CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

NOTICE

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

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

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

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

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

AVIS

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

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

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

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30.

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

SELF-EFFICACY EXPECTATIONS OF ABILITY TO DEAL WITH SEXUALLY HARASSING BEHAVIOR IN THE WORK PLACE

by

SHIRLEY EVA FORBES KABACHIA

A Thesis

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF

Doctor Of Philosophy

in

Counselling Psychology

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

Spring, 1987

ISBN 0-315-37641-4

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR Shirley Eva Forbes Kabachia

TITLE OF THESIS Self-Efficacy Expectations Of Ability To Deal With Sexually Harassing Behavior In The Work Place

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED PH.D.

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED 1987

Permission is hereby granted to the UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed) .....

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

11439 39 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta T6J 0M5
Canada

DATED January 19, 1987

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommended to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Self-Efficacy Expectations Of Ability To Deal With Sexually Harassing Behavior In The Work Place" submitted by Shirley Eva Forbes Kabachia in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Psychology.

.....

Supervisor

.....

.....

.....

.....

External Examiner

Date..January.20...1987

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to investigate factors related to working women's interpretations of and responses to sexually oriented behavior in the work place. The sample (N = 168) was randomly selected from women employed with nine different employers in a large urban center.

Four tests were administered to the subjects: The Demographic Questionnaire (DQ), the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI), the Jackson Personality Inventory (JPI), and the Interpretative Response Questionnaire (IRQ). Point biserial correlations were calculated to analyse the data.

Several patterns of modest correlations were obtained which formed the basis for the following speculations:

1. There was more variation in the responses to the ambiguous situations on the IRQ than there was for the reponses to the blatant situations. The latter responses revealed a consistently high discomfort level, high frequency of feelings (anger, shock and fear) directed outwards toward the aggressor, and a high frequency of "direct approach or confrontation" responses as the subject's anticipated best response.

2. Considerable discomfort was expressed for all 10 situations; however, for the two situations involving (a) display of a picture of a nude and (b) being whistled at by male co-workers, subjects with high JPI Anxiety scores, those with high JPI Conformity scores, and those with low JPI Self-Esteem scores were more likely to express a high

level of discomfort than were other subjects.

3. Subjects with low JPI Risk Taking scores, and those with low JPI Social Adroitness scores saw several situations as less likely to happen to them.

4. Subjects with low JPI Conformity scores and those with High JPI Innovation scores were more likely to express a higher level of self-efficacy concerning their ability to carry out their anticipated best responses.

5. Older subjects and subjects who had experienced little or no unwanted sexual behavior were more likely to find situations that implied physical attractiveness to be unlikely for them.

6. Older subjects were more likely than younger subjects to see as legitimate the request to go out with a supervisor for dinner, before a promotion decision.

7. For most of the 10 situations, the feelings subjects believed they would feel were feelings of fear, anger or shock directed towards the aggressor. However, in the situation involving being whistled at by male co-workers, subjects tended to express feelings of humiliation, embarassment and guilt.

8. The nature of the sexually oriented behavior itself contributed more to subjects' interpretations and responses than did other variables.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Henry Janzen, committee chair, for his guidance throughout the planning and completion of this study. Completing a doctoral thesis while holding down a full-time job has proved to be a lengthy procedure and I appreciate the encouragement that helped me see it through.

I also wish to express appreciation to Dr. Lorraine Wilgosh, Dr. Dallas Cullen, and Dr. Wilf Schmidt for their role as committee members, and Dr. Lorna Cammaert for serving as external examiner. Special thanks go to Dr. Tom Maguire and Dr. Dwight Harley for their advice on the data analysis. Thanks also to Dr. Rosemary Liburd and Dr. Barbara Paulson for their assistance in identifying scoring clusters for one of the questionnaires used in the study.

This study could not have been completed without the cooperation of nine Edmonton employers and the 169 working women who took the time to participate in the project. Their contribution is much appreciated.

I want to express my appreciation to Josieve Green who proof read this thesis for me, and a special thanks to other friends who were supportive and who understood.

Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my son, Steven, for his encouragement and love. His patience, support, and willingness to postpone activities so that this project could be completed have meant so much.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

Chapter Page

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

Table — — Page

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

1.1 Introduction And Background

1.11 Sexual Harassment

Issues related to unwelcome sexual attention in the work place have only recently become accepted as research topics. Before 1975 there was no mention of these issues in the research literature. Around 1975 the word **sexual harassment** was coined to describe unwanted sexual behavior (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981) and a considerable interest was stimulated in related issues by the publication of a survey done by the Working Women United Institute of New York (Hodgson, 1975).

As the research interest in sexual harassment has been very recent, there is much about this issue that is not yet known. Earlier studies were published in the feminist and management literature and the popular media. These studies focused largely on self-report accounts of personal experience with unwelcome sexual attention (Backhouse & Cohen, 1978; Hodgson, 1975; Safran, 1976), the emotional and economic suffering of sexual harassment victims (Backhouse & Cohen, 1978; Crull, 1982; Farley, 1978), and the legal and human rights obligations of employers to provide a work place free of unwelcome

sexual behaviors (Attenborough, 1979; Errington & Davidson, 1980; Faley, 1982; Hoyman & Robinson, 1980).

The earlier surveys (Backhouse & Cohen, 1978; Hodgson, 1975; Safran, 1976) demonstrated that sexual harassment was (a) more prevalent in the work place than was previously believed, (b) a definite obstacle to career development for working women, (c) a source of tremendous, but little understood, stress to its victims, and (d) a problem which most victims tolerated in silence.

As more was learned about sexual harassment, it became clear that it not only interferred with women's career development, but it also had a negative impact on work place productivity (Biles, 1981; Gutek, 1985; Hoyman & Robinson, 1980; Pidhjirnyj, 1981) and on the mental and physical health of its victims (Brothers, 1981; Crull, 1982; Gosselin, 1984; Safran, 1981).

A survey of a random sample of U.S. federal civil servants by the Merit Systems Protection Board (1981) revealed that 42% of the women in the sample and 15% of the men believed themselves to have been victims of sexual harassment in the 24 month period covered by the study. This survey also found that, of the employees who experienced unwanted sexual attention in the work place, only three percent of the women and two percent of the men filed any kind of formal complaint. Of those who took formal action, 59% felt that reporting the incidents

made things better, while a number of the respondents indicated that filing a formal complaint actually made matters worse. This latter finding is consistent with possible reasons for the silence of many victims of sexual harassment. Backhouse and Cohen (1978) describe sexual harassment victims' fears of being humiliated, ostracized or punished if they let anyone know what was happening to them.

Iverson (1985) and Tangri, Burt and Johnson (1982) observed that there was tremendous social pressure on sexual harassment victims not to complain, as people who had not experienced this particular problem personally tended either to trivialize it or to deny that such a thing as sexual harassment could actually exist. This contributed to "blame the victim" attitudes on the part of others. For a person already under a great deal of stress, this tendency to blame the victim would certainly discourage using any formal complaint procedures.

Interpretation of Unwanted Sexual Behavior

There is considerable evidence now that unwelcome sexual behaviors are interpreted quite differently by different individuals. Gutek, Morasch and Cohen (1983) observed that work place sexuality, by necessity, is ambiguous--otherwise, the initiator would risk loss of face on rejection and possibly loss of job as well. It is this **ambiguity** which seems to make the behavior so difficult to interpret and react to effectively. This

was supported in the Merit Systems Protection Board study (1981). It was also noted in this study that there were distinct male-female differences in the number of respondents who classified ambiguous sexual behaviors as sexual harassment. More women than men felt that these behaviors were harassment. This male-female difference was also observed by Collins & Blodgett (1981) and Guteck, Morasch and Cohen (1983). Gutek (1985) found that men's and women's experiences as sexual harassment victims were clearly different. Because of these distinct differences, and because of the need to limit the scope of this particular research, the focus of this study was on women and their perceptions of and responses to sexual harassment in the work place.

Backhouse and Cohen (1978) noted, following their interviews with Canadian women, that some of these women found it difficult to apply the word **sexual harassment** to even the most blatant unwanted sexual behaviors. Perhaps there is something inherent in the term **sexual harassment** which makes for confusion about the degree of offensiveness required before a behavior can be called sexually harassing. This observation was supported by Cammaert (1985) who noted that while 30% of the undergraduate students and 23% of the graduate students who responded to a questionnaire reported that they had experienced inappropriate sexual behavior at the University of Calgary, a higher percentage indicated that

they had experienced the specific sexually oriented behaviors listed on the questionnaire.

There is evidence that age and marital status of the victim are related to the harasser's choice of prey (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981); although women of all ages and every marital status have been victims of sexual harassment. There is not, however, an adequate explanation for the inconsistencies in interpretation of and response to unwelcome sexual behavior in the work place. Neither is there satisfactory documentation of the factors which prevent the sexual harassment victim from taking action against the harasser. Tangri, Burt and Johnson (1982) suggested that there must be a complex interrelationship of personality, situational and cognitive factors at play.

It has been this researcher's observation, when investigating sexual harassment complaints, that individual women have widely differing interpretations of the meaning of unwanted sexual behaviors. What some find very offensive, others find mildly irritating. The factors which appear in the literature as possible contributors to this variation in interpretation are: (a) the ambiguity level of the behavior (Gutek, Morasch and Cohen, 1983), (b) the spill-over of sex-role expectations into work-role expectations on the part of employer, employee and co-workers (Gutek & Morasch, 1982), (c) the victim's perception of society's treatment

of other victims of sex-related aggression (Attenborough, 1979; Crull, 1982) and her belief that this is something she must expect to put up with if she is to work with men, and (d) her confidence in her ability to respond effectively to that behavior in that situation (Bandura, 1977a; 1977b). Bandura refers to such confidence as "self-efficacy" and presents it as the basis of motivation, learning, and adaptation of behavior.

1.12 Cognitive Mediation

Bandura's theory of self-efficacy and its role in learning and adjustment is worth looking at in reference to the interpretation of and response to unwelcome sexual behaviors in the work place. Bandura (1980) and Bandura, Adams and Beyer (1977) demonstrated that individuals' belief in their ability to perform a specific activity (self-efficacy) was predictive of whether or not they would attempt the behavior and how long they would persist under adverse conditions.

Women's interpretations of unwanted sexual behavior in the work place and their response to this behavior can be more readily understood if we focus on the cognitive processes mediating these interpretations and coping behaviors.

Bandura's theory of self-efficacy was used as the operative model for this study.

1.13 Sex-Role Identity

The concept of androgyny as described by Bem (1974; 1975) appears useful for further understanding of the wide variation in women's interpretations of unwanted sexual behaviors in the work place. Bem and Lenny (1976) described the androgynous person as more situationally adaptable than the strongly masculine or feminine sex-typed person. They defined **situationally adaptable** as when a person's behavior tends to change with the situation--assertiveness in some situations, submissiveness in others; expressive behavior in some situations, instrumental behavior in others. They found that the sex-typed person was more likely to behave consistently across situations, even when the behavior was not adaptive to a specific situation. If this is true, then, a woman who sees herself as strongly feminine sex-typed will tend to restrict her behavior to fit culturally appropriate feminine sex-role behaviors, while an androgynous woman would draw from a wider repertoire of behaviors.

According to Bem's concept of sex-role identity, a woman who sees herself as androgynous should be able to cope better with unwanted sexual behavior in the work place than sex-typed women (either feminine or masculine) as she would have a broader repertoire of behaviors to draw from and would not feel so much obligation to conform to cultural sex-role expectations.

1.14 Personality

Sommer and Lasry (1984) noted that personality, cognitive processes and coping skills contributed considerably to the quality of an individual's reactions to stressful situations. It is possible, then, that personality traits may have some bearing on how a woman interprets unwelcome sexual behavior. There is not enough evidence in the literature on sexual harassment to determine whether or not personality would influence a person's interpretation of the degree of offensiveness of specific behaviors and the likelihood of being selected as a victim by a potential harasser.

The information available on rape and rape victims is applicable here (Jensen & Gutek, 1982), as both sexual harassment and rape are gender related offences and both are seen as related to a need for power on the part of the offender (Brownmiller, 1976; Kadar, 1982a, 1982b; Landsberg, 1982). Landsberg reports that rapists tend to follow a strategy of testing a potential victim's compliance and vulnerability to threat before initiating an assault. It follows that women with such personality traits as assertiveness and self confidence should be less likely to be chosen as victims of both rape and sexual harassment.

The socialization to which men and women are exposed in North American culture rewards women for demonstrating

stereotyped sex-role behavior, including submissiveness to men, nurturance of others, and vulnerability. Women are also expected to be polite, even in abusive situations. Thus, a woman whose behavior illustrates the feminine qualities of submissiveness, nurturance, politeness and emotional expressiveness could very well be seen as an easier victim than one who is not so sex-typed in these characteristics. This being the case, she may feel more vulnerable when confronted by unwelcome sexual behavior and this could influence her interpretation of the behavior.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

This study was conducted to investigate the relationships of self-efficacy expectations, demographic factors, personality and sex-role identity with a working woman's interpretation of and reaction to specific sexually oriented behavior in the work place. The purpose was to better understand the factors that contribute to the wide variation found in women's perceptions of specific sexual behaviors in the work place.

This study focused on women's interpretations of and responses to sexual behavior in the work place and did not include men in the sample. There were several reasons for this:

1. There is sufficiently strong evidence in the literature that men and women perceive work place sexual behavior differently, especially where the behavior is ambiguous (Collins & Blodgett, 1981; Gutek, Morasch & Cohen, 1983; Safran, 1981).

2. There is an indication that men's and women's experience of sexual harassment is different. The Merit Systems Protection Board study (1981) found that men were less likely than women to (a) experience the coercive aspects of sexual harassment, (b) be harassed by a supervisor, and (c) be harassed by someone older than themselves. This was confirmed by Gutek (1985) who found that men were less likely than women to experience negative job repercussions of sexual harassment.

3. There is also evidence that women are much more likely to experience sexual harassment in the work place than are men. Forty-two percent of the women in the Merit Systems protection Board study and 15% of the men claimed to have been sexually harassed. This difference is large enough for us to assume that men who are harassed would have to deal with perceptions of themselves as violating sex-role stereotypes.

These reasons are sufficient to support the belief that sexual harassment experienced by women is not the same phenomenon as sexual harassment experienced by men. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to explore harassment of women and men in separate studies.

Considering the difficulty the women in Backhouse and Cohen's study (1978) had in applying the term **sexual harassment** to even blatantly unwelcome sexual behaviors, any reference to the term sexual harassment was omitted in communications with subjects in the study. Instructions on the Interpretative Response Questionnaire referred to "a work situation in which **there may or may not be behavior of a sexual nature**" and suggested that these behaviors "**might or might not be offensive**". (Appendix I). Subjects were not at any time asked if they considered any of the behaviors to be sexually harassing. They were, however, asked to indicate their discomfort level for each behavior.

1.21 Delimitation of the Problem

A sample of 169 working women was tested with four instruments to see if their interpretations of and reactions to sexually oriented behavior in 10 hypothetical work situations were related to selected demographic factors, personality traits, self-efficacy, and sex-role identity. Possible relationships among interpretation of the situations, suggested responses, and factors blocking the suggested responses were examined.

1.22 Definitions of Terms

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is defined by Bandura (1977b) as the

belief that one can successfully perform a specific behavior.

Sex-Role Identity

The concept of sex-role identity developed by Bem (1974, 1975) was used in this study. Sex-role identity has been defined by Bem as the degree to which a person has integrated culturally accepted femininity (expressive) and masculinity (instrumental) attributes into her or his self-definition and behavior.

Sexual Harassment

The definition of sexual harassment accepted by the Canadian Human Rights Commission (Canadian Labour Law Reports, 1982) was used for this study as it provides a general definition of sexual harassment and examples of specific behaviors to illustrate the definition. The definition was used primarily in developing the 10 situations which formed the basis of the Interpretative Response Questionnaire (IRQ). For purposes of this study sexual harassment was defined as:

> Behavior related to sexuality that may be verbal, physical, deliberate, unsolicited or unwelcome; it may be one incident or a series of incidents. While the following is not an exhaustive list, sexual harassment may include:
>
> --verbal abuse
>
> --unwelcome remarks, jokes, innuendos or taunting about a person's clothing, body or

sexual activities

--displaying of pornographic pictures

--unwelcome invitations or requests, whether indirect or explicit, to engage in behavior of a sexual nature

--leering or other gestures associated with sexuality

--unnecessary physical contact such as touching, patting, pinching, punching

--physical assault

For a practice to be considered sexual harassment it must: be reasonably perceived as a term or condition of employment (including availability or continuation of work, promotional or training opportunities) or of the provision of goods, services, facilities or accommodation customarily available to the general public; or influence decisions on such matters; or interfere with job performance or access to or enjoyment of goods, services, facilities or accommodation; or humiliate, insult or intimidate any individual.

Sexual harassment will be considered to have taken place if a reasonable person ought to have known that such a behavior was unwelcome. (Canadian Labour Law Reports, 1982, p. 277).

1.23 Research Questions

There were four major research questions explored in this study:

1. Is there a relationship between working women's interpretations of sexually oriented behavior in the work place and (a) demographic variables, (b) personality variables, and (c) sex-role identity? The measures of interpretation of sexually oriented behavior which were used in the study were Interpretative Response Questionnaire (IRQ) question one (level of discomfort), question two (likehood of the incident happening to the respondent), and question three (feelings evoked by the incident). The 12 questions on the Demographic Questionnaire (DQ) were used as measures of demographic variables; the 15 scales on the Jackson Personality Inventory (JPI) were used as measures of personality variables; and the four categories on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) were used as measures of sex-role identity.

2. Is there any relationship between working women's anticipated responses to sexually oriented behavior in the work place and (a) demographic variables, (b) personality variables, (c) sex-role identity, and (d) interpretations of sexually oriented behavior? Anticipated responses to sexually oriented behavior were measured by IRQ question four (anticipated best response) and IRQ question six (anticipated alternate response).

3. Is there a relationship between working women's self-efficacy expectations of their ability to make their anticipated best response and (a) interpretations of sexually oriented behavior, (b) anticipated response, (c) demographic variables, (d) personality variables, and (e) sex-role identity? Self-efficacy expectations were measured on IRQ question five.

4. Is there a relationship between factors preventing working women from making their anticipated best response to sexual behavior in the work place and:
(a) interpretations of sexually oriented behavior, (b) anticipated response, (C) self-efficacy expectations, (d) demographic variables, (e) personality variables, and (f) sex-role identity? Factors preventing women from making their anticipated best response were measured on IRQ question seven.

1.3 Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship of (a) demographic variables, (b) personality variables, and (c) sex-role identity to women's interpretations of and response to sexual behavior in the work place. The major value of this study is contribution of information which can help counsellors and managers understand how sexual harassment affects women in the work place. Men were not included

in the sample because there is evidence that very few men (compared to women) are victims of unwanted sexual behavior at work and their experience of sexual harassment is different from the experience women have with this problem.

For purposes of this study, women's interpretation of unwanted sexual behavior was examined in the context of: (a) level of discomfort associated with specific incidents, (b) the likelihood that specific incidents could possibly happen to them, and (c) feelings evoked by specific behavior.

Women's responses to unwelcome sexual behavior at work were examined in the context of (a) the best possible response they feel they could make, (b) the alternate response they would make if they could not carry out their "best" response, and (c) factors which would prevent them from carrying out their "best" response.

The chapters which follow contain a review of related literature, description of the research method used in the study, results of the statistical analysis done, and discussion of the results.

CHAPTER TWO

RELATED LITERATURE

The literature reviewed in this chapter concerns sexual harassment in the work place, its impact on both victim and employer, and how people perceive and respond to it. Literature concerning self-efficacy, the theoretical framework for the study, is also reviewed.

2.1 Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment is presented in the literature as one of the obstacles encountered by women in their search for career satisfaction, economic survival, and equality of opportunity in the work place (Backhouse & Cohen, 1978). Unwelcome sexual behavior in the work place has been a topic of research for a relatively short time; therefore, there is still a good deal of knowledge to be acquired about this subject.

Research on sexual harassment has been difficult partly because of (a) the sensitive nature of the issue, (b) the misconceptions about female sexuality and sexual victimization held by the general public and the helping professions (Crull, 1982; Dziech & Weiner, 1984; Masson, 1984; Miller, 1976), and (c) the complexity of the issue (Gutek, 1985).

2.11 Establishment Of Sexual Harassment As A Serious Research Issue

The first studies published on sexual harassment were exploratory surveys which served to lay the ground work for more stringent research. These studies attempted to answer questions about the incidence of sexual harassment in the work place, the degree of actual concern people felt about it, its impact on employees and employers, and why there were so few complaints made about it.

Incidence of Sexual Harassment

Incidence rates for sexual harassment reported in the earlier studies were inconsistent. Studies indicated that from 42% to 90% of the women in the work place experienced sexual harassment. This inconsistency was largely due to such aspects of research design as (a) the use of different definitions of sexual harassment, (b) the use of self-selected (and probably biased) samples, and (c) reference to different time periods (entire working life, present job, or previous two years) in which the respondent was to report experiencing sexual harassment.

Hodgson (1975) compiled the results of a survey done by the Working Women United Institute of New York with 155 women in the Ithaca area. Seventy percent of this sample reported having experienced sexual harassment at least once. Safran (1976) reported the results of the

much quoted Redbook magazine survey in which 88% of the 9,000 readers who responded to the January, 1976 questionnaire (How do you handle sex on the job?) believed they had experienced sexual harassment at least once in their working lives. The massive response to this study and the high incidence of sexual harassment reported were considered serious enough that, despite the weakness of the sampling technique used (self-selected sample), the results of that study were used as evidence in court and in hearings of state legislatures and federal commissions in the United States (Safran, 1981).

The Women's Rights Committee of the B. C. Federation of Labour and the Vancouver Women's Resource Centre conducted a survey in which 90% of the sample of 203 women reported having experienced sexual harassment (Errington & Davidson, 1980). The sampling procedure used involved a self-selected sample and a low response rate which may have biased the results. Questionnaires were sent out by the B. C. Federation of Labour in response to requests following a report of the study in the media. There was a 21% return rate. Questionnaires were also distributed through shop stewards in the Hospital and Administrative components of the B. C. Government Employees' Union. There was a 15% return rate for these. The authors stated that the use of printed questionnaires meant that most of the population of immigrant women was not sampled.

Numerous studies were done in the United States by various government bodies. Hoyman and Robinson (1980) refer to a survey done in 1976 with women employed by the United Nations. Fifty percent of the respondents reported experiencing sexual harassment while employed at the United Nations. McIntyre and Renick (1982) referred to a 1980 survey of women employed by the State of Florida. Forty-six percent of the 956 respondents reported experiencing sexual harassment at some time in their present job and 16% reported harassment severe enough to cause considerable discomfort and interfere with their jobs.

The weaknesses in the design of these studies means that the results cannot be generalized beyond the actual subjects who responded. However, these studies did help to establish sexual harassment as a serious enough problem that the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board was directed to do a careful study of sexual harassment among federal employees (Sexual Harassment in the Federal Government, 1980). This carefully designed study used a stratified, random sample of women and men employed in the U. S. civil service. A questionnaire was developed after careful research of case law, government regulations, policy and training programs, and a review of case testimonials. The questionnaire was sent to 23,000 people and had an 85% response rate.

The Merit Systems Protection Board study is considered to be a well designed and rigorous study (McIntyre and Renick, 1982). It can be considered representative of U.S. Federal Government employees, and is generally accepted as depicting the extent of sexual harassment in the United States. This study found that 42% of the women and 15% of the men who responded reported experiencing sexual harassment during the two year period covered in the questionnaire.

Although the surveys vary concerning the reported incidence of sexual harassment, they are consistent in reporting that very few formal complaints were made by sexual harassment victims. The Merit Systems Protection Board study (1981) found that less than five percent of both female and male victims reported the problem to their superiors or took formal action. Of those few who did report sexual harassment, some found it to be a very effective course of action, while approximately half of the women and one third of the men found that either nothing changed or conditions actually got worse.

Tangri, Burt and Johnson (1982), in their comments on the Merit Systems Protection Board Study, observed that most of the respondents did not consider reporting sexual harassment to be an appropriate response. These authors speculated that perhaps the respondents (a) believed that the most frequent type of harassment--co-worker harassment--would not require

formal action, (b) felt that they should be able to handle things themselves, or (c) experienced social pressures from perceived acceptability of sexual harassment in North American society.

The research done by Backhouse and Cohen (1978) included interviews with personnel managers in a variety of companies and found adherence to common sexual harassment myths among many of them. Some felt that women played a role in encouraging harassment and could easily stop it if they wished. Of those who recognized sexual harassment as a legitimate problem, some felt that they would have to resolve such a problem by moving the woman as she would likely be in a less senior position. Others did not recommend that the victim report harassment to management as reporting it would put additional pressure on her and most likely damage her career.

The joint Red Book/Harvard Business Review study (Collins & Blodgett, 1981; Safran, 1981) found that female managers had much less confidence than male managers that senior management would act effectively to deal with a sexual harassment complaint. Respondents to the Red Book survey (Safran, 1976) reported incidents of women being fired because of sexual harassment. Safran reported that the majority of the respondents would not report sexual harassment and that 75% believed that reporting it would not result in the behavior being

stopped. Instead, they feared that reporting sexual harassment would result in the issue being trivialized, and the victim labelled as a "troublemaker". It would appear from such studies that many women had either experienced or witnessed behavior which had led them to believe that sexual harassment complaints would not be taken seriously. This is certainly consistent with the small number of women and men in the Merit Systems Protection Board Study (1981) who reported the harassment to which they were subjected.

