

Diss
PSY
31

**SEXUAL HARASSMENT AT WORKPLACES AND
COPING STRATEGIES EMPLOYED BY
WOMEN**

**By
ANILA**

Dr. Muhammad Ajmal
National Institute of Psychology
Centre of Excellence
Quaid-i-Azam University
Islamabad-Pakistan
1998

SEXUAL HARASSMENT AT WORKPLACES AND COPING
STRATEGIES EMPLOYED BY WOMEN

By
ANILA

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the
Dr. Muhammad Ajmal
National Institute of Psychology
Centre of Excellence

Quaid-i-Azam University
Islamabad-Pakistan
1998



Dedicated to

All those Women who are courageous enough to
keep on working despite their experiences of
sexual harassment at workplaces.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	(i)
ABSTRACT	(iii)
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER II: THEORETICAL FORMULATIONS AND RELEVANT RESEARCH	8
Definitional Issues	8
Measurement of Sexual Harassment	18
Theories of Sexual Harassment	21
The Harassers and the Harassed	37
Victims' Responses to Sexual Harassment	47
Effects of Sexual Harassment on Victims	59
Rationale of the Present Research	65
CHAPTER III: OBJECTIVES AND THE DESIGN OF THE PRESENT RESEARCH	69
CHAPTER IV: OUTCOMES OF THE RESEARCH: PART I	75
Development of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire	75
CHAPTER V: OUTCOMES OF THE RESEARCH CONTINUED: PART II	85
Pilot Study	85
Main Study	91
CHAPTER VI: DISCUSSION	119
REFERENCES	139
ANNEXURES:	
A: Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (46 items, Urdu and English Versions)	155
B: Item total correlation coefficients of the 46 items SHEQ	163
C: Items belonging to Gender Harassment, Unwanted Sexual Attention, Sexual Coercion, and Redundant Items (Urdu Version)	164
D: Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (35 items, Urdu and English Versions)	168
E: Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (Urdu and English Versions)	174
F: Demographic Description of the Sample of Main Study	182
G: Personal Strain Questionnaire (Urdu and English Versions)	185
H: Demographic Information Sheet	189

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I gratefully acknowledge the contributions of those who have assisted me directly or indirectly in this difficult task of completing my Ph.D. research.

I owe much to my supervisor Dr. Naeem Tariq, Director, National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University. He was a valuable guide as well as a critic. He helped me straighten out the logic, guided in arranging the ideas to achieve a readable style, and provided methodological expertise.

My special thanks are for Dr. Z. A. Ansari who remained a source of inspiration for me and I find words too inadequate to express the gratitude I feel for him.

Dr. Seema Pervez- a teacher, a colleague, and a friend- provided encouragement and sound advice for the work. My friend and colleague Sarwat Khan's skills in editing could bring substantial improvements in the manuscript. I am thankful to both of them. I am also thankful to Mr. Tanvir Akhtar and Ms. Farida Rafai for their useful suggestions during the research work.

I am deeply indebted to my dear friend Rehana Shujaat, without whose help I would not have been able to reach the defined target of the sample. I am also thankful to my colleague Anis-ul-Haque who helped me out at various stages of data collection. I would also like to thank my sister Sonia Amer; my cousins Saima Pervez and Somia Pervez; and my students Farah Naz Khan, Fizza Sabir, Seemaba Babri, Shazia Ashraf, and Shazia Khalid who have assisted me in the data collection.

Those who have assisted most tangibly in the thesis include Gulnaz, who has transformed rough copy into typed manuscript, and Muhammad Usman who has assisted me in running the SPSS for data analysis. For their efforts in expediting this work, I am warmly grateful.

Special thanks to all those working women who volunteered to participate in the research as subjects.

I also gratefully acknowledge the contribution of those anonymous consulting editors of Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research who have reviewed the article based on the

development of the Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire included in the first part of the present research. Their suggestions have really helped me out in improving the methodology.

My husband Kamal Qazi provided constant encouragement, helpful advice, and necessary support to complete my Ph.D. work. He not only relinquished without complaint many hours of time with me which were rightfully his, but also did more than his fair share to create an atmosphere within which the work could proceed with a bare minimum discord or distraction. I am really grateful to him.

My parents believed from the start that the Ph.D. work would get finished. Their wishes and prayers for my success have always been an inspiration to me. Completion of this work is their dream come true. I find words too inadequate to express the gratitude and love that I feel for them.

ANILA KAMAL

ABSTRACT

The present research investigates women's experiences of sexual harassment at the workplaces, its effects on harassed female workers and the coping strategies employed by them. The research has been carried out in two parts.

Part I deals with the development of an indigenous Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (SHEQ) which measures the women's experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces of Pakistan. The development process was carried out in four phases with independent samples. The 35 items of SHEQ are divided into Gelfand, Fitzgerald, and Drasgow's (1995) three dimensions of harassment: Gender Harassment, Unwanted Sexual Attention, and Sexual Coercion. The procedure followed for the development is almost same as that of Fitzgerald et al.'s (1988) Sexual Experience Questionnaire (SEQ). The results of the several studies carried out during the development of SHEQ suggest that it possesses sufficient reliability and validity for research use.

Part II of the research deals with the exploration of the frequency of sexual harassment at the workplaces and determination of the relationship of various demographic variables with women's experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces. The effects of sexual harassment on harassed female workers in terms of vocational, psychological, interpersonal, and physical strain, the coping strategies that harassed women workers employ in terms of internally focussed and externally focussed coping strategies, and the hypotheses formulated for these variable have also been tested. In Part II, two studies have been carried out. The pilot study was done on a small sample (N=60) and it was aimed at calculating the frequency of sexual harassment at workplaces and determining the relationship of sexual harassment with some demographic variables. The main study was carried out on a comparatively larger sample (N=205), it again aimed at calculating the frequency of sexual harassment as well as determination of the relationship of sexual harassment with various demographic variables. It also dealt with the exploration of the effects of sexual harassment and coping strategies employed by women through testing of a few hypotheses formulated in this regard.

In the Pilot Study, a sample of 60 working women who showed their willingness to participate were selected. Their age ranged from 19 to 50 years ($M=28.78$, $SD=6.55$). All of the subjects were working with male bosses, colleagues, and subordinates. SHEQ along with a demographic information sheet were administered on them. As regard the frequency of the experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces, it was found that the prevalence estimate was same as that of the research of Gelfand, Fitzgerald, and Drasgow's (1995). Thus, the highest prevalence was on the dimension of Gender Harassment, followed by Unwanted Sexual Attention, and then Sexual Coercion. Data on relationship of various demographic variables with women's sexual harassment experiences indicate that the results were consistent with those of some Western studies, which confirmed that SHEQ could be used as a measure of women's experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces.

In the Main Study, a sample of 205 women working with male bosses, colleagues, and subordinates was taken. Their mean age and standard deviation were 29.36 and 6.66 years, respectively. Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (SHEQ), Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ), Personal Strain Questionnaire (PSQ) of Occupational Stress Inventory, and a demographic information sheet which collected information on age, education, marital status, job status, organization, and reasons for doing job were administered. The prevalence rate was in the same direction as found in the pilot study of the present research and earlier by Gelfand et al.'s (1995) research. The relationship of different demographic variables with sexual harassment was found to be mostly in line with Western studies. It has been concluded that experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces affect working women in terms of vocational, psychological, interpersonal, and physical strain. The women with more experiences of sexual harassment employed more externally focussed coping strategies as compared to internally focussed coping strategies. Implications and limitations of this research have also been discussed.

Chapter-I
INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

Sexual harassment, whether at workplace, at educational institution, at street, at leisure or even at home is a problem gaining increasing recognition in every society (Brooks & Perot, 1991; Dzeich & Weiner, 1984; Matlin, 1993; Pattinson, 1991; York, 1989). Despite the widespread nature of the problem, there are still considerable misunderstandings as well as differences of opinion concerning whether particular situations or behaviours are sexually harassing in nature or not. In particular, men and women see and evaluate such behaviours very differently. Studies have found large sex differences in perceptions and reactions to sexually harassing situations. Both sexes maintain that what is harassment to one person may not be seen as harassment to another (Collins & Blodgett, 1981; Gervasio & Ruckdeschel, 1992; Gutek, Cohen, & Konrad, 1990; Kanekar & Dhir, 1993; Kenig & Ryan, 1986; Lott, Reilly, & Howard, 1982; Padgitt & Padgitt, 1986; Powell, 1986; Pryor, LaVite, & Stoller, 1993; Reilly, Lott, & Gallogly, 1986; Stockdale, 1993; Tata, 1993). Perhaps the only real test remains how the victim reacts to the unwelcome attentions of another and what she, or he, can and should do about it. Women are mostly the victims and men are the perpetrators. Women are universally more likely to find social sexual behaviour as objectionable. Conversely, men are more likely to label a woman's behaviour as 'sexy' or 'come-on', when women would describe such behaviour as friendly.

Sexual harassment is, in fact, a new name for the problem which is certainly not new. It was as late as mid-1970s that a name was given to it, when Working Women United Institute (1977) used the term for the first time in connection with one of the first reported cases of Carnita Wood who sought unemployment compensation after leaving a job due to sexual advances of her superior (cited in Fitzgerald, 1990a). According to Goodman (1981), sexual harassment of women workers has been a problem for as long as women have worked outside the home. He noted that "The history of sexual harassment dates back at least to the time women first traded their labor in the

marketplace" (p. 449). In 1908, "Harper's Bazaar" published a collection of stories documenting the experiences of women who had migrated to the city at the turn of the century to find work. These stories revealed widespread and extensive harassment to which these women were subjected to (cited in Betz & Fitzgerald, 1987). Bularzik (1978) in a fascinating historical account of the phenomenon, told of a broom factory in which women carried knives to protect themselves. According to Goodman (1981), many of the essential facts about sexual harassment, particularly its frequency, are as true today as they were at the turn of the century. However, as the concern expressed about sexual harassment is relatively recent, many people may not have yet recognised it as a serious problem. Indeed, it is often difficult to differentiate between a sexist attitude within a workplace at one hand, and sexual harassment on the other. Many people still regard it as a "fuss about nothing", something that is inevitable consequence of men and women working together, or a harmless fun (Baker, Terpstra, & Larntz, 1991; Hemmasi, Graf, & Russ, 1994; Lott, Reilly, & Howard, 1982; Mazer & Percival, 1989; Reilly, Lott, & Gallogly, 1986).

The issue of sexual harassment was brought into public awareness through the efforts of two authors. Farley's (1978) book titled 'Sexual Shakedown: The Sexual Harassment of Women on the Job' aimed at bringing sexual harassment to public attention for the first time. Soon after that, MacKinnon's (1979) book titled 'Sexual Harassment of Working Women' sought a legal mechanism for handling sexual harassment and compensating its victims. In a strong and compelling argument, MacKinnon contended that sexual harassment was primarily a problem for women, that it rarely happened to men and, therefore, it should be viewed as a form of sexual discrimination. Viewing sexual harassment as a form of sexual discrimination would make available to victims the same legal protection which was available to victims of sexual discrimination. Subsequently, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC, 1980) established guidelines consistent with MacKinnon's position, and numerous cases of sexual harassment reached the courts of the United States (Livingston, 1982). These days, sexual harassment is certainly considered a form of victimization about which increasing concern is being expressed in the workplace (Ellis, Barak, & Pinto, 1991; Gutck & Cohen, 1987; Gutck, Cohen, & Konrad, 1990; Jensen & Gutek, 1982; Konrad

& Gutek, 1986; Little-Bishop, Seidler-Feller, & Opaluch, 1982; Schneider, 1982; Sheffey & Tindale, 1992).

Sexual harassment at workplace can be broadly described as repeated and unwanted verbal or sexual advances, sexually explicit derogatory statements or sexually discriminating remarks made at the workplace. These would be offensive to a worker involved, particularly if they caused the worker to feel threatened, humiliated, harassed, and would interfere with the worker's job performance, job satisfaction, commitment, and undermine job security, or create a threatening or intimidating work environment. Furthermore, sexual harassment at workplace can take many forms including leering, ridicule, embarrassing remarks or jokes and unwelcome comments; suggestive remarks or other verbal abuse; leering at a person's body; repeated and/or unwanted physical contact; compromising invitations; demands for sexual favours, and physical assault. The unwelcome comments can include remarks about dress or appearance. People usually fail to recognize the difference between social interaction at work (which involves social relationship in which both persons, that is male and female, enter into or develop with mutual understanding), and sexual harassment (which is the imposition of unwelcome attention or action on one person i.e., female often by another person i.e., male). The occurrence of sexual harassment is, in general, a product of the position of, and reflects the attitude towards, women in society and in the workplace (Kanekar & Menon, 1992; Pattinson, 1991).

According to Fitzgerald (1992), sexual harassment is found in both public and private sectors, in all types of organizations, and at all levels. Very often when sexual harassment is talked about, it is in the context of the office where there is a clear cut division of status between female secretarial staff and male management, reinforced by the unwritten rule that the women workers have to look and dress attractively. However, there are many other instances of sexual harassment. For instance, teachers and other workers dealing with young people can face sexual harassment from them (Grauerholz, 1989; Reilly, Carpenter, Dull, & Bartlett, 1982). Additionally, sexual harassment can result from the isolation of women in male dominated jobs, or it can be a product of male resentment about a woman doing a particular job (Gutek & Morasch, 1982). The harasser may be in

the same status job as the woman involved or in a lower status job than the worker against which the unwanted attention is directed. In the latter case, harassment can be used as a weapon to undermine the authority of woman supervisors, managers, and tutors. The common link is that the action is unwanted by the women. Thus, sexual harassment is frequently a display of power over the recipient or is designed to undermine, isolate, and degrade that person as a worker (Carothers & Crull, 1984; DiTomaso, 1989; Wolshok, 1981).

Consequences of experiences of sexual harassment often mean that women leave their jobs rather than face the harassment. In some cases they may be dismissed or lose promotion prospects for failing to comply with the suggestions made. Unwanted attention frequently creates a stressful and hostile working environment which leads to mental and physical illnesses such as headaches, digestive problems, nausea, depression, general physical disability, and lack of resistance to infections (Coles, 1986; Crull, 1982; Jensen & Gutek, 1982; Lindsey, 1977; Loy & Stewart, 1984; Martin, 1978, 1980; McGrath, Keita, Strickland, & Russo, 1990; Schneider, 1982).

Despite the serious problems it poses to the victims, sexual harassment may be described as a forgotten problem, often overlooked by people (Stockdale & Vaux, 1993). Women probably feel that, like cancer and the common cold, nobody will find a cure. The easiest course, clearly would be to disregard it, not write about it, never discuss it, and hope it 'goes away', like a headache. However, it is a problem which has finally been recognized and defined, not necessarily by men, but by women. Their judgement must be respected because they are the prime victims, have always been the victims, and probably always will be the victims. Harassment is no fun, it can be a living hell for some. As sexual harassment is a social evil, women should not be conditioned into accepting it as part of their every day lives. After all, sexual harassment is not heaven-sent rather it is man-made.

The phenomenon of sexual harassment has also been studied in different cultures (e.g., Gelfand, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1995; Matsui, Kakuyama, Onglatco, & Ogutu, 1995). In Pakistan, researchers took interest in sexual harassment as late as 1990s (Anila, 1990, 1992, 1994, 1995; Anila, Ansari, & Tariq, 1991; Anila, Tariq, & Ansari, 1995; Pakistan National Report, 1995; Shah, 1994; Zaidi, 1994). Most of these studies dealt only with the qualitative aspects of the phenomenon

of sexual harassment. Anila (1990) found that the nature of sexual harassment in Pakistan consisted of staring, unwanted sexual comments and, physical contact etc. (e.g., brushing against, squeezing, or pinching). It occurs most frequently in co-education institutions, public places (e.g., bus stops, markets, stadiums, cinema halls, parks, and females' college gates, etc.). The harassers include mostly males of all ages belonging to different socioeconomic strata of the society. The victims of sexual harassment are believed to be mostly those females who attract attention by indecent dress and make-up and by their own behaviour, such as giggling, style of walking, etc. However, those who are decent and sober and who do not indulge themselves in those kinds of behaviours may also, at times, become victims of sexual harassment. The motives of harassers and reasons for sexual harassment are usually to show off, to attract attention, or/and for fun, etc. Common reactions of victims in Pakistan, according to this study, include ignoring, giving verbal and facial expression of liking or disliking, avoiding the situation, and self-blaming, etc. However, most of the research respondents observed that they would ignore the situation.

Anila (1995) reports that sexual harassment is the least spoken issue in Pakistani society. Although all women know it and experience it but nobody cared or dared to report it because throughout their lives they had been discouraged to speak about such incidences. In the words of one of the female students "a girl should always remain defensive and careful, the snake habitually will bite. Similarly men have the habit of teasing women" (p. 52). The author concludes that these attitudes and habits contribute to the continuation of the incidence of sexual harassment in the society.

In Pakistani culture, the anticipation of sexual harassment incidences and the desire to avoid them seem to influence women's freedom in general. This problem is compounded because women are made to feel responsible for their own victimization by being told that if a man harasses them, it is because they have been doing something to provoke him (Anila, 1995; Zaidi, 1994). In her research on the sexual harassment at the university campus, Anila (1994) reported that the events of sexual harassment construct a barrier to educational pursuits of females. Most of the females do not take admission in institutions with co-education. Those who do feel very uncomfortable in these

situations. They even feel frightened to move about in the university campus without a friend accompanying them.

Interesting is to note that in Pakistan, as much as elsewhere, males and females blame each other for the occurrence of the incidence of sexual harassment (e.g., Anila, 1990, 1995). However, the attributions and attitudes seem to be interrelated. For example, Anila, Ansari, and Tariq (1991) developed a Sexual Harassment Attribution Questionnaire (SHAQ) which measured the direction of attribution of responsibility for sexual harassment: to male, female, or to both of them. Later, Anila, Tariq, and Ansari (1995) used this questionnaire along with Sex Role Attitude Scale (Anila & Ansari, 1992), on a sample of 100 male and 100 female university students. Sex role attitudes and attribution of responsibility for sexual harassment were found to be interrelated. Furthermore, the male students, the older in age, and those studied in institutions with co-education attributed the responsibility for sexual harassment to the 'girl' as compared to their counterparts.

Pakistan National Report (1995) is the first government level statement of the issue although it is not research based. According to this report, sexual harassment in the workplace and the street takes many forms. At the workplace these include sexual propositions, vulgar posters, lewd songs, scurrilous jokes, and "accidental" touching, and, in the more serious cases, rights, benefits, promotions, and job security are offered or withheld on the basis of sexual favours granted or denied. In the street, these range from the more common instances of verbal abuse, sexist remarks, "accidental" pushing and shoving, and exhortations to cover the hair and, in extreme cases, stabbing and acid burning. Most of these forms of violence are justified on the grounds that women's "rightful" place is in the home. Incidents of public humiliation and violence, including family vendetta cases where women were publically stripped naked and dragged through the streets, is part of the accelerating violence against women in Pakistan.

So far, all the studies in Pakistan related to sexual harassment were carried out on the students at professional colleges and universities by the researchers at university levels. No attempt has been made to study the situation of sexual harassment at workplace. The phenomenon of sexual harassment at Pakistan may not be completely understood through investigations at educational

institutions only, because at workplaces women also experience the problem of sexual harassment as much as is the case in educational institutions. According to Bularzik (1978), since the industrial revolution working women have been searching for remedies to unwanted sexual attention in the workplace, and despite of all the efforts they have failed to stop it. The problem is continuing and women of today are desperately trying to cope with it. Like other countries of the world, the Pakistani woman also faces sexual harassment. Efforts need to be made to study this phenomenon particularly at workplaces in the light of the cultural norms of Pakistan. The present study is the first of its kind in the country.

Chapter-II
THEORETICAL FORMULATIONS AND RELEVANT RESEARCH

THEORETICAL FORMULATIONS AND RELEVANT RESEARCH

DEFINITIONAL ISSUES

One of the most persistent and troubling problems in the literature on sexual harassment has been the lack of a widely agreed upon definition of the construct, one that was broad enough to comprehend the variety of experiences to which the construct refers, and yet specific enough to be of practical use. According to MacKinnon (1979), it is not surprising that women would not complain of an experience for which there has been no name. Until 1975, lacking a term to express it, sexual harassment was literally unspeakable.

Although since the mid-1970s, there was an explosion of interest, research, and litigation regarding sexual harassment, still a generalized, shared and social definition remained inaccessible. Another related problem has been the lack of a generally agreed upon operational definition, one that could be used in research and theory building. Although many studies have been conducted, each has tended to develop its own methodology, a practice yielding conflicting estimates of incidence rates and behaviours. This not only has led to disarray in the literature but has also diminished the credibility of sexual harassment reports within the legal system. Thus the opportunity for social sciences to contribute to social change in this important area of women's life has so far remained limited.

Definitions developed to date have been of two varieties, those that are stated a priori (theoretical definitions), and those that are constructed from investigation of individuals' judgements or perceptions of sexual harassment, i.e., empirical definitions (Fitzgerald, 1990a).

A Priori Definitions

Although based, to some degree, on informal observations of the phenomena, most definitions of sexual harassment are a priori in nature; that is, rather than being explicitly data-based, they are derived from theoretical propositions concerning the nature of the construct. Such a priori definitions take one of the two forms. The first (Type I) consists of a general statement describing the nature of the behaviour and (sometimes) the status of the relationship of the persons involved. Such statements generally do not, however, define or list any particular behaviours or classes of behaviour. The second type (Type II) takes quite a different, and in some ways opposite, form as they consist of a list of specific actions, with no formal explication of the theoretical framework from which such a list is derived, with a general exception that the behaviour is usually described as unwanted by the recipient.

Definitions of the first type include all legal and regulatory abstractions, as well as other, more explicitly, theoretical statements. Examples include the extremely influential guidelines published by the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC, 1980), which have guided much subsequent sexual harassment litigation, as well as statements from various influential professional organizations. EEOC defines harassment on the basis of sex as a violation of Section 703 of Title VII of the United States Civil Rights Act. EEOC definition of sexual harassment is as follows:

Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favours, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when: (i) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment, (ii) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions affecting such individual, or (iii) such conduct has the purpose or effect of substantially interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment (cited in Livingston, 1982, p. 9).

Similarly, the National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs (as cited in Till, 1980, p.7) developed a working definition of sexual harassment in an educational context, "Academic sexual harassment is the use of authority to emphasize the sexuality or sexual identity of the student in a manner which prevents or impairs that student's full enjoyment of educational benefits, climate, or opportunities".

Probably the most influential nonregulatory definition (and one by which all others were, to some degree, influenced) is that of MacKinnon (1979) who states:

Sexual harassment... refers to the unwanted imposition of sexual requirements in the context of a relationship of unequal power. Central to the concept is the use of power derived from one social sphere to lever benefits or impose deprivations in another... when one is sexual, the other material, the cumulative sanction is particularly potent (p. 1).

A conceptually similar definition is offered by Benson (as cited in Fitzgerald, 1990a, p.23), who states: "Sexual harassment is broader than sexual coercion... (and) can only be understood as the confluence of authority relations and sexual interest in a society stratified by gender".

LaFontaine and Tredeau (as cited in Fitzgerald, 1990a) defined sexual harassment as:

Sexual harassment is any action occurring within the workplace whereby women are treated as objects of the male sexual prerogative. Furthermore, given that women are invariably oppressed by these actions, all such treatment is seen to constitute harassment, regardless of whether the victim labels it as problematic or not (p.23).

Farley (1978) asserts:

Sexual harassment is best described as unsolicited, nonreciprocal male behaviour that asserts a woman's sex role over her function as worker. It can be any or all of the following: Staring at, commenting upon, or touching a woman's body; requests for acquiescence in sexual behaviour; repeated nonreciprocated propositions for dates; demands for sexual intercourse; and rape (pp. 14-15).

Type II definitions, on the other hand, are more concrete as compared to Type I definitions.

For example, according to Betts and Newman (as cited in Fitzgerald, 1990a):

a good definition of sexual harassment includes the following behaviours: (i) verbal harassment or abuse; (ii) subtle pressure for sexual activity; (iii) unnecessary patting or pinching; (iv) constant brushing against another person's body; (v) demanding sexual favours accompanied by implied or overt threats concerning an individual's employment status; and (vi) demanding sexual favours accompanied by implied or overt promise of preferential treatment with regard to an individual's employment status (p.24).

Similarly, according to Working Women United Institute (as cited in Evans, 1978) sexual harassment can be any or all of the following:

Verbal sexual suggestions or jokes, constant leering or ogling, 'accidentally' brushing against a woman's body, a 'friendly' pat, squeeze, pinch or arm around her, catching her alone for a quick kiss, the explicit proposition backed by threat of losing her job, and forced sexual relations (pp. 203-204).

The Project on the Status and Education of Women (as cited in Fitzgerald, 1990a) states that:

Sexual harassment may take the form of verbal harassment or abuse, subtle pressure for sexual activity, sexist remarks about a woman's clothing, body, or sexual activities, unnecessary touching, patting, or pinching, leering or ogling of a woman's body, demanding sexual favours accompanied by implied or overt threats concerning one's job, grades, letters of recommendations, etc., physical assault (p. 24).

Hadjifoutiou (1983) defined sexual harassment as:

All those actions and practices by a person or group of people at work which are directed at one or more workers and which are repeated and unwanted; may be deliberate or done unconsciously; cause humiliation, offence or distress; may

interfere with job performance or create an unpleasant working environment; comprise remarks or actions associated with a person's sex; emphasize a person's sexuality over her role as a worker (p. 9).

Although these definitions are based on the researchers' own judgements and perceptions of the construct, still they have made a significant contribution in the research and produced a valuable literature on sexual harassment.

Empirical Definitions

Empirical definitions of sexual harassment are derived by asking women directly if they have ever been harassed, and if so, to describe their experiences. These qualitative data are then content analyzed, and a classification scheme is usually developed, the categories of which serve as the general elements of the definition. Ideally, such a system would then be validated with data from an independent sample, using raters trained in the classification scheme. The most complete effort of this sort is that of Till (1980) who classified the responses of a national sample of college women into five general categories, covering a wide spectrum of behaviours from sexist comments to rape. The first of these categories or types was labeled "generalized sexist remarks and behaviour" (gender harassment). Such behaviour is not necessarily designed to elicit sexual cooperation, but rather to convey insulting, degrading or sexist attitudes about women. The second category consists of "inappropriate and offensive, but essentially sanction-free sexual advances" (seductive behaviour). This behaviour is unwanted and offensive but there is no penalty attached to the woman's negative response. The third category includes "solicitation of sexual activity or other sex-related behaviour by promise of reward" (sexual bribery). The fourth category covers "coercion of sexual activity by threat of punishment" (sexual coercion). Finally, in the fifth category, Till (1980) reports instances of "sexual crimes and misdemeanours including rape and sexual assault" (sexual imposition or assault). Till (as cited in Fitzgerald, 1990a) observes:

Categories are not sharply delineated, although they are arranged in a roughly hierarchical continuum. Many of the reported incidents involve several categories,

as when a student is promised something in exchange for sexual favour and simultaneously threatened about noncooperation (p.25).

Despite such classificatory difficulties, Till's (1980) work has been extremely influential, and provides the basis for further research.

A slightly different, but conceptually related definitional strategy has been to present a series of behaviours, varying in severity, type, and context, and ask subjects whether or not, in their opinion, the situation constituted sexual harassment. Such a strategy thus shifts the definitional locus (i.e., from "victim" to "observer"), and attempts to develop the construct through consensual validation. Gutek, Morasch, and Cohen (1983) reported one of the earliest and most influential studies of this type. In their study, subjects (218 undergraduate psychology majors) were presented with a series of scenarios portraying "socio-sexual behaviour" in a workplace setting. The scenarios systematically varied the sex of the initiator, the status of the initiator (supervisor, coworker, subordinate), and his/her behaviour (sexually suggestive touching was depicted in some scenarios and accompanied by either a personal or a work related comment). A typical scenario reads "Jane is walking down the hall at work. Mr. Davidson, Jane's boss, walks up from behind. As Mr. Davidson passes Jane, he pats her on the fanny and says "Hurry up, you'll never get everything done today". Subjects rated the incident on five point scale. Responses were factor analyzed to produce five dimensions: The quality of the relationship between the two, (e.g., the extent to which they were friends, liked each other, etc.); the qualitative aspects of the incident itself, (was it friendly, insulting, welcoming, and so forth); the appropriateness of the initiator's behaviour; the probability of the incident; and, finally, the probability of such an incident occurring with the role reversed. In general, women viewed the incidents much more negatively, particularly when they involved touching combined with a work related comment (as in the example above). In addition, the women assessed the general quality of the relationship between the participants somewhat more negatively than men. The relationship was also viewed more negatively by the subjects when the initiator was male, or of higher status. This was particularly true if a high status initiator was portrayed as touching and making work related comments.

The results reported in the above quoted study identified many of the important variables that have since been shown to influence perceptions of sexual harassment: sex of rater, status of initiator, explicitness of behaviour, and degree of connection to work situation. The findings of gender differences in perceptions of sexually harassing behaviours is the most robust of all that have been examined to date, having been reported in almost every investigation so far completed (see, for example, Collins & Blodgett, 1981; Padgitt & Padgitt, 1986; Powell, 1986). Not surprisingly, women are consistently more likely to view such behaviour as harassment (Kenig & Ryan, 1986) as offensive (Padgitt & Padgitt, 1986), or both (Rossi & Weber-Burdin, 1982).

A similarly consistent finding has been that behaviours initiated by supervisors or others with a substantial power advantage are more likely to be judged as harassment. In her investigation of perceptions of sexual harassment on a college campus, Ormerod (1987) reported that several forms of sexual behaviours were rated more severely when the faculty member was portrayed as having some formal responsibility for evaluating a student (cited in Fitzgerald, 1990a). This parallels Gutek, Morasch, and Cohen's (1983) report that subjects viewed incidents more negatively when they were initiated by a supervisor.

A variable closely related to initiator status is the degree of coercion represented by the behaviour. Subjects overwhelmingly agree that requests for sex linked to threats of retaliation for noncompliance constitute sexual harassment; to a slightly lesser degree, the same is true of behaviours that link sex to promises of reward. For example, 94 per cent of men and 98 per cent of the women in Konrad and Gutek's (1986) sample agreed that "being asked to have sexual relations with the understanding that it would hurt your job situation if you refused, or help if you accepted" was sexual harassment. In Adams, Kottke, and Padgitt's (1983) sample of college students, sexual bribery was defined as harassment by over 97 per cent of the men and 99 per cent of the women. Eliciting sexual cooperation by threats (either direct or subtle) received the highest sexual harassment ratings from the students and faculty in Ormerod's (1987) sample (6.95 and 6.92, respectively, on a 7-point scale). Thus both a priori and empirical definitions clearly agree that such *quid pro quo* (a sexual compliance is exchanged, or proposed to be exchanged for an employment

opportunity) behaviours constitute sexual harassment of the most basic, unambiguous sort (cited in Fitzgerald, 1990a).

At the opposite end of the spectrum lies the more ambiguous behaviours and those that are more sexist (as opposed to sexual) in nature. Behaviours drawn from Till's (1980) "gender harassment" category received the lowest sexual harassment ratings from Ormerod's (1987) sample, while only 30 per cent of the male (but 47 per cent of the female) students surveyed by Adams, Kottke, and Padgitt (1983) defined sexist comments as sexual harassment. Similarly, Padgitt and Padgitt (1986) found that their original data (perceptions of eight sexually harassing behaviours) did not form a Guttman scale, using standard criteria for scalability and reproducibility. They noted that three items seemed to account for many of the inconsistent answers: sexist comments, body language (such as leering at one's body or standing too close), and invitations (e.g., for dates) in which sexual expectations are not stated. When these items were removed, the five remaining behaviours demonstrated sufficient pattern to approximate a reasonable Guttman scale for both male and female subjects.

Review of these and similar studies would suggest that the coercive *quid pro quo* behaviours are always seen as harassment, whereas "gender harassment", and "seductive behaviour" (the first and second categories in Till's (1980) typology) elicit much less agreement. Although this is generally the case, it is also true that contextual variables moderate such perceptions in even seemingly the most clear cases. A study by Reilly, Carpenter, Dull, and Bartlett (1982) makes this point. These researchers utilized a "factorial survey" methodology of Rossi and Anderson (1982) as a means of assessing what factors are of importance in judgements of sexual harassment. Briefly, this methodology involves presenting respondents with a series of brief stories or scenarios that vary along different dimensions of interest, using a computer programme to generate scenarios of faculty-student interactions. Several factors are systematically varied including: (a) the instructor's status (graduate student or professor), age, and marital status; (b) the class standing of the female student; (c) the setting of the interaction; (d) the nature of any past relationship between the instructor and the student; (e) behaviour of the student; (f) verbal behaviour of the instructor; (g) physical behaviour of

the instructor; and (h) presence or absence of threat or coercion. Reilly et al.'s (1982) research is one of the most sophisticated attempts to date made for developing an empirical definition of sexual harassment (see Rossi and Weber-Burdin (1982) for a replication and extension, and Rossi and Weber-Burdin (1983) for a discussion and integration of both studies).

A somewhat different approach to this problem was taken by Terpstra and Baker (1986). Rather than varying the contextual components of interactions, these researchers used a standard stimulus list and examined the effect on perceptions of individual differences in subjects' attitudes, attributes, and behaviours (gender, attitudes toward women, religiosity, self esteem, and locus of control). The results of this study are complex and somewhat difficult to interpret, because these consist of a series of interaction effects. For example, nonreligious subjects with liberal attitudes toward women perceived a relatively high number of incidents as harassment, whereas religious liberal subjects perceived fewer examples as harassment. The opposite relationship was found for subjects with conservative attitudes toward women. Discussing the complexity of their results, these authors offer a model of perceptions of sexual harassment that includes individual differences variables with respect to the perceiver (e.g., sex, age, attitudes, and so forth), situational variables (including characteristics of the offender), the actual behaviour exhibited, and variables involved in the cognitive appraisal process (e.g., causal attributions).

Gutek, Nakamura, Gahart, Handschumacher, and Russell (1980) have categorized the sexually harassing behaviours in the course of conducting three surveys on the topic. This categorization covers a broad range of social/sexual behaviours under the assumption that in order to study a new and relatively unresearched area like sexual harassment, a comprehensive framework is the best. Social/sexual behaviours are defined as nonwork related looks, gestures, touching, or remarks that have sexual content.

Gutek et al. (1980) reported a primary distinction between reciprocal and attentional behaviours. Reciprocal behaviours are those that require a response from the target. Two kinds of behaviours that require reciprocation might be considered sexual harassment. One is required sexual activity and the other is required dating. A person who is expected to engage in sexual activity in

order to get a job, for example, must ultimately either say yes or no. That is, a response is required from the recipient. The other reciprocal category of behaviour, dating, likewise requires a response. A person either agrees or does not agree to socialize as a condition of work. The necessity for reciprocation is usually viewed as one of the most stressful parts of sexual harassment. Further, it is usually impossible for the target to ignore the initiator's request. Also, refusal often does not stop the offending behaviour. Finally, the initiator may continue to ask, escalating either the rewards that are promised for compliance or the punishments that are threatened for noncompliance.

The second category of behaviours is called attentional. These behaviours, which include looks, gestures, comments, and touching, do not require a response from the recipient. Sometimes they are considered less disturbing because they do not involve reciprocation. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC, 1980) guidelines do not contain such an assumption; they state that the occurrence of these behaviours creates an intimidating environment for workers.

Within the attentional category in Gutek et al.'s (1980) categorization, a distinction is made between touching and nontouching. Respondents to three surveys noted repeatedly that the invasion of their personal space, being touched by someone when the touching was unwelcome, is different from being the subject of comments or gestures. One of the issues that needs to be addressed is when touching is viewed as sexual and when it is viewed as nonsexual (Gutek, Morasch, & Cohen, 1983). Nonsexual touching is rarely viewed as sexual harassment, according to respondents in the major surveys. Less than 7 per cent of men and 8 per cent of women consider nonsexual touching to be sexual harassment. However, it may well be the case that there is little consensus about which touching behaviours are sexual and which are nonsexual. Certainly, grabbing at a person's genitals is considered sexual by everyone, but putting an arm around someone's shoulder or waist, brushing up against someone, or leaning against someone may be defined as sexual by some people and as nonsexual by others.

