



eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago
Loyola eCommons

Master's Theses

Theses and Dissertations

1989

Perceptions of Sexual Harassment in the Workplace

Susan Sheffey
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sheffey, Susan, "Perceptions of Sexual Harassment in the Workplace" (1989). *Master's Theses*. 3638.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/3638

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 1989 Susan Sheffey

Perceptions of Sexual Harassment in the Workplace

by

Susan Sheffey

**A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of**

Master of Arts

December

1989

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to express her thanks and appreciation to Dr. R. Scott Tindale for his guidance and support throughout the course of this research project. Dr. Tindale was extremely helpful during all aspects of the project. Thanks are also extended to Dr. Linda Heath for her many helpful comments, suggestions and support, especially during the early stages of the project. Finally, the author would like to acknowledge Dr. Bernard Dugoni for his statistical expertise.

In addition, the author would like to extend special gratitude and thanks to her family and friends for their unconditional support and encouragement throughout all of the author's academic pursuits.

VITA

The author, Susan Carol Sheffey, is the daughter of Ralph Elliott Sheffey and Joyce (Kirschenbaum) Sheffey. She was born July 13, 1963, in Chicago, Illinois.

Her elementary education was obtained in Evanston, Illinois. Her secondary education was completed in 1981 at Evanston Township High School, Evanston, Illinois.

In August, 1981, Ms. Sheffey entered the University of Illinois in Champaign-Urbana, Illinois, receiving the degree of Bachelor of Science in Psychology in May, 1985. While attending the University of Illinois, Ms. Sheffey was on the Dean's list, a member of the Undergraduate Psychological Association and a member of Psi Chi.

In August, 1986, Ms. Sheffey was granted an assistantship in the Applied Social Psychology program at Loyola University of Chicago, enabling her to complete the Master of Arts Degree in January, 1990.

TABLES OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... | ii |
| VITA..... | iii |
| LIST OF TABLES..... | v |
| CONTENTS OF APPENDICES..... | vi |
| INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE..... | 3 |
| Overview of Sexual Harassment..... | 3 |
| Definitions of Sexual Harassment..... | 6 |
| Theoretical Perspectives Of Sexual Harassment..... | 8 |
| Sex Role Spillover Model..... | 15 |
| METHOD..... | 24 |
| Subjects..... | 24 |
| Design | 24 |
| Materials..... | 25 |
| Procedure..... | 26 |
| RESULTS..... | 28 |
| Manipulation Check..... | 29 |
| Degree of Sexual Harassment..... | 31 |
| Frequency of the Behavior..... | 36 |
| Appropriateness the Behavior..... | 37 |
| Emotion and Attractiveness Scales..... | 37 |
| DISCUSSION..... | 45 |
| REFERENCES..... | 56 |
| APPENDIX A..... | 59 |
| APPENDIX B..... | 71 |
| APPENDIX C..... | 77 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| 1. Frequency and Percentages for the Bem Sex Role Inventory | 30 |
| 2. Means for the Sextype by Sex by Status Interaction for Sexual Harassment | 33 |
| 3. Means for the Sextype by Status by Jobtype Interaction for Sexual Harassment | 35 |
| 4. Eigenvalues and Percentage of Variance for Factor Loadings | 39 |
| 5. Correlations Between the Emotion and Attractiveness Scales and Sexual Harassment, Appropriateness, and Frequency | 41 |

CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

| | Page |
|--|------|
| APPENDIX A Pilot Study Measures..... | 59 |
| I. Job Title Questionnaire..... | 60 |
| II. Degree of Sexual Harassment for Behaviors/Comments Questionnaire..... | 63 |
| III. Appropriateness of Behaviors/Comments Questionnaire..... | 67 |
| APPENDIX B Sexual Harassment Questionnaire for Main Study..... | 71 |
| I. Prototype of Sexual Harassment Questionnaire.... | 72 |
| II. Scenarios for Sexual Harassment Questionnaire... | 74 |
| APPENDIX C Bem Sex Role Inventory..... | 77 |

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, sexual harassment has become a common recurring problem for working women. It is a form of occupational discrimination against women, and occasionally men, which has only recently received public attention (Powell, 1983). Sexual harassment was first recognized as a social issue in the mid 1970's. Feminists, building on the concept of sex discrimination, gained legal recognition of sexual harassment as a problem contributing to inequity in employment and educational opportunity (Brewer and Berk, 1982). In 1980, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) issued interpretive guidelines on sexual harassment. The purpose was to reaffirm EEOC's long held position that sexual harassment is an unlawful employment practice under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Since then, social scientists have been researching sexual harassment both in organizational and academic settings. Most of the research to date has been of an exploratory nature, consisting of various survey techniques, case studies, and self reports. The research utilizing surveys basically documents the existence of sexual harassment. Studies have been criticized for being overly descriptive and of limited generalizability, for their lack

of specificity in identifying factors that account for the variability in women's experience of harassment, and for the lack of theoretical substance (Brewer and Beck, 1982). Recently, however, studies are moving away from the problem documentation stage and are beginning to focus on the causes and correlates of sexual harassment (Terpstra and Baker, 1986).

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Overview of Sexual Harassment

In general, sexual harassment in the workplace is viewed as a serious problem. Surveys have found that 70% to 90% of female respondents have experienced some form of unwanted sexual attention, ranging from leers and remarks to overt requests for sexual favors with the implied threat of retaliation (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981). A survey by Powell (1983) revealed that most types of sexual attention have been experienced more by younger than older women, single rather than married or divorced women, and women working in hospitals and other such service organizations rather than by women in other types of organizations. Race, education, occupational position, salary, and years employed were not related to the sexual attention experienced.

In surveys assessing the incidence of sexual harassment among managers, it was found that, in general, female managers are more likely than male managers to classify certain behaviors as sexual harassment. Most male managers either denied the existence of sexual harassment, denied sexual harassment was a problem, or were aware of only a few isolated incidents. Furthermore, male managers believe that

the issue of sexual harassment has been exaggerated. (Backhouse & Cohen, 1981). Female managers acknowledged that sexual harassment was a definite occupational hazard for women in the workplace. In addition, many of the female managers had first hand experience with sexual harassment during their careers. However, success in dealing with it was limited since in many cases senior management was not prepared to deal with sexual harassment and take appropriate action unless it involved transferring or firing a female victim (Backhouse & Cohen, 1981).

Survey results have shown the effects of sexual harassment to be costly both to the victim and to the organization (Terpstra and Baker, 1986). The costs for women associated with noncompliance in response to sexual harassment include verbal denigration of a woman's sexuality, noncooperation from male coworkers, negative job evaluations or poor personnel recommendations, demotion, and termination of employment (Hemming, 1985). Changing or transferring jobs can lead to a reduction in the likelihood of promotion and/or further training based on job experience. In addition, sick pay and pension rights connected to years of service may also be forfeited (Gosselin, 1984). Other forms of "nonsexual harassment" include ostracism, discharge for incompatibility, and unfavorable references given to prospective new employers (Matlin, 1987). Finally, women may also suffer psychologically by experiencing stress and anxiety due to

sexual harassment (Farley, 1978). The U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1981) reported that 33% of the women surveyed who had experienced some form of sexual harassment said their emotional and physical conditions became worse as a result. Jensen and Gutek's (1982) analyses revealed significant relationships between the victims' self report of negative affect due to sexual harassment and items measuring loss of job motivation, feelings of being distracted, and dread of work.

Costs to businesses have led organizations to be concerned with the problem of sexual harassment (Livingston, 1982). For example, the federal government estimated a loss of 189 million dollars in a two year period due to the sexual harassment of its employees (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981). The results of a recent study of sexual harassment at Fortune 500 companies found that the total annual cost of harassment at each firm is approximately \$6,719,593 (Fritz, 1989). Included in this sum are the costs associated with job turnover, medical insurance claims, absenteeism, and reduced productivity. In another example, a \$100,000 judgement was ordered in favor of a Fresno, California woman who claimed that her manager plagued her with obscenity and threats if she would not have sex with him. The State Fair Employment Commission ordered the company to pay \$40,000 in compensatory damages and \$60,000 in punitive damages (Kronenberger & Bourke, 1981).

Definitions of Sexual Harassment

Before one can attempt to eliminate sexual harassment and the costs associated with it, the concept must be defined. Definitions of sexual harassment are important because they can educate the community and promote discussion and conscientious evaluation of behavior and experience (Garvey, 1986). There are several definitions of sexual harassment throughout the literature. Farley (1978) defines it as:

Unsolicited, nonreciprocal male behavior that asserts a woman's sex role over her function as a worker. It can be any or all of the following: staring at, commenting upon, or touching a woman's body; repeating nonreciprocated propositions for dates; demands for sexual intercourse; and rape (p. 68).

The Alliance Against Sexual Coercion defines sexual harassment as "any sexually oriented practice that endangers a woman's job, that undermines her job performance, and that threatens her economic livelihood" (Backhouse and Cohen, 1981). Other definitions include physical assault and intimidation (Sommers, 1982).

The EEOC defines sexual harassment as:

Unwelcome sexual advances, request for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature that takes place under any of the following circumstances:

1. when submission to the sexual advance is a condition of keeping or getting a job, whether expressed in implicit or explicit terms.
2. when a supervisor or boss makes personnel decisions based on an employee's submission to or rejection of sexual advances.
3. when conduct unreasonably interferes with a person's work performance or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work environment.

Feminist perspective recognizes that harassment under the dual specter of personal and institutional power is a problem. It is believed that a broader definition is needed so that less oppressive and exploitative forms of sexual misconduct, such as noncoercive behavior, will be recognized as sexual harassment.

In general, there appears to be a lack of a standard definition of sexual harassment in the literature. The diversity of definitions have allowed the court system considerable discretion in ruling upon the legality of social sexual behaviors under Title VII. Two types of theories have emerged from the court rulings. The tangible benefits theory states that sexual harassment claims are actionable under Title VII only if a direct relationship between the behaviors and employee related consequences can be demonstrated (Terpstra and Cook, 1985). On the other hand, under atmosphere of discrimination theory, courts have allowed sexual harassment claims to proceed under Title VII where there were no direct employment -related consequences. As a result of the several definitions, there appears to be confusion as to what particular behaviors constitute sexual harassment. Behavior that is perceived as sexual harassment by one individual may be viewed differently by others (Terpstra and Baker, 1986). Terpstra and Baker (1986) argue that perceptions are more directly related to responses and outcomes of sexual harassment than actual sexually harassing

behaviors. That is, behavior that is perceived as sexual harassment by one individual might be casually shrugged off or even viewed positively by others (Terpstra and Baker, 1986). For example, Terpstra and Cook (1985) hypothesize that educated women perceive more situations to be sexual harassment. They argue that more years of education may lead one to be less tolerant of poor treatment and more aware of and sensitized to women's issues in general and sexual harassment in particular. Gutek, Morasch, and Cohen (1983) found that men were more likely than women to label certain behaviors as sexual. Finally, Abbey (1982) found in a study of university students that men tend to misperceive women's attitudes and friendliness in common social settings. In her study, Abbey showed that what a women intends as friendliness may be interpreted by a man as a sexual overture.

