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ABSTRACT

Growing attention to the problem of sexual harassment in academia has stimulated attempts to clearly define the phenomenon. The purpose of this study is to investigate patterns of students' judgments to scenarios designed to represent the "gender harassment," "seductive behavior," and "sexual bribery" (Fitzgerald & Shullman, 1985) domains of sexual harassment without the use of emotionally laden language. Student participants (n=986) completed three questionnaires. The first questionnaire assessed students' sex-role stereotypes and attitudes; the second questionnaire assessed students' experiences of sexual harassment; the third questionnaire assessed judgments of scenarios describing realistic situations between people of different genders, status and academic positions. The scenarios were constructed using emotionally "neutral" language to avoid leading participants to specific judgments of harm or intent. Participants were asked to judge behavior depicted in the scenarios in terms of appropriateness, sexism, sexual harassment, and reportability, without being given a predetermined definition of sexual harassment from which to reference their decisions. Analyses indicate that there is some relationship between stereotypic attitudes and scenario judgments and that there are significant gender differences.
in the patterns of judgments. Significant ethnic
differences in sex-role stereotypes and patterns of
judgments were not obtained. These descriptive data support
other studies which stress the problem of oversimplification
of the dimensions within the phenomenon of sexual
harassment, and may guide future studies designed to more
clearly define the "hostile environment" aspect of sexual
harassment which must consider relationships between gender,
status, academic position, context, and victims perceptions
in determining seriousness of the harassment.
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INTRODUCTION

The Equal Employment Opportunities Commission (EEOC) defined the legal parameters of sexual harassment in 1980, four years after it was first recognized as a legal cause of action under Title VII (Pollack, 1990). Although the EEOC Guidelines do not have the force of law (Brandenberg, 1982), the federal courts rely heavily on them when deciding cases of discrimination (Henken, 1989) and they are considered to provide employees protection from both quid pro quo harassment, defined as an explicit exchange of sex for employment (Henken, 1989; MacKinnon, 1979), and "hostile environment" which addresses less tangible loss or harm (Pollack, 1990).

Given that employment situations covered by Title VII were the initial stage for legal battles involving sexual harassment, it is not surprising that most academic institutions, when faced with possible loss of federal funds for non-compliance with Title IX, adapted the EEOC Guidelines (Crocker, 1983) for use in academia. These Guidelines as cited in Crocker (1983) read, in pertinent part:

Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when:
1. Submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an
individual's employment or admission to an academic program,
2. Submission to or rejection of such conduct is used as the basis for decisions affecting an individual's employment status or academic standing, or
3. Such conduct has the purpose or effect of substantially interfering with an individual's performance on the job or in the classroom, or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work or study environment.

Crocker (1983) identified two issues which have influenced the development and acceptance of definitions of sexual harassment by colleges and universities that can be used to illustrate the problem of simply adopting the EEOC's legalistic definition for use in academia. First, the application of specific terminology within the definitions themselves may be problematic, and second, interpretations of the "most serious" types of sexual harassment may be influenced by these terms. This study was designed to 1) investigate the influence of terminology on judgments of seriousness of certain types of behavior by analyzing students' responses to scenarios depicting interactions between people in academic settings, and 2) determine patterns of gender differences in these judgments.

Interpretations of the seriousness of sexual harassment incidents are quite clearly reflected in the terminology used to characterize the type of harassment experienced. The word "submission" in the basic definition quoted above, for example, communicates the perceived lack of power on the
part of the harassed person, yet does not address the relative degree of power a supervisor or a professor might actually have over the harassed person. For example, a student may be so academically, psychologically and financially dependent on a professor and the institution he represents that little or no actual force is necessary before she feels the implications of her refusal to comply with his wishes. In other words, questions such as, "How much 'force' does it take in different settings for 'submission' to occur? and 'If 'force' is not applied, is the relationship one of 'consent'?" must be considered when attempts to define the domain of sexual harassment are made.

As even this brief foray into legal discourse shows, the role of language and legal terminology in shaping definitions of sexual harassment is complex. Similar problems exist with regard to judgments of the seriousness of different situations. Common assumptions that direct requests for sexual favors in exchange for rights or privileges of work or education--"quid pro quo" harassment--are more serious than "hostile environment" harassment cases, which may be less directly threatening, have not been tested empirically. It may be that students view hostile environment situations as more damaging to their mental health or professional futures than quid pro quo harassment. In short, the legal heritage of sexual
harassment law, reflected in legal terminology and judgments of severity, has developed independently of an empirical research base which would examine the accuracy of these and other assumptions. Legal definitions are, in part, derived through public consensus regarding the 'reasonableness' of a standard for conduct. Since these standards may be influenced by information and data from the social sciences, this investigation addresses some of the variables which may contribute to contextually distinct definitions within the domain of sexual harassment.

The next section contains a review of the legal and psychological literatures related to definitions of sexual harassment. The following section will address the psychological dimensions of sexual harassment, including a discussion of perpetrators and victims, prevalence data, and descriptions of psychological aspects of the phenomenon. Subsequent sections will focus on the current study including the rationale, design, instrumentation and methods, analyses and results, and implications for future research.
LEGAL AND OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Legal Definitions

The evolution of legal and behavioral definitions of sexual harassment and subsequent stereotypes of both victims and perpetrators in academia are similar to those of female victims and male perpetrators of other 'sex' crimes. Within the criminological literature there are many references to the tendency of the criminal justice system to encourage the use of consensual definitions to enhance the efficiency of the legal process (Sudnow, 1965) and of the practices which maintain these definitions (LaFree, 1989). For example, in some states charges of rape must be corroborated by a witness (Estrich, 1991; Quina, 1990) and judges instructions have frequently included a warning to jurors that rape is easy to accuse and hard to prove (Brownmiller, 1975). Of all victims of violent crime, only women who have been sexually victimized are required to answer questions in court regarding their past behavior and experiences (Estrich, 1991)--even the accused rapist can not be asked such questions in front of a jury--and, as LaFree (1989) found in his comprehensive study of jurors attitudes regarding sexual assault cases, attitudes regarding victims' gender-role behavior and moral character are directly linked to their determinations of defendant guilt. The consensual definition being applied may be that women are, at least to
some degree, responsible for being raped, and it is the role of the court and the jury to determine how responsible the raped women is for the assault as evidenced by her past behavior. Sexual harassment cases are handled in a similar manner (Estrich, 1991). For example, in the only sexual harassment case to reach the Supreme Court (Meritor Savings Bank v. Mechele Vinson, 477 U.S. 57, 68, 1986), the court ruled that evidence of Vinson's "sexually provocative speech or dress" was "obviously relevant" in determining proof of unwelcomeness of sexual harassment (Pollack, 1990). Besides being inadequate in defining the subjugation and injury of sexual harassment (and other forms of abuse) for women (MacKinnon, 1979; Pollack, 1990), the practice of applying 'neutral' criteria for credibility and proof reduces the characteristics of individuals who are sexually harassed to clusters representing "normal" victims.

Catherine MacKinnon's decade of work in the area of sexual harassment theory and legal practice has been widely influential (Fitzgerald, 1990). MacKinnon (1979) contributed a definition to early discussions of sexual harassment which accepts sex as the primary motivation for men to commit sexual harassment. More recently, MacKinnon expanded on her early definitions by adding that sexual harassment is offensive when an "unwanted imposition of sexual requirements in the context of a relationship of

In general, behavior such as leering or ogling, sexually suggestive or sexist jokes or remarks, 'accidental' physical contact, 'friendly' pats, squeezes or pinches, subtle pressure for sexual activity, propositions accompanied by threats of tangible loss or harm, and sexual assault are commonly considered forms of sexual harassment (MacKinnon, 1979). However, responses to less tangible hostile environment claims involving repeated requests for dates, sexual innuendoes, and other sexually toned overtures may be more discrepant. Because many people rely on the consensual legal and institutional definitions of sexual harassment when they are not affected personally by the problem, they may more easily accept behavior which involves actual or expected physical contact and negative or insulting behavior as sexually harassing (McCormick, Adams-Bohley, Peterson & Gaeddert, 1990), possibly because it more closely approximates their understanding of aberrant or unnecessarily aggressive behavior. Since sexual harassment is considered a sexually motivated form of behavior, less insidious forms of harassment are often discounted as simply a "natural" expressed recognition of a woman's attractiveness (Herbert, 1989).

Additionally, in part because it was originally developed to address non-academic employment settings and
later extended to academia, the law is not constructed to adequately address situations involving harassment by a peer. For example, legal precedents which will allow the gender hierarchy to be considered in cases of sexual harassment involving co-workers, have only recently been set (see Ellison v. Brady, ___F.2d___, 1991 WL 4579 (9th Cir. 1991)). In the Ellison decision, the court for the first time determined that the standard for evaluating the severity of sexual harassment should be that of a "reasonable woman," since women's experiences of intergender personal and professional relationships and interactions may be quite different from those of men. Thus, definitions of sexual harassment have broadened in substantial ways in recent years.

Operational Definitions

While legally accepted definitions of sexual harassment have undergone a series of changes, and institutionally accepted definitions differ (Wilson & Krauss, 1981), personal definitions are in some ways dependent on both. Fitzgerald (1990) cites the difficulty of establishing an agreed upon definition of sexual harassment as one of the most persistent and troubling problems associated with the literature in this area, and the lack of a commonly accepted linguistic definition of sexual harassment has made finding a satisfactory operational definition even more difficult.
As is often the case in the progression of research in new areas of the social sciences (Edwards & Cronbach, 1952, cited in Fitzgerald, 1990), initial attempts to isolate and define variables of interest have been open-ended and descriptive in nature. The most common data-based strategies for developing definitions of sexual harassment have involved asking women who have been sexually harassed to describe their experiences. Early studies of sexual harassment in academia such as those conducted by Benson and Thomas (1982), Lott, Reilly and Howard (1982), Adams, Kottke, and Padgitt (1983), and Wilson and Krauss (1981) consisted of surveys which identified or described actual incidents of sexual harassment which met a preexisting definition or description of sexual harassment included in the survey instrument. The definitions used in the various instruments were obtained differently in each case, creating basic problems of reliability and validity which are only recently beginning to be addressed in this area of research (Fitzgerald, 1990).

In order for a series of studies or even a single study to reflect a reasonable degree of content validity, the domain of interest must be clearly defined and used to generate sets of items which will adequately sample the domain (Fitzgerald, 1990). The items must then be shown to be interpreted similarly by all respondents so that the
instrument may be considered a reliable measure of the domain of interest. Since there are substantial differences in individual perceptions of what actually constitutes sexual harassment, procedures which ask research participants to determine whether they have been sexually harassed after labeling certain behaviors as sexually harassing introduces systematic and random error into the response rate (Fitzgerald, 1990). Those studies which ask participants to determine intent as part of their assessment are even more problematic. Women’s subjective determinations of others’ intentions may result in a lowering of actual incidence rates since they have been socialized to accept many types of behavior which may be sexually exploitative as sexual jokes or even as complimentary (Fitzgerald, 1990). Similarly, men may not view their behavior as inappropriate, contributing to lower rates of reporting by male subjects, as well.

Probably the most commonly cited study which attempted to develop definitions of sexual harassment which were consensually validated (Fitzgerald, 1990) was that reported by Guteck, Morasch and Cohen (1983) in which employee participants were presented with a series of vignettes of social-sexual behavior in workplace settings. This influential study varied the gender and status of the initiator of the interaction and his/her behavior and asked
the research participants to make determinations regarding the relationship between the initiator and the recipient and aspects of the incident itself. The results of this study indicate that the status of the initiator, explicitness of the behavior and degree of connection to the work situation all influence perceptions of sexual harassment (Guteck, et al., 1983); their findings that women are significantly more likely to perceive a situation as sexually harassing are the most robust reported to date (Fitzgerald, 1990). Subsequent studies, such as that conducted by Ormerod (1987) in a university setting, support the finding that behaviors initiated by an individual with a distinct status advantage over the recipient of the behavior are more likely to be judged as sexual harassment than behaviors initiated by peers. Konrad and Guteck (1986) found that in an employment setting, the status of the initiator was closely related to participants' judgments of coercion on the part of the initiator. Furthermore, just as rape is now considered a violent way to assert power using a physical strength advantage or threat with a weapon (Groth, 1979), analyses of case studies of sexual harassment in academia support the hypothesis that a sexual harasser uses his age, social position, academic authority, and economic influence in a students' life to assert power, depending on fear and/or vulnerability of a victim to ensure control (Bond, 1988;
Yet, interesting studies recently conducted indicate that these salient positional differences may not always be the key. Goodwin, Roscoe, Rose and Repp (1990), report that among university employees, the most common perpetrators of sexual harassment are male co-workers or peers. A recent study by the Project on the Status and Education of Women (1988) also reports that a large proportion of the sexual harassment experienced by female students is levied by their peers. In all cases of sexual harassment, the element of power remains central to the victim's perception of the incidents (Shullman & Watts, 1990)--in the case of peer harassment then, the power differential is created by the gender hierarchy rather than by a formal or institutional status differential.

Till (1980) classified the responses of a nation-wide sample of women college students into five general categories of sexual harassment which have been used to define the domains of interest in numerous subsequent studies conducted by Fitzgerald and her colleagues (Fitzgerald & Shullman, 1985; Fitzgerald, Shullman, Bailey, Richards, Swecker, Gold, Ormerod, & Weitzman, 1988; Ormerod, 1987). These domains have been revised by Fitzgerald and colleagues into the following categories: gender harassment, defined as generalized sexist remarks and behavior such as suggestive stories or offensive jokes; seductive behavior,
defined as inappropriate and offensive but sanction-free sexual advances such as attempts to draw a recipient into an unwanted discussion of personal or sexual matters; sexual bribery, defined as solicitation of sex-linked behavior by promise of rewards such as being subtly offered a good grade to engage in social-sexual behavior; sexual coercion, defined as sexual activity which is coerced by threat of punishment such as being directly threatened with a failing grade for not engaging in a sexual relationship; and, sexual imposition, defined as assaultive behavior such as forced physical contact. Additional studies (e.g., Franklin, Moglin, Zatling-Boring, & Angress, 1981) have made clear distinctions between gender and sexual harassment. Although Franklin et al. consider gender harassment a form of sexual harassment, they consider those behaviors which are primarily verbal (e.g., sexual remarks, jokes, and innuendos) as being directed at the recipient because she is considered inferior; that is, they are not necessarily intended to elicit sexual cooperation. This distinction may be illuminated by drawing an analogy between the "gender" form of sexual harassment and racial and ethnic slurs (Paludi, Grossman, Scott, Kindermann, Matulda, Ostwald, Dovan & Mulcahy, 1990), which are designed to communicate that superiority of the person making the comment. The primary drawback of this distinction for sexual harassment
is that it emphasizes the intent of the initiator and subordinates the perceptions of the recipient in determining the existence of the insult. While the problem of intent today rarely surfaces in regard to racial or ethnic slurs, gender-related "jokes" and comments are still generally acceptable in many contexts and intent (or lack thereof) is a frequent defense for those accused of insulting or degrading women.

In academia, the most divergent views regarding definitions of sexual harassment are not between students and faculty, but between women and men (Hite, 1990; Paludi, 1990a; Truax, 1989). Women students and women faculty are much more likely than their male counterparts to feel that "social-sexual" behavior, such as expected socializing and sexual touching, may be sexually harassing. Their ability to identify themselves as potential victims of sexual harassment, even if they have not been subjected to it in the past, likely effects these views. And, as one might expect, women who reject rigid sex-role stereotypes tend to define sexual harassment more broadly than do women who accept these roles (McCormick et al., 1990).

The interpretations of sexually-toned behavior by people who have been sexually harassed may, on occasion, be more accurate in relation to the behavior and experiences of others than in relation to their own experiences. Witness,
for example, the hesitancy of victims of rape to label their experience rape, even when clear legal and societal conventions would support that label (Koss, 1985; 1990). Numerous case studies provide examples of victims of sexual harassment similarly unwilling or unable to label their experiences as sexually harassing. Clinical researchers contend that sexual harassment victims responses are consistent with those of other forms of sexual assault (Koss, 1990; Rabinowitz, 1990) and little is known about the differences in personal definitions of sexual harassment between groups of people who have and groups of people who have not been sexually harassed.

The key to understanding these different perspectives on sexual harassment may involve accepting Farley's (1978) definition of sexual harassment as a power-motivated rather than a sex-motivated behavior. According to Farley, the primary factor in determining whether behavior is potentially sexually harassing is the perception of a power differential between the initiator and recipient of the behavior by the recipient. In other words, the perceived ability of a person who is sexually harassed to alter the relationship between herself and the harasser, combined with her tendency to either accept or reject such interference, will determine whether she considers herself "victimized" by a harasser's actions. Research such as this, which examines
the concomitants of power (status, position, authority, gender) in sexual harassment is still in its' infancy (Fitzgerald, 1990).
SOCIAL-PSYCHOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Perpetrator Typologies

Dziech and Weiner (1984) suggest that professors who sexually harass are of two distinct types: the public and the private harasser. The public harasser may be overtly sexist and seductive with students and women colleagues, making openly suggestive remarks and comments and frequently telling sexually toned jokes and stories. Public harassers are rarely considered coercive (Dziech and Weiner, 1984). Private harassers are often the opposite of public harassers in style and strategy. Private harassers create a public persona which is appropriate and even conservative and then use this persona, and their formal authority, as a subterfuge to gain access to students, who are unprepared for the change in demeanor when they are alone with him (Dziech and Weiner, 1984). Within these two typologies are several categories of both public and private harassers based on the particular roles they assume: the counselor/helper may encourage students to trust him by offering extra help on assignments, talking about personal problems, or even loaning money; the confidante encourages self-disclosure on the students' part by disclosing personal information about himself, later using the fact that he and the student shared information to convince the student and others that the relationship was consensual; the
intellectual seducer uses his professional role to gain information about students as a part of class requirements, often requiring the content of written papers to be highly personal or sensitive; and the opportunist simply takes advantage of various types of circumstances to gain intimacy with his students (Dzeich and Weiner, 1984). The common theme among all acknowledged types of men who sexually harass is that, when questioned, they deny the power they hold over women students (Zalk, 1990), and as Fitzgerald (1990) points out, they rarely choose to harass in front of witnesses.

Contrasting these sexual harasser categories and typologies with the blitz versus confidence rape categories and Groth's (1977) typology of rapists, helps to clarify the sexual assault continuum of sexual harassment and rape discussed by Koss (1990), Quina (1990), and others. First, there is a similarity between blitz rape, which occurs when the victim has no prior acquaintance with the assailant, and opportunistic sexual harassment of women who are unknown to the harasser. Second, the pretenses used to establish the relationship which precedes a confidence rape are often quite similar to those used by sexual harassers: encouraging trust; using strategies such as offering assistance, promising information, material items, employment, social activities; making references to mutual acquaintances; or
trading social pleasantries (Burgess and Holmstrom, 1979). Third, like rape, some sexually harassing behavior, appears to be rooted in misogynistic attitudes and practices. Groth (1977) calls rape a "pseudosexual" (p. 23) rather than a sexual act, pointing out that rapists are compelled more by compensatory and retaliatory motives seeded in anger and hostility toward women than by sexual motives. Fourth, the similarities between manifestations of the expressions of anger and power through 'sexuality' which result in rape, allow "distinguishable patterns of rape [to] become evident" (Groth, 1977, p. 24) as they also do with sexual harassment. The variations in the manifestation of anger and power are dependent on the "hierarchy and interrelationships among the three factors [anger, power, and sexuality] and the relative intensity with which each is experienced and the variety of ways in which each is expressed" (Groth, 1977, p. 23). For example, rage which is manifested as a sexual assault may be directed at individual chosen 'targets' or chance acquaintances, may involve distinct patterns of humiliation and/or physical threat, or even occur in a remarkably patterned location or context, dependent on the specific characteristics of the perpetrator.

While anger, power, and sadistic rapists all use 'sexual' behavior to satisfy non-sexual needs, they do so in
different ways (Groth, 1977). The *anger rapist* is particularly brutal as he vents feelings of anger, rage, hatred and frustration by overpowering and subduing his victim. The *power rapist* uses verbal or physical threats and intimidation to control his victim to assure himself of his power, security, strength, mastery and control. Groth (1977) suggests that power rapists are compensating for feelings of inadequacy, vulnerability and helplessness. The *sadistic rapist* eroticizes his aggression by ritualistically injuring "sexual" areas of a victim's body, finding pleasure in his deliberate attempts to torment and distress his victims. While the overt violence inherent in rape may dramatically overshadow the covert violence of sexual harassment, case studies of women's experiences of sexual harassment indicate that there are many similarities (see Dzeich & Weiner, 1984 and Paludi, 1990b for examples) between experiences of sexual harassment and experiences of rape. Finally, Groth (1977) identifies the primary motivation of all types of rapists, as Dzeich and Weiner (1984), Paludi (1990a; 1990b), Zalk (1990) and many others have done with sexual harassers, as a quest for dominance.