There is definitely evidence that women have not felt free to complain about sexual harassment in the work place. Errington and Davidson (1980), in carrying out their study, reported that some of the questionnaires were returned with trivializing comments added by male supervisors. They concluded that if this were a reflection of the attitudes of these particular supervisors, then any women in their areas who were subjected to sexual harassment would not see anything to be gained from reporting the problem. Terpstra and Cook (1985) examined the 76 formal charges of sexual harassment made to the Illinois Department of Human Rights, by women, between July 1, 1981 and June 30, 1983. They reported that 60% of the complaints involved job discharge situations. This fact, they interpreted as meaning that women tolerate much of the less extreme harassment without complaining, but they do complain in

situations where there is nothing left to lose.

In summary, the incidence of sexual harassment in the work place reported in the literature varies according to the sampling procedures used, the definition of sexual harassment used, and the time period referred to in the study. As many as 90% of women in a self-selected sample (Errington & Davidson, 1980) indicated that they had experienced sexual harassment at some point in their working lives, while 42% of the women in a random sample (Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981) indicated that they had experienced sexual harassment during a proscribed 24 month period. There was also evidence that working women did not feel free to complain to management about sexual harassment (Backhouse & Cohen, 1978; Errington & Davidson, 1980; Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981).

Explanatory Models

Tangri, Burt and Johnson (1982) examined three possible models to explain sexual harassment in the work place and found that none fully explained the phenomenon. However, they did suggest that all three added to an understanding of the myths that surround harassment. The first of the three models they examined was the natural model, or the view of sexual harassment as natural sexual attraction between women and men. The second was the organizational model, or the view that the distribution of authority and power in hierarchical organizational

structures creates opportunities for abuse of the less powerful. The third was the sociocultural model, or the view that sexual harassment is a reflection of the distribution of power and status between women and men in society, and functions to preserve men's dominance over women in society in general.

Impact on the Victim

Women who have experienced sexual harassment tend to be consistent in reporting that they suffered both psychological and economic effects from the experience.

Psychological effects. Women have reported that exposure to unwanted sexual behavior at work tended to result in feelings of anger, fear, guilt, embarrassment, frustration, and powerlessness (Crull, 1982; Errington & Davidson, 1980; Safran, 1976). In addition to the affective reactions, Crull (1982) commented that her patients demonstrated stress related problems such as depression, headache and nausea.

Collins and Blodgett (1981) reported that the degree of victim suffering was not in accordance with perceived seriousness of the harassing behavior. Their respondents seemed more bothered by persistent "low-level" behavior which is harder to prove and therefore about which it is more difficult to make a credible complaint.

Economic effects. Lowered self esteem and deterioration of confidence in one's ability to perform job related tasks, decline in motivation, distracting

worries which influence job performance, combined with retaliation from the harasser resulted in women finding that sexual harassment seriously interfered with their career development and with their ability to support themselves and their families (Backhouse & Cohen, 1978; Errington & Davidson, 1980; U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981). A small number of women reported that they either quit a job, transferred, or were fired because of sexual harassment (Errington & Davidson, 1980; Safran, 1976).

Job satisfaction. Gutek (1985) interviewed a large sample of 405 men and 827 women in the Los Angeles County area. Sample selection was done through a random-digit dialing technique developed by the Field Research Corporation of San Francisco. Women in her sample who experienced unwelcome sexual behavior at work tended to express less job satisfaction than those who were not exposed to these behaviors. Surprisingly, women who experienced what Gutek termed "positive sexual attentions", such as comments about physical appearance and manner of dressing, also reported lower job satisfaction. Gutek saw this as related to the tendency to trivialize work done in settings where physical appearance was emphasized.

Impact on the Employer

Pidhjirnyji (1981) suggested that the hidden costs of sexual harassment in lowered employee productivity,

increased absences, more use of sick benefits, and higher employee turnover are expensive for the employer. The U.S. Merit System Protection Board study (1981) made conservative estimates of these costs based on the sexual harassment reported by their respondents and suggested that the United States Government lost $189 million between May, 1978 and May 1980 because of sexual harassment.

2.12 Victims of Sexual Harassment

There is a limited amount of descriptive information about sexual harassment victims in the literature. The message is clear that (a) it is a problem which affects employees at all levels in the work place, and (b) some are more likely to be harassed than others. However, the difficulty of predicting who will be harassed and under what circumstances has led Tangri, Burt and Johnson (1982) to conclude that sexual harassment "may approximate a random event in women's working lives" (p. 52) as no factors appear to correlate with choice of victim in a predictive manner.

Demographic Variables

Age. The survey information available indicates that women of all ages have experienced sexual harassment (Safran, 1976; U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981), but that younger women are most likely to be victimized. The U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board

study found that 67% of female victims and 27% of male victims were between ages 16 and 19, while 22% of female victims and 12% of male victims were aged 55 or older. Terpstra and Cook (1985) found this same emphasis on youth when they observed that among those who filed formal harassment complaints, women in the 25-35 year age range were significantly overrepresented compared to their actual numbers in the labour force, and women in the 45 and over age range were significantly underrepresented.

Marital status. The Merit Systems Protection Board Study (1981) found that while women and men of every marital status reported being sexually harassed, single and divorced women were more likely than married women to be chosen as victims, while widowed women were least likely. Widowed men were more likely than other men to be sexually harassed and married men were least likely.

The Terpstra and Cook (1985) study supported the findings of the Merit Systems Protection Board in relation to marital status. They found that harassment complainants included significantly more single women and significantly fewer married women than would have been expected from their presence in the labour force. This study reported divorced, widowed, and separated women as one group. As the harassment incidence for widowed women has been seen to be different than that for divorced and separated women (Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981),

it is assumed that the data for this combined group would not be reliable.

Salary level. The survey results about salary level and incidence of harassment are inconsistent. Hodgson (1976) reported that women on the lower end of the pay scale were most likely to be harassed. Safran (1976) reported harassment across all levels of work--from unskilled workers to executives. The State of Florida survey referred to by McIntyre and Renick (1982) found that women in maintenance jobs reported more sexual harassment than did office workers. However, among office workers, women in more prestigious, responsible positions reported more harassment than the secretarial staff. McIntyre and Renick suggested that this was probably due to the higher educational level of these women. They would, therefore, be more aware of what constituted sexual harassment. The authors did not offer any research support for this interpretation. It is worth noting that these studies were all surveys which were not designed to control for such variables as education, job classification, or awareness of women's issues in order to examine the contribution of salary level.

The Merit Systems Protection Board study (1981) found differences in the incidence of sexual harassment across salary levels to be very small. It appeared that salary was not, in itself, predictive of who would

experience sexual harassment. Logic would suggest that women who had more need of a job and whose job skills were less marketable might be easier to victimize as they would have more at stake. However, there is no evidence that salary level by itself would measure need and marketability.

Terpstra and Cook (1985) suggested that financial status and perceived job mobility could influence one's decision to file a formal complaint of sexual harassment. They found that, compared to their presence in the labour force, women earning between $15,000.00 and $19,000.00 were significantly overrepresented among complainants, and those earning less than $10,000.00 were underrepresented.

Education level. Sexual harassment was experienced by women and men of all levels of education in the Merit Systems Protection Board study. However, the more highly educated women and men were more likely to report unwanted sexual attentions on the job. This is consistent with the observation made by McIntyre and Renick (1982) and with the results obtained by Terpstra and Cook. The Merit Systems Protection Board study pointed out that part of the difference between educational levels, for women, could be explained by the traditionality of the jobs concerned. The more highly educated women were much more likely to occupy nontraditional jobs and be the first of their sex in

their jobs. As McIntyre and Renick (1982) suggested, they might also be more aware of what constitutes sexual harassment and of what action to take. This being the case, it may not be education level itself which influences the reported incidence of sexual harassment, but rather other factors related to education, such as (a) awareness of what constitutes sexual harassment, (b) awareness of individual legal rights, (c) awareness of reporting mechanisms, and (d) employment in a job traditionally reserved for men.

Terpstra and Cook (1985) suggested that the difference noted for education level could be the result of perception. They speculated that more highly educated women might be less tolerant of a poor working atmosphere as well as being more aware of sexual harassment issues. They speculated also that differing levels of knowledge of legal avenues could have been a factor in their study as they were looking at characteristicts of women who actually file complaints.

Occupation. The Merit Systems Protection Board study (1981) found that women who believed that they had been sexually harassed were found in all occupations, both traditional and nontraditional. However, they were more likely to be found in work situations where they had a supervisor of the opposite sex, or in technical or professional trainee positions. Although women in these occupational situations were identified in the study as

more likely to experience harassment, these observations must be interpreted cautiously, as the percentage of women in each occupational category who had been victimized was similar enough to appear to be almost an even distribution across occupations. For example, they reported that of women in trainee positions, professional/technical positions, administrative/management, office/clerical, and blue collar/service, 51%, 45%, 42%, 40%, and 38% respectively believed that they had experienced sexual harassment.

Terpstra and Cook (1985) found that women from para-professional and technical occupations tended to be more highly represented among harassment complainants than would be expected from their presence in the work force. They also found professional women to be underrepresented as complainants. They explained the apparent inconsistency between their data and that of the Merit Systems Protection Board as likely due to the fact that the Merit Systems study reported professional and technical occupations together as one.

Interest in women's issues. Wilson and Kraus (1983) explored the notion that incidence of perceived sexual harassment could be a reflection of the feminist ideology of those women who saw themselves as sexual harassment victims. They found no significant difference in acceptance or rejection of feminist ideology among those students at the East Carolina University who reported

experiencing sexual harassment in general and those who reported severe forms of harassment. They interpreted their results as evidence that reports of sexual harassment were not reflections of the victim's feminist ideology.

Previous Victimization

There is very little information available about personal characteristics of women who do or do not experience sexual harassment in the work place. Although it seems logical that a person who had experienced being a victim of sexual harassment might interpret and respond to unwanted sexual attentions differently from a person who had had no such experience, there is no available literature which addresses this directly.

Jensen and Gutek (1982) looked at the influence of being a victim on the assignment of responsibility for sexually harassing incidents. They found that 62% of the of women in their sample agreed with the statement that "Women who are asked by men at work to engage in sexual relations could have done something to prevent it" (p. 126). However, more of the women who had never experienced sexual harassment (as opposed to those who had) agreed with the statement.

Personality and Victimization

It is possible that personality traits may have some bearing on how a woman interprets and responds to sexually harassing behavior. There is no research on

sexual harassment that deals adequately with this issue. It seems logical, though, that a potential harasser would not attempt to harass a person if he had reason to believe he would not be able to get away with it. Jensen and Gutek (1982) suggested that rape and sexual harassment are similar enough to allow for the application of the literature on rape to the understanding of sexual harassment. They supported this perception of similarity by pointing out that both involve coercion and unwanted sexual attention. It is useful to be able to apply research information on rape to issues related to sexual harassment as there is a much more developed literature about rape. However, it must be remembered that rape involves much more violence than does sexual harassment.

The literature on rape provides some support for the speculation that harassers may possibly choose victims who appear less likely to foil the attempt. Landsberg (1982) suggested that the women who have managed to avoid being raped appear to be more job oriented, more self confident, and are more likely to have been involved in physical fights in childhood. The police in Canada and the United States advocate in their Lady Beware program that women should behave confidently, assertively, and go about their business with an appearance of a sense of purpose as a way of helping to avoid attack from a rapist. This seems to imply that victims of sexual

offenses, like victims of such crimes as robbery, were somehow seen by their attacker as "easier " to attack than those they did not choose as victims.

Characteristics of rapists and sexual harassers are difficult to discover. In the case of rapists, only those caught and incarcerated are available to be studied and they may very well be a nonrepresentative sample. Wolf and Baker (1980) described the imprisoned rapist as "a young violent man who is for the most part indistinguishable from other felons involved in robbery, assault, and burglary" (p. 276). The authors also admitted that because of the trauma and humiliation surrounding sexual offences, many do not get reported by the victim and there is no way to learn anything about these victims and perpetrators. Backhouse and Cohen (1978) reported that they made extensive efforts to find and interview men who had sexually harassed women. However, they found that no man they approached would admit to being a harasser, not even those who had been publicly exposed as such.

2.13 Perceptions of Unwanted Sexual Behavior

One of the most striking findings about sexual harassment is the wide range of interpretations individual women and men demonstrated for specific sexual behaviors in the work place. In general, people tend to agree that the most blatant behaviors (such as offers of

jobs for sexual favours, or offensive, sexual contact from a person in a more powerful position at work) are sexual harassment. However, for the more ambiguous behaviors--those where the meaning and intent of the behavior are unclear--there is a wide range of interpretations with marked differences noted between women and men (Collins & Blodgett, 1981; Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981).

There appears to be agreement in the area of power differential. Most women and men agree that the status of the harasser is important in determining the seriousness of the behavior. Collins and Blodgett (1981) and Gutek, Morasch and Cohen (1983) found that both women and men expected supervisors and people in authority to adhere to a higher standard of work place behavior than other employees.

Attribution of Responsibility And Perception of Unwanted Sexual Behavior

Jensen and Gutek (1982) looked at blame attributed to victims of sexual harassment. They found that men were more likely than women to attribute responsibility to the victim for (a) bringing about the sexually harassing behavior and (b) not doing enough to prevent it. The authors examined defensive attribution theory developed by Walster (1966) and Shaver (1970) and the "just world" theory of Lerner (1978) as possible explanations for the male female differences in the

attribution of responsibility to the victim. They suggested that Shaver's description of the role of personal and situational relevancy in determining attribution of responsibility (Shaw & McMartin, 1977) was consistent with their findings. They suggested that the men attributed more responsibility to the female victim because they could see the possibility that they themselves could possibly be in the position of the male harasser, and would want to minimize any blame that could then be attributed to them. They reported that the women attributed less responsibility to the female victim because they also could see the possibility that they might sometime be in her position, and wanted to minimize any blame that could then be attributed to them.

Lerner (Lerner and Miller, 1978) suggested that it would be less threatening for people to view the world as just and good where everything happened for a logical reason. He speculated that, when faced with uncontrollable events or tragedies, viewing the event as a random, uncontrollable occurrence would mean that the observer would also have to accept the reality of her or his own vulnerability. Therefore, a defensive solution, such as believing that the victims contributed to their own plight, would imply that the observer was somehow different and, therefore, not at risk.

Jensen and Gutek (1982) made only a cursory reference in their study to the research done on

defensive attribution and did not mention the controversy about the conceptual and methodological weaknesses of this research. The concept of defensive attribution appears to have many complexities which Walster and Shaver were not in a position to explain--complexities which were demonstrated in inconsistent results and numerous unanswered questions (Bains, 1983; Fincham & Jaspars, 1980; Harris, 1981; Jaspars, Fincham & Hewstone, 1983). Fincham and Jaspars (1980) pointed out several problems with the defensive attribution research which make it difficult to apply: (a) often the victim and the perpetrator were the same person, (b) the definitions of "responsibility" used were inconsistent, (c) the difficulty in measuring degree of identification with the perpetrator or victim make it almost impossible to test the theory.

The Jensen and Gutek (1982) study has provided an interesting explanation for male/female differences in attribution of responsibility to sexual harassment victims. However, there is still a good deal of work to be done on the concept of defensive attribution before it can be considered as a sound explanation for the reported sex difference in perception of the roles played by the harasser and the victim.

Sex-Role Beliefs

Jensen and Gutek (1982) demonstrated that female harassment victims who adhered to traditional sex-role

beliefs were more likely to see the victim (either themselves or others) as being responsible for the sexually harassing behavior. They included three items on their sex-role scale which concerned whether or not women (a) provoke advances, (b) do something to cause advances and/or (c) are able to do something to prevent advances. They found a positive correlation between traditional sex-role beliefs and both self blame and blame of other victims of sexual harassment.

Sex-Role Spillover And Perception of Unwanted Sexual Behavior

Gutek and Morasch (1982) found that sex-role spillover, or the carry over of sexual aspects of sex-role into the work place, influenced, in two ways, how a woman was treated (and how she expected to be treated) by co-workers and supervisors. In jobs which had traditionally been men's work, male sex-role expectations were attributed to the job itself, making a woman in the job a sex-role deviate. She was, therefore, likely to be treated differently from male co-workers and was also likely to attribute the difference in treatment to the fact that she was a woman. The authors found that these women were more aware of sexually harassing behavior.

Gutek and Morasch found that in jobs which had traditionally been considered women's work, female sex-role expectations were attributed to the work-role.

This tended to result in the familiar roles of women as spouse, lover, parent, and nurturing supporter being confused with job-roles. Consequently, inappropriate expectations were common. The authors found that a woman in this setting was less likely to label unwanted sexual attentions as harassment if she observed that the same behavior was also directed at her co-workers.

This study also found that women in integrated work settings experienced less sexual harassment than women working in either traditional or nontraditional jobs. There was less defensiveness about male-female social interaction in integrated jobs, or those jobs not identified with either male or female sex-role.

2.14 Summary

Sexual harassment was looked at as an obstacle to women in the work place--more of an obstacle for women than for men. Research on issues related to unwanted sexual attentions in the work place is fairly recent and has established the problem as a serious phenomenon which occurs frequently enough to interfere with women's progress in the work place and employers' profit.

Although sexual harassment victims can be somewhat described by such demographic factors as age, marital status, salary, and educational level, it is clear that all women are potential victims and no demographic factors are predictive of who will or will not be

sexually harassed. There is very little information available about the relationship of such factors as previous victimization and victim personality traits to either victim selection or to how a women interprets and responds to unwelcome sexual behavior in the work place.

Perceptions of unwanted sexual attentions at work tend to vary widely between men and women. Also, there is reason to believe that sexual harassment is experienced differently by men and women, with women reporting more of the forms of sexual harassment that are damaging to their career progress and job satisfaction. Women are more likely than men to be harassed by a supervisor or someone who holds power over them at work and are, therefore, more likely to experience retaliation for refusal to comply with requests for sexual favours.

There is also a considerable variation among women in perception of unwanted sexual behavior at work. Factors such as women's sex-role beliefs and the type of sex-role spillover related to the job seem to be related to this variation in perception. However, much remains to be learned about women's interpretations of and responses to unwanted sexual behavior in the work place. Contributions of victim personality traits and demographic factors are not clear. The role played by internal mediating factors (such as self-efficacy) is also not clear.

2.2 Self-Efficacy: Theoretical Framework

Women's interpretations of unwelcome sexual behavior in the work place and their attempts to cope with these behaviors might be better understood if we focus on the cognitive processes mediating these interpretations and coping behaviors. This study explored the issue in the context of social learning theory and Bandura's theory of self-efficacy.

2.21 Bandura's Theory of Self-Efficacy

Bandura (1977a; 1977b; 1978) has presented self-efficacy as a mechanism through which to better understand and predict psychological and behavioral change. He has explained that effective behavioral change is due to the creation and strengthening of the individual's self-efficacy expectations, or, in other words, one's confidence in one's own ability to perform the specific behaviors in question.

Bandura (1977a; 1977b) suggested that self-efficacy expectations are predictive of (a) whether or not a person will initiate a particular behavior; (b) how much effort a person will be willing to extend to maintain the behavior; and (c) how long the person will persist with the behavior when confronted by internal and external obstacles.

Self-efficacy expectations were described by Bandura (1977a) in terms of three concepts. The first was **level** of self-efficacy expectation. Level refers to the degree of difficulty of the tasks the individual feels capable of attempting. Some people may feel able to attempt very difficult tasks when these tasks are placed on a hierarchy ordered by level of difficulty; others may feel capable of attempting those of moderate difficulty, while some may feel able to attempt only simple tasks. The second concept was **strength** of self-efficacy expectation, or the degree of confidence one has in one's ability to perform the relevant tasks. The third concept was **generality**, or the creation of self-efficacy expectations which extend beyond the specific behavior to other situations and other behaviors.

Development of Self-Efficacy

Bandura (1976; 1977a; 1977b) suggested that four sources of information are used by the individual in the development of efficacy expectations. The first, and most effective, source was **performance accomplishments**, or repeated success in performing specific behaviors. The second was **vicarious experience**, or learning by observing others (especially similar others) performing specific behaviors. The third was **verbal persuasion**, or suggestion by self or other that one is capable of performing specific behaviors. The fourth was **emotional arousal**, or inferences which one draws from the

physiological states experienced when one is confronted by a situation requiring specific behaviors.

These sources of efficacy information can be applied to self-efficacy beliefs about ability to sucessully cope with sexually oriented behavior in the work place. It can be assumed that women who have successfuly dealt with unwanted sexual behavior (performance accomplishment) and those who have observed others successfully deal with it (vicarious experience) would develop the belief that they would know to handle, and would be able to handle, similar types of unwanted sexual behavior (self-efficacy). It can also be assumed that receiving verbal assurances and reading about ways of successfully handling unwanted sexual behaviors (verbal persuasion) would add to women's self-efficacy beliefs about their ability to deal successfully with similar unwanted behaviors. The emotional arousal or feellings associated with successfully dealing with unwanted sexual behavior would also add to women's self-efficacy beliefs.

2.22 Application of Bandura's Theory

The theory of self-efficacy has generated considerable research and has proved useful in the treatment of a number of clinical problems.

Treatment of Phobics

The studies conducted by Bandura to develop the concept of self-efficacy (Bandura & Adams, 1977; Bandura,

Adams & Beyer, 1977; Bandura, Jeffery & Gajdos, 1975) dealt with snake phobics and used the same measure of self-efficacy to ensure comparability across studies. All of these studies found that self-efficacy increased with successful performance and that level and strength of self-efficacy was predictive of performance level. Bandura, Jeffery and Gajdos (1975) found that snake phobics who increased their efficacy expectations after elimination of their phobic behavior were able to generalize their expectations of mastery to other fear provoking situations. Bandura and Adams (1977) noted that level and strength of post-treatment efficacy expectations of chronic snake phobics were highly predictive of actual performance.

Treatment of Addictive Behavior

Chambliss and Murray (1979a) used self-efficacy and drug-efficacy training to help smokers reduce their smoking. Subjects in this study were randomly assigned to two groups. Subjects in one group were encouraged to attribute their smoking reductions to a placebo drug which was administered. Subjects in the other group were encouraged to attribute their smoking reductions to their own ability to control their desire to smoke. They found that there was greater smoking reduction for those in the self-efficacy condition than for those in the drug condition. They also found that the results interacted with locus of control. The Internal subjects experienced

more success with the self-efficacy condition, while both conditions were equally effective for External subjects.

Several other studies used self-efficacy training in smoking cessation programs. Condiotte and Lichenstein (1981) found that there was a strong relationship between progressive control of smoking behavior and improvement in self efficacy. At the end of the treatment, they found a strong relationship between the final measurement of self-efficacy and maintenance of treatment gains. They concluded that post-treatment efficacy state was predictive of the conditions under which specific subjects would relapse. Corn (1979) and DiClemente (1981) also found self-efficacy state related to maintenance of smoking cessation in follow-up behavior.

Chamblis and Murray (1979b) examined the application of self-efficacy enhancement to weight reduction and found an interaction with locus of control similar to the one they observed in the smoking cessation study. They concluded that a weight reduction program designed to enhance self-efficacy expectations works well with Internal subjects, but External subjects lose more weight if they can attribute responsibility to something other than themselves.

Prediction of Academic Achievement

Self-efficacy has been shown to influence the learning of cognitive skills. Lalonde (1980) demonstrated that expectations of academic self-efficacy

could predict grade point average and post secondary educational plans. Schunk (1980) found academic self-efficacy predictive of math performance and persistence with math learning for children identified as having definite problems with division. Hackett (1985) found math self-efficacy predictive of math anxiety and choice of math-related college majors. Schunk (1985), in a review of self-efficacy studies, decided that self-efficacy not only influences motivation to learn, but is itself influenced by different educational practices.

Development of Sports Skills

Several researchers have tried with varying degrees of success to use the concept of self-efficacy in the analysis and refinement of sport performance. Shelton and Mahoney (1978) found that strategies to increase self-efficacy were useful in improving the performance of weight lifters. Weinberg, Gould, Jackson and Barnes (1980) found that instructions to use positive self-efficacy statements did not improve the tennis serves of novice and experienced players. However, they did not train the servers in the use of the cognitive strategy, nor did they actually measure level and strength of self-efficacy to determine if the strategy actually worked to increase self-efficacy.

Self-Efficacy and Sexual Harassment

There is no reference in the literature to the application of self-efficacy theory to perceptions of and responses to unwanted sexual behavior in the work place. However, assuming that Bandura is correct in his assertion that self-efficacy will influence whether or not one will (a) actually attempt a behavior, (b) invest enough energy in it to sustain it, and (c) persist with the behavior against internal and external obstacles, this theoretical framework can add considerably to our understanding of how women interpret unwanted sexual behaviors and how they will respond when confronted by these behaviors in the work place.

Application of the theory of self-efficacy would allow the counsellor to predict who would be most able to initiate and maintain effective coping behavior when confronted by unwanted sexual behavior in the work place. It would also provide a framework for helping sexual harassment victims enhance their self-efficacy for dealing with the unwanted sexual behavior.

