetrator of the behavior has some physical, psychological, or social power over the victim (Olweus, 1993). Likewise, sexual harassment has been described as a way to assert authority and power, rather than being purely related to sexuality and sexual interest (D. J. Benson & Thomson, 1982). However, real-world reports of bullying, incivility, and sexual harassment in a variety of settings have been shown to include the occurrence of behaviors perpetrated by those in subordinate positions against those with more organizational power. This occurrence has been termed "contrapower harassment" (K. A. Benson, 1984, p. 517) and multiple theories used to understand power dynamics in sexual harassment have been applied in order to explain this phenomenon.

Role Theories

One theory discussed in the literature on contrapower sexual harassment is role theory (e.g., Heiss, as cited in McKinney, 1992). This theory proposes that an individual's actual and expected status and role in society and the associated responsibilities and privileges influence his or her actions and beliefs. Furthermore, interactions with others are influenced by status and roles based on factors such as gender and hierarchical rank. In traditional sexual harassment cases, role theory would predict that men in positions of authority over women use the power of their roles in order to receive sexual favors. In terms of contrapower harassment, however, a

person in a position of authority is threatened by a person with some other source of power, such as gender (McKinney, 1992), so that a woman in a position of authority might be harassed by a lower ranking-man.

Gender-role spillover theory specifically addresses gender as a source of power by asserting that traditional expectations of interactions between men and women spill over into the workplace, which results in men treating female colleagues as sex objects (Gutek & Morasch, 1982). The social structural perspective further provides explanation of how gender may affect contrapower harassment when the harassment is not sexual in nature. The basis of this perspective is that traditional gender roles, such that women are nurturers and men are providers, have resulted in expectations that men and women will fill stereotypic roles within society (Rudman & Glick, 2008). Because of this, students may expect that female faculty members will be more sympathetic and helpful when they fall behind or become overwhelmed by the responsibilities of school, family, and employment. Lampman et al. (2009) theorized that when a female faculty member does not fulfill the expected role, she may become the target of uncivil, bullying, and sexual harassment behaviors.

Much research supports the notion that power is obtained through gender. Grauerholz's (1989) study of 208 female faculty members found gender to be a major factor in harassment. The vast majority (82%) of the sample reported that male students exclusively had perpetrated sexual harassment against them. In DeSouza and Fansler's (2003) studies of contrapower sexual harassment at a large university, male undergraduate students reported perpetrating more sexually harassing behaviors against faculty members than female students. Furthermore, from the perspective of the faculty, female professors were more likely than male professors to report harassment by male students (DeSouza & Fansler, 2003).

Identity Theories

In addition to expectations based on stereotypic gender roles, the social structural perspective of contrapower harassment posits that some students, particularly those who are male, who are of nontraditional age, and who have real-world experience, may dislike being taught and evaluated by women, whom they view as having lower social status than men (Rudman & Glick, 2008). Social identity theory builds on this idea by explaining the perceived need for retaliation (see Korte, 2007 for a review). This theory holds that individuals whose social identity or personal value has been undermined will react to defend their social status. Within the college environment, when students feels judged or criticized by a professor from a sociocultural group that is perceived as lower in social status than their own, this results in a threat toward their social identity. In an effort to reassert social power, students may engage in harassing behaviors toward professors from groups viewed as having less power, including women, minorities, those with less experience, and those in lower academic positions (e.g., untenured; Lampman et al., 2009). Additionally, it has been suggested that professors teaching certain courses that discuss controversial topics and challenge students' beliefs may also trigger uncivil and harassing behaviors. Specifically, teaching women's studies and required liberal arts courses that often address topics such as politics and religion may result in particularly tense classroom discussions that could escalate into acts of aggression toward faculty members (Lampman et al, 2009).

This notion of threatened identity was demonstrated in a case study of a female instructor who experienced much harassment while teaching a women's studies course (D. Lee, 2005). D. Lee (2005) reported on the male students in the course who repeatedly challenged the instructor's authority and created a hostile environment in which the female students did not feel

comfortable participating, thereby asserting male domination in the classroom. Quantitative research findings have also supported these theories. Lampman et al. (2009) found that women who were ethnic minorities were more likely to receive unwanted sexual attention from students than White women. The pilot study conducted by Love and MacDonald (2010) found that ethnic minorities of both sexes were more likely to experience direct incivility, illegal, threatening behaviors, and cyberbullying from students than Whites. Additionally, individuals of minority sexual orientations were significantly more likely than heterosexuals to report experiencing illegal, threatening behaviors and cyberbullying, with gay men most likely to report both types of behavior. Individuals who were both gay and ethnic minorities were more likely to experience illegal, threatening behaviors and cyberbullying as well (Love & MacDonald, 2010).

Regarding level of experience, professors in tenure-track positions have reported more bullying and incivility (Lampman et al., 2009) and sexual harassment (DeSouza & Fansler, 2003) than tenured faculty. DeSouza and Fansler (2003) also found that younger female faculty members in their sample were more likely to experience sexual harassment from students, potentially reflecting perceived inexperience of the younger women. Interestingly, Love and MacDonald's (2010) pilot study showed the opposite in terms of level of experience. Faculty members holding a doctorate and those in associate, assistant, or full professor positions were more likely to experience poor student behaviors than their less experienced counterparts. It was suggested that this may be the result of these individuals having been in the profession longer and having had greater exposure to students' misbehaviors (Love & MacDonald, 2010).

An Integrated Model

Whereas the theories discussed above tend to focus primarily on one source of power each, Rospenda et al. (1998) identified organizational, sociocultural, and informal sources of

power that together contribute to instances of contrapower harassment. Information was obtained

through focus groups and in-depth interviews with a total of 66 university employees. Sources

of power identified by the study participants included gender, race, class, access to resources,

and affiliations with individuals who have power within the organization. Through their

interview with one African American male faculty member, Rospenda et al. discovered that

certain individuals may allow continued harassment in order to uphold a particular stereotype

within their cultural group, such as one of masculinity or strength. This may be particularly true

for men experiencing harassment by other men. Additionally, a victim of contrapower

harassment may refrain from reporting the behavior in order to protect his or her identity as an

individual of a minority sexual orientation (Rospenda et al., 1998). Therefore, perpetrators of

contrapower harassment may prey on individuals from backgrounds known to possess strong

pride in their strength or who may want to hide certain aspects of their identity.

Regarding class, students of higher socioeconomic status may hold power over faculty

members due to the university's desire to accommodate these individuals whose parents may be

able to make financial contributions to the institution. This represents the notion of consumerism

within academia, which affords students more power within the organization. Another

organizational factor that allows students to possess some power over faculty members is

through course evaluations, which are linked to promotions and tenure in many institutions

(Rospenda et al., 1998). DeSouza and Fansler's (2003) findings that tenure-track faculty were

more likely to experience sexual harassment than tenured faculty supports this aspect of

Rospenda et al.'s (1998) integrated theory.

Concerning female-on-female sexual harassment, Rospenda et al. (1998) reported that

traditionally men have competed for control within organizations, and women have competed for

affiliation with the men in control. Whereas men use their power to get sex, women have been known to use sex in order to obtain power. This type of situation was reported by one of Rospenda et al.'s female interviewees, who spoke about being harassed by a woman in a subordinate position who was involved in a sexual relationship with a man in a superior position. Their relationship reportedly created a hostile working environment because of favorable treatment of the female subordinate. When the female interviewee reported the relationship to university officials, the female subordinate refused to do certain tasks that were required of her and accused the victim of trying to harm her (Rospenda et al., 1998). Although it was not discussed by the interviewee, in such situations it is reasonable to be concerned that because of the harasser's affiliation with someone in a position of authority, the victim's job could be in danger. Rospenda et al.'s comprehensive integration of a number of variables that could be used as sources of power in effect explains practically any situation in which contrapower harassment is perpetrated.

Current Study

The current study utilized Rospenda et al.'s (1998) integrated model of contrapower harassment as rationale for examining interpersonal mistreatment in the faculty–student relationship. This model, as well as previous research (e.g., Clark 2008b; Lampman et al., 2009; Matchen & DeSouza, 2000; McKay et al., 2008), has shown that professors can and do experience bullying, cyberbullying, incivility, and sexual harassment at the hands of their students. However, the majority of research on contrapower harassment has examined bullying, incivility, and sexual harassment separately, and the interaction of these behaviors has rarely been studied. It is unlikely that such negative behaviors exist in a vacuum, and patterns of occurrence can offer a new perspective on the interpersonal mistreatment experienced by

professors. The current study examined all four types of interpersonal mistreatment as they are experienced by college-level instructors. This study focused on the perpetration of these behaviors by students because faculty–student relationships and classroom engagement are the foundation of higher education. Additionally, emphasis has been placed on recognizing students' potential for violence since the shootings at Virginia Tech in 2007, and further research is needed to develop a clear understanding of what warning signs should be addressed.

The current study also used Rospenda et al.'s (1998) model of organizational, sociocultural, and informal sources of power to determine whether professors representing certain groups experience more interpersonal mistreatment by students than others. This study sought to confirm previous research findings that particular groups are targeted for mistreatment more than others and examined all possible sources of power and organizational variables that may be used by students to mistreat college faculty members.

Research Questions

A quantitative research design was used to examine the interpersonal mistreatment, including bullying, cyberbullying, incivility, and sexual harassment, of college professors by their students. The following research questions were addressed:

1. Are bullying, cyberbullying, incivility, and sexual harassment overlapping constructs that make up a continuum of interpersonal mistreatment? Specifically, what factor structures emerge based on (a) frequency of occurrence and (b) how upsetting the behaviors are perceived to be?

2. In a national sample of college instructors, what is the prevalence of interpersonal mistreatment perpetrated by students?

3. What behaviors are perceived to be the most upsetting for faculty members?

4. Who is most likely to be the target of interpersonal mistreatment by students based on personal characteristics (i.e., gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability status) and academic characteristics (i.e., level of education, academic rank, tenure, discipline, years of experience)?

5. Are there differences in the types of behaviors or frequency of interpersonal mistreatment based on type of institution (i.e., community college, public, private) or region of the country?

Hypotheses

First and foremost, the current study attempted to establish bullying, cyberbullying, uncivil, and sexual harassment behaviors on a continuum of interpersonal mistreatment. Researchers have theorized a connection among these concepts, but few have used statistical methods to establish an actual overlap. I hypothesized that, rather than breaking into four clear constructs as has been suggested by the previous study of each area separately, the behaviors would separate into categories based on frequency and severity. I believed that most severe behaviors occurred less frequently, but would be viewed as being the most upsetting by faculty who experienced them. Additionally, I hypothesized that those behaviors that occurred most frequently would be viewed as the least upsetting by faculty members. In effect, this would polarize these behaviors at opposite ends of a spectrum of interpersonal mistreatment.

Second, this study aimed to provide evidence of the pervasiveness of interpersonal mistreatment of college instructors by students in terms of prevalence. Severity level of interpersonal mistreatment behaviors was determined by Research Question 3, which addressed the behaviors faculty members perceived to be the most upsetting. I hypothesized that the most

upsetting behaviors would be the most severe in terms of being physically and psychologically harmful and most likely to be prosecuted.

Next, the hypothesis for Research Question 4 was based on the integrated theory of contrapower harassment (Rospenda et al., 1998). This theory states that contrapower harassment can occur based on perceived power obtained through organizational, sociocultural, and informal means. Gender is one of the biggest and most widely researched sources of sociocultural power in American society. Therefore, I hypothesized that female instructors would experience more interpersonal mistreatment by students than male instructors. It was also expected that individuals of all minority groups, including ethnicity, sexual orientation, and disability status, would experience more interpersonal mistreatment due to students perceiving their own majority group status as a source of power over these instructors. Another personal characteristic that has been associated with higher rates of interpersonal mistreatment is age (DeSouza, 2011), which is often associated with level of experience. It was expected that individuals of younger age would experience higher levels of interpersonal mistreatment in this study.

Organizational status is also a factor students may use to obtain power over college instructors. Lower status within an organization has been shown to relate to higher levels of harassment. Lampman et al. (2009) and DeSouza and Fansler (2003) demonstrated that college instructors in tenure-track positions reported more instances of interpersonal mistreatment than those who were tenured. A similar pattern was expected to emerge in this study as well. In general, I hypothesized that individuals who were viewed as having less academic experience would experience higher rates of interpersonal mistreatment. This was expected to be based on fewer years spent teaching, holding a degree other than a doctorate, being untenured, and having lower academic rank.

The department in which an individual teaches may also influence their treatment by students. Lampman et al. (2009) and D. Lee (2005) provided evidence that women's studies courses in particular can create a hostile atmosphere where students' beliefs are challenged and controversial subjects are discussed. Likewise, general education courses required of all college students may instigate more interpersonal mistreatment due to lack of interest or challenging of religious, political, or family beliefs (Lampman et al., 2009). Generally these general education and women's studies courses are taught by faculty in the college of arts and sciences. Therefore, I hypothesized that professors teaching courses within the humanities and formal science fields would experience more interpersonal mistreatment than those in other disciplines. Additionally, the majority of research on college student incivility has been conducted with the field of nursing, and it is proposed that rates of incivility are higher in this discipline due to the stress and competitiveness associated with it (Clark, 2008a). Therefore, I also hypothesized that faculty members teaching in the health sciences would report experiencing more interpersonal mistreatment than instructors in other disciplines.

Last, researchers of workplace bullying have suggested that organizations within the private sector are characterized by more competition and pressure, and less security, which may lead to more interpersonal mistreatment among employees (i.e., Salin, 2001), and some empirical evidence has supported this (Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2007). Additionally, workplace and school bullying studies have taken place in various countries around the world, and it has been suggested that global region may have an effect on varying prevalence rates. However, at this time previous research on bullying, cyberbullying, incivility, and sexual harassment in higher education has not addressed differences in prevalence based on type of institution or geographic

region. Therefore, the current study attempted to distinguish differences based on these variables.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Participants

The population under study included all college instructors employed full- or part-time at all community, private, and public colleges and universities across the United States. According to the U.S. Department of Labor (Bureau of Labor Statistics, n.d.), postsecondary teachers held approximately 1.7 million jobs in 2008. This classification of postsecondary teachers includes college and university faculty, graduate teaching assistants, and career and technical trade teachers (Bureau of Labor Statistics, n.d.). Bartlett, Kotrlik, and Higgins (2001) have suggested that when running group comparative statistics on categorical data, a sample size of at least 370 is necessary for a population of 10,000 or more with an alpha level of .05. Additionally, these authors reported that an optimal ratio of ten to one should be used when determining sample size for factor analysis. Bartlett et al. maintained that using a ratio of five to one is also acceptable as long as there are no fewer than 100 observations. In order to have enough participants to support a stable factor structure for the factor analysis of a 49-item measure, the goal was to obtain a sample of 370 to 490 individuals.

Sampling Methods

To reach a national sample of college instructors, a questionnaire was distributed via e-mail to current instructors employed at higher education institutions throughout the United

States. To obtain the required sample size, the e-mail invitation was sent to 4,000 college instructors. The strategy used to obtain the sample employed stratified, quota, and cluster sampling techniques. First, eight separate strata were identified based on regions of the country: Northeast, Southeast, South, Midwest, Great Plains, Northwest, Southwest, and West. Next, a list of community, private, and public colleges and universities within each stratum was generated using the *I'm Higher* website (www.imhigher.com). Trade schools and institutions with an enrollment of less than 2,500 students were excluded from possible selection because it was believed that there would not be a large enough number of faculty members employed at such institutions. Within each stratum, a community college, private institution, and public institution were selected to meet a sampling quota, resulting in a total of 24 institutions at which sampling occurred. In order to be selected, institutions were required to have an active website with an accessible list of current faculty members' e-mail addresses. Last, at each institution a cluster of current faculty members was chosen randomly. Only instructors currently listed as teaching at the chosen institutions and who had a valid e-mail address as listed on the institution's website were eligible for selection as an e-mail recipient. In an effort to equalize the sample of instructors recruited from each region of the country and from each type of institution, approximately 166 faculty members from each of the 24 selected institutions across the United States were selected to receive the invitation to participate in the study.

After the initial invitations were sent, approximately 345 completed surveys were collected within a 3-week time period. Since this did not meet the minimum sampling requirement of 370 participants, another 1,000 e-mail invitations were sent to additional randomly selected instructors at 19 of the 24 institutions chosen for sampling. Five institutions were left out of the second-round recruitment phase because all faculty members at those

institutions had already received invitations to participate in the study. This resulted in a total of 5,000 e-mail invitations being sent to college faculty members. With 411 useable surveys being collected, there was a response rate of 8.2% for this study.

Sample Characteristics

The on-line survey was accessed by 502 individuals, of whom 411 completed the survey in its entirety. The sample was 56% ($n = 230$) women and 43% ($n = 176$) men. Five individuals (1%) did not report their gender. Eighty-one percent ($n = 333$) of the sample was White, 6% ($n = 26$) reported having a multi-ethnic background, and 4% ($n = 18$) were from foreign countries, including France, Lebanon, China, India, Japan, Switzerland, England, Germany, Zambia, Romania, Spain, and Austria. Almost 2% ($n = 8$) of the sample identified themselves as African American, almost 2% ($n = 7$) were Hispanic, and 1% ($n = 5$) were Asian. Another 2% ($n = 8$) of participants identified themselves as other ethnicities, including Middle Eastern and Native American. Six individuals (2%) did not report their ethnicity. Participants were predominantly able-bodied (96%, $n = 396$) and predominantly heterosexual (89%, $n = 367$). Almost 5% ($n = 20$) of the sample identified as gay or lesbian, 2% ($n = 9$) identified as bisexual, and 3% ($n = 14$) did not report their sexual orientation. Participants' ages ranged from 24 to 78 with an average age of 49.86 years ($SD = 11.18$), although 41 participants (10%) did not report their age.

Sixty-three percent ($n = 259$) of the faculty members held a doctoral degree, 32% ($n = 133$) held master's degrees, 3% ($n = 14$) held bachelor's degrees, and 1% ($n = 4$) reported holding another type of degree, including an educational specialist certificate or less than a bachelor's degree. About 22% ($n = 92$) of the sample were full professors, 21% ($n = 85$) were associate professors, 22% ($n = 92$) were assistant professors, almost 18% ($n = 72$) were instructors or lecturers, 14% ($n = 59$) were adjunct professors, and 3% ($n = 11$) reported being in

other positions such as visiting professor or in administrative positions (i.e., dean, department

chair) which included teaching duties. Forty-three percent ($n = 177$) of the sample held tenured

positions, 20% ($n = 84$) were in tenure-track positions, and 36% ($n = 148$) were in non-tenure-

track positions. One percent ($n = 2$) of the sample did not report their tenure status. Participants

reported teaching between .5 and 44.0 years in their current position, with an average of 10.81

years of teaching experience ($SD = 9.48$). Almost 28% ($n = 113$) of the sample did not report

how many years they had been teaching in their current positions. Regarding discipline, 18% (n

$= 74$) reported teaching in the humanities fields, 15% ($n = 62$) in social and behavioral sciences,

14% ($n = 57$) in the physical sciences, 12% ($n = 49$) in education, 12% ($n = 48$) in health

sciences, 10% ($n = 42$) in business, almost 9% ($n = 35$) in the arts, 5% ($n = 22$) in applied

sciences, 2% ($n = 8$) in communications, almost 2% ($n = 6$) in agriculture/natural resources, and

2% ($n = 7$) in other fields, including law and ski area operations.

Regarding characteristics of the institutions at which the participants worked, 51% ($n =$

209) were from public colleges or universities, 28% ($n = 113$) were from community colleges,

and 21% ($n = 88$) were from private colleges or universities. Participants represented colleges in

24 different states. About 19% ($n = 79$) of participants taught at institutions in the Midwest, 16%

($n = 64$) in the Great Plains states, 15% ($n = 60$) in the West, 13% ($n = 52$) in the South, 12% (n

$= 48$) in the Southwest, 11% ($n = 47$) in the Northeast, 6% ($n = 25$) in the Southeast, and 4% ($n =$

18) in the Northwest. Region of the country was not reported by 4% ($n = 18$) of participants.

Measures

For the current study, participants were asked to complete the Faculty Experience Survey

(Appendix A), which is a self-report measure of interpersonal mistreatment developed for the

pilot study described above. The survey includes questions about a total of 49 bullying,

cyberbullying, uncivil, and sexually harassing behaviors. Content analysis of current literature on each of these topics was done and behaviors used in previous studies were pooled (Clark, 2008b; Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Grauerholz, 1989; Lampman et al., 2009; Love et al., 2010; McKay et al., 2008). An initial list of 67 behaviors was compiled and reviewed by colleagues and professors. Redundant items were either removed or combined to shorten the questionnaire. Another item was removed after analysis of the results of the pilot study showed a very high correlation with another item and failure to load on any of the factors that emerged.

The Faculty Experience Survey asks participants how often they have experienced each of 49 behaviors perpetrated by students while teaching at their current institution. This information was originally reported on a 4-point rating scale with response categories including *never*, *rarely*, *occasionally*, and *very frequently*. For the pilot study, participants were also asked to rate on a 4-point rating scale how upset they were by a behavior if they had experienced it at least once. The response categories included *not at all upset*, *mildly upset*, *moderately upset*, and *very upset*. Response rates for these items were too low and did not allow for the research questions to be answered. Therefore, for the current study, participants were asked to rate how upset they were or how upset they believed they would be if each behavior happened to them. Additionally, in order for the rating scales to operate as equal interval ratings, response options ranged from 0 to 4 and were anchored with the terms *never* and *very frequently* for a measure of how often the behaviors occur, and *not at all upset* and *very upset* for a measure of how upsetting the behaviors are perceived. The fifth response option was added to provide the variance in responses needed to conduct a factor analysis on the data. Participants were instructed to consider the rating scale as interval in nature so that all points on the scale are equidistant.

Demographic information was also collected via the questionnaire. This included personal characteristics, including gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and physical disability status, and academic characteristics, including level of education, academic rank, tenure, discipline, and years of experience. Additionally, organizational information was obtained, including type of institution at which the participant was employed and the state in which that institution was located.