Analyses of case studies of the individual differences in *modus operandi* of both sexual harassers (Zalk, 1990) and rapists (Groth, 1979) indicate that their attitudes about themselves and women influence their particular style of
assault. Zalk points out that sexual harassers lack the emotional maturity to set limits on their own behavior, and "act out" in environments which do not provide sufficient external controls—a theme which finds parallel in studies of rapists (Groth, 1977; Meuhlenhard & Linton, 1987). Zalk (1990) adds three additional themes to Dzeich and Weiner's original public versus private characterization of sexual harassers which further illuminate the similarities between sexual harassment and rape. The *seducer/demander* versus the *receptive/non-initiator* category focuses on the active-passive continuum, referring to the diligence of the harasser in pursuing his victim. Receptive/non-initiators are those who may not make the first overture, and justify sexual involvement with students on the basis that the student "asked" for or offered sex "for free." Zalk (1990) contends that "superego constraints" are operational within this category of harasser, and that this is the primary distinction between receptive and seducer harassers, who may seem to be without conscience. The *untouchable* versus the *risk taker* category is related to the degree of entitlement the harasser assumes, that is, the degree to which he feels access to his victim is his "right." Untouchable harassers are distinguished by narcissism and egocentricity which contribute to their self-perceptions of omnipotence; rules do not apply to them. They may express sincere commitment
to wives, family and job, and "unabashedly escort their student lover to university events" seemingly unaware that this "presents tremendous risks to their status quo" (Zalk, 1990, p. 158). Risk takers, on the other hand, usually recognize the boundaries of acceptable behavior and knows they have "stepped out of line" (Zalk, 1990, p. 158). These harassers seem unable to modify their own behavior and instead blame their victims for tempting them to misbehave and punishing them accordingly (Zalk, 1990). The infatuated versus the sexual conqueror category refers to the dimension of care the harasser has for his victim, that is, whether the attention is directed at a particular woman or women in general. Some counselors and therapists report that men who fit the conquerer profile seemed unable to distinguish between different women, being able to recall specific events and/or encounters but not the identity of the women involved (Zalk, 1990).

Identity of Perpetrators

Although a great deal of data exist (reviewed under Prevalence of Sexual Harassment in Academia) about the prevalence of experiences of sexual harassment, and the typologies of Dzeich and Weiner (1984) and Zalk (1990) offer insight into some of the intrapersonal dynamics which contribute to the propensity of men to "act out" in this manner, little is known about the prevalence or actual
identity of sexual harassers (Fitzgerald & Weitzman, 1990). Some forms of sexual harassment may be experienced by many women at the same time, as when, for example, a professor tells sexually demeaning jokes or uses Playboy magazine to highlight a discussion on female anatomy. In such cases one man may be responsible for sexually harassing hundreds of women through the creation of a hostile educational environment. Other forms of sexual harassment which involve one-to-one interaction offer little evidence of the actual numbers of perpetrators, since professors may still be harassing many different women, albeit on an individual basis. Quina (1990) points out that data from known sex offenders suggests that most sex abusers, from harassers to rapists, are "habitual offenders" who may assault hundreds of victims, often in a remarkably patterned fashion.

Preliminary analyses of data collected by Fitzgerald, Weitzman, Gold & Ormerod (1988), and further analyzed by Fitzgerald and Weitzman (1990) offer some insight into the number of professors who may be sexually harassing their students. In their survey of 235 male faculty from a "prestigious research-oriented university," they found that more than 37 percent indicated that they had attempted to initiate "personal" relationships with students, and 40.2 percent of these reported that their attempts were directed exclusively at female students. Over one-quarter of their
sample indicated that they had dated students and an even higher percentage reported that they had engaged in sexual encounters with students. Eleven percent reported that they had attempted to "stroke, caress or touch" a female student. Despite the results of these behavioral inventories, only one man reported that he had ever sexually harassed a student. (Since men's and women's perceptions of "sexually toned" behavior often differ substantially (Hite, 1990; Paludi, 1990a; Truax, 1989), it may be that recipients of these overtures would label the interactions very differently.) Based on these self-report data, Fitzgerald et al. (1988) suggest that a conservative estimate of the number of faculty who become sexually involved with their students is 25 percent, and that these men are indistinguishable from their colleagues by age, marital status, rank or academic discipline.

The data collected by Fitzgerald et al. (1988) from women faculty members and discussed by Fitzgerald and Weitzman (1990) indicate that they hold substantially different attitudes and perceptions regarding their students from those of their male colleagues, and that their experiences with students are also different from those of their male colleagues. The vast majority of these women reported that they established "friendships" with students which were not sexual in nature and that the friendships
were with both women and men. In fact, none of the women reported exclusively forming friendships with male students. Only seven percent of the women reported ever dating a student with even fewer reporting engaging in sexual encounters with students. In addition, nine percent reported being the targets of physical overtures of a sexual nature from male students and 15 percent reported being asked by male students for dates, drinks, and so on.

While Fitzgerald and Weitzman (1990) report that men in the sample took pains to describe circumstances in which sexual interactions between faculty and students are appropriate, the women who commented along this vein addressed the prevalence and injustice of sexual harassment. All three of the women who reported being sexually involved with male students expressed discomfort and uncertainty about the relationship which increased over time, even though the relationships began after the formal faculty-student relationship had ended (Fitzgerald & Weitzman, 1990). (Fitzgerald and Weitzman do not report any data regarding the incidence of same-sex relationships for either female or male faculty.)

These data suggest that women academicians are not likely to initiate sexual relationships with male students, although they are likely to develop mentoring relationships or friendships with them. Additionally, reports from men
who say they have been sexually harassed, indicate that
their harasser was a "young, attractive, single woman with
little or no workplace authority" (Fitzgerald & Weitzman,
1990, p.137), and the great majority of these men report
being flattered by the sexual advances they received
(Guteck, 1985). These attitudes, combined with the fact
that women 1) rarely hold organizational power which would
allow them to reward men for sexual compliance, and 2) tend
to accept patterns of sex-role behavior which make it
extremely unlikely that they would demand sexual favors in
the first place (Fitzgerald & Weitzman, 1990), support the
conclusion that, while it is possible for women to sexually
harass men, the likelihood of their doing so is
statistically so remote that referring to sexual harassment
in non-gendered terms "unjustly dilutes the damage wrought
by male sexual harassment of females" (Elgart & Schanfield,

Justifications of Perpetrators

As in the case of perpetrators of physical violence
against women (Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987; Ryan, 1988;
Scully & Marolla, 1984; Walker, 1979), sexual harassers are
often provided with a multitude of social justifications for
their behavior by their colleagues and friends, and by
social norms (Farley, 1978; Herbert, 1989; MacKinnon, 1979;
Wise & Stanley, 1987). Men are allowed "minor"
transgressions against women because of their "nature," and are forgiven more serious abuses because of the "nature" of women (Herbert, 1989). Self-reports of rapists and non-rapists provide insight into the ways men justify aggression against women (Scully & Morolla, 1984), many of whom are unable to acknowledge that women have a right to say "no" to sexual overtures from men, or believe that a woman's "no" really means "no" (Quina, 1990).

While information on the characteristics of men who sexually harass is somewhat limited (Paludi & DeFour, 1990), research suggests that male professors' perceptions of their 'social' behavior in general, may be quite different from the perceptions of the female recipients of the behavior (Fitzgerald et al. 1988; Hite, 1990; Paludi, 1990a; Truax, 1989). Truax (cited in Paludi & DeFour, 1990) states that there is often little disagreement with what has happened between students and professor, but rather, with what the behavior means. Professors will try to justify their behavior on the grounds that ...the student would be flattered by the attention (p. 24).

The degree to which men misconstrue the friendly behavior of women as sexually provocative (Abbey, 1987) and then act on their perceptions (Lipton, McDonel & McFall, 1987) offers further support for the notion that the precise content of the harassment experienced by women in academia is determined daily by the men with whom they work. That is, because men are still commonly allowed to define their
behavior as sexually harassing or not (Hite, 1990) within university communities, women must continue to argue in response to men's perception of their own behavior, when, in fact as in law, the intent of the harasser is quite irrelevant to a legal determination of cause for sexual harassment (Goodwin et al., 1990).

The tension between men and women in an academic community is often heightened by men who believe themselves to be nonsexist and who do not appreciate the institutionalized privilege they hold over women (Dzeich & Weiner, 1984), and by professors who deny the institutionalized power differential between themselves and their students (Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Paludi, 1990a). Male professors who report frequent initiation of personal relationships with female students frequently fail to acknowledge that the students' actual freedom of choice to engage in a social relationship may be somewhat (or greatly) limited by fear of retaliation or academic reprisal (Zalk and Dederick, cited in Paludi, 1990a). These last two sections help frame the importance of perspective taking in this field of inquiry, and set the stage for further discussion of the severity of the problem of sexual harassment in academia.

Victims of Sexual Harassment

The life experiences of women who are sexually harassed are similar in some ways to the life experiences of women
who have been sexually assaulted or battered (Truax, 1989; Walker, 1979). Like victims of battering, many women who are sexually harassed are also victims of prior or repeated instances of sexual assault (Truax, 1989); a similar pattern of repeated victimization has been found in the case of child sex abuse (Russell, 1984), and marital rape (Frieze, 1983). For some reason, the social forces which contribute to such patterns of repeated abuse of women have been difficult to subvert. As Russell (1984), Truax (1989), and Walker (1979) have all pointed out, even a single experience of sexual victimization can generate powerful feelings of helplessness and erode victims' self-esteem, initiating cycles of repeated abuse which eventually serve to confirm attributions of self-blame and replace the victim's lost sense of stability--both of which further contribute to feelings of helplessness (Peters, 1988).

It may be quite simply that sex-role socialization leaves women vulnerable to victimization and men vulnerable to perpetrating acts of violence against them (Guteck, 1985; Walker, 1979). Estrich (1991) points out that the treatment of women as sexual objects is still commonly considered acceptable behavior outside of the workplace, reflecting the salience of the experience of subordination women face in their daily lives. Few women are unfamiliar with at least some strategies they have constructed to protect themselves
from potentially dangerous circumstances they find themselves in at work, at school, in the park, and, of course, at home, yet women are confronted daily with situations in which they are vulnerable to men, should the men decide to act in a physically aggressive way. Most women become expert negotiators of power dynamics with men—learning to 'selectively avoid' those situations which are risky (Paludi & DeFour, 1990)—situations in which they are made the target of anatomical discussions or jokes, verbally abused, or aggressively fondled. Many potentially dangerous situations can be avoided. Women may avoid being alone on the street, in a bar or restaurant, at a store, in a car, or in a public restroom—locations well-known to women as risky—but many work and school-related situations such as meetings with a boss or supervisor or advisor are more difficult to avoid. And negotiation may not be useful if a man decides to exert his power without any consideration of a woman's rights, feelings, or perceptions, particularly in situations where the woman's position is complicated further by additional elements of subordinate roles, economic power differentials and economic dependence (Guteck, 1985). Furthermore, many women with prior histories of abuse may never have learned any negotiating strategies at all, so, when such abuse does occur, some women who perceive themselves as powerless to act, believe that they must
tolerate the harassment. Those who do feel more powerful may make attempts to undermine the harassment if they are able, as in the case of undergraduate students who often attempt to forestall escalation of sexual harassment by male professors (Rabinowitz, 1990). However, since a woman’s financial, economic or institutional dependency on a professor may be very great (Guteck, 1985), and her professional (and therefore personal) future may depend on her ability to appease him, such attempts are usually not risk free.

Prevalence of Sexual Harassment in Academia

Estimates of the prevalence of sexual harassment of women students on college campuses are affected by both institutional and personal definitions of sexual harassment, and by the methods of data collection used by researchers. Like faculty, when students are asked to respond to questions about their experiences of sexual harassment which are couched in legal terms or definitions, the reported incidence rate is low. However, when they are asked to respond to scenarios or questions about their experiences which use more descriptive language, reported incidence rates increase, often substantially. Clearly, differences in the way sexual harassment is defined or described will affect individuals’ abilities to identify their own experiences as sexually harassing or not, and will
contribute to reported rates of sexual harassment on campuses and elsewhere.

Estimates of prevalence of sexual harassment among university students using non-standardized definitions and strategies range from 15-89% (Adams, et al., 1983; Benson & Thomson, 1982; Bond, 1987; 1988; Carlson & Tibbetts, 1988; Glaser & Thorpe, 1986; Maihoff & Forrest, 1983; Mazur & Percival, 1989; McCormick et al., 1990; Reilly, Lott & Gallogly, 1986; Singer, 1989; Smith, 1988; Wilson & Krauss, 1981), making empirically driven discussions regarding incidence rates very problematic. For example, Truax (1989) reports that 35 to 40 percent of women students on a typical college campus are affected by sexual harassment, and that 95 percent of the victims are females who are sexually harassed by males. In contrast, Mazur and Percival (1989) report sexual harassment rates of 85 to 89 percent, with no significant sex differences for overall rates of experience. An additional empirical problem exists in that many of these studies ask respondents to evaluate their experiences of sexual harassment based on the type of behavior, not on the identity of the harasser. Thus, most reporting rates include data pertaining to peer harassment as well as professor-student harassment, without distinguishing between the two. Therefore, it is not clear what proportion of these incidents involve student peers,
faculty and students, faculty peers, or faculty and administrators, as not all prevalence research standardizes these types of questions. In addition, since most attempts to define or explain sexual harassment have not clearly addressed peer harassment, the major theoretical models which have been developed may only pertain to a subset of cases described by students. Therefore, gathering information about incidences of peer harassment is important. Methodological problems aside, liberal and conservative estimates of sexual harassment prevalence indicate that sexual harassment on college campuses exists in large proportions.

A variable which has not been considered in investigations of sexual harassment, but which is also important in assessing prevalence and the role of power in sexual harassment, is the racial and ethnic background of the initiator and recipient of the harassment. Little is known about this element since most published studies on prevalence or attitudes have either not asked for or not reported data regarding the racial or ethnic background of research participants (Quina, 1990). According to Quina (1990), there are at least two groups of factors which may make women of color more vulnerable to sexual harassment than Caucasian women: economic factors and racial stereotypes. While the economic dependence of a victim on a
sexual harasser has previously been noted, the correlation between race and social class often makes women of color more economically vulnerable than Caucasian women. Most women of color in academic institutions in the U.S. are secretaries, administrative staff, cooks and housekeepers; those who are faculty members are often untenured (Quina, 1990). Since relatively few women of color hold positions of power within the academy, students who are women of color may have few relevant role models within the institution. Similarly, the racial stereotypes of women of color may increase their vulnerability to sexual harassment as many of these commonly held images portray them as unusually sexual or desiring of sexual attention (Quina, 1990; Tong, 1984). The combination of these two factors may also compound the vulnerability of students who are women of color, as each tends to reinforce the other. For example, women of color who are financially dependent on their low-status positions in the university may tolerate racially stereotyped comments about their personal lives, which harassers may consider confirmation of an image which is then used to initiate a similar interaction with a student who is a woman of color. Since experiences and attitudes regarding sexual harassment are intricately linked (Brooks & Perot, 1991), it is reasonable to assume that the experiences of women of color who are sexually harassed may affect their definitions of
and attitudes regarding sexual harassment in ways discernibly different from those of most Caucasian women. Additionally, DeFour (1990) points out that previous experiences with the legal system may make women of color even less likely to report sexual harassment than Caucasian women, as they have found that mainstream strategies for handling such problems have not worked for them in the past.

Effects of Sexual Harassment on Victims

In addition to research designed to define the parameters of sexual harassment and obtain information on prevalence, and studies designed to examine specifically the role of a power differential on the dynamics of sexual harassment (Bond, 1988), clinical studies have focused on the effects of harassment on the victim (Malovich and Stake, 1990). The consequences of sexual harassment on the personal and professional lives of women students are described by researchers (Paludi & DeFour, 1990; Smith, 1986; 1988) and victims (see Dzeich & Weiner, 1984, for examples of case studies) as devastating. The age at which most students attend college is often a time when individuals both question and begin to assert their independence, developing a commitment to sets of values which are reflections of their self-images and personal identities (Cole & Cole, 1989). These processes may be more critical or delicate for women due to cohort effects, since,
for most, their access to women as role models at home or elsewhere has been limited. Women may lack the psycho-social foundation men have, in terms of family history and support, and cultural expectations regarding their educational and occupational futures. Sexual harassment can undermine and even destroy the positive college experience for some women, replacing feelings of self-worth and efficacy with self-doubt and powerlessness.

Anger, fear, grief (Quina, 1990), anxiety, depression, insomnia (Rabinowitz, 1988), guilt, shame, distorted body image, problems in other relationships (Quina, 1990), lowered self-esteem (Paludi, 1990b; Paludi & DeFour, 1990; Quina, 1990), lost education and work opportunities (Dzeich & Weiner, 1984), dropped classes, changed majors and withdrawal from school (Rabinowitz, 1990; Smith, 1988), have all been reported as effects of sexual harassment in academia. Koss (1990) suggests that when sexual harassment experiences are particularly traumatic, women may exhibit characteristics of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder such as intense terror, flashbacks of the event(s), helplessness, hypervigilance and arousal, eating disorders, avoidance of stimuli associated with the event(s), and general numbing of response. Tong (1984) identified a "sexual harassment syndrome," identifying general emotional and physical responses to sexual harassment which include:
--general depression which is manifested in various complaints which prevent the student from attending class or completing work;
--overall dissatisfaction with school;
--sense of powerlessness, helplessness and vulnerability;
--loss of academic self-confidence, and decline in academic performance;
--feelings of isolation from other students;
--changes in attitudes or behaviors regarding sexual relationships;
--irritability with family and friends;
--fear and anxiety;
--inability to concentrate;
--alcohol and drug dependency.

These effects vary from person to person and are frequently suffered in silence (Dzeich & Weiner, 1984). In addition, victims may not recognize their reactions and "symptoms" as being related to being sexually harassed (Koss, 1990; Rabinowitz, 1990).

Sexual harassment shares important similarities with various forms of sexual assault, and although it is rarely as violent or life threatening as rape, structural and social features such as psychological effects (Koss, 1990; Quina, 1990) and the way cases are handled legally (Pollack, 1990) may be common to both. In addition, most women who have been sexually harassed experience an enormous amount of guilt, shame and self-doubt regarding their experiences (Rabinowitz, 1990), similar to that experienced by victims of physically violent 'sexual' crimes (Koss, 1990; Walker, 1979), such as rape and incest. Women in the United States are socialized to take responsibility for arousing men's
sexual interest (Rabinowitz, 1990) and are therefore vulnerable to interpretations of harassment and assault which blame them for the perpetrator's behavior (Jensen & Guteck, 1982). In many of the case studies cited (see Dzieich & Weiner, 1984; Quina, 1990, for examples), students have retrospectively reported a "set-up" period during which the harasser lavished them with intellectual praise and attention, rendering them vulnerable to later overtly sexual harassment. When the behavior or expectations of the professor changed abruptly, these women frequently exonerated their professors and accepted blame for the souring of the relationship, because they were initially flattered by his "intellectual" interest (Quina, 1990; Rabinowitz, 1990). Because women of college age frequently lack confidence in their academic and intellectual abilities (Kenig & Ryan, 1986), they may be particularly easy targets for male faculty who use their academic positions to gain social access to women. Women who seem to suffer most from being sexually harassed by their professors are those who feel they had previously had a good mentoring or long-standing working relationship with the professor who harassed them (Glaser & Thorpe, 1986). After being harassed by a formerly trusted mentor or advisor, these women will often question their previous academic success and frequently become suspicious of all male faculty (Benson &
Thompson, 1982). This pattern is similar to that of other forms of sexual assault in which recovery is more difficult for the victim when the perpetrator is known, especially when there was a long-term relationship of trust between them which was betrayed (Finkelhor, 1988).

Less is known about the effects of peer sexual harassment on women students. Researchers who delve into the case histories of individual women usually focus on dramatic cases which resulted in salient damage or distress. Since academia and society more readily accept those cases which occur within the context of an institutionalized power differential as sexual harassment, women whose experiences fit these criteria may be more likely to expose themselves to research and/or public scrutiny than are women whose experiences are less stereotypic.