2.23 Distinction Between Efficacy Expectations And Outcome Expectations

Bandura (1977a; 1977b) stated that while people may feel confident that they can perform a particular behavior, they still may not attempt the behavior as they may believe that the behavior will not achieve the

desired result. Therefore, in order to actually attempt a behavior, people would have to believe that the behavior was within their range of competency, and that the behavior itself was worth doing in terms of expected outcomes.

This concept is useful in possibly explaining and understanding why many women would sooner quit a job than make a formal complaint about sexual harassment. Those who have witnessed the lack of support given to others who made complaints, or saw complainants' work situations actually get worse following the complaint (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981) would likely believe that making a complaint would be an ineffective response to the problem.

2.3 Summary

Literature related to sexual harassment and self-efficacy has been examined in this chapter. Sexual harassment has been demonstrated to be a very real problem for women in the work place--more so than it is for men. Research on the perception of sexually oriented behavior in the work place has been discussed and the need for further research in this area has been demonstrated.

Bandura's concept of self-efficacy has been discussed as a useful operative model for this study. It would appear to have potential for better understanding

of women's interpretation of and response to unwanted sexual behavior in the work place.

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD AND PROCEDURES

This study was designed to investigate working women's interpretations of and responses to sexually oriented behavior in the work place. Subjects completed four testing instruments, one of which required them to respond to 10 hypothetical work place incidents involving sexually oriented behavior.

3.1 Population and Sample

The population sampled in this study was working women employed either full-time or part-time by selected employers in a large metropolitan city (Edmonton) in western Canada.

3.11 Selection procedures

Twelve employers were identified who employed women in a variety of occupations and who would, therefore, have good potential for providing a sample of Edmonton working women for the study. Contact was made with each employer by phone followed up by letter (see Appendix II) describing the purpose of the study and requesting permission to involve a random sample of the company's female employees in the research project. Nine employers

agreed to make their employees available for participation.

A random sample of female employees was selected from each of the nine places of employment. A table of random numbers (Arkin & Colton, 1963) was used. Each woman was sent a letter inviting her to participate in the study (see Appendix III). Those willing to participate were asked to indicate the time(s) they could be available for testing by completing the "Reply Form". Completion of the "Reply Form" was assumed to be indication of informed consent to participate in the study. The letter of invitation was accompanied by a covering letter from senior management, confirming the employer's willingness to have employees participate in the study.

There was an approximate 34% acceptance rate across the 505 women who were invited to participate (see Table 1).

3.12 Description of the Sample

Sample Size

One hundred and sixty-nine women were tested. One of the subjects scored above four on the Infrequency scale of the Jackson Personality Inventory and was, therefore, eliminated from the study. This was considered necessary as a high infrequency score implies that the JPI results may not be valid due to

Table 1

Employer and Consent Rate for Women Invited to Participate In The Study

Employer	Number of Subjects Participating
Civil Service (Federal)	25
Technical school (Post-secondary)	39
Hotel	13
Edmonton schools*	08
Utilities company	27
Social Services	19
Department store	21
Hospital	06
Bank	11
Total	169

*One elementary, one junior high and one senior high school.

misunderstanding, error in the use of the answer sheet, or lack of co-operation. If the infrequency score was high due to lack of understanding of test questions, then it would be possible that the subject's responses on the three other instruments could also be invalid. This left a sample of 168 working women.

Age Range

Subjects ranged in age from 19 to 65 years of age with over 60% of thr sample falling between 20 and 39 years of age (see Table 2).

Marital Status

Over half of the subjects were married and 21% were single (see Table 3). However, all six of the marital status categories were represented in the sample.

Family Income

Total family income rather than personal income was requested as it was felt that financial need might relate to perception of and freedom to respond to unwanted sexual behavior in the work place. All of the income ranges on the Demographic Questionnaire (DQ) were represented in the sample, with 30% falling in the $20,000-$34,000 range (see Table 4). All ranges were well enough represented to make meaningful comparisons possible.

Cultural Background

Information on cultural heritage which was collected on the DQ was not used for data analysis as it could not

Table 2

Age Range of Sample Compared to Age Range of Canadian Women in The Paid Labour Force*

Age Range	Frequency	Percent of Sample	Percent of Canadian Women
15-19	01	01%	09%
20-24	27	16%	17%
25-34	57	34%	29%
35-44	41	24%	22%
45-54	30	17%	15%
55-65	12	08%	08%
	Total 168	Taoal 100%	Total 100%

*Statistics Canada, 1985.

Table 3

Marital Status of Subjects

Marital Status	Frequency	Percent of Sample
Single	36	21%
Married	87	52%
Common-law	14	08%
Separated	05	03%
Divorced	23	14%
Widowed	03	02%

Table 4

Family Income Level of Subjects

Family Income Range	Frequency	Percent of Sample
$ 8,000-$19,000	34	21%
$20,000-$34,000	50	30%
$35,000-$49,000	36	22%
$50,000 and over	45	27%
	Total 165*	Total 100%

*Not answered by three subjects.

be categorized in any meaningful way. This was due to the considerable ethnic mixture presented by many individuals and the fact that while many had grown up in families which had been in Canada for several generations, there was no provision on the DQ to collect this information.

Number of Dependents

Sixty-two percent of the subjects had no dependents, while those with more than two dependents comprised only six percent of the sample (see Table 5).

Education Level

There was a wide range of educational backgrounds represented in the sample. Subjects' educational backgrounds ranged from 11% who had not completed high school to 23% who held either undergraduate or graduate degrees (see Table 6). Bachelor degrees in nursing, social work, and teaching were classified as professional degrees for purposes of this study.

Previous Exposure to Unwanted Sexual Behavior

The sample was consistent with the sexual harassment literature in this respect. Forty-seven percent indicated frequent or occasional exposure to unwanted sexual behavior at some time during their life, while 53% indicated hardly any or no exposure at all (see Table 7).

Concern With Women's Issues

A large percentage (87%) of the sample described themselves as either very concerned or somewhat concerned

Table 5

Number of Dependents of Subjects

Number of Dependents	Frequency	Percent of Sample
0	104	62%
1	30	18%
2	21	13%
3	08	05%
4	02	01%
	Total 165*	Total 99%

*Not answered by three subjects.

Table 6

Education Level of Subjects

Education Level	Frequency	Percent of Sample
Grades 7-9	03	02%
Grades 10-11	16	09%
High school diploma	54	32%
Journeyman (trades)	05	03%
Post-secondary (one year)	26	15%
Post-secondary (two years)	13	08%
Undergraduate degree	06	04%
Professional or graduate degree	32	19%
Other	13	08%
	Total 168	Total 100%

Table 7

Previous Exposure to Unwanted Sexual Behaviors

Previous Exposure	Frequency	Percent of Sample
Frequently	13	08%
Occasionally	[redacted]	39%
Hardly ever	58	35%
Never	31	18%

Table 8

Expressed Concern For Women's Issues

Amount of Concern	Frequency	Percent of Sample
Very concerned	49	29%
Somewhat concerned	98	58%
Very little concerned	17	10%
Not at all concerned	04	02%

about women's issues (see Table 8). Only 12% declared very little or no concern at all with women's issues.

Range of Occupations

The women in the sample were employed in 11 of the occupational classifications found in the Canadian Classification and Dictionary of Occupations (CCDO). The most heavily represented occupations were the clerical occupations (see Table 9). This was expected as a large portion of the female work force in Canada is employed in clerical jobs (Statistics Canada, 1984).

Job Status

The majority of subjects (148) worked full-time, while 14 reported that they worked part-time and 6 indicated that they had both a part-time and full-time job. The part-time workers were under-represented in the study as they were not available during the whole of the working day (testing was done during work hours). Also part-time workers were more likely to be on hourly wage so would have to inconvenience themselves more to participate in the two hour testing session.

Supervisory Responsibilitiees

Over half of the subjects (64%) were in non-supervisory positions. Of those who have supervisory responsibilitiees, only two supervised more than 20 staff members (see Table 10).

Table 9

Occupational Classification of Subjects in Sample Compared to That of Canadian Women in The Paid Labour Force

CCDO Classification	Frequency	Percent of Sample	Percent of Canadian Women
11 Managament/administration	32	19%	10%
21 Natural science/math/ engineering	01	01%	01%
23 Social sciences	12	07%	02%
27 Teaching	17	10%	06%
31 Medical/health	07	04%	09%
41 Clerical	73	44%	34%
51 Sales	09	05%	09%
61 Service	11	07%	17%
71 Nursery and related	01	01%	01%
81 Processing (food)	02	01%	02%
85 Product fabrication/ repair	01	01%	05%
Total	166*	99%	96%**

*Two subjects did not declare their job title.

**Several occupational classifications in the work force were not represented in the sample.

Table 10

Supervisory Responsibilities of Subjects

Number Supervised	Frequency	Percent of Sample
More than 20	02	01%
11-20	09	05%
1-10	49	29%
0	108	64%

Additional Comments Concerning Sample

Several points about the sample used in this study should be noted:

(1) This was a large sample of working women in representative occupational areas.

(2) The sample size was large enough to permit statistical analysis and other similar kinds of comparisons.

(3) The data will be generalized only to a similar population of women representative of the ages and occupations found in this study. Caution should be used in generalizing from this study in the age groups in which a small pool of subjects were found.

(4) In the main, this sample is cross-sectional in terms of age and occupation and hence reasonably representative of similar groups of women.

3.2 Testing Instruments

Four testing instruments were used in this study: two published tests, the Bem Sex-Role Inventory and the Jackson Personality Inventory, and two tests constructed specifically for this study, the Demographic Questionnaire and the Interpretative Response Questionnaire.

3.21 The Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI)

The BSRI was used in this study as a measure of sex-role identity. The BSRI (Bem, 1974) was constructed by Bem to measure sex-role identification and has generated more research than other recently developed measures of psychological androgyny (Kelly & Worell, 1977; Pyke, 1985). The scale differs from more traditional measures of femininity and masculinity in that it is based on an orthogonal, two-dimensional model of the constructs. Because the BSRI treats femininity and masculinity as separately distributed constructs, rather than as bipolar ends on a single continuum, it can provide, in addition to femininity and masculinity scores, scores for individuals who score either high on both constructs or low on both constructs. Individuals in these score categories are labelled androgynous and undifferentiated, respectively.

The BSRI contains 60 items--20 items rated by judges to represent stereotyped feminine attributes in North American society, 20 items rated as representative of stereotyped masculine attributes, and 20 neutral items. Although the BSRI has been criticized for including only positive items, Wiggins and Holzmuller (1978) concluded that the measure of psychological androgyny gained from the BSRI appeared to "reflect a highly generalizable personological construct" (p. 50) that did distinguish between androgynous and sex-stereotyped persons, in a

variety of areas of interpersonal behavior.

Anastasi (1982) praised the item selection procedures used and suggested that they strengthen the definition of the constructs and the reliability of the instrument. Bem (1974) reported good internal consistency, test-retest reliability and a very low correlation between the femininity and masculinity scales. She found that both the femininity and masculinity scales did correlate with social desirability while the androgyny scores did not.

Several researchers, however, have criticized the validity of Bem's femininity and masculinity constructs on the grounds that one assumption underlying the development of the constructs (that stereotypic femininity-masculinity qualities are well known in the population at large) may not be true (Myers & Gonda, 1982a; Myers & Gonda, 1982b; Uleman & Weston, 1986). These researchers suggested that femininity and masculinity constructs may be much more complex than allowed for by either the bipolar or the two-dimensional models. Kelly and Worell (1977) suggested that social desirability could possibly be a confounding factor for the femininity scores and they noted this as a problem which requires further research.

The validation studies reported by Bem (1975), Bem and Lenny (1976), and Bem, Martyna and Watson (1976) showed that scores on the BSRI were predictive of

subjects' choices of sex-stereotyped activities, and supported the underlying assumption that androgynous individuals are less restricted in behavior than sex-typed persons. However, Pyke (1985), in an examination of a number of studies done with the BSRI, observed that evidence in support of two major assumptions underlying the concept of androgyny--that androgynous persons would be (a) psychologically more healthy and (b) more flexible than sex-typed persons--was equivocal at best and provided little solid support for either assumption. Pyke suggested that there is need for considerably more research with the BSRI as there have been contradictory findings in the research done to date. Some of the contradictions Pyke attributes to the use of different scoring procedures for the BSRI, and to the choice of dependent measures which appeared to overlap with the masculinity construct on the BSRI. However, it was Pyke's conclusion that, despite the difficulties in interpreting the research done with the BSRI, there was some evidence of construct validity, and as the instrument has been used in research more than the other measures of androgyny, it is the preferred test of androgyny to use.

Although it is understood that more research is needed on the BSRI (Anastasi, 1982; Kelly & Worell, 1977) and on the concept of androgyny (Pyke, 1985; Uleman & Weston, 1986), it is the most respected measure of the

two-dimensional concept of sex-role identity available at the present time (Astley & Downey, 1980) and, therefore, has been chosen for this study.

BSRI Constructs

The BSRI provides scores for femininity, masculinity, and androgyny. It also provides a score referred to as undifferentiated.

The individual (of either sex) who scores above the median on the femininity scale and below the median on masculinity is classified as feminine. This person is considered to have internalized culturally accepted feminine attributes into her or his self-definition and behavior (Bem, 1974).

The individual who scores above the median on the masculinity scale and below the median on femininity is classified as masculine. This person is assumed to have internalized culturally accepted masculine attributes into her or his self-definition and behavior (Bem, 1974).

The individual who scores above the median on both femininity and masculinity is classified as androgynous. This person is said to have integrated culturally accepted attributes of both femininity and masculinity into her or his self-definition and behavior (Bem, Martyna & Watson, 1976).

The individual who scores below the median on both femininity and masculinity is classified as undifferentiated. This person is thought to have

integrated few of the culturally accepted feminine and masculine attributes into her or his self-definition and behavior. Although not sex-typed, the undifferentiated person differs from the androgynous person significantly enough to be classified separately (Bem, 1977; Bem, Martyna & Watson, 1976; Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1975).

Scoring Method

There were two scoring methods reported by Bem (1981) in the BSRI manual--the t-ratio method and the "median split" method. Both scoring methods have proven somewhat problematic. When both are used on the same data, there does tend to be some difference in the sex-role categories assigned. Bem (1977) insisted that the difference was not substantial. However, Pyke (1985) disagreed.

The t-ratio method did not distinguish between androgynous and undifferentiated subjects and is no longer recomended by Bem. The median split method has been criticized by some because, with this method, a very small difference in one score can result in a different sex-role classification (Pyke, 1985). Pyke also noted that when results of studies using the different scoring methods were compared, the median split method seemed to produce fewer significant results.

A third scoring method was discussed by Pyke (1985), the combined method. Here the t-ratio is used to identify feminine, masculine and nonsex-typed subjects.

Then the median split method is used to separate the androgynous and the undifferentiated. This method appears to avoid the problems associated with both the other methods of scoring the BSRI; however, it has not been used widely, so Pyke reported that it should be used with caution.

The median split method is the scoring method recommended by Bem and was, therefore, the scoring method used in this study.

3.22 The Jackson Personality Inventory (JPI)

The JPI (Jackson, 1976) was used as a measure of personality in this study. This particular personality test was chosen because it reflects "interpersonal, cognitive, and value orientations likely to have important implications for a person's functioning" (Jackson, 1976, p.9), and it measures such traits as "self-esteem", "social adroitness", social participation", and "risk taking", which were assumed to be relevant to the study.

The JPI was intended to be a research and counselling tool for use with subjects of average intelligence or above. It measures 15 personality traits (see Appendix IV) and contains an Infrequency scale for use in invalidating the profiles of those who consistently respond in an unlikely manner. Scores of five or higher on the Infrequency scale invalidate the

individual's scores on the other 15 JPI scales.

Jackson (1976) speculated that a high Infrequency score could indicate several things: (a) lack of understanding of the test items, (b) an error in the use of the answer form which would result in many items being answered in ways not intended, or (c) lack of co-operation on the part of the subject. It was decided that any subject with an Infrequency score above four would be excluded from the analysis.

Construction of the JPI

The construction of the JPI is one of its strong points and contributes to its construct validity (Anastasi, 1982). Scale development began with detailed descriptions of the constructs, drawn from over 30 years of research on Murray's personality theory (Murray, 1938). Jackson used carefully controlled procedures to generate a pool of more than 100 items for each scale, and then selected 20 items per scale based on high biserial correlations with the total scale score, and low correlations with scores on other scales and the Social Desirability scale on the Personality Research Form (Jackson, 1967). Validity data were obtained from correlations with scores on other psychological tests, peer ratings and self ratings. Correlations were also done with behavioral data in real-life settings (Jackson, 1976). Coefficient alpha reliability values range from .71 to .88 for all but the Social Adroitness,

Responsibility, and Tolerance scales which demonstrate a reliability coefficient of between .60 and .70 (Goldberg, 1978).

The norms for the JPI are based on a population of 2,000 male and 2,000 female college and university students.

3.23 The Demographic Questionnaire (DQ)

The DQ was developed to collect descriptive information about the sample. The first nine questions cover demographic information about the subjects (see Appendix V). The next two questions ask about the subjects' previous exposure to unwanted sexual behaviors, and about the subjects' degree of interest in women's issues. The final question allows the subject to comment further if she so wishes. Twenty-seven of the subjects chose to write a comment. All comments made were explanations of answers given for questions 10 and 11.

3.24 The Interpretative Response Questionnaire (IRQ)

This instrument was constructed to collect information about subjects' interpretations of and responses to sexually oriented behavior in the work place. Question five provides the measure of self-efficacy strength used in the study.

The IRQ consists of 10 hypothetical work incidents involving varying degrees of sexually oriented behavior.

The subject is asked to answer the same seven questions about each of the 10 incidents (see Appendix I).

Construction of the IRQ

Item selection. Fifteen work place incidents were chosen from the questionnaire used in the joint Redbook/Havard Business Review study (Collins & Blodgett, 1981; Safran, 1981), their reports of respondent anecdotes, and anecdotes referred to by Errington and Davidson (1981) in their study with Vancouver women.

Effort was made to word the descriptions of the incidents so that no reference was made to any pre-existing personal or social relationship between the perpetrator and victim as response to the behavior itself was desired. There is evidence that the nature of social interaction between the perpetrator and victim does influence judgments made by an observer concerning sexual harassment (Reilly, Carpenter, Dull & Barlett, 1982; Weber-Burdin & Rossi, 1982).

As a pilot study, five working women answered the seven questions for each of the 15 items. Five items were consequently dropped because of redundancy in discomfort level (IRQ question one) and likelihood of occurrence (IRQ question two). The 10 items remaining, in the judgment of the researcher, offered a good balance of ambiguous versus blatant incidents, and supervisor initiated versus co-worker initiated incidents.

The 10 items were administered to 13 women students in a "Nontraditional Occupations for Women" class at the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology to confirm readability of the questionnaire and administration time.

IRQ Content

The IRQ contains 10 work place situations involving sexually oriented behavior in the work place. The situations were arranged from the most ambiguous to the most blatant. Subjects were required to answer the same seven questions about each incident (see Appendix I).

Degree of discomfort. For question one, subjects were asked to indicate the degree of discomfort they believed they would feel in such a situation. Rather than ask if they felt this incident constituted sexual harassment--a term which appears to have a variety of meanings for people at large--it was decided to refer to discomfort level, which is more easily measured. Response was on a five point scale ranging from "no discomfort" to "extreme discomfort".

Likelihood of occurrence. For question two, subjects were asked to rate, on a 10% to 100% scale, the probability that this type of incident could happen to them.

Feelings. For question three, subjects were asked to suggest what feelings they believed they would experience in such a situation. Responses were manually sorted by the researcher into clusters (see Appendix VI).

Anticipated best response. On question four, subjects were asked to indicate the best response they felt they could give in such a situation. Again responses were manually sorted by the researcher into clusters (see Appendix VII). The clusters were developed by the researcher in consultation with two other psychologists. They are based on whether or not the subject, in her response, demonstrated an awareness of the problem combined with an attempt to deal directly with it or to withdraw from it. These two responses were labelled cluster one and two respectively. Cluster three was used for mixed or incongruent responses, cluster four for responses demonstrating acceptance of the behavior, and cluster five for omitted responses.

Self-efficacy. On question five, subjects rated, on a 10% to 100% scale, the probability that they would be able to carry out their anticipated best response. This was used as a measure of strength of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977a).

Anticipated alternate response. On question six, subjects were asked to suggest an alternate response if they felt that they would not be able to give their anticipated best response. Answers were sorted into the same clusters used for question four.

Factors preventing subjects from carrying out their anticipated "best" response. On IRQ question seven, subjects were asked to suggest anything that might

prevent them from carrying out their anticipated best response. Answers were manually sorted by the author into clusters (see Appendix VIII).

3.3 Test Administration

The four instruments were administered to subjects in small groups of two to ten people. Administration took approximately two hours. Some subjects completed all four instruments in one sitting, while others used two one-hour sessions to better accommodate their work responsibilities. In all cases, tests were administered in the same order to minimize any influence of the test administration procedure on the results. Testing was done on the employer's premises during the working day. Some employers allowed subjects to use work time, while other subjects used lunch hour time or time immediately before or after their work shift. The nature of the subject's job was a major factor in determining whether or not she used work time to complete the tests.

Before completing the tests subjects were asked to read the letter accompanying the instruments, which emphasized the confidentiality of their results and instructed them not to put their names on the answer sheets (see Appendix IX).

3.4 Statistical Analysis of Data

The four research questions were tested by calculation of point biserial correlations (SPSSX program) between pairs of variables. Point biserial correlations were used because correlations were being made between dichotomous and continuous variables. There is a known tendency for correlations involving dichotomous variables to be lower than correlations with variables which can take on a range of values (Kerlinger & Pedhazar, 1973); however, use of dichotomous variables was unavoidable in this study because of the nature of the information required.

Relationships between variables where correlations were $r > .30$ were investigated further by use of the chi-square test of independence (NONPO2 program). Relationships where point biserial correlations were between .20 and .29 were reported only if they followed a consistent pattern across the 10 situations on the IRQ. Single correlations of $r < .20$ were not reported even though they may have reached statistical significance of $p < .05$, because with a sample size of 168 even comparatively small correlations (e.g. $r = .15$) would be statistically significant at the .05 level (Slavin, 1984).

3.5 Summary

A description of the procedures used in the study, tests administered, and analysis of data are found in this chapter. The construction of the Demographic Questionnaire and the Interpretative Response Questionnaire has been described; the literature concerning the Bem Sex-Role Inventory and the Jackson Personality Inventory has been summarized; and the selection of subjects and administration of the testing instruments has been described.

The subjects (N = 169) comprised 34% of the 505 working women, randomly selected from women employed with nine Edmonton employers, who consented to participate in the study. One subject was disqualified because of a high infrequency score on the JPI, leaving a sample of N = 168. Four instruments--BSRI, DQ, IRQ, and JPI--were administered to the subjects. Results were analyzed using point biserial correlations and the chi-square test for independence.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to explore possible relationships between working women's interpretations of and responses to sexually oriented behavior and four other factors: (a) demographic variables, (b) personality variables, (c) sex-role identity, and (d) self-efficacy expectations. Four research questions were outlined in Chapter One. Results of the point biserial correlations done to answer the four research questions will be reported in Chapter Four along with the results of chi-square tests of independence carried out with selected variables, and relevant frequency counts.

4.1 Summary Of IRQ Responses

Results will be discussed first in terms of a summary of responses to the 10 IRQ questions and then in reference to the four research questions.

4.11 IRQ Question One: Level of Discomfort

Subjects were asked in question one to imagine the situation had just happened to them and that they should indicate "what level of discomfort (if any)" they would feel. There was a definite difference in the pattern of

discomfort levels across the 10 situations. The most dramatic difference in level of discomfort was noted between the ambiguous and blatant situations. Over 80% of the women in the sample agreed that the three most blatant situations--situation 8 (boss drops coin down subject's blouse), situation 9 (boss attempts to coerce subject into sexual relationship), and situation 10 (supervisor retaliates for subject's refusal of sexual favours)--would produce feelings of "considerable" to "extreme" discomfort (see Table 11).

For the two most ambiguous situations--situation 1 (picture of nude woman on office wall), and situation 2 ("accidental" touch as manager leans over subject's shoulder to point out typing correction)--over 50% of the women felt they would feel medium to extreme discomfort. Actual responses given for situation 2 indicated that being uncertain of the man's intent was a major issue. Some subjects expressed feelings of guilt for their discomfort, as they were not sure he intended anything out of line. This is consistent with the reinforcement women receive from society to take responsibility for men's sexual offences against them (Backhouse & Cohen, 1978).

It is interesting to note that for the remaining five situations--situation 3 (persistent dinner invitations from supervisor), situation 4--(being whistled at by a group of men in an auto repair shop),

Table 11

Level of Discomfort: Percent of Respondents

Situation	No Discomfort to Slight Discomfort	Medium Discomfort	Considerable to Extreme Discomfort
1	48%	21%	30%
2	37%	19%	44%
3	30%	21%	49%
4	25%	33%	41%
5	39%	17%	44%
6	30%	24%	45%
7	31%	24%	45%
8	03%	02%	95%
9	08%	12%	80%
10	04%	02%	94%

situation 5--(off-colour comments from a colleague), situation 6 (dinner invitation from supervisor before promotion), and situation 7 (foreman looks subject up and down)--over 60% of the subjects believed they would experience medium to extreme discomfort (see Table 11). For situation 4, a situation where the subject is whistled at by a group of men in an auto repair shop, 75% of the women felt they would experience medium to extreme discomfort if this were to happen to them. For situation 5, which involves a colleague who makes off-colour comments, almost 40% of the subjects felt they would experience little or no discomfort. Three of these situations (situations 3, 6, and 7) involve a person in authority. For these three situations approximately 70% of the women felt they would experience medium to extreme discomfort.