Procedure

A web questionnaire was developed in Qualtrics software. Before data collection could take place, the study was reviewed by the Indiana State University Institutional Review Board and was determined to be exempt from further oversight. Data collection took place in spring 2011. Invitations to participate in the study were sent via e-mail. E-mail recipients were asked to click on a link to the web survey, which was available over a period of five weeks. The survey was estimated to take approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete.

The first page of the questionnaire was an informed consent document that explained the purpose of the study, provided contact information for the primary researcher and advisor, and informed the participant of the exempt status of the study. Because this was an anonymous web survey, signed consent was not required. However, consent to participate was implied when the participant continued with the questionnaire after reading the informed consent document. All data collected were kept confidential, and participants were not directly identifiable in any way. Completed questionnaire data were stored in an electronic file. Only I had access to the data. Data from participants who withdrew from the study by not completing the survey were destroyed (i.e., deleted from the electronic file). However, once participants submitted their

completed survey forms, they were not able to withdraw their responses, as there was no way to track which survey was submitted by whom.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

There has been ongoing debate in the research literature about the categorization of data obtained from rating scales similar to the one used in the Faculty Experience Survey as ordinal versus interval (e.g., Knapp, 1990; S. Wang, Yu, Wang, & Huang, 1999). The intensity of the debate centers on the belief that inferential statistical analyses should only be performed on interval data. However, several authors (Labovitz, 1967; M. Wang & Mahoney, 1991; S. Wang et al., 1999) have demonstrated statistically that parametric tests, such as factor analysis, are robust to the use of "quasi-interval" data (M. Wang & Mahoney, 1991, p. 55) and often provide the same results as non-parametric tests. Additionally, it is common practice in behavioral science research to attempt to establish the validity of a rating scale using factor analysis (Gilley & Uhlig, 1993). Therefore, the data obtained in this study were considered quasi-interval in nature and parametric tests, including factor analysis, were utilized.

Factor Analysis

The main question of this study was whether the bullying, cyberbullying, incivility, and sexual harassment behaviors included in the Faculty Experience Survey demonstrated separate or overlapping constructs. It was hypothesized that, rather than breaking into four clear constructs as has been suggested by the previous study of each area separately, the behaviors would separate into categories based on frequency and severity. It was believed that the most severe

behaviors would occur less frequently, but would be viewed as the most upsetting by faculty members. Additionally, it was predicted that the mildest behaviors would occur most frequently and would be viewed as the least upsetting. To test this hypothesis, behavioral items for both frequency of occurrence and how upsetting the behaviors were perceived to be were factor analyzed separately.

Statistical Assumptions

Before conducting exploratory factor analyses on the data obtained through the Faculty Experience Survey, the statistical assumptions were considered and tested statistically when appropriate. The first assumption is that there is a large enough sample size to result in a stable factor structure. With a sample of 411 participants, the study reached the goal of obtaining a sample of 370 to 490 college faculty members. Bartlett et al. (2001) recommended a five to one ratio of participants to items being factor analyzed. The resulting ratio for this study was 8.4 participants for every survey item, providing a strong sample size for conducting factor analyses.

The second and most important assumption of factor analysis is that there are linear relationships between all pairs of variables included in the analyses (Field, 2009). To test this assumption, intercorrelations between all variables were examined by generating two Pearson's correlation matrices of all 49 behavioral items included on the Faculty Experience Survey, first for the frequency of occurrence responses and then for the level of upset responses. Field (2009) suggested that survey items that consistently correlate with other items at either below .3 or above .8 should be removed from the analysis. The only item that met this criteria was "sexually assaulted you," which did not correlate with any item regarding frequency of occurrence since all participants answered that they had never experienced this behavior. Thus, this item had no variance and would not have been included in the analysis in any case. Regarding level of upset,

all correlations fell within acceptable limits, and therefore no items were removed from the analysis. This resulted in 48 items factor analyzed for frequency of occurrence, and all 49 behavioral items were analyzed for level of upset.

Last, there is an assumption that variables included in a factor analysis are normally distributed. Given the type of data collected in this survey, it was expected that this assumption would be violated due to the tendency for certain items on the Faculty Experience Survey to be either extremely common or uncommon or extremely upsetting or non-upsetting. According to Mertler and Vannatta (2005), when factor analysis is used in an exploratory and descriptive fashion, as was done in the current study, the assumption of normality does not need to be assessed, although it should be noted that when this assumption is not met, the resulting factor solution may be less powerful. Therefore, this assumption was not tested statistically. Additionally, Field (2009) stated that meeting the assumption of normality is most important when results are intended to be generalized beyond the study sample. This created some limitations for the current study but did not prevent the analyses from being conducted.

Factor Analysis of Frequency of Occurrence

The factor analysis was conducted using principle axis factoring with an oblique promax rotation. The oblique rotation was utilized because the factors were expected to correlate since the behaviors were hypothesized to be largely overlapping. Scree plots, eigenvalues, and percentage of variance explained were examined to determine how many factors to retain in the model. According to Field (2009), selected factors ideally have eigenvalues greater than 1 and explain at least 8% of the variance. However, in order to choose a factor solution that made conceptual sense, multiple models were examined and solutions involving factors that explained less than 8% of the variance were considered. The scree plot showed a point of inflection at

factor three, but a slight curve continued through five factors before a steady plateau was reached. Therefore, three-, four-, and five-factor solutions were examined. The four- and five-factor models added little to the amount of variance explained by the model, 2.5% and 4.6% respectively, and the additional factors in these models offered lower internal consistency than the factors in the three-factor solution when scale reliability was tested. Specifically, the four-factor model offered Cronbach's alphas of .94, .91, .77, and .62, while the Cronbach's alphas for the five-factor solution were .91, .92, .77, .82, and .51 in comparison to the alphas for the three-factor model, which are listed in Table 1. Additionally, the three-factor solution provided conceptually stronger categories of behavior. The result was 48 behavioral items loading on three factors (see Table 1 for a summary of the factors). This factor solution converged in five iterations. The first factor included 25 items and was labeled Direct Incivility to represent behaviors that were directed specifically at the professor. Factor 2 included 10 items and was labeled Poor Student Behaviors. Last, factor 3 included 13 items and was labeled Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors. Together the three factors explained 39.3% of the variance in the model.

Table 1

Eigenvalues, Percentages of Variance, Cumulative Percentages, and Cronbach's Alphas for Factors of the 49-Item Faculty Experience Survey Based on Frequency of Occurrence

Factor	Eigenvalue	% of variance	Cumulative % of variance	Cronbach's alpha
1. Direct Incivility	14.45	30.10	30.10	.94
2. Poor Student Behaviors	3.02	6.29	36.38	.91
3. Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors	1.40	2.91	39.30	.73

Cronbach's alpha was calculated for each factor scale in order to determine scale reliability. The Direct Incivility and Poor Student Behavior factors had Cronbach's alphas of .94 and .91, respectively. The original Cronbach's alpha for the Aggressive, Threatening Behavior factor was .72, but upon removing item 15, "flirted with you or asked you out," scale reliability improved with a resulting Cronbach's alpha of .73. All of the scales exceeded the commonly used cut-off value of .70 in determining scale reliability, indicating good internal consistency (Field, 2009). Field noted that factor loadings are significant when the value is greater than 0.298 for a sample size of 300 or more. Factor loadings in this model were generally high and all were higher than this value (see Table 2 for items by factor and factor loadings).

Table 2

Factor Loadings for Faculty Experience Survey Items Based on the Promax-Rotated Three-Factor Solution

| | Frequency ($n = 358$) | | | Level of Upset ($n = 248$) | | |
| | Factor | | | Factor | | |
Item	1	2	3	1	2	3
10. Made unwarranted criticisms of your performance	**.77**	.48	.35	.43	.54	**.78**
2. Challenged your authority or questioned your credentials	**.75**	.41	.31	.43	.47	**.71**
6. Made belittling, discrediting, or demeaning remarks about or toward you	**.74**	.44	.34	.52	.48	**.80**
1. Made hostile or threatening verbal remarks	**.72**	.40	.41	.61	.35	**.70**
42. Ignored your legitimate requests (insubordination)	**.72**	.67	.36	.47	**.68**	.64
7. Complained about constructive feedback	**.70**	.57	.33	.30	**.65**	.64
25. Continually showed disdain while you were teaching	**.69**	.63	.20	.41	.68	**.69**
17. Gossiped or spread malicious rumors about you	**.67**	.38	.46	.55	.38	**.72**
37. Bypassed the hierarchy for complaints	**.67**	.53	.37	.47	.52	**.63**

(continued)

Table 2 (continued)

Factor Loadings for Faculty Experience Survey Items Based on the Promax-Rotated Three-Factor Solution

| | | Frequency ($n = 358$) | | | Level of Upset ($n = 248$) | | |
| | | Factor | | | Factor | | |
	Item	1	2	3	1	2	3
48.	Reacted hostilely to trivial errors you may have made	**.66**	.43	.42	.50	.59	**.67**
26.	Used you as the subject of lies or accusations	**.65**	.36	.39	.75	.37	**.77**
49.	Showed lack of respect and intolerance for cultural, ethnic, and class differences	**.63**	.54	.42	**.63**	.47	.55
13.	Made inappropriate comments/threats regarding personal characteristics, values or beliefs	**.62**	.42	.54	.65	.41	**.78**
19.	Applied excessive pressure to change your stance	**.61**	.56	.35	.47	.55	**.66**
31.	Created tension in class by dominating discussions	**.61**	.60	.31	.36	**.68**	.62
43.	Made racist comments	**.59**	.43	.46	**.76**	.42	.60
28.	Ignored you when asking a question or speaking	**.56**	.50	.30	.49	.60	**.67**
16.	Sent harassing or threatening e-mails to you	**.56**	.26	.45	.75	.34	**.77**
9.	Stared at you inappropriately	**.55**	.37	.40	.48	.52	**.69**
3.	Violated your personal space	**.55**	.38	.39	.50	.39	**.63**
22.	Made fun of you in front of others	**.53**	.43	.32	.70	.41	**.77**
5.	Harassed or threatened you through a social network site	**.52**	.24	.52	.69	.36	**.79**
35.	Made sexist comments	**.49**	.47	.45	**.64**	.48	.60
4.	Took credit for your work	**.36**	.17	.28	**.64**	.26	.58
27.	Impersonated you online	**.32**	.11	.32	**.87**	.25	.68
41.	Failed to meet assignment requirements	.40	**.78**	.20	.14	**.84**	.37
20.	Failed to keep scheduled appointments	.46	**.75**	.23	.21	**.69**	.36
39.	Engaged in a non-class activity during class	.42	**.75**	.14	.23	**.76**	.43
34.	Talked during class	.55	**.73**	.21	.34	**.75**	.55
46.	Failed to read the syllabus	.39	**.72**	.17	.13	**.79**	.36

Table 2 (continued)

Factor Loadings for Faculty Experience Survey Items Based on the Promax-Rotated Three-Factor Solution

		Frequency (*n* = 358)			Level of Upset (*n* = 248)		
			Factor			Factor	
	Item	1	2	3	1	2	3
23.	Turned in a late assignment without prior approval	.40	**.72**	.23	.19	**.77**	.34
14.	Cheated on papers, exams assignments, or quizzes	.38	**.70**	.16	.30	**.59**	.46
12.	Lied to you	.55	**.69**	.28	.41	**.60**	.56
30.	Requested that you make exams or assignments easier	.46	**.66**	.28	.22	**.76**	.52
8.	Interrupted class by making noises, arriving late, leaving early in rude/distracting way	.57	**.58**	.23	.42	.62	**.64**
45.	Made hostile or threatening phone calls to you	.35	.12	**.60**	**.90**	.26	.61
47.	Inappropriately patted, hugged, stroked, kissed, fondled, or pinched you	.29	.16	**.58**	**.88**	.29	.53
11.	Sent harassing or threatening text messages to you	.50	.13	**.58**	**.81**	.32	.78
18.	Posted negative or embarrassing information about you on a website	.42	.21	**.54**	**.79**	.37	.78
33.	Touched you in an aggressive manner	.27	.17	**.53**	**.88**	.20	.60
21.	Sent harassing or threatening instant messages to you	.45	.12	**.50**	**.84**	.34	.80
44.	Posted a lewd/unprofessional response to an on-line forum	.32	.18	**.40**	**.85**	.40	.67
32.	Posted your information or picture on a voting website	.28	.24	**.40**	.65	.46	**.74**
40.	Propositioned you for a sexual encounter	.13	.06	**.38**	**.78**	.38	.52
29.	Invaded your home life	.25	.25	**.37**	**.76**	.23	.53
38.	Used physical violence	.24	.19	**.35**	**.89**	.13	.49
15.	Flirted with/asked you out	.22	.23	**.33**	.56	.54	**.60**
24.	Maliciously damaged or stole your property	.29	.17	**.31**	**.84**	.23	.66
36.	Sexually assaulted you (rape or attempted rape)	--	--	**--**	**.88**	.12	.48

Note. Boldface indicates highest factor loadings.

Factor Analysis of Level of Upset

A factor analysis was conducted on the level of upset responses to the Faculty Experience Survey using principle axis factoring with an oblique promax rotation and scree plots, eigenvalues, and percentage of variance were examined to determine how many factors to retain. The scree plot showed a point of inflection at Factor 3, but a slight curve continued through five factors before a steady plateau was reached. Therefore, three-, four-, and five-factor solutions were examined. Again, the four- and five-factor models added little to the amount of variance explained by the model, 1.7% and 3.1% respectively, and the fourth and fifth factors in these models offered lower internal consistency than the factors in the three-factor solution. Specially, the four-factor solution offered Cronbach's alphas of .97, .91, .95, and .85, while Cronbach's alphas for the five-factor solution were .97, .91, .94, .88, and .83 in comparison to the alphas for the three-factor model, which are listed in Table 3. Additionally, the three-factor solution provided conceptually stronger categories of behavior. The result was that all 49 items loaded onto three factors, which converged in four iterations (see Table 3 for a summary of the factors).

Table 3

Eigenvalues, Percentages of Variance, Cumulative Percentages, and Cronbach's Alphas for Factors of the 49-Item Faculty Experience Survey Based on Level of Upset

Factor	Eigenvalue	% of variance	Cumulative % of variance	Cronbach's alpha
1. Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors	22.70	46.33	46.33	.97
2. Poor Student Behaviors	5.43	11.07	57.41	.92
3. Direct Incivility	1.54	3.14	60.55	.95

The first factor included 17 items and was labeled Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors. Factor 2 included 12 items and was labeled Poor Student Behaviors. Last, Factor 3 included 20 items and was labeled Direct Incivility. Together the three factors explained 60.6% of the variance in the model. Factor loadings in this model were generally high and all were higher than Field's (2009) cutoff value of .298 (see Table 3 for items by factor and factor loadings). Cronbach's alpha was calculated for each factor scale in order to determine scale reliability. The Cronbach's alphas for the Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors, Direct Incivility, and Poor Student Behaviors factors were .97, .95, and .92, respectively. According to Field's (2009) description of the commonly used cut-off value of .7, all of the factors showed high reliability.

As can be seen in Table 2, there is significant overlap of items on the three frequency factors and the three factors based on level of upset. The two Direct Incivility factors had 17 items in common. The two Poor Student Behavior factors shared nine items, and the two factors describing Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors had 11 items in common. All together, the three frequency factors and the three factors representing levels of upset matched on 37 of the 49 behavioral items on the Faculty Experience Survey. These findings provide support for the hypothesis that the behaviors represent overlapping constructs that do not break into the neat categories of behavior, including bullying, cyberbullying, incivility, and sexual harassment, that have been previously discussed in the literature. Rather, these behaviors combine to describe three types of behavior that are based on level of severity.

Prevalence Rates

Research Question 2 asked how prevalent interpersonal mistreatment is toward college faculty members. To address this question, the prevalence of each of the 49 behaviors was examined through use of frequencies and descriptive statistics. Table 4 shows the frequency of

occurrence of each behavior based on factor scale. As can be seen, poor student behaviors were

among the most prevalent in this sample, with reports of experiencing a single behavior at least

Table 4

Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages for Frequency Items of the Faculty Experience Survey

Item	n	M	SD	At Least Once (%)
Factor 1: Direct Incivility				
10. Made unwarranted criticisms of your performance	408	0.88	0.91	60.1
2. Challenged authority/questioned credential	410	0.88	0.98	56.0
6. Made belittling, discrediting, or demeaning remarks about or toward you	409	0.84	0.95	55.8
1. Made hostile/threatening verbal remarks	410	0.55	0.76	41.9
42. Ignored your legitimate requests	410	0.98	0.99	63.7
7. Complained about feedback from you	409	1.29	1.14	71.1
25. Continually showed disdain while you were teaching	410	1.07	1.11	62.4
17. Gossiped or spread malicious rumors about you	409	0.64	0.96	40.4
37. Bypassed the hierarchy for complaints	410	0.91	1.05	57.4
48. Reacted hostilely to trivial errors you may have made	410	0.60	0.87	43.0
26. Used you as the subject of lies or accusations	410	0.37	0.72	26.6
49. Showed lack of respect and intolerance for cultural, ethnic, and class differences	410	0.98	1.04	62.2
13. Made inappropriate comments regarding personal characteristics values or beliefs	410	0.48	0.85	31.4
19. Applied excessive pressure to change your stance	411	1.07	1.04	64.0
31. Created tension in class by dominating discussions	408	1.22	1.09	71.6
43. Made racist comments or jokes	411	0.46	0.80	32.9
28. Ignored you when asking a question or trying to speak to him or her	409	0.53	0.83	37.5
16. Sent harassing/threatening e-mails to you	406	0.27	0.61	20.4
9. Stared at you inappropriately	410	0.50	0.83	34.4
3. Violated your personal space	407	0.51	0.76	38.2
22. Made fun of you in front of others	409	0.32	0.61	25.6

(continued)

Table 4 (continued)

Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages for Frequency Items of the Faculty Experience Survey

Item	*n*	*M*	*SD*	At Least Once (%)
5. Harassed or threatened you through a social networking site	405	0.15	0.50	9.3
35. Made sexist comments or jokes	410	0.59	0.82	42.5
4. Took credit for your work or ideas	408	0.18	0.50	13.9
27. Impersonated you online and either posted or sent inappropriate information	408	0.04	0.26	2.9
Factor 2: Poor Student Behaviors				
41. Failed to meet assignment requirements	411	2.53	1.16	96.4
20. Failed to keep scheduled appointments	409	1.88	1.21	87.8
39. Engaged in a non-class activity during class	411	2.23	1.24	93.2
34. Talked amongst themselves during class	411	1.95	1.15	92.7
46. Failed to read the syllabus for your class	410	2.63	1.25	93.2
23. Turned in a late assignment without prior approval	406	2.20	1.23	92.9
14. Cheated on papers, assignments, exams	411	1.78	1.06	90.8
12. Lied to you	411	1.93	1.19	88.6
30. Requested that you make exams or assignments easier	408	1.66	1.28	79.7
8. Interrupted class by purposely making noises, arriving late or leaving early in a rude or distracting way	410	1.38	1.24	70.4
Factor 3: Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors				
45. Made hostile/threatening calls to you	410	0.08	0.34	5.8
47. Inappropriately patted, hugged, stroked, kissed, fondled, or pinched you	408	0.06	0.27	5.4
11. Sent harassing or threatening text messages to you	409	0.17	0.51	12.1
18. Posted negative or embarrassing information about you on a website	410	0.15	0.47	11.7
33. Touched you in an aggressive manner	408	0.06	0.32	3.9
21. Sent harassing or threatening instant messages to you	408	0.04	0.26	2.6
44. Posted a lewd or unprofessional response to an on-line discussion forum	410	0.11	0.48	7.1

Table 4 (continued)

Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages for Frequency Items of the Faculty Experience Survey

Item	*n*	*M*	*SD*	At Least Once (%)
32. Posted your information or picture on a voting website	406	0.19	0.67	10.4
40. Propositioned you for a sexual encounter	409	0.10	0.41	7.5
29. Invaded your home life	409	0.22	0.56	16.4
38. Used physical violence against you	407	0.03	0.27	1.6
24. Maliciously damaged or stole your property	409	0.11	0.36	9.3
Items not included on a scale				
15. Flirted with you or asked you out	410	0.42	0.76	29.0
36. Sexually assaulted you	411	0.00	0.00	0.0

once ranging from 70% to 96%. When the item scores were summed for this scale, it was

determined that only one individual in this sample reported never having experienced any poor

student behaviors. Failing to meet assignment requirements (96%), engaging in non-class

activities during class (93%), failing to read the syllabus (93%), turning in a late assignment

(93%), and talking amongst themselves during class (93%) were the most common behaviors in

this study. Occurrences of direct incivility ranged from 3% to 72%. Overall, 94% of the college

faculty members in this sample reported experiencing at least one act of direct incivility by a

student. Aggressive, threatening behaviors were the least frequently occurring behaviors in this

study, with 2% to 16% of faculty members reporting experiencing one of these behaviors at least

once. Overall, less than 46% of the sample reported experiencing an aggressive, threatening

behavior. Sexual assault (0%), physical violence (2%), sending harassing or threatening instant

messages (3%), and aggressive touching (4%) were the least common behaviors reported. These

rates provide evidence of the prevalence of the interpersonal mistreatment of college instructors by students on campuses across the nation.