A second distinction within the attentional category is between verbal and nonverbal behaviour. Verbal behaviour, such as comments or whistles are usually clear; whereas nonverbal behaviour such as looks and gestures may be more subtle and covert.

A final distinction within the attentional category applies to comments, looks, and gestures; it is whether they are intended to be positive or negative. Sexual comments often are given with the intention of complimenting the other person. Such comments, looks, or gestures are usually less objectionable for women than the ones that are clearly meant to be insulting. Using crude sexual terms to order someone around or to demean them is clearly different from making comments that are meant to flatter or to compliment. One reason for considering even "positive" behaviour as sexual harassment is that "positive" comments or looks can be used to undermine another's position or work effectiveness. For example, consider the case where a man in a business meeting comments on the attractiveness of a woman colleague's eyes. Although it is a positive comment but it will have the effect of diverting attention from the woman's work performance to her physical appearance (Kanter, 1977).

MEASUREMENT OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

A satisfactory operational definition of sexual harassment has proven more difficult to achieve than a linguistic one. Although numerous surveys and studies have appeared, each has typically constructed its own data collection instrument, a situation that has resulted in much confusion in the literature.

In their discussion of the progression of research in new fields, Edwards and Cronbach (1952) describe the initial phase as one of survey research, in which investigators attempt to identify and isolate variables of importance. This stage is typically followed by that of technique research, where the focus is on operationalizing the variables in a reliable manner, a process that is necessary before research can proceed to the more advanced experimental and applied stages. Even the most cursory review of the sexual harassment literature makes clear that the field is only now beginning to make the transition from survey to technique investigations.

As Edwards and Cronbach (1952) suggest, initial efforts in any research are open ended in nature, as investigators attempt to isolate and define the variables of interest. By using the same technique, Crull (1979) reported on the experiences of 92 women, self-identified as victims of sexual

harassment, and identified types of behaviours and experiences that appeared to typify the phenomenon (cited in Fitzgerald, 1990a), while Till (1980) classified responses to his open-ended survey of harassment in higher education into five types or levels, each of progressively greater severity. Similarly, Benson and Thomson (1982) presented their subjects (senior women at the University of California-Berkeley) with the definition of sexual harassment developed by the Working Women United Institute (WWUI, 1978) and then asked them, among other things, whether they had ever been sexually harassed, and if so, to describe the incident. Responses were classified into seven categories, ranging from body language and undue attention to sexual bribery. Somewhat more structured approaches are that of Wilson and Kraus (1983), who presented their subjects with the seven types of harassment incidents identified by the Project on the Status and Education of Women (1978) and asked them to report the number of professors who had engaged in each. Adams, Kottke, and Padgitt (1983) took a similar approach albeit with a slightly different list, while Maihoff and Forrest (1983) asked subjects about only four behaviours, three of which were judged to be extremely severe. Finally, in an extensive examination of harassment at the university, Lott, Reilly, and Howard (1982) asked respondents not only about sexual insults (both verbal and nonverbal), threats or bribery, or sexual assault that they themselves had experienced, but also if they had ever heard of such incidents happening to others, and present figures for both types of data.

The investigations reviewed to this point have all (with the exception of Crull, 1979) taken place within the university environment; examinations of the workplace, however, reveal similar methodologies. In the largest investigation undertaken to date, the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1987) asked a stratified probability sample of the federal workforce whether they had experienced any of seven sexual harassing behaviours during the previous 24 months. In a large scale study of the private sector, Gutek (1985) used a structured interview conducted by telephone to elicit information about six types of behaviours (sexual comments, sexual looks or gestures, sexual and nonsexual touching, coerced dating, and sexual relations). These are the two earliest and widely quoted studies of the sexual harassment at workplace.

According to Fitzgerald (1990a), a review of these studies makes it clear that the objective measurement of sexual harassment remains at a somewhat rudimentary level. As important as these investigations are, they contain several problems from a measurement perspective, suggesting that researchers have seriously neglected (or thought unnecessary) the technique research requirement outlined by Edwards and Cronbach (1952). These problems centre on the very basic issues of reliability and validity, the *sine quo non* of any data collection technique. To examine the latter first, consider for a moment the issue of validity. Of the three facets of validity generally contemplated by measurement theorists, content validity is probably the most relevant here. According to commonly accepted definitions, content validity requires, at a minimum, an adequate specification of the domain of interest, and the generation of a set of items that adequately cover this domain. Each facet of the domain should be represented and appropriately weighed, and care must be taken to construct the items in such a way that they are interpreted similarly by all respondents. This last consideration brings the concept of reliability, that is, whether or not the instrument consistently measures, both across subjects, and within subjects across time.

Reviewing the studies conducted so far, Fitzgerald (1990a) observes that these issues have not been sufficiently addressed to in the measurement of sexual harassment. With respect to stability, no study reports a test-retest correlation coefficient (nor an internal consistency coefficient, for that matter, although that is a separate issue). We have no assurance that the subjects' responses are stable; that is would they answer the same way if asked again. Equally important, there are logical grounds upon which to suspect that the subjects may not have interpreted the items in the same manner. For example, some studies have utilized the term "sexual harassment" and asked women whether or not they have been harassed (e.g., Till, 1980); others label their intentions in cover letters or survey titles and then present women with a list of behaviours to consider (e.g., U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981); finally, some do not use the term harassment, but ask women to determine whether the touching was meant to be sexual, or the comments were meant to be insulting (e.g., Gutek, 1985). Such procedures introduce a large element of error into measurement.

It has been widely demonstrated that substantial individual differences exist in the perceptions of what constitutes sexual harassment (see, for example, Gutek, Morasch, & Cohen 1983). Therefore, asking respondents whether they have been harassed, or labeling behaviours as harassment or/and probing whether a respondent has experienced them, introduces systematic as well as random error into the procedure (random because of idiosyncratic definitions of harassment; systematic because most women have been socialized to accept many forms of sexual exploitation under the guise of joking or compliments, thus systematically reducing their rate of response). A conceptually similar problem is introduced when a researcher asks a subject to make a subjective determination of the intent of a behaviour (e.g., was it meant to be insulting?) before they can say whether or not they have experienced it. Although this may be feasible when examining person perception or attribution, yet it is not an appropriate method for collecting incidence data as it can result in lowering of true incidence rates, given that women are less likely to label a behaviour as sexual than are men, and are socialized not to recognize many sexually insulting behaviours as being just that (Tangri, Burt, & Johnson, 1982).

Finally, it appears that investigators have not paid sufficient attention to the concept of content validity. Many studies give no rationale for the behaviours they have chosen to include while others include a statement to the effect that these items were chosen because they had been used in previous research. Examination of certain relevant studies suggests that several tap a rather narrow spectrum of behaviour (e.g., Maihoff & Forrest, 1983) while others list what might be considered the major facets of the domain but do not include multiple items to measure each facet (e.g., Reilly et al., 1982), suggesting that they may not have been adequately sampled and measured.

THEORIES OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

During the last decade some progress has been made in the development of theories of sexual harassment and with the passage of time these theories have become increasingly diverse, complex, and sophisticated. As the social sciences become increasingly sophisticated about the inadequacy of single and sovereign theories about any realm of social behaviour, it is perhaps

inevitable that a comprehensive theory of sexual harassment will require incorporating factors operating at several levels of social life. In some cases the same explanatory construct appears at several levels of analysis, the prime example being "power" which operates at cultural, organizational, and individual levels. The researches (e.g., Brewer & Berk, 1982; Cleveland & Kerst, 1993; Tangri, Burt, & Johnson, 1982) suggest that no single explanation covers the full range of phenomena labelled sexual harassment. None of the literature has demonstrated that any one "cause" is both necessary and sufficient.

Furthermore, how one defines sexual harassment will, of course, determine how apt a given theory will be. For example, sexual harassment is usually defined as something that men do to women (e.g., Backhouse & Cohen, 1981; Bularzik, 1978; Farley, 1978; MacKinnon, 1979; Studd & Gattiker, 1991), and if a theory that rests on the premise that sexual harassment is the abuse of organizational power which is usually in the hands of men, then it will encompass those incidents of sexual harassment which were not included in the definition (female bosses harassing male subordinates), and also exclude other incidents (such as, street harassment). Definitions that specify the sex of the harasser and of the victim invoke either sociobiological or sociocultural explanations. Furthermore, defining sexual harassment as the abuse of organizational power (Dzeich & Weiner, 1984; Gutek & Morasch, 1982; MacKinnon, 1979; May & Hughes, 1992; Nieva & Gutek, 1981) incorporates causal assumptions into the definition, and excludes theories that would explain "contra-power" harassment. Definitions that include negative consequences for the individual or the organization (Gutek & Koss, 1993) will not produce theories that easily explain females harassing males or contra-power harassment.

Tangri and Hayes (1996) have reviewed the theories about sexual harassment. They observe that different models of various levels of analysis are organised like the layers of an onion: the "deep structure" or inner most representing species-wide evolutionary behavioural adaptations and other biological processes; the next representing sociocultural norms, values, and institutions; the next representing organizational structures and arrangements; and the outermost layer represents idiosyncratic individual and dyadic characteristics, the most outwardly visible variables.

Other classifications of theories of sexual harassment are also possible. Terpstra and Baker (1986), for example, organize the factors associated with sexual harassment into environmental level variables (the ratio of men to women in the population and sex role attitudes, socioeconomic inequalities, task design, worker proximity, organizational climate, employee composition, organization and work roles, sex ratios and formal status or power differentials, and "individual" level variables (motivation, attitudes, personality, physiology, demographic characteristics, and information processing styles). Since this is a classification of variables rather than a theory, it does not offer an account of how variables at the various levels are related to each other, or about harassment outside of the work context.

In a few pages to follow has been given a brief description of all models starting from the inner most layer which is related to two sociobiological arguments, i.e., sexual harassment results either from evolutionary adaptive sociosexual behavior that is dimorphic with respect to gender, or from hormones and intellectual defenses against nature's vagaries. These theories can be classified as "Natural/Biological Model", the term used for the first time by Tangri et al. (1982).

The Natural/Biological Models

Based on their review of court cases, legal defense, and prior research, Tangri et al. (1982) described the Natural/Biological model which suggests that sexual behaviour is simply a natural extension of human sexuality. Its assumptions include a natural, mutual attraction between men and women, a stronger male sex drive, and men in the role of sexual initiators. According to this model, the harassing behaviour is not meant to be offensive or discriminatory, but is merely the result of biological urges. Tangri et al. (1982) suggest that if this model is correct, women victims should be similar to their harassers in age, race and other socially relevant characteristics; both parties should be unmarried or eligible as partners; the behaviors exhibited should closely resemble typical 'courtship' behaviors and, of course, the harasser should desist if the woman shows disinterest. Thus this model implies that the concept of sexual harassment is a mistaken one; the relevant interactions are most appropriately viewed as courtship behaviour. The other theories which extend these view

points i.e., the significance of sex and aggression, the two most basic human drives in the phenomenon of sexual harassment include the theories which emphasize current hormonal forces and evolutionary adaptations.

The Hormonal Model suggests that sexual harassment is a normal expression of men's stronger sex drive. In the words of Paglia (1992) "men are in a constant state of sexual anxiety, living on the pins and needles of their hormones ... They must quest, pursue, court, or seize... by concentration and insistence [they] may carry the day" (pp. 117-118). This version also argues that objectifying women as sex objects is just another expression of humans' highest faculty - conceptualization- and will never disappear. The behaviour is simply another expression of humans' struggle to fix and stabilize nature's dreadful flux.

It can be noted that females are also human beings who presumably share this faculty (of conceptualizing) and the same dreadful state of nature, yet do not seem to engage in sexual harassment to nearly the degree that males do. Further, if raging hormones were the cause we should find younger men and older women whose sex drives are at their peak more often culpable, whereas the reverse (older men and younger women) is found much more often (Gutek, 1985; Pryor, 1987; Reilly, Carpenter, Dull, & Bartlett, 1982; Schneider, 1991; Tangri et al., 1982). This argument appears so weak as to not warrant further evaluation. Thus we can move to more elaborate an argument, that is sexual harassment is the result of evolutionary adaptation to reproductive cost/benefit ratios.

The Evolutionary Adaptation Model is explicated by Studd and Gattiker (1991) who present the proposition that because reproduction entails different cost/benefit calculus for men and women, they have evolved different reproductive strategies and the psychological mechanisms to support them. Specifically, men should aggressively compete for access to sexually receptive women of reproductive age, establish long-term mateship in which confidence of paternity is maximized (i.e., be primarily monogamous), and expend parental investment to increase the success of offspring produced (i.e., provide for the survival and flourishing of offspring). This is not, however, the scenario that would lead to sexual harassment.

The alternative reproductive strategy for men, according to Studd and Gattiker (1991) is the "pursuit of short-term, low cost, and low commitment sexual liaisons" (p. 253), which presumably maximizes reproductive success for the male not by assuring survival of offsprings, but simply by increasing the probability of impregnating females. It is the "evolved psychology" of this strategy that accounts for sexual harassment of women by men according to this theory. Women on the other hand, because their reproductive investments (of time, energy, and risk) are much higher than men's, should be more sexually cautious and choosier than men, selecting those "who have at least the potential to provide economic resources or parental effort over the long-term in exchange for sexual access" (p. 253). Therefore, "women ... have evolved a generally negative emotional response to unsolicited sexual attention from men" (p. 256).

According to Tangri and Hayes (1996), this is not the logical conclusion to draw from the argument. It would be more logical to conclude that women should welcome any sexual attention, thus increasing their choices, and exercise the right to choose among suitors. On the other hand, if women have evolved a generally negative emotional response to unsolicited sexual attention from men, then normal mating behaviour should usually be initiated by women, not men, a conclusion not drawn by Studd and Gattiker (1991) in their Evolutionary Adaptation Model.

The Organizational Models

Tangri et al. (1982) were the first to suggest that sexual harassment is a result of aspects of the workplace infrastructure that provide opportunities for harassment. According to them, powerful women may harass subordinate men, and such occurrences are rare only because women are generally employed in subordinate positions. If this theory is accurate, it is individuals in positions of little power, either men or women, who are most likely to be targets of harassing behaviour (e.g., trainees, temporary or part time workers, those on probation, low income individuals, etc.).

There are also other explanations of sexual harassment that focus on various aspects of organizational structure or process. Most of these are conditions that make it easier or more likely for sexual harassment to occur such as requirements for night work or travel out of town with

coworkers, or organizational norms that require women to act "sexy". But none of them explain why workers take advantage of these opportunities, or why men disproportionately do things to women that women do not like. A few of such models have been outlined below.

Sex Role Spillover Theory does provide an explanation for why workers sexually harass other workers (Gutek & Morasch, 1982). Sex role spillover is defined as the carryover into the workplace of gender-based expectations for behaviour that are irrelevant or inappropriate to work. According to the theory this occurs because in most cultures gender identity is more salient than work identity, and because men and women fall back on sex role expectations when they (as men) are not used to women carrying out work roles, or (as women) are prevented from, or resented for, carrying out work roles. This is most likely to occur when the gender ratio is heavily skewed in either direction, i.e., when those in the workplace are either predominantly male or predominantly female.

In the workplace with predominantly male workers, when nontraditionally employed women are treated differently than their (male) colleagues, and they are aware of this differential treatment, then these women are likely to report a high frequency of social sexual behaviours that are not part of the work role in general, and to feel that sexual harassment is a problem at work. In the workplace with predominantly female workers, the traditionally employed women occupy jobs in which the job itself takes on aspects of the female sex role, and depending on the job (e.g., air hostess, actress), this may include the sexual aspects of the female sex role. Yet, because the job description heavily overlaps with gender-role prescriptions, women may attribute how they are treated to the nature or part of the job, rather than to their gender.

Some of the predictions from this theory have been tested and supported by Gutek and Morasch (1982). For example, they found out that nontraditionally employed women in male-dominated work settings perceive themselves being treated differently from male colleagues, that this differential treatment is directed at them as women, and that such women consider this treatment to be discriminatory (in general) and harassment (when the content is sexual). Traditionally employed women surrounded by other women who do the same work and who are all treated similarly, but whose role partners (e.g., supervisors) are men, are less likely to perceive their treatment as

discriminatory or as harassment. Finally, women who work in integrated work settings (i.e., having nonskewed sex ratios) are least likely to report experiencing sexual harassment at work (see also Sheffey & Tindale, 1992).

Theories that emphasize structural factors over gender are supported by research that finds symmetrical outcomes (such as incidence rates of sexual harassment or seriousness of outcomes for victims of sexual harassment) for men and women under symmetrical conditions (such as skewness of sex ratios in opposite directions, or positional authority held by either sex). The difficulty has been finding the contexts in which such symmetry occurs. That is, sexualized female occupations outnumber sexualized male occupations. The number of women working for male bosses is far greater than the number of men working for female bosses. It is, therefore, difficult to test half of the derivations from these models. When these hypotheses can be tested, the evidence is strained. The enormous size of the sample used in U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1981) study of sexual harassment in federal workforce generated a sufficient number of men working in female-dominated workplaces to test whether they were more subject to sexual harassment than men working in other sex ratio contexts. This did indeed, turn out to be the case. However, this reversal of the sex ratio did not generate nearly the incidence rate of harassment that women in male-dominated workplaces reported. It is not, therefore, a sufficient explanation for sexual harassment at work.

Thus in 1985, Gutek added a "gender hypothesis" to the sex role spillover model, arguing that men more than women sexualize the environments they work in, and therefore, other things being equal, they make more sexual comments and suggestions than women. Women receive such remarks more than men do, and women experience more sexual harassment than men. Gutek suggests that this sex difference is rooted in sex role socialization for sexual behaviour which prescribes the role of initiator and pursuer to men, and limit setter to women.

Organizational Power Model described, in the earliest writings related to sexual harassment, men abusing their organizational power to coerce or intimidate women (Backhouse & Cohen, 1981; Bularzik, 1978; Farley, 1978; MacKinnon, 1979). This for quite some time remained the focus of most research and legal developments. Later, writings and policy statements emphasized

a gender-neutral version of organizational power, arguing that where there was formal power that derived from the hierarchical structure of an organization, it would be abused (though not by everyone who could) to extort sexual gratification (Crocker, 1983; EEOC, 1980; Nieva & Gutek, 1981; Zalk, 1991). Thus, although men typically harass women, in principle it is possible for women to sexually harass men. It is less likely only because women tend to be employed in positions subordinate to men (Evans, 1978).

However, the interpretation of sexual harassment as an abuse of organizational power appeared to be challenged by findings that peers rather than supervisors are the most frequent harassers (Gutek, 1985; Phillips, Stockdale, & Joeman, 1989; U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981), and by documentation of "contra-power" harassment (McKinney, 1992), i.e., the harassment of superiors by subordinates. These findings raise the question of what constitutes organizational power, and whether formal authority is the only kind of power that can be used this way.

Drawing on a substantial body of organizational theory and research, Cleveland and Kerst (1993) explicate the various kinds of power that are used in organizations, how they are used, by whom, and to what end. They also show how these are often linked to gender and help explain sexual harassment. This explication does not exclude the role of other sources of power (societal and interpersonal), but may be seen as an extension of these.

Formal organizational power is derived from the structure of occupations within the organization (the levels of hierarchy and how they are related vertically and horizontally), who occupies what positions, and who has access to the most important resources of the organization. In each of these respects, women are generally positioned at a disadvantage to men, occupying positions of less formal authority and in departments that are not central to the mission of the organization (Kanter, 1977). We do not need to describe the power disadvantage deriving from formal subordinacy, and how this increases women's vulnerability to sexual harassment. These implications are obvious enough (Collins & Blodgett, 1981; Little-Bishop, Seidler-Feller, & Opaluch, 1982; Schneider, 1982). Even without formal subordinacy, however, women's organizational power is

also eroded by being excluded from the informal structures of influence, information, and opportunities (Kanter, 1977). Studies of selection, promotion, and perceived causes of performance also find systematic sex bias against women (Heilman, Martell, & Simon, 1988; Stewart & Gundykunst, 1982). Thus formal differences in status are not the only source of power within organizations; informal dynamics also operate against women at all status levels.

Among coworkers, organizational power differences are created through informal networks, differential support from peers, and differences among peers in how much latitude in decision-making they are granted by supervisors. That these differences are often linked to gender is demonstrated by studies that show why a woman who occupies the same position as a man often does not have the same level of authority or influence (DiTomaso, 1989; Kanter, 1977; Pleck, 1976; Ragins & Sundstrom, 1989; Wolf & Fligsten, 1979). In a sexist organizational culture, sexual harassment from colleagues is just another expression of the undervaluing and undermining of women at work. It is a particularly effective tool for countering the threat of women invading previously male-dominated domains (Benson & Thomson, 1982; LaFontaine & Tredeau, 1986).

Sexual harassment by subordinates has been documented in academic settings as well, where female professors report being harassed by male students (Grauerholz, 1989). Subordinates and peer harassers use sexual or sex role assertion to gain power or minimize power differentials. It should also be noted that contra-power harassment is the rarest form of harassment, and is nearly always perpetrated by men against women (Benson, 1984; Grauerholz, 1989; McKinney, 1992).

Cleveland and Kerst (1993) point out that explaining sexual harassment as an attempt to gain power, or as an expression of a sense of entitlement granted either by organizational power or by societal gender stratification does not address the question of why all men do not harass all women. Although this question might be referred to research on individual differences, they attempt to answer it by adding two elements. These elements are Gutek and Morasch's (1982) sex role spillover thesis, and the "misperception" hypothesis, i.e., the behaviour intended and perceived by women as friendly is perceived by men as sexy. As mentioned earlier Gutek has incorporated a "gender hypothesis" into the sex role spillover model to account for the fact that under symmetrical

sex ratio conditions, there is still a gender difference in the incidence and nature of sexual harassment. Gutek assumes that the underlying basis for the "gender hypothesis" is differential sex role socialization, which is a sociocultural interpretation. The misperception findings are interpreted as possible support for a natural/biological model of sexual harassment presumably based on man's stronger sex drive. Since there is no way to prove that men in general have a stronger sex drive therefore they should not be allowed greater societal permission for sexual activities of all kinds, an alternative interpretation of the "misperception" findings is that the perceptions of both men and women are embedded in sex role socialization for dimorphic patterns of sexual behaviour.

In both of these adjustments to their analysis of the role of power in sexual harassment, as well as in their own discussion of sociocultural power, Cleveland and Kerst (1993), along with others (Finigan, 1982; Izraeli, 1983; Kanter, 1977; Sokoloff, 1980), recognize that organizational explanation alone, though robust, is an insufficient explanation for sexual harassment in organizations. Most comprehensive explanations must also incorporate elements from another layer of the onion, the sociocultural milieu.

Workplace Dispute Resolution Model gives a sociological perspective on sexual harassment. For example, Lach and Gwartney-Gibbs (1993) have presented a sociological perspective of sexual harassment at workplaces. The model can provide insights on how sexual harassment may be patterned by employing organizations, social arrangements within firms, sex segregated occupations, nontraditional occupations, and race and ethnicity. This theoretical model suggests that sexual harassment is the most visible example of a multitude of workplace disputes (and processes to resolve disputes) which systematically disadvantage women in the workplace. The model describes workplace disputes, including sexual harassment as consisting of origins, processes, and outcomes. After reviewing the empirical research, Lach and Gwartney-Gibbs (1993) suggest that sexual harassment is only one type of 'dispute' in the workplace, more or less serious than other types of disputes experienced by both women and men. It is patterned by gender roles, occupational sex segregation, and the social organization of work in offices in such a way as to systematically disadvantage women workers. Thus it is just one of many "gendered" workplace disputes (e.g.,

wages, job performance) that contribute inequality between women and men. It is a serious issue both for women workers and for employers in order to maintain fairness in treatment, legitimacy of the organization, and ultimately efficiency in production.

The Sociocultural Model

There are two ways to think about how the broader sociocultural context relates to sexual harassment. One is to consider how individuals bring their gender status sex-stereotypical responses with them into the organization, and how this shapes their positions and experiences within it (Sokoloff, 1980). From this perspective, sexual harassment at work is an extension of the male dominance that thrives in the larger society. Another approach is to examine the sociocultural system itself and address the questions of how and why it assigns status the way it does. From this perspective, sexual harassment is not a consequence of an unfortunate, though remediable, aspect of relations between the sexes in the larger society, but is rather the organizing principle of our system of heterosexuality.

Both perspectives seem to have validity. However, they make different assumptions about how anomalous sexual harassment is: In the first view it is systemic deviance, an aberration unleashed by male dominance, much as criminal behaviour might be viewed as an aberrant but systemic response to systemic poverty and other such factors. In the second place, dominance and its expression in sexual harassment are not deviant, but a "normal", both normatively and statistically consequence of the ideology of heterosexuality, i.e., heterosexual instrumentalism. According to Schacht and Atchison (1993) "Heterosexual instrumentalism refers to the behaviours which reflect and sustain the expectation that all heterosexuality subordination... The ultimate goal... is the maintenance of preexisting gender inequalities" (p. 41).

According to Pryor (1987) "sexual harassment may be better understood in the general context of heterosexual relationships in our society" (p. 288), than within the confines of intraorganizational structures. MacKinnon (1979) proposes that sexual harassment be understood as one among several expressions of, and mechanisms for, perpetuating beliefs, attitudes, and actions

which devalue women because of their sex and enforce male dominance; in short, a social system defined by patriarchy. Other practices serving the same purpose are rape, prostitution, incest, and pornography (Schacht & Atchison, 1993). It does not affect this analysis to note that not all members of one class oppress all members of another class, just as it does not require that all Americans be capitalists to accept that the United States is an economy based on capitalism.

Another power-based sociocultural explanation of sexual harassment is offered by Vaux (1993). Vaux agrees with many feminists that male entitlement rights, sexual access rights, and coercion are inherent in the American culture. He suggests that the dynamic at work in sexual harassment belongs to a broader class of attitudes and behaviours known as "moral exclusion" (Opatow, 1990). Thus, Vaux (1993) sees sexual harassment as:

an instance of moral exclusion, where by members of a relatively powerful group conduct their lives in their own interest, sometimes at the expense of a relatively less powerful group, in such a way that any harm is denied, diminished, or justified (p. 132).

This theory is consistent with power-based theories and describes a psychological mechanism operating at both the individual and cultural level that facilitates victimization. In this version, the ultimate explanation for using this mechanism is the more powerful group's desire to maintain their position of privilege.

A closely related version of this perspective is one that emphasizes social identity processes rather than power *per se*, yet sees the use of status, prestige, authority and power as central to men's agentic style of identity construction. In this view, sexual harassment is a "corollary of the agentic style of identity construction whereby men define themselves as different from and better than women" (Stockdale, 1991, p. 58). This begs the question of why more men than women use this style and why men but not women define themselves as better than members of the other sex.

There is general agreement in the literature about the characteristics of the sex stratification system and the socialization patterns that maintain it. Men are expected to exercise and are socialized for dominance, leadership, sexual initiative and persistence, and self interest. Women are

expected to exercise and are socialized for submissiveness, nurturing, sexual gatekeeping and self abnegation. These attributes and behaviours may be verbal and nonverbal, explicit and implicit, coerced and persuaded (Blumberg, 1984; Finigan, 1982; Henley, 1977; Henley & Freeman, 1975; Korman & Leslie, 1982; Lottes, 1991; Saal, Johnson, & Weber, 1989; Weitzman, 1979). The relationship of this pattern of sex role definitions to sexual harassment is spelled out in Tangri et al.'s (1982) sociocultural model:

society rewards males for aggressive and domineering sexual behaviours and females for passivity and acquiescence. Members of each sex are socialized to play their respective and complementary roles. Because women, more than men, are taught to seek their self-worth in the evaluation of others, particularly of men (Bardwick, 1971), they are predisposed to try to interpret male attention as flattery, making them less likely to define unwanted attention as harassment. Their training to be sexually attractive, to be social facilitators and avoid conflict, to not trust their own judgement about what happens to them, and to feel responsible for their own victimization, contributes to their vulnerability to sexual harassment. According to this model, the function of sexual harassment is to manage ongoing male-female interactions according to accepted sex status norms, and to maintain male dominance occupationally and, therefore, economically, by intimidating, discouraging, or precipitating removal of women from work (p. 40).

Socialization for these patterns occurs throughout the life span and across institutions (Fain & Anderton, 1987) including the family, heterosexual dating, work, and training for work.

Both versions of the sociocultural model have the advantage over the organizational model of explaining not only why sexual harassment is endemic in social life, occurring outside as well as inside organizations, but also how it is linked to other kinds of sexual coercion. The natural/biological model has these same advantages.

Each of these models contributes another layer to our understanding, and all of them taken together probably account for most of the variation in incidence, type, severity, and consequences of

sexual harassment. Nevertheless, given the strong associations among gender, power, and harassment, we must still return to the question of why all men or all power-holders do not harass, and why the same behaviours are perceived and experienced by some men and women as harassment and not by others.

Individual Differences

There are two general approaches to individual differences in research on sexual harassment. The primary focus is framed by the question "What characteristics distinguish harassers from nonharassers, and what characteristics distinguish victims from nonvictims?" The other approach asks what characteristics of perceivers, and characteristics of incidents influence the perception of sexual harassment, that is, whether a certain behaviour is considered sexual harassment, and how serious it is considered so.

The search for individual level characteristics of harassers and victims does not negate any of the other levels of explanation, and often invokes diffuse status characteristics such as gender, age, or marital status as the context in which personal motives are satisfied (DeFour, 1990; LaFontaine & Tredeau, 1986; Mansfield, Koch, & Henderson, 1991; Neibuhr & Boyles, 1991; Schneider, 1982, 1991). Zalk (1990) also aptly argues:

The fact that misogyny is rampant in most societies and that these societies provide for and promote its expression does not explain why men hate women. Concluding that men hate women because they can is nonsensical. Just as hating women is not simply an expression of many individuals' idiosyncratic psychological histories existing in a social vacuum, neither is sexual harassment the acting out of isolated individuals' emotional irritants. Not all men sexually harass women, but it is pervasive enough in most societies to indicate that the social structure nurtures a male psychology that finds gratification in this behaviour ... [and] reflects a pattern of shared experience" (p. 142).

To explain the individual differences among harassers through a psychodynamic model, Zalk (1990) adapts and interprets profiles suggested by Dzeich and Weiner (1984) describing five professional roles that male professors may play vis-a-vis the female students they harass. These are the 'Counselor-helper', who plays the role of nurturer and caretaker; the 'Confidante', who treats students as friends and equals; the 'Intellectual seducer', who impresses students and encourages their awe; the 'Opportunist', who uses various opportunities to harass students; and the 'Power broker', who uses promises of rewards or threats of punishment (subtle or not) to extract sexual compliance. Although these roles vary in the extent to which the harassment is public or private, the harasser is the initiator or the willing noninitiator, assumes entitlement, or is himself infatuated, "the theme which appears to characterize almost all men who have sex with female students is anger toward women" (Zalk, 1990, p. 166). Since the evidence for these profiles rests for now on qualitative data, no quantitative conclusions about their explanatory power can be made at the present time. Yet these profiles are recognizable to anyone who has spent time in academia, and they are not limited to that setting. Similar types are also found in work settings.

In order to study the distinguishing characteristics of those likely to sexually harass, Pryor (1987) developed a scale consisting of scenarios that present male subjects with opportunities to sexually harass a hypothetical woman. He concluded:

the profile of a person who is likely to initiate severe sexually harassing behaviour... is one that emphasizes sexual and social male dominance... These belief structures seem to contribute to the likelihood of sexual harassment... and seem coupled with a basic insensitivity to other's perspectives (p. 277).

Pryor also found that men who scored high on the scale measuring likelihood of sexually harassing are more likely than low scorers to be high in authoritarianism, low in machiavellianism, have negative feelings about sexuality, describe themselves in masculine terms that strongly differentiate them from stereotypical femininity, and have a tendency to behave in sexually exploitive ways when their motives can be disguised by situational excuses. In light of this profile, it becomes

harder to argue that sexual harassment is simply the result of perceptual or communication errors, and not coercive in intent.

Other research has focussed on the characteristics of victims of harassment. According to Vaux (1993) this research suffers from two difficulties: Victim incidence is assessed by self-reports which are influenced both by "false consciousness" (unwillingness or inability to identify harassing behaviours as such), and "victim sensitivity" (the same behaviours being harassment to some persons and not to others).

Some research acknowledges these issues by separating reports of uninvited and unwelcome sexual experiences (objectively defined sexual harassment) and subjective perceptions that one has been sexually harassed. Barak, Fisher, and Houston (1992) found a large gap between these two ways of defining incidence, the objective incidence being much higher than the subjective one. It is due to the attitudinal characteristics of the perceivers.

In conclusion, when Tangri and Hayes (1996) pull together the most strongly supported arguments about the causes of sexual harassment, the most puzzling question to be answered by all the theories is why men's sexual behaviour is so often experienced by women as harassing even when there is no explicit or implicit threat of sanctions or promise of rewards, and even when men do not have a formal power advantage. The answer appears to lie in the point on which the most conservative and most radical theories agree. That is, the system of heterosexual relations is adverbial and coercive. Even the middle-of-road theories (which focus primarily on organizational structure or sex role socialization), acknowledge that some of the asymmetry in men's and women's initiation of and reactions to unwanted sexual attention is based on the asymmetry in power relations between the sexes that exist outside of organizations as McKinney and Maroules (cited in Tangri & Hayes, 1996, p. 38) observe about the causes of sexual harassment:

If there is any common feature to the many factors suggested as variables influencing sexual harassment by researchers in this area, it is the factor of power or status. Whether formal or informal, organizational or diffuse, real or perceived,

status differences between victims and offenders are the root of the problem of sexual harassment.

THE HARASSERS AND THE HARASSED

Harassers/Perpetrators' Characteristics

The preceding account amply reveals that a vast majority of sexual harassment behaviours are initiated by men. As MacKinnon (1979) and others point out, women have been socialized to be subservient, submissive, and passive in relation to men. At workplace, traditional gender role socialization is salient because men are more likely to be in dominant positions relative to women. As a result, at workplace just as much as anywhere else, women are less likely than men to initiate any kind of sexual encounter.

One factor that has been given a great deal of attention is the initiator's position in the organization. A narrow definition of sexual harassment i.e., sex as a condition of getting work, would suggest that only supervisors could initiate harassment because of the power they have in offices. Although supervisors are the most likely initiators according to many reports (e.g., Benson & Thomson, 1982; Farley, 1978; Gutek et al., 1980), still a narrow interpretation of harassment could include others as initiators. People in the work situations are in positions to coerce or pressure other people into engaging in sexual relations. A broader definition of sexual harassment, therefore, suggests that people at virtually all positions within an organization could be initiators of sexual harassment. To illustrate, if harassment includes even being the target of obscene jokes or catcalls, then people at all levels could be initiators. The legal guidelines of EEOC (1980), however, state that where a lower level person is the actual initiator of an objectionable behaviour (e.g., bombarding a coworker with obscene pictures and letters), the supervisor is also responsible because it is his responsibility to check the behaviour of the workers at his office.

There is a stereotype of men who consistently initiate the interactions of sexual harassment. This is of the office "wolf" or "Casanova" who approaches many women. This stereotype is supported by the data of Gutek et al.'s (1980) study. The greatest consensus among women about

initiator is that the man who approaches them also approaches other women. Eighty four per cent of the women in the first pilot study and 71 per cent of the women in the 1980 survey reported that man "behaves this way" towards other women. However, men who approach women vary in age, marital status, and work relationship to the female targets. The harasser is frequently a supervisor, but supervisors are not the only men who sexually touch women, or try to coerce them into socializing for engaging in sexual activity. Fifty two per cent of women in Gutek's sample reported that the initiator was a supervisor. However, even in the case of demanding sexual activity, one quarter of initiators in the study were not in a supervisory position. Many groups of people, besides supervisors, are in positions of some power over a worker, particularly if they think they will be protected by their supervisor. For example, people on whom one depends for work, people who provide supplies, or customers, or clients can demand sexual favours. Workers are often interdependent, such as team mates on an assembly line job or partners in a police car. To assume that only supervisors are in positions to impose sexual demands is to have an overly simplistic view of the interdependent nature of work environments.