Theoretical Perspectives of Sexual Harassment

In order to understand better the behaviors that are perceived to be forms of sexual harassment, several researchers have developed causal models (Tangri, Burt, and Johnson, 1982; Gutek, 1985; Terpstra and Baker, 1986). The models help to predict the likely victims, harassers, and settings involved in sexual harassment cases.

There are three models that have emerged from the literature on legal briefs, feminist writings, and popular accounts of sexual harassment (Tangri, Burt, and Johnson, 1982). The models are organizational, socio-cultural and

natural-biological. Tangri, Burt, and Johnson examined data collected from the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1981) to evaluate the validity of the three models.

The first model, the organizational model, assumes that sexual harassment is the result of certain opportunity structures within the organization. People in higher positions use their authority and status (legitimate power) to coerce lower status people into accepting the role of a sex object or engaging in sexual interaction (Gutek, 1985). Tangri, Burt, & Johnson found some support for the organizational model as an explanation for the existence of sexual harassment and concluded that the model was useful but only when used in conjunction with other models.

Terpstra and Baker (1986) view the organizational model as a learning/conditioning model. Learning theory states that a behavior that is followed by positive reinforcement (reward) will tend to be strengthened and occur more often in the future. One aspect of learning theory, social modeling, states that new patterns of behavior can be learned through observation and imitation of others. Vicarious reinforcement occurs when, during this observation, one sees others receive rewards for certain behaviors. This may lead the observer to behave in similar ways. Terpstra and Baker argue that men and women have been exposed to different socialization pressures and have been conditioned to behave in a fashion that is consistent with the existing definition of gender in

their society. They view the major influence upon attitudes and behavior to be social sex roles. Sexual harassment is the exhibition of this conditioned behavior.

A second aspect of the organizational approach to sexual harassment focuses on the formal status and power differentials at work. Eagly (1983) states that the higher formal status that men typically possess in organizations is the main cause of sex differences in observed influence and behavior. Employees and employers agree with the notion that individuals of higher status are perceived as having the right to make demands of those of lower status and the individuals of lower status are expected to comply with these demands. These formal status inequalities are legitimized by social norms associated with hierarchical roles. In summary, sexual harassment can be viewed as a display of formal power or influence in accordance with the social norms attached to hierarchical roles.

The second model, the socio-cultural model, received the least amount of attention in the literature. This model basically suggests that "sexual harassment reflects the larger society's differential distribution of power and status between the sexes" (Tangri, Burt, and Johnson, 1982). The model asserts that harassment is a mechanism for maintaining male dominance over women in work and in society in general. Society rewards males for assertive and aggressive behavior and rewards women for passive,

acquiescent, and compliant behavior (Gutek, 1985).

Unlike the organizational model, the socio-cultural model asserts that gender is more of a predictor of who will be the recipient of sexual harassment than organizational status. Women are more often the victims and men are more often the perpetrators. Furthermore, based on sex role socialization, the socio-cultural model predicts that women will react passively and will be correct in not expecting the organization to be supportive of the situation. Finally, it is predicted that the sexual harassment will occur more frequently when the sex-ratio is skewed in either direction. When women are in the minority, they are viewed as intruders. They are not able to obtain support from other women, since there are so few. When women are in the majority, it is usually in low status, low paying jobs with little job security. In both situations, the women are easy targets for some form of sexual harassment.

As with the organizational model, Tangri, Burt and Johnson (1982) were not able to find adequate support for the model in their research. In general, people's attitudes were not congruent with the socio-cultural explanation of sexual harassment.

The third model, the natural-biological model assumes sexual harassment is a manifestation of a natural attraction between two people. There are two versions to this model. The first asserts that behavior is not meant to be sexually

harassing. Instead it is a natural expression of men's stronger sex drive. That is, men may more often initiate sexual overtures, at work as well as in other settings. The second stresses that any individual may be attracted to any other individual and may pursue that attraction without intent to harass. This second view does not include unequal sex drives (Tangri, Burt, and Johnson, 1982).

The natural-biological model is based on a number of assumptions. The first assumption is that the human sex drive is stronger in men than in women. Men are led by biological factors to be sexually aggressive toward women but without discriminatory intent. In addition, it is natural for this behavior to occur in work settings as well as any other type of setting. Finally, since this aggression is a natural behavior, it is not grounds for court action. If this assumption holds true, it would be expected that the majority of harassers would be in the age groups with the highest biological sex drives and there would be no difference between the harassing behavior of people in different organizational positions or status. Based on this assumption, it is predicted that majority of victims will be women, but some victims may be males. The victim will be similar to the harasser in age, race and occupational status.

A second assumption is that men and women are naturally attracted to each other, both sexes participate in sexually oriented behavior in the work place, and that they

like it that way (Tangri, Burt and Johnson, 1982). If sexually harassing behavior is just a normal mutual sexual attraction, it would be expected to follow established patterns for romantic attraction. For example, male-female pairs should be similar in age, race, and other background characteristics, attitudes, and status. In addition, it would be expected that males and females would express an interest in and attraction to each other. Finally, since this behavior is something both the males and females want, there should be no need to file a complaint. It is predicted that the victim would not be married or at least should be available as a continuing partner. The model also predicts that the victim should be the only person to whom the harasser directs his/her attention and that the victim should not be offended by the sexually harassing behavior and may even be flattered by the behavior. In only a few cases should the victim want to file a complaint.

A third assumption of the natural model asserts that sexual harassment is a form of behavior that is an idiosyncratic predisposition of a minority of men (Tangri, Burt, and Johnson, 1982). This assumption does not recognize any systematic pattern of sexual harassment and denies any sexual harassment to be a sex based form of discrimination. If this assumption held true, sexual harassment should be randomly distributed among males of all ages, statuses, and occupational positions. In addition, there should be a low

base rate of harassers since the behavior occurs in only a minority of men.

The model predicts that the harasser would most likely be a man, but may be of either sex. The male harasser should be young and the female harasser should be middle age since at that time both will be experiencing their highest sex drive. The harassers should be found in all organizational settings and climates and should be distributed generally or randomly among the population.

In summary, the assumptions of the natural-biological model both trivialize and exaggerate sexual harassment. The assumptions trivialize sexual harassment by stating that the behavior is normal, idiosyncratic, and harmless. Sexual harassment is exaggerated to the point where it seems hopeless to find a solution since the assumptions imply that it is human nature and there is nothing that can be done. According to Tangri, Burt and Johnson (1982) the most critical issue is that the assumptions fail to recognize the fact that sexual harassment discriminates against women by reducing women's chances to compete successfully in the workplace. Tangri, Burt, and Johnson (1982) find this to be a critical issue because they believe that failure to find any systematic pattern of harassment or any evidence of harmful effects on women would support this model. Tangri, Burt and Johnson found little evidence to support this model.

The three models, organizational, socio-cultural, and

natural-biological, were tested by Tangri et al. (1982) using data collected from a survey conducted by the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1981). Data were collected from a stratified sample of 20,083 federal employees. The results indicate that none of the models by themselves can offer adequate explanations for sexual harassment (Brewer, 1982). According to Tangri et al. (1982), the data reflect a broader range of experiences than the models describe and therefore no clear cut pattern emerges that can be used to explain one of the models alone. However, a model that combines certain aspects of each of the three models may be useful in explaining the occurrence of sexual harassment.

Sex Role Spillover Model

Due to the inadequacy of the three models proposed by Tangri et al. (1982), Gutek and Morasch (1982) proposed a model that takes situational factors into account. Data were collected from a representative sample of Los Angeles County working people (827 women and 405 men). The results indicate that there are three types of organizational settings, or situations, in which males and females interact. The settings are traditional, nontraditional, and integrated.

Certain aspects of the three models were combined into a model termed the "sex-role spillover" model (Gutek and Morasch, 1982). The model is used to explain the carryover into the work place of gender based roles that are usually inappropriate or irrelevant to work. It focuses on the work

place and its environment rather than on either individual differences or broad cultural themes (Gutek, 1985). The model incorporates aspects of role theory in order to explain the manifestation of sexual harassment.

The sex role spillover perspective focuses on work roles, the set of expectations associated with the tasks to be accomplished on the job (Katz and Kahn, 1978). In general, role expectations are expectations held by particularized or generalized others for the appropriate behavior that ought to be exhibited by the persons holding the given role.

A person's role is partly dependent upon the roles of other related actors in the social context. The self is in part composed of a collection of social roles. The social component of the self is a collection of roles one can bring out as circumstances demand. Since the type of role one brings out depends on the situation, it is required that there be other persons involved. For example, in the workplace, a woman is expected to perform certain role related behaviors, such as managing a division of employees at a bank. At home, the same woman would be expected to perform very different role related behaviors, such as taking care of her family.

In the work environment, the work role expectations are shared. For example, a sales clerk has a set of expectations about what is appropriate behavior for a sales

clerk while the other organizational members also have a set of expectations about what constitutes appropriate behavior for a sales clerk. In general, the organization can be viewed as a set of role relationships since each employee occupies an organizational role. Theoretically, the work role behavior should be identical across people who occupy the same role. In practice, however, work role behavior is shaped by the individual workers who incorporate their own personalities and self identities into the work role. This can be problematic if the worker expresses an aspect of the self that is inappropriate to work roles. For example, the expression of sexuality is an aspect of the self that is considered inappropriate to work roles. According to Gutek and Morasch (1982), if people at work behaved within the narrow confines of work roles, then sexual jokes, flirtatious behavior, dating, and sexual coercion (sex role behavior) would not exist in most work places.

These aspects of the sex role (a set of expectations about the behavior of men and women) are, however, present in the workplace and reflect how work roles are affected by spillover from sex roles. According to Nieva and Gutek (1981), women employees in a male setting face the basic challenge of finding a comfortable fit between the disparate demands of their sex roles and their work roles. Performing successfully in the female sex role and work role can be seen as a mutually exclusive, zero sum game (Nieva and Gutek,

1981). If a woman is successful at work, she becomes, almost by definition, less successful at being a woman (Nieva & Gutek, 1981). For example, this woman may be seen as aggressive, assertive, and domineering. These characteristics are stereotypical male and are perceived as negative qualities for a woman to possess.

Sex role spillover occurs, for example, when women are expected to be more nurturing, sympathetic, and loyal than men in the same work roles. It can also occur when a man is expected to behave in a stereotypical manner, such as paying for a business lunch with a female colleague.