Level of Upset

Research Question 3 addressed which behaviors were found to be most upsetting by faculty members in this sample. The level of upset caused by each of the behaviors was examined through use of descriptive statistics and frequencies. Table 5 shows the level of upset of each behavior based on factor scale. As can be seen, poor student behaviors, which were the most prevalent behaviors as discussed previously, were also among the least upsetting behaviors, with 5% to 24% of faculty members in this sample reporting being or expecting to be very upset by each of these behaviors. Turning in an assignment late (5%), failing to keep scheduled appointments (6%), and creating tension in the classroom by dominating discussions (6%) were the least upsetting behaviors in this study. Reported response to direct incivility behaviors had a wider range of occurrence, with between 8% and 46% of the sample reporting being or expecting to be very upset by these behaviors. The most upsetting behaviors in this study were aggressive, threatening behaviors, which were also the least prevalent behaviors. Two behaviors on this scale were reported as being less upsetting than the remaining behaviors: "Made hostile or threatening phone calls to you" (9%) and "made sexist comments or jokes" (19%). The remaining behaviors were rated as being very upsetting by 30% to 83% of this sample. Sexual assault (83%) and physical violence (78%) were the most upsetting behaviors in this study, which supports the hypothesis that the most severe behaviors (aggressive, threatening behaviors) would be the most upsetting.

Table 5

Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages for Upset Items of the Faculty Experience Survey

Item	*n*	*M*	*SD*	Very Upset (%)
Factor 1: Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors				
45. Made hostile or threatening calls to you	316	3.07	1.38	8.5
38. Used physical violence against you	315	3.37	1.34	77.8
47. Inappropriately patted, hugged, stroked, kissed, fondled, or pinched you	318	3.03	1.44	59.7
33. Touched you in an aggressive manner	315	3.04	1.40	58.7
36. Sexually assaulted you	313	3.45	1.32	83.4
27. Impersonated you on-line and either posted or sent inappropriate information	315	2.94	1.39	51.7
44. Posted a lewd or unprofessional response to an on-line discussion forum	316	2.70	1.40	38.6
21. Sent harassing or threatening instant messages to you	317	2.50	1.48	37.5
24. Maliciously damaged or stole your property	321	2.91	1.39	49.2
11. Sent harassing or threatening text messages to you	323	2.58	1.42	37.5
18. Posted negative or embarrassing information about you on a website	321	2.60	1.40	38.3
40. Propositioned you for a sexual encounter	320	2.79	1.47	49.4
43. Made racist comments or jokes	329	2.79	1.27	37.4
29. Invaded your home life	323	2.90	1.44	53.6
4. Took credit for your work	327	2.53	1.37	33.6
35. Made sexist comments or jokes	334	2.24	1.23	18.6
49. Showed lack of respect and intolerance for cultural, ethnic, and class differences	354	2.60	1.19	29.7
Factor 2: Poor Student Behaviors				
41. Failed to meet assignment requirements	384	1.59	1.15	6.8
46. Failed to read the syllabus for your class	377	1.60	1.16	8.5
23. Turned in a late assignment without prior approval	376	1.39	1.15	5.1
39. Engaged in a non-class activity during class	380	2.17	1.17	16.3
30. Requested that you make exams or assignments easier	359	1.17	1.16	5.6
34. Talked amongst themselves in a distracting way during class	372	2.12	1.05	10.8
20. Failed to keep scheduled appointments	375	1.58	1.08	5.6

Table 5 (continued)

Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages for Upset Items of the Faculty Experience Survey

Item	*n*	*M*	*SD*	Very Upset (%)
31. Created tension in class by dominating discussions	360	1.54	1.03	5.6
42. Ignored your legitimate requests	341	2.20	1.14	16.1
7. Complained about feedback from you	359	1.52	1.19	8.4
12. Lied to you	375	2.03	1.14	13.1
14. Cheated on papers, assignments, exams	382	2.41	1.19	23.8
Factor 3: Direct Incivility				
6. Made belittling, discrediting, or demeaning remarks about or toward you	346	2.39	1.27	24.9
5. Harassed or threatened you through a social networking site	322	2.48	1.49	37.9
13. Made inappropriate comments regarding personal characteristics, values or beliefs	336	2.06	1.31	18.8
10. Made unwarranted criticisms of your performance	344	1.94	1.20	12.5
16. Sent harassing/threatening e-mails to you	324	2.60	1.42	38.6
22. Made fun of you in front of others	329	2.17	1.37	22.5
26. Used you as the subject of lies or accusations	325	2.73	1.28	36.6
32. Posted your information or picture on a voting website	315	2.17	1.52	29.2
17. Gossiped or spread malicious rumors about you	339	2.47	1.34	30.7
2. Challenged your authority or questioned your credentials to teach a course	354	2.22	1.36	22.6
1. Made hostile/threatening verbal remarks	349	2.96	1.20	46.4
9. Stared at you inappropriately	336	1.59	1.22	8.0
25. Continually showed disdain while you were teaching	355	2.07	1.22	14.9
48. Reacted hostilely to trivial errors you may have made	336	1.88	1.17	11.0
28. Ignored you when asking a question or trying to speak to him or her	330	2.10	1.22	15.5
19. Applied excessive pressure or coercion to change your stance	348	2.01	1.28	16.7
8. Interrupted class by making noises, arriving late, leaving early in rude/distracting way	363	2.11	1.16	14.9
37. Bypassed the hierarchy for complaints	344	2.22	1.20	17.2

Table 5 (continued)

Means, Standard Deviations, and Percentages for Upset Items of the Faculty Experience Survey

Item	*n*	*M*	*SD*	Very Upset (%)
3. Violated your personal space	343	2.17	1.32	21.6
15. Flirted with you or asked you out	331	1.60	1.39	16.0

Combined with the prevalence rates reported above, this information supports the hypothesis that the factors emerging from the data were based on frequency of occurrence and severity of the behaviors, with the least common behaviors being the most upsetting (aggressive, threatening behaviors) and the most common behaviors being the least upsetting (poor student behaviors) in this sample. Direct incivility tended to be moderately frequent and moderately upsetting, completing the placement of these three categories of behavior along a spectrum of interpersonal mistreatment.

Group Differences

Research Question 4 asked who was most likely to be the target of interpersonal mistreatment by students based on personal (i.e., gender, age, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability status) and academic characteristics (i.e., level of education, academic rank, tenure, discipline, years of experience). Based on the integrated theory of contrapower harassment (Rospenda et al., 1998), it was hypothesized that female instructors; individuals of minority groups based on ethnicity, sexual orientation, and disability status; and younger instructors would experience higher levels of interpersonal mistreatment in this study. Regarding academic characteristics, it was hypothesized that individuals who were viewed as having less academic experience, based on fewer years spent teaching, holding a degree other than a doctorate, being untenured, and having lower academic rank, would experience higher rates of interpersonal

mistreatment. Additionally, based on previous research showing higher levels of mistreatment of faculty members teaching general education, potentially controversial, and high stress courses (Clark, 2008a; Lampman et al., 2009; D. Lee, 2005), it was hypothesized that individuals teaching in the humanities, formal sciences, and health sciences would experience higher rates of interpersonal mistreatment. Research Question 5 asked whether there were differences in frequency of occurrence based on type of institution (i.e., community college, public, private) or region of the country. Since no previous research in the college population has explored differences based on these variables, no hypothesis was made.

To answer these research questions, the plan was to conduct nine factorial analyses of variance (ANOVAs). As reported above, three factors emerged from the data on the frequency of the behaviors included on the Faculty Experience Survey: Direct Incivility, Poor Student Behaviors, and Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors. A scale was created to represent each of these factors by taking the average of the ratings for each item on that factor. These scales served as the dependent variables in analyses of group differences (see Table 6 for descriptive statistics of these variables).

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for the Direct Incivility, Poor Student Behaviors, and Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors Frequency Factor Scales (N = 411)

Scale	Minimum	Maximum	M	SD
Direct Incivility	0	3.16	.65	.55
Poor Student Behaviors	0	4.00	2.02	.89
Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors	0	2.42	.11	.21

Statistical Assumptions

Prior to running the factorial ANOVAs, statistical assumptions were considered and tested when necessary to determine the appropriateness of conducting this type of analysis on the data collected in this study. The assumptions of ANOVAs are the same as any parametric test and include the assumptions of interval- or ratio-level data, independence of the observations, normality of the populations, and homogeneity of variance. As was discussed earlier, the data obtained in this study were determined to be "quasi-interval" (M. Wang & Mahoney, 1991, p. 55) in nature, and were therefore deemed appropriate for use in parametric tests. Second, since participants' responses to the Faculty Experience Survey were not dependent on one another, the assumption of independence was also met.

Regarding the assumption of normality, the central limit theorem states that in large samples the sampling distribution tends to approximate normal (Field, 2009). However, it is best to test this assumption by examining the distribution of the data. For the current study, frequency distributions and P-P plots were examined for each of the three factor scales. The Poor Student Behaviors scale most closely approximated a normal distribution; however, the Direct Incivility and Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors scale distributions showed positive skew and leptokurtosis. To quantify the normality of these distributions, skewness and kurtosis of each of the scales were converted to z-scores and compared against critical values (1.96, $p <$ .05; 3.29, $p < .001$) to determine whether these variations from normal occurred due to chance (Field, 2009). Values for the Poor Student Behavior scale were in the range expected by chance, indicating that the assumption of normality was met for this variable, $z_{skew}(411) = 1.57, p > .05$; $z_{kurtosis}(411) = -3.10, p > .05$. For the Direct Incivility scale, the distribution was significantly positively skewed, $z(411) = 11.02, p < .001$, and leptokurtic, $z(411) = 9.06, p < .001$. The

distribution for the Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors scale was also significantly positively skewed, $z(411) = 41.21$, $p < .001$, and leptokurtic, $z(411) = 167.54$, $p < .001$. According to Field (2009), the F statistic controls well for Type I error in conditions of skew, kurtosis, and non-normality, particularly in large samples where group sizes are equal. Additionally, Glass and Hopkins (1996) stated "non-normality has negligible consequences on type-I and type-II error probabilities unless the populations are highly skewed, the n's are very small, or 'one-tailed' tests are employed" (p. 403). Therefore, in the case of the Direct Incivility scale it was decided that the distribution was close enough to normal to utilize this variable in the factorial ANOVAs with little impact on the results.

On closer examination of the Aggressive, Threatening Behavior scale, it was discovered that 54.3% ($n = 223$) of the sample reported never having experienced any of these behaviors. This high number of zero values likely caused the significant positive skew and leptokurtosis in this distribution and was likely to lead to inaccurate results in an ANOVA. Therefore, it was decided to convert this scale into a dichotomous variable, representing faculty members who had experienced at least one Aggressive, Threatening Behavior versus those who had never experienced any of these behaviors. Group differences were examined using multiple Pearson's chi-square tests, which are non-parametric and do not assume normality. In addition to the assumption of independence, which has already been discussed, the chi-square test assumes that expected frequencies of groups being compared are greater than 5. The large sample size in this study accounts for this assumption being met.

The last assumption of factorial ANOVAs is homogeneity of variance. This assumption was tested using the Levene's test, and results of this test were examined for each factorial ANOVA that was run. Of the six factorial ANOVAs that were run, four included significant

Levene's tests, indicating that the assumption of homogeneity of variance was violated. However, according to Everitt (1996) and Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs (2003), the ANOVA *F*-statistic is robust to violations of this assumption in large samples and when group sizes are nearly equal. Therefore, results of the ANOVAs were interpreted without any additional corrections being made.

Independent Variables

The independent variables for the analyses included all of the personal, academic, and institutional characteristics of the professors in the study sample. In preparing to run the analyses, variables with large numbers of categories were collapsed into fewer categories in order to provide more power in determining group differences (see Table 7 for categories of demographic characteristics). Among personal characteristics, these variables included ethnicity, sexual orientation, and age. Since large numbers of participants identified as belonging to majority groups, minority categories were combined for both ethnicity and sexual orientation characteristics to offer a stronger basis for comparison. Since participants reported their exact ages, these numeric data were transformed to categorical data for use in the analyses. Age was initially broken into categories by decade, but because of the low number of participants in the 20 to 29 age range and the 60 to 69 and 70 and over age ranges, these categories were condensed. Academic characteristics that involved collapsing of categories included level of education, academic rank, discipline, and years of teaching experience. For level of education, the levels were categorized into majority and minority groups. Due to the low number of participants (3%) who reported having "other" academic ranks, such as visiting, research, or Emeritus professor, post-doctoral fellow, or holding an administrative position (e.g., chair, dean) with teaching duties, these individuals were excluded from analyses. Regarding discipline,

categories with low numbers of participants were combined to create an "other" category. Last, the numeric data obtained for years of teaching experience was broken into categories based on knowledge of typical periods of pre-tenure, early tenure, and late tenure. No changes were made to categories of institutional variables.

Table 7

Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N = 411)

Characteristic	*n*	%
Personal Characteristics		
Sex		
Female	230	56
Male	176	43
Ethnicity		
White, U.S. Citizen	333	81
Non-White and/or Foreign National	72	18
Disability Status		
Able-Bodied	396	96
Disabled	12	3
Sexual Orientation		
Heterosexual	367	89
Minority Sexual Orientation (i.e., homosexual, bisexual, other)	30	7
Age		
24-39	88	21
40-49	86	21
50-59	113	28
60 and over	83	20
Academic Characteristics		
Level of Education		
Doctorate	259	63
Other (i.e., less than bachelor's, bachelor's, master's, Educational Specialist)	151	37
Academic Rank		
Adjunct	59	14
Instructor/Lecturer	72	18
Assistant Professor	92	22
Associate Professor	85	21
Full Professor	92	22
Tenure Status		
Tenured	177	43

(continued)

Table 7 (continued)

Demographic Characteristics of Participants (N = 411)

Characteristic	*n*	%
Tenure-track	84	20
Non Tenure-track	148	36
Discipline		
Arts	35	9
Business	42	10
Education	49	12
Health Sciences	48	12
Humanities	74	18
Physical Sciences	57	14
Social and Behavioral Sciences	62	15
Other (i.e., Law, Agriculture, Communications, Applied Sciences)	43	11
Years of Experience		
0-5 (pre-tenure)	122	30
6-11 (early tenure)	74	18
12 and up (late tenure)	102	25
Institutional Characteristics		
Type of Institution		
Public College or University	209	51
Community College	113	28
Private College or University	88	21
Region of the Country		
Midwest	79	19
Great Plains	64	16
West	60	15
South	52	13
Southwest	48	12
Northeast	47	11
Southeast	25	6
Northwest	18	4

Note. Totals of percentages are not 100 for every characteristic due to rounding and missing data.

Group Differences Based on Personal Characteristics

Direct incivility. A 2 (Gender: Male, Female) x 2 (Sexual Orientation: Heterosexual, Minority Sexual Orientation) x 2 (Ethnicity: White, U.S. Citizen, Non-White and/or Foreign National) x 2 (Disability Status: Disabled, Able-bodied) x 4 (Age: 24-39 years, 40-49 years, 50-

59 years, 60+ years) factorial ANOVA was conducted with the Direct Incivility factor scale as the dependent variable. For this analysis, the Levene's test was significant, $F(32, 323) = 2.89$, $p < .001$, indicating that this assumption was violated. However, ANOVA is robust to violations of this assumption (Everitt, 1996; Hinkle et al., 2003).

A significant age by sexual orientation interaction effect was found, $F(3, 323) = 2.64$, $p < .05$, $\omega^2 = .02$. Omega squared effect size indicated that 2% of the variance in having experienced direct incivility was explained by this age by sexual orientation interaction. Analysis of simple main effects revealed that individuals 60 years old and over from minority sexual orientations reported significantly more direct incivility from students than heterosexuals in the same age group, $F(1, 353) = 16.86$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.57$. All other groups were similar in terms of the frequency of direct incivility reported (see Table 8 for a summary of the means and standard deviations for age and sexual orientation). There were no significant main effects for age, $F(3, 323) = 1.47$, $p = .22$, or sexual orientation, $F(1, 323) = .97$, $p = .33$. This finding partially supported the hypothesis that individuals of minority groups would be more likely to be the targets of direct incivility. However, individuals of minority sexual orientations only reported higher occurrence of these behaviors in the oldest age range. There were no other significant interactions or main effects for gender, $F(1, 32) = .57$, $p = .45$, ethnicity, $F(1, 32) = .65$, $p = .42$, or disability status, $F(1, 32) = 1.39$, $p = .24$. The observed power for this ANOVA design was 1.0, which is very large according to Cohen's (1992) standards for statistical power analysis. Cohen determined that observed power of .70 or higher is sufficient for detecting differences between group means. Therefore, this statistical model had more than sufficient power to detect group differences.

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations of the Direct Incivility Scale for Age as a Function of Sexual Orientation

	Sexual Orientation					
	Heterosexual			Minority Sexual Orientation		
Age	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*
24-39	80	$.70_a$	.50	7	1.25_a	.94
40-49	77	$.65_a$	.49	7	$.69_a$	.53
50-59	103	$.66_a$	.53	8	$.63_a$	.50
60 and over	74	$.50_a$	.46	5	1.30_b	1.06

Note. Means in a row sharing a common subscript are not statistically different at $p < .001$. For all measures, higher means indicated higher frequency of direct incivility.

Poor student behaviors. A second 2 x 2 x 2 x 2 x 4 factorial ANOVA using personal characteristics as the independent variables was conducted with the Poor Student Behaviors scale as the dependent variable. The Levene's test indicated that variances were equal for this model, $F(32, 323) = 1.36$, $p = .10$. However, there were no significant interactions or main effects for gender, $F(1, 32) = .63$, $p = .43$, age, $F(3, 32) = .61$, $p = .61$, ethnicity, $F(1, 32) = .01$, $p = .94$, disability status, $F(1, 32) = 1.95$, $p = .16$, or sexual orientation, $F(1, 32) = .09$, $p = .77$. The observed power for the statistical model was .98, which is very large and indicates more than sufficient power to detect even small differences in group means (Cohen, 1992).

Aggressive, threatening behaviors. Four 2 (Experience of Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors: Never, At Least Once) x 2 Pearson's chi-square tests were conducted using Gender (Male, Female), Ethnicity (White, U.S. Citizen, Non-White and/or Foreign National), Disability Status (Disabled, Able-bodied), and Sexual Orientation (Heterosexual, Minority Sexual Orientation) as independent variables. An additional 2 x 4 (Age: 24-39 years, 40-49 years, 50-59 years, 60+ years) chi-square test was conducted. No significant differences were detected between actual and expected counts per group for gender, $\chi^2(1, n = 406) = 1.28$, $p = .26$,

ethnicity, $\chi^2(1, n = 405) = 1.91, p = .17$, disability status, $\chi^2(1, n = 408) = 2.22, p = .14$, sexual

orientation, $\chi^2(1, n = 397) = 1.61, p = .21$, and age, $\chi^2(3, n = 370) = 3.08, p = .38$. These findings

indicate that none of these groups were significantly more or less likely to experience aggressive,

threatening behaviors than what would be expected by chance.

Group Differences Based on Academic Characteristics

Direct incivility. A 2 (Level of Education: Doctoral, Other) x 3 (Tenure Status: Tenured,

Tenure-Track, Non Tenure-Track) x 3 (Years of Experience: 0-5 years, 6-11 years, 12-44 years)

x 5 (Academic Rank: Adjunct, Instructor/Lecturer, Assistant, Associate, Full) x 8 (Discipline:

Arts, Business, Education, Health Sciences, Humanities, Physical Sciences, Social and

Behavioral Sciences, Other) factorial ANOVA was conducted with the Direct Incivility factor

scale as the dependent variable. The Levene's test indicated that the assumption of homogeneity

of variance was violated in this model, $F(149, 138) = 1.39, p < .05$. However, there were no

significant interactions or main effects for degree held, $F(1, 149) = .02, p = .88$, academic rank,

$F(4, 149) = 1.19, p = .32$, tenure status, $F(2, 149) = .36, p = .70$, years teaching, $F(2, 149) = 1.59$,

$p = .21$, or discipline, $F(7, 149) = 1.34, p = .24$. The observed power for the statistical model

was .98, which is very large and indicates more than sufficient power to detect even small

differences in group means (Cohen, 1992).

Poor student behaviors. A second 2 x 3 x 3 x 5 x 8 factorial ANOVA using academic

characteristics as the independent variables was conducted with the Poor Student Behaviors scale

as the dependent variable. The Levene's test indicated that the assumption of homogeneity of

variance was violated in this model, $F(149, 138) = 1.60, p < .01$. However, there were no

significant interactions or main effects for degree held, $F(1, 149) = 1.22, p = .27$, academic rank,

$F(4, 149) = 1.39, p = .24$, tenure status, $F(2, 149) = .16, p = .85$, years teaching, $F(2, 149) = .49$,

$p = .62$, or discipline, $F(7, 149) = 1.12$, $p = .36$. The observed power for the statistical model was 1.0, which is very large and indicates more than sufficient power to detect even small differences in group means (Cohen, 1992).

  Aggressive, threatening behaviors. Five Pearson's chi-square tests using academic characteristics as independent variables and the Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors factor as the dependent variable were conducted. A 2 (Experience of Aggressive, Threatening Behavior: Never, At Least Once) x 2 (Level of Education: Doctoral, Other) chi-square test revealed a significant association between level of education and having experienced aggressive, threatening behavior, $\chi^2(1, n = 410) = 7.00$, $p < .01$. Upon inspection of the standardized residual values for each group in this analysis, as found in the contingency table (see Table 9), none of the values are higher than the critical value of 1.96 ($p < .05$), indicating that the values of all of the groups combined were driving the significant chi-square test. Therefore, instructors in this sample who had a doctoral degree were more likely to have experienced an aggressive, threatening behavior than what would be expected by chance. Also, those holding less than a doctorate were less likely to have experienced an aggressive, threatening behavior than what would be expected by chance. Based on the odds ratio, faculty members with a doctorate were 1.73 times more likely to have experienced at least one aggressive, threatening behavior than those without a doctorate. This was the opposite direction of what was hypothesized.

