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Abstract

Incivility— the violation of commonly held norms of mutual respect —constitutes a widespread phenomenon and a social problem that includes not only physical fighting, harassment, and threats, but also more passive manifestations such as social isolation and the spreading of rumors. Incivility can create an unsafe environment that results in emotional, physical, and psychological problems for its victims.

What can we do about incivility? What factors contribute to its persistence? How can we protect victims? These are some of the questions that warrant more scholarly attention. These concerns speak directly to the important of understanding the context surrounding incivility. The focus on organizational context is important for discovering causes of incivility and for suggesting policies that will eliminate incivility. Building on labor processes and stratification literatures, this dissertation investigates the role organizational context plays in generating incivility in two unique institutional contexts, schools and workplaces.

I conduct three analyses that highlight various ways incivility unfolds in institutions. My first analysis, drawing on data from Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS), lays out the ways in which organizational context, broadly, matters for incivility. I empirically test how organizational chaos and bureaucratic structures impact the incidence of bullying among students in schools. My second analysis, which also
utilizes data from ELS, introduces racial composition and explores how the percentage of black, Latino and Asian students in a school shaped the incidence of bullying. Drawing on data from the 2002 to 2003 National Organizational Survey (NOS), my final analysis brings together the prior foci (bureaucracy, organizational chaos, and racial composition) but extends the scope to gender composition and to another core institutional domain, namely the workplace. Additionally, in this analysis, I consider the relationship between organizational context and three dimensions of incivility (bullying, racial discrimination, sexual harassment).

Findings demonstrate overlapping ways in which organizational context matters for incivility. General aspects of organizational context, such as organizational chaos and bureaucratic structures and more specific features of context including race and gender composition influence incivility. The gender and race composition of the institution foster incivility. Results also suggest that disorganization in the procedural processes of organizations promotes incivility whereas the presence of accountability structures protects against incivility. Taken together, this dissertation seeks to provide a more thorough understanding of how various aspects of context matter for diverse forms of incivility in multiple institutional setting.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Incivility – by which I mean the violation of commonly held norms of mutual respect – is a serious problem in institutional settings (Roscigno, Hodson, and Lopez 2009a). Such violations can include not only physical fighting, demeaning and abusive behavior, verbal or written threats, but also more passive manifestations such as social isolation, rudeness, and the spreading of rumors (Anderson and Pearson 1999; Clark and Springer 2007; Cortina 2008; Mutz and Reeves 2005; Salin 2003).

Incivility can create an unsafe environment that results in emotional, physical, and psychological problems for its victims (Espelage and Swearer 2003; Olweus 1978; McCarthy and Mayhew 2004). Additionally, incivility can result in a lack of trust in relationships, poor work performance, and overall lower functioning for victims (Swearer, Espelage, Vaillancour, and Hymel 2010; Williams and Guerra 2011; Williams and Perguero 2013). Indeed, the consequences of incivility for victims can last long after the uncivil behavior has ended (Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, and Cooper 2004; Lewis 2004).

Incivility occurs in the relational domain of institutions, including communal exchanges, interpersonal conflicts, and physical altercations (Rayner, Hoel, and Cooper 2002; Roscigno et al. 2009a). It is often between people who have different levels of power within the institution (Salin 2003). Institutional power can refer to institutional position but also power derived from social status hierarchies, such as race and gender.
White males, for instance, regardless of institutional position, hold culturally circumscribed status advantages relative to their racial minority and female counterparts.

Most prior research focuses on the consequences of incivility for victims and perpetrators and the characteristics that may predispose individuals to incivility, such as body or personality type (Aalsma and Brown 2008; Cowie, Naylor, Rivers, Smith, and Perceira 2000; Espelage and Swearer 2003; Olweus 1993; Swearer et al. 2010). Although this work is important, it primarily focuses on individuals rather than examining incivility as a consequence of institutional or organizational context. Conceptualizations of organizational contexts – that is, characteristics of institutional environments that impact their functioning and/or compositional make-up – are key for furthering our understanding of incivility because they allow for the study of processes and mechanisms that cause incivility (Reskin 2003; Roscigno et al. 2009a). Moreover, studies on how organizational context influences incivility may prove important for designing policies and programs that ultimately help eradicate incivility. In this dissertation, I investigate the role organizational context plays in generating incivility in two unique institutional contexts, schools and workplaces.

**Prior Research on Incivility and Organizational Context**

Although prior research on labor process has considered the connection between incivility and organizational context, few studies have empirically tested this relationship (e.g., Andersson and Pearson 1998; Chamberlain, Crowley, Tope, and Hodson 2008; Cortina 2008; Hodson, Roscigno, Lopez 2006; Roscigno et al. 2009a; Salin 2003). Along
these lines, most studies have focused on incivility that occurs in work environments. Additionally, research has primarily investigated one dimension of incivility, namely bullying (see Chamberlain et al. 2008 for an exception). Here, bullying is largely defined as repeated and unwarranted physical, verbal, and/or social abuse (Espelage and Swearer 2003; Olweus 1993; Smith et al. 1999).

Studies have identified organizational chaos as a feature of organizational context that is important for predicting bullying in workplaces. Organizational chaos is defined as poor organization and coordination of the daily procedural processes of the workplace (Roscigno et al. 2009a: 749; also see Einarsen et al. 2003; Salin 2003). Roscigno and his colleagues (2009a; 2009b; Hodson et al. 2006) provide some of the few empirical tests of the relationship between organizational chaos and bullying at work. Drawing on content-coded organizational ethnographies and integrating quantitative and qualitative techniques, they consider bullying between supervisors and their employees and between co-workers. In several analyses they find that chaos creates opportunities for bullies, and within a context of limited oversight or constraint. Similarly, other research theorizes that organizational chaos may promote an environment that overlooks civility and ultimately supports abusive behavior and interpersonal conflict (Einarsen et al. 2003; Rayner et al. 2002; Salin 2003).

Research has also considered whether bureaucratic structure, as an aspect of organizational context, influences the incidence of bullying. Bureaucratic structures are defined as rules, procedures, and/or policies pertaining to the safety of individuals in the organizational environment. These often include directives pertaining to conduct and
safety of individuals in a given organization. Although limited empirical work has been
done in this area, it is suggested that bureaucratic structures can reduce bullying by
creating accountability structures and clear guidelines for behavioral conduct
(Chamberlain et al. 2008; Roscigno et al. 2009a; Salin 2003). Additionally, bureaucratic
structures may also mediate the effect of organizational chaos on bullying. Roscigno and
his colleagues (2009b) find that bureaucratic structures help protect institutions from the
emergence of organizational chaos. As a result, these institutions report fewer incidences
of bullying when compared to institutions without bureaucratic structures. While
bureaucratic structures might reduce bullying, it is also the case that a gap often exists
between intended organizational functioning and actual organizational practices that
hinders the effectiveness of these structures (Hodson et al. 2006; Kalev, Dobbin, and
Kelly 2006).

Prior work has contributed to our understanding of incivility, and bullying in
particular, by noting that it is partially rooted in organizational context. But like most
research, these studies have theoretical and methodological limitations – limitations that
present opportunities for further research. Below, I consider some of these limitations,
and then turn to the goals of this dissertation and how it builds upon and extends prior
work.

Limitations of Prior Research

Prior research on incivility has three key shortcomings. First, most studies have only
empirically tested the relationship between organizational context and incivility in one
institutional setting: the workplace. Most attention, in fact, considers incivility in the workplace between supervisors and employees, employees and employees, and employees and customers. Given that incivility manifests in relational interactions occurring within institutional and organizational life, it would be worthwhile to see if the lessons derived from analyses of workplaces extend to other organizational domains. Organizational context, for example, should influence the incidence of incivility among students in school environments. It is important to consider incivility in schools and other institutional settings in order to consider whether organizational context is pertinent to non-work institutions. I suspect it is.

Second, research has primarily conceived of incivility as uni-dimensional. Studies have focused on bullying as the only form of incivility. However, since incivility is rooted in power imbalances in institutional environments, the conception can and probably should be extended. Indeed, incivility might be targeted at specific status groups, such as females and minorities. Here, incivility could include additional dimensions, such as racial discrimination and sexual harassment—dimensions that reflect a relational forms of abuse that emerge from power struggles and with parallels to bullying (Dellinger and Williams 2002; Giuffre and Williams 1994; Hirsh and Lyons 2010; Pager 2003).

Third, prior work has focused almost exclusively on general aspects of organizational context, such as organizational chaos and bureaucratic structures. These features of context are assumed to affect everyone the same way, regardless of race and gender. However, organizational environments are made up of people from different
status groups, such as racial minorities and females, who hold different levels of institutional power. As mentioned previously, institutional power can refer to institutional position but also power derived from social status hierarchies, such as race and gender. Given the diversity in many institutional settings, it may be the case that particular status groups, such as females and racial minorities, are more vulnerable to incivility and/or have differential access, for instance, to bureaucratic protections (Blalock 1967; Kanter 1977).

**Dissertation Goals and General Overview**

This dissertation has three overlapping goals, each of which addresses important gaps in prior research. First, this study empirically examines incivility in two institutional settings: schools and workplaces. The aim here is to develop an understanding of how organizational structures and processes shape incivility across unique institutional domains. Building on past studies, I consider the effect organizational context has on incivility among students in schools. Specifically, I apply theories on incivility in the workplace to the study of schools and investigate whether the concept of organizational context is useful for explaining incivility in non-work institutions. Next, and similar to prior research, I test the relationship between organizational context and incivility in the workplace.

Second, this dissertation expands the conceptualization of incivility to include both general forms of abuse, such as bullying, and more targeted abuse, including sexual harassment and racial discrimination. In this regard, I develop a theoretical explanation
and methodological test for examining how organizational context influences multiple dimensions of incivility. I draw specifically on and extend stratification-based theories to understand and empirically test how incivility manifests as general and targeted abuse.

Third, I extend upon and analyze aspects of organizational context. In addition to considering general aspects of organizational context, I include specifically female composition and racial minority composition as potentially influential dimensions of organizational environment. It may be the case that female and racial minorities experience more incivility when they are numerically underrepresented in institutions because they represent clear examples of difference and may be easy targets for abusive behavior (Kanter 1977). Or incivility may be greater in institutions with growing female and racial minority compositions. In these contexts, the majority group may feel threatened by the growth of these historically underrepresented groups and may abuse as a way to protect themselves (Blalock 1967). The inclusion of additional aspects of organizational context is important for the development of effective policies and programs that speak to the diverse characteristics of organizational environment that impact incivility.

To address these goals, I conduct three separate analyses. Each analysis, reflected in the following three chapters, is organized in a stand-alone article format, with an introduction, review of literature, sections on research design and methods, research finding, and conclusion. The three chapters address different aspects of organizational context and incivility in schools and workplaces. Chapter 2 and chapter 3 extend prior work through considering incivility, specifically bullying, in schools. Chapter 2 lays out
the ways in which organizational context, broadly, matters for incivility. The purpose of the chapter is to provide an empirical test of how organizational chaos and bureaucratic structures impact the incidence of bullying among students in schools. Chapter 3 denotes the potential relevance of an additional structural factor, namely racial composition (since racial composition is pretty variable across schools (unlike gender) and given theories surrounding contact, competition and vulnerability). Drawing on racial threat and social isolation theories, discussed in more detail below, this chapter investigates how the percentage of black students in a school, the percentage of Latino students in a school, and the percentage of Asian students in a school impacts bullying.

Chapter 4 brings together the prior foci (bureaucracy, organizational chaos, and racial composition) but extends the scope to both considerations of gender composition as well as to another institutional domain, namely the workplace. Additionally, chapter 4 examines three dimensions of incivility (bullying, racial discrimination, sexual harassment) to consider whether aspects of organizational context influence dimensions of incivility in the same ways.

**Detailed Description of Each Chapter**

My first analysis, Chapter 2, considers organizational chaos, bureaucratic structures, perceptions of bureaucratic structures, and bullying among students in schools. The chapter draws on data from the Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS), a nationally representative sample of American High School students and their schools. I use the baseline year of the survey when all the students are in 10th grade. I utilize the
school administrators’ component of ELS to define my measures because it allows for the examination of school context. However, in order to examine perceptions of bureaucratic structures, I include one measure from the student component of ELS that I aggregate to the level of school context.

Bullying is constructed from school administrators’ answer to the following question: “how often bullying was a problem at their school during the 2001-2002 academic year?” School Administrators could respond to this question in one of five ways: “Daily,” “At least once a week,” “At least once a month,” “On occasion,” and “Never happens.” Organizational chaos is an aggregated measure constructed from school administrators’ answers to the following two questions: 1) How often was tardiness a problem in your school? and 2) How often was absenteeism a problem in your school? Bureaucratic structure is an aggregated measure constructed from ten questions that represent school administrators’ account of the level of rules and controls implemented within their school, such as having metal detectors, controlling access to school grounds, and requiring picture IDs for students. Perceptions of bureaucratic structure is an aggregate measure that represents students’ interpretations of the following: school rules are strictly enforced; everyone knows what the rules are; school rules are fair; punishment is the same no matter who you are; students know punishment for broken rules.

Using logistic regression modeling, I consider the relationship between organizational chaos and bullying among students in schools. I also examine the effect bureaucratic structures and perceptions of bureaucratic structures have on organizational
chaos and bullying. Consistent with prior research, results indicate that organizational chaos enhances bullying. I also find that bureaucratic structures reduce bullying. However, bureaucratic structures do not mediate the effect organizational chaos has on bullying. I find that organizational chaos still increases bullying among students despite the presence of bureaucratic structure. Additionally, results indicate that bureaucratic structure and not perception of bureaucratic structure influences bullying. Overall, these results suggest that, like in workplaces, organizational chaos and bureaucratic structure are helpful for understanding the incidence of bullying among students in schools.

Chapter 3 draws on racial threat and social isolation theories to investigate the effect racial composition has on bullying among students in schools. Racial threat theory argues that a growing minority composition will pressure the majority group to protect valued resources through discrimination. The theory argues that discrimination will stop once the minority composition reaches a certain percentage of the population (Blalock 1967; Defina and Hannon 2009). Additionally, theories on social isolation argue that a numerically underrepresented group may be especially susceptible to discrimination from the majority group (Kanter 1977; McBrier and Wilson 2004; Moss and Tilly 1996; Roscigno 2007).

Building on these theoretical frameworks and drawing on data from ELS, I use logistic regression to test the linear and non-linear effects the percentage of black students, the percentage of Latino students, and the percentage of Asian students in a given school have on bullying. Like chapter 2, the measures are taken from the school administrators’ component of ELS. I use the same measure from bullying as described
above. My findings suggest that both racial threat and social isolation theories are useful for explaining bullying in schools. Racial threat theory is important for understanding bullying in higher concentration Asian schools, while social isolation theory helps explain higher incidence of bullying in lower concentration black and Latino schools. These results suggest that diverse aspects of organizational context influence bullying.

Chapter 4 turns to the study of incivility in workplaces. I consider how diverse aspects of organizational context influence the incidence of three dimensions of incivility: bullying, sexual harassment, and racial discrimination. The chapter draws on data from the 2002 to 2003 National Organizational Survey (NOS), a national sample of 516 work organizations in which the unit of analysis is the workplace. Bullying is derived from a three-indicator scale (alpha=.72) that includes dimensions of physical abuse, slander or social isolation, and verbal or written threat. Sexual harassment is measured from the following question: “In the past 12 months, have there been any formal complaints about sexual harassment?” Racial discrimination is measured by the question “In the past 12 months, have there been any formal complaints about racial, ethnic, or religious discrimination?”

Using logistic regression modeling, I test whether bullying, sexual harassment, and racial discrimination are rooted in similar aspects of organizational context. I first investigate the effect organizational chaos, female composition of the workplace, and racial minority composition of the workplace have on these three dimensions of incivility. Organizational chaos is derived from a measure that considers whether the number of full-time employees has increased, decreased, or remained the same in the past
12 months. Female composition is defined as the percentage of female employees in a given workplace. Racial minority composition is defined as the percentage of non-white employees in a given workplace. This chapter draws on theories of racial threat and social isolation, as discussed above, to theorize the implications of female and racial minority compositions.