Data from various areas of research into victimization of women do provide a general profile of response which can probably be applied to victims of all types of sexual harassment. Quina (1990) writes, "The striking thing about sexual harassment is that it is almost never harmless" (p.93). Women who are sexually harassed find that their sense of control over their future and belief in a "just world" are shattered; many will no longer view themselves as strong and their positive self-image is often destroyed.
(Rabinowitz, 1990). To acknowledge victimization, of any sort, is to acknowledge loss. The pain of these losses may be the primary reason so many women choose not to acknowledge their experiences as sexual harassment. As Dzeich and Weiner (1984) point out, even students who are able to identify a harasser will rarely view themselves as having been sexually harassed or victimized.

There is a wide range of needs for individual resolution of experiences of sexual harassment (Quina, 1990). Those women who report severe emotional and/or academic reactions such as fear, anxiety and stress behaviors may need timely counseling or therapy, while those with less dramatic responses may find that their discomfort simply lessens over time. Other responses such as guilt, depression, helplessness and relationship problems may increase with time (Quina, 1990), requiring direct and even intensive intervention for resolution to occur. Most women find that it helps to talk to someone about their experiences. Many simply need to have their perceptions validated to begin to accept their reactions as normal and healthy; finding that others’ experiences are often quite similar helps to undermine the victim-blaming which women who are sexually harassed inevitably face (Koss, 1990; Quina, 1990; Rabinowitz, 1990).

Researchers and therapists emphasize that treatment of sexually harassed women should include providing information
regarding the prevalence of sexual harassment to assure women that they are not alone; emphasizing that the origin of sexual harassment is in power relations and that women are not responsible for others' aggressive behavior, regardless of the way they behave or dress; acknowledging the emotional, behavioral and physical effects of sexual harassment to validate women's experiences and assure them that their reactions are normal; countering tendencies to accept blame and responsibility, particularly in those women who complied with the harasser in any way; and encouraging expression of anger, resentment, and sense of loss without judging whether legally definable events occurred (Koss, 1990; Rabinowitz, 1990). Most important to recovery from sexual harassment is that women have access to information and intervention in a supportive and empowering environment which will enable them to regain the abilities to problem solve, make decisions and behave assertively--abilities which are often damaged by these experiences (Quina, 1990; Rabinowitz, 1990).

**Victim and Non-victim Responses to Sexual Harassment**

Stereotypes which contribute to the formation of perceptions of women as victims of rape and other sexual assaults include assumptions about the relevance to the incident of assault of women's physical characteristics and sexual propensities (Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson &
Rosenkrantz, 1972; Clark & Lewis, 1977), women's degree of responsibility for causing the crime (Ryan, 1988), and personal characteristics (Sattem, Savells & Murray, 1984), which find parallel in literature pertaining to attitudes toward women who have been sexually harassed by their professors (Dzech & Weiner, 1984; LaFree, Reskin & Visher, 1985; Valentine-French & Radke, 1989). Quina (1990) provides three categories of stereotypic "myths" about victims of sexual abuse which illuminate these perceptions and assumptions. They are 1) sexual assault is a form of seduction in which women seduce men who are powerless to resist their own stronger sex drives, 2) women secretly need and want to be forced into sex, and 3) women do not tell the truth about being assaulted. These myths are clearly illuminated in the classic response to most victims of any type of sexual assault, "What were you doing and what were you wearing?" (Quina, 1990).

Both the level of understanding individuals have regarding the institutionally accepted parameters for sexual harassment grievances, and sex-role related and personal resource related factors such as those obtained from self-report inventories (Baker, Terpstra, & Larntz, 1990; Terpstra & Baker, 1989) will affect their reactions and ability to effectively confront their own and others' experiences of sexual harassment. Students' familiarity
with definitions of sexual harassment and campus policies prohibiting this behavior depend on a number of factors such as the visibility of the issues of sexual harassment and sex discrimination at the institution (Markunas & Joyce-Brady, 1986), university commitment to educating the campus community about the problem (Allen & Okawa, 1987), and personal knowledge and/or experience of sexual harassment (Lott et al., 1982; Brooks & Perot, 1991).

Personal attitudes regarding sexual harassment will also depend on social-psychological factors as such social mores and stereotypes, and additional factors such as gender (Baker et al., 1990; Lott et al., 1982), acceptance of sex-role stereotypes and other personal characteristics such as self-esteem (Malovich & Stake, 1990), locus of control (Baker et al., 1990; Terpstra & Baker, 1989), and political perspective (McCormick et al., 1990). Individual responses to experiences of sexual harassment will vary as a function of such personal and social factors as the harassed woman’s personal style, the severity and duration of the incidents, and the availability of social support afterward (Quina, 1990).

Research indicates that many women students do feel powerless to take effective action against a professor who is harassing and often find that access to women faculty who might advocate for them is limited (Paludi & DeFour, 1990).
In most academic institutions, women faculty still constitute a low status minority who are often quite isolated from one another and insecure in their positions (Dzech & Weiner, 1984). The ability and even the desire of a female faculty member to exert influence over a male colleague who sexually harasses students is often minimal, as she may be professionally dependent on and personally intimidated by him, as well (Dzech & Weiner, 1984).
RATIONALE FOR THE CURRENT STUDY

This extensive review of the literature regarding legal, definitional, and psychosocial components of the phenomenon of sexual harassment in academia highlights two intriguing issues: 1) dramatic variations in definitions of sexual harassment exist within the social sciences, and 2) these variations appear to be driven by attempts to clarify the legal parameters of sexual harassment.

Under the EEOC guidelines there are two distinct patterns of conduct which constitute sexual harassment in academia (Robertson, Dyer and Campbell, 1988). The first involves sexually oriented behavior which creates a situation in which a job, grade, or other facet of academic standing is dependent on cooperation with or tolerance of the sexual behavior. The second pattern of conduct involves sexually oriented behavior which is not obviously coercive, but which creates an offensive or hostile environment. Recent surveys conducted in academic settings indicate that the latter is the more common type of harassment experienced by students (Robertson et al., 1988). While deliberate attempts to coerce students into sexual relationships do occur, the more frequently occurring incidents are thought to consist of offensive touching, sexual comments, jokes, and innuendos (Dziech and Weiner, 1984).
The problem of variations in definitions has resulted in disparate prevalence figures and incongruous use of terms such as "unwelcome," "submission," and "substantial." Interpretations of the seriousness of sexual harassment incidents are quite clearly reflected in the legal terminology used to characterize the type of harassment experienced. This terminology usually implies that quid pro quo harassment is more serious than hostile environment forms of harassment, and also tends to assume a status differential between the harassed person and the harasser which does not always exist. In other words, many behaviors which constitute sexual harassment from a subjective point of view do not fall neatly into commonly accepted categories of harassment, and the study of sexual harassment has not been driven by attempts to isolate presenting symptoms of victims or by use of perceptual definitions provided by those who feel victimized by sexual harassers. An obvious parallel exists between the evolution of definitions of sexual harassment and definitions of rape. The latter has only recently been expanded both behaviorally and legally to include rape by a date or acquaintance and rape by a spouse—in large part because of the recognition that perceptual experiences of victims of these forms of sexual violence produce symptoms and psychological responses consistent with those of victims of rape by an unknown assailant.
Recently, two important court cases have altered the balance between the legal and behavioral science domains regarding sexual harassment. The *Meritor* case, which went to the Supreme Court, upheld the hostile environment portion of the EEOC Guidelines by determining that the perception of the victim carries more weight than the intent of the harasser. The *Ellison* case, which was heard by the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals, upheld the use of a "reasonable woman" standard to determine offensiveness of sexual harassment.

With these cases as legal precedent, within academia students' perceptions may be considered the standard of "reasonableness." It is therefore important to understand what students consider to be sexually harassing behavior. Unfortunately, the majority of attempts to clarify the parameters of the domain of sexual harassment have asked participants to respond to predetermined descriptions of sexual harassment as a means of confirming a 'consensual' definition of the domain. Because the legal definition of sexual harassment has been used as the basis for behavioral definitions, the actual relevance of both are open to debate. Students have not been asked to determine, on their own, whether they would consider a particular interaction to be sexual harassment. Thus, because traditional scientific methods for defining the domain of interest have not been
utilized, sexual harassment researchers have not produced comprehensive inventories of victims' perceptual definitions of the phenomenon. Such inventories will certainly become necessary as institutions integrate these legal precedents into their policies and handling of sexual harassment grievances.

Much of the scenario research designed to contribute to understanding of the definitional process imparts a pre-judgment clearly communicated by the phrasing of the scenario item. For example, Fitzgerald and Hesson-McInnes (1989) include an item in their recent study which reads "A professor subtly threatens a student with some sort of punishment if she isn't sexually cooperative." Since the goal of their study was to determine the degree of severity, coercion, and harassment depicted in each scenario, another item included for comparison reads "A professor directly threatens or pressures a student to engage in sexual activity by threats of punishment or retaliation." It is not surprising that the participants judged the second item to be more coercive and sexually harassing than the first item, yet it remains unclear what the actual differences between "subtly" and "directly" threatening a student are. While researchers acknowledge that simple lists of behaviors do not provide adequate definitions of the domain of sexual harassment (Fitzgerald, 1990), general statements of
concomitants of harassment such as power differentials, gender hierarchy, etc., are also inadequate. The salience of distinctions based on elements of power which are articulated through terms such as "subtle" and "direct" may be irrelevant. Judgments of severity that are dependent on subjective criteria and which use general attitude items devoid of descriptive language, do little to clarify these criteria. In order to examine the specific elements of power and the relationships among them, more descriptive scenarios which may encourage more independent judgments of offense should be used.

This study was an initial attempt to address the methodological concerns raised above, with corollary emphasis on the demographic variables of sex and ethnicity. The scenarios described below do not contain pre-judgments of threat or offense but rather outline interactions descriptively. Thus, this study investigated patterns of students' judgments to scenarios designed to represent the "gender harassment," "seductive behavior," and "sexual bribery" domains of sexual harassment which were not influenced by emotionally laden language (e.g., "sexist comment," "crude," "seductive" or "suggestive remarks," "fondle," etc.). The resultant data should prove useful for interpreting the types of relationships and interactions students judge to be harassing and/or reportable. Because
of the ethnic, racial and cultural diversity of the student population at the University of Hawai'i, demographic data from the student sample were gathered in an attempt to provide some initial descriptive data on these variables and their relationship to incidence rates, behavioral definitions and attitudes.
METHOD

Overview

Respondants were asked to respond to two questionnaires. The first questionnaire consisted of personal background information including questions pertaining to experiences of sexual harassment and questions designed to gain information about sex-role stereotypes held by the participants. Three separate versions of the second questionnaire consisted of ten scenarios, each describing interactions between characters in an academic setting. Each scenario was followed by four questions pertaining to the appropriateness, sexism, sexual harassment and reportability of the interaction described in the scenario.

Prior to completing the questionnaires, students were told the general purpose and intent of the study and were given the opportunity to ask the researcher questions about the study (although questions pertaining to definitions of sexual harassment were not addressed until after the questionnaires were completed).

Analyses were conducted to determine patterns of relationships between sex-role stereotypes and judgments of scenarios, and demographic variables and response patterns. Percentage of agreement figures were tabulated for clarity and interpretability and to emphasize the descriptive power of the data.
Participants

Nine hundred eighty-six survey participants were solicited through a large department offering liberal arts core and required courses and two lower division social science courses offered by other departments. Analyses were conducted to assess population characteristics between the two samples which might effect response patterns. Although the social science students were more likely to be female, U.S. citizens, and had more years on the U.H. campus than the liberal arts students, the latter two variables were unrelated to response patterns on any version of the scenarios, and gender was a primary variable of interest. Therefore, the participants from the liberal arts and social science classes are considered a single sample for the remainder of this discussion.

The characteristics of the respondent sample are as follows: nearly 96% of those surveyed were undergraduate students--61.9% of the participants were female and 38.1% were male--women are somewhat overrepresented within the sample population (campus enrollment of women is 54.3%). The students in this sample were slightly older than average for this university; 78.4% of those surveyed were between the ages of 18 and 22 (mean age on campus for undergraduates is 22.3 years). The overall ethnic breakdown within the sample was roughly similar to enrollment at the university;
29.3% Japanese/Japanese-American, 18.2% Caucasian, 7.1% Filipino, 11.8% Hawaiian/Pt. Hawaiian, 26.1% other Asian and Pacific Islander, and 7.5% other. Hawaiian/Pt. Hawaiian and other Asian and Pacific Islander student categories were slightly overrepresented while Japanese/Japanese-American, Caucasian and Filipino student categories were underrepresented within the sample. Six percent of the sample population were international students at the university on student visas; 37.9% had been at the university for a year or less and 10% had been on campus for more than four years; 93.5% of the participants were unmarried and 45.6% lived at home with parents or grandparents while an additional 26.6% lived in a campus dormitory with roommates. A higher percentage of women than men students were at the university on student visas (7.2% vs. 4.0%), or foreign born (25.2% vs. 17.8%) and 32.4% of the female students v. 24.5% of the male students were Japanese/Japanese-American. A comparably higher proportion of male students than female students were either of Chinese or Filipino ancestry.

Instrumentation and Procedure

Three instruments were used to assess participants' (1) experiences of sexual harassment, (2) attitudes regarding sexual harassment and sex roles, and (3) responses to scenarios depicting situations which may or may not be
The first instrument (SH-E) was a slightly modified version of a survey used at previously at this university (O'Hagen, 1985). Modifications made for instrumentation purposes in this study did not alter the psychometric properties of the original instrument—increasing only the number of demographic questions asked. This survey assessed prevalence of sexual harassment using legal definitions of the term. That is, participants were presented with the university policy's definition of sexual harassment and then asked, "Using the above definition, have you ever been sexually harassed while at [the university]?

The second instrument (SH-A), also taken from the 1985 study (O'Hagen, 1985), asked participants to agree or disagree with five statements relating to the sexual behavior of women and men. These statements were:

1. Most women who are sexually insulted by a man provoke his behavior by the way they talk, act or dress.
2. I believe that sexual intimidation is a serious social problem.
3. A man must learn that a women's "no" to his sexual advances really means "no."
4. It is only natural for a man to make sexual advances to a woman he finds attractive.
5. Encouraging a professor's or supervisor's sexual interest is frequently used by women to get better grades or to improve their work situation.
The composite version of these first two instruments, as distributed to research participants, is included as Appendix A.

Each of three versions of the third instrument (SH-J), developed by the author, presented ten scenarios depicting gender harassment, seductive behavior, and sexual bribery—the "gray areas" of sexual harassment. These scenarios were designated A through H. Of the ten scenarios, two "anchor" scenarios were designed to represent opposite ends of the gray area continuum. At the non-harassment end, the scenario described a clearly consensual non-harassment relationship between two people who are not academically dependent on one another. At the harassment end, the scenario described an obviously coercive use of academic or supervisory authority. The other eight scenarios depicted varying degrees of possible use of academic or supervisory influence to initiate a social relationship, involved possibly inappropriate physical contact, or derogatory comments of a sexual and/or professional nature. Three different versions of each scenario, designated SH-J1 through SH-J3, varied the degree of influence and power held by the individual initiating the interaction by altering their positions (undergraduate student, graduate student, faculty, staff, administrator), status, and/or gender relative to those of the recipients of the comments or behavior.
The first scenario, designated "A," describes a verbal interaction between two people who are going out to lunch. Version SH-J1 reads as follows:

A professor and his student go to lunch. He comments that she looks very nice and says he is proud to be seen with her.

In SH-J2 the scenario was altered so that the characters are a male student and a female professor. In this second version the male student makes the comment to the female professor. In SH-J3, the characters are a male professor and a female secretary. In this third version the professor makes the comment to the secretary.

The second scenario, designated "B," describes a verbal interaction regarding an important academic project. Version SH-J1 reads as follows:

A student is working on a research project for her senior thesis. Her advisor tells her that she needs to do some additional work on a portion of the projects and offers to meet her in the graduate students' lounge to help her with it.

In SH-J2 the scenario was altered so that the student is male. All other elements within this second version remain the same. In SH-J3 the characters are a female office assistant and her work supervisor. She is working on a project for a class which will allow her to apply for a promotion when the supervisor offers assistance.

The third scenario, designated "C," describes a comment made by a male to two females on campus. Version SH-J1 reads as follows:
Two college students are talking in the hallway of the Biology building. Their biology professor approaches them and says, "I can see why girls are so poor at science, they never stop talking long enough to think."

In SH-J2 the scenario was altered to depict two female college professors who are approached in the Administration building by a graduate student. In SH-J3 two female college professors are approached in the Administration building by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The fourth scenario, designated "D," describes an interaction between two people which includes physical contact. Version SH-J1 reads as follows:

A transfer student from a nearby college enters her English class for the first time. The professor asks her to stay after class for a couple of minutes. When she approaches his desk, he puts his arm around her shoulder and leaves it there while he explains what the class has done so far during the semester.

In SH-J2 the transfer student is male. All other elements of the second version of this scenario remain the same. In SH-J3, the scenario was altered to depict a male food service worker and a male supervisor.

The fifth scenario, designated "E," describes a verbal interaction which suggests an exchange of academic favor for social favor. Version SH-J1 reads as follows:

A graduate student needs access to a particular undergraduate class for research purposes. Her advisor, with whom she’s been working for four years, offers to let her work with students in his class if she will have lunch with him the next day.

In SH-J2 the scenario was altered to depict a female graduate student who needs access to a male graduate
student's class. In SH-J3, the characters are a female assistant professor and a male full professor.

The sixth scenario, designated "F," describes a verbal interaction between two people which suggests an exchange of academic or professional favor for social favor. Version SH-J1 reads as follows:

An undergraduate student receives a note from one of her instructors, telling her that there is a problem with her classwork and she will have to take an incomplete. She is scheduled to graduate and tells the professor that she needs to receive credit this semester. He tells her not to worry, he will take care of it and suggests that they have dinner together the following weekend.

In SH-J2 the professor is female. All other elements of the second version of this scenario remain constant. In SH-J3 the scenario was altered to depict an interaction between a female secretary and her female boss, the department chair.

The seventh scenario, designated "G," describes a verbal interaction. Version SH-J1 reads as follows:

A college sophomore comes to class very upset one day. Her psychology professor asks to see her after class and then asks her what is wrong. She tells him she had a fight with her boyfriend. The professor tells the student that she is too bright to be wasting her time with men her age and needs to spend time with someone more mature like him.

In SH-J2 the scenario was altered to depict a female college professor who is approached by one of her male students. SH-J3 describes the same interaction between a female college professor who is approached by one of her male colleagues.

The eighth scenario, designated "H," describes a chance meeting at the beach. Version SH-J1 reads as follows:
A student sees a professor at the beach that she had taken a class from last year. He asks her to have coffee with him. They have a great time and she suggests that they meet again the next day at the beach. He agrees and eventually they begin dating.

In SH-J2 the scenario was altered to depict an interaction between a female professor and a male student. In SH-J3 the interaction is between a female dean and a male professor she was involved in hiring.

The ninth scenario, designated "I," describes an interaction between a returning student and her or his advisor. Version SH-J1 reads as follows:

A woman who has returned to school after raising her children is trying to decide on a major. Her advisor, a man twenty years her junior, suggests that she should focus on home economics or possible social work. She insists that she wants to study either oceanography or zoology. He says he will write a letter recommending that she not be accepted by either of these departments because she does not have the potential to grasp technical concepts.

In SH-J2 the scenario depicts a male student and his female advisor, who suggests that he focus on physical education or construction management rather than oceanography or zoology. In SH-J3 the student is a former university maintenance person and the student and advisor are both female. The advisor suggests that the student focus on Human Resources rather than oceanography or zoology.

The tenth scenario, designated "J," describes a verbal interaction. Version SH-J1 reads as follows:

A college professor asks to see one of his students in his office after class. Once there, he immediately
begins telling her about the difficulties he's having with his wife. After several minutes he sighs and says, "It's so nice to have a woman my own age to talk to, I feel like we could really get to be close friends."

In SH-J2 the scenario was altered to depict a male student commiserating to his female professor. In SH-J3 a male professor commiserates to his female colleague.

All of the scenarios were worded so as to avoid terms which might be considered "value-laden" or "emotionally-charged." Rather than constructing an item regarding gender harassment and labeling the interaction as such, for example:

A professor habitually makes sexist remarks (e.g., suggesting that traditionally masculine fields like engineering are inappropriate for women or that something is wrong with men who want to be nurses) (Fitzgerald & Weitzman, 1989, p. 314);

a similar item was worded,

A woman who has returned to school after raising her children is trying to decide on a major. Her advisor, a man twenty years her junior, suggests that she should focus on home economics or possible social work. She insists that she wants to study either oceanography or zoology. He says he will write a letter recommending that she not be accepted by either of these departments because she does not have the potential to grasp technical concepts.