Table 9

Contingency Table for Level of Education and Experience of Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors

Experience of Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors		Level of Education	
		Other	Doctorate
Never			
	Count	95	128
	Expected	82.1	140.9
	Standardized Residual	1.4	-1.1
At Least Once			
	Count	56	131
	Expected	68.9	118.1
	Standardized Residual	-1.6	1.2

A 2 (Experience of Aggressive, Threatening Behavior: Never, At Least Once) x 5 (Academic Rank: Adjunct, Instructor/Lecturer, Assistant, Associate, Full) chi-square revealed a significant association between academic rank and experience of aggressive, threatening behaviors, $\chi^2(4, n = 400) = 21.27, p < .001$. Upon examination of the contingency table (see Table 10), the association between being an adjunct professor and experiencing aggressive, threatening behavior at least once drove the significance of the chi-square test. Adjunct professors were significantly less likely to have experienced an aggressive, threatening behavior than would be expected by chance. There appeared to be no significant influence of being an instructor/lecturer or an assistant professor on likelihood of experiencing aggressive, threatening behavior. Although it was not a significant association, associate and full professors were somewhat more likely to have experienced aggressive, threatening behaviors at least once. These findings were in the opposite direction of what was predicted based on the integrated theory of contrapower harassment.

Table 10

Contingency Table for Academic Rank and Experience of Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors

Experience of Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors		Academic Rank				
		Adjunct	Instructor/ Lecturer	Assistant	Associate	Full
Never						
	Count	45	44	51	36	41
	Expected	32.0	39.1	49.9	46.1	49.9
	Standardized Residual	2.3	0.8	0.2	-1.5	-1.3
At Least Once						
	Count	14	28	41	49	51
	Expected	27.0	32.9	42.1	38.9	42.1
	Standardized Residual	-2.5	-0.9	-0.2	1.6	1.4

A 2 (Experience of Aggressive, Threatening Behavior: Never, At Least Once) x 3 (Tenure Status: Tenured, Tenure-Track, Non Tenure-Track) chi-square revealed a significant connection between tenure status and likelihood of experiencing aggressive, threatening behaviors, $\chi^2(2, n = 409) = 31.20, p < .001$. The likelihood of tenured and non tenure-track faculty members both to have experienced aggressive, threatening behaviors drove the significance of this analysis (see Table 11 for a summary of the contingency table). Tenured professors in this sample were significantly more likely to have experienced an aggressive, threatening behavior than would be expected by chance. Non tenure-track faculty members were significantly less likely to have experienced this type of behavior than would be expected by chance. Based on the odds ratio, tenured professors were 2.2 times more likely than tenure-track professors and 3.57 times more likely than non tenure-track faculty members to experience aggressive, threatening behaviors. Again, this was in the opposite direction of what was predicted.

Table 11

Contingency Table for Tenure Status and Experience of Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors

Experience of Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors	Tenure Status		
	Tenured	Tenure-Track	Non Tenure-Track
Never			
Count	69	49	103
Expected	95.6	45.4	80.0
Standardized Residual	-2.7	0.5	2.6
At Least Once			
Count	108	35	45
Expected	81.4	38.6	68.0
Standardized Residual	3.0	-0.6	-2.8

A 2 (Experience of Aggressive, Threatening Behavior: Never, At Least Once) x 3 (Years of Experience: 0-5 years, 6-11 years, 12-44 years) chi-square revealed a significant association between years of experience and likelihood of experiencing aggressive, threatening behaviors, $\chi^2(2, n = 298) = 14.61, p < .01$. The significance of this analysis was driven by faculty members who had been teaching for 0 to 5 years being less likely to have experienced at least one aggressive, threatening behaviors than would be expected by chance (see Table 12 for a summary of the contingency table). Additionally, there was a strong connection between having 6 to 11 years of experience and having experienced aggressive, threatening behaviors, although the standardized residuals were also below the level of significance. Professors teaching for 6 to 11 years were more likely to have experienced and less likely to have never experienced an aggressive, threatening behavior. There was no significant association between teaching for 12 to 44 years and experiencing this type of behavior. Based on the odds ratio, professors with 6 to 11 years of experience were 1.47 times more likely than those who had been teaching longer and 3 times more likely than those with less experience teaching to experience aggressive, threatening behaviors. These findings were in the opposite direction of what was hypothesized.

Table 12

Contingency Table for Years of Experience and Experience of Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors

Experience of Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors	Years of Experience		
	0-5 years	6-11 years	12-44 years
Never			
Count	82	30	51
Expected	66.7	40.5	55.8
Standardized Residual	1.9	-1.6	-0.6
At Least Once			
Count	40	44	51
Expected	55.3	33.5	46.2
Standardized Residual	-2.1	1.8	0.7

A 2 (Experience of Aggressive, Threatening Behavior: Never, At Least Once) x 8 (Discipline: Arts, Business, Education, Health Sciences, Humanities, Physical Sciences, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Other) chi-square did not reveal any significant connections between discipline and experience of aggressive, threatening behaviors, $\chi^2(7, n = 410) = 7.54, p = .38$.

Group Differences Based on Institutional Characteristics

Direct incivility. A 3 (Type of Institution: Public, Private, Community College) x 8 (Region of Country: Northeast, Southeast, South, Midwest, Great Plains, Northwest, Southwest, West) factorial ANOVA was run using the institutional characteristic variables as independent variables and the Direct Incivility factor scale as the dependent variable. The Levene's test indicated that the assumption of homogeneity of variance was violated in this model, $F(21, 370) = 1.86, p < .05$. However, there were no significant interactions or main effects for type of institution, $F(2, 21) = 1.70, p = .18$, or region of the country, $F(7, 21) = .63, p = .73$. The observed power for the statistical model was .72, which is moderately large. According to Cohen (1992), this indicates sufficient power to detect differences in group means.

Poor student behaviors. A second 3 x 8 factorial ANOVA using institutional

characteristics as the independent variables was conducted with the Poor Student Behaviors scale as the dependent variable. The Levene's test indicated that variances were equal for this model, $F(21, 370) = 1.16$, $p = .28$. A significant main effect was found for region of country as a function of frequency of poor student behaviors, $F(7, 370) = 3.81$, $p = .001$, $\omega^2 = .15$. Omega squared effect size indicated that 15% of the variance in having experienced poor student behaviors was explained by region of the country. A Games-Howell post-hoc test was chosen to determine where differences lie among the eight different regions of the country. Analyses revealed that faculty members at institutions in the Midwest reported significantly more poor student behaviors than those in the Northwestern ($p < .05$, $d = 93$), Southwestern ($p < .05$, $d = .59$), and Western ($p = .001$, $d = .73$) regions of the country. Additionally, faculty members in the Great Plains states reported significantly more poor student behaviors than those in the West ($p < .05$, $d = .61$). See Table 13 for a summary of means and standard deviations for region of the country. The main effect for type of institution was not significant, $F(2, 21) = 2.47$, $p = .09$. The observed power for the statistical model was 1.0, which is very large and indicates more than sufficient power to detect even small differences in group means (Cohen, 1992).

Table 13

Means and Standard Deviations of the Poor Student Behaviors Scale for Region of the Country

Region	n	M	SD
Northeast	47	2.16	.89
Southeast	24	2.24	1.05
South	52	2.13	.90
Midwest	79	$2.27_{a,b,c}$	.81
Great Plains	64	2.16_d	.79
Northwest	18	1.50_a	.90
Southwest	48	1.76_b	.94
West	60	$1.67_{c,d}$	.83

Note. Means in a column sharing subscripts are significantly different from each other. For all measures, higher means indicated higher frequency of poor student behavior.

Aggressive, threatening behaviors. A 2 (Experience of Aggressive, Threatening Behavior: Never, At Least Once) x 3 (Type of Institution: Public, Private, Community College) chi-square revealed no significant connection between type of institution and experience of aggressive, threatening behaviors, χ^2(2, $n = 410$) = 2.02, $p = .36$. A 2 (Experience of Aggressive, Threatening Behavior: Never, At Least Once) x 8 (Region of Country: Northeast, Southeast, South, Midwest, Great Plains, Northwest, Southwest, West) chi-square revealed a marginally significant association between region of the country and experience of aggressive, threatening behaviors, χ^2(7, $n = 393$) = 13.61, $p = .058$. The contingency table (see Table 14) showed a tendency for college faculty members in the South and Southeast regions of the country to be less likely to have experienced aggressive, threatening behaviors. There was also a tendency for professors teaching in the Midwest and Great Plains states to be more likely to have experienced this type of behavior.

Table 14

Contingency Table for Region of the Country and Experience of Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors

Experience of Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors		Region of the Country							
		North east	South east	South	Midwest	Great Plains	North west	South west	West
Never									
	Count	23	19	34	37	28	10	28	36
	Expected	25.7	13.7	28.4	43.2	35.0	9.8	26.3	32.8
	Standardized Residual	-0.5	1.4	1.0	-0.9	-1.2	0.0	0.3	0.6
At Least Once									
	Count	24	6	18	42	36	8	20	24
	Expected	21.3	11.3	23.6	35.8	29.0	8.2	21.7	27.2
	Standardized Residual	0.6	-1.6	-1.1	1.0	1.3	-0.1	-0.4	-0.6

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Factor Analysis

The main purpose of this study was to examine bullying, cyberbullying, uncivil, and sexual harassment behaviors to determine whether these exist as separate or overlapping constructs. It was hypothesized that these behaviors overlap greatly and are better categorized based on frequency and severity of behavior, rather than on type of behavior. It was suggested that these groups then create a spectrum of interpersonal mistreatment ranging from the most common and least upsetting to the least common and most upsetting behaviors.

To test this theory, two factor analyses were conducted on the 49 behavioral items included on the Faculty Experience Survey. The first analysis, which was conducted using data from participants regarding how frequently they had experienced each of the behaviors, yielded a three-factor solution: (a) Direct Incivility, (b) Poor Student Behaviors, and (c) Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors. The second analysis, based on participants' ratings of how upset they were or would expect to be upon experiencing each of the behaviors on the Faculty Experience Survey, also resulted in a three-factor solution: (a) Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors, (b) Poor Student Behaviors, and (c) Direct Incivility. The two sets of factors demonstrated a great deal of overlap of behavioral items.

Poor Student Behaviors

All the poor student behaviors that were represented both on the frequency and upset scales described uncivil behaviors as described in the literature on classroom incivility. In many cases, the terms bullying and incivility are used interchangeably in the literature (Jones, 2006). However, the intent to cause harm is more ambiguous with uncivil behaviors than with bullying behaviors. In the case of the poor student behaviors identified in this study (e.g., "Failed to meet assignment requirements," "Failed to keep scheduled appointments," "Turned in a late assignment without prior approval"), there appeared to be a common lack of intent to cause harm to the faculty member in students' perpetration of these behaviors. Instead, these behaviors seemed to represent students' lack of participation in their own learning (e.g., "Engaging in non-class activities during class," "Failing to read the syllabus," "Talking amongst themselves during class") and attempts to pass a course while not putting forth the effort (e.g., "Cheating on papers, quizzes, and exams;" "Requesting that you make exams or assignments easier"). The item "Lied to you" could be interpreted as a more direct action taken against a faculty member, but it is more likely that participants in this study recalled instances in which students lied regarding reasons for missing class or not handing in an assignment when interpreting this behavioral item. Given this interpretation, this behavior represents a lack of engagement and effort in the learning process.

There was one item on the Poor Student Behavior scale originating from the survey items based on frequency of occurrence that did not load on the same scale based on level of upset: "Interrupted class by making noises, arriving late or leaving early in a rude or distracting way." When examining level of upset, this item fell on the Direct Incivility scale. This discrepancy is likely due to the ambiguity of this item regarding whether interrupting class was viewed as an

intentional act or as inconsiderate behavior which inadvertently interrupted class. A similar issue may explain the three remaining items that fell on the Poor Student Behavior scale for level of upset, but are contained on the Direct Incivility scale for frequency of occurrence: "Ignored your legitimate requests (insubordination)," "Complained about constructive feedback," and "Created tension in class by dominating discussion." For each of these behaviors, intent to be disrespectful is ambiguous and is likely to be interpreted differently by each faculty member based on personal experience and sensitivity to mistreatment.

Despite the likelihood of poor student behaviors to be unintentional, these behaviors should not be ignored. It has been suggested that allowing continued incivility in the classroom without consequence can give students the impression that uncivil behaviors are acceptable, which begins to define the learning climate (Miner-Rubino & Cortina, 2007). This perception of classroom interactions as hostile creates the type of environment in which student behaviors could escalate into more aggressive forms of mistreatment (DeSouza, 2008; Felblinger, 2008). Additionally, an uncivil climate can affect student learning due to its disruptive nature (D. Lee, 2005) and the negative impacts on faculty members' attitudes toward teaching (Luparell, 2007) and abilities to meet course objectives (Morrissette, 2001).

Direct Incivility

Each of the original four types of behaviors surveyed in this study, bullying, cyberbullying, incivility, and sexual harassment, appeared on the Direct Incivility scale. Of the 17 items shared between the Direct Incivility scales for frequency of occurrence and level of upset, seven originally represented uncivil behaviors (e.g., "Made unwarranted criticisms of your performance," "Challenged your authority," "Continually showed disdain while you were teaching"). These behaviors appear to be more intentional in nature as opposed to the more

passive or ambiguous uncivil behaviors on the Poor Student Behavior scale. There were two uncivil behaviors included on the Direct Incivility scale for frequency of occurrence that loaded on the Aggressive, Threatening Behavior scale for level of upset: "Showed lack of respect and intolerance for cultural, ethnic, and class differences" and "Took credit for your work." These behaviors do not represent aggressive, threatening behaviors as understood from the perspective of causing the most physical and/or psychological damage. However, these behaviors were clearly among the most upsetting behaviors on the Faculty Experience Survey, perhaps due to how much of a personal attack these behaviors may seem. Faculty members are often very dedicated to their research and put a lot of trust in students who assist them with their work. Therefore, having this trust betrayed would be a very upsetting experience. Similarly, although students showing a lack of respect or intolerance of diversity is a relatively common behavior, it is likely to feel like a personal attack, especially for faculty members from diverse backgrounds.

Five of the shared items on the Direct Incivility scale represented verbal and relational bullying behaviors (e.g., "Made hostile or threatening verbal remarks," "Gossiped or spread rumors about you," "Made fun of you in front of others"). These types of behaviors show intent on behalf of the perpetrator to cause harm, and resulted in moderate distress for the faculty members in this sample. Additionally, two cyberbullying behaviors loaded on both the Direct Incivility scales: "Sent harassing or threatening e-mails to you" and "Harassed or threatened you through a social networking site." These behaviors may have been found on this scale rather than on the Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors scale, where the majority of the cyberbullying behaviors loaded, due to the increasingly common nature of these behaviors. As more faculty members communicate with students through e-mail and are easily accessed through social networking sites, it may be more common to receive hostile messages from students.

Additionally, with written communication, students may be less aware of how their comments are being perceived, and tone cannot be conveyed as easily as in face-to-face or telephone conversations. One cyberbullying item was found on the Direct Incivility scale for frequency of occurrence, but loaded on the Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors scale for level of upset: "Impersonated you online." This indicates a moderate frequency of occurrence, but was still very upsetting to faculty members. This is an explicit behavior that is more difficult to misperceive, and therefore, may seem like more of an individual attack than the other cyberbullying behaviors that could potentially be explained as a misunderstanding.

Finally, two sexual harassment behaviors loaded on both the Direct Incivility scales: "Stared at you inappropriately" and "Violated your personal space." According to Lim and Cortina (2005), these behaviors fall within the realm of unwanted sexual attention. However, it is likely that faculty members interpreted these behaviors as hostile or disrespectful as opposed to sexual in nature, resulting in their placement on this scale. A third item, "Made inappropriate comments regarding your appearance, age, gender, sexual orientation, disability, personal values or beliefs, etc.," which combines sexual harassment and other types of discrimination, also loaded on both Direct Incivility scales. Because even the sexually harassing aspects of this behavior are more discriminatory than sexual in nature, this type of harassment is more closely associated with incivility as well (Lim & Cortina, 2005). Two sexual harassment items that loaded on the Direct Incivility factor for frequency of occurrence were found on the Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors scale regarding level of upset: "Made racist comments" and "Made sexist comments." These seem to represent behaviors that occur moderately frequently, but were among some of the most upsetting behaviors for this sample. The reason for this may be that these behaviors are more overt and intentional in nature, and therefore, faculty members may

view such statements as a personal attack. There may also be more fear of escalation with these behaviors due to their derogatory nature.

Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors

Eleven items from the Faculty Experience Survey loaded on both the Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors scales for frequency of occurrence and level of upset. Of these 11 behaviors, five were obtained from the literature on classic bullying behaviors (e.g., "Touched you in an aggressive manner," "Used physical violence against you," "Maliciously damaged or stole your property"). These behaviors are overtly aggressive and have a high likelihood of causing physical or psychological harm, including fear of continued abuse or escalation of the situation. These are also behaviors that are likely to be reported to an authority figure, such as a supervisor or the police. The item "Invaded your home life" was one of the bullying behaviors included on this scale. This is a more ambiguous statement, but it appeared as though faculty members in this sample interpreted this item as threatening, perhaps because of a heightened sense of vulnerability when students invade private time and "safe" space away from the academic environment.

The item "Made hostile or threatening phone calls to you" was also included on this scale, and has represented classic bullying behavior in other studies. However, given that this is a bullying method that utilizes communication technology and affords the perpetrator anonymity, 24-hour access to victims, and the opportunity for repeated harassment, which are common characteristics of cyberbullying behaviors (Dickerson, 2005), this item will be compared with the cyberbullying items on the Faculty Experience Survey. Phone calls may be seen as more threatening than e-mail, which was a behavior that appeared on the Direct Incivility scale, because a student's aggressive tone is more apparent via telephone. Also, e-mail has become a

primary mode of communication in academia, whereas phone calls are less frequent, tend to be more personalized, and indicate greater familiarity, which could lead to feeling more vulnerable in response to such a threat. Harassment or threats via telephone can provide anonymity to a perpetrator as well, which may offer even more power over the victim (K. A. Benson, 1984).

Four additional behaviors on the Aggressive, Threatening Behavior scales represented cyberbullying behaviors (e.g., "Posted a lewd or unprofessional response to an online forum," "Posted negative or embarrassing information about you on a website"). This is the highest number of cyberbullying behaviors to load on any of the factors. Based on which factors these behaviors loaded on, receiving threats via text message, instant message, and telephone appeared to be less common and more upsetting to faculty members than receiving threats via e-mail or social networking sites, which were behaviors included on the Direct Incivility scale. This could be largely due to faculty members keeping cell phone numbers and instant messaging screen names private, indicating that students would have to try harder to obtain personal information about a faculty member to harass him or her in these ways. These means may offer a higher level of exposure to threatening messages as well, since messages would be harder to ignore or screen before opening, as opposed to e-mail and social networking sites, where faculty members may automatically ignore and delete any messages from unknown users. Also, text message, instant message, and telephone may offer more anonymity since telephone numbers can be blocked and obscure screen names can be created that conceal the identity of the user. In comparison, official university e-mail addresses and social networking profiles with pictures and names would make a harasser's identity more readily known, although fake addresses and profiles could always be created for the purpose of harassment. Likely, greater exposure to

certain types of cyberbullying behaviors than others contributes to faculty members experiencing less upset in response.

One cyberbullying behavior loaded on the Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors scale for frequency of occurrence, but loaded on the Direct Incivility scale for level of upset: "Posted your information or picture on a voting website." This indicates low reported rates of occurrence versus a moderate level of upset by faculty members in this sample. Since the Faculty Experience Survey asks about behaviors which faculty members are aware of, it is possible that this behavior is occurring more often with the use of websites such as ratemyprofessors.com and knowyourprofessor.com than faculty members realize. Additionally, faculty members may not find this type of behavior very threatening since the comments are not made directly to the faculty member and are made in a public forum where threats could be viewed by anyone and consequences could be easily enforced with the available written proof.

Finally, two sexual harassment behaviors were shared among the two Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors scales: "Inappropriately patted, hugged, stroked, kissed, fondled, or pinched you" and "Propositioned you for a sexual encounter." These represent behaviors that are sexual in nature and may involve an assumption on the part of the perpetrator that the faculty member is interested in engaging in a sexual relationship with him or her. Acting out in this way may also be an attempt to obtain power or leverage over an individual who holds power in the academic relationship (K. A. Benson, 1984). These behaviors could easily be viewed as threatening in nature, with fear of escalation, and could result in physical and psychological harm. Two sexual harassment behaviors were not in common among the two scales. "Flirted with you or asked you out" loaded on the Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors scale for frequency of occurrence, but on the Direct Incivility scale for level of upset. This indicates that the

prevalence of this behavior was low in this sample, but that faculty members were only moderately upset by the prospect of this happening. This behavior may appear less threatening and perhaps even flattering or innocent, contributing to this behavior being viewed as less upsetting. The second item not shared between the scales, "Sexually assaulted you," did not load on any factor for frequency of occurrence since no one in the sample reported ever having experienced this behavior. However, this item loaded on the Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors scale for level of upset, indicating that this behavior would be very upsetting to faculty members in this sample, as was expected.

Comparison with Pilot Study Findings

In the pilot study conducted by Love and MacDonald (2010), 107 faculty members from a mid-size Midwestern university were surveyed using the Faculty Experience Survey. A factor analysis was conducted on the data for how often each of the behaviors was experienced, resulting in a four-factor solution: (a) Poor Student Behaviors, (b) Direct Incivility, (c) Cyberbullying Behaviors, and (d) Illegal, Threatening Behaviors (Love & MacDonald, 2010). There are many similarities between these results and the three-factor solutions for frequency of occurrence and level of upset in the current study.

Poor student behaviors. All nine of the shared poor student behaviors in the current study also appeared on the Poor Student Behaviors scale of the pilot study. Only one item was not in common among the three Poor Student Behaviors scales: "Created tension in class by dominating discussion." Overall, the findings from both the pilot study and the current study show strong support for a common factor that describes behaviors that are very common and may be seen as rude or distracting, but are not typically viewed as upsetting or as being perpetrated in order to cause harm.

