INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

**ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600**

UMI[®]

NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI[®]

The Effects of Affirmative Action on Rationalizing Sexual Harassment

Maria Giglio

**A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts**

Department of Psychology

**Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario**

September, 2001

**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-66821-5

Canada

The undersigned recommend to the
Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
Acceptance of the thesis:

"The Effects of Affirmative Action on Rationalizing Sexual Harassment"

submitted by

Maria Giglio

in Partial fulfillment of the requirements for

the degree of Master of Arts

Chair

Thesis Supervisor

Carleton University
September, 2001

Abstract

Past research has found that both men and women oppose affirmative action efforts. As a result, recipients of preferential treatment have experienced negative consequences, which have been fueled by men's feelings of victimization and unfair treatment, and women's concerns that such 'special treatment' undermines their ability and competence. Thus, the present study examined potential backlash reactions, and in particular, gender and sexual harassment was explored as one potential strategy men, in particular, may view as an acceptable response to female beneficiaries. 128 male and 137 female participants were provided with information about the hiring policies (merit vs. preferential equivalent vs. preferential minimum standard) of a male-dominated organization, and then listened to an audio-taped interview with a female beneficiary during which she described an incident of harassment from one of her male colleagues (gender discrimination vs. sexual harassment vs. sexual coercion). Attitudes toward the selection procedure and reactions to the female beneficiaries treatment in the workplace as well as the harassment incident were assessed using analysis of variance. As expected, both men and women were opposed to preferential treatment procedures. However, contrary to hypothesis, men did not view sexual harassment as 'par for the course' when affirmative action policies were used. Implications and limitations of these findings are discussed.

Acknowledgement

I would firstly like to thank Dr. Kim Matheson for making the Master's program a wonderful experience. I am especially grateful for Dr. Matheson's unconditional support, including her dedication, encouragement and patience in working with me on this research project. I would also like to thank my committee members, including Dr. Jo Wood, Dr. Hymie Anisman, Dr. Diana Majury and Dr. Lise Paquet for their expertise and constructive criticism. I would like to extend my appreciation to my fiancé, for his encouragement and emotional support during the past two years. I wish to acknowledge Dr. Teresa Janz for her friendship, statistical expertise and confidence in me. Lastly, I am also grateful to my parents, who provided their support whenever and wherever needed.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iv
Table of Tables	vi
List of Appendices	vii
Introduction	1
Defining Affirmative Action	1
The Affirmative Action Debate	5
Sex Differences in Attitudes to Affirmative Action	7
Sexual Harassment	10
What is Sexual Harassment?	10
Antecedents of Harassment	12
Attitudes Toward Sexual Harassment	14
The Present Study	15
Method	17
Participants	17
Procedure	17
Measures	21
Results	25
Design and Statistics	25
Demographic Characteristics	25

Table of Contents (Continued)

Manipulation Checks	26
Attitudes to Selection Procedures	27
Reactions to the Beneficiary	30
Perceptions of the Harassment Incident	33
Perceptions of Beneficiary's Emotional State	34
Discussion	34
The Effects of Affirmative Action	36
Reactions to Harassment Incident	39
The Effects of Affirmative Action on Rationalizing Sexual Harassment	41
References	44
Appendices	54

List of Tables

Table	Description	Page
1	Factor Analysis Item Loadings for Emotional State	24
2	Observed Frequencies(%) on Manipulation Check Questions	27
3	Effects of Selection Procedure on Attitudes to Affirmative Action by Harassment Condition for Men	29
4	Effects of Selection Procedure on Attitudes to Affirmative Action for Women	30
5	Effects of Selection Procedure on Expected Treatment of Beneficiary by Harassment Condition for Men	33
6	Effects of Selection Procedure on Expected Treatment of Beneficiary for Women	34

List of Appendices

Appendix	Description	Page
A	Announcement for Recruiting	53
B	Instructions	54
C	Transcript of Audio-Taped Interview	58
D	Informed Consent	65
E	Manipulations of Levels of Selection Procedure	66
F	Manipulations of Levels of Sexual Harassment	68
G	Measures	71
H	Debriefing	78

The Effects of Affirmative Action on Rationalizing Sexual Harassment

Although the presence of sex discrimination in the Canadian labor market has improved in the last few decades, this situation of discrimination in the workforce continues. In particular, women embody only 3 percent of top managerial positions, 15 percent of scientists and engineers, 15 percent of elected officials, and 16 percent of physicians (Clayton & Crosby, 1992). The pervasiveness of sex discrimination in the workplace has led to Canada's adoption of employment equity policies. The adoption of such policies has fueled heated debates in the disciplines of law, politics, philosophy, and psychology. Issues such as reverse discrimination versus true equality have been at the forefront of the political debate for several decades. Although these issues are still salient, social psychologists have shifted debate around affirmative action policies to explore attitudes, perceptions and consequences of such selection procedures from the perspective of the beneficiaries (Doverspike, Taylor & Arthur, 2000). Specifically, an examination of men's and women's reactions and evaluations to female beneficiaries of affirmative action may be used to aid in the identification of problems associated with the implementation of such programs.

Defining Affirmative Action

The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms authorizes under sub-section 2 of section 15, equality rights provision, the creation of employment equity programs that have the purpose of ameliorating the conditions of disadvantaged groups (Hogg, 1992). The Canadian federal government implemented such policies as a result of the Abella Royal Commission (1984), which noted that progress toward equal opportunities on the basis of voluntary programs was ineffective (Abella, 1984). Employment equity was

Canada's affirmative action response, although the terminology was intended to disassociate such efforts from the controversy that surrounded affirmative action quota procedures (Clayton & Crosby, 1992; Jones, 1988; Prager, 1986). Affirmative actions reflect many possible procedures that include any positive action taken to increase the likelihood of true equality for individuals of differing categories (Crosby & Cordova, 1996). The goal of affirmative action policies is to explicitly challenge the success of principles of liberal equality that assume the same treatment of all individuals without consideration of social historical conditions will result in the same outcomes for all. Affirmative actions similarly challenge the principles of passive nondiscrimination, which operate in the same contextual vacuum. Thus, despite the explicit recognition and consideration of groups' social status, affirmative action policies are intended to show a long run commitment to the treatment of persons as individuals and not as members of groups (Clayton & Crosby, 1992).

There are several different affirmative action policies that have been implemented. Most affirmative action programs are based on some form of preferential treatment. Plous (1996) lists four types of preferential selection procedures that vary in their treatment of group membership and individual merit: selection among equally qualified candidates, selection among comparable candidates, selection among unequal candidates, and selection among qualified and unqualified candidates.

The first form of affirmative action is selection among equally qualified candidates. This procedure occurs when a female or minority candidate is selected from a pool of equally qualified applicants (Plous, 1996). Thus, individuals who have the same qualifications for a particular job would be grouped together and if this type of

affirmative action policy were implemented the female candidate would be offered the position first. In comparison to the three other forms of hiring and promotion policies this procedure is the least obtrusive form of preferential treatment in that the candidate's qualifications and his/her group status are weighted equally in the decision making process.

The second type of affirmative action procedure implements greater preferential treatment in that this policy places greater emphasis on candidates with comparable worth as opposed to candidates holding completely equal qualifications. This form of selection procedure occurs when female or minority candidates are roughly comparable to other candidates within a range of relevant criteria and are chosen regardless of insignificant differences on any specific qualifications (Plous, 1996).

The third form of preferential treatment occurs when female or minority candidates are significantly less qualified for a position than other candidates, but their qualifications are sufficiently acceptable to meet the requirements of the position for which they are nonetheless chosen based on their group status (Plous, 1996). This type of policy is ranked as an aggressive form of affirmative action because the candidate's group status as opposed to his/her qualifications is weighted more heavily in the decision making process.

The fourth type of selection procedure is the strongest form of preferential treatment in that selection among qualified and unqualified candidates occurs when unqualified female or minority candidates are chosen over other qualified candidates (Plous, 1996). Although an unqualified female candidate may be chosen over a qualified candidate, this policy still considers the applicants' qualifications for selection but they

are simply not the deciding factor. The assumption is clearly that the extent of discrimination against women (or minorities) is so vast, that the only possibility for their infiltration into the organization or job strata is through aggressive recruitment, and subsequent training to the position. This form of affirmative action policy is least likely to be adopted (Plous, 1996).

Although most affirmative action programs are based on preferential treatment policies that target hiring and promotion procedures, not all anti-discriminatory policies in the workplace rely on such techniques. Some policies are designed to "identify and eliminate barriers hidden in employment systems" (Tougas & Veilleux, 1989, 1990) and place more emphasis on target recruitment and training opportunities. These types of programs offer a range of services to women and minorities such as career counseling, with the goal of providing women and minorities with the tools to help themselves (Tougas & Veilleux, 1989, 1990). Furthermore, some workplace policies focus on passive nondiscriminatory policies in which equal opportunity is the immediate goal and no preferential treatment is given to any group (Matheson, Echenberg, Taylor, Rivers, & Chow, 1994). Color blind and sex blind policies are forms of passive nondiscrimination (Turner, 1990). These strategies are clearly less obtrusive and appear to be less likely to show reverse favoritism to the disadvantaged group, and hence are generally viewed as acceptable courses of action (Matheson et al., 1994, 2000; Tougas & Veilleux, 1989). However, while these policies represent alternatives to preferential treatment strategies, in the context of systemic discrimination, it is argued that they are relatively ineffectual (Clayton & Crosby, 1992). Thus, while the goal of these policies may be to eliminate

social inequities, the strategies for doing so are varied and have been controversial and heatedly debated.

The Affirmative Action Debate.

The implementation of affirmative action programs in Canada and the United States as a strategy for social change for women and minorities has created ongoing debates among both beneficiary and nonbeneficiary groups alike, regarding legal, moral and most recently, the social and psychological issues. Supporters of affirmative action contend that these hiring and promotions policies are necessary to remedy the effects of past discrimination against women and minorities (Bacchi, 1996). In addition, Bacchi (1996) asserts that affirmative action programs are necessary to recognize that power and bias play a role in selection procedures and argues that such policies provide deserved opportunities to individuals otherwise discriminated against.

Opponents of affirmative action argue that such policies are in reality reverse discrimination (Steele, 1990; Taylor, 1973). Specifically, these opponents suggest that remedying the problem of past discrimination cannot be justified by using affirmative action programs because they themselves are inherently discriminatory practices. Thus, the argument of reverse discrimination contends that giving special benefits to women, for example, is unjust because such policies continue to base special treatment on 'irrelevant' characteristics and therefore continue to discriminate against individuals who do not have such characteristics.

Fletcher and Chalmers (1991) conducted a study to assess peoples' attitudes about affirmative action. Canadian citizens were asked, "how important it was to them to guarantee equality between men and women in all aspects of life" (Fletcher & Chalmers,

1991). Nearly 72 percent of Canadian citizens agreed that equality between the sexes was very important (Fletcher & Chalmers, 1991). When asked whether they thought large companies should have quotas to ensure a fixed percentage of women be hired, approximately 65 percent of Canadians thought large companies should not have quotas. If equality between the sexes is an important issue to most Canadians, why is there such controversy and so little support for affirmative action, given that the principle of equality is at the foundation of such policies?

Because the actual goals and definitions of affirmative action are not clear cut and perhaps not available to most Canadians, a closer look at individuals' perceptions of what affirmative action is may allow us to understand the inconsistency between Canadians support for equality and opposition to affirmative action policies (i.e. quotas). While Fletcher and Chalmer's (1991) findings are limited to attitudes toward quotas, Kravitz and Platania (1993) note that respondents in their study perceived affirmative action policies and strict quotas to be indistinguishable from each other. In fact, most individuals defined affirmative action procedures in terms of a quota system (Kravitz & Platania, 1993). Similar to Fletcher and Chalmers (1991), these participants strongly disapproved of quota systems and as a result opposed affirmative action. Clayton and Crosby (1992) also found that 19 percent of participants in their study thought quotas were always part of affirmative action and another 32 percent said they were sometimes part of affirmative action policy. Such studies suggest many individuals hold extreme negative attitudes about affirmative actions because they believe that such actions entail selection quotas without regard to qualification. However, as noted earlier, unless the situation of discrimination is so extreme as to require quotas, affirmative action policies

always consider the individual's qualifications and merit in the selection process, although it is not always the defining force in choosing a candidate (Clayton & Crosby, 1992).

A lack of clarity concerning the definition of affirmative action is not restricted to the general public, but is also evident among researchers examining affirmative action. For example, Fletcher and Chalmers (1991) explicitly defined affirmative action in terms of quotas. Similarly, Heilman and her colleagues have consistently operationalized affirmative action in terms of a sex based preferential selection procedure in which merit was not even a consideration (Heilman, Simon & Pepper, 1987; Heilman, McCullough & Gilbert, 1996). More recently, Heilman, Battle, Keller and Lee (1998) conducted a study and revealed that when affirmative action was solely defined in terms of preferential selection based on group membership alone, negative reactions occurred. However, negative reactions about affirmative action policies were alleviated when the policy made clear that merit was also considered in the decision making process (Brown et al., 2000; Graves & Powell, 1994; Heilman et al., 1998; Major, Feinstein, & Crocker, 1994; Matheson et al., 2000; Stanush et al., 1998; Taylor, 1994; Tougas et al., 1996). Thus, when affirmative action is defined in terms of quotas (or not defined at all), most individuals disagree with such policies. Such studies are clearly problematic for understanding the implications of affirmative action policies.