Perhaps the men who harass women have a "character defect" or are just experiencing "personal proclivities", as a traditional management approach would suggest. Sometimes such men are said to "like women", yet it is unlikely that men who harass women like those women at all. However, more plausible explanations also exist. For example, the need to exert power over women or to humiliate them, or an unwillingness to control sexual impulses are possible psychodynamic explanations. Confusion of roles may also enter into such behaviour. The inability or unwillingness to differentiate social versus work settings can contribute to social/sexual behaviours. A man who treats a woman at work as a potential date, rather than a coworker, may make little distinction between interacting a woman in a party or in a committee meeting. Finally, the way corporations are organized and jobs are designed can hinder or facilitate the incidence of social/sexual experiences. When men and women work as colleagues, they may view each other as sex objects less frequently

than men and women who work in sex segregated jobs and/or where men are supervisors and women are subordinates (Gutek & Morasch, 1982).

Victims' Characteristics

Gender

A large proportion of the early research on sexual harassment was directed at identifying factors that placed individuals at risk for sexual harassment. Although much of this work is confusing and contradictory, it had the effect of clearly establishing that sexual harassment is overwhelmingly a woman's problem. The original U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1981) report found that of the 462,000 individuals in their sample of the Federal workforce who had experienced sexual harassment, over two thirds were women; other studies make clear that this is a serious underestimate. For example, Fitzgerald et al. (1988) demonstrated that, with the exception of gender harassment (e.g., sexist comments, jokes, etc.), virtually all the harassment reported by their sample of over 3000 college students was reported by women. And, given the way the items were phrased, it is not clear whether the gender harassment that was reported by the male subjects was directed at them personally, or was actually directed at women and observed by the men.

This is not to deny that occasional instances of reverse harassment do occur, and are very distressing to the men involved. Still, it is clear that this is a highly unusual event (not surprising in a culture where women are directly socialized not to be sexually assertive and deviations from this norm are quite extraordinary). It is, in fact, exactly the extreme counter normativeness of such behaviour that makes it the focus of such extensive attention. Far more common than these occurrences, however, are studies showing that men interpret women's behaviours as sexual when, in fact, they are not. For example, Saal, Johnson, and Weber (1989) replicated and extended Abbey's (1982) research demonstrating the male observers see more "sexiness" in women's behaviour than do female observers; women observers were more likely to interpret a particular behaviour as "friendly", an interpretation similar to that given by the women 'targets' themselves when they were

asked to describe the characteristics they were attempting to project. These authors suggest that this difference in social perceptions may account for some incidents of sexual harassment, in that men may misinterpret a woman's behaviour as being a sexual invitation. It seems equally reasonable to suggest that this tendency to sexualize women's behaviour may also account for many instances where men report being sexually harassed by women, a suggestion similar to that made by Gutek (1985).

According to Gutek and Nakamura (1982), in the workplace men are more often in leadership positions than are the women. Male supervisors may be tempted to generalize the aggression and control expected of them on the job to sexual aggression, and women subordinates may carry their passivity too far. Some women, believing that sexual harassment is unavoidable, may permit men to sexually exploit them. As long as the normal masculine gender role teaches men to confuse sexuality with dominance, men are encouraged to be sexual aggressors and women to be sexual victims. Traditional gender role socialization alone, however, can not account completely for workers' experience with unwanted sexual advances. Work roles (e.g., how much authority men have on the job vis-à-vis women) must also be considered.

Together, gender roles and work roles interact to present men and women with very different opportunities. Men are in an excellent position to sexually harass women because of both men's training in sexual aggressiveness and their supervisory power over women employees. Women, on the other hand, have little opportunity to harass male coworkers because they are neither sexually aggressive nor in a position of authority over men. Consequently, it should come as no surprise that women are more likely to complain about sexual harassment than do men.

Age

Gutek (1985) reported that the women victims she studied were often younger than the average worker. Of the women in Gutek's sample who had experienced sexual harassment, over half were less than 35 years old. Other studies report similar results (Baker, 1989; Coles, 1986; Fain & Anderton, 1987; Gutek & Dunwoody, 1987; LaFontaine & Tredeau, 1986; Martin, 1984; U. S.

Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981, 1987). A few studies, however, do report somewhat different findings. For example, Brooks and Perot (1991) in their study of women faculty members and graduate students report that older women experience a higher frequency of sexual harassment than younger women.

According to Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1992), although there is a relative consistency of the data indicating that younger women are at greater risk for harassment, this may represent somewhat of an over simplification, as it is also found that the experience of sexual harassment is not limited to younger women. In fact, all age groups report experiencing harassment, and it seems that the practice of utilizing the median to divide the sample into younger and older workers renders the data sample specific and thus somewhat arbitrary. More informative practice would be to simply sort subjects into a priori categories of age (e.g., less than 25, 26-30, 31-35, 36-40, etc.), the procedure followed by the U. S. Merit Systems researchers (1981, 1987).

Probably more importantly, studies rarely examined what sorts of harassment are experienced by which groups of women. For example, gender harassment would reasonably be expected to demonstrate a weaker relationship to age. Most of the investigations confound the experience of sexual harassment with the recognition or labelling of harassment, variables that likely bear differential relationship to age. Thus, although younger women do appear to be at greater risk for sexual harassment, to conclude that the problem is limited to this group may be erroneous.

Education

Researches have also found that women with higher levels of education are more likely to report sexual harassment than women with lower levels of education (Coles, 1986; Fain & Anderton, 1987; Martin, 1984). Lach and Gwartney-Gibbs (1993) suggest that this may be a function of awareness and sensitization to the problem among more educated women. Gutek (1985) reports that highly educated women tended to hold more liberal attitudes about social behaviour at work. These women were more likely to report being insulted by sexual propositions at work, and to indicate that both men and women contributed equally to sexual overtures.

Marital Status

Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1992) reports that marital status is also related to the experience of sexual harassment, with unmarried (divorced, separated, never married, and cohabiting) women more often experiencing harassment than other (married, widowed) women (see also Coles, 1986; Fain & Anderton, 1987; LaFontaine & Tredeau, 1986; Martin, 1984; Ryan & Kenig, 1991; Schneider, 1982). As is the case with the variable of age, it is easy to over interpret such data. Marital status is more likely a "dummy variable", representing one or more factors that are influential, e.g., perceived availability; lack of the protected status of a wife, particularly if the husband or partner is a powerful male; or, most likely, age itself. Gutek and Nakamura (1982) report that married women and widows report fewer experiences of sexual harassment than do single or divorced women. But the highest incidence is among women who are living with a man. These cohabiting women are twice as likely as women in general to report that they were touched sexually by a man at work (29 per cent compared to 15 per cent). And they were almost twice as likely to report insulting sexual looks or gestures (32 per cent compared to 19 per cent) than were women in general.

Farley (1978) cites instance of sexual harassment among professional women, older women, teenagers, minority woman, and so on. She contends that sexual harassment can happen to any woman, and not only to just certain small groups of women, or a specific kind of woman.

Job Status

According to Tangri et. al. (1982) in work organizations generally women are employed in subordinate positions, that is, in low status job as compared to men. Therefore, they are more vulnerable to experience sexual harassment at the workplaces (see also Baker, 1989; Evans, 1978, LaFontaine & Tredeau, 1986). This has been described by many researcher, that is, the men abuse their organizational power to coerce or intimate women (Backhouse & Cohen, 1981; Bularzik, 1978; Farley, 1978; MacKinnon, 1979). However, this interpretation has been challenged by the findings that peers or coworkers rather than supervisors are the most frequent harassers (Gutek, 1985; Phillips, Stockdale, &

Joeman, 1989; U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981), and sometimes the harassment of superiors by subordinates has also occurred (McKinney, 1992). While describing the effect of job status Cleveland and Kerst (1993) have used the term "organizational" power, and they stated that formal organizational power is derived from the job status of the workers within the organization in which women are usually in the subordinate positions (see also Collins & Blodgett 1981; Little-Bishop, Seidler-Feller, & Opaluch, 1982; Schneider, 1982). Even without formal subordination, women's organizational power is also eroded by being excluded from the informal structure of influence, information, and opportunities (Kanter, 1977). Studies of selection, promotion, and perceived causes of performance also find systematic sex bias against women (Heilman, Martell, & Simon, 1988; Stewart & Gundykunst, 1982). Thus formal differences in job status are not the only source of power within organizations; informal dynamics also operate against women at all job status. For example, studies have shown that women who occupy the same position as men often do not have the same level of authority or influence (DiTomaso, 1989; Kanter, 1977; Pleck, 1976; Ragins & Sundstrom, 1989; Wolf & Fligsten, 1979). Thus the sexual harassment from colleagues is just another expression of the undervaluing and undermining the women at work (LaFontaine & Tredeau, 1986). While when the subordinates sexually harass the women in high status jobs they used sexual harassment as a weapon to undermine the authority of their supervisors. (Carothers & Crull, 1984; DiTomaso, 1989; Wolshok, 1981).

Organizations

According to Fitzgerald (1992), the sexual harassment is found in both public and private sectors and in all type of organizations (see also Farley, 1978; Lach & Gwartney-Gibbs, 1993; Loy & Stewart, 1984). A number of researches have been carried out to study the phenomenon of sexual harassment at different types of organizations. For example, U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board Studies (1981, 1987) were done to study sexual harassment at the federal workplaces; Gutek's (1985) study on Los Angeles county workers; Culbertson et al.,'s (1992) study on U. S. Navy personnel; Little-Bishop, Seidler-Fellar, and Opaluch's (1982) study on airline personnel, Coles's (1986) study on California Department of Fair Employment and Housing; and Gruber and Bjorn (1982) study on coworkers. Thus the phenomenon of

sexual harassment has been explored in almost every type of organization and is a problem of every work organization.

Reasons for Doing the Job

It has also been found by many studies that women victims indicate that their experience of sexual harassment is characterized by the threat of losing a job for failing to comply with sexual demands. Carothers and Crull (1984) found that when women turn down their harasser, they face work sabotage, reprimands, and even job loss. Thus these women may feel coerced into acquiescing to their demands. Ellis (1981) has labelled this type of harassment behavior as "exploitation harassment" and suggest that it is an abuse of power. The exploitation harassment is mostly occur with the woman who is working or doing the job because of her financial problems, because she needs money to support herself or her family and because she cannot leave her job as a result of her experiences of sexual harassment. On the other hand the woman who is doing job just to pass her time without any financial problems or liabilities are usually not bound to face the exploitation harassment.

According to U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1981, p.46), the women most likely to be sexually harassed are very dependent on their jobs and they have even showed it very clearly in the responses of narrator victims to the question, "At the time of this experience, how much did you need this job?". It is interesting that women who had faced actual or attempted rape or assault were more likely than others to have needed their job a great deal at the time of harassment. Still, as yet not a single study has been carried out to directly study the variable of reasons for doing job.

Physical Attractiveness

Gutck and Nakamura (1982) reported that people who labelled themselves as physically attractive were more likely to report that they were expected to date or engage in sexual activity as a part of their jobs than were people who did not see themselves as physically attractive. They were also more likely to report complimentary comments of a sexual nature than women who reported themselves to be less attractive. Women who rated themselves as physically attractive were more

likely to report social-sexual behaviours in general than were less attractive women. Of the women who rated themselves very attractive, 73 per cent reported at least one social-sexual incident, compared to 33 per cent of the other female respondents. According to Farley (1978) these relationships are fairly consistent, but still it does not seem to be true that, as popular opinion suggests, sexual harassment is a problem that affects only young and attractive women.

Race/Ethnicity

Few attempts have been made to examine whether and to what degree race and ethnic status influence a woman's risk of being sexually harassed. DeFour (1989) has speculated that various myths concerning the sexuality of ethnic women (for example, that Hispanic women are "fiery" or passionate, or that Black women are sexually promiscuous) may place them at greater risk than other women by providing the harasser with a rationale for his approach. Similarly, she argues that the economic vulnerability of many ethnic women makes it more difficult for them to resist unwelcome advances. Despite the intuitive appeal of these arguments, at this point they remain largely unexamined, most likely because most samples have not contained enough women of ethnic minority status to allow them to be tested.

Gutek's (1985) report of harassment from a large, scientifically selected sample of the Los Angeles county workforce provides the best data so far available on this question, because approximately one third of the 824 women respondents were non-Caucasians. Gutek (1985) reported that, in this group, the minority women were no more vulnerable to harassment than other women, and, in fact, were actively less likely to report quitting a job because of sexual harassment. However, she points out "A variety of factors may contribute to these findings; minority women may report fewer of their experiences and Caucasian women may represent the cultural standard of attractiveness" (p. 56). Fain and Anderton (1987) found that minority women were more likely than nonminority women to experience pressure for sexual favours, sexual gestures, and requests for dates. However, Martin (1984) reviewing the same data, found no connection between race and ethnicity, and the levels of harassment. Clearly, this is still a largely unexplored area.

Attitudes

Although most attitudinal studies in the area of sexual harassment have examined beliefs of general population about harassment and its nature and causes, a few efforts have been made to examine the attitudes and behaviours of the victim herself. The most extensive effort of this sort was that of Gutek (1985). She found that both men and women believed that women who were the target of sexual behaviour in the workplace find such experiences flattering and complimentary. She also reported that the majority of individuals in her survey believed that these women encouraged advances by seductive dress or behaviour, and that they could prevent advances if they wanted to. Attitudinal studies conducted in Pakistan also support these findings (see for example, Anila, 1990, 1995). However, women who actually had such experiences reported that they found them insulting (Anila, 1995). In particular, women who had experienced various negative consequences of harassment such as quitting or losing their job had different attitudes about women's responsibility for sexual advances. They were less likely to believe that women caused overtures or to think that women dress or act seductively; rather, they were more likely to believe that sex role expectations cause men to seek sex at work (see also, Brooks & Perot, 1988). Both victims and nonvictims, however, did tend to hold women (other than themselves) responsible for sexual propositions received at work. It also appeared that divorced, separated, and cohabiting women were likely to view sex at work more traditionally, i.e., as somewhat complimentary rather than insulting.

Finally, as might be expected, attitudes toward feminism and sexual harassment (i.e., personal definitions of harassment) also influence the ways in which women structure their experiences. Valentine-French and Radtke (1989) found that less traditional participants, both males and females, attribute the same level of responsibility for sexual harassment incidents to males and females, the participants with more traditional attitudes attribute more responsibility to females than to males. Males and females attribution decisions also depended on the victim's reaction (Janoff-Bulman, 1979). They attributed more responsibility to the victim when she was self-blaming than when the victim blamed the perpetrator or gave no explicit reaction. Valentine-French and Radtke (1989) found that in the absence of a victim's reaction, the subjects viewed the victim as being in the

wrong place at the wrong time and the perpetrator as responsible for the incident, that is, they derogated both the victim and the perpetrator. The reason for derogation of the perpetrator is obvious. In the case of the victim, they may have felt the situation could have been avoided through a little foresight (see also, Vogelmann-Sinc, Ervin, Christensen, Warmsun, & Ullman, 1979). Women with profeminist attitudes seem more likely to label behaviours that they have experienced as sexual harassment (Barak, Fisher, & Houston, 1992; Brooks & Perot, 1988; Matsui, Kakuyama, Onglatco, & Ogutu, 1995; Pryor & Day, 1988) especially when these behaviours occur within the framework of seduction or gender harassment (Schneider, 1982).

At work, there is support for the idea that women in nontraditional jobs experience more sexual harassment than women in traditional jobs (Coles, 1986; Gutek, 1985; Gutek & Dunwoody, 1987; LaFontaine & Tredeau, 1986). In an examination of U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board's (1981) data, Tangri, Burt, and Johnson (1982) found that both women and men in nontraditional fields were more likely than women and men in traditional fields to experience sexual harassment. It appears that women in traditional and nontraditional jobs experience different types of sexual harassment as well as different kinds of harassers. Coles (1986) also found that women in traditional jobs are more likely than women in nontraditional jobs to report harassment by their superiors or clients of their employer. In traditionally female settings, men (however few) tend to be the bosses and women may feel coerced into acquiescing to their demands.

VICTIMS' RESPONSES TO SEXUAL HARASSMENT

The understanding of the phenomenon of sexual harassment is not complete unless we study how does women attempt to cope with harassment when they are confronted with it. How does sexual harassment affect women and the organization for which they work. These questions are interconnected because the responses of victims are influenced by the amount of support and understanding recieved from significant others and employers. Likewise, the extent of emotional, physical, and psychological damage a woman experiences from sexual harassment also depends on the responsiveness of other people and the organization for which she works.

Barriers to Reporting Sexual Harassment

Despite the prevalence reports, court cases, establishment of policies and procedures, and other publicity, sexual harassment remains an invisible and elusive problem because its victims are extremely hesitant to report its occurrence to the authorities. For example, Adams, Kottke, and Padgitt (1983) found that none of the victims that they surveyed reported their experiences.

The major strategy used by victims to handle sexual harassment is to ignore it (see for example, Benson & Thomson, 1982; MacKinnon, 1979), a response that yielded continued harassment of the same or greater intensity (Project on the Status and Education of Women, 1978). According to many researches, victims were more willing to report harassment to their friends than to any other group; fewer victims would report to their department head or major advisor than to friends, but they preferred these three groups substantially more than any other including faculty members, affirmative action officers, sexual harassment committee members, and other administrators (Collins & Blodgett, 1981; Hotelling, 1991; Ormerod, 1989; U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1987). Gold (1989) reported that victims were significantly more likely to recommend more assertive strategies to others than they would employ themselves.

In their study on sexual harassment in academia, Meek and Lynch (1983) found the reasons behind nonreporting behaviors of the women victims. They reported that women asked themselves several questions after experiencing sexual harassment; "Did the person really have something sexual in mind?... Did I do something to elicit the behaviour?... Would any one believe me if I were to report the behaviour?... Will I experience some form of retaliation if I do report the situation?..." (p. 3). The first two questions explain the women's willingness to blame themselves when undesirable events happen in their lives. But underlying all four questions is evidence of the power inequality between instructor and student which undoubtedly is a major factor in the lack of reporting that occurs. Crocker (1983) asserted that fear of reprisal is always present whether a complaint is stated or not and thus the fear of jeopardizing one's academic future is primary for victims of sexual harassment.

Till (1980) suggested that a part of victims' fear was that reports or protests would call attention to their sex instead of their work. Dziech and Weiner (1984) observe that three other factors contribute to victims not reporting sexual harassment: confusion as to what constitutes harassment; confusion over the uncertain boundaries of relationships, both in terms of gender and in terms of teacher-student role; and unwillingness to identify with what many believe is a "feminist" issue. A scenario study by Williams and Cyr (1992) showed that student respondents thought the victim would be likely to report the incidence if she had not previously been friendly toward the perpetrator.

A review of the literature on responses to harassment suggests that they fit into a two-by-two table: One axis consists of individual attempts to cope with harassment and coping responses involving another party such as a supervisor, therapist, physician, spouse, coworker, or an outside agency or institution, e.g., the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, a law firm, or a state agency. The second axis consists of indirect (e.g., ignoring, avoiding, evading) versus direct (e.g., confronting) responses. Researches quoted in the following sections show that the individual's indirect coping responses (e.g., ignore the incident, avoid the perpetrator) are more common than responses that fit into the other three quadrants.

Coping of Sexual Harassment on Ones Own

Real victims do not usually tell the harasser to stop; their initial attempts to manage the harasser are rarely direct; typically, harassers are more powerful, physically and organizationally, than the victims, and sometimes the perpetrator's intentions are unclear. The first or the first several harassing events are often ignored (Benson & Thomson, 1982; Dunwoody-Miller & Gutek, 1985; Lindsey, 1977; Loy & Stewart, 1984; MacKinnon, 1979). Most of the researches find that the mild forms of sexual harassment (e.g., jokes or teasing of a sexual nature) are ignored by the harassed (Gruber, 1989; Livingston, 1982; Maypole & Skaine, 1983; McKinney, 1990). In their study of women automobile assembly workers, Gruber and Bjorn (1982) found that 23% of women said they ignored the harassment and 22% responded "mildly" [by telling the man, "I have heard all that

before", or "I am not your type" (p. 286)]. A woman is quite likely to ignore the behaviour or respond mildly if she can ascribe the man's behaviour to some extenuating circumstance (e.g., "It had to do with the pair of pants I was wearing. He thought they were nice" (Gutek, 1985, p. 79); at the time he had been feeling lonely, he had left his wife" (Gutek, 1985, p. 86). She may also interpret or reinterpret the situation so that the incident is not defined as sexual harassment (Rabinowitz, 1990). Interpreting the situation as "horse-play" or "laughing it off" is common (e.g., Gutek, 1985; Ragins & Scandura, 1992). Gruber and Bjorn (1982) also found that making light of the harassment was a fairly common response reported by 10% of the women autoworkers they studied.

Sometimes a woman tries to avoid the man, an indirect strategy reported by 51% of women officers and 68% of enlisted women in a U.S. Navy study (Culbertson et al., 1992; Loy & Stewart, 1984). Benson and Thomson (1982) found that female students try to avoid taking classes from male professors who have the reputation of sexually harassing their students. They also encouraged peers to avoid working with harassers on their research projects or having them on committees, changed advisers, temporarily dropped out of school, and changed majors (see also Loy & Stewart, 1984; Zalk, 1990).

As the severity of the harassment increases, the more likely it is that the harassed will react more assertively (Baker, Terpstra, & Larntz, 1990; Brooks & Perot, 1988; Dunwoody-Miller & Gutek, 1985; Gruber, 1989; Gruber & Bjorn, 1982; Hogbacka, Kandolin, Haavio-Mannila, & Kauppinen-Toropainen, 1987; Livingston, 1982; Loy & Stewart, 1984). A victim of the harassment may try to defuse the harassing behaviour (through joking), confront the harasser (either politely or more directly), or use the organizational power structure to sanction the harasser.

Many men and women believe that women should be able to handle sexual harassment themselves (Benson & Thomson, 1982; Collins & Blodgett, 1981; Gutek, 1985; Sheppard, 1989). In a random sample survey of Los Angeles county workers, 79% of the women who had received at least one sexual overture from a man at work reported that they were confident they could handle future overtures (Gutek, 1985). Thus, the majority of people apparently believe that sexual

harassment is something that can and should be handled individually, i.e., by the person who is harassed.

U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1987) reported that the majority of victims in their study of the federal workplace either ignored the behaviour or did nothing (53 per cent), a strategy that was generally viewed as ineffective, whereas 61 per cent of the women who asked or told the harasser to stop reported that this response "made things better". Fifteen per cent of the victims reported the harasser to their supervisor, but less than half felt that this was an effective strategy (see also Reilly, Lott, & Gallogly, 1986).

Jennings and Metha (as cited in Fitzgerald & Ormerod, 1992) reported that their interviews of harassment victims indicated that those who reacted to the incident with anger were more likely to take external action; those whose primary emotional response was fear were more likely to ignore the behaviour, blame themselves, and so on. According to Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1992) although many articles on sexual harassment speculate on the role of self blame, fear of retaliation and so forth in influencing women's coping behaviours, only Jennings and Metha have showed a link between emotional and instrumental responses in their study. No other study seems to have examined the relationship between particular types or levels of harassment with the victims' response. This is particularly important omission as the link between type of harassment and labelling or recognition of harassment is well established, whereas the stress and coping literature has equally firmly linked the appraisal of a stressor with subsequent coping responses.

Dzeich and Weiner (1984) report that in order to cope with the sexual harassment, women dress themselves in a way to appear asexual or less attractive (thus acting on their self blame), demonstrate their feelings of inferiority and victimization, avoid the instructor, and/or avoid the instructor's suggestive comments by talking about lack of time, boy friends, and spouses. Unfortunately by taking this latter mechanism, women confirm that they are defined in relationship to men rather than as independent individuals (Benson & Thomson, 1982). Other diversionary tactics used are directing disclosures of personal matters back to academic discussions, leaving the office

door open during office visits, and sitting a safe distance from the instructor (Benson & Thomson, 1982).

Direct strategies (confronting the harasser) are less often used but are reported to be effective. Rowe (1981), for example, finds the following direct responses to be quite effective: Write a letter to the harasser, describing explicitly what is objectionable and outline a proper working relationship; deliver the letter in the hand of the harasser and wait while he reads it. A letter has several advantages over a verbal request that the harassment should be discontinued. A written response shows that the victim felt strongly enough about the matter to write the letter, and allows her to deliberate in choice of words. Perhaps most importantly, the letter serves as a record that the victim confronted the perpetrator, copies of which can be shown in a court of law, should the harassment continued or should the perpetrator retaliate.

Other forms of direct response include hitting or insulting the harasser, tactics that are not commonly tried. In their study of automobile workers, Gruber and Bjorn (1982) found that 15% of women autoworkers verbally "attacked" the harasser and 7% physically attacked or stopped the harasser. Little-Bishop, Seidler-Feller, and Opaluch (1982), using an airline population, asked the female attendants to record the incidence of sexual harassment by personnel of higher, equal, and lower status. Subjects then rated their affective responses to hypothetical scenarios involving similar interactions. It was hypothesized that the lower the job status of the harasser, the more negative is the recipient's affective state. Results showed the affective state of the recipient was most negative with lower job status personnel engaging in moderate verbal and physical harassment. With mild harassment, job status had no differential effect.

Coping of Sexual Harassment Involving Others

Individual responses to harassment are considerably more common than responses involving a third party or another institution, perhaps because most of the options involving other people are also direct (i.e., confrontational). Benson and Thomson (1982) found that when students could not

avoid the harassers, they reported the following kind of indirect strategy involving others: bringing a friend along whenever they were forced to interact with the harasser.

Direct responses involving others are used by a minority of women victims and the more formal forms of protest (filing a grievance or lawsuit) are less common than simply reporting the harassment to someone in authority (Grauerholz, 1989). In a survey of workers in Finland, only 20% of women (and 5% of men) said they would report harassment to a supervisor if they were harassed. In the random sample survey of workers in Los Angeles, 18% of women who were harassed actually did report the harassment to someone in authority (Gutek, 1985). Comparable figures for a random sample of Navy personnel were 24% for enlisted women and 12% for women officers (Culbertson et al., 1992). Gruber and Bjorn (1982) found that 7% of the harassed automobile workers they studied reported the matter to someone in authority (see also Loy & Stewart, 1984).

Only 5% of women victims responding to the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board Study (1987) either filed a formal complaint or requested an investigation. In the 1989 Navy study, among those women who were harassed, 12% of enlisted women and 5% of female officers filed a grievance. According to the first U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board Study (1981) of the federal workforce only 2% of the people harassed took official action; half that number won their cases. The court cases discussed in the media constitute a very small percentage of cases of sexual harassment.

In general, harassment victims do not make official complaints either to their organization or to another agency for several reasons. They feel that making a complaint will not accomplish anything, they are concerned about retaliation for complaining (Culbertson et al., 1992; Gutek, 1985), and often they do not want to hurt the harasser and they fear that complaining might negatively affect his job and/or family (Gutek, 1985). Women who blame themselves for the harassment are especially concerned about protecting "the person that they were too embarrassed or afraid to report the harassment (Culbertson et al., 1992). In the U.S. Navy Study, the most common negative reaction reported by women who did complain about harassment was "I was humiliated in front of others" (reported by 33% of enlisted women and 34% of officers).

There are a few studies which show that characteristics of the woman victim might also affect how she responds to harassment. Gruber and Bjorn (1986) tested three hypotheses about coping with sexual harassment. They found support for the hypothesis that women with less organization power would respond less actively and directly than women with some organizational power. (The power was defined as having high job skills, having high job status, and/or not being at a lower organizational level than the harasser). They also found some support for a second hypothesis, namely that women with fewer personal resources (i.e., those having low self-esteem, low personal control, strong sense of being trapped in their job) would respond in an indirect manner more often than women with more personal resources. Similar findings were reported by Jensen and Gutek (1982) who found that women who tended to exhibit behavioral self-blame (i.e., felt their own behaviour contributed to the harassment) were less likely than other women victims to discuss the harassment with others or report it to others. They also found that women who had traditional sex role attitudes were less likely than other women to report the harassment to some one. Finally, Gruber and Bjorn (1986) found no support for their third hypothesis that black women, representing people who had low "socio-cultural power", would respond less assertively than white women (see also Culbertson et al., 1992, for consistent findings).

The Effectiveness of Different Responses/Coping Strategies

The available research suggests that the indirect strategies of coping with harassment by reinterpreting, ignoring, and avoiding are very common, but not particularly effective (Reilly, Lott, & Gallogly, 1986; U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1987). Quitting a job or leaving school may be effective in stopping the immediate harassment of that person, but it has other consequences for the victim, and it is unlikely to stop the harasser from harassing other women (Rabinowitz, 1990). If they are not particularly effective, why then are the indirect responses so commonly tried? Gruber and Bjorn (1982) suggest three reasons why individuals' indirect methods may be so common. First, indirect methods such as reinterpreting the situation or avoiding the harasser may allow a woman to "manage" the situation without disrupting the work setting or her relationship with

other people at work (Benson & Thomson, 1982; Collins & Blodgett, 1981; Gutek, 1985; Sheppard, 1989). Second, women may perceive the direct methods as riskier and less certain in their outcomes than the indirect methods. Avoiding the perpetrator may seem safer than confronting him or filing a complaint against him. Although there is some evidence that fear of retaliation is a realistic fear (Coles, 1986), there is no evidence that direct methods of coping with harassment are necessarily riskier than indirect methods, particularly if riskiness is equated with effectiveness of stopping the harassment. While they appear to be more effective in stopping the harassment than indirect methods of coping with sexual harassment, it is possible to make a case that direct attempts at dealing with harassment may be problematic for women as a group. By forcing the perpetrator and/or the organization to deal with the issue, the woman making the complaint may be viewed as disrupting the workplace and she may well engender hostile reactions (Biaggio, Watts, & Brownell, 1990; DiTomaso, 1989). A victim of sexual harassment usually employs a direct response to sexual harassment if she has a supportive supervisor and works in an organization having a sexual harassment counsellor or prominently displayed posters forbidding sexual harassment. Third, Gruber and Bjorn (1982) suggested that some harassment is ambiguous because it combines a degree of sexual interest with offensive behaviour. They observe "this ambiguity may reduce a woman's ability to respond in an assertive or direct manner" (p. 276; see also Gutek, 1985). Along similar lines, in a scenario study, Williams and Cyr (1992) found that male (but not female) students rated the perpetrator's behaviour as less harassing if the woman target had made a prior commitment to a friendly relationship with the harasser.

Stages of Response to Sexual Harassment

According to Salisbury, Ginorio, Remick, and Stringer (1986) another approach to the study of responses to harassment is a stage model. Most harassment is not a one time occurrence, but unfolds over time. How a woman responds probably depends on the progression of the harassment. Has she already tried ignoring, evading, or joking? Is the harassment continuing, escalating, becoming more hostile or threatening? The progressive reactions to harassment observed among

women in psychotherapy document a sequence of changes in the victim's central beliefs about herself, her coworkers, and the work world . Four stages of response could be identified:

Confusion/Self-blame: The sexual harassment has a series of events. After each incident, the victim believed that the harassment was going to level off or eventually stop. When the harasser's behaviour escalated, which it did in virtually all the cases studied, the victim felt out of control and helpless.

Fear/Anxiety: Subsequent to the harasser's continuing behaviour the victim felt trapped and became "paranoid". She feared potential retaliation at work, she feared being called on phone in the early morning, having her home watched, or being followed in a car. Concentration, motivation, work performances and attendance were adversely affected and self esteem declined.

Depression/Anger: Once the woman recognized that she was a legitimate victim who was not to blame for her harassment, anxiety often shifted to anger, particularly when she decided to leave her job or was fired. This anger about being treated unfairly was a prime motive to file charges. While filing charges may have represented a positive step by the victim to take control of her destiny, it often led to a decided deterioration in the work situation.

Disillusionment: The organizational response to sexual harassment was often hurtful and disappointing. By speaking up, the women encountered a whole new set of institutional abuses. Often, the woman eventually realized that she had been naive about getting help in the system. She then questioned her expectations about fairness, loyalty, and justice. These ingenuous beliefs gradually might be replaced by the insight that justice did not always prevail.

Classification of Responses to Sexual Harassment

A number of schemes for classifying responses to harassment have been proposed (Gruber, 1989; Maypole, 1986; Terpstra & Baker, 1989). These focus mainly on the degree to which the victim responds assertively to the harasser. Gruber ordered responses along a continuum from the least confrontational to the most. Terpstra and Baker (1989) proposed a similar framework. Gutek and Koss (1993) provided a two dimensional system defined by degree of assertiveness, and whether the response involved the help of others.

Although useful as a starting point for theory, such frame works suffer from a major shortcoming, that is, they are not devised from the reactions of actual victims. They are based either on rational derivation (Gruber, 1989; Gutek & Koss, 1993) or, problematically, on the written responses of research participants to brief descriptions of hypothetical situations. Given that actual victims have been shown to behave quite differently than research participants or the general public say that they would behave (Gutek & Koss, 1993), the generalizability of such systems is open to question. Similarly problematic is the focus in the literature on action oriented, problem solving responses to the neglect of more psychological reactions (e.g., cognitive distancing, reattribution), reflecting a widespread assumption that assertive responding is always both appropriate and effective.

Addressing these issues, Fitzgerald (1990b) proposed a framework devised by coding responses provided by actual victims surveyed in a large sexual harassment prevalence study (Fitzgerald et al., 1988). The system consists of ten strategies, classified as either "Internally focused" (endurance, denial, detachment, reattribution/relabelling, and illusory control), or "Externally focused" (avoidance, appeasement, assertion/confrontation, seeking institutional/organizational relief, and seeking social support). Internal strategies are characterized by attempts to manage the cognitions and emotions associated with the event (e.g., "I just tried to forget about it", "I told myself he did not mean to upset me"), whereas externally focused strategies are problem solving in nature (e.g., "I told him to leave me alone", "I reported him to the supervisor"). Confirmatory

factor analysis of the inventory, namely Coping with Sexual Harassment Questionnaire designed to assess these strategies confirms the structure of these two general categories, which are negatively correlated but by no means mutually exclusive (Fitzgerald & Swan, 1995). These strategies are described as follows.

Internally Focused Strategies/Responses: A common response, particularly to less severe situations, is simply to ignore the harassment and do nothing (endurance), or to pretend that the situation is not happening or has no effect (Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Gruber & Bjorn, 1982; Gutek, 1985; Gutek & Koss, 1993; Loy & Stewart, 1984; U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981, 1987). For example, a British survey found that 26% of the harassed workers "did nothing" whatsoever in response to being harassed (Phillips, Stockdale, & Joeman, 1989). It is difficult to ascertain exactly what "doing nothing" means in this context; e.g., it may imply a deliberate decision to ignore the situation, to pretend as if it is not happening, or to think that one does not care. Such responses are labelled as "denial". As Breznitz (1983) noted that denial can be of information, threat, vulnerability, or affect. Alternatively, doing nothing may imply 'endurance', that is tolerating a situation because it is unavoidable, one is afraid, or one does not know what else to do.

Little is known concerning the prevalence of the other internally focused responses that have been identified (detachment, illusory control, relabeling). Gruber and Bjorn (1982) found that 10% of the blue-collar victims they studied used relabelling as a coping strategy, reinterpreting the situation in such a way that it was not defined as harassment. Others involved extenuating circumstances (e.g., the harasser was lonely), or attempted to interpret his intentions as benign (Gutek, 1985; Rabinowitz, 1990). According to Rabinowitz (1990) self-blame or "Illusory control" is also common. Jensen and Gutek (1982) found that 25% of female victims attributed harassment in some way to their own behaviour, and attribution that inhibited both reporting and seeking social support.