The situation which seemed to cause the least discomfort was situation 1 (picture of nude) and even here over 50% of the subjects felt they would experience medium to extreme discomfort.

4.12 IRQ Question Two: Perceived Likelihood

Subjects were asked in question two what likelihood there was that they would ever experience such a situation at some point in their working life. Over 60% of the subjects responded that they felt there was less than 50% probability that any of these situations would

ever happen to them (see Table 12). They saw situation 1 (picture of nude), situation 8 (boss drops coin down subject's blouse), situation 9 (manager attempting to coerce subject into a sexual relationship), and situation 10 (supervisor retaliating for subject's refusal) as least likely to happen to them.

4.13 IRQ Question Three: Feelings

Subjects were asked in question three to state how they would feel in such a situation. The responses were sorted into five clusters (Appendix VI). The clusters used were: (a) cluster one--feelings of fear, anger, and distaste directed outwards, toward the aggressor, (b) cluster two--feelings of guilt, humiliation and depression directed inwards, toward the self, (c) cluster three--confused or mixed feelings, (d) cluster four--positive feelings about the situation or the aggressor, and (e) cluster five--unclassifiable or omitted response.

In all situations, except situation 4 (whistles from men in auto shop), cluster one feelings were suggested by more subjects than was any other type of feeling (see Table 13). For situation 4, more subjects expressed cluster two (feelings directed inward). This is consistent with (a) the high discomfort level for this situation (see Table 11), (b) the fact that it was a group of men, as opposed to an individual, and (c) the

Table 12

Perceived Likelihood: Percent of Respondents

Situation	Degree of Likelihood		
	10% to 40%	50% to 70%	80% to 100%
1	78%	07%	15%
2	60%	21%	18%
3	62%	22%	16%
4	63%	19%	17%
5	60%	23%	17%
6	67%	26%	07%
7	60%	23%	17%
8	82%	13%	05%
9	77%	17%	05%
10	76%	17%	07%

Table 13

Responses About Feelings Across Ten Situations

Expressed as Percentage of Responses For Each Situation

Situation	Feelings			
	Outward	Inward	Mixed	Positive
1	50%	19%	11%	20%
2	47%	20%	18%	14%
3	56%	22%	10%	12%
4	26%	52%	06%	16%
5	65%	19%	06%	09%
6	56%	21%	12%	11%
7	50%	34%	03%	13%
8	54%	44%	01%	01%
9	70%	15%	05%	10%
10	91%	09%	00%	00%

social pressure that women receive to make themselves attractive to men.

Only 9% of subjects expressed positive feelings (cluster four response) for situation 5 (off-colour comment), 1% for situation 8 (boss drops coin down blouse), 10% for situation 9 (proposition from superior), and 0% for situation 10 (retaliation). Two situations received more positive responses than the others. Twenty percent of the responses for situation 1 (picture of nude) were positive, and 16% for situation 4 (whistles).

4.14 IRQ Question Four: Anticipated Best Response

Subjects were asked in question four to indicate what they felt would be the best way to respond in the situation. The responses were sorted into five clusters (Appendix VII). These clusters were: (a) cluster one--direct attempt to cope through verbal or physical confrontation, humor, rearranging the situation, or reporting the situation to a person in authority; (b) cluster two--withdrawal from or ignoring the situation; (c) cluster three--mixed or incongruent responses; (d) cluster four--behaving in a way accepting of the situation or encouraging a relationship with the aggressor; and (e) cluster five--omitted response.

Anticipated Best Responses

The response pattern across the 10 situations (see Table 14) demonstrates a strong preference for cluster

Table 14

Anticipated "Best" Response: Expressed as Percentage of Responses For Each Situation

Situation	Direct Attempt To Cope	Coping By With-drawing	Incon-gruent Response	Accepts Behavior	No Response
1	44%	37%	17%	02%	01%
2	66%	17%	11%	03%	02%
3	90%	03%	03%	02%	02%
4	20%	62%	07%	09%	02%
5	69%	19%	09%	02%	01%
6	80%	00%	05%	13%	02%
7	48%	40%	09%	01%	02%
8	72%	18%	06%	00%	03%
9	83%	10%	04%	00%	04%
10	96%	02%	01%	00%	01%

one (direct attempt to cope) responses on the part of most subjects for all situations except situation 4. Here, the majority of the subjects offered cluster two (withdrawal) responses. As situation 4 involves being whistled at by a shop full of men, it is understandable that many would choose to ignore the incident rather than confront anyone directly. Many of those who chose cluster one responses, chose to use humor rather than confrontation. The emphasis on withdrawal responses for situation 4 is consistent with the preference for "feelings inward" responses for IRQ question three (see Table 13).

It is interesting to note that cluster four responses (acceptance of behavior or encouragement of relationship with aggressor) was very seldom suggested by subjects. The highest frequency for this response was for situation 6 (dinner invitation) and situation 4 (whistles) where approximately thirteen and nine percent respectively offered cluster four responses. No subject suggested a cluster four response for situations 8, 9, and 10--the most unpleasant situations. These responses are consistent with the "positive feelings" responses for these situations (see Table 13). However, it is interesting to note that only two percent of the women offered cluster four responses for situation 1, even though twenty percent expressed positive feelings in IRQ question three. It would appear that although they could

express positive feelings about the situation involving the picture of the nude in the colleague's office, they felt that they would not respond in a manner which demonstrated acceptance of the situation. Considering the tendency noted by Gutek, Morasch & Cohen (1983) for men to be more likely to interpret certain behaviors as sexual, it is possible that these women did not want their feelings about the picture to be interpreted as an invitation for a sexual response.

4.15 IRQ Question Five: Self-Efficacy

Responses for IRQ question five were given on a 10 point scale. Subjects were asked to indicate the probability (from 10% to 100%) that they could actually carry out the anticipated best response they outlined in question four.

The pattern of strength of self-efficacy responses across all 10 situations revealed, for most subjects, a consistent belief in their ability to carry out their anticipated best response (see Table 15).

4.16 IRQ Question Six: Anticipated Alternate Response

Subjects were asked, on IRQ question six, to describe what response they would make to each situation if they could not carry out the response they had described in question four. Question six responses were sorted into the same five clusters used for question four

Table 15

Self-Efficacy Expectations: Expressed as Percentage of Responses For Each Situation

Situation	Strength of Self-Efficacy		
	10%-40%	50%-70%	80%-100%
1	05%	12%	82%
2	06%	11%	83%
3	05%	13%	82%
4	08%	14%	78%
5	08%	08%	84%
6	06%	16%	79%
7	08%	13%	79%
8	08%	13%	79%
9	10%	16%	74%
10	07%	15%	77%

(Appendix VII).

The large portion of the sample which omitted question six (see Table 16) reflects the high strength of self-efficacy scores found for IRQ question five.

As in IRQ question four, the response pattern for question six, across the 10 situations, favours cluster one (direct attempt to cope) responses. However, situation 4 (whistles) does not follow this pattern, as there was a similar number of cluster one and cluster two (withdrawal) responses. Very few subjects offered cluster four (encourage relationship) responses as their anticipated alternate response.

4.17 IRQ Question Seven: Factors Preventing Subjects From Carrying Out Their Anticipated Best Response

Subjects were asked in IRQ question seven to indicate what would prevent them from carrying out the response they had described in IRQ question four. Answers were sorted into seven clusters (Appendix VIII). The clusters were: (a) cluster one--fear of retaliation; (b) cluster two--fear that nothing would change, even if they were successful in carrying out their anticipated best response; (c) cluster three--rectification of the situation by the aggressor; (d) cluster four--fear of their own feelings; (e) cluster five--unsure of aggressor's intent; (f) cluster six--likes aggressor; (g) cluster seven--nothing would prevent her.

Table 16

Anticipated Alternate Responses: Expressed as Percentage of Responses For Each Situation

Situation	Direct Attempt To Cope	Coping By Withdrawing	Incongruent Response	Accepts The Behavior	No Response
1	27%	17%	12%	01%	42%
2	38%	10%	03%	01%	48%
3	36%	11%	04%	04%	45%
4	23%	21%	05%	02%	49%
5	34%	21%	04%	01%	39%
6	45%	01%	04%	06%	44%
7	27%	20%	04%	02%	47%
8	37%	17%	04%	01%	41%
9	39%	12%	04%	00%	45%
10	42%	09%	01%	01%	47%

Over 50% of the subjects felt that nothing would prevent them from carrying out their anticipated best response for situations 2 to 10 (see Table 17). This was consistent with the high levels of self-efficacy expressed (see Table 15). For situation 1 (picture of nude), only 33% reported that nothing would prevent them from using their question four response. However, more subjects expressed fear of retaliation, fear of no action being taken, and concern about unclear intent for situation 1 than for the other nine situations. Fear of retaliation (cluster one) was offered most frequently across all 10 situations as a factor which would prevent subjects from carrying out their anticipated best response.

4.2 Research Question One

The intent of this research question was to explore relationships between interpretations of unwelcome sexually oriented behavior and (a) demographic variables, (b) personality and (c) sex-role identity. Because the sample size was large enough to result in relatively small correlations reaching a significance level of .05, it was decided to report only correlations of $r > .30$ and those of $r = .20$-$.29$ where there was a consistent pattern across the ten situations on the IRQ. The results of the point biserial correlations and chi-square tests are

Table 17

Factors Preventing Women From Making Their Anticipated Best Responses

	Factors Preventing Anticipated Best Responses						
Situation	Fear of Retaliation	Nothing Will Be Done	Situation Rectified	Fear of Own Feelings	Unclear Intent	Likes The Aggressor	Nothing
1	32%	15%	01%	05%	14%	00%	33%
2	19%	08%	01%	04%	13%	04%	51%
3	19%	07%	02%	02%	07%	04%	59%
4	20%	02%	02%	08%	03%	02%	63%
5	20%	07%	00%	05%	07%	00%	61%
6	16%	07%	04%	02%	12%	05%	54%
7	21%	05%	01%	07%	02%	02%	62%
8	27%	05%	01%	07%	02%	00%	58%
9	17%	05%	01%	04%	03%	01%	69%
10	14%	07%	01%	05%	05%	10%	68%

reported and also any relevant frequency counts of responses are displayed.

4.21 Relationship Between Interpretations of Sexually Oriented Behaviors And Demographic Variables

The measures of "interpretation of sexually oriented behaviors" used in this study were (a) discomfort level (IRQ question one), (b) perceived likelihood of the situations happening to the respondent (IRQ question two), and (c) feelings the respondent believed would be elicited by each situation (IRQ question three).

Discomfort Level And Demographic Variables

There were no strong correlations between discomfort level and any of the 12 variables on the DQ. None of these point biserial correlations met the reporting criteria.

Perceived Likelihood And Demographic Variables

Perceived likelihood was measured by IRQ question two. Subjects responded on a 10 point scale indicating the probability (10% to 100%) that each of the 10 situations could possibly happen to them.

Perceived likelihood and previous exposure to unwanted sexual behavior. The only variable on the DQ which correlated $r = .30$ or greater with IRQ question two was the variable measured in DQ question 10--"previous exposure to unwanted sexual behavior" (see Table 18). Situation 2 ("accidental" touch), situation 3 (persistent

Table 18

Perceived Likelihood Correlated With Previous Exposure To Unwanted Sexual Behavior

Situation	Point Biserial Correlation	r^2	Significance
1	.24630	.06066	.0013
2	.42118	.17739	.00001
3	.33815	.11434	.00001
4	.27026	.07304	.0004
5	.25331	.06417	.0009
6	.25337	.06420	.0009
7	.32826	.10775	.00001
8	.08867	.00786	.2531
9	.14741	.02173	.0563
10	.06479	.00429	.4041

dinner invitations from supervisor), and situation 7 (foreman looks subject up and down) correlated $r > .30$ while situation 1 (picture of nude), situation 4 (whistles from men in auto plant), situation 5 (off-colour comment from colleague), and situation 6 (dinner invitation from supervisor before promotion) correlated $r > .20$. Only the three most blatant situations (situations 8, 9, and 10) did not follow this pattern, and this is accounted for by the fact that most of the women, regardless of how they answered DQ question 10, found all three situations highly unlikely.

Chi-square tests of independence were done with the raw scores to explore these relationships further (see Table 19). The chi-square calculations, with two degrees of freedom, were significant at the $p < .00001$ level for situation 2 (touch), the $p < .001$ level for situation 7 (foreman), the $p < .01$ level for situation 5 (comment) and situation 6 (dinner invitation), and the $p < .05$ level for situation 1 (picture), situation 4 (whistles) and situation 10 (retaliation). Although the majority of both those who had and those who had not experienced unwelcome sexual behaviors felt that the situations were unlikely to happen to them, there was a slight tendency for those who had experienced unwelcome behaviors to make higher estimates of the likelihood that the situations could happen to them.

Table 19

Relationship Between Likelihood and Previous Exposure To Unwanted Sexual Behavior

	Experienced Unwanted Behavior			No Unwanted Behavior			
	Likelihood			Likelihood			
Situation	10%-40%	50%-70%	80%-100%	10%-40%	50%-70%	80%-100%	Chi-Square
1	70%	10%	20%	86%	03%	10%	07.135
2	40%	32%	28%	79%	12%	09%	26.427
3	53%	27%	20%	70%	18%	11%	05.760
4	53%	24%	23%	72%	15%	12%	07.277
5	47%	29%	23%	70%	18%	11%	09.287
6	54%	37%	09%	79%	16%	05%	11.728
7	44%	34%	21%	74%	14%	12%	15.615
8	76%	17%	07%	87%	09%	03%	03.662
9	70%	23%	06%	84%	11%	05%	04.647
10	70%	24%	05%	81%	10%	09%	06.487

Perceived likelihood and age. A pattern of marginal negative correlations was demonstrated between perceived likelihood and age (see Table 20) where situation 2 ("accidental" touch), situation 3 (persistent dinner invitations from supervisor), situation 5 (off-colour comment from colleague), situation 6 (dinner invitation from supervisor before promotion), situation 7 (foreman looks subject up and down), and situation 9 (attempt by manager to coerce subject into sexual relationship) correlate $r > -.20$.

Chi-square tests of independence were calculated to explore this relationship further (see Table 21). The chi-square tests for situation 2 (touch) and situation 7 (foreman) were significant at the $p < 0.05$ level (chi-square = 14.452 and 13. 046 respectively with four degrees of freedom). This would indicate that the older women were slightly less likely than the younger women to believe that these two incidents could happen to them. Chi-square could not be computed for situation 6 because more than 20% of the cells contained fewer than five responses. However, the same pattern was apparent also for situation 6. Despite the marginal negative correlation noted between likelihood and age, over 60% of all subjects found the 10 situations unlikely for them.

Perceived likelihood and family income. Very mild negative correlations were demonstrated between perceived likelihood and family income (see Table 22). It was the

Table 20

Perceived Likelihood Correlated With Age

Situation	Point Biserial Correlation	r^2	Significance
1	-.09591	.00920	.2162
2	-.27911	.07790	.0002
3	-.26398	.06969	.0005
4	-.15907	.02530	.0394
5	-.24129	.05822	.0016
6	-.22383	.05010	.0035
7	-.26442	.06992	.0005
8	-.15247	.02325	.0485
9	-.29370	.08626	.0001
10	-.16340	.02670	.0343

Table 21

Relationship Between Age And Perceived Likelihood

Situation	Age 15-29 Years			Age 30-49 Years			Age 50-65 Years		
	Likelihood			Likelihood			Likelihood		
	10%-40%	50%-70%	80%-100%	10%-40%	50%-70%	80%-100%	10%-40%	50%-70%	80%-100%
1	75%	11%	14%	71%	10%	18%	76%	16%	08%
2	47%	39%	14%	51%	27%	22%	84%	04%	12%
3	46%	31%	23%	65%	26%	09%	67%	17%	17%
4	52%	28%	20%	60%	23%	17%	67%	21%	12%
5	43%	37%	20%	62%	22%	16%	68%	20%	12%
6	49%	43%	08%	68%	28%	04%	72%	16%	12%
7	37%	41%	21%	64%	23%	13%	68%	16%	16%
8	72%	23%	05%	84%	12%	04%	83%	08%	08%
9	62%	28%	09%	76%	20%	04%	87%	12%	00%
10	61%	32%	06%	74%	20%	07%	81%	08%	11%

Table 22

Perceived Likelihood Correlated With Family Income

Situation	Point Biserial Correlation	r^2	Significance
1	-.07461	.00557	.3409
2	-.13220	.01748	.0905
3	-.18817	.03541	.0155
4	-.12271	.01506	.1164
5	-.16913	.02860	.0299
6	-.18777	.03526	.0157
7	-.20790	.04322	.0074
8	-.22182	.04921	.0042
9	-.20367	.04248	.0087
10	-.24610	.06057	.0014

more distasteful situations--situation 7 (foreman), situation 8 (coin), situation 9 (proposition) and situation 10 (retaliation)--which correlated $r > -.20$. These correlations are very small and cannot support generalization.

Feelings And Demographic Variables

Feelings and age. The responses about feelings subjects believed they would feel in each of the 10 situations (IRQ question three) were sorted into five clusters (see Appendix VI).

There were no consistently strong correlations between the five feeling clusters and age. Cluster four (positive feelings toward the aggressor) presented a correlation of $r = .36$ with age in situation six only (see Table 23). Situation six involves a dinner invitation from a supervisor who wishes to "know the subject better in order to recommend her for promotion". The mild correlation noted suggests that older women may have been slightly more likely than younger women to consider such an invitation a legitimate request. This was supported by the correlation of $r = -.24$ between age and discomfort level for situation six. The correlation indicated a very slight tendency for older women to feel less discomfort with this situation. However, the correlation between age and likelihood of $r = -.22$ also indicated a very slight tendency for older women to feel that the situation was unlikely to happen to them.

Table 23

Age Correlated With Positive Feelings Toward the Aggressor

Situation	Point Biserial Correlation	r^2	Significance
1	.05715	.00327	.4618
2	.16429	.02699	.0333
3	.15283	.02336	.0480
4	.19219	.03694	.0126
5	-.01177	.00014	.8797
6	.36392	.13244	.00001
7	.15054	.02415	.0514
8	.00729	.00005	.9253
9	.12445	.01549	.1080
10*			

*No subject expressed positive feelings about the aggressor in situation 10.

Feelings and Job Status. There was a mild tendency in five situations for women who worked at more than one job (one full-time and one part-time) to omit IRQ question three which asks for a description of feelings that would be elicited by the 10 situations. This was noted for situation 1 (picture of nude), situation 2 ("accidental" touch), situation 4 (whistles from the men in the auto shop), situation 5 (off-colour comment from colleague), and situation 10 (retaliation by supervisor) which received correlations of r = .34, .30, .25, .33, and .25 respectively (see Table 24). These are difficult situations to clarify feelings about and it is possible that women who juggle both a full-time and a part-time job would be accustomed to managing the time demands of their work schedules by avoiding unclear situations.

Feelings and supervisory status. There was a moderate correlation of r = .32 between number supervised and feelings directed inwards for situation 1 only. Situation 1 involves the picture of a nude on the wall in the office of a colleague. The results here were biased by the fact that the two subjects who supervised more than 20 staff both responded that they would feel embarrassment or self-depreciation in the situation. The small number of subjects (N = 2) in this category (see Table 10) renders this correlation unreliable. When the two senior supervisors were included with the other supervisors and a chi-square test of independence was

Table 24

Job Status Correlated With Omission of IRQ Question 3 (Description of Feelings Elicited by The Situation)

Situation	Point Biserial Correlation	r^2	Significance
1	.33697	.08760	.00001
2	.29597	.08760	.0001
3	.06943	.00482	.3721
4	.24908	.06204	.0011
5	.32960	.10864	.00001
6	.16152	.02609	.0363
7	.06871	.00472	.3762
8	.06079	.00369	.4343
9	.15325	.02349	.0473
10	.25129	.06315	.0010

done comparing feelings of supervisors and non-supervisors, the results were not significant at a $p < .05$ level (see Table 25).

4.22 Relationship Between Interpretation of Sexually Oriented Behavior And Personality Variables

Interpretation of responses to sexually oriented behavior was measured on IRQ question one (discomfort level), IRQ question two (perceived likelihood), and IRQ question three (feelings). Relationships between interpretation of sexually oriented behavior and personality variables (JPI) are explored in this section.

Discomfort Level And Personality

Three JPI variables (anxiety, conformity and self esteem) correlated slightly with level of discomfort (IRQ question one).

Level of discomfort and anxiety. There was a marginal correlation between anxiety and level of discomfort in situation 1 (picture of nude woman), situation 4 (whistles from male co-workers), and situation 7 (foreman eying subject up and down). The correlations were $r = .26$, .23, and .32 for situations 1, 4, and 7 respectively (see Table 26). These situations involve behavior which is very difficult to assess as socially acceptable or unacceptable because it is not easy, with these three types of behavior, to determine where appreciation ends and disrespect begins.

Table 25

Relationship Between Supervisory Status and Feelings

Situation 1--Picture of Nude

Supervisory Status	Feelings Outward	Feelings Inward	Mixed Feelings	Positive Feelings
Does not supervise any staff	33% (62)	12% (22)	07% (13)	13% (25)
Does supervise staff	17% (31)	07% (14)	04% (07)	07% (13)

Chi-Square = 0.360 Degrees of Freedom = 3 $p<0.9484$

Table 26

Anxiety Correlated With Level of Discomfort

Situation	Point Biserial Correlation	r^2	Significance
1	.26504	.07025	.0005
2	.08847	.00783	.2541
3	.15123	.02287	.0504
4	.23447	.05497	.0022
5	.13396	.01794	.0834
6	.12913	.01668	.0953
7	.32239	.10393	.00001
8	.14645	.02145	.0582
9	.09099	.00828	.2408
10	.11292	.01275	.1450

Chi-square tests of independence were done to explore the relationships further (see Table 27). The five discomfort categories in IRQ question one were collapsed to form two categories in order to calculate chi-square. "No discomfort" and "slight discomfort" became "low discomfort", while "medium", "considerable", and "extreme" discomfort became "high discomfort". The scores on the JPI were divided into three categories for the purpose of calculating chi-square. It was necessary to collapse the categories in this way in order to have a large enough number in each cell to calculate a valid chi-square. For situation 1 (picture), situation 3 (persistent dinner invitation), situation 4 (whistles), and situation 5 (comment), those whose anxiety scores on the JPI were above a standard (T) score of 38 were more likely to express high discomfort in relation to these situations.

The chi-square results for these four situations were significant at the $p < 0.05$ level. Chi-square, with two degrees of freedom, was 7.351, 6.166, 6.764 and 9.001 for situations 1, 3, 4 and 5 respectively. Chi-square could not be calculated for situations 8, 9, and 10 because of the small number of subjects expressing little to no discomfort. Subjects found these three situations uncomfortable, regardless of their JPI Anxiety scores.

Level of discomfort and conformity. There was a small positive correlation between conformity and level of

Table 27

Relationship Between Level of Discomfort And Anxiety

Situation	Anxiety Score 23-37		Anxiety Score 38-52		Anxiety Score 53-67	
	Low Discomfort	High Discomfort	Low Discomfort	High Discomfort	Low Discomfort	High Discomfort
1	15%	08%	20%	23%	13%	21%
2	09%	14%	19%	24%	09%	24%
3	08%	15%	16%	27%	06%	28%
4	08%	14%	12%	31%	05%	29%
5	13%	10%	18%	26%	08%	25%
6	08%	14%	12%	32%	10%	23%
7	08%	14%	16%	28%	07%	28%
8	01%	22%	01%	42%	01%	33%
9	02%	21%	02%	39%	03%	32%
10	02%	21%	01%	41%	01%	33%

discomfort on situation 1 (picture), situation 4 (whistles), and situation 7 (foreman). Correlations were r = .23, .21, and .23 respectively (see Table 28). It would be logical to expect that those who scored higher on conformity would also feel more discomfort in these difficult to interpret situations.

Chi-square tests of independence were calculated to explore the relationships further (see Table 29). Results for situation 1 (picture of nude) and situation 4 (whistles) were significant at the $p < 0.05$ level. Chi-square, with two degrees of freedom, was 8.650 and 9.777 for situations 1 and 4 respectively. Results indicated a slight tendency for those with a standard (T) score of 42 and above on conformity to be more likely to find the two situations uncomfortable than they would be to find them comfortable.

Level of discomfort and self-esteem. There were small negative correlations between self-esteem and level of discomfort on six situations. Correlations for situation 1 (picture), situation 2 (touch), situation 4 (whistles), situation 5 (comment), situation 9 (proposition), and situation 10 (retaliation) were r = -.22, -.21, -.24, -.25, -.28, and -.24 respectively (see Table 30).