Sex Differences in Attitudes Toward Affirmative Action

There is a well-documented tendency for women and visible minorities to be more supportive of preferential treatment procedures than nontargeted groups (Arthur, Doverspike, & Fuentes, 1992; Bobocel et al., 1998; Fletcher & Chalmers, 1991; Kravitz

& Klineberg, 2000; Malos, 2000; Matheson et al., 1994; Tougas & Veilleux, 1988, 1989; Stanush, Arthur & Doverspike, 1998). Nonetheless, affirmative action policies based on preferential treatment are often viewed by both men and women as inherently unfair (Clayton & Crosby, 1992; Heilman, et al., 1996; Matheson et al., 1994, 2000; Nacoste, 1987, 1990; Dovidio, Mann, & Gaertner, 1989; Fletcher & Chalmers, 1991; Stanush et al., 1998; Tougas & Veilleux, 1988, 1989). Nacoste (1990) suggests that when people are given preferential consideration because of the group in which they belong, procedural justice is compromised. Matheson et al. (1994) further contends that "perceptions of procedural justice are viewed as more important than achieving a fair outcome" (p. 2087). Indeed, when affirmative action policies are merit-based as opposed to adopting procedures increasingly associated with preferential treatment, both men and women showed greater support for affirmative action policies (Heilman et al., 1996; Matheson et al., 1994; Nacoste, 1990; Tougas et al., 1989), while increasingly negative responses were expressed to actions with a greater focus on group criteria (Chang, 1996; Garcia, Erskine, Hawn, & Casmay, 1981; Matheson et al., 1994; Tougas et al., 1989).

The opposition expressed by women and minorities to affirmative action policies may go beyond issues of perceived fairness, to concerns that such actions imply that they are lacking in individual merit and competence, hence requiring special treatment. Indeed, some authors suggest that the negative consequences to women associated with being an affirmative action recipient may outweigh the benefits (Heilman et al., 1987, 1996; Summers, 1991). Research supports the idea that women who are hired 'because they are women' devalue their own qualifications and competence, show reduced motivation to excel, and express less organizational commitment (Chacko, 1982;

Heilman, Block, & Lucas, 1992; Heilman & Herlihy, 1984; Heilman, Rivero & Brett, 1991; Heilman et al., 1987; Nacoste, 1989, 1990). The lack of confidence women and minorities may hold about their qualifications may in itself lead to behavioural confirmation (Heilman et al., 1991; Turner & Pratkanis, 1993), which in turn may validate their doubts despite their true qualifications.

The negative psychological impacts of affirmative actions on beneficiaries may stem not only from their own reactions to the policies, but as well from the stigmatisation created by those who do not benefit from such programs, namely men (Heilman, 1996; Heilman et al., 1992; Nacoste, 1989). Indeed, some have argued that male backlash is one of the main restraining forces against affirmative action (Norton & Fox, 1997). Such backlash may be particularly likely to come from those who believe that they themselves are negatively affected by such programs. Past research has found that outgroup's attitudes to affirmative action are a function of perceptions of their own sense of deprivation and concerns about self-interest (Kluegel & Smith, 1986; Nosworthy, Lea & Lindsay, 1995). Similarly, Veilleux and Tougas (1989) argue that collective relative deprivation, the idea that men perceive their group as being treated unfairly in the workplace, in that that men may lose opportunities in terms of hiring, promotion and salary as a result of affirmative action, plays a significant role in explaining men's opposition to affirmative action programs for women. Such men expressed feelings of victimization and an overall sense of unfair treatment (Heilman et al, 1998). As a result of men's feelings of victimization and overall sense of unfair treatment, Nacoste (1990) suggests men's devaluation of female beneficiaries' competence and achievements may result in hostility toward the target group women. When men believed that selection

procedures were not based on merit or they had no information about the type of preferential selection processes, men attached a stigma of incompetence to women beneficiaries (Heilman et al., 1998).

Hulin, Fitzgerald, and Drasgow (1996) further suggest that once women are hired into male dominated areas they are often subject to both gender and sexual harassment that may reflect backlash from the dominant group (men) who may feel frustrated and cheated in their own opportunities by these female beneficiaries. Indeed, because of these negative consequences associated with being a beneficiary, some researchers (Stockdale, 1996) have suggested that getting women and minorities into nontraditional, male dominated occupations needs to be supported at more than the hiring level.

Sexual Harassment

In light of past research, the present study will examine the effects of preferential selection procedures in terms of potential backlash reactions to beneficiaries. In particular, sexual harassment will be explored as one potential strategy men may use to express hostility to female beneficiaries. Sexual harassment, a form of sex discrimination against women in the workplace, has been recognized as a social issue since the mid 1970's (Sheffey & Tindale, 1992). In general, 70 to 90% of women have and/or will experience some form of gender and/or sexual harassment in their lifetime (Sheffey & Tindale, 1992). This astonishing rate of gender and/or sexual harassment indicates that this form of workplace hostility has reached epidemic proportions. What is gender and sexual harassment and why does it happen?

What is sexual harassment? There are several definitions of sexual harassment throughout the literature. For example, Till (1980) developed a five-category model of

harassment that included: gender harassment, seductive behavior, sexual bribery, threat, and sexual imposition. However, a more condensed and inclusive model is represented by Fitzgerald and her colleagues (Fitzgerald, Gelfand & Drasgow, 1994; Fitzgerald & Hesson-McInnis, 1989). These researchers suggest three categories of harassment: gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion (Fitzgerald, Drasgow, Hulin, Gelfand, & Magley, 1997).

Gender harassment involves “generalized sexist comments and behaviors that convey insulting, degrading, and/or sexist attitudes”(Fitzgerald et al., 1997, p.580). Examples of gender harassment include suggestive stories or offensive jokes, staring, sexist remarks about career options or being treated “differently” on the basis of gender (Stockdale, 1996 & Fitzgerald et al, 1997).

Unwanted sexual attention is described as ranging from inappropriate and/or offensive physical or verbal sexual advances to serious sexual imposition and assault (Fitzgerald & McInnis, 1989). Examples of this type of behavior involve unwelcome requests for dates, drinks, backrubs as well as any unwelcome touching, fondling and so on. Fitzgerald and McInnis (1993) refer more generally to these first two types of harassment as “Conditions of Work”, which emphasize the presence of sexist, abusive, or unwanted sexual behavior or attention.

Sexual coercion, the third form of harassment, is characterized by the perpetrator’s solicitation of sexual activity or other sex-related behaviors by promise of reward or threat of punishment (Fitzgerald et al., 1997; Fitzgerald & McInnis, 1989). This last form of sexual harassment is also referred to in a more general way as Quid Pro Quo, highlighting the act of solicitation and the aspects of threat and reinforcement as

part of the harassing behavior (Fitzgerald et al., 1997; Fitzgerald & Hesson-McInnis, 1993).

Antecedents of harassment. Although it is important to have definitions of sexual harassment that explicitly spell out what behaviors constitute it and what behaviors do not, it is equally important to frame the issue of sexual harassment within a social context to address the antecedents of these harassing behaviors. Several models exist in the literature to explain the underlying causes of gender and sexual harassment. Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1993) frame the antecedents of sexual harassment within an organizational model, which contends that sexual harassment is a power issue, whereby power is derived from the organizational hierarchy. Thus, it is individuals in positions of little power, either men or women, who are most likely targets of harassing behaviors.

Although this model recognizes the important role power plays in sexual harassment, it has several limitations. Specifically, this theory suggests that sexual harassment only occurs between an employer and an employee and does not recognize sexual harassment that occurs between peers in the workplace. In fact, sexual harassment in the workplace occurs most frequently between coworkers and peers (Hulin, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1993).

A theory that may better explain the cause of sexual harassment is the sex-role spillover model (Gutek, 1985). This theory suggests that there is a transference of gender roles into the workplace, hence the term “spillover” (Stockdale, 1996). Sex role spillover generally occurs when the make-up of the work group is either predominantly male or female as opposed to gender balanced. Gutek (1985) suggests that when men hold stereotypical expectations of women (i.e. passivity, nurturance, dependence and the

view of women as sexual objects), and such expectations are anticipated in a workplace, sex role spillover occurs (Stockdale, 1996). Thus, when a woman is found in either a predominately male or female profession, this makes her “femaleness” more salient. The characteristics of her femaleness that become most salient to men are the stereotypical view of female as “sexual object”. As a result, women in these contexts experience more sexual harassment than a woman in gender neutral jobs (Stockdale, 1996). This model is perhaps more useful in explaining the causes of sexual harassment in comparison to the organizational model because it inherently recognizes peer harassment. Also, this model recognizes that harassment toward women is more likely to occur in male dominated occupations as opposed to gender neutral jobs, suggesting that sexual harassment is a form of sex discrimination in the workplace.

Unfortunately, little empirical support has been found for this theory (Gutek & Cohen, 1987; Gutek, Cohen & Konrad, 1990; Gutek & Morasch, 1982; Ragins & Scandura, 1995). This theory also does not address the role of the power differential that exists between men and women. Such power differences between men and women are indeed one of the major causes of sexual harassment, especially in male dominated occupations (Cleveland & McNamara, 1996; Lafontaine & Tredeau, 1988). A socio-cultural model using a feminist analysis of the antecedents of sexual harassment does address these power issues.

The socio-cultural model, otherwise referred to as the power/dominance model, asserts that male domination of women in the workplace, a domination that reflects the patriarchal system in which men are the predominant political and economic group, is the culprit of sexual harassment (Cleveland & McNamara, 1996; Lafontaine & Tredeau,

1988;). Specifically like Gutek, the socio-cultural theory proposes that female workers are more likely to experience sexual harassment in traditionally male-dominated occupations. However, this model goes further than the sex-role spillover model because it conceptualizes sexual harassment as the assertion of personal power, with power deriving from gender, rather than from the organizational structure.

The socio-cultural model of sexual harassment provides the basis for the present study's contention that attitudes toward affirmative action, and perceptions that women have been hired into male-dominated occupations as a result of affirmative action, may result in men's perceptions that sexual harassment is an appropriate response to the female beneficiary. Because there is a shift in power when affirmative action policies are implemented, sexual harassment may reflect the increased hostility toward female beneficiaries of affirmative action.

Attitudes toward sexual harassment. Research on both men's and women's perceptions of gender and sexual harassment reveals that both sexes recognize and define more serious forms of sexual harassment as such (Tata, 1993). For example, the behaviors associated with sexual bribery, sexual coercion, and sexual assault were all perceived to be incidents of sexual harassment by both men and women (Tata, 1993). However, unlike men, women tended to perceive an incident as more likely to be sexual harassment, more likely to have an effect on the recipient of the harassing behavior, and to be a more negative event than did males (Foulis & McCabe, 1997). Furthermore, several studies have also indicated that women, unlike men, have defined "less severe" behaviors such as gender harassment, as sexual harassment, and more often considered

sexual harassment a problem at work (Fitzgerald & Ormerod, 1991; Jones & Remland, 1992).

The perceived reasons for harassment also differ between women and men. When asked what they thought the reasons may be for why sexual harassment occurred, men perceived an incident of harassment to be based on attraction, as opposed to women who perceived it to be more power driven (Foulis & McCabe, 1997). This finding has several implications, suggesting that men perhaps displace accountability for sexual harassment and are unable to see the underlying causes of harassment.

Both Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1993) and Foulis and McCabe (1997) further suggest that various attitudes of the perceiver are a function of their gender role stereotypes. Specifically, these studies found that individuals with sexist attitudes were more accepting of sexual harassment. In contrast, individuals who endorsed ideas about feminism reported less acceptance of sexual harassment (Fitzgerald & Ormerod, 1993). These findings suggest that attitudes and perceptions about women in general can have a profound affect on both men's and women's willingness to label sexual harassment and to believe, empathize, and support victims of harassment.

Linking Affirmative Action and Sexual Harassment: The Present Study

Affirmative action is clearly controversial, particularly as the strategies to implement it become more aggressive. It has been opposed by both women who feel as though it undermines perceptions of their competence, and by men who feel as though it puts them at an unfair disadvantage. As a result of these factors, not only has there been opposition to affirmative action policies, but there have been negative repercussions in the treatment of beneficiaries. In particular, it was suggested that sexual harassment may

be a mechanism for maintaining traditional roles and power differentials in the workplace. As a result, in the face of affirmative action, which challenges the fairness of the status quo, such actions may form the basis for reasserting male dominance. Even men who do not perform the acts of sexual harassment may view it as justified. These issues were explored in the present study.