Externally Focused Strategies/Responses: The most common problem-solving strategy appears to be "avoidance". The researches suggest that approximately half of employed victims actively attempt to cope in this way i.e., they avoid the harraser (Culbertson, Rosenfeld, Booth-

Kewley, & Magnusson, 1992; Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Gutek, 1985; McKinney, Olson, & Satterfield, 1988; Schneider, 1991; U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981, 1987). Also common is "appeasement", an attempt to "put off" the harasser without direct confrontation (e.g., humor, excuses, delaying, etc.). Humor is particularly common in less serious situations (U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981, 1987). Gruber and Bjorn (1982) label this response "masking". In addition, 10% of their blue-collar victims used delaying tactics hoping the harasser would "take the hint" that they were not interested.

Not surprisingly, a substantial number of victims seek "social support"; as 68% of the U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1981) victims discussed the problem with a coworker and 60% talked about their harassment with friends and family. Women also employ a variety of "assertive" responses to communicate that harassment is unwelcome, most commonly, a direct request that the perpetrator should stop his behaviour and leave the woman alone; 44% of the female victims of U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1987) asked the harasser to stop. In addition, 14% threatened to expose the harassment to others at work. Gruber and Bjorn (1982) reported that 15% of the victims verbally attacked their harassers and 7% physically attacked them.

By far the most infrequent response is to "seek institutional/organizational relief (i.e., notifying a supervisor, bringing a formal complaint, and filing a lawsuit). Victims apparently turn to such strategies as a last resort when all other efforts have failed. Not surprisingly, the least confrontational responses are the most common; victims are more likely to talk with a supervisor than file a formal complaint, and legal claims are by far the least common response.

EFFECTS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT ON VICTIMS

According to Hulin (1993), sexual harassment has also been recognized as a serious social and organizational problem like other stressors at work. It has been shown to have substantial consequences for individuals as well as for organizations. French (1976) viewed work stress and the resulting strain in terms of the interaction between the individual and the environment. According to French, work stresses are the major producers of psychological strain. Schuler (1979) suggests that

stress in work organization can result in a variety of negative psychological, physiological, and behavioural symptoms. In short, stresses at work are usually seen as having substantial consequences for the individual (i.e., strain) and affecting work performance (e.g., lack of job involvement, lack of concern for other colleagues and the organization, absenteeism, accident proneness, and the other counterproductive behaviours). Similarly sexual harassment has been linked to the self-reported decrements in job performance, career interruption and job loss, psychological distress, a wide variety of stress-related illnesses, and a damage to interpersonal relationships at work.

According to Dzeich and Weiner (1984) the effects of sexual harassment may be divided into three types: emotional, physical, and behavioral. Victims will vary in their emotional responses to sexual harassment. Some will deny its existence or importance. Others will react with disbelief, shock, and/or doubt to even the most blatant acts; some will feel ambivalence and sympathy toward their harassers. Many will blame themselves and feel responsible for what they should have done or known to prevent the incident. Fear of resisting or reporting is a common response to sexual harassment; feelings of powerlessness are related to this fear. Self-esteem and confidence in both academic work and personal relationships are likely to plummet. Victims find themselves mistrustful of men in general. Additional emotional responses include anger, hurt, depression, and feeling trapped. Any or all of these emotions may result in decreased concentration and drive and general listlessness.

It is very difficult to conduct research on the psychological and somatic reactions to sexual harassment. To show that harassment entails harmful consequences for victim requires the demonstration that it has caused physical or/and emotional distress. Evidence of breakdown in the victim undermines her credibility and competence as a person and as an employee (Hamilton & Dolkart 1991; Jenvold, 1991). Clinicians who evaluate victims of sexual harassment need to be aware that they are evaluating some one undergoing multiple abnormal stressors (Brown, 1991). They must also be mindful of the ways for mental health practitioners to not become tools of the

harasser or institution including forced psychotherapy and illegal fitness-for-duty examination (Jensvold, 1991).

According to Gutek and Koss (1993), the extent of emotional, physical, and psychological damage a woman experiences from harassment in work situations also depends on the responsiveness of other people and the organization for which she works. Measuring the impact of harassment involves outcomes within three domains, which include somatic health, psychological health, and work variables including attendance, morale, performance, and impact on career track. In short, there is no single impact of sexual harassment. Instead, there are many different impacts depending on the domain examined and point in the process where the assessments are made. In the following, some more relevant research has been reviewed as regards the effects of sexual harassment.

Effects on the Harassed Women-Work Outcome

Nearly one out of ten women reported that they left their jobs as a result of sexual harassment in the original U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board Study (1981) and three separate studies of employed people in Los Angeles (Gutek, 1985; Gutek et al., 1980). In a period of two years, over 36,000 federal employees quit their jobs, were transferred, or were fired because of sexual harassment (U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1987). Among 88 cases filed with the California Department of Fair employment and Housing, almost half had been fired and another quarter had quit out of fear or frustration (Coles, 1986). Some of the women who were fired or quit their jobs were unable to find or unwilling to take another job in the same field or occupation. This shows that sexual harassment can derail a career or lead, rather force, a woman into an occupation which pays less well and/or offers fewer opportunities for advancement.

Among other negative work related outcomes that have been reported is deterioration of interpersonal relationships at work (Bandy, 1989; Culbertson, Rosenfeld, Booth-Kewley, & Magnusson, 1992; DiTomaso, 1989; Gutek, 1985). Harassment can constrain the potential for forming friendships or work alliances with male coworkers (Schneider, 1982). As a result of

harassment, university students report that they dropped courses and changed majors, academic departments and programs, and career intentions (Adams, Kottke, & Padgitt, 1983; Benson & Thomson, 1982; Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Lott, Reilly, & Howard, 1982).

Sexual harassment also affects women's satisfaction with the job and commitment to the organization (Culbertson et al., 1992). O'Farrell and Harlan (1982) reported that harassment had a strong negative impact on women's satisfaction with coworkers and supervisors in their study of women in blue collar jobs. It was less strongly related to satisfaction with promotions and satisfaction with work content. Negative affect such as anger or disgust at being harassed has been associated with loss of motivation, distraction, and dreading work (Jensen & Gutek, 1982). General hostility toward women which seems especially prevalent in some blue collar jobs is often expressed in a sexually harassing manner (Carothers & Crull, 1984; DiTomaso, 1989; Wolshok, 1981).

The impact of sexual harassment on women's job performance is less clear. According to Martin (1978, 1980), the exclusion of police women from informal social interaction networks which results from sexual harassment denies them the feed back that is necessary for successful job performance. But Gruber and Bjorn (1982) found that women autoworkers reported that sexual harassment had relatively little effect on their work behaviour or sense of competence. Sexual harassment may not affect the diligence or effort a woman puts into her work, but lack of access to information and support from others in the work environment may well have an indirect effect on her work performance (see also Collinson & Collinson, 1989; DiTomaso, 1989).

Sexual harassment and sex discrimination appear to go together. Women who report a lot of sexual harassment in their organization also tend to believe the organization is discriminatory in its treatment of women (DiTomaso, 1989; Ragins & Scandura, 1992). A study in Finland (Hogbacka, Kandolin, Haavio-Mannila, & Kauppinen-Toropainen, 1987) also showed that women who had encountered sexual harassment in their work group were more likely than other women to experience sex discrimination.

Psychological and Somatic Effects on the Harassed Women

Beyond work outcomes, sexual harassment has been associated with a variety of negative effects on the victim. For example, Gruber and Bjorn (1982) found that in their sample of 138 women in mostly unskilled jobs in an auto industry, sexual harassment negatively affected self esteem and life satisfaction. However, it was unrelated to family/home satisfaction, political efficacy, or personal control. Benson and Thomson (1982) found that sexual harassment was associated with a low sense of self confidence, and Gutek (1985) found that sexual harassment sometimes affected the women's relationship with other men.

Some victims of sexual harassment may experience physical problems, such as, insomnia, headaches, digestive problems, and neck and backaches (MacKinnon, 1979). Depending on the severity of the abuse, 21% to 82% of women indicated that their emotional or physical condition worsened as a result of harassment (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981). In a sample of 92 women who had requested assistance against sexual harassment, virtually all reported debilitating stress reactions affecting work performance and attitudes, psychological, and physical health (Crull, 1982). The physical symptoms frequently reported by victims included gastrointestinal disturbances, jaw tightness and teeth grinding, nervousness, binge-eating, headaches, inability to sleep, tiredness, nausea, loss of appetite, weight loss, and crying spells (Crull, 1982; Gutek, 1985; Lindsey, 1977; Loy & Stewart, 1984; Safran, 1976; Salisbury, Ginorio, Remick, & Stringer, 1986). Among the emotional reactions reported by victims of sexual harassment were anger, fear, depression, anxiety, irritability, loss of self esteem, feelings of humiliation and alienation, and a sense of helplessness and vulnerability (Gutek, 1985; Safran, 1976; Silverman, 1976; Tong, 1984; Working Women United Institute, 1978).

Many researchers have speculated that gender-based abuse is related to the high rates of depression among women compared to men (Hamilton, Alagna, King, & Lloyd, 1987; McGrath, Keita, Strickland, & Russo, 1990). Recently, similarities have been noted between the symptoms seen in the aftermath of sexual harassment and the symptoms characteristics of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) as defined in the American Psychiatric Association's (APA, 1987)

"Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM-III-R)" (Hamilton & Dolkart, 1991; Jenvold, 1991; Koss, 1990). The PTSD diagnosis conceptualizes the symptoms seen in the aftermath of severe stressors as normal responses to abnormal conditions (APA, 1987). Considerable evidence suggests that PTSD can and does develop in persons with no history of psychopathology prior to the stressor.

Four criteria are required to qualify for the PTSD diagnosis: exposure to a stressor outside the realm of normal human experience, reexperiencing of the trauma, heightened arousal, and avoidance of people and interests that remind the victim of the trauma. The hallmark of PTSD is intrusive reexperiencing of the trauma, which may not occur until months or years following the trauma when recollections are triggered by some actual or symbolic reminder nightmares and are accompanied by intense psychological distress. One victim of sexual harassment described her reexperiences as follows: "Memories of my intimate experiences with him continued to plague me. At unexpected moments, particularly when I was alone in my car, I would suddenly feel him there with me. His fingertips would draw my face toward his, and I would again feel his kiss, catching me unaware and sending a jolt of anxiety through my body" (Anonymous, 1991, p. 506). As this excerpt illustrates, reexperiencing is more than a visual phenomenon; physical reactions associated with the trauma re-occur as well. To reduce the distress of reexperiencing, trauma victims often go to great lengths to avoid reminders of the trauma.

A survey of 3020 women provides prevalence data for sexual harassment in a nationally representative sample of women of whom 2720 had been employed at some point in their lives (Kilpatrick, 1992). Data were collected by a random-digit-dial telephone survey. Measurement included standard questions to assess both major depression and PTSD as defined by the DSM-III-(R). Women suffering from PTSD and depression were more likely to have been sexually harassed than women who have never experienced PTSD or depression, suggesting that sexual harassment may contribute to depression and PTSD. Women who were diagnosed as having PTSD or depression reported more of each of seven types of harassment than did employed women in general. For example, 37% of women suffering from PTSD and 31% of women currently suffering from depression reported that they had been told sex stories by a supervisor, compared to 17% of the

whole sample of employed women; 16% and 14% of women suffering from PTSD and depression respectively, compared to 7% of women in general, said they were touched sexually by a supervisor; and 17% and 15% of PTSD and depressed women, respectively, compared to 6% of employed women in general, reported that they were kissed or fondled by a supervisor.

Among those women who reported that they have been sexually harassed, women suffering from PTSD or depression appeared to have more negative beliefs about the effects of sexual harassment than the women who were not suffering from PTSD or depression. For example, among the 488 women victims of sexual harassment in the survey of Kilpatrick (1992), 57% of women in general, but 62% of women suffering from PTSD and 65% of women suffering depression thought their career would be hurt if they complained about the harassment. In addition, although 35% of the harassed women said the harassment interfered with their job, 43% of women with PTSD and 45% of depressed women said that sexual harassment interfered with their job. Among the harassed women 74% of women in general, and 77 and 69% of women diagnosed as having PTSD and depression respectively, said they told their bosses to stop the offensive behaviour. Women suffering from PTSD were less likely, however, than other harassed women to file a formal complaint: 6% of women with PTSD, 13% of depressed women, and 12% of employed women who were harassed filed a formal complaint against the harassment.

RATIONALE OF THE PRESENT RESEARCH

The review of the relevant literature suggests that sexual harassment is a very serious social and psychological issue and the women from every walk of life are affected by it. Especially at workplaces, it is a grave problem because its presence affects the working women's output as evidenced by the studies quoted throughout this chapter. In Pakistan, this issue is yet to be acknowledged and investigated. So far, not a single psychological research has been carried out on sexual harassment at the workplaces of Pakistan, which has quite a different culture from the Western countries. The common observation indicates that an overwhelming number of women in Pakistan who step out of their homes or/and go on work, at some point in their lives, have been

sexually harassed, and it occurs in all type of places, organizations, and at all job levels (Pakistan National Report, 1995).

In sexual harassment, in fact, vulnerability is the key factor. The weakest sections of society, foremost among which are women, particularly those without the conventional support structures, such as offered by husbands and fathers, are the most vulnerable to get abused. In the case of women in Pakistan, it is both gender and culture. They are thus doubly damned. Nonetheless, even in Western cultures where role of working women are quite normal a phenomenon, it is clear that sexual harassment in the workplaces is as common as it is in far more patriarchal cultures. In Pakistan, when men encounter working women, the assumption is that there must be something wrong either with the woman or with the family set up that a woman of that family is outside of her home. That is, if there is any degree of respectability in the family, the woman would not go out to work. This is a cultural phenomenon. Women should be mothers, daughters, sisters, and wives. There is no other role assigned to them, and they are expected to be at home. Women are considered dependent in our society and men are considered providers; and if women shift from that role, they are inviting trouble (Hassan, 1996).

In Pakistan, as much as elsewhere in the world, sexual harassment is considered as one of the few crimes in which the fault, according to popular beliefs, lies with the victim rather than the aggressor or harasser. Women in Pakistan do not even have the right to protest. They seem to have accepted sexual harassment as an implicit part of life for their gender. It hardly ever occurred to them that they could have a choice or that they should fight back. Instead they have been taught to accept such behaviour from men as a fact of life (Anila, 1995). The situation is worsened by the fact that many women carry within themselves the deep rooted guilt that perhaps they themselves are to be blamed for their plight. The status given to a newly born girl child as compared to a boy child, and the differential treatment met to girls in the family and then women in the society, it is quite probable that women develop a guilt for being a female (Hafeez, 1993; Pervez, 1996). Since a culture such as ours largely negates a woman's right to be anything but a mother and a wife, any attention that is focussed on her as an individual may induce feelings of deep self-doubts. She may

feel that she has done something wrong to have brought such attention upon herself. Indeed, most of the harassed women have to battle it out on various fronts. Sexually harassed in the workplace, they can not turn to their spouses or other male family members for support, out of fear that they themselves will be held responsible for bringing such attention upon themselves. Thus women tend to expect a sceptical reaction to their complaints because of these very attitudes. When added to the fact that sexual harassment often occurs in a situation of unequal power relationship like workplaces or educational institutions, an environment in which many victims are reluctant to speak up, let alone file charges, and thus they continue to take their humiliation silently, as if they do not, they run the risk of seriously jeopardizing their status in society and their own family. As a result, women remain in perpetual fear of compromising their honor in an effort to ward off threat to their jobs, and family support. Apart from the emotional and psychological trauma that sexual harassment inflicts on a woman, it remains a practical problem as to how it affects her performance at work. We have learnt through relevant researches that the productivity level of the harassed women dip and they start suffering from serious self-doubts about their abilities. Many women in the situations quit their jobs, even if they can not afford to do so. Those who stay, feel uncomfortable and their concentration in the job is affected adversely. Sexual Harassment affects their life outside the work domain as well, such as their interpersonal relations. It can also have strong physiological impact on women, causing psychosomatic ailments. The present research has planned to study these effects.

Furthermore, the study of various demographic variables of the women as related to their experiences of sexual harassment have also been planned in the present research. These demographic variables are age, education, marital status, job status, organization, and reasons for doing job. The other variables such as physical attractiveness, race and ethnicity, and attitudes are relevant to study, but are not included in the present research as it is quite difficult to handle many variables in a single study.

As more and more women in Pakistan are stepping out into the workplace, which is an act determined both by need and a woman's coming of age, the issue of sexual harassment is getting increasingly important to address. It is to be recognized as a problem which is real, crucial and

which requires an in depth understanding. The present research, which is the first of its kind in the country, has planned to probe into sexual harassment at the workplace with a focal interest to know the frequency of sexual harassment and coping strategies women use to counter it. The present research also probed into the effect of sexual harassment on working women in terms of vocational, psychological, interpersonal, and physical strain that women felt as a result of sexual harassment at their workplaces. A few hypotheses have also been formulated to test the relationship between all these variables.

Chapter-III
OBJECTIVES AND THE DESIGN OF THE PRESENT RESEARCH

OBJECTIVES AND THE DESIGN OF THE PRESENT RESEARCH

Objectives

The present research aims at investigating the nature and frequency of sexual harassment at the workplaces. The research also explores the effects of sexual harassment on working women in terms of vocational, psychological, interpersonal, and physical strain which may lead to a poor work output. Furthermore, the study also investigates the coping strategies employed by the harassed women. The relationship of different demographic variables with working women's experience of sexual harassment have also been probed into. More specifically the present research has been planned to achieve the following objectives:

1. To develop an indigenous scale for the measurement of various aspects of women's experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces of Pakistan.
2. To investigate the frequency of sexual harassment at the workplaces.
3. To determine the relationship of different demographic variables (e.g., age, education, marital status, job status, organization, and reasons for doing job) with working women's experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces. (The Pilot Study includes only age, education, marital status, and reasons for job. The Main Study, however, includes all the demographic variables).
4. To find out the coping strategies the harassed women workers employ in terms of internally focussed and externally focussed coping strategies.
5. To find out whether there is any reported effects of sexual harassment on the harassed women workers in terms of vocational, psychological, interpersonal, and physical strain.

Hypotheses

To achieve the above objectives of the present research, a number of hypotheses were formulated.

These are listed below.

1. Higher the frequency of the experiences of sexual harassment at workplace, greater will be the vocational strain felt by working women.
2. Higher the frequency of experiences of sexual harassment at workplace, greater will be the psychological strain felt by working women.
3. Higher the frequency of experiences of sexual harassment at workplace, greater will be the interpersonal strain felt by working women.
4. Higher the frequency of experiences of sexual harassment at workplace, greater will be the physical strain felt by working women.
5. Higher the frequency of experiences of sexual harassment at workplace, more will be the externally focussed coping strategies as compared to internally focussed coping strategies employed by women.
6. Greater the vocational strain felt by harassed working women, greater will be the externally focussed coping strategies as compared to internally focussed coping strategies.
7. Greater the psychological strain felt by harassed working women, greater will be the externally focussed coping strategies as compared to internally focussed coping strategies.
8. Greater the interpersonal strain felt by harassed working women, greater will be the externally focussed coping strategies as compared to internally focussed coping strategies.
9. Greater the physical strain felt by harassed working women, greater will be the externally focussed coping strategies as compared to internally focussed coping strategies.

Definitions of the Variables

The variables of the present research have been defined as follows:

1. *Sexual Harassment*

It refers to the unwelcome sexual advances, request for sexual favours, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature by males towards females (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1980). Moreover, Gelfand, Fitzgerald, and Drasgow's (1995) three dimensions of sexual harassment were considered. These dimension are as follows:

Gender Harassment: This category encompasses a range of verbal and nonverbal behaviours generally not aimed at sexual cooperation; rather they convey insulting, hostile, degrading and sexist attitudes about women.

Unwanted Sexual Attention: It includes both verbal and nonverbal behaviour which ranges from repeated, nonreciprocated requests for dates; intrusive letters and phone calls; touching, grabbing, and cornering; and gross sexual imposition or assault. Although frequently experienced as intimidating or coercive, it can be distinguished from the third category (sexual coercion) by its lack of job related losses or benefits, either explicit or implied.

Sexual Coercion: It is the classic instance of *quid pro que* sexual harassment. Behaviour of this type refers to bribes or threats, whether explicit or subtle, that condition some job-related benefit on sexual cooperation. Although it is almost universally recognized and labeled as harassment, it is perhaps not paradoxically, also the least common.

2. *Personal Strain*

It refers to the perception of strain caused by overtaxing of the ability of the individual to cope with the demands made upon her/him, thereby depleting her/his physical or psychological resources (House & Kahn, 1981 as cited in Akhtar-ullah, 1996). According to Osipow and Spokane (1987) the strain resulting from the stress of any kind at job manifests itself in different areas described very briefly as follows:

Vocational Strain: It is seen in the area of work productivity, attendance, and satisfaction.

Psychological Strain: It is reflected in individual's affective responses of various types, such as anxiety, depression, and lethargy.

Interpersonal Strain: It involves interpersonal and social behaviours. These behaviours include withdrawal, isolation, anger, and irritability toward others.

Physical Strain: It includes the development of psychogenically-based disorders. Often these have a cardiovascular basis. Sleep and eating disruptions can also be observed.

3. *Coping Strategies*

According to Fitzgerald (1990b) in order to cope with the sexually harassing situations the harassed women can respond in two ways which are broadly classified as "internal" or "external" in nature. The internal strategies represent attempts to manage the cognitions and emotions associated with the event (e.g., Detachment, Denial, Relabelling, Illusory Control, and Endurance). External strategies focus on the harassing situation itself (e.g., Avoidance, Assertion/Confrontation, Seeking Institutional/Organizational Relief, Social Support, and Appeasement).

Internally Focussed Strategies

- (i) **Detachment:** It is related to the coping strategies in which the individual utilizes a distancing strategy, which includes such things as minimizing the situation, treating it like a joke, telling herself it is not really important, etc.)
- (ii) **Denial:** The coping strategies depicting that the individual denies that the harassment is occurring; she pretends that nothing is happening or that she does not notice; she assumes that it won't continue; she tries to forget about it.
- (iii) **Relabelling:** The responses indicate that the individual reappraises the situation as nonthreatening; she offers excuses for the harasser (e.g., he did not mean to upset me), or interprets the behaviour as flattering or positive in some way.

- (iv) **Illusory Control:** The individual attempts to gain a sense of control by taking responsibility for the incident, through attributing the harassment to her behaviour, attire, demeanour or actions.
- (v) **Endurance:** Endurance includes the responses which indicate that the individual does nothing; she "puts up with" the behaviour, either through fear of retaliation, hurting the harasser, not having behaved, being blamed of embarrassment or because she believes that there are no resources available for help.

Externally Focussed Strategies

- (vi) **Avoidance:** The individual attempts to avoid the situation by staying away from the harasser (e.g., dropping the meeting, quitting a job, or minimizing direct contact.
- (vii) **Assertion/Confrontation:** The individual refuses sexual or social offers; verbally confronts the harassers or otherwise makes clear that the behaviour is unwelcome.
- (viii) **Seeking Institutional/Organizational Relief:** The individual reports the incidence, consults with an appropriate administrator, files a grievance or in some other way attempts to invoke organizational relief.
- (ix) **Social Support:** The individual seeks the support of significant others; seeks validation of her perceptions, acknowledgement of the reality of the occurrence, or seeks reassurances from others.
- (x) **Appeasement:** The individual attempts to evade the harassment but without confrontation or assertion. She offers an excuse to legitimize her noncompliance, invokes external reasons, uses humour, or attempts to placate the harasser.

Design of the Research

The present research has been completed in two parts. Part I deals with the development of an indigenous questionnaire for the measurement of the frequency of sexual harassment at the workplaces. Part II deals primarily with the exploration of the relationship of demographic variables, personal strains

(e.g., vocational, psychological, interpersonal, and physical), and coping strategies (internally focussed or externally focussed) with sexual harassment.

Part I

This part of the research was aimed at the development and validation of an indigenous Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire. This was carried out in four phases with independent samples.

- Phase I: *Generation of item pool for the questionnaire.*
- Phase II: Categorization of items into Gelfand, Fitzgerald, and Drasgow (1995) three dimensions.
- Phase III: Selection of the final items for the questionnaire.
- Phase IV: Determination of the reliability and validity of the questionnaire.

Part II

Two studies have been carried out in part II. First one is a pilot study which deals with the frequency of sexual harassment at workplaces, and exploration of the relationship between sexual harassment and certain demographic variables. Second is the main study which again probes into the frequency of sexual harassment at the workplaces by employing a larger sample, the relationship between demographic variables and the women's experiences of sexual harassment along with the testing of the hypotheses related to effects of sexual harassment on working women in terms of personal strains they experience and coping strategies they employ to deal with experiences of sexual harassment.

Chapter-IV
OUTCOMES OF THE RESEARCH : PART I

OUTCOMES OF THE RESEARCH: PART I

DEVELOPMENT OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

The development of an indigenous questionnaire namely "Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire" (SHEQ) has been carried out in four phases by using independent samples. The procedure followed in the development of SHEQ is almost the same as that of the development of Fitzgerald et al.'s (1988) "Sexual Experience Questionnaire" (SEQ).

Step-wise procedures of the development of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire have been described in the following.

Phase I: Generation of item pool

The purpose of the first phase of the research was to generate item pool for SHEQ.

Sample

Sample consisted of 54 women working with males (bosses, colleagues, and subordinates) in different fields and at various job status/levels. They were from hospitals ($n=11$), banks ($n=7$), research organizations and NGOs ($n=5$), ministries ($n=7$), semi-government offices/corporations ($n=16$), and private offices ($n=8$). The job levels of women were equivalent to the government grades which range from 2 to 20 with majority of them falling into grades 11 to 15 ($n=33$), and grades 17 to 18 ($n=14$). Rest ($n=7$) were from other grades. Different field of jobs were taken so that a variety of experiences can be explored. Only those women were included in the sample who voluntarily participated in the study. On the whole 78 women were contacted but 24 refused to participate. Most of the women who refused were from the higher job grades.

Procedure

In depth interviews were carried out with each woman subject individually. All of the women were asked to tell about the incidence of sexual harassment that they themselves or their female colleagues had experienced at their respective workplaces. They were also asked to report whether the harassers were

their bosses, colleagues, or subordinates. Each interview took about an average of 30 minutes during which the subjects described in detail all about the incidences of the sexual harassment at workplaces including the victim and the harasser's job status, the scenario, etc. The interviews were recorded (with paper and pencil) and later on the incidents of sexual harassment were extracted from them for making an item pool.

Results

As a result of these items, detailed incidents of sexual harassment were recorded which were later used to construct 46 items in phase II of the research.

Phase II: Categorization of items

In Phase II of the present research, 46 items were constructed on the basis of incidents of sexual harassment recorded in interviews with the subjects during Phase I. First, the items were written in questionnaire format by the researcher. All the items were written in behavioural terms. The word "sexual harassment", however, did not appear in any item, rather it was written in the instructions given to the subjects. In every item the three job levels (bosses, colleagues, and subordinates) of males in the workplaces were taken because the subjects during the interviews of Phase I of the research had mentioned that they were harassed by all levels of males at their workplaces. Thus every item described an incidence in which a male (boss/colleagues/subordinate), with whom the female respondent did not want to develop any relationship except a working relationship, initiated any kind of offensive or sexually harassing behaviour. The items were categorized into Gelfand, Fitzgerald, and Drasgow's (1995) three dimensions of sexual harassment. For this purpose consensus among judges for the categorization of items into Gender Harassment, Unwanted Sexual Attention, and Sexual Coercion was taken.

Sample

Three psychologists (one Ph.D. and two M.Phil. degree holders) who had insight into issues pertaining to women were taken as judges for the categorization of the items according to Gelfand et al.'s (1995) dimensions.

Procedure

The judges were explained the three dimensions of sexual harassment and were asked to categorize the items in the light of the Gelfand's et al.'s (1995) definitions of the three dimension of sexual harassment.

Results

In the item pool of 46 items, the judges identified 10 items for the dimension of "Gender Harassment"; 27 items for "Unwanted Sexual Attention"; and 9 items for "Sexual Coercion" (See Annexure 'A' for Urdu and English versions).

Phase III: Selection of final items

The Phase III of the present research deals with final selection of the items on the basis of item-total correlation. The questionnaire consisting of 46 items was again administered on an independent sample.

Sample

A sample of 60 working women with mean age of 30.04 years voluntarily participated in this phase of the research. On the whole, 100 women were contacted but 40 refused to participate. The subjects were taken from different work settings e.g., hospitals, banks, government and private offices. They belonged to different professions, such as doctors, nurses, telephone operators, lawyers, researchers, stenotypists, etc. and were working at officer as well as nonofficer levels.

Procedure

The subjects were instructed that they were being given to read different incidents of sexual harassment which women usually face at their workplaces where either their bosses, colleagues, or subordinates were the initiators of sexual harassment. The subjects were also instructed that while responding to each item they should keep in mind that the experiences of sexual harassment could be differentiated by social interaction at work, which involved social relationship in which men and women enter into or develop with mutual understanding.

For each item the subjects were instructed to encircle the responses most closely describing their own experiences. The response options included: (1) Never, (2) Once, (3) A few times, and (4) Very frequent. As the SHEQ was designed primarily to identify the frequency of various types of harassment and thus was scored simply by counting the number of subjects who endorsed the "once", "a few times", and "very frequent" response options for every item.

Results

The item-total correlation yielded 35 items which were found significantly correlated at $p < .001$ and above, the r ranged from .42 to .71 (See Annexure 'B', for the r scores of the 46 items). Therefore, these items were included in the final form of SHEQ. The distribution of 35 items in different dimensions were: (I) Gender Harassment, 7 items (e.g., staring, suggestive jokes or songs, use of pornographic material, etc.); (II) Unwanted Sexual Attention, 21 items (e.g., unwanted discussion of personal or sexual matters, requests for dates, attempt to establish a romantic sexual relation, unwanted and forceful attempts to touch or fondle, rape, etc.); and (III) Sexual Coercion, 7 items (e.g., subtle or direct bribery for sexual cooperation, subtle or direct threats for retaliation of sexual noncooperation, actually experienced negative consequences for sexual noncooperation, etc). Eleven items were found redundant. (See Annexure 'C' for the distribution of items in the three dimensions and for the redundant items in Urdu version and Annexure 'A' for English version). The equal number of items for each scale did not turn out to be possible during the development of the SHEQ. The same problem was faced in the development of Fitzgerald et al.'s (1988) SEQ. According to Fitzgerald et al. (1988), "the original intent during the construction of SEQ had been to design an inventory with 50 items (10 on each scale) ... However, in practice it proved difficult to construct without considerable redundancy. In particular, levels of Bribery and Threat (Coercion) appeared to be completely covered by 4 items" (p. 158).

Phase IV: Determination of Reliability and Validity

Determination of the reliability and validity of SHEQ has been done in this phase of the research.

Sample

The 35-item SHEQ was administered on a sample of 60 working women with age range of 21 to 43 years with mean age 29.02 years. As before, all the women who participated were volunteers. They were also taken from different organizations such as hospitals, banks, educational institutions, government and private offices. They include doctors, receptionists, stenotypists, teachers, engineers, nurses, etc., and working at officer as well as nonofficer levels.

Instruments

Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire

The 35-items SHEQ developed and finalized during the Phase III of the present research was used for the determination of its reliability and validity (see Annexure D, for Urdu and English versions).

Coping with Harassment Questionnaire

For the determination of validity of SHEQ, an Urdu translated version of Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ, Fitzgerald, 1990b) was administered. Urdu translation of CHQ was done by 10 bilingual psychologists with proficiency in Urdu and English languages. Then through a committee approach, three experts (one Ph.D. and two M. Phils.) selected those Urdu statements which best described the items in the original English version (see Annexure 'E' for both the English and Urdu versions of CHQ). CHQ is a 50 items inventory yielding scores for 10 coping strategies which are classified into two general categories, i.e., Externally focussed strategies (Avoidance, Assertion/Confrontation, Seeking Institutional/Organizational Relief, Social Support, and Appeasement) and Internally focussed strategies (Detachment, Denial, Relabeling, Illusory Control, and Endurance).

Typically, the CHQ is used to describe an individual's responses to a particular incidence of harassing behaviour, but in the present research the respondents were asked to describe how they usually responded to their experiences of sexual harassment as indicated in the incidents described in SHEQ.

Procedure

The procedure was same as that of Phase III of the study. That is, the subjects were explained the purpose of the research along with the instruction and response alternatives of the SHEQ and CHQ.

Results

For the determination of reliability, Cronbach Alpha Coefficients, Intercorrelations, and Split-half reliability have been calculated.

Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients

Initial psychometric analysis, using Cronbach's alpha coefficient yielded an internal consistency coefficient of .94 for the entire 35-item SHEQ. For other scales (dimensions) it ranged from .70 to .92 (Table 1).

Table 1
Alpha reliability coefficients of total and subscales of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (N = 60)

	Subscales	No. of Items	Alpha Coefficients
I.	Gender Harassment	7	.70
II.	Unwanted Sexual Attention	21	.92
III.	Sexual Coercion	7	.80
	Total SHEQ	35	.94

Interscale correlations coefficients

The internal consistency was further determined by intercorrelation of every scale as well as with that of the total score on SHEQ. All the correlations were highly significant as shown in

Table 2.

Table 2
Interscale correlations of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (N = 60)

	Subscales	I	II	III
I.	Gender Harassment	-		
II.	Unwanted Sexual Attention	.76**	-	
III.	Sexual Coercion	.52**	.67**	-
	Total SHEQ	.84**	.98**	.76**

** $p < .000$

Split-half Reliability

For calculating the split-half reliability coefficient, SHEQ was divided into two parts with 18 items in the first part and 17 items in the second. The reliability coefficient was found as .91. Alpha coefficient of 18 items part was .90, and 17 items part was .88.

Note: The reliability of SHEQ has also been obtained in the Part II of the present research in which a comparatively larger sample has been taken.

Validity

Phase IV also deals with the determination of the validity of SHEQ. As all the items of SHEQ have been determined empirically and judged by the experts as well, it has sufficient content validity. However, for the determination of the convergent and discriminant validities, The CHQ is used because according to Fitzgerald, Hulin, and Drasgow (1994) the more assertive and severe external responding was associated with more severe sexual harassment experiences (see also, Baker, Terpstra, & Larntz, 1991; Dunwoody-Miller & Gutek, 1985; Gruber, 1989; Gruber & Bjorn, 1982; Livingston, 1982; Loy & Stewart, 1984). Therefore, it was assumed that the higher the frequency of sexual harassment at workplace, more will be the externally focussed coping strategies as compared to internally focussed coping strategies. The correlations found for SHEQ with each scale of CHQ are given in Table 3.

Table 3
Correlations of scales of Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ) with Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (SHEQ) ($N = 60$)

CHQ	SHEQ
	<i>r</i>
I. Internally focussed Strategies	-.25*
Detachment	-.26*
Denial	-.18
Relabeling	-.09
Illusory Control	-.05
Endurance	-.10
II. Externally focussed Strategies	.26*
Avoidance	.10
Assertion/Confrontation	.07
Seeking Institutional/Organizational Relief	.07
Social Support	.26*
Appeasement	.05

* $p < .05$

Table 3 shows that although only four correlations are found significant but their directions indicate that the subjects who report more experiences of sexual harassment usually react by adopting externally focused strategies which can be seen in the positive correlation of externally focused strategies with SHEQ. Thus the SHEQ has convergent validity. On the other hand, the subjects who report more sexual harassment experiences do not employ internally focused strategies as can be seen by the negative correlations between the SHEQ and internally focused strategies. This shows the discriminant validity of SHEQ.

Note: The validity of SHEQ has also been obtained in Part II of the present research in which a comparatively larger sample has been taken.

The alpha reliability coefficients of the total CHQ and its subscales have also been calculated as seen in Table 4.

Table 4
Alpha reliability coefficients of total and subscales of Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ) (N= 60)

Subscales	No. of Items	Alpha coefficients
I. Internally focussed Strategies		
Detachment	5	.62
Denial	5	.64
Relabelling	6	.72
Illusory Control	5	.70
Endurance	5	.53
Total	26	.85
II. Externally focussed Strategies		
Avoidance	5	.73
Assertion/Confrontation	5	.62
Seeking Institutional/Organizational Relief	5	.76
Social Support	5	.83
Appeasement	4	.51
Total	24	.80
Total CHQ	50	.84

All the alpha coefficients showed that CHQ is a reliable and internally consistent measure for the use in the present research. The correlation coefficients of CHQ with SHEQ, as done in the validation of SHEQ have already indicated that it is a valid measure as well.