Gutek and Morasch (1982) give three possible explanations as to why the carry over of the sex role into the work role may occur. First, they argue that gender identity is a more basic cognitive category than work role. For instance, a person is more likely to be categorized as a man or woman first and as a fire fighter or secretary second. Furthermore, a male secretary is likely to be evaluated quite differently than a female secretary. Gutek (1985) states that we notice people's gender and remember it long after we have forgotten their other characteristics. Therefore, the characteristics we associate with gender, such as sex role expectations, are likely to be salient at work as well as in other settings.

The second reason Gutek and Morasch give for the carry over of the sex role into the work role is that certain women

may feel more comfortable in the traditionally stereotypical female roles at work. This is especially true if they feel men will only accept them in this "female" role.

Finally, the last reason is that men may be much more accustomed to interacting with women outside of the workplace than in the workplace. Men are more accustomed to interacting with women as spouses, lovers, and parents than as fellow workers and therefore may feel more comfortable interacting with women who are playing these roles. As more women enter the labor force and more interaction between men and women occur, the sex role spill over of this type will hopefully decrease.

In terms of the three previously mentioned organizational settings (traditional, nontraditional, and integrated), Gutek and Morasch (1982) believe that when the sex ratio at work is skewed, sex-role spillover is likely to occur. In the traditional work setting, the female dominated jobs consist of women who may be unaware of sexual harassment incidents. Women's work role and sex role are considered to be almost identical. Since women are in the majority, sexual harassment may be happening to many women and viewed as part of the job. This makes sexual harassment acceptable and/or expected. The sexuality aspect of the female sex role spills over to the work role when the occupation and job are female dominated but the work group is male dominated (Gutek, 1985). For example, a clerical worker is a female dominated

occupation and within an organization, a specific job such as secretary may also be female dominated. However, upper level positions within the same organization, or the work group, may be male dominated. In this situation, sex role spillover may occur.

When a women is employed in a nontraditional job, the sex role of the majority, or the male, spills over into the work role. According to Gutek and Morasch (1982) the women's sex roles and work roles are incongruent. The woman is seen as a woman in a man's job and she is perceived as a role deviate and treated differently than a man. This differential treatment is perceived by the woman as discrimination, and when the content is sexual, it is seen as harassment. Gutek and Morasch (1982) predict that women in nontraditional occupations will report a higher frequency of social sexual behavior at work and are more likely to see sexual harassment as a problem than women in traditional jobs.

Finally, women in integrated work settings are less likely to be harassed at work than women in other work settings. Gutek (1985) found that sex integrated work shows less sex role spillover and fewer problems with sex at work. Although only preliminary analyses have been performed, Gutek's data do support the sexual spillover model.

A potential problem with the data supporting the sex role spillover model, in general, is that the data were not

originally collected for the purpose of validating the model. Gutek's (1985) data were obtained from a survey of working men and women in Los Angeles county, interviewed by telephone in their homes. The purpose of the research was to obtain information on the prevalence of sexual harassment. The sexrole spillover model was tested post hoc using this data. Research specifically testing this model is needed to confirm Gutek's results.

Another study conducted by Gutek, Morasch, and Cohen (1983) was designed to assess the way in which people interpret ambiguous, but potentially sexual interactions between the sexes in a work setting. Respondents were asked to evaluate scenarios in which three factors were manipulated. The factors were sex of the initiator of the behavior, the status of the initiator relative to the target, and the type of behavior. The behaviors consisted of a pat on the fanny, a comment on the target's work, and/or a comment on the target's body. Subjects evaluated the scenarios by responding to 19 five-point Likert-type items. Results indicated that men interpreted the scenarios more positively than women, incidents initiated by women were seen more positively but less likely, incidents initiated by a higher status person were seen less positively, and incidents that included touching were seen as negative.

Finally, Nokovich & Popovich (1988) tested the sex role spillover model by examining the extent to which skewed

sex ratios lead to perception of sex-role spillover and, in turn, perceptions of sexual harassment. Subjects read vignettes in which sex ratios were skewed and then responded to four questionnaires concerning male and female sex-role characteristics. Perceptions of sexual harassment were assessed using two versions of the Job Experience Survey. In terms of the three work settings, they used secretary and housekeeper for traditional, crane operator and car mechanic for nontraditional, and reporter and real estate agent for integrated. The results indicated that women in integrated positions were perceived to be sexually harassed more often than women employed in traditional or nontraditional jobs. This contradicts Gutek and Morasch's (1982) findings that women in integrated occupations report sexual harassment to be less of a problem than women in the traditional and nontraditional occupations.

The purpose of the present study was to test the validity of the sex-role spillover model using the traditional, nontraditional, and integrated work settings. Subjects read scenarios similar to the scenarios used in Gutek's study (1983). However, the work settings (traditional, nontraditional, and integrated) were also manipulated. Research on sexual harassment (Collins and Blodgett, 1981) indicates that sexual overtures on the part of the supervisors are perceived as being more serious than similar behaviors on the part of the coworkers, perhaps

because any sexual overture on the part of a supervisor toward a subordinate carries with it an implied or potential job threat. Therefore, for this study, the relationship between the victim and perpetrator remained constant. The harasser was always the supervisor and the victim was always the subordinate. However, the status difference between the supervisor and the subordinate was varied such that there was a low status condition and a high status condition. For the low status condition, the supervisor was, in most cases, a former co-worker who was one level above the subordinate. For the high status condition, the superordinate maintained a very high level position within the institution, such as president or owner.

It was hypothesized that 1) subjects will perceive sexual harassment to occur more frequently to women in the traditional work settings and less frequently to women in the integrated and nontraditional in the integrated work settings, 2) ambiguous behaviors will be perceived to be less acceptable in the nontraditional and integrated work settings than the traditional work setting, 3) ambiguous behaviors will be perceived to be incidents of sexual harassment more often when viewed in the context of the nontraditional and integrated work settings than the traditional work setting, and 4) subjects differing in sextype (as defined by the Bem Sex Role Inventory) will have different perceptions of the various incidents.

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects consisted of 114 male and 120 female undergraduate students at Loyola University of Chicago. Subjects participated in order to partially fulfill the requirements for their introductory psychology course.

Design

The study consisted of a 2 X 3 X 2 X 4 factorial design with two between and two within subject factors. The within subject independent variables were 1) degree of status differential between the superordinate and subordinate (large status difference or small status difference) and 2) sex ratio or skewness of the job (traditional, nontraditional, or integrated). The between subject factors consisted of sex of the subject and the sextype of the respondent as determined by Bem's Sex Role Inventory (masculine, feminine, androgynous, or undifferentiated).

A pilot study was conducted in order to determine the types of occupations that students perceive to fall into the three categories. Subjects were asked to examine a list of job titles and to decide whether the job title was a traditional (female dominated), nontraditional (male dominated), or integrated (equal number of males and females)

job. Based on these results, several job titles were chosen for each category (see Appendix A).

An additional pilot study was also run to determine the types of behaviors that are considered to be sexual harassment. Subjects were asked to state, on a scale ranging from one to five, the degree to which they felt the behavior was definitely sexual harassment (1), ambiguous (3) or definitely not sexual harassment (5) (see Appendix A). In addition, subjects were also asked to rate the appropriateness of the behaviors within a work setting on a scale ranging from 1 (definitely appropriate in a work setting) to 5 (definitely inappropriate in a work setting). The job titles with the highest means for each jobtype and those behaviors that fell into the ambiguous category were used for the scenarios in the present study.

Based on the results of the pilot studies, 12 scenarios were written which described an interaction between a subordinate and a supervisor in one of the three types of work settings.

Materials

Each subject received a packet containing six scenarios (see Appendix B.) Pilot testing was performed and it was determined that the six scenarios could feasibly be read within the one hour time frame. A Latin Square design with random rotation was implemented in order to counter balance the scenarios. In addition to reading the scenarios,

subjects were also asked to respond to Bem's Sex-Role Inventory to determine how subjects viewed their own sex roles (see Appendix C.) The order of the sex-role inventory was counter balanced with the scenarios in order to avoid demand characteristics. After reading each scenario, subjects were asked to rate the following statements using a 5-point scale: 1) the degree to which they felt the scenario was an incident of sexual harassment, ranging from 1 - Definitely Not Sexual Harassment, to 5 - Definitely Sexual Harassment, 2) how frequently they felt the behavior would occur in a similar setting (1 - Never, 5 - All the Time), and 3) how appropriate the behavior was within a work setting (1 - Definitely Appropriate in Work Setting, 5 - Definitely Inappropriate in a Work Setting). Following these ratings, subjects were asked to estimate the percentage of women and men employed in the occupation described in the scenario. Finally, subjects rated the given behavior using a series of seven point semantic differentials in order to assess their attitudes toward the the way in which the woman felt in the particular scenarios.

Procedure

Subjects were told that the researchers were interested in obtaining information on how students perceive incidents of sexual harassment. After informed consent was obtained, the respondents 1) responded to Bem's Sex-Role inventory and 2) read brief scenarios describing social interactions, which

were based on the results of the two pilot studies, and 3) answered questions pertaining to the scenarios. Subjects were assured that all responses would remain confidential and anonymous. The order of the Bem Sex Role Inventory and the survey were counter balanced in order to avoid order effects. Finally, subjects were debriefed upon completion of the study.

RESULTS

Prior to conducting the present study, descriptive statistics were compiled for the pilot data. This was done to determine which job titles were considered to be male dominated, female dominated, and integrated and which behaviors were considered to be sexual harassment, ambiguous, and not sexual harassment.

Preliminary analyses for the main study consisted of frequency counts for all the variables in the study in order to determine any out of range variables. In addition, T-test analyses were conducted to determine whether the two types of comments, physical and verbal, differed significantly in terms of the three major dependent variables: incident of sexual harassment, frequency of the incident, and the appropriateness of the incident. No significant differences were found, therefore, type of behavior was not included in any further analyses.

Following these preliminary analyses, the Bem Sex Role Inventory was scored by first calculating a separate score for the masculine and feminine portion of the test by summing the items corresponding to each portion. The median of the distribution of scores across subjects for the femininity scale, or F scale (Med.= 5.55), and masculinity

scale, or M scale (Med. = 5.0), were obtained in order to perform a median split. Once the median split was performed, subjects were divided into four categories - androgynous (high F scale, high M scale), masculine (high M scale, low F scale) feminine (high F scale, low M scale), and undifferentiated (low M scale, low F scale). For this study, masculinity and femininity scales were combined to form same sex if respondents scored high on the scale representing their sex and low on the opposite sex scale, and crossed sex if respondents scored high on the scale representing the opposite sex and low on the same sex scale (see Table 1).