In addition, drawing on studies of organizational policies, I examine the role bureaucratic structures, in the form of grievance procedures and sensitivity programs, play in the persistence of incivility in the workplace. Research on organizational policies find that grievance procedures can help provide outlets for employees to file claims of discrimination (Edelman, Uggen, and Erlanger 1999; Kalev et al. 2006) and that sensitivity programs can help educate employees and may reduce discrimination in the process (Hirsh and Kmec 2009). Grievance procedures are considered with a two-indicator scale: Equal Employment Opportunities (EEO) department (does the organization have a department or section responsible for Equal Employment Opportunity or Affirmative Action?), and grievances procedure (do formal procedures exist for resolving disputes?). Sensitivity programs are considered with a two-indicator scale: sexual harassment training (do managers receive sexual harassment training?), and diversity training (do managers have access to a diversity training program?).

Results indicate that organizational chaos increases the emergence of bullying. Additionally, in line with racial threat theory, an emergent female composition increases the likelihood of bullying and sexual harassment until the female population represents a certain compositional threshold. Likewise, a growing racial minority composition
increases the incidence of racial discrimination until a particular threshold is reached. These findings seem to show that organizational context has different effects on dimensions of incivility. Results suggest that race and sex composition have the clearest implications for racial discrimination and sexual harassment, respectively, and that organizational chaos most clearly influences bullying. Next, the results related to bureaucratic structures and incivility indicate that grievance procedures increase the likelihood of bullying and racial discrimination and that sensitivity programs increase the incidence of bullying, sexual harassment, and racial discrimination. Although these findings may seem counterintuitive, they may suggest that these organizations do not have the accountability systems and safeguards to support the functioning of their procedures and programs (Roscigno et al. 2009b). Moreover, it is not the mere presence of bureaucratic structures that reduces incivility, but rather it is the effectiveness of these structures that alleviates incivility (Hodson et al. 2006).
Chapter 2: Organizational Chaos, Bureaucratic Structures and Bullying in American Schools

School bullies repeatedly teased and threatened eleven-year-old Jaheem Herrera. After notifying school personnel on several occasions, he took dramatic actions to end his life by hanging himself in his bedroom closet (Simon 2009). As denoted by Jaheem’s case, bullying among students in schools can be incredibly consequential for the physical and emotional well-being of victims (Aalsma and Brown 2008; Swearer et al. 2010). Bullying has consequently become a growing concern for parents and policy makers. Forty-nine out of fifty states have adopted laws addressing the issue. Although these laws are important, without understanding how aspects of organizational context—such as functional or compositional aspects of environments—influence bullying, it remains unclear how or whether these laws will matter.

Bullying is repeated and unwarranted physical (e.g., hitting), verbal (e.g., threatening) and/or social (e.g., spreading rumors) abuse. Research on bullying in schools focuses significant attention on the factors that may predispose students to such behavior (e.g., Esbensen et al. 2009; Nansel 2001). This research does not, however, go much beyond attributes of victims or perpetrators, and does little to investigate how organizational context may create an atmosphere conducive to or constraining of
bullying. Studies on organizational contexts are important for determining the process and mechanisms that shape bullying, and can help administrators create policies and programs that actually address it to the extent it is a problem.

Although educational literature rarely considers how context matters for bullying, research on labor processes investigates the association between organizational context and bullying in workplaces. This work focuses on organizational chaos and bureaucratic structure as two key aspects of organizational context (Hodson, Roscigno, and Lopez 2006; Salin 2003). Studies suggest that organizational chaos, which I define as poor organization and coordination of the daily procedural processes of the workplace, increases the incidence of bullying and that bureaucratic structures, which I define as rules, procedures, and/or policies pertaining to the safety of individuals in the organizational environment, may help protect against bullying. Bureaucratic structures may also mitigate the influence organizational chaos has on bullying (e.g., Chamberlain et al. 2008; Hodson et al. 2006; Roscigno et al. 2009).

In this paper, I build on research on labor processes in the workplace to consider how organizational context may influence bullying among students in schools. I argue that bullying is not unique to the institutional domain of work. Rather, bullying is rooted in power struggles between perpetrators and victims of abuse across institutional environments (see Einarsen et al. 2003; McCarthy and Mayhew 2004; Roscigno et al. 2009a). Thus, perspectives on bullying in one institutional setting, the workplace, will likely have utility for addressing bullying in another domain, namely education. This
extends prior research by empirically testing the effect organizational context has on bullying in schools.

My analyses draw on school-level data from the Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS:02), a nationally representative sample of American High School students and their schools. Using logistic regression modeling, I consider whether organizational chaos increases the presence of bullying in schools. I also investigate whether bureaucratic structures reduce bullying and if bureaucratic structure helps alleviate the effect organizational chaos has on bullying. Findings in these regards suggest that indeed these aspects of organizational context are important even in the context of schooling. I conclude with considerations for policy and future research on bullying in institutional setting.

PRIOR RESEARCH ON BULLYING IN SCHOOLS

Most research on bullying, most notably among psychologists, focuses on two areas of study. First, research identifies background characteristics that predispose individuals to bullying. Studies find that certain personality and character traits make some individuals more susceptible to bullying. In this regard, students who are physically weak, have low self-esteem, and exhibit passive behaviors may be at greater risk for victimization (Olweus 1978, 1993).

Second, studies consider the short and long term consequences of bullying for victims. Victims of bullying may be more likely to experience depression, anxiety, and loneliness (Esbensen and Carson 2009; Espelage and Swearer 2003; Olweus 1978;
Nansel, Overpeck, Pilla, Ruan, Morton, and Scheidt 2001; Swearer, Espelage, Vaillancour, and Hymel 2010) and may be at greater risks for suicidal ideation and violent behaviors (Aalsma and Brown 2008). Research also suggests that involvement in bullying reduces academic performance (Swearer et al. 2010; Williams and Peguero 2013). Certainly, this body of research is important as it sheds light onto the emotional, physical, and psychological costs of bullying for victims (Aalsma and Brown 2008; Olweus 1993; Swearer et al. 2010). However, it offers a limited understanding of the causes of bullying in schools by not considering the role of organizational context.

Although there is little work on organizational context and bullying in schools, some studies on victimization and bullying confirm that organizational context is key to predicting abusive behavior in schools (e.g., Ma 2002; Gottfredson and DiPietro 2011; Williams and Guerra 2011). Ma (2002), for instance, examines disciplinary climate and school size. She found that schools with a weak disciplinary climate or schools that took limited disciplinary actions were at greater risks for the incidence of bullying. Additionally, her results indicate that students who attend small schools are more likely to experience bullying compared those attending larger schools.

More recently, Williams and Guerra (2011) and Gottfredson and DiPietro (2011) build on collective efficacy frameworks to explain school bullying. Collective efficacy is defined as shared trust and support extended among members of a group. It also includes informal social control where members of a group are willing to protect the other members of the group. Social relationships serve as informal social controls for undesirable behaviors, such as crime and violence. Williams and Guerra study
perceptions of bullying and collective efficacy as forms of cohesion and trust. They find that bullying is reduced in schools that have cohesion and trust between students and teachers. In schools with high perceptions of cohesion and trust, bullying is expected to diminish.

Building on the social networks aspect of collective efficacy, and using data from the National Study of Delinquency Prevention in Schools, Gottfredson and DiPietro test aspects of organizational context. These aspects of context include school size, student-teacher ratio, and the number of students that teachers instruct in a given week. They find that schools with lower student-teacher ratios and schools where teachers instruct fewer students in a week report less victimization. They do not find any effect for school size. Their results suggest that the influence student-teacher ratios have on victimization is mediated by social capital. Here, the assumption is that smaller ratios equate to similar belief systems among students and teachers. These studies use theories on crime in neighborhoods to understand victimization in schools.

Some research considers more directly how schools might function similarly to workplaces (Bidwell 1965; Herriott and Firestone 1984; March and Olsen 1976; Meyer and Rowan 1978; Weick 1976). Like workplaces, schools rely on loosely and tightly coupled systems of control. Tight coupling refers to a centralized system of control where individuals in power set goals that are enforced equally across the organization (Herriott and Firestone 1984). Loose coupling, then, is the absence of a centralized system of enforcement (Meyer and Rowan 1978). Even though schools and workplaces are distinct in their aims, similar roles exist between the two. Students (or employees) are expected to
respect the authority of their teachers (or managers) and receive rewards (grades, scholarships) for their productivity and success in school. Teachers have the responsibility of guiding the instructional activities of students and are required to follow and enforce school rules and regulations (Meyer and Rowan 1978). As such, systems of control may influence individuals in schools and workplaces in a comparable ways. It is for this reason that I turn to research on bullying in workplaces—research that highlights aspects of organizational context that may be especially meaningful.

WORKPLACE CONTEXT, BULLYING AND IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOLING

Research on labor processes finds that organizational context—that is, characteristics of institutional environments that impact their functioning and/or compositional make-up— is useful for understanding causes of bullying in workplaces (e.g., Roscigno et al. 2009a; 2009b; Salin 2003). Particularly important for workplace bullying, it seems, are organizational chaos and bureaucratic structure.

Organizational Chaos

Studies on labor processes identify a relationship between organizational chaos and bullying in the workplace (Chamberlain 2008; Einarsen et al. 2003; Roscigno and Hodson 2004; Roscigno et al. 2009a; Salin 2003). Organizational chaos is defined as poor organization and coordination of the daily procedural processes of the workplace (Roscigno et al. 2009a: 749; also see Einarsen et al. 2003; Salin 2003). It influences the
culture of the workplace by hindering camaraderie among workers and creating unclear worker expectations (Salin 2003). Consequently, organizational chaos is thought to encourage an environment that is conducive to bullying in the workplace (Hodson et al. 2006; Roscigno et al. 2009a, b).

Organizational chaos emerges from significant job insecurity including the fear of downsizing and corporate restructures in the workplace. When employees face job insecurity, they are forced to deal with stresses and pressures that result from not knowing their job future and from having to complete the same work assignments with a smaller workforce. Organizational chaos creates a lack of cohesion and confusion among workers. Management may abuse their employees in order to pressure employees to produce more in less time (Vaez et al. 2004) or management may discriminate against employees as a way to express their lack of control in determining their own job future (Chamberlin 2008; Lopez et al. 2009; Roscigno et al. 2009a; Salin 2003).

Organizational chaos tends to result in a culture of tolerance for abusive behavior and interpersonal conflict in the workplace (Chamberlain 2008; Roscigno and Hodson 2004; Salin 2003). In fact, within such a context, a culture may emerge that reduces the “costs” of bullying for offenders by offering rewards or promotions to those who have bullied to succeed within the job structure (Chamberlain 2008; Salin 2003). Moreover, bullying may be viewed as joking and ignored by those in positions of authority (Salin 2003). Drawing on such work, my analyses explore whether organizational chaos has the same effect on bullying in schools as it does on bullying in workplaces. I expect that organizational chaos will increase the likelihood of bullying among students in schools.
Bureaucratic Structures

Bureaucratic structures—by which I mean rules, procedures, and/or policies pertaining to the functioning of organizations—are meant, at least partially, to safeguard the workplace by encouraging fair practices and restricting discriminatory behaviors (Holzer and Neumark 2000). Bureaucratic structures certainly have the capacity to enhance opportunities for vulnerable workers (Holzer and Neumark 2000; Reskin and McBrier 2000). Yet, some research finds that these structures ultimately have little impact (Edelmann and Petterson 1999) and may even increase the likelihood of unfair practices (Edelmann et al. 1999; Hirsh and Kmec 2009). This may be a function of poor quality structures that were only adopted to demonstrate compliance with the law (Dobbin et al. 1993; Edelmann et al. 1999).

Research on bureaucratic structures and bullying concur with studies on organizational policy. Drawing on content-coded organizational ethnographies and integrating quantitative and qualitative techniques, Roscigno and his colleague (2009a, 2009b) consider bullying among employees. They find that the persistence of formal grievance procedures results in fewer incidences of bullying. Additionally, Salin (2003) finds that rules and procedures can discourage bullying by increasing the seriousness and consequences of bullying for offenders.

Bureaucratic structures are also thought to mediate the effect of organizational chaos on bullying. Roscigno and his colleagues (2009b) find that bureaucratic structures help protect institutions from the emergence of organizational chaos. As a result, these institutions report fewer incidences of bullying when compared to institutions without
bureaucratic structures. Although bureaucratic structures are expected to reduce bullying, a gap often exists between intended organizational functioning and actual organizational practices that hinders the effectiveness of these structures (Hodson et al. 2006; Kalev, Dobbin, and Kelly 2006).

Building on prior research, I consider the effect bureaucratic structures have on bullying in schools. Although I acknowledge that bureaucratic structures may only be effective when they are given proper organizational support, I suspect that bureaucratic structures will nevertheless reduce bullying. I also expect that bureaucratic structures will mediate the effect organizational chaos has on bullying.

**HYPOTHESES**

This study extends prior research by investigating how organizational context influences the incidence of bullying in schools. I test three hypotheses related to organizational chaos, bureaucratic structures and bullying in schools. First, I expect that organizational chaos will increase the presence of bullying in schools. With regard to bureaucratic structures, I suspect that bureaucratic structures will reduce the incidence of bullying. Lastly, I expect that bureaucratic structures will mitigate the effect organizational chaos has on bullying.

**DATA AND METHODS**

I draw on data from the restricted-use version of the Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS:02) and the Common Core of Data 2002 (CCD) to test my expectations.
ELS:02 is a nationally represented sample of over 15,000 students in over 750 schools. Data were first collected from a sample of schools. Then students were randomly selected from each school sampled. The school-based component of the survey was completed by school principals, and other school administrators. I use the baseline year of the survey, which was collected spring term 2002. All the students in the baseline year of the survey are sophomores in high school. The survey sampled Asian students at a higher rate than White, Black, and Latino students to ensure representation of Asian students.

CCD is a national statistical database that is collected annually by the department of Education. It includes information on the compositional context of all public elementary and secondary schools in the U.S. I match ELS:02 with CCD to capture indicators of racial composition, school size, and school structure. Since matching was required and private schools are absent from the CCD, I only include public schools in my analyses.

The sample size includes 9370 students. These data are especially appropriate for my study in that they allow for the examination of organizational chaos, bureaucratic procedures and bullying in schools (see NCES 2007 for a detailed discussion of the data). Reported results are based on logistic regression models.

Dependent Variable

My outcome of interest is school bullying. School Administrators were asked to the best of their knowledge, how often bullying was a problem at their school during the 2001-2002 academic year. School Administrators could respond to these questions in one of
five ways: “Daily,” “At least once a week,” “At least once a month,” “On occasion,” and “Never happens.” These responses were dichotomized to indicate whether the school experienced any incidence of bullying in a one month period. That is, if a school administrator said that bullying occurred “at least once a month”, “at least once a week”, or “daily” in their school their response was coded as 1 and if a school administrator said that bullying occurred “On Occasion” or “Never Happens” in their school their response was coded as 0. I consider this to be a conservative measure because school personnel have every reason to represent their school in a favorable light. Nonetheless, about 32% of schools reported at least one incidence of bullying at least once a month during the academic year.

Key Independent Variables

Building on labor process and organizational policy literatures, I consider one measure of organizational chaos and two indicators of bureaucratic structures in schools. The measure of organizational chaos reflects inconsistent and uncertainty in the school environment, which effects the coordination of everyday processes of schools (Roscigno et al. 2009a). Organizational Chaos is an aggregated measure constructed from school administrators’ answer to the following two questions: how often was tardiness a problem in your school, and how often was absenteeism a problem in your school (alpha=.8775). School Administrators could respond to these questions in one of five ways: “Daily,” “At least once a week,” “At least once a month,” “On occasion,” and “Never happens.” Daily=5 and Never happens=1 for each question. After aggregating these two questions,
this indicator ranges from 2 to 10. Most schools reported high levels of tardiness and absenteeism (Mean=9.65). As a result, this measure of organizational chaos does not have much variation and may provide only a limited understanding of how organizational chaos influences bullying in schools. Future research is tasked with finding more precise measures of organizational chaos in schools.