The first goal of this study was to replicate sex differences in attitudes toward several preferential treatment selection procedures, as well determine how such selection procedures affect perceptions of the beneficiary. Three selection procedures were compared: (1) merit-based selection; (2) preferential treatment among equally qualified candidates (preferential equivalent); and (3) preferential treatment of women, followed by qualifications (preferential minimum standard). Based on previous studies, it was hypothesized that even in a context in which sex discrimination was made evident, both men and women would be more opposed to procedures that increasingly relied on group membership as a decision criteria, in comparison to merit. However, women were expected to be more supportive of such procedures. This study also hypothesized that men would have a more negative view of female beneficiaries of a preferential treatment selection procedure, rather than a merit-based policy.

The second goal of this study was to examine differences in perceptions of how female beneficiaries of preferential selection procedures should expect to be treated. Specifically, it was hypothesized that men in particular would report that they not only believe that women should expect worse treatment under such policies when they enter the workplace, but as well that, gender and sexual harassment would be a reasonable reaction to the women. To test this latter hypothesis, participants were asked about their

reactions to a female employee who reported experiencing one of three forms of harassment: gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention or sexual coercion. While men were expected to find such actions increasingly unacceptable when women were selected on the basis of merit, they were expected to view such actions as 'par for the course' when preferential selection procedures were used to hire women.

The third goal of this study was to explore women's reactions to female beneficiaries in an attempt to examine whether their tendency to sympathize with victims of harassment dissipate under conditions of affirmative action. Women, like men, are mostly opposed to preferential treatment procedures and are more likely to endorse merit-based policies. However, sexual harassment research suggests that women, unlike men, are usually more sensitive to identifying sexual harassment as such. Thus, what was of interest in the present study was whether women would react differently to scenarios of sexual harassment as a function of the presence of preferential selection procedures.

Method

Participants

137 female and 128 male students enrolled in Introductory Psychology were recruited to participate in this study concerning 'women in the workplace' in exchange for one experimental credit (see Appendix A for recruitment notice). They were randomly assigned (in equal numbers) to one of nine conditions comprising a 3 (Selection Procedure) x 3 (Sexual Harassment) design.

Procedure

Individuals participated in small groups. The study was described as examining the effects of the military's policies on hiring and promotion in terms of the subjective

experiences of employees hired through such procedures. Participants were informed that because there are still very few women in the military, the Department of National Defense was particularly interested in monitoring the experiences women have faced, and to consider these experiences in an effort to advance a healthy work environment (see Appendix B for instructions).

Participants were told that they would be listening to a 10-15 minute audiotaped interview between a Major and a recently hired Officer Cadet. Participants were also told that several interviews were conducted in the last year with newly recruited Officers in an attempt to assess the Officer's overall experiences and concerns, their level of job and life satisfaction, and the effects of the military on their family, leisure, and social life (see Appendix C for transcript). Furthermore, participants' were informed that perhaps the military holds too many biases to make credible recommendations of their own and, therefore, it was of interest to obtain the impressions of outside observers. Participants were also told that students were one of the target populations for recruitment and so their impressions of new hirees' experiences would be critical in future recruitment and retention efforts.

Participants were told that following the interview they would be asked to complete several questionnaires that relate to issues presented in the audiotaped interview. After providing participants with a description of the study, they completed an informed consent form (see Appendix D).

Before the audiotope began, participants were told that it was important for everyone to have some background knowledge about the military's hiring and promotion policies. All participants were given a rationale for the use of the selection procedures by

being told that the Military was dedicated to selecting and promoting the best candidates for the job, but that there was also a distinct preference for the hiring of men in the military and women made up only 10 percent of the National Defense. Each group of participants was then randomly assigned to hear one of three hiring and promotion policies: merit based policy, preferential treatment among equal candidates, and a preferential treatment among unequal candidates. This constituted the manipulation of the selection procedures. In the merit-based selection procedure, participants were told that “the military’s policy of hiring and promotion is to always give the job to the most qualified individual based on merit alone” . The preferential treatment among equal candidates manipulation (preferential equivalent) indicated that “the military has adopted a policy of giving a particular position to a qualified woman if a woman and a man hold equal qualifications”, while participants’ in the preferential treatment among unequal candidates manipulation (preferential minimum standard) were told “the military has adopted a policy of giving the position to the most qualified woman regardless of other qualified male candidates”(see Appendix E).

Following this background information, participants listened to a 10-minute audiotape. This audiotape provided filler information intended to strengthen the validity of the cover story. For example, questions pertaining to the Officer’s life and job satisfaction, relationships with family, friends and coworkers and positive and negative experiences associated with the transitions from civilian to military Officer were addressed. At the end of the tape, the level of sexual harassment was manipulated. In the context of responding to the question “has there been any significant experiences you have encountered with fellow Officers that have been particularly negative?” participants

were randomly assigned (within each level of selection procedure) to hear one of three sexual harassment experiences by the newly recruited Officer. The three levels of sexual harassment included: gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion. Gender harassment involved female officer being exposed to sexist remarks from another male officer. Remarks included “women don’t belong in the military, so why don’t you run home like a good little girl and make me something to eat!”. Unwanted sexual attention included a verbal sexual advance, in which a male officer made comments to the female officer, including “you look so hot today, I’m so aroused, that all I can think about is you naked having sex with me- I bet you want to too”. Sexual coercion was characterized by the female interviewee as having experienced a male officer making a verbal sexual advance with the promise of reward or threat of punishment, namely that if she told of the sexual advance, untrue rumors would be spread about her sexual activities with higher Military officials (see Appendix F).

After the audiotape was finished, participants were asked to fill out several questionnaires assessing demographic information, manipulation checks, their attitudes to selection procedures allegedly used, reactions to the interviewee’s competence and treatment by the military, perceptions of the harassment incident, perceptions of the interviewee as a victim of harassment, and their hostility toward women. Once participants completed the questionnaires, they were debriefed and informed of the true purpose of the study (Appendix H). Participants were then given their experimental credit, a list of contact numbers, and thanked for their participation.

Measures

The following measures were imbedded within a 20-minute questionnaire (see Appendix G). Along with the following measures, numerous filler items were included that addressed issues raised in the cover story, including participants' perceptions of the interviewee's quality of family, leisure and work life, and her social and work experiences. These questions were included to reduce demand characteristics.

Manipulation Checks. To assess the effectiveness of the manipulation for selection procedure and harassment condition, participants were presented with two open-ended questions. The first question assessed the selection procedure manipulation and asked participants to "please describe the main criteria the military says it used to hire new personnel". The second question assessed the harassment manipulation and asked participants to "briefly describe the negative interaction that was focussed on in the interview you heard". Answers were coded as either "0" accurately described the manipulation, "1" somewhat described the manipulation, or "2" did not understand the manipulation.

Attitudes toward the selection procedures. Several questions were developed to assess participants' perceptions of the selection procedure described in the military's hiring policy. The items were drawn and modified from Matheson et al (2000). Seven questions assessed participants' perceptions of the fairness of the selection procedures using 7-point bipolar rating scales. Participants rated the hiring policy as unfair versus fair, discriminatory against women versus nondiscriminatory, necessary versus unnecessary, appropriate versus inappropriate, uncalled for versus called for, biased versus unbiased and discriminatory against men versus nondiscriminatory. The mean of

these 7 items was calculated (with the appropriate items reversed) such that higher scores reflected perceptions that the selection procedure was fair. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .80 for this scale, indicating strong internal reliability for this scale.

Two items were also developed to assess whether participants perceived women as fairly represented in the military by asking them to firstly indicate "what percentage of the military's officers do you think are women"? and to secondly assess how fair they thought this proportion was by using a 7-point rating scale from 1 "very unfair" to 7 "very fair".

Reactions to the female officer. Four items assessed participants' perceptions and evaluations of the female interviewee's competence and ability using a 7-point rating scale ranging from 1 "not at all" to 7 "very". Examples of such items included "how competent will this officer be at performing her job?" and "if the officer does get a promotion, how quickly do you think it will happen"? Responses to these four items were averaged, such that higher scores representing a more positive perception of the beneficiary's competence. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .77.

Seven items were also developed to assess participants' perceptions of the implications of the military's alleged hiring and promotion policy for women. For example, questions such as "Do you think the military's hiring and promotion policies have affected the female officer's ability to advance in her job?" and "Do you think women hired under the military's current hiring and promotion policies deserve to be reacted to negatively by their male co-workers?" were included. Responses were along a 7-point rating scale ranging from 1 "not at all" to 7 "definitely". The mean for these seven items was calculated to reflect higher scores to indicate more negative reactions to

women hired under the relevant promotion policy. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .70, indicating good internal reliability among these items.

Responses to sexual harassment. Various measures were developed to examine participants' reactions and perceptions of the incident of gender and/or sexual harassment that the female officer encountered. Two items were constructed to assess participants' perceptions of whether the incident was sexual harassment ("would you define the encounter described with the officer's male co-worker as an incident of sexual harassment?") and the incident's level of seriousness ("how serious do you think this incident was?"). Responses were on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 "not at all" to 7 "definitely/extremely". These items were not significantly correlated ($r =$), and so were analyzed separately.

Responses to the female officer's emotional state. A checklist format questionnaire was developed that assessed participants' perceptions of the female officer's emotional state with regard to the negative interaction she experienced. Data reduction was performed to form composite scores. A principal components analysis with a varimax rotation was conducted to identify various emotional factors. Based on the scree test, three factors emerged. These three factors accounted for 38.67 % of the total explained variance in the responses. Factor scores were created by unit weighting and averaging items with loadings greater than .40; where an item loaded on more than one factor, it was assigned to the factor that was most conceptually relevant (Table 1). The first factor comprised of emotions reflecting positive/happy feelings (including beautiful, sexy, complimented, special, appealing, flattered, sexually excited, well liked) (Cronbach's alpha = .80). The second factor consisted of emotions reflecting negative /

upset feelings (including dirty, helpless, afraid, anxious, embarrassed, depressed, nervous, taken advantage of) (Cronbach's $\alpha = .74$). The third factor comprised emotions reflecting anger (including annoyed, offended, uncomfortable, upset, angry) (Cronbach's $\alpha = .53$).

Table 1

Factor Analysis Item Loadings for Emotional State

Factor	Item	Factor Loading	Cronbach's α
Positive Emotions			.80
	Beautiful	.76	
	Sexy	.60	
	Complimented	.84	
	Special	.70	
	Appealing	.53	
	Flattered	.86	
	Sexually excited	.61	
	Well liked	.40	
Negative Emotions			.74
	Dirty	.63	
	Helpless	.60	
	Afraid	.63	
	Anxious	.56	
	Embarrassed	.61	
	Depressed	.52	
	Nervous	.61	
	Taken Advantage Of	.40	
Angry Emotions			.53
	Annoyed	.40	
	Offended	.46	
	Uncomfortable	.48	
	Upset	.41	
	Angry	.48	

Results

Design and Statistics

To ensure that the manipulations were effective, responses to these checks were examined. A series of 2 (Sex) x 3 (Selection procedure: merit based policy, preferential equivalent, and preferential minimum standard) x 3 (Sexual Harassment: gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion) between groups analyses of variance (ANOVAs) was employed to assess the effects of these variables on attitudes to affirmative action, reactions to the female beneficiary's competence and treatment, reactions to the harassment incident, and perceptions of the female victim. Where effects were significant, multiple comparisons were performed with family-wise error being held to $p < .05$ by using Tukey's correction for pairwise comparisons.

Demographic Characteristics

To assess demographic characteristics, descriptive statistics were examined. Participants' age varied from 17 to 51 years ($M = 20.98$, $SD = 4.29$). There were 137 (51.7%) females and 128 (48.3%) males roughly equally distributed across experimental conditions. A substantial proportion of participants were employed part-time (50.6%; $n = 134$), however, many only worked during the summer (24.9%; $n = 66$). A small proportion was working full-time (12.5%; $n = 33$), while others did not work at all (10.2%; $n = 27$). Given the experimental context, it was also of interest to look at participants' intended career, revealing that the most frequently listed career was law enforcement, including both lawyer or police officer (17.5%, $n = 44$).

Less than half (41.9%; $n = 111$) of the participants had experienced an incident of sexual harassment. Of those who had experienced an incident of sexual harassment, 32%

($n=67$) were women and 10% ($n=21$) were men. Of those who did not experience sexual harassment 21% ($n=44$) were women and 37% ($n=77$) were men.

Manipulation Checks

A chi-square test of independence was performed to assess whether selection procedure resulted in differences in accuracy of reporting the military's hiring policy by answering the question "Please describe the main criteria the military says it uses to hire new personnel". As expected, no differences among the three selection procedure conditions were found $\chi^2(4, n=263) = 6.25, ns$. The majority ($n=229, 87\%$) of participants described the selection procedure accurately. Also, a chi-square test of independence between the harassment condition and participants' perceptions of the incident as harassment was examined for the open-ended question "Briefly describe the negative interaction that was focussed on in the interview you heard". As expected, no significant differences among the groups were found $\chi^2(4, n=263) = 3.31, ns$. Accordingly, 92% ($n=241$) of participants accurately described the harassment condition (See Table 2). It was decided that participants who failed to correctly identify the selection procedures and the harassment incident on the manipulation checks would not be included in the analyses as they could not be expected to respond as a function of this independent variable.