The main analyses consisted of a repeated measures analysis of variance (using the multivariate analysis of variance model) for each of the dependent variables. The dependent variables included the degree to which the behavior constituted an incident of sexual harassment (sexual harassment), the appropriateness of the behavior (appropriateness), the frequency in which the behavior occurred within the various job settings (frequency), and percentage of males and females comprising each of the occupations (used as a manipulation check).

Manipulation Check

The fourth question for each scenario asked respondents to estimate the percentage of males and females occupying the various job settings. These measures were used as manipulation checks to test whether the sample in the present

Table 1

Frequency and Percentages for the Bem Sex Role Inventory

| Sextype | Frequency | Percent |
|------------------|-----------|---------|
| <hr/> | | |
| Androgynous | 59 | 25.4 |
| Male | 22 | 9.5 |
| Female | 37 | 15.9 |
| Same Sex | 97 | 41.8 |
| Male | 47 | 20.3 |
| Female | 50 | 21.6 |
| Cross Sex | 21 | 9.1 |
| Male | 9 | 3.8 |
| Female | 12 | 5.2 |
| Undifferentiated | 55 | 23.7 |
| Male | 34 | 14.7 |
| Female | 21 | 9.0 |

study perceived the job titles comprising the jobtype variable (traditional, nontraditional, and integrated) as significantly different from one another. An analysis of variance for repeated measures revealed a significant effect of jobtype for both percentage of males, $F(2,446) = 1552.08$, $p < .001$, (traditional $M=20.2$, integrated $M=51.5$, and nontraditional $M=84.7$), and percentage of females $F(2,446) = 1532.10$, $p < .001$. (traditional $M=79.7$, integrated $M=48.5$, nontraditional $M=15.3$). Subjects therefore perceived the job titles to be different from one another.

Post hoc comparisons of the means revealed that subjects perceived the various job settings to employ different percentages of men (Tukey HSD $(3,446) = 4.11$, $p < .01$) and women (Tukey HSD $(3,446) = 4.13$, $p < .01$.)

Degree of Sexual Harassment

A $2(\text{Status}) \times 3(\text{Jobtype}) \times 2(\text{Sex}) \times 4(\text{Sextype})$ analysis of variance for repeated measures was performed in order to analyze the three main dependent variables, sexual harassment, appropriateness, and frequency. The analysis for the sexual harassment judgement revealed significant main effects for sex, sextype, and jobtype and two three-way interactions; sextype by sex by status, and sextype by sex by jobtype. For the main effect of sex, females ($M=2.83$), as predicted, perceived the incident to be more sexually harassing than males ($M=2.65$), $F(1,222) = 4.10$, $p = .044$.

The main effect of sextype, $F(1,222) = 2.62$, $p = .05$,

showed that undifferentiated subjects perceived the incident to be the most sexually harassing ($M=2.85$), while same sex subjects viewed the incident to be the least sexually harassing ($M=2.6$). There were no significant differences between the four sextypes when post hoc comparisons were applied. However, when the less stringent T-test was performed, a significant difference was found between same sex and undifferentiated subjects ($t(143) = 2.82, p < .05$).

The main effect of jobtype supported the main hypothesis, that behaviors in the nontraditional and integrated job settings would be viewed as more sexually harassing than the same behaviors in the traditional job settings, $F(2,444) = 31.42, p < .001$. Post hoc comparisons showed that the three job settings (traditional $M=2.45$; nontraditional $M=2.80$; integrated $M=2.98$) were all significantly different from one another, Tukey HSD ($3,230$) $= .19, p < .05$.

In addition to the three main effects for sexual harassment, as mentioned above, there were also two three-way interactions. The significant sextype by sex by status interaction, $F(3,222) = 3.22, p = .024$, was broken down by status to determine if individuals differing by sex and sextype perceived the incident differently depending on the status differential (see Table 2). An analysis of simple effects did not reveal any significant differences between sextypes in the low status condition.

Table 2

Means for the Sextype By Sex By Status Interaction for Sexual Harassment

| Sextype | | | | |
|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Androgynous | Undifferen- tiated | Same | Cross |
| Low Status | | | | |
| Male | 2.82 (1.21) (n=22) | 2.73 (1.05) (n=46) | 2.58 (.97) (n=9) | 2.56 (.96) (n=34) |
| Female | 2.94 (1.22) (n=37) | 2.87 (.94) (n=50) | 2.83 (1.02) (n=12) | 2.65 (.95) (n=20) |
| High Status | | | | |
| Male | 2.80 (.96) (n=22) | 2.98 (1.12) (n=46) | 2.45 (.96) (n=9) | 2.23 (.82) (n=20) |
| Female | 2.49 (.97) (n=37) | 2.83 (.97) (n=50) | 2.7 (1.07) (n=12) | 3.17 (1.01) (n=20) |

Note. Numbers in parentheses below the means are standard deviations.

Within the high status condition, analyses of simple effects revealed a significant sex by sextype interaction ($F(3,223) = 4.63, p = .004$). Androgynous ($M=2.80$) and undifferentiated males ($M=2.98$) perceived the incident to be more sexually harassing than the androgynous ($M=2.49$) and undifferentiated females ($M=2.83$). The patterns of means for the same and cross sextypes were consistent with the results in the low status conditions such that females in these sextype categories perceived the incidents to be more sexually harassing than males.

When the significant sextype by status by jobtype interaction, $F(6,444) = 2.26, p = .037$, was broken down by status, a main effect of jobtype was found for both the low status ($F(2,444) = 12.85, p < .001$) and high status conditions ($F(2,446) = 17.51, p < .001$) (see Table 3). In the low status condition, the incident was perceived as the most sexually harassing in the integrated job settings while the same incidents in the traditional job settings were seen as the least sexually harassing. Post hoc comparisons for jobtype revealed the traditional ($M=2.47$) jobtype to be significantly different from the nontraditional ($M=2.83$) and integrated ($M=2.94$) jobtypes (Tukey HSD ($6,444$) = .20, $p < .05$).

As Table 3 shows, the only exception to the overall pattern of means for jobtype in the low status condition was with the androgynous subjects. Androgynous subjects

Table 3

Means for Sextype by Status by Jobtype Interaction for Sexual Harassment

| Jobtype | Sextype | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|
| | Androgynous (n=59) | Undifferen- tiated (n=55) | Same (n=97) | Crossed (n=21) |
| Low Status | | | | |
| Traditional | 2.75 (1.3) | 2.54 (1.0) | 2.28 (.98) | 2.42 (.77) |
| Integrated | 2.92 (1.09) | 3.00 (.93) | 2.88 (1.05) | 3.10 (1.05) |
| Nontraditional | 3.02 (.26) | 2.94 (1.06) | 2.69 (.96) | 2.62 (1.04) |
| High Status | | | | |
| Traditional | 2.17 (.98) | 2.70 (1.03) | 2.57 (1.02) | 2.23 (.81) |
| Integrated | 2.98 (.94) | 3.11 (1.14) | 2.71 (1.08) | 3.19 (.94) |
| Nontraditional | 2.66 (.99) | 2.96 (1.02) | 2.54 (.95) | 2.95 (1.03) |

Note. Numbers in parenthesis are standard deviations.

perceived the incident to be the most sexually harassing in the nontraditional job setting, followed by the integrated job setting. This pattern was reversed for the other three sextypes. As with the other sextypes, the androgynous subjects viewed the incident in the traditional job setting to be the least sexually harassing.

In the high status condition, as with the low status condition, a main effect of jobtype revealed that behaviors in the traditional jobs were perceived as the least sexually harassing while the same behaviors were perceived as the most sexually harassing in the integrated job settings. Post hoc comparisons revealed a significant differences between all three jobtypes; traditional ($M=2.47$), nontraditional ($M=2.72$) and integrated ($M=2.92$), Tukey HSD ($6,444$) = .20, $p < .05$.

In addition to a simple main effect of jobtype in the high status condition, there was also a sextype by jobtype simple interaction, $F(6,446) = 2.50$, $p = .022$. Same sex subjects perceived the degree of sexual harassment to be equal in the traditional and nontraditional job settings ($M's=2.57$), whereas subjects in the other sextype categories perceived the degree of sexual harassment to be greater in the nontraditional job setting than in the traditional job setting.

Frequency of the Behavior

For the second dependent variable, frequency, there was only a main effect of jobtype $F(2,446) = 15.18$, $p < .001$.

Post hoc mean comparisons revealed a significant difference between the traditional job setting ($M=3.43$) and the integrated job setting ($M=3.17$), Tukey HSD (3,446) = .17, $p < .05$, and the traditional job setting and nontraditional job setting ($M=3.28$), Tukey HSD (3,446) = .14, $p < .05$. Respondents perceived the incidents to occur more frequently in the traditional job setting than in the nontraditional and integrated. There was no significant difference between the nontraditional and integrated job settings.

Appropriateness of the behavior

For the third dependent variable, appropriateness, the repeated measures ANOVA revealed main effects of sex and jobtype. As was predicted, females ($M=3.35$) viewed the incident as significantly more inappropriate than males ($M=3.09$), $F(2,223) = 13.24$, $p < .001$. For the significant main effect of jobtype, ($F(2,446) = 46.87$, $p < .001$) a post hoc mean comparison revealed significant differences between the three jobtypes, traditional ($M=2.91$), nontraditional ($M=3.27$), and integrated ($M=3.52$), Tukey HSD (3,446) = .20, $p < .05$. The behavior/comment was perceived as more inappropriate in the integrated and nontraditional job setting as compared to the traditional job setting, where it was perceived as less inappropriate. This pattern of means is the same pattern found for incident of sexual harassment.

Emotion and Attractiveness Scales

Ten semantic differential scales were included in order

to determine if the independent variables influenced respondents' perceptions of how the women in the scenarios felt about herself. These ten scales (see Appendix B) were factor analyzed using varimax rotation. The items were factor analyzed across jobtype and status as well as within condition to determine if the relationship was the same. Two factors emerged for each of the scenarios (see Table 4). The first factor contained items relating to the way in which the subjects perceived the woman's emotional evaluation of the situation, such as good - bad and relaxed - tense. The second factor related more to how the woman felt physically (i.e. beautiful-ugly).