Direct incivility. There was less overlap in Direct Incivility items between the two studies. Of the 17 shared Direct Incivility items in the current study, 13 were included on the Direct Incivility scale of the pilot study. However, 16 behavioral items were identified that do not show consistent overlap on the pilot study and the current study's frequency of occurrence scales. Despite these behaviors being described as less ambiguous and more intentional than poor student behaviors, it appears as though there is more discrepancy in the reports of these behaviors by faculty members. When examining the data for the current study, there was greater variability in frequency of occurrence for several of the direct incivility behaviors on the Faculty Experience Survey than for other items on the measure. The variance scores for level of upset were moderately high for direct incivility behaviors as well. This suggests that the frequencies of these behaviors are wide-ranging and that faculty members are likely to interpret these behaviors differently based on personal characteristics, such as personality traits and previous experiences. Although the reports vary, there seems to be agreement on the classification of a large number of these behaviors as representing direct incivility.

Aggressive, threatening behaviors. In the current study, the majority of cyberbullying items were included on the Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors scale, as opposed to the pilot study which included a fourth scale of mainly cyberbullying items. Of the 11 common items on the Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors scales in the current study, four were contained on the Illegal, Threatening Behaviors scale and four loaded on the Cyberbullying factor in the pilot study. Additionally, two of the items on the Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors scales in the current study (i.e., "Propositioned you for a sexual encounter," "Used physical violence against you") did not load on any factor in the pilot study, most likely due to low rates of occurrence. Given the aggressive nature of the items included on the Cyberbullying scale in the pilot study

(e.g., "Sent harassing or threatening text messages to you," "Touched you in an aggressive manner"), it was not unexpected for these behaviors to join with the Illegal, Threatening Behaviors to create the Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors scale in the current study. Also, the fact that cyberbullying behaviors did not emerge on a separate factor in the current study supported my hypothesis that bullying, cyberbullying, uncivil, and sexual harassment behaviors overlap to create a spectrum of interpersonal mistreatment.

Overall, the factor structures for the pilot study and the frequency of occurrence and level of upset data from the current study are very similar. This provides strong support for these behavioral classifications and the resulting spectrum of interpersonal mistreatment. For more details about the results of the pilot study, see Appendix B.

Contributions to the Literature

Very few researchers have examined the similarities among bullying, cyberbullying, uncivil, and sexual harassment behaviors. Only three known studies have shown a statistical overlap among these separate constructs. Lim and Cortina (2005) found that 22% of their sample of female court employees had experienced both incivility and gender harassment (a form of sexual harassment). Additionally, they found a significant moderate correlation between incivility and sexualized harassment, demonstrating an overlap of sexual and nonsexual aggressive behaviors (Lim & Cortina, 2005). The findings of the current study support this with a strong overlap in terms of the number of incivility and sexual harassment behaviors appearing on the combined Direct Incivility scale together.

In Land's (2000) study comparing perceptions of teasing, bullying, and sexual harassment among adolescents, teasing and bullying behaviors made up a single factor. Sexual harassment behaviors made up a second, strongly correlated factor. In the current study, there

was not such clean separation between bullying and sexual harassment behaviors, with both types of behaviors appearing on the Direct Incivility and Aggressive, Threatening Behaviors scales. This difference in findings can be attributed to Land's focus on student perceptions of behaviors compared to the current study's consideration of frequency of occurrence and level of upset of behaviors in determining behavior classification.

Additionally, Lampman et al.'s (2009) analysis of contrapower harassment of college faculty members resulted in two factors: an Incivility-Bullying scale containing 15 items and a Sexual Attention scale containing three items. The current study also found overlap among uncivil and bullying behaviors on the Direct Incivility scale, but showed overlap of sexual harassment and cyberbullying behaviors in this category as well, as opposed to the more clearly separated factors emerging from Lampman et al.'s data. Perhaps inclusion of a larger number of behaviors on the Faculty Experience Survey and obtaining a sample from various types of institutions across the United States, compared to Lampman et al.'s 30-item survey distributed only to faculty members at one public university in Alaska, allowed for a better understanding of the statistical relationships among the various types of behaviors. Regarding the loading of behavioral items during factor analysis, Lampman et al. utilized more stringent criteria in analyzing their factors, using a factor loading cutoff of .5, which resulted in only 18 of 30 items loading on their two factors. In the current study, items with factor loadings as low as .31 were included on the scales, resulting in all 49 behaviors loading on the three factors resulting from the level of upset data and all but two items loading on the three factors resulting from the frequency of occurrence data. Allowing for a larger number of items to load on the factors may have contributed to greater overlap of the various behaviors as well, and even when items with lower factor loadings were included, the resulting factor scales in the current study had high

scale reliability scores, demonstrating strong statistical connections among the items included in each factor (Field, 2009).

The current findings provide important evidence for the theory that bullying, cyberbullying, uncivil, and sexual harassment behaviors do not represent separate constructs as have been previously defined and researched. The current study supports what some researchers have begun to demonstrate statistically among pairs of these behaviors, but it reveals different results from studies that have attempted to show connections among at least three of these types of behaviors. The current study shows that these four types of behaviors significantly overlap and appear to create a spectrum of interpersonal mistreatment ranging from the most common and least upsetting behaviors, which are mainly uncivil and represent poor student behaviors, to the least common and most upsetting behaviors, which tend to be very aggressive and likely to cause physical or psychological harm to the victim.

Implications

With the growing occurrence of deadly shootings on college campuses over the past two decades (Jenson, 2007), campus communities, parents, and the media have placed emphasis on early detection of college student distress that may lead to dangerous behaviors. This has been seen in the movement toward implementing emergency mass notification systems, emergency response plans, and threat assessment teams on campuses around the country (Applied Risk Management, 2008). One potential indicator of violence is uncivil or aggressive behavior (Clark, 2008a; Kolanko et al., 2006) displayed in the classroom and in one-on-one interactions. Patterns of intimidating or bullying others and having difficulty controlling anger (Bulach et al., 2003) are clear outward signs that an individual may be prone to using violent means in order to express their feelings. Placing these behaviors on a spectrum of interpersonal mistreatment can

provide cues to certain types of behaviors that could escalate into more violent acts. Given the findings of the current study, it seems that students who are willing to perpetrate direct incivility, in which their intent to mistreat a faculty member is quite obvious, would be more likely to act in aggressive, threatening ways as well. Therefore, recognizing and addressing direct incivility in an appropriate manner may prevent students from escalating to using more aggressive, threatening behaviors. Likewise, students who engage in poor student behaviors with few repercussions may view faculty members as "push-overs" and perceive more opportunity to perpetrate direct incivility in order to get what they want. This demonstrates how common, low-level behaviors could escalate into more serious and harmful attacks.

Clark's (2008a) article on "the dance of incivility" suggested that not addressing lower-level student behaviors could result in faculty members also demonstrating incivility, which would contribute to an overall atmosphere of hostility within a classroom or academic department in which violence would be more likely to erupt. Therefore, faculty members need to be aware of how they respond to disrespectful student behaviors. By modeling more appropriate ways of handling conflict and resolving problems in the classroom, faculty members will teach students how to behave appropriately in the academic environment. It can be difficult to keep emotions contained when one is upset by interpersonal mistreatment, but consulting with other professionals can help faculty members to gain perspective and rationally decide how to proceed (American Psychological Association [APA], 2011).

Students may be largely unaware of how their poor student behaviors and direct incivility are viewed by and negatively impact faculty members. Therefore, an important step in reducing the amount of interpersonal mistreatment taking place on college campuses is to help students increase their awareness of their own behaviors and the consequences of those behaviors for

themselves and others. Taylor (2010) recommended that college faculty members not assume that students understand what is expected of them and instead be clear about academic and behavioral expectations and about consequences for misbehavior. DeSouza (2011) also suggested outlining a zero tolerance policy in the syllabus regarding mistreatment and enforcing it consistently. Then when interpersonal mistreatment occurs, faculty members need to address behaviors immediately and use these opportunities to educate students on what type of behaviors will and will not be tolerated in the student–professor relationship. This education should occur both explicitly and in the form of modeling appropriate interpersonal behavior (DeSouza, 2011). In addition to providing this education in the classroom, campus-wide efforts also need to be made to address this growing problem. This could occur as part of the orientation process for new students and during study skills and career exploration workshops or classes. College counselors need to support this effort by providing dynamic programming in classrooms, residence halls, and with various student organizations as well. This process should result in students becoming more aware of their negative behaviors and choosing to re-engage in the learning process in more appropriate ways. However, if negative student behaviors continue, escalate, or reach a certain level of severity, these behaviors need to be reported to a superior and/or campus police and disciplinary action may need to be taken.

Taylor (2010) made some recommendations for faculty members to help college students re-engage in the learning process. He reported that the current generation of students tend to place high value on entertainment and stimulation, have typically been academically successful with minimal effort, and possess a consumer mentality, which includes the quest for immediate gratification. Taylor suggested utilization of supplemental materials, such as CDs, DVDs, and websites, for the purpose of helping students learn and understand the material being taught. He

recommended that class time be spent helping students learn specific skills and identify the relevancy of the material in order to keep students interested (Taylor, 2010). It was also suggested by APA's Violence Directed Against K-12 Teachers Task Force (2011) that faculty should incorporate more cooperative learning in the classroom, which increases engagement and retention of information. Theoretically, improving classroom engagement should reduce the amount of interpersonal mistreatment experienced.

It was recommended by Applied Risk Management (2008), in a report to the Massachusetts Department of Higher Education, that faculty and staff be trained in recognizing threatening behavior and signs of mental illness so at-risk students may receive the help they need before violence erupts. When an individual fantasizes about violence, his or her thoughts may be communicated through verbal and nonverbal cues, which are experienced by those who come into contact with him or her, including college faculty members (Depue & Depue, 2008). Therefore, faculty members need to report unusual student behavior to a department chairperson, the dean of students, the campus threat assessment team, the campus safety and security office, and/or local police in order to maintain safety for all faculty, staff, students, and community members to whom the perpetrator may have access. When multiple instances of aggression are reported and a pattern of threatening or hostile behavior can be seen, college administrators will have more evidence of a student's instability and stronger justification for disciplining the student or even dismissing him or her from the institution. However, it can be difficult for faculty members to report mistreatment when they do not believe they will be supported by administrators and that doing so may even put their job in danger (DeSouza, 2011). Therefore, it is important for administrators to support and protect faculty members by having firm conduct, netiquette, and anti-discrimination policies in place and being consistent with enforcing these

policies when students misbehave (DeSouza, 2011). Overall, it is important to address interpersonal mistreatment early on, both at the micro and macro levels, in order to avoid growing hostility and eruptions of violence on campus.

Prevalence of Interpersonal Mistreatment

The second purpose of this study was to determine the prevalence of interpersonal mistreatment at institutions of higher education across the United States. Poor student behaviors were the most prevalent type of behavior in this sample, with 70% to 96% of faculty members reporting experiencing at least one of these behaviors. In fact, upon examination it was determined that only one individual in this sample reported never having experienced any poor student behaviors. This demonstrates how common these behaviors are in the college classroom. Direct incivility behaviors were reported to occur at lower rates than poor student behaviors, but overall 94% of the sample had experienced at least one of these behaviors. This indicates that the likelihood of experiencing some form of direct incivility as a college faculty member is very high. Finally, aggressive, threatening behaviors occurred least frequently, with only 2% to 16% of faculty members having experienced each individual behavior on this scale. One behavior, sexual assault, had never been experienced by anyone in the sample. Still, overall 46% of faculty members in the sample had experienced at least one aggressive, threatening behavior. This is a surprisingly high percentage of faculty members experiencing these relatively rare behaviors.

It is hoped that the high rates of occurrence demonstrated here will encourage college administrators to develop strong policies and to enforce them consistently in order to promote a more positive academic environment. Some colleges and universities, such as the University of Arizona, where three professors were killed by a nursing student in 2002, have already adopted

such policies and offer strict guidelines for faculty and staff to adhere to when addressing disruptive and threatening behavior. Both the Dean of Students Office at the University of Arizona (University of Arizona and the Arizona Board of Regents, 2010) and DeSouza (2011) recommended that faculty members communicate classroom rules and policies in the course syllabus and consistently enforce and report violations of them to designated parties, such as the department chairperson, the dean of the college, and the dean of students. When behaviors have persisted or escalated, faculty complaints should be investigated by a designated authority and students should be sanctioned according to the student conduct code. Because so many key players are involved in enforcing such policies, campus systems will operate best if all parties can agree on what behaviors constitute mistreatment, what steps should be taken to discipline students, and what are appropriate consequences for these behaviors.

Responses to Interpersonal Mistreatment

This study also examined how upset faculty members were or would expect to be in response to experiencing interpersonal mistreatment. It was found that aggressive, threatening behaviors were the most upsetting behaviors included on the Faculty Experience Survey. Although this study did not examine the personal and professional impacts of interpersonal mistreatment, it is assumed that a higher level of upset might indicate a higher potential for personal or professional consequences to be caused by the behavior. Behaviors included on the Direct Incivility scale appeared to be moderately upsetting to faculty members in this sample, and those on the Poor Student Behaviors scale were the least upsetting behaviors. These results followed an expected pattern of the most rare, aggressive behaviors being the most upsetting, whereas the most common, passive behaviors were the least upsetting.

These data contribute to the understanding of how detrimental interpersonal mistreatment can be to victims. In Lampman et al.'s (2009) study, female faculty members reported being more upset by all behaviors than men, and also reported experiencing more negative consequences such as anxiety, difficulty sleeping, depression, and trouble concentrating at work. Additionally, McKay et al. (2008) found that over a quarter of the faculty members in their study who had experienced mistreatment suffered a negative impact on their work productivity and 13% reported considering leaving their job because of it. Not addressing interpersonal mistreatment of faculty members could prove to be costly to colleges and universities if employee efficiency decreases, turnover rates increase, and the amount of medical leave requested increases (Willness et al., 2007). Employees may seek health and mental health treatment after experiencing personal consequences of mistreatment, which could take away from time on the job and increase utilization of employee assistance programs, ultimately costing institutions a great deal of money (Willness et al., 2007). It is recommended that instructors experiencing interpersonal mistreatment be aware of the consequences they suffer and use available resources to address these concerns, as well as make college administrators aware of negative responses to mistreatment. Likewise, administrators who are made aware of interpersonal mistreatment of faculty members should be proactive in offering resources to employees for coping with the stress, fear, and degradation that can result from interpersonal mistreatment (Luparell, 2007).

Group Differences

The final purpose of this study was to determine who was most likely to be the target of poor student behaviors, direct incivility, and aggressive, threatening behaviors based on personal, academic, and institutional characteristics. Based on the integrated theory of contrapower

harassment (Rospenda et al., 1998), it was hypothesized that female instructors; individuals of minority groups based on ethnicity, sexual orientation, and disability status; and younger instructors would experience higher levels of interpersonal mistreatment. Regarding academic characteristics, it was hypothesized that individuals who were viewed as having less academic experience, based on fewer years spent teaching; holding a degree other than a doctorate; being untenured; and having lower academic rank would experience higher rates of interpersonal mistreatment. Additionally, based on previous research showing higher levels of mistreatment of faculty members teaching general education, potentially controversial, and high stress courses (Clark, 2008a; Lampman et al., 2009; D. Lee, 2005), it was hypothesized that individuals teaching in the humanities, physical sciences, and health sciences would experience higher rates of interpersonal mistreatment. There were no hypotheses regarding differences in frequency of occurrence based on type of institution (i.e., community college, public, private) or region of the country since no previous research in the college population has explored differences based on these variables.

Personal Characteristics

No group differences based on personal characteristics were seen for poor student behaviors or aggressive, threatening behaviors in this sample. As previously discussed, poor student behaviors represented students' lack of participation in their own learning and attempts to pass a course while not putting forth much effort. Additionally, the behaviors included in this category appeared to lack intent to cause harm to the faculty member, whereas this intent would be expected in cases where specific faculty members were targeted due to personal characteristics. It seems more likely that poor student behaviors are perpetrated by a large number of students regardless of who is teaching the course, as this has become a typical form of

social interaction (Andersson & Pearson, 1999). Aggressive, threatening behaviors also appeared to occur regardless of the personal characteristics of the instructor. This may be because students who perpetrate these behaviors act out sporadically in response to negative emotions, such as frustration and anger, that they have difficulty controlling and communicating in other ways (Andersen et al., 1985). Therefore, these students may not be purposefully selecting against whom they perpetrate these behaviors.

In contrast, it was found that individuals 60 years old and over from minority sexual orientations reported significantly more direct incivility from students than heterosexuals in the same age group. Although this combination of age and sexual orientation only explained 2% of the variance in having experienced direct incivility for faculty members in this sample, the effect size for differences in the means for heterosexuals and faculty members from minority sexual orientations in the oldest age group was very large. This indicates that the power in this analysis was focused on the specific comparison of these groups. This finding partially supports Rospenda et al.'s (1998) integrated theory of contrapower harassment, which suggests that students perceive their own majority group status as a source of power over instructors from minority groups. However, this was only true in this study for individuals who also fell into the oldest age group. This is the opposite of what was expected since the stigma experienced by these individuals has resulted in many older lesbians and gay men hiding their sexual orientation from others, particularly at work (Cook-Daniels, 1997; Kean, 2006; Morrow, 2001). Cook-Daniels (1997) reported that this group still tends to reject traditional gender identities, however, allowing them to be more identifiable and more vulnerable to abuse and exploitation. Additionally, due to the older age of these individuals and the likelihood they have been teaching

longer, they have potentially encountered more mistreatment over time that could be linked to their sexual orientation.

The current study failed to provide support for the hypothesis that female instructors would experience more mistreatment, which has been demonstrated in previous studies (e.g., DeSouza & Fansler, 2003). However, gender differences have been found in studies of sexual harassment, but not in research examining other types of behaviors as well (DeSouza, 2011; Lampman et al., 2009; Love & MacDonald, 2010). Additionally, no differences were found in faculty members' experience of interpersonal mistreatment based on ethnicity or disability status, which does not support the theory that students seek power over an individual who is perceived as threatening to their own group identity (Rospenda et al., 1998). However, this may suggest that disability status, gender, and ethnicity did not represent characteristics that were threatening to the students of college faculty members in this sample.

Overall, it is a positive finding in this study that faculty members for the most part were not targeted for mistreatment based on personal characteristics. However, it is still important for faculty members and college administrators to be aware of personal characteristics which could present opportunities for faculty members to be the targets of interpersonal mistreatment. It is important for faculty members who believe they are being targeted based on personal characteristics to report perpetrators to designated campus officials to ensure that campus anti-discrimination, student conduct, and netiquette policies for online courses are being adhered to. Additionally, campus administrators must be prepared to support faculty members in these reports and discipline students for such mistreatment (DeSouza, 2011), especially when the claim can be substantiated and intent to mistreat and/or cause harm is clear. This will send a strong message to students that discrimination will not be tolerated.

Academic Characteristics

No group differences were found in reported rates of poor student behaviors and direct incivility based on academic characteristics. However, several group differences were found for aggressive, threatening behaviors. Faculty members in this sample who had a doctoral degree and were tenured were more likely to have experienced an aggressive, threatening behavior than would be expected by chance. Adjunct professors and those who had been teaching for zero to five years were significantly less likely to have experienced this type of behavior. It was somewhat more likely for an associate or full professor and for those who had been teaching for six to 11 years to have experienced an aggressive, threatening behavior than those who were instructors, adjunct or assistant professors or had been teaching for fewer than six or more than 11 years. These findings indicate that individuals with higher levels of experience in academia experienced more of these types of behaviors, except in the case of faculty members who had been teaching six to 11 years.

Overall, these findings are the opposite of what was expected. However, Love and MacDonald's (2010) study yielded similar results, with faculty members holding a doctorate and those in associate, assistant, or full professor positions being more likely to experience poor student behaviors than their less experienced counterparts. DeSouza (2011) also found male, tenured professors to experience more harassment and incivility than untenured faculty members. This pattern of findings suggests that students do not target faculty members based on their level of experience but that faculty members who have been teaching longer have had more interactions of all kinds with students, including interpersonal mistreatment. However, this pattern was only seen in the current study for aggressive, threatening behaviors and not for poor student behaviors or direct incivility. Given the very high prevalence rates of poor student

behaviors and direct incivility in this sample, it follows that faculty members at all levels of experience reported encountering these behaviors.

In addition to mere prolonged exposure to students, experienced faculty members may also encounter more aggressive, threatening behaviors due to administrative duties within their departments, such as serving on graduate student committees, which often involve more intimate relationships with students focused on issues of personal and professional identity development. Furthermore, graduate students are often viewed as junior colleagues, which can blur the boundaries in terms of power in the student–professor relationship (Applied Risk Management, 2008). The majority of fatal mass shootings on college campuses in the past two decades were perpetrated by graduate students, potentially due to the tendency for these students to focus mainly on academics to the exclusion of other interests, to experience more financial stress, and to feel more pressure to succeed (Applied Risk Management, 2008). Therefore, faculty members working with these students may experience more aggressive forms of mistreatment. Future research should seek evidence to support this theory by examining the differences in interpersonal mistreatment based on the specific populations with which faculty members work. Also, faculty members need to be aware of the potential risks of working with certain populations of students and be proactive in establishing clear expectations of appropriate behavior and firm boundaries with students who violate these expectations.

In the current study, there were also no differences in experience of any type of interpersonal mistreatment based on the discipline in which faculty members taught. Previous literature suggested higher levels of mistreatment of faculty members teaching general education, potentially controversial, and high stress courses. However, some of these reports (Clark, 2008a; D. Lee, 2005) were anecdotal in nature and did not represent actual comparisons based on rates

of occurrence. Lampman et al. (2009) found that faculty members teaching women's studies and required liberal arts courses were more likely to experience mistreatment from students. However, the current study asked more simply about the discipline in which faculty members taught and not about specific courses, which may have contributed to a non-significant finding. In future studies it may be more helpful to ask specifically whether faculty members teach these types of courses. For now it appears that course content does not necessarily provoke students to mistreat faculty members.