I include two measures of bureaucratic structures. I consider actual bureaucratic structures, such as rules and procedures that schools have in place to control the school environment and perceptions of bureaucratic enforcement which are students understanding of the effectiveness of these rules and procedures to actual control the school environment. By testing these two types of bureaucratic structures, I can better consider the gap between organizational functioning and actual organizational practices (Hodson et al. 2006; Kalev et al. 2006).

The first measure, bureaucratic structure, is an aggregated measure constructed from ten questions that represented school administrators’ account of the level of rules and controls implemented within their school (alpha=.6036). School administrators indicate whether or not each rule/control was evident at their school (i.e., control access to school buildings during school hours, control access to school grounds during school hours, require students to pass through metal detectors each day, perform one or more random metal detector checks on students, close the campus for most students during lunch, use one or more random dog sniffs to check for drugs, perform one or more random sweeps for contraband, require clear book bags or ban book bags on school grounds, require students to wear badges or picture IDs, require faculty and staff to wear
badges or picture IDs, and use one or more security cameras to monitor the school). A school that had all ten of these bureaucratic rules and controls received a 10 on this measure and a school that had none of these rules and controls received a 0.

Because this dataset has a limited number of bureaucratic structures, I use this measure as an approximation for rules and programs that schools may have in place that are more closely related to the monitoring of bullying. The rational behind using this measure as an approximation is that schools that have the bureaucratic rules/controls mentioned above may be more likely to have other structures in place that may help protect against bullying. These other structures may include grievance procedures for victims of bullying, programs that education students about the dangers of bullying, and policies that restrict and punish bullying in schools.

The second indicator of bureaucratic structures is perceptions of bureaucratic enforcement. Perceptions of Bureaucratic Enforcement is an aggregate measure that represents student’s interpretations of the following: school rules are strictly enforced; everyone knows what the rules are; school rules are fair; punishment is the same no matter who you are; students know punishment for broken rules (alpha= .6712). Students could respond to each of these five statements in one of four ways: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. Strongly Agree=4 and Strongly Disagree=1 on this measure. After aggregating these statements, this indicator ranges from 5 to 20. This measure was averaged across all students in each school to form a school level measure. I test two indicators of bureaucratic structures to capture both the presence of rules and procedures and the perceived effectiveness of rules and procedures.
Control Variables

I control for racial diversity, poverty, locale, size, and social problems and disorder since all have been linked to the likelihood of bullying in school (Gottfredson 2001; Gottfredson and DiPietro 2011; Graham et al. 2007; Hanish and Guerra 2000; Ma 2002; Peguero 2009; Stewart 2003; Williams and Peguero 2013). I measure racial diversity by considering the percentage of students in a given school that are nonwhite. I include the percent of students on free/reduced lunch as an approximation for the impoverished student composition. Urbanicity considers whether the school is located in an urban locale (non-urban locale are the reference category). School size is measured as the number of students in a given school.

The school’s level of social problems and disorder construct is measured by fourteen questions that represented school administrators’ account of the level of social problems and disorder within their school. School administrators indicate whether or not each of the following is a problem at their school (i.e., class cutting, physical conflicts, robbery or theft, vandalism, use of alcohol, use of illegal drugs, students under the influence of drugs/alcohol while at school, the sale of drugs on campus, possession of weapons, racial-ethnic tensions, gang activities, physical abuse of teachers, verbal abuse of teachers, and student acts of disrespect for teachers). Table 1 reports ranges, means, and standard deviations for my dependent variable and key independent variables along with my control measures.
ANALYTIC STRATEGY

My analyses proceed in several steps. All results are presented in Table 2. First, using logistic regression, in model 1, I consider the effect school level controls have on bullying, independent of organizational chaos and bureaucratic structure. Model 2 begins my consideration of organizational context. Model 2 adds organizational chaos to the equation presented in model 1. Next, to consider the influence of bureaucratic structures, model 3 adds bureaucratic structures and perceptions of bureaucratic enforcement to the equation presented in model 1. Finally, in model 4, I investigate whether bureaucratic structure mitigates the relationship between organizational chaos and bullying. Model 4 includes both organizational chaos and bureaucratic structures along with school level controls. The core question is whether features of organizational context influence the presence of bullying in schools. Results are discussed in odd ratios.

RESULTS

Model 1 begins with an examination of school level characteristics that impact bullying. The results suggest that the racial diversity of the school body decreases the likelihood of bullying by 2%. In other words, diverse schools experience 2% less bullying than schools that are not as diverse. Schools in urban areas are 25% less likely to report bullying when compared to schools in non-urban areas. These findings make some sense considering that students in these types of schools may have higher thresholds for violence and therefore may be less likely to view the incidence of bullying as an offense that needs to be reported to authorities (Devoe et al. 2005; Dinkes et al. 2009; Esbensen and Carson...
2009; Totura et al. 2009). Given the prior work mentioned above, the finding for the percentage of students on free/reduced lunch is surprising. The results suggest that the percentage of students on free/reduced lunch increases the likelihood of bullying by .004%. It is also worth noting that there is a high correlation between the racial diversity of the school and the percentage of students on free/reduced lunch (.5968). Schools that have a diversity racial composition may also have more students that are on free/reduced lunch. The relationship between these two measures may be driving the positive effect I find for the percentage of students on free/reduced lunch. Although multicollinearity may be an issue for these two measures, I kept both of them in the modeling because they are both theoretically related to the study of bullying in schools and only serve as control measures in this research.

Additionally, school size impacts bullying. As the number of students in a school increases, bullying decreases by 1%. Studies suggest that school size may have no effect on victimization (Gottfredson and DiPietro 2011) or that smaller schools actually experience more bullying (Ma 2002). Additionally, consistent with prior studies on victimization and misbehavior, social problems and disorder in schools enhance the reporting of bullying by 73% (Stewart 2003). Racial diversity, urbanicity, school size, school problems are all significant under p<.001. The percentage of students on free/reduced lunch is significant under p<.01. These findings are relatively consistent with prior research and most of these results are notably consistent throughout the modeling. Next, I turn my attention to understanding how theories on organizational context and bullying in workplaces may work in schools.
Impact of Organizational Chaos and Bureaucracy

How does organizational chaos influence the incidence of bullying in schools? Model 2 adds organizational chaos to the equation presented in model 1. I expect organizational chaos will increase bullying in schools. I find support for this hypothesis. The findings indicate that as organizational chaos increases the likelihood of bullying increases by 40% (p<.001). These results suggest that organizational chaos is not just harmful for workplaces, but it is also consequential for school environments. Schools may have more incidences of bullying because of organizational chaos. Although labor process literature notes the dangers of organizational chaos, the literature also suggests the influence bureaucratic structures may have on mitigating the effect organizational chaos has on bullying.

How does bureaucratic structure influence bullying in schools? Model 3 adds bureaucratic structure and perceptions of bureaucratic enforcement to the equation presented in model 1. I expected initially that bureaucratic structures would reduce bullying in schools. I find partial support for this hypothesis. The findings indicate that bureaucratic structures in the form of written rules and procedures reduce the likelihood of bullying by 4% (p<.01). This makes sense considering that written rules and procedures create guidelines and directives that may help foster an environment that protects against bullying.

The results for perceptions of bureaucratic enforcement are not statistically significant. Since perceptions of bureaucratic enforcement capture students’ opinion of the effectiveness of bureaucratic structures, it may be the case that students do not have
an accurate grasp on the value of rules and procedures for deterring behaviors. It could also be the case, since I cannot explicate causal ordering, that rules and procedures were implemented after incidents of bullying. In this case, the measure for the perceptions of bureaucratic enforcement could be capturing the more precise climate of the school environment. More research is needed to determine the full effect of these findings. Nonetheless, these results suggest that bureaucratic structures reduce bullying in schools, but what about the relationship between bureaucratic structures, organizational chaos, and bullying?

Do bureaucratic structures mitigate the effect organizational chaos has on bullying? Model 4 consists of organizational chaos and bureaucratic structures along with school level controls. Given prior literature, I have two expectations related to this hypothesis. First, I expect that bureaucratic structure will continue to reduce the incidence of bullying. Second, I suspect that organizational chaos will no longer have a significant effect on bullying. I find partial support for this hypothesis. Similar to model 3, the findings indicate that bureaucratic structures, in form of rules and procedures, decrease the likelihood of bullying by 4% (p<.01). However, also similar to a prior model, bullying is still 1.4 times more likely in schools that have organizational chaos (p<.001). Perception of bureaucratic enforcement is still not statistically significant. These results suggest that bureaucratic structures do very little to mitigate the effect organizational chaos has on bullying.

In another analysis (see Table 3), I further explore the relationship between bureaucratic structures and organizational chaos through the inclusion of interactions
between organizational chaos and bureaucratic structures. These interactions were not statistically significant which further suggests that bureaucratic structures may not mitigate the relationship between organizational chaos and bullying. Bureaucratic structures do impact bullying but may not be powerful enough to alleviate the influence of organizational chaos. Both may, in fact, exist simultaneously within contemporary organizations, as noted within the sociology of work literature.

I continue to explore this relationship in additional analyses through considering bullying in schools with high and low levels of bureaucratic structure (see Table 4 and 5). Schools with high levels of bureaucratic structure (or schools with at least 5 of the bureaucratic rules and controls listed in the data/method section) make up about 20% of the total sample size. Schools with low levels of bureaucratic structure (or schools with 2 or fewer of the bureaucratic rules and controls listed in the data/method section) constitute about 30% of the sample. I find that the effect organizational chaos has on bullying is greater in schools with high levels of bureaucratic structure when compared to schools with low levels of bureaucratic structure. In schools with high level of bureaucratic structure, bullying is 2.17 times more likely when the school has organizational chaos (p<.01). Whereas, in schools with low levels of bureaucratic structure, bullying is only 1.39 times more likely when organizational chaos is present (p<.001). Of course, as explained earlier, these findings may reflect rules and procedures that were implemented after incidences of bullying, which I am unable to capture due to limitations with causal ordering. It is also likely that these findings point to the gap between intended organizational functioning and actual workplace practices. The
presence of bureaucratic structure is thought to reduce bullying but this structure may need organizational accountability and resources to actually influence change. For example, schools that have diversity officers or grievance procedures in place for the reporting of bullying may be less likely to face the effect organizational chaos has on bullying because these schools have effective bureaucratic structures.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Bullying is a reality in many schools and is consequential for the health and safety of students. The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between organizational context and bullying in schools. Labor processes literature finds that organizational chaos increases the incidence of bullying in workplaces. Studies suggest that bureaucratic structures can create accountability structures and may minimize bullying in workplaces. But how does organizational context influence bullying among students in schools?

I use theories on bullying in workplaces to understand the incidence of bullying in schools. The study contributes to scholarship by empirically testing the relationship between organizational context and bullying in schools. Most research is primarily focused in one institutional context, the workplace. I extend previous work by examining variation in the institutional settings of bullying. This research is important for the development of policies and programs that may actually reduce bullying.

Results indicate that organizational context influences bullying in schools. Organizational chaos enhances bullying. I also find that bureaucratic structures reduce
bullying. However, bureaucratic structures do not mediate the effect organizational chaos has on bullying. I find that organizational chaos still increases bullying despite the presence of bureaucratic structure. Additionally, results indicate that bureaucratic structure and not perception of bureaucratic enforcement influences bullying. Overall, these results suggest that, like in workplaces, organizational chaos and bureaucratic structure are helpful for understanding the incidence of bullying among students in schools.

With any study, however, there are limitations. Most important in this regard is this study’s reliance on cross-sectional data, which constrains me from establishing the causal ordering between aspects of organizational context and bullying. Such features of context may have emerged in response to the presence of bullying. Second, the indicator used for the reporting of bullying is, at best, a conservative measure. The measure is collected from data from school officials, who have reasons to represent their school in a favorable light. School officials may not be able to account for some incidences of bullying because victims of bullying must identify abuse, blame perpetrators, and notify school personnel in order to be counted (Felstiner et al. 1980). Next, the measured reports of bullying may not actually be capturing the incidence of bullying, but instead rough or combative interchanges among students. Lastly, I acknowledge that the magnitudes of the effects are small, which may suggest that the results mean little for predicting the incidence of bullying.

Despite such caveats and consistent with prior work on educational processes, I would suggest that although contextual effects may be small, they do inform our
understanding of the relevance of school context (Alexander and Eckland 1975).

Moreover, it is also notable that patterns relative to the role of organizational context are consistent with prior work on workplace bullying.

Results from my analyses call for policy makers to consider the role of organizational context when developing policies regarding bullying within schools. Although some individuals may be predisposed to bullying because of, for instance, their body type, organizational context is also important. Schools need to develop functional systems of control that minimize the presence of organizational chaos. Also, schools need to have bureaucratic structures that effectively reduce abusive behaviors. I urge school personnel to invest resources into the health and safety of the organizational context. Additionally, the task for future scholarship is to continue to explore the role of organizational context by integrating literatures and constructing creative analyses that capture process and mechanisms that predict the emergence of bullying.
Chapter 3: Racial Composition and Bullying among Students in American Schools

Bullying is a serious problem in American schools (Hart 2005). Every day, 160,000 students stay home from school because they are afraid of being bullied (U.S. Department of Education). Suicide rates are almost double among bullied victims (Aalsma and Brown 2008) and many school shootings have resulted from the incidence of bullying (Grim 2008). Certainly, bullying can create an unsafe environment that results in emotional, physical, and psychological problems for its victims (Espelage and Swearer 2003; Olweus 1978; McCarthy and Mayhew 2004).

Bullying is defined as repeated and unwarranted physical (e.g., hitting), verbal (e.g., threatening) and/or social (e.g., spreading rumors) abuse (Olweus 1978). It involves a real or perceived imbalance in physical or social power between perpetrators and victims (Olwesus 1991). For example, students who are popular or physically strong may bully students who are unpopular or physically weak. Bullying may also target specific groups of people, such as racial minorities, that hold lower cultural and social statuses relative to their white counterparts (Sacks and Salem 2009). In fact, given the legacy of racial segregation and discrimination in American schools, it may be the case that the racial composition of a school is an important aspect of organizational context that influences the likelihood of bullying among students in schools (Roscigno 2007).
Most research on bullying and organizational context—such as functional or compositional aspects of environments—focuses on aspects of organizational context that are assumed to affect everyone the same way, regardless of race. For instance studies examine how a schools’ size (Gottfredson & DiPietro 2011; Ma 2002), disciplinary environment (Ma 2002), and collective efficacy (Gottfredson and DiPietro 2011; Williams and Guerra 2011) shape the potential for bullying. Few studies if any, however, consider the racial composition of the school. A focus on racial composition extends prior work on bullying and may prove important for designing policies and programs that might help eliminate bullying among students in schools.

Theories of racial threat seek to explain the role racial composition plays in the persistence of discrimination in institutional settings (e.g., Cohen 1998; 2001; Jacobs and Carmichael 2001; Roscigno 2007; Roscigno and Tomaskovic-Devey 1996; Welch and Payne 2010). These theories stipulate that a growing racial minority composition will pressure the majority group to protect valued resources through discrimination (Blalock 1967). Minority group members may experience discrimination as the majority group seeks to defend their privileges and advantages – including economic positions, political power and social statuses. In line with this theory, bullying may be especially present in schools that have large and/or growing racial minority compositions.

In contrast to racial threat perspectives, social isolation theories argue that numerically underrepresented groups may be especially susceptible to discrimination from the majority group (e.g, Kanter 1977; Moss and Tilly 1996; Roscigno 2007; Stainback and Irvin 2012; Tomaskovic-Devey 1993). Studies find that racial minorities
may become especially vulnerable to discrimination when they represent a small proportion of the total population and are easily visible and targeted (e.g., Roscigno 2007; Tomaskovic-Devey 1993). This would suggest, in the context of schooling, that bullying is more likely in schools where racial minorities make up a small proportion of the total student body.