The scores of the items loading on the first factor were combined to form an index relating to the emotional or evaluative nature of the incident. All items which had factor loadings with an absolute value greater than .4 were used in computing the index. In situations where both factor loadings were greater than .4, the factor with the higher loading was used and the other loading was used in the formation of the second index. All items were given equal weighting in computing the index. The computations were based upon the original 1 to 7 point scale. Three of the items, 2, 6, 8, and 10, were recoded so all items would be in the same direction. A higher score on this index indicated a more negative evaluation. The scores of the items loading on the second factor were combined in the same manner to form

Table 4

Eigenvalues and Percentage of Variance For Factor Loadings

| Factor | Eigen- Value | Percent of Variance | Factor | Eigen- Value | Percent of Variance |
|----------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Traditional Job Setting | | | | | |
| Low Status | | | High Status | | |
| 1 | 5.8 | 58.1 | 1 | 5.6 | 56.3 |
| 2 | 1.1 | 11.3 | 2 | 1.1 | 11.4 |
| Nontraditional Job Setting | | | | | |
| Low Status | | | High Status | | |
| 1 | 5.5 | 54.7 | 1 | 5.0 | 50.5 |
| 2 | 1.3 | 13.2 | 2 | 1.4 | 13.9 |
| Integrated Job Setting | | | | | |
| Low Status | | | High Status | | |
| 1 | 5.7 | 56.5 | 1 | 5.8 | 58.3 |
| 2 | 1.2 | 12.1 | 2 | 1.2 | 11.8 |

second index. This index related to the perceptions of the physical nature or attractiveness of the women in the scenarios.

A total of 12 indices were computed, two indices for each condition. The indices were correlated with the three dependent variables, sexual harassment, appropriateness, and frequency (see Table 5).

As the Table 5 shows, the first index, emotions, correlated significantly with the three dependent variables in each of the six conditions. For sexual harassment, the correlations were quite high, ranging from .59 for the high status, integrated condition, to .42 for the high status, traditional condition. Respondents who perceived the incidents to be more sexually harassing also viewed the women to have negative emotions toward the situation.

The second scale, attractiveness, was significantly correlated across the statuses for the integrated job settings. Attractiveness correlated significantly with the first dependent variable, sexual harassment, in the low status and high status integrated conditions.

The attractiveness scale correlated significantly with the second dependent variable, appropriateness of behavior, in the low status, traditional and low status, integrated conditions. However, these correlations were low, as with sexual harassment. The attractiveness scale did correlate highly with appropriateness in the high status, integrated

Table 5

Correlations Between the Emotion and Attractiveness Scales
and Sexual Harassment, Appropriateness, and Frequency

| Scale | Condition | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | Low Status | | | High Status | | |
| | T | I | NT | T | I | NT |
| Sexual Harassment | | | | | | |
| Emotion | .51 ^{***} | .49 ^{***} | .57 ^{***} | .42 ^{***} | .59 ^{***} | .57 ^{***} |
| Attrac- tiveness | .06 | .13 [*] | .07 | .01 | .14 [*] | .09 |
| Appropriateness | | | | | | |
| Emotion | .56 ^{***} | .62 ^{***} | .46 ^{***} | .46 ^{***} | .58 ^{***} | .44 ^{***} |
| Attrac- tiveness | .16 ^{**} | .13 ^{**} | -.04 | .07 | .44 ^{**} | -.04 |
| Frequency | | | | | | |
| Emotion | -.28 ^{***} | -.27 ^{***} | -.12 [*] | -.30 ^{***} | -.36 ^{***} | -.23 ^{***} |
| Attrac- tiveness | -.16 ^{**} | -.10 ^{**} | .02 | -.18 ^{**} | -.15 ^{**} | .02 |

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

condition such that respondents perceiving the incident to be less appropriate perceived the women to feel less attractive than in other conditions.

The same pattern held for the third dependent variable, frequency. Both the emotion scale and the attractiveness scale correlated negatively with the frequency. The more negative one scored on the scale (more attractive, positive emotions), the less frequently the respondents perceived the situation occurring. The majority of the correlations were low, although the emotions scale tended to correlate higher with frequency than the attractiveness scale.

Finally, a repeated measures multivariate analysis of variance was performed in order to examine the scales within the full model. Multivariate main effects were found for jobtype, $F(4,213) = 18.39$, $p < .001$, and sextype, $F(6,430) = 2.82$, $p = .01$. Follow up analyses were performed for the two factors. Univariate main effects were found for the emotion scale and the attractiveness scale. For the emotion scale, significant main effects were found for jobtype and sextype.

For the significant univariate main effect of jobtype, $F(2,432) = 3.86$, $p = .002$, post hoc comparisons did not reveal significant differences, the pattern was consistent with the other dependent variables for jobtype (traditional $M=29.37$, integrated $M=29.68$, nontraditional $M=30.48$). A less stringent test, the students T-Test, was conducted and

revealed a significant difference between traditional ($M=29.37$) and nontraditional jobtypes ($M=30.48$), $t(225) = 2.95$, $p = .004$, and a significant difference between integrated ($M=29.68$) and nontraditional jobtypes ($t(225) = 2.03$, $p = .044$.) Women in the nontraditional jobtypes were perceived as feeling more negatively about the situation than women in integrated and traditional job settings.

A univariate main effect of sextype for the emotion scale was also found, $F(3,216) = 4.00$, $p = .005$. Post hoc comparisons, using Tukey HSD, revealed a significant difference between androgynous sextypes ($M=28.28$), crossed sextypes ($M=31.02$), Tukey HSD ($4,230$) = 2.74, $p < .05$, and undifferentiated sextypes ($M=31.14$), Tukey HSD($4,231$) = 2.86, $p < .05$. Respondents falling into the same sex ($M=29.79$) category did not score significantly different than any of the other three sex types. Androgynous sextypes perceived the women to feel the most positively about themselves, while undifferentiated sextypes perceived the women to feel the most negatively about themselves.

For the attractiveness scale, there were also significant univariate main effects for sextype and jobtype, $F(3,223) = 6.29$, $p = .001$, and $F(2,446) = 23.06$, $p = .001$, respectively. For the main effect of sextype, the patterns of means were consistent with those of the emotion scale ($F(3,223) = 6.29$, $p < .001$.) Post hoc comparisons revealed a significant difference between undifferentiated ($M=6.6$) and

androgynous ($M=5.55$) sextypes, Tukey HSD ($4,230$) = .74, $p < .001$. As with the emotion scale, androgynous sextypes perceived the women to feel the most attractive while undifferentiated sextypes perceived the women to feel the least attractive.

Finally, post hoc comparisons for the main effect of jobtype, $F(2,446) = 23.06$, $p < .001$ showed there to be significant differences between the integrated jobtype ($M=5.56$) and nontraditional jobtype ($M=6.31$), Tukey HSD ($3,231$) = .32, $p < .05$. The traditional job setting ($M=6.28$) was not significantly different from the other two job settings. Women in the integrated jobs settings were perceived as feeling the most attractive, while women in the nontraditional job settings were perceived as feeling the least attractive.

DISCUSSION

In general, the major hypotheses of the study were supported. The results revealed that ambiguous behaviors are perceived in different ways, depending on the job setting. Specifically, as was predicted in the three major hypotheses, 1) the incident was perceived as sexual harassment to a greater degree in the integrated and nontraditional job settings as compared to the traditional job setting; 2) the behavior/comment was perceived to be less appropriate in the traditional and integrated job setting as compared to the nontraditional job settings; and 3) the behavior/comment was perceived to occur more frequently in the traditional job setting than in the integrated and nontraditional job settings.

These findings are consistent with the sex-role spillover model, as well as other previous research on sexual harassment. As mentioned, sex role spillover is the carryover into the work place of gender based expectations for behavior that are irrelevant or inappropriate to work. Women in male dominated, nontraditional job settings experience sex role spillover in the sense that they are sex role deviates who are treated differently from other (male) work role occupants. In female dominated jobs, sex role and

work role are practically identical. They are treated similarly to other female work role occupants and think treatment is a function of the job (Gutek, 1985).

Gutek et al. (1982) argued that the sex ratio at work leads to sex role spillover, which results in sexual harassment. The basic purpose of the present research was to determine whether or not perceptions of an incident differ depending on the job setting. It was found that respondents perceived the behavior to be less sexually harassing in the traditional job settings than in the integrated and nontraditional job settings. Thus, the sex-role spillover model was supported. According to Gutek, et al. (1982), the sexuality aspect of the female sex role spills over to the work role when the occupation is female dominated, the job itself is female dominated, and the work role-set is male dominated. When the job under scrutiny is a secretary, as in the present study, the sex role and work role as seen as practically identical. The behaviors and comments are seen as part of the job and are not considered to be sexually harassing.

In nontraditional occupations, the higher perceived incidence of sexual harassment can be attributed to three factors. The first factor is that the minority status of women serve to highlight the general incongruity between their sex role (feminine) and their work role (masculine). Women's sex roles may be especially salient, increasing the

likelihood that she will be treated in a stereotypical fashion (Gutek and Morasch, 1982). According to Pryor and Day (1988), women in nontraditional female jobs report more sexual harassment not because they receive more sexual attention, but because they consider more of the attention they received as unwelcome. The findings of the present study reveal that individuals perceiving but not actually experiencing the incident react in the same manner.

Second, according to Lafontaine and Tredeau (1986), women in nontraditional male dominated jobs, such as car mechanics, are perceived as threats to male privilege and power. As a result, they may be the victims of more serious forms of sexual harassment.

Finally, individuals in male dominated occupations may be more apt to identify incidents as harassment than those employees in traditionally female dominated positions because, as stated above, they are more aware of their minority status and the differential treatment they are receiving. It has been found, however, that the specific type of male dominated job affects the frequency of sexual harassment reports. Lafontaine and Tredeau (1986) found that individuals employed in firms perceived to have high equal employment opportunity for women reported significantly lower levels of harassment than those firms with low opportunity.

In the integrated work settings, women are not as likely to have the problems of either traditional or

nontraditional employees because there is not as much sex role spillover experienced in these types of jobs. In theory, neither the male nor the female sex role is emphasized in integrated work settings (Gutek and Morasch, 1982). Gutek and Morasch (1982) and Tangri et al. (1982) found that the women employed in integrated job settings reported fewer social sexual behaviors in the workplace and reported sexual harassment to be less of a problem than women employed in traditional or nontraditional job settings. In fact, integrated organizations were the most likely to accept dating among employees. The results of the present study revealed that ambiguous behaviors in integrated jobs were perceived to be more sexually harassing and less appropriate than in nontraditional or traditional job settings. However, it was found that subjects perceived the behaviors to occur less frequently than in the traditional and nontraditional job settings, which is consistent with the previous findings and supports the sex role spillover model.

The findings of the present study concerning the degree and frequency of sexual harassment are consistent with previous sexual harassment research. The results of the Fortune 500 survey indicated that formal complaint rates were highest in firms where the work force was at least 75 percent male. Corporations whose work forces were at least 75 percent female (female dominated) experienced the lowest complaint rate (Fritz, 1989).