The initial version of the scenarios questionnaire (SH-J1) was designed to represent "stereotypic" academic relationships which might be vulnerable to sexual harassment. All of the scenarios in this version described interactions between a male professor and a female student
which were initiated by the professor. SH-J1 was designed as the "anchor" version for comparison between the two subsequent versions of the questionnaire. The second version (SH-J2) featured "non-stereotypic" academic relationships between initiators and recipients (i.e., academic relationships which might not be traditionally considered to be vulnerable to sexual harassment). They described interactions initiated by a male student to a female professor, a female professor to a female or male student, a male student to a female student, or a non-gendered person initiating an interaction to someone of higher status than themselves. The third version (SH-J3) also featured "non-stereotypic" academic relationships but some of the initiators in this version are male professors. In some scenarios the initiator and recipient are of the same sex but different status and in other cases they are peers of different sexes.

Each scenario was followed by four questions regarding the appropriateness of the comment or behavior, whether it was sexist or not, whether it constituted sexual harassment, and whether it should be reported. Participants were also asked to provide a rationale for each decision and were given the opportunity to qualify their answers. All three versions of the instrument are included as Appendices B-D.

During data collection the order in which participants received the two questionnaires was randomized, with one-
half of the participants receiving the prevalence questionnaire first and one-half receiving the scenario questionnaire first. Because the SH-E scale included a legalistic definition of sexual harassment, a coding process was applied to determine whether order of completion affected responses to the SH-J. Correlation analyses indicated that order of completion did not affect patterns of response to the SH-J scales.

Gaining a participant sample which was representative of the entire campus population was a primary objective of the study, so the data gathering process was conducted during class time. Since classes were fifty minutes long, each participant received only one version of the second questionnaire. Subsequently, between groups analyses of the demographic and attitudinal data gathered from SH-J was conducted. The resultant correlation matrices indicated that there were no significant demographic or attitudinal differences which correlated to scenario version, so respondents to all three versions were considered a single sample when examining SH-E and SH-A responses.
RESULTS

Summary of Objectives

The data collection process sought to provide data which would allow the opportunity to 1) accurately reflect the current incidence rates of sexual harassment obtainable through survey techniques, 2) determine the construct validity of the 1985 instruments, 3) assess the consistency of the scenario instrument, 4) investigate gender differences in stereotypic attitudes, and 5) analyze relationships between the demographic variables of gender and ethnicity and scenario judgments within a representative sample of the undergraduate student population at this university.

The more specific questions of interest addressed in this study concern: 1) gender and ethnic differences in attitudes and judgments between the three versions of SH-J; 2) gender and ethnic differences in these responses within each version of the questionnaire; and, 3) the degree to which the language used to construct these particular scenarios affected the hierarchy of harassment suggested by Fitzgerald and her colleagues. By altering the gender and status/authority of the individuals depicted in each scenario without suggesting a judgment of seriousness through use of emotionally-charged language and terminology, it was expected that differences in patterns of response
would emerge which would help clarify the relative salience of different relationships of power (i.e., faculty-student, male-female, etc.) important to this population. Questions regarding trends within sets of scenarios were addressed by analyzing the four separate judgments for each scenario which were designed to represent the two dimensions of seriousness: appropriateness, sexism, or harassment, and reportability.

**Incidence Data**

In response to the question, "Using the above [legalistic] definition, have you ever been sexually harassed while at UHM?" 8.4% of the 986 research participants in this study reported being sexually harassed while attending the university. Correlation analyses indicate that, in general, female students (n=64, 10.5%) in this sample were more likely to have reported being sexually harassed than males (n=19, 5.1%) (r=.07, p < .03), which, while significant, represents a small overall proportion of variance accounted for by this variable. Of those women who reported being sexually harassed, 96.4% were sexually harassed by a male while 77.8% of the men who reported being sexually harassed were harassed by a female (r=.29, p < .01). Many other demographic factors were measured. Discussion of these other variables and their relationship to experiences of harassment will be addressed in subsequent papers.
Gender Differences in Stereotypic Attitudes

As Table 1 indicates, correlation analyses of gender differences in response rates indicate that men were significantly more likely to hold stereotypical beliefs than were women. More men than women agreed with the statements: "Most women who are sexually insulted by a man provoke his behavior by the way they talk, act, or dress," \( r = -.12, p = .0003 \); "It is only natural for a man to make sexual advances to a woman he finds attractive" \( r = -.20, p = .0001 \); and, "Encouraging a professor's or supervisor's sexual interest is frequently used by women to get better grades or to improve their work situation" \( r = -.11, p = .0005 \). Women were more likely to agree with the statement "I believe that sexual intimidation is a serious social problem," \( r = .08, p < .02 \), than were men.

Significant negative relationships were found within the entire population sample between responses to the statement "Most women who are sexually harassed by a man provoke his behavior by the way they talk, act, or dress" and the collapsed sexual harassment (H) subscale \( r = -.10, p = .0015 \), and with the collapsed report (R) subscale \( r = -.07, p = .045 \) when all versions of the scenarios were combined. This statement also correlated significantly with the Sexist (S) subscale \( r = -.10, p = .045 \), the H subscale \( r = -.19, p = .0001 \), and the R subscale \( r = -.11, p = .019 \) on
version SH-J1, the H subscale ($r=-.15, p = .021$) on version SH-J2, and the Appropriate (A) subscale ($r=.12, p = .045$) on version SH-J3. Thus, people who held more stereotypic attitudes were generally more likely to make stereotypic judgments on the scenario items than were people who held less stereotypic attitudes.

**Factors Influencing Scenario Judgments**

Table 2 gives a summary of all participants' judgments on SH-J(1-3) by scenario. Judgment trends observed on this collapsed table were generally stable across the three versions of the scenarios when percentages of agreement figures were compared between versions, as outlined in Tables 3, 4, and 5. Correlation analyses between responses to individual items and the order in which the participant received the questionnaires indicate that the order of completion did not significantly affect responses to the stereotypic statements or response patterns in judgments to the scenarios. The relatively low reporting rate for experiences of sexual harassment precluded analysis of the effects of this variable on judgment patterns.

Tables 3, 4, and 5 provide a breakdown by version of responses to each question on each scenario. Those items for which responses differed significantly from the first version (SH-J1) are highlighted on Tables 4 (SH-J2) and 5 (SH-J3). The four questions of inappropriateness, sexism,
sexual harassment, and reportability are displayed as subscale columns. In some instances differences in percentages between two groups of participants are highlighted as significant for some comparison pairs while the same percentage is not significant for other pairs. This discrepancy is due to differences in sample size and variance, as there were four coded responses (yes, no, maybe, don't know) to each question while only percentages of "yes" or "no" answers were analyzed.

Comparisons of the significantly different percentages between Tables 3 and 4 indicate that all significant differences in judgments between versions SH-J1 and SH-J2 reflect a decrease in the numbers of participants who judge the scenarios negatively. Four of the five scenarios (C, E, G, J) in which this occurred on the Inappropriate subscale reflected a change in status of the initiator and no change in gender. One item (I) altered the gender of the recipient of a comment regarding academic potential. On the Sexist subscale, three scenarios (D, G and I) were rated less sexist by a significant number of participants. Scenarios D and I altered the gender of the recipient and scenario G reversed the status hierarchy between the initiator and the recipient. On the Harassment subscale, significantly fewer participants judged items D, E, G and J as harassing on SH-J2. Scenario D altered the gender of the recipient and the
remaining three scenarios altered the status of the recipient. Five items (C, D, E, G, J) were rated by significantly fewer participants as warranting reporting on the Report subscale. Again, all but one scenario (D) altered the status of the characters only while scenario D altered only the gender of the recipient.

No significant differences in judgments between the first two versions of the SH-J instrument on scenarios A, B, F or H were obtained. Scenario A, in which the status of the initiator and the recipient were reversed on version SH-J2, reflected an overall small number of participants who judged the scenarios and sexually harassing or reportable although over 50% of participants judged both versions to be inappropriate. Scenario B altered the gender of the recipient only. The judgments on this scenario were quite similar to those on the "anchor" scenario, i.e., very few participants judged either version of this scenario negatively. Scenario F, the "anchor" scenario at the sexual harassment end of the "gray area" spectrum which described sexual bribery to initiate a social relationship, altered the gender of the recipient of the interaction. A high percentage of participants judged both versions of this scenario negatively. Scenario H, the "anchor" scenario at the consensual relationship end of the "gray area" spectrum which described the initiation of a social relationship
between two non-academically linked individuals, reversed the status of the initiator and the recipient. Most participants did not judge this scenario negatively on either version.

Comparisons between Tables 3 and 5 show increases and decreases in percentages of participants who judge SH-J3 differently from SH-J1, and two scenarios (C, E) showed no significant differences in response pattern. Six scenarios on SH-J3 (A, D, F, G, I, J) showed decreases in negative judgments and two scenarios (B, H) reflect increases in negative judgments when compared to SH-J1. All six of the items on which decreased negative judgments were noted were judged more positively on the Inappropriateness subscale. All six items altered the relationship between the initiator and the recipient from faculty-student to supervisor-worker or professor-professor. In addition, in scenario D both characters were male and in Scenario F both were female. Four scenarios (D, F, G, I) showed significant decreases in negative judgments on the Sexist subscale. Three of these scenarios (D, F, I) equated the gender while scenario G equated the status of the initiator and the recipient. On the Harassment subscale, three of the six scenarios which showed significant decreases in negative judgments (D, F, I) equated the gender of the initiator and recipient, two (G, J) equated the status, and one (A) altered the type of
professional relationship between the two. These same six scenarios were judged reportable by significantly fewer participants.

Scenarios B and H, which were judged more negatively by a significant number of research participants, altered the status (B) and gender and status (H) of the characters. The former was judged more negatively on all four subscales and the latter on the Sexist, Harassment and Report subscales. Table 6 provides a breakdown of this section of results by scenario.

**Gender Differences in Scenario Judgments**

Collapsed responses of the Inappropriate, Sexist, Harassment, and Report subscales on the three versions of each scenario indicate that there were significant gender differences in judgments regarding whether the comments or behavior were sexist (r=.08, p < .02) and whether they constituted sexual harassment or not (r=.07, p < .02).

Tables 7, 8, and 9 display the breakdown in percentages of female and male student participants who judge scenarios as inappropriate, sexist, sexually harassing, or reportable for different versions of the survey. Of the forty possible percentage comparisons on each version of the scenarios, ten pairs reflect significant gender differences on version SH-J1, twenty pairs reflect significant gender differences on version SH-J2, and five pairs reflect significant gender
differences on version SH-J3. The average difference in percent for all significant gender comparisons within each version was 15.6% on SH-J1, 11.5% on SH-J2, and 12.2% on SH-J3. Across all scenarios there were significant gender differences in judgments to nine Inappropriate subscale items, thirteen Sexist subscale items, eight Harassment subscale items, and four Report subscale items. The gender differences noted on the Report subscale were all from the SH-J2 version of the scenarios.

Table 10 provides a breakdown of the within groups gender differences by scenario. This presentation of figures utilizes the four questions for each version of each scenario as the unit for analysis (looking across rows), and allows the total number of items on each version of a scenario to be examined for significant gender differences. For example, in Scenario A, females and males differed significantly in their judgments of inappropriateness on SH-J1, inappropriateness and sexism on SH-J2, and did not differ from one another on any dimension on SH-J3. For purposes of parsimony, these data will be grouped in categories of no gender differences noted, some gender differences noted (1 or 2 items), or dramatic gender differences noted (3 or 4 items) for the remainder of the discussion of Table 10 results. Of the thirty total versions of scenarios, twelve displayed no gender
differences, thirteen displayed some gender differences, and five displayed dramatic gender differences. Of those scenarios for which no significant gender differences were obtained, five were stereotypic, two were female superordinate initiator to male subordinate recipient, two were female superordinate initiator to female subordinate recipient, two were male initiator to female recipient peers, and one was a neutral initiator to a male recipient. Of those thirteen scenarios for which some significant gender differences were obtained, seven were stereotypic, three were male subordinate initiator to female superordinate recipient, one was a female superordinate initiator to a female subordinate recipient, one was a female superordinate initiator to male subordinate recipient, and one was a neutral initiator to a female subordinate recipient. Of the five scenarios for which dramatic significant gender differences were obtained, two were male subordinate initiator to female superordinate recipient, two were male superordinate initiator to male subordinate recipient, and one was male initiator to female peer recipient.

Table 11 displays students' judgments to scenarios by version and gender. These figures indicate a good deal of overlap in within groups gender-based patterns of response to the different versions of each scenario. That is, while
percentages of judgments of inappropriateness, sexism, sexual harassment or reportability may differ between genders, the response patterns within the group of women and the response patterns within the group of men were roughly similar in many cases. Of eighty possible comparisons within each group, thirty-one comparisons of womens' and thirty-two comparisons of mens' responses showed significantly different response patterns to different versions of the scenarios. Of these sixty-three total pairs which were significantly different, forty-one were common to women and men and twenty-two were not.

Table 12 provides a post hoc ranking of scenarios by the percentage of all student participants who judged an item as inappropriate, sexist, sexually harassing, or reportable. The second and third set of columns in the table provide a breakdown by percentage of agreement for women and men. While women were generally more likely to judge a scenario as inappropriate, sexist, sexually harassing, or reportable than were men, the ranking order was roughly similar for both groups, and supported the presence of a continuum of seriousness similar to that originally proposed.

Ethnic Differences in Scenario Judgments

When correlation analyses were conducted to examine judgment patterns between ethnic groups, results were
inconclusive. A very small number of comparisons (n=4 of a possible 120 scenario responses) showed significant ethnic differences in response patterns indicating that a discernable response pattern related to ethnicity was not observed. A slightly larger number of ethnic differences were obtained when the entire sample was divided by gender, but further analyses to determine the nature of the relationships were unsuccessful due to the small sample sizes in some of the ethnic groups.
DISCUSSION

Discussion of Results

Incidence rates and instrument validation. O'Hagen (1985) reported an incidence rate of 17.1% using the 1985 prevalence instrument, a much larger figure than the 8.4% incidence rate of sexual harassment reported in this study. Sampling techniques between the two studies differed substantially. Research participants from the O'Hagen study were obtained in a manner which involved the participant depositing the questionnaire in a box in the middle of campus. Although surveys were distributed to all university employees (faculty, undergraduate and graduate students, and staff, n=4500+) only 617 individuals responded (a return rate of less than 14%). Therefore, it is likely that the 1985 results were not representative of the campus population as a whole.

Data were collected by the author and members of the Sexual Harassment Research Group in a related study to compare O'Hagen's instrument (SH-E) to a behaviorally-based prevalence instrument developed and tested at the Pennsylvania State University (Appendix E). When the Penn Harassment Survey was used to assess incidence of sexual harassment at this institution for a comparable student sample during the same time-frame, incidence rates similar to those reported by other state universities were obtained
(Hippensteele, Adams, & Norris, 1990). Of the approximately 160 students who responded that they had experienced at least one incident (from a list of several descriptions of different types of experiences) initiated by a "person in a position of authority," 26% reported being sexually harassed while at UHM (Honolulu Star-Bulletin, January 9, 1991, p.3). Thus, the 1985 O'Hagen survey, which utilized a legalistic definition of sexual harassment to both inform and solicit responses, appears to be significantly less sensitive to reported experiences of sexual harassment than the Penn Harassment Survey which employs behavioral definitions. Although surveys designed to assess actual experience are inherently problematic, these results support the use of a behaviorally oriented survey such as the Penn Harassment Survey as a reasonable indicator of levels of harassment within a campus community. Detailed discussion of incidence rates using the two instruments is beyond the scope of the current discussion.

Gender differences in stereotypic attitudes. The present study offers support for the hypothesis that gender-related sexual harassment stereotypes are similar to those regarding other types of sexual crimes, and that propensity to accept these stereotypes differs between women and men, although a cautionary note regarding the interpretation of these results is necessary. In several cases the
correlation between gender and item response was very strong, but the variance accounted for by gender was, in most cases, quite low. While not negating the descriptive richness of these data, it must be remembered that gender is merely one of many variables influencing these responses and neither the data collection process or the current discussion are an attempt to provide a thorough explanation of all of the possible variables of influence.

Participants were asked to answer a set of five questions designed to assess common stereotypes regarding the sexual behavior of women and men (SH-A) and to respond to realistic scenarios depicting the so-called "gray areas" of sexual harassment (SH-J). Although no direct comparison data are available, responses to the stereotypical statements were generally consistent with those reported elsewhere using other measures (Howard, 1984; Ryan, 1988). For example, a higher percentage of male respondents agreed with the statement "It is only natural for a man to make sexual advances to a woman he finds attractive," than with the statement "Most women who are sexually insulted by a man provoke his behavior by the way they talk, act or dress," consistent with findings that men are held less responsible for behavior which is labeled seductive than for behavior which is labeled assaultive (Ryan, 1988)--in this case the operative terms appear to be "sexually insulted" vs. "sexual
advances." Gender differences in responses to these statements are also consistent with those reported elsewhere. Men were more likely to agree with all four of the stereotypic statements than were women and these gender differences in response rates were significant in three of the four cases. Furthermore, the level of agreement with the statement "Encouraging a professor's or supervisor's sexual interest is frequently used by women to get better grades or to improve their work situation" combined with the levels of agreement to the two previous statements, support the empirically-based conclusion drawn by Howard (1984), that victims may be evaluated negatively with regards to certain stereotyped characteristics and blamed for behaving in manners consistent with these stereotypes. For example, the statement "Most women who are sexually harassed by a man provoke his behavior by the way they talk, act, or dress" represents a stereotypic "victim-blaming" response common in cases of sexual abuse. The fact that it correlated with collapsed subscales on the combined and separated versions of the scenarios attests to a relationship between stereotypes and judgments of realistic depictions of sexually harassing interactions.

Since each participant responded to only one version of the SH-J instrument, Table 2 is an ad hoc summation which
combines the responses of different groups of participants to each of the three versions of the scenarios. These results are particularly intriguing as the responses from all three versions of the scenarios were collapsed for this stage of the analysis. The percentage of agreement figures indicate that the participants judged the scenarios in a manner which was situationally dependent to at least some degree; that is, they appeared to make meaningful distinctions between different situations and the extent to which these situations constitute reportable sexual harassment, sexism or simply inappropriate behavior. In addition, the percentages of judgments of harassment were reasonably consistent with the hierarchy of domains of sexual harassment discussed by Fitzgerald and her colleagues. The anchor scenario (F) and scenario E, which were designed to represent sexual bribery, were judged as sexually harassing by the highest percentage of participants. Three of the five scenarios designed to represent seductive behavior (D, G, J) were judged to be sexually harassing by a large percentage of participants and scenario A, which also represented seductive behavior was judged sexually harassing by a significant percentage of respondents, as well. Scenarios C and I, designed to represent gender harassment, were also judged to be sexually harassing by a significant percentage of participants, but,
in keeping with the continuum proposed by Fitzgerald (1990), these figures were generally lower than those in response to the sexual bribery and seductive behavior items. The two exceptions were scenarios A and B, which was designed to represent potentially seductive interactions. Scenario A was judged to be sexually harassing by a significant number of participants, although the number was lower than for the two gender harassment scenarios. Scenario B was judged to be sexually harassing by a very small number of participants, only the anchor item at the non-harassment end of the continuum resulted in a lower percentage of negative judgments. Given the variations from version SH-J1 to versions SH-J2 and SH-J3 (as described above), it had not been expected that any such pattern would emerge for the combined responses.

Factors influencing scenario judgments. As expected, the participants also seemed to be sensitive to variations in context, status, initiator vs. recipient position and gender of the characters, although the cautionary note regarding relatively low levels of explained variance applies here, as well. As discussed above, a substantial proportion of the respondents in this sample judged eight of the nine scenarios designed to represent some degree of sexual harassment as constituting sexual harassment, while an even higher percentage felt that the comments or behavior
described in these eight scenarios were inappropriate or sexist and should be reported. The "anchor" items, representing the ends of the "gray area" continuum were consistently rated as at or near their designated position by a vast majority of respondents (Table 12 displays these results).