Note: The reliability of CHQ has also been obtained in Part II of the present research in which a comparatively larger sample has been taken.

Discussion and Conclusion

An examination of the available data suggests that SHEQ possesses sufficient reliability and validity for research purposes. All the items were empirically determined by the members of the relevant population. Convergent and discriminant validities also seem promising, although the correlations are not very high. The reason may be that the criterion scale (CHQ) was developed in U.S.A. and was only translated into Urdu, the national language of Pakistan.

The procedure followed in the development of SHEQ is same as that of Fitzgerald et al., (1988) Sexual Experience Questionnaire (SEQ), except for the process of item generation. Unlike Fitzgerald et al. who identified the items from the relevant literature or wrote them on their own, in the present research all the items were empirically determined. Another difference is that in SEQ, Fitzgerald et al. used the term sexual harassment as the criterion item. While in SHEQ, the criterion item has not been included, rather the subjects were instructed that the questionnaire deals with the frequency of sexual harassment at workplaces. The SEQ is a 20 item scale, while SHEQ contains 35 items which is considerably larger a number than is the case in SEQ. Some of the incidents or items in SHEQ are quite elaborated as compared to SEQ. It may be due to over sensitivity of the issue in the Pakistani culture. It may also be noted that all the incidents or items in SHEQ have been empirically determined as compared to the items of SEQ. This may be one of the reasons that we find elaborated incidence in items of SHEQ.

In the present research, care has been taken to attend to the methodological issues pointed out by Fitzgerald and Shullman (1993, pp. 8-10). For example during the item generation process the researcher inquired about the full range of potentially sexually harassing behaviours, from gender harassment to sexual assault. Moreover, the items were written in behavioural terms and in enough details to ensure that all the respondents would interpret them similarly. Most importantly, the data were collected individually from each respondent which is considered by Fitzgerald and Shullman as the best method of data collection.

One problem that persists throughout this research is the general unwillingness of women to participate in the study. Only a few women agreed to participate when they were assured by the

researchers that their identity would not be disclosed although assurance of confidentiality was given to all the women approached. Anila (1995) had earlier also reported that sexual harassment was difficult to study as it was the least spoken issue in Pakistani society. Another reason for the unwillingness could be that instead of asking indirectly, the respondents were simply told that the research was meant to identify their experiences of sexual harassment though the items did not use the word of sexual harassment.

The present study also has usual limitations of generalizability, although possibly less so because of a wide variety of professions of women have been taken as compared to most earlier studies which were confined to only one profession. Still, the present research is also somewhat limited in drawing conclusions concerning employed women's sexual harassment experiences because the nature of sexual harassment varies with the type of profession and working hours, etc. Moreover, though the sample covered quite a variety of occupational groups still it is quite small. Therefore, the Part II of the present research was undertaken to replicate findings on some basic issues pertaining to the development of SHEQ employing a larger sample of employed women, and also to test a few hypotheses related to women's sexual harassment experiences, resultant personal strain and the strategies employed by women as their coping efforts in face of sexual harassment.

Chapter-V
OUTCOMES OF THE RESEARCH CONTINUED: PART II

OUTCOMES OF THE RESEARCH CONTINUED: PART II

The Part I of the present research deals with the development of an indigenous Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire. In Part II, SHEQ has been used to study different variables related to women's experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces. For that purpose, two studies have been carried out. The pilot study was done on a small sample, and was aimed at calculating the frequency of sexual harassment at workplaces and determining the relationship of sexual harassment with some demographic variables. The main study, however, was carried out on a comparatively larger sample and reliability and validity of SHEQ have been again estimated along with determining the reliabilities of other instruments used in the study such as Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ) and Personal Strain Questionnaire (PSQ). Thus, the main study also looked into the effects of sexual harassment on the harassed women workers in terms of vocational, psychological, interpersonal, and physical strain. The coping strategies that harassed women workers employed in terms of internally focussed and externally focussed were explored. The hypotheses formulated for the present research were also tested employing the sample of the main study.

PILOT STUDY

A pilot study was designed to provide general understanding of the variables to be studied in the main study. It was planned to achieve the following objectives:

1. To investigate the frequency of sexual harassment at workplaces.
2. To determine the relationship of demographic variables like age, education, marital status, and reasons for doing job on the working women's experiences of sexual harassment

Sample

A sample of 60 working women who showed their willingness to participate were selected from different work organizations including hospitals, banks, government and private organizations, and airport staff. Their age ranged from 19 to 50 years ($M = 28.78$, $SD = 6.55$). Their education was

matric/intermediate ($n = 22$); bachelors and higher degree including the professional degrees ($n = 38$). Out of 60 women, 43 were unmarried and 17 were married. Most of the women were doing their jobs because of financial problems ($n = 48$); only 12 were working just to pass their time. The subjects belonged to a wide range of professions, e.g., telephone operator, stenotypist, receptionist, airline ticketing, secretary, diplomatic counsellor, research assistant, banking, airhostess, nurse, and government officers, etc. The subjects were approached by female researchers at their respective offices. Out of 100 women approached, only 60 agreed to participate in the study after getting the assurance of confidentiality of their identity and responses.

Instruments

Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire

The Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (SHEQ) developed in Part I of the present research was used as an instrument (see Annexure D, for Urdu and English versions). To recapitulate, it is a 4-point scale in which the response options included: (1) Never, (2) Once, (3) A few times, and (4) Very frequent. The total score of the 35 items of SHEQ can be thus ranged from 35 to 140. The high score indicates the more frequency of sexually harassing experiences.

Demographic Information Sheet

A demographic information sheet was also administered on the sample to collect information on variables like age, education, marital status, and reasons for doing job.

Procedure

The subjects were asked to respond to each item of SHEQ by encircling the response alternative most closely describing their own experiences.

Results

In order to get a clear picture of the experiences of sexual harassment for the present sample, frequencies and percentages on every item of SHEQ have been calculated. The frequencies as shown in Table 5 are calculated by adding the responses of subjects who endorsed the response alternatives of 'once', 'a few times', and 'very frequent'.

Table 5

Frequencies and percentages of the experiences of sexual harassment among working women (N = 60)

Item No.	Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire*	f	%
	<i>Your boss/coworker/subordinate</i>		
1.	...told a dirty joke to you.	32	53.3
2.	...appreciated your figure.	32	53.3
3.	...stared at you from head to toe with dirty looks.	31	51.7
4.	...tried to make you sit with him on some lame excuses.	41	68.3
5.	...admired your dress or make-up.	54	90.0
6.	...invited you for outing or going to a restaurant with him to eat.	42	70.0
7.	...tried to show you a magazine containing pornographic material.	8	13.3
8.	...tried to flirt with you.	36	60.0
9.	...offered you lift in his car.	45	75.0
10.	...hummed filthy songs in your presence.	28	46.7
11.	...tried to give you a card.	28	46.7
12.	...withheld (delayed) your work so that you might go to him again and again regarding that work.	34	56.7
13.	...made obnoxious calls to you on the telephone.	21	35.0
14.	...took interest in your personal life with the intention that you might start responding favourably to him.	37	61.7
15.	...tried to talk about your or his own sexual life.	12	20.0
16.	...tried to probe your sexual frustration and deprivations, and pretended to be a sympathizer.	18	30.0
17.	...assured you of promotion in the job or of some other benefits if you could fulfil his immoral (bad) demands.	13	21.7
18.	...collided with you while passing by.	17	28.3
19.	...tried to touch your hand while giving you something.	36	60.0
20.	...called you "darling", "sweet heart", etc.	17	28.3
21.	...put his hand on your shoulder or back while working.	20	33.3
22.	...tried to give you a love letter.	14	23.3
23.	...admired your face or hair.	54	90.0
24.	...tried to have body touch with you while sitting for some work.	28	46.7
25.	...tried to talk with you about some vulgar movie or a television programme.	24	40.0
26.	...threatened you to be fired (turn out of the job) if you did not develop romantic ties with him.	9	15.0
27.	...have made you face some loss in your job for not meeting his immoral (bad) demands.	18	30.0
28.	...tried to defame you for not fulfilling his immoral (bad) demands.	20	33.3
29.	...tried to have an immoral (bad) talk with you.	29	48.3
30.	...forced you to fulfil his immoral (bad) demands by exploiting hardships of your personal life at your work.	13	21.7
31.	...tried to pat on your shoulders or back while praising your work.	29	48.3
32.	...threatened you to put you out of job if you did not have physical/sexual relations with him.	5	8.3
33.	...put his hand on your hand while posing to teach you something, e.g., how to work on a computer, or any other such task.	37	61.7
34.	...tried to kiss you.	15	25.0
35.	...tried to rape you.	5	8.3

Gender Harassment: Item Nos. 1,3,5,7,10,23, 25.

Unwanted Sexual Attention: Item Nos. 2,4,6,8,9,11,13,14,15,16,18,19,20,21,22,24,29,31,33,34,35.

Sexual Coercion: Item Nos. 12,17,26,27,28,30, 32.

*The original questionnaire is in Urdu, the national language of Pakistan (See Annexure D).

The Table 5 indicates that the highest frequency (90.0%) of the experiences of sexual harassment of the present sample is on the items 5 and 23. These items represent Gender Harassment. 75.0% and 70.0% of the women endorsed items 9 and 6, respectively. These indicate Unwanted Sexual Attention. Among the items of Sexual Coercion the highest frequency is on the item 12, which was endorsed by 56.7% of the working women.

To find the differences among women, if any, regarding age, education, marital status, and reasons for doing job, *t*-test analyses were carried out. Tables 6 to 9 show these analyses.

Table 6
Age-wise differences on total and subscales of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (N=60)

Subscales	Age (in years)				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Less than 30 (<i>n</i> = 39)		30 & above (<i>n</i> = 21)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Gender Harassment	15.31	4.53	15.71	3.78	.35	.727
II. Unwanted Sexual Attention	38.90	13.74	40.20	12.62	.36	.722
III. Sexual Coercion	10.51	4.28	9.71	2.20	.80	.428
Total SHEQ	64.72	20.76	65.62	16.89	.17	.865

df = 58

The results shown in Table 6 indicate nonsignificant differences among women of less than 30 years of age and women of 30 years and above age.

The results shown in Table 7 indicate nonsignificant difference among women with educational level of matric/intermediate, and those who had obtained education upto B.A. and above.

Table 7
Education-wise differences on total and subscales of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire

Subscales	Education				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Matric & intermediate (<i>n</i> = 22)		B.A & above (<i>n</i> = 38)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Gender Harassment	15.05	4.36	15.68	4.23	.56	.579
II. Unwanted Sexual Attention	36.95	11.97	40.74	13.93	1.07	.291
III. Sexual Coercion	9.32	2.90	10.76	4.01	1.48	.145
Total SHEQ	61.32	17.91	67.18	20.05	1.13	.261

df = 58

The higher educated group showed slightly greater mean score on all the scales as well as the total SHEQ indicating more experiences of sexual harassment among this group as compared to the lesser educated group. However, the difference failed to reach any significance level.

The marital status also does not seem to have any effect on women's experiences of sexual harassment as indicated by nonsignificant differences between married and unmarried women (Table 8).

Table 8
Marital Status-wise differences on total and subscales of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire

Subscales	Marital Status				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Unmarried (<i>n</i> = 43)		Married (<i>n</i> = 17)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Gender Harassment	15.30	4.22	15.82	4.43	.42	.673
II. Unwanted Sexual Attention	38.74	12.93	40.88	14.39	.56	.578
III. Sexual Coercion	10.65	4.10	9.18	2.20	1.41	.164
Total SHEQ	64.69	19.60	65.88	19.26	.21	.833

df = 58

Table 9
Job Reasons-wise differences on total and subscales of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire

Subscales	Reasons for job				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	To pass time (<i>n</i> = 12)		Financial problems (<i>n</i> = 48)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Gender Harassment	16.08	4.72	15.29	4.17	.57	.568
II. Unwanted Sexual Attention	46.92	17.38	37.46	11.49	2.29	.026
III. Sexual Coercion	11.92	4.89	9.81	3.25	1.80	.077
Total SHEQ	74.92	24.98	62.57	17.11	2.03	.047

df = 58

The reasons for doing job grouped in two categories showed a significant difference (Table 9). The women who were doing job for just passing their time showed more experiences of sexual harassment as compared to the needy women, i.e., those who were doing a job for financial reasons. A significant difference was found among these women on the total SHEQ and on the scale of Unwanted Sexual Attention. On the other subscales although the difference is not significant yet the women who are doing job for passing their time are likely to show more experiences as compared to the other group.

Discussion on Findings of the Pilot Study

First of all the frequency of sexual harassment at workplaces has been calculated. The findings are generally the same as that reported by Gelfand, Fitzgerald, and Drasgow (1995). That is, the highest prevalence of sexual harassment is on the dimension of Gender Harassment, then comes Unwanted Sexual Attention, and the lowest frequency of experiencing is on the dimension of Sexual Coercion.

The relationship of sexual harassment with different demographic variables such as age, education, marital status, and reasons for doing job has also been explored in the pilot study. The findings of nonsignificant differences between two age groups are similar to those of some western studies (e.g., Farley, 1978; Fitzgerald & Ormerod, 1992).

On the variable of education, the educated women of the present study showed slightly greater mean scores on all the subscales as well as the total SHEQ indicating more experiences of sexual harassment among this group as compared to the lesser educated women, although the difference is nonsignificant. As regards the reporting behaviour, the reason may be, as also observed by Lach and Gwartney-Gibbs (1993), that the women with higher level of education may have more awareness and sensitization to the problem of sexual harassment as compared to the less educated women. As a consequence, highly educated women are more likely to report their experiences. Lach and Gwartney-Gibbs (1993) also explained that as highly educated women victims generally have greater sensitivity and more awareness of the implications of the problem of sexual harassment, therefore, they are more likely than lower educated women victims to label uninvited sexual attention as sexual harassment. For instance, highly educated women victims called the behaviour sexual harassment even if the person doing it did not mean to be offensive. This could indicate that highly educated women are more likely to view with suspicion the perceived motive or demeanor of the person initiating a behaviour, and thus more likely than less educated counterparts to regard that behaviour as sexual harassment.

The findings of the pilot study also indicate nonsignificant differences between married and unmarried women's experiences of sexual harassment at workplace. This is also consistent with the findings of earlier researchers like Farley (1978) and Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1992). According to the findings of the present study and those done in the West, nonsignificant differences between married and

unmarried women have been reported as regards their experiences of sexual harassment, although according to U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board (1981) mostly the victims of sexual harassment are either single or divorced. However, considering the very small number of married women (17 married versus 43 unmarried) and the undefined nature of unmarried group (never married, widow, separated, living alone, etc.), it may not be possible to reach at any conclusion on the basis of the findings of this pilot study.

The reasons for doing job was grouped into two categories, that is "just to pass time" and "because of financial problems". The women who are doing job for passing their time showed more experiences of sexual harassment on total SHEQ and on the subscale of Unwanted Sexual Attention. Thus these women reported their experiences of nonreciprocated requests for dates; intrusive letters and phone calls, touching, grabbing, and cornering; and gross sexual imposition or assault. Thus, it can be contended that women workers who do their jobs without any financial problems, may be perceived by harassers in such a way that they are encouraged to harass for sexual or/and social sexual motives. Moreover, once subjected to sexual harassment, the victims having no financial problem feel safe to report the incident as they have no fear of losing the job or facing any negative repercussions.

Since all these variables have been later studied again in the main study employing a larger sample, these are not fully discussed here and instead a comprehensive discussion (in Chapter VI) appears discussing the findings of both studies.

THE MAIN STUDY

The main study was carried out with a larger sample and was aimed at achieving the following objectives.

1. To investigate the frequency of sexual harassment at the workplaces.
2. To determine the relationship of different demographic variables (e.g., age, education, marital status, job status, organization, and reasons for doing job) with working women's experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces.

3. To find out whether there is any reported effect of sexual harassment on the harassed women workers in terms of vocational, psychological, interpersonal, and physical strain.
4. To find out the coping strategies the harassed women workers employ in terms of internally focussed and externally focussed coping strategies.
5. To test the hypotheses formulated for the present research.

In addition to these, reliability and validity of the instruments were determined.

Sample

A sample of 205 women working with male bosses, colleagues, and subordinates was taken from different private and government organizations in Islamabad and Rawalpindi. The mean age and standard deviation of the sample turned out to be 29.36 years and 6.66 years, respectively. On the whole 300 women were contacted but only 205 volunteered to participate in the study. Those who regretted to participate reported that these were their personal experiences which they did not want to disclose to anyone. Thus the sample taken was that of "convenience" because sexual harassment being a very sensitive issue, a random sample was difficult to take as most of the women either denied that they ever had experienced sexual harassment or simply refused to participate. (See, Annexure 'F') for detailed description of the sample.

Instruments

The instruments used in this study are Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (SHEQ), Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ), and Personal Strain Questionnaire (PSQ) of Occupational Stress Inventory. Their detailed description along with their reliabilities are as follows.

1. *Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (SHEQ)*

The 35 items SHEQ developed in Part I of the present research has been used to measure the frequency of sexual harassment experienced by women at the workplaces. To recapitulate, it is a 4-point scale and its scores range from 35 to 140. A high score indicates more frequency of the experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces. Its items are divided into Gelfand et al.'s (1995) three dimensions namely "Gender Harassment", "Unwanted Sexual Attention", and "Sexual Coercion" (see Annexure D).

The reliability coefficients have also been calculated with a sample of 60 working women. The results given below are as satisfactory as that of the earlier effort to determine the reliability of SHEQ (see pp. 80-81).

Alpha Reliability Coefficients

The alpha reliability coefficient of the Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire as shown in Table 10 is quite good (.94). The alpha coefficients of its subscales ranged from .74 to .92 which are also satisfactory.

Table 10
Alpha reliability coefficients of total and subscales of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (SHEQ) (N= 205)

Subscales	No. of Items	Alpha Coefficients
I. Gender Harassment	7	.74
II. Unwanted Sexual Attention	21	.92
III. Sexual Coercion	7	.80
Total SHEQ	35	.94

Interscale Correlation Coefficients

The interscale correlation coefficients of all the subscales of SHEQ as shown in Table 11 are quite satisfactory. The correlation coefficients of the subscales with total SHEQ are also very satisfactory.

Table 11
Interscale correlations of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (SHEQ) (N=205)

Subscales	I	II	III
I. Gender Harassment	-		
II. Unwanted Sexual Attention	.82***	-	
III. Sexual Coercion	.66***	.75***	-
Total SHEQ	.89***	.98***	.83***

***p<.001

Split-half Reliability Coefficient

The split-half reliability coefficient of SHEQ has been found as .89 (N=205), which is quite satisfactory.

2. Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ)

CHQ is a 50 items questionnaire which is developed by Fitzgerald (1990b) and is scored on a 5-point scale. It is based on two broad categories identified by Ormerod and Gold (1988). These are

internally focussed coping strategies (Detachment, Denial, Relabeling, Illusory Control, and Endurance), and externally focussed coping strategies (Avoidance, Assertion/Confrontation, Seeking Institutional/Organizational Relief, Social Support, and Appeasement). In the CHQ, these coping strategies are divided into ten subscales with five items in each scale except the subscales of Relabeling and Appeasement, in which the number of items are 6 and 4, respectively. Urdu translated version of CHQ has been used in the present research (see Annexure 'E' for the CHQ, the English and Urdu versions).

Note: See Phase IV of Part I of the present research at p.79, for details regarding Urdu translation of CHQ.

The reliability of CHQ has also been calculated with a sample of 205 working women of the Part II of the present research in which alpha coefficients, split-half reliability, and interscale correlations have been calculated.

The results given below are as satisfactory as that of the earlier effort to determine the reliability of CHQ (see. p.82).

Alpha Reliability Coefficients

Table 12
Alpha reliability coefficients of total and subscales of Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ) (N= 205)

CHQ	No. of Items	Alpha coefficients
I. Internally focussed Strategies		
Detachment	5	.58
Denial	5	.69
Relabelling	6	.73
Illusory Control	5	.72
Endurance	5	.59
Total	26	.88
II. Externally focussed Strategies		
Avoidance	5	.73
Assertion/Confrontation	5	.80
Seeking Institutional/Organizational Relief	5	.81
Social Support	5	.81
Appeasement	4	.44
Total	24	.88
Total CHQ	50	.86

As seen in Table 12 the alpha reliability coefficient of Coping with Harassment Questionnaire is also very satisfactory (.86). The subscales also show satisfactory alpha coefficients which ranged from .58 to .88 except the subscale of Appeasement whose alpha reliability coefficient is .44. This may be due to a small number of items in this scale. The alpha coefficients of total internally focussed strategies and total externally focussed strategies are even better than the total CHQ i.e., .88.

Split-half Reliability Coefficient

The split-half reliability coefficient of CHQ has been found to be .86, which is quite satisfactory.

Interscale Correlation Coefficients

Table 13 shows the interscale correlations of the CHQ. The correlation coefficients of all the subscales with total CHQ are significant at $p < .001$. The interscale correlation coefficients of each of the subscales of internally focussed strategies are significantly correlated with all other internally focussed strategies. In most of the cases they are not significantly correlated with all the subscales of externally focussed strategies. In a number of cases there are negative correlations of the internally focussed strategies with the externally focussed strategies. Same is the case with the subscales of externally focussed strategies. All the subscales are significantly correlated with the other subscales of externally focussed strategies except the subscale of Appeasement which is significantly correlated with all the subscales of internally focussed strategies and is not significantly correlated with the subscales of externally focussed strategies. However, it is significantly correlated with the total externally focussed strategies. The Table 13 also shows a zero correlation between the total externally focussed strategies and the total internally focussed strategies, which confirmed the main idea of the instrument that these two kinds of strategies are very different from each other and there is no correlation between them.

Table 13
Interscale correlations of Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ) (N= 205)

Subscales	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XI
<i>Internally focussed Strategies</i>												
I. Detachment	-											
II. Denial	.65***	-										
III. Relabeling	.62***	.61***	-									
IV. Illusory Control	.28***	.29***	.54***	-								
V. Endurance	.41***	.70***	.54***	.23***	-							
VI. Total	.76***	.84***	.87***	.61***	.75***	-						
<i>Externally focussed Strategies</i>												
VII. Avoidance	.07	-.06	-.13	.06	-.15*	-.06	-					
VIII. Assertion/Confrontation	.03	-.20**	-.06	.08	-.3***	-.12	.50***	-				
IX. Seeking Institutional/ Organizational Relief	-.08	-.27***	-.05	.05	-.36***	-.18**	.40***	.60***	-			
X. Social Support	.09	-.08	.06	.12	-.26***	-.01	.43***	.46***	.57***	-		
XI. Appeasement	.54***	.41***	.59***	.48***	.38***	.62***	.12	.04	.06	.13	-	
XII. Total	.14	-.11	.06	.19**	-.26***	.00	.71***	.79***	.81***	.78***	.30***	-
Total CHQ	.64***	.53***	.67***	.57***	.36***	.72***	.45***	.46***	.43***	.53***	.65***	.70

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

3. Personal Strain Questionnaire (PSQ) of Occupational Stress Inventory (OSI)

The third instrument used is the Personal Strain Questionnaire (PSQ), which is one of the three measures of Occupational Stress Inventory (OSI, Osipow & Spokane, 1987). The OSI measures the (i) source of stress in the work environment through Occupational Role Questionnaire (ORQ), (ii) the psychological strain experienced by individuals as a result of work stressors through Personal Strain Questionnaire (PSQ), and (iii) coping resources available to combat the effects of stressors and alleviate strain through Personal Resource Questionnaire (PRQ). In the present research, only Personal Strain Questionnaire (PSQ) was used because it measures the psychological strain felt by women due to stress, and one of the main interests of the present research has been to study sexual harassment as a source of stress in workplace instead of occupational stress. Therefore, SHEQ is taken instead of ORQ. Similarly, the coping strategies of the harassed women were measured by Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ) instead of Personal Resource Questionnaire (PRQ) because the source of stress being studied is sexual harassment, not the occupational role.

PSQ is a 40 items questionnaire which measures the domain of psychological strain and is comprised of four scales each consisting of 10 items. Description of these scales is as follows.

I. Psychological Strain (PSY): It measures the extent of psychological and/or emotional problems being experienced by the individual. High scorers may report feeling depressed, anxious, unhappy and/or irritable. They may report complaining about little things, responding badly in routine situations, and having no sense of humour. They may report that things are not "going well".

II. Interpersonal Strain (IS): It measures the extent of disruption in interpersonal relationships. High scorers may report frequent quarrels or excessive dependency on family members, spouses, and friends. They may report wanting to withdraw and have time alone or, conversely, not having time to spend with friends.

III. Physical Strain (PHS): It measures complaints about physical illness or poor self-care habits. High scorers may report frequent worries about their health as well as a number of physical symptoms (colds, heart palpitations, aches and pains, stomach aches, and erratic eating habits). They may report unplanned weight changes, over use of tea/coffee, and disturbances in sleeping patterns. They may also report feeling lethargy and apathy.

IV. Vocational Strain (VS): It measures the extent to which the individual is having problems in work quality or output. Attitude toward work are also measured. High scorers may report poor attitude toward their work, including dread, boredom, and lack of interest. They may report making errors in their work or having accidents. They may also report that the quality of their work is suffering. Concentration problems and absenteeism may be in evidence.

The PSQ is scored on a 5-point scale. The response alternative of 1 indicates the statement is 'rarely or never' true; 2 indicates 'occasionally' true, 3 indicates 'often' true; 4 indicates 'usually' true, and 5 indicates the statement is true 'most of the time'. The direction of scoring is not the same for all items. The item nos. 6, 8, 9, 14, 19, 20, 24, and 27 are reversed scored.

The OSI including PSQ subscale has been used in Pakistan by Akhtar-ullah (1996). She has reported its sufficient reliability and validity to be used on a Pakistani sample. For the present research, only PSQ was selected and translated into Urdu by eight bilingual psychologists with a minimum qualification of Masters in Psychology. Then through committee approach three experts selected the Urdu statements which clearly conveyed the true meaning of the original English statements. The item number 33 of PSQ has been changed because of the cultural norms of the Pakistani society by replacing the word 'alcohol' with 'tea/coffee' (see Annexure 'G' for English and Urdu versions of Personal Strain Questionnaire).

Like in the case of CHQ, the reliability of PSQ has also been calculated on the sample of 205 women subjects of the present research. Alpha reliability coefficients, split-half reliability and interscale correlations have been described as the following.

Alpha Reliability Coefficients

For the Personal Strain Questionnaire (PSQ), the alpha coefficients are satisfactory as it is shown in Table 14. The alpha coefficients of the total PSQ is .93 and of its subscales it ranged from .63 to .85.

Table 14
Alpha reliability coefficients of Personal Strain Questionnaire (PSQ) (N= 205)

Subscales	No. of Items	Alpha Coefficients
I. Vocational Strain	10	.83
II. Psychological Strain	10	.84
III. Interpersonal Strain	10	.63
IV. Physical Strain	10	.85
Total PSQ	40	.93

Interscale Correlations

The Table 15 shows the interscale correlation coefficients of Personal Strain Questionnaire. All the correlation coefficients are significant at $p < .000$, which include the interscale correlations as well as the correlation coefficients of subscales with total PSQ.

Table 15
Interscale correlations of Personal Strain Questionnaire (PSQ) (N=205)

Subscales	I	II	III	IV
I. Vocational Strain	-			
II. Psychological Strain	.71***	-		
III. Interpersonal Strain	.55***	.63***	-	
IV. Physical Strain	.52***	.67***	.62***	-
Total	.82***	.90***	.81***	.85***

*** $p < .001$

Split-half Reliability Coefficient

The split-half reliability coefficient of PSQ has been found as .83 (N=205), which is also quite satisfactory.

4. Demographic Information Sheet

In order to collect information about the demographic details of the sample, a demographic information sheet was also administered to the subjects. The information collected regarding

demographic variables were on age, education, marital status, job status, organization, and reasons for doing job i.e., the financial problems or just to pass time (see Annexure 'H').

Procedure

The working women were approached individually at their respective workplaces. All the instruments were administered in a single sitting with each subject. Before the administration, the subjects were briefed regarding the nature of the research being carried out in order to obtain their consent and cooperation. They were also assured by female researchers about the confidentiality of their responses and were requested to give their responses truly.

Results

Frequency of Sexual Harassment at Workplaces

First of all, the frequency of sexual harassment at workplaces has been measured. To get a clear picture, frequencies and percentages, on each item of SHEQ have been calculated (see Table 16).

Table 16

Frequencies, percentages, and ranks of the experiences of sexual harassment among working women (N = 205)

Item No.	Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire*	f	%
	<i>Your boss/coworker/subordinate</i>		
1.	...told a dirty joke to you.	75	36.59
2.	...appreciated your figure.	84	40.98
3.	...stared at you from head to toe with dirty looks.	123	60.00
4.	...tried to make you sit with him on some lame excuses.	104	50.73
5.	...admired your dress or make-up.	165	80.49
6.	...invited you for outing or going to a restaurant with him to eat.	92	44.88
7.	...tried to show you a magazine containing pornographic material.	17	8.30
8.	...tried to flirt with you.	90	43.90
9.	...offered you lift in his car.	121	59.02
10.	...hummed filthy songs in your presence.	78	38.05
11.	...tried to give you a card.	89	43.41
12.	...withheld (delayed) your work so that you might go to him again and again regarding that work.	85	41.46
13.	...made obnoxious calls to you on the telephone.	47	22.93
14.	...took interest in your personal life with the intention that you might start responding favourably to him.	105	51.22
15.	...tried to talk about your or his own sexual life.	36	17.56
16.	...tried to probe your sexual frustration and deprivations, and pretended to be a sympathizer.	41	20.00
17.	...assured you of promotion in the job or of some other benefits if you could fulfil his immoral (bad) demands.	36	17.56
18.	...collided with you while passing by.	88	42.93
19.	...tried to touch your hand while giving you something.	110	53.66

Continued ...

Item No.	Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire*	f	%
20.	...called you "darling", "sweet heart", etc.	42	20.49
21.	...put his hand on your shoulder or back while working.	62	30.24
22.	...tried to give you a love letter.	40	19.51
23.	...admired your face or hair.	134	65.37
24.	...tried to have body touch with you while sitting for some work.	75	36.59
25.	...tried to talk with you about some vulgar movie or a television programme.	53	25.85
26.	...threatened you to be fired (turn out of the job) if you did not develop romantic ties with him.	21	10.24
27.	...have made you face some loss in your job for not meeting his immoral (bad) demands.	29	14.15
28.	...tried to defame you for not fulfilling his immoral (bad) demands.	36	17.56
29.	...tried to have an immoral (bad) talk with you.	81	39.51
30.	...forced you to fulfill his immoral (bad) demands by exploiting hardships of your personal life at your work.	29	14.15
31.	...tried to pat on your shoulders or back while praising your work.	72	35.12
32.	...threatened you to put you out of job if you did not have physical/sexual relations with him.	13	6.34
33.	...put his hand on your hand while posing to teach you something, e.g., how to work on a computer, or any other such task.	72	35.12
34.	...tried to kiss you.	24	11.71
35.	...tried to rape you.	12	5.85

Gender Harassment: Item Nos. 1,3,5,7,10,23,25.

Unwanted Sexual Attention: Item Nos. 2,4,6,8,9,11,13,14,15,16,18,19,20,21,22,24,29,31,33,34,35.

Sexual Coercion: Item Nos. 12,17,26,27,28,30,32.

*The original questionnaire is in Urdu, the national language of Pakistan (See Annexure D).

Table 16 shows that among the experiences of the working women of the present sample, the highest percentage of experiences of sexual harassment is on the item no. 5, which belongs to Gender Harassment. The second and third highest percentages are on the items 23 and 3, respectively, which also belong to the Gender Harassment. The fourth, fifth, and sixth highest percentages are on the items 9, 19, and 14, respectively. All these belong to the category of Unwanted Sexual Attention. The next seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth highest percentages are on the items 4, 6, 8, and 11. All these also belong to Unwanted Sexual Attention. Among the items of Sexual Coercion, the highest percentages is on the item no. 12, whose percentage is twelveth highest among all the items.

Table 16 also shows that the lowest percentage is on the item 35 which is an example of Sexual Coercion. The second and third lowest percentages are on the items 32 and 17, respectively, which also belong to the Sexual Coercion.

Thus the most prevalent kind of sexual harassment among the working women of the present sample is Gender Harassment. Next comes the Unwanted Sexual Attention, and the least common is Sexual Coercion.

Relationship between Demographic Variables with Sexual Harassment, Coping Strategies, and Personal Strains

The demographic variables studied were age, education, marital status, job status (officer or nonofficer level), organization (public or private), and reasons for job.

Age

In order to determine the effect of age on the women's experience of sexual harassment, their coping strategies and personal strain experienced by them, the present sample was divided into two categories i.e., ages below 30 years ($n=117$) and 30 years and above ($n=88$).

First of all *t*-test was applied on the scores of total and subscales of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (Table 17).

Table 17
Age-wise differences on total and subscales of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (SHEQ)

Subscales	Age (in years)				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Below 30 (<i>n</i> = 117)		30 & above (<i>n</i> = 88)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Gender Harassment	13.06	4.11	14.47	4.56	-2.31	.022
II. Unwanted Sexual Attention	33.74	11.55	35.74	13.18	-1.16	.249
III. Sexual Coercion	8.63	2.91	9.70	3.42	-2.39	.018
Total SHEQ	55.43	17.33	59.90	19.90	-1.71	.088

df = 203

The results in Table 17 show that there is a significant difference between the two age groups on the subscales of Gender Harassment and Sexual Coercion. The working women belonging to the age group of 30 years and above have more experiences of Gender Harassment and Sexual Coercion as compared to the younger group. There is no significant difference between the two groups on Unwanted Sexual Attention and total SHEQ although here also the older group shows more experiences as compared to the younger group.

To see the difference between the two age groups on their coping strategies, *t*-test was applied on Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ).

Table 18

Age-wise differences on total and subscales of Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ)

Subscales	Age (in years)				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Below 30		30 & above			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Internally focussed Strategies						
Detachment	15.26	4.92	14.75	4.56	.75	.452
Denial	15.03	5.46	14.86	5.20	.23	.821
Relabeling	14.37	6.24	13.10	5.61	1.50	.135
Illusory Control	11.15	5.16	11.07	4.95	.12	.905
Endurance	14.34	5.06	13.93	4.80	.59	.558
Total	70.15	20.13	67.72	20.22	.86	.393
II. Externally focussed Strategies						
Avoidance	19.21	5.02	19.27	5.57	-.08	.937
Assertion/Confrontation	17.44	6.24	17.70	5.61	-.30	.768
Seeking Institutional/Organizational Relief	13.11	5.79	13.81	6.90	-.78	.434
Social Support	16.09	6.05	15.42	6.28	.78	.439
Appeasement	10.03	3.70	10.47	3.70	-.83	.409
Total	75.90	18.72	76.66	20.39	-.28	.782
Total CHQ	146.05	29.22	144.38	26.52	.42	.673

d.f = 203

The results in Table 18 indicate that there is nonsignificant differences between the two age groups on all the coping strategies employed by working women. Among the older group, the mean score on the total externally focussed strategies is more as compared to the total internally focussed coping strategies, indicating that higher the frequency of the experiences of sexual harassment more frequently the externally focussed coping strategies are used as compared to internally focussed coping strategies. Same is the case with younger group.

To see the difference in the strain experienced by women of the two age groups, *t*-test was applied on Personal Strain Questionnaire (Table 19).

Table 19

Age-wise differences on total and subscales of Personal Strain Questionnaire (PSQ)

Subscales	Age (in years)				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Below 30		30 & above			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Vocational Strain	19.94	6.82	20.13	6.42	-.20	.844
II. Psychological Strain	23.20	7.34	23.95	7.31	-.73	.464
III. Interpersonal Strain	22.20	5.63	23.47	5.30	-1.64	.103
IV. Physical Strain	20.16	7.63	21.59	7.26	-1.36	.177
Total PSQ	85.50	23.30	89.14	22.15	-1.13	.259

df = 203

The results in Table 19 indicate that there is nonsignificant difference between the two age groups on the total as well as on any of the subscales of PSQ. Although all the differences are nonsignificant but the mean scores indicate that, on the whole, older women experience more strain as compared to younger women as indicated by the mean scores of total and subscales of PSQ.