Institutional Characteristics

Differences were seen in the frequency of poor student behaviors and aggressive, threatening behaviors experienced by faculty members teaching in certain regions of the country. This study found that faculty members teaching at institutions in the Midwest reported experiencing significantly more poor student behaviors than those in the Northwestern, Southwestern, and Western regions of the country. Additionally, faculty members in the Great Plains states reported significantly more poor student behaviors than those in the West. As was previously discussed, poor student behaviors represent a lack of engagement in the learning process. However, these behaviors may also symbolize a communication pattern that is more evident in the Midwest and Great Plains regions of the country. Sigler, Burnett, and Child (2008) found that college students in the Upper Midwest, which was similar to the Great Plains region defined in the current study, scored significantly lower on measures of assertiveness. The authors suggested that there may be a tendency toward passive-aggressive communication in this region based on a desire for conflict-avoidance and indirectness in order to project social modesty (Sigler et al., 2008). This may result in a hidden culture of aggression, particularly in settings where it is important to appear respectful even when respect is not present, such as the

classroom. The regional differences in reported occurrence of poor student behaviors may also represent differing cultural attitudes toward academics, although there are no current studies that support this theory.

The findings of this study also showed a tendency for faculty members in the South and Southeast regions of the country to be less likely to have experienced aggressive, threatening behaviors, while faculty members teaching in the Midwest and Great Plains states were somewhat more likely to have experienced this type of behavior. These findings were the opposite of previous research studies on aggression, which have provided evidence for a Southern culture of violence (i.e., Wolfgang & Ferracuti, 1967). However, more recent studies have produced mixed findings. In White and Koss's (1991) research on dating violence among college students, infliction of symbolic aggression, which included behaviors such as yelling, insulting, and throwing things, was significantly greater in the Southeast region and the Great Lakes region, which was similar to the Midwest region in the current study, than in the Great Plains and Western states. Additionally, physical violence was perpetrated and experienced more than expected in the Great Lakes region and less than expected in the Great Plains and Western states (White & Koss, 1991). These researchers found that more symbolic and physical aggression occurred in states with a higher social stress index, indicating more economic stressors, such as business failures, unemployment, and bankruptcies; family stressors, such as divorce, infant deaths, and disaster assistance; and other stressors, such as higher rates of new welfare cases and high school dropouts (White & Koss, 1991). This partially supports the findings of the current study and may help explain the occurrence of more aggressive, threatening behaviors reported by faculty members in the Midwest and Great Plains states.

It should be noted that the results of the current study are based on regions in which students were attending college and not necessarily the regions in which students were raised, which would be assumed to account more for cultural attitudes and communication styles. However, Sigler et al. (2008) found no significant differences in assertiveness scores of lifetime versus non-lifetime residents of the regions they examined. These authors suggested that individuals adapt their communication styles in ways that make them more similar to those they interact with in their everyday lives (Sigler et al., 2008). Therefore, the results of the current study may accurately depict student attitudes based on geographic region.

The pattern of findings seen for poor student and aggressive, threatening behaviors did not emerge for direct incivility behaviors in the current study. This may be due to the nature of direct incivility to involve more intent to mistreat faculty members, which seems to imply a more purposeful choice to behave in such a way (Olweus, 1993). In contrast, poor student behaviors may represent a particular communication style seen in certain regions of the country (Sigler et al., 2008). These behaviors and aggressive, threatening behaviors may also reflect cultural values and attitudes toward education and aggression, respectively. Additionally, aggressive, threatening behaviors may reflect students' inability to control negative emotions, resulting in lashing out at whomever is present at the time (Andersen et al., 1985). Therefore, students in the Midwest and Great Plains regions may not actually intend to mistreat college faculty members. Further research is needed to better understand regional differences in interpersonal mistreatment.

It may be helpful for faculty members teaching in regions of the country where the rates of poor student behaviors and aggressive, threatening behaviors are higher to educate students on proper ways to behave within the classroom and to work to engage students in the learning

process. This education also needs to occur on a campus-wide level, such as in new student orientation and as programming offered by campus counselors. This could potentially reduce distractions in the classroom and increase students' motivation for learning. The APA Violence Directed Against K-12 Teachers Task Force, which was created in 2007 to address this growing problem, suggested promoting academic engagement through demonstrating relevancy of the material being taught, structuring learning in a way that is interesting and engages students, utilizing cooperative learning tasks, and keeping students on task in the classroom (APA, 2011). Additionally, the task force recommended maintaining privacy of student grades, giving feedback on what students did right as well as what needs to be improved, and helping students build on their strengths (APA, 2011). However, these suggestions were based on a K-12 learning environment and may not necessarily apply in college classroom settings.

No group differences were found in reported frequency of any type of interpersonal mistreatment based on type of institution (i.e., public, private, community) in this sample. Although no specific hypotheses were made regarding these analyses due to lack of previous research on this topic, some differences were expected to be observed based on assumptions that can be made about differing levels of difficulty and pressures to succeed that arise at each type of institution. Chapman (1981) reported that students with higher education aspirations and with more confidence in their abilities choose to attend private colleges, suggesting a higher caliber of students at these institutions. This information might suggest that private colleges and universities have a more competitive atmosphere, which could be assumed to lead to fewer poor student behaviors in the classroom due to the seriousness of the students in attendance, but more direct incivility and aggressive, threatening behaviors due to increased levels of stress (Clark, 2008a). However, socioeconomic status along with many other factors also significantly

influence which type of higher education institution students choose to attend (Chapman, 1981). Additionally, within each institutional type there is great variability in the level of education offered, the competitiveness of the environment, and the quality and maturity of the students enrolled. It may be more useful for future research to focus on the atmosphere of various institutions as an indicator of interpersonal mistreatment rather than type of institution.

Limitations

Generalizability

The results of this study may not be generalizable to the larger population of college instructors across the United States for multiple reasons. First, the response rate for this study was 8.2%, which is low compared to meta-analytic research showing average response rates ranging from 31% to 63% for web-based surveys (Anseel, Lievens, Schollaert, & Choragwicka, 2010; Sheehan, 2001). This raises questions about how generalizable the findings are to all college faculty members when they may not even provide a good representation of the individuals who were invited to participate in the study. According to Anseel et al.'s (2010) study, individuals in managerial and executive positions respond at lower rates to surveys than those in non-managerial positions, possibly due to receiving multiple survey invitations or having a higher work load. This could explain why response rates were so low for the faculty members in this study, who tend to have heavy workloads and likely receive several invitations to participate in research per year. The timing of the survey invitation being sent to faculty members may have presented a problem as well, since the time period corresponded with the end of the semester for most institutions, which is typically a busier time for faculty members. Additionally, this study did not utilize techniques that are commonly used to increase response

rates for web surveys, such as offering incentives and sending reminders to participate (Anseel et al., 2010).

Another issue regarding generalizability involves the potential overrepresentation of interpersonal mistreatment in this sample. It is possible that there was a tendency for faculty members who had experienced bullying, cyberbullying, incivility, and sexual harassment to be more likely to participate in the study, particularly considering the low response rate. Therefore, there may be large differences between faculty members who participated in the study and those who did not. Additionally, although stratified, quota, and cluster sampling techniques were used, there could be differences between faculty members from the institutions chosen for sampling and those in the general population of college instructors. However, there is no way to test these differences or to know for sure whether the faculty members in this sample are truly representative of the total population of college instructors.

The faculty members in this sample largely identified as representing majority groups, including heterosexuals, Whites, and able-bodied individuals. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2010) reported that in the fall of 2009 18.4% of full-time faculty members at degree-granting institutions represented minority racial/ethnic groups. Therefore, the percentage of faculty members from minority ethnic groups obtained in this sample, which was also 18%, is comparable to the larger population. However, NCES does not collect information about faculty members' sexual orientation or disability status, which makes it difficult to determine whether individuals of minority sexual orientations and with disabilities were fairly represented in this sample. If faculty members from minority groups were underrepresented in this study, there may have been less statistical power to detect group

differences, and the ability to generalize findings to the general population of college faculty members in the United States may be limited.

Measure

Further limitations are related to the measure used to obtain information in this study. The Faculty Experience Survey is a self-report measure that relies on faculty members to answer questions related to bullying, cyberbullying, uncivil, and sexually harassing behaviors based on memory and personal perceptions of such behaviors. It is likely that although some instructors do not notice such behaviors, others are particularly attuned to such occurrences, perhaps based on personal sensitivity to such behaviors. Likely in a large sample of faculty members a balance of these perceptual extremes would be achieved. However, because there may have been a tendency for faculty members who had experienced interpersonal mistreatment to participate in this study, the personal sensitivity of this sample could be higher than in the general population of college instructors.

The power of the Faculty Experience Survey to divide into accurate categories of interpersonal mistreatment may be limited as well. There are many more behaviors that occur within the student–professor relationship than were included on the Faculty Experience Survey, including positive interactions. Examining even more behaviors in this study might have offered a more complete picture of the relationships between students and college faculty members. However, I chose to focus only on negative behaviors and an effort was made to keep the survey as short as possible so that it would not be overly tiresome and time consuming for study participants to complete.

Finally, this study was the second to use the Faculty Experience Survey, which offered the opportunity for changes to be made to the wording of survey questions and behavioral items

in an effort to obtain more accurate information. However, more changes may need to be made, particularly in the wording of specific behavioral items that were split between two factors when considering the frequency of occurrence and level of upset data collected. Certain behaviors were combined in order to reduce the number of behavioral items included on the survey, but this may have made behavioral categorization more difficult. For example, the item "Interrupted class by making noises, arriving late or leaving early in a rude or distracting way" loaded on the Poor Student Behaviors scale based on frequency of occurrence and on the Direct Incivility scale based on level of upset. Because interrupting class by making noises may be a very deliberate behavior directed at the professor whereas arriving late or leaving early in a distracting manner is more likely to be a passive and unintentional behavior, it might be helpful to consider separating these into two items on the Faculty Experience Survey for use in future studies. Another change that could be made to the survey would be to ask about experience of behaviors within a certain time period. This may eliminate the effects of longevity in academia on examination of group differences and allow more differences based on personal characteristics to be seen.

Statistical Analyses

In completing the factor analyses for the data collected in this study, it was assumed that the assumption of normality would not be met, which could affect the power of the resulting factor solution (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005). However, the large sample size in this study lent power to the analyses by increasing the ability to detect real differences in the data, which translates into reduced chances of committing Type II errors. Additionally, factor loadings for the three-factor solutions for both the frequency of occurrence and level of upset data were all higher than the recommended cutoff of .3 for a sample of 300 or more, indicating significance at the $\alpha = .01$ level (Field, 2009). Utilizing a low alpha level in statistical analyses reduces the

chances of committing Type I errors, which occur when statistical differences are detected that are not accurate. This control over Type I and Type II errors in the current study provides support for strong statistical power. Finally, scale reliability scores indicating internal consistency of the items on each factor were all higher than the commonly used cut-off value of .7 (Field, 2009), offering additional evidence for the strength of the two resulting factor structures.

When examining statistical assumptions of each of the three behavior scales for use in determining group differences in this sample, it was discovered that the Direct Incivility and Aggressive, Threatening Behavior scales did not meet the assumption of normality. It was decided that the Direct Incivility scale was close enough to normal not to affect significantly the results of the analyses based on Field's (2009) and Glass and Hopkins' (1996) assertions that error rates are well-controlled by the F statistic, especially when the sample size is large. However, it is still possible that because the Direct Incivility variable was significantly positively skewed and leptokurtic, that the power to detect group differences was limited, affecting the results of the factorial ANOVAs conducted.

Because of the large positive skew and leptokurtosis of the Aggressive, Threatening Behavior scale due to the large number of participants who reported never having experienced these behaviors, it was decided to conduct several Pearson's chi-square tests, which are non-parametric and do not assume normality. Although this allowed for group differences still to be examined based on this variable, this eliminated the ability to detect multivariate relationships between groups. Several univariate relationships were discovered in these analyses, but it is not known if faculty members experience even more aggressive, threatening behaviors when they represent more than one academic characteristic, such as holding a doctorate, being tenured, and

having taught for six to 11 years. This multivariate information could offer a different

perspective on whether experience level or more specific factors affect a faculty member's

likelihood of experiencing aggressive, threatening behaviors.

Regarding other statistical assumptions, the assumption of homogeneity of variance was

violated, as indicated by significant Levene's tests for four of the six factorial ANOVAs

conducted. According to Everitt (1996) and Hinkle et al. (2003), the ANOVA F-statistic is

robust to violations of this assumption in large samples and when group sizes are nearly equal.

Therefore, results of the ANOVAs were interpreted without any additional corrections being

made. However, violation of this assumption may have limited the ability of group differences

to be detected in this sample, particularly for specific independent variables with unequal

majority and minority group sizes.

Finally, although an effort was made to make levels of independent variables equal by

combining groups to form overall minority categories, these groups still included fewer

participants than majority groups. In some instances where the difference in group sizes were

larger, such as with ethnicity, disability status, and sexual orientation, actual group differences

may not have been able to be detected. This may have also been a problem in detecting

differences in geographic region since certain regions were underrepresented in comparison to

others. Future studies should attempt to obtain equal group sizes in order to maximize the ability

to detect group differences.

Conclusions

The findings of this study are important for providing evidence of the occurrence of

various types of interpersonal mistreatment in the student–professor relationship. More

specifically, the findings of this study provide support for the hypothesis that bullying,

cyberbullying, uncivil, and sexual harassment behaviors are overlapping rather than separate constructs. The position of these behaviors on a spectrum of interpersonal mistreatment ranging from the most common and least upsetting to the least common and most upsetting behaviors provides clues as to how behaviors could escalate to more serious levels if left unaddressed. It is hoped that these findings will draw attention to the importance of protecting faculty members from mistreatment through development of stricter campus conduct policies and enforcement of these policies. This need for protection is further supported by how upsetting these behaviors were perceived to be by faculty members in this sample, suggesting the likelihood of faculty members suffering personal and professional consequences as a result of experiencing these behaviors.

This study also sought to identify faculty members who may be targeted for interpersonal mistreatment by students due to personal, academic, or institutional characteristics. Geographic region was a strong factor in the experience of poor student behaviors and aggressive, threatening behaviors, with faculty members in the Midwest and Great Plains regions reporting experiencing more of these behaviors. Direct incivility was the only type of behavior to be influenced by personal characteristics, with faculty members 60 years old and over and representing minority sexual orientations experiencing more of these behaviors than heterosexuals and sexual minorities in other age groups. Finally, aggressive, threatening behaviors were encountered more by faculty members who had more experience as indicated by having taught longer, being tenured, having a doctoral degree, and being in positions of higher academic rank.

In response to these findings, it is suggested that college campuses address interpersonal mistreatment in several ways. First, faculty members need to be willing to set firm expectations

for classroom conduct and educate students about appropriate classroom behaviors. This education should also take place through campus-wide programming. Also, finding creative ways to re-engage students in classroom learning will serve as a means for reducing interpersonal mistreatment. When mistreatment does occur, faculty members need to avoid reacting in uncivil ways themselves, which could prolong negative exchanges with students and contribute to a hostile environment. Finally, faculty members need to report continued or severe mistreatment to appropriate campus officials, such as a department chairperson, the dean of students, campus police, and/or the campus threat assessment team. Furthermore, campus administrators need to have policies in place against the mistreatment of faculty members and take reports of such mistreatment seriously in order to prevent potential violence.

REFERENCES

Agervold, M. (2007). Bullying at work: A discussion of definitions and prevalence, based on an empirical study. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 48,* 161-172. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9450.2007.00585.x

American Psychological Association, Violence Directed Against K-12 Teachers Task Force. (2011). *Violence against teachers: A silent national crisis.* Retrieved December 3, 2011, from http://www.apa.org/ed/schools/cpse/activities/violence-against.aspx

Andersen, P. A., Andersen, J. F., & Mayton, S. M. (1985). The development of nonverbal communication in the classroom: Teachers' perceptions of students in grades K-12. *Western Journal of Communication, 49,* 188-203. doi:10.1080/10570318509374194

Andersson, L. M., & Pearson, C. M. (1999). Tit for tat? The spiraling effect of incivility in the workplace. *Academy of Management Review, 24,* 452-471. doi:10.2307/259136

Anseel, F., Lievens, F., Schollaert, E., & Choragwicka, B. (2010). Response rates in organizational science, 1995–2008: A meta-analytic review and guidelines for survey researchers. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 25,* 335-349. doi:10.1007/s10869-010-9157-6

Applied Risk Management (2008, June). Campus violence prevention and response: Best practices for Massachusetts higher education. Retrieved from http://www.mass.edu/library/Reports/CampusViolencePreventionAndResponse.pdf

Barrientos, J. (2010, January 16). Officials highlight growing dangers of cyber bullying. *The Bakersfield Californian*. Retrieved from http://www.bakersfieldcalifornian.com/local/x113240062/Officials-highlight-growing-dangers-of-cyber-bullying

Bartlett, J. E., II, Kotrlik, J. W., & Higgins, C. (2001). Organizational research: Determining appropriate sample size for survey research. *Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal, 19*(1), 43-50.

Benson, D. J., & Thomson, G. E. (1982). Sexual harassment on a university campus: The confluence of authority relations, sexual interest and gender stratification. *Social Problems, 29,* 236-251. doi:10.1525/sp.1982.29.3.03a00030

Benson, K. A. (1984). Comment on Crocker's "An analysis of university definitions of sexual harassment." *Signs, 9,* 516-519. doi:10.1086/494083

Beran, T. N. (2006). A construct validity study of bullying. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 52,* 241-250.

Berdahl, J. L., & Moore, C. (2006). Workplace harassment: Double jeopardy for minority women. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91,* 426-436. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.2.426

Blau, G., & Andersson, L. (2005). Testing a measure of instigated workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 78,* 595-614. doi:10.1348/096317905x26822

Bond, L., Wolfe, S., Tollit, M., Butler, H., & Patton, G. (2007). A comparison of the Gatehouse Bullying Scale and the Peer Relations Questionnaire for students in secondary school. *Journal of School Health, 77,* 75-79. doi:10.1111/j.1746-1561.2007.00170.x

Bulach, C., Fulbright, J. P., & Williams, R. (2003). Bullying behavior: What is the potential for violence at your school? *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 30,* 156-164.

Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor. (n.d.). *Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2010-11 Edition.* Retrieved March 27, 2010, from http://www.bls. gov/oco/ocos066.htm

Campbell, M. A. (2005). Cyber bullying: An old problem in a new guise? *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 15,* 68-76. doi:10.1375/ajgc.15.1.68

Chapell, M., Casey, D., De la Cruz, C., Ferrell, J., Forman, J., Lipkin, R., . . . Whittaker, S. (2004). Bullying in college by students and teachers. *Adolescence, 39,* 53-64.

Chapell, M. S., Hasselman, S. L., Kitchin, T., Lomon, S. N., MacIver, K. W., & Sarullo, P. L. (2006). Bullying in elementary school, high school, and college. *Adolescence, 41,* 633-648.

Chapman, D. W. (1981). A model of student college choice. *Journal of Higher Education, 52,* 490-505. doi:10.2307/1981837

Clark, C. M. (2008a). The dance of incivility in nursing education as described by nursing faculty and students. *Advances in Nursing Science, 31*(4)*,* E37-E54.

Clark, C. M. (2008b). Faculty and student assessment of and experience with incivility in nursing education. *Journal of Nursing Education, 47,* 458-465. doi:10.3928/01484834-20081001-03

Clark, C. M., & Springer, P. J. (2007). Thoughts on incivility: Student and faculty perceptions of uncivil behavior in nursing education. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 28,* 93-97.

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112,* 155-159. doi:10.1037//0033-2909.112.1.155

Cook-Daniels, L. (1997). Lesbian, gay male, bisexual and transgendered elders: Elder abuse and neglect issues. *The Haworth Maltreatment & Trauma Press, 9,* 35-49.

Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J. (2009). Patterns and profiles of response to incivility in the

workplace. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 14,* 272-288.

doi:10.1037/a0014934

deLara, E. W. (2008). Developing a philosophy about bullying and sexual harassment: Cognitive

coping strategies among high school students. *Journal of School Violence, 7*(4), 72-96.

doi:10.1080/15388220801973862

Depue, R. L., & Depue, J. M. (2008). To dream, perchance to kill. In *Campus violence*

prevention and response: Best practices for Massachusetts higher education (Appendix

E: Supplementary articles from research team). Retrieved from

http://www.mass.edu/library/Reports/CampusViolencePreventionAndResponse.pdf

DeSouza, E. R. (2008). Workplace incivility, sexual harassment, and racial micro-aggression:

The interface of three literatures. In M. A. Paludi (Ed.), *The psychology of women at*

work: Challenges and solutions for our female workforce, Vol 2: Obstacles and the

identity juggle (pp. 65-84). Westport, CT: Praeger.

DeSouza, E. R. (2011). Frequency rates and correlates of contrapower harassment in higher

education. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26,* 158-188.

doi:10.1177/0886260510362878

DeSouza, E., & Fansler, A. G. (2003). Contrapower sexual harassment: A survey of students and

faculty members. *Sex Roles, 48,* 519-542. doi:10.1023/a:1023527329364

Dickerson, D. (2005). Cyberbullies on campus. *University of Toledo Law Review, 1,* 51-74.

Duarte, C., & Bodfield, R. (2009, September 27). Disrespect breeds assaults, harassment in local schools: Hundreds of incidents noted in Star analysis; incivility widespread. *Arizona Daily Star*. Retrieved from http://azstarnet.com/news/local/education/disrespect-breeds-assaults-harassment-in-local-schools/article_97e52c89-c62e-520d-abca-4fa3b86ff8fa.html

Edwards, S. L., & O'Connell, C. F. (2007). Exploring bullying: Implications for nurse educators. *Nurse Education in Practice, 7,* 26-35. doi:10.1016/j.nepr.2006.03.004

Elinoff, M. J., Chafouleas, S. M., & Sassu, K. A. (2004). Bullying: Considerations for defining and intervening in school settings. *Psychology in the Schools, 41,* 887-897. doi:10.1002/pits.20045

Everitt, B. S. (1996). *Making sense of statistics in psychology: A second-level course.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Felblinger, D. M. (2008). Incivility and bullying in the workplace and nurses' shame responses. *Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic, and Neonatal Nursing, 37,* 234-242. doi:10.1111/j.1552-6909.2008.00263

Feldmann, L. J. (2001). Classroom civility is another of our instructor responsibilities. *College Teaching, 49,* 137-140.

