PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

**Sexual Harassment - Now You See It Now You Don't:
Perceptions of Male and Female Relationships.**

by
Krista Louise Kiiffner

**A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Graduate Studies and Research in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Masters of Arts**

Department of Psychology

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

September 1994

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

**THE AUTHOR HAS GRANTED AN
IRREVOCABLE NON-EXCLUSIVE
LICENCE ALLOWING THE NATIONAL
LIBRARY OF CANADA TO
REPRODUCE, LOAN, DISTRIBUTE OR
SELL COPIES OF HIS/HER THESIS BY
ANY MEANS AND IN ANY FORM OR
FORMAT, MAKING THIS THESIS
AVAILABLE TO INTERESTED
PERSONS.**

**L'AUTEUR A ACCORDE UNE LICENCE
IRREVOCABLE ET NON EXCLUSIVE
PERMETTANT A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE
NATIONALE DU CANADA DE
REPRODUIRE, PRETER, DISTRIBUER
OU VENDRE DES COPIES DE SA
THESE DE QUELQUE MANIERE ET
SOUS QUELQUE FORME QUE CE SOIT
POUR METTRE DES EXEMPLAIRES DE
CETTE THESE A LA DISPOSITION DES
PERSONNE INTERESSEES.**

**THE AUTHOR RETAINS OWNERSHIP
OF THE COPYRIGHT IN HIS/HER
THESIS. NEITHER THE THESIS NOR
SUBSTANTIAL EXTRACTS FROM IT
MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE
REPRODUCED WITHOUT HIS/HER
PERMISSION.**

**L'AUTEUR CONSERVE LA PROPRIETE
DU DROIT D'AUTEUR QUI PROTEGE
SA THESE. NI LA THESE NI DES
EXTRAITS SUBSTANTIELS DE CELLE-
CI NE DOIVENT ETRE IMPRIMES OU
AUTREMENT REPRODUITS SANS SON
AUTORISATION.**

ISBN 0-315-98504-6

Canada

Name Krista Louise Kipper

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

Social Psychology ~~Psychology~~

SUBJECT TERM

0451

SUBJECT CODE

U·M·I

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0688
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0727
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religious 0527
Sciences 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology of 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language 0679
General 0289
Ancient 0290
Linguistics 0291
Modern 0291
Literature 0401
General 0294
Classical 0295
Comparative 0297
Medieval 0298
Modern 0316
African 0591
American 0305
Asian 0352
Canadian (English) 0355
Canadian (French) 0593
English 0311
Germanic 0312
Latin American 0315
Middle Eastern 0313
Romance 0314
Slavic and East European 0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Religion 0318
General 0321
Biblical Studies 0319
Clergy 0320
History of 0322
Philosophy of 0469
Theology 0323

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0324
Anthropology 0326
Archaeology 0327
Cultural 0310
Physical 0272
Business Administration 0770
General 0454
Accounting 0338
Banking 0385
Management 0501
Marketing 0503
Canadian Studies 0505
Economics 0508
General 0509
Agricultural 0510
Commerce-Business 0511
Finance 0358
History 0366
Labor 0351
Theory 0578
Folklore 0366
Geography 0351
Gerontology 0578
History 0578
General 0578

Ancient 0579
Medieval 0561
Modern 0582
Black 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0336
Middle Eastern 0333
United States 0337
History of Science 0585
Law 0398
Political Science 0615
General 0616
International Law and Relations 0617
Public Administration 0617
Recreation 0814
Social Work 0452
Sociology 0626
General 0627
Criminology and Penology 0938
Demography 0631
Ethnic and Racial Studies 0628
Individual and Family Studies 0629
Industrial and Labor Relations 0630
Public and Social Welfare 0700
Social Structure and Development 0344
Theory and Methods 0709
Transportation 0999
Urban and Regional Planning 0453
Women's Studies 0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture 0473
General 0285
Agronomy 0475
Animal Culture and Nutrition 0476
Animal Pathology 0359
Food Science and Technology 0478
Forestry and Wildlife 0479
Plant Culture 0480
Plant Pathology 0817
Plant Physiology 0777
Range Management 0746
Wood Technology 0306
Biology 0287
General 0308
Anatomy 0309
Biostatistics 0379
Botany 0329
Cell 0353
Ecology 0369
Entomology 0793
Genetics 0410
Limnology 0307
Microbiology 0317
Molecular 0416
Neuroscience 0433
Oceanography 0821
Physiology 0778
Radiation 0472
Veterinary Science 0786
Zoology 0760
Biophysics 0425
General 0996
Medical 0996

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry 0425
Geochemistry 0996

Geodesy 0372
Geology 0373
Geophysics 0388
Hydrology 0411
Mineralogy 0345
Paleobotany 0426
Paleoecology 0418
Paleontology 0985
Paleozoology 0427
Palynology 0368
Physical Geography 0415
Physical Oceanography 0372

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences 0566
General 0300
Audiology 0992
Chemotherapy 0567
Dentistry 0350
Education 0769
Hospital Management 0758
Human Development 0982
Immunology 0564
Medicine and Surgery 0347
Mental Health 0569
Nursing 0570
Nutrition 0380
Obstetrics and Gynecology 0354
Occupational Health and Therapy 0381
Ophthalmology 0571
Pathology 0419
Pharmacology 0572
Pharmacy 0382
Physical Therapy 0573
Public Health 0574
Radiology 0575
Recreation 0575

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0383
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences 0485
Chemistry 0749
General 0486
Agricultural 0487
Analytical 0488
Biochemistry 0738
Inorganic 0490
Nuclear 0491
Organic 0494
Pharmaceutical 0495
Physical 0754
Polymer 0405
Radiation 0605
Mathematics 0986
Physics 0606
General 0608
Acoustics 0748
Astronomy and Astrophysics 0607
Atmospheric Science 0798
Atomic 0759
Electronics and Electricity 0609
Elementary Particles and High Energy 0610
Fluid and Plasma 0752
Molecular 0756
Nuclear 0611
Optics 0463
Radiation 0346
Solid State 0984
Statistics 0984
Applied Sciences 0346
Applied Mechanics 0984
Computer Science 0984

Engineering 0537
General 0538
Aerospace 0539
Agricultural 0540
Automotive 0541
Biomedical 0542
Chemical 0543
Civil 0544
Electronics and Electrical 0348
Heat and Thermodynamics 0545
Hydraulic 0546
Industrial 0547
Marine 0794
Materials Science 0548
Mechanical 0743
Metallurgy 0551
Mining 0552
Nuclear 0549
Packaging 0765
Petroleum 0554
Sanitary and Municipal 0790
System Science 0428
Geotechnology 0796
Operations Research 0795
Plastics Technology 0994
Textile Technology 0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0621
Behavioral 0384
Clinical 0622
Developmental 0620
Experimental 0623
Industrial 0624
Personality 0625
Physiological 0989
Psychobiology 0349
Psychometrics 0632
Social 0451

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

**"Sexual Hrrassment - Now You See It Now You Don't:
Perceptions of Male and Female Relationships"**

**submitted by Krista Louise Kiiffner, B.A. Honours
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master's of Arts**

Thesis Supervisor

Chair, Department of Psychology

Carleton University

September 7, 1994

Abstract

This study investigated men's and women's perceptions of sexual harassment, and the roles of personal orientation and contextual characteristics in defining situations as sexual harassment. Perceptions of sexual harassment were measured by a series of questionnaires. Subjects (N=133) completed questionnaires on their attitudes toward women and their sexual beliefs prior to viewing one of six videotaped scenarios of a male and female interaction that depicted one of the characters initiating sexually harassing behaviours onto the other character. The scenarios varied in the gender of the initiator/recipient (a male harassing a female or a female harassing a male), and the history and degree of interpersonal relationship between the initiator and recipient of harassment (no relationship history, a history of casual dating, or a history of a serious interpersonal relationship). Following the videotape, subjects were asked questions concerning the scenario, including their perceptions of the situation and the individuals involved. Each subject was also asked about their own personal experiences with sexual harassment. Correlational analyses indicated that respondents attitudes towards women and sexual beliefs affected their perceptions of the situation as harassing in that the more liberal subjects' attitudes and belief, the more likely they were to perceive harassment. Multivariate Analysis of Covariance further indicated that while subjects' gender

precise, and widely agreed upon definition of sexual harassment.

The term "sexual harassment" has been developed to label the imposition of unwanted, sexually-oriented practices and/or requirements upon individuals in the context of their work place (Cohen & Backhouse, 1978). Such practices and requirements can range from verbal comments about an individual's sexuality, to demands for intimacy with overt or implicit threats of employment security, to forcible rape (Walker, Erikson & Woolsey, 1985). While sexual harassment refers to a broad range of behaviours that may occur either singly or repeatedly, exactly what behaviours fall within the range of harassment remains controversial and adds to the complexity of the issue (Hotelling, 1991). Research has endeavoured to identify specific behaviours and categories of behaviours which constitute sexual harassment. Explicit in the empirical work and implicit in theoretical accounts of sexual harassment, is the notion that any unwanted sexualized behaviour - sexual jokes, comments about one's appearance, requests for dates, subtle pressure for sexual activity, and forcible rape, constitutes sexual harassment (Schneider, 1982).

According to MacKinnon (1979), sexual harassment can be divided into two forms. The first she terms "quid pro quo" in which a bargaining situation exists. For example, sexual compliance is exchanged or proposed to be exchanged for an

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my sincerest gratitude and acknowledgment to Dr. Kim Matheson whose time and guidance was very much appreciated. Special thanks goes to Caroline Burnley who always provided me with excellent feedback and who was always there providing me with a reality check. Lastly, I would like to dedicate this thesis to the memory of Dr. Nicholas P. Spanos for everything he gave to me.

Table of Contents

	Page
Title Page	i
Acceptance Sheet	ii
Abstract	iii, iv
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables	vii
List of Appendices	viii
Introduction	1
Conceptual Framework	1
Incidence Rates	5
Psychological Determinants	8
Personal Orientation and Attitudes	9
Contextual Characteristics	24
Purpose	43
Method	46
Subjects	46
Materials/Videotape	47
Measures	48
Procedure	53
Results	55
Discussion	62
References	73

List of Tables

Table	Description	Page
1	Rotated Factor Loadings for Perceptions of Initiator of Sexual Harassment	52
2	Rotated Factor Loadings for Perceptions of Recipient of Sexual Harassment	54
3	Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Dependent Variables with the Sexual Beliefs Subscales	58

List of Appendices

	Page
Appendix A: Videotape Scenario Scripts	81
Appendix B: Attitudes Toward Women Scale	87
Appendix C: Sexual Beliefs Scale	90
Appendix D: Degree and Certainty Ratings	94
Appendix E: Perceptions of the Initiator Questionnaire	96
Appendix F: Perceptions of the Recipient Questionnaire	98
Appendix G: Personal Experience Scale	100
Appendix H: Debriefing	103

Introduction

Sexual harassment against employees is widespread throughout the work force (Bond, 1988, Divasto, Kaufman, Rosner, Jackson, Christy, Pearson, & Burgett, 1984; Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981) and has been constructed as a social problem of significant proportions with marked negative consequences for the victims (Mazer & Percival, 1989). However, despite the construction of sexual harassment policies, publications offering prevention strategies, and ethical statements denouncing such behaviour, sexual harassment continues to occur.

Only recently, has sexual harassment been subjected to careful scrutiny. The majority of the research in this area focuses on incidence rates and/or its effects on the recipients of harassing behaviours (Gutek & Morasch, 1982). However, with the increased consciousness about sexual harassment, has come the realization that in order to discover some of the causal factors of harassment and thereby develop preventive measures, research on this phenomenon must move beyond the problem-documentation stage and begin focusing on the dimensions and correlates of sexual harassment.

Conceptual Framework - Defining Sexual Harassment

One of the most important factors that has delayed awareness and response to sexual harassment has been the difficulty in defining and measuring sexually harassing behaviour. As stated by Somer (1982) there is no clear,

precise, and widely agreed upon definition of sexual harassment.

The term "sexual harassment" has been developed to label the imposition of unwanted, sexually-oriented practices and/or requirements upon individuals in the context of their work place (Cohen & Backhouse, 1978). Such practices and requirements can range from verbal comments about an individual's sexuality, to demands for intimacy with overt or implicit threats of employment security, to forcible rape (Walker, Erikson & Woolsey, 1985). While sexual harassment refers to a broad range of behaviours that may occur either singly or repeatedly, exactly what behaviours fall within the range of harassment remains controversial and adds to the complexity of the issue (Hotelling, 1991). Research has endeavoured to identify specific behaviours and categories of behaviours which constitute sexual harassment. Explicit in the empirical work and implicit in theoretical accounts of sexual harassment, is the notion that any unwanted sexualized behaviour - sexual jokes, comments about one's appearance, requests for dates, subtle pressure for sexual activity, and forcible rape, constitutes sexual harassment (Schneider, 1982).

According to MacKinnon (1979), sexual harassment can be divided into two forms. The first she terms "quid pro quo" in which a bargaining situation exists. For example, sexual compliance is exchanged or proposed to be exchanged for an

employment opportunity or security. The second form arises when sexual harassment is a persistent "condition of work". This includes the creation of a hostile work environment which may include a range of different behaviours but with no stated or implicit threat. The distinction between the two forms highlights the different facets of the problems of sexual harassment. In the quid pro quo form, the coercion behind the advances is clarified by the reprisals that follow a refusal to comply. Less clear, and undoubtedly more pervasive, is the second situation in which sexual harassment simply makes the work environment unbearable, although the individual is never promised or denied anything explicitly connected with their job (MacKinnon, 1979, pp. 32-40).

The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (1980), states that unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favours, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature, constitute sexual harassment when (1) submission to such conduct is made either implicitly or explicitly as a term of an individual's employment, (2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as a basis for future employment decisions, (3) such conduct has the purpose or effects of substantially interfering with an individual's work performance or creates a hostile work environment (EEOC, 1980 p. 88 cited in Barak, Fisher, & Houston, 1992). The United States Merit Systems Protection Board (1981) provides a definition in terms of identifying six categories of sexual

harassment including: uninvited pressure for sexual favours; uninvited deliberate touching; uninvited suggestive looks; uninvited letters/calls; uninvited pressures for dates; and uninvited sexual teasing, jokes, remarks or questions. Similarly, The Project of the Status and Education of Women has identified seven specific types of sexual harassment: verbal harassment, leering, offensive sexual remarks, unwanted touching, subtle pressure for sexual activity, overt demands for sexual activity, and physical assault. Fitzgerald (1991) suggests that a definition of sexual harassment include "the sexualization of an instrumental relationship through the introduction or imposition of sexist or sexual remarks, or requests or requirements of sexual activity within the context of formal power differentials". Fitzgerald also notes that harassment can also occur where no formal power differentials exist if the behaviour is unwanted or offensive to the individual receiving it. Instances of these behaviours can be classified into: general harassment, seductive behaviour, and sexual imposition or assault.

As can be seen, various operational definitions of harassment have been suggested and adopted by researchers. While all the definitions identify sexual compliance in exchange for employment security/opportunity as sexual harassment, differences and disagreements about what types of behaviours constitute harassment and the creation of a hostile work environment prevail. Some researchers propose that any

uninvited sexualized behaviours constitute harassment (The United States Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981) while others identify only specific behaviours as being harassing (Project of the Status and Education of Women, 1982). Furthermore, other research stresses the power differential context of harassment, including both positional power in the workforce and gender power in larger society (MacKinnon, 1979, Fitzgerald, 1991).

Research has also demonstrated that both the observers and those actually involved in harassing situations have widely differing subjective ideas as to what constitutes sexual harassment (Cohen & Gutek, 1985; Jensen & Gutek, 1982; Powell, 1986). Furthermore, while situations which meet the criteria of working definitions of sexual harassment (e.g. definitions cited above) occur frequently, the perceptions and labelling of these incidents as sexual harassment per se, is uncommon (Fitzgerald, Shullman, Bailey, Richards, Swecker, Gold, Ormerod, & Weitzman, 1988). Because working definitions of sexual harassment rely so heavily upon subjective perceptions, differences in the manner in which individuals view social exchanges in the workplace, is another significant component for the emergence of an understanding of sexual harassment.