Education

The relationship of education with working women's experiences of sexual harassment, their coping strategies, and the personal strain experienced by them have also been explored in the present study. The total sample has been divided into two groups on the basis of their education. One group's education level is of bachelors degree and less ($n=117$), the other group is of the education level of masters and above ($n=88$). The first group is usually considered as less educated group while the second group is considered as highly educated group because it also includes doctors, lawyers, engineers, and Ph.Ds. In Pakistan the persons with education less than Masters degree get nonofficer level jobs.

The results shown in Table 20 indicate that there is significant difference between the highly educated and less educated groups on the total Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire and on each of its subscales.

Table 20

Education-wise differences on total and subscales of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (SHEQ)

Subscales	Education				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Bachelor & less (<i>n</i> = 117)		Master & above (<i>n</i> = 88)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Gender Harassment	14.42	4.50	12.66	3.96	2.92	.004
II. Unwanted Sexual Attention	37.50	12.76	30.73	10.50	4.06	.000
III. Sexual Coercion	9.50	3.55	8.53	2.51	2.18	.030
Total SHEQ	61.42	19.60	51.92	15.62	3.74	.000

df = 203

Following are the differences of Coping Strategies according to the levels of subjects' education.

Table 21

Education-wise differences on total and subscales of Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ)

Subscales	Education				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Bachelor & less (<i>n</i> = 117)		Master & above (<i>n</i> = 88)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Internally focussed Strategies						
Detachment	15.03	4.75	15.06	4.81	-.05	.963
Denial	14.60	5.15	15.44	5.57	-1.12	.263
Relabeling	14.53	6.02	12.89	5.87	1.96	.052
Illusory Control	12.44	5.16	9.36	4.36	4.51	.000
Endurance	14.21	4.75	14.10	5.21	.16	.874
Total	70.81	20.35	66.85	19.79	1.39	.165
II. Externally focussed Strategies						
Avoidance	19.17	5.23	19.33	5.31	-.21	.831
Assertion/Confrontation	18.03	5.60	16.91	6.39	1.34	.182
Seeking Institutional/ Organizational Relief	13.65	6.12	13.09	6.50	.63	.530
Social Support	16.30	6.31	15.15	5.89	1.33	.185
Appeasement	10.68	3.45	9.60	3.93	2.09	.038
Total	77.83	19.17	74.08	19.62	1.38	.171
Total CHQ	148.64	27.75	140.93	27.98	1.96	.051

df = 203

When *t*-test was applied on the scores of Coping with Harassment Questionnaire, significant differences were found on the scale of Illusory Control which belongs to internally focussed coping strategies and on the scale of Appeasement which is a form of externally focussed coping strategies (Table 21). On the other scales, no significant difference was found between the two education groups. The women belonging to low education group employed the strategy of Illusory Control and

Appeasement more frequently as compared to women of high education group. Moreover, overall mean scores do indicate that the less educated working women employ more coping strategies as compared to the highly educated women, though these differences are just failed to reach the significance level ($p < .051$).

Table 22
Education-wise differences on total and subscales of Personal Strain Questionnaire (PSQ)

Subscales	Education				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Bachelor & less (<i>n</i> = 117)		Master & above (<i>n</i> = 88)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Vocational Strain	21.62	7.36	17.90	4.80	4.12	.000
II. Psychological Strain	25.17	7.78	21.33	6.02	3.85	.000
III. Interpersonal Strain	24.11	5.65	20.92	4.77	4.27	.000
IV. Physical Strain	22.24	7.84	18.83	6.54	3.31	.001
Total PSQ	93.14	24.42	78.98	17.63	4.61	.000

df = 203

The results in Table 22 show significant differences between the low and high education groups on the total PSQ and its four subscales. The working women with less education experience more vocational, psychological, interpersonal, physical, and total personal strain as compared to high education group.

Marital Status

Another demographic variable studied with reference to experiences of sexual harassment is the marital status of the working women. There were 136 single and 69 married women in the present sample.

Table 23
Marital Status-wise differences on total and subscales of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (SHEQ)

Subscales	Marital Status				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Single (<i>n</i> = 136)		Married (<i>n</i> = 69)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Gender Harassment	13.75	4.08	13.49	4.89	.40	.690
II. Unwanted Sexual Attention	34.85	12.07	34.10	12.77	.41	.683
III. Sexual Coercion	9.01	3.06	9.23	3.41	-.46	.645
Total SHEQ	57.61	18.10	56.82	19.57	.29	.776

df = 203

The results presented in Table 23 show that there are nonsignificant difference between the single and married working women in their experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces. The

mean scores on the total SHEQ and its subscales indicate no significant difference between the two groups.

Table 24

Marital Status-wise differences on total and subscales of Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ)

Subscales	Marital Status				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Single (<i>n</i> = 136)		Married (<i>n</i> = 69)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Internally focussed Strategies						
Detachment	14.98	4.62	15.16	5.07	-.26	.797
Denial	14.98	5.13	14.93	5.75	.06	.949
Relabeling	13.51	5.66	14.45	6.61	-1.06	.289
Illusory Control	11.27	5.14	10.81	4.91	.62	.539
Endurance	14.34	4.92	13.83	5.00	.70	.484
Total	69.08	19.14	69.18	22.17	-.03	.973
II. Externally focussed Strategies						
Avoidance	19.93	4.86	17.88	5.75	2.67	.008
Assertion/Confrontation	17.73	5.97	17.20	5.98	.59	.553
Seeking Institutional/ Organizational Relief	12.93	5.99	14.35	6.76	-1.53	.128
Social Support	15.60	6.13	16.22	6.20	-.68	.495
Appeasement	10.13	3.62	10.41	3.86	-.51	.608
Total	76.32	19.10	76.06	20.14	.09	.931
Total CHQ	145.40	28.69	145.24	26.91	.04	.971

df = 203

As shown in Table 24, there is no significant difference between the married and single working women in their coping strategies of sexually harassing experiences at workplaces except on the coping strategy of Avoidance. Single women cope with sexual harassment by employing Avoidance strategy significantly more frequently than married women

Table 25

Marital Status-wise differences on total and subscales of Personal Strain Questionnaire (PSQ)

Subscales	Marital Status				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Single (<i>n</i> = 136)		Married (<i>n</i> = 69)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Vocational Strain	20.34	6.98	19.59	5.91	.65	.515
II. Psychological Strain	23.85	7.19	22.88	7.56	.89	.375
III. Interpersonal Strain	22.83	5.59	22.57	5.38	.33	.745
IV. Physical Strain	20.78	7.49	20.77	7.54	.01	.992
Total PSQ	87.80	23.25	85.81	22.10	.56	.579

df = 203

On the PSQ, no significant difference was found between the single and married women on its total score as well as on its subscales as shown in Table 25.

Job Status

The difference in the experiences of sexual harassment among working women at officer and nonofficer levels was also explored. Out of 205 subjects 101 belonged to officer category and 104 to the nonofficer category. Their mean scores on SHEQ total and subscales indicate nonsignificant difference between the women working at officer and nonofficer levels. Although the women working at nonofficer level experience more sexual harassment as compared to officers as revealed by their mean scores, but these differences are nonsignificant (Table 26).

Table 26

Job Status-wise differences on total and subscales of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (SHEQ)

Subscales	Job status				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Officer level (<i>n</i> = 101)		Nonofficer level (<i>n</i> = 104)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Gender Harassment	13.34	4.21	13.98	4.49	-1.06	.291
II. Unwanted Sexual Attention	33.12	12.49	36.03	11.96	-1.70	.090
III. Sexual Coercion	8.93	3.03	9.24	3.32	-.70	.487
Total SHEQ	55.39	18.66	59.25	18.37	-1.49	.137

df = 203

The effect of the job status of working women on their coping strategies was also studied by exploring the difference between the coping strategies of officer and nonofficer level working women. The results as shown in Table 27 indicate nonsignificant differences between the officer and nonofficer level working women in all the coping strategies except on the coping strategy of Assertion/Confrontation, which belongs to the externally focussed strategies. The mean scores on this scale indicate that women working at nonofficer level employ this strategy significantly more often than the women from officer level.

Table 27

Job Status-wise differences on total and subscales of Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ)

Subscales	Job Status				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Officer level (<i>n</i> = 101)		Nonofficer level (<i>n</i> = 104)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Internally focussed Strategies						
Detachment	15.49	4.65	14.61	4.86	1.32	.187
Denial	15.67	5.36	14.27	5.24	1.90	.059
Relabeling	13.34	5.87	14.30	6.11	-1.15	.252
Illusory Control	10.61	5.16	11.61	4.93	-1.41	.161
Endurance	14.25	5.11	14.09	4.80	.23	.816
Total	69.36	19.11	68.87	21.21	.17	.862
II. Externally focussed Strategies						
Avoidance	19.21	5.04	19.27	5.47	-.08	.934
Assertion/Confrontation	16.66	6.18	18.41	5.64	-2.12	.035
Seeking Institutional/ Organizational Relief	12.98	6.18	13.83	6.38	-.96	.336
Social Support	15.33	6.04	16.27	6.24	-1.10	.273
Appeasement	9.95	3.84	10.48	3.55	-1.03	.305
Total	74.13	18.47	78.26	20.16	-1.53	.128
Total CHQ	143.49	25.98	147.13	29.92	-.93	.354

df = 203

On the PSQ total as well as subscales, significant differences have been found among the women working at officer and nonofficer levels. On the total and on subscales the nonofficer level women showed significantly more strain as compared to officer level women (Table 28). Thus the nonofficer level women feel more vocational, psychological, interpersonal, and physical strain as compared to officer level women.

Table 28

Job Status-wise differences on total and subscales of Personal Strain Questionnaire (PSQ)

Subscales	Job status				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Officer level (<i>n</i> = 101)		Nonofficer level (<i>n</i> = 104)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Vocational Strain	18.65	5.25	21.35	7.53	-2.96	.003
II. Psychological Strain	22.48	6.62	24.54	7.83	-2.03	.043
III. Interpersonal Strain	21.42	4.80	24.03	5.87	-3.49	.001
IV. Physical Strain	19.53	7.21	21.98	7.59	-2.37	.019
Total PSQ	82.08	19.59	91.90	24.72	-3.14	.002

df = 203

Organization

In order to explore whether sexual harassment is more common in public or private sector, the women from both sectors were taken. Of the 205 working women of the present sample, 131 belong to public sector and 74 belong to private organizations.

Table 29

Organization-wise differences on total and subscales of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (SHEQ)

Subscales	Organizations				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Public (<i>n</i> = 131)		Private (<i>n</i> = 74)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Gender Harassment	13.24	4.21	14.41	4.54	-1.84	.067
II. Unwanted Sexual Attention	32.42	10.89	38.45	13.68	-3.46	.001
III. Sexual Coercion	8.82	2.92	9.57	3.56	-1.63	.104
Total SHEQ	54.48	16.67	62.43	20.67	-3.00	.003

df = 203

On the total scale of SHEQ significant differences have been found (Table 29). The overall mean scores indicate that women belonging to private sector experience more sexual harassment as compared to public sector. Significant differences have also been found on the scale of Unwanted Sexual Attention. The private sector working women experience more Unwanted Sexual Attention as compared to the women working at public sector. On the scales of Gender Harassment and Sexual Coercion, nonsignificant differences have been found among the two groups.

On the CHQ, nonsignificant differences have been found among the women working at public and private sectors as shown in Table 30. The mean scores of total CHQ indicate that private sector women employ more coping strategies (of one type or the other) as compared to public sector working women, although these differences are nonsignificant.

Table 30

Organization-wise differences on total and subscales of Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ)

Subscales	Organization				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Public (<i>n</i> = 131)		Private (<i>n</i> = 74)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Internally focussed Strategies						
Detachment	15.28	5.07	14.61	4.16	.97	.331
Denial	15.31	5.47	14.35	5.06	1.23	.219
Relabeling	13.93	6.40	13.64	5.24	.34	.735
Illusory Control	10.65	4.94	11.95	5.19	-1.77	.078
Endurance	14.52	5.07	13.54	4.67	1.36	.174
Total	69.69	21.83	68.09	16.88	.55	.585
II. Externally focussed Strategies						
Avoidance	19.18	5.66	19.35	4.48	-.23	.819
Assertion/Confrontation	16.95	5.84	18.61	6.07	-1.92	.056
Seeking Institutional/ Organizational Relief	13.13	6.49	13.91	5.90	-.85	.397
Social Support	15.39	6.20	16.54	6.02	-1.29	.198
Appeasement	10.19	4.03	10.27	3.04	-.15	.883
Total	74.84	20.44	78.68	17.36	-1.36	.175
Total CHQ	144.53	31.40	146.77	20.94	-.55	.586

df = 203

On the PSQ, significant difference have been found on the total as well as all the subscales of PSQ. The women belonging to private sector showed significantly more vocational, psychological, interpersonal, physical, and overall or total personal strain as compared to women working at public sector (see Table 31).

Table 31

Organization-wise differences on total and subscales of Personal Strain Questionnaire (PSQ)

Subscales	Organization				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Public (<i>n</i> = 131)		Private (<i>n</i> = 74)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Vocational Strain	19.10	6.40	21.65	6.76	-2.68	.008
II. Psychological Strain	22.27	6.60	25.73	8.01	-3.33	.001
III. Interpersonal Strain	21.99	5.13	24.07	5.93	-2.63	.009
IV. Physical Strain	19.53	6.80	22.99	8.16	-3.25	.001
Total PSQ	82.89	20.66	94.44	24.69	-3.58	.000

df = 203

Reasons for doing the Job

The reasons for doing job i.e., whether the women are doing the job because of a financial problems for fun sake or to pass their time, have also been related to their experiences of sexual harassment, their coping strategies and the personal strain that they experience at workplaces. Out of 205 women, 108 belonged to the category of women who were doing their jobs just for financial problems and 91 belonged to those women who were doing their jobs for fun sake or for passing their time. Six women did not respond to this questionnaire. As seen in Table 32, there are significant differences between the two categories of women on the total SHEQ scores as well as on its subscales. The women with financial problems experienced significantly more Gender Harassment, Unwanted Sexual Attention, Sexual Coercion and overall sexual harassment as compared to those women who were doing the job just to pass their time, i.e., without any financial reasons.

Table 32
Job Reasons-wise differences on total and subscales of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (SHEQ)

Subscales	Job Reasons				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Financial Problems (<i>n</i> = 108)		To pass time (<i>n</i> = 91)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Gender Harassment	14.75	4.60	12.58	3.71	3.61	.000
II. Unwanted Sexual Attention	37.28	13.07	32.10	10.72	3.02	.003
III. Sexual Coercion	9.57	3.51	8.60	2.73	2.15	.033
Total SHEQ	61.60	19.94	53.28	15.85	3.21	.002

df = 197

On CHQ, significant differences have been found on the total CHQ score and the subscale of Illusory Control which belongs to the internally focussed strategies, and the subscale of Appeasement which belongs to the externally focussed strategies. On the total scores of externally focussed strategies also the difference is significant (Table 33). This means that the women doing their jobs with financial problems employ significantly more Illusory Control coping strategy as compared to the other group. Similarly, on the subscale of Appeasement, the women with financial problems employ significantly more this strategy as compared to the other group. The total scores on

CHQ indicate that women with financial problems employ significantly more coping strategies as compared with the other group.

Table 33
Job Reasons-wise differences on total and subscales of Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ)

Subscales	Job Reasons				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Financial Problems (<i>n</i> = 108)		To pass time (<i>n</i> = 91)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Internally focussed Strategies						
Detachment	15.24	4.46	14.80	5.12	.65	.519
Denial	14.99	4.96	14.96	5.75	.05	.964
Relabeling	14.43	6.10	13.07	5.80	1.60	.849
Illusory Control	12.06	5.19	9.95	4.76	2.98	.003
Endurance	14.27	4.72	13.99	5.25	.40	.693
Total	70.99	20.25	66.77	20.09	1.47	.142
II. Externally focussed Strategies						
Avoidance	19.66	5.17	18.58	5.34	1.44	.151
Assertion/Confrontation	18.21	5.69	16.88	6.22	1.58	.116
Seeking Institutional/ Organizational Relief	14.06	6.55	12.71	5.99	1.50	.897
Social Support	16.48	6.20	14.99	6.19	1.69	.092
Appeasement	10.86	3.63	9.34	3.55	2.97	.003
Total	79.27	19.48	72.50	19.34	2.45	.015
Total CHQ	150.26	25.85	139.26	30.00	2.78	.006

df = 197

The significant differences have also been found on the total as well as on all the subscales of PSQ. The women with financial problems experience significantly more vocational, psychological, interpersonal, physical, and total personal strain as compared to the other group (Table 34).

Table 34
Job Reasons-wise differences on total and subscales of Personal Strain Questionnaire (PSQ)

Subscales	Job Reasons				<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
	Financial Problems (<i>n</i> = 108)		To pass time (<i>n</i> = 91)			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I. Vocational Strain	21.75	7.20	18.18	5.41	3.90	.000
II. Psychological Strain	25.21	7.41	21.77	6.86	3.38	.001
III. Interpersonal Strain	24.58	5.37	20.77	4.93	5.18	.000
IV. Physical Strain	22.64	7.64	18.92	6.85	3.58	.000
Total PSQ	94.18	23.54	79.64	19.20	4.99	.000

df = 197

Hypotheses Testing

Nine hypotheses were formulated regarding the experiences of sexual harassment at workplace, personal strains, and coping strategies employed by working women at their workplaces. (see pages 7. Following are the findings regarding the first for hypotheses formulated in the present research. These hypotheses are:

1. Higher the frequency of the experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces, greater will be the vocational strain felt by harassed working women.
2. Higher the frequency of the experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces, greater will be the psychological strain felt by harassed working women.
3. Higher the frequency of the experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces, greater will be the interpersonal strain felt by harassed working women.
4. Higher the frequency of the experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces, greater will be the physical strain felt by harassed working women.

To test these hypotheses, correlation coefficients between the score on SHEQ, and PSQ have been carried out (Table 35).

Table 35
Correlation coefficients of total and subscales of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (SHEQ) with total and subscales of Personal Strain Questionnaire (PSQ) ($N = 205$)

PSQ	SHEQ			
	I Gender Harassment	II Unwanted Sexual Attention	III Sexual Coercion	Total SHEQ
I. Vocational Strain	.29***	.37***	.22***	.35***
II. Psychological Strain	.37***	.41***	.32***	.41***
III. Interpersonal Strain	.35***	.44***	.32***	.43***
IV. Physical Strain	.35***	.42***	.33***	.42***
Total PSQ	.40***	.48***	.35***	.47***

*** $p < .001$

In the light of the findings given, the first hypothesis of the present study has been confirmed ($r = .35, p < .000$). The high correlation between the SHEQ and the subscale of psychological strain of the PSQ ($r = .41, p < .000$) indicates that the second hypotheses is also confirmed. The third

hypothesis of the study is also confirmed, the correlation coefficient between SHEQ and the interpersonal strain subscale of PSQ is also highly significant and positive ($r = .43, p < .000$). The correlation coefficient between SHEQ and physical strain subscale of PSQ is highly significant ($r = .42, p < .000$). Therefore the fourth hypothesis stands confirmed.

The fifth hypothesis of the study was formulated to test the relationship between sexual harassment experiences and coping strategies employed by women. The hypothesis is written below.

5. Higher the frequency of the experiences of sexual harassment at workplace, more will be the externally focussed coping strategies as compared to the internally focussed coping strategies.

To test this hypothesis correlation coefficients between Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire and Coping with Harassment Questionnaire have been calculated and shown in table 36.

Table 36
Correlation coefficients of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (SHEQ) with Internally focussed and Externally focussed strategies of Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ) ($N = 205$)

CHQ	SHEQ			
	I. Gender Harassment	II. Unwanted Sexual Attention	III. Sexual Coercion	Total
I. Internally focussed Strategies				
Detachment	.21**	.18*	.09	.19*
Denial	.14*	.07	-.03	.07
Relabeling	.16*	.22***	.08	.20**
Illusory Control	.27***	.37***	.26***	.35**
Endurance	.01	-.01	-.09	-.02
Total	.21***	.22***	.08	.21**
II. Externally focussed Strategies				
Avoidance	.19*	.13	.10	.15*
Assertion/Confrontation	.31***	.33***	.27***	.34**
Seeking Institutional/Organizational Relief	.19*	.23***	.18*	.23**
Social Support	.17*	.16*	.16*	.17*
Appeasement	.24***	.28***	.17**	.27**
Total	.31***	.31***	.25***	.32**

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

The results in Table 36 show that the fifth hypothesis of the study has been confirmed. Although the correlation coefficients of both total internally focussed coping strategies and total externally focussed coping strategies with SHEQ are significant and positive, but total internally focussed coping strategies have less significance value ($r = .21, p < .01$) as compared to total externally focussed coping strategies ($r = .32, p < .001$). Thus it seems quite true that greater are the experiences of sexual harassment, more will be the externally focussed coping strategies as compared to internally focussed coping strategies.

It is quite interesting to note that the subscale of Endurance which is one of the five forms of the internally focussed coping strategies has even showed a negative correlation ($r = -.02$) with SHEQ. Although this correlation is not significant but it indicates that higher the experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces, lower tends to be the endurance as an internally focussed coping strategy.

In order to find out whether the harassed female workers who feel more personal strain (vocational, psychological, interpersonal, and physical) due to sexual harassment employ externally focussed coping strategies rather than internally focussed coping strategies as compared to those harassed female workers who feel less personal strain, four hypotheses numbered six, seven, eight, and nine) have been formulated. These are listed below:

6. Greater the vocational strain felt by harassed working women, greater will be the externally focussed coping strategies as compared to the internally focussed coping strategies.
7. Greater the psychological strain felt by harassed working women, more will be the externally focussed coping strategies as compared to the internally focussed coping strategies.

8. Greater the interpersonal strain felt by harassed working women, greater will be the externally focussed coping strategies as compared to the internally focussed coping strategies.
9. Greater the physical strain felt by harassed working women, greater will be the externally focussed coping strategies as compared to the internally focussed coping strategies.

To test these hypotheses correlation coefficients were calculated between total and subscales of PSQ with total and subscales of CHQ (Table 37).

Table 37

Correlation coefficients of total and subscales of Personal Strain Questionnaire (PSQ) with Internally focussed and Externally focussed strategies of Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ) (N=205)

CHQ	PSQ				
	Vocational Strain	Psychological Strain	Interpersonal Strain	Physical Strain	Total
I. Internally focussed Strategies					
Detachment	.10	.10	.20**	.14*	.16*
Denial	.16*	.18**	.24***	.17*	.21**
Relabeling	.10	.06	.18**	.10	.13
Illusory Control	.09	.13	.19**	.07	.13
Endurance	.18**	.21**	.19**	.07	.14*
Total	.17*	.18**	.28***	.16*	.22**
II. Externally focussed Strategies					
Avoidance	.06	.13	.11	.07	.13
Assertion/Confrontation	.10	.07	.03	-.01	.02
Seeking Institutional/ Organizational Relief	.22**	.22**	.19**	.09	.12
Social Support	.38***	.36***	.33***	.29***	.34***
Appeasement	.11	.06	-.04	.03	-.002
Total	.23***	.22**	.16*	.12	.15*

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

The hypothesis number six has been confirmed as there is a highly significant and positive correlation between vocational strain and total externally focussed coping strategies ($r = .23, p < .001$) as compared to the correlation between vocational strain and total internally focussed coping strategies ($r = .17, p < .01$).

The hypothesis number seven also has been confirmed as there is more positive correlation between psychological strain and total externally focussed ($r = .22, p < .01$) as compared to the correlation between psychological strain and total internally focussed strategies ($r = .18, p < .01$).

The hypothesis number eight has not been confirmed. The results show that there is a highly significant and positive correlation between interpersonal strain and total internally focussed coping strategies ($r = .28, p < .001$) as compared to the significantly positive correlation between total externally focussed coping strategies and interpersonal strain ($r = .16, p < .01$). Thus the women who feel interpersonal strain due to sexual harassment at workplaces employ internally focussed coping strategies more often as compared to externally focussed coping strategies.

The hypothesis number nine also has not been confirmed as there is significantly positive correlation between total internally focussed coping strategies with physical strain ($r = .18, p < .05$) while there is nonsignificant positive correlation between total externally focussed coping strategies and physical strain ($r = .12, n.s$). Thus greater the physical strain felt by harassed working women, more is the internally focussed coping strategies employed by them as compared to externally focussed coping strategies.

Chapter-VI
DISCUSSION

DISCUSSION

The Development of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire

The present research aimed at studying the phenomenon of sexual harassment at the workplaces of Pakistan. It examined the prevalence of sexual harassment at the workplaces, its relationship with various demographic variables, the cost and consequences of experiencing sexual harassment, and finally how did women cope with such experiences.

To achieve these objectives, an indigenous instrument was required which could measure the women's experiences of sexual harassment at the workplaces of Pakistan. Therefore, first of all "Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire" (SHEQ) was developed, and its reliability and validity were determined by the present researcher. Though SHEQ requires many more validation studies to prove its robustness, however, an examination of the data obtained in the present research suggests that it possesses sufficient reliability and validity for research purposes as it stands relevant and sensitive to the cultural peculiarities of Pakistan. In future, SHEQ may be useful for increasing understanding of the experiences of sexual harassment faced by women at the workplaces of Pakistan. It may also have a role in the development and evaluation of programs designed to prevent or alleviate harassing behaviours at the workplaces.

Frequency of Sexual Harassment at the Workplace

The SHEQ covered Gelfand, Fitzgerald, and Drasgow's (1995) three dimensions of sexual harassment, namely Gender Harassment, Unwanted Sexual Attention, and Sexual Coercion. As regards the frequency of sexual harassment at workplaces, the findings of the present research indicate that the most prevalent kind of sexual harassment among the working women is Gender Harassment which includes admiration of dresses, make-up, face, or hair, staring, suggestive jokes or songs, and use of pornographic material (magazine and video). Also

experienced is the Unwanted Sexual Attention, which includes discussion of personal and sexual matters, requests for dates, attempt to establish romantic sexual relation, forceful attempts to touch or fondle, obnoxious telephone calls, and rape. The least common is the harassment called Sexual Coercion. It includes subtle or direct bribery for sexual cooperation, subtle or direct threats of retaliation for sexual noncooperation, and actually experienced negative consequences for sexual noncooperation. Similar findings were found both in the pilot study ($N = 60$) and the main study ($N = 205$). These findings are also consistent with earlier studies done in the West (e.g., Fitzgerald, et. al., 1988; Gelfaud, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1995). Interesting is to note that, the most frequent sexual harassment experiences are "admiration of dress or make-up", "admiration of face or hair", and "staring". The least frequent experiences are "rape", "threats to put out of job if refused to have sexual relations", and "assurance for promotion in the job and other benefits if the sexual demands of the harasser are met". In general, the classic form of *quid pro quo* sexual harassment was not as common as has sometimes been assessed (Dziech & Weiner, 1983) at least in the sample of the present research. It seems that, though not quite frequently, yet such incidents of sexual harassment do occur in Pakistan too. Broadly speaking, the trend seems to be generalizable that there is a relationship between the seriousness of sexual harassment and frequency with which it is experienced by women.

It is important to note here that estimates of incidence of sexual harassment at the workplaces through researches like the present one could be misleading. It is difficult to estimate how often it occurs because the boundaries of sexual harassment are often unclear and because so many cases go unreported. In the West, the estimates of the percentage of the employed women who have been sexually harassed range from 21 per cent to 90 per cent by different researches (see for example, Gutek, 1985, Quina & Carlson, 1989; Terpstra & Baker, 1989). Clearly, the problem is pervasive. In the present research, from those working women who were approached by the researcher, only about 60 per cent agreed to respond, but all who participated in the research, reported their experiences of sexual harassment, which ranged from mild to severe form. However, like most of the earlier researches on sexual harassment, the present

research also faces the problem of a potential sample selection bias as women who volunteered to respond may differ considerably from those who did not. Still the findings of the present research indicate that sexual harassment is wide spread in the workplaces of Pakistan.

The studies conducted in the West show that the estimates of the frequency of sexual harassment also vary from sample to sample. The present research being the first of its type in Pakistan may not have given the exact estimates but seems to have paved way for future efforts in this regards. It is also difficult to draw any but the most general conclusion about the extent of sexual harassment from the present research, because the sample has been somewhat small.

Demographic Variables and Sexual Harassment

Though the perpetrators of sexual harassment are predominantly males, yet an overwhelming majority of researches done on sexual harassment employed females for obtaining empirical data. This is so perhaps because perpetrators are difficult to identify and contact. This could also be due to the biased cultural sexist attitudes that if a woman has been made a victim of sexual harassment, there must be something wrong with the woman which might have invited or caused the trouble. Fitzgerald (1992) pointed out that the causes and predictors of sexual harassment were very complex. The present research has attempted to explore these by studying the relationship between certain demographic variables of female victims with their experiences of sexual harassment, their coping strategies, and the personal strain experienced by them. The findings have been discussed below.

Age

The present research found that the older women reported more experiences of Gender Harassment and Sexual Coercion as compared to the younger group. While on the Unwanted Sexual Attention and total SHEQ, there were observed no age differences. All the subjects had reported their experiences of sexual harassment regardless of their age. This means that in our culture, as well as elsewhere, women of all ages experience sexual harassment. Apparently, one

may expect that younger women are more vulnerable to sexual harassment, and a number of researches do support this (e.g., Baker, 1989; Coles, 1986; Fain & Anderton, 1987; Gutek, 1985; Gutek & Dunwoody, 1987; LaFontaine & Tredeau, 1986; Martin, 1984; U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981, 1987). On the other hand, Brooks and Perot (1991) findings are in accord with the findings of the present research, namely, older women have more experience of sexual harassment than younger women. According to Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1992) although there is a relative consistency of data indicating that younger women are at a greater risk for harassment, yet to conclude this may be just an oversimplification because many studies report that the experience of sexual harassment is not limited to the younger women only (see also, Farley, 1978). It seems that by initiating sexual attention, the objective of the male workers is not to initiate courtship as explained by Natural/Biological Models (Tangri et al., 1982). As they make women of all ages their target of sexual harassment, their motivation could be just to undermine and degrade their female coworkers. As explained by Organizational Power Model (Backhouse & Cohan 1981; Bularzik, 1978; Farley, 1978; MacKinnon, 1979), they use harassment as a weapon to undermine the authority of women as a coworkers.

Data on coping strategies of the younger and older working are according to the expectations based upon the review of the existing literature that women employ externally focussed coping strategies more often as compared to internally focussed coping strategies. No age differences have been found in this regard. Moreover, higher the frequency of the experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces, more often externally focussed coping strategies, as compared to internally focussed coping strategies, will be employed by harassed working women. This is so mainly because the externally focussed coping strategies like Assertion/Confrontation and Social Support usually discourage the harassers and their uninvited behaviours, as reported by a number of earlier researches (e.g., Gruber & Bjorn, 1982; U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981, 1987).

The relationship between the harassed women's age and the personal strain they experience as a result of sexual harassment has also been explored in the present research. On

the vocational, psychological, interpersonal, and physical strain the older ones reported more strain as compared to younger ones although this difference failed to reach any significance level. This is what could be expected. The older women have reported more experiences of sexual harassment, than younger women therefore, they also reported more strain as compared to younger ones. Interesting is to note, however, that subjects, regardless of the age, have reported strain at the workplaces as a result of sexual harassment. Therefore, whenever there is a problem of sexual harassment, it will cause women to feel strain.

Education

The women belonging to low education group have reported more experiences of sexual harassment on all of its three dimensions, that is Gender Harassment, Unwanted Sexual Attention, and Sexual Coercion. These findings do not correspond with the findings of the pilot study which were nonsignificant and the sample was also too small to make any conclusion. Therefore, the findings of the main study may be considered more reliable as compared to the pilot study. However, these findings are also contrary to many Western studies which have reported that women with high levels of education are more likely to report harassment (e.g., Coles, 1986; Fain & Anderton, 1987; Martin, 1984; U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981). Here, the real question is whether educated women experience sexual harassment more often compared with less educated women. The answer is probably not. In fact, one may conjecture that Pakistani educated women may be less likely to become an easy target of harassment owing to their, relatively speaking, high position and status in the society. In Pakistan, women with low or less education are employed on low status jobs, and thus may become somewhat vulnerable to sexual harassment by the men working with them on higher status and with more organizational power. This explanation is in accord with organizational power model which stated that men abuse their organizational power to coerce or intimidate women because men usually work at high status jobs as compared to women (Backhouse & Cohan 1981; Bularzik, 1978; Farley, 1978; MacKinnon, 1979).

Still, the issue of education as it relates to the women's sexual harassment experiences assumes greater significance in Pakistan where less educated women are far more in number as compared to more educated ones and the phenomenon of sexual harassment may be differentially perceived by women with different educational levels. It, therefore, warrants further exploration in future research.

As regards the coping strategies employed by working women facing sexual harassment, nonsignificant differences have been found between more educated and less educated women on all the coping strategies except on two subscales: Illusory Control being an internally focussed coping strategy, and Appeasement which is an externally focussed coping strategy. Women belonging to low education group employed more Illusory Control and Appeasement as compared to high education group. Thus the women with low education, who also face more experiences of sexual harassment at their workplaces, may try to gain a sense of control by attributing the responsibility of their sexual harassment experiences to their own behaviours or attire. They do so by blaming themselves for what has happened with a belief that they would not have experienced sexual harassment, if they had looked or dressed differently or even behaved differently. These findings confirm what has been found earlier in a study carried out in Pakistan by Anila (1995) who concluded that in Pakistani culture, women were made to feel responsible for their own victimization by being told that if a man harassed them, it was because they had been doing something to provoke him. As a result, the harassed women dress down to look unattractive. Another coping strategy that the less educated women employed after experiencing sexual harassment was Appeasement, which meant they evaded the harassment either by offering some excuse or trying to pacify the harassers. They did so without any confrontation or assertion and tried not to hurt the feelings of the harasser by making some stories in order to get rid of the harasser, or just joking around with him. This also confirmed what the Organizational Power Model had suggested that as the women usually work in low status jobs with less formal authority, therefore they can not confront the harassers who usually have more organizational power and can easily destroy women's career (Backhouse & Cohen,

1981; Bularzik, 1978; Farley, 1978; MacKinnon, 1979). Thus, as the less educated women are usually at the low status jobs, so the harassers may abuse their organizational power to undermine, humiliate, and degrade the women (Carothers & Crull, 1984; DiTomaso, 1989; Wolshok, 1981). The victims may not confront the harassers because they can not afford to leave the job or have confrontations at workplaces, which not only may influence their output but may also further evoke the harassers to go beyond the limits. The results of the present research further indicated that the less educated working women employed more coping strategies as compared to highly educated women, although the differences just failed to reach any significance level. Future research with larger samples may further establish that more the women experience sexual harassment at workplaces, more coping strategies will be employed by them.

As regards the personal strain experienced by women harassed at their workplaces, the women with less education level have more experiences of sexual harassment so they experience more vocational, psychological, interpersonal, and physical strain at the workplaces as compared to the highly educated women. The less educated women workers may also face more problems at workplaces due to sexual harassment which may, in turn, adversely affect their attitude towards their work. As a consequence, they may show a poor output. Sexual Harassment does create a stressful and hostile working environment for women. It also causes interpersonal problems as well as mental and physical illnesses, such as headaches, digestive problems, nausea, depression, etc. These findings have been found by many researchers in the West (e.g., Coles, 1986; Crull, 1982; Jenson & Gutek, 1982; McGrath, Keita, Strickland, & Russo, 1990; Schneider, 1982). In Pakistan, further researches are needed which may focus on the psychosomatic effects of stressful situations caused by sexual harassment and on the resultant negative effects as regards the work attitudes, work output, and job satisfaction.