Building on these theoretical frameworks, I empirically investigate the effect racial minority composition has on the incidence of bullying among students in schools. This study extends prior research in two ways. First, I consider racial composition to be an aspect of organizational context. As mentioned above, prior research has a limited understanding of organizational context. I extend previous studies by testing variations in the concept of organizational context. Second, I examine three racial minority groups: blacks, Latinos, and Asians. Most studies on racial threat and social theory only consider blacks as a racial minority group. The few studies that do examine other racial minority groups produce inconsistent findings (e.g., Hood and Morris 1997; Hjerm and Nagayoshi 2011; Huddy and Sears 1995; Stein, Post, and Rinden 2002; Taylor 1998). The significance of studying three racial minority groups is that novel patterns of bullying may be observed across groups.

My analysis draws on school-level data from the Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS:02), a nationally representative sample of American High School students and their schools. Using logistic regression modeling, I test the linear and non-linear effects the percentage of black students, the percentage of Latino students, and the percentage of Asian students on bullying. My findings suggest that both racial threat and
social isolation theories are useful for explaining bullying in schools. Racial threat theory is important for understanding bullying in higher concentration Asian schools, while social isolation theory helps explain higher incidence of bullying in higher concentration black and Latino schools. These results suggest that diverse aspects of organizational context influence bullying.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Racial Composition and Bullying in Schools**

Although scholarship devotes significant attention to the study of bullying (e.g., Esbensen and Carson 2009; Espelage and Swearer 2003; Gottfredson & DiPietro 2011; Olweus 1978; 1993; Ma 2002; Nansel, Overpeck, Pilla, Ruan, Morton, and Scheidt 2001; Swearer et al. 2010), only a few studies examine the relationship between racial composition and bullying among students in schools. Racial composition is a relevant factor in structural and status based disadvantages in neighborhoods, workplaces, and housing markets. Given the history of racial inequalities in schools, racial composition may potentially have significant implications for the persistence of school bullying (Espelage and Swearer 2003).

Hanish and Guerra (2000) provide one of the few examples of research that examines racial composition and bullying. They investigate how the racial composition of a school influences perceptions of peer victimization among white, black, and Hispanic students in that school. The authors define peer victimization as the incidence of children being teased, attacked, or bullied by one or more peers over time (Hanish and
Guerra 2000: 202). They find that white students are at greater risk for peer victimization in schools that are made up of predominately non-white student bodies. Black students are less likely to experience victimization in schools made up of racially integrated student bodies. They do not find racial composition to be a significant factor for the peer victimization of Hispanic students.

The findings noted above provide a limited understanding of racial composition and victimization in schools for a couple of reasons. First, relative to the total sample size, this study has only a small sample of white students and only a few schools that are made up of predominately white student bodies. As a result, their study may be unable to actually capture the experiences of racial minority students in schools with predominately white student bodies. Likewise, their study may be over emphasizing the experiences of white students in schools with predominately non-white student populations. Also, Hanish and Guerra’s (2000) sample consists of primarily low-income students, which may suggest that their findings are identifying interactions between race and class instead of accounting for the role of racial composition among students in general.

I build on this work by using a national sample of students from racially diverse student bodies. Because of the limited amount of research on racial composition and bullying, I draw on theories of racial threat and social isolation to make theoretical sense of the connection between racial composition and bullying in schools. Below, I review the literature on racial threat theory and social isolation theory. I conclude with an explanation of how I apply these theories to the study of racial composition.
Theories on Racial Threat

According to racial threat literature (see as examples Cohen 1998; Olzak 1990; Tomaskovic-Devey and Roscigno 1996), a growing racial minority composition generates competitive pressures and a tendency for the racial majority group to protect valued resources, statuses, and positions by way of discrimination (Blalock 1967). An emergent minority group may experience discrimination as the majority group seeks to defend their privileges and advantages including economic positions, political power and social statuses.

In his seminal work on racial threat theory, Blalock (1967) suggest two reasons why the majority group may feel threatened by the growth of the racial minority group. First, as the minority group increases in size, competition intensifies for scarce resources, including limited access to jobs (e.g., promotion, hiring), and housing (e.g., locations). In the case of schools, these resources may include access to advanced classes (e.g., honors or Advance Placement courses), coveted school activities (e.g., sports teams, trips), or even physical space. The second reason the majority group may feel threatened is because a growing racial minority group increases the possibility of collective action against the majority group. The assumption is that the majority group members hold simpler beliefs and interests. The minority group may become a risk to the economic, political, and/or educational interests of the majority group. In schools, this fear of collective action against the majority group may be reflective in threats related to school funding, programs, or services for students.
Racial threat theory has been tested in multiple contexts (e.g., Blanchard 2007; Cohen 1998, 2001; Jacobs and Carmichael 2001; Roscigno 2007; Roscigno and Tomaskovic-Devey 1996; Welch and Payne 2010, 2012). Studies have considered how racial threat may influence access to jobs, wages, and promotion structures. Cohen (1998; 2001) studies racial differences in the US labor market and finds that whites hold an advantage over blacks. His work suggests that black composition is associated with long-term joblessness among black workers (Cohen 1998). Cohen finds that all white groups benefit from the presence of black populations in the labor market. White men in the non-working class group benefit the most (Cohen 2001). Cohen suggests that the differences between black and white workers are likely the result of discrimination against black workers by the white majority group.

Additionally, research on residential segregation examines the effect racial composition has on integration. Studies suggest that racial segregation increases as the minority composition grows because whites perceive blacks to be economic and social threats and decide to move away from them (Logan, Stults, and Farley 2004). Blanchard (2007), for example, considers the role religious communities play in racial segregation. He finds that counties with large numbers of white conservative protestant congregations have more racial segregation. Research on segregation points to racial threat as an explanation for housing inequalities (Blanchard 2007; Logan et al. 2004).

Racial threat theories have also been applied within criminal justice contexts. Studies have examined how racial composition is related to the application of judicial policies and practices (Behrens, Uggen and Manza 2003; Smith and Holmes 2003), arrest
and sentencing rates (Mosher 2001), and even imprisonment (Jacobs and Carmichael 2001; Jacobs, Malone, and Iles 2012). This line of research finds that the proportion of blacks in an area is correlated with tougher penalties for crimes in that area. These studies make the case that there is a link between race and crime. Discrimination emerges as a growing black composition threatens the perceived safety and security of the white majority group.

More recently, research has begun to investigate racial threat in schools through considering the link between race and crime (Welch and Payne 2010; 2012; Payne and Welch 2010). Welch and Payne (2010) find that schools are more likely to assign harsher penalties for misbehavior in schools with large and/or growing black student populations. Additionally, they find that schools with growing black student compositions are less likely to offer punishments that are restorative responses for misbehaviors when compared to schools with predominately white student compositions. Schools with predominately white student compositions have more restorative responses for student misbehaviors. Welch and Payne (2012) find that schools with growing black student compositions are more likely to use expulsion, suspension, and in-school suspension as methods for dealing with misbehavior. This punishment type occurs even in schools that have less delinquent behavior and drug use. The authors conclude that the behavior of schools with emergent black student compositions is likely the result of discrimination. School officials are likely associating race with crime and are fearful that black students will threaten the safety of other students (Welch and Payne 2010; 2012). Many prior studies, as discussed above, consider the linear relationship between racial composition
and discrimination and conclude that a racial minority composition always poses a threat to the majority group.

Other research considers the racial threat argument to predict a curvilinear relationship between racial minority composition and discrimination (e.g., Blalock 1967). In other words, discrimination may increase until the racial minority group reaches a particular percentage of the population, and thereafter discrimination will decline because the minority group is well represented in the population. Defina and Hannon (2009) consider the curvilinear effect of racial threat on housing segregation. They examine whether segregation exists between black-white and Hispanic-white groups. They find that housing segregation is significantly reduced in areas that have become more racially diverse. Defina and Hannon suggest that more contact among people from a diversity of racial groups may help explain decreases in housing segregation.

Studies have similarly measured non-linear effects of racial composition in the workplace. Blalock (1967), for example, studied race relations in workplaces between white and black employees. He found that black employees experienced discrimination until black employees reached about 23% of the total workforce. After reaching this point, black employees experienced less discrimination with their increases in size. Similarly, McCreary, England, and Farkas (1989) find that the employment of black men declines in a city until the black population reaches about 50% of the total population. According to this theory, bullying may be especially present in schools that have large and/or growing racial minority compositions.
Theories on Social Isolation

An alternative to racial threat theory, derived from social isolation theories, suggests that a small numerical minority group may be especially susceptible to stereotyping and discrimination from the majority group (Kanter 1977; Roscigno 2007). Along these lines, most research focuses on inequalities at work as well as dynamics surrounding gender.

In her influential book, *Men and Women of the Corporation*, Kanter (1977) examines the experiences of female managers in a predominately male dominated workplace. She argues that female managers, who were the numerical minority group, represented clear examples of difference in the workplace, and, thus, were more easily targeted for discrimination. Specifically, these female managers were likely to experience exclusion from informal social networks, stereotyping based on their gender, and biased evaluations on their job performance. These managers may not have been evaluated on the quality of their work performance but rather scrutinized for not resembling the perceptions and expectations projected on them by the majority group. Kanter finds that the female managers were unable to change the culture of the workplace because of their small numbers. She concludes that a growing representation of female managers would result in less discrimination by the majority male group.

Kanter primarily focuses on female workers. However, she suggests that her findings are applicable to other numerically underrepresented groups. She states that the experiences of these female workers “echo the experiences of people of any kind who are rare and scarce: the lone blacks among whites, the lone man among woman, the few foreigners among natives” (Kanter 1977:207).
Scholars extend this theory to the study of racial minority groups (e.g., McBrier and Wilson 2004; Roscigno 2007; Stainback and Irvin 2012; Tomaskovic-Devey 1993). Roscigno (2007), drawing on data from the Ohio Civil Rights Commission, finds that, among black workers, serious cases of workplace racial discrimination decline to some degree with increases in the percentage of black workers. He finds that discrimination against black workers was greatest in workplaces where blacks represent around 20% of the workforce.

Studies also examine underrepresentation in social status (instead of numerical underrepresentation) (Turco 2010; Williams 1992; Yoder 1994; Zimmer 1988). Workplaces are made up of social status hierarchies that give some groups advantages over other groups. White males, regardless of institutional position, hold culturally circumscribed status advantages relative to their minority and female counterparts. Turco (2010), drawing on interviews from Black female and male workers in the Leveraged buyout industry, finds that cultural resources were given to the male workers and withheld from female workers regardless of race. Female workers seemed to experience more discrimination when compared to other workers. She concludes that in this context gender is a more relevant social status for exclusion than race. Moreover, this line of research has shown that numerically underrepresented groups may be more vulnerable to discrimination because their small numbers make it difficult for them to change cultural biases and stereotyping. How might social isolation theories play out in schools?

Although Williams and Peguero (2013) do not attempt an analysis of social isolation theory, their study provides one of the few empirical tests of how bullying may
result from numerical and status underrepresentation in schools (also see Peguero and Williams 2013). They consider whether the effect bullying has on achievement varies for high and low achieving Asian, Black, and Latino students. These racial groups are often numerical and status minorities in their schools. Rudman and Fairchild (2004) proposed a conceptual framework that predicted backlash in stereotype maintenance from the perspective of both perceivers and actors. Research indicates that cultural stereotypes evoke a normative standard to which the target is compared; when individuals fail to fit the standard, a contrast effect may cause them to be viewed as deviant (Phelan and Rudman 2010; Rudman and Fairchild 2004).

Building on this theory, Williams and Peguero argue that bullying is a consequence for racial minorities that break stereotypes related to academic achievement. In line with the history of racial inequality in schools, research demonstrates that both faculty and students themselves enter school with the notion that black and Latino students are not as likely to succeed academically when compared to white students. Likewise, Asian students are viewed as the “model minority” and, as a result are expected to achieve universal and unparalleled academic success (Chou and Feagin 2008; Kao 2000; Lee 2009). So, broken stereotypes would be the equivalent of high achieving black and Latino students and low achieving Asian students. Williams and Peguero test the consequences of broken stereotypes and find that high achieving black students experience more bullying than their white counterparts. They find no significant difference for Latino or Asian students. In their study, black students represent numerical and status minority group members that have experienced discrimination. Although their
study provides a novel approach to the study of bullying and competitive pressures in schools, they look at bullying and race at the individual level and are, therefore, unable to draw conclusions about the influence of racial composition. I extend their work through considering the racial composition of the school.

CURRENT STUDY AND HYPOTHESES

This study investigates the role racial composition plays in the persistence of bullying. Similar to prior work, I consider bullying to be a form of discrimination (Williams and Peguero 2013; Peguero and Williams 2013), and I draw on racial threat and social isolation theories to investigate the relationship between racial composition and bullying.

I consider three hypotheses and test two arguments related to racial threat. First, I consider whether the percentage of black, the percentage of Latino, and the percentage of Asian students in a school increase the incidence of bullying among students in schools (hypothesis 1). Second, I investigate curvilinear effects of racial composition. I examine whether bullying increases until the racial minority group reaches a particular percentage of the total population and thereafter bullying declines as the minority group becomes more represented in the population. I test whether the percentage of black, the percentage of Latino, and the percentage of Asian students in a school increase the incidence of bullying until a certain threshold is reached and therefore results in few incidences of bullying among students in schools (hypothesis 2). Third, I examine the role social isolation theory may play in the persistence of bullying. Along these lines, I test whether the presence of a small numerical minority group is likely to result in more bullying. In
order to find support for social isolation theory, I would expect to see a negative
association between racial composition and bullying because I am arguing that schools
with fewer racial minority students will have more incidences of bullying. Specifically, I
test whether there is a negative relationship between the percentage of black, the
percentage of Latino, and the percentage of Asian students and bullying among students
in school (hypothesis 3).

DATA AND METHODS

I draw data from the restricted-use version of the Educational Longitudinal Study of 2002
(ELS:02) and the Common Core of Data 2002 (CCD) to test the aforementioned ideas.
ELS:02 is a nationally represented sample of over 15,000 students in over 750 schools.
Data were first collected from a sample of schools. Then students were randomly selected
from each school sampled. The school-based component of the survey was completed by
school principals, and other school administrators. I use the baseline year of the survey,
which was collected spring term 2002. All the students in the baseline year of the survey
are sophomores in high school. The survey sampled Asian students at a higher rate than
White, Black, and Latino students to ensure representation of Asian students.

CCD is a national statistical database that is collected annually by the department
of Education. It includes information on the compositional context of all public
elementary and secondary schools in the U.S. I match ELS:02 with CCD to capture
indicators of racial composition, school size, and school structure. Since matching was
required and private schools are absent from the CCD, I only include public schools in my analyses.

The sample size was 9,120 students. These data include measures of school and classroom characteristics and are especially appropriate for this study in that they allow for the examination of racial composition and bullying among students in schools (for a detailed discussion of the see NCES 2007). Reported results are based on logistic regression models.

**Dependent Variable**

My outcome of interest is school bullying. School Administrators were asked to the best of their knowledge, how often bullying was a problem at their school during the 2001-2002 academic year. School Administrators could respond to these questions in one of five ways: “Daily,” “At least once a week,” “At least once a month,” “On occasion,” and “Never happens.” These responses were dichotomized to indicate whether the school experienced any incidence of bullying in a one month period. That is, if a school administrator said that bullying occurred “at least once a month”, “at least once a week”, or “daily” in their school their response was coded as 1 and if a school administrator said that bullying occurred “On Occasion” or “Never Happens” in their school their response was coded as 0. I consider this to be a conservative measure because school personnel have every reason to represent their school in a favorable light. Nonetheless, about 32% of schools reported at least one incidence of bullying at least once a month during the academic year.
Key Independent Variables

Building on racial threat and social isolation theory, I include measures of the racial composition of the school: the percentage of black students, the percentage of Latino students, and the percentage of Asian students in a given school. Black and Latino compositions reflect U.S. population statistics in that few schools (about 17 percent and 14 percent, respectively) have black and Latino populations that represent more than 30%. Likewise, Asian students, on average, represent about 5.2% of the student body sampled.