Incidence Rates

While the concept of sexual harassment is a relatively new social and research issue, the behaviours usually defined

as such are not (Brewer & Berk, 1982). Mazer and Percival (1989) note that unwanted sexual behaviour between men and women has such an extensive history that one might conclude that sexual harassment is almost a "natural", if an unfortunate part of male-female interactions.

Organizational studies have found that large numbers of women report being harassed at work. Depending upon the definition of sexual harassment employed, it is estimated that 42 to 90 per cent of women have been harassed within their workplace (Baldridge & McLean, 1980; Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981; Safran, 1976; United Nations, 1975, cited in Farley, 1978). Recent surveys of sexual harassment also suggest that over half of all female employees have received some kind of sexual overture or comment from a co-worker of the other gender (Schneider, 1984; Tangri, Burt & Johnson, 1982).

Early surveys found that 70 to 90 per cent of female respondents viewed sexual harassment as a serious problem (Farley, 1978). Webking (1979) found that among 250 Lethbridge women in various occupations, 50 percent of respondents reported having experienced some form of sexual harassment. The Women's Rights Committee of British Columbia Federation of Labour in conjunction with the Women's Research Centre (1980), found that 90 percent of unionized working women reported experiences with sexual harassment. Surveys conducted in the United States, have found similarly high

rates of harassment among working women. Silverman (1976) and the Working Women's Institute (1975) found that as many as 70 per cent of female respondents reported sexual harassment on the job, Safran (1976) found 88 percent, and Largen (1979) found 44 percent.

Incidence studies conducted at universities and colleges have also found that sexual harassment is a widespread occurrence (Cornell University 1975, cited in Farley, 1978). Adams, Kottke & Padgitt (1983) and Cammeart (1985) found rates of 30 to 50 percent of female undergraduate and graduate students reported sexual harassment. Other studies report that 23 to 30 percent of all college women in the United States have been sexually harassed (Dziech & Weiner, 1984; Maihoff & Forrest, 1983).

Although the legal definition of sexual harassment is not gender specific, the literature indicates that men and women are not equally likely to experience sexual harassment (Gutek, 1985; Popovich, Licata, Nakovich, Martelli, & Zolotny, 1986). Tangri, Burt and Johnson's (1982), analysis of the data collected from the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1981) found that 42 percent of women compared to 15 percent of men reported being sexual harassed at work. A greater percentage of women also reported experiencing the most severe forms of sexual harassment (e.g. sexual assault, sexual compliance for job security) (3.1 percent of women versus 1.7 percent of men). Gutek (1985) reported that women are nine times more

likely than men to report quitting a job, five times more likely than men to report having transferred jobs, five times more likely than men to report having quit trying for an employment opportunity, and three times more likely than men to report losing a job, because of sexual harassment.

Therefore, while incidence findings vary widely depending on the behaviours, methodologies, and sampling techniques employed, there is growing documentation that sexual harassment occurs regularly in both work and academic environments with often severe implications for the recipient, particularly if the recipient is a women (Padgitt & Padgitt, 1986).

Psychological Determinants of Sexual Harassment

Given our incomplete understanding of sexual harassment, the various determinants and hypotheses set forth regarding the origins of this phenomenon need to be further investigated. The determinants of sexual harassment which have been advanced in the literature, have been explored from the perspective of several conceptual frameworks (Tangri, Burt, & Johnson, 1982, Jensen and Gutek, 1985). Such perspectives have incorporated themes such as the perceptions and attributions of harassment (Cohen & Gutek, 1985; York, 1989), the independent effects of individual and situational variables and the combinations of these factors, on influencing the reactions and perceptions of sexual harassment (Gutek, 1985; Gutek & Morasch, 1982). Following these

perspectives, the effects of both personal and situational variables will be examined in the present study as they affect perceptions of sexual harassment.

Personal Orientation and Attitudes Towards Sexual Harassment

Recent research has attempted to elucidate the ways in which characteristics of the individual account for differing perceptions of sexual behaviour. (Baker, Terpstra & Larntz, 1990; Benson & Thomson, 1982; Howells, Shaw, Greasley, Robertson, Gloster & Metcalfe, 1984; Konrad & Gutek, 1986; Malovich & Stake, 1990; Ellis, Barak & Pinto, 1991). In particular, Konrad and Gutek (1986) theorize that perceptions of harassment are influenced by various subject or "personal" variables, and that basic differences in personal orientation towards sexual behaviour exist. Personal orientation to sexual behaviour is conceptualized as an individual's personal response to sexual incidents, or how an individual feels when they experience a sexual overture (Konrad & Gutek, 1986). Subjects' gender, personal experiences with harassing behaviours, and attitudes toward women and gender-roles, are factors which have been found to affect perceptions of appropriate gender-role behaviour and reactions to sexual harassment (Gutek, 1985; Konrad & Gutek, 1986; Malovich & Stake, 1990; McKinney, 1990).

Gender: how do men and women view sexual harassment.

Among the variables that affect perceptions of harassment, gender is considered one of the most powerful and robust

demonstrated to date in the literature (Collins & Blodgett, 1981; Fitzgerald & Ormerod, 1991; Lott, Reilly, & Howard, 1982; Padgitt & Padgitt, 1986; Powell, 1986). Due to the higher rates of victimization, more information exists on female perceptions of sexual harassment than male perceptions (McKinney, 1990). Nevertheless, when men and women are compared, the existing research indicates significant differences in perception (Abbey, 1982; Gutek, 1985; Jensen & Gutek, 1986; Konrad & Gutek, 1986).

Research indicates that women consistently use broader definitions of sexual harassment, have lower levels of tolerance regarding sexual behaviours, and tend to define sexual behaviours as harassing and/or offensive more so than do men (Konrad & Gutek, 1986; Kenig & Ryan, 1986). For example, various studies examining perceptions of harassment have asked subjects (both members of the workforce and university students) to read a series of sexual harassment vignettes and indicate whether or not they perceived the incidents to be sexually harassing. The results indicate that women's thresholds for defining particular behaviours as harassment consistently appear lower than those of men. Female subjects in comparison to male, express more negative attitudes and are more likely to consider sexual advances made by the opposite gender as objectionable (Adams, Kottke & Padgitt, 1983; Baker, Terpstra & Cutler, 1990; Kenig & Ryan, 1986; Konrad & Gutek, 1986; Powell, 1986). In contrast, male

subjects are found to perceive the actions of opposite gender individuals as less harassing than do female subjects. Men hold more positive images of social-sexual work behaviours than do women, tend to rate both hypothetical scenarios and specific social-sexual behaviours as less harassing than do women, and consider sexually related behaviours on the job and at school as more natural, less problematic and serious than do women. The research also indicates that men believe that women who have been sexually harassed are likely to have provoked this behaviour, that attractive woman must learn how to deal with sexual advances, that flirtations make the workday interesting, and that women frequently encourage sexual interest to improve their work situation (Gutek, '985; Gutek, Nakamura, Gahart, Handschumacher & Russel, 1980; Lott, Reilly, & Howard, 1982),

Lott et al (1982) conclude that these findings indicate that men are more accepting of sexual behaviours than women, and that men are more tolerant of non-mutual sexual advances. Therefore, it appears that women not only define behaviour as sexual harassment more frequently but are also, as a group, more consistent in their definitions. In contrast, men are less willing to label given behaviours as sexual harassment and give less patterned responses.

Evidence from a number of studies also indicates that men compared to women, tend to perceive other people and relationships in a more sexualized manner (Abbey, 1982). This

tendency is considered another significant interpersonal component in an emerging model of sexual harassment (Johnson, Stockdale, & Saal, 1991). In particular, Saal, Johnson and Weber (1989) in investigating perceptions of male-female behaviour, found that subjects' responses to a series of male-female "getting acquainted" scenarios, indicated that men perceived more sexuality in the female discussants behaviour than did the women. In contrast, female observers viewed the female discussants as more friendly than did male observers. Saal, et al (1989) concluded that when women attempt to create a friendly atmosphere at work, their behaviour may be misinterpreted by men as a sign of sexual interest. They further concluded that their findings suggest that men's thresholds for perceiving sexuality in women's behaviour may be reached more easily than female subjects' thresholds.

Similarly, Abbey (1982) in examining male and female observations of interactions between mixed gender pairs, found that compared to women, men tended to view the female actor as significantly more seductive, and sexually attracted to and anxious to date, the male actor. The men also reported being more sexually attracted to the female actor than the female subjects were to the male actor. Goodchilds and Zellman (1984) similarly found differences in perceptions of men and women to a variety of cues which might occur on a date. Their data indicated that females perceive dating situations and actions in a less sexual manner than do men.

In short, it appears that as women become more friendly and outgoing in acclimating to their work environment, men may misinterpret and label their behaviour as sexy and signs of interest. Consequently, these gender differences in social perceptions may be reflected in male's perceptions of sexual harassment (Collins & Blodgett, 1981). These findings are not to suggest that men's perceptions are so distorted that they view any friendly woman as a flirtatious seductress. As noted by Abbey (1982), both genders under some circumstances, have difficulty in distinguishing platonic friendliness from sexual invitation, though men are more likely to assume that friendlessness implies sexual attraction. Thus, common forms of sexual harassment - repeated date requests, staring, unnecessary touch and sexual innuendos, may result because men behave in terms of their perceptions of women's behaviours (Saal, Johnson, & Weber, 1989).

Research also indicates that gender differences exist in the assignments and attributions of responsibility in sexual harassment (Konrad & Gutek, 1986; Merit System Protection Board, 1981; Valentine-French & Radtke, 1989). Jensen and Gutek (1982) assert that male subjects will assign more responsibility to female victims and less to the male initiators than do female subjects. Saal, Johnson, and Weber (1989) noted that this again may be attributed to the tendency among men to perceive women's friendly behaviour as signs of sexual interest. However, there may also be a defense function

being served by this pattern of attributions, in that men do not want their own behaviour to be viewed as their own fault, and women do not want to be held responsible if they are the recipients of sexual harassment.

Although the bulk of the literature indicates gender differences in perceptions, a number of studies have failed to find such differences. Rielly, Carpenter, Dull and Bartlett (1982) found that among undergraduate and faculty members at a California university, there was no indication of disagreements among gender groups in the way sexual harassment was defined. Female students assigned slightly greater ratings of harassment to the written vignettes than did male subjects, but such differences were quite small. Likewise, Thomann and Wiener (1987) found that while female subjects were more likely than men to view some incidents as sexual harassment, these differences did not reach statistical significance. Terpstra and Baker (1987) in asking subjects to rank order sexual behaviours as to whether they were: not sexual harassment, were ambiguous, or were definitely sexual harassment, found that no significant gender differences existed between male and female students' perceptions of sexual harassment. Baker, Terpstra and Cutler (1990) in re-examining gender differences also failed to find significant gender differences in perceptions and severity ranking of sexual harassment. Terpstra and Baker (1987) conclude that studies reporting gender differences in perceptions may be

overstated. Alternatively, the gender differences in reported perceptions of sexual harassment may be changing and/or overstated. Perhaps, the reduction in differences is a reflection of different studies using different behavioural stimuli or different methodology or a recent change in men's perceptions and awareness of sexual harassment which stem from the increasing public awareness given to this issue (Baker, Terpstra, & Cutler, 1990).

Attitudes. Another possibility is that gender differences in perceptions of harassment may be mediated by gender roles and attitudes. Researchers suggest that given the difficulty in defining sexual harassment, individuals will superimpose their own pre-existing attitudes and beliefs onto events (Cohen & Gutek, 1985), resulting in individuals having systematically different orientations toward sexual behaviours at work. The research indicates that the readiness to label behaviour as sexually harassing is associated with the acceptance of gender identity, attitudes toward women and sexuality in general. It has also been hypothesized that attitudes will affect the amount of support or blame given to victims and perpetrators when others become aware of harassment in their workplace (Malovich & Stake, 1989).

For instance, research in the area of sexual aggression, such as rape, has indicated a relationship between men's and women's gender role attitudes, adversarial sexual beliefs, acceptance of interpersonal violence and self-reported

proclivity to acts of sexual aggression. Krulewitz and Payne (1977) found support for the contention that attitudes toward traditional gender-roles and women affect perceptions of rape. Labelling individuals who hold more traditional views toward women as non-feminist, and those individuals with positive attitudes toward women and feminism as pro-feminist, they found that in reaction to rape incidents, non-feminist individuals required substantial evidence of force before they were likely to judge an incident as rape. In contrast, pro-feminist individuals' perceptions of rape were not affected by the amount of force depicted in rape scenario. Similarly, Field (1978) found that individuals advocating pro-feminist attitudes assigned less responsibility to victims of rape than did subjects embracing more conservative gender-role beliefs.

Based on the rape literature findings, it appears that perceptions of rape are affected by adherence to traditional gender-role beliefs and attitudes toward women. Although sexual harassment is not equivalent to rape, it has been suggested that both behaviours may be viewed as different points on a continuum of sexual violence and victimization which is associated with gender-role beliefs and socialization. In generalizing findings of rape research to incidents of sexual harassment, it is suggested that those who adhere to traditional stereotypical gender-role concepts and beliefs may also assign greater responsibility to victims of sexual harassment in general, and/or be less inclined to

perceive incidents of harassment as such.

Pryor (1985) suggested that individuals who hold pro-feminist attitudes may be more inclined to have "sexual harassment" available as a cognitive label for unwanted social-sexual behaviours. Such enhanced availability may further result in such individuals interpreting more behaviours as sexual harassment. Powell (1986) in studying the effects of gender-role identity on definitions of sexual harassment, asserts that men and women with a traditional gender-role orientation are more willing to tolerate unwelcome sexual behaviours and are less inclined to term it harassment. In contrast, more androgynous individuals are less complaisant toward unwelcome advances and more inclined to label such experiences as harassment. Therefore, Powell concludes that individuals who see themselves in traditional gender-role terms may provide narrower definitions of harassment than do individuals who see themselves in less traditional terms.

For example, the research has repeatedly found that attitudes regarding gender-role traditionality have strong inhibitory effects on subjective perceptions of sexual harassment. In operationalizing gender-role attitudes in terms of traditional versus non-traditional attitudes, researchers have surmised that individuals with a traditional gender-role orientation might be more likely to view sexually aggressive actions as appropriate. Subsequently, such individuals may be less likely to confront sexual harassment than would more non-

traditional individuals. As predicted, gender-role attitudes proved to be significant predictors of subjects' attitudes toward harassment. Traditional subjects are found to be more tolerant of harassing behaviours than liberal subjects, and are less likely to report unwanted sexual advances as sexual harassment, and/or physically or verbally react to such behaviour (Baker, Terpstra & Larntz, 1990; Malovich & Stake, 1990). Subjects with more traditional attitudes also attribute more responsibility to female victims than to male victims compared to less traditional subjects who attribute less responsibility to victims of sexual harassment and attribute the same level of responsibility to both male and female victims (Jensen & Gutek, 1982; Valentine-French & Radtke, 1989).

Thus, the research indicates that traditional gender-role attitudes and orientations contribute to attitudes toward harassment, and may support and contribute to environments in which sexually harassing behaviour is accepted (Malovich & Stake, 1990).

Previous harassment experience. A number of researchers have documented differences in the experiences of men and women with sexual behaviours and harassment in work settings (Gutek, 1985, Konrad & Gutek, 1984; Tangri, Burt, & Johnson, 1982). Results suggests that being conscious of harassment may be directly influenced by having been previously subjected to sexual harassment, especially on several

occasions. Thus, a significant question arises - Do individuals who report more sexual harassment experiences differ in their attitudes and perceptions of sexual harassment from those with little or no harassment experience. Various studies provide evidence to address this question (Gutek, 1985; Konrad & Gutek, 1986; Mazer & Percival, 1989; Powell, 1983).