The results concerning sex differences revealed that female subjects perceived the incidents to be more sexually harassing and less appropriate than male subjects. These finds are also consistent with previous research on sexual harassment. Gutek and Morasch (1982) found that women were more likely than men to label a particular behavior as sexually harassing. Benson and Thomas (1982) found that in ambiguous cases, women perceived the incident to be more sexually harassing than men. Finally, Blodgett (1981) found that male managers were more likely than female managers to think that sexual harassment was not a problem and were less likely than women to label a series of vignettes as containing sexual harassment.

Since the sex role spillover model is based on work roles and sex roles, whether one's sex role orientation, based on the Bem Sex Role Inventory, would affect perceptions of sexual harassment was also examined. Overall, it was found that androgynous and undifferentiated sextypes perceived the incident to be more sexually harassing than cross and same sex sextype. Bem (1974) describes androgynous sextypes as being flexible in that they can be both masculine and feminine, both assertive and yielding, and both instrumental and expressive, depending on the type of situation. Since they scored high on both the femininity and masculinity scales, perhaps they are more sensitive to incidents involving potentially sexually harassing behavior.

There are two possible explanations for the results pertaining to the undifferentiated subjects. First, perhaps the individuals scoring low on both scales, the undifferentiated subjects, are also flexible and are able to perceive situations in an unbiased manner since they are not persuaded by or oriented toward a particular sex role type. Second, it is possible that individuals' scores that fell just slightly below the median on both scales in our sample may fall slightly above the median in another sample. These individuals would therefore be classified as androgynous and their perceptions of sexual harassment would be congruent with the perceptions of the androgynous sextypes in the present study.

In addition to a main effect of sextype for the degree of sexual harassment, sextype also affected perceptions in terms of higher order interactions involving status. The differing sex role orientations were consistent with previous jobtype findings in the low status conditions. Respondents perceived the incident to be more sexually harassing in the nontraditional and integrated job settings than in the traditional job settings.

Within the high status conditions, respondents with different sex role orientations perceived the situations differently. For example, same sex subjects perceived the degree of sexual harassment to be identical in the traditional and nontraditional work settings. As with

subjects in the other sextype categories, they rated the incident in the integrated job setting as the most sexually harassing. According to Bem (1974), strongly sex typed individuals are limited in the range of behaviors available to them because they suppress any behaviors that may be considered undesirable or inappropriate for their sex. Therefore, it is not surprising that they would rate the two extreme job settings identically. Even when there is a high status differential between the subordinate and supervisor, same sex subjects did not perceive the incident to be sexually harassing in either the female dominated jobs or male dominated jobs. Their gender schema (see Bem, 1981) may be so strong that it overrides other important factors. Thus, same sex subjects may view an individual first and foremost as male or female and may not even take environmental factors into account when evaluating the situation.

This notion is also consistent with one of the explanations provided by Gutek and Morasch (1982) as to why sex roles may carry over into the work role. They argue that gender identity is a more basic cognitive category than work role. Hence, a person is more likely to be categorized as a man or a women first and categorized in terms of their occupational role second.

In addition to the three major hypothesis, it was also expected that jobtype would influence respondents'

perceptions of how the woman in the scenarios would feel about herself. The results of the correlations between the major dependent variables and the emotion and attractiveness factors were not surprising. As would be expected, respondents who 1) perceived the incident to be sexually harassing, 2) felt the behavior was less appropriate, and 3) perceived the incidents to occur less frequently, rated the women as feeling more negatively about herself. On the other hand, respondents who perceived the incident to be less sexually harassing, viewed the behavior as more appropriate, and perceived the incident to occur more frequently, rated the women as feeling more positively about herself.

Furthermore, women in the traditional job settings were viewed more positively than women in the integrated and nontraditional job settings, which is consistent with the findings for the three main dependent variables. Finally, females perceived the women in the scenarios to feel more negatively about themselves than males. This finding is also consistent with the sex differential findings for the other dependent variables.

In general, sexual harassment arises from the unequal power relations between men and women (Hemming, 1985). The U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board survey (1981) revealed that male superiors harassing female subordinates involves intimidation, since the male has the power to retaliate if the female refuses to comply. In addition, results of the

survey showed that 42% of women and 15% of men reported having been sexually harassed at work in the preceding 24 months. The most severe forms of sexual harassment were experienced by 3.1% of female and 1.7% of male victims (Tangri, Burt, and Johnson, 1982). This consisted of actual rape or assault.

Over 50% of adult women are in the labor force. Participation in the work force by women has increased from 34.8% in 1960 to 51.7% in 1980 (Peterson and Massengill, 1982). As women are the more frequent victims of sexual harassment, greater numbers of working women increases opportunities for harassment to occur. The more men and women come into contact at work, the greater the potential for sexual harassment to occur (Gutek, 1985).

The results of the present study demonstrate that the type of job setting will influence whether an ambiguous, but potentially sexual behavior will be perceived as sexual harassment. Furthermore, the results revealed that individuals differing by sex and sextype will differ in their perceptions of behavior that is potentially sexual.

As previously stated, there is a lack of a standard definition of sexual harassment in the literature. As the results of this study have shown, it is not easy to have a single definition of sexual harassment. Variables such as job setting and status may affect the perceptions of the victim and others involved in the situation. Therefore, it

is important to study individual definitions and perceptions of sexual harassment in order to gain an understanding of the way in which individuals perceive potentially sexual behaviors. Future studies on sexual harassment may want to examine the perceptions of individuals in an actual work setting in order to compare how their perceptions' of potentially sexual incidents compare to the perceptions of individuals responding to questionnaires.

A problem with this study, as with other similar studies (i.e. Nokovich and Popovich, 1988), is that the focus of the present research was to examine perceptions of sexual harassment as opposed to examining actual experiences involving sexual harassment in the workplace. Gutek and Morasch (1982), Terpstra and Cook (1985), and Nokovich and Popovich (1988) argue that there is a significant difference between perception and reception of sexual harassment. Perhaps women actually employed in integrated occupations would not perceive the ambiguous behaviors to be sexually harassing. However, their perceptions would be based on actually experiencing the situation, knowing the people with whom they work and interpreting the behavior in light of this knowledge.

The findings of the present study can be used to develop training programs for organizations designed to increase employees' awareness of the potential for sexual harassment. Many of the training programs that are in

existence now simply focus on how to alleviate sexual harassment once it occurs. It is important, however, to prevent sexual harassment from occurring in the first place. The programs must focus on 1) the types of behaviors that may have the potential to be perceived as sexual harassment and 2) the circumstances under which these behaviors may be perceived as sexual harassment. This can be a first step in preventing sexual harassment, or at least certain forms of sexual harassment that are based on a misunderstanding of ambiguous behaviors. These programs can stress that ambiguous behaviors will be perceived differently by different people and that misunderstandings can be avoided by being aware of how one's behavior may be interpreted by others. Perhaps specific types of training programs can be developed for different types of job settings within various departments of individual organizations.

Sexual harassment is widespread. As long as men and women interact together in the workplace and particularly as long as men are in positions of authority over women, it is likely that some form of harassment in work environments will occur. Perhaps by understanding how potentially sexual behavior will be interpreted by others, some forms of sexual harassment can be avoided.

REFERENCES

- Abbey, A. (1982). Sex differences in attributions for friendly behavior: do males misperceive female's friendliness? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42(5), 830-838.
- Backhouse, C. & Cohen, L. (1981). Sexual harassment on the job. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Bem, S.L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162.
- Bem, S.L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. Psychological Review, 88(4), 354-364.
- Brewer, M.B. (1982). Further beyond nine to five: an integration and further directions. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 55-74.
- Brewer, M.B., & Berk, R.A. (1982). Beyond nine to five: introduction. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 1-4.
- Collins, E.G.C. & Blodgett, T.B. (1981). Sexual harassment...some see it...some won't. Harvard Business Review, 59, 76-95.
- Eagly, A.H. (1983). Gender and social influence: a social psychological analysis. American Psychologist, 38, 971-981.
- Farley, L. (1978). Sexual shakedown: The sexual harassment of women on the job. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Fritz, N.R. (1989). Sexual harassment and the working woman. Personnel, 66, 4-8.
- Garvey, M.S. (1986). The high cost of sexual harassment suits. Personnel Journal, 65, 75-78.
- Gosselin, H.L. (1984). Sexual harassment on the job: psychological, social, and economic repercussions. Canada's Mental Health, 32, 21-24, 32.

- Gutek, B.A. (1985). Sex and the workplace. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Gutek, B.A. & Morasch, B. (1982). Sex ratios, sex role spillover and sexual harassment of women at work. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 55-74.
- Gutek, B.A., Morasch, B. & Cohen, A.G. (1983). Interpreting social sexual behavior in a worksetting. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 22(1), 30-48.
- Hemming H. (1985). Women in a man's world: sexual harassment. Human Relations, 38(1), 67-79.
- Jensen I. & Gutek, B.A. (1982). Attributions and assignments of responsibility for sexual harassment. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 121-136.
- Katz D., and Kahn, R.L. The social psychology of organizations. (2nd ed.) New York: Wiley, 1978.
- Korda, M. Sex at the office. In D.S. David and R. Brannon (eds.), The forty-nine percent majority: The male sex role. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1976.
- Lafontaine, E. and Tredeau, L. (1986). The frequency, sources and correlates of sexual harassment among women in traditional male occupations. Sex Roles, 15(7/8), 433-442.
- Livingston, J.A. (1982). Responses to sexual harassment on the job: legal, organizational, and individual actions. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 5-22.
- Matlin, M.W. The psychology of women. Holt, Rinehart & Winston: New York, 1987.
- Nieva, V.F. & Gutek, B.A. (1981). Women and work: a psychological perspective. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Nokovich, D. & Popovich, P.M. (1988) Sex-role spillover and sexual harassment: a laboratory investigation. Paper presented at the meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, Illinois.
- Peterson, D.J. & Massengill, D. (1982). Sexual harassment: a growing problem in the workplace. Personnel Administrator, 27, 79-87.

- Powell, G.N. (1983). Definitions of sexual harassment and sexual attention experienced. The Journal of Psychology, 113, 113-117.
- Pryor, J.B., and Day, J.D. (1988). Interpretations of sexual harassment: An attributional analysis. Sex Roles, 18(7/8), 405-417.
- Sommers, A. (1982). Sexual harassment in academe: legal issues and definitions. Journal of Social Issues, 38(4), 23-32.
- Tangri, 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. (1986). A framework for the study of sexual harassment. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 7(1), 17-34.
- Terpstra, D.E. & Cook, S.E. (1985). Complainant characteristics and reported behaviors and consequences associated with formal sexual harassment charges. Personnel Psychology, 38, 559-574.
- 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.

Appendix A

Please rate the following job titles to the degree to which you feel the job is male dominated, has an equal number of men and women, or is female dominated. Please use the following scale, ranging from 1 to 5, to determine your ratings.