Chi-square tests of independence were calculated to explore the relationship further (see Table 31). Results for situations 1 (picture), 2 (touch), 3 (persistent

Table 28

Conformity Correlated With Level of Discomfort

Situation	Point Biserial Correlation	r^2	Significance
1	.22618	.05116	.0032
2	.09965	.00993	.1987
3	.17901	.03204	.0202
4	.21364	.04564	.0054
5	.17909	.03207	.0202
6	.18193	.03310	.0183
7	.22585	.05101	.0032
8	.12960	.01680	.0941
9	.09698	.00941	.2111
10	.19687	.03876	.0105

Table 29

Relationship Between Level of Discomfort And Conformity

Situation	Conformity Score 28-41		Conformity Score 42-55		Conformity Score 56-68	
	Low Discomfort	High Discomfort	Low Discomfort	High Discomfort	Low Discomfort	High Discomfort
1	22%	13%	19%	25%	07%	14%
2	16%	20%	16%	28%	06%	15%
3	13%	22%	11%	28%	05%	20%
4	14%	22%	09%	34%	02%	19%
5	15%	20%	18%	25%	05%	17%
6	11%	24%	15%	29%	04%	17%
7	13%	22%	14%	29%	04%	17%
8	01%	33%	02%	42%	00%	21%
9	04%	31%	02%	41%	02%	19%
10	04%	31%	01%	43%	00%	22%

Table 30

Self Esteem Correlated With Level of Discomfort

Situation	Point Biserial Correlation	r^2	Significance
1	-.21652	.04688	.0048
2	-.20538	.04218	.0076
3	-.16127	.02601	.0368
4	-.23575	.05558	.0021
5	-.25180	.06340	.0010
6	-.15044	.02263	.0516
7	-.14082	.01983	.0687
8	-.11851	.01404	.1260
9	-.27581	.07607	.0003
10	-.23688	.05611	.0020

Table 31

Relationship Between Level of Discomfort And Self Esteem

Situation	Self Esteem Score 29-42		Self Esteem Score 43-55		Self Esteem Score 56-68	
	Low Discomfort	High Discomfort	Low Discomfort	High Discomfort	Low Discomfort	High Discomfort
1	04%	07%	17%	26%	27%	19%
2	02%	08%	11%	33%	24%	22%
3	03%	08%	09%	34%	18%	28%
4	02%	09%	07%	36%	16%	30%
5	02%	09%	14%	30%	23%	22%
6	03%	08%	13%	31%	15%	30%
7	02%	08%	11%	31%	17%	30%
8	01%	10%	01%	42%	01%	44%
9	00%	11%	04%	41%	04%	40%
10	00%	11%	02%	42%	02%	42%

dinner invitation), 4 (whistles), and 5 (comment) were significant at the $p < 0.05$ level. Chi-square, with two degrees of freedom, was 8.199, 14.403, 6.156, 7.462 and 8.244 respectively. For these five situations, those with a standard (T) score below 56 on the JPI Self-Esteem scale were more likely to report high discomfort than they were to report low discomfort. Most subjects reported high discomfort for situations 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 independent of their self-esteem score.

Perceived Likelihood And Personality

There were only two personality variables (risk taking and social adroitnesss) that correlated sufficiently with perceived likelihood (IRQ question two) to be reported.

Perceived likelihood and risk taking. Although there were no strong correlations here, there was a consistent pattern of mild correlations (see Table 32). All but situations 9 and 10 (two of the more unpleasant situations) correlated $r > .20$, with situation 5 (comment) correlating $r > .30$. Chi-square tests of independence were calculated to explore the relationships further (see Table 33). Chi-square tests for situations 5 (comment) and 7 (foreman) were significant at the $p < .05$ level. Chi-square, with four degrees of freedom, was 15.215 and 15.803 respectively for these two situations. Chi-square for situations 1, 8, 9 and 10 could not be calculated because of the small frequencies in some of

Table 32

Risk Taking Correlated With Perceived Likelihood

Situation	Point Biserial Correlation	r^2	Significance
1	.23778	.05654	.0019
2	.20080	.04032	.0091
3	.26711	.07135	.0005
4	.27052	.07318	.0004
5	.30630	.09382	.0001
6	.23910	.05717	.0018
7	.28942	.08376	.0001
8	.22142	.04903	.0039
9	.13400	.01796	.0833
10	.18744	.03513	.0150

Table 33

Relationship Between Perceived Likelihood And Risk Taking

	Risk Taking Score 33-46			Risk Taking Score 47-61			Risk Taking Score 62-76		
	Likelihood			Likelihood			Likelihood		
Situation	10%-40%	50%-70%	80%-100%	10%-40%	50%-70%	80%-100%	10%-40%	50%-70%	80%-100%
1	54%	02%	10%	18%	04%	02%	06%	00%	04%
2	43%	14%	10%	14%	05%	04%	03%	03%	04%
3	45%	15%	07%	13%	05%	06%	04%	02%	03%
4	47%	11%	08%	11%	07%	06%	05%	02%	03%
5	42%	16%	08%	15%	05%	04%	02%	02%	05%
6	46%	17%	03%	17%	05%	02%	04%	04%	02%
7	41%	17%	08%	16%	04%	04%	03%	02%	05%
8	56%	07%	02%	20%	04%	01%	07%	01%	02%
9	52%	10%	04%	19%	05%	00%	06%	02%	02%
10	51%	10%	05%	19%	05%	01%	06%	02%	02%

the cells. Results of chi-square tests of independence (see Table 33) indicated that those with a standard (T) score below 47 on risk taking on the JPI were likely to see situations 1 to 7 as improbable.

Perceived likelihood and social adroitness. There was a slight correlation between scores on JPI Social Adroitness and perceived likelihood for situations 2 (typist--"accidential" touch), 5 (off-colour comment from colleague), 6 (dinner invitation from supervisor to prepare for promotion of subject), 7 (foreman eying subject up and down), 8 (boss dropping coin in blouse), and 10 (retaliation for refusal) with all of these correlations falling between $r > .20$ and $r < .29$ (see Table 34).

These correlations were explored further with chi-square tests of independence (see Table 35). Results for situations 4 and 7 reached the $p < 0.05$ and $p < .01$ significance levels respectively. Chi-square, with four degrees of freedom, was 9.580 for situation 4 and 14.014 for situation 7. Chi-square could not be calculated for situations 3, 8, 9 and 10. These results indicated that those with standard (T) scores below 40 on the JPI Social Adroitness scale were likely to feel that situations 4 (whistles) and 7 (foreman) would not be apt to happen to them. For the other eight situations, subjects tended to see the incidents as unlikely to happen to them regardless of their social adroitness score.

Table 34

Social Adroitness Correlated With Perceived Likelihood

Situation	Point Biserial Correlation	r^2	Significance
1	.18793	.03532	.0147
2	.20165	.04166	.0088
3	.18912	.03577	.0141
4	.16178	.02617	.0362
5	.27036	.07309	.0004
6	.25889	.06702	.0007
7	.27787	.07721	.0003
8	.24726	.06114	.0012
9	.17455	.03047	.0236
10	.22524	.05073	.0033

Table 35

Relationship Between Perceived Likelihood And Social Adroitness

	Sca Score 20-39			Sca Score 40-59			Sca Score 60-81		
	Likelihood			Likelihood			Likelihood		
Situation	10%-40%	50%-70%	80%-100%	10%-40%	50%-70%	80%-100%	10%-40%	50%-70%	80%-100%
1	18%	02%	03%	53%	04%	09%	08%	01%	03%
2	17%	03%	03%	39%	14%	11%	04%	04%	04%
3	17%	04%	02%	38%	16%	11%	07%	02%	02%
4	17%	02%	04%	42%	14%	10%	04%	03%	04%
5	16%	04%	02%	40%	16%	10%	04%	04%	04%
6	16%	07%	00%	46%	16%	04%	06%	04%	02%
7	18%	03%	02%	38%	16%	11%	04%	04%	04%
8	21%	01%	01%	53%	10%	02%	07%	02%	02%
9	20%	02%	01%	49%	13%	04%	08%	02%	01%
10	21%	02%	00%	48%	13%	04%	07%	02%	03%

Feelings And Personality Variables

None of the correlations between feelings (IRQ question three) and the 15 variables on the JPI were large enough to report.

4.23 Relationship Between Interpretation of Sexually Oriented Behavior And Sex-Role Identity

The four BSRI categories were used to measure sex-role identity. The BSRI did not correlate substantially with any of the measures of interpretation of sexually oriented behavior (level of discomfort, perceived likelihood, and feelings). This would imply that sex-role identity as measured on the BSRI was not related to one's responses to IRQ questions one, two and three.

4.3 Research Question Two

The intent of this research question was to explore relationships between working women's anticipated responses to sexually oriented behavior in the work place and (a) demographic variables, (b) personality variables, (c) sex-role identity, and (d) interpretations of the behavior. The results of the point biserial correlations, chi-square tests, and relevant frequency counts are reported in this section.

4.31 Relationship Between Anticipated Responses And Demographic Variables

The measures of "anticipated response" used in this study were (a) IRQ question four (anticipated best response), and (b) IRQ question six (anticipated alternative response). Demographic variables used were the questions on the DQ. In IRQ question four, subjects were asked what was the best way to respond to the situation described in the question. Responses were sorted into five clusters (see Appendix VII).

Anticipated Best Response And Demographic Variables

There was little correlation between any demographic variables and anticipated best response. The only demographic variable which correlated at all was age which showed a mild negative correlation with the cluster one ("direct attempt to cope") response. This correlation showed up only for situation 6 (dinner invitation) and 7 (foreman). Correlations were -.38 and -.26 respectively (See Table 36). This would indicate a very slight tendency for older women to avoid directly confronting the aggressor in these two situations.

Anticipated Alternate Response And Demographic Variables

Subjects were asked on IRQ question six to indicate what response they would be likely to give if they could not actually do what they had outlined in their anticipated best response (IRQ question four).

Table 36

Age Correlated With Anticipated Best Response "Direct Attempt To Cope"

Situation	Point Biserial Correlation	r^2	Significance
1	-.19040	.03625	.0134
2	-.17753	.03152	.0213
3	-.19636	.03856	.0107
4	-.10229	.01046	.1870
5	-.19848	.03939	.0099
6	-.37514	.14073	.00001
7	-.25982	.06751	.0007
8	-.12810	.01643	.0977
9	.09950	.00990	.1994
10	-.01963	.00038	.8006

There were moderate positive correlations between alternate response cluster two (withdrawal) and the number supervised for situation 1 (picture), situation 4 (whistles), situation 8 (coin), and situation 9 (proposition). The correlations for these four situations were r = .23, .32, .23, and .44 respectively (see Table 37). These results were biased by the small number of subjects (two) who supervise more than 20 staff (see Table 10). Both of these subjects offered a cluster two response in these four situations. The small number of subjects in this category render these figures unreliable.

There was a moderate, positive correlation between number supervised and alternate response cluster four (behavior accepting of situation or encouraging of relationship) for one situation--situation 6 (dinner invitation)--which had a correlation of r = .43 (see Table 38). These results could mean that women who are senior supervisors might see a dinner situation as more likely to be legitimately job related as more senior people are more likely to have experienced work-related lunches and dinners. However, these results are questionable because of the small number of subjects who supervise over 20 staff.

Table 37

Supervisory Status Correlated With Anticipated Alternate Response "Coping By Withdrawing"*

Situation	Point Biserial Correlation	r^2	Significance
1	.22857	.05224	.0790
2	-.07395	.00547	.5744
3	-.07395	.00547	.5744
4	.32041	.10266	.0126
5	.11998	.01439	.3612
6			
7	.01525	.00023	.9079
8	.23181	.05374	.0747
9	.44458	.19765	.0004
10	-.11910	.01418	.3647

*N = 60 (only subjects with supervisory responsibilities are included.)

Table 38

Supervisory Status Correlated With Alternate Response "Likes Aggressor" (N = 60)

Situation	Point Biserial Correlation	r^2	Significance
1*			
2	-.10382	.01078	.1805
3	.09325	.00870	.2293
4	.05505	.00303	.6761
5	-.05802	.00337	.6597
6	.43060	.18542	.0006
7	.08275	.00685	.5296
8*			
9*			
10*			

* No subject chose this alternate response for these situations.

4.32 Relationship Between Anticipated Response And Personality Variables

There were no correlations between JPI scores and either anticipated best response (IRQ question four) or anticipated alternate response (IRQ question six) which met the reporting criteria. This would indicate that there was no relationship between personality as measured on the JPI and how women in this sample anticipated they would respond to the 10 situations on the IRQ.

4.33 Relationship Between Anticipated Response And Sex-Role Identity

There were no correlations between BSRI scores and either anticipated best response (IRQ question four) or anticipated alternate response (IRQ question six) which met the reporting criteria. This would indicate that there was no relationship between sex-role identity as measured on the BSRI and how women in this sample anticipated they would respond to the 10 IRQ situations.

4.34 Relationship Between Anticipated Response And Interpretation of Sexually Oriented Behavior

Subjects' responses on the measures of anticipated response (IRQ questions four and six) were correlated with their responses on measures of interpretation of sexually oriented behavior (IRQ question one--level of discomfort; IRQ question two--likelihood; and IRQ

question three--feelings). Again very few correlations were large enough to report.

Anticipated Best Response And Interpretation

Only one of the measures of interpretation (IRQ question one--level of discomfort) correlated somewhat with anticipated best response. There was a moderate correlation between anticipated best response cluster one (direct attempt to cope) and level of discomfort for situation 1 (picture), situation 2 (touch), and situation 6 (dinner invitation). Correlations for these three situations were r = .31, .36, and .48 respectively (see Table 39).

Chi-square tests of independence were done to explore the relationships further (see Table 40). Results for situations 1 and 2 were at the $p < .01$ and $p < 0.05$ levels respectively. Chi-square, with one degree of freedom, was 9.645 for situation 1 and 5.083 for situation 2. These results indicated that subjects who offered a cluster one (direct attempt to cope) response for IRQ question four in these two situations had a slight tendency to experience high discomfort. Discomfort did not seem to be related to the choice of cluster two (withdrawal) responses for situation 2, while slightly more of those who chose a cluster two response for situation 1 reported very little expected discomfort. Chi-square could not be calculated for situation 6 as no subject chose a cluster two response for this situation.

Table 39

Anticipated Best Response "Direct Attempt To Cope" Correlated With Level of Discomfort

Situation	Point Biserial Correlation	r^2	Significance
1	.31059	.09647	.00001
2	.36386	.13239	.00001
3	.10541	.01111	.1739
4	.11394	.01298	.1414
5	.09439	.00890	.2236
6	.48002	.23042	.00001
7	.06981	.00487	.3686
8	.04155	.00173	.5928
9	-.01183	.00014	.8791
10	-.03658	.00134	.6378

Table 40

Relationship Between Level of Discomfort And Anticipated Best Response

Situation	"Direct Attempt to Cope" Response		"Coping by Withdrawing" Response	
	Low Discomfort	High Discomfort	Low Discomfort	High Discomfort
1	18%	36%	28%	18%
2	23%	56%	11%	10%
3	28%	68%	01%	03%
4	06%	19%	16%	59%
5	31%	49%	07%	13%
6	21%	79%	00%	00%
7	16%	38%	15%	31%
8	03%	77%	01%	20%
9	07%	83%	01%	10%
10	04%	93%	00%	03%

However, 79% of those who chose a cluster one response also expected to experience high discomfort in situation 6.

Results of Chi-square tests for the remaining seven situations did not suggest a relationship between discomfort level and choice between a cluster one and cluster two response. In fact, the majority of subjects expected to experience high discomfort in situations 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, and 10, irrespective of their response choice.

There was a moderate negative correlation between discomfort level and anticipated "best" response cluster four (encourages relationship with aggressor) for situation 2 (touch), situation 4 (whistles), and situation 6 (dinner invitation). The correlations were r = -.21, -.27, and -.43 respectively (see Table 41). Most of the subjects who offered a cluster four response for situations 1, 2, 4, and 6 felt that they would experience little discomfort in these situations (see Table 42). However the number of subjects who offered a cluster four response was so small that the results cannot be generalized further.

Anticipated Alternate Response And Interpretation

There were no correlations between IRQ question six (anticipated alternate response) and (a) IRQ question one (level of discomfort), (b) IRQ question two (likelihood), and (c) IRQ question three (feelings) which met the

Table 41

Level of Discomfort And Anticipated Best Response

"Encouraging Relationship With Aggressor"

Situation	Point Biserial Correlation	r^2	Significance
1	-.18983	.03604	.0137
2	-.20955	.04391	.0064
3	-.05816	.00338	.4539
4	-.27234	.07417	.0004
5	-.05757	.00331	.4586
6	-.43508	.18929	.00001
7	-.06763	.00457	.3838
8*			
9*			
10*			

*No subject offered a cluster four response for these situations.

Table 42

Cross Tabulation: Level of Discomfort And Anticipated Best Response "Encourage Relationship With Aggressor"*

Situation	Level of Discomfort	
	Low	High
1	03	00
2	05	01
3	01	02
4	09	06
5	02	01
6	18	03
7	01	01
8	00	00
9	00	00
10	00	00

*Results reported as frequency counts because of the small number of subjects who chose this response.

reporting criteria.

4.4 Research Question Three

The intent of this research question was to explore relationships between subjects' self-efficacy, or confidence that they could actually carry out their anticipated best response and (a) their interpretation of sexually oriented behavior, (b) their anticipated responses, (c) demographic variables, (d) personality variables, and (e) sex-role identity. The results of the point biserial correlations and chi-square tests of independence are reported in this section.

4.41 Relationship Between Self-Efficacy Expectations And Interpretation of Sexually Oriented Behavior

The measure of self-efficacy expectations used in this study was IRQ question five which measures strength of self-efficacy as described by Bandura (1977a; 1977b). Subjects indicated, on a scale of 10% to 100%, the probability that they could actually carry out the anticipated best response they described for IRQ question four. Interpretation of sexually oriented behavior was measured with IRQ question one (level of discomfort), question two (likelihood), and question three (feelings).

There were no correlations between IRQ question five and IRQ questions one, two, and three which met the

reporting criteria. This would indicate that there was no relationship between strength of self-efficacy and interpretation of sexually oriented behaviors as measured on the IRQ.

4.42 Relationship Between Self-Efficacy Expectations And Anticipated Response

The measures of anticipated response used in this study were IRQ question four (anticipated best response) and IRQ question six (anticipated alternate response).

There was a moderate, positive correlation between self-efficacy expectations and anticipated best response cluster one (direct attempt to cope) for situation 3 (persistent dinner invitation), situation 6 (dinner invitation), and situation 10 (retaliation). The correlations for these situations were $r = .37$, $.20$, and $.21$ respectively (see Table 43). For situation 3, 151 subjects (92%) suggested a cluster one response (see Table 44). Of those 151, 82% felt at least 80% certain that they could carry out their anticipated best response. The small number of subjects who chose cluster two (withdrawal), three (incongruent) or four (accepting) responses for situation 3 made it impossible to calculate chi-square for this situation.

There were no correlations between self-efficacy expectations (IRQ question five) and anticipated alternate response (IRQ question six) which met reporting

Table 43

Self-Efficacy Expectations Correlated With Anticipated Best Response "Direct Attempt to Cope"

Situation	Point Biserial Correlation	r^2	Significance
1	-.09837	.00968	.2046
2	.07767	.00603	.3170
3	.37502	.14064	.00001
4	-.05242	.00275	.4998
5	.05983	.00358	.4410
6	.20213	.04086	.0086
7	-.07916	.00627	.3077
8	.03550	.00126	.6478
9	.11415	.01303	.1407
10	.21290	.04532	.0056

Table 44

Self-Efficacy And Anticipated Best Response--Situation Three (Persistent Dinner Invitation)

Strength of Self-Efficacy	Direct Attempt to Cope	Coping by Withdrawing	Incongruent Response	Accepts Behavior
10%-40%	04%	01%	00%	01%
50%-70%	12%	00%	01%	00%
80%-100%	76%	02%	02%	01%

criteria.

4.43 Relationship Between Self-Efficacy Expectations And Demographic Variables

There were no correlations between self-efficacy expectations (IRQ question five) and demographic variables (DQ questions) which met reporting criteria.

4.44 Relationship Between Self-Efficacy Expectations And Personality Variables

There were three JPI variables (conformity, innovation, and self-esteem) which correlated slightly with self-efficacy expectations across a number of situations.

Self-Efficacy Expectations And Conformity

Conformity and self-efficacy expectations correlated slightly for situation 1 (picture), situation 3 (persistent dinner invitations), situation 6 (dinner invitation), and situation 8 (coin). The correlations were $r = -.25$, $-.26$, $-.27$, and $-.20$ respectively (see Table 45).

Chi-square tests of independence were done to explore these relationships further (see table 46). Chi-square for situation 8 (coin) was significant at the $p < .05$ level. With four degrees of freedom, chi-square = 10.757. Chi-square could not be calculated for situations 1, 3 and 6 because of small numbers in more

Table 45

Self-Efficacy Expectations Correlated With Conformity

Situation	Point Biserial Correlation	r^2	Significance
1	-.24897	.06119	.0011
2	-.11686	.01366	.1314
3	-.26180	.06854	.0006
4	-.07026	.00494	.3655
5	-.16210	.02628	.0358
6	-.26718	.07139	.0005
7	-.11096	.01231	.1522
8	-.20086	.04034	.0090
9	-.17982	.03234	.0197
10	-.16255	.02642	.0353

Table 46

Relationship Between Self-Efficacy And Conformity

	Cny Score 20-41			Cny Score 42-55			Cny Score 56-68		
	Self-Efficacy			Self-Efficacy			Self-Efficacy		
Situation	10%-40%	50%-70%	80%-100%	10%-40%	50%-70%	80%-100%	10%-40%	50%-70%	80%-100%
1	00%	02%	33%	04%	05%	35%	02%	05%	14%
2	01%	03%	30%	01%	05%	37%	04%	02%	16%
3	01%	02%	33%	02%	07%	34%	03%	04%	14%
4	03%	03%	29%	03%	09%	31%	02%	01%	18%
5	01%	02%	32%	03%	04%	35%	04%	02%	16%
6	01%	02%	33%	02%	07%	32%	02%	06%	14%
7	03%	04%	29%	03%	06%	33%	02%	03%	17%
8	01%	04%	30%	02%	06%	35%	04%	03%	14%
9	03%	03%	31%	03%	08%	30%	04%	05%	13%
10	01%	04%	30%	03%	07%	34%	03%	04%	14%

than 20% of the cells. For all four of these situations, most of the subjects with a standard (T) score below 42 on conformity felt that there was an 80% to 100% probability that they could carry out their anticipated best response. Of those who scored below 50% probability on self-efficacy expectation for situations 3, 6, and 8, between 44% and 58% scored above 56 on conformity.

Self-Efficacy Expectations And Innovation

There was a slight positive correlation between innovation and strength of self-efficacy for situation 1 (picture of nude), situation 5 (off-colour comment from colleague), situation 6 (dinner invitation from supervisor before promotion), and situation 10 (retaliation by supervisor). Correlations were r = .23, .21, .24, and .22 respectively (see Table 47).

Chi-square tests of independence were done to explore this relationship further. Of those who scored above a standard (T) score of 52 on innovation, very few scored below 50% level of probability on the strength of self-efficacy measure (see Table 48). Results were significant at the 0.05 level for situation 10 only. With four degrees of freedom, chi-square = 9.772 for situation 10 (retaliation). Chi-square could not be calculated for situations 1 and 5.

Self-Efficacy Expectations And Self-Esteem

There was a slight correlation between self-esteem and strength of self-efficacy expectations for situation

Table 47

Self-Efficacy Expectations Correlated With Innovation

Situation	Point Biserial Correlation	r^2	Significance
1	.22610	.05112	.0032
2	.16897	.02855	.0286
3	.14009	.01963	.0701
4	.06619	.00438	.3939
5	.21473	.04611	.0052
6	.23875	.05700	.0018
7	.09618	.00925	.2149
8	.18045	.03256	.0192
9	.11151	.01243	.1501
10	.21807	.04755	.0045

Table 48

Relationship Between Self-Efficacy And Innovation

Situation	Inv Score 27-39			Inv Score 40-52			Inv Score 53-65		
	Self-Efficacy			Self-Efficacy			Self-Efficacy		
	10%-40%	50%-70%	80%-100%	10%-40%	50%-70%	80%-100%	10%-40%	50%-70%	80%-100%
1	02%	04%	09%	04%	06%	40%	00%	03%	33%
2	02%	02%	11%	03%	05%	40%	01%	04%	32%
3	02%	02%	10%	04%	06%	39%	00%	04%	32%
4	01%	04%	09%	04%	06%	39%	03%	03%	30%
5	04%	01%	10%	03%	04%	41%	01%	02%	33%
6	01%	04%	09%	04%	07%	38%	01%	04%	32%
7	02%	01%	11%	03%	06%	38%	01%	07%	29%
8	01%	03%	11%	06%	07%	34%	01%	03%	34%
9	02%	04%	09%	06%	05%	36%	03%	06%	29%
10	02%	04%	08%	04%	06%	39%	01%	05%	30%

1 (picture), situation 2 (touch), situation 4 (whistles), and situation 6 (dinner invitation). Correlations were r = .26, .25, .22, and .25 respectively (see Table 49).