Control Variables

I control for poverty, locale, size, social problems and disorder, and security since they have been linked to the likelihood of bullying in school (Gottfredson 2001; Gottfredson and DiPietro 2011; Graham et al. 2007; Hanish and Guerra 2000; Ma 2002; Peguero 2009; Stewart 2003). I include the percent of students on free/reduced lunch as an approximation for poverty in the school. Urbanicity considers whether the school is located in an urban locale (non-urban locale are the reference category). School size measures the number of students in a given school.

The school’s level of social problems and disorder construct is measured by sixteen questions that represented school administrators’ account of the level of social problems and disorder within their school. School administrators indicate whether or not each of the following is a problem at their school (i.e., tardiness, absenteeism, class cutting, physical conflicts, robbery or theft, vandalism, use of alcohol, use of illegal
drugs, students under the influence of drugs/alcohol while at school, the sale of drugs on campus, possession of weapons, racial-ethnic tensions, gang activities, physical abuse of teachers, verbal abuse of teachers, and student acts of disrespect for teachers).

The school’s level of security construct is measured by eleven questions that represented school administrators’ account of the level of security implemented within their school. School administrators indicate whether or not each of the following security measure is evident at their school: control access to school buildings during school hours, control access to school grounds during school hours, require students to pass through metal detectors each day, perform one or more random metal detector checks on students, close the campus for most students during lunch, use one or more random dog sniffs to check for drugs, perform one or more random sweeps for contraband, require clear book bags or ban book bags on school grounds, require students to wear badges or picture IDs, require faculty and staff to wear badges or picture IDs, and use one or more security cameras to monitor the school. Table 1 reports ranges, means, and standard deviations for my dependent variable and key independent variables along with my control measures.

**ANALYTIC STRATEGY**

My analyses proceed in several steps. All results are presented in Table 2. First, using logistic regression, in model 1, I consider the effect school level control measures have on bullying independent of racial composition. In the next two models, I test varying forms of racial threat theory. In model 2, I consider the effects of racial composition by adding the natural logarithm of the percentage of black, the percentage of Latino, and the
percentage of Asian students to the equation presented in model 1. Next, in model 3, I examine the curvilinear influence of racial composition. I test the linear and non-linear effects of the percentage of black, the percentage of Latino, and the percentage of Asian students along with the school level controls. Finally, in model 4, I test social isolation theory by considering the linear effects of black, Latino, and Asian student groups alongside the school level controls. Results are discussed in odd ratios.

RESULTS
Model 1 considers how school-level control measures impact the incidence of bullying. All the measures are significant at \( p \leq 0.001 \). The results suggest that the percentage of students on free/reduced lunch reduces the likelihood of bullying among students in schools by about 1%. This finding makes some sense considering that students in impoverished schools may be less likely to view the incidence of bullying as an offense that needs to be reported to authorities (Devoe et al. 2005; Dinkes et al. 2009; Esbensen and Carson 2009; Totura et al. 2009). Schools in urban areas are 42% less likely to report bullying when compared to schools in non-urban areas.

Additionally, school size influences bullying. As the size of school increases, bullying decreases by 1%. Studies suggest that school size may have no effect on victimization (Gottfredson and DiPietro 2011) or that smaller schools actually experience more bullying (Ma 2002). Additionally, consistent with prior studies on victimization and misbehavior, the level of security in schools reduces the likelihood of bullying by about
6% and social problems and disorder in schools increase the reporting of bullying by 73% (Stewart 2003).

It is also worth noting that, although most of the measures of school-level controls are consistent through all three models, the measure for the percentage of students on free/reduced lunch is significantly different in models 2 thru 4. In these models, the measure becomes positive, and the percentage of students on free/reduced lunch increases the likelihood of bullying by .004%. This effect is small but may be related to over representation of black and Latino students in these schools. The correlation table shows a moderate between the percentage of students on free/reduced lunch and the percentage of black (.45) and Latino (.38) students in schools. As discussed in chapter 2, there is a strong relationship between the racial diversity of the school and the percentage of students on free/reduced lunch. Schools that have a diversity racial composition may also have more students that are on free/reduced lunch. More research is needed to determine the causes of this effect. How can we make sense of the connection between racial composition and bullying among students in schools?

**Racial Threat and Bullying**

Models 2 and 3 draw on theories of racial threat to explain bullying. Model 2 considers the effects of racial composition by adding the natural logarithm of the percentage of black, the percentage of Latino, and the percentage of Asian students to the equation presented in model 1. My first hypothesis suggests that a minority composition will increase the reporting of bullying. I find some support for this hypothesis with regard to
the Asian student composition. As the percentage of Asian students in a school increases the likelihood of bullying also increases.

I further investigate the role of racial threat by adding non-linear effects for the percentage of black, percentage of Latino, and percentage of Asian students to the modeling. Does a growing racial minority composition only increase bullying among students in schools until a certain threshold? My second hypothesis tests Blalock’s theory and argues that an emergent minority composition only increases bullying to a certain point and after that point is reached bullying will decline. Again, I find support for this hypothesis as it relates to the Asian student composition. It is worth noting that model 3 (Pseudo R²=.2186) explains slightly more of the variation in the dependent variable than model 2 (Pseudo R²=.2040). Model 3 may provide a better understanding of racial composition.

Figure 1, derived from model 3, shows that bullying will be greater in schools that have growing Asian student populations until a threshold is reached and thereafter bullying will decline. Figure 1 provides a good visual of the effect for the percentage of Asian students but it is hard to know exactly where this threshold is because, on average, Asian students only represent about 5% of the total student body.

This finding for the Asian student composition makes some sense because Asian students are often viewed as the “model minority” and they place a high emphasis on learning and academic success (Chou & Feagin, 2008; Kao, 2000; Lee, 2009). As shown in the ELS dataset, and other data sources, Asian students have higher test scores and GPA’s than comparable white students. Asian students may actually prove to be a threat
to the resources, statuses, and positions of the white majority group since Asian students challenge white students academically. Although these findings are interesting and may prove important for school policy, more research is needed to better understand the relationship between an emergent Asian student body and bullying. These data do not allow us to determine the race of the perpetrator of bullying so it is unclear as to whether White students are oppressing Asian students.

Social Isolation and Bullying

Model 4 considering the linear effects of the percentage of black, the percentage of Latino, and the percentage of Asian student groups alongside the school level controls. My third hypothesis, drawing on social isolation theory, tests whether the presence of a small numerical minority group is likely to result in more bullying among students in schools. In order to find support for social isolation theory, I would expect to see a negative association between racial composition and bullying because I am arguing that schools with fewer racial minority students will have more incidences of bullying among students in schools. I find partial support for my third hypothesis. The results show that schools that have small black and Latino student populations experience more bullying (p<.001). As the percentage of black and the percentage of Latino students in a school increases bullying is reduced by 2% and 1%, respectively. There is no significant effect for the Asian student composition.

Interestingly, model 3 also shows that in student bodies where the black composition is small there will be more bullying until the school becomes more racially
integrated. Figure 2, derived from model 3, shows that schools with small black student populations report more bullying until the black student population becomes a larger percentage of the student body. Similarly to Asian students, it is hard to tell exactly where this threshold is because the average school only has a black composition of 17%. This finding provides further support for social isolation theory. It seems as if schools with small black student populations experience more bullying than schools with larger black populations.

According to social isolation theory, schools with low concentrations of black and Latino student populations may have more bullying because black and Latino students face both numerical and status based underrepresentation in these contexts. Although these data do not reveal victimization, it may be the case that black and Latino students experience bullying as the result of their small representation in the school environment.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION
The main objective of this study, drawing on racial threat and social isolation theory, was to investigate the relationship between racial composition and bullying in schools. Research on racial threat literature concludes that a growing minority composition will be discriminated against as the white majority group seeks to protect valued resources (e.g., Blalock 1967; Jacobs and Carmichael 2001; Welch and Payne 2010; 2012), whereas social isolation theory argues that a small minority composition will be stereotyped and discriminated against because they are rare and represent difference (e.g., Kanter 1977;
Roscigno 2007). Building on these theoretical frameworks, this study makes two important contributions.

First, I extend the concept of organizational context to the study of racial composition in schools. Prior research on organizational context tends to focus on general aspects of context that are thought to influence all groups of people the same, regardless of race. Second, I examine three racial minority groups: blacks, Latinos, and Asians when most studies consider one racial minority group. The inclusion of three racial minority groups is valuable for understanding differences in discrimination across racial groups. These two contributions are important for developing policies and programs that address racial difference in the likelihood of bullying among students in schools.

Results indicate that the effect racial minority composition has on bullying varies by particular racial groups. Social isolation theory is useful for explaining bullying in schools with small black and Latino student populations. I find that as schools become more integrated with black and Latino students there will be less bullying. In contrast, the relationship between Asian student population and bullying is explained through racial threat theory. An emergent Asian student population results in more bullying among students until a threshold is reached and thereafter bullying declines. These findings suggest the importance of considering and understanding racial minority groups as distinct groups that may be impacted differently by processes of discrimination in schools. Moreover, racial inequalities that exist in schools may vary by the social status of the racial minority group.
As with any study, this study has limitations, which might spark future research questions. First, the indicator used for the reporting of bullying is, at best, a conservative measure. The measure is collected from data from school officials, who have reasons to represent their school in a favorable light. School officials may not be able to account for some incidences of bullying because victims of bullying must identify abuse, blame perpetrators, and notify school personnel in order to be counted (Felstiner et al. 1980). There is some prior work that suggests that minority students, who are more likely to attend schools with higher percentages of impoverished students and that are in urban areas, have a higher threshold for violence and are less likely to report victimization in school (e.g., Devoe et al. 2005; Dinkes et al. 2009). Second, the indicator for bullying may not actually be capturing the incidence of bullying but instead rough or combative interchanges among students. Finally, as mentioned earlier, the measure of bullying does not record the racial background of the perpetrator. As a result, I have no way of knowing whether perpetrators of bullying targeted victims from their same or different racial background. I, therefore, call for scholars to devote more attention to the study of bullying and racial composition in schools.

Moreover, my findings set forth an agenda for continued exploration of school bullying and its association with racial composition. My results suggest that the racial composition of the student body influences the level of bullying in schools and that the effect racial composition has on bullying differs by the racial background of the minority group. Future research is needed to further investigate the processes that underline these patterns of inequality. Qualitative work on the social and cultural aspects of racial group
functioning in schools may provide a more complete understanding of the patterns that have emerged in this study. For example, youth violence and school bullying literature have begun to identify racial victimization and the role of culture in victimization. Research on racial composition in schools is especially important as the United States becomes more racially diverse and seeks to provide a safe and healthy school environment for all students.
Chapter 4: General and Target Incivility at Work: Overlaps and Divergences in Bullying, Racial Discrimination and Sexual Harassment

Workplace incivility, or “negative relational aspects of employment, with implications for safety, integrity, and dignity,” is quite prevalent according to most estimates (Rayner et al. 2002; Roscigno et al. 2009b, p. 748; Zapf et al. 2003). It occurs between people who have different levels of power within the institution (Salin 2003). Incivility is consequential for workers’ emotional, physical, and psychological well-being (Lewis 2004; McCarthy and Mayhew 2004). This makes sense given that individuals within workplace environments often have to confront relations with co-workers and supervisors on an everyday basis.

Research finds that incivility, as a form of bullying, tends to vary in its emergence depending on features of organizational context. Particularly important in this regard are organizational chaos – that is, poor organization and coordination of the daily procedural processes of the workplace – and bureaucratic structures in the workplaces (Roscigno et al. 2009a:749; also see Einarsen et al. 2003; Hodson, Roscigno, Lopez 2006; Salin 2003). Organizational chaos is found to increase the likelihood of bullying, whereas bureaucratic structure is thought to reduce bullying. Research on incivility rarely goes beyond considering the relationship between these features of organizational context and bullying in the workplace.
This gap in research is unfortunate. Since the less powerful will be particularly vulnerable to incivility, it may be the case that incivility might also be targeted at specific status groups, such as females and minorities who hold lower cultural and social statues relative to their white counterparts. Scholarship on race and gender discrimination specifically, although not necessarily grounded within broader theoretical discussions surrounding incivility, would certainly concur (e.g., Dellinger and Williams 2002; Giuffre and Williams 1994; Hirsh and Lyons 2010; Pager 2003). Might it be the case that general forms of incivility, such as bullying, coincide in both cause and likelihood with more targeted forms, such as sexual harassment and racial discrimination? And, do aspects of organizational context pertaining to race/sex composition impact not only targeted types of incivility, such as sexual harassment and racial discrimination but bullying as well?

In this article, I address the above questions and gaps in what we know about incivility. I do so by building on and integrating labor processes and stratification literatures and considering their respective insights relative to incivility as an important, albeit underdeveloped, sociological construct. Although studies often consider how bullying can be a form of incivility, incivility can also emerge as sexual harassment, and racial discrimination. I argue for a more diverse understanding of incivility because incivility is fundamentally relational in nature and is rooted in power struggles between perpetrators and victims of abuse in institutional settings (see Einarsen et al. 2003; McCarthy and Mayhew 2004; Roscigno et al. 2009a). I extend prior research by suggesting: (1) that incivility can emerge as bullying, sexual harassment, and racial
discrimination, and; (2) that, beyond being patterned by specific aspects of organizational context surrounding chaos, incivility may also vary systematically by female and minority composition, and; (3) that bureaucratic structures within workplaces themselves may mitigate or exacerbate incivilities.

My analysis draws on the National Organizational Survey 2002 and considers three forms of incivility: bullying, sexual harassment, and racial discrimination. I test variation in the concept of organizational context by considering general aspects of context, such as organizational chaos, along side more diverse aspects of context, such as race/sex composition. Additionally, I consider whether bureaucratic structures in the forms of grievance procedures (e.g., having an EEO office or formal grievance procedures) and sensitivity programs (i.e., for diversity, conflict, and sexual harassment) mitigate or exacerbate the incivilities being investigated. I conclude by discussing the implications of these findings for sociological theorizing and conceptions surrounding incivility and future analyses.

GENERAL AND TARGETED INCIVILITY

Workplace incivility is a violation of commonly agreed upon norms of mutual respect (Hodson 2001), often with negative repercussions in terms of safety, integrity, and dignity as noted earlier. Such norm violations can be subtle in nature, such as isolating, embarrassing, or spreading rumors about another worker. They can also have more severe manifestations including physical fighting, threats and harassment. These violations often result in shame and significant psychological distress for victims (Lewis 2004; McCarthy
and Mayhew 2004) and, more broadly, can create a sense of shared injustice in the work environment (Molm et al. 2006).

Incivility occurs in relational aspects of institutions including communal exchanges, interpersonal conflicts, and physical altercations among people in institutional settings (Rayner, Hoel, and Cooper 2002; Roscigno et al. 2009a, 2009b), often between people who have different levels of power within the institution (Salin 2003). Institutional power can refer to institutional position but also power derived from social status hierarchies, such as race and gender. White males, for instance, regardless of institutional position, hold culturally circumscribed status advantages relative to their racial minority and female counterparts.

Most research on labor processes conceives of incivility as uni-dimensional. Studies have focused on bullying as a form of incivility. Bullying is conceived and measured as physical, verbal, and/or social abuse in the context of employment, usually at the hands of supervisors (e.g., Hodson et al. 2006; Rayner et al. 2002; Roscigno et al. 2009a, 2009b; Salin 2003). Bullying cuts across status divides and types of workplaces. Consequently, all workers are potentially vulnerable to bullying in the workplace.

However, since incivility is rooted in power imbalances in institutional environments, bullying may not be the only form of incivility. Incivility might be targeted at specific status groups, such as females and minorities that hold lower cultural and social statues relative to their white counterparts. Although little work has been done in this area, incivility could include additional dimensions, such as racial discrimination and sexual harassment. Covert norm violations may include workplaces where minorities
and women are excluded from networks that provide support and job promotions (McDonald 2011; see also Royster 2003; Wilson and McBrier 2005). And, more overtly, minorities and women may experience outright harassment as a function of their tokenism or difference in the workplace. Stratification research highlights racial discrimination and sexual harassment as negative, pertinent features of many contemporary workplaces (e.g., Roscigno 2007; Skaggs and Bridges 2013). Indeed, racial discrimination and sexual harassment are relational forms of abuse and emerge from power struggles that may be similar to bullying (Dellinger and Williams 2002; Giuffre and Williams 1994; Hirsh and Lyons 2010; Pager 2003).