For example, if you think the job is 100% male dominated, that is, the job is held by only men, give the job title a rating of '1'. If the job is 100% female dominated, give it a rating of '5'. If the job is held by an equal number of men and women, give it a '3'. If you feel the job is somewhere between male dominated and equal number of men and women, rate the job a '2'. Please mark your rating on the line preceding the job title.

| | | | | | | | | |
|------|-------|---|-------|------------------|-------|---|-------|--------|
| + | ----- | + | ----- | + | ----- | + | ----- | + |
| 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 |
| 100% | | | | 50% | | | | 100% |
| Men | | | | Equal Number | | | | Female |
| | | | | of men and women | | | | |

- _____ 1. CAR MECHANIC
- _____ 2. HOUSEKEEPER
- _____ 3. DENTIST
- _____ 4. REAL ESTATE AGENT
- _____ 5. HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER
- _____ 6. NURSE
- _____ 7. SECRETARY
- _____ 8. RETAIL MANAGER
- _____ 9. LAWYER
- _____ 10. MEDICAL DOCTOR
- _____ 11. COLLEGE PROFESSOR
- _____ 12. HAIR DRESSER

| | | | | |
|------|---|----------------------------------|---|--------|
| + | + | + | + | + |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 100% | | 50% | | 100% |
| Men | | Equal Number of men and women | | Female |

- _____ 13. TRAVELING SALESPERSON
- _____ 14. BUS DRIVER
- _____ 15. FIRE FIGHTER
- _____ 16. LIBRARIAN
- _____ 17. POLICE OFFICER
- _____ 18. CRANE OPERATOR
- _____ 19. NEWSPAPER REPORTER
- _____ 20. INTERIOR DECORATOR
- _____ 21. ACCOUNTANT
- _____ 22. MANAGER
- _____ 23. CLERK-TYPIST
- _____ 24. DIETICIAN
- _____ 25. FLORIST
- _____ 26. BOOKKEEPER
- _____ 27. SECURITY OFFICER
- _____ 28. SUPERVISOR
- _____ 29. ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT
- _____ 30. FURNITURE MOVER
- _____ 31. ILLUSTRATOR
- _____ 32. PHYSICIAN
- _____ 33. ARTIST
- _____ 34. CHEF

| | | | | |
|------|---|----------------------------------|---|--------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 100% | | 50% | | 100% |
| Men | | Equal Number of men and women | | Female |

- _____ 35. PHARMACIST
- _____ 36. CONSTRUCTION WORKER
- _____ 37. WELDER
- _____ 38. HUMAN RESOURCE GENERALIST
- _____ 39. FLIGHT ATTENDANT
- _____ 40. BARTENDER
- _____ 41. GRAPHIC DESIGNER
- _____ 42. PILOT
- _____ 43. JOURNALIST
- _____ 44. PHOTOGRAPHER
- _____ 45. STOCK BROKER
- _____ 46. COOK
- _____ 47. CONSTRUCTION WORKER
- _____ 48. TELEPHONE REPAIR PERSON
- _____ 49. MAINTENANCE ENGINEER
- _____ 50. PAINTER
- _____ 51. TELEPHONE OPERATOR
- _____ 52. TEACHER
- _____ 53. DENTAL HYGIENIST

Please indicate the degree to which you feel the following verbal and physical behaviors are sexual harassment within a work setting. The behaviors will describe various interactions between a supervisor and subordinate at work.

Please rate the behaviors using the following scale, ranging from 1 to 5. For example, if you feel that the given behavior is definitely a form of sexual harassment, place a '5' on the line preceding the behavior. If you feel that the given behavior definitely not a form of sexual harassment, place a '1' on the line preceding the behavior. If you are not sure whether the behavior is a form of sexual harassment or not, place a '3' on the line preceding the behavior.

Assume that a supervisor at Company X performed the following verbal and physical behaviors. Please rate the behaviors by placing a number corresponding to the scale above on the line preceding the behavior.

| | | | | |
|---------------------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| +-----+-----+-----+-----+ | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Definitely | Probably | Ambiguous | Probably | Definitely |
| Not Sexual | Not Sexual | | Sexual | Sexual |
| Harassment | Harassment | | Harassment | Harassment |

The supervisor:

- _____ 1. asked subordinate about work
- _____ 2. remarked to subordinate about work progress
- _____ 3. commented about subordinate's personality
- _____ 4. said subordinate reminds him of old girlfriend
- _____ 5. promised help in the future
- _____ 6. said cooperation could improve chances for promotion
- _____ 7. warned that success could be affected if subordinate refused to have sex
- _____ 8. threatened demotion if subordinate refused to have sex with him
- _____ 9. told offensive jokes

| +-----+-----+-----+-----+ | | | | |
|---------------------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Definitely | Probably | Ambiguous | Probably | Definitely |
| Not Sexual | Not Sexual | | Sexual | Sexual |
| Harassment | Harassment | | Harassment | Harassment |

The supervisor:

- _____ 10. suggested dinner and a movie after work
- _____ 11. asked subordinate to come home with him after work
- _____ 12. told subordinate a dirty joke
- _____ 13. said subordinate would be good in bed
- _____ 14. straightened subordinate's hair
- _____ 15. commented to subordinate: "You must be doing a lot of running these days, your body looks terrific."
- _____ 16. patted subordinate on fanny and said "hurry up, you'll never get everything done today."
- _____ 17. held subordinate's hand during private meeting
- _____ 18. squeezed subordinate in the waist
- _____ 19. said he looked forward to working together
- _____ 20. wanted to speak more privately
- _____ 21. remarked about subordinate's hair
- _____ 22. fondled and kissed subordinate
- _____ 23. attempted sex
- _____ 24. forced subordinate down
- _____ 25. brushed against subordinate's body
- _____ 26. made sexual propositions linked to negative job conditions
- _____ 27. asked subordinate about her family
- _____ 28. said "Honey, could you type this letter for me?"

| +-----+-----+-----+-----+ | | | | |
|---------------------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Definitely | Probably | Ambiguous | Probably | Definitely |
| Not Sexual | Not Sexual | | Sexual | Sexual |
| Harassment | Harassment | | Harassment | Harassment |

The supervisor:

- _____ 29. asked if she was a good cook
- _____ 30. made sexual propositions linked to positive job conditions
- _____ 31. made sexual propositions unlinked to job conditions
- _____ 32. used physical contact when speaking with subordinate
- _____ 33. used offensive language (profanity)
- _____ 34. repeated requests for dates
- _____ 35. placed arm around subordinate
- _____ 36. made direct remarks of an offensive nature
- _____ 37. flirted
- _____ 38. talked about personal problems
- _____ 39. complimented her new clothes
- _____ 40. tried to get subordinate to talk about men she dates
- _____ 41. said her sweater was flattering
- _____ 42. told her about his wife
- _____ 43. said he wished he was not attached
- _____ 44. said she was intelligent for a woman
- _____ 45. stared at her breasts while discussing business matters
- _____ 46. winked at subordinate as he walked past her office
- _____ 47. helped subordinate pick up papers that she dropped

| +-----+-----+-----+-----+ | | | | |
|---------------------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Definitely | Probably | Ambiguous | Probably | Definitely |
| Not Sexual | Not Sexual | | Sexual | Sexual |
| Harassment | Harassment | | Harassment | Harassment |

The supervisor:

- _____ 48. told subordinate she was doing an excellent job
and to keep up the good work
- _____ 49. put hand on subordinates shoulder during
discussion
- _____ 50. moved closer to subordinate during conversation
- _____ 51. poked subordinate in the ribs
- _____ 52. walked up from behind subordinate in hallway and
patted her on the fanny
- _____ 53. removed thread from subordinate's jacket sleeve
during conversation
- _____ 54. put hand on subordinate's arm during discussion

Please indicate the degree to which you feel the following verbal and physical behaviors are appropriate in a work setting. The behaviors will involve various interactions between a supervisor and subordinate at work.

Rate the behaviors using the following scale, ranging from 1 to 5. For example, if you feel that the given behavior is definitely appropriate in a work setting, place a '1' on the line preceding the behavior. If you feel that the given behavior is definitely not appropriate in a work setting, place a '5' on the line preceding the behavior. If the behavior falls somewhere in the middle between appropriate and inappropriate, place a '3' on the line preceding the behavior.

Assume that a supervisor at Company X performed the following verbal and physical behaviors. Please rate the behaviors by placing a number corresponding to the scale above on the line preceding the behavior.

| | | | | |
|---|---|-----------|--|--|
| +-----+-----+-----+-----+ | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Definitely appropriate in a work setting | Somewhat appropriate in a work setting | Ambiguous | Somewhat inappro- priate in a work setting | Definitely inappro- priate in a work setting |

The supervisor:

- _____ 1. asked subordinate about work
- _____ 2. remarked to subordinate about work progress
- _____ 3. said he looks forward to working together
- _____ 4. wanted to speak more privately
- _____ 5. remarked about subordinate's hair
- _____ 6. commented about subordinate's personality
- _____ 7. said subordinate reminds him of old girlfriend
- _____ 8. suggested dinner and a movie after work
- _____ 9. asked subordinate to come home with him after work

| +-----+-----+-----+-----+ | | | | |
|---|---|-----------|--|--|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Definitely appropriate in a work setting | Somewhat appropriate in a work setting | Ambiguous | Somewhat inappro- priate in a work setting | Definitely inappro- priate in a work setting |

The supervisor:

- _____ 10. told subordinate a dirty joke
- _____ 11. said subordinate would be good in bed
- _____ 12. straightened subordinate's hair
- _____ 13. held subordinate's hand during private meeting
- _____ 14. put hand on subordinate's shoulder during discussion
- _____ 15. moved closer to subordinate during conversation
- _____ 16. poked subordinate in the ribs
- _____ 17. squeezed subordinate in the waist
- _____ 18. fondled and kissed subordinate
- _____ 19. attempted sex
- _____ 20. forced subordinate down
- _____ 21. promised help in the future
- _____ 22. said cooperation could improve chances for promotion
- _____ 23. warned that success could be affected if subordinate refused to have sex
- _____ 24. threatened demotion if subordinate refused to have sex with him
- _____ 25. told offensive jokes
- _____ 26. brushed against subordinate's body
- _____ 27. made sexual propositions linked to negative job conditions

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|--|--|-----------|--|--|
| Definitely appropriate in a work setting | Somewhat appropriate in a work setting | Ambiguous | Somewhat inappropriate in a work setting | Definitely inappropriate in a work setting |

The supervisor:

- _____ 28. made sexual propositions linked to positive job conditions
- _____ 29. made sexual propositions unlinked to job conditions
- _____ 30. made physical contact
- _____ 31. used offensive language (profanity)
- _____ 32. repeated requests for dates
- _____ 33. placed arm around subordinate
- _____ 34. made direct remarks of an offensive nature
- _____ 35. flirted
- _____ 36. talked about personal problems
- _____ 37. complimented her new clothes
- _____ 38. tried to get subordinate to talk about men she dates
- _____ 39. said her sweater was flattering
- _____ 40. told her about his wife
- _____ 41. said he wished he was not attached
- _____ 42. said she was intelligent for a woman
- _____ 43. stared at her breasts while discussing business matters
- _____ 44. winked at subordinate as he walked past her office
- _____ 45. asked subordinate about her family

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|-----------|--|--|
| Definitely appropriate in a work setting | Somewhat appropriate in a work setting | Ambiguous | Somewhat inappro- priate in a work setting | Definitely inappro- priate in a work setting |

The supervisor:

- _____ 46. said "Honey, could you type this letter for me?"
- _____ 47. asked if she was a good cook
- _____ 48. helped subordinate pick up papers that she dropped
- _____ 49. told subordinate she was doing an excellent job
and to keep up the good work
- _____ 50. walked up from behind subordinate in hallway and
patted her on the fanny
- _____ 51. commented to subordinate "You must be doing a lot
of running these days, your body looks terrific."
- _____ 52. patted subordinate on fanny and said "hurry up,
you'll never get everything done today."
- _____ 53. removed thread from subordinate's jacket sleeve
during conversation
- _____ 54. put hand on subordinate's arm during discussion

Appendix B

Carol Walters has been a fire fighter for three years. She has just finished a 24 hour shift and is gathering her possessions so she can enjoy a two day break. As she is signing out, William Davis, a fire captain who has been on the force for 25 years, comments to her: "You must be doing a lot of running these days, your body looks terrific."

1. To what degree do you feel the above scenario constitutes an incident of sexual harassment?

| | | | | | |
|------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|--|
| +-----+ | | +-----+ | | +-----+ | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Definitely | Probably | Ambiguous | Probably | Definitely | |
| Not Sexual | Not Sexual | | Sexual | Sexual | |
| Harassment | Harassment | | Harassment | Harassment | |

2. In a work setting like the one above, how frequently do you feel this type of behavior occurs?

| | | | | | |
|---------|---|-----------|---|--------------|--|
| +-----+ | | +-----+ | | +-----+ | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Never | | Sometimes | | All The Time | |

3. In the work setting like the one above, how appropriate is the behavior?

| | | | | | |
|-------------|-------------|-----------|----------|------------|--|
| +-----+ | | +-----+ | | +-----+ | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Definitely | Somewhat | Ambiguous | Somewhat | Definitely | |
| Appropriate | Appropriate | | Inappro- | Inappro- | |
| | | | priate | priate | |

4. What percentage of men and women do you feel occupy the position of fire fighter? Please make sure your response adds up to 100 percent.

Male _____ %

Female _____ %

100 %

5. Please rate on the following series of rating scales how you think the woman in the above scenario is feeling.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Good Bad

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Unpleasant Pleasant

A horizontal number line with tick marks at 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. The word "Beautiful" is written below the line near the number 1, and the word "Ugly" is written below the line near the number 7.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Safe Dangerous

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Happy Sad

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Dirty Clean

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Feminine Masculine

Violent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Gentle

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Relaxed Tense

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Strong Weak

Carol Walters has been a fire fighter for three years. She has just finished a 24 hour shift and is gathering her possessions so she can enjoy a two day break. As she is signing out, William Davis, a former coworker who was recently promoted to fire engineer, a position one level above fire fighter, comments to her: "You must be doing a lot of running these days, your body looks terrific."

Elizabeth Fisher is a housekeeper for a major hotel chain. She has been working there full time there since the start of the school semester in order to pay her tuition at the local college, which she attends at night. She is waiting in the main lobby for Craig Reed, the head of housekeeping, to discuss the weeks job duties. The hotel is sponsoring a national convention, therefore temporary job assignments are required in order to accommodate the extra guests. He finds her in the lobby and says: " Why don't we go where we can speak more privately."

Elizabeth Fisher is a housekeeper for a major hotel chain. She has been working there full time there since the start of the school semester in order to pay her tuition at the local college, which she attends at night. She is waiting in the main lobby for Craig Reed, the district manager of the hotel chain, to discuss the weeks job duties. The hotel is sponsoring a national convention, therefore temporary job assignments are required in order to accommodate the extra guests. He finds her in the lobby and says: "Why don't we go where we can speak more privately."

Mary Douglas is a secretary for a large financial corporation. She works in a large office with about thirty other secretaries. They perform various tasks for the administrative staff. She usually receives her assignments from the head of the secretarial pool, but sometimes she receives them from various heads of administration. Lately, she has been receiving a majority of her work from Jeff Hayes, the vice president of Finance. She is sitting at her desk, finishing a typing job when Mr. Hayes walks over to her and sits down in the chair next to her desk. As he is explaining what he would like to be done, he removes a thread from the sleeve of her jacket.

Mary Douglas is a secretary for a large financial corporation. She works in a large office with about thirty other secretaries. They perform various tasks for the administrative staff. She usually receives her assignments from the head of the secretarial pool, but sometimes she receives them from various heads of administration. Lately, she has been receiving a majority of her work from Jeff Hayes, who is the head of the secretarial pool. She is sitting at her desk, finishing a typing job when Mr. Hayes walks over to her and sits down in the chair next to her desk. As he is explaining what he would like to be done, he removes a thread from the sleeve of her jacket.

Jefferson High School is known throughout the area as having an extremely high rate of outstanding academic achievement. Jeannie Evans is a history teacher at the school. She teaches advanced placement history and history honors. She enjoys teaching and the students really seem to get a lot out of her class. The newly hired principle of the school, Gavin Brady, has decided to hold weekly meetings with the teachers in order to get to know the teachers better and learn how the school operates. This week, when the meeting with the principle and other teachers in her division ended, Jeannie stayed after in order to discuss specific matters concerning her classroom. During the conversation, the principle commented, "Your sweater is very flattering."

Jefferson High School is known throughout the area as having an extremely high rate of outstanding academic achievement. Jeannie Evans is a history teacher at the school. She teaches advanced placement history and history honors. She enjoys teaching and the students really seem to get a lot out of her class. The superintendent of the school district, Gavin Brady, has decided to hold monthly meetings with the teachers at the various schools in order to exchange information and keep up with the operations of each school. This week, when the meeting with the superintendent and other teachers in her division ended, Jeannie stayed after in order to discuss specific matters concerning her classroom. During the conversation, the principle commented, "Your sweater is very flattering."

Robin Clark is a journalist for one of the major city newspapers. Her beat is foreign policy and government. She enjoys this area because it gives her a chance to travel. She has just finished writing the last article of a five part series. She is sitting at her computer proofreading the final paragraph when Paul White, the Editor-in-Chief of the newspaper, winks at her as he walks past her desk.

Robin Clark is a journalist for one of the major city newspapers. Her beat is foreign policy and government. She has just finished writing the last article of a five part series. She is sitting at her computer proofreading the final paragraph when Paul White, the editor of foreign policy and government and Robin's immediate supervisor, winks at her as he walks past her desk.

Carworks is a very successful automotive plant. One reason for the organizations success is that they are open 24 hours a day in order to accommodate the needs of their customers. Jennifer Price is a mechanic at the plant. She became interested in automobile reparations after taking an automobile maintenance class at age 16 when she obtained her drivers license. She is a conscientious and efficient worker. As Steven Reynolds, her immediate supervisor, is talking with her, he puts his hand on her shoulder.

Carworks is a very successful automotive plant. One reason for the organizations success is that they are open 24 hours a day in order to accommodate the needs of their customers. Jennifer Price is a mechanic at the plant. She became interested in automobile reparations after taking an automobile maintenance class at age 16 when she obtained her drivers license. She is a conscientious and efficient worker. As Steven Reynolds, the president and founder of Carworks, is talking with her, he puts his hand on her shoulder.

Appendix C

Directions: On the following page, you will find listed a number of personality characteristics. We would like you to use those characteristics to describe yourself; that is, we would like you to indicate, on a scale from 1 to 7, the degree to which each of these characteristics is true of you. The 1 to 7 scale we would like you to use is defined as follows:

- 1 = It is never or almost never true of me.
- 2 = It is usually not true of me.
- 3 = It is sometimes but infrequently true of me.
- 4 = It is occasionally true of me.
- 5 = It is often true of me.
- 6 = It is usually true of me.
- 7 = It is always or almost always true of me.

Thus, if you were asked to rate yourself on the characteristics "sly", "malicious", "irresponsible", and "carefree", and you felt that it is sometimes but infrequently true that you are "sly", never or almost never true that you are "malicious", always or almost always true that you are "irresponsible", and often true that you are "carefree", you would rate these characteristics as follows:

| | | | |
|-----------|----------|---------------|----------|
| Sly | <u>3</u> | Irresponsible | <u>7</u> |
| Malicious | <u>1</u> | Carefree | <u>5</u> |

Please make sure that you rate yourself on all 32 characteristics listed on the following page, using the 1 to 7 scale defined above.

Scale to use for ratings:

- 1 = Never or almost never true of me.
 2 = Usually not true of me.
 3 = Sometimes but infrequently true of me.
 4 = Occasionally true of me.
 5 = Often true of me.
 6 = Usually true of me.
 7 = Always or almost always true of me.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|-------|---------------|-------|
| Defend my own beliefs | _____ | Adaptable | _____ |
| Affectionate | _____ | Dominant | _____ |
| Conscientious | _____ | Tender | _____ |
| Masculine | _____ | Conceited | _____ |
| Sympathetic | _____ | Love Children | _____ |
| Willing to take a stand | _____ | Tactful | _____ |
| Independent | _____ | Moody | _____ |
| Reliable | _____ | Forceful | _____ |
| Sensitive to other's needs | _____ | Conventional | _____ |
| Assertive | _____ | Feminine | _____ |
| Jealous | _____ | Aggressive | _____ |
| Eager to sooth hurt feelings | _____ | Secretive | _____ |
| Have leadership abilities | _____ | Warm | _____ |
| Willing to take risks | _____ | Understanding | _____ |
| Compassionate | _____ | Truthful | _____ |
| Strong Personality | _____ | Gentle | _____ |

APPROVAL SHEET

The thesis submitted by Susan Sheffey has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. R. Scott Tindale, Director
Assistant Professor, Psychology, Loyola

Dr. Linda Heath
Professor, Psychology, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the thesis and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the thesis is now given final approval by the committee with reference to content and form.

The thesis is thereby accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts.

11/28/89

Date

Robert Tindale

Signature