Cross-tabulations were done to examine this relationship further; however, chi-square tests could not be calculated because of the small numbers in several cells. Perusal of Table 50 revealed that not many subjects scored below a standard (T) score of 43 on the JPI Self-Esteem scale, and not many scored below 50% probability on the strength of self-efficacy measure. Of those who did score below 50% probability on the strength of self-efficacy measure, very few (0% to 15%) made high scores (above 55) on the JPI Self-Esteem scale.

4.45 Relationship Between Self-Efficacy Expectations And Sex-Role Identity

There were no correlations between IRQ question 5 (strength of self-efficacy) and BSRI categories (sex-role identification) which met the reporting criteria.

4.5 Research Question Four

The intent of this research question was to explore the relationship between factors preventing women from making their anticipated best responses and (a) interpretation of sexually oriented behavior, (b) anticipated responses, (c) self-efficacy expectations, (d) demographic variables, (e) personality variables, and

Table 49

Self-Efficacy Expectations Correlated With Self-Esteem

Situation	Point Biserial Correlation	r^2	Significance
1	.26060	.06791	.0006
2	.25024	.06262	.0011
3	.12982	.01685	.0935
4	.22030	.04853	.0041
5	.19954	.03982	.0095
6	.25332	.06417	.0009
7	.04219	.00178	.5871
8	.14347	.02058	.0636
9	.08044	.00647	.3000
10	.17124	.04932	.0265

Table 50

Relationship Between Self-Efficacy And Self Esteem

	Ses Score 29-42			Ses Score 43-55			Ses Score 56-68		
	Self-Efficacy			Self-Efficacy			Self-Efficacy		
Situation	10%-40%	50%-70%	80%-100%	10%-40%	50%-70%	80%-100%	10%-40%	50%-70%	80%-100%
1	01%	02%	08%	05%	04%	34%	00%	06%	40%
2	02%	01%	07%	02%	04%	35%	01%	05%	42%
3	01%	02%	08%	03%	05%	34%	01%	05%	40%
4	02%	01%	07%	05%	07%	31%	01%	05%	40%
5	02%	01%	08%	04%	04%	35%	01%	03%	41%
6	01%	02%	07%	04%	07%	31%	01%	06%	40%
7	01%	01%	09%	04%	06%	32%	03%	05%	38%
8	02%	01%	09%	05%	06%	32%	01%	07%	38%
9	02%	01%	08%	04%	08%	30%	03%	06%	36%
10	02%	02%	07%	03%	06%	33%	02%	07%	37%

(f) sex-role identity.

The measure of factors preventing women from carrying out their anticipated best responses was IRQ question seven. Subjects were asked in question seven to indicate what would prevent them from carrying out the anticipated best response they had outlined in question four. Responses were sorted into seven clusters (see Appendix VIII).

There were no correlations large enough to report between IRQ question seven and any of the above variables.

4.6 Summary

The summary of results covers only those results which met the reporting requirements outlined at the beginning of this chapter.

4.61 Summary: Research Question One

The intent of research question one was to explore relationships between interpretation of sexually oriented behavior and (a) demographic variables, (b) personality variables, and (c) sex-role identity. Interpretation of sexually oriented behavior was measured on three IRQ questions: question one (level of discomfort), question two (degree of likelihood), and question three (feelings). Demographic variables were measured on the 12 DQ questions, personality variables by the 15 JPI

scales, and sex-role identity by the four categories on the BSRI.

There were several demographic variables which correlated sufficiently with interpretation of sexually oriented behavior to meet the reporting criteria.

The examination of perceived likelihood and previous exposure to unwanted sexually oriented behavior (see Tables 18 and 19) demonstrated that there were approximately 60% of the subjects who saw all situations as unlikely to happen to them. However, there was a slight tendency found for those who saw situations 1 to 7 as at least 50% likely for them to have experienced unwanted sexual behavior of some sort at some point in their lives (see Table 12). Responses for situations 8, 9, and 10--the three most unpleasant situations--did not follow that pattern as most subjects, regardless of response for DQ question 10, saw these situations as highly unlikely.

Examination of perceived likelihood and age (see Tables 20 and 21) showed that although 60% of the subjects saw all 10 situations as unlikely, there was a mild tendency for older women to see less probability than younger women that situation 2 (touch), situation 6 (dinner invitation) and situation 7 (foreman) would happen to them.

There was a moderate correlation between age and feeling cluster four (positive feelings about situation

or aggressor) for situation 6 (dinner invitation). This indicated a mild tendency for older women to consider such an invitation a legitimate request (see Table 23).

Several personality variables correlated slightly with the measures of interpretation of sexually oriented behavior. Examination of discomfort level and anxiety (see Tables 26 and 27) showed that subjects with standard (T) scores of 38 or more on JPI Anxiety were slightly more likely to express feelings of high discomfort for situation 1 (picture), situation 3 (persistent dinner invitations), situation 4 (whistles), and situation 5 (comment).

Examination of discomfort level and conformity (see Tables 28 and 29) showed that subjects with standard (T) scores of 42 or above on JPI Conformity were likely to find situation 1 (picture) and situation 4 (whistles) uncomfortable.

Results of an examination of discomfort and self-esteem (see Tables 30 and 31) revealed that subjects with standard (T) scores below 56 on JPI Self-Esteem were likely to report medium to extreme discomfort for situation 1 (picture), situation 2 (touch), situation 3 (persistent dinner invitations), situation 4 (whistles), and situation 5 (comment).

Perceived likelihood and risk taking were examined (see Tables 32 and 33) and it was found that subjects with standard (T) scores below 47 on JPI Risk Taking were

likely to see situations 1 to 7 as unlikely to happen to them. This pattern did not hold for situations 8 (coin), 9 (proposition), and 10 (retaliation) because almost all subjects saw these situatons as unlikely, regardless of their scores on JPI Risk Taking.

4.62 Summary: Research Question Two

The intent of research question two was to explore relationships between working women's anticipated responses to sexually oriented behavior in the work place and the following: (a) demographic variables, (b) personality variables, (c) sex-role identity, and (d) interpretation of sexually oriented behavior. Anticipated responses were measured on IRQ question four (anticipated "best" response) and IRQ question six (anticipated "alternate" response). Answers to questions four and six were sorted into five clusters (Appendix VII).

An examination of anticipated best response and age (see Table 36) showed that there was a very slight tendency in situation 6 (dinner invitation) and situation 7 (foreman) for older women to avoid cluster one (direct approach to the problem) responses.

Results of an examination of level of discomfort and cluster one response (see Tables 39 and 40) showed that there was a slight tendency for subjects who offered a cluster one anticipated "best" response (direct approach

to the problem) for situation 1 (picture) and situation 2 (touch) to experience high discomfort.

Level of discomfort and cluster four (accepting behavior) response were examined (see Table 41 and 42). Results indicated that not many subjects chose a cluster four response. However, most of those who did offer this response in situation 1 (picture), situation 2 (touch), situation 4 (whistles), situation 5 (comment), and situation 6 (dinner invitation) felt that they would experience little or no discomfort in these situations.

4.63 Summary: Research Question Three

The intent of this research question was to explore relationships between subjects' self-efficacy expectations of their ability to carry out the anticipated best responses they described for IRQ question four and the following: (a) interpretation of sexually oriented behavior, (b) anticipated responses to sexually oriented behavior, (c) demographic variables, (d) personality variables, and (e) sex-role identity. Self-efficacy expectations were measured on IRQ question five which measures strength of self-efficacy.

Results of an examination of self-efficacy and cluster one (direct approach to the problem) anticipated "best" response (see Table 43 and 44) showed that for situation 3 (persistent dinner invitations), most of the subjects offered a cluster one response and 82% of these women also felt certain that they could carry out their

anticipated "best" response.

Examination of self-efficacy and conformity (see Tables 45 and 46) revealed that subjects with a standard (T) score below 42 on JPI Conformity tended to feel confident that they could carry out their anticipated "best" response for situation 1 (picture), situation 3 (persistent dinner invitations), situation 6 (dinner invitation), and situation 8 (coin).

Self-efficacy and self-esteem were examined (see Tables 49 and 50) and it was found that subjects who scored below 50% probability on IRQ question five (strength of self-efficacy) for situations 1 (picture), 2 (touch), 4 (whistles), and 6 (dinner invitation) tended also to make low scores on the JPI Self-Esteem scale.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

This study was conducted to investigate working women's interpretation of and response to sexually oriented behavior in the work place. The sample for the study was composed of 168 women employed by nine different Edmonton employers (see Table 1). Subjects were employed in jobs covering a range of 11 CCDO classifications (see Table 9). The age range of the sample was from 19 years to 65 years (see Table 2). Subjects completed four testing instruments.

Point biserial correlations were calculated to test the four research questions outlined in Chapter One. Chi-square tests of independence were done to investigate selected relationships further.

5.1 Limitations Of The Study

The limitations of this study must be kept in mind when interpreting the results and especially when generalizing from the data. Several factors in particular are important to note in this respect. The most serious limitation can be found in the sampling procedure. Although an attempt was made to procure a

random sample, those who were randomly chosen could only be invited to participate in the study. As was noted in Table 1, 34% of the women who were invited agreed to participate. Accepting this limitation of the study was necessary for ethical and practical reasons. It would have been unethical to attempt to pressure people to participate in a study which involved such a sensitive issue. Practically speaking, none of the employers would have permitted selection of their staff on anything other than a volunteer basis.

Because only 34% of those invited actually participated, generalization of the results will have to be restricted to a similar population of women representative of the ages and occupations represented in the study.

A second limitation on the interpretation of the results was the use of point biserial correlations. Point biserial correlations were used because of the dichotomous data collected on both the DQ and the IRQ. As has been noted in Chapter Three, correlations using dichotomous data tend to be smaller than correlations between two sets of continuous data. For this reason, correlations as small as $r = .20$ were reported in Chapter Four. However, the correlations obtained must still be considered as quite modest and cannot easily support generalization.

A third limitation was the use of a pencil and paper questionnaire to examine subjects' interpretations of and responses to unwanted ~~sexually oriented~~ behavior rather than using behavioral measures. Behavioral measures would have seriously limited the size of the sample. However, it must be assumed that there would be some difference between responses subjects could write on a questionnaire and actual behavioral responses they would make if confronted with the situation.

5.2 Incidence Of Sexual Harassment

Subjects were asked in DQ question 10 to indicate whether or not they had ever, in their lifetime, experienced "persistent and unwelcome sexual advances or embarrassing sexual comments at work, at school, or in some other setting". They were asked to rate the frequency of their experience on a four point scale from "frequently" to "never". Their responses, summarized in Table 9, showed that 47% of the women in the sample reported experiencing unwanted sexual behavior either "frequently" or "occasionally" at some time in their life. This is consistent with the incidence of sexual harassment reported in the Merit Systems Protection Board study (1981) where 42% of the sample reported experiencing sexual harassment in the 24 month period referred to in the study. If it can be assumed that

those who responded "hardly ever" on DQ question 10 had experienced unwanted sexual behavior at least once, the result would be 82% who had experienced this type of behavior at some point in their working lives--a percentage consistent with the 88% reported in the Red Book study (Safran, 1976).

5.3 Observed Patterns Across Situations

There were not many correlations for any of the four research questions which were large enough to meet reporting criteria. However, among those results that were reported, there appeared to be several patterns related to the degree of ambiguity involved in the situations. The more ambiguous situations (situation 1 to 7) tended to receive a wider variation in responses for IRQ questions one, two, three and four (see Tables 11-14) compared to the small variation in the responses to the least ambiguous situations (situations 8, 9, and 10).

5.31 Blatant Situations

Responses for the most blatant situations--Situation 8 (coin), situation 9 (proposition), and situation 10 (retaliation)--tended to be fairly uniform across the sample with a high level of discomfort (IRQ question one), low perceived likelihood (IRQ question two), high

frequency of cluster one feelings, or "feelings expressed outward toward the aggressor" (IRQ question three), and a high frequency of cluster one, or "direct approach", anticipated "best" responses (IRQ question 4).

The difference in response pattern between the ambiguous and blatant situations is consistent with the literature (Collins & Blodgett, 1981; Gutek, 1985; Gutek, Morasch & Cohen, 1983; Padgitt & Padgitt, 1986) where the subjects were found to have more difficulty interpreting ambiguous as opposed to blatant situations. Gutek, Morasch and Cohen (1983) suggested that sexuality in the work place had to be ambiguous if the initiator was to avoid possible negative consequences. Ambiguous behavior serves this purpose as the intent can be easily redefined by the perpetrator when confronted about the behavior.

There is an apparent contradiction in the response pattern for the three most blatant situations. The low perceived likelihood combined with the high discomfort level for the subjects is logical as the behavior described in these three situations is very unpleasant. It follows that most subjects would not want to see themselves as possible recipients of such behavior. The high frequency of feelings directed outwards for IRQ question three is also consistent with the low likelihood and high discomfort level as such unpleasant behavior would tend to elicit feelings of anger toward the perpetrator.

The apparent contradiction lies in the high rate of endorsement of cluster one (direct attempt to cope) anticipated best responses for these situations, which initially appears inconsistent with the high discomfort level. Also, the preference for this type of response is not consistent with the evidence in the literature (U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981) which found that most victims responded by attempting to ignore the behavior. However, this high frequency of cluster one responses is consistent with the defensive attribution theory introduced by Walster (1966) and developed by Shaver (1970). Walster suggested that the severity of an accident was an important factor in the assignment of responsibility by observers. The high frequency of "feelings outward" responses for IRQ question three in situations 8, 9, and 10 would indicate that most subjects were assigning responsibility to the perpetrator for the sexually oriented behavior in these situations. They were not blaming themselves. Shaver suggested that blame avoidance was a major motivator in defensive attribution. The high frequency of "direct attempt to cope" responses for IRQ question four for these three situations could be related to the concept of blame avoidance in two ways.

Firstly, blame avoidance could help to explain these results in that a direct approach to the problem would demonstrate that the subject was doing everything she could in the situation and therefore was blameless.

Secondly, these situations, which were so obviously unjustified in the first place, would not put the subject in a double bind as would the ambiguous situations. In these three blatant situations, subjects can respond without fearing blame from self or others for overreacting or for misunderstanding the meaning of the behavior. The inconsistency with the U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board study is not unexpected. That study found that the less extreme forms of sexual harassment were more frequent. Therefore, many of the subjects would have been referring to ignoring less severe (more ambiguous) forms of behavior than that involved in the three blatant situations in this study. Also, in the years between the data collection for Merit Systems study and the present study, there has been considerable discussion in the media about the best ways to handle sexual harassment in the work place.

Bandura (1977b), in a discussion of what he referred to as the "self-exonerative process", suggested that people are most likely to deter themselves from committing injurious acts towards others when the connection between the act and the consequences is clear (unambiguous). This idea could help to explain the high frequency of "direct attempt to cope" responses for the three blatant situations in that the causal connection between the act and possible consequences is clear, leaving no room for doubt as to who is responsible for

the situation. Therefore, the victim would be freed to respond directly without experiencing self blame or blame from others.

5.32 Ambiguous Situations

Situation 1 (picture), situation 2 (touch), situation 3 (persistent invitation), situation 4 (whistles), situation 5 (comment), situation 6 (promotion dinner), and situation 7 (foreman) all involve behavior for which the man's intent and North American society's role expectations for women are both unclear. These are situations in which a woman could anticipate acute embarrassment if she complained strongly and was told that she had misinterpreted the behavior.

Discomfort Level And Personality

There were moderate correlations between discomfort level and personality for situations 1 and 4. Women who made high scores on JPI Anxiety, those who made high scores on JPI Conformity, and those who made low scores on JPI Self-Esteem expressed high discomfort in these two situations. Although other women al o expressed high discomfort in situations 1 and 4, those who scored high on JPI Anxiety, or on JPI Conformity, and low on JPI Self-Esteem were most likely to express this degree of discomfort.

Situation 1 (picture) and situation 4 (whistles) are both situations which give women mixed messages. The

picture of the nude woman could be a demonstration of the owner's admiration for female beauty, or it could be a demonstration of an attitude toward women which views women as objects to fill male sexual needs. The constant debate in the media about erotica versus pornography would indicate that this issue is far from settled. The feelings women in the sample reported they would feel in this situation reflect this controversy as 50% expressed feelings "outward toward the aggressor", 19% expressed feelings directed "inward toward the self", 11% expressed mixed feelings and 20% expressed "positive" feelings toward the situation (see Table 13).

The whistles from male colleagues in situation 4 could also convey the same mixed message. This behavior could be interpreted as sincere admiration, or as something meant to trivialize and intimidate. It could also be seen as an attempt to treat women as sex objects rather than as respected colleagues. It is interesting to note that the feelings the women expressed for this situation (see Table 13) are largely "feelings inward" or embarrassment and self-denigrating feelings. This type of feeling was expressed in 50% of the responses for situation 4.

The social pressures to which North American women are exposed encourage women to feel complimented by male attention, regardless of the form the attention takes (Gutek, 1985). It is, therefore, understandable that

those women who feel more anxious, have more need to conform, and experience lower self-esteem would be more likely to experience discomfort in these two types of situations.

Regardless of the possible explanations for the discomfort level expressed for these two situations, the most important information to note is the fact that a high percentage of subjects believed that they would experience a good deal of discomfort if they had to work in an environment where pictures of nudes were displayed or if they were exposed to whistles from groups of male colleagues. This is consistent with the observation made by Collins and Blodgett (1981) that seriousness of sexual harassment should not be judged by the severity of the incident as their subjects reported experiencing considerable stress from persistent, "low level" harassment.

Discomfort Level And Anticipated Best Response

There was a moderate correlation between discomfort level and anticipated "best" response for situation 1 (picture), situation 2 (touch), and situation 6 (promotion dinner). In all three situations the perpetrator's intentions are particularly unclear. Subjects who offered a cluster one (direct approach) response expressed high discomfort (see Table 40). It can be assumed that discomfort served a motivating function for these women. Situations 1, 2 and 6 are

ambiguous enough that subjects might not take a direct approach unless their discomfort level was high enough that they felt compelled to do something to end the discomfort. This is consistent with the findings in the literature (Gutek, Morasch & Cohen, 1883; Padgitt & Padgitt, 1986) that ambiguous situations were more difficult to interpret and respond to.

Perceived Likelihood And Demographic Variables

A moderate relationship was also found between perceived likelihood and two demographic variables for situation 2 (touch) and situation 7 (foreman). Women who were 50 years of age or older, and women who had little or no previous exposure to unwanted sexual behavior felt that these situations were unlikely to happen to them.

Both situations 2 and 7 imply physical attractiveness on the part of the subject. In North American society physical attractiveness is often associated with youth. Consequently, older women may feel less likely to experience similar situations. Also, by age 50, many women will have been able to define for themselves how they wish to relate to men and may feel that the confidence of this decision would make them less likely to be approached in the manner described in situations 2 and 7. This would be consistent with Landsberg's (1982) suggestion, in reference to rape, that women who appear more able to foil an assault will be less likely to be assaulted.

A woman's ability to see situations 2 and 7 as likely to happen to her will also depend to a certain extent on her ability to believe that she can actually be a recipient of unwanted sexual behaviors. Jensen and Gutek (1982) applied Lerner's "just world" theory (Lerner & Miller, 1978) to attitudes about victims of unwanted sexually oriented behavior. The just world theory refers to the need some people seem to have to maintain a feeling of security for themselves by perceiving threatening events as more predictable or controllable than they really are. To do this they would have to deny the uncontrollable, or even random, nature of certain unpleasant or tragic events. Blaming the victims by believing that they contributed to their own fate is one way they could maintain a feeling of security. As long as they could be different from the victims in either personal qualities or behavior they could believe that they had some control over events and would not be likely to experience the victims' fate. This defensive form of thought is seen as basic to the "blame the victim" stance many take and frees individuals from the anxiety of having to accept themselves as possible victims.

Those who have experienced unwanted sexual behaviors know it is possible that they can be approached with unwanted sexually oriented behavior. Therefore, it is not surprising that women who had little or no previous experience with unwanted sexual behaviors would be more

likely to feel that the incidents would be unlikely to happen to them. This is certainly consistent with Jensen and Gutek's 1982 study where they found that women who had not experienced unwanted sexual behavior were more likely, than women who had, to attribute responsibility to the victim for preventing the situation.

It is possible that the variety of work settings incorporated into the 10 situations could have influenced the degree of perceived likelihood expressed by the subjects. There was an attempt to avoid having subjects try to identify with specific occupations in order to answer the questions. This was done by refraining from making reference to specific job roles, except in situation 2 (typing) and situation 8 (waitressing). Although an auto shop is referred to in situation 4, there is no reference made to the specific job role of the woman. Also, perceived likelihood was low for all 10 situations, with the three most unpleasant seen as the most unlikely of all. This would imply that the nature of the perpetrator's behavior had more influence on the perceived likelihood response than did occupation of subject.

Perceived Likelihood And Personality

There was also a moderate relationship found between perceived likelihood and two personality variables for situation 4 (whistles) and situation 7 (foreman). Those who made low scores on JPI Risk Taking and those who made

low scores on JPI Social Adroitness tended to express little likelihood that these two situations could happen to them.

Both situations 4 and 7 imply a nontraditional work setting, which might be an unlikely setting for a woman who scored low on JPI Risk Taking. These results suggest that the women in the sample who saw themselves as low risk takers, and those who felt less skilled socially, possibly felt that they would be less likely to venture into situations where the type of behavior described in situations 4 and 7 could occur. At first glance, this appears to be inconsistent with Landsberg's speculation (1982) that those least able to foil an assault would be the most likely victims. At second glance, however, it may indeed be a confirmation of Landsberg's speculation, as these women may very well exclude themselves from situations where they feel more vulnerable or less able to cope successfully. These results are also consistent with the suggestion made by Jensen and Gutek (1982) that people like to believe that they have some control over whether or not they are victimized, and therefore, define victims as having qualities they themselves do not have.

The perception of all 10 situations by so many subjects as unlikely to happen to them, and the pattern of responses indicating that the subjects saw the most unpleasant situations as the least likely for them, is consistent with defensive attribution theory as explained

by Walster (1966) and Shaver (1970). As suggested by Walster, the more severe situations elicited more defensive thought in that they were seen as less likely. It is quite possible that subjects would view the more severe situations as having less personal and situational relevance for them and, therefore, as Shaver suggested, find them less likely to happen to them--not because of the work role, but because of the severity of the perpetrator's behavior.

Age And Situation 6

Situation 6 involves a dinner invitation from the subject's supervisor who wants to get to "know her better" before recommending her for a promotion. Moderate correlations between age and several other variables were noted for this situation. Older women, or women over 50 years of age (N = 26), were more likely to express positive feelings about the situation (see Table 23), were more likely to feel less discomfort, were more likely to perceive the situation as unlikely for them (see Table 20), and were not likely to offer a cluster one (direct approach) response as their anticipated best response in this situation (see Table 36). The implication is that women over age 50 would be more likely to see the request as legitimate rather than as a request with an ulterior motive.

5.4 Feelings Elicited By Unwanted Sexual Behavior

The feelings elicited by the 10 situations were consistent with reports in the literature. For all situations, except situations 2 and 4, over 50% of the subjects' responses referred to feelings of anger, fear or shock directed outward toward the aggressor (see Table 13). For most situations, between 10% and 20% of the responses referred to feelings of embarrassment, guilt, anxiety or discouragement. However, subjects expressed this type of feeling more frequently for situation 4 (whistles), situation 7 (foreman), and situation 8 (coin). The feelings the subjects believed they would experience in these situations were very similar to those reported by Crull (1982), Errington and Davidson (1980), and Safran (1976) for sexual harassment victims.

The three situations with the highest frequency of feelings turned inward are interesting to note. Situation 4 (whistles) has been discussed already as a situation which incorporates society's mixed messages about women and sexuality. Fifty-two percent of the subjects' responses for this situation were in the "feelings inward" category. This is supported by the fact that 74% of the subjects believed that they would feel high discomfort in this situation (see Table 11).

For situation 7 (foreman) 34% of the responses were in the "feelings inward" category--an indication of the

self-blame or "blame the victim" tendency referred to by Jensen and Gutek (1982). This tendency is seen also in situation 8 (coin) where 44% of the responses were in the "feelings inward" catgory.

5.5 Sex-Role Identity

The BSRI did not correlate even minimally with any of the other variables in the study. The lack of correlation between the BSRI and the IRQ responses could be due to a number of factors. Firstly, it could be seen as evidence that there is no relationship between sex-role identity as measured on the BSRI and working women's interpretation of and response to sexually oriented behavior in the work place.

A second possibility is the scoring method used. Pyke (1985), in a review of research done with the BSRI, observed that the median split method seemed to yield the fewest significant results. This scoring method places the near-feminine and the near-masculine in sex-role categories when even one point difference in score could change the category. Depending on the number of subjects in the near-feminine and near-masculine categories, this could confound the results in a correlation study.