Between groups comparisons of responses to different versions of each scenario in Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6 indicate that, for the population as a whole, both gender and status hierarchies are salient when participants were asked to make judgments regarding the acceptability of certain types of behavior. The patterns of judgments between version SH-J1 and SH-J2 and SH-J1 and SH-J3 indicate that student participants in this study generally perceived scenarios describing interactions between male faculty initiators and female student recipients as less acceptable than variations which altered this "stereotypic" relationship. With few exceptions, student participants seemed to judge those scenarios with which they might easily identify as potentially more serious than those with less personal relevance. However, some of the noted exceptions are interesting. For example, between SH-J1 and SH-J2, only the gender of the subordinate recipient of a physical overture by a male professor is altered in scenario D. A significantly lower percentage of participants judged this
scenario as sexist, harassing or reportable when the interaction is between a male professor and a male student than when it is between a male professor and a female student, even though the status differential remains the same. Another interesting exception is in the response patterns to scenario I between versions SH-J1 and SH-J3. Version SH-J3 alters the gender of the superordinate initiator of a comment regarding the technical abilities of a women returning to school. When the initiator of this comment is a woman, significantly fewer participants judge the interaction as sexist, harassing or reportable; although this item is judged similarly across these two versions in terms of inappropriateness and remains the highest rated in terms of reportability for version SH-J3, only 36% perceive the item with a female initiator as sexist, as opposed to 83.6% when the comment is made by a man.

There were a number of other factors apparently considered by participants when making a determination of whether the behavior should or should not be reported. For example, scenario F, which described behavior which might easily be considered coercive in the form of an exchange of a positive academic or job-related evaluation for dinner, was judged similarly in terms of appropriateness and sexism to scenario I, which described a less overt form of verbal harassment in the form of a sex-stereotyped comment about
lack of "innate" skill. However, respondents were less likely to indicate that the behavior should be reported when coercion was involved. Scenarios which described sexist comments about women’s and, in one case, a man’s relative ability to perform stereotypically gendered activities were rated as inappropriate by the vast majority of participants, yet the percentages of women and men who felt these behaviors constituted sexual harassment were inconsistent with the percentages of those who felt that the behavior should be reported. One interpretation of this result is that comments or behavior do not necessarily have to meet the legal criteria of sexual harassment in order to be considered serious enough to warrant formal attention. This finding appears to contradict those of many other studies (see Dzeich and Weiner, 1984, for a thorough review of these studies) which have found that sexist and/or sexual comments are, for the most part, tolerated and accepted by women. It is, of course, possible that this apparent discrepancy may be explained by differences between statements that something should be reported vs. actual reporting behavior. This point will be addressed more fully under Implications for Future Research.

Gender differences in scenario judgments. As expected, both general and specific group differences within and between genders did emerge. The correlations between the
responses to the stereotypical statements and the responses to the scenarios indicate that in some cases traditional gender-role attitudes do affect respondents' judgments regarding the appropriateness of comments or behavior, whether the comments or behavior were sexist and whether they constituted sexual harassment, although the explained variance in each of these cases was low. These findings support others in which individuals with traditional gender-role attitudes attribute more global and characterological blame to female victims than individuals with more egalitarian gender-role attitudes (Check and Malamuth, 1983; Howard, 1984; Malovich and Stake, 1990; Muehlenhard, Friedman and Thomas, 1985).

Significant gender differences in judgments regarding the appropriateness of a comment or behavior, whether the comment or behavior was sexist, and whether it constituted sexual harassment were observed, and women were generally more likely to label sexually oriented comments or behavior as objectionable than were men. The arrangement of the data in Table 12 indicate that significant gender differences were more prevalent on questions regarding the appropriateness or sexism of a scenario than on questions regarding whether the scenario described sexual harassment or an interaction which participants judged reportable. In some cases, male participants were more likely to judge a
scenario as reportable than were women, although none of these differences were significant.

Comparing each of the four responses (appropriateness, sexism, harassment, reportability) to all three versions of the ten scenarios, ten out of forty pairs of items showed significant gender differences on SH-J1, twenty out of forty pairs on SH-J2, and five out of forty pairs on SH-J3. Interestingly, most of the scenarios from versions SH-J2 and SH-J3 for which significant gender differences have been noted, altered the scenario to depict an interaction which may be more personally relevant to male participants than to female participants. That is, changes in initiator or recipient identity involved replacing one or the other role with a male student character. One dramatic example of gender differences in patterns of response was observed in relation to scenario A between versions SH-J1 and SH-J2. On the first "stereotypic" version in which a professor tells a student "she looks very nice" and he is "proud to be seen with her", 7.8% of the females and 14.3% of the males who responded to this item judged it reportable. In response to the second version, in which a male student makes the same comment to a female professor, 10.7% of the female participants and 2.7% of the male participants judged the item reportable, although responses to questions of appropriateness, sexism, or sexual harassment remained
generally consistent across both genders and versions.

Regarding responses across individual versions of each scenario, it appears that, again, there was more agreement between genders on scenarios involving stereotypic academic relationships and scenarios depicting traditional gender-biased hierarchical interactions than other non-stereotypic or non-traditional relationships. Those scenarios for which more "dramatic" gender differences were noted involved interactions initiated by a male student or received by a male student. There was some overlap between both of these relationship categories within the category of "some" gender differences.

As reported in Tables 11 and 12, these data reflect a good deal of continuity in within group patterns of response to different versions of the scenarios. Generally, nearly two-thirds of the sixty-three within group comparisons which were significant were common to both groups, indicating that many of the changes in judgments to scenarios which seem to be related to variations in gender and/or status of characters or other concomitants of power, are salient to women and men within this population. And, although women did judge the scenarios to be less acceptable in the majority of cases, approximately half of the gender differences obtained were not significant.

When the three versions of the scenarios were analyzed independently and items ranked for judgments of seriousness
on the inappropriate, sexism, sexual harassment dimension (Table 12), the ranking of items on the continuum of gender harassment, seductive behavior, and sexual bribery was generally consistent with that discussed from Table 2, although the rankings of many items did change somewhat. The percentages of participants who judged different versions of scenarios negatively was less stable. So, for example, while scenario F (the anchor item on the sexual bribery end of the continuum) was judged negatively by the highest number of participants on version SH-J1 and SH-J2 and the second highest number of participants of version SH-J3, the actual percentages of participants judging the scenario as sexually harassing changed dramatically. This figure was 82.7% and 76.9% for versions SH-J1 and SH-J2 respectively, but dropped to 50.9% on version SH-J3, indicating that far fewer participants judge the interaction between a female supervisor and a female secretary (SH-J3) as potentially sexually harassing than when the interaction is between a female professor and a female student (SH-J2) or a male professor and a female student (SH-J1).

On the dimension of reportability, a similar phenomenon was observed, although there was an overall higher rate of consistency across versions on this dimension than the inappropriateness-sexual harassment dimension. Scenario G was ranked fifth in percentage of participants who judged it
reportable across all three scenario versions, yet the percentage of participants judging it so changed substantially. In response to version SH-J1 in which a male professor makes a suggestive comment about dating "mature men like him" to a female student, 52.3% of the participants judged the item reportable. Version SH-J2, depicting an interaction between a male student initiator and a female professor recipient, was judged reportable by 26.9% of participants, and version SH-J3, depicting the same interaction initiated by a male professor and received by a female professor, was judged reportable by 27.1% of the participants who responded to this version. This example highlights the salience of the status hierarchy as an important variable in determinations of reportability, as no other features of this scenario were altered between versions.

Ethnic differences in scenario judgments. The lack of ethnic differences is, in itself, an interesting finding. The time constraints which limited participants to completing only one version of the SH-J, also limited the depth of the ethnic information requested, so that more elaborate strategies for determining ethnic identification, rather than simply genetic background, were rejected in favor of obtaining the attitude and judgment data. More accurate strategies for determining self and family ethnic
identification may have produced different results. An alternate explanation, however, is that class background has a stronger influence on stereotypes and judgments, and may somehow negate the influence of ethnic background or identification. There are numerous studies which support the claim that higher education has a liberalizing effect on individual attitudes and behaviors relating to sexuality (Crooks & Baur, 1990), and it seems reasonable that attitudes and judgments pertaining to sexual harassment may be subsumed under the general rubric of sexuality, in terms of attitudes.

**General Discussion**

This study was designed to explore and clarify relationships between characteristics of students and personal definitions of the domain of sexual harassment, and to examine patterns of judgments to situations which might be regarded as sexually harassing without offering prejudgments of the behavior or using emotionally-charged language to describe the interactions. The results support the hypothesis that students develop behavioral definitions of sexual harassment which are not coincident to legal definitions of the term.

In general, these data indicate that student participants representing this particular population define a wide range of behavior as inappropriate or sexually
harassing. Additionally, their judgments of the structure of sexual harassment as a domain appears to be multidimensional. They clearly judged stereotypic academic relationships involving a male professor directing sexually toned comments or behavior toward a female student as less acceptable than other versions of the interactions involving a different set of characters. These results indicate that the continuum of harassment outlined by Till (1980) and revised and validated by Fitzgerald and colleagues, is not an artifact of an imposed hierarchy of seriousness communicated through emotionally laden-charged in scenarios, and provide significant support for their multidimensional structuring of this domain.

Although these results do not provide a comprehensive explanation of the variables which influence attitudes and judgments regarding sexual harassment, student's responses do reflect a salient and consistent distinction between the concepts of gender harassment, called "sexism" in this study, and other forms of the general construct of sexual harassment. In addition, an unexpected variation in judgments of reportability indicates that determinations of sexual harassment are not necessarily consistent with judgments of reportability. While those items judged as sexual harassment by a vast majority of participants were judged as reportable by a similar percentage, the
percentages of participants who judged gender harassment items as reportable were widely discrepant. Scenario I which depicts a professor (in all three versions) telling a female or male student that s/he "can't grasp technical concepts" was judged reportable by the highest percentage of participants across both genders and all three versions of the scenarios. Scenario C, also depicting a sexist remark directed at two women by a person in authority was rated as reportable by a much lower percentage of respondents. This finding is consistent with others recently reported (Fitzgerald and Hesson-McInnes, 1989) that gender harassment and sexual harassment are conceptually distinct to many people. The salience of this distinction has led Fitzgerald and Hesson-McInnes (1989) to suggest that gender harassment should not be considered a part of the domain of sexual harassment. While this conclusion might enhance the theoretical clarity of the domain, the legal implications of such a separation, to be discussed in the next section, could be profound.

It is interesting, although not altogether surprising, that gender differences were most pronounced with regards to judgments of sexism, or gender harassment, with women being more likely to judge items as sexist than men. There are a number of possible explanations for the emergence of such a pattern. First, the results of the sex-role stereotype
portion of the study indicate that there remain significant gender differences in such attitudes within this population. While some recent studies such as Fitzgerald and Hesson-McInnes (1989) have suggested that general sex-role attitudes are becoming increasingly liberal, these present data indicate that a relatively high percentage of this population continues to subscribe to stereotypic sex-role attitudes. It is not clear, however, whether these general attitudes are directly linked to gender differences in attitudes and beliefs about sexual harassment--the data obtained do not comprehensively address this question.

Second, it seems that the gender harassment attitudes obtained in this study are consistent with the notion that personal relevance is a salient feature of the judgment process. That is, judgments to scenarios depicting student victims differed in some cases from those involving other non-student victims. As discussed previously, this study was designed to allow student participants to make judgments without being guided by emotionally-charged language or identifying themselves as participants in the scenario, and without using a predetermined definition of sexual harassment as a guide for their judgments. It appears that even when the weight of factors relating to the process of personal identification and labeling of personal experience is reduced in this manner, personal relevance remains a central feature of the judgment process.
Third, the preponderance of gender differences in judgments of sexism and related variations across versions of the scenarios support the personal relevance related hypothesis proposed by Fitzgerald and Hesson-McInnes (1989) that such differences may be associated with the roles ascribed to different characters portrayed in this type of attitude study. Specifically, their suggestion was that women, who are the majority of recipients of unwanted sexual attention (Fitzgerald, et al., 1988), will find the nature of the interaction salient, while men, who will more frequently be the initiators of such interactions, may find the outcome of the situation to be more important. Thus, women may be attempting to determine the intent of the initiator in an interaction in order to evaluate whether it poses a threat. In other words, individuals who might be likely to imagine themselves as the recipient of an interaction as described in a scenario, tended to judge the scenario as more serious than those who were not as likely to perceive themselves as potential recipients. The majority of the scenarios in the current study, which placed women in the recipient role, generally support the preliminary explanation offered by Fitzgerald and Hesson-McInnes (1989) cited earlier. This is a particularly interesting finding, since the lack of language which would imply intent of the initiators in these scenarios required
participants to make such judgments independently. These data indicate that participants' assessments of intent were similar to those produced through methodologically different studies—consistent with the notion that this process is a specific manifestation of the personal relevance hypothesis cited previously.

Last, the nature of the interaction between judgments and personal experiences of sexual harassment remains unclear. Because the legalistic instrument used in the current study did not prove to be a reliable indicator of incidence rates within the population, analyses of the relationship between actual experiences of sexual harassment and scenario responses were unlikely to produce meaningful results, and may have even been misleading. This remains an important gap in the existing literature, particularly since the estimated numbers of women on college campuses who are sexually harassed continues to increase.

The scenario variations which place men as recipients of sexual harassment appear to be the first of their kind in the published literature in this area. These initial data suggest that men may make judgments of seriousness which are based on different criteria than those used by women—a notion which is consistent with the Fitzgerald and Hesson-McInnes (1988) hypothesis that men consider the potential outcome of a situation to be more important than the nature
of the situation. While many of the scenarios in which the male student is the target of the interaction were judged more serious by men than when the target is a woman, these scenarios were still evaluated as more serious by female participants than they were by male participants. However, since examining men’s attitudes in this manner appears to be novel, these data must be interpreted with caution. A number of issues related to making evaluations of this type have not been systematically investigated in men. For example, men’s perceptions of personal vulnerability are probably much different from the perceptions of women because of their physical size difference and a variety of psycho-social factors. Such a perceptual difference might logically be linked to the salience of outcome vs. nature in judgments of situations, since men simply may not feel as threatened by sexually toned overtures as women do (witness data reported by Guteck (1985), suggesting that most men are "flattered" by such overtures).

Detailed investigations of the degree to which perceived differences in power and status affect individual judgments of sexual harassment and subsequent feelings about what actions should or should not be taken as a result of such experiences have yet to be conducted. The discrepancy between incidence rates of sexual harassment and likelihood of reporting has been well documented (Brooks and Perot,
The current study supports previous findings which suggest that the dimension of threat is to some degree related to the imposition of requirements of sex for conditions of work (quid pro quo harassment), and that the perceived offensiveness of the situation is a significant predictor of actual reporting behavior (Brooks and Perot, 1991). In view of these findings, it is not surprising that in response to fictitious scenarios, those incidents which were most often judged reportable are those which are the most clear-cut and "stereotypic" in nature. However, the complicated relationships between variables which are related to actual reporting behavior such as the prior relationship with the harasser, type of incident, perception of blame, and others defy simple explanations. While one of the advantages of the current study is that it does provide an initial attempt at determining the relationship between judgments of seriousness of gender and sexual harassment and subsequent reportability without the addition of personal experience variables, these results do not contribute to the gap in knowledge regarding actual reporting of sexual harassment. They are, however, consistent with the notion that current law regarding sexual harassment is only recently beginning to address the reality of women's experiences of sexual harassment. The Ellison case which imposes a "reasonable woman" standard for determining
offense is a necessary step toward changes in the law which will allow women to define and impose their own standards for perceptions of harm in these cases.

While the point that significant ethnic differences were not obtained has already been discussed, the similarity between women's and men's attitudes within this sample bears mentioning, as well. Discussions between women and men regarding sexual harassment are frequently notable for their emphasis of perceptual differences and subsequent volatility. It is commonly accepted that women and men differ widely in their attitudes regarding what types of behaviors should be considered sexually harassing. This has become an even more prevalent point with the legal precedents which validate women's perceptions and the salience of the gender hierarchy. Thus the concordance between women's and men's responses was much higher than had been expected. This may, again, be due to the liberalizing effects of higher education. It could also be the result of social desirability factors, even though responses to these questionnaires were anonymously obtained. A third possibility is that responses to paper and pencil tests simply do not provide data which accurately reflect attitudes and perceptions regarding this phenomenon. A fourth possibility is that perceptual limitations focus our attention on the disagreements between individuals regarding
sexual harassment rather than the agreements, and, in fact, women’s and men’s attitudes are very similar.

Implications for Future Research

A primary disadvantage of investigations of subjective phenomena such as attitudes regarding sexual harassment is the problem of too much complexity—the influence of a large number of independent variables must be assessed. Multifactor experiments can provide a closer approximation of the actual settings within which certain attitudes are manifested than simpler studies, however comprehensive theoretical explanations of attitudes regarding sexual harassment remain distant goals. In the interest of achieving an acceptable degree of internal validity, restricting the conditions in which we assess these attitudes necessarily limits the generalizability of results. For now, advances in social scientists’ ability to make predictions based on a number of independent variables, of what students perceive as sexually harassing and in their ability to test these predictions, is a more realistic goal. Although a number of studies have been published addressing this point, none have adequately delineated the domain of sexual harassment (Fitzgerald, 1990) in a manner which will permit consistent prediction to occur.

The relationship between sex-role stereotypes and perceptions and beliefs about sexual harassment deserves
additional attention. These preliminary results indicate that some differentiation in judgments to the scenarios is related to individual acceptance of sex-role stereotypes, although the questions included in this study were not designed to provide a comprehensive look at how and in what cases such a relationship might be manifested. Future investigations would benefit from an analysis of both general attitudes regarding gender roles and specific beliefs about sexual harassment, and the inclusion of numerous items which examine the different constructs in a variety of contexts. In addition, the manner in which traditional sex-roles reflect the general power imbalance between women and men also requires further attention. Estrich (1991), suggests that women adopt traditional roles not because they are comfortable with them, but rather because they are usually in positions of limited power and are therefore more vulnerable to the expectations of more powerful people in the workplace. Thus, when men are uncomfortable with women in the workplace, they may find women’s adoption of traditional sex-roles, which may be compatible with their own adoption of traditional sex-roles, eases dissonance. Empirical studies by Guteck (1985) suggest that men are less bothered by a sexually-toned workplace than are women, and it may be that men exert influence on women to maintain traditional roles at work in
order to satisfy their own need for comfort or familiarity.

An additional variable of importance in assessing the attitudes and perceptions of individuals regarding sexual harassment is the relationship between personal relevance and the judgment process. The gender harassment attitudes obtained in this study are consistent with the notion that personal relevance is a salient feature of this process. Because this study allowed student participants to make judgments without being guided by emotionally-charged or value-laden language and without using a predetermined definition of sexual harassment as a guide for their judgments, they might have been more likely to make judgments which were unhhampered by personal identification with the initiator or the recipient of the interaction. Yet, it appears that even when factors relating to the process of personal identification and labeling of personal experience are controlled in this manner, personal relevance remains a central feature of the judgment process. This is clearly an area ripe for future study.

A related point which bears mentioning is that social consensus should not serve as the sole basis for definitions of sexual harassment (Fitzgerald, 1990). Since the perceptions of individuals asked to respond to definitional studies are affected by demographic, attitudinal, and experiential variables (Fitzgerald, 1990), they are likely
to differ from those of women who actually experience sexual harassment. And since even the law regarding the definition of sexual harassment acknowledges the validity of the perceptions of those who are recipients of the harassing behavior (MacKinnon, 1987), perceptions of non-harassed individuals which differ from victims' may be irrelevant.

While attitudes regarding sexual harassment will most certainly influence students' perceptions regarding real-life experiences they may encounter (Jensen and Guteck, 1982), the decisions students make on paper and pencil tests such as those used in the current study will likely differ from their decisions regarding real-life experiences. Further research which addresses the relative consistency between reported attitudes and behavioral definitions and responses to actual experiences of sexual harassment is clearly warranted. The results of the current study provide some insight into avenues for exploring these relationships. For example, the difference in judgments of severity of an interaction relating to the academic position of the initiator in the current study are quite clear. When the initiator is a male professor, participants were more likely to judge the interaction negatively than when the initiator was either female or situated differently within the institutional hierarchy. Yet the apparently logical relationship between judgment of severity and actual
reporting may not exist. While the results of this study indicate that a higher percentage of students judge scenarios which depict sexual harassment of a female student by a male professor as reportable than scenarios depicting other academic and gender variations, actual reporting behavior may support the hypothesis that students are more likely to report incidents initiated by people who are not in positions of power and/or influence within the university hierarchy. It is well documented that students who are sexually harassed rarely report the incident (Adams et al., 1983; Brooks & Perot, 1991; Fitzgerald et al., 1988), and that a great many fail to report for fear of retaliation (Adams et al., 1983; Fitzgerald et al., 1988). Since sexual harassers who are respected or senior tenured members of the university faculty are likely to be perceived as having a greater opportunity to retaliate against a student complainant than a peer of the student, incidents of peer harassment or harassment by a low ranking or non-tenured professor may actually be reported more frequently.