Women are consistently found to report more negative outcomes due to sexual incidents than are men (Gutek, 1985; Konrad & Gutek, 1985). As reported by Gutek (1985) women were nine times more likely than men to report quitting a job, five times more likely than men to report having transferred jobs, five times more likely than men to report having quit trying for a job, and three times more likely than men, to report losing a job because of sexual harassment. Konrad and Gutek (1984) also report that four men compared to 75 women quit a job due to sexual harassment, nine men compared to 57 women lost a job, three men versus 42 women transferred jobs, 22 men versus 185 women talked to others about sexual harassment, and 7 men versus 79 women gave up trying for a job because of sexual harassment. Such experiences and the negative outcomes of sexual harassment may influence the differential labelling behaviours of both men and women.

In incidents of heterosexual harassment, men tend to view women as responsible for the situation, whereas females tend to judge women less responsible (Konrad & Gutek, 1986;

Valentine-French & Radtke, 1989). Explanations for this may be related to the degree of similarity between the female victim and the subject. Shaver's (1970) research on defensive attributions, suggest that the more an individual identifies with a victim the less likely they will be to attribute responsibility to the victim. According to this hypothesis, previously harassed individuals may have a different belief system which predisposes them to perceive and evaluate sexual harassment differently from those with no such experience (Mazer & Percival, 1989). In support of this hypothesis, Jensen and Gutek (1982) found that women who had previously been victims of harassment, were less inclined to blame the victim than women who had not been previously victimized. Similarly, Ellis, Barak and Pinto, (1991) found a high positive correlation between experiences and perceptions of sexual harassment. The more frequent the reported actual experience of harassment, the higher were women's tendency to report having been sexually harassed at their work place. Moreover, the strength of this relationship varied among severity levels of reported harassment experiences. The greater the level of severity or explicitness of the experienced incident, the greater the relationship between reported and labelled sexual harassment.

Konrad and Gutek (1984) also indicate that experiencing negative outcomes due to sexual harassment on the job affects the labelling of sexual behaviours. They found that men's

labelling of very serious sexual behaviours was more strongly related to negative experiences as recipients than their labelling of less extreme behaviours. Men who reported experiencing negative outcomes were more likely than men who had no negative experiences, to label expected sex and dating as sexual harassment. In contrast, women's labelling of less serious behaviours were more strongly associated to negative experiences than women who had not been subjected to such negative experiences. Women who reported experiencing negative outcomes were more likely than women without such experience to label insulting sexual looks, gestures and comments as sexual harassment. Furthermore, women who reported having transferred jobs and talked to co-workers about the problem of sexual harassment, labelled more behaviours as sexual harassment than women who had not engaged in these activities.

Konrad and Gutek (1986) suggest that having negative sexual experiences at work may lead individuals to develop negative attitudes toward such behaviours, therefore labelling more sexual behaviours as harassment than individuals who have not had such negative experiences. This reasoning provides further support for gender differences in perceptions of sexual harassment. Given women experience more sexual harassment at work than men, women also report having more negative experiences with sexual behaviour than do men (Gutek, 1985; Tangri, Burt, & Johnson, 1982). Consequently, women in comparison to men, are more likely to label sexual behaviours

as harassment.

Gutek, Nakamura, Gahart, Handschumacher, and Russell (1980) found that women who had been subjected to sexual comments, looks, gestures, and unnecessary physical contact in the workplace, were more likely than men who had also been subjected to similar behaviours, to view these behaviours as negative, and to label them as sexual harassment. Likewise, Kenig and Ryan (1986) noting that women consistently have lower levels of tolerance regarding harassing behaviours than do men, suggest that women as a group are more sensitive and less accepting of sexual behaviours. In contrast, men, although aware of harassment issues, are not as likely to feel as threatened by it.

Barak, Fisher and Houston (1992) hypothesized that experiences with sexual behaviours come to be related to perceptions of sexual harassment in that individuals who have had little past sexual experiences may have less experience with sexual coercion and unwanted sexual attention. Consequently, such individuals may be less skilled at noticing sexual harassment and labelling it as such. Alternatively, individuals who experience a great deal of sexual behaviour at work may become habituated to its occurrence and thereby use the label of sexual harassment less often than individuals with less experience with sexual behaviours. Konrad and Gutek (1984) found that for less sexualized behaviours which were not meant to be insulting, (complimentary looks and comments)

both men and women who report experiencing such behaviours, were less likely to label them as sexual harassment than men and women who had not experienced these behaviours.

Some studies have found no relationship between having a specific experience(s) and the likelihood of defining and perceiving future experiences as harassment. Powell (1983) found no correlation between experiences with sexual attention and defining similar incidents as sexual harassment. Likewise, Schneider (1982) found that actual incidents of harassment that women experienced within the last year at their work, did not predict women's willingness to use the label of "sexual harassment" regarding behaviours such as jokes about one's body, pinches/grabs and sexual propositions. Relatedly, Mazer and Percival (1989) found that respondents who reported more experiences with sexual harassment, neither defined more incidents as harassment nor regarded such incidents as more serious than those respondents with less experience with harassing behaviours.

While research exists which both supports and does not support the experience-perception relationships, no conclusive findings have been reached. Apparently, the fact of having been previously subjected to unwanted sexual behaviours in the past may influence subsequent perceptions of harassment under some conditions. However, such findings are mostly correlational in nature. As such, additional research is needed to further explore the conditions under which past

experiences with harassment affect the labelling of sexual behaviours as harassment.

Contextual Characteristics of Harassing Situations

Reactions to sexual harassment may not be solely a function of individual orientation. In addition to personal orientation variables, a number of researchers argue that contextual factors play a large role in regulating perceptions of harassment (Konrad & Gutek, 1986; Livingston, 1982; Reilly, Carpenter, Dull, & Bartlett, 1982; Valentine-French & Radtke, 1989). As stated by Reilly, Carpenter, Dull, and Bartlett (1982) "there is no doubt that numerous situational factors are involved in incidents of sexual harassment. Each such occurrence is inevitably unique - the "perpetrator", the "victim", their past and present relationship, and the types of behaviours and severity involved, all have different configurations for every individual case" (p.99).

Peer harassment. Many attempts at explaining sexual harassment have included some consideration of the power or status of the parties involved (Niebuhr & Boyles, 1991). In particular the status of the initiator of harassment has been positively related to various measurements of perceptions of sexual harassment. The greater the initiator's organizational status, the more likely the behaviour will be perceived and/or labelled as sexual harassment (Coles, 1986; Fitzgerald, Shullman, Baily, Richards, Swecker, Gold, Ormerod, & Weitzman, 1988).

A common post hoc explanation for harassment in the research has been that it constitutes the exercise of one's power over another. In earlier studies, sexual harassment was viewed as an expression of institutional power (Lafontaine & Tredeau, 1986). The organizational model or power differential hypothesis asserts that the most significant basis for dominance in sexual harassment is occupational prestige associated with an individual's formal position in an organization (Gutek, 1985; Gutek & Morasch, 1982). Unlike other relationships, there is an inherent inequality in business-type arrangements (Bertz & Fitzgerald, 1987). Generally, individuals of higher formal status are perceived as having the right to make demands on those in subordinate positions, with such subordinate individuals being expected to comply with their demands (Baker & Terpstra, 1986).

Although the consensus in sexual harassment literature is that harassment is "more likely to originate from supervisors than from others" (Littler-Bishop, Siedler-Feller, & Opaluch, 1982, p.143) other research indicates that it is co-workers/peers who are most likely to be the initiator of harassment of both genders (Benson, 1984; U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981). Lafontaine and Tredeau (1986) in summarizing harassment experiences of women, reported that peers were cited as the most frequent sources of harassment followed by supervisors and subordinates. Quinn and Lees (1984) also indicated that the majority of initiators of

harassment are not supervisors. Although, those lower in employment ranks are always more vulnerable to abuses of power, they argue that the sheer numbers of co-workers suggests that horizontal harassment is more likely than hierarchical harassment. Schneider (1982) drawing on a survey sample of working women, also indicates that co-workers were reported as the major initiators of harassment. She explains such findings by suggesting that compared to supervisors, subordinates and co-workers are less constrained in their behaviour by formal authority relationships and are more likely to have daily contact with workers than supervisors. Benson (1984) in examining power differentials in harassment, also argues that harassment frequently occurs where the recipient has equal power with the initiator, and refers to this behaviour as "peer harassment".

Only a few major investigations of peer/co-worker harassment have been conducted. Given they have not been consistent in their definitions, categories and samples, comparisons across such studies are limited (Hunter & McClelland, 1991).

Ellis, Barak and Pinto (1991), found no differences between reported incidents caused by high versus equal initiator status in either gender harassment or seductive behaviour categories. Furthermore, within their other three levels of harassment - sexual coercion, bribery and imposition, only relatively small differences in ratings were

found between high status and equal status harassment.

The power differential perspective has also been questioned by research conducted in academic environments. Hunter and McClelland (1991) found that while faculty-student harassment arouses greater moral concern, student-student harassment was more pervasive. Relatedly, Roscoe, Goodwin, Rose, and Repp (1987) in investigating harassment among university staff, found that both men and women indicated that the positions most frequently held by the initiator of harassment were co-workers or subordinates. Finally, Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1991) found neither the recipient's status, nor the degree of the faculty member's power over the recipient, affected subjects' ratings of faculty-student scenarios.

While most sexual harassment incidents come from co-workers and are therefore not direct assertions of workplace authority, it has been argued that power does enter into these dynamics given that men are the primary initiators of most approaches and women are the ones acted upon (Schneider, 1982). Tangri, Burt, Johnson (1982) found that while co-workers were the most common harassers of both male and female federal employees (65 per cent for females, 76 percent for males) the pattern of organizational relationships differed for men and women. Supervisors were found to be two and a half times more common initiators of harassment toward women than to men, and subordinates were the least common harassers for

females but the most common for male victims. They also found that fewer than half of the men reported that they would consider sexual teasing, jokes, and remarks from a co-worker to be sexual harassment. In contrast, more women than men said that all types of sexual behaviour from either a supervisor or co-worker would bother them and they would consider it harassment. Tangri et al (1982) concluded that the power differential component of harassment is more common for female victims than for male victims.

Alternatively, perhaps the power relationship that is essential to sexual harassment is the relation which exists between men and women in wider society (as opposed to employment status). Padgitt and Padgitt (1986) reflecting on the comparatively high incidence of harassment initiated by peers rather than authority figures, suggest that harassment is more of a gender issue than a strictly organizational power issue. As noted by Benson (1984) men have more potential earning power, may be physically stronger, and have the general prerogative of male dominance. Thus, gender can operate as a diffuse status characteristic creating additional power differentials in sexual harassment incidents. As such, definitions of harassment of women are accurate in stating that harassment occurs in the context of unequal power, with the abuser being more powerful than the victim.

One issue the research points to then, is the complexity of the concept of power. Recent research illustrates that

harassment can occur where there are no power imbalances and/or other types of power can be used by initiators of harassment (McKinney, 1990). Consequently, the organizational power differential theory alone, does not adequately explain the sources of variation in perceptions of sexual harassment. Other explanations, including examinations of alternative forms of power (e.g. gender power differences) may merit more attention than simple positional power differences.

Nature of harassing behaviour. Research has established that a consensus about what behaviours are and are not harassing is notably lacking. Certain behaviours because of their severity are considered sexual harassment by most individuals (Reilly, Carpenter, Dull, & Bartlett, 1982; Weber-Burden & Rossi, 1982). Specifically, the research indicates that individuals generally perceive behaviours such as, sexual assault, unwanted physical contact of a sexual nature, and sexual propositions coupled with threats of changes in job status, as clear-cut instances of sexual harassment (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981). Conversely, there is less definitional consensus regarding more ambiguous, less flagrant sexual behaviours such as, sexual propositions unaccompanied by threats, request for dates or socializing, offensive language, sexual remarks, and unwanted nonverbal attention such as gestures, stares and whistles (Terpstra & Baker, 1988).

Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1991) found that of the factors

individuals utilized in making judgements about harassment, the severity or explicitness of the behaviours involved was the most salient. Subjects overwhelmingly agree that requests for sex linked to threats of retaliation for noncompliance constitutes harassment regardless of other variables involved (e.g. prior relationship between the parties involved). To a somewhat lesser degree, the same was true of behaviours that link sex to promises of reward (Fitzgerald & Ormerod, 1991). Konrad and Gutek (1986) found that 94 percent of men and 98 percent of the women in their sample agreed that "being asked to have sexual relations with the understanding that refusal would hurt your job situation" was harassment. Adams, Kottke and Padgitt (1983) found that among university students, a high degree of consensus for three overt sexual behaviours was found: physical advances, sexual propositions and bribery. However, more variation existed in the responses to less severe behavioral categories such as sexist comments, undue attention and body language. Likewise, Gutek, Nakamura, Gahart, Handschumacker, and Russel (1980) found that 80 percent of subjects believed that request for dates and sexual activity coupled with explicit job threats constituted sexual harassment, compared to only 20 percent of subjects who considered positive sexual comments to be harassing.

Relatedly, Baker and Terpstra (1988) in ranking and arranging socio-sexual behaviours in a hierarchical fashion, found that when a behaviour has no direct link to concrete

job-related consequences (e.g. is not "quid pro quo" harassment), or only indirectly affects the conditions of employment by creating a hostile environment, subjects are inconsistent in their judgements. In an attempt to distinguish between factors that clearly define sexual harassment and those that lead to disagreement or ambiguous definitions, Reilly, Carpenter, Dull and Bartlett (1982) designed 25 slightly different vignettes in which a female is potentially harassed by a male. They found a high degree of consensus existed for the vignettes containing actions or statements on the part of the initiator suggesting coercion, threat or unusually intimate or sexually suggestive behaviours. In contrast, cases depicting moderate levels of harassment led to confusion among subjects' perceptions. Relatedly, Powell (1983) found that for full-time working women, sexual harassment was defined as including sexual propositions, touching/grabbing and brushing up against one's body. However, staring and flirting were not considered harassment, and the sample was evenly divided over whether sexual remarks, gestures, or sexual relationships should be included in a definition of harassment.

While there is less consensus regarding so called "less serious harassing behaviours" the research indicates that such behaviours are decidedly the most common type of harassing incidents. Surveys examining the prevalence of sexual harassment, indicate that joking remarks and sexual comments

about an individual's anatomy are among the most commonly reported experiences, followed by verbal advances and comments about appearance (Benson & Thomson, 1982; Maihoff & Forrest, 1983). Specific to work settings, Cammaert, (1985) found the types of harassment most often encountered (according to behavioural checklists) take the form of verbal remarks. These include sexual jokes, remarks about an individual's sex-life, remarks about one's body, and making sexually suggestive remarks with double meanings. Tangri, Burt and Johnson (1982) report that the most severe forms of harassment are rarely experienced. Only one percent of female employees reported actual or attempted rape or sexual assault experience, as did only .03 percent of the male workforce. Less serious forms of harassment such as sexual touching, looks and remarks occurred much more frequently than did the more serious forms. Likewise, Errington and Davidson (1980) found that touching and fondling were among the highest reported experiences. Such touching was reported to occur in three specific manners: 1) openly, and blatantly in front of others (e.g. patting shoulders, hair and hips); 2) touching which appeared accidental (e.g. squeezing up against one's body); and, (3) sexual advances made out of sight of other employees (e.g. in stockrooms).