Table 2

Observed Frequencies (%) on Manipulation Check Questions

	Accurately	Sort of	Not at all
Merit	84(92.3%)	3(3.3%)	4(4.4%)
Preferential Equiv.	73(83.9%)	3(3.5%)	11(12.6%)
Minimum Standard	72(84.7%)	1(1.2%)	12(14.1%)
Gender Harassment	79(91.9%)	6(7%)	1(1.2%)
Unwanted Sexual Attention	80(92%)	3(3.4%)	4(4.6%)
Sexual Coercion	82(93.2%)	4(4.6%)	3(3.4%)

Attitudes to the Selection Procedures

It is generally expected that if a group is perceived to be fairly represented in the workplace, affirmative action procedures will be viewed as unnecessary. To determine whether women were perceived to be unequally represented in the workplace, a 2 (sex) x 3 (selection procedure) x 3 (harassment condition) univariate ANOVA was conducted on participants' perceptions of the fairness of the proportion of women in the workplace.

A significant main effect was found for sex ($F(1,195)=10.86, p<.001, \eta^2=.05$), indicating that men ($M=3.49, SD=1.51$) perceived the proportion of women in the workplace to be more fair than did women ($M=2.84, SD=1.29$). Nonetheless, the ratings of both males, $t(100) = -3.83, p<.01$, and females, $t(113) = -10.32, p<.01$, was significantly below the scale midpoint (4), suggesting both perceived the proportion of women to be unfair. An ANOVA was also done to assess participants' perceptions of the percentage of female

military officers, after being explicitly told in the cover story that 10% were women. No differences were found for sex, selection procedure or harassment condition. Participants were relatively accurate in reporting the percentage of female military officers ($M = 11.23$, $SD = 5.41$).

A 2 (sex) x 3 (selection procedure) x 3 (harassment condition) ANOVA was also conducted to assess participants' attitudes toward the selection procedure. Neither the main effect for gender ($F < 1$) nor the interaction between gender and affirmative action type ($F < 1$) were significant. However, as expected, a significant main effect was found for the selection procedure, ($F(2, 195) = 39.17$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .29$). This was qualified by a 3-way interaction between sex, selection procedure and harassment condition ($F(4, 195) = 3.05$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .06$). Simple effects for selection procedure x harassment condition were examined for both men and women. For men, significant simple main effects were found for selection procedure ($F(2, 91) = 22.36$, $p < .001$) and harassment condition ($F(2, 91) = 3.11$, $p < .05$). Follow-up analyses for selection procedure revealed that men in both the preferential equivalent ($M = 3.92$, $SD = 1.08$) and minimum standard conditions ($M = 3.85$, $SD = .90$) perceived the affirmative action policy to be less fair than did men in the merit condition ($M = 5.33$, $SD = .95$). The effect of harassment was qualified by a simple interaction between selection procedure and harassment condition, $F(4, 91) = 2.30$, $p < .10$. Simple effects of the harassment condition at each level of selection procedure were examined. A significant effect was found only for the minimum standard condition $F(2, 27) = 5.78$, $p < .01$. Pairwise comparisons revealed that men in the minimum standard condition perceived the selection procedure to be most fair when the beneficiary experienced an incident of sexual coercion, than when she experienced either gender

harassment or unwanted sexual attention, between which there were no differences (See Table 3).

Table 3

Effects of Selection Procedure on Attitudes to Affirmative Action by Harassment

Condition for Men and Women

Selection Procedure	Harassment Condition	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>
<u>Men</u>				
Merit	Gender Harassment	4.78	1.31	11
	Unwanted Sexual Attention	5.67	1.05	12
	Sexual Coercion	5.48	.95	13
PE	Gender Harassment	3.48	.65	11
	Unwanted Sexual Attention	4.00	.88	12
	Sexual Coercion	4.32	1.47	11
MS	Gender Harassment	4.09	.86	8
	Unwanted Sexual Attention	3.27	.84	12
	Sexual Coercion	4.36	.62	10
<u>Women</u>				
Merit	Gender Harassment	5.74	1.12	11
	Unwanted Sexual Attention	4.77	1.19	11
	Sexual Coercion	5.08	1.25	15
PE	Gender Harassment	4.24	.69	14
	Unwanted Sexual Attention	3.86	.70	11
	Sexual Coercion	4.30	.82	12
MS	Gender Harassment	3.92	.99	15
	Unwanted Sexual Attention	4.03	1.55	10
	Sexual Coercion	3.39	.96	14

Note: PE= preferential equivalent; MS= minimum standard; M= mean; SD= standard

Deviation; n= number of participants. Scores could range from 1 to 7.

For women, a simple effect was only found for selection procedure ($F(2,104)=18.03, p<.001$). Follow-up analyses revealed that, similar to men, women in both the preferential equivalent ($M=4.15, SD=.74$) and minimum standard ($M=3.76, SD=1.15$) conditions perceived the selection procedure to be less fair than did women in the merit-based condition ($M=5.18, SD=1.23$). No simple interactions were found for women (See Table 4).

Table 4

Effects of Selection Procedure on Attitudes to Affirmative for Women

Selection Procedure	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>
Merit	5.18	1.23	37
Preferential Equivalent	4.15	.74	37
Minimum Standard	3.76	1.15	39

Note: M= mean; SD= standard deviation; n= number of participants. Scores could range from 1 to 7.

Reactions to the Beneficiary

Perceptions of the beneficiary's competence were examined in a 2 (sex) x 3 (selection procedure) x 3 (harassment condition) ANOVA. A main effect was found for selection procedure ($F(2,195)=3.89, p<.05, \eta^2=.04$). Pairwise comparisons revealed that participants in the merit condition ($M=4.64, SD=.83$) perceived the woman interviewed

as least competent relative to the preferential equivalent condition ($\underline{M}=4.94$, $\underline{SD}=.98$) and the minimum standard condition ($\underline{M}=4.99$, $\underline{SD}=.81$), between which there was no difference. No main nor interactive effects were found for harassment condition ($\underline{F}<1$) or gender ($\underline{F}(1,195) = 1.40$, $\underline{ns}$).

A 2 (sex) x 3 (selection procedure) x 3 (harassment condition) ANOVA on the index of the perceived implications of the hiring procedure for women in the military indicated a significant main effect for selection procedure ($\underline{F}(2,195) = 4.94$, $p<.01$, $\underline{\eta}^2=.05$), and for harassment condition $\underline{F}(2,195) = 3.53$, $p<.05$, $\underline{\eta}^2=.04$). However, these effects were qualified by a significant 3-way interaction between selection procedures, harassment condition and sex on the perceived implications for women ($\underline{F}(2,195) = 2.75$, $p<.05$, $\underline{\eta}^2=.05$). Simple effects for selection procedure x harassment condition were examined for each men and women.

For men, a significant simple effect for harassment condition was found ($\underline{F}(2,91) = 4.00$, $p<.05$). Tukey's comparisons further indicated that when the beneficiary experienced an incident of unwanted sexual attention ($\underline{M}= 3.83$, $\underline{SD}= 1.01$) or sexual coercion ($\underline{M}=3.84$, $\underline{SD}= 1.16$), men did not expect the beneficiary to be negatively treated in the workplace, and only did so when the beneficiary experienced gender harassment ($\underline{M}=4.52$, $\underline{SD}= 1.10$). Furthermore, a simple interaction between selection procedure and harassment condition was found for men $\underline{F}(4,91) = 2.32$, $p<.05$. The simple effects of the harassment condition at each level of the selection procedure revealed an effect for the merit condition $\underline{F}(2,33) = 4.76$, $p<.05$. Multiple comparisons indicated that men in the merit condition expected the least negative treatment toward the beneficiary when she experienced an incident of unwanted sexual attention or sexual coercion and expected the

most negative treatment of the beneficiary when she experienced gender harassment. (See Table 5).

For women, a significant simple effect was found for selection procedure ($F(2,104) = 6.99, p < .001$). Follow-up analyses revealed that women expected the most negative treatment toward the beneficiary when they believe that the military used minimum standard selection procedures rather than preferential equivalent or merit-based standards (See Table 6).

Perceptions of the Harassment Incident

A 2 (sex) x 3(selection procedure) x 3 (harassment condition) MANOVA on the three items that assessed participants' perceptions of whether a negative incident occurred, whether they defined the incident as sexual harassment and perceptions of the seriousness of the incident showed a significant multivariate effect for harassment condition ($\text{Pillai's } \lambda = .40; F(6,388) = 16.15, p < .001, \eta^2 = .20$). Univariate analyses indicated a significant effect on whether the experience was defined as sexual harassment ($F(2,195) = 50.03, p < .001, \eta^2 = .34$), and perceptions of the seriousness of the harassing incident ($F(2,195) = 15.61, p < .001, \eta^2 = .14$). Tukey's pairwise comparisons on the harassment condition revealed that participants in both the unwanted sexual attention ($M = 6.82, SD = .49$) and sexual coercion ($M = 6.96, SD = .20$) conditions were more likely to define the incident as sexual harassment than in the gender harassment condition ($M = 5.26, SD = .207$). With regard to seriousness of the harassing incident, pairwise comparisons indicated that as the harassment condition became more serious, so too did participants' perceptions of the incident (gender harassment: $M = 5.76, SD = 1.03$; unwanted sexual attention: $M = 6.06, SD = 1.01$; sexual coercion: $M = 6.57, SD = .72$).

Table 5

Effects of Selection Procedure on Expected Treatment of Beneficiary by Level of Harassment for Men and Women

SP	HC	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>
<u>Men</u>				
Merit	Gender Harassment	4.55	1.14	11
	Unwanted Sexual Attention	3.62	.89	12
	Sexual Coercion	3.32	1.23	13
PE	Gender Harassment	4.44	.75	11
	Unwanted Sexual Attention	4.25	1.16	12
	Sexual Coercion	4.05	1.14	11
MS	Gender Harassment	4.59	1.53	8
	Unwanted Sexual Attention	3.61	.90	12
	Sexual Coercion	4.29	.91	10
<u>Women</u>				
Merit	Gender Harassment	3.52	.91	11
	Unwanted Sexual Attention	3.55	.97	11
	Sexual Coercion	4.19	.80	15
PE	Gender Harassment	4.22	.75	14
	Unwanted Sexual Attention	3.69	1.01	11
	Sexual Coercion	3.82	.62	12
MS	Gender Harassment	4.45	.98	15
	Unwanted Sexual Attention	4.50	.81	10
	Sexual Coercion	4.36	.49	14

Note: SP= selection procedure; HC= harassment condition; PE= preferential equivalent;

MS= minimum standard; M= mean; SD= standard deviation; n= number of participants.

Scores could range from 1 to 7.

Table 6

Effects of Selection Procedure on Expected Treatment of Beneficiary for Women

Selection Procedure	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>
Merit	3.80	.92	37
Preferential Equivalent	3.93	.81	37
Minimum Standard	4.43	.87	39

Note: M= mean; SD= standard deviation; n= number of participants. Scores could range from 1 to 7.

A significant multivariate effect was also found for sex (Pillais = .05, $F(3,193) = 3.29$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .05$). However, this latter effect was qualified by a significant 2-way interaction between harassment condition and sex (Pillais = .08; $F(6,388) = 2.94$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$). Univariate tests revealed a significant interaction on whether participants defined the event as sexual harassment ($F(2,195) = 6.35$, $p < .005$, $\eta^2 = .06$). Simple effects for sex at each level of harassment condition were examined. A simple effect was found for gender harassment ($F(1,68) = 7.72$, $p < .005$, $\eta^2 = .10$) indicating that women (M = 5.83, SD = 1.71) were more likely to define gender harassment as sexual harassment than men (M = 4.50, SD = 2.29) were. There were no differences in unwanted sexual attention ($F < 1$) or sexual coercion ($F < 1$) as a function of sex.

Perceptions of Beneficiary's Emotional State

A 2 (sex) x 3 (selection procedure) x 3 (harassment condition) MANOVA assessing participants' perceptions of the beneficiary's emotional state (positive, negative and angry) showed a significant effect for harassment condition (Pillais = .12; $F(6,388) =$

3.97, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .06$). Univariate tests identified a main effect only for the negative emotions ($F(2,195) = 12.30$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .11$). Tukey's comparisons further revealed that participants in both the unwanted sexual attention ($M = .42$, $SD = .27$) and sexual coercion ($M = .51$, $SD = .28$) conditions perceived that the beneficiary would feel more negative emotions than the gender harassment condition ($M = .29$, $SD = .27$) did. No further main nor interactive effects were found.

Discussion

Opposition to employment equity programs, particularly preferential treatment policies, by both men and women, has fueled numerous studies in an attempt to establish or negate the negative effects associated with being an affirmative action recipient. Of particular interest in the present study was to examine aspects of potential male backlash toward the target group women, as such backlash has been considered to be one of the main obstructing forces against affirmative action efforts (Nacoste, 1990; Norton & Fox, 1997;). Several theories over the last decade have surfaced to understand the complexity associated with male backlash to affirmative actions (i.e. self-interest theories, justice theories). However, what is unclear from past research is how such backlash is expressed toward female beneficiaries and the consequences associated with this expression. Some researchers (Hulin, Fitzgerald, and Drasgow, 1996) have suggested that one way male backlash may be asserted in the workplace is through gender and/or sexual harassment of the beneficiary. Therefore, the primary goal of this study was to examine whether gender and sexual harassment would be viewed as acceptable reactions toward female beneficiaries of preferential selection procedures.