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

Finn, J. (2004). A survey of online harassment at a university campus. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19,* 468-483. doi:10.1177/0886260503262083

Fitzgerald, L. F., Weitzman, L. M., Gold, Y., & Ormerod, M. (1988). Academic harassment: Sex and denial in scholarly garb. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12,* 329-340. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1988.tb00947.x

Fogg, P. (2008). Academic bullies. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 55*(3), B10-B13.

Frisen, A., Jonsson, A.-K., & Persson, C. (2007). Adolescents' perception of bullying: Who is the victim? Who is the bully? What can be done to stop bullying? *Adolescence, 42,* 749-761.

Gilley, W. F., & Uhlig, G. E. (1993). Factor analysis and ordinal data. *Education, 114,* 258-264.

Glass, G. V., & Hopkins, K. D. (1996). *Statistical methods in education and psychology* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Gradinger, P., Strohmeier, D., & Spiel, C. (2009). Traditional bullying and cyberbullying: Identification of risk groups for adjustment problems. *Journal of Psychology, 217,* 205-213. doi:10.1027/0044-3409.217.4.205

Grauerholz, E. (1989). Sexual harassment of women professors by students: Exploring the dynamics of power, authority, and gender in a university setting. *Sex Roles, 21,* 789-801. doi:10.1007/bf00289809

Gruber, J. (2003). Sexual harassment in the public sector. In M. Paludi & C. A. Paludi, Jr. (Eds.), *Academic and workplace sexual harassment: A handbook of cultural, social science, management, and legal perspectives* (pp. 49-75). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Gruber, J. E., & Fineran, S. (2008). Comparing the impact of bullying and sexual harassment victimization on the mental and physical health of adolescents. *Sex Roles, 59,* 1-13. doi:10.1007/s11199-008-9431-5

Gunnarsdottir, H. K., Sveinsdottir, H., Bernburg, J. G., Fridriksdottir, H., & Tomasson, K. (2006). Lifestyle, harassment at work and self-assessed health of female flight attendants, nurses and teachers. *Work, 27,* 165-172.

Gutek, B. A., & Morasch, B. (1982). Sex-ratios, sex-role spillover, and sexual harassment of women at work. *Journal of Social Issues, 38*(4), 55-74. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1982.tb01910.x

Harper, D. (2001). Bully. *Online etymology dictionary*. Retrieved from http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?term=bully

Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (2003). *Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Ilies, R., Hauserman, N., Schwochau, S., & Stibal, J. (2003). Reported incidence rates of work-related sexual harassment in the United States: Using meta-analysis to explain reported rate disparities. *Personnel Psychology, 56,* 607-631. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2003.tb00752.x

James, J. (1981). Sexual harassment. *Public Personnel Management, 10,* 402-407.

Jenson, J. M. (2007). Aggression and violence in the United States: Reflections on the Virginia Tech shootings. *Social Work Research, 31,* 131-134. doi:10.1093/swr31.3.131

Jones, C. (2006). Drawing boundaries: Exploring the relationship between sexual harassment, gender and bullying. *Women's Studies International Forum, 29,* 147-158. doi:10.1016/j.wsif.2006.03.001

Katzer, C., Fetchenhauer, D., & Belschak, F. (2009). Cyberbullying: Who are the victims? A comparison of victimization in internet chatrooms and victimization in school. *Journal of Media Psychology: Theories, Methods, and Applications, 21,* 25-36. doi:10.1027/1864-1105.21.1.25

Kauffman, J. M., & Burbach, H. J. (1997). On creating a climate of classroom civility. *Phi Delta Kappan, 79,* 320-325.

Kean, R. (2006). Understanding the lives of older gay people. *Nursing Older People, 18*(8), 31-36.

Knapp, T. R. (1990). Treating ordinal scales as interval scales: An attempt to resolve the controversy. *Nursing Research, 39,* 121-123. doi:10.1097/00006199-199003000-00019

Kolanko, K. M., Clark, C., Heinrich, K. T., Olive, D., Serembus, J. F., & Sifford, K. S. (2006). Academic dishonesty, bullying, incivility, and violence: Difficult challenges facing nurse educators. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 27,* 34-43.

Korte, R. F. (2007). A review of social identity theory with implications for training and development. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 31,* 166-180. doi:10.1108/03090590710739250

Labovitz, S. (1967). Some observations on measurement and statistics. *Social Forces, 46,* 151-160. doi:10.2307/2574595

Lampman, C., Phelps, A., Bancroft, S., & Beneke, M. (2009). Contrapower harassment in academia: A survey of faculty experience with student incivility, bullying, and sexual attention. *Sex Roles, 60,* 331-346. doi:10.1007/s11199-008-9560-x

Land, D. J. (2000). *Teasing, bullying, and sexual harassment among adolescents* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.

Lee, D. (2005). Students and managers behaving badly: An exploratory analysis of the vulnerability of feminist academics in anti-feminist, market-driven UK higher education. *Women's Studies International Forum, 28,* 195-208. doi:10.1016/j.wsif.2005.04.007

Lee, V. E., Croninger, R. G., Linn, E., & Chen, X. (1996). The culture of sexual harassment in secondary schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 33,* 383-417. doi:10.2307/1163290

Lenckus, D. (2002). College shooting underscores risks. *Business Insurance, 36*(44), 3-4.

Lewis, D. (2004). Bullying at work: The impact of shame among university and college lecturers. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 32,* 281-299. doi:10.1080/03069880410001723521

Leymann, H. (1996). The content and development of mobbing at work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5,* 165-184. doi:10.1080/13594329608414853

Li, Q. (2006). Cyberbullying in schools: A research of gender differences. *School Psychology International, 27,* 157-170. doi:10.1177/0143034306064547

Lim, S., & Cortina, L. M. (2005). Interpersonal mistreatment in the workplace: The interface and impact of general incivility and sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90,* 483-496. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.3.483

Lim, S., Cortina, L. M., & Magley, V. J. (2008). Personal and workgroup incivility: Impact on work and health outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93,* 95-107. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.95

Loredo, C., Reid, A., & Deaux, K. (1995). Judgments and definitions of sexual harassment by high school students. *Sex Roles, 32,* 29-45. doi:10.1007/bf01544756

Lott, B., Reilly, M. E., & Howard, D. R. (1982). Sexual assault and harassment: A campus community case study. *Signs, 8,* 296-319. doi:10.1086/493964

Love, C. D., & MacDonald, C. D. (2010, October). *The link between college student classroom behaviors and mental health*. Poster presented at the American College Counseling Association Conference, St. Louis, MO.

Love, C. D., MacDonald, C. D., & Roberts-Pittman, B. J. (2010, August). *Bullying in college: A comparison of two measurement methods.* Poster presented at the annual American Psychological Association Convention, San Diego, CA.

Lundberg-Love, P., & Marmion, S. (2003). Sexual harassment in the private sector. In M. Paludi & C. A. Paludi, Jr. (Eds.), *Academic and workplace sexual harassment: A handbook of cultural, social science, management, and legal perspectives* (pp. 77-101). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Luparell, S. (2004). Faculty encounters with uncivil nursing students: An overview. *Journal of Professional Nursing, 20,* 59-67. doi:10.1016/j.profnurs.2003.12.007

Luparell, S. (2007). The effects of student incivility on nursing faculty. *Journal of Nursing Education, 46,* 15-19.

MacDonald, C. D., & Roberts-Pittman, B. J. (2009, March). *Bullying and cyberbullying experienced by diverse college students: A preliminary study.* Paper presented at the Great Lakes Counseling Conference, Muncie, Indiana.

Martin, R. J., & Hine, D. W. (2005). Development and validation of the Uncivil Workplace Behavior Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 10,* 477-490. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.10.4.477

Matchen, J., & DeSouza, E. (2000). The sexual harassment of faculty members by students. *Sex Roles, 42,* 295-306. doi:10.1023/a:1007099408885

Matthiesen, S. B., & Einarsen, S. (2007). Perpetrators and targets of bullying at work: Role stress and individual differences. *Violence and Victims, 22,* 735-753. doi:10.1891/088667007782793174

May, D. C., & Dunaway, R. G. (2000). Predictors of fear of criminal victimization at school among adolescents. *Sociological Spectrum, 20,* 149-168.

Mayer, M. J. (2010). Structural analysis of 1995-2005 School Crime Supplement datasets: Factors influencing students' fear, anxiety, and avoidant behaviors. *Journal of School Violence, 9,* 37-55. doi:10.1080/15388220903153496

McCormack, A. S. (1995). Revisiting sexual harassment of undergraduate women, 1989 and 1993. *Violence Against Women, 1,* 254-265. doi:10.1177/1077801295001003005

McDougall, L. (1999). A study of bullying in further education. *Pastoral Care in Education, 17*(2), 31-37. doi:10.1111/1468-0122.00125

McKay, R., Arnold, D. H., Fratzl, J., & Thomas, R. (2008). Workplace bullying in academia: A Canadian study. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 20,* 77-100. doi:10.1007/s10672-008-9073-3

McKinney, K. (1990). Sexual harassment of university faculty by colleagues and students. *Sex Roles, 23,* 421-438. doi:10.1007/bf00289230

McKinney, K. (1992). Contrapower sexual harassment: The effects of student sex and type of behavior on faculty perceptions. *Sex Roles, 27,* 627-643. doi:10.1007BF03187138

McMaster, L. E., Connolly, J., Pepler, D., & Craig, W. M. (2002). Peer to peer sexual harassment in early adolescence: A developmental perspective. *Development and Psychopathology, 14,* 91-105. doi:10.1017/s0954579402001050

Menesini, E., & Nocentini, A. (2009). Cyberbullying definition and measurement: Some critical considerations. *Journal of Psychology, 217,* 230-232. doi:10.1027/0044-3409.217.4.230

Mertler, C. A., & Vannatta, R. A. (2005). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods.* Glendale, CA: Pyrczak.

Mesch, G. S. (2009). Parental mediation, online activities, and cyberbullying. *CyberPsychology and Behavior, 12,* 387-393. doi:10.1089/cpb.2009.0068

Mikkelsen, E. G., & Einarsen, S. (2001). Bullying in Danish work-life: Prevalence and health correlates. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10,* 393-413. doi:10.1080/13594320143000816

Milam, A. C., Spitzmueller, C., & Penney, L. M. (2009). Investigating individual differences among targets of workplace incivility. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 14,* 58-69. doi:10.1037/a0012683

Miner-Rubino, K., & Cortina, L. M. (2007). Beyond targets: Consequences of vicarious exposure to misogyny at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92,* 1254-1269. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.5.1254

Morrissette, P. J. (2001). Reducing incivility in the university/college classroom. *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning, 5*(4). Retrieved from http://www. ucalgary.ca/~iejll/volume5/morrissette.html

Morrow, D. F. (2001). Older gays and lesbians: Surviving a generation of hate and violence. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services, 13,* 151-169. doi:10.1300/J041v13n01_11

Murnen, S. K., & Smolak, L. (2000). The experience of sexual harassment among grade-school students: Early socialization of female subordination? *Sex Roles, 43*, 1-17. doi:10.1023/a:1007007727370

National Center for Education Statistics. (2010). *Full-time instructional faculty in degree-granting institutions, by race/ethnicity, sex, and academic rank: Fall 2005, fall 2007, and fall 2009* [Data file]. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d10/tables/ dt10_260.asp

Nordstrom, C. R., Bartels, L. K., & Bucy, J. (2009). Predicting and curbing classroom incivility in higher education. *College Student Journal, 43,* 74-85.

Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys*. Oxford, England: Hemisphere.

Olweus, D. (1991). Bully/victim problems among schoolchildren: Basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program. In D. J. Pepler & K. H. Rubin (Eds.), *The development and treatment of childhood aggression* (pp. 411-448). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

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

Olweus, D. (1994). Annotation: Bullying at school: Basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 35,* 1171-1190. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.1994.tb01229.x

Pearson, C. M., Andersson, L. M., & Wegner, J. W. (2001). When workers flout convention: A study of workplace incivility. *Human Relations, 54,* 1387-1419. doi:10.1177/00187267015411001

Pellegrini, A. D. (2002). Bullying, victimization, and sexual harassment during the transition to middle school. *Educational Psychologist, 37,* 151-163. doi:10.1207/S15326985EP3703_2

Privitera, C., & Campbell, M. A. (2009). Cyberbullying: The new face of workplace bullying? *CyberPsychology and Behavior, 12,* 395-400. doi: 10.1089/cpb.2009.0025

Reigle, R. R. (2007). *The online bully in higher education*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED495686)

Reio, T. G., & Ghosh, R. (2009). Antecedents and outcomes of workplace incivility: Implications for human resource development research and practice. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 20,* 237-264. doi:10.1002/hrdq.20020

Richman, J. A., Rospenda, K. M., Nawyn, S. J., Flaherty, J. A., Fendrich, M., Drum, M. L., & Johnson, T. P. (1999). Sexual harassment and generalized workplace abuse among university employees: Prevalence and mental health correlates. *American Journal of Public Health, 89,* 358-363. doi:10.2105/ajph.89.3.358

Romi, S., & Freund, M. (1999). Teachers', students' and parents' attitudes towards disruptive behaviour problems in high school: A case study. *Educational Psychology, 19,* 53-70. doi:10.1080/0144341990190104

Rospenda, K. M., Richman, J. A., & Nawyn, S. J. (1998). Doing power: The confluence of gender, race, and class in contrapower sexual harassment. *Gender and Society, 12,* 40-60. doi:10.1177/089124398012001003

Rowland, M. L., & Srisukho, K. (2009). Dental students' and faculty members' perceptions of incivility in the classroom. *Journal of Dental Education, 73,* 119-126.

Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2008). *The social psychology of gender: How power and intimacy shape gender relations*. New York, NY: Guilford.

Rusby, J. C., Taylor, T. K., & Foster, E. M. (2007). A descriptive study of school discipline referrals in first grade. *Psychology in the Schools, 44,* 333-350. doi:10.1002/pits.20226

Salin, D. (2001). Prevalence and forms of bullying among business professionals: A comparison of two different strategies for measuring bullying. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10,* 425-441. doi:10.1080/13594320143000771

Saunders, P., Huynh, A., & Goodman-Delahunty, J. (2007). Defining workplace bullying behaviour professional lay definitions of workplace bullying. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 30,* 340-354. doi:10.1016/j.ijlp.2007.06.007

Schneider, B. E. (1987). Graduate women, sexual harassment, and university policy. *Journal of Higher Education, 58,* 46-65. doi:10.2307/1981390

Ševčíková, A., & Šmahel, D. (2009). Online harassment and cyberbullying in the Czech Republic: Comparison across age groups. *Journal of Psychology, 217,* 227-229. doi:10.1027/0044-3409.217.4.227

Sheehan, K. (2001). E-mail survey response rates: A review. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 6*(2). Retrieved from http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol6/issue2/sheehan.html

Shute, R., Owens, L., & Slee, P. (2008). Everyday victimization of adolescent girls by boys: Sexual harassment, bullying or aggression? *Sex Roles, 58,* 477-489. doi:10.1007/s11199-007-9363-5

Sigler, K., Burnett, A., & Child, J. T. (2008). A regional analysis of assertiveness. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 37,* 89-104. doi:10.1080/17475750802533364

Skiba, R., Simmons, A. B., Peterson, R., McKelvey, J., Forde, S., & Gallini, S. (2004). Beyond guns, drugs and gangs: The structure of student perceptions of school safety. *Journal of School Violence, 3*(2/3), 149-171. doi:10.1300/J202v03n02_09

Skogstad, A., Einarsen, S., Torsheim, T., Aasland, M. S., & Hetland, H. (2007). The destructiveness of laissez-faire leadership behavior. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 12,* 80-92. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.12.1.80

Smith, L. (2007). Major shootings on American college campuses. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 53*(34), A19-A19.

Smith, R. G., & Gross, A. M. (2006). Bullying: Prevalence and the effect of age and gender. *Child and Family Behavior Therapy, 28*(4), 13-37. doi:10.1300/J019v28n04_02

Strauss, S. (2003). Sexual harassment in K-12. In M. Paludi & C. A. Paludi, Jr. (Eds.), *Academic and workplace sexual harassment: A handbook of cultural, social science, management, and legal perspectives* (pp. 105-145). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Summers, J. J., Bergin, D. A., & Cole, J. S. (2009). Examining the relationships among collaborative learning, autonomy support, and student incivility in undergraduate classrooms. *Learning and Individual Differences, 19,* 293-298. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2008.09.006

Taylor, M. (2010). Teaching Generation NeXt: A pedagogy for today's learners. In The Higher Learning Commission (Ed.), *A collection of papers on self-study and institutional improvement* (26th ed., pp. 192-196). Retrieved December 3, 2011, from http://www.taylorprograms.com/images/Teaching_Gen_NeXt.pdf

Theriot, M. T., Dulmus, C. N., Sowers, K. M., & Johnson, T. K. (2005). Factors relating to self-identification among bullying victims. *Children and Youth Services Review, 27,* 979-994. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2004.12.024

Twemlow, S. W. (2008). Assessing adolescents who threaten homicide in schools: A recent update. *Clinical Social Work Journal, 36,* 127-129. doi:10.1007/s10615-007-0100-x

Twemlow, S. W., & Fonagy, P. (2005). The prevalence of teachers who bully students in schools with differing levels of behavioral problems. *The American Journal of Psychiatry, 162,* 2387-2389. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.162.12.2387

Twemlow, S. W., Fonagy, P., Sacco, F. C., & Brethour, J. R., Jr. (2006). Teachers who bully

students: A hidden trauma. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 52,* 187-198.

doi:10.1177/0020764006067234

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). Indicators of

school crime and safety: 2009. Retrieved April 9, 2010, from

http://nces.ed.gov/programs/ crimeindicators/crimeindicators2009/

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2009). Facts about sexual harassment.

Retrieved March 18, 2011, from http://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/publications/fs-sex.cfm

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2010). *Sexual harassment charges, EEOC &*

FEPAs combined: FY 1997 – FY 2010 [Data file]. Retrieved March 18, 2011, from

http://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/statistics/enforcement/sexual_harassment.cfm

University of Arizona and the Arizona Board of Regents. (2010). Disruptive and threatening

student behavior: Guidelines for faculty and staff. Retrieved from

http://deanofstudents.arizona.edu/sites/deanofstudents.arizona.edu/files/disruptive_threat

_bklt_Web_0.pdf

Wang, M., & Mahoney, B. (1991). Scales and measurements revisited. *Health Values, 15,* 52-56.

Wang, S., Yu, M., Wang, C., & Huang, C. (1999). Bridging the gap between the pros and cons in

treating ordinal scales as interval scales from an analysis point of view. *Nursing*

Research, 48, 226-229. doi:10.1097/00006199-1999070000-00006

White, J. W., & Koss, M. P. (1991). Courtship violence: Incidence in a national sample of higher

education students. *Violence and Victims, 6,* 247-256.

Whitted, K. S., & Dupper, D. R. (2008). Do teachers bully students? Findings from a survey of students in an alternative education setting. *Education and Urban Society, 40,* 329-341. doi:10.11770013134507304487

Willness, C. R., Steel, P., & Lee, K. (2007). A meta-analysis of the antecedents and consequences of workplace sexual harassment. *Personnel Psychology, 60,* 127-162. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00067.x

Witkowska, E. (2005). *Sexual harassment in schools: Prevalence, structure and perceptions.* Available from http://hdl.handle.net/2077/4349

Wolak, J., Mitchell, K. J., & Finkelhor, D. (2007). Does online harassment constitute bullying? An exploration of online harassment by known peers and online-only contacts. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 41*(6), S51-58. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.08.019

Wolfgang, M. E., & Ferracuti, F. (1967). *The subculture of violence.* New York, NY: Tavistock.

APPENDIX A: FACULTY EXPERIENCE SURVEY

The following questions will allow you to tell us more about your experiences of being mistreated by students at your current institution. Please answer openly and truthfully.

1)   Please treat the rating points (0-4) on the following scales as equally spaced.

Since you have been teaching in your current position...

   a) How often have you been aware that a student or students directed each of the following behaviors toward you?

Never				Very Frequently
0	1	2	3	4

   b) If you have experienced or were to experience these behaviors, how upset would you be by the experience?