Research conducted in academic institutions also complements the experiences reported in work environments. McKinney (1990) in investigating peer-harassment among

university faculty, found that 40 percent of the respondents reported receiving sexist comments, 26 percent reported experiencing unwanted body language, 9 percent experienced unwanted physical advances, and only 1 per cent reported being subjected to sexual bribery. Roscoe, Goodwin, Rose and Repp (1989) found that sexist behaviours, sexual comments and body language were among the most frequently reported harassing behaviours. Likewise, Benson and Thomson (1982) using an inclusive definition of sexual harassment, found that 30 percent of randomly sampled students at Berkeley University had experienced "unwanted and objective sexual behaviours" in the forms of unwanted sexual attention, verbal advances and invitations, undue attention and emotional come-ons. In contrast only three cases of overt sexual bribery were reported.

Literature examining the nature of harassing behaviours also re-affirms the existence of gender differences in definitions of sexual harassment. Women are more likely than men to view certain types of sexual interactions as harassment (Powell, 1986). Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1991) found that while respondents of both genders agree that quid pro quo types of behaviour are more intrusive and sexually harassing, gender became a more salient factor when the incidents being judged were less explicit, and ambiguous. In such cases, Benson and Thomson (1982) report that women typically perceive more harassment than men. Likewise, Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1991)

suggest that females may feel more harassed by behaviours that men consider innocuous , trivial, or acceptable forms of sexual approach.

For example, Powell (1986) found that women perceived more sexual harassment than men, when harassing behaviours were considered least extreme (e.g. complimentary remarks) and most offensive (sexual bribery). Other survey research indicates that women are more sensitive to non-verbal implicit forms of harassment in comparison to men. In incidents involving explicit requests for sexual behaviours or blatant sexual touching, both men and women perceive harassment as equal rate, however, women are more likely than men to perceive such harassment as serious (Jones, Remland, & Brunner, 1987). In incidents involving leering, sexual jokes, paralinguistic cues and sexual innuendoes, women also perceive more harassment than men (Gutek, 1985; Gutek & Morasch, 1982). The U.S. Merit System Protection Board study (1981) also found that women were more likely than men to label sexual teasing, jokes and remarks from co-workers or supervisors to be sexual harassment.

Konrad and Gutek (1986) conclude that the gender differences in the types of behaviours considered harassment, implies that different types of sexual behaviours may be evaluated negatively by women and positively by men. They further suggest that a significant implication of this, is that men may initiate more sexual behaviour at work than

women, and that may lead to complaints of harassment given that men are less likely to view sexual behaviour as unacceptable. Alternatively, the gender differences found in evaluations of harassing behaviours may explain the gender differences in perceptions of the existence of harassment discussed earlier.

In summary, the greatest agreement about harassing behaviours is found with respect to the most infrequent behaviours - sexual bribery and coercion with threats of employment status alterations. The nature and definitions of the more widespread sexist, inappropriate and subtly offensive incidents continues to remain a subject of much disagreement.

Initiators and recipients of harassment. The issue of sexual harassment has generally been thought of as primarily a woman's problem. However, the research indicates that the experience of harassment is not exclusive to women. It is significant to recognize that men are also subjected to this form of victimization (Gutek, 1982, Roscoe, Goodwin, Rose, & Repp, 1987; Tangri, Burt, & Johnson, 1982). Roscoe et al (1987) found that among a sample of university students, 12 percent of the men who returned the survey indicated they had personally been subjected to behaviours which were considered harassing. Lott, Reilly, and Howard (1982) in asking university students about personal encounters with sexual insults, found that 35 percent of the male students reported they had been sexually insulted by a woman on the university

campus, and 12 percent reported being insulted by a woman outside the university.

Given little research has included male victims, it is difficult to predict the responses of male subjects to men receiving harassment (Jones, Remland, & Brunner, 1987). In accordance with defensive attributional theory, Shaver (1970) suggests that male subjects might sympathize more with a male victim than a female one, thus hold male victims less responsible than female victims. Alternatively, men might find the situation of a male victim as irrelevant and thus remain uninfluenced by the recipient's gender (Lerner & Miller, 1978). Valentine-French and Radtke (1989) found that female subjects attributed more responsibility to female recipients of harassment than to male recipients. In contrast, male subjects attributed the same levels of responsibility to both the male and female recipients. They concluded that female subjects' responses may reflect a desire to distance themselves from the recipient's fate, whereas male subjects may perceive the victim role as irrelevant to them and thus are not influenced by the recipient's gender.

The impact of harassment on men, is another area which has been largely ignored by research. However, the few existing studies which have examined this, suggest that men are not likely to suffer negative effects as a result of receiving sexual overtures at work (Konrad & Gutek, 1986).

Gutek (1985) found that men have a more positive image

of social-sexual behaviours than do women, and tend to enjoy sexual overtures from women. Malovich and Stake (1990) found that while some male students did report experiencing harassment defined as sexual innuendoes, sexual come-ons and requests for dates, none could be properly labelled as a victim. The responses of these male students suggested that rather than feeling harassed, they enjoyed the experience, felt flattered, and perceived the incident as an interesting learning experience. These reactions are similar to those reported by men in the workplace (Konrad and Gutek, 1986). Konrad and Gutek (1986) found that men were four times more likely than women to report they would be flattered to receive sexual overtures at work, and four times less likely than women, to report they would be insulted.

Given harassment is perceived and evaluated more positively by men, coupled with the fact that men are less likely to consider a social-sexual behaviour directed at them as harassing (Gutek, 1980), men may file fewer sexual harassment complaints than women (Konrad & Gutek, 1986). Moreover, such gender differences may also make it difficult for men and women to understand each others reactions to such incidents (Abbey, 1987).

Defining characteristics of the perpetrators of harassment is another area needing investigation. Although men are consistently reported as the primary initiators of harassment, there are reports of women initiators. Roscoe,

Goodwin, Repp and Rose (1987) found that while men were reported as the primary initiators of harassing incidents among students, females were also reported as harassers. McKinney (1990) also found that ten percent of the females and 35 percent of the male students surveyed, reported experiencing unwanted, uninvited sexual behaviours from a women.

Pryor (1985) addressed the evidence which suggests that individual's understanding of harassment typically involves male behaviour. He suggests that a possible theoretical generalization is that the general unexpectedness or inappropriateness of a behaviour from an initiator will contribute to an increase in the likelihood of labelling the behaviour as harassment. Consequently, sexual behaviours initiated by a woman would increase the likelihood of it being perceived as harassment. However, Gutek, Morasch and Cohen (1983) found that sexual advances initiated by a woman to a man, are seen as less likely and less harassing than the same advances made by a man to a women. Johnson, Stockdale and Saal (1991) found similar results when they reversed traditional male-female roles. Female subjects' perceptions of behaviour as sexualized on the part of the initiator were found only in the male initiator-female recipient dyad, and not the female initiator-male recipient dyad.

Given the dearth of information on less familiar situations such as a female making an unwanted sexual overture

and a male being the recipient of harassment, the present study will incorporate gender of the recipient and initiator as variables in the research design.

Previous interpersonal relationships. A prior relationship between the initiator and recipient, is one characteristic which appears to have an effect on ratings of sexual harassment. Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1991), suggest that interactions that might otherwise be viewed as inappropriate may be perceived as more acceptable if the recipient has previously consented to intimacy with the initiator. That is, expectancies derived from previous encounters between the initiator and recipient can alter interpretations of an incident, introducing uncertainty and disagreement about whether sexual harassment occurred. Although the literature on this topic is sparse, the available evidence provides a basis for seriously investigating the effects of a previous relationship between the initiator and recipient on perceptions of harassment.

For example, Hunter and McClelland (1991) in presenting students with vignettes which included a prior relationship between the characters involved, found that several levels of this dimension had a significant effect on seriousness ratings. In comparisons to characters who had had a previous romantic relationship, only having been acquaintances (the recipient "had occasionally spoken with" the initiator) or a lack of any previous contact (the recipient "had never spoken

with" the initiator) made a statistically significant difference in the direction of increased seriousness.

Reilly, Carpenter, Dull, and Bartlett (1982) also found that prior social relations between a professor and student (such as having previously dated) significantly diminished ratings of sexual harassment across a series of hypothetical vignettes. Specifically, they found that unusually intimate or sexually suggestive behaviours on the part of the instructor, coupled with the refusal by the student to date the instructor, increased the chance of an act being labelled as harassment. However, evidence of a continuation of a prior relationship between the instructor and student decreased this chance. Similarly, Cohen and Gutek (1985) presented subjects with brief vignettes depicting sexual harassment in which the parties involved had a history of an interpersonal work relationship. They found subjects placed little emphasis on the variables which directly involved the harassing nature of the incident, and placed more weight on the personal aspects of the incident, such as the interpersonal relationship between the individuals involved.

There is also evidence of gender differences regarding views of organizational relationships. Kenig and Ryan (1986) found that while most respondents judged romantic relationships as appropriate when involving co-workers, female subjects are consistently more likely than the male subjects to see such relationships as inappropriate. Quinn

(1977) suggests that women's negative perceptions of work relationships is rooted in their experience. While sexual liaisons with co-workers has been found to enhance a man's status in work organizations, such liaisons are found to degrade women's status. It may be expected, then, that men have more positive perceptions of sexual relationships between co-workers than women (Quinn, 1977). Consequently, men and women may perceive harassing incidents where the individuals involved have had a previous relationship differently (Konrad & Gutek, 1986).

Extrapolations from rape literature. Research on the assignment of responsibility in rape incidents, may also be useful in providing a starting point from which to generalize about the effects of a previous relationships on perceptions of sexual harassment (Jensen & Gutek, 1982).

Research in the area of acquaintance rape demonstrates that individuals frequently believe that sexual pressure, including physical pressure is simply not an aberrant or illegal behaviour if it takes place in a dating situation (Roberts, 1989). There exists some evidence that individuals who have experienced forced intimacy are less likely to perceive and label such incidents as rape when their perpetrator was previously known to them. Studies of women who contact rape crisis centres, have consistently found that those who are most likely to report to police and pursue and win legal actions are those raped by strangers (Robert, 1989).

A recent study in Seattle found that a prior relationship with the rapist, was the single most significant factor in under-reporting of rape to the authorities (Roberts, 1989). Another Massachusetts study, found that the closer a relationship was between the victim and the rapist, the less likely the woman was to report the rape (Roberts, 1989). Feldman-Summers and Norris (1984) in investigating differences between rape victims who report and those who do not, also found that women who are raped by an acquaintance are less likely to report the incident.

Rape research also suggests that a previous relationship with a rapist may be viewed as providing greater opportunity for provocation of the rape by the victim (Calhoun, Selby, & Warring, 1976). Klemmack and Klemmack (1976) reported that less than 20 percent of a sample of women who read a description of acquaintance raped labelled it as such. In contrast, such results were not found in the stranger rape conditions, suggesting that acquaintance rape is less likely to be perceived as rape and may be perceived as within the realm of normative acts (Check & Malamuth, 1983). Likewise, Check and Malamuth (1983) found that acquaintance rape situations may lead to ambiguities which can bias perceptions and result in greater hesitancy about defining the situation as rape. Such biased perceptions would also account for previous findings that people do not consider rape by acquaintances as "real" rape (Klemmack & Klemmack, 1976).

In opposition to the aforementioned studies, Howell, Shaw, Greasley, Robertson, Gloster, and Metcalfe (1984) found that among their British sample, a relationship between the survivor and rapist had no effect on judgments of rape. However, they suggest that their findings may be due to fact that a previous relationship only affects judgment when it involved a suggestion of interpersonal intimacy, which was absent in their scenarios.

To date, no studies exist which present an array of relationship histories between the initiator and recipient in either the rape or sexual harassment literature. However, issues of sexual behaviour, interpersonal relationships and sexual harassment are a part of organizational behaviour (Konrad & Gutek, 1986).

Purpose

There are a number of significant reasons for investigating the social perceptions of sexual harassment. Cognitions and perceptions of sexual harassment, may have direct behavioral consequences for the reporting of such incidents, the processing of sexual harassment cases by judicial systems, and extralegal social reactions to the recipients and offenders (Konrad & Gutek, 1986).

Given the complexity involved in investigating the independent effects of personal and contextual variables, few studies have assessed how such factors may be interrelated in

influencing perceptions of sexual harassment.

As cited in the literature, men and women are found to perceive and react to sexual behaviour and harassment differently. This may be partly explained by different orientation towards women, and gender-role attitudes, and partly by different experiences with sexual behaviours. Because working definitions of sexual harassment rely heavily upon subjective perceptions, differences in the way women and men view social exchanges in the workplace are potentially significant components for an emerging model of sexual harassment.

While much of the harassment research has begun to address the problems of determining what types of behaviours are perceived as harassment, many of such studies assess only extreme behaviours which as demonstrated by the literature, rarely occur. Consequently, there exists only a limited number of systematic studies investigating less flagrant behaviours (Gervasio & Ruckdeschel, 1992). Nonetheless, behaviours other than direct economic retaliation for sexual noncompliance are increasingly being considered sexual harassment. As such, the present study investigated how individuals evaluate less extreme behaviours to determine how such behaviours affect perceptions of harassment.

The harassment research has also failed to assess a range of different contextual characteristics and how they influence perceptions. Traditionally, the context of work-

place sexual harassment involves male initiators, female victims and the existence of formal power differentials (e.g. supervisors harassing subordinates). Consequently female initiators, co-worker harassment, and behaviours on the part of the recipient, such as past relationships with the initiator, have received little attention. As such, the present study investigated the differential affects of women initiating harassment, in comparison to male initiators, and the conditions which need to prevail for a previous interpersonal relationship between the parties involved to have significant effects on perceptions. Furthermore, the present study presented harassment within a co-worker context in order to examine perceptions of harassment outside of a positional power-differential context.

In summary, it appears that perceptions of sexual harassment may be a complicated function of interactions between gender, attitudes and sexual beliefs, and contextual characteristics. Such variables philosophically or cognitively appear to act as a direct and relevant anchoring point for attributions and definitions of harassment. While the exact explanation of the links between such variables remains equivocal, it is nonetheless evident that perceptions of harassment cannot be divorced from these influences. As such, the present study examined the effects of various personal variables, and manipulated various contextual variables which influence perceptions of harassment. Variations on a single

situation were presented in attempts to uncover the relative importance of the contextual and personal variables discussed on social perceptions and reactions to sexual harassment. Subjects completed questionnaires on their attitudes toward women and their sexual beliefs prior to viewing one of six videotaped scenarios of a male and female interaction. Two particular contextual characteristics were manipulated: gender of the initiator (a male harassing a female or a female harassing a male), and the degree and history of an interpersonal relationship between the initiator and the recipient (no relationship history, a history of casual dating, or a history of a serious interpersonal relationship). The crossing of these two contextual characteristics in a completely crossed factorial design yielded six different conditions. Following the videotape, subjects were asked to complete a series of questionnaires reflecting their perceptions of the videotaped condition. Subjects were also asked about their own personal experiences with sexual harassment.

Method

Subjects

Subjects were 133 undergraduate first year university students 18 years of age and older; 71 were males and 62 were females and the mean age was 21.04. Subjects were recruited through class solicitation and from sign-up sheets posted on .

the introductory psychology bulletin board. Subjects received experimental credit for their participation.

Materials

Videotape. Subjects viewed a four minute videotaped scenario that depicted a single interaction between a man and a woman at work. In all of the videotaped scenarios, the initiator and recipient were presented in a work context and as co-workers, having the same positional status and seniority (See Appendix A). The scenarios involved an office setting in which the initiator persistently asked an unwilling recipient to go on a date with him/her. Sexually harassing behaviour directed at the recipient by the initiator included mild to moderate forms of sexual harassment including, sexual innuendoes, repetitive requests for a date, and physical touching. Threats to the recipient's work position or status and threats of violence were not included in the scenarios. The recipient's response in all of the scenarios was neutral to negative; while the recipient did not blatantly ask the initiator to leave he/she alone the initiator's actions were consistently discouraged both verbally and physically.