A third consideration is the validity of the assumptions underlying the concept of androgyny. It was assumed (Bem, 1975; Bem & Lenny, 1976; Bem, Martyna &

Watson, 1976) that the androgynous person would be more behaviorally flexible in response to changing situational demands, and more psychologically healthy. Pyke (1985) and Myers and Gonda (1982a; 1982b) have suggested that the evidence in support of these two assumptions is equivocal. Even if Bem's assumptions are correct, there is no evidence that the IRQ data for perceived likelihood, level of discomfort, feelings elicited by the 10 situations, anticipated best responses, and strength of self-efficacy are related to behavioral flexibility and psychological well being. In fact, the lack of results for the BSRI is consistent with the failure of the JPI scales to correlate strongly with the IRQ results. This might mean that the lack of correlation between the IRQ results and the BSRI might be just one more bit of evidence that the nature of the unwelcome sexual behaviors themselves is the major contributor to working women's interpretations of and responses to sexual harassment in the work place.

5.6 Theoretical Framework

The self-efficacy measure used in this study (IRQ question five) did not correlate highly with any of the other variables. There was a modest correlation between strength of self-efficacy and three JPI variables--conformity, innovation and self-esteem--for

situation 1 (picture) and situation 6 (promotion dinner). For these two situations, subjects with low scores on conformity (see Table 45) and those with high scores on innovation (see Table 47) rated themselves as strongly confident they could carry out their anticipated "best" response for these two situations. The few subjects who scored low on self-efficacy for these two situations tended also to make low scores on JPI Self-Esteem (see Table 49). These results are consistent with each other and suggest that subjects who are creative or original, and those who have little need to conform will be confident in their ability to handle these two ambiguous situations.

The relationships which showed up for self-efficacy cannot be generalized to any extent as over 70% of the subjects felt there was an 80% to 100% probability that they could carry out their anticipated "best" responses on all ten situations (see Table 15). This leaves little room for variation or correlation with other variables.

There are three possible explanations for the failure of self-efficacy expectations to correlate substantially with other variables in the study--the measure of strength of self-efficacy used, defensive attribution of responsibility, and controlling conditions.

5.61 Measure Of Self-Efficacy

The first explanation focuses on the measure of self-efficacy itself, or IRQ question 5. This measure did not permit sufficient variation in efficacy strength. Each subject indicated on question five her ability to carry out the response she outlined in question four. Therefore, each subject was really answering a different question for IRQ question five. Possibly, most subjects offered a response for IRQ question four which they felt capable of carrying out, resulting in most rating themselves as able to perform the response described in question four. Or perhaps the subjects indicated responses for question four which they believed would work and indicated a strong probability that they could carry out the responses, even though they might actually behave very differently if confronted by such a situation.

Possibly a more useful measure of self-efficacy would be composed of a range of responses for each situation, ordered in a hierarchy according to level of difficulty. This would allow for measurement of both level and strength of self-efficacy as described by Bandura (1977a; 1977b; 1980).

5.62 Attribution of Responsibility

It is possible that blame avoidance (Shaver, 1970) influenced the pattern of high self-efficacy scores. In

view of the high self-efficacy scores, it is important to ask whether or not the subjects would actually carry out their anticipated best response if confronted with the behaviors described in the 10 IRQ situations. The self-efficacy research (Bandura, 1980; Bandura & Adams, 1977) demonstrated a strong relationship between self-efficacy and behavior. Bandura's studies were all done with snake phobics who were in a treatment program to overcome their fears. Fear of snakes is a fear accepted and understood by society: It would not put Bandura's subjects in the double bind position in which victims of sexual harassment often find themselves. Bandura's subjects could concentrate on overcoming their fears--they could even attribute blame to the snake if they wished.

The subjects in the present study would have to consider not only their discomfort with the behavior, but also possible attributions of responsibility directed towards them by self and others. They would also have to consider the economic realities of possible job consequences of any action they might take in situations similar to the 10 IRQ situations.

Direct action, which was the action most frequently cited for nine of the situations, would be consistent with advice given in the popular media about handling unwanted sexual behavior. It could, therefore, be seen by the subjects as the most accepted (or blameless) thing

to do. If blame avoidance was a factor in the high endorsement of cluster one (direct attempt to cope) responses for IRQ question four (see Table 14) and for the high self-efficacy responses (see Table 15), then social attitudes and defensive thought would be a confounding factor in the results.

5.63 Controlling Conditions

The third explanation is that possibly women's interpretations of and responses to sexually oriented behavior in the work place is determined more by the nature of the situation itself than by the qualities the woman brings with her into the situation. This is consistent with the findings in the sexual harassment literature (Reilly, Carpenter, Dull & Barlett, 1982; Weber-Burdin & Rossi, 1982) that subjects' judgments about sexual harassment were more influenced by the perpetrator's behavior and intentions than by other factors. This is also consistent with Bandura's (1977b) suggestion that the behavior people have learned to use in specific situations is best analyzed in terms of "controlling conditions" rather than in terms of "types of people".

Bandura (1977b) theorized that the major determinants of the behavior we choose to adopt for ourselves are "the influences closely tied to it--the stimulus inducements, the anticipated satisfactions, the

observed benefits, the experienced functional value, the perceived risks, the self-evaluative derivatives, and the various social barriers and economic constraints" (p. 54). He suggested also that people do not behave consistently from one situation to another, but behave according to the demands of each individual situation.

If Bandura is correct, then little substantial correlation can be expected between (a) interpretation of and response to situations and (b) factors such as self-efficacy, personality, demographic variables, or sex-role identity. Perhaps the factors referred to by Bandura above would be valuable to look at as contributors to working women's interpretation of and response to sexually oriented behavior in the work place.

The third explanation is supported by the fact that none of the modest correlations found in this study were of consistent value across all 10 of the situations on the IRQ. This would suggest that the major influence in the perception of and response to sexually oriented behavior in the work place appears to be the nature of the behavior presented in the situation itself and the meaning, for the individual, of the rewards and consequences of the situation.

5.7 Summary

The findings related to incidence of sexual

harassment and the feelings generated by unwanted sexual attention in the work place were consistent with the survey literature reported in Chapter Two. The point biserial correlations used to investigate the four research questions were too small to support much breadth of generalization. However, some patterns of modest correlations were noted for the more ambiguous situations in relation to (a) discomfort level and personality, (b) discomfort level and anticipated best response, (c) perceived likelihood and demographic variables, (d) perceived likelihood and personality across several situations, and (e) age correlated with level of discomfort, feelings, perceived likelihood and anticipated best response for situation 6 (promotion dinner).

The failure of self-efficacy expectations to correlate substantially with other variables was attributed to the nature of the self-efficacy measure, the influence of the subjects' self-exonerative process, and the possibility that the nature of the sexually oriented behavior itself may contribute more than the other variables to the interpretation of and response to the 10 situations on the IRQ.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions based on the results of statistical analysis to test the four research questions and observations of IRQ responses are described below. There were no strong correlations to support any of the four research questions. Despite the lack of substantial correlations, there were several patterns of modest correlations which allow a degree of speculation.

6.1 Research Questions

There were no strong relationships between interpretation of sexually oriented behavior by working women in this study and demographic variables, personality variables, or sex-role identity (research question one). However, patterns of modest correlations across some of the ambiguous situations allow speculation that perception of sexually oriented behavior may be influenced, to some extent, by: (a) previous exposure to unwelcome sexual behaviors, (b) age, (c) the personality trait "anxiety", (d) the personality trait "conformity", (e) the personality trait "self-esteem", (f) the personality trait "risk taking", and (g) the personality

trait "social adriotness".

There were no strong relationships between anticipated "best" responses offered by working women in this sample and demographic variables, personality variables, sex-role identity, and interpretations of sexually oriented behaviors (research question two). However, the patterns of modest correlations for some ambiguous situations allow speculation that choice of response may be influenced, to some extent, by: (a) age, and (b) level of discomfort.

There were no strong relationships between the strength of self-efficacy expectations of the working women in this sample and interpretation of sexually oriented behavior, anticipated response to sexually oriented behavior, demographic variables, personality variables, and sex-role identity (research question three). However, the pattern of modest correlations for two ambiguous situations allows speculation that self-efficacy expectations may be influenced by three personality traits: (a) conformity, (b) innovation, and (c) self-esteem.

There were no strong relationships between factors preventing working women in the sample from carrying out their anticipated best response and interpretation of sexually oriented behavior, anticipated response, self-efficacy expectations, demographic variables, personality variables, and sex-role identity (research

question four).

6.2 General Observations

General observations, consistent with the overall purpose of the study, can be drawn from the subjects responses to the questions on the IRQ:

1. The nature of the behavior described for each situation had considerable influence on the subjects interpretations of and responses to the 10 situations on the IRQ. This indicated that the behavior itself should be considered as the major variable influencing women's interpretation of and response to sexually oriented behavior in the work place.

2. Women in the sample believed they would experience considerable discomfort if they were faced with unwanted sexual behavior in the work place. They expressed discomfort in reference to both blatant and ambiguous behavior. Behavior such as posting suggestive pictures, whistles from male colleagues, off-colour comments from male colleagues, uninvited invitations for dates from male supervisors, physical contact from senior personnel (especially where the intent is unclear), and openly suggestive looks or glances all create discomfort for the majority of these subjects.

These forms of behavior are more likely to be found in the average work setting than are the more blatant

forms of sexual behavior. However, they are often overlooked when sexual harassment is defined as they are neither direct propositions nor the forms of gross behavior often associated with the term "sexual harassment". This observation, along with Gutek's finding (1985) that even "positive" sexually oriented behavior contributes to lowered job satisfaction for women, provides information worthy of note for employers interested in creating a "productive" work atmosphere. It is important that counsellors and employers are careful to really listen to, and not trivialize, the discomfort voiced by women who are faced with these types of sexually oriented behavior in the work place.

3. Most women in the sample felt the 10 IRQ situations were not very likely to happen to them. This can be seen as a form of defensive thought designed to lower anxiety about one's vulnerability to victimization by defining "victim" as someone with qualities different from one's own. This tendency adds to the complexity of sexual harassment as a research issue, and can imply that harassment victims might receive less sympathy, from both women and men, than their discomfort merits.

4. Most of the women in the sample preferred to use a "direct approach" response for nine of the situations on the IRQ. However, for the situation involving a group of men whistling at the subject, most preferred the "withdraw or ignore" approach. Their preference for

using a direct approach, when appropriate, has implications for employers who (a) wish to establish formal harassment complaint procedures or (b) wish to sensitize employees to methods of effectively dealing with unwanted sexual behaviors in the work place.

Bandura (1977a; 1977b) suggested that people do not perform behaviors they are competent to perform if they believe those behaviors will not have the desired result. A formal complaint program would have to be seen as providing a real solution to the problem without being punitive to the complainant before most women would be willing to see it as an effective solution. Confrontation of the harasser and attempts to work out the problem informally would be more likely to occur if there was an atmosphere supportive of the individual's right to a work environment free from harassment.

6.3 Recommendations

Further research is needed to assess the relationship of self-efficacy to working women's intepretations of and responses to sexually oriented behavior in the work place. The author recommends the following for future research on interpretations of and responses to sexual harassment:

1. That a measure of self-efficacy be developed that provides a hierarchy of responses for each situation.

This would provide a measure of both level and strength of self-efficacy and would ensure that every subject was answering the same question in reference to self-efficacy.

2. That the computer generated, random-digit dialing system described by Gutek (1985) be used for sample selection. This method appears to have a good response rate, and would be less cumbersome than approaching subjects through their employers.

3. That contributions of personality to women's interpretations of and responses to sexually oriented behavior be examined using the modal profiles developed by Jackson (1978). Use of the entire configuration of personality scores, rather than individual scores, could add to our understanding of this issue.

4. That the nature of the unwanted sexual attention be considered as one of the variables influencing women's interpretation of and response to sexual harassment and studies be done which carefully control for this factor.

It is recommended that both counsellors and employers note the fact that many of the women in the sample felt that all 10 situations on the IRQ would create high discomfort for them. This included situations involving erotic pictures on an office wall, "accidental" touch by a senior person of the opposite sex in a work situation, being whistled at by a group of male colleagues, and dating invitations from senior members of

staff, as well as the more crude, blatant types of behavior found in situations 8, 9, and 10 on the IRQ. It is important that counsellors working with women who have experienced unwanted sexual attentions be aware of the discomfort involved, especially with the less blatant kinds of behavior.

The above observation is important also for employers. Gutek (1985) noted that "an unprofessionl ambience" at work, or a work place which emphasized gender, permitted crude language, and encouraged sexual behaviors, provided women employees with less job satisfaction than a more "professional" work atmosphere. She also found that any sexual behavior at work, even complimentary, positive sexual behaviors, contributed to lower job satisfaction for women. The discomfort level expressed by women in this study for all 10 situations is consistent with Gutek's findings. An employer who is interested in employee productivity and efficiency, as well as in employee human rights, would be wise to look carefully at the work place atmosphere in order to promote a professional type of work ambience.

REFERENCES

Anastasi, A. (1982). Psychological testing. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Arkin, H., & Colton, R. (1963). Tables for sataisticians. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc.

Astley, S. L., & Downey, R. G. (1980). Sex-role consequences: Depends on the the point of view. Journal of College Student Personnel, 21, 419-426.

Attenborough, S. (1979). Myths about sexual harassment: Research report #8. Ottawa: National Union of Provincial Government Employees.

Backhouse, C., & Cohen, L. (1978). The secret opression: Sexual harassment of working women. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada.

Bains, G. (1983). Explanations and the need for control. In M. Hewstone (Ed.), Attribution theory: Social and functional extensions (126-143). Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell Publisher.

Bandura, A. (1976). Effecting change through participant modelling. In J. D. Krumboltz, & C. E. Thoresen (Eds.), Counselling methods (pp 248-261). New York: Rinehart & Winston.

Bandura, A. (1977a). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84, 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1977b). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1978). Reflections on self-efficacy. Advances in Behavior Research and Therapy, 1, 237-269.

Bandura, A. (1980). Gauging the relationship between self-efficacy judgment and action. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 4, 263-268.

Bandura, A., & Adams, N. E. (1977). Analysis of self-efficacy theory of behavioral change. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 1, 287-310.

Bandura, A., Adams, N. E., & Beyer, J. (1977). Cognitive processes mediating behavioral changes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 125-139.

Bandura, A. Jeffrey, R. W., & Gajdos, E. (1975). Generalized change through participant modelling with self-directed mastery. Behavior Research and Therapy, 13, 141-153.

Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personal and Social Psychology, 31, 634-643.

Bem, S. L. (1975, May). Beyond androgyny: Some presumptions for a liberated sexual identity. Keynote address for APA-NIMH conference on the research needs of women. Madison, Wisconson.

Bem, S. L. (1977). On the utility of alternative procedures for assessing psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45, 196-205.

Bem, S. L. (1981). Bem sex-role inventory: Professional

manual. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Bem, S. L., & Lenny, E. (1976). Sex-typing and the avoidance of cross-sex behavior. Journal of Personal and Social Psychology, 33, 48-54.

Bem, S. L., Martyna, W., & Watson, C. (1976). Sex typing and androgyny: Further explorations of the expressive domain. Journal of Personality And Social Psychology, 34, 1016-1023.

Biles, G. E. (1981). A program guide for preventing sexual harassment in the workplace. Personnel Administrator, 26, 49-56.

Brothers, J. (1981). Sexual harassment in the secretary's workplace. The Secretary, 41, 13-15.

Brownmiller, S. (1976). Against our will: Men, women and rape. New York: Bantam Books.

Canadian Labor Law Reports, (1982), 2, 722.

Cammaert, L. P. (1985). How widespread is sexual harassment on campus? International Journal of Womens' Studies, 8, 388-397.

Chambliss, C., & Murray, E. (1979a). Cognitive procedures for smoking reduction: Symptom attribution versus efficacy attribution. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 3, 91-95.

Chambliss, C., & Murray, E. (1979b). Efficacy attribution, locus of control, and weight loss. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 3, 349-353.

Collins, G. E., & Blodgett, T. B. (1981). Sexual harassment...Some see it...Some won't. Harvard Business Review, 59, 76-95.

Condiotte, M. M., & Lichenstein, E. (1981). Self-efficacy and relapse in smoking cessation programs. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49, 648-658.

Corn, J. R. (1979). Self-efficacy and behavioral self control in a smoking cessation program (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40(2-B), 908.

Crull, P. (1982). Stress effects of sexual harassment on the job: Implications for counselling. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 52, 539-544.

DiClemente, C. (1981). Self-efficacy and smoking cessation maintenance: A preliminary report. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 5, 175-187.

Dziech, B. W., & Weiner, L. (1984). The lecherous professor: Sexual harassment on campus. Boston: Beacon Press.

Employment And Immigration Canada (1971). Canadian classification and dictionary of occupations. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services.

Errington, G. B., & Davidson, A. (1980). Sexual harassment in the workplace: A discussion paper. Vancouver: B. C. Federation of Labour Women's Rights Committee and the Vancouver Women's Research Centre.

Faley, R. (1982). Sexual harassment: Critical review of legal cases with general principles and preventive measures. Personnel Psychology, 35, 583-600.

Farley, L. (1978). Sexual shakedown: The sexual harassment of women on the job. New York: McGraw Hill.

Fincham, F. D. & Jaspars, J. M. (1980). Attribution of responsibility. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (pp 82-139). New York: Academic Press.

Goldberg, L. R. (1978). The Jackson personality inventory. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), The eighth mental measurement yearbook, (pp 867-871). Highland Park: Gryphon Press.

Gosselin, H. L. (1984). Sexual harassment on the job: Psychological, social and economic repercussions. Canada's Mental Health, 32, 21-24.

Gutek, B. A. (1985). Sex and the work place. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Gutek, B. A., & Morasch, B. (1982). Sex-ratios, sex-role spillover, and sexual harassment of women at work. Journal of Social Issues, 38, 55-74.

Gutek, B., Morasch, B., & Cohen, A. (1983). Interpreting social-sexual behavior in a work setting. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 22, 30-48.

Hackett, G. (1985). Role of mathematics self-efficacy in the choice of math-related majors of college

women and men: A path analysis. Journal of Counselling Psychology, 32, 47-56.

Harris, B. (1981). Developmental aspects of the attributional process. In J. H. Harvey, & G. Weary (Eds.), Prospectives on the attributional process (pp 59-75). Dubuque, Iowa: William C, Brown Company Publishers.

Hodgson, L. (1975). Sexual harassment on the job: Results of a preliminary survey. New York: Working Women United Institute.

How do you handle...Sex on the job? (1976, January). Redbook, 146, 74-75.

Hoyman, M., & Robinson, R. (1980). Interpreting the new sexual harassment guidelines. Personnel Journal, 59, 996-1000.

Iverson, M. J. (1985). Coping with sexual harassment. Vocational Education, 60, 18-19.

Jackson, D. N. (1967). Personality research form manual. Port Huron, Mich.: Research Psychologists Press.

Jackson, D. N. (1976). Jackson personality inventory manual. Goshen, New York: Research Psychologists Press, Inc.

Jackson, D. (1978). Interpreter's guide to the Jackson Personality Inventory. In P. McReynolds (ed), Advances in psychological assessment, Vol. 4 (pp 56-102). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Jaspars, J. M., Fincham, F. D., & Hewstone, M. (1983). Attributional theory and research: Conceptual, developmental and social dimensions. New York: Academic Press.

Jensen, I. W., & Gutek, B. A. (1982). Attributions and assignment of responsibility in sexual harassment. Journal of Social Issues, 38, 121-136.

Kadar, M. (1982a). Sexual harassment as a form of social control. In M. Fitzgerald, C. Guberman & M. Wolfe (eds.), Still ain't satisfied: Canadian feminism today (168-180). Toronto: The Women's Press.

Kadar, M. (1982b, November). Sexual harassment: Where we stand research and policy. Paper presented at the meeting of CRIAW, Ottawa.

Kelly, J. A., & Worell, L. (1977). Parent behaviors related to masculine, feminine, and androgynous sex-role orientations. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 44, 843-851.

Kerlinger, F. N., & Pedhazar (1973). Multiple regression in behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Lalonde, B. D. (1980). The construction and validation of a measure of academic self-efficacy (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40(8-A), 4510.

Landsberg, M. (1982). Women and children first. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada.

Lerner, J., & Miller, D. (1978). Just world research and the attribution process: Looking back and ahead. Psychological Bulletin, 85, 1030-1051.

Masson, J. M. (1984, November). Freud and the seduction theory. The Atlantic, pp. 33-60.

McIntyre, D. I., & Renick, J. C. (1982). Protecting public employees and employers from sexual harassment. Public Personnel Management Journal, 11, 282-292.

Miller, J. B. (1976). Toward a new psychology of women. Boston: Beacon Press.

Murray, H. A. (1938). Explorations in personality. New York: Oxford University Press.

Myers, A. M. & Gonda, G. (1982a). Empirical validation of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 304-318.

Myers A. M. & Gonda, G. (1982b). Utility of the masculinity-femininity construct. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 514-522.

Padgitt, S. C., & Padgitt, J. S. (1986). Cognitive structure of sexual harassment: Implications for university policy. Journal of College Student Personnel, 27, 34-39.

Pidhjirnyj, M. (1981, August). Sexual harassment in the workplace. Women's Bureau Newsletter, Ontario Ministry of Labour, 27, No. 2.

Pyke, S. W. (1985). Androgyny: An integration. International Journal of Women's Studies, 8, 529-539

Reilly, T., Carpenter, S., Dull, V., & Barlett, K. (1982). The factorial survey: An approach to defining sexual harassment on campus. Journal of Social Issues, 38, 99-110.

Safran, C. (1976, November). What men do to women on the job: A shocking look at sexual harassment. Redbook, 146, 149, 217-224.

Safran, C. (1981). Sexual Harassment: The view from the top. Red Book, 150, 47-51.

Schunk, D. H. (1980). Self-efficacy in achievement behavior (Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 40(7-A), 3909.

Schunk, D. H. (1985). Self-efficacy and classroom learning. Psychology in the Schools, 22, 208-223.

Sexual harassment in the Federal Government. (Oct. 23, Nov. 1, 13, 1979). Hearings before the subcommittee on investigations of the Committee on Post Office And Civil Service, House of Representatives. Ninety Sixth Congress. Serial No. 96-57.

Shaver, K. G. (1970). Defensive attribution: Effects of severity and relevance on the responsibility assigned for an accident. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 14, 101-113.

Shaw, J. I., & McMartin, J. A. (1977). Personal and situational determinants of attribution of responsibility for an accident. Human Relations, 30, 95-107.

Shelton, T. O., & Mahoney, M. J. (1978). The Content and effect of "psyching up" strategies in weight lifters. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 2, 275-284.

Slavin, R. E. (1984). Research methods in education: A practical guide. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Sommer, D., & Lasry, J. (1984). Personality and reactions to stressful events. Canada's Mental Health, 32, 19-20.

Spence, J., Helmreich, R. L., & Strapp, J. (1975). Ratings of self and peers on sex-role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personal and Social Psychology, 32, 29-37.

Statistics Canada (1985, Nov.). The labour force (Catalogue No. 71-001). Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services.

Tangri, S. S., Burt, M. R., & Johnson, L. B. (1982). Sexual harassment at work: Three explanatory models. Journal of Social Issues, 38, 33-54.

Terpstra, D. E., & Cook, S. E. (1985). Complainant characteristics and reported behaviors and consequences associated with formal sexual harassment charges. Personnel Psychology, 38, 559-574.

Uleman, J. S., & Weston, M. (1986). Does the BSRI measure sex roles? Sex Roles, 15, 43-62.

U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board. (1981). Sexual harassment in the federal workplace: Is it a problem? Washington, D.C.: U. S. Governmsnt Printing Office.

Walster, E. (1966). Assignment of responsibility for an accident. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 73-79.

Weber-Burdin, E., & Rossi, P. H. (1982). Defining sexual harassment on campus: A replication and extension. Journal of Social Issues, 38, 111-120.

Weinberg, R. S., Gould, D., Jackson, A., & Barnes, P. (1980). Influence of cognitive strategies on tennis serves of players of high and low ability. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 50,663-666.

Wiggins, J. S., & Holzmuller (1978). Psychological androgyny and interpersonal behavior. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 40-52.

Wilson, K. R., & Kraus, L. A. (1983). Sexual harassment in the university. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24, 219-224.

Wolf, J., & Baker, V. (1980). Characteristics of imprisoned rapists. In G. G. Warner (Ed.), Rape and sexual assault (pp 265-278). Germantown, Maryland: An Aspen Publication.

APPENDIX I

INTERPRETATIVE RESPONSE QUESTIONNAIRE

Each question on this questionnaire describes a work situation in which THERE MAY OR MAY NOT be behavior of a sexual nature. These behaviors MIGHT OR MIGHT NOT be offensive. The purpose of the questionnaire is to help determine what behaviors women find create discomfort for them in the work place and how women would interpret these behaviors.

As you answer each question, please imagine yourself in the situation and respond in that context.

Please note: The situations described on this questionnaire are imaginary. They do not refer to your actual place of work or any others you may be familiar with.

CONFIDENTIAL

INTERPRETATIVE RESPONSE QUESTIONNAIRE

SITUATION 1
There is a man in your company with whom you have to consult on a daily basis about a joint project you are doing. He has a large poster of a nude woman on the wall by his desk. As you come into his office he seems to watch you carefully for your reaction to the poster.

1. Imagine this has just happened to you. What level of discomfort (if any) would you feel? Indicate by circling the appropriate letter below.

a) no discomfort at all b) slight discomfort c) medium discomfort d) considerable discomfort e) extreme discomfort

2. What likelihood is there that you would ever experience such a situation at some point in your working life? Circle the appropriate probability figure below.