Building on and extending prior research, I establish a connection between labor processes research (which tends to focus on generalized forms of incivility such as bullying) and stratification literature (which tends to highlight ascriptive abuse, such as sexual harassment and racial discrimination) to consider bullying, sexual harassment and racial discrimination as forms of incivility. Below, I turn to prior literature in more detail and highlight features of organizational context that arguably matter most for the persistence of incivility in the workplace.

**ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT AND INCIVILITY**

Research on labor processes finds that organizational context – that is, characteristics of institutional environments that impact their functioning and/or compositional make-up – is important for predicting incivility in workplaces. Most research on organizational context identifies organizational chaos and bureaucratic structures, discussed in more
detail below, as key aspects of context that influence incivility. These general aspects of context are thought to predict the likelihood of incivility in the same way for every employee, regardless of race and gender.

However, organizational environments are made up of people from different status groups, such as racial minorities and females, who hold different levels of institutional power. Given the diversity in institutional settings, it could be the case that particular status groups, such as females and racial minorities are more vulnerable to incivility (Blalock 1967; Kanter 1977). This study, in addition to considering general aspects of organizational context, examines female composition and racial minority composition as aspects of the organizational context. Specifically, I consider the effect of organizational chaos, female composition, racial minority composition and bureaucratic structures, have on incivility.

**Organizational Chaos**

Workplace incivility, particularly bullying, seems especially prevalent in workplaces that have organizational chaos. Organizational chaos is defined as poor organization and coordination of the daily procedural processes of the workplace (Roscigno et al. 2009a: 749; also see Einarsen et al. 2003; Salin 2003).

Organizational chaos often emerges from factors such as downsizing and restructuring within the workplace. Such factors place undue stress on workers because workers have the same workload and time constraints with a smaller workforce. As a result, management may abuse their employees in order to pressure employees to produce
more in less time (Vaez et al. 2004) or management may discriminate against employees as a way to express their lack of control in determining their own job future (Chamberlin 2008; Lopez et al. 2009; Roscigno et al. 2009a; Salin 2003).

Ultimately, organizational chaos replaces bureaucratic processes with unreliable and unclear worker expectations that create cultures of tolerance for abusive behavior and interpersonal conflict (Chamberlain 2008; Roscigno and Hodson 2004; Salin 2003). In workplaces with organizational chaos, incivility may be treated as an acceptable behavior and may entail a rewarding (or not punishing) of workers that have used sabotage or other types of incivility to advance within the organizational hierarchy (Salin 2003). Thus, given prior research, organizational chaos should increase the incidence of incivility in the workplace.

Race/Sex Composition

Incivility is also likely to emerge as a consequence of other aspects of organizational context, such as the race and gender composition of the workforce. Building on stratification research, and racial threat and social isolation theories in particular, I consider ways in which race and gender composition may influence incivility in the workplace.

According to threat literature (see as examples Cohen 1998; Olzak 1990; Tomaskovic-Devey and Roscigno 1996), a growing minority group will pressure the majority group to protect valued resources, statuses, and positions by way of discrimination (Blalock 1967). An emergent minority group may experience
discrimination as the majority group seeks to defend their privileges and advantages. Studies suggest that discrimination will increase until the minority group reaches a particular percentage of the population, and thereafter decline as the minority group becomes a large percentage of the population (Blalock 1967; Defina and Hannon 2009). In line with this theory, incivility will increase until the female and racial minority compositions of the workplace reach a particular threshold. Thereafter, incivility will decline as women and minorities become more represented in the workplace.

An alternative possibility, derived from social isolation theories, suggests that discrimination may be more apparent in workplaces that have small or “token” female and racial minority representation (Kanter 1997; Tomaskovic-Devey 1993). Even though token members may experience privileges and rewards, they are also visible in the workplace and, thus, could be more easily targeted (Kanter 1997; Vallas 2003). These workers, for example, may not be evaluated on the quality of their work performance but rather scrutinized for not resembling the perceptions and expectations projected on them by the majority group (Kanter 1997; Tomaskovic-Devey 1993; Moss and Tilly 1996). Moss and Tilly (1996), for instance, found that employer’s hiring standards excluded qualified black men because the black men held subtle differences in “soft skills” criteria. Additionally, in line with “minority vulnerability” thesis, token members may experience group specific processes of inequality that limit their mobility and opportunities within the workplace (McBrier and Wilson 2004). According to this theory, incivility will be more likely in workplaces whether females and minorities represent a small proportion of the total workforce.
Bureaucratic Structures and Incivility

A caveat must be added to my discussion thus far. I must recognition that workplace contexts and vulnerabilities to incivility may differ owing to variations in bureaucratic structures. Arguably, bureaucratic structures—by which I mean rules, procedures, and/or policies pertaining to the safety of individuals in the organizational environment—are meant to safeguard the workplace by encouraging fair practices and restricting discriminatory behaviors (Holzer and Neumark 2000). The predictions here draw from research on organizational policy to consider two principal types of bureaucratic structures: grievance procedures and sensitivity programs.

Prior research suggests that the presence of grievance procedures can help provide an outlet for employees to file claims of discrimination. Edelman, Uggen, and Erlanger (1999) find that equal employment opportunity (EE0) units call attention to civil rights issues and encourage workers to pursue their employment rights. These structures help establish accountability and responsibility for change and may, in fact, be one of the most effective ways to reduce inequalities (Kalev et al. 2006).

Additionally, sensitivity programs are meant to reduce discrimination in the workplace. However, this may not always be the case. Hirsh and Kmec (2009), using data from 84 hospitals, find that diversity programs for managers reduces the filing of discrimination charges while diversity programs for employees increases employees’ rights awareness and increases filing. Likewise, Kalev et al. (2006) consider how diversity programs and education influence diversity among managerial positions and find that this is one of the least effective methods for increasing diversity among
management. They conclude that employers may only be adopting training programs as “window dressing” to protect them against liability or to improve morale rather than to increase managerial diversity.

Although one might assume that the presence of grievance procedures or sensitivity programs would decrease workplace incivility, prior research does not necessarily suggest this. Consistent with the discussion above, grievance procedures and related programs—in the form of offices/officials, and diversity programs—may amplify for potential victims instances where their rights have been violated (Edelmann et al. 1999; Hirsh and Kmec 2009). Additionally, bureaucratic structures could very well aggravate perpetrators, creating a backlash toward victims (Kalev et al. 2006). In line with research on organizational policy, bureaucratic structures have the potential to reduce incivility, but only when these structures are given proper support and backing by the organization.

**CURRENT STUDY AND EXPECTATIONS**

This study investigates how diverse aspects of organizational context influence the occurrence of three dimensions of incivility. Specifically, I consider how organizational chaos, female composition, racial minority composition, and bureaucratic structure predict the incidence of bullying, sexual harassment, and racial discrimination in the workplace.

Drawing on labor processes research, *I expect that organizational chaos will increase the likelihood of bullying, sexual harassment, and racial discrimination.*
Building on stratification literature, I suspect that race and gender composition will have the clearest implications for racial discrimination and sexual harassment, respectively. I also expect that they will have an impact on more bullying. Indeed, women and minorities are, on average, more likely to be concentrated in jobs with poorer organization and greater vulnerability, where bullying is more likely to manifest (Salin 2003). Moreover, perpetrators who otherwise might discriminate based on race or gender may very well transform specific racist/sexist conduct into bullying, particularly when trying to avoid organizational sanctions or accusations of discrimination (Roscigno 2007). Lastly, I consider the role of bureaucratic structures. In line with research on organizational policy, I expect that bureaucratic structures may mitigate or exacerbate the likelihood of bullying, sexual harassment, and racial discrimination in the workplace.

DATA AND METHODS
I draw from the 2002 to 2003 National Organizations Survey (NOS) to test the aforementioned ideas. NOS is a national sample of work organizations in which the unit of analysis is the workplace. The data set is derived from the employment information provided by respondents of the 2002 General Social Survey (GSS). About of half of the respondents of the GSS were asked to provide their employers’ contact information. This resulted in a sample of 874 U.S. workplace establishments. NOS then conducted telephone interviews and mail questionnaires with organizational personnel from 516 of these establishments. Importantly for my purposes, the NOS offers three indicators of incivility and aspects of organizational context including organizational chaos,
bureaucratic structures, and race/sex composition of the workplace (Smith, Kalleberg and Marsden 2002). Due to missing data, my sample size varies somewhat for each dependent variable. I use multiple imputation of missing data for independent variables in the analyses (von Hippel 2007). Reported results are based on logistic regression using a maximum likelihood estimation procedure.

There are two sources of potential bias in these data, each of which may make the analysis I offer below, a conservative test. First, the survey respondents are organizational representatives. Organizational representatives, of course, have every reason to represent their organizations in a favorable light. Reports of bullying, racial discrimination and sexual harassment should therefore be assumed to reflect underestimates. Secondly, indicators of racial discrimination and sexual harassment reflect instances wherein at least one formal charge has been filed with the company (as opposed to number of charges or instances that never reached the formal charge stage) (see Felstiner et al. 1980). It is thus noteworthy, consequent to such limitations, that 25 percent of establishments report bullying as a problem, almost 30 percent report a formal charge of sexual harassment and approximately 14 percent report at least one charge of racial discrimination (see Table 1). There is obviously a significant variation in this data on the dependent variables of interest, despite the limitations noted above. Analyses and results should, nevertheless, be interpreted as conservative estimates relative to the “real world” prevalence of such phenomena.
**General and Ascriptive Incivility**

The indicator of **Bullying** is derived from a scale (alpha=.72) that includes dimensions of physical abuse, slander or social isolation, and verbal or written threat. Physical abuse\(^1\) is derived from the question “how many times in the past year has a physical assault occurred, including incidents such as fistfights, pushing, shoving, kicking, etc.?”. Slander/social isolation is captured by the question “how often in the past year has bullying occurred, including repeated intimidation, slandering, social isolation, or humiliation by one or more persons against another?” Verbal or written threats are considered from the question “how often in the past year have verbal or written threats occurred, including incidents of shouting, swearing, threatening e-mails, or attempts to provoke arguments?” For reasons of consistency with other dependent variables, I recoded the scale into a dichotomous indicator (0=no such instances of any of the above; 1=one or more manifestations of bullying). As noted in Table 1, approximately 25 percent of establishments report some manifestation of bullying over the prior year.

Importantly, this data also offers organizational reports of sexual harassment and racial discrimination. **Sexual harassment** is measured by the following: “In the past 12 months, have there been any formal complaints about sexual harassment?” (0=no; 1=yes). A notable 30 percent of establishments report sexual harassment. Cases of racial discrimination are reported in about 14 percent of workplaces sampled. **Racial discrimination** is measured by the question “In the past 12 months, have there been any formal complaints about racial, ethnic, or religious discrimination?” (0=no; 1=yes).

---

\(^1\) Physical abuse is a continuous variable that ranged from 0 to 55 cases. In order to include it in the scale in a manner consistent with other scale indicators, we converted it into 0 for no reported cases and 1 for reported cases.
Although complaints of religious discrimination are included in the racial discrimination measure, the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission (EEOC) reports that religious discrimination is relatively uncommon. In 2008, formal complaints of religious discrimination only accounted for a total of 5% of all EEOC charges whereas racial discrimination comprise over 35% of all charges. This lends confidence that nearly all reports of discrimination embedded in this indicator centers on race in particular.

**Organizational Chaos**

As previously discussed, organizational chaos often emerges as the result of downsizing and restructuring within the workplace. The measure of organizational chaos captures whether the number of full-time employees has increased, decreased, or remained the same in the past 12 months. Increasing or decreasing the number of full-time employees represents a form of change that may cause undue stress, insecurity and chaos within the organization. The measure indicates whether the employer reports significant increases or decreases in the number of full-time employees (=1) over the last year versus no to little change (=0).

**Race/Sex Compositional Context**

Consistent with prior discussion of race/sex compositional context, I include indicators of the percentage of full time and part time permanent female and the percentage of full time and part time permanent racial minority employees in a given workplace. Variations in race and gender composition are notably well represented in this data, and are reported
in Figure 1. Female composition is relatively normally distributed, with a mean of 49.6 and a range of 0 to 100 percent of the total workforce. Minority composition seems to mirror U.S. population characteristics in so much as few workplaces (about 40 percent) have a racial minority workforce that is greater than 30 percent.

**Bureaucratic Structures**

Following recent research, I consider two types of bureaucratic structures: internal grievance procedures and sensitivity programs (e.g., Edelman et al. 1999; Hirsh and Kmec 2009). **Internal grievance procedures** are considered with a two-indicator scale: Equal Employment Opportunities (EEO) department (does the organization have a department or section responsible for Equal Employment Opportunity or Affirmative Action?), and grievances procedure (are there formal procedures for resolving disputes?). I recoded this scale into one dichotomous indicator (0=no EEO department and no grievances procedure); 1=one or both of these structures). The existence of such procedures arguably mitigates incivility in the workplace by virtue of internal accountability. Recent work, however, suggests that this may only sometimes be the true, depending on the degree to which such institutional structures are empowered to monitor and enforce compliance (Kalev 2006 et al.)

Sensitivity programs is often undertaken with the hope of educating employees regarding their rights, responsibilities and constraints. Building on prior work, I consider a two-indicator scale: sexual harassment training (is there sexual harassment training for managers?), and diversity training (is there a diversity training program for managers?). I
recoded this scale into a dichotomous indicator (0=no sexual harassment or diversity training); 1=one or both of these forms of sensitivity trainings).

**Controls**

Organizational size has been shown to influence workplace incivility (e.g., Baldi and McBrier 1997; Hirsh and Kmec 2009). I include the number of full time workers as a measure of organizational size. Since the sample includes establishments that have several operating sites, I also take into consideration the number of establishment (the total number operating sites of the larger organization). Consistent with prior research (Baldi and McBrier 1997), I include organizational age (measured as the difference between the year the NOS survey was taken and the year the organization was established). Table 1 reports these indicators along with the dependent variables of interest and controls.

**ANALYTIC STRATEGY AND RESULTS**

My analysis proceeds in two steps. First, using logistic regression, I consider how female and minority composition influence bullying, sexual harassment, and racial discrimination in the workplace. I begin by reporting core findings surrounding female and minority composition, derived from the analysis, in Figures 3 and 4. These models from which these figures are derived, reported in Table 2, include female and minority composition and non-linear effects for both and a measure for organizational chaos. The core question is whether similar aspects of organizational context shape these three
dimensions of incivility. I suspect that female and minority compositions will have the most direct influence on sexual harassment and racial discrimination. More general dimensions of organizational context, on the other hand, should be more influential for bullying. Table 3, follows up on my initial analyses by addressing whether bureaucratic structures shape the likelihood of incivility and/or perhaps moderate some of the organizational effects established in the first portion of the analyses.

**Incivility, Race/Sex Composition, Organizational Chaos**

How does incivility vary in light of the female and minority composition of the workplace? Figures 3 and 4, derived from coefficients reported in Table 2, report the effect female composition (Figure 3) and minority composition (Figure 4) on each type of incivility. The horizontal-axis represents the percentage of female workers or minority workers ranging from 0 to 100 percent, whereas the vertical-axis reports predicted probability of a sexual harassment or racial discrimination charge, respectively. The effects presented in Figures 3 and 4 are non-linear, and reveal patterns generally consistent with racial threat arguments noted previously. Once numerical dominance for females is established, the relation becomes negative. The threat threshold pertaining to minority composition and racial discrimination (Figure 4) appears to be somewhat higher (between 50 and 60 percent), and then the effect dissipates.

Consistent with prior discussions, minority composition has the most profound effects for racial discrimination. Although only by a slight margin, female composition has the greatest effect on sexual harassment. Female composition seems to also have a
significant influence on bullying. In fact, female composition may have a larger effect on bullying after females reach numerical dominance (over 50 percent) when compared to the effect female composition has on sexual harassment. Minority composition seems to also shape, to some degree, the persistence of bullying.