Two independent variables were manipulated in the videotaped scenarios. The first was gender of the initiator/recipient. In half of the scenarios, the initiator was a male and the recipient was a female; in the other half, the initiator was female and the recipient was male. The second variable was the history of an interpersonal

relationship between the initiator and the recipient. In particular, there were three different relationship histories such that the initiator had no interpersonal relationship with the recipient, the initiator and recipient had a history of casual dating, or the initiator and recipient had a history of a serious interpersonal relationship. Relationship history was depicted in the scenarios through verbal statements made by both the initiator and recipient, such as the presence or absence of the initiator commenting on past dates with the recipient and/or referring to the recipient as an ex-girlfriend/boyfriend and the recipient stating to the initiator that they are not longer a couple and/or living together.

Measures

Gender Role Beliefs. Subjects completed the Attitudes Toward Women Scale developed by Spence, Helmreich and Strapp (1973) (See Appendix b) and the Sexual Beliefs Scale developed by Spanos and DuBreuil (1991). The Attitudes Toward Women Scale is a 25-item scale that was designed to assess beliefs regarding equality and women's roles in society. Participants responded to the items using a 4-point scale ranging from A "strongly agree" to D "strongly disagree". The letter coding was transformed into a numeric interval scale ranging from 1 to 4 and mean responses across the items were summed (with relevant items reversed) such that high scores represent pro-feminist attitudes (Cronbach's Alpha=.90).

The Sexual Beliefs Scale (See Appendix C) is a 32-item scale designed to assess beliefs about men and women's roles in sexual relations. It includes three subscales which measure beliefs that, (1) women are in need of protection (4 items, Cronbach's Alpha=.70), (2) women are perceived in traditional roles (9 items, Cronbach's Alpha=.70), and (3) women are perceived as sexual objects (17 items, Cronbach's Alpha=.91). Responses to the items were made on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 "not at all true" to 5 "very true". Scores were summed across the items comprising each subscale and were calculated to provide an index in which high scores indicate that women are viewed as in need of protection, and as being untrustworthy and sexually manipulative, respectively.

Degree and Certainty of Sexual Harassment. Subjects' perceptions of the degree of sexual harassment in the scenarios and their certainty of its occurrence were measured using two Likert-type scales. Subjects rated how certain they were that the scenario depicted sexual harassment on 5-point scale ranging from 1 "sexual harassment definitely did not occur" to 5 "sexual harassment definitely did occur". Subjects rated the degree of sexual harassment they perceived in the scenario on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 "sexual harassment did not occur at all" to 6 "sexual harassment occurred to a very great degree" (See Appendix D). While ratings of certainty and degree were highly correlated ($r=.71$, $p<.01$) they were analyzed separately because of their conceptual

differences.

Perceptions of the Psychology of the Initiator and the Recipient. Subjects also completed two scales designed to assess perceptions of the initiator and recipient. Subjects' perceptions of how the initiator thought and felt about the recipient were measured on a 12-item scale (See Appendix E). Examples of items included the initiator was "only joking with the recipient", or the initiator was "attempting to sexually arouse the recipient". Perceptions were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 "not at all true" to 5 "very true". The items on this scale were factor analyzed using an unweighted least squares solution within a varimax rotation. Three factors emerged (based on scree plots) (See Table 1). Based on item loadings greater than .30 the first factor was comprised of six items reflecting perceptions that the initiator intended to harass the recipient (Cronbach's Alpha=.78). The second factor was comprised of three items reflecting perceptions that the initiator was sexually interested in the recipient (Cronbach's Alpha=.68). The third factor was comprised of two items reflecting perceptions that the initiator was joking with the recipient ($r=.74$, $p<.01$).

Responses to the items which loaded on each factor were summed to yield three subscale scores for each subjects, such that high scores indicated that subjects believed the initiator intended to harass the recipient, the initiator was sexually interested in the recipient, and the initiator was

only joking with the recipient.

Insert Table 1 about here

Subjects' perceptions of how the recipient thought and felt about the initiator were measured on a 12-item scale (See Appendix F). Examples of items included the recipient "did not like the initiator", or the recipient "felt he/she was being asked to trade sex for job security". Perceptions were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 "not at all true" to 5 "very true". The items on this scale were factor analyzed using an unweighted least squares solution within a varimax rotation. Two factors emerged (based on scree plots) (See Table 2). Based on item loadings greater than .30, the first factor was comprised of nine items reflecting perceptions that the recipient felt used by the initiator (Cronbach's Alpha=.71). The second factor was comprised of three items reflecting perceptions that the recipient felt the initiator's harassment was "quid pro quo" (Cronbach's Alpha=.68). Responses to items which loaded on these factors were summed (with relevant items reversed) to yield a felt used and subjected to "quid pro quo" harassment score for each subject. High scores indicated that subjects believed the recipient felt used and that the recipient felt subjected to "quid pro quo" harassment by the initiator.

Table 1

Rotated Factor Loadings for Perceptions of Initiator

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
	Intended to Harass	Sexual Interest	Joking
was trying to undermine recipient's authority in the office	.79		
wanted to put the recipient down	.74		
wanted to embarrass the recipient	.63		
was threatened by recipient's competence in the office	.60		
was sexually attracted to recipient	.60		
was asking the recipient to trade sex for job security	.54		
was trying to get the recipient to like him/her		.71	
was trying to arouse recipient sexually		.62	
didn't like the recipient		-.43	
was only joking with recipient			.82
was trying to be funny			.82
saw recipient as a potential sexual conquest	--	--	--

Insert Table 2 about here

Personal Experiences with Sexual Harassment. Finally, subjects rated the frequency with which they had personally experienced sexual harassment or knew of others who had (See Appendix G). Experiences were measured on a 14-item personal experience questionnaire developed for the purpose of this study. The personal experience questionnaire included 2 subscales which measured, (1) personal experiences with sexually harassing behaviours (7 items, Cronbach's Alpha=.77), and (2) knowledge of others (e.g. family, friends) who have personally experienced sexually harassing behaviours (7 items, Cronbach's Alpha=.83). Responses to the items were made on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 "never experienced" to 5 "frequently experienced". Scores were summed across the items of the 2 subscales to provide a personal experience and knowledge of others' experience index for each subject in which high scores indicated greater past experience with sexual harassment. While ratings of personal experience and knowledge of others who have experience with harassment were highly correlated ($r=.56$, $p<.01$) they were analyzed separately because of their conceptual differences.

Procedure

Subjects were informed that the experiment dealt with perceptions of male and female relationships. They were not

Table 2

Rotated Factor Loadings for Perceptions of Recipient

Item	Factor 1 Felt Used	Factor 2 "Quid Pro Quo"
felt like a sexual object	.60	
was sexually attracted to the initiator	-.58	
felt put down	.56	
was sexually aroused	-.53	
liked the initiator	-.43	
didn't like the initiator	.42	
thought the initiator was funny	-.40	
felt embarrassed	.39	
thought the initiator was teasing him/her	-.37	
felt he/she was being asked to trade sex for job security		.94
thought the initiator was trying to undermine his/her authority		.73
thought the initiator wanted to go out with him/her		-.30

informed about the focus on sexual harassment. Subjects were randomly assigned to one of the six experimental conditions. Each condition consisted of approximately 20 subjects with equal numbers of male and females in each. After being given a description of the study, respondents completed the informed consent form, the Attitudes Toward Women Scale and the Sexual Beliefs Scale. Upon completion of these questionnaires, subjects viewed one of the six video scenarios. Following the videotape, subjects' perceptions of sexual harassment were assessed. Subjects were also asked to rate the occurrence of harassing behaviour in terms of their own experiences. Subjects were then debriefed about the study (See Appendix H).

Results

To assess the relationship between personal orientation variables and perceptions of harassment, a series of correlational analyses were conducted between subjects' attitudes toward women, the three sexual beliefs subscales, the two personal experience subscales and their perceptions of harassment.

Following this, the interactive effects of personal orientation and contextual characteristics on perceptions of harassment were examined in a series of 2(gender of subject) x 2(gender of initiator/recipient: male initiator/female recipient versus female initiator/male recipient) x 3(history of an interpersonal relationship: no relationship history

versus casual dating history versus serious interpersonal relationship) completely randomized factorial multivariate analyses of covariance (MANCOVA), with the Attitudes Toward Women Scale scores as the covariate.

Individual Difference Characteristics

Participants in this study were moderately pro-feminist in their attitudes toward women ($M=61.5$, $SD=9.18$; possible range=25-100) and generally did not perceive women as in need of protection ($M=12.42$, $SD=3.68$; possible range=4-20) as in traditional roles ($M=19.30$, $SD=5.71$; possible range=9-45) or as sexual objects ($M=39.68$, $SD=5.71$; possible range=17-85). No significant gender differences were found on the attitudes toward women or the sexual beliefs dimensions.

Many of the subjects reported having some personal experience with sexual harassment ($M=14.65$, $SD=4.41$; possible range=7-35) or knowledge of others who have had past experiences with harassment ($M=17.94$, $SD=5.51$; possible range=7-35). The type of personal experiences with harassment most commonly reported included unwanted sexual advances (e.g. pinching, touching, rubbing/brushing), sexually-oriented jokes, comments or gestures, and unwanted sexual propositions. Again there were no gender differences on these variables.

Personal Characteristics and Perceptions of Harassment

Attitudes toward women and sexual beliefs. To assess the extent to which subjects' personal characteristics were related to perceptions of harassment Pearson Product Moment

Correlations were conducted among the Attitudes Toward Women Scale and the Sexual Beliefs Scale subscales with perceptions of the degree and certainty of sexual harassment and perceptions of the initiator and recipient in the scenarios.

A significant positive correlation between subjects' attitudes toward women scores and the ratings of degree ($r=.35$, $p<.01$) and certainty ($r=.40$, $p<.01$) of harassment was found. This indicates that the more liberal subjects were in their attitudes toward women, the greater the degree of harassment they perceived, and the more certainty they expressed that harassment had occurred. With respect to perceptions of the initiator and recipient, a significant positive correlation between subjects' attitudes toward women scores and the perception that the recipient felt used ($r=.32$, $p<.01$) was also found. This indicates that the more liberal subjects were in their attitudes toward women, the more they perceived that the recipient felt used by the initiator. No further significant zero order correlations were found.

Similarly, significant negative correlations were found between the three subscales of the Sexual Beliefs Scale and ratings of degree and certainty of harassment (See Table 3).

Insert Table 3 about here

This pattern of correlations indicates that the more subjects perceived women to be in need of protection, as sexual objects,

Table 3

Pearson Correlation Coefficients For Dependent Variables
with Sexual Beliefs Scale

Dependent Variables	Sexual Protective	Beliefs Sexual	Scale Traditional
Degree of Harassment	-.24**	-.27**	-.32**
Certainty of Harassment	-.26**	-.33**	-.39**

** p < .01

and that women should be in traditional roles, the less the degree of harassment they perceived, and the less certain they were that harassment occurred. In terms of their perceptions of the actors, one correlation was significant in that there was a significant negative correlation between perceptions of women in traditional roles and the perception that the recipient felt used ($r = -.26$, $p < .01$). As with the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, this indicated that the less subjects perceived women as belonging in traditional roles, the more they perceived that the recipient felt used by the initiator. No further significant zero order correlations were found.

Personal experiences. To assess the extent to which subjects personal experiences with harassment and knowledge of others experiencing harassment were related to perceptions of harassment Pearson Product Moment Correlations between the two Personal Experience subscales and perceptions of the degree and certainty of harassment and perceptions of the initiator and recipient were performed. None of the correlations were significant suggesting that no relationship exists between previous experiences and perceptions of harassment or perceptions of the initiator and recipient.

Contextual Effects on Perceptions of Harassment

Degree and certainty of harassment. The extent to which the scenario was perceived to be a situation of sexual harassment was assessed in a $2(\text{subject gender}) \times 2(\text{gender of initiator}) \times 3(\text{history of relationship})$ MANCOVA on the degree

and certainty of sexual harassment with attitudes toward women as the covariate¹. Consistent with the correlational analyses, the covariate was significant, Pillais=.14, $F(2,119)=9.71$, $p<.001$. However, none of the main effects nor any of the interactions were significant. On average the scenarios were all perceived as depicting a high degree of harassment ($M=4.32$, $SD=1.25$) and subjects were certain that the behaviours depicted were harassment ($M=4.30$, $SD=1.01$), irrespective of gender or the contextual characteristics.

Initiator's intention to harass, sexual interest, and joking. To assess the effects of subjects' gender and contextual factors on the perceptions of the initiator and recipient with attitudes toward women as the covariate, a 2(gender of subject) x 2(gender of the initiator) x 3(relationship history) MANCOVA was conducted on the three subscales assessing perceptions of the initiator. The covariate was not significant (Pillais=.01, $F(3,113)=.40$). However, a significant main effect for gender of the initiator/recipient was found, Pillais=.18, $F(3,113)=8.22$,

¹ A series of hierarchical regressions was conducted in which subjects' ratings of certainty and degree of harassment, and the subscales reflecting their perceptions of the initiator and recipient were regressed onto attitudes toward women on the first step followed by the three sexual beliefs subscales. In none of the regressions did the sexual beliefs subscales explain significant variance over and above attitudes toward women. Therefore only attitudes toward women were used as a covariate in all further analyses. When attitudes toward women were not used as a covariate, gender did not come out significant as either a main effect or an interaction.

$p < .001$. Follow-up analyses of covariance (ANCOVA) indicated that when the initiator was a male/recipient was a female, subjects perceived a greater intention to harass ($M=17.20$, $SD=4.33$) than when the initiator was a female/recipient was a male ($M=15.19$, $SD=5.5$), $F(1,115)=12.62$, $p < .001$. In contrast, subjects perceived the female initiator as being more sexually interested in the recipient ($M=18.02$, $SD=2.08$), than was the male initiator ($M=17.11$, $SD=1.83$), $F(1,115)=15.74$, $p < .001$. There was no difference in perceptions of whether the initiator was joking; on average subjects did not view the initiator as only joking with the recipient ($M=2.76$, $SD=1.07$). There were no other significant multivariate main effects or interactions.

Recipient felt used and quid pro quo harassment. To examine perceptions of the recipients' feelings a 2(gender of subject) $\times$ 2(gender of the initiator) $\times$ 3(relationship history) MANCOVA with attitudes toward women as the covariate was performed on the factors reflecting perceptions of the recipients' feelings. The covariate was significant, Pillais=.08, $F(2,116)=5.06$, $p < .001$. Once again a main effect was found for gender of the initiator/recipient, Pillais=.12, $F(2,116)=7.62$, $p < .001$. Follow-up ANCOVA's indicated that subjects believed that when the recipient was a female/initiator was a male, the recipient felt more subjected to "quid pro quo" harassment ($M=7.86$, $SD=3.39$) than when the initiator was a female/recipient was a male ($M=6.27$, $SD=2.81$),

$F(1,117)=13.57, p<.001$. No differences were found in the extent to which the recipient was perceived to feel used; on average, subjects did perceive that the recipient felt used ($M=35.80, SD=5.31$). There were no further significant multivariate main effects or interactions.

Discussion

Given an understanding of sexual harassment relies heavily upon subjective perceptions, differences in the way individuals view sexual exchanges in the workplace may be a potentially significant component for an emerging explanatory model of sexual harassment. To investigate individuals' divergent perceptions as to what constitutes harassment, the present study examined various personal orientation and contextual characteristics which may influence such perceptions among male and female university students.

Personal Orientation Variables

Past research theorizes that perceptions of harassment are influenced by various personal variables. In particular, gender of the perceiver, perceivers' gender-role attitudes, and personal experience with harassment are factors which have all been found to affect perceptions and reactions to harassment (Gutek, 1985; Malovich & Stake, 1990). In the present study personal factors were more predictive of perceptions of sexual harassment than were contextual characteristics.

Among the personal variables that influence perceptions of harassment, gender of respondent is considered one of the most robust demonstrated in the literature (Collins & Blodgett, 1981; Fitzgerald & Ormerod, 1991; Padgitt & Padgitt, 1986). Research consistently finds that when the perceptions of men and women are compared, significant differences are found in that women use broader definitions of harassment, express more negative attitudes toward harassment and are less accepting of harassment than men. One of the most surprising results of the present study was the marked absence of any effects due to subjects' gender. The lack of these gender differences raises a number of issues, some of which may be answered through subjects' attitudes/beliefs and personal experiences with harassment.