It may also be that determinations of severity in real-life experiences of sexual harassment simply defy stereotypic hierarchies of power. Clearly, if a woman perceives herself as at enough of a disadvantage in a professional or non-professional interaction that she feels unable to terminate a relationship which she experiences as
sexually harassing, the exact nature of the power differential (e.g., academic position, status, physical size, etc.) may be of little consequence. Since the majority of case studies involving sexual harassment in academia reflect a population of victims who have made some effort to terminate the relationship either through formal or informal means, attempts to investigate the experiences of those who feel unable to extricate themselves from such relationships should also be made. Such investigations might produce radically different profiles of both victims and perpetrators of sexual harassment.

A particularly controversial point related to perceptual definitions of sexual harassment is that women students experience many incidents of sexual harassment which fit legal definitions of the term such as propositions, fondling, and grabbing, but often do not label their experiences as sexual harassment (Fitzgerald et al., 1988). Fitzgerald points out that "women are, after all, socialized to accept many nonconsensual or even offensive sexual interactions as being nonremarkable, a fact of life" (1990, p. 37). Following this reasoning, it could be argued that victims' labeling of their experiences as sexual harassment should not be a necessary element in the development of a consensual definition of the phenomenon. This argument is controversial and will probably remain an issue for debate for some time.
The suggestion made by Fitzgerald and Hesson-McInnes (1989) regarding a separation of the domain of sexual harassment into distinct construct areas of gender and sexual harassment is problematic in a number of ways. First, such a dichotomy is theoretically and conceptually problematic because it masks the underlying continuity between various forms of behavior and its effects. Second, it is pragmatically problematic because it may be used to minimize the acknowledgment of harm to victims. Third, it is legally problematic because it may be used to remove some of these situations from the purview of the law. Drawing from Estrich’s (1991) discussion of "real rape," the attention placed on naming the particular type of harassment seems dangerously misguided. While the theoretical basis for such a distinction may be defendable, delineating sexual harassment into a variety of more theoretically specific constructs which exclude many women’s experiences from the general domain of sexual harassment effectively negates much of the progress toward sexual harassment victims’ rights made in the last decade. Such a separation of constructs places the legal emphasis on the resultant hierarchy of incidents and precludes attention to the subjective experience of harm faced by the harassed woman. For this reason, continued attempts to define the domain of sexual harassment should consider the tradition of interaction
between social-psychological and legal definitions of the term, and consider the effects of sexual harassment on victims as part of the definitional process.

The continued acceptance of sex-role stereotypes both apart from and within academic and employment settings certainly affects individual judgments of sexual harassment. The emphasis on both theoretical and empirical work which is related to stereotypic sexual harassment of students by professors when peer harassment is thought to be much more prevalent may be a manifestation of these stereotypes within the research community. Through continued attempts to define the domain of sexual harassment and analysis of concomitants of power reflected in manifestations of the construct, application of revisions of the domain may eventually result in an explanatory model with a reasonable degree of accuracy and predictive validity. Facilitation of this definitional process requires a concerted effort on the part of researchers to not lose sight of the practical application of their work. Since "measurement of sexual harassment is still in its infancy" (Fitzgerald, 1990, p. 40) and the problem of sexual harassment is of considerable concern on many college campuses, accumulated data will frequently be used to effect policy change. Social scientists must seriously consider the ways in which legal scholars, attorneys, victims' rights
advocates, employers, and unions address sexual harassment, and work to address the gaps in data concerning peer harassment and issues relating to the experiences of women of color who are sexually harassed. Attention to the ways in which data and theory might be used both to help and hurt those who have been or will be sexually harassed is vital. Emphasis on the interaction between social scientific and legal theory must include recognition that social scientific strategies for defining a phenomenon of interest have not been systematically applied to sexual harassment. This recognition should help sensitize researchers, legal theorists and practitioners to the definitional issues currently facing institutions, sexual harassers, victims, and others, and may facilitate the design of more effective methods to reduce the incidence of sexual harassment experienced by women in academia.
### Table 1
Gender Differences in Sex Role Stereotypes
(n=988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Percent Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most women who are sexually harassed by a man provoke his behavior by the way they talk, act or dress.</td>
<td>r: -.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that sexual intimidation is a serious social problem.</td>
<td>Women: <em>92.8%</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A man must learn to understand that a woman's “no” to his sexual advances really means “no.”</td>
<td>Men: 87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is only natural for a man to make sexual advances to a woman he finds attractive</td>
<td>r: -.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging a professor's or supervisor's sexual interest is frequently used by women to get better grades or to</td>
<td>Women: 17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improve their work situation.</td>
<td>Men: 40.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*bold indicates significance p < .05*
*and bold indicate significance p ≤ .0005*
Table 2
Students' Judgments by Scenario
(n=986)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios (collapsed)</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Initiator tells recipient &quot;she looks very nice&quot; and he is &quot;proud to be seen with her&quot;</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Initiator asks recipient to meet in the student lounge to discuss her/his senior thesis</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Initiator tells two female recipients that &quot;girls are poor at science&quot;</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Initiator puts arm on recipient while reviewing class material with her/him</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Initiator permits recipient to recruit research subjects if she will go to lunch with him the next day</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Initiator tells recipient s/he will &quot;take care of&quot; an incomplete if she will have dinner with her/him</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Initiator tells recipient that &quot;she is too bright&quot; to date young men and should date mature men like him</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Initiator sees recipient at the beach; they begin dating</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Initiator tells recipient to go into home economics because she can't &quot;grasp technical concepts&quot;</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Initiator commiserates with recipient about problems he is having with his wife</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenarios</td>
<td>Inappropriate</td>
<td>Sexist</td>
<td>Harassment</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Professor tells student &quot;she looks very nice&quot; and he is &quot;proud to be seen with her&quot;</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Professor asks student to meet in the student lounge to discuss her senior thesis</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Professor tells two female students that &quot;girls are poor at science&quot;</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. M. professor puts arm on student while reviewing class material with her</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Professor permits student to recruit research subjects if she will go to lunch with him the next day</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Professor tells student he will &quot;take care of&quot; an incomplete if she will have dinner with him</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Professor tells student that &quot;she is too bright&quot; to date young men and should date mature men like him</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Student sees former professor at the beach; they begin dating</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Professor tells student to go into home economics because she can't &quot;grasp technical concepts&quot;</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Professor commiserates with student about problems he is having with his wife</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
All Students' Judgments to SH-J1
(n=457)
Table 4
All Students' Judgments to SH-J2
(n=260)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Student tells professor &quot;she looks very nice&quot; and he is &quot;proud to be seen with her&quot;</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Advisor asks student to meet in the student lounge to discuss his senior thesis</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Grad. student tells two professors that &quot;girls are poor at science&quot;</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. M. professor puts arm on student while reviewing class material w/him</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Student permits student to recruit research subjects if she will go to lunch with him the next day</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Professor tells student she will &quot;take care of&quot; an incomplete if she will have dinner with her</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Student tells professor that &quot;she is too bright&quot; to date young men and should date mature men like him</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Student sees former professor at the beach; they begin dating</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Professor tells student to go into management because he can't &quot;grasp technical concepts&quot;</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Student commiserates with professor about problems he is having with his wife</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*bold indicates significantly different responses from SH-J1 (p < .05)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Professor tells secretary &quot;she looks very nice&quot; and he is &quot;proud to be seen with her&quot;</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Supervisor asks worker to meet in the student lounge to discuss her class project</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. VPAA tells two female professors that &quot;girls are poor at science&quot;</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. M. supervisor puts arm on worker while reviewing class material w/him</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Professor permits professor to recruit research subjects if she will go to lunch with him the next day</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Supervisor tells secretary she will &quot;take care of&quot; a problem at work if sec. will have dinner with her</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Professor tells professor that &quot;she is too bright&quot; to date young men and should date mature men like him</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Dean sees professor at the beach; they begin dating</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Professor tells student to go into home economics because she can't &quot;grasp technical concepts&quot;</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Professor commiserates with professor about problems he is having with his wife</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**bold indicates significantly different responses from SH-J1 (p < .05)**
Table 6
All Students' Judgments by Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario A</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 Professor tells student</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;she looks very nice&quot; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he is &quot;proud to be seen with her&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 Student tells professor</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;she looks very nice&quot; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he is &quot;proud to be seen with her&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 Professor tells secretary</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;she looks very nice&quot; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he is &quot;proud to be seen with her&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

bold indicates significantly different response from SH-J1 ($p < .05$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario B</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 Advisor asks student to</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meet in the student lounge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to discuss her senior thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 Advisor asks student to</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meet in the student lounge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to discuss his senior thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 Supervisor asks worker to</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meet in the student lounge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to discuss her class project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

bold indicates significantly different response from SH-J1 ($p < .05$)
### Table 6 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario C</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 Professor tells two female students that &quot;girls are poor at science&quot;</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 Grad. student tells two professors that &quot;girls are poor at science&quot;</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 VPAA tells two female professors that &quot;girls are poor at science&quot;</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bold indicates significantly different response from SH-J1 (p < .05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario D</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 M. professor puts arm on student while reviewing class material w/her</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 M. professor puts arm on student while reviewing class material w/him</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 M. supervisor puts arm on worker while reviewing class material w/him</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bold indicates significantly different response from SH-J1 (p < .05)
Table 6 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario E</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 Professor permits student to recruit research subjects if she will go to lunch with him the next day</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 Student permits student to recruit research subjects if she will go to lunch with him the next day</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 Professor permits professor to recruit research subjects if she will go to lunch with him the next day</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bold indicates significantly different response from SH-J1 ($p < .05$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario F</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 Professor tells student he will &quot;take care of&quot; an incomplete if she will have dinner with him</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 Professor tells student she will &quot;take care of&quot; an incomplete if she will have dinner with her</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 Supervisor tells secretary she will &quot;take care of&quot; an incomplete if she will have dinner with her</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bold indicates significantly different response from SH-J1 ($p < .05$)
Table 6 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario G</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 Professor tells student that &quot;she is too bright&quot; to date young men and should date mature men like him</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 Student tells professor that &quot;she is too bright&quot; to date young men and should date mature men like him</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 Professor tells professor that &quot;she is too bright&quot; to date young men and should date mature men like him</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**bold indicates significantly different response from SH-J1 \( p < .05 \)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario H</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 Student sees former professor at the beach; they begin dating</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 Student sees former professor at the beach; they begin dating</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 Dean sees professor at the beach; they begin dating</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**bold indicates significantly different response from SH-J1 \( p < .05 \)**
Table 6 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario I</th>
<th>Inappropriate Sexist Harassment Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1</td>
<td>Professor tells student to go into home economics because she can't &quot;grasp technical concepts&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2</td>
<td>Professor tells student to go into management because he can't &quot;grasp technical concepts&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3</td>
<td>Professor tells student to go into home economics because she can't &quot;grasp technical concepts&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bold indicates significantly different response from SH-J1 (p < .05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario J</th>
<th>Inappropriate Sexist Harassment Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1</td>
<td>Professor commiserates with student about problems he is having with his wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2</td>
<td>Student commiserates with professor about problems he is having with his wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3</td>
<td>Professor commiserates with professor about problems he is having with his wife</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bold indicates significantly different response from SH-J1 (p < .05)
Table 7
Students' Judgments to SH-J1 by Gender
(Fn=296, Mn=161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor tells student “she looks very nice”</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and he is “proud to be seen with her”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor asks student to meet in the student</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lounge to discuss her senior thesis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor tells two students that “girls are</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor at science&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. professor puts arm on student while</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reviewing class material w/her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor permits student to recruit research</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjects if she will go to lunch with him the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor tells student he will “take care of”</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an incomplete if she will have dinner with him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor tells student that “she is too</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bright” to date young men and should date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mature men like him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student sees former professor at the beach;</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they begin dating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor tells student to go into home</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economics because she can’t “grasp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technical concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor commiserates with student about</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problems he is having with his wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bold pairs indicate significant gender differences in response (p < .05)
### Table 8

**Students' Judgments to SH-J2 by Gender**

*(Fn=149, Mn=111)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Student tells professor</em> &quot;she looks very nice&quot; and he is &quot;proud to be seen with her&quot;</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Advisor asks student to meet in the student lounge to discuss his senior thesis</em></td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Grad. student tells two professors that &quot;girls are poor at science&quot;</em></td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>M. professor puts arm on student while reviewing class material w/him</em></td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Student permits student to recruit research subjects if she will go to lunch with him the next day</em></td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Professor tells student she will &quot;take care of&quot; an incomplete if she will have dinner with her</em></td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Student tells professor that &quot;she is too bright&quot; to date young men and should date mature men like him</em></td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Student sees former professor at the beach; they begin dating</em></td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Professor tells student to go into management because he can't &quot;grasp technical concepts&quot;</em></td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Student commiserates with professor about problems he is having with his wife</em></td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*bold pairs indicate significant gender differences in response (p < .05)*
### Table 9
Students' Judgments to SH-J3 by Gender
\( (F_n=165, M_n=104) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F M</td>
<td>F M</td>
<td>F M</td>
<td>F M</td>
<td>F M</td>
<td>F M</td>
<td>F M</td>
<td>F M</td>
<td>F M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor tells secretary</td>
<td>33.0 32.7</td>
<td>25.1 21.2</td>
<td>14.5 14.4</td>
<td>3.6 8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;she looks very nice&quot; and he is &quot;proud to be seen with her&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor asks worker to meet in the student lounge to discuss her class project</td>
<td>21.8 10.6</td>
<td>4.8 3.8</td>
<td>6.7 3.8</td>
<td>6.1 3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPAA tells two female professors that &quot;girls are poor at science&quot;</td>
<td>91.0 86.5</td>
<td>88.5 89.4</td>
<td>27.3 13.5</td>
<td>45.5 30.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. supervisor puts arm on worker while reviewing class material w/him</td>
<td>81.2 82.5</td>
<td>15.8 8.7</td>
<td>41.8 31.7</td>
<td>27.9 19.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. permits prof. to recruit research subjects if she will go to lunch with him the next day</td>
<td>83.6 83.7</td>
<td>35.8 43.3</td>
<td>66.1 58.7</td>
<td>61.2 58.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor tells sec. she will &quot;take care of&quot; a problem at work if sec. will have dinner with her</td>
<td>75.2 75.0</td>
<td>38.2 37.5</td>
<td>51.5 50.0</td>
<td>50.3 51.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor tells professor that &quot;she is too bright&quot; to date young men and should date mature men like him</td>
<td>75.8 83.7</td>
<td>43.0 34.6</td>
<td>40.0 44.2</td>
<td>26.7 27.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean sees professor at the beach; they begin dating</td>
<td>11.5 8.6</td>
<td>1.8 4.8</td>
<td>2.4 2.9</td>
<td>2.4 .9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor tells student to go into home economics because she can't &quot;grasp technical concepts&quot;</td>
<td>91.5 88.5</td>
<td>38.2 32.7</td>
<td>18.8 13.5</td>
<td>87.3 81.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor commiserates with professor about problems he is having with his wife</td>
<td>60.6 52.9</td>
<td>26.7 19.2</td>
<td>33.9 30.8</td>
<td>23.6 23.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**bold pairs denote significant gender differences in response \( (p < .05) \)**
Table 10
Students' Judgments to Scenarios by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario A</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor tells student</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;she looks very nice&quot; and he is &quot;proud to be seen with her&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student tells professor</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;she looks very nice&quot; and he is &quot;proud to be seen with her&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor tells secretary</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;she looks very nice&quot; and he is &quot;proud to be seen with her&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

bold pairs indicate significant gender differences within groups (p < .05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario B</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor asks student to meet in the student lounge to discuss her senior thesis</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor asks student to meet in the student lounge to discuss his senior thesis</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor asks worker to meet in the student lounge to discuss her class project</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

bold pairs indicate significant gender differences within groups (p < .05)
Table 10 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario C</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F M</td>
<td>F M</td>
<td>F M</td>
<td>F M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor tells two students that &quot;girls are poor at science&quot;</td>
<td>93.9 88.2</td>
<td>91.9 85.7</td>
<td>24.7 14.3</td>
<td>42.2 42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad. student tells two professors that &quot;girls are poor at science&quot;</td>
<td>91.3 84.7</td>
<td>95.3 84.7</td>
<td>22.8 14.4</td>
<td>17.5 10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPAA tells two female professors that &quot;girls are poor at science&quot;</td>
<td>91.0 86.5</td>
<td>88.5 89.4</td>
<td>27.3 13.5</td>
<td>45.5 30.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- bold pairs indicate significant gender differences within groups ($p < .05$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario D</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F M</td>
<td>F M</td>
<td>F M</td>
<td>F M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. professor puts arm on student while reviewing class material w/her</td>
<td>93.9 80.1</td>
<td>46.6 31.7</td>
<td>63.9 64.0</td>
<td>50.3 57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. professor puts arm on student while reviewing class material w/him</td>
<td>87.2 82.9</td>
<td>29.5 18.0</td>
<td>57.0 38.7</td>
<td>46.3 34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. supervisor puts arm on worker while reviewing class material w/him</td>
<td>81.2 62.5</td>
<td>15.8 8.7</td>
<td>41.8 31.7</td>
<td>27.9 19.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- bold pairs indicate significant gender differences within groups ($p < .05$)
Table 10 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F  M</td>
<td>F  M</td>
<td>F  M</td>
<td>F  M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor permits student to recruit research subjects if she will go to lunch with him the next day</td>
<td>91.2 80.7</td>
<td>53.7 34.2</td>
<td>67.2 51.6</td>
<td>65.5 55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student permits student to recruit research subjects if she will go to lunch with him the next day</td>
<td>77.2 67.6</td>
<td>47.7 37.6</td>
<td>55.7 45.0</td>
<td>46.3 34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. permits prof. to recruit research subjects if she will go to lunch with him the next day</td>
<td>83.6 83.7</td>
<td>35.8 43.3</td>
<td>66.1 58.7</td>
<td>61.2 58.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bold pairs indicate significant gender differences within groups (p < .05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F  M</td>
<td>F  M</td>
<td>F  M</td>
<td>F  M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor tells student he will &quot;take care of&quot; an incomplete if she will have dinner with him</td>
<td>95.6 89.4</td>
<td>66.2 49.7</td>
<td>85.5 77.6</td>
<td>85.8 79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor tells student she will &quot;take care of&quot; an incomplete if she will have dinner with her</td>
<td>92.6 91.9</td>
<td>55.7 51.4</td>
<td>79.2 73.9</td>
<td>83.9 79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor tells sec. she will &quot;take care of&quot; a problem at work if sec. will have dinner with her</td>
<td>75.2 75.0</td>
<td>38.2 37.5</td>
<td>51.5 50.0</td>
<td>50.3 51.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bold pairs indicate significant gender differences within groups (p < .05)
Table 10 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario G</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F M</td>
<td>F M</td>
<td>F M</td>
<td>F M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor tells student that &quot;she is too bright&quot; to date young men and should date mature men like him</td>
<td>91.9 85.7</td>
<td>51.7 48.5</td>
<td>62.2 59.0</td>
<td>50.7 55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student tells professor that &quot;she is too bright&quot; to date young men and should date mature men like him</td>
<td>87.2 75.7</td>
<td>46.3 36.0</td>
<td>51.0 37.8</td>
<td>33.6 18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor tells professor that &quot;she is too bright&quot; to date young men and should date mature men like him</td>
<td>75.8 83.7</td>
<td>43.0 34.6</td>
<td>40.0 44.2</td>
<td>26.7 27.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bold pairs indicate significant gender differences within groups (p < .05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario H</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F M</td>
<td>F M</td>
<td>F M</td>
<td>F M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student sees former professor at the beach; they begin dating</td>
<td>10.1 12.4</td>
<td>1.4 .6</td>
<td>.7 0</td>
<td>0 .6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student sees former professor at the beach; they begin dating</td>
<td>10.4 12.4</td>
<td>1.4 .6</td>
<td>.7 0</td>
<td>0 .6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean sees professor at the beach; they begin dating</td>
<td>11.5 8.6</td>
<td>1.8 4.8</td>
<td>2.4 2.9</td>
<td>2.4 .9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bold pairs indicate significant gender differences within groups (p < .05)
### Table 10 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario I</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor tells student to go into home economics because she can't &quot;grasp technical concepts&quot;</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor tells student to go into management because he can't &quot;grasp technical concepts&quot;</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor tells student to go into home economics because she can't &quot;grasp technical concepts&quot;</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*bold pairs indicate significant gender differences within groups (p < .05)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario J</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor commiserates with student about problems he is having with his wife</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student commiserates with professor about problems he is having with his wife</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor commiserates with professor about problems he is having with his wife</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*bold pairs indicate significant gender differences within groups (p < .05)*
Table 11
Students' Judgments by Scenario and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1</td>
<td>Professor tells student &quot;she looks very nice&quot; and he is &quot;proud to be seen with her&quot;</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2</td>
<td>Student tells professor &quot;she looks very nice&quot; and he is &quot;proud to be seen with her&quot;</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3</td>
<td>Professor tells secretary &quot;she looks very nice&quot; and he is &quot;proud to be seen with her&quot;</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*bold indicates significantly different response (within gender)*