The Effects of Affirmative Action

Consistent with past research, in the present study men perceived the proportion of women in the workplace to be fairer than did women, even though participants were explicitly told sex discrimination in the military existed, and they were relatively accurate in the estimates of the proportion of women (based on what they were told in the experimental instructions). Previous research has documented men's reluctance to acknowledge the continued existence of discrimination (e.g., Matheson et al, 1994; Tougas). Men's unwillingness to acknowledge sex discrimination may reflect a disguised expression of neosexist beliefs (Tougas, Brown, Beaton, & Joly, 1995). Such neosexist beliefs may include perceiving women's qualifications as inferior (Elliott, 1987, 1989; Paul, 1989), and/or the implicit belief that women do not belong in the military, and hence the low proportion of women was perceived as fair. Nonetheless, both men and women perceived the proportion of women in the military to be relatively unfair. This finding may be influenced by demand characteristics associated with the military's highly publicized discriminatory practices, which have been expressed in the media as involving the explicit exclusion and maltreatment of women from the military.

Given differences in perceptions of the fairness of the status quo, sex differences were expected in support for preferential treatment policies to address this discrimination. Thus, it was somewhat surprising to find that both women and men were equally likely to rate both forms of preferential treatment selection procedures as unfair. Opposition to a primary emphasis on group membership (preferential minimum standard) is consistent with previous findings (Clayton & Crosby, 1992; Dovidio et al., 1989; Fletcher &

Chalmers, 1991; Heilman et al., 1996; Matheson et al., 1994, 2000; Nacoste, 1987, 1990; Stanush et al., 1998; Tougas & Veilleux, 1988, 1989), and is in line with procedural justice theories (Doverspike, Taylor & Arthur, 2000), that suggest that even when justification is provided to individuals for considering group membership (i.e. sex discrimination), concerns about procedural fairness outweigh the perceived fairness of the outcome.

However, the comparable opposition to the preferential equivalence strategy is not consistent with past research, which has consistently found that when women's qualifications are a primary consideration, attitudes toward this form of preferential treatment procedure are more favorable (Brown et al., 2000; Graves & Powell, 1994; Heilman et al., 1998; Major, Feinstein, & Crocker, 1994; Matheson et al., 2000; Stanush et al., 1998; Taylor, 1994; Tougas et al., 1996). Indeed, opposition to this policy was particularly surprising given the both women and men in the study viewed the status quo as unfair. It may be that the contexts in which such procedures are implemented play a role. Thus, preferential treatment may be perceived as more detrimental to recipients when applied in contexts in which there exist strong stereotypes about their competence, which seems to be the case when such policies are implemented in the military (Gilbert & Stead, 1999; Heilman et al., 1987, 1991). As a result, even if the targeted group, women, perceive the procedure to be fair more generally, in a context where backlash is anticipated, they may be more reticent about its adoption, as concerns about stereotyped and discriminatory treatment may prevail (Heilman et al., 1998; Maio & Esses, 1998; Truax, Cordova, Wood, Wright & Crosby, 1998). However, when asked about their expectations that women would be negatively treated, women did not think that they

would be treated more negatively when preferential equivalence procedures were used, relative to the merit-based selection procedures. They only anticipated more negative treatment when women were selected using a minimum standard criteria.

An alternative explanation is in line with self-interest theories (Kluegal & Smith, 1986; Nosworth, Lea & Lindsay, 1995; Williams et al., 1999), in that women may oppose all forms of preferential treatment policies because they want to be perceived and judged as competent, independent individuals, which the stigma associated with their group membership, and being an affirmative action recipient may undermine. Indeed, when preferential equivalence procedures are used, even when women report them to be fair, physiological indicators suggest that they are highly stressed when selected under these criteria (Matheson, Majka, & Giglio, 2001). Thus, it may be that women's more negative reaction to these procedures in the present study reflected a greater anticipation of having to outperform in order to be viewed as competent. It is unfortunate that it may be in the very contexts in which affirmative actions are most needed (i.e. male-dominated occupations), that such a stigma may be most salient and detrimental.

Based on past research (Heilman et al., 1998), it was expected that both men and women would perceive the female beneficiaries' competence more negatively when the role of merit in the preferential treatment policies was ambiguous. However, contrary to all other research, the opposite was found to be true. Instead, participants in the merit condition perceived the beneficiary to be least competent and perceived the beneficiary as more competent when preferential treatment procedures were used. It is possible that this is an artifact of the measures used in the present study. After careful examination of the questions used to assess competence, it may be that the items were less of an indication

of participants' perceptions of the female candidate's inherent abilities to perform her job as a military officer, and more a measure of her likelihood to succeed in a strongly male-biased environment without the support of strategies like affirmative action. Similarly, perceptions of the beneficiary as more competent under preferential treatment may be an indication that she is more likely to succeed in a male-dominated organization when affirmative action policies are implemented.

Alternatively, it is plausible the consideration of women's competence in a male-dominated organization such as the military, influenced perceptions of the beneficiaries competence. Such perceptions may have been mediated by neosexist beliefs held by both men and women about women's inability to be a competent military officer. Thus, it may be that when women are hired into male-dominated occupations based solely on their merit, stereotyped beliefs that women should not be allowed in the military or that women are not physically capable of fulfilling job duties, may explain why both men and women perceived the beneficiaries competence to be lower under conditions of merit.

Reactions to Harassment Incident

Consistent with past research (Tata, 1993), both men and women defined more overt forms of sexual harassment (i.e. unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion) as such. Also, both men and women perceived more overt forms of harassment as more serious than gender harassment, although women were more likely to view the latter to constitute harassment. This latter finding is consistent with previous research (Fitzgerald & Ormerod, 1991; Foulis & McCabe, 1997; Jones & Remland, 1992), suggesting that men's inability to recognize and define gender harassment as sexual harassment may be a function of sexist attitudes and gender role stereotyping, particularly their belief that

women do not belong in the military. Unfortunately, past research (Hanisch, 1996) has shown that gender harassment can seriously undermine the quality of work life for women, and their ability to perform. As the serious implications of gender harassment were less recognized, it seems that education in accordance with workplace policies to specifically address this covert form of harassment is needed to prevent women's experiences of gender harassment, both in male-dominated and gender neutral occupations. In particular, male-dominated occupations should have knowledge of the prevalence rates and antecedents of gender harassment in an effort to create appropriate workplace policies to deal effectively with perpetrators and to work towards the elimination of such harassment.

It was also expected that the harassment condition would influence participants' perceptions of the beneficiaries' treatment in the workplace. The present findings indicated that men in the unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion conditions expected the least negative treatment of the beneficiary, but only when the military's hiring policy was based solely on merit. Of particular interest, gender harassment was viewed as expected treatment of the beneficiary across all selection procedures. This finding may be consistent with responses to victimization in relation to belief in a just world theory (Hafer & Olson, 1998; Reichle, Schneider, & Montada, 1998). Although victim blaming often accomplishes restoration of one's belief in a just world, it is also possible for individuals' to restore justice through victim compensation. Thus, when a woman experiences an incident of sexual harassment, men become increasingly aware that sex discrimination exists, which in turn may be conceptualized as an injustice. Subsequently, the awareness that the beneficiary is experiencing unjust suffering

threatens men's belief in a just world, which may be restored by suggesting the beneficiary, is favorably treated in the workplace. Thus, because gender harassment was not recognized as a serious form of harassment, men in the gender harassment condition were unable to label this harassment as sex discrimination and hence did not view this as an injustice for women. Further research is necessary to assess whether the belief in a just world can account for these findings. If men perceive sexual harassment to be an indication of discrimination and hence, an injustice, nonbeneficiaries may be more supportive of affirmative actions and have a more positive view of beneficiaries overall. This would be consistent with men's greater support for the preferential minimum standard criteria when they were exposed to the female officer who had experienced sexual coercion. If so, this would suggest that backlash is not being expressed by men in their reactions to affirmative action policies. Rather, men seem to show greater support for the preferential selection policy and the beneficiary when sex discrimination is made salient.

The Effects of Affirmative Action on Rationalizing Sexual Harassment

It was hypothesized that sexual harassment would be viewed as deserved by the beneficiary based on men's perceived unfairness of the hiring procedure. However, contrary to expectations, men asserted more positive attitudes particularly to the adoption of preferential minimum standard procedures when the female beneficiary experienced an incident of sexual coercion. This finding suggests that male backlash to the hiring of women may be secondary to other influencing factors when dealing with such blatant discrimination directed specifically at an individual woman. This would be consistent with the finding that men did not believe that women should expect to be negatively

treated as a function of the hiring procedure when they heard that she experienced more blatant forms of sexual harassment, when she had been hired on the basis of merit alone. Thus, when an obvious form of sexual harassment occurs (i.e. sexual coercion), sex discrimination may become more salient to men. This heightened awareness that sex discrimination targeted at individual women exists may cause men to conclude that it is fair and just to adopt strategies to remedy the problem of systemic discrimination, and that women should not expect to be treated poorly when she succeeds in being selected. Because these findings were not found when the female candidate reported gender harassment, it appears that the most overt form of sex discrimination, sexual coercion, is necessary to invoke men's anti-discrimination schemas.

Importantly, the findings of the present research do not support the hypothesis that sexual harassment was being endorsed as a backlash reaction to beneficiaries of affirmative actions or that sexual harassment would be viewed as an acceptable reaction to beneficiaries as a strategy used by men to express hostility toward the target group or to reassert male dominance in the workplace. It is possible that this finding is a reflection of demand characteristics associated with recent media exposure emphasizing the rampant acts of sexual harassment experienced by women in the military. It may also be a function of the student population used. It may be that education is correlated with attitudes toward sexual harassment. Thus, students may have come into the study with more negative perceptions of sexual harassment and may be less likely to endorse such behaviors as acceptable. Therefore, it is possible that different findings would occur using an organizational sample that may hold more diverse attitudes toward sexual harassment.

Future research is necessary within an organizational sample to explore whether these findings would be replicated.

Furthermore, the present study sought to examine men's and women's perceptions and evaluations of female beneficiaries of affirmative action policies in an effort to identify potential negative consequences associated with the implementation of such programs. Findings of this study suggest that sexual harassment is not male backlash toward female beneficiaries of affirmative action, but rather, being aware that sexual harassment exists in the workplace plays an important role in providing individuals with information about sex discrimination, which seems to positively influence nonbeneficiaries' perceptions and evaluations of the female beneficiary as well as the affirmative action policy itself. Understanding what fuels support for affirmative action programs by nonbeneficiaries is the first step in eliminating barriers and opposition associated with the implementation of such programs.

References

- Abella, R.S. (1984). Equality in employment: A royal commission report. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services.
- Arthur, W., Jr., Doverspike, D., & Fuentes, R. (1992). Recipients' affective responses to affirmative action interventions: A cross-cultural perspective. Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 10, 229-243.
- Bacchi, C.L. (1996). The Politics of Affirmative Action: Women, Equality & Category Politics. London: Sage Publications.
- Bobocel, D.R., Son Hing, L.S., Davey, L.M. Stanley, D.J., & Zanna, M.P. (1998). Justice-based opposition to social policies: Is it genuine? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75, 653-669.
- Brown, R.P., Charnsangevej, T., Keough, K., Newman, M. & Rentfrow, P. (2000). Putting the 'affirm' into affirmative action: Preferential selection and academic performance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79, 736-747.
- Chacko, T. (1982). Women and equal employment. Some unintended effects. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 119-123.
- Chang, W.C. (1996). Toward equal opportunities: Fairness, values, and affirmative action programs in the U.S. Journal of Social Issues, 52, 93-97.
- Clayton, S.D., & Crosby, F.J. (1992). Justice, Gender, and Affirmative Action. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan press.
- Cleveland, J.N., & McNamara, K. (1996). Understanding sexual harassment: Contributions from research on domestic violence and organizational change. In

- M.S. Stockdale (Eds.), Sexual Harassment in the Workplace: Perspectives, Frontiers, and Response Strategies (pp.217-240) London: Sage Publications.
- Crosby, F., & Clayton, S. (1990). Affirmative action and the issue of expectancies. Journal of Social Issues, 46 (2), 61-79.
- Crosby, F., & Cordova, D.I. (1996). Words worth of wisdom: Toward an understanding of affirmative action. Journal of Social Issues, 52 (4), 33-49.
- Doverspike, D., Taylor, M.A., & Arthur, W. (2000). Affirmative Action: A Psychological Perspective. Huntington, New York: Nova Science Publishers, inc.
- Dovidio, J.F., Mann, J., & Gaertner, S.L. (1989). Resistance to affirmative action: The implications of aversive racism. In F.A. Blanchard & F.J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative action in perceptions (pp. 83-102). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., & Hesson-McInnis, M. (1989). The dimensions of sexual harassment: A structural analysis. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 35, 309-326.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., & Ormerod, L.F. (1993). Breaking the silence: The sexual harassment of women in academia and the workplace. In F.L. Denmark., & M.A. Paludi (Eds.), Psychology of Women: A Handbook of Issues and Theories. (pp.553-581). Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., Drasgow, F., Hulin, C.L., Gelfand, M.J., & Magley, V.J. (1997). Antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations: A test of an integrated model. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82 (4), 578-589.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., & Ormerod, A.J. (1991). Perceptions of sexual harassment: The influence of gender and context. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15, 281-294.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., Drasgow, F., Hulin, C.L., Gelfand, M.J., & Magley, V.J. (1997).

- Antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations: A test of an integrated model. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82 (4), 578-589.
- Fletcher, J.F., & Chalmers, M.C. (1991). Attitudes of Canadians toward affirmative action: Opposition, value pluralism, and nonattitudes. Political Behaviour, 13 (1), 67-95.
- Foulis, D., & McCabe, M.P. (1997). Sexual harassment: Factors affecting attitudes and perceptions. Sex Roles, 37 (9/10), 773-799.
- Gilbert, J.A., Stead, B.A. (1999). Stigmatization revisited: Does diversity management make a difference in applicant success? Group and Organization Management, 24, 239-256.
- Gracia, L., Erskine, N., Hawn, K., & Casmay, S. (1981). The effect of affirmative action on attributions about minority group members. Journal of Personality, 49, 427-437.
- Graves, L.M., & Powell, G.N. (1994). Effects of sex-based preferential selection and discrimination on job attitudes. Human Relations, 47, 133-157.
- Gutek, B.A. (1985). Sex and the workplace. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gutek, B.A., & Cohen, A.G. (1987). Sex ratios, sex role spillover and sex at work: A comparison of men's and women's experiences. Human Relations, 40 (2), 97-115.
- Gutek, B.A., & Morasch, B. (1982). Sex ratios, sex-role spillover and sexual harassment of women at work. Journal of Social Issues, 38 (4), 55-74.
- Gutek, B.A., Conhen, A.G., & Konrad, A. (1990). Predicting social-sexual behaviour at work: A contact hypothesis. Academy of Management Journal, 33, 560-577.

- Hafer, C.L., & Olson, J.M. (1998). Individual differences in the belief in a just world and responses to personal misfortune. In L.Montada & M.J. Lerner, Responses to Victimizations and Belief in a Just World. New York: NY: Plenum Press.
- Hanisch, K.A. (1996). An integrated framework for studying the outcomes of sexual harassment: Consequences for individuals and organizations, In M.S.Stockdale (Ed)., Sexual Harassment in the Workplace: Perceptives, Frontiers, and Response Strategies. London: Sage Publications.
- Heilman, M.E. (1996). Affirmative action's contradictory consequences. Journal of Social Issues, 52 (4), 105-109.
- Heilman, M.E., Block, C., & Lucas, J. (1992). Presumed incompetent? Stigmatization and affirmative action efforts. Journal of Applied Psychology, 77, 536-544.
- Heilman, M.E., & Herlihy, J.M. (1984). Affirmative action, negative reaction? Some moderating conditions. Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance, 33, 204-213.
- Heilman, M.E., Rivero, J.C., & Brett, J.F. (1991). Skirting the competence issue: Effects of sex-based preferential selection on task choices of women and men.. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76, 99-105.
- Heilman, M.E., Simon, M.C., & Repper, D.P. (1987). Intentionally favored, unintentionally harmed? Impact of sex-based preferential selection on self-perceptions and self-evaluations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 72 (1), 62-68.
- Heilman, M.E., McCullough, W.F., & Gilbert, D. (1996). The other side of affirmative action: Reactions of nonbeneficiaries to sex-based preferential selection. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81 (4), 346-357.

- Heilman, M.E., Battle, W.S., Keller, C.E., & Lee, R.A. (1998). Type of affirmative action policy: A determinant of reactions to sex-based preferential selection? Journal of Applied Psychology, 83 (2), 190-205.
- Hogg, P.W. (1992). Constitutional Law of Canada. (3rd Eds.). Toronto, Ontario: Carswell.
- Hulin, C.L., Fitzgerald, L.F., & Drasgow, F. (1996). Organizational influences on sexual harassment. In M.S. Stockdale (Eds.), Sexual Harassment in the Workplace: Perspectives, Frontiers and Response Strategies (pp.127-150). London: Sage Publications.
- Krativz, D., & Klineberg, D.A. (2000). Reactions to two versions of affirmative action among whites, blacks, and hispanics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 83, 597-611.
- Kravitz, D.A., & Platania, J. (1993). Attitudes and beliefs about affirmative action: Effects of target and of respondent sex and ethnicity. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78 (6), 928-938.
- Kruegel, D., & Smith, E. (1986). Beliefs about Inequality. New York, NY: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Lafontaine, E., & Tredeau, L. (1986). The frequency, sources, and correlates of sexual harassment among women in traditional male occupations. Sex Roles, 15 (7/8), 433-442.
- Jones, J.M. (1988). Racism in Black and White: A bicultural model of reaction and evolution. In P.A. Katz & D.A. Taylor (Eds.), Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy (pp. 117-136). New York: Plenum Press.

- Jones, T.S., & Remland, M.S. (1992). Sources of variability in perceptions of and responses to sexual harassment. Sex Roles, 27 (3/4), 121-142.
- Malos, S.B. (2000). The new affirmative action. Socioeconomic preference criteria in college admissions. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 36, 5-22.
- Maio, G.R., & Esses, V.M. (1998). The social consequence of affirmative action: Deleterious effects on perceptions of groups. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24, 65-74.
- Major, B., Feinstein, J., & Crocker, J. (1994). Attributional ambiguity of affirmative action. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 15, 113-141.
- Matheson, K., Echenberg, A., Taylor, D.M., Rivers, D., & Chow, I. (1994). Women's attitudes toward affirmative action: Putting actions in context. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24 (23), 2075-2096.
- Matheson, K., Majka, K., & Giglio, M. (2001). Self-report and neuroendocrine reactions to preferential treatment procedures: Is what you say what you feel? Journal of Applied Psychology, Under Review.
- Matheson, K., Warren, K.L., Foster, M.D., & Painter, C. (2000). Reactions to affirmative action: Seeking the bases for resistance. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30 (5), 1013-1038.
- Mazer, D.B., & Percival, E.F. (1989). Ideology or experience? The relationships among perceptions, attitudes, and experience of sexual harassment in university students. Sex Roles, 20, 135-147.
- Nacoste, R.W. (1987). Social psychology and affirmative action: The importance of process in policy analysis. Journal of Social Issues, 43 (1), 127-132.

- Nacoste, R.W. (1989). Affirmative action and self-evaluation. In F.A. Blanchard & F.J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative Action in Perspective (pp103-109). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Nacoste, R.W. (1990). Sources of stigma: Analyzing the psychology of affirmative action. Law and Policy, 12 (2), 175-195.
- Norton, J.R., & Fox, R.E. (1997). The change equation: Capitalizing on diversity for effective organizational change. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Nosworthy, G.J., Lea, J.A., & Lindsay, R.C.L. (1995). Opposition to affirmative action: Racial affect and traditional value predictors across four programs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 25, 314-337.
- Plous, S. (1996). Ten myths about affirmative action. Journal of Social Issues, 52 (4), 25-31.
- Prager, J. (1986). Merit and qualifications: Contested social meanings and their impact on affirmative action. In M.W. Combs, & J. Gruhl (Eds.), Affirmative action: Theory, analysis, and prospects (pp⁵: 21-43). Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland.
- Ragins, B.R., & Scandure, T.A. (1995). Antecedents and work-related correlates of reported sexual harassment: An empirical investigation of competing hypotheses. Sex Roles, 32 (7/8), 429-455.
- Reichle, B., Schneider, A., & Montada, L. (1998). How do observers of victimization preserve their belief in a just world cognitively or actionally? Findings from a longitudinal Study. In L.Montada & M.J. Lerner (Eds.), Responses to Victimization and Belief in a Just World. New York, NY: Plenum Press.

- Sheffey, S., & Tindale, R.S. (1992). Perceptions of sexual harassment in the workplace. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22 (19), 1502-1520.
- Stanush, P., Arthur, W.A., Jr., & Doverspike, D. (1998). Hispanic and African-American reactions to a simulated race-based affirmative action scenerio. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 20 (1), 3-16.
- Steele, S. (1990). The content of our character: A new vision of race in America. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Stockdale, M.S. (1996). What we know and what we need to learn about sexual harassment. In M.S. Stockdale (Eds.), Sexual Harassment in the Workplace: Perspectives, Frontiers, and Response Strategies (pp.3-25) London: Sage Publications.
- Summers, R.J. (1991). The influence of affirmative action on perceptions of a beneficiary's qualifications. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 21, 1265-1276.
- Tata, J. (1993). The structure and phenomenon of sexual harassment: Impact of category of sexually harassing behaviour, gender and hierarchical level. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 23 (3), 199-211.
- Taylor, M.C. (1994). Impact of affirmative action on beneficiary groups: Evidence from the 1990 General Social Survey. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 15, 143-178.
- Till, F.J. (1980). Sexual harassment: A report on the sexual harassment of students. Washington, DC: National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs.

- Taylor, P.W. (1973). Reverse Discrimination and compensatory justice. Analysis 33, 9-17.
- Tougas, F., Brown, R., Beaton, A.M., & Joly, S. (1995). Neosexism: Plus ca change, plus c'est pareil. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8, 842-849.
- Tougas, F., & Veilleux, F. (1989). Who likes affirmative action: Attitudinal processes among men and women. In F.A. Blanchard & F.J. Crosby (Eds.), Affirmative Action in Perspective (pp.111-124). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Tougas, F., & Veilleux, F. (1990). The response of men to affirmative action strategies for women: The study of a predictive model. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 22, 424-432.
- Tougas, F., Joly, S., Beaton, A., & St-Pierre, L. (1996). Reactions of beneficiaries to preferential treatment: A reality check. Human Relations, 49, 453-464.
- Truax, K., Cordova, D.I., Wood, A., Wright, E., & Crosby, F. (1998). Undermined? Affirmative action from the target's point of view. In J.K. Swim & C.Stangor (Eds.). Prejudice: The Target's Perspective (pp. 149-171). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Turner, M.E., & Pratkanis, A.R. (1993). Effects of preferential and meritorious selection on performance: An examination of intuitive and self-handicapping perspectives. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19, 47-58.
- Turner, R. (1990). The Past and Future of Affirmative Action. New York, NY: Quorum Books.

Appendix A

Workplace policies and Quality of Life Student Recruitment

This study involves your subjective perceptions of employees work experiences and on employees' quality of life based on hearing an audio tape of employees experiences. This study also involves completing a series of questionnaires.

The study should take about 30 minutes, and you will be given experimental credit for your participation.

Appendix B: Instructions

The participants will be greeted by the experimenter and will be asked to be seated until all other participants have arrived. The experiment will be explained as a study interested in assessing the Department of National Defenses policies regarding hiring and promotion procedures. Each participant or group of participants will be required to listen to an audio-taped interview and asked to complete a questionnaire package.

The following will be said as the experimenter meets the participants.

“Hello, my name is Maria and I am the primary researcher in this study. In this study we are interested in studying the effects of military policies on hiring and promotion in terms of the subjective experiences of employees who have been hired through such policies. Since there are still very few women in the military, there are clear concerns about experiences women have had. Because women in the military is fairly new, this study is interested in detecting problems to aid in the advancement of healthy work environments.

We think that the impressions of students such as you can help in this because the military is trying to recruit and hire students and individuals in your age group. Therefore, for some of you the experiences and concerns military personnel express may be important to your decision making process. And even if they don't affect you directly, because it is people like you that the military is interested in, your reactions and opinions are still important. Your unbiased impressions may help in making recommendations about the future endeavors of the military's recruitment process.

Any questions so far?

The study will begin with everyone listening to an audio taped interview between a Major and a newly recruited Officer Cadet. This interview is approximately 10-15 minutes in length. Several interviews were conducted in the last year with newly recruited Officer Cadets in an attempt to assess the Officers' experiences, their overall level of job and life satisfaction, and how the military's hiring and promotion policies have affected the Officer's life.

You will listen to one of the interviews that was selected for the purpose of this study. Following the audiotape, I will be asking each of you to complete a series of questionnaires, most of which relate to issues that may be present in the interview. Again, this will take approximately 15-20 minutes.

Before we begin, please read and complete the informed consent form.

- *Collect consent forms*

Before we listen to the interview, it is important for everyone to have some key background knowledge about the military's hiring and promotion policies. The Military is dedicated to selecting and promoting candidates on the basis of both skill and ability which means choosing the best person for the job. This being said, there is also a distinct preference for the hiring of men in the military. In particular, women make up less than 5% of the military

At this time participants will be subjected to experimental manipulation in which they will be given one of three selection procedures, depending on assigned experimental condition:

1. Merit-based policy

“Nonetheless, the militaries policy of hiring and promotion is to always give the job to the most qualified individual based on merit alone”. Therefore, they look at each individual’s resume to assess education, experience, and personal characteristics. Qualified individuals are invited to an interview, and asked to complete a series of physical and skill based tests. Those who meet the qualifications are rank ordered and the best candidates are chosen.