Past research has found that the traditionality of individuals' gender beliefs (with men generally being more traditional than women on the Attitudes Toward Women Scale) largely explain the effects of gender on perceptions of harassment (Hunter & McClelland, 1991). In the present study, however, there were no significant gender differences found on the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, the Sexual Beliefs Scale nor on the Personal Experience Scale. Thus, if gender role beliefs such as attitudes toward women, do mediate the gender effects, it is not surprising that there were no significant gender effects, given there were no attitudinal differences. Indeed, even when attitudes were not held constant, gender did not

significantly affect sexual harassment perceptions.

Alternatively, as suggested by Baker, Terpstra and Cutler (1990) perhaps the gender effects found in the previous research are overstated. A number of studies have also failed to find gender differences in perceptions of harassment (Baker, Terpstra & Cutler, 1990; Rielly, Carpenter, Dull & Bartlett, 1982; Thomann & Wiener, 1987;). Perhaps the lack of gender differences in the aforementioned research and the present study is a reflection of recent changes in men's perceptions and awareness of sexual harassment. Perhaps, men are becoming more aware and better educated about the nature of harassment, bringing their definitions closer to those of females, or at least their self-reports of their definitions. The extent to which gender differences may be disappearing and the basis for these shifts merits further research.

While there were no gender differences in the present study, differences in perceptions of harassment did vary as a function of attitudes toward women and sexual beliefs. In accordance with the previous research, the present study found that in general, individuals who held more conservative attitudes regarding women and sexual relationships (as measured by the Attitudes Toward Women and the Sexual Beliefs Scales) were less certain about whether sexual harassment occurred and believed it occurred to a lesser degree. The present study also found that subjects' attitudes toward women and sexual beliefs affected their perceptions of the recipient

of harassment. More specifically, individual's who held more liberal attitudes toward women and did not perceive women in traditional roles perceived the recipient as feeling more used than did subjects with more traditional attitudes and beliefs. These findings are consistent with past research that has found that traditional subjects are more tolerant of harassment, are more likely to attribute responsibility to female victims (Baker, Terpstra & Larntz, 1990; Malovich & Stake, 1990) and therefore are more likely to minimize the seriousness of harassing behaviours.

Regarding personal experiences with harassment, the research suggests that being conscious of harassment may be directly influenced by having previously been subjected to sexual harassment (Gutek, 1985; Konrad & Gutek, 1984). However, this was not the case in the present study. Subjects who had personally experienced more harassment or knew of others who had, were neither more certain that harassment had occurred in the scenarios, did not regard the incidents as more serious, nor did they perceive the initiator or recipient differently than those with less harassment experience. Thus, while one might expect that individuals who have previously dealt with sexual harassment would respond differently to questions of how harassment should be defined and perceived than individuals who have not had any experience with harassment, this was not supported by our results. Perhaps the processes which influence perceptions of sexual harassment are

more universal than would be imagined in that it appears that individuals can have similar perceptions of harassment despite having differences in personal experiences. Alternatively, the failure to find a positive experience-perception relationship may be due to subjects not relating to or identifying with the actors in the scenarios. That is, while past experiences may affect future perceptions of individuals' own situations, perceptions of sexual harassment situations of other individuals may not vary as a function of the extent to which the individual can identify with the other.

Our findings on personal experience may also reflect the nature of questions used in the harassment experience questionnaire. In particular, the basis for classification of experiences in the present study was simply the frequency of different types of harassment (e.g. verbal/physical) subjects' reported to have experienced themselves or knew of others who had. It would be useful for future studies to consider different ways of conceptualizing personal experiences as more of a multidimensional variable which would include examining whether individuals defined their situation as harassment, how individuals and their co-workers reacted and responded to their experiences, how recent their experience was, whether they experienced harassment once or repeatedly, and so on. Perhaps individuals' definitions of their experiences as sexual harassment and the social visibility and salience of these experiences would be more predictive of their future

interpretations than the specific behaviour or experience itself.

Lastly, it is possible that the present findings were affected by the fact that the extent of past experience in the sample was relatively low. The relatively low incidence of harassment reported may reflect the fact that most of the students in our sample were young and in their first year of university. A substantially higher incidence of harassment has been reported in samples of more advanced students, who have greater academic and work experiences which place them in situations in which harassment is more likely to occur (e.g. Benson & Thompson, 1982).

Finally, it is notable that in stark contrast to previous research (Gutek, 1985; Konrad & Gutek, 1986; Mazer & Percival, 1989) the present study did not find that women reported significantly more experience with sexual harassment than did men. Perhaps men do experience harassing behaviours at similar rates to women. However, given that the consequences (e.g. future violence/victimization) of being harassed by a woman are not as serious as the reverse, men may not have reported such experiences in the past, nor even defined them as harassment; indeed they may have even reported being flattered and enjoying such behaviour (Malovich & Stake, 1990). Needless to say, given that the male subjects in the present study did report experiencing harassing behaviour, the need to recognize that this group is also subjected to

harassment must be acknowledged. The occurrence of male victimization therefore deserves further investigation.

Contextual Characteristics

A number of researchers have asserted that in addition to personal variables, contextual factors also play a large role in regulating perceptions of harassment (Konrad & Gutek, 1986; Livingston, 1982). The findings of the present study lend some support to these assertions.

Although harassment has generally been thought of as primarily initiated by men toward women, the experience of harassment is not exclusive to women nor is initiating harassment exclusive to men (Gutek, 1982; Roscoe, Goodwin, Rose & Repp, 1987). Indeed, in the present study, gender of the initiator did not affect the extent to which respondents defined the situation as sexual harassment. However, the gender of the initiator did have a strong effect on subjects' perceptions of the initiator such that subjects believed that the initiator's intention to harass the recipient was greater when the initiator was a male as opposed to a female. These results are supported by the fact that women as a group, consistently experience more unwanted sexual attention from men than men experience from women and the consequences of the unwanted attention tend to be much more negative for women (Farley, 1978; Gutek, 1985; Konrad & Gutek, 1986; Shaver, 1970). Consequently, individuals may have become sensitized to the greater undesirability and consequences of men initiating

unwanted sexual attention and were therefore more inclined to regard sexual harassment as intentional when it was initiated by a man instead of woman.

Consistent with this, gender of the initiator/recipient also had a significant effect on perceptions of the recipient. Subjects believed that the recipient felt more subjected to "quid pro quo" harassment when the recipient was a female as opposed to a male. Research which has theorized that sexual harassment is a form of power may shed light on these findings. Research in the area of sexual harassment has long assumed that harassment occurs in situations where there exists a power imbalance either in the workplace and/or in wider society. Given men may be perceived as having greater ascribed power (e.g. greater potential earning power, greater physical strength, and general prerogative of male dominance) and a greater likelihood of being harassers, individuals may perceive the effects of harassment as being different for women as opposed to men, despite equivalent levels of organization status, if they believe that traditional male prerogatives do not extend to women. This is consistent with the research which has investigated how men react to uninvited sexual attention. Studies indicate that when men receive sexual attention from women at work they frequently report that they enjoyed the experience and felt flattered rather than feeling harassed or victimized. Perhaps then, the critical power-imbalance lies in perceptions of possible

threat or victimization. In general, men are more likely to continue to feel safe and in control when they are propositioned by a female. Subsequently, individuals may not perceive harassing behaviours as negatively when initiated by a woman. In contrast, individuals may be more likely to perceive a woman recipient feeling victimized (e.g. being subjected to "quid pro quo" harassment) when a man is the initiator because they can perceive the possibility of future threat and/or victimization, despite the fact that the scenarios did not contain any "quid pro quo" threats.

One focus of future research then, should be to determine the merit of these explanations. In particular, thought must be given to ways to explore the cultural assumptions underlying the gender-relations of harassment. Specifically, the dynamics underlying female initiators of harassment, and male recipients must be further investigated, and in particular the role of perceived implicit and explicit threat. Finally, it should also be noted that men can also experience harassment from other men and women from other women, although both are less frequent than the man to woman scenario. The dynamics of these less frequent situations may be quite different, and so through examining the unique pattern of responses and perceptions to these situations, further insight can be gained into the social and contextual factors involved with harassment.

Although the literature on the effects of a previous

interpersonal relationship between the initiator and recipient of harassment is sparse, the available research does suggest that this contextual characteristic should affect perceptions of harassment (Fitzgerald & Ormerod, 1991; Hunter & McClelland, 1991; Reilly, Carpenter, Dull & Bartlett, 1982). However, the present study failed to find that a history of an interpersonal relationship between the initiator and recipient had an effect on perceptions of harassment, or on perceptions of the initiator or recipient. The general lack of any significant effects of a history of an interpersonal relationship must however, be interpreted carefully given the results may be a methodological artifact. In particular, given that the videotaped scenarios were very brief, skeletal stories, the history of interpersonal relationships and their sequelae may not have been presented clearly enough. Unfortunately, given there was no manipulation check included, it was not possible to ascertain whether subjects were actually attuned to this information about the initiator and recipient. However, given issues of sexual behaviour, interpersonal relationships and sexual harassment are all part of organizational behaviour, future research investigating the effects of past relationships on perceptions and definitions of harassment is merited.

In summary, the present study set out to examine the extent to which personal orientation and contextual characteristics affected perceptions of sexual harassment.

Factors such as, gender, personal experience with harassment and the relationship history between the initiator and recipient did not significantly influence perceptions. However, subjects' attitudes toward women and sex-roles and the gender of the initiator/recipient were significantly related to ratings and perceptions of harassment and the individuals involved. Thus, this study has extended our understanding of the dynamics of sexual harassment in that the factors which may make individuals more or less tolerant to harassment in others, and the significance of the context of incidents of harassment were revealed. In combination with the results of previous research, this information may be useful in developing more effective interventions to prevent harassment. By providing organizations with an awareness of the factors which may influence perceptions of harassment, complaints of sexual harassment may be taken seriously and dealt with more appropriately.

In conclusion, while the results of this study suggests that there is no straightforward answer regarding which variables affect perceptions of harassment, this study does support the need to further investigate the role of personal and contextual variables.

References

- Abbey, A. (1987). Misperceptions of friendly behaviour as sexual interest: A survey of naturally occurring incidents. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 11, 173-194.
- Adams, J.W., Kottke, J.L., & Padgitt, J.S. (1983). Sexual harassment of university students. Journal of College Personnel, 484-491.
- Baker, D.D., Terpstra, D.E. & Cutler, B.D. (1990). Perceptions of sexual harassment: A re-examination of gender differences. Journal of Psychology, 24(4), 409-416.
- Baker, D.D., Terpstra, D.E., & Larntz, K. (1990). The influence of individual characteristics and severity of harassing behaviour on reactions to sexual harassment. Sex Roles, 22(5/6), 305-321.
- Baldrige, K., & McLean, G. (1980) Sexual harassment: How much of a problem is it ...really? Journal of Business Education, 56, 294-297.
- Barak, A. Fisher, W.A., & Houston, S. (1992). Individual difference correlates of the experience of sexual harassment among female university students. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22, 17-37.
- Benson, K.A. (1984). Comment on Crocker's "An analysis of university definitions of sexual harassment". Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 9, 516-519.
- Benson, D.J., & Thomson, G.E. (1982). Sexual harassment on a university campus: The confluence of authority relations, sexual interest, and gender stratification. Social Problems, 29(3), 236-250.
- Bertz, N.E. & Fitzgerald, L.E. (1987). The Career Psychology of Women. Orlando, Fla: Academic Press.
- Bond, M.A. (1988). Division 27 sexual harassment survey: Definition, impact, and environmental context. The Community Psychology, 21, 7-10.
- Brewer, M.B., Berk, R.A. (1982). beyond nine to five: Introduction. Journal of Social Issues, 38, 1-4.
- Brownmiller, S. (1975). Against Our Will: Men, women, and rape. New York: Simon and Schuster.

- Calhoun, L.G., Selby, J.W., & Warring, D.J. (1976). Social perceptions of the victim's causal role in rape: An exploratory examination of four factors. Human Relations, 29, 517-526.
- Cammaert, L.P. (1985). How widespread is sexual harassment on campus? International Journal of Women's Studies, 8, 388-397.
- Check, J.V., & Malamuth, N.M. (1983). Sex role stereotyping and reactions to depictions of stranger versus acquaintance rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 344-356.
- Cohen, L., & Backhouse, c. (1978). The Secret Oppression: Sexual harassment of working women. Toronto: MacMillan of Canada.
- Cohen, A.G. & Gutek, B.A. (1982). Responses to sexual harassment on the job: Legal, organizational and individual actions. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 5-22.
- Coles, S.F. (1986). Forced to quit: Sexual harassment complaints and agency response. Sex Roles, 4(1/2), 81-92.
- Collins, E.G.C. & Blodgett, T.B. (1981). Sexual harassment: Some see it ... some won't. Harvard Business Review, 59(2), 76-95.
- DiVasto, P.V., Kauffman, A., Rosner, L., Jackson, R., Christy, J., Pearson, S., & Burgett, T. (1984). The prevalence of sexually stressful events among females in the general population. Archives of Sexual Behaviour, 13, 59-67.
- Dziech, B., & Weiner, L. (1984). The Lecherous Professor. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Ellis, S., Barak, A., & Pinto, A. (1990). Moderating effects of personal cognitions on experienced and perceived sexual harassment of women in the workplace. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 21, 1320-1337.
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (1980). Guidelines on discrimination because of sex. Federation Register, 45, 74676-74677. In A. Barak, W.A. Fisher, & S. Houston. (1992). individual correlates of the experience of sexual harassment among female university students. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22, 17-37.

- Erikson, G.W. & Woolsey, L. (1985). Sexual Harassment: Ethical research and clinical implication in the academic setting. International Journal of Women's Studies, 8, 424-433.
- Farley, L. (1978). Sexual Shakedown: The sexual harassment of women on the job. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Feldman-Summers, S., & Norris, J. (1984). Differences between rape victims who report and those who do not report to a public agency. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 14, 562-573.
- Field, H.S. (1978). Attitudes toward rape: A comparative analysis of police, rapists, crisis counsellors, and citizens. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 156-179.
- Fitzgerald, L.F. (1991). Sexual Harassment: The definition and measurement of a construct. In M. Paludi (Ed.). Ivory Power: Sexual Harassment in Academia & The Workplace. Sunny Press.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., & Ormerod, A.J. (1991). Perceptions of sexual harassment: The influence of gender and academic context. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15, 281-294.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., Shullman, S.H., Baily, N., Gold, Y., Ormerod, M., Richards, M., Swecker, J. & Weitzman, L.M. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 32, 157-175.
- Gervasio, A.H., & Rucheschel, K. (1992). College students' Judgments of verbal sexual harassment. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22, 190-211.
- Goodchilds, J.D., & Zellman, G.L. (1984). Sexual signalling and adolescent aggression in adolescent relationships. In N.M., Malamuth & E. Donnerstein (Eds.). Pornography and Sexual Aggression. Florida: Academic Press.
- Gutek, B.A. (1985). Sex and the workplace: The impact of sexual behaviour and harassment on women, men and organizations. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gutek, B.A. & Morasch, P. (1982). Sex-ratios, sex-role spill-over, and sexual harassment of women at work. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 55-74.