Marital Status

Marital status of the working women does not seem to be an important factor as regards the sexual harassment experiences, because the respondents of the present research reported the same frequency of the experiences of sexual harassment regardless of their marital status. Earlier, Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1992) reported that marital status was related to the experiences of sexual harassment, with unmarried women more often experiencing harassment than married ones (see also, Coles, 1986; Fain & Anderton, 1987; LaFontaine & Tredeau, 1986; Martin, 1984; Ryan & Kenig, 1991; Schneider, 1982). However, Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1992) also believed that it was an over interpretation of the data. Marital status was more like a "dummy variable", representing one or more factors that were working. These factors included perceived availability, lack of the protected status of a wife, particularly if the husband was a powerful (dominating) male, or most likely age of the woman (see also, Farley, 1978). Similarly, Gutek and Nakamura (1982) found that unmarried women, particularly those cohabiting, reported having experienced sexual harassment more frequently. In Pakistani culture, the phenomenon of cohabiting or living with a man without marriage is not observable. Neither is it socially and legally acceptable. Therefore, it is not likely that in any future research the marital status, except for being married, unmarried, or widowed, etc. could be studied easily. However, efforts may be made to explore further the relevant marital status factors which may determine the vulnerability of a woman to be a victim of sexual harassment. The finding of the present research also indicated that the motive of the harassers was not usually to initiate socialization or force the woman into courtship behaviour, rather they just wanted to degrade the women co-workers.

As regards the coping strategies employed by working women, the only significant difference related to the variable of marital status was on the coping strategy of Avoidance. The women living alone or the unmarried ones tried to stay away from the harasser as much as possible. The unmarried women also avoided being alone with harassers at their workplaces and took somebody along with them if they had to see the harasser (for official purpose or any other

reason). Anila (1994) while studying sexual harassment at university campus, also found that the female students took somebody along with them if they had to see their supervisors who harassed them. Thus this strategy is quite common among female students as well as working women.

As regards the strain felt by harassed married and unmarried women, the results of the present research are according to the expectations, showing no significant difference between the unmarried and married working women. As the marital status does not show any difference in the women's experiences of harassment at workplaces, therefore, it also does not seem to affect the vocational, psychological, interpersonal, and physical strain experienced by working women at their workplaces.

Job Status

The job status of the working women seems to be somewhat related to their experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces. The women working at nonofficer levels reported more sexual harassment experiences as compared to women working at officer levels or high status jobs, though the differences were nonsignificant. Existing literature suggests that victims of sexual harassment tend to be working predominantly in low status jobs with little power as compared to those who initiated harassment (see, for example Baker, 1989; Evans, 1978; LaFontaine & Tredeau, 1986). However, the job status of the harassers has not been explored in the present research. According to the findings of the present research, incidence rates did vary somewhat with job grades, as the women in lower status jobs were somewhat more likely than others to be sexually harassed but generally the rates were similar for all levels of jobs. This is in accord with some other studies conducted in the West (e.g., Farley, 1978; Fitzgerald, 1992; Little-Bishop, Seidler-Feller, & Opaluch, 1982). Thus it seems that the problem of sexual harassment is not concentrated in any particular job status. Although some women may be more vulnerable to sexual harassment than others, yet no woman seems to have immunity against it and a prestigious position job status is no sure protection. Furthermore, job status may have

some effect on the type of harassment a woman is likely to face. For instance, women working in low status jobs, may experience physical harassment while women on high status jobs may experience only verbal sexual harassment, and most of the times, the expression of sexual harassment might remain subtle. In short, whatever job status a woman may have achieved, sexual harassment is there to remind her of male prerogatives and of her inferior and dependent positions (see, for example, Carothers & Crull, 1984; DiTomaso, 1989; Wolshok, 1981).

As regards the coping strategies employed by officer and nonofficer level women, the only significant difference found was on coping strategy of Assertion/Confrontation. It shows that nonofficer level women either confront the harasser or make it clear to the harasser that his behavior is unwelcome. This finding is somewhat different from what one could expect after going through the review of the existing literature related to Organization Power Model (Backhouse & Cohen, 1981; Bularzik, 1978; Farley, 1978; MacKinnon, 1979), which suggests that as the women workers usually have less organizational power as compared to male workers, therefore men can easily coerce or intimidate women, and usually women of low job status are more vulnerable to be the victim of sexual harassment as they can not do anything against their superiors in the work organizations. It is difficult to explain the findings of the present study as the job status of the harassers has not been explored. May be the harassers are working at the low status job as compared to women working at nonofficer levels. Another reason may be that as the women of nonofficer level experience more sexual harassment, therefore, they employ more Assertion/Confrontation coping strategy (Backhouse & Cohen, 1981; Mackinnon, 1979).

As regards the personal strain experienced by women, the present research found that the women working at nonofficer level reported more vocational, psychological, interpersonal, and physical strain as compared to women working at officer levels. It should be noted that women working at low status jobs showed slightly more experiences of sexual harassment and this could be the reason that they showed more personal strain as well. This also somewhat explains why women working at nonofficer levels employ more Assertion/Confrontation coping strategy as compared to the officer level women. As they feel more personal strain of vocational,

psychological, interpersonal, and physical type, they may become more assertive, and confront harassers more frequently. Future research may focus on the variable of the status of the victim and perhaps also of the harasser to find out the intricate relationship with sexual harassment and the coping behaviour of the victim.

Organizations

Organization in which the women work is another important factor in the study of sexual harassment at workplaces. The present research has found out that the women working in private organizations face more experiences of sexual harassment especially of Unwanted Sexual Attention as compared to those working in the public or government organizations. These findings are somewhat different from what Fitzgerald (1992) has reported from the Western literature, that is, sexual harassment is found in both public and private sectors and in all types of organizations (see also Farley, 1978; Lach & Gwartney-Gibbs, 1993; Loy & Stewart, 1984). However, in Pakistan the sexual harassment incidence rates vary from one organization to organization, and this variation in the incidence rate suggests that the problem could be somewhat more in private organizations than in the public ones. Another reason for more prevalence of sexual harassment in private sector as reported by the women respondents could be because in Pakistan the private jobs are not at all secure. Men employers may easily exploit the relatively speaking insecure positions of female workers who may have either to scumb to sexual pressures of the all-powerful employers or lose their jobs.

As regards the coping strategies employed by women in both public and private organizations, there is not much difference among them, although the private sector women employed more coping strategies of one type or the other as compared to public sector women which is perhaps because of the fact that they have to encounter sexual experiences somewhat more often.

The private sector women have also reported more personal strain which includes vocational, psychological, interpersonal, and physical type as compared to those working in the

public sector. Although the results are based upon the mean scores of each scale but if we look into the individual items of each scale then we can point out that the women working in this private organizations have reported poor attitude toward their work, including dread, boredom, and lack of interest. Their quality of work also suffers because of their experiences of sexual harassment. Concentration problems and absenteeism are also evident and they have reported feeling of being depressed, anxious, unhappy, and irritable. They have also showed a number of physical symptoms (cold, heart palpitations, aches and pains). They also have reported erratic eating habits and unplanned weight changes, excessive use of coffee or tea, and disturbance in sleeping patterns. As a results, the private sector women have also reported excessive dependency on family members, spouses, and friends.

Reasons for Doing the Job

Reasons for doing the job was studied because these days many women who work do so because of real-economic needs. A few, however, work for fun sake or to pass their time, as they have nothing else to do. The present research has found that the women with financial problems experienced significantly more sexual harassment of all the three types, namely, Gender Harassment, Unwanted Sexual Attention, and Sexual Coercion, in comparison with those women who were doing their job just to pass their time, i.e., without any financial reasons. Exploiting the needy women is what Ellis (1981) named "exploitation harassment", a sort of abuse of power, harasser fully knowing that as the woman working with him is having financial problems, she cannot leave her job and thus for this reason she may live up with harassment without annoying the harasser. Only a few initial successful efforts may encourage the harasser to continue with his harassing behaviour.

As regards the coping strategies employed by the women, the findings of the present research indicate that the women with financial problems also experienced more sexual harassment and employed more coping strategies especially the strategies of Illusory Control, Appeasement, total externally focussed strategies, and they also employed more coping strategies

including external and internal type as compared to the ones who are doing their jobs just to pass their time. Thus the women with financial problems tried to gain a sense of control by taking responsibility for the incidents, through attributing the responsibility of the harassment to themselves. They sometimes made up some story so that the harassers will leave them alone, or just joked around with the harassers with a hope that they would leave them alone. They were even very careful not to make the harassers angry or mad. They rather tried not to hurt the feelings of the harasser by their reactions. Despite all this, they used externally focussed coping strategies more as compared to internally focussed coping strategies, that is, they focussed on the harassing situation itself instead of attempting to manage the cognitions and emotions associated with sexually harassing event. The respondents reported that they tended not to complain and not to use grievance procedures because of the male domination at work and the practical reality of pitting their words against that of their boss or some other high ranking male authority. Additionally, they feared that public exposure of the matter would result in their being blamed, being branded as a trouble maker, and thus being unable to find work in the future.

The findings of the present result also indicate that the women with financial problems experiences significantly more vocational, psychological, interpersonal, physical, and total personal strain. Thus they have problems in their work quality and output, they also have psychological and emotional problems. Their interpersonal relationships are also not so good, and they have complaints about physical illness and have poor self-care habits. This is in accord with what have been expected because the woman with financial problems experience more sexual harassment therefore, they felt more personal strain.

The women with financial problem usually become submissive after experiencing sexual harassment as they are dependent on their job, and if they lose their job then the financial damage to working women as a result of male sexual harassment may prove to be devastating. In the first place, a women worker may have the economic penalty of a lost salary during the period between her first employment and her next job. This could be damaging, although the degree will depend upon the women's skill, education, and general "employability". Even skill,

however, is no cause for optimism. Frequently, it will do little to off-set the cycle of downward mobility that leaving the job will trigger either by lack of comparable employment or none at all. This may result in the financial problems not only for the woman but also for her immediate family. For those women who are more attached to their jobs because of their professional positions and a high level of seniority in their respective office or because they are better paid or staying in job is in fact important in their career progression, quitting is much more difficult. The result is severe conflicts and strains.

The findings of the present research as regards the "reason for doing job" are not comparable to any other study carried out earlier as this aspect was perhaps never ever studied directly, though some indirect attempt were made (e.g., U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981). The present researcher contends that those women workers who do their jobs for financial problems and with compulsions, may be perceived by harassers in such a way that they are encouraged to harass for sexual or/and social sexual motives. Moreover, once subjected to sexual harassment, the victims having financial problems, and fearing loss of the job or other such negative repercussions, employ more coping strategies. However, as there is no sufficient body of knowledge available on this particular issue, and the findings of the present research remaining inconclusive, more research is needed with improvement in type and sizes of the samples involved.

More About Strain Experienced and Coping Strategies Employed

After studying the relationship between different demographic variables with working women's experiences of sexual harassment, their coping strategies, and the strain that they felt as a result of their experiences, the hypotheses formulated for the present research were tested.

The data on first hypothesis regarding the vocational strain the working women feel as a result of their experiences of sexual harassment at the workplaces, reveal that women with more experiences of sexual harassment face greater amount of vocational strain. This strain is related to problems such as work quality and output. Some women even suffered serious adverse

consequences in the form of job transfer, or dismissal. Boredom, lack of interest and errors in their work or accidents during work due to lack of concentration is also evident. Thus it can be concluded that the problem of sexual harassment does not necessarily end with a bad experience for the victim, rather the problems between the victim and the harasser may spill over into the working group, causing further problems for the victim, and the work environment. In extreme cases, the impact of individual incidents may extend far beyond the office, and affecting victims' psychological, interpersonal, and physical well being. Similar observations have been made earlier (see, for example, Coles, 1986; Culbertson, Rosenfeld, Booth-Kewley, & Magnusson, 1992; Hamilton & Dolkart, 1991; Jenson & Gutek, 1982; Jenvold, 1991; Lach & Gwartney-Gibbs, 1993; U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981, 1987).

The second hypothesis is confirmed and indicates that the psychological strain felt by harassed working women is related to the frequency of sexual harassment experiences. A significant number of women reported that they suffered impairment in the emotional health. Their feelings were that the sexual harassment degraded and humiliated the victims and diminished the victim's value as a productive human being. They reported being depressed, anxious, unhappy, and irritable. The anxiety and stress produced led the victim being off the work, falling sick, being less efficient at work, or leaving the job to seek work elsewhere. These findings are also in accord with those of some earlier researches (e.g., Benson & Thomson, 1982; Crull, 1982; Gruber & Bjorn, 1982; Gutek, 1985; Hamilton, Alagna, King, & Lloyd, 1987; Safran, 1976; Silverman, 1976; Tong, 1984; U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981).

The victims of sexual harassment are affected in their interpersonal relations as well. This is indicated by the confirmation of the hypothesis that higher the experiences of sexual harassment, greater will be the interpersonal strain felt by the victims. Generally the harassed working women becomes mistrustful of men and thus become excessively dependent on their family members, spouses, and friends. Deterioration of interpersonal relationships at work due to sexual harassment has also been found by many earlier researchers (e.g., Bandy, 1989;

Culbertson, Rosenfeld, Booth-Kewley, & Magnusson, 1992; DiTomaso, 1984; Gutek, 1985; Hamilton & Dolkart, 1991; Jenvold, 1991), and the present research tends to support their findings.

The fourth hypothesis of the present research has also been confirmed, that is, the working women who reported more experiences of sexual harassment also reported greater physical strain felt by them. As a result of sexual harassment, the harassed women experience physical problems such as headaches, digestive problems, neck and back aches, heart palpitation, binge-eating, loss of appetite, insomnia, etc. These findings of the present research thus confirmed what has already been found earlier by many researchers (e.g., Crull, 1982; Gutek, 1985; Lindsey, 1977; Loy & Stewart, 1984; MacKinnon, 1979; Safran, 1976; Salisbury, Ginorio, Remick, & Stringer, 1986; U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981).

Thus the first four hypotheses have confirmed the prevailing view about sexual harassment, that as the victims of sexual harassment, women experience most of the negative effects of sexual harassment. It appears that some harassed women experience dramatic consequences of harassment and others do not. The contributing factors could be the level of severity of sexual harassment, and personal and organizational characteristics. Some victims are more likely to be harassed than others and some reported having suffered greater consequences, such as fear of losing job, and showing poor performance. They are also much more likely to report experiencing emotional or physical problems. However, the frequency of sexual harassment or level of severity alone by itself does not determine whether adverse consequences will occur or not. Some victims of seemingly mild form of sexual harassment (e.g., Gender Harassment) have reported serious consequences while others who are pressed for sexual favours (Sexual Coercion) by a coworker may not face such drastic effects. This only leads us to observe that one single factor may not fully explain the adverse effects the victims may face.

The fifth hypothesis of the present research was also confirmed indicating that the women who had more experience of sexual harassment at workplaces, instead of employing internally focussed coping strategies, employed more often externally focussed coping strategies

which included Avoidance, Assertion/Confrontation, Seeking Institutional/Organisational Relief, Social Support, and Appeasement. Quite often the harassed working women refused the sexual advances either by verbally confronting the harassers or making it clear to them that their behaviour was unwelcome. In the Western countries, women often consult an appropriate member of the administration regarding the harassment they face. In Pakistan, however, there is not any formal procedure for complaining about the sexual harassment at workplaces. Here, most of the women may try at first to evade the harassment, without confrontation and by offering an excuse. Sometimes they may also avoid the situation by staying away from the harasser and by seeking the support of significant others. They, at times, also seek the validation of their perceptions, or acknowledgement of the reality of occurrence of sexual harassment from others at their workplaces. The women subjected to sexual harassment even may take the responsibility for the incident by self-blaming. These observations were found in Pakistan earlier also by Anila (1995), and Zaidi (1994), and the West by Jenson and Gutek (1982), and Robinowitz (1990). The harassed women sometimes even reappriase the situation as less threatening by interpreting the behaviour as flattering. In the present research, there was often a reluctance shown by women to report harassment because they were ashamed, blamed themselves as having caused the behaviour of the harasser and they believed that they would not be taken seriously. The number of complaints was probably tiny compared with the number of offenses. The onus was usually on women to provide the proof of what had happened to them and no woman was going to enjoy the prospects of standing in front of an authority and being questioned. One of the major deterrents to reporting harassment was the fear of being involved in a public scandal. Workplace gossip and innuendo could be extremely distressing for many women.

The hypothesis number six concerning the vocational strain has also been confirmed: The harassed women who reported vocational strain employed more externally focussed coping strategies as compared to internally focused coping strategies. Similarly, the harassed women who reported more psychological strain employed more externally focussed coping strategies as

compared to internally focussed coping strategies. It showed that hypothesis number seven has also been confirmed. These findings of the present research are in accord with what a number of researches have reported, that is, as the severity of sexual harassment increases, the more likely it is that the harassed women will react more assertively (Baker, Terpstra, & Larntz, 1991; Brooks & Perot, 1988; Dunwoody- Miller & Gutek, 1985; Gruber, 1989; Gruber & Bjorn, 1982; Hogbacka et al., 1987; Livingston , 1982; Loy & Stewart, 1984). The hypothesis number eight and nine have not been confirmed, as the women who feel interpersonal and physical strains due to sexual harassment at workplace employ internally focused coping strategies more as compared to externally focused coping strategies. Thus for these types of strains they tried to manage the cognitions and emotions associated with the sexual harassing events instead of focussing on the harassing situations.

Conclusion

Sexual harassment is a new name describing an old problem and a generation of women have been subjected to these experiences. In Pakistan, the present research is first of its kind. Although the issue of sexual harassment is quite common in Pakistan but not a single social psychological research on sexual harassment at workplaces has been carried out before this study. Thus the present research is quite significant in this respect.

The indigenous "Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire" (SHEQ) developed by the present researcher measures the women's experiences of sexual harassment at the workplaces of Pakistan. Though, SHEQ requires many more validation studies to prove its robustness, however, an examination of the available data suggests that it possesses sufficient reliability and validity for research purposes as it stands relevant and sensitive to the cultural peculiarities of Pakistan. Fitzgerald (1990a) noted that content validity is the most relevant form of validity to be determined in sexual harassment research. The present research has looked into this issue quite thoroughly. It has also focussed on the convergent and discriminant validities of SHEQ. It has also tried to take care of all the methodological issues to improve the research on sexual harassment, as stressed by Fitzgerald and Shullman (1993). For example, during

the development of SHEQ, the researcher has inquired about the full range of potentially sexually harassing behaviours, from gender harassment to sexual assault. All the items of SHEQ are written in behavioural terms and in enough detail to ensure that all respondents interpret them similarly. In future, SHEQ may be useful for increasing understanding of the experiences of sexual harassment faced by women at the workplaces of Pakistan. It may also have a role in the development and evaluation of programs designed to prevent or alleviate harassing behaviours at the workplaces.

The present research has also focussed on the consequences of sexual harassment of women, and how does sexual harassment affect women workers and how do they attempt to cope with experiences of harassment. These topics are interconnected because the responses of victims are usually influenced by the amount of support and understanding received from significant others. Likewise, the extent of emotional, physical, and psychological strain or damage that women experience from harassment also depends on the responsiveness of other people and that of the organization for which they work. Sexual harassment seems to have a direct impact upon the profitability of the enterprise. From the standpoint of the women concerned, they suffer both the adverse consequences of sexual harassment itself and long-term damage to their career prospects if, for example, they are forced to quit or change their jobs. Thus sexual harassment is an obstacle to the proper integration of women into the labour market.

Quite interestingly the present research has found somewhat similar results as were found in the studies carried out in other countries as regards the relationship of various demographic variables with women's experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces. Although quite a large number of demographic variables such as, women's age, education, marital status, job status, organization, and reasons for job have been studied, yet there are many more demographic and organizations variables which may also play a role in the women's experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces e.g., physical attractiveness of women, their attitudes, the working hours of the organizations in which they work, chances of encounters between men and women during work, nature of their job, profession, etc. These variables are yet to be explored. Although a wide variety of professions of women have been taken in the present research as compared to a study confined to only one profession, yet the present research is quite limited in drawing conclusion concerning employed women's sexual harassment experiences because the nature of sexual

harassment varies with the type of profession. The sample of the present research is quite small as regards the different professions, and in future large samples from different professions may present a more reliable picture.

The present research also has usual limitations of generalizability of its findings because of nonrepresentative sample, because only those women were included as subjects who voluntarily participated. Generalization of the findings of the present research is also not recommended because as reported by Arvey and Cavanaugh (1995), generalization across different populations are perhaps limited owing to the fact that the prevalence of sexual harassment is a function of workplace characteristics (i.e., type of job, etc.) as well as the women's personal characteristics (i.e., age, education, etc.). Unless similarities in such workplaces and respondents characteristics are demonstrated care should be taken when generalizing across different populations. In spite of all this, the present research is a significant contribution in understanding the situation of sexual harassment at the workplaces of Pakistan.

To conclude, the problem of sexual harassment does not end when the harasser walks out of the room or when a new day begins in the office. The harassed working women are affected by their interpersonal, psychological, and physical problems and crises experiences at workplaces. How strongly and in what way they are affected undoubtedly depends on a complex combination of demographic variables (i.e., who they are, how they view the world, how many options they have), and situational variables (i.e., what sort of sexual harassment experience they had and what sort of office they were working in). The present research is the first step taken studying the complex nature of the phenomenon of sexual harassment and how does it affect the victims as well as the organizations in which they work. The researcher feels that if sexual harassment is to remain an unspoken problem, many women will continue to lose their jobs, face mental torture and suffer from ill-health. Only through further studies into the phenomenon of sexual harassment we can do something to right an age-old wrong.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Abbey, A. (1982). Sex differences in attributions for friendly behaviour: Do males misperceive female's friendliness? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42, 830-838.
- Adams, J. W., Kottke, J. L., & Padgitt, J. S. (1983). Sexual harassment of university students. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 23, 484-499.
- Akhtar-ullah, S. (1996). *Role of perceived social support as a coping resource for job stress*. Unpublished M.Phil. thesis, National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1987). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorder*. (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Anila. (1990). *Perception of sexual harassment among a group of male and female medical college students*. Unpublished manuscript, National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Anila. (1992). *Attribution of responsibility for sexual harassment as related to sex role attitudes*. M.Phil. thesis, National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Anila. (1994, January). Sexual harassment in the university campus. *NIP Newsletter*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 2-3.
- Anila. (1995). Sexual harassment: Myths versus women's reality. *Personality Study and Group Behaviour*, 15, 47-54.
- Anila., & Ansari, Z. A. (1992). *Development of Sex Role Attitude Scale for Pakistan*. Unpublished manuscript, National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Anila., Ansari, Z. A., & Tariq, N. (1991). Development of an indigenous Sexual Harassment Attribution Questionnaire for Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 6(1-2), 55-68.
- Anila., Tariq, N., & Ansari, Z. A. (1995). *Demographic variables, sex role attitudes and attributions of responsibility for sexual harassment*. Paper submitted for publication.

- Anonymous. (1991). Sexual harassment: A female counseling student's experience. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 69, 502-505.
- Arvey, R. D., & Cavanaugh, MA. (1995). Using surveys to access the prevalence of sexual harassment: Some methodological problems. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51(1), 39-52.
- Backhouse, C., & Cohen, L. (1981). *Sexual harassment at the job: How to avoid the working women's nightmare*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Baker, N. L. (1989). *Sexual harassment and job satisfaction in traditional and nontraditional industrial occupations*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles, California.
- Baker, D. D., Terpstra, D. E., & Larntz, K. (1991). The influence of individual characteristics and severity of harassing behaviours on reactions to sexual harassment. *Sex Roles*, 22, 305-323.
- Bandy, N. (1989). *Relationships between male and female employees at Southern Illinois University*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois.
- Barak, A., Fisher, W. A., Houston, S. (1992). Individual difference correlates of the experience of sexual harassment among female university students. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22(1), 17-37.
- Bardwick, J. (1971). *The psychology of women*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Benson, K. (1984). Comments on Crocker's analysis of university definition of sexual harassment. *Signs*, 9, 377-397.
- Benson, D. J., & Thomson, G. (1982). Sexual harassment on a university campus: The confluence of authority relations, sexual interest, and gender gratification. *Social Problems*, 29(3), 236-251.
- Betz, N. E., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1987). *The career psychology of women*. New York: Academic Press.
- Biaggio, M. K., Watts, D., & Brownell, A. (1990). Addressing sexual harassment. Strategies for prevention and change. In M. A. Paludi (Ed.), *Ivory power: Sexual harassment on campus* (pp. 213-230). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Blumberg, R. L. (1984). A general of gender stratification. *Sociological Theory*, 2, 23-101.

- Breznitz, S. (1983). The seven kind of denial. In S. Breznitz (Ed.), *The denial of stress*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Brewer, M. B., & Berk, R. A. (1982). Beyond nine to five: Introduction. *Journal of Social Issues*, 38(4), 1-4.
- Brooks, L., & Perot, A. R. (1988). *Predicting reporting of sexual harassment*. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Convention, Atlanta, GA.
- Brooks, L., & Perot, A. R. (1991). Reporting sexual harassment: Exploring a predictive model. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 31-47.
- Brown, L. S. (1991, March). *Psychological evaluation of victims of sexual harassment*. Paper presented at the National Conference to Promote Men and Women Working Productively Together, Bellevue, WA.
- Bularzik, M. (1978). Street harassment at the workplace: Historical notes. *Radical America*, 12, 25-43.
- Carothers, S. C., & Crull, P. (1984). Contrasting sexual harassment in female and male dominated occupations. In K. B. Sacks & D. Remy (Eds.), *My troubles are going to have trouble with me: Everyday trails and triumphs of women workers* (pp. 219-227). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Cleveland, J. N., & Kerst, M. E. (1993). Sexual harassment and perceptions of power: An under-articulated relationship. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 42(1), 49-67.
- Coles, F. S. (1986). Forced to quit: Sexual harassment complaints and agency response. *Sex Roles*, 14, 81-95.
- Collins, E. G., & Blodgett, T. B. (1981). Sexual harassment: Some see it ... some won't. *Harvard Business Review*, 59, 76-95.
- Collinson, D. L., & Collinson, M. (1989). Sexuality in the workplace: The domination of men's sexuality. In J. Hearn, D. L. Sheppard, P. Tancred-Sheriff, & G. Burrell (Eds.), *The sexuality of organization* (pp. 91-109). London: Sage.

- Crocker, P. L. (1983). An analysis of university definitions of sexual harassment. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 24, 219-224.
- Crull, P. (1979). *The impact of sexual harassment on job: A profile of the experiences of 92 women*. Working Women's Institute Research Series, Report No. 3.
- Crull, P. (1982). Stress effects of sexual harassment on the job: Implications for counselling. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 52, 539-544.
- Culbertson, A. L., Rosenfeld, P., Booth-Kewley, S., & Magnusson, P. (1992). *Assessment of sexual harassment in the Navy: Results of the 1989 Navy-wide survey*. TR-92-11. San Diego, CA: Navy Personnel Research and Development Centre.
- DeFour, D. C. (1989, August). Sexual harassment of women of color. In M. Paludi (Chair), *Sexual harassment in academia and the workplace*. Workshop presented to the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA.
- DeFour, D. C. (1990). The interface of racism and sexism on college campuses. In M. A. Paludi (Ed.), *Ivory power: Sexual harassment on campus*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- DiTomaso, N. (1989). Sexuality in the workplace: Discrimination and harassment. In J. Hearn, D. L. Sheppard, P. Tancred-Sheriff, & G. Burrell (Eds.), *The sexuality of organization* (pp.71-90). London: Sage.
- Dunwoody-Miller, V., & Gutek, B. A. (1985). *S.H.E. Project Report: Sexual harassment in the state workforce: Results of a survey*. Sacramento: Sexual Harassment in Employment Project of the California Commission on the Status of Women.
- Dzeich, B. W., & Weiner, L. (1984). *The lecherous professor: Sexual harassment on campus*. Boston: Beacon.
- Edwards, A. L., & Cronbach, L. J. (1952). Experimental design for research in psychotherapy. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 8, 51-59.
- Ellis, J. (1981). Sexual harassment and race: A legal analysis of discrimination. *Journal of Legislation*, 8, 30-45.

- Ellis, S., Barak, A., & Pinto, A. (1991). Moderating effects of personal cognitions on experienced and perceived sexual harassment of women at workplace. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 21(16), 1320-1337.
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (1980). Guidelines on discrimination because of sex. *Federal Register*, 45, 74676-74677.
- Evans, L. J. (1978). Sexual harassment: Women's hidden occupational hazard. In J. R. Chapman & M. Gates (Eds.), *The victimization of women* (pp. 203-223). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fain, T. C., & Anderton, D. L. (1987). Sexual harassment: Organizational context and diffuse status. *Sex Roles*, 17, 291-311.
- Farley, L. (1978). *Sexual shakedown: The sexual harassment of women in the working world*. London: Melbourne House.
- Finigan, M. (1982). The effects of token representation on participation in small groups and decision making groups. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 34, 531-550.
- Fitzgerald, L. F. (1990a). Sexual harassment: The definition and measurement of a construct. In M. Paludi (Ed.), *Ivory power: Sexual harassment in academia* (pp. 21-44). New York: State University of New York Press.
- Fitzgerald, L. F. (1990b, March). *Assessing strategies of coping with harassment: A theoretical/empirical approach*. Paper presented at the Mid-winter Conference of the Association for Women in Psychology, Tempe, AZ.
- Fitzgerald, L. F. (1992, November). *Sexual harassment in organization: ASAE executive briefing*. American Society of Association Executive, Washington, DC.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Hulin, C. L., & Drasgow. (1994). The antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations: An integrated model. In G. P. Keita & J. J. Jr. Hurrell (Eds.), *Job stress in changing workforce: Investigating gender, diversity, and family issues* (pp. 55-73). Washington, DC: American Psychological Organization.

- Fitzgerald, L. F., & Ormerod, A. J. (1992). Breaking silence: The sexual harassment of women in academia and the workplace. In F. Denmark & M. Paludi (Eds.), *Handbook of the psychology of women*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Shullman, S. L., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y., Ormerod, M., & Weitzman, L. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 32, 152-175.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Swan, S. (1995). Why didn't she report him? The psychological and legal implications of women's responses to sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51(1), 117-138.
- Frazier, P. A., Cochran, C. C., & Olson, A. M. (1995). Social science research on lay definitions of sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51(1), 21-37,
- French, J. R. P. (1976, September). *Job demands and worker health*. Paper presented at American Psychological Association Symposium, Washington, DC.
- Gelfand, M. J., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Drasgow, F. (1995). The structure of sexual harassment: A confirmatory analysis across cultures and settings. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 47(1), 164-177.
- Gervasio, A. H., & Ruckdeschel. (1992). College students' judgement of verbal sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22(3), 190-211.
- Gold, Y. (1989, August). *Women's ways of coping: Strategies for dealing with sexual harassment*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Goodman, J. L. (1981). Sexual harassment: Some observations on the distance traveled and the distance yet to go. *Capital University Law Review*, 10, 445-469.
- Grauerholz, E. (1989). Sexual harassment of women professors by students: Exploring the dynamics of power, authority, and gender in a university setting. *Sex Roles*, 21(11/12), 789-801.
- Gruber, J. E. (1989). How women handle sexual harassment: A literature review. *Social Science Research*, 74, 3-9.

- Gruber, J. E., & Bjorn, L. (1982). Blue-collar blues: The sexual harassment of women autoworkers. *Work and Occupation, 9*, 271-298.
- Gruber, J. E., & Bjorn, L. (1986). Women's responses to sexual harassment: An analysis of socio-cultural, organizational, and personal resource models. *Social Science Quarterly, 67*(4), 814-826.
- Gutek, B. A. (1985). *Sex and the workplace*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gutek, B. A., & Cohen, A. G. (1987). Sex ratios, sex role spillover, and sex at work: A comparison of men's and women's experiences. *Human Relations, 40*(2), 97-115.
- Gutek, B. A., Cohen, A. G., & Konrad, A. M. (1990). Predicting social-sexual behaviour at work: A contact hypothesis. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(3), 560-577.
- Gutek, B. A., & Dunwoody, V. (1987). Understanding sex in the workplace. In A. H. Stromberg, L. Larwood, & B. A. Gutek (Eds.), *Women and work: An annual review. Vol. 2.* (pp. 249-269). London: Sage Publications.
- Gutek, B. A., & Koss, M. P. (1993). Changed women and changed organization: Consequences of and coping with sexual harassment. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 42*(1), 28-48.
- Gutek, B. A., & Morasch, B. (1982). Sex ratios, sex role spillover, and sexual harassment of women at work. *Journal of Social Issues, 38*(4), 55-74.
- Gutek, B. A., Morasch, B., & Cohen, A. G. (1983). Interpreting social-sexual behaviour in a work setting. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 22*, 30-48.
- Gutek, B. A., & Nakamura, C. Y. (1982). Gender roles and sexuality in the world of work. In E. Allgeier & N. McCormick (Eds.), *Changing boundaries: Gender roles and sexual behaviour* (pp. 182-201). Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.
- Gutek, B. A., Nakamura, C. Y., Gahart, M., Handschumacher, I., & Russell, D. (1980). Sexuality and the workplace. *Basic and Applied Psychology, 1*, 255-265.
- Hadjifoutiou, N. (1983). *Women and harassment at work*. London: Pluto Press.
- Hafeez, S. (1993). *The girl child in Pakistan: Priority concerns*. Islamabad: UNICEF.

- Hamilton, J. A., Alagna, S. W., King, L. S., & Lloyd, C. (1987). The emotional consequences of gender-based abuse in the workplace: New counseling programs for sex discrimination. *Women and Therapy, 6*, 155-182.
- Hamilton, J. A., & Dolkart, J. L. (1991, March). *Legal reform in the area of sexual harassment: Contributions from social sciences*. Paper presented at the National Conference to Promote Men and Women Working Productively Together, Bellevue, WA.
- Hassan, I. N. (1996). Violence against women. In I. N. Hassan (Ed.), *Psychology of women* (pp. 395 - 412). Islamabad, Pakistan: Allama Iqbal Open University.
- Heilman, M., Martell, R. F., & Simon, M. C. (1988). The vagaries of sex bias: Conditions regulating the under valuation, equivaluation, and overvaluation of female job applicants. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, 41*, 98-110.
- Hemmasi, M., Graf, L. A., & Russ, G. S. (1994). Gender-related jokes in the workplace: Sexual humour or sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24*(12), 1114-1128.
- Henley, N. M. (1977). *Body politics: Power, sex, and nonverbal communication*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Henley, N. M., & Freeman, J. (1975). The sexual politics of interpersonal behaviour. In J. Freeman (Ed.), *Women: A feminist perspective* (pp. 391-401). Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.
- Hogbacka, R., Kandolin, I., Haavio-Mannila, E., & Kauppinen-Toropainen, K. (1987). *Sexual harassment in the workplace: Results of a survey of Finns*. Ministry of Social Affairs and Health, Equality Publications, Series E: Abstracts 1/1987, Helsinki, Valtion Painatuskeskus.
- Hotelling, K. (1991). Sexual harassment: A problem shielded by silence. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 69*, 497-501.
- Hulin, C. (1993, May). *A framework for the study of sexual harassment in organizations: Climate stressors, and patterned responses*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Industrial/Organizational Psychology, San Francisco.
- Izraeli, D. N. (1983). Sex effects or structural effects? An empirical test of Kanter's theory of proportions. *Social Forces, 62*, 153-165.