These findings related to bullying and composition may be a function of the disparately low status of female and minority workers and the types of workplaces within which they are concentrated. Moreover, it could be that perpetrators understand that explicit sexual or racial forms of harassment in the workplace are monitored and sanctioned, whereas bullying is more likely to be tolerated and is not, in the U.S. context, illegal (Roscigno 2009a).

Female composition also has some influence on the emergence of racial discrimination, and racial concentration has some implications for the likelihood of sexual harassment. I attribute two factors to these patterns. First, with regard to racial minorities, African American women have a dual vulnerability in society because they hold lower racial and gender statuses relative to white males. Second, and in the case of sex composition’s impact on racial discrimination it could be reflective of female segregated workplaces where white women are placed in positions of authority over minority subordinates (Wharton 2000).

Two indicators of organizational context, reported in Table 2, seem to matter as well, although to a less significant degree. Organizational chaos increases the likelihood of reporting general bullying by 62 percent. Although this effect is weak (.10), it is stronger (under .01) when female and minority compositions are removed from the
model. This may suggest that organizational chaos is more likely to occur in workplaces that have higher female and minority compositions. Organizational size increases the incidence of general and ascriptive forms of incivility across all equations. Despite the assumption that larger organizations will necessarily be more bureaucratic, and thus more formalized and constraining relative to incivility, the finding suggests that the incidence of incivility is magnified in heavily populated workplaces.

The Impact of Bureaucratic Structures

What effects do bureaucratic structures have on incivility? Table 3 adds bureaucratic structures to the models presented earlier. Grievance procedures and sensitivity programs seem to increase incivility rather than decrease it. Grievance procedures increase the reporting on bullying and to a lesser degree increase the incidence of racial discrimination (p<.10). Sensitivity programs increase the likelihood of all three forms of incivility. These results are not altogether inconsistent with the findings of prior work. First, rights protective structures may amplify for potential victims instances where their rights have been violated (Edelmann et al. 1999; Hirsh and Kmec 2009), thus leading to greater incidents of charge filing. Second, these structures could very well aggravate potential perpetrators, creating a backlash towards potential victims (Kalev et al. 2006). Lastly, and acknowledging that I am unable to explicate specific causal relationships on these fronts, bureaucratic structures may have been implemented to demonstrate compliance with the law in the aftermath of reported incidences of incivility (Dobbin et al. 1993; Edelmann et al. 1999).
Given the effects reported, it is hardly surprising that bureaucratic structures explain little about the impact on female and black compositions. There is, however, one subtle shift worth noting when comparing the findings reported in Tables 2 and 3. The inclusion of bureaucratic structures seems to influence the extent to which organizational chaos matters. Organizational Chaos now shows stronger effects on bullying.

CONCLUSIONS

Incivility is a reality in many workplaces, with consequences for workers at the time it is occurring and long after it has ended (Lewis 2004; McCarthy and Mayhew 2004). In this paper, I build on labor processes and stratification literatures by suggesting: (1) that incivility can be general or more targeted in its emergence; (2) that, beyond being patterned by specific aspects of organizational context surrounding chaos, incivility may also vary systematically by female and minority composition, and; (3) that bureaucratic structures within workplaces themselves may mitigate or exacerbate incivilities.

I began by considering incivility to be multi-dimensional. I conceive of incivility as bullying but also as sexual harassment and racial discrimination. Though organizational chaos remains an important factor to consider, my results demonstrate how gender and race compositions are especially important for the persistence of three dimensions of incivility. The patterns reported are generally consistent with racial threat arguments. Female and minority compositions increase the reporting of incivility until certain thresholds are reached. Though I have no way of discovering exactly who reported the incivility, I suspect that workplaces with growing female and minority
compositions may consist of predominantly low status positions filled largely with female, minority, and other vulnerable workers.

Second, my results suggest that bureaucratic structures may increase the reporting of incivility. Workplaces that have sensitivity programs seem to report more incidences of incivility. Additionally, my results indicate that bureaucratic structures do not mitigate the effect female and minority compositions have on sexual harassment and racial discrimination. In fact, the presence of these structures may expose organizational chaos.

Admittedly, there are limitations to any analysis and mine is hardly an exception. Most important in this regard is my reliance on cross-sectional data, which prevents me from establishing the causal ordering between bureaucratic structure and incivility. Such structures indeed may have been implemented in response to incivility, thus helping to explain the largely positive relations my analyses reveal. Secondly, the reports of incivility that my analyses draw from offer, at best, conservative indicators: they rely on employers’ reports, which are likely an underestimate, and do not distinguish between workplaces that have one versus multiple reported cases. It is notable, however, that despite these caveats, consistent patterns relative to organizational contexts emerge and in a manner generally consistent with prior work on such topics.

One result of my analysis is a call for organizations to recognize that low status positions—those that are often held by female and minority workers—may be especially vulnerable to incivility of varying forms. In healthy and stable organizational contexts, there is little doubt that bureaucratic structures can mitigate the influences of incivility. Likewise, we know from previous research that these structures, when supplied with the
necessary resources and power, may help eradicate discrimination (Holzer and Neumark 2000; Kalev et al. 2006; Reskin and McBrier 2000). Organizations should thus invest resources into implementing bureaucratic structures, but in a manner that empowers these structures to monitor and hold perpetrators accountable.

Incivility is a useful and important sociological construct that warrants much more theoretical and empirical attention. I have suggested throughout that it may be either general or targeted in its orientation, and that it holds significant implications for those on the receiving end. Labor processes literature and ethnographic treatments of ground-level workplace dynamics provide useful inroads to understanding incivility’s organizational underpinnings. Stratification scholarship, on the other hand, has made clear the ways in which race and sex statuses, as well as competition processes within organizations, are meaningful. The task for future scholarship is to effectively integrate these literatures on the theoretical end—i.e., in conceptions of power and vulnerability surrounding incivility and incivility’s overlap with more material and objectively measurable forms of inequality (e.g., hiring, wages, etc.)—and construct creative analyses wherein unique dimensions of incivility and pertinent organizational processes are simultaneously accounted for.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

Jessica (Jesse) Logan, was a petite, blond-haired, blue-eyed Ohio high school senior who committed suicide after sexting a nude photo of herself to her boyfriend. When they broke up, he sent the photo to everyone else at her school. Jesse was cruelly harassed for months by the other girls at her school, who called her a slut and a whore. When Jess’s grades dropped, she started skipping school and when she did go to school, she would hide in the bathroom to avoid being teased. Her mother found her hanging in the closet with her cell phone on the floor nearby (PureSight).

This is an extreme example of how devastating bullying and incivility are for victims. Incivility is the violation of commonly agreed upon norms of mutual respect. It is consequential for the integrity, safety, and dignity of victims (Roscigno et al. 2009a). In some cases, incivility can result in suicide for its victims. More commonly, though, victims face shame and psychological distress that can last long after the experience of incivility has ended.

What can we do about incivility? What factors contribute to its persistence? How do we restrict it? How can we protect victims? These are some of the questions that policy makers, community members, and the public have sought to answer. Such concerns also speak directly to the importance of understanding the context surrounding incivility.

Incivility occurs within interactions between individuals and groups in institutional settings, and ranges from violent outbursts including physical fighting to
harassment to more even more passive yet aggressive behaviors, such as social isolation and the spreading of rumors (Anderson and Pearson 1999; Clark and Springer 2007; Cortina 2008; Mutz and Reeves 2005; Salin 2003). It exists within everyday relations that are directly or indirectly influenced by attributes of organizational environments. Thus, it is worthwhile to interrogate how organizational contexts and the interpersonal exchanges that occur with impact incivility.

The aim of this dissertation has been to shed light onto the various ways incivility unfolds in two unique institutional contexts. I consider schools and workplaces because individuals in each of these institutions have everyday interactions and experiences that are ripe for incivility. I argue that we should broaden our conceptualization of incivility to include both general (i.e., bullying) and targeted (i.e., sexual harassment and racial discrimination) abuse because incivility reflects relational forms of abuse that emerge from power struggles between individuals/groups. I suspect that incivility is not just general in it is targeting of victims and may be aimed at certain groups that are especially vulnerable to inequalities in power, such as females and minorities. Likewise, I show that various aspects of organizational context pertaining to the race and gender makeup of the institution are also important to incivility. Building on labor processes and stratification literatures, I conduct three separate analyses that draw on organizational level data – from schools and workplaces – to address the role organizational context plays in the persistence of incivility.
Core Findings Regarding Incivility

My analyses highlight overlapping patterns in the ways organizational context influences incivility in schools and workplaces. Analyses suggest that general aspects of organizational context, such as organizational chaos and bureaucratic structures, and more targeted features of context including race and gender composition matter for incivility.

Organizational chaos in the daily procedural processes of institutions consistently results in incivility in schools. Such chaos can reduce camaraderie and create unclear expectations that prompt interpersonal conflict and abuse. In contrast, bureaucratic structure including rules, procedures, and policies can create clear guidelines that help alleviate incivility in schools. Additionally, incivility is more likely in schools where black and Latino students make up a small proportion of the total student body. Incivility is also found in schools that have large and/or growing Asian student compositions. In the workplace, growing racial minority and female compositions are likely to result in more incivility until these groups become more represented.

Findings from this dissertation demonstrate the persistence of competitive pressures that foster the exclusion of specific race and gender groups. Although the discrimination of racial minorities and females is illegal, incivility may provide a covert way for the majority group to discriminate. In line with theories on racial threat, the majority group may seek to protect values resources and statues, which may give way to incivility. Such resources and statues may include access to school activities, classes, work promotions and so forth. Or, racial minorities and females may be excluded from
valued resources and statues altogether. Additionally, and more general speaking, my findings highlight that organizational structure is important for reducing chaos and promoting accountability processes that protect against incivility.

Incivility, Organizational Chaos and Bureaucratic Structure

My analyses suggest that organizational chaos and bureaucratic structures influence the persistence of incivility in schools and workplaces. Results indicate that organizational context has differing impacts on incivility depending on institutional setting.

In schools, findings suggest that organizational chaos creates a culture conducive to incivility. Students are more likely to experience bullying when chaos in the form of absenteeism and tardiness is present. Additionally, bureaucratic structure is found to either reduce or enhance incivility depending on institutional context. In schools, bureaucratic structures help alleviate bullying possibly through the providing guidelines for conduct. It makes sense that institutional rules/procedures would reduce relational forms of abuse. In workplaces, however, the presence of bureaucratic structure promotes more incivility. There seems to be decoupling between the intended purpose of bureaucratic structures and actual workplace practices. This disconnect is likely explains increases incivility.
Incivility and Race Composition

The findings from this dissertation point to the importance of racial composition for the study of incivility. In schools and workplaces, incivility is closely tied to racial minority composition.

In schools, the racial minority composition of the student body impacts incivility. In workplaces, findings also suggest that a growing racial minority composition increases the likelihood of incivility until a particular threshold is reached. After the threshold is reached, incivility declines. This is not surprising because racial minority workers are often in entry-level positions that have limited organizational power and that leave them unprotected from abuse. These findings may mean that racial minorities are more vulnerable to incivility. However, it is difficult to draw this conclusion because this dissertation relies on organizational level data and is unable to determine the perpetrator of the abuse.

Incivility as Bullying, Sexual Harassment, and Racial Discrimination

My analyses suggest that incivility includes general manifestations, such as bullying, but also more targeted forms of abuse including sexual harassment and racial discrimination. Bullying occurs in institutional settings regardless of the gender or race make-up of the institution. In institutional environments, everyone is vulnerable to the occurrence of bullying. Sexual harassment and racial discrimination, however, seem to be especially targeted toward females and racial minorities. The female and racial minority
compositional contexts shape the amount of reported sexual harassment and racial discrimination, respectively. Although striking differences exist between these general bullying and the two more targeted manifestations, important similarities are also.

Results indicate that bullying is likely to emerge in institutions that have organizational chaos. Sexual harassment is more likely in institutions with emergent female compositions. Findings also suggest that bullying, sexual harassment, and racial discrimination are all associated with higher racial minority compositions in institutional settings. Additionally, all three dimensions of incivility are impacted by the presence of bureaucratic structures, though bureaucratic structures enhance or reduce these incivilities depending on the institutional context.

Methodological Limitations

As with any study, this dissertation has some limitations that influence its generalizability. First, I based my findings on conservative reports of incivility. The measure for incivility is collected from school and organizational personnel that may not have accurate estimates of incivility among students and employees.

Second, this research uses cross-sectional data to determine the effect organizational context has on incivility. This data limitation prevents me from determining causal order. For example, I cannot be sure that bureaucratic structures were present in institutions before the emergence of incivility.

Third, this study cannot identify perpetrators of incivility or their attributes. Therefore, I have a difficult time knowing whether certain groups experience incivility
from the majority group because of their group representation. For example, is the racial minority group experiencing incivility from the majority group? Or are racial minority group members abusing one another?

**Theoretical Strengths, and Policy Implications**

Despite these limitations, this project offers important theoretical strengths that enhance the study of incivility. First, this dissertation empirically tests incivility in two institutional settings: workplaces and schools. Most prior research focuses on incivility in the workplace. Drawing on labor processes literature, I show how organizational context influences incivility across institutional settings. Second, this research investigates three dimensions of incivility. Previous studies consider bullying as the only form of incivility. I draw on stratification literature to expand the conceptualization of incivility to include both general forms of abuse, such as bullying, and more targeted abuse, including sexual harassment and racial discrimination. Third, also utilizing stratification work, this dissertation considers how diverse aspects of organizational context influence incivility. Prior research focuses on general aspects of organizational context, such as organizational chaos and bureaucratic structures. In addition to investigating these aspects of context, I include female composition and racial minority composition as aspects of the organizational context.

These contributions also have implications for organizational policy. Policies must consider a broader understanding of incivility that includes multiple institutional settings, and abuse that can be aim at specific groups. Policy makers are encouraged to
examine features of organizational context to determine how their environment impacts incivility. Policy makers are also urged to take seriously the creation and enforcement of rules/procedures that maintain healthy and safe organizational environments as a way to protect against incivility.

**Directions for Future Research**

This dissertation also sets a solid foundation for future studies on incivility in institutional settings. Future research is charged with the task of expanding the conceptualization of incivility. Studies are needed to consider how organizational context influences incivility in other institutional settings including religious and political arenas. Research will also do well to test other dimensions of incivility including those related to age discrimination, immigrant abuse, and intolerance of disabled persons. Studies are also urged to consider additional aspects of organizational context, such as immigrant composition.

Additionally, future work could be especially informative if it took seriously the possibility of multi-method designs. Qualitative work is needed to complement quantitative analyses. Interviews may prove important for understanding the reasoning and thought processes behind the persistence of incivility. And, studies that conduct an in-depth analysis on individuals within a small sample of institutions may be necessary for determining why organizational context influences incivility. For example, why are some bureaucratic structures more effective at reducing the incidence of incivility? Or why does the racial minority composition increase incivility? Moreover, future research
is necessary to determine the core causes of incivility and to determine the most effective responses for eradicating it.