- Gutek, B.A., Morasch, B. & Cohen, A.G. (1983). Interpreting social-sexual behaviour in a work setting. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 22, 30-48.
- Gutek, B.A., & Nakamura, C.Y. (1982). Gender rates and sexuality in the world of work. In E.R. Allgeirer, & N.B. McCormack (eds.). Changing Boundaries: Gender roles and sexual behaviour. California: Mayfield.
- Gutek, B.A., Nakamura, C.Y., Gahart, M., Handschumacker, I., & Russell, D. (1980). Sexuality and the workplace. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 1, 255-265.
- Hotelling, K. (1991). Sexual harassment: A problem shielded by silence. Journal of Counselling and Development, 69, 497-500.
- Howells, K., Shaw, F., Greasley, M., Robertson, J., Gloster, D., & Metcalfe, D. (1984). Perceptions of rape in a British sample: Effects of relationship, victim status, sex and attitudes toward women. Journal of Social Psychology, 23, 35-40.
- Hunter, C., & McClelland, K. (1991). Honouring accounts for sexual harassment: Factorial survey analyses. Sex Roles, 24, 725-752.
- Jensen, I.N. & Gurek, B.A. (1982). Attributions and assignment of responsibility of sexual harassment. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 121-136.
- Johnson, C.B., Stockdale, M.S., & Saal, F.E. Persistence of men's misperceptions of friendly cues across a variety of interpersonal encounters. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15, 463-475.
- Kenig, S., & Ryan, J. (1986). Sex differences in levels of tolerance and attribution of blame for sexual harassment on a university campus. Sex Roles, 15, 535-549.
- Klemmack, S.H., & Klemmack, D.L. (1976). The social definition of rape. In M Walker, & S. Brodsky (Eds.), Sexual Assault. Lexington: Lexington.
- Kruewitz, J.E., & Payne, E. J. (1978). Attributions about rape: Effects of rapist force, observer sex, and sex role attitudes. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 8, 291-305.

- 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.
- Lerner, M. J., & Miller, D.T. (1978). Just work research and attributional process: Looking back and ahead. Psychology Bulletin, 85, 1030-1051.
- Lester, D., Banta, B., Barton, J., Elain, N., Mackiewicz, L. & Winkelried, J. (1986). Judgments about sexual harassment: Effects of the power of the harasser. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 63, 990.
- Littler-Bishop, S., Siedler-Feller, D. & Opaluch, R.E. (1987). Sexual harassment in the workplace as a function of initiator's status: The case of airline personnel. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 137-148.
- Livingston, J.A. (1982). Responses to sexual harassment on the job: Legal, organizational and individual actions. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 5-22.
- Lockheed, M.E., & Hall, K.P. (1976). Conceptualizing sex as a status characteristic: Application to leadership training strategies. Journal of Social Issues, 32, 111-124.
- Lott, B., Reilly, M.E., & Howard, D.R. (1982). Sexual assault and harassment: A campus community case. Signs, 8, 296-319.
- MacKinnon, C. (1979). Sexual Harassment of Working Women: A Case of Sex Discrimination. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- Maihoff, N. & Forest, L. (1983). Sexual harassment in higher education: An assessment study. Journal of The National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counsellors, 46, 3-8.
- Malovich, N.J. & Stake, J.E. (1990). Sexual harassment on campus - Individual differences in attitudes and beliefs. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 14, 63-81.
- Mazer, D.B., & Percival, E.F. (1989). Ideology or experience? The relationships among perceptions, attitudes, and experiences of sexual harassment in university students. Sex Roles, 20, 135- 144.
- McKinney, K. (1990). Sexual harassment of university faculty by colleagues and students. Sex Roles, 23(7/8), 421-437.

- Niebuhr, R.E., & Boyles, W.R. (1991). Sexual Harassment of military personnel: An examination of power differentials. Journal of Intercultural Relations, 15, 445-457.
- Niehouse, O.L., & Doades, J.R. (1980). Sexual harassment: An old issues - a new problem. Supervisory Management, 52, 10-15.
- Padgitt, S.C., & Padgitt, J.S. (1986). Cognitive structure of sexual harassment: Implications for university policy. Journal of College Student Personnel, 27, 34-39.
- Popovich, P.M., Licata, B.J., Nakovich, D., Martelli, T. & Zolotny, S. (1986). Assessing the incidence and perceptions of sexual harassment behaviours among American undergraduates. The Journal of Psychology, 120(4), 387-396.
- Powell, G.N. (1986). Effects of sex role identity and sex on definitions of sexual harassment. Sex Roles, 4(1/2), 9-19.
- Pryor, J.B. (1985). The lay person's understanding of sexual harassment. Sex Roles, 13, 273-278.
- Quinn, R. E. (1977). Coping with cupid: The formation, impact and management of romantic relationships in organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 22, 30-44.
- Quinn, R.E. & Lees, P.L. (1984). Attraction and harassment: Dynamics of sexual politics in the workplace. Organizational Dynamics, 13(2), 35-46.
- Reilly, T., Carpenter, S., Dull, V. & Bartlett, K. (1982). The factorial survey: An approach to defining sexual harassment on campus. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 99-110.
- Roscoe, B., Goodwin, M.P., Repp, S.E., & Rose, M. (1987). Sexual harassment of university students and student-employees: Findings and implications. College Student Journal 21, 254-273.
- Safran, C. (1976). What men do to women on the job: A shocking look at sexual harassment. Redbook (November), 148-149.

- Schneider, B.E. (1982). Consciousness about sexual harassment among heterosexual and lesbian women workers. Journal of Social Issues, 38, 75-98.
- Shaver, K.G. (1970). Defensive attribution: Effects of severity and relevance on the responsibility assigned for an accident. Journal of Personality and Social Issues, 38, 99-110.
- Shotland, R.L., & Goodstein, L. (1983). Just because she doesn't want to, doesn't mean it's rape: An experimentally based causal model of the perceptions of rape in a dating situation. Social Science Quarterly, 46, 220-232.
- Silverman, D. (1976). Sexual harassment: Working women's dilemma. Quest: A Feminist Quarterly, 3(Winter), 15-24.
- Somers, A. (1982). Sexual harassment in academe: Legal issues and definitions. Journal of Social Issues, 38, 23-32.
- Spanos, N.P. (1991). Sexual beliefs scale. (unpublished manuscript)
- Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R. & Strapp, J. (1973). A short version of the attitudes toward women scale (ATW). Bulletin of Psychonomic Society, 2, 219-220.
- Summers, R.J. (1991). Determinants of judgements of and responses to a complaint of sexual harassment. Sex Roles, 25, 379-392.
- Tangri, S.S., Burt, M.R. & Johnson, L.B. (1982). Sexual harassment at work: Three explanatory models. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 33-54.
- Terpstra, D.E. & Baker, D.D. (1987). Psychological and demographic correlates on perceptions of sexual harassment Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs, 112(4), 459- 478.
- Thoman, D.A. & Weiner, R.L. (1987). Physical and psychological causality as determinants of culpability in sexual harassment cases. Sex Roles, 17(9/10), 573-591.
- U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board. (1981). Sexual harassment in the federal workplace: Is it a problem? Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office cited in Coles, S.F. (1986). Forced to quit: Sexual harassment complaints and agency response. Sex Roles, 4(1/2), 81-92.

- Valentine-French, S. & Radtke, H.L. (1989). Attributions of responsibility for an incident of sexual harassment in a university setting. Sex Roles, 21(7/8), 305-321.
- Walker, G., Erikson, L., & Woolsey, L. (1985). Sexual harassment: Ethical research and clinical implications in the academic setting. International Journal of Women's Studies, 8, 424-433.
- Weber-Burdin, E. & Rossi, P.H. (1982). Defining sexual harassment on campus: A replication and extension. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 33-54.
- Webking, E. (1979). A study of sexual harassment in Lethbridge. Prepared for the Lethbridge Citizens Human Rights Council. In L.P. Cammaert (1985). How widespread is sexual harassment on campus? International Journal of Women's Studies, 8, 388-397.
- Women's rights committee of the British Columbia federation and the Vancouver Women's Research Centre (1980). In Errington, D.C., & Davidson, A., Sexual Harassment in The Workplace. Vancouver, British Columbia.
- York, K.M. (1989). Defining sexual harassment in workplaces: A policy-capturing approach. Academy of Management Journal, 32(4), 830-850.

Appendix A

Videotape Scenario Scripts

HARASSER: MALE/ HARASSEE: FEMALE
NO DATING HISTORY

Wendy is sitting at her desk, Kevin arrives.

Kevin: Good morning Wendy. Last night was pretty boring eh?

Wendy: Well that's staff parties for you.

Kevin: Yeah, well at least we had each others company to keep us from falling asleep. By the way, I hope you were able to get some sleep after I dropped you off, things lasted quite late.

Wendy: I slept alright thanks. Look we had better get to work. The boss wants to see the Macintosh report finished by the end of the day.

Kevin: Looks like it's going to be another stressful day eh? (Leaning over Wendy) Listen... what are you doing this evening? Maybe we could go out for dinner after work to celebrate finally finishing this report. We could go out, get to know each other better... have a few drinks, dinner, then back to my place for dessert.

Wendy: Actually, Kevin, I made other plans.

Kevin: Can't they be changed? (starts rubbing her shoulders). I mean who knows better than your own colleague, the stresses your work put on you and how to get you to relax. I bet I could really relax you.

Wendy: Look, this doesn't look too professional (removes Kevin's hands and stands up).

Kevin: I don't think anyone would mind. After all you know the boss really likes her staff to be close (moves up against Wendy), she thinks it is good for morale...speaking of morale, I bet you would be good at keeping mine up (laughs)

Wendy: Kevin, I just don't think dating someone from work is a good idea.

Kevin: You know ...things could be a lot less ridgid around here if we got to know each other better. I am sure if you think about it some more you will change your mind (pats her behind). I'll make reservations for 6:00.

HARASSER: FEMALE/ HARASSEE: MALE
NO DATING HISTORY

Kevin is sitting at his desk, Wendy arrives.

Wendy: Good morning Kevin. Last night was pretty boring eh?

Kevin: Well that's staff parties for you.

Wendy: Yeah, well at least we had each others company to keep us from falling asleep. By the way, I hope you were able to get some sleep after I dropped you off, things lasted quite late.

Kevin: I slept alright thanks. Look we had better get to work. The boss wants to see the Macintosh report finished by the end of the day.

Wendy: Looks like it's going to be another stressful day eh? (Leaning over Kevin) Listen... what are you doing this evening? Maybe we could go out for dinner after work to celebrate finally finishing this report. We could go out, get to know each other better... have a few drinks, dinner, then back to my place for dessert.

Kevin: Actually, Wendy, I made other plans.

Wendy: Can't they be changed? (starts rubbing his shoulders). I mean who knows better than your own colleague, the stresses your work put on you and how to get you to relax. I bet I could really relax you.

Kevin: Look, this doesn't look too professional (removes Wendy's hands and stands up).

Wendy: I don't think anyone would mind. After all you know the boss really likes her staff to be close (moves up against Kevin), she thinks it is good for morale...speaking of morale, I bet I would be good at keeping yours mine (laughs)

Kevin: Wendy, I just don't think dating someone from work is a good idea.

Wendy: You know ...things would be a lot less ridgid around here if we got to know each other better. I am sure if you think about it some more you will change your mind (pats his behind). I'll make reservations for 6:00.

HARASSER: MALE/ HARASSEE: FEMALE
CAUSAL DATING HISTORY

Wendy is sitting at her desk, Kevin arrives.

Kevin: Good morning Wendy. Last night was pretty boring eh?

Wendy: Well that's staff parties for you.

Kevin: Yeah, well at least we had each others company to keep us from falling asleep. By the way, I hope you were able to get some sleep after I dropped you off, things lasted quite late.

Wendy: I slept alright thanks. Look we had better get to work. The boss wants to see the Macintosh report finished by the end of the day.

Kevin: Looks like it's going to be another stressful day eh? (Leaning over Wendy) Listen... what are you doing this evening? Maybe we could go out for dinner after work to celebrate finally finishing this report. We could go to that new restaurant we went to last month... have a few drinks, dinner, then back to my place for dessert.

Wendy: Actually, Kevin, I made other plans.

Kevin: Can't they be changed? (starts rubbing her shoulders). I mean who knows better than your own colleague, and occassional escort, the stresses your work put on you and how to get you to relax. I bet I could really relax you.

Wendy: Look, this doesn't look too professional (removes Kevin's hands and stands up).

Kevin: I don't think anyone would mind. After all you know the boss really likes her staff to be close (moves up against Wendy), she thinks it is good for morale...speaking of morale, I bet you would be good at keeping mine up (laughs)

Wendy: Kevin, I just don't think dating someone from work is a good idea.

Kevin: Well you don't seem to have a problem with it when your in need of an escort for one of your social functions.

Wendy: Well I have changed my mind.

Kevin: Well, I am sure if you think about it some more you will see things really haven't changed that much and you will change your mind (pats her behind). I'll make reservations for 6:00

HARASSER: FEMALE/ HARASSEE: MALE
CAUSAL DATING HISTORY

Kevin is sitting at his desk, Wendy arrives.

Wendy: Good morning Kevin. Last night was pretty boring eh?

Kevin: Well that's staff parties for you.

Wendy: Yeah, well at least we had each others company to keep us from falling asleep. By the way, I hope you were able to get some sleep after I dropped you off, things lasted quite late.

Kevin: I slept alright thanks. Look we had better get to work. The boss wants to see the Macintosh report finished by the end of the day.

Wendy: Looks like it's going to be another stressful day eh?
(Leaning over Kevin) Listen... what are you doing this evening? Maybe we could go out for dinner after work to celebrate finally finishing this report. We could go to that new restaurant we went to last month... have a few drinks, dinner, then back to my place for dessert.

Kevin: Actually, Wendy, I made other plans.

Wendy: Can't they be changed? (starts rubbing his shoulders). I mean who knows better than your own colleague, and occassional escort, the stresses your work put on you and how to get you to relax. I bet I could really relax you.

Kevin: Look, this doesn't look too professional (removes Wendy's hands and stands up).

Wendy: I don't think anyone would mind. After all you know the boss really likes her staff to be close (moves up against Kevin), she thinks it is good for morale...speaking of morale, I bet I would be good at keeping yours up (laughs)

Kevin: Wendy, I just don't think dating someone from work is a good idea.

Wendy: Well you don't seem to have a problem with it when your in need of an escort for one of your social functions.

Kevin: Well I have changed my mind.

Wendy: Well, I am sure if you think about it some more you will see things really haven't changed that much and you will change your mind (pats his behind). I'll make reservations for 6:00

HARASSER: MALE/ HARASSEE: FEMALE
SERIOUS DATING HISTORY

Wendy is sitting at her desk, Kevin arrives.

Kevin: Good morning Wendy. Last night was pretty boring eh?

Wendy: Well that's staff parties for you.

Kevin: Yeah, well at least we had each others company to keep us from falling asleep. By the way, I hope you were able to get some sleep after I dropped you off, things lasted quite late.

Wendy: I slept alright thanks. Look we had better get to work. The boss wants to see the Macintosh report finished by the end of the day.

Kevin: Looks like it's going to be another stressful day eh? (Leaning over Wendy) Listen... what are you doing this evening? Maybe we could go out for dinner after work to celebrate finally finishing this report. It would be just like old times... a few drinks, dinner then back to my place for dessert.

Wendy: Actually, Kevin, I made other plans.

Kevin: Can't they be changed? (starts rubbing her shoulders). I mean who knows better than your own colleague, your own ex-boyfriend, the stresses your work put on you and how to get you to relax. I bet I could really relax you.

Wendy: Look, this doesn't look too professional (removes Kevin's hands and stands up).

Kevin: I don't think anyone would mind. After all you know the boss really likes her staff to be close (moves up against Wendy), she thinks it is good for morale...speaking of morale, I bet I am still good at keeping yours up (laughs)

Wendy: Kevin, I just don't think dating someone from work is a good idea.

Kevin: Well you didn't seem to have a problem with it when we were living together.

Wendy: We are not longer a couple...things have changed.

Kevin: Well, I am sure if you think about it some more you will see things really haven't changed that much and you will change your mind (pats his behind) I'll make reservations for 6:00.

HARASSER: FEMALE/ HARASSEE: MALE
SERIOUS DATING HISTORY

Kevin is sitting at his desk, Wendy arrives.