from SH-J1 ($p < .05$)
Table 11 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario B (Females)</th>
<th>Inappropriate Report</th>
<th>Sexist Report</th>
<th>Harassment Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 Professor asks student to meet in the student lounge to discuss her senior thesis</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 Advisor asks student to meet in the student lounge to discuss his senior thesis</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 Supervisor asks worker to meet in the student lounge to discuss her class project</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario B (Males)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 Professor asks student to meet in the student lounge to discuss her senior thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 Advisor asks student to meet in the student lounge to discuss his senior thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 Supervisor asks worker to meet in the student lounge to discuss her class project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

bold indicates significantly different response (within gender) from SH-J1 ($p < .05$)
Table 11 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario C (Females)</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 Professor tells two female students that &quot;girls are poor at science&quot;</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 Grad. student tells two professors that &quot;girls are poor at science&quot;</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 VPAA tells two female professors that &quot;girls are poor at science&quot;</td>
<td>91.0%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario C (Males)</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 Professor tells two female students that &quot;girls are poor at science&quot;</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 Grad. student tells two professors that &quot;girls are poor at science&quot;</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 VPAA tells two female professors that &quot;girls are poor at science&quot;</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bold indicates significantly different response (within gender) from SH-J1 ($p < .05$)
Table 11 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario D (Females)</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 M. professor puts arm on student while reviewing class material w/her</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 M. professor puts arm on student while reviewing class material w/him</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 M. supervisor puts arm on worker while reviewing class material w/him</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario D (Males)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 M. professor puts arm on student while reviewing class material w/her</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 M. professor puts arm on student while reviewing class material w/him</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 M. supervisor puts arm on worker while reviewing class material w/him</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*bold indicates significantly different response (within gender) from SH-J1 (p < .05)*
Table 11 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario E (Females)</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 Professor permits student to recruit research subjects if she will go to lunch with him the next day</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 Student permits student to recruit research subjects if she will go to lunch with him the next day</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 Professor permits professor to recruit research subjects if she will go to lunch with him the next day</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario E (Males)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 Professor permits student to recruit research subjects if she will go to lunch with him the next day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 Student permits student to recruit research subjects if she will go to lunch with him the next day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 Professor permits professor to recruit research subjects if she will go to lunch with him the next day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*bold indicates significantly different response (within gender) from SH-J1 (p < .05)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario F (Females)</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 Professor tells student he will &quot;take care of&quot; an incomplete if she will have dinner with him</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 Professor tells student she will &quot;take care of&quot; an incomplete if she will have dinner with her</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 Supervisor tells secretary she will &quot;take care of&quot; an incomplete if she will have dinner with her</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario F (Males)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 Professor tells student he will &quot;take care of&quot; an incomplete if she will have dinner with him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 Professor tells student she will &quot;take care of&quot; an incomplete if she will have dinner with her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 Supervisor tells secretary she will &quot;take care of&quot; an incomplete if she will have dinner with her</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bold indicates significantly different response (within gender) from SH-J1 ($p < .05$)
Table 11 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario G (Females)</th>
<th>Inappropriate Sexist Harassment Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 Professor tells student that &quot;she is too bright&quot; to date young men and should date mature men like him</td>
<td>91.9% 51.7% 62.2% 50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 Student tells professor that &quot;she is too bright&quot; to date young men and should date mature men like him</td>
<td>87.2% 46.3% 51.0% 33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 Professor tells professor that &quot;she is too bright&quot; to date young men and should date mature men like him</td>
<td>75.8% 43.0% 40.0% 25.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario G (Males)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 Professor tells student that &quot;she is too bright&quot; to date young men and should date mature men like him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 Student tells professor that &quot;she is too bright&quot; to date young men and should date mature men like him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 Professor tells professor that &quot;she is too bright&quot; to date young men and should date mature men like him</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**bold indicates significantly different response (within gender) from SH-J1 (p < .05)**
### Table 11 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario H (Females)</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 Student sees former professor at the beach; they begin dating</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 Student sees former professor at the beach; they begin dating</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 Dean sees professor at the beach; they begin dating</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scenario H (Males)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario H (Males)</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 Student sees former professor at the beach; they begin dating</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 Student sees former professor at the beach; they begin dating</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 Dean sees professor at the beach; they begin dating</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*bold indicates significantly different response (within gender) from SH-J1 (p < .05)*
Table 11 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario I (Females)</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 Professor tells student to go into home economics because she can't &quot;grasp technical concepts&quot;</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 Professor tells student to go into management because he can't &quot;grasp technical concepts&quot;</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 Professor tells student to go into home economics because she can't &quot;grasp technical concepts&quot;</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario I (Males)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1 Professor tells student to go into home economics because she can't &quot;grasp technical concepts&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2 Professor tells student to go into management because he can't &quot;grasp technical concepts&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3 Professor tells student to go into home economics because she can't &quot;grasp technical concepts&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bold indicates significantly different response (within gender) from SH-J1 ($p < .05$)
Table 11 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario J (Females)</th>
<th>Inappropriate</th>
<th>Sexist</th>
<th>Harassment</th>
<th>Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor commiserates with student about problems he is having with his wife</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student commiserates with professor about problems he is having with his wife</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor commiserates with professor about problems he is having with his wife</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario J (Males)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor commiserates with student about problems he is having with his wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student commiserates with professor about problems he is having with his wife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor commiserates with professor about problems he is having with his wife</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*bold indicates significantly different response (within gender) from SH-J1 (p < .05)*
Table 12
Rankings by Scenario and % Agreement

### Inappropriate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All participants</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1</td>
<td>(457)</td>
<td>(260)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2</td>
<td>(269)</td>
<td>(149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3</td>
<td>(165)</td>
<td>(111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1</td>
<td>(161)</td>
<td>(104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2</td>
<td>(111)</td>
<td>(104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3</td>
<td>(104)</td>
<td>(104)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- F 93.4  F 92.3  I 90.3  I 89.4  I 91.5  F 89.4  F 91.9  I 88.5
- C 91.9  C 88.5  C 91.3  C 91.0  C 88.2  C 84.7  C 86.5
- I 91.2  I 86.5  E 83.6  F 89.9  E 63.8  G 85.7  D 82.9  G 83.7
- G 89.7  D 85.4  G 87.2  D 81.2  I 81.4  I 82.0  E 83.7
- D 89.1  G 82.3  F 75.1  G 91.9  D 87.2  G 75.8  E 60.7  G 75.7  F 75.0
- E 97.5  E 73.1  D 74.0  E 91.2  E 77.2  F 75.2  D 80.1  E 97.8  D 82.5
- J 85.8  J 71.2  J 57.5  J 90.9  J 75.2  J 60.6  J 76.4  J 65.8  J 52.9
- A 61.7  A 56.5  A 33.1  A 69.3  A 63.8  A 33.0  A 47.3  A 46.8  A 32.2
- H 10.9  H 12.7  B 13.0  H 10.1  B 12.8  B 21.8  H 12.4  H 15.3  B 10.6
- B 0.1  B 10.3  H 10.4  B 7.9  H 10.4  H 11.5  B 8.7  B 9.1  H 8.5

**bold indicates significantly different within version responses between genders (p < .05)**

### Sexist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All participants</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1</td>
<td>(457)</td>
<td>(260)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2</td>
<td>(269)</td>
<td>(149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3</td>
<td>(165)</td>
<td>(111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J1</td>
<td>(161)</td>
<td>(104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J2</td>
<td>(111)</td>
<td>(104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH-J3</td>
<td>(104)</td>
<td>(104)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- C 89.7  C 90.8  C 86.8  C 91.9  C 95.3  C 88.5  C 85.7  C 84.7  C 89.4
- I 83.6  I 55.4  E 45.0  I 88.5  I 58.7  G 43.0  I 74.5  F 51.4  E 43.3
- F 60.4  F 53.9  G 39.8  F 66.2  F 55.7  F 38.2  F 49.7  I 49.5  F 37.5
- G 50.6  E 43.5  F 37.9  E 53.7  E 47.7  I 38.2  G 48.5  E 37.8  G 34.6
- E 46.8  G 41.9  I 36.0  G 51.2  G 46.3  E 35.8  E 34.2  G 36.0  I 32.5
- D 41.4  J 28.9  A 24.2  D 46.6  J 36.2  J 26.2  D 31.7  A 19.8  A 21.2
- J 30.4  A 25.8  J 23.8  A 34.8  A 30.3  A 26.1  J 24.2  J 18.2  J 19.2
- A 30.0  D 24.6  D 13.0  J 33.6  D 29.5  D 15.8  A 21.1  D 13.0  D 8.7
- B 1.5  B 1.9  B 4.5  B 1.4  B 2.7  B 4.8  B 1.7  B 9.9  H 4.8
- H 1.1  H 1.7  H 2.9  H 1.4  H 6.8  H 1.8  H 6.5  H 9.9  B 3.8

**bold indicates significantly different within version responses between genders (p < .05)**
Table 12 continued

### Sexual Harassment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All participants</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(457)</td>
<td>(260)</td>
<td>(269)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**bold indicates significantly different within version responses between genders (p < .05)**

### Reportable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All participants</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(457)</td>
<td>(260)</td>
<td>(269)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**bold indicates significantly different within version responses between genders (p < .05)**
Appendix A

SEXUAL HARASSMENT SURVEY

The Office for Student Affairs and a research team from the departments of Women's Studies and Psychology are conducting a survey on sexual harassment at UHM. We ask your assistance in completing this questionnaire. This survey is designed to be anonymous—please do not put your name on it.

Mark the appropriate answer:

1. Sex: female____ male____
2. Age:____
3. Ethnicity______________________________

4a. Were you born in a country other than the United States? ______
   If yes, where were you born? ________________________________

4b. Were you raised there, or somewhere else besides the United States? (please specify the country) ________________________________

5. Are you in Hawaii on a student visa?____

6. "Marital" status: married____ single____ separated/divorced/widowed

7. Do you live with your parents or grandparents____ with spouse and/or children____ with your significant other____ with housemates____ with roommates in the dorm____ alone in the dorm____ alone in a house or apartment____ other____

8. Current position on campus: undergraduate student____
   graduate student____ faculty____ staff____ administrator____

9. How many years at UHM?____________________

10. Have you ever seen a presentation by CORE (the UHM student Rape Awareness program) at UHM?____

11. Please indicate your attitudes regarding the behaviors described below by placing a check in the appropriate space.        Agree  Disagree

   a. Most women who are sexually insulted by a man provoke his behavior by the way they talk, act or dress.  ____  ____
   b. I believe that sexual intimidation is a serious social problem.  ____  ____
   c. A man must learn to understand that a woman's "no" to his sexual advances really means "no".  ____  ____
   d. It is only natural for a man to make sexual advances to a woman he finds attractive.  ____  ____
   e. Encouraging a professor's or supervisor's sexual interest is frequently used by women to get better grades or to improve their work situation.  ____  ____
UHM policy regarding sexual harassment states that "sexual harassment includes, but is not limited to, the following:

a. Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature;
b. Solicitation of sexual activity of other sex-related behavior by promise of rewards and/or threat of punishment;
c. Activities of a sexual nature which have the effects of unreasonably interfering with an individual's performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive environment;
d. Verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature, expressed or implied, imposed on the basis of sex, that denies, limits, or conditions the provision of aid, benefits, services or treatment".

12. Using the above definition, have you ever been sexually harassed while at UHM? yes no

If you answered yes to question 12, please answer the remaining questions on both surveys. If you answered no to question 12, please skip the next two pages and go on to the next survey.

13. How many times have you been sexually harassing while at UHM?_____

14. How long ago was the most recent incident you experienced? it is ongoing____ within the past six months____ between six months and a year ago____ between one and two years ago____ between two and five years ago____ more than five years ago____

15. Please describe the incident you consider the most serious. ________________

For the remaining questions, please refer to the incident you have described above.

16. What was the relationship between you and the harasser? stranger____ acquaintance____ friend____ co-worker____ supervisor____ teacher____ other (specify)________________________

17. If the harasser was a teacher, was s/he an undergraduate student____ graduate student____ faculty member____ lecturer (night school)____

18. Was the harasser a member of the opposite sex?____

19. What was the harasser's ethnicity (if known)?________________________

20. Where did the harassment occur? in or near the dorm____ on-campus parking lot____ library____ classroom____ harasser's office____ other office____ off campus____ other (specify)____
21a. Did you speak with anyone about the incident(s)?
   b. If so, who? friend (same sex)___ friend (opposite sex)___ significant
      other___ parent___ other relative___ teacher___ on-campus
      counselor___ other counselor___ harasser___ other (specify)___

22. Did you report the incident? yes___no___

23. If you did not report the incident, why not? (you may mark multiple
    reasons)
    ___ fear of retaliation
    ___ was too upset to think about the incident
    ___ did not know how to report (Where to go, etc.)
    ___ the incident wasn't important enough
    ___ didn't know I was being harassed until later
    ___ felt that it was my fault
    ___ didn't want anyone else to know
    ___ didn't know who I could trust
    ___ other (please explain)____________________

24. If a friend of yours was/is being sexually harassed, what would you tell
    her (or him) to do?
Appendix B

SEXUAL HARASSMENT SURVEY #1

As you may know, sexual harassment is a topic of much current debate at the University of Hawaii. One issue which has become apparent is that little is known about what people on this campus actually consider to be sexual harassment.

You are being invited to participate in the first of a series of studies designed to investigate this issue. The results of these studies will ultimately help people concerned with sexual harassment learn how it is defined by students, faculty and staff, who live, learn and work at this university. Survey #1 describes scenarios involving faculty and students; subsequent surveys will describe situations between two students, a student and staff member, two faculty members, etc., and will examine female-to-male and intra-gender harassment.

This survey is intended to be voluntary and anonymous; please do not put your name on it. Answer all questions as honestly as possible. If you are uncomfortable answering a question, leave it blank. If you have questions or comments about this survey, the studies, or the topic of sexual harassment at the university, please call Susan Hippenstele of the Department of Psychology at ext. 8968.

QUESTIONS:

What is your status at the University of Hawaii (please circle)? Undergraduate student, graduate student, law student, medical student, faculty, or staff.

Are you (please circle) female? or male? What is your age? _____

What is your ethnic background? ________________

How many years at UHM? _______________________

Are you in Hawaii on a student visa? _______________________

1. A professor and his student go to lunch. He comments that she looks very nice and says that he is proud to be seen with her.

   Is the professor being appropriate?

   Is the professor being sexist?

   Is the student being sexually harassed?

   Should the student report the professor's behavior? Why, or why not?
2. A student is working on a research project for her senior thesis. Her advisor tells her that she needs to do some additional work on a portion of the projects and offers to meet her in the graduate students' lounge to help her with it.

Is the professor being appropriate?
Is the professor being sexist?
Is the student being sexually harassed?
Should the student report the professor's behavior? Why, or why not?

3. Two college students are talking in the hallway of the Biology building. Their Biology professor approaches them and says, "I can see why girls are so poor at science, they never stop talking long enough to think".

Is the professor being appropriate?
Is the professor being sexist?
Are the students being sexually harassed?
Should the students report the professor's comment? Why, or why not?

4. A transfer student from a nearby college enters her English class for the first time. The professor asks her to stay after class for a couple of minutes. When she approaches his desk, he puts his arm around her shoulder and leaves it there while he explains what the class has done so far during the semester.

Is the professor being appropriate?
Is the professor being sexist?
Is the student being sexually harassed?
Should the student report the professor's behavior? Why, or why not?
5. A graduate student needs access to a particular undergraduate class for research purposes. Her advisor, with whom she's been working for four years, offers to let her work with students in his class if she will have lunch with him the next day.

Is the professor being appropriate?
Is the professor being sexist?
Is the student being sexually harassed?
Should the student report the professor's behavior?
Why, or why not?

6. An undergraduate student receives a note from one of her instructors, telling her that there is a problem with her classwork and she will have to take an incomplete. She is scheduled to graduate and tells the professor that she needs to receive the credit this semester. He tells her not to worry, he will take care of it and suggests that they have dinner together the following weekend.

Is the professor being appropriate?
Is the professor being sexist?
Is the student being sexually harassed?
Should the student report the professor’s behavior?
Why, or why not?

7. A college sophomore comes to class very upset one day. Her psychology professor asks to see her after class and then asks her what is wrong. She tells him she had a fight with her boyfriend. The professor tells the student that she is too bright to be wasting her time with men her age and needs to spend time with someone more mature like him.

Is the professor being appropriate?
Is the professor being sexist?
Is the student being sexually harassed?
Should the student report the professor's behavior?
Why, or why not?
6. A student sees a professor at the beach that she had taken a class from last year. He asks her to have coffee with him. They have a great time and she suggests that they meet again next day at the beach. He agrees and eventually they begin dating.

Is the professor being appropriate?
Is the professor being sexist?
Is the student being sexually harassed?
Should the student report the professor's behavior?
Why, or why not?

9. A woman who has returned to school after raising her children is trying to decide on a major. Her advisor, a man twenty years her junior, suggests that she should focus on home economics or possibly social work. She insists that she wants to study either oceanography or zoology. He says he will write a letter recommending that she not be accepted by either of these departments because she does not have the potential to grasp technical concepts.

Is the professor being appropriate?
Is the professor being sexist?
Is the student being sexually harassed?
Should the student report the professor's behavior?
Why, or why not?

10. A college professor asks to see one of his students in his office after class. Once there, he immediately begins telling her about the difficulties he's having with his wife. After several minutes he sighs and says, "It's so nice to have a woman my own age to talk to, I feel like we could really get to be close friends."

Is the professor being appropriate?
Is the professor being sexist?
Is the student being sexually harassed?
Should the student report the professor's behavior?
Why, or why not?
Appendix C

SEXUAL HARASSMENT SURVEY #2

As you may know, sexual harassment is a topic of much current debate at the University of Hawaii. One issue which has become apparent is that little is known about what people on this campus actually consider to be sexual harassment.

You are being invited to participate in the first of a series of studies designed to investigate this issue. The results of these studies will ultimately help people concerned with sexual harassment learn how it is defined by students, faculty and staff, who live, learn and work at this university. Survey #2 describes scenarios involving faculty and students; subsequent surveys will describe situations between a student and staff member, two faculty members, two staff members, etc.

This survey is intended to be voluntary and anonymous; please do not put your name on it. Answer all questions as honestly as possible. If you are uncomfortable answering a question, leave it blank. If you have questions or comments about this survey, the studies, or the topic of sexual harassment at the university, please call Susan Hippensteele of the Department of Psychology, at ext. 8386.

QUESTIONS:

What is your status at the University of Hawaii (please circle)? Undergraduate student, law school student, graduate student, law student, medical student, faculty, or staff.

Are you (please circle) female? or male? What is your age? 
What is your ethnic background? How many years at UHM? 
Are you in Hawaii on a student visa?

1. A student and his professor go to lunch. He comments that she looks very nice and says that he is proud to be seen with her.

Is the student being appropriate?
Is the student being sexist?
Is the professor being sexually harassed?

Should the professor report the student's behavior? Why, or why not?
2. A student is working on a research project for his senior thesis. His advisor tells him that he needs to do some additional work on a portion of the project and offers to meet him in the graduate students' lounge to help him with it.

Is the professor being appropriate?

Is the professor being sexist?

Is the student being sexually harassed?

Should the student report the professor's behavior? Why, or why not?

3. Two college professors are talking in the hallway of the Administration building. A graduate student in physics approaches them and says, "I can see why women are so poor at science, they never stop talking long enough to think".

Is the student being appropriate?

Is the student being sexist?

Are the professors being sexually harassed?

Should the professors report the student's comment? Why, or why not?

4. A transfer student from a nearby college enters his English class for the first time. The professor asks him to stay after class for a couple of minutes. When he approaches his desk, the professor puts his arm around the student's shoulder and leaves it there while he explains what the class has done so far during the semester.

Is the professor being appropriate?

Is the professor being sexist?

Is the student being sexually harassed?

Should the student report the professor's behavior? Why, or why not?
5. A graduate student needs access to a particular undergraduate class for research purposes. Another graduate student, with whom she's been working for four years, offers to let her work with students in his class if she will have lunch with him the next day.

Is the second graduate student being appropriate?