Conclusion

Drawing on labor processes and stratification literatures, this dissertation sought to fill important theoretical and methodological gaps concerning the conceptualization of incivility in institutional settings. I devoted needed attention to the study of incivility outside of workplaces, by considering how incivility works in schools. I have also drawn necessary focus onto the definition of and implications for incivility as both general (i.e. bullying) and targeted (i.e. sexual harassment and racial discrimination) in its manifestations. Lastly, I devoted needed emphasis to a broader understanding of organizational context, including consideration of female and racial minority compositions as potentially meaningful dimensions or organizational life. This research addresses limitations in prior research and may prove important for designing policies and programs that reduce incivility across institutional contexts.
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Appendix A

Tables from Chapter 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Percentage/Mean(S.D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bullying</td>
<td>Aggregate measure of bullying reported by Administrators (1=one or more incidents of bullying in a given month)</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>31.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Chaos</td>
<td>Aggregated measure of tardiness and absenteeism reported by Administrators</td>
<td>2-10</td>
<td>9.65 (1.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic Structures</td>
<td>Aggregated measures that includes: control access to school buildings during school hours, control access to school grounds during school hours, require students to pass through metal detectors each day, perform one or more random metal detector checks on students, close the campus for most students during lunch, use one or more random dog sniffs to check for drugs, perform one or more random sweeps for contraband, require clear book bags or ban book bags on school grounds, require students to wear badges or picture IDs, require faculty and staff to wear badges or picture IDs, and use one or more security cameras to monitor the school</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>3.74 (2.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Bureaucratic</td>
<td>Aggregated measures that includes student responses to the following: Schools rules are strictly enforced; everyone knows what the rules are; School rules are fair; punishment is the same no matter who you are; Students know punishment for broken rules</td>
<td>5-20</td>
<td>13.75 (2.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Percentage of nonwhite students in a given school</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>38.69 (32.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students on free/reduce lunch</td>
<td>Percentage of students receiving free or reduced priced lunch</td>
<td>0-98</td>
<td>30.27 (20.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanicity</td>
<td>School is located in an urban area</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>33.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Size</td>
<td>Number of students enrolled</td>
<td>46-4653</td>
<td>1449.46 (850.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Problems</td>
<td>Aggregated measure that includes: class cutting, physical conflicts, robbery/theft, vandalism, use of alcohol, use of illegal drugs, students under the influence of drugs/ while at school, the sale of drug on campus, possession of weapons, racial-ethnic tensions, gang activities, physical abuse of teachers, verbal abuse of teachers, students acts of disrespect for teachers</td>
<td>14-58</td>
<td>29.66 (6.31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: I report percentages for dummy variables and the mean and standard deviation (S.D.) for continuous variables.
Table A.2: Logistic Regression for School Bullying on Organizational Chaos and Bureaucratic Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Independent Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Chaos</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.334 (.052)***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.336 (.053)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic Structures</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.044 (.013)**</td>
<td>-0.045 (.013)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Bureaucratic Enforcement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.043 (.031)</td>
<td>0.047 (.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>-0.016 (.001)***</td>
<td>-0.016 (.001)***</td>
<td>-0.016 (.001)***</td>
<td>-0.015 (.001)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students on free/reduce lunch</td>
<td>0.005 (.002)**</td>
<td>0.004 (.002)*</td>
<td>0.004 (.002)*</td>
<td>0.004 (.002)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanicity</td>
<td>-0.291 (.068)***</td>
<td>-0.322 (.068)***</td>
<td>-0.291 (.069)***</td>
<td>-0.323 (.069)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Size</td>
<td>-0.001 (.000)***</td>
<td>-0.001 (.000)***</td>
<td>-0.001 (.000)***</td>
<td>-0.001 (.000)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Problems</td>
<td>0.245 (.007)***</td>
<td>0.246 (.007)***</td>
<td>0.247 (.007)***</td>
<td>0.249 (.007)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-6.823 (.178)***</td>
<td>-10.130 (.554)***</td>
<td>-7.342 (.485)***</td>
<td>-10.732 (.722)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R²</td>
<td>0.1943</td>
<td>0.1986</td>
<td>0.1963</td>
<td>0.2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log-likelihood</td>
<td>2353.97</td>
<td>2460.27</td>
<td>2324.39</td>
<td>2376.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>9370</td>
<td>9370</td>
<td>9370</td>
<td>9370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Significant levels: *p<.05  **p<.01  ***p<.001; standard errors in parentheses
### Table A.3: Logistic Regression for School Bullying on Organizational Chaos and Bureaucratic Structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Independent Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Chaos</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.334 (.052)***</td>
<td>0.336 (.053)***</td>
<td>0.088 (.172)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic Structures</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.045 (.013)**</td>
<td>-0.757 (.484)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of Bureaucratic Structures</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.047 (.031)</td>
<td>0.049 (.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>-0.016 (.001)***</td>
<td>-0.016 (.001)***</td>
<td>-0.015 (.001)***</td>
<td>-0.015 (.001)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students on free/reduce lunch</td>
<td>0.005 (.002)**</td>
<td>0.004 (.002)*</td>
<td>0.004 (.002)*</td>
<td>0.004 (.002)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanicity</td>
<td>-0.291 (.068)***</td>
<td>-0.322 (.068)***</td>
<td>-0.323 (.069)***</td>
<td>-0.318 (.069)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Size</td>
<td>-0.001 (.000)***</td>
<td>-0.001 (.000)***</td>
<td>-0.001 (.000)***</td>
<td>-0.001 (.000)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Problems</td>
<td>0.245 (.007)***</td>
<td>0.246 (.007)***</td>
<td>0.249 (.007)***</td>
<td>0.248 (.007)***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interaction**

| Org Chaos*Bureaucratic Structures | - | - | - | 0.090 (.065) |
| Org Chaos*Perceptions of Bureaucratic Enforcement | - | - | - | -0.047 (.103) |
| Constant                        | -6.823 (.178)*** | -10.130 (.554)*** | -10.732 (.722)*** | -8.272 (1.776)*** |
| Pseudo R²                       | 0.1943 | 0.1986 | 0.2007 | 0.2009 |
| Log-likelihood                  | 2353.97 | 2460.27 | 2376.45 | 2378.79 |
| N                               | 9370 | 9370 | 9370 | 9120 |

Notes: Significant levels: *p<.05  **p<.01  ***p<.001; standard errors in parentheses
### Table A.4: Logistic Regression for School Bullying on Organizational Chaos in Highly Bureaucratic Schools

**Model 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Key Independent Variables</strong></th>
<th><strong>School Characteristics</strong></th>
<th><strong>Organizational Chaos</strong></th>
<th><strong>Percentage of students on free/reduce lunch</strong></th>
<th><strong>Urbanicity</strong></th>
<th><strong>School Size</strong></th>
<th><strong>School Problems</strong></th>
<th><strong>Constant</strong></th>
<th><strong>Pseudo R²</strong></th>
<th><strong>Log-likelihood</strong></th>
<th><strong>N</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chaos</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>0.773 (.238)**</td>
<td>-0.014 (.001)***</td>
<td>-0.795 (.103)***</td>
<td>-0.001 (.000)***</td>
<td>0.222 (.009)***</td>
<td>-6.823 (2.366)***</td>
<td>0.2049</td>
<td>1025.54</td>
<td>3960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students on free/reduce lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Significant levels: *p<.05  **p<.01  ***p<.001; standard errors in parentheses

### Table A.5: Logistic Regression for School Bullying on Organizational Chaos in Low Bureaucratic Schools

**Model 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Key Independent Variables</strong></th>
<th><strong>School Characteristics</strong></th>
<th><strong>Organizational Chaos</strong></th>
<th><strong>Percentage of students on free/reduce lunch</strong></th>
<th><strong>Urbanicity</strong></th>
<th><strong>School Size</strong></th>
<th><strong>School Problems</strong></th>
<th><strong>Constant</strong></th>
<th><strong>Pseudo R²</strong></th>
<th><strong>Log-likelihood</strong></th>
<th><strong>N</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chaos</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>0.328 (.063)***</td>
<td>-0.015 (.001)***</td>
<td>-0.352 (.077)***</td>
<td>-0.001 (.000)***</td>
<td>0.209 (.007)***</td>
<td>-9.311 (.644)***</td>
<td>0.1669</td>
<td>1548.56</td>
<td>7296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students on free/reduce lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Significant levels: *p<.05  **p<.01  ***p<.001; standard errors in parentheses
Appendix B

Tables and Figures from Chapter 3
Table B.1: Variable Definitions, Range, Means, and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Percentage/Mean(S.D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Bullying</td>
<td>Aggregate measures bullying reported by Administrators (1=one or more incidents of bullying in a given month)</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>31.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of black students</td>
<td>Percentage of black students in a given school</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>17.37 (23.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Latino students</td>
<td>Percentage of Latino students in a given school</td>
<td>0-99</td>
<td>14.19 (22.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Asian students</td>
<td>Percentage of Asian students in a given school</td>
<td>0-83</td>
<td>5.24 (11.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students on free/reduce lunch</td>
<td>Percentage of students receiving free or reduced priced lunch</td>
<td>0-98</td>
<td>30.23 (20.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanicity</td>
<td>School is located in an urban area</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>31.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Size</td>
<td>Number of students enrolled</td>
<td>46-4653</td>
<td>1427.23 (833.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Problems</td>
<td>Aggregated measure that includes: tardiness, absenteeism, class cutting, physical conflicts, robbery/theft, vandalism, use of alcohol, use of illegal drugs, students under the influence of drugs while at school, the sale of drug on campus, possession of weapons, racial-ethnic tensions, gang activities, physical abuse of teachers, verbal abuse of teachers, students acts of disrespect for teachers</td>
<td>18-68</td>
<td>39.22 (6.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Security</td>
<td>Aggregated measures that includes: control access to school buildings during school hours, control access to school grounds during school hours, require students to pass through metal detectors each day, perform one or more random metal detector checks on students, close the campus for most students during lunch, use one or more random dog sniffs to check for drugs, perform one or more random sweeps for contraband, require clear book bags or ban book bags on school grounds, require students to wear badges or picture IDs, require faculty and staff to wear badges or picture IDs, and use one or more security cameras to monitor the school</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>3.75 (2.05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: I report percentages for dummy variables and the mean and standard deviation (S.D.) for continuous variables.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Independent Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of black students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.059 (.004)**</td>
<td>-0.022 (.002)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of black students²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0005 (.000)***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Latino students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.011 (.005)*</td>
<td>-0.009 (.002)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Latino students²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.000 (.000)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Asian students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.067 (.008)***</td>
<td>-0.005 (.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Asian students²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.001 (.000)***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log of Percentage of black students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.167 (.013)***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log of Percentage of Latino students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.060 (.016)***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log of Percentage of Asian students</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.062 (.017)***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students on free/reduce lunch</td>
<td>-0.007 (.001)***</td>
<td>0.004 (.002)*</td>
<td>0.004 (.002)*</td>
<td>0.004 (.002)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanicity</td>
<td>-0.534 (.070)***</td>
<td>-0.351 (.075)***</td>
<td>-0.351 (.075)***</td>
<td>-0.273 (.074)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Size</td>
<td>-0.001 (.000)***</td>
<td>-0.001 (.000)***</td>
<td>-0.001 (.000)***</td>
<td>-0.001 (.000)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Problems</td>
<td>0.246 (.007)***</td>
<td>0.258 (.007)***</td>
<td>0.258 (.007)***</td>
<td>0.251 (.007)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Security</td>
<td>-0.059 (.014)***</td>
<td>-0.024 (.016)</td>
<td>-0.024 (.016)</td>
<td>-0.008 (.015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R²</td>
<td>0.1859</td>
<td>0.2040</td>
<td>0.2178</td>
<td>0.2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log-likelihood</td>
<td>1994.09</td>
<td>2187.75</td>
<td>2335.97</td>
<td>2158.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>9120</td>
<td>9120</td>
<td>9120</td>
<td>9120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Significant levels: *p<.05  **p<.01  ***p<.001; standard errors in parentheses
Figure B.1: The relationship between the percentage of Asian Students within a School and the Incidence of Bullying

Figure B.2: The relationship between the percentage of Black Students within a School and the Incidence of Bullying
Appendix C

Tables and Figures from Chapter 4
Table C.1: Variable Definitions, Means, and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Percentage/Mean (S.D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of Incivility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>scale that includes: physical abuse, bullying (as a specific form of slander or social isolation), verbal or written threat (1=one or more incidents of bullying)</td>
<td>25.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>Formal complaints of sexual harassment (1=yes)</td>
<td>29.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Discrimination</td>
<td>Formal complaints of racial discrimination (1=yes)</td>
<td>13.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female composition</td>
<td>Percentage of full and part time permanent female employees</td>
<td>49.65 (32.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Minority composition</td>
<td>Percentage of full and part time permanent minority employees</td>
<td>32.46 (36.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Chaos</td>
<td>Change (increase/decrease) in the number of employees (change=1)</td>
<td>39.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bureaucratic Structures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance Procedures</td>
<td>Scale that includes Department for Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and Formal procedures for resolving disputes (1=one or more of these grievance processes)</td>
<td>64.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity Programs</td>
<td>Scale that includes: Sexual Harassment training for managers and Diversity training for managers (1=one or more of the trainings)</td>
<td>57.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Size</td>
<td>Number of full and part time permanent employees</td>
<td>514.60 (1895.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of establishments</td>
<td>Total number of operating sites of the larger organization</td>
<td>187.34 (1585.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Age</td>
<td>Organizational age in years from the year of the NOS survey</td>
<td>33.3 (36.91)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: We report percentages for dummy variables and the mean and standard deviation (S.D.) for continuous variables.
Table C.2: Logistic Regression of Incivility on Compositional Context and Organizational Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bullying</th>
<th>Sexual Harassment</th>
<th>Racial Discrimination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Composition</td>
<td>0.035 (.016)*</td>
<td>0.045 (.021)*</td>
<td>0.026 (.022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Composition^2</td>
<td>-0.0004 (.0002)**</td>
<td>-0.0006 (.0002)**</td>
<td>-0.004 (.0003)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Composition</td>
<td>0.027 (.014)*</td>
<td>0.029 (.017)^</td>
<td>0.073 (.019)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Composition^2</td>
<td>-0.0003 (.0002)^</td>
<td>-0.0003 (.0002)^</td>
<td>-0.001 (.0002)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Chaos</td>
<td>0.485 (.248)^</td>
<td>0.187 (.300)</td>
<td>0.084 (.320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational size</td>
<td>0.001 (.0002)***</td>
<td>0.001 (.0002)***</td>
<td>0.001 (.0001)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Establishments</td>
<td>-0.0003 (.0003)</td>
<td>-0.00001 (.0002)</td>
<td>-0.0002 (.0004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Age</td>
<td>-0.007 (.004)^</td>
<td>-0.005 (.004)</td>
<td>0.005 (.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.730 (.433)^***</td>
<td>-2.742 (.751)***</td>
<td>-4.712 (.710)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R^2</td>
<td>0.1915</td>
<td>0.2020</td>
<td>0.2785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log-likelihood</td>
<td>100.02</td>
<td>76.30</td>
<td>111.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Significant levels: ^ p<.10  *p<.05  **p<.01  ***p<.001; standard errors in parentheses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Context</th>
<th>Bullying</th>
<th>Sexual Harassment</th>
<th>Racial Discrimination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Composition</td>
<td>0.037 (.017)*</td>
<td>0.050 (.021)*</td>
<td>0.027 (.023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Composition²</td>
<td>-0.0005 (.0002)**</td>
<td>-0.0007 (.0002)**</td>
<td>-0.0004 (.0002)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Composition</td>
<td>0.014 (.014)</td>
<td>0.021 (.018)</td>
<td>0.060 (.019)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Composition²</td>
<td>-0.0002 (.0001)</td>
<td>-0.0002 (.0002)</td>
<td>-0.0005 (.0002)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Chaos</td>
<td>0.509 (.257)*</td>
<td>0.185 (.315)</td>
<td>0.096 (.329)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance Procedures</td>
<td>0.926 (.403)*</td>
<td>0.645 (.717)</td>
<td>1.505 (.814)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity Programs</td>
<td>0.988 (.377)**</td>
<td>3.346 (1.135)**</td>
<td>1.682 (.691)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational size</td>
<td>0.001 (.0002)***</td>
<td>0.001 (.0002)***</td>
<td>0.0004 (.0001)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of establishments</td>
<td>-0.0004 (.0003)</td>
<td>-0.0002 (.0002)</td>
<td>-0.0003 (.0004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational age</td>
<td>-0.010 (.004)*</td>
<td>-0.006 (.004)</td>
<td>0.002 (.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.961 (.472)***</td>
<td>-5.672 (1.456)***</td>
<td>-5.913 (1.004)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R²</td>
<td>0.2301</td>
<td>0.2630</td>
<td>0.3246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log-likelihood</td>
<td>120.19</td>
<td>99.36</td>
<td>130.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Significant levels: ^ p<.10  *p<.05  **p<.01  ***p<.001; standard errors in parentheses.
Figure C.3. Percent Female Workforce and Workplace Incivility
Figure C.4. Percent Minority Workforce and Workplace Incivility