Wendy: Good morning Kevin. Last night was pretty boring eh?

Kevin: Well that's staff parties for you.

Wendy: Yeah, well at least we had each others company to keep us from falling asleep. By the way, I hope you were able to get some sleep after I dropped you off, things lasted quite late.

Kevin: I slept alright thanks. Look we had better get to work. The boss wants to see the Macintosh report finished by the end of the day.

Wendy: Looks like it's going to be another stressful day eh? (Leaning over Kevin) Listen... what are you doing this evening? Maybe we could go out for dinner after work to celebrate finally finishing this report. It would be just like old times... a few drinks, dinner, then back to my place for dessert.

Kevin: Actually, Wendy, I made other plans.

Wendy: Can't they be changed? (starts rubbing his shoulders). I mean who knows better than your own colleague, your own ex-girlfriend, the stresses your work put on you and how to get you to relax. I bet I could really relax you.

Kevin: Look, this doesn't look too professional (removes Wendy's hands and stands up).

Wendy: I don't think anyone would mind. After all you know the boss really likes her staff to be close (moves up against Kevin), she thinks it is good for morale...speaking of morale, I bet I am still good at keeping yours up (laughs)

Kevin: Wendy, I just don't think dating someone from work is a good idea.

Wendy: Well you didn't seem to have a problem with it when we were living together.

Kevin: We are not longer a couple...things have changed.

Wendy: Well, I am sure if you think about it some more you will see things really haven't changed that much and you will change your mind (pats his behind) I'll make reservations for 6:00.

2 of/de 2

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISION™ RESOLUTION TARGETS

Appendix B

Attitudes Toward Women Scale

Please indicate your opinion about each statement by circling one response only; where A = agree strongly; B = agree mildly; C = disagree mildly; & D = disagree strongly.

- | | Agree
Strongly | | Disagree
Strongly |
|--|-------------------|---|----------------------|
| 1. Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than a man. | A | B | C D |
| 2. Women should take increasing responsibility for leadership in solving the intellectual and social problems of the day. | A | B | C D |
| 3. Both husband and wife should be allowed the same grounds for divorce | A | B | C D |
| 4. Telling dirty jokes should be mostly a masculine prerogative. | A | B | C D |
| 5. Intoxication among women is worse than intoxication among men. | A | B | C D |
| 6. Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing laundry. | A | B | C D |
| 7. It is insulting to women to have the "obey" clause remain in the marriage service. | A | B | C D |
| 8. There should be a strict merit system in job appointment and promotion without regard to sex. | A | B | C D |

	Agree Strongly		Disagree Strongly	
9. A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage.	A	B	C	D
10. Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.	A	B	C	D
11. Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expense when they go out together.	A	B	C	D
12. Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.	A	B	C	D
13. A woman should not expect to go exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man.	A	B	C	D
14. Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters.	A	B	C	D
15. It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks.	A	B	C	D
16. In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up of children.	A	B	C	D
17. Women should be encouraged not to become sexually intimate with anyone before marriage, even with their fiances.	A	B	C	D

	Agree Strongly		Disagree Strongly	
18. The husband should not be favoured by law over the wife in the disposal of family property or income.	A	B	C	D
19. Women should be concerned with duties of childbearing and house tending, rather than with desires for professional and business careers.	A	B	C	D
20. The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hand of men.	A	B	C	D
21. Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set up by men.	A	B	C	D
22. On average, women should be regarded as less capable of contributing to economic production than are men.	A	B	C	D
23. There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.	A	B	C	D
24. Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.	A	B	C	D
25. The modern girl is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given to the modern boy.	A	B	C	D

Perceptions of the Recipient Questionnaire

In the above situation Kevin:	Not at all			Very true	
	1	2	3	4	5
was sexually attracted to Wendy	1	2	3	4	5
felt like a sexual object	1	2	3	4	5
didn't like Wendy	1	2	3	4	5
felt put down	1	2	3	4	5
thought Wendy was funny	1	2	3	4	5
felt embarrassed	1	2	3	4	5
liked Wendy	1	2	3	4	5
was sexually aroused	1	2	3	4	5
thought Wendy wanted to go out with him	1	2	3	4	5
thought Wendy was teasing him because she liked him	1	2	3	4	5
thought Wendy was trying to undermine his authority in the office	1	2	3	4	5
felt he was being asked to trade sex for job security	1	2	3	4	5

	Not at all true			Very true	
8. In a job or professional situation women have an advantage over equally competent men, because women can use flirting and sex as well as competence to get ahead, while men have only competence.	1	2	3	4	5
9. If they could get away with it, a lot of women college students who were doing badly in a course would have sex with the professor in order to get a better grade.	1	2	3	4	5
10. If they thought it would work for them, a lot of women would lie about using birth control in order to get pregnant and pressure their boyfriend into marrying them.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Ideally, a woman should be a virgin when she marries.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Ideally, a woman should be less sexually experienced than the man she marries.	1	2	3	4	5
13. It is more important for women be sexually faithful in a relationship than it is for men.	1	2	3	4	5
14. When it comes to a choice between career advancement and the needs of the children, wives should be more willing than husbands to make career sacrifices.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Women who cheat on their husbands or boyfriends are likely to claim that they were raped if they think it will get them off the hook.	1	2	3	4	5

- | | Not at all
true | | | Very
true | |
|---|--------------------|---|---|--------------|---|
| 16. Because women are physically weaker than men, its important that they have a man around who can protect them. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. Most women enjoy traditional displays of politeness like having doors opened for them, and pulling out their chairs when they sit down. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. Basically, its no big deal if a man has casual sex with someone other than his wife, as long as he does his best to protect his wife's feelings by not letting her find out. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. A lot of so called "date rape" involves women who consented to sex but later cried rape to protect their reputation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. Casual sex before marriage is more acceptable for men than for women. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. I can see how a woman might have sex before marriage with a guy she really cares about, but a woman who has sex with guys she doesn't know well because she finds them physically attractive is a slut. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. Sometimes women play the role of a sweet, naive, innocent girl just to hook men into giving them what they want. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. Women often play hard to get sexually in order to protect their reputation, even when they secretly feel sexually aroused. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

	Not at all true			Very true	
24. Frequently women want sex but won't admit it because they don't want the guy to think that they are cheap or easy.	1	2	3	4	5
25. A lot of women are willing to hide their true beliefs and play whatever role they think will work in order to catch an attractive guy with money and a good job.	1	2	3	4	5
26. It is a man's duty to protect and defend the honour of the woman he cares about.	1	2	3	4	5
27. The worst thing a woman can do to a man is cheat on him sexually.	1	2	3	4	5
28. A lot of women flirt with other men in order to let their boyfriend know that he had better give them whatever they want or they will leave him.	1	2	3	4	5
29. The worst thing a man can do is not defend the reputation of the woman he loves.	1	2	3	4	5
30. Although men and women may be equal in many ways, women feel safe and secure knowing they have a man around who can look after them and protect them.	1	2	3	4	5
31. Probably a lot of so called rape involves women who are trying to get back at a guy who they voluntarily had sex with but who didn't want to see them again.	1	2	3	4	5
32. A good woman is like a rare gem. A man who is lucky enough to find one should treasure and protect her.	1	2	3	4	5

Degree and Certainty Ratings

Please indicate how certain you are that Kevin sexually harassed Wendy:

- (a) Kevin definitely did not sexually harass Wendy
- (b) Kevin probably did not sexually harass Wendy
- (c) Unsure
- (d) Kevin probably did sexually harass Wendy
- (e) Kevin definitely sexually harassed Wendy

Please circle the one alternative that best describes the video you saw:

In the video Kevin sexually harassed Wendy -

- (a) Not at all
- (b) To a very slight degree
- (c) To a slight degree
- (d) To a moderate degree
- (e) To a great degree
- (f) To a very great degree

Please indicate how certain you are that Wendy sexually harassed Kevin:

- (a) Wendy definitely did not sexually harass Kevin
- (b) Wendy probably did not sexually harass Kevin
- (c) Unsure
- (d) Wendy probably did sexually harass Kevin
- (e) Wendy definitely sexually harassed Kevin

Please circle the one alternative that best describes the video you saw:

In the video Wendy sexually harassed Kevin -

- (a) Not at all
- (b) To a very slight degree
- (c) To a slight degree
- (d) To a moderate degree
- (e) To a great degree
- (f) To a very great degree

Perceptions of the Initiator Questionnaire

For each item below please circle a number between 1 and 5 that best describes how you feel. The number 1 means that you think the item is "Not at all true" while 5 means you think the item is "Very true". Numbers between 1 and 5 reflect differences in beliefs between the two extremes.

In the above situation Kevin:	Not at all			Very true	
was sexually attracted to Wendy	1	2	3	4	5
saw Wendy as a potential sexual conquest	1	2	3	4	5
didn't like Wendy	1	2	3	4	5
wanted to put Wendy down	1	2	3	4	5
was only joking with Wendy	1	2	3	4	5
wanted to embarrass Wendy	1	2	3	4	5
was just trying to be funny	1	2	3	4	5
was trying to arouse Wendy sexually	1	2	3	4	5
was trying to get Wendy to like him	1	2	3	4	5
was trying to undermine Wendy's authority in the office	1	2	3	4	5
was asking Wendy to trade sex for job security	1	2	3	4	5
was threatened by Wendy's competence in the office	1	2	3	4	5

For each item below please circle a number between 1 and 5 that best describes how you feel. The number 1 means that you think the item is "Not at all true" while 5 means you think the item is "Very true". Numbers between 1 and 5 reflect differences in beliefs between the two extremes.

In the above situation Wendy:	Not at all			Very true	
	1	2	3	4	5
was sexually attracted to Kevin	1	2	3	4	5
saw Kevin as a potential sexual conquest	1	2	3	4	5
didn't like Kevin	1	2	3	4	5
wanted to put Kevin down	1	2	3	4	5
was only joking with Kevin	1	2	3	4	5
wanted to embarrass Kevin	1	2	3	4	5
was just trying to be funny	1	2	3	4	5
was trying to arouse Kevin sexually	1	2	3	4	5
was trying to get Kevin to like her	1	2	3	4	5
was trying to undermine Kevin's authority in the office	1	2	3	4	5
was asking Kevin to trade sex for job security	1	2	3	4	5
was threatened by Kevin's competence in the office	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix F

Perceptions of the Recipient Questionnaire

In the above situation Kevin:	Not at all			Very true	
was sexually attracted to Wendy	1	2	3	4	5
felt like a sexual object	1	2	3	4	5
didn't like Wendy	1	2	3	4	5
felt put down	1	2	3	4	5
thought Wendy was funny	1	2	3	4	5
felt embarrassed	1	2	3	4	5
liked Wendy	1	2	3	4	5
was sexually aroused	1	2	3	4	5
thought Wendy wanted to go out with him	1	2	3	4	5
thought Wendy was teasing him because she liked him	1	2	3	4	5
thought Wendy was trying to undermine his authority in the office	1	2	3	4	5
felt he was being asked to trade sex for job security	1	2	3	4	5

In the above situation Wendy:	Not at all			Very true	
	1	2	3	4	5
was sexually attracted to Kevin	1	2	3	4	5
felt like a sexual object	1	2	3	4	5
didn't like Kevin	1	2	3	4	5
felt put down	1	2	3	4	5
thought Kevin was funny	1	2	3	4	5
felt embarrassed	1	2	3	4	5
liked Kevin	1	2	3	4	5
was sexually aroused	1	2	3	4	5
thought Kevin wanted to go out with her	1	2	3	4	5
thought Kevin was teasing her because he liked her	1	2	3	4	5
thought Kevin was trying to undermine her authority in the office	1	2	3	4	5
feltShe was being asked to trade sex for job security	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix G

Personal Experience ScalePersonal Experiences

Sex: Male or Female (Please Circle)

Age:

We would like to know the number of time YOU personally have encountered these situations. Please circle the appropriate number that corresponds to your personal experience in your workplace.

Unwanted sexual advance in the form of pinching, touching, rubbing/brushing:

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once	A few times	Occasionally	Frequently

Sexually-oriented jokes, comments or gestures:

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once	A few times	Occasionally	Frequently

An unwanted sexual proposition and promised preferential treatment or reward:

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once	A few times	Occasionally	Frequently

An unwanted sexual proposition:

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once	A few times	Occasionally	Frequently

An unwanted sexual proposition and threats of reprisal for refusing:

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once	A few times	Occasionally	Frequently

An unwanted sexual proposition from a person of the same sex:

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once	A few times	Occasionally	Frequently

An unwanted sexual proposition from a person of the opposite sex:

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once	A few times	Occasionally	Frequently

We would like to know if you know of anyone who has been subjected to any of these situations and how often these situations have occurred. Please circle the appropriate number that corresponds to their experience in the workplace.

Unwanted sexual advance in the form of pinching, touching, rubbing/brushing:

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once	A few times	Occasionally	Frequently

Sexually-oriented jokes, comments or gestures:

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once	A few times	Occasionally	Frequently

An unwanted sexual proposition and promised preferential treatment or reward:

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once	A few times	Occasionally	Frequently

An unwanted sexual proposition:

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once	A few times	Occasionally	Frequently

An unwanted sexual proposition and threats of reprisal for refusing:

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once	A few times	Occasionally	Frequently

An unwanted sexual proposition from a person of the same sex:

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once	A few times	Occasionally	Frequently

An unwanted sexual proposition from a person of the opposite sex:

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once	A few times	Occasionally	Frequently

Debriefing

DEBRIEFING

Sexual Harassment is defined as unwanted attention of a sexually oriented nature, made by an individual(s) who knows or ought reasonably know that such attention is unwanted; and/or an implied or expressed promise of reward for complying with or submitting to a sexually oriented request or advance; and/or an implied or expressed threat of reprisal for not complying with or submitting to a sexually oriented request or advance. Sexual harassment may also include behaviours such as: unwarranted touching, suggestive remarks or other verbal abuse in a sexual context, leering, compromising invitations, demands for sexual favours, and sexual assault.

Sexual harassment in the workplace is a common occurrence and one which is gaining increased attention and concern. Nevertheless, very little is known about the factors that lead people to define an interpersonal situation as one involving harassment, or about individual differences in the extent to which people view the same interaction as involving harassment.

The present research is designed to examine sexual harassment, male and female perceptions of sexual harassment, how people construe the actions of men and women in sexual harassment situation, and the role of contextual characteristics leading a situation to be defined as sexual harassment. The two specific contextual characteristics being investigated in the present study are: gender of the initiator (male or female), and a history of an interpersonal relationship between the individuals involved (serious dating history, casual dating history, no dating history). The questionnaire subjects are asked to complete serve to measure subjects' attitudes towards women and sexual relationships, and whether and to what degree subjects perceived the scenario as consisting of sexual harassment. Videotaped scenarios are used (as opposed to written vignettes) in order to best simulate real life sexual harassment incidents and to heighten subjects' sensitivity to sexual harassment. It is hoped that the findings of this research will contribute to the knowledge and understanding of sexual harassment.

Sexual harassment involves the violation of fundamental rights, individual integrity and dignity. Carleton University does not tolerate sexual harassment, and in situations where it has occurred, encourages complaints. If you have any questions, concerns or complaints regarding sexual harassment and/or Carleton University's complaints regarding sexual harassment and/or Carleton University's Sexual Harassment Policy please contact:

Nancy Adamson, Status of Women Co-ordinator #788-2600 ext.5622

If you have any questions or comment about this research, then please feel free to contact:

Krista Kiiffner, Researcher

#788-2600 ext.2683

Dr. Nick Spanos, Faculty Sponsor

#788-2600 ext.2683

If you have any ethical concerns about this research then please feel free to contact:

Dr. Lise Paquet, Department of Psychology Ethics Committee

#788-2600 ext.2644

Dr. W. Jones, Chair, Department of Psychology #788-2600 ext.2644

END

2 9-05-95

FIN