Is the second graduate student being sexist?

Is the first graduate student being sexually harassed?

Should the first student report the second student's behavior? Why, or why not?

6. An undergraduate student receives a note from one of her instructors, telling her that there is a problem with her classwork and she will have to take an incomplete. She is scheduled to graduate and tells the professor that she needs to receive the credit this semester. The instructor tells her not to worry, she will take care of it and suggests that they have dinner together the following weekend.

Is the professor being appropriate?

Is the professor being sexist?

Is the student being sexually harassed?

Should the student report the professor's behavior? Why, or why not?

7. A young college professor comes to class very upset one day. One of her students asks to see her after class and then asks her what is wrong. She tells him she had a fight with her boyfriend. The student tells the professor that she is too bright to be wasting her time with men her age and needs to spend time with someone more mature like him.

Is the student being appropriate?

Is the student being sexist?

Is the professor being sexually harassed?

Should the professor report the student's behavior? Why, or why not?
8. A professor sees a student at the beach that she had had in a class the previous year. She asks him to have coffee with her. They have a great time and she suggests that they meet again the next day at the beach. He agrees and eventually they begin dating.

Is the professor being appropriate?

Is the professor being sexist?

Is the student being sexually harassed?

Should the student report the professor's behavior? Why, or why not?

9. A man who has returned to school after a career in construction is trying to decide on a major. His advisor, a woman twenty years his junior, suggests that he should focus on physical education or possibly construction management. He insists that he wants to study either oceanography or zoology. She says she will write a letter recommending that he not be accepted by either of these departments because he does not have the potential to grasp the technical concepts.

Is the professor being appropriate?

Is the professor being sexist?

Is the student being sexually harassed?

Should the student report the professor's behavior? Why, or why not?

10. A student asks to see one of his professors in her office after class. Once there, he immediately begins telling her about the difficulties he's having with his wife. After several minutes he sighs and says, "It's so nice to have a woman my own age to talk to. I feel like we could really get to be close friends."

Is the student being appropriate?

Is the student being sexist?

Is the professor being sexually harassed?

Should the professor report the student's behavior? Why, or why not?
Appendix D

SEXUAL HARASSMENT SURVEY #3

As you may know, sexual harassment is a topic of much current debate at the University of Hawaii. One issue which has become apparent is that little is known about what people on this campus actually consider to be sexual harassment.

You are being invited to participate in the first of a series of studies designed to investigate this issue. The results of these studies will ultimately help people concerned with sexual harassment learn how it is defined by students, faculty and staff, who live, learn and work at this university. Survey #3 describes scenarios involving faculty and staff.

This survey is intended to be voluntary and anonymous; please do not put your name on it. Answer all questions as honestly as possible. If you are uncomfortable answering a question, leave it blank. If you have questions or comments about this survey, the studies, or the topic of sexual harassment at the university, please call Susan Hippensteele of the Department of Psychology, at ext. 8986.

QUESTIONS:

What is your status at the University of Hawaii (please circle)? Undergraduate student, law school student, graduate student, law student, medical student, faculty, or staff.

Are you (please circle) female? or male? What is your age? ___

What is your ethnic background? ____________________________

How many years at UHM? ______

Are you in Hawaii on a student visa? ______________________

1. A professor and his secretary go to lunch. He comments that she looks very nice and says that he is proud to be seen with her.

   Is the professor being appropriate?

   Is the professor being sexist?

   Is the secretary being sexually harassed?

   Should the secretary report the professor's behavior?

   Why, or why not?
2. An office assistant is taking a class to be eligible for promotion. Her supervisor sees her working on a display for a class project and tells her that she needs to do some additional work on a portion of the display and offers to meet her in the lounge after work to help her with it.

Is the supervisor being appropriate?
Is the supervisor being sexist?
Is the office assistant being sexually harassed?
Should the office assistant report the supervisor's behavior? Why, or why not?

3. Two college professors are talking in the hallway of the Administration building. The Vice President for Academic Affairs approaches them and says, "I can see why women are so poor at science, they never stop talking long enough to think".

Is the VPAA being appropriate?
Is the VPAA being sexist?
Are the professors being sexually harassed?
Should the professors report the VPAA comment? Why, or why not?

4. A food service worker enters his new workplace for the first time. His supervisor asks him to stay after work for a couple of minutes. When he approaches his desk, the supervisor puts his arm around the worker's shoulder and leaves it there while he explains what the job entails.

Is the supervisor being appropriate?
Is the supervisor being sexist?
Is the worker being sexually harassed?
Should the worker report the supervisor's behavior? Why, or why not?
5. An assistant professor needs access to a particular undergraduate class for research purposes. A full professor, with whom she's been working for four years, offers to let her work with students in his class if she will have lunch with him the next day.

Is the full professor being appropriate?

Is the full professor being sexist?

Is the assistant professor being sexually harassed?

Should the assistant professor report the full professor's behavior? Why, or why not?

6. An secretary receives a note from her boss, the department chair, telling her that there is a problem with her work. She is scheduled for a promotion and tells her boss that she needs to work the problem out quickly, so that she is able to receive a good recommendation. The department chair tells her not to worry, she will take care of it and suggests that they have dinner together the following weekend.

Is the department chair being appropriate?

Is the department chair being sexist?

Is the secretary being sexually harassed?

Should the secretary report the professor's behavior? Why, or why not?

7. A young college professor comes to class very upset one day. One of her colleagues asks to see her after class and then asks her what is wrong. She tells him she had a fight with her boyfriend. The colleague tells the professor that she is too bright to be wasting her time with men her age and needs to spend time with someone more mature like him.

Is the colleague being appropriate?

Is the colleague being sexist?

Is the professor being sexually harassed?

Should the professor report the colleague's behavior? Why, or why not?
8. A dean sees a professor at the beach that she was partially responsible for hiring a year ago. She asks him to have coffee with her. They have a great time and she suggests that they meet again the next day at the beach. He agrees and eventually they begin dating.

Is the dean being appropriate?
Is the dean being sexist?
Is the professor being sexually harassed?
Should the professor report the dean's behavior? Why, or why not?

9. A woman has begun taking classes after a career as a university maintenance person. On the first day of class, one of her professors, a woman twenty years her junior, suggests that she should focus on classes in the Human Resources field. The woman insists that she wants to study either oceanography or zoology. The professor says she will write a letter recommending that she not be accepted by either of these departments because she does not have the potential to grasp the technical concepts.

Is the professor being appropriate?
Is the professor being sexist?
Is the woman being sexually harassed?
Should the woman report the professor's behavior? Why, or why not?

10. A professor asks to see one of his colleagues in her office after class. Once there, he immediately begins telling her about the difficulties he's having with his wife. After several minutes he sighs and says, "It's so nice to have a woman my own age to talk to. I feel like we could really get to be close friends."

Is the professor being appropriate?
Is the professor being sexist?
Is the colleague being sexually harassed?
Should the colleague report the professor's behavior? Why, or why not?
Appendix E

[Penn Harassment Survey]

HARASSMENT SURVEY
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I AT MANOA
FALL 1990

SECTION 1: Attitudes and Definitions

1. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements (Circle response category)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Most people who complain of sexual harassment are overreacting to expressions of normal sexual attraction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) People who receive annoying sexual attention usually have provoked it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Subordinates often put up with unwanted sexual attention for fear of reprisal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Sexual harassment is a personal matter; the University should not be involved in controlling it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Mature individuals can handle unwanted sexual attention without involving the University.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Persons who are sexually harassed are significantly handicapped in their ability to succeed at work or in school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Sexual harassment is not an extensive problem at UHM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. There is disagreement over the definition of sexual harassment. Would you consider the following acts to be sexual harassment if carried out by someone with authority over others (e.g., by a teacher, supervisor, resident advisor, research assistant, teaching assistant)? Would you consider it sexual harassment if done by someone without authority (e.g., a peer, co-worker, fellow student)? (SH=sexual harassment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act</th>
<th>If done by someone with authority?</th>
<th>If done by someone without authority?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH  NO SH NO OPINION</td>
<td>SH  NO SH NO OPINION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Unwanted sex-stereotyped jokes, references, examples, or depictions</td>
<td>1  2  3</td>
<td>1  2  3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If done by someone with authority?</td>
<td>If done by someone without authority?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>NOT SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Unwanted teasing, jokes, remarks, or questions of a sexual nature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Unwanted sexually suggestive looks or gestures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Unwanted letters or phone calls of a sexual nature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Unwanted leaning over or cornering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Unwanted pressure for dates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Unwanted touching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Unwanted pressure for sexual activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 2: General Experience

(1) Undergraduates should answer this section in terms of their experience as a student at UHM, (2) faculty should answer in terms of their experiences as a teacher at UHM, going back in time no more than 5 years, (3) staff should answer in terms of their experiences as a staff person going back no more than 5 years, and (4) graduate students should answer this section in terms of experience both as graduate students and as teachers/TAs.

3. Have you ever experienced sex-stereotyped references, depictions or jokes in a UHM classroom or work situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Several Times</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If so, to what extent were you bothered by them?</td>
<td>Not at all bothered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very bothered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Have you ever experienced racially-stereotyped references, depictions or jokes in a UHM classroom or work situation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Several Times</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If so, to what extent were you bothered by them?
Not at all  | Very
bothered | bothered
1 | 2 | 3 | 4

b. Have you ever experienced religiously-stereotyped references, depictions or jokes in a UHM classroom or work situation?
Never  | Once  | Several Times  | Frequently
1 | 2 | 3 | 4

If so, to what extent were you bothered by them?
Not at all  | Very
bothered | bothered
1 | 2 | 3 | 4

c. Have you ever experienced stereotyped references, depictions, or jokes that refer to sexual orientation in a UHM classroom or work situation?
Never  | Once  | Several Times  | Frequently
1 | 2 | 3 | 4

If so, to what extent were you bothered by them?
Not at all  | Very
bothered | bothered
1 | 2 | 3 | 4

d. Have you ever experienced stereotyped references, depictions, or jokes that refer to a person's disability in a UHM classroom or work situation?

If so, to what extent were you bothered by them?
Not at all  | Very
bothered | bothered
1 | 2 | 3 | 4

4. Are you a student currently enrolled a class(es) at UHM?
Yes  | No  | (If no, skip to question #5)

a. Have you avoided faculty members or TAs because you were afraid of unwanted sexual attention?
Never  | Once  | Several Times  | Frequently
1 | 2 | 3 | 4

b. Have you felt that faculty members or TAs avoided you because they were uncomfortable or wary of unwanted sexual attention?
Never  | Once  | Several Times  | Frequently
1 | 2 | 3 | 4

c. Do you feel that the kinds of fears mentioned above have any significant effect on your education?
Not at all  | Very much  | Not applicable
1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0
5. Are you now, or have you ever been in a position of authority at UHM where you can or did determine grades, pay, and/or promotion?

Yes____ No____ (If no, skip to question #6)

a. While in such a position of authority, have you ever feared that legitimate academic or personal interest toward a student/subordinate would be misconstrued as sexual interest?

Never 1 2 3 4
Once 2 3 4
Several Times 3 4
Frequently 4

b. Have you avoided students/subordinates because of fears?

Never 1 2 3 4
Once 2 3 4
Several Times 3 4
Frequently 4

c. Do you feel that students/subordinates have avoided contact with you because of unwanted sexual attention?

Never 1 2
Once 2
Several Times 3
Frequently 4

d. Do you feel the kinds of fears mentioned above have any significant effect on the effectiveness of your instruction/supervision?

Not at all 1 2
Very much 3
Not applicable 4

SECTION 3: Non-peer Experiences

(1) Undergraduates should answer this section in terms of their experience as a student at UHM, (2) faculty should answer in terms of their experiences as a teacher at UHM, going back in time no more than 5 years, (3) staff should answer in terms of their experiences as a staff person going back no more than 5 years, and (4) graduate students should answer this section in terms of experience both as graduate students and as teachers/TAs.

6. Have you been subject to any of the following during your time at UHM from a person in a position of authority?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Several Times</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Unwanted teasing, jokes, remarks, or questions of a sexual nature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Unwanted pressure for dates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Unwanted letters or phone calls of a sexual nature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Unwanted sexually suggestive looks or gestures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
156

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Several Times</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e. Unwanted deliberate touching, leaning over, cornering or pinching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Unwanted pressure for sexual favors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Actual or attempted rape or sexual assault</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have not been subject to any of the above, please skip to #22

7. a) From how many different people have you received the above attention during this period (enter number__) at UHM?

   b) Since August 1989, have you been subjected to one or more of the above from a person in a position of authority at UHM?
      Yes__ No__ (If no, skip to question #10)

8. Since August 1989, have you been to any of the following by a UHM associated person with authority over you?

   a. Unwanted teasing, jokes, remarks, or questions of a sexual nature
   b. Unwanted pressure for dates
   c. Unwanted letters or phone calls of a sexual nature
   d. Unwanted sexually suggestive looks or gestures
   e. Unwanted deliberate touching, leaning over, cornering or pinching
   f. Unwanted pressure for sexual favors
   g. Actual or attempted rape or sexual assault

9. From how many different people have you received the above attention during this period (enter number__) at UHM?
10. If you have been subjected to any of the following from someone in a position of authority over you, please select the one experience which had the greatest impact on you and answer the questions in this section in terms of that experience. This experience may include more than one incident with the same person(s).

During any particular experience a person may be subject to more than one kind of unwanted sexual attention. During the experience you are describing here, did the following happen to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Unwanted teasing, jokes, remarks, or questions of a sexual nature</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Unwanted pressure for dates</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Unwanted letters or phone calls of a sexual nature</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Unwanted sexually suggestive looks or gestures</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Unwanted deliberate touching, leaning over, cornering or pinching</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Unwanted pressure for sexual favors</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Actual or attempted rape or sexual assault</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How did this experience effect you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No effect</th>
<th>Annoyance</th>
<th>Upsetting</th>
<th>Very Upsetting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How did you respond to the incident?

- Confronted the person who bothered me
- Ignored the attention
- Went along with the attention
- Avoided contact with the person
Talked to a University official informally (e.g., tutor) ___
Lodged a formal complaint with the University ___
Other (please specify) ________________________________

13. Were you concerned about possible reprisals?
   Yes___ No___ (If no, skip to question #14)
   If yes, what specifically were you concerned about? (check all that apply)

   Grades, recommendations or evaluation ___
   The person's attitude toward you ___
   The conditions at work or in class ___
   Other (please specify) ________________________________

14. Did the experience interfere with your academic or professional performance?
   Not at all 1 2 3 4 Very much
   If so, how? (e.g., grades suffered, avoided class, work, etc.)

15. Did you talk to any University official informally (e.g., tutor, faculty member, dean)?
   Yes___ No___
   If yes, what was the position of the person you talked to, and how helpful were they in resolving your situation?

16. Did you talk to any University official formally?
   Yes___ No___
   If yes, what was the position of the person you talked to, and how helpful were they in resolving your situation?
17. If you did not make a formal complaint, check all of the following reasons that may have influenced this decision. (If you did make a formal complaint, skip to question #18) (Check all that apply)

I did not want to report the behavior at all (formally or informally)  
I felt informal channels were inadequate  
I did not know the behavior constituted sexual harassment  
I did not know to whom to go  
I was afraid the University would be unreceptive  
I didn't think anything could be done about my situation  
I didn't want to hurt the person who bothered me  
I was afraid it would be held against me if I complained  
I was too embarrassed  
I thought complaining would make the situation worse  
I thought it would take too much time and effort  
Other (please specify)  

18. Regardless of whether or not you made a formal complaint, was the situation resolved?
Yes___ No___

If yes, how?

19. Were you satisfied with the outcome?
Not at all 1 2 Very much 3 4

20. Please describe the person(s) who bothered you by their:

a) Gender
___a male ___two or more males ___two or more females
___both males and females ___a female ___unknown

b) Age
___older than you ___same age(s) as you ___of different ages
___younger than you ___unknown
c) Department (field of concentration)
___same as you ___different from you ___numerous departments
___unknown

d) Location of offense
___dormitory ___classroom ___fraternity/sorority
___office ___off campus residence ___other (describe)

21. It would be helpful to us if you would describe this experience in detail. Please do so omitting any incriminating information (names, courses, etc.). You may include a separate piece of paper if necessary.

SECTION 4: Peer Experiences

(1) Undergraduates should answer this section in terms of their experience as a student at UHM, (2) faculty should answer in terms of their experiences as a teacher at UHM, going back in time no more than 5 years, (3) staff should answer in terms of their experiences as a staff person going back no more than 5 years, and (4) graduate students should answer this section in terms of experience both as graduate students and as teachers/TAs.

22. Have you been subject to any of the following during your time at UHM from a peer or co-worker associated with the University?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Several Times</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Unwanted teasing, jokes, remarks, or questions of a sexual nature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Unwanted pressure for dates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Unwanted letters or phone calls of a sexual nature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Unwanted sexually suggestive looks or gestures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Unwanted deliberate touching, leaning over, cornering or pinching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Unwanted pressure for sexual favors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Actual or attempted rape or sexual assault</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you have not been subject to any of the above, please skip to #34

a. To which of the following have you been subjected to by a UHM peer or co-worker since August 1989?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Several Times</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Unwanted teasing, jokes, remarks, or questions of a sexual nature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Unwanted pressure for dates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Unwanted letters or phone calls of a sexual nature</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Unwanted sexually suggestive looks or gestures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Unwanted deliberate touching, leaning over, cornering or pinching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Unwanted pressure for sexual favors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Actual or attempted rape or sexual assault</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. From how many different people have you received the above attention during this period (enter number) at UHM?

Since you have been subjected to the above from peers or co-workers, please select the one experience which had the greatest impact on you and answer the questions in this section in terms of that experience.

24. During any particular experience a person may be subject to more than one kind of unwanted sexual attention. During the experience you are describing here, did the following happen to you?

(Circle Y or N as appropriate) Yes No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Unwanted teasing, jokes, remarks, or questions of a sexual nature</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Unwanted pressure for dates</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. Unwanted letters or phone calls of a sexual nature  Y  N
d. Unwanted sexually suggestive looks or gestures  Y  N
e. Unwanted deliberate touching, leaning over, cornering or pinching  Y  N
f. Unwanted pressure for sexual favors  Y  N
g. Actual or attempted rape or sexual assault  Y  N

25. Was this experience personally upsetting to you?  
Not at all  Very much  
1   2   3   4

a. When did this event occur?  Before August 1989 ___  On or after August 1989 ___

26. Did the experience interfere with your academic or professional performance?  Not at all  Very much  
1   2   3   4

If so, how? (e.g., grades suffered, avoided class, work, etc.)

27. Did you confront the person who bothered you?  Yes__  No__

Why or why not?

28. Did it make things become better, no different, or worse?  
Better  No different  Worse  
1   2   3   4   5

29. Did you talk to any University official: informally (e.g., tutor, faculty member, dean)?  Yes__  No__

If yes, what was their position and how helpful were they?

30. Did it make things become better, no different, or worse?  
Better  No different  Worse  
1   2   3   4   5

31. Did you do anything else about the situation?  Yes__  No__

If yes, what did you do?
32. Please describe the person(s) who bothered you by their:
   a) Gender
      _a male _two or more males _two or more females
      _both males and females _a female _unknown
   b) Age
      _older than you _same age(s) as you _of different ages
      _younger than you _unknown
   c) Department (field of concentration)
      _same as you _different from you _numerous departments
      _unknown
   d) Location of offense
      _dormitory _classroom _fraternity/sorority
      _office _off campus residence _other (describe)

33. It would be helpful to us if you would describe this experience in detail. Please do so omitting any incriminating information (names, courses, etc.). You may include a separate piece of paper if necessary.

SECTION 5: Experience as Accused

34. Has anyone ever said that you were sexually bothering them during your time at UHM?  Yes__  No_
   a) If yes, was the accusation fair?  Yes__  No_
      Why, or why not?

   b) Did the accusation make you (check all that apply):
      apprehensive about social interactions  ___
      more conscious about what you said and did  ___
      less able to work  ___
      no effect  ___
      other ____________________________
SECTION 6: Background

35. Are you male or female? Male____ Female____

36. Are you a permanent U.S. resident? Yes____ No____

37. Are you

   Tenured faculty____ Graduate student____ Staff____

   Non-tenured faculty____ Undergraduate student____

38. If you are an undergraduate student, what is your year?

   Freshman____ Junior____
   Sophomore____ Senior____

   a) If you are a graduate student, have you completed at least two years of
      graduate work at UHM? Yes____ No____

39. How many years have you been at UHM?

40. Which college (e.g., Engineering, Business, Arts and Sciences, etc.) are
    you enrolled in? (or give the name of your major department)
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