Not at all upset				Very upset
0	1	2	3	4

1. Made hostile or threatening verbal remarks, including yelling or swearing at you
2. Challenged your authority or questioned your credentials to teach a course
3. Violated your personal space
4. Took credit for your work or ideas
5. Harassed or threatened you through a social networking site (e.g., MySpace, Facebook, Twitter)
6. Made belittling, discrediting, or demeaning remarks about or toward you
7. Complained about constructive feedback from you
8. Interrupted class by purposely making noises while you were speaking, arriving late or leaving early in a rude or distracting way
9. Stared at you inappropriately
10. Made unwarranted criticisms of your performance
11. Sent harassing or threatening text messages to you
12. Lied to you
13. Made inappropriate comments or threats regarding your appearance, age, gender, sexual orientation, disability, personal values or beliefs, etc.
14. Cheated on papers, assignments, exams, or quizzes
15. Flirted with you or asked you out
16. Sent harassing or threatening e-mails to you

17. Gossiped or spread malicious rumors about you
18. Posted negative or embarrassing images or information about you on a website, including during an on-line course
19. Applied excessive pressure or coercion to change your stance (e.g., change a grade, give make-up exam, provide extension)
20. Failed to keep scheduled appointments
21. Sent harassing or threatening instant messages to you
22. Made fun of you in front of others
23. Turned in a late assignment without prior approval
24. Maliciously damaged or stole your property
25. Continually rolled his/her eyes, frowned, sighed, gave dirty looks, or otherwise showed disdain while you were teaching
26. Used you as the subject of lies or accusations
27. Impersonated you on-line and either posted or sent inappropriate information
28. Ignored you when asking a question or trying to speak to him or her
29. Invaded your home life (e.g., called you at home, showed up at your house uninvited)
30. Requested that you make exams or assignments easier
31. Created tension in class by dominating discussions
32. Posted your information or picture on a voting website that allows you to be voted the ugliest, fattest, dumbest, etc. (e.g., rateyourprofessor.com)
33. Touched you in an aggressive manner
34. Talked amongst themselves in a distracting way during class
35. Made sexist comments or jokes
36. Sexually assaulted you (rape or attempted rape)
37. Bypassed the hierarchy for complaints
38. Used physical violence against you
39. Engaged in a non-class activity during class (e.g., read a newspaper, checked e-mail, answered a cell phone or text-messaged, slept)
40. Propositioned you for a sexual encounter
41. Failed to meet assignment requirements
42. Ignored your legitimate requests (insubordination)
43. Made racist comments or jokes
44. Posted a lewd or unprofessional response to an on-line discussion forum for class designed to incite negative reactions in you or other students
45. Made hostile or threatening phone calls to you
46. Failed to read the syllabus for your class
47. Inappropriately patted, hugged, stroked, kissed, fondled, or pinched you
48. Reacted hostilely to trivial errors you may have made
49. Showed lack of respect and intolerance for cultural, ethnic, and class differences

2) Please feel free to share any other experiences of being bullied, harassed, or mistreated by students here.

3) What gender are you?

     0   Male   0   Female

4) How old are you? _____

5) What is your family background? Mark all that apply.
      0   Foreign National, what country? _____
      0   White (Anglo)
      0   Hispanic (Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or Latin American)
      0   Black, African American
      0   Native American (American Indian)
      0   Middle Eastern
      0   Asian
      0   Pacific Islander
      0   Other _____

6) Are you physically disabled?
      0   Yes   0   No

7) What is your sexual orientation?
      0   Heterosexual
      0   Bisexual
      0   Gay/Lesbian
      0   Other

8) What is your highest level of education?
      0   Bachelor's Degree
      0   Master's Degree
      0   Doctoral Degree
      0   Other _____

9) What is your current position?
      0   Adjunct Professor
      0   Instructor/Lecturer
      0   Assistant Professor
      0   Associate Professor
      0   Full Professor
      0   Other _____

10) What best describes your tenure status in your current position?
      0   Tenured
      0   Tenure-track
      0   Non tenure-track

11) How long have you been teaching at your current institution (in years)? _____

12) In which discipline do you teach at your current institution? (Choose the option that best applies)
      0   Agriculture/ Natural Resources

0   Arts
0   Applied Sciences (i.e., engineering, technology, architecture)
0   Business
0   Communications
0   Education
0   Health Sciences (i.e., nursing, medicine)
0   Humanities
0   Physical Sciences (i.e., chemistry, physics, biology, mathematics)
0   Social and Behavioral Sciences
0   Other _____

13) Which best describes the institution at which you are currently employed?
0   Public college or university
0   Private college or university
0   Community college

14) In which state are you currently employed? _____

APPENDIX B: DESCRIPTION OF PILOT STUDY

Methods

Participants

A pilot study was conducted by Love and MacDonald (2010) on a sample of 107 faculty members at a midsize Midwestern university. The sample was 56% ($n = 60$) female and 43% ($n = 46$) male; 1% ($n = 1$) of the sample did not report gender. The sample was also predominantly (86%, $n = 92$) White, predominantly able-bodied (95%, $n = 102$), and predominantly heterosexual (92%, $n = 97$). One percent ($n = 1$) of the sample did not report sexual orientation. Participants' ages ranged from 29 to 72 with an average age of 50.24 ($SD = 9.77$), although only 78 participants reported their ages. Seventy-two percent ($n = 76$) of the faculty members held a doctoral degree, and 28% ($n = 30$) held other degrees. One percent ($n = 1$) of the sample did not report highest level of education. About 51% ($n = 54$) of the sample held untenured positions at the university, and 49% ($n = 52$) were tenured. Faculty members reported teaching between .5 and 37.0 years, with an average of 11.73 years of teaching experience ($SD = 9.63$). Four participants (4%) did not report how long they had been teaching in their current positions (Love & MacDonald, 2010).

Measure

Participants were invited via e-mail and an announcement posted on the faculty portal of the university website to complete an anonymous web survey. Participants were asked to complete a questionnaire reporting how often they had experienced each of a series of 50

specific bullying, cyberbullying, uncivil, and sexually harassing behaviors from a student or students since they had been teaching in their current positions. For each behavior, participants rated frequency of occurrence on a 4-point scale ranging from *never* to *very often*. Additionally, for each behavior that participants reported having experienced at least once, they were also asked how upset they were by the behavior. These items were answered using a 4-point scale ranging from *not at all upset* to *very upset*. Demographic information was also collected.

Results

Factor Analysis

Love and MacDonald (2010) conducted a principle axis factor analysis with oblique promax rotation on the frequency of the 50 behaviors included on the Faculty Experience Survey. Forty-five of the 50 behaviors loaded onto four factors. The first factor included 21 items and explained 31.6% of the variance. This factor was labeled Direct Incivility and Cronbach's alpha for the scale was .94. The second factor contained 10 items, explained 7.1% of the variance, and included Poor Student Behaviors. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .90. Factor 3 was made up of eight items and explained 5% of the variance. This scale was labeled Illegal, Threatening Behaviors and had a Cronbach's alpha of .77. The final factor included six items and explained 4.8% of the variance. The factor represented Cyberbullying Behaviors and had a Cronbach's alpha of .82. Together the four factors explained 48.5% of the total variance. All of the scales showed good internal consistency (see Table 15 for items by factor and factor loadings). Due to low reports of how upsetting the behaviors were to the participants, a factor analysis could not be conducted on these data (Love & MacDonald, 2010). Therefore, this set of questions was rewritten for the current study so all participants could respond based on how upset they were or how upset they believe they would be by each behavior.

Table 15

Factor Loadings for Faculty Experience Survey Frequency Items Based on the Promax-Rotated Four-Factor Solution

			Factor		
	Item	1	2	3	4
6.	Made belittling, discrediting, or demeaning remarks about or toward you	**.82**	.45	.39	.38
13.	Made inappropriate comments or threats regarding your appearance, age, gender, sexual orientation, disability, personal values or beliefs, etc.	**.78**	.42	.59	.42
2.	Challenged your authority or questioned your credentials	**.77**	.48	.40	.32
17.	Gossiped or spread malicious rumors about you	**.77**	.44	.31	.38
10.	Made unwarranted criticisms of your performance	**.77**	.42	.39	.35
42.	Ignored your legitimate requests (insubordination)	**.74**	.65	.34	.32
7.	Complained about constructive feedback	**.69**	.52	.16	.26
37.	Bypassed the hierarchy for complaints	**.68**	.43	.44	.13
26.	Used you as the subject of lies or accusations	**.67**	.40	.28	.36
25.	Continually showed disdain while you were teaching	**.66**	.62	.12	.26
50.	Showed lack of respect and intolerance for cultural, ethnic, and class differences	**.66**	.60	.19	.27
8.	Interrupted class by purposely making noises, arriving late or leaving early in a rude or distracting way	**.65**	.47	.22	.27
43.	Made racist comments or jokes	**.63**	.53	.39	.32
19.	Applied excessive pressure to change your stance	**.61**	.55	.36	.28
9.	Stared at you	**.55**	.41	.29	.28
3.	Violated your personal space	**.54**	.36	.49	.22
35.	Made sexist comments or jokes	**.54**	.51	.32	.36
49.	Punished trivial errors you may have made	**.54**	.25	.24	.09
22.	Made fun of you in front of others	**.52**	.19	.32	.31
15.	Flirted with you or asked you out	**.44**	.38	.43	.20
44.	Posted a lewd or unprofessional response to an on-line discussion designed to incite negative reactions in you or other students	**.26**	.24	.23	.16

(continued)

Table 15 (continued)

Factor Loadings for Faculty Experience Survey Frequency Items Based on the Promax-Rotated Four-Factor Solution

		Factor			
	Item	1	2	3	4
41.	Failed to meet assignment requirements	.41	**.79**	.21	.06
46.	Failed to read the syllabus for your class	.36	**.76**	.29	.16
39.	Engaged in a non-class activity during class	.47	**.74**	.27	.27
20.	Failed to keep scheduled appointments	.51	**.71**	.30	.13
14.	Cheated on papers, assignments, exams, or quizzes	.38	**.69**	.41	.18
23.	Turned in a late assignment without prior approval	.33	**.68**	.18	.01
34.	Talked amongst themselves in a distracting way during class	.43	**.66**	.17	.19
31.	Created tension in class by dominating discussion	.49	**.63**	.20	.24
30.	Requested you make exams or assignments easier	.48	**.61**	.19	.33
12.	Lied to you	.58	**.60**	.37	.21
16.	Sent harassing or threatening e-mails to you	.41	.26	**.69**	.28
4.	Took credit for your work or ideas	.40	.21	**.66**	.16
29.	Invaded your home life	.44	.21	**.60**	.12
1.	Made hostile or threatening verbal remarks	.56	.37	**.58**	.17
45.	Made hostile or threatening phone calls to you	.51	.32	**.50**	.15
24.	Maliciously damaged or stole your property	.17	.18	**.38**	.20
28.	Ignored you when asking a question or trying to speak to him or her	.36	.38	**.37**	.23
47.	Inappropriately patted, hugged, stroked, kissed, fondled, or pinched you	.03	.14	**.33**	.02
27.	Impersonated you on-line and either posted or sent inappropriate information	.18	.12	.00	**.89**
21.	Sent harassing or threatening instant messages to you	.30	.12	.28	**.74**
33.	Touched you in an aggressive manner	.33	.21	.38	**.57**
18.	Posted negative or embarrassing images or information about you on a website	.47	.36	.04	**.54**
11.	Sent harassing or threatening text messages to you	.35	.09	.36	**.53**
5.	Harassed or threatened you through a social networking site	.45	.20	.22	**.46**

Note. Boldface indicates highest factor loadings.

Regarding the five items that did not load on any of the factors, it is suspected that the items measuring frequency of having been sexually assaulted and physically attacked did not load due to the very low rate of reported occurrence (1% and 2%, respectively). Additionally, the item "made a sexual proposition that included or strongly implied promises of rewards for complying or punishment for refusing" was very highly correlated with the item "propositioned you for a sexual encounter" ($r = .92, p < .001$). Therefore, this item was removed from the survey for all future administrations. Last, it was unclear why the item measuring frequency of a student posting participants' information on a voting website did not load on any identified factors. There was adequate variability in participant responses and this item was not very highly correlated with any other item. Therefore, this item was retained in the survey for future analyses.

Prevalence Rates

Poor student behaviors were the most frequently occurring behaviors included in the survey, with 99% of faculty members in the sample reporting that they had experienced at least one of these behaviors (Love & MacDonald, 2010). Uncivil behaviors directed at faculty occurred at wide-ranging rates, with 8% to 73% of faculty experiencing these behaviors at least once. Almost 94% of the sample reported experiencing at least one of these behaviors. Illegal or threatening behaviors were less common, with between 5% and 45% of faculty reporting the occurrence of specific behaviors. About 60% of the sample had experienced at least one of these behaviors. Cyberbullying behaviors were reported least frequently, with almost 22% of participants reporting having experienced at least one of these behaviors (Love & MacDonald, 2010). Table 16 shows the frequency of occurrence of each behavior based on factor scale.

Table 16

Frequencies and Percentages for Items Included in Direct Incivility, Poor Student Behaviors,
Illegal and Threatening Behaviors, and Cyberbullying Scales (N = 107)

Scale Items	Never	At Least Once
Direct Incivility Scale		
Made belittling or demeaning remarks about you	54 (50.5%)	52 (48.5%)
Made inappropriate comments regarding your appearance, age, gender, sexual orientation, disability, etc.	77 (72.0%)	30 (28.0%)
Made unwarranted criticisms of your performance	42 (39.3%)	64 (59.8%)
Gossiped or spread rumors about you	70 (65.4%)	37 (34.6%)
Challenged your authority or questioned your credentials	44 (41.1%)	63 (58.9%)
Bypassed the hierarchy for complaints	48 (44.9%)	59 (55.1%)
Ignored your legitimate requests	49 (45.8%)	58 (54.2%)
Used you as the subject of lies or accusations	75 (70.1%)	32 (29.9%)
Complained about constructive feedback	28 (26.2%)	78 (72.9%)
Made racist comments or jokes	71 (66.4%)	35 (32.7%)
Interrupted class on purpose by making noise	39 (36.4%)	68 (63.6%)
Applied excessive pressure to change your stance	41 (38.3%)	66 (61.7%)
Violated personal space	64 (59.8%)	42 (39.3%)
Punished trivial errors you may have made	79 (73.8%)	28 (26.2%)
Made fun of you in front of others	83 (77.6%)	23 (21.5%)
Stared at you	61 (57.0%)	46 (43.0%)
Made sexist comments or jokes	69 (64.5%)	38 (35.5%)
Flirted with you or asked you out	73 (68.2%)	34 (31.8%)
Continually showed disdain while you were teaching	41 (38.3%)	66 (61.7%)
Showed lack of respect and intolerance for cultural, ethnic, and class differences	44 (41.1%)	62 (57.9%)
Posted a lewd/unprofessional response to online discussion	96 (89.7%)	9 (8.4%)
Poor Student Behaviors Scale		
Failed to meet assignment requirements	5 (4.7%)	101 (94.4%)
Engaged in non-class activity during class	10 (9.3%)	97 (90.7%)
Failed to read the syllabus for your class	8 (7.5%)	97 (90.7%)
Failed to keep scheduled appointments	10 (9.3%)	97 (90.7%)
Turned in late assignment without prior approval	15 (14.0%)	92 (86.0%)
Talked amongst selves in a distracting way during class	13 (12.1%)	94 (87.9%)
Created tension in class by dominating discussions	43 (40.2%)	64 (59.8%)
Cheated on papers, assignments, tests, quizzes, etc.	14 (13.1%)	92 (86.0%)
Requested that you make exams or assignments easier	29 (27.1%)	77 (72.0%)
Lied to you	14 (13.1%)	91 (85.0%)
Illegal and Threatening Behaviors Scale		
Inappropriately hugged, patted, kissed, fondled, you	102 (95.3%)	5 (4.7%)
Sent harassing or threatening e-mails to you	81 (75.7%)	25 (23.4%)

(continued)

Table 16 (continued)

Frequencies and Percentages for Items Included in Direct Incivility, Poor Student Behaviors, Illegal and Threatening Behaviors, and Cyberbullying Scales (N = 107)

Scale Items	Never	At Least Once
Took credit for your work	98 (91.6%)	8 (7.5%)
Maliciously damaged or stole your property	99 (92.5%)	7 (6.5%)
Invaded your home life (e.g., called, showed up uninvited)	100 (93.5%)	7 (6.5%)
Made hostile or threatening verbal remarks	59 (55.1%)	48 (44.9%)
Ignored you when asking a question or trying to speak	75 (70.1%)	32 (29.9%)
Made hostile or threatening phone calls to you	89 (83.2%)	17 (15.9%)
Cyberbullying Scale		
Impersonated you online/posted inappropriate information	105 (98.1%)	2 (1.9%)
Sent harassing or threatening instant messages to you	103 (96.3%)	3 (2.8%)
Touched you in an aggressive manner	102 (95.3%)	5 (4.7%)
Sent harassing or threatening text messages to you	101 (94.4%)	6 (5.6%)
Posted negative/embarrassing information online	94 (87.9%)	13 (12.1%)
Harassed/threatened you through a social networking site	95 (88.8%)	11 (10.3%)
Items not included on scales		
Sexually assaulted you	106 (99.1%)	1 (0.9%)
Used physical violence against you	105 (98.1%)	2 (1.9%)
Made a sexual proposition that implied reward/punishment	104 (97.2%)	3 (2.8%)
Propositioned you for a sexual encounter	103 (96.3%)	4 (3.7%)
Posted your information or picture on a voting website	88 (82.2%)	19 (17.8%)

Regarding how upset the participants were by the behaviors included in the survey, the behaviors that were the most upsetting, as determined by high rates of participants who had experienced the behavior reporting that they were either moderately or very upset by the behavior, were also among the least common behaviors. These included "Sexually assaulted you" (100%, $n = 1$); "Used physical violence against you" (100%, $n = 2$); "Touched you in an aggressive manner" (100%, $n = 5$); "Inappropriately hugged, patted, kissed, fondled, or pinched you" (80%, $n = 5$); "Made hostile or threatening phone calls to you" (75%, $n = 16$); "Invaded your home life" (72%, $n = 7$); and "Maliciously damaged or stole your property" (71%, $n = 7$).

Targets of Mistreatment

Two factorial ANOVAs were run for each of the four factors that emerged from the data. The first ANOVA examined the differences between groups based on personal factors, including gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and disability status. The second ANOVA looked at group differences in academic characteristics of the participants, including highest degree earned and academic rank. It was hypothesized that individuals who were female, of a minority ethnic background, a minority sexual orientation, or who were physically disabled would be the targets of more interpersonal mistreatment by students using these factors to obtain power over the instructor. Additionally, it was hypothesized that instructors with less experience, as determined by a lower academic rank or holding a degree other than a doctorate, would also experience more interpersonal mistreatment.

Regarding the first factor, direct incivility, individuals who were not physically disabled actually experienced more of these behaviors than those who reported being physically disabled, $F(1, 11) = 16.47$, $p < .001$. The factorial ANOVA also showed that individuals of minority ethnic backgrounds were significantly more likely to have reported experiencing these behaviors than participants who identified themselves as White, $F(1, 11) = 7.57$, $p < .01$. There were no significant differences in experience of direct incivility based on academic characteristics.

Regarding the second factor, poor student behaviors, again, individuals who were not physically disabled were more likely to experience these behaviors, $F(1, 11) = 8.64$, $p < .01$. Additionally, participants who held a doctoral degree, $F(2, 11) = 7.72$, $p < .01$, and those in assistant and associate or full professor positions, $F(5, 11) = 3.33$, $p < .01$, were significantly more likely to experience poor student behaviors.

Behaviors represented by the third factor, illegal and threatening behaviors, were reported as occurring more frequently by gay and lesbian individuals of a minority ethnic background, $F(1, 102) = 17.53$, $p < .001$. Overall, individuals of minority ethnic backgrounds in this sample were significantly more likely to report experiencing these behaviors than Whites, $F(1, 11) = 147.82$, $p < .001$, two-tailed. The factorial ANOVA also showed that gay men were significantly more likely than heterosexual men, $F(1, 101) = 7.50$, $p < .01$, and lesbian women, $F(1, 101) = 10.01$, $p < .01$, to report having experienced these behaviors. Additionally, heterosexual women were more likely than lesbians to experience these behaviors, $F(1, 101) = 4.05$, $p < .05$. Last, men, $F(1, 11) = 44.23$, $p < .001$, and individuals who were not physically disabled, $F(1, 11) = 135.79$, $p < .001$, reported experiencing significantly more illegal, threatening behaviors than their female and physically disabled counterparts.

Last, cyberbullying behaviors were experienced significantly more by gay men than heterosexual men and lesbians, $F(1, 11) = 39.65$, $p < .001$. Also, gay and lesbian ethnic minorities were more likely than White gay men and lesbians to experience these behaviors, $F(1, 11) = 26.87$, $p < .001$. Overall, ethnic minorities were more likely to experience cyberbullying than Whites, $F(1, 11) = 34.29$, $p < .001$. There were no significant differences in experience of cyberbullying based on academic characteristics.

Discussion

Results of the factor analysis seemed to support the hypothesis that bullying, uncivil, and sexually harassing behaviors combine to create a spectrum of interpersonal mistreatment. The first three factors appeared to be separated into categories based on severity and frequency of behavior, ranging from poor student behaviors, which were least severe and most common to faculty members, to direct incivility, which included moderately frequent and moderately severe

behaviors, to severe, illegal, and threatening behaviors, which were much less common. For the most part, cyberbullying behaviors, which occurred infrequently in this sample, made up a separate factor. This may provide some evidence that these behaviors represent a unique construct (Love & MacDonald, 2010).

Regarding the targets of mistreatment, participants who reported having no physical disability also reported experiencing more poor student behaviors and direct incivility then their physically disabled counterparts. However, very few participants in this study reported being physically disabled ($n = 5$), so these results should be interpreted with caution.

Overall, ethnic minorities and individuals of minority sexual orientations, particularly gay men, tended to be the targets of more interpersonal mistreatment by students. Specifically, these groups reported experiencing more direct incivility, illegal, threatening behaviors, and cyberbullying than their majority group counterparts. These findings supported theories of contrapower harassment and my hypothesis that students targeted individuals who they believe they possess some power over due to minority group status. For this to be true, minority group status would have to be known to students. It is possible that gay men were targeted more frequently than lesbians in this sample because their sexual orientation was more well-known to students.

Poor student behaviors were the only behaviors in the study that did not differ significantly based on ethnic background or sexual orientation. This was likely due to all faculty members experiencing these behaviors at very high rates. However, poor student behaviors occurred more often for faculty members who held a doctoral degree and those in assistant, associate, or full professor positions, as opposed to faculty members who were adjunct professors, instructors, or librarians. This was the opposite of what was expected, since it was

believed that students would target faculty members they perceived as having less experience and less status at the university. The results likely reflected the tendency for individuals with doctorates and higher academic ranks to have had longer careers in academia, which would afford more opportunity to experience these types of behaviors. None of the behaviors in the survey were experienced at higher rates by individuals considered to be of lower status at the university (e.g., untenured, lower rank, less education). This may be because students are not as well aware of their professors' membership in these categories as they are of personal characteristics such as gender, sexual orientation, and ethnicity.