2. Preferential Equivalent

“As a result, the military has adopted hiring and promotion policies that address the under representation of women in the military. Specifically, the military has adopted a policy of giving a particular position to a qualified woman if a woman and a man hold equal qualifications or there exists insignificant differences in qualifications”. Therefore, they look at each individual’s resume to assess education, experience, and personal characteristics. Qualified individuals are invited to an interview, and asked to complete a series of physical and skill based tests. Those who meet the qualifications are rank ordered; then where a male and female are similarly ranked, the female candidate is selected first.

3. Preferential Minimum Standard

As a result, the military has adopted hiring and promotion policies that address the under representation of women in the military. Specifically, the military has adopted a policy of giving the position to the most qualified woman regardless of other qualified male candidates. Therefore, they look at each individual’s resume to assess education, experience, and personal characteristics. Qualified individuals are invited to an interview,

and asked to complete a series of physical and skill based tests. Those who meet the qualifications are divided into men and women, and each set of candidates is rank ordered. Then, the qualified female candidates are selected first, after which any remaining positions go to the qualified men.

Continue for all subjects...

“Before I play the audio tape for you, I want to ask everyone to listen carefully to the dialogue between the Major and Jane, a new Officer Cadet. Any questions at this time?”

- *Experimenter begins the audio taped interview. After the audio tape, each participant is given a package of questionnaires to complete. Participants will be asked to complete the questionnaires at which point the experimenter will collect them. After completion of the questionnaires, participants will be debriefed and informed of the true nature of the experiment.*

Appendix C: Transcript of Audio-Taped Interview

Officer Cadet Jane Smith enters the Major's office.

Major: Good afternoon Officer Cadet Smith, how are you?

Officer Jane: I'm doing okay Sir, thank you.

Major: Before we begin the actual interview, I want to make sure you understand the reason for this interview. Basically, the Chief of Defense Staff and the Board want to learn more about an Officer's process of integration into the military, the experiences they may have encountered and how it has affected their job and life satisfaction. Is that clear?

Officer Jane: Yes Sir, I'm clear about the purpose of this meeting.

Major: I also want to make clear before we begin that this interview will be taped, so some things you say or part of your experiences will be documented and perhaps used in a report, but no identifying information will be included. Is this acceptable to you?

Officer: Yes Sir.

Major: To begin, I want you to state your rank, your unit and your current occupation in the CF.

Officer: I am an Officer Cadet and currently working at CFB Kingston. I am also attending the Officer Professional Development program.

Major: How many women currently are there in your unit?

Officer: There are 6 women and approximately 450 men.

Major: Approximately how long have you been part of the CF?

Officer: About a year.

Major: What is your age?

Officer: I am 24.

Major: What is your marital status, do you have any children?

Officer: I am married, but have no kids.

Major: Since you have been part of the CF, has it and if so how has it affected your family life?

Officer: Well, I can say without a doubt significant changes have occurred with regard to family life. Before entering the military there was much more time to spend with my husband and other family members, like my parents and sister. My husband and I could visit our families any time we wanted, we both lived in close proximity to them so it made seeing each other much more convenient. This past year, I think I have seen my family a total of 4 times. Since they live in Windsor and my husband and I live in Kingston it is obviously difficult to see each other. In the beginning it was difficult, but I'm getting used to it now. I also sometimes find it difficult to find the time to spend with my husband. Between occupational training and work it makes time scarce, which definitely puts strain on a relationship, but no major problems-just learning how to adjust. I think I share similar experience with many Officers whose first time it is being away from their immediate family. I am fortunate to have my husband in Kingston with me.

Major: That's true. Now, what about leisure activities, do you still have time for other activities outside of your school and training?

Officer: Barely. I try and make time for leisure activities with my husband. We both enjoy skiing and biking so I try and make time for these activities, but it's difficult and many times I end up canceling our plans.

Major: I definitely can relate. What about your training and unit-are you happy with your overall position here?

Officer: Right now, I'm finding things a bit easier, but not easy. I think I'm a lot happier now that I'm settled and more familiar with daily routine and regiments. I definitely had a difficult time adjusting to being among almost all men and I think it was difficult for them to be around me, sometimes even awkward. I have had a few negative experiences in my unit, but mostly positive ones I can remember. Initially, I wasn't physically or psychologically prepared for what was coming in terms of physical standards or the level of discipline that was required of me. I think that there definitely needs to be a realistic job preview at the recruiting center, which includes telling everyone what they will face, and especially in the combat arms!

Major: Explain your experience further, if you can?

Officer: Well, I think many recruits in general don't have a clear picture of what it means to be in the military. But there are particular issues women like me who are in the combat arms face. I know that the recruitment center is motivated and eager to hire women and they tend to glorify all aspects of the military, especially combat arms. I don't particularly know why that is, maybe they are trying to get more women in the combat arms. I think everyone should have a clear and realistic idea of why they want to be in the combat arms. But women especially need to be prepared to work with superiors who aren't accustomed to working with women, and be prepared to defend your reason for being there. I know I have on several occasions.

Major: Continuing along this path, how are your relationships with fellow Officers in your unit, or throughout your training for that matter?

Officer: I can't say that my relationships have been wonderful. I have connected with a few great Officers in my time here, but again being among almost all men makes it

difficult to connect. There is an element of competition present that perhaps hinders the growth of friendships between fellow Officers-I mean we are all trying to progress to the next level, and the reality is, some of us might not make it. For maybe the first 4 months of my military training I think I endured harsh behaviors and attitudes toward me. There are still today some male Officers that treat me with disrespect and refuse to recognize my accomplishments based on my merit.

Major: Has there been any significant experiences you have encountered with fellow Officers that have been particularly negative?

Officer: Well, I'm a bit reluctant to talk about a particular incident simply because I don't want to dwell on it.

Major: I think your experiences are not only important to me, but also to women in your unit and ultimately to policy makers in the CF.

Officer: (manipulation 1-gender harassment) Okay, but like I said, I don't want to dwell on this. I experienced one particular incident in my 3rd month here by a fellow male Officer. He was in my unit at the time I was a Basic Officer and we were going through training together. He was generally mean spirited toward and liked to make fun of me being a woman. He would say things like "girls aren't strong enough to do this, or women should be pregnant and stay at home". Most days I just ignored his crudeness, except for this one particular comment he made to me. He came up to me one day during a training exercise and said very quietly "you are an incompetent bitch who is just like every other woman here, incapable of doing any job. Women don't belong in the military, why don't you run home with all the other good little girls and make me something to eat". From all the nasty comments this one Officer had made, this was by

far the worst I encountered. What he said stuck in my head-it's difficult to erase it. Like I said before, I don't want to dwell on this negative experience. Can we move on?

Major: Sure. I thank you for your honesty. You have given me much valuable information about your time spent here and I hope that you have minimal negative experiences and many more positive ones. I think we covered everything, but if we have any more questions we will be in contact with you. Do you have any recommendations for the Chief of Defense Staff and the Board about making the transition from civilian to military Officer easier?

Officer: Well, like I explained earlier-I think it is important for individuals to be both mentally and physically prepared for what they will endure in the months of training, particularly for women. I also think it is important to have maybe some type of awareness or a prevention type program for all trainees concerning issues of harassment and sexual harassment in general-making men especially aware of potential consequences they may face and how this behavior is unacceptable. That's about it Sir.

Major: Thanks Officer Cadet Smith for your time and again I appreciate your honesty and valuable recommendations. Have a good day.

Officer: You to Sir. good-bye.

Major: good-bye Officer Smith.

Officer (Manipulation2-unwanted sexual attention): Okay, but like I said, I don't want to dwell on this. I experienced one particular incident in my 3rd month here by a fellow male Officer. He was in my unit, at the time I was a Basic Officer and we were going through training together. Most days he made some type of a sexual comment to me, like how great I looked in my uniform, how he wanted to have drinks with me, or how my

breasts were the perfect size-but I tried to stay focussed in whatever activity I was involved in and repeatedly told him I'm not interested in what he has to say. I guess I wasn't clear enough with him because things seemed to get progressively worse-his comments became more frequent and more explicit. One particular incident I recall that I found the most disturbing was one day during a training exercise. He came up to me and whispered "you look so hot today-I'm so aroused that all I can think about is you naked having sex with you-I bet you want to too". I told him that he was disgusting and I wanted nothing to do with him. From all the nasty comments this one Officer had made, this was by far the worst I encountered. What he said stuck in my head-it's difficult to erase it. Like I said before, I don't want to dwell on this negative experience. Can we move on?

Officer (manipulation 3-sexual coercion): Okay, but like I said, I don't want to dwell on this. I experienced one particular incident in my 3rd month here by a fellow male Officer. He was in my unit, at the time I was a Basic Officer and we were going through training together. Most days he made some type of a sexual comment to me, like how great I looked in my uniform, how he wanted to have drinks with me, or how my breasts were the perfect size-but I tried to stay focussed in whatever activity I was involved in and repeatedly told him I'm not interested in what he has to say. I guess I wasn't clear enough with him because things seemed to get progressively worse as his comments became more frequent and more explicit. One particular incident I recall that I found the most disturbing was one day during a training exercise. He came up to me and whispered "you look so hot today-I'm so aroused that all I can think about is ripping your clothes

off and having sex with you-I bet you want to too". I told him that he was disgusting and I wanted nothing to do with him. The next thing I remember is him getting all red in the face-I don't know if he was humiliated or angry and he reminded me how he was every male Officers' friend in the unit, how he was a popular guy and others liked him. He threatened that if I didn't have sex with him he would spread a nasty rumor about me being a slut and engaging in all kinds of sexual activities with other Officers and higher officials. He told me no one would ever respect me again! He also threatened that if I didn't sleep with him he would write a letter to the Captain documenting my alleged sexual behaviors with Officials and other Officers and complaining about me undermining unit morale. From all the nasty comments this one Officer had made, this was by far the worst I encountered. What he said stuck in my head-it's difficult to erase it. Like I said before, I don't want to dwell on this negative experience. Can we move on?

Appendix D: Informed Consent

The purpose of an informed consent is to ensure that you understand the purpose of the study and the nature of your involvement. The informed consent has to provide sufficient information such that you have the opportunity to determine whether you wish to participate in the study.

Research Title: Experiences of men and women in the military

Research personnel: The following people are involved in this research project and may be contacted at any time:

Maria Giglio (Student Investigator, 520-2600, ext. 7513)

Dr. K. Matheson (Principle Investigator, 520-2600, ext. 2648)

If you have any questions or concerns about the ethics of this study, please contact Dr. M. Sénéchal (Chair, Dept. of Psychology Ethics Committee, 520-2600 ext. 1155)

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to examine and evaluate your impressions of the experiences of newly recruited Officer's in the military, specifically women, in an effort to advance healthy work environments.

Task Requirements: You will be required to listen to a 10-15 minute actual audio-taped interview with a member of the military. Afterwards, you will be asked to complete several questionnaires pertaining to your perceptions of the content of the taped interview.

Duration and Locale: The experimental session will take about 30 minutes and will take place in Room A304, Loeb Building, Carleton University.

Potential Risk/Discomfort: There are no physical risks in this study.

Anonymity/confidentiality: The data gathered in this study are confidential and will only be used by researchers associated with this project. Your name should not appear anywhere on your questionnaire to maintain anonymity. The consent forms are kept separate from your responses.

Right to Withdraw: Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. At any point during the study you have the right to not complete certain measures or to withdraw with no penalty whatsoever.

Signatures: I have read the above form and understand the conditions of my participation. My participation in this study is voluntary, and if for any reason, at any time, I wish to leave the experiment I may do so without having to give an explanation and with no penalty whatsoever. Furthermore, I am also aware that the data gathered in this study are confidential and anonymous with respect to my personal identity. My signature indicates that I agree to participate in the study.

Participant's Name: _____ Researcher's Name: _____

Participant's Signature: _____ Researcher's Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix E: Manipulations of levels of Selection Procedures

- *Participants will be subjected to experimental manipulation in which they will be given one of three selection procedures, depending on assigned experimental condition:*

Merit-based policy

“Nonetheless, the militaries policy of hiring and promotion is to always give the job to the most qualified individual based on merit alone”. Therefore, they look at each individual’s resume to assess education, experience, and personal characteristics. Qualified individuals are invited to an interview, and asked to complete a series of physical and skill based tests. Those who meet the qualifications are rank ordered and the best candidates are chosen.

Preferential Equivalent

“As a result, the military has adopted hiring and promotion policies that address the under representation of women in the military. Specifically, the military has adopted a policy of giving a particular position to a qualified woman if a woman and a man hold equal qualifications or there exists insignificant differences in qualifications”. Therefore, they look at each individual’s resume to assess education, experience, and personal characteristics. Qualified individuals are invited to an interview, and asked to complete a series of physical and skill based tests. Those who meet the qualifications are rank ordered; then where a male and female are similarly ranked, the female candidate is selected first.”