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

3. How would you feel in this situation?

4. What do you think would be the best way to respond in this situation?

5. Do you believe you could actually carry out this response in such a situation? Indicate the probability that you would be able to respond as described above.

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

6. If you would not do what you described in question 4, what would you do in this situation?

7. What things (if any) might possibly keep you from making the response you described in question 4?

INTERPRETATIVE RESPONSE QUESTIONNAIRE

SITUATION 2:
You are typing a report for one of the managers in your company. He wants to make a slight change in the wording of the paragraph you are about to type. As he points out the change, he puts his hand on your shoulder and leans forward so that his body presses against your head and shoulder.

1. Imagine this has just happened to you. What level of discomfort (if any) would you feel? Indicate by circling the appropriate letter below.

a) no discomfort at all b) slight discomfort c) medium discomfort d) considerable discomfort e) extreme discomfort

2. What likelihood is there that you would ever experience such a situation at some point in your working life? Circle the appropriate probability figure below.

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

3. How would you feel in this situation?

4. What do you think would be the best way to respond in this situation?

5. Do you believe you could actually carry out this response in such a situation? Indicate the probability that you would be able to respond as described above.

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

6. If you would not do what you described in question 4, what would you do in this situation?

7. What things (if any) do think might possibly keep you from making the response described in your answer to question 4 ?

INTERPRETATIVE RESPONSE QUESTIONNAIRE

SITUATION 3:

Each day for the past two weeks, the man who supervises your work unit asks you to go out with him for dinner after work. Although you have always refused his offer, he continues to ask you.

1. Imagine this has just happened to you. What level of discomfort (if any) would you feel? Indicate by circling the appropriate letter below.

a) no discomfort at all b) slight discomfort c) medium discomfort d) considerable discomfort e) extreme discomfort

2. What likelihood is there that you would ever experience such a situation at some point in your working life? Circle the appropriate probability figure below.

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

3. How would you feel in this situation?

4. What do you think would be the best way to respond in this situation?

5. Do you believe you could actually carry out this response in such a situation? Indicate the probability that you would be able to respond as described above.

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

6. If you would not do what you described in question 4, what would you do in this situation?

7. What things (if any) do think might possibly keep you from making the response described in your answer to question 4 ?

INTERPRETATIVE RESPONSE QUESTIONNAIRE

SITUATION 4:
This is your first day at work in a large automotive repair shop. As you walk onto the floor with your supervisor, there is a chorus of catcalls and whistles from the men.

1. Imagine this has just happened to you. What level of discomfort (if any) would you feel? Indicate by circling the appropriate letter below.

a) no discomfort at all b) slight discomfort c) medium discomfort d) considerable discomfort e) extreme discomfort

2. What likelihood is there that you would ever experience such a situation at some point in your working life? Circle the appropriate probability figure below.

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

3. How would you feel in this situation?

4. What do you think would be the best way to respond in this situation?

5. Do you believe you could actually carry out this response in such a situation? Indicate the probability that you would be able to respond as described above.

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

6. If you would not do what you described in question 4, what would you do in this situation?

7. What things (if any) do think might possibly keep you from making the response described in your answer to question 4 ?

INTERPRETATIVE RESPONSE QUESTIONNAIRE

SITUATION 5:
The colleague who works next to you likes to start the day with a lewd joke or some sort of sexual comment addressed to you. As you enter the office today, he notices a brooch on your sweater and comments, "I see you were so good last night that your boy friend gave you a distinguished service medal".

1. Imagine this has just happened to you. What level of discomfort (if any) would you feel? Indicate by circling the appropriate letter below.

a) no discomfort at all b) slight discomfort c) medium discomfort d) considerable discomfort e) extreme discomfort

2. What likelihood is there that you would ever experience such a situation at some point in your working life? Circle the appropriate probability figure below.

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

3. How would you feel in this situation?

4. What do you think would be the best way to respond in this situation?

5. Do you believe you could actually carry out this response in such a situation? Indicate the probability that you would be able to respond as described above.

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

6. If you would not do what you described in question 4, what would you do in this situation?

7. What things (if any) do think might possibly keep you from making the response described in your answer to question 4 ?

SITUATION 6:
Your supervisor has just informed you about a promotion that has just opened up. He suggests that he should know you better before he can recommend you for it, so he wants you to go out for dinner with him on Friday evening.

1. Imagine this has just happened to you. What level of discomfort (if any) would you feel? Indicate by circling the appropriate letter below.

a) no discomfort at all b) slight discomfort c) medium discomfort d) considerable discomfort e) extreme discomfort

2. What likelihood is there that you would ever experience such a situation at some point in your working life? Circle the appropriate probability figure below.

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

3. How would you feel in this situation?

4. What do you think would be the best way to respond in this situation?

5. Do you believe you could actually carry out this response in such a situation? Indicate the probability that you would be able to respond as described above.

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

6. If you would not do what you described in question 4, what would you do in this situation?

7. What things (if any) do think might possibly keep you from making the response described in your answer to question 4 ?

INTERPRETATIVE RESPONSE QUESTIONNAIRE

SITUATION 7:
You have noticed that whenever the foreman of the road crew comes into your office to see your boss, he stares at you in a rather insinuating way. Today he comes in as you are picking up a report that had fallen on the floor. You stood up to see him standing in the doorway slowly eying you up and down.

1. Imagine this has just happened to you. What level of discomfort (if any) would you feel? Indicate by circling the appropriate letter below.

a) no discomfort at all b) slight discomfort c) medium discomfort d) considerable discomfort e) extreme discomfort

2. What likelihood is there that you would ever experience such a situation at some point in your working life? Circle the appropriate probability figure below.

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

3. How would you feel in this situation?

4. What do you think would be the best way to respond in this situation?

5. Do you believe you could actually carry out this response in such a situation? Indicate the probability that you would be able to respond as described above.

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

6. If you would not do what you described in question 4, what would you do in this situation?

7. What things (if any) do think might possibly keep you from making the response described in your answer to question 4 ?

INTERPRETATIVE RESPONSE QUESTIONNAIRE

SITUATION 8:
As you pick up your tray of drinks to serve your three customers in the little restaurant where you work, your boss comes up and stands very close behind you, the front of his body touching your back. He reaches around and drops a coin down the front of your blouse, commenting that it is a tip for good service. You can see your three customers grinning in amusement.

1. Imagine this has just happened to you. What level of discomfort (if any) would you feel? Indicate by circling the appropriate letter below.

a) no discomfort at all b) slight discomfort c) medium discomfort d) considerable discomfort e) extreme discomfort

2. What likelihood is there that you would ever experience such a situation at some point in your working life? Circle the appropriate probability figure below.

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

3. How would you feel in this situation?

4. What do you think would be the best way to respond in this situation?

5. Do you believe you could actually carry out this response in such a situation? Indicate the probability that you would be able to respond as described above.

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

6. If you would not do what you described in question 4, what would you do in this situation?

7. What things (if any) do think might possibly keep you from making the response described in your answer to question 4 ?

INTERPRETATIVE RESPONSE QUESTIONNAIRE

SITUATION 9:
The head of your department has been suggesting dates to you for several weeks. Today he calls you into his office. He tells you how bad his marriage is and says he can't stand to work near you if you won't go to bed with him. He suggests you look for a job elsewhere.

1. Imagine this has just happened to you. What level of discomfort (if any) would you feel? Indicate by circling the appropriate letter below.

a) no discomfort at all b) slight discomfort c) medium discomfort d) considerable discomfort e) extreme discomfort

2. What likelihood is there that you would ever experience such a situation at some point in your working life? Circle the appropriate probability figure below.

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

3. How would you feel in this situation?

4. What do you think would be the best way to respond in this situation?

5. Do you believe you could actually carry out this response in such a situation? Indicate the probability that you would be able to respond as described above.

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

6. If you would not do what you described in question 4, what would you do in this situation?

7. What things (if any) do think might possibly keep you from making the response described in your answer to question 4 ?

INTERPRETATIVE RESPONSE QUESTIONNAIRE

SITUATION 10:
Your supervisor asked you last week to have sex with him. You refused and he said no more about it. Today a friend hinted to you that you should check your personnel file. You did and discovered that a performance evaluation, very critical of your ability to perform your daily work, had just been placed on your file.

1. Imagine this has just happened to you. What level of discomfort (if any) would you feel? Indicate by circling the appropriate letter below.

a) no discomfort at all b) slight discomfort c) medium discomfort d) considerable discomfort e) extreme discomfort

2. What likelihood is there that you would ever experience such a situation at some point in your working life? Circle the appropriate probability figure below.

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

3. How would you feel in this situation?

4. What do you think would be the best way to respond in this situation?

5. Do you believe you could actually carry out this response in such a situation? Indicate the probability that you would be able to respond as described above.

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

6. If you would not do what you described in question 4, what would you do in this situation?

7. What things (if any) do think might possibly keep you from making the response described in your answer to question 4 ?

APPENDIX II

11439 39 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta

April 16, 1985

Mr.
Principal
School
Edmonton, Alberta

Dear

I am conducting a research project with working women for my doctoral thesis in Educational Psychology at the University of Alberta. The object of my study is to examine working women's interpreations of and reactions to sexually oriented behavior in the work place in order to better understand the reasons for individual differences in these interpretations and reactions, and to clarify what behaviors are and are not acceptable to women in the work place.

One of the factors I am looking at is differences across occupations in the interpretation of this type of work place behavior. In order to collect the data for the study, I plan to test 200 women employed with five or more Edmonton employers. I am using four tests and test administration will take approximately two hours.

I would like to include 10 women from your school in my sample. The procedure I would use to select participants would be to first select a random sample from all female employees; send each selected person a letter inviting her to participate in the study; and finally, conduct a two hour testing session with those who agree to take part in the study.

All responses on the tests are confidential and names are not put on individual tests. When the study is completed, a summary of the overall results will be sent to all participants and to each employer.

I would like to discuss with you the possibility of including some of your rmployees in my study and also the most effective way of organizing the data collection in your school.

Yours truly,

Shirley Kabachia
Phd Candidate, University of Alberta

Self-Efficacy Expectations of Ability to Deal With Sexually Harassing Behavior in the Work Place

Shirley Kabachia, PHD Candidate, Educational Psychology
University of Alberta

OBJECT: To examine working women's interpretations of and reactions to sexually oriented behavior in the work place, and to identify some of the factors related to differences among these interpretations and reactions.

SAMPLE: 200 women employed with five or more Edmonton employers.

PROCEDURE: The sample will be randomly selected from all women employed with each employer. Those selected will be invited to participate in the study. Participants will take part in a two hour testing session.

TESTS: Four tests will be administered to all participants.

1. The Demographic Questionnaire (DQ)
2. The Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BEM)
3. The Jackson Personality Inventory (JPI)
4. The Interpretative Response Questionnaire (IRQ)

DATA ANALYSIS: A correlational analysis of the above data.

USEFULNESS: The information gained from this study will be useful in:

1. The development of counselling programs for women;
2. The development of training programs for supervisory and working staff;
3. Clarifying what sexually oriented behaviors women find acceptable and what behaviors they find offensive in the work place.

RESULTS: All employers and all participants will receive a summary of the overall results of the study once the research is completed.

APPENDIX III

July 3, 1985

Dear Employee;

We have been asked and have agreed to participate in a University study (for a PhD Thesis) of the working women's interpretations of and reactions to sexually oriented behaviour in the work place.

This study will involve two hours of your time and will require you to complete 4 tests under supervision in our . They will be done ANONYMOUSLY - you will NOT be required to sign or otherwise identify yourself.

Please understand that you have been chosen on the basis of random selection to participate, but it is up to you to decide whether you want to do so. This is NOT a job or Company requirement.

If you do decide to participate, please try to select a time which will minimize your absence from the selling floor, so that you can minimize the effect on customer service.

The person conducting the study is Ms. Shirley Kabachia. A letter from Shirley is also enclosed to explain the process to you.

Whatever your final decision is on participation, thanks for giving the matter your consideration.

Sincerely,

Personnel Manager

July 3, 1985

Dear

You are invited to take part in a research study about work place behavior. This study is part of a doctoral thesis in educational psychology at the University of Alberta. **You are one of 200 women, employed with five different employers, who have been invited to take part in this study.** Your name has been **randomly selected** from a list of women employed at _____. Your senior management is aware of the project and does not object to staff participation in it.

The purpose of this study is to **help us understand how women interpret sexually oriented behaviors in the work place.** With so many changes in men's and women's roles in the past ten years, many men and women feel that they are no longer certain how the opposite sex expects them to behave in the work place. It is hoped that this study will help make clear what work place behaviors women feel are offensive and what behaviors they feel are acceptable in the work place.

Your participation in the study will involve a **two hour testing session** at one of the times on the attached form. **Testing will be done in** _____ on the second floor of your store.

All answers given by individuals to the test questions will be kept CONFIDENTIAL by the researcher. The results of the study will be reported as averages of many people's answers, not as individual's answers. When the project is complete, a summary of the overall results will be made available to all participants and their employers.

If you wish to participate in this study, please fill in the attached form indicating the time you can come for testing and leave it with _____ by July 9,1985. If the only time you can come for testing is during your normal work hours, **permission for you to be absent from work for any part of the two hour testing period is subject to your supervisor's approval.**

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter. If you have any questions about this study, please call me at 437-3683

Sincerely,

Shirley Kabachia
Phd Candidate, University of Alberta

REPLY FORM

Name _____

I will take part in the research study and will come to the testing location at the times* checked below.

I understand that an individual's answers on the tests are **confidential** and that the results of the study will be reported as averages of many people's answers.

***Choose either one 2-hour or two 1-hour** testing sessions from the times below. Be sure you have the approval of your supervisor for any work time you wish to use for participation in the study.

TIME CHART

	9-10	10-11	11-12	12-1	1-2	2-3	3-4	4-5
Mon., July 15								
Tues., July 16								
Wed., July 17								
Thurs., July 18								

If you have any questions about the research study, please call Shirley Kabachia at 437-3683 (after 6:00pm).

The location of the testing will be _____.

Please return Reply Form to _____ before July 9, 1985.

APPENDIX IV

JACKSON PERSONALITY INVENTORY--TRAIT DESCRIPTIONS*

Scale	Description of High Scorers	Description of Low Scorers
Anxiety	Tends to worry over inconsequential matters; more easily upset than the average person; apprehensive about the future.	Remains calm in stressful situations; takes things as they come; usually composed and collected.
Breadth of Interest	Attentive and involved; motivated to participate in a wide variety of activities.	Has narrow range of interests; remains uninterested when exposed to new activities; has confined tastes.
Complexity	Seeks intricate solutions to problems; enjoys abstract thought; enjoys intricacy.	Prefers concrete to abstract interpretations; avoids probing for new insight.

Scale	Description of High scorers	Description of Low Scorers
Conformity	Susceptable to social influences; consistent with others standards.	Refuses to go along with the crowd; independent in thought and action.
Energy Level	Active and spirited; has reserves of strength; capable of prolonged activity.	Tires quickly and easily; lacks stamina; slow to respond.
Innovation	Creative and inventive; originality of thought; develops novel solutions to problems.	Little creative motivation; conservative thinker; prefers routine activities.
Interpersonal Affect	Tends to identify closely with other people and their problems; concerned about others.	Emotionally aloof; prefers impersonal relationships; little compassion for others.

Scale	Description of High Scorers	Description of Low Scorers
Organization	Makes effective use of time; completes work on schedule; not easily distracted.	Frequently procrastinates; easily distracted; often loses things; not systematic; rarely plans before doing things.
Responsibility	Feels a strong obligation to be honest; sense of duty to others.	Can't be relied on to meet obligations; frequently breaks promises.
Risk Taking	Enjoys gambling and taking chances; venturesome; unconcerned with danger.	Cautions about unpredictable situations; doesn't take chances.

Scale	Description of high Scorers	Description of low Scorers
Self Esteem	Confident in dealing with others; not easily embarrassed or influenced by others.	Feels awkward among people; has low opinion of self; easily embarrassed.
Social Adroitness	Skillful at persuading others; diplomatic; socially intelligent; discreet, worldly.	Tactless when dealing with others; socially naive; straightforward; insensitive to effect on others.
Social Participation	Eagerly joins variety of groups; values positive interpersonal relationships	Keeps to self; has few friends; avoids social activities.
Tolerance	Accepts people even if their beliefs and customs differ from own; open to new ideas; unprejudiced.	Entertains only opinions consistent with own; quick value judgments about others.

Scale	Description of High Scorers	Description of Low Scorers
Value Orthodoxy	Values traditional customs and beliefs; conservative; opposed to change in social customs.	Critical of tradition; liberal attitudes about behavior; unconventional; believes few things should be censored.
Infrequency	Responds in unlikely or apparently random manner, or does not understand the items. A score higher than four invalidates the individual's results.	

*Adapted from JPI Manual (Jackson, 1976, pp 10).

APPENDIX V

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Read each question carefully and answer either by checking the appropriate response or writing in the required information.
ALL INFORMATION GIVEN ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS CONFIDENTIAL.

SECTION A

1. Indicate your approximate age below:

15-19( ) 20-24( ) 25-29( ) 30-34( ) 35-39( ) 40-44( )
45-49( ) 50-54( ) 55-59( ) 60-65( ).

2. Your job title is:

3. Do you work full time ( ) part time ( ) or both ( )?

4. In your present job, do you supervise other staff members? yes ( ) no ( ).
If yes, how many people do you supervise? ( ).

5. Indicate your marital status: Single ( ) married ( ) common law ( ) separated ( ) divorced ( ) widowed ( )

6. Check the figures which best represent your total family income:

$5,000-$9,000 ( ) $10,000-$14,000 ( ) $15,000-19,000 ( )
$20,000-$24,000 ( ) $25,000-$29,000 ( )
$30,000-$34,000 ( ) 35,000-$39,000 ( ) $40,000-$44,000 ( )
$45,000-$49,000 ( ) $50,000-$54,000 ( ) $55,000-$60,000( )
over $60,000 ( ).

7.How many children or dependents do you have at home?
0( ) 1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5( ) more than 5( ).

8. Indicate your cultural heritage or the ethnic group to which you belong:

9. Check the highest level of education you have completed:

Grades 1-6 ( ) Grades 7-9 ( ) Grades 10-11 ( )
High school diploma ( )
Journeyman status in an apprenticeship trade ( )
A one year technical or community college certificate ( )
A two year technical or community collegediploma ( )
A university undergraduate degree ( )
A university professional or graduate degree ( )
Other ( ) specify:

SECTION B

Please read the following question carefully. If you find that you would prefer not to answer it, feel free to omit the question. However, any answer you can give for the question will contribute in an important way to the results of the research project.

10. If you have at ANY TIME IN YOUR LIFE experienced persistent and unwanted sexual advances or embarrassing sexual comments at work, at school, or in some other setting, check one of the following:

a) I have experienced the above frequently. ( )
b) I have expereinced the above occasionally. ( )
c) I have experienced the above hardly at all. ( )
d) I have never experienced the above. ( )

11. To what extent are you concerned about womens issues? Check one.

a) very concerned ( )
b) somewhat concerned ( )
c) very little concerned ( )
d) not at all concerned ( )

12. If you have any comments you would like to add feel free to do so in this space:

APPENDIX VI

CLASSIFICATIONS FOR SCORING IRQ QUESTION THREE

QUESTION THREE--FEELINGS ELICITED BY THE SITUATION.

Cluster One: Includes feelings directed outward towards the aggressor. These are feelings based on the assumption that someone has done something to the recipient that is wrong, unfair, uncalled for or unnecessarily hurtful. Included in this cluster are:

(a) Feelings related to anger and irritation.

(b) Feelings related to fear and intimidation.

(c) Feelings related to discomfort and disgust.

(d) Feelings related to surprise and shock.

(e) Feelings related to infringement of rights.

(f) Feelings expressed as an action, such as "I would feel like hitting him".

(g) Feelings related to ridicule of the aggressor.

Cluster Two: Includes feelings directed inwards towards the self. These include feelings of embarrassment and self depreciation. These feelings imply self blame and an underlying belief that the aggressor has a right to behave in a way that may cause one discomfort. Included in this cluster are:

(a) Feelings related to sadness, depression or discouragement.

(b) Feelings related to guilt and anxiety.

(c) Feelings related to shyness.

(d) Feelings related to being cornered.

(e) Feelings related to being abused or devalued.

(f) Feelings related to being ridiculed, made fun of, or being played with.

(g) Feelings related to embarrassment.

Cluster Three involves mixed feelings or feelings which are confused, unsure, or incongruent. Included are:

(a) Unsure or qualified feelings.

(b) Feelings related to confusion.

(c) Reference to two or more conflicting or incongruent feelings.

Cluster Four includes positive and neutral feelings about the situation. Included are:

(a) Feelings of sympathy for the aggressor.

(b) No feelings at all, or the situation doesn't bother the respondent.

(c) Feels that it is not her concern--it is his problem not hers.

(d) Feelings of amusement.

(e) Feelings related to encouraging the behavior: Pleased, flattered, proud.

(f) Feelings of curiosity.

(g) Feelings that the aggressor is within his rights.

Cluster Five includes unclassifiable responses.

APPENDIX VII

CLASSIFICATIONS FOR SCORING IRQ QUESTION FOUR

QUESTION FOUR--THE BEST WAY TO RESPOND IN THIS SITUATION.

Cluster One includes responses which demonstrate a recognition of the problem issue in the situation and an attempt to cope with it. Included are attempts to:

(a) Cope directly with the situation through verbal confrontation.

(b) Cope directly with the situation through physical confrontation or aggression.

(c) Cope by employing humor.

(d) Cope indirectly. Recognition of the problem but avoidance of any confrontation. Rearranging the situation.

(e) Cope by involving a person(s) in authority.

Cluster Two: An attempt to cope which does not acknowledge awareness of the problem in the situation. Included are attempts to:

(a) Cope by ignoring the situation.

(b) Cope by physical withdrawal from the situation.

Cluster Three: Incongruent response--responses indicating confusion, unsureness, or conflicting approaches to solving the problem.

Cluster Four: Responses which demonstrate acceptance of the behavior as "o.k." or an interest in developing a relationsip with the aggressor.

Cluster Five: No response, or unclassifiable response.

APPENDIX VIII

CLASSIFICATIONS FOR SCORING IRQ QUESTION SEVEN

QUESTION SEVEN--WHAT WOULD PREVENT THE RESPONDENT FROM MAKING THE RESPONSE suggested in question four as the best possible response.

Cluster One: Fear of retaliation, of making matters worse or of offending the aggressor. Included are:

(a) Fear of retaliation.

(b) Fear of further embarrassment especially if she has to continue working with him on a daily basis.

(c) Fear of intimidation, or escalation of the harassment.

(d) Fear of offending thee aggressor.

(e) Fear of being thought priggish, troublesome, humorless, overreacting; fear of not being believed, not taken seriously.

(f) Fear of violence.

Cluster Two: Fear that nothing will change anyway even if she does try to do something about the situation. Included are:

(a) Unreceptive boss, or a boss who would likely be hostile, patronizing, or unapproachable.

(b) Solution for the situation is too inconvenient, or is not possible or available in her situation.

(c) Concern that the issue will be covered up or ignored.

(d) Concern there are no avenues of redress in her particular work place.

(e) Realization of the manager's power in a situation where she feels she would not receive a fair hearing.

(f) A feeling that it doesn't matter as she is planning to leave anyway.

Cluster Three: The situation is rectified.

Cluster Four: Her own feelings or emotions prevent her from responding effectively. Included are:

(a) She feels too angry, upset or embarrassed to respond without losing control.

(b) She feels too intimidated, shy, or unassertive to be able to react.

(c) She feels too shocked to react quickly enough to be effective.

Cluster Five: She is unsure of the intent of the behavior.

Cluster Six: If she likes him or wants to develop a relationship with him.

Cluster Seven: There are no blocks mentioned.

APPENDIX IX

Dear Participant:

Thank-you for taking part in this research study. As explained to you in the invitation letter, the purpose of the study is to help us learn more about the way women interpret and respond to certain sexual behaviors in the work place. How to distinguish between mutual flirtation and sexual behavior that is objectionable in the work place is difficult for both men and women. It is hoped that the results of this research will help us to better understand the distinctions that women make between the two.

You will be asked to complete four tests in the next two hours. Each person will answer the questions in relation to herself. There are **no right or wrong** answers to the questions--only **answers relevant to you as an individual.**

The tests you will be asked to complete are as follows:

1. **The Demographic Questionnaire**--designed to collect some descriptive information about you.
2. **The Bem Inventory**--designed to help you describe yourself in terms of 60 different descriptive items.
3. **The Jackson Personality Inventory**--a standardized personality test.
4. **The Interpretive Response Questionnaire**--designed for you to describe your interpretation of 10 hypothetical work place situations.

Please do not put your name on any of the answer sheets. Your answers to all questions are confidential. Results will be reported as averages of a number of individuals' responses, not as answers given by specific individuals.

When the project is complete, results of the overall study will be made available to you and your employer.

Thank-you again for taking the time to participate in this study. Your answers will play an important part in helping us to understand people's work place behavior.

Sincerely,

Shirley E. Kabachia
Phd Candidate
Department of Educational Psychology
University of Alberta

P.S. It is unlikely that any of the questions on the tests will be upsetting for you. However, if you do find you feel that you want to talk to someone about it, please feel free to call me at 437-3683.