Preferential Minimum Standard

“As a result, the military has adopted hiring and promotion policies that address the under representation of women in the military. Specifically, the military has adopted a policy of giving the position to the most qualified woman regardless of other qualified male candidates. Therefore, they look at each individual’s resume to assess education, experience, and personal characteristics. Qualified individuals are invited to an interview, and asked to complete a series of physical and skill based tests. Those who meet the qualifications are divided into men and women, and each set of candidates is rank ordered. Then, the qualified female candidates are selected first, after which any remaining positions go to the qualified men.”

Appendix F: Manipulations for levels of Sexual Harassment

Manipulation #1: Gender Harassment

Officer Smith states, "Okay, but like I said, I don't want to dwell on this. I experienced one particular incident in my 3rd month here by a fellow male Officer. He was in my unit, at the time I was a Basic Officer and we were going through training together. He was generally mean spirited toward and liked to make fun of me being a woman. He would say things like "girls aren't strong enough to do this, or women should be pregnant and stay at home". Most days I just ignored his crudeness, except for this one particular comment he made to me. He came up to me one day during a training exercise and said very quietly "you are an incompetent bitch who is just like every other woman here, incapable of doing any job. Women don't belong in the military, why don't you run home with all the other good little girls and make me something to eat". From all the nasty comments this one Officer had made, this was by far the worst I encountered. What he said stuck in my head-it's difficult to erase it. Like I said before, I don't want to dwell on this negative experience. Can we move on?"

Manipulation #2: Unwanted Sexual Attention

Officer Smith states, " Okay, but like I said, I don't want to dwell on this. I experienced one particular incident in my 3rd month here by a fellow male Officer. He was in my unit, at the time I was a Basic Officer and we were going through training together. Most days he made some type of a sexual comment to me, like how great I looked in my uniform, how he wanted to have drinks with me, or how my breasts were the perfect size- but I tried to stay focussed in whatever activity I was involved in and repeatedly told him I'm not interested in what he has to say. I guess I wasn't clear enough with him because

things seemed to get progressively worse as his comments became more frequent and more explicit. One particular incident I recall that I found the most disturbing was one day during a training exercise. He came up to me and whispered "you look so hot today-I'm so aroused that all I can think about is you naked having sex with me-I bet you want to too". I told him that he was disgusting and I wanted nothing to do with him. From all the nasty comments this one Officer had made, this was by far the worst I encountered. What he said stuck in my head-it's difficult to erase it. Like I said before, I don't want to dwell on this negative experience. Can we move on?"

Manipulation #3: Sexual Coercion

Officer Smith states, " Okay, but like I said, I don't want to dwell on this. I experienced one particular incident in my 3rd month here by a fellow male Officer. He was in my unit, at the time I was a Basic Officer and we were going through training together. Most days he made some type of a sexual comment to me, like how great I looked in my uniform, how he wanted to have drinks with me, or how my breasts were the perfect size-but I tried to stay focussed in whatever activity I was involved in and repeatedly told him I'm not interested in what he has to say. I guess I wasn't clear enough with him because things seemed to get progressively worse as his comments became more frequent and more explicit. One particular incident I recall that I found the most disturbing was one day during a training exercise. He came up to me and whispered "you look so hot today-I'm so aroused that all I can think about is ripping your clothes off and having sex with you-I bet you want to too". I told him that he was disgusting and I wanted nothing to do with him. The next thing I remember is him getting all red in the face-I don't know if he was humiliated or angry and he reminded me how he was every male Officers friend in

the unit, how he was a popular guy and others liked him. He threatened that if I didn't have sex with him he will spread a nasty rumor about me being a slut and engaging in all kinds of sexual activities with other Officers and higher officials. He told me no one would ever respect me again! From all the nasty comments this one Officer had made, this was by far the worst I encountered. What he said stuck in my head-it's difficult to erase it. Like I said before, I don't want to dwell on this negative experience. Can we move on?"

Appendix G: Measures

The military's hiring profile is intended to meet their needs and requirements. However, not everyone agrees with its policies. We would like to know your impressions and thoughts of the hiring policy that has been adopted.

Please describe the main criteria the military says it uses to hire new personnel:

Do you think the policy is?

Very unfair

Very fair

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Discriminates
against womenDoes not discriminate
against women

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Necessary

Unnecessary

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Appropriate

Inappropriate

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Uncalled for

Called for

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Biased

Unbiased

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Discriminates against men							Does not discriminate against men
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Roughly, what percentage of the military's officers do you think are women?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Do you think this proportion is
Very unfair

Very fair

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

In the interviews, female officers were asked about various aspects of their work life with the military, including job satisfaction, the effects on their family life and leisure activities, and their experiences with co-workers. We would like to get your impression of the feelings and experiences of the officer you heard being interviewed. For each of the following statements, please circle the number that best reflects your perceptions.

1. Overall, her job satisfaction was:

Very poor

Very good

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

2. Overall, her quality of leisure life was:

Very poor

Very good

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

3. Overall, her quality of family life was:

Very poor

Very good

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

4. Overall, her quality of interactions with her co-workers was:

Very poor

Very good

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Please rate the extent to which each of the following factors appear to need greater attention in improving the quality of life for female personnel, based on the interview you listened to:

Not at all

A great deal

Providing greater training	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Providing realistic expectations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Providing higher salaries	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Giving more time off	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Stationing married couples together	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Providing family benefits	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Creating better family housing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Developing a better team spirit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Training men how to work with women	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Training women how to work with men	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Developing a better complaint process	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Monitoring how new recruits are treated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Developing a better sexual harassment policy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

One aspect of military life that has been of particular concern when women were hired was the interactions between women and their male co-workers. In the interview you just listened to

1. How well did the officer feel that she got along with her male co-workers in general?

Very poorly

Extremely well

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. How much support did the officer feel that she got from her female co-workers?

Not at all

Very much

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. Were there any negative incidents between the officer and any of her male co-workers?

Not at all

Definitely

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. Would you define the encounter described with the officer's male co-worker as an incident of sexual harassment?

Not at all

Definitely

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. How serious do you think this incident was?

Not at all

Extremely

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

In these interviews the officers were encouraged to discuss particular encounters with their male co-workers that might have upset them.

Briefly describe the negative interaction that was focussed on in the interview you heard:

In the interview you heard, was the interaction described in a way that would suggest to you that the officer felt any of the following emotions (check all that apply)

☐ Accepting	☐ Afraid	☐ Angry
☐ Annoyed	☐ Anxious	☐ Appealing
☐ Beautiful	☐ Complimented	☐ Depressed
☐ Dirty	☐ Embarrassed	☐ Flattered
☐ Helpless	☐ Humoured	☐ Nervous
☐ Offended	☐ Responsible	☐ Sexually Excited
☐ Sexy	☐ Special	☐ Taken advantage of
☐ Uncomfortable	☐ Upset	☐ Well liked

Not at all						Definitely
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

8. Do you think the military's hiring and promotion policies have affected the way her co-workers treat her?

Not at all						Definitely
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

9. Do you think that women hired under the military's current hiring and promotion policies should expect to be reacted to negatively by their male co-workers?

Not at all						Definitely
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

10. Do you think that women hired under the military's current hiring and promotion policies deserve to be reacted to negatively by their male co-workers?

Not at all						Definitely
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

11. Do you think that the negative encounter the female officer described in her interview reflected backlash to the military's current hiring and promotion policies?

Not at all						Definitely
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix H: Debriefing

There is more to this study than I have told you about so far. But before I tell you exactly what it is, I would like to explain why it is necessary in some kinds of psychological studies not to tell people all about the purpose of the study at the very beginning. In some kinds of studies, if we tell people what the purpose of the experiment is and what we predict about how they will react, then they might deliberately do whatever it is they think that we want them to do, just to help us out and give us the results that they think we want. If that happened, their reactions would not be a good indication of how they might react in a situation in everyday.

It is also possible that the opposite might occur and that people might think that if we predicted that they would do a certain thing, they might deliberately not do that to show us that we can't figure them out. That would also make the results invalid, because again what people would be responding to is what they thought we were looking for rather than responding naturally as they would in everyday situations.

This is not a problem in all studies. For example, in a study on learning, if you wanted to have people learn something and then test them, you might want them to know exactly what they were going to be asked to recall so that they would do their best and learn as well as they could.

Now I would like to explain what the true purpose of this study is, and why we couldn't tell you everything from the beginning.

The actual purpose of this experiment was to examine men and women's perceptions and evaluations of women's treatment in the workplace when affirmative action policies are thought to be part of the selection process. Past research findings indicate that both men and women are opposed to affirmative action programs in which preferential treatment selection procedures are used. Previous findings have also suggested that there may be some backlash when such policies are implemented, and that the beneficiaries of such programs are viewed as less competent, and not deserving of their position. This may be particularly the case among nonrecipients, men, who may feel that they themselves are being discriminated against under affirmative action conditions. Or, it may be evident among other members of the group that is targeted, i.e., women, who are afraid that such programs may make them look less competent. To test these ideas, in some of our sessions we described an hiring policy in which gender is taken into consideration, and in others it was not. We want to see if men and women felt differently about the officer whom you heard being interviewed depending on how she was hired.

We are also interested in studying men and women's reactions toward the treatment of female beneficiaries in the workplace, in particular when an incident of sexual harassment occurs. There are concerns that the use of affirmative programs may result in hostility toward women, and this may be expressed through gender or sexual harassment. Even if a person doesn't do the harassing, they may believe that such harassment can be expected and is a reasonable reaction to female beneficiaries. To assess this possibility, some participants heard the women interviewed in the tape talk about an incident of gender harassment, while others heard an incident of unwanted sexual attention or a

situations of sexual coercion, so we could see just how extreme the behaviour has to be before it is viewed as unacceptable. To clarify the differences between these types of harassment, gender harassment is defined as generalized sexist comments and behaviours that are insulting, degrading, and/or sexist. Unwanted sexual attention is a more serious form of sexual harassment, involving inappropriate and/or offensive physical or verbal sexual advances that may extend to serious sexual imposition and assault. Examples of this type of behaviour involve unwelcome requests for dates, as well as any unwelcome touching or fondling etc. Finally, sexual coercion is characterized by the perpetrator's solicitation of sexual activity or other sex-related behaviors by promise of reward or threat of punishment. We believe that most people will view this last type of behaviour as inappropriate, although they may find gender harassment as part of the course when women are selected under affirmative action.

While this study is not being done with the Military and the audio tape that you listened to was not an actual interview but a simulation made by fellow students for the purpose of this experiment. We used the military's policy because such issues really are of concern to the military, as they are to other organizations that are trying to achieve greater gender balance through affirmative action. I would like to stress that the ideas expressed about the military's hiring and promotion policies and the interview do not reflect the policies or experiences of the Canadian forces. However, the military is currently actively trying to look at and work with the issues pertaining to the quality of life of its personnel, and to seek mechanisms for retention, particularly of its female recruits. The military has very clear anti-discrimination and sexual harassment policies that it takes very seriously.

The questionnaires you filled out will be used to examine your reactions and perceptions of the treatment of women in the workplace when affirmative action policies are thought to be involved in the selection process. These findings clearly have implications for the use of affirmative action and its relationship to the prevalence of affirmative action in the workplace. The results will therefore have clear implications for understanding the need for policies that ensure that women and men do have a positive working environment.

So this study was not a test of your ability or your character. There were no correct responses. People's natural responses are what we are looking for. Also, we are not interested in the responses of any one individual. In order for us to draw any conclusions, we will have to combine the data that we got from you together with data from other people so that we can draw conclusions about the average person's reactions. What this means is that it is going to be necessary for us to ask you not to say anything about the study to anyone else. If you talked to someone else about the study and told them all the things I just told you and then they were in the study, that would be just the same as if I told them at the beginning all about the whole purpose of the study; their reactions wouldn't be natural.

If anybody asks you about the study, just tell them it was a study about impressions about experiences in the Military. You're not lying, as this is really the

context in which we are looking at these ideas. You don't need to make it a mystery, just something you've been asked not to talk about any more in case they bias their own reactions. If they want to know more, they can sign up for the study.

Do you have any questions? Comments? Suggestions?

Thank-you for your help. In the event that you have any concerns about this study, or anything you wish to discuss further, a list of people you can contact will be given to you. Also, since listening to the experiences of sexual harassment expressed may be distressing for some people, a list of services will be provided that are assessable to hopefully a variety of needs.

The following people are involved in this research project and may be contacted at any time if you have any further questions about the project, what it means, or concerns about how it was conducted:

Maria Giglio (Student Investigator, 520-2600, X7513)
Dr. K. Matheson (Principle Investigator, 520-2648)

If you have any ethical concerns about how this study was conducted, please contact either of the following:

Dr.M.Sénéchal (Chair of Dept. of Psychology Ethics Committee, 520-2600, X1155)
Dr. K.Matheson (Chair, Dept. of Psychology, 520-2648)

Contact Numbers

- Carleton University Counseling Services 520-2600 ext.6600
- Carleton University Sexual Harassment Advisor 520-5622
- Womyn's Centre on Campus 308 University Centre 520-2712
- 24 Hour Distress Line 238-3311
- Rape Crisis Line 562-2333