- Janoff-Bulman, R. (1979). Characterological versus behavioural self-blame: Inquiries into depression and rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1798-1809.
- Jensen, I. W., & Gutek, B. A. (1982). Attribution and assignment of responsibility in sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues*, 38(4), 121-136.
- Jensvold, M. F. (1991, March). *Assessing the psychological and physical harm to sexual harassment victims*. Paper presented at the National Conference to Promote Men and Women Working Productively Together, Bellevue, WA.
- Kanekar, S., & Dhir, V. L. (1993). Sex related differences in perceptions of sexual harassment of women in India. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 133(1), 119-120.
- Kanekar, S., & Menon, S. A. (1992). Attitudes towards sexual harassment of women in India. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22(24), 1940-1952.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). Some effects of the proportions on group life: Skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82, 965-990.
- Kenig, S., & Ryan, J. (1986). Sex differences in the levels of tolerance and attribution of blame for sexual harassment on a university campus. *Sex Roles*, 15, 535-549.
- Kilpatrick, D. G. (1992, June). *Treatment and counselling needs of women veterans who were raped, otherwise sexually assaulted, or sexually harassed during military service*. Testimony before the U. S. Senate Committee on Veteran's Affairs.
- Konrad, A. M., & Gutek, B. A. (1986). Impact of work experiences on attitudes toward sexual harassment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31, 422-438.
- Korman, S. K., & Leslie, G. R. (1982). The relationship of feminist ideology and date sharing to perceptions of sexual aggression in dating. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 18, 114-129.
- Koss, M. P. (1990). Changed lives: The psychological impact of sexual harassment. In M. A. Paludi (Ed.), *Ivory power: Sexual harassment on campus* (pp. 73-92). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Lach, D. H., & Gwartney-Gibbs, P. A. (1993). Sociological perspective on sexual harassment and workplace dispute resolution. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 42(1), 102-115.

- LaFontaine, E., & Tredeau, L. (1986). The frequency, sources, and correlates of sexual harassment among women in traditional male occupations. *Sex Roles, 15*, 423-432.
- Lindsey, K. (1977, November). Sexual harassment on the job and how to stop it. *Ms.* pp. 47-51 & 74-78.
- Little-Bishop, S., Seidler-Feller, D., & Opaluch, R. E. (1982). Sexual harassment in the workplace as a function of initiator's status: The case of airline personnel. *Journal of Social Issues, 38*(4), 137-148.
- Livingston, J. A. (1982). Responses to sexual harassment on the job: Legal, organizational, and individuals actions. *Journal of Social Issues, 38*(4), 5-22.
- Lott, B., Reilly, M. E., & Howard, D. R. (1982). Sexual assault and harassment: A campus community case study. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 8*, 296-319.
- Lottes, I. L. (1991). The relationship between nontraditional gender roles and sexual coercion. *Journal of Psychology and Human Ecology, 4*, 89-109.
- Loy, P. H., & Stewart, L. P. (1984). The extent and effects of sexual harassment of working women. *Sociological Focus, 17*, 31-43.
- MacKinnon, C. A. (1979). *Sexual harassment of working women*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Maihoff, N., & Forrest, L. (1983). Sexual harassment in higher education: An assessment study. *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counsellors, 46*, 308.
- Mansfield, P. K., Koch, P. B., & Henderson, J. (1991). The job climate for women in traditionally male blue-collar occupations. *Sex Roles, 25*, 63-79.
- Martin, S. E. (1978). Sexual politics in the workplace: The interactional world of policewomen. *Symbolic Interactions, 1*, 55-60.
- Martin, S. E. (1980). *Breaking and entering: Policewomen on patrol*. Berkely: University of California Press.
- Martin, S. E. (1984). Sexual harassment: The link between gender stratification, sexuality and women's economic status. In J. Freeman (Ed.), *Women: A feminist perspective* (pp. 54-69). Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Matlin, M. W. (1993). *The psychology of women*. (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

- Matsui, T., Kakuyama, T., Onglatco, M., & Ogutu, M. (1995). Women's perceptions of social-sexual behaviour: A cross-cultural replication. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 46*(2), 203-215.
- May, L., & Hughes, J. C. (1992). Is sexual harassment coercive? In E. Wall (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Confrontations and decisions*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Maypole, D. E. (1986). Sexual harassment of social workers at work. *Social Works, 31*, 29-34.
- Maypole, D. E., & Skaine, R. (1983). Sexual harassment in the workplace. *Social Works, 28*, 385-390.
- Mazer, D. B., & Percival, E. F. (1989). Ideology or experience? The relationship among perceptions, attitudes, and experiences of sexual harassment in university students, *Sex Roles, 20*, 135-147.
- McGrath, E., Keita, G. P., Strickland, B. R., & Russo, N. F. (1990). *Women and depression: Risk factors and treatment issues*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- McKinney, K. (1990). Sexual harassment of university faculty by colleagues and students. *Sex Roles, 23*, 385-390.
- McKinney, K. (1992). Contra-power sexual harassment: The effects of student sex and type of behaviour on faculty perceptions. *Sex Roles, 27*, 627-643.
- McKinney, K., Olson, C. V., & Satterfield, A. (1988). Graduate students' experiences with and responses to sexual harassment: A research note. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 3*, 319-325.
- Meek, P. M., & Lynch, A. Q. (1983). Establishing an informal grievance procedure for cases of sexual harassment of students. *Journal of the NAWDAC, 46*(2), 30-33.
- Neibuhr, R. E., & Boyles, W. R. (1991). Sexual harassment of military personnel. *International Journal of International Relations, 15*, 445-457.
- Nieva, V., & Gutek, B. (1981). *Women and work: A psychological perspective*. New York: Praeger.
- O'Farrell, B., & Harlan, S. L. (1982). Craftworkers and clerks: The effects of male coworker hostility on women's satisfaction with nontraditional jobs. *Social Problems, 29*, 252-264.
- Opotow, S. (1990). Moral exclusion and injustice: An overview. *Journal of Social Issues, 46*, 1-20.
- Ormerod, A. J. (1987, August). *Perceptions of sexual harassment*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York.

- Ormerod, A. J. (1989, August). *Women's students self-efficiency expectations about coping with sexual harassment*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Ormerod, A. J., & Gold, Y. (1988, March). *Coping with sexual harassment: Internal and external strategies for coping with stress*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Association for Women in Psychology, Bethesda, MD.
- Osipow, S. H., & Spokane, A. R. (1987). *Occupational Stress Inventory: Manual research version*. Psychological Assessment Resources, Florida, USA.
- Padgitt, S. L., & Padgitt, J. S. (1986). Cognitive structure of sexual harassment: Implications of university policy. *Journal of College Students Personnel*, 27, 34-39.
- Paglia, C. (1992). Sexual aggression and nature. In E. Wall (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Confrontations and decisions*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Pakistan National Report. (1995, September). *Proceedings of the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing, China*. Ministry of Women's Development and Youth Affairs, Government of Pakistan.
- Pattinson, T. (1991). *Sexual harassment: The hidden facts*. London: Futura Publications.
- Pervez, S. (1996). Factors responsible for sex typing. In I. N. Hassan (Ed.), *Psychology of Women* (pp. 181-204). Islamabad, Pakistan: Allama Iqbal Open University.
- Phillips, C. M., Stockdale, J. E., & Joeman, L. M. (1989). *The risks in going to work: The nature of people's work, the risks they encounter, and the incidence of sexual harassment, physical attack and the threatening behaviour*. London: The Suzy Lamplugh Trust.
- Pleck, J. H. (1976). Male threat from female competence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 44, 81-95.
- Powell, G. N. (1986). Effects of sex roles identity and sex on definitions of sexual harassment. *Sex Roles*, 14, 9-19.
- Project on the Status and Education of Women. (1978). *Sexual harassment: A hidden issue*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.

- Pryor, J. B. (1987). Sexual harassment proclivities in men. *Sex Roles, 17*, 269-290.
- Pryor, J. B., & Day, J. D. (1988). Interpretations of sexual harassment: An attributional analysis. *Sex Roles, 18*, 405-417.
- Pryor, J. B., LaVite, C. M., & Stoller, L. M. (1993). A social psychological analysis of sexual harassment: The person/situation interaction. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 42*(1), 68-83.
- Quina, K. & Carlson, N. L. (1989). *Rape, incest, and sexual harassment: A guide for helping survivors*. New York: Praeger.
- Rabinowitz, V. C. (1990). Coping with sexual harassment. In M. A. Paludi (Ed.), *Ivory power: Sexual harassment on campus* (pp. 103-118). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Ragins, B. R., & Scandura, T. A. (1992, May). *Antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment*. Paper presented at the Society for Industrial/Organizational Psychology Conference, Montreal, Canada.
- Ragins, B. R., & Sundstrom, E. (1989). Gender and power in organizations: A longitudinal perspective. *Psychological Bulletin, 105*, 51-88.
- Reilly, T., Carpenter, S., Dull, V., & Bartlett, K. (1982). The factorial survey: An approach to defining sexual harassment on campus. *Journal of Social Issues, 38*(4), 99-110.
- Reilly, M. E., Lott, B., & Gallogly, S. M. (1986). Sexual harassment of university students. *Sex Roles, 15*, 333-358.
- Rossi, P. H., & Anderson, A. B. (1982). The factorial survey approach: An introduction. In P. Rossi & S. Nock (Eds.), *Measuring social judgement: The factorial survey approach*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Rossi, P. H., & Weber-Burdin, E. (1982). Defining sexual harassment on campus: A replication and extension. *Journal of Social Issues, 38*, 111-120.
- Rossi, P. H., & Weber-Burdin, E. (1983). Sexual harassment on campus. *Social Science Research, 12*, 131-158.
- Rowe, M. (1981). Dealing with sexual harassment. *Harvard Business Review, 59*, 42-46.
- Ryan J., & Kenig, S. (1991). Risk and ideology in sexual harassment. *Sociological Inquiry, 61*, 231-241.

- Saal, F. E., Johnson, C. B., & Weber, N. (1989). Friendly or sexy? It may depend on whom you ask. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 13, 263-276.
- Safran, C. (1976, November). What men do to women on the job: A shocking look at sexual harassment. *Redbook*, 149, 217-224.
- Salisbury, J., Ginorio, A. B., Remick, H., & Stringer, D. M. (1986). Counseling victims of sexual harassment. *Psychotherapy*, 23, 316-324.
- Schacht, S. P., & Atchison, P. H. (1993). Heterosexual instrumentalism: Past and future directions. *Feminism and Psychology*, 3, 37-53.
- Schneider, B. E. (1982). Consciousness about sexual harassment among heterosexual and lesbian women workers. *Journal of Social Issues*, 38(4), 75-98.
- Schneider, B. E. (1991). Put up or shut up: Workplace sexual assault. *Gender and Society*, 5, 533-548.
- Schuler, R. S. (1979). *Definition and conceptualization of stress in organizations* (Working Paper. 79-50). Columbus: Ohio State University, College of Administrative Science.
- Shah, N. (1994, January). Diary of working woman. *Newsline*, pp. 32-33.
- Sheffey, S., & Tindale, R. S. (1992). Perceptions of sexual harassment in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22, 1502-1520.
- Sheppard, D. (1989). Organizations, power, and sexuality: The image and self-image of women managers. In J. Hearn, D. L. Sheppard, P. Tancred-Sheriff, & G. Burrell (Eds.), *The sexuality of organization*. London: Sage.
- Silverman, D. (1976). Sexual harassment: Working women's dilemma. *Quest: A Feminist Quarterly*, 3, 15-24.
- Sokoloff, N. J. (1980). *Between money and love: The dialectics of women's home and market work*. New York: Praeger.
- Stewart, L. P., & Gundykunst, W. P. (1982). Differential factors influencing the hierarchical level and number of promotions of males and females within organization. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25, 586-597.

- Stockdale, J. E. (1991). Sexual harassment at work. In E. C. Viano (Ed.), *Critical issues in victimology: International perspectives*. New York: Springer.
- Stockdale, M. S. (1993). The role of sexual misperceptions of women's friendliness in an emerging theory of sexual harassment. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 42(1), 84-101.
- Stockdale, M. S., & Vaux, A. (1993). What sexual harassment experiences lead respondents to acknowledge being sexually harassed? A secondary analysis of a university survey. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 43(1), 221-234.
- Studd, M. V., & Gattiker, U. E. (1991). The evolutionary psychology of sexual harassment in organizations. *Etiology and Sociobiology*, 12, 249-290.
- Tangri, S. S., Burt, M. R., & Johnson, L. B. (1982). Sexual harassment at work: Three explanatory models. *Journal of Social Issues*, 38(4), 33-54.
- Tangri, S. S., & Hayes, S. M. (1996). *Theories of sexual harassment*. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, Howard University, USA.
- Tata, J. (1993). The structure and phenomenon of sexual harassment: Impact of category of sexually harassing behaviour, gender, and hierarchical level. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 23(3), 199-211.
- Terpstra, D. E., & Baker, D. D. (1986). A framework for the study of sexual harassment. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 7, 17-34.
- Terpstra, D. E., & Baker, D. D. (1989). The identification and classification of responses to sexual harassment. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 10, 1-14.
- Till, F. J. (1980). *Sexual harassment: A report on the sexual harassment of students*. Washington DC: National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs.
- Tong, R. (1984). *Women, sex, and the law*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Allenheld.
- U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board. (1981). *Sexual harassment of federal workers: Is it a problem ?* Washington DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board. (1987). *Sexual harassment in the federal workplace: An update*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- Valentine-French, S., & Radtke, H. L. (1989). Attributions of responsibility for an incident of sexual harassment in a university setting. *Sex Roles, 21*(7/8), 545-555.
- Vaux, A. (1993). Paradigmatic assumptions in sexual harassment research: Being guided without being misled. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 42*(1), 116-135.
- Vogelmann-Sine, S., Ervin, E. D., Christensen, R., Warmsun, C. H., & Ullman, L. P. (1979). Sex differences in feelings attributed to a woman in situations involving coercion and sexual advances. *Journal of Personality, 47*(3), 420-431.
- Weitzman, L. J. (1979). *Sex role socialization: A focus on women*. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.
- Williams, K. B., & Cyr, R. R. (1992). Escalating commitment to a relationship: The sexual harassment trap. *Sex Roles, 27*, 47-72.
- Wilson, K. R., & Kraus, L. A. (1983). Sexual harassment in the university. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 24*, 219-224.
- Wolf, W. C., & Fligsten, N. D. (1979). Sex and authority in the workplace: A policy-capturing approach. *Academy of Management Journal, 32*, 830-850.
- Wolshok, M. (1981). *Blue-collar women: Pioneers on the male frontier*. Garden City, NJ: Achor Books.
- Working Women United Institute. (1977). *Sexual harassment at workplace*. Cambridge, MA: Alliance Against Sexual Coercion.
- Working Women United Institute. (1978). *Responses of fair employment practices agencies to sexual harassment complaints: A report and recommendations*. New York: Working Women's Institute, Research Report No. 2.
- York, K. M. (1989). Defining sexual harassment in the workplace: A policy capturing approach. *Academy of Management Journal, 32*, 830-850.
- Zaidi, F. (1994, January). Sexual harassment: The working women's dilemma. *Newsline*, pp. 28-45.
- Zalk, S. R. (1990). Men in the academy: A psychological profile of harassment. In M. A. Paludi (Ed.), *Ivory power: Sexual harassment on campus*, (pp. 141-176). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Annexure-A
SEXUAL HARASSMENT EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE
(46 items, Urdu and English Versions)

SEXUAL HARASSMENT EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

(46 items, Urdu Version)

میں قومی ادارہ نفسیات ، قائد اعظم یونیورسٹی میں ریسرچ کر رہی ہوں - میں یہ معلوم کرنا چاہتی ہوں کہ ہمارے ملک کے دفاتر میں کام کرنے والی خواتین کو کام کے دوران کن کن طریقوں سے ہراساں (Sexual Harassment) کیا جاتا ہے - ذیل میں چند واقعات درج کیے گئے ہیں جو کہ ہمارے دفاتر میں اکثر وقوع پذیر ہوتے رہتے ہیں -

آپ سے درخواست ہے کہ ہر واقعہ کو پڑھیں اور جواب دیں کہ کیا آپ کے ساتھ کبھی ایسا واقعہ اس باس ، ساتھی ورکر یا ماتحت کے ذریعے پیش آیا ہو جس کے ساتھ آپ ذاتی یا دوستانہ مراسم نہیں بڑھانا چاہتیں - اگر آپ کے ساتھ ایسا واقعہ کبھی نہیں پیش آیا تو " کبھی نہیں " والے خانے میں / کا نشان لگادیں - اگر آپ کے ساتھ ایسا واقعہ صرف ایک مرتبہ پیش آیا ہو تو " ایک مرتبہ " والے خانے میں / کا نشان لگادیں - اگر ایسا واقعہ ایک سے زیادہ مرتبہ پیش آیا تو " چند مرتبہ " والے خانے میں نشان لگادیں اور اگر ایسا واقعہ اکثر اوقات پیش آتا ہے تو " اکثر " والے خانے میں / کا نشان لگادیں -

سوالنامہ پر کرتے وقت اس بات کا خیال رکھیں کہ میں صرف دفاتر میں خواتین کو ہراساں کرنے والے واقعات کے بارے میں جاننا چاہتی ہوں - ایسے واقعات کسی بھی وقت کسی بھی خاتون کے ساتھ پیش آسکتے ہیں اس لیے جواب پوری دیانتداری سے دیں اور اس بات کا یقین رکھیں کہ آپ کے جوابات کا کسی کو علم نہیں ہوگا - بلکہ یہ صرف ریسرچ کے سلسلے میں استعمال ہوں گے -

شکریہ !

نوٹ : ہر واقعہ کے لیے صرف ایک ہی خانے میں نشان لگانا ہے۔

کبھی نہیں	ایک مرتبہ	چند مرتبہ	اکثر
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

کبھی نہیں	ایک مرتبہ	چند مرتبہ	اکثر
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

۹- آپکے باس / ساتھی درکر / ماتحت نے آپکے ساتھ فلرٹ کرنے کی کوشش کی ہو۔

۱۰- آپکے باس / ساتھی درکر / ماتحت نے آپکو گاڑی میں لفٹ دینے کی پیشکش کی ہو۔

۱۱- آپکے باس / ساتھی درکر / ماتحت نے آپکے ساتھ فون پر بیہودہ گفتگو کی ہو۔

۱۲- آپکے باس / ساتھی درکر / ماتحت نے کوئی چیز مثلاً فائل وغیرہ پکڑا تے ہوئے آپکا ہاتھ چھونے کی کوشش کی ہو۔

۱۳- آپکے باس / ساتھی درکر / ماتحت نے آپکو کارڈ دینے کی کوشش کی ہو۔

۱۴- آپکے باس / ساتھی درکر / ماتحت نے آپکا کام روکا ہو تاکہ آپ اپنے کام کی وجہ سے بار بار اسکے پاس جائیں۔

۱۵- آپکے باس / ساتھی درکر / ماتحت نے آپکے پاس سے گزرتے ہوئے آپ کو ٹکڑ ماری ہو۔

۱۶- آپکے باس / ساتھی درکر / ماتحت نے آپ کے ساتھ خواہ مخواہ گپ شپ لگانے کی کوشش کی ہو۔

۱۷- آپکے باس / ساتھی درکر / ماتحت نے آپکی موجودگی میں بیہودہ گانے گنگنائے ہوں۔

اکثر	چند مرتبہ	ایک مرتبہ	کبھی نہیں	
_____	_____	_____	_____	۱۸- آپکے پاس / ساتھی در کر / ماتحت نے آپکو "ڈارلنگ" "سیری جان" وغیرہ جیسے ناموں سے پکارا ہو۔
_____	_____	_____	_____	۱۹- آپکے پاس / ساتھی در کر / ماتحت نے آپکی موجودگی میں اپنے ساتھی مرد حضرات سے بہودہ گفتگو کی ہو۔
_____	_____	_____	_____	۲۰- آپکے پاس / ساتھی در کر / ماتحت نے اپنے آپ کو عمر میں بڑا (یعنی باپ کی جگہ) اور ہمدرد ظاہر کرتے ہوئے آپکا ماتھا چومنے کو کوشش کی ہو۔
_____	_____	_____	_____	۲۱- آپکے پاس / ساتھی در کر / ماتحت نے کام کے دوران آپکے کندھے یا لمبر پر ہاتھ رکھا ہو۔
_____	_____	_____	_____	۲۲- آپکے پاس / ساتھی در کر / ماتحت نے آپکی گھریلو زندگی میں دلچسپی لی ہو اس نیت سے کہ اس بہانے آپ اسکو لفٹ کرنا شروع کر دیں۔
_____	_____	_____	_____	۲۲- آپکے پاس / ساتھی در کر / ماتحت نے آپکی یا اپنی جنسی زندگی کے بارے میں گفتگو کرنے کی کوشش کی ہو۔
_____	_____	_____	_____	۲۲- آپکے پاس / ساتھی در کر / ماتحت نے آپکی جنسی زندگی کی محرومیوں کو کریدنے کی اور اپنے آپکو ہمدرد ظاہر کرنے کی کوشش کی ہو۔
_____	_____	_____	_____	۲۵- آپکے پاس / ساتھی در کر / ماتحت نے آپکو نوکری میں ترقی یا کسی اور قسم کے فائدے کا یقین دلایا ہو اگر آپ اسکے غیر اخلاقی مطالبات پورے کرنے کو تیار ہو جائیں۔

۲۶- آپکے باس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکو نوکری سے نکلوانے کی دھمکی دی ہو اگر آپ نے اسکے ساتھ رومانی تعلقات نہ قائم کیے۔

۲۷- آپکے باس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت کے غیر اخلاقی مطالبات پورے نہ کرنے پر آپکو نوکری میں نقصان اٹھانا پڑا ہو۔

۲۸- آپکے باس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت کے غیر اخلاقی مطالبات پورے نہ کرنے پر آپ کو بدنام کرنے کی کوشش کی ہو۔

۲۹- آپکے باس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکو (Rape) کرنے کی کوشش کی ہو۔

۳۰- آپکے باس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکی ذاتی مجبوریوں کا فائدہ اٹھاتے ہوئے اپنے غیر اخلاقی مطالبات پورے کرنے پر مجبور کیا ہو۔

۳۱- آپکے باس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکو رومانی خط (Love Letter) دینے کی کوشش کی ہو۔

۳۲- آپکے باس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکو چومنے (Kiss) کی کوشش کی ہو۔

۳۳- آپکے باس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکو آنکھ ماری ہو۔

۳۴- آپکے باس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکو چٹکی کالی ہو۔

۳۵- آپکے باس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت ہر وقت آپکو گھورتے رہتے ہوں۔

۲۶- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکے ساتھ کسی بہبودہ فلم یا وی پروگرام کے بارے میں گفتگو کرنے کی کوشش کی ہو۔

۲۷- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت کام کے دوران آپکے اتے قریب کھڑے ہو گئے ہوں کہ آپکو انکا سانس بھی محسوس ہوا ہو۔

۲۸- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکے چہرے یا بالوں کی تعریف کی ہو۔

۲۹- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکے ساتھ غیر اخلاقی گفتگو کرنے کی کوشش کی ہو۔

۳۰- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپ سے متعلق غلط باتیں پھیلانے کی کوشش کی ہو۔

۳۱- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے کام کے بہانے آپ کے ساتھ لگ کر بیٹھنے کی کوشش کی ہو۔

۳۲- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپ پر باقی ساتھی خواتین ورکرز کی نسبت زیادہ مہربانیاں کیں ہوں مثلاً ہر کام میں مدد وغیرہ وغیرہ۔

۳۳- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکے کام کی تعریف کرتے ہوئے آپکے کندھے یا پیٹھ تھپکنے کی کوشش کی ہو۔

کبھی نہیں ایک مرتبہ چند مرتبہ اکثر

۳۴ - آپکے پاس / ساتھی درکر / ماتحت نے آپکو نوکری سے لکھوانے
کی دھمکی دی ہو اگر آپ نے اسکے ساتھ جسمانی / جنسی تعلقات
نہ قائم کیے ۔

۳۵ - آپکے پاس / ساتھی درکر / ماتحت نے کام سیکھانے کے بہانے آپکے
ہاتھ کے اوپر ہاتھ رکھ دیا ہو مثلاً کمپیوٹر سیکھانا یا کوئی
بھی اور کام ۔

۳۶ - آپکے پاس / ساتھی درکر / ماتحت نے آپ پر آوازیں کسی ہوں ۔

SEXUAL HARASSMENT EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE
(46 items, English Version)*

No.	Items
	<i>Your boss/coworker/subordinate</i>
1.	...told a dirty joke to you.
2.	...appreciated your figure.
3.	...stared at you from head to toe with dirty looks.
4.	...tried to show you a magazine containing pornographic material.
5.	...tried to make you sit with him on some lame excuses.
6.	...admired your dress or make-up.
7.**	... tried to talk about your personal life.
8.	...invited you for outing or going to a restaurant with him to eat.
9.	...tried to flirt with you.
10.	...offered you lift in his car.
11.	...made obnoxious calls to you on the telephone.
12.	...tried to touch your hand while giving you something.
13.	...tried to give you a card.
14.	...withheld (delayed) your work so that you might go to him again and again regarding that work.
15.	...collided with you while passing by.
16.**	... tried to gossip with you.
17.	...hummed filthy songs in your presence.
18.	...called you "darling", "sweet heart", etc.
19.**	... talked vulgar things in your presence with other male colleagues.
20.**	... tried to kiss your forehead showing to be older (like your father) and sympathetic.
21.	...put his hand on your shoulder or back while working.
22.	...took interest in your personal life with the intention that you might start responding favourably to him.
23.	...tried to talk about your or his own sexual life.
24.	...tried to probe your sexual frustration and deprivations, and pretended to be a sympathizer.
25.	...assured you of promotion in the job or of some other benefits if you could fulfill his immoral (bad) demands.
26.	...threatened you to be fired (turn out of the job) if you did not develop romantic ties with him.
27.	...have made you face some loss in your job for not meeting his immoral (bad) demands.
28.	...tried to defame you for not fulfilling his immoral (bad) demands.
29.	...tried to rape you.
30.	...forced you to fulfil his immoral (bad) demands by exploiting hardships of your personal life at your work.
31.	...tried to give you a love letter.
32.	...tried to kiss you.
33.**	... winked at you.
34.**	...pinched you.
35.**	...is all the time staring at you.
36.	...tried to talk with you about some vulgar movie or a television programme.
37.**	... stood so close to you during work that you could feel his breath.
38.	...admired your face or hair.
39.	...tried to have an immoral (bad) talk with you.
40.**	... tried to spread rumor about you to smear your reputation.
41.	...tried to have body touch with you while sitting for some work.
42.**	... favoured you more as compared to other female colleagues.
43.	...tried to pat on your shoulders or back while praising your work.
44.	...threatened you to put you out of job if you did not have physical/sexual relations with him.
45.	...put his hand on your hand while posing to teach you something, e.g., how to work on a computer, or any other such task.
46.**	... passed remarks on you.

Gender Harassment: Item Nos. 1,3,4,6,17,19,35,36,38,46.

Unwanted Sexual Attention: Item Nos. 2,5,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,15,16,18,20,21,22,23, 24,29,31,32,33,34,37,39,41,43,45.

Sexual Coercion: Item Nos. 14,25,26,27,28,30,40,42,44.

*The original questionnaire is in Urdu, the national language of Pakistan.

** Shows the redundant items.

Annexure-B
ITEM TOTAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF THE 46-ITEM
SHEQ

ITEM TOTAL CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF THE 46-ITEM SHEQ (N=60)

Item No.	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	Item No.	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>
1.	.64	.000	24.	.47	.000
2.	.55	.000	25.	.48	.000
3.	.43	.001	26.	.44	.000
4.	.45	.000	27.	.53	.000
5.	.60	.000	28.	.60	.000
6.	.50	.000	29.	.59	.000
7.*	.37	.004	30.	.53	.000
8.	.62	.000	31.	.50	.000
9.	.69	.000	32.	.61	.000
10.	.59	.000	33.*	.28	.033
11.	.52	.000	34.*	.34	.008
12.	.70	.000	35.*	.20	.117
13.	.59	.000	36.	.58	.000
14.	.65	.000	37.*	.38	.003
15.	.58	.000	38.	.42	.001
16.*	.36	.005	39.	.71	.000
17.	.45	.000	40.*	.39	.002
18.	.56	.000	41.	.64	.000
19.*	.30	.020	42.*	.39	.002
20.*	.39	.002	43.	.69	.000
21.	.66	.000	44.	.50	.000
22.	.56	.000	45.	.62	.000
23.	.68	.000	46.*	.33	.010

Note: The items correlated at $p < .001$ and above were included in the final SHEQ.

*Shows the redundant items.

Annexure-C
ITEMS BELONGING TO GENDER HARASSMENT,
UNWANTED SEXUAL ATTENTION, SEXUAL
COERCION AND REDUNDENT ITEMS
(Urdu Version)

**ITEMS BELONGING TO GENDER HARASSMENT,
UNWANTED SEXUAL ATTENTION, SEXUAL
COERCION AND REDUNDENT ITEMS
(Urdu Version)**

**GENDER HARASSMENT
(7 Items)**

- ۱- آپکے باس/ساتھی ور کڑ ماتحت نے آپکو بیہودہ لطیفہ سنایا ہو۔
- ۲- آپکے باس/ساتھی ور کڑ ماتحت نے آپکو سر سے پاؤں تک گندی نظروں سے گھورا ہو۔
- ۳- آپکے باس/ساتھی ور کڑ ماتحت نے آپکے لباس یا میک اپ کی تعریف کی ہو۔
- ۴- آپکے باس/ساتھی ور کڑ ماتحت آپکو بیہودہ تصویروں والا رسالہ دکھانے کی کوشش کی ہو۔
- ۵- آپکے باس/ساتھی ور کڑ ماتحت نے آپکی موجودگی میں بیہودہ گانے گائے ہوں۔
- ۶- آپکے باس/ساتھی ور کڑ ماتحت نے آپکے چہرے یا بالوں کی تعریف کی ہو۔
- ۷- آپکے باس/ساتھی ور کڑ ماتحت نے آپکے ساتھ کسی بیہودہ فلم یا ٹی وی پروگرام کے بارے میں گفتگو کرنے کی کوشش کی ہو۔

- ۱۱- آپشن کی ہے۔ (rape) کے لئے کی کوپٹی کی ہے۔
- ۲۰- آپشن کی ہے۔ (kiss) کے لئے کی کوپٹی کی ہے۔
- ۱۹- آپشن کی ہے۔ (rape) کے لئے کی کوپٹی کی ہے۔
- ۷۱- آپشن کی ہے۔ (rape) کے لئے کی کوپٹی کی ہے۔
- ۱۲- آپشن کی ہے۔ (rape) کے لئے کی کوپٹی کی ہے۔
- ۱۳- آپشن کی ہے۔ (rape) کے لئے کی کوپٹی کی ہے۔
- ۱۵- آپشن کی ہے۔ (rape) کے لئے کی کوپٹی کی ہے۔
- ۱۳- آپشن کی ہے۔ (rape) کے لئے کی کوپٹی کی ہے۔
- ۱۴- آپشن کی ہے۔ (rape) کے لئے کی کوپٹی کی ہے۔
- ۱۱- آپشن کی ہے۔ (rape) کے لئے کی کوپٹی کی ہے۔
- ۱۰- آپشن کی ہے۔ (rape) کے لئے کی کوپٹی کی ہے۔
- ۹- آپشن کی ہے۔ (rape) کے لئے کی کوپٹی کی ہے۔
- ۸- آپشن کی ہے۔ (rape) کے لئے کی کوپٹی کی ہے۔
- ۷- آپشن کی ہے۔ (rape) کے لئے کی کوپٹی کی ہے۔
- ۶- آپشن کی ہے۔ (rape) کے لئے کی کوپٹی کی ہے۔
- ۵- آپشن کی ہے۔ (rape) کے لئے کی کوپٹی کی ہے۔
- ۴- آپشن کی ہے۔ (rape) کے لئے کی کوپٹی کی ہے۔
- ۳- آپشن کی ہے۔ (rape) کے لئے کی کوپٹی کی ہے۔
- ۲- آپشن کی ہے۔ (rape) کے لئے کی کوپٹی کی ہے۔
- ۱- آپشن کی ہے۔ (rape) کے لئے کی کوپٹی کی ہے۔

- چکر: ۵

- ۱۔ یہاں تک کہ میں اپنے لیے کسی بھی چیز سے انکار کر رہا ہوں، اس لیے میں اسے مانگا ہوں۔
- ۲۔ یہاں تک کہ میں اپنے لیے کسی بھی چیز سے انکار کر رہا ہوں، اس لیے میں اسے مانگا ہوں۔
- ۳۔ یہاں تک کہ میں اپنے لیے کسی بھی چیز سے انکار کر رہا ہوں، اس لیے میں اسے مانگا ہوں۔
- ۴۔ یہاں تک کہ میں اپنے لیے کسی بھی چیز سے انکار کر رہا ہوں، اس لیے میں اسے مانگا ہوں۔
- ۵۔ یہاں تک کہ میں اپنے لیے کسی بھی چیز سے انکار کر رہا ہوں، اس لیے میں اسے مانگا ہوں۔
- ۶۔ یہاں تک کہ میں اپنے لیے کسی بھی چیز سے انکار کر رہا ہوں، اس لیے میں اسے مانگا ہوں۔
- ۷۔ یہاں تک کہ میں اپنے لیے کسی بھی چیز سے انکار کر رہا ہوں، اس لیے میں اسے مانگا ہوں۔
- ۸۔ یہاں تک کہ میں اپنے لیے کسی بھی چیز سے انکار کر رہا ہوں، اس لیے میں اسے مانگا ہوں۔
- ۹۔ یہاں تک کہ میں اپنے لیے کسی بھی چیز سے انکار کر رہا ہوں، اس لیے میں اسے مانگا ہوں۔
- ۱۰۔ یہاں تک کہ میں اپنے لیے کسی بھی چیز سے انکار کر رہا ہوں، اس لیے میں اسے مانگا ہوں۔

(7 Items)

SEXUAL COERCION

- ۱۱ - سہولتوں کی فراہمی کے لئے حکومت نے اقدام کیا ہے، یہ سچا ہے یا جھوٹا؟
- ۱۰ - ۲۰۰۰ء تک لوہے کی قیمتیں گرتی رہیں، یہ سچا ہے یا جھوٹا؟
- ۹ - سہولتوں کی فراہمی کے لئے حکومت نے اقدام کیا ہے، یہ سچا ہے یا جھوٹا؟
- ۸ - سہولتوں کی فراہمی کے لئے حکومت نے اقدام کیا ہے، یہ سچا ہے یا جھوٹا؟
- ۷ - سہولتوں کی فراہمی کے لئے حکومت نے اقدام کیا ہے، یہ سچا ہے یا جھوٹا؟
- ۶ - سہولتوں کی فراہمی کے لئے حکومت نے اقدام کیا ہے، یہ سچا ہے یا جھوٹا؟
- ۵ - سہولتوں کی فراہمی کے لئے حکومت نے اقدام کیا ہے، یہ سچا ہے یا جھوٹا؟
- ۴ - سہولتوں کی فراہمی کے لئے حکومت نے اقدام کیا ہے، یہ سچا ہے یا جھوٹا؟
- ۳ - سہولتوں کی فراہمی کے لئے حکومت نے اقدام کیا ہے، یہ سچا ہے یا جھوٹا؟
- ۲ - سہولتوں کی فراہمی کے لئے حکومت نے اقدام کیا ہے، یہ سچا ہے یا جھوٹا؟
- ۱ - سہولتوں کی فراہمی کے لئے حکومت نے اقدام کیا ہے، یہ سچا ہے یا جھوٹا؟

Annexure-D
SEXUAL HARASSMENT EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE
(35 items, Urdu and English Versions)

SEXUAL HARASSMENT EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

(35 items, Urdu Version)

میں قومی ادارہ نفسیات، قائد اعظم یونیورسٹی میں ریسرچ کر رہی ہوں۔ میں یہ معلوم کرنا چاہتی ہوں کہ ہمارے ملک کے دفاتر میں کام کرنے والی خواتین کو کام کے دوران کن کن طریقوں سے ہراساں (Sexual Harassment) کیا جاتا ہے۔ ذیل میں چند واقعات درج کیے گئے ہیں جو کہ ہمارے دفاتر میں اکثر وقوع پذیر ہوتے رہتے ہیں۔

آپ سے درخواست ہے کہ ہر واقعہ کو پڑھیں اور جواب دیں کہ کیا آپ کے ساتھ کبھی ایسا واقعہ اس باس، ساتھی ورکر یا ماتحت کے ذریعے پیش آیا ہو جس کے ساتھ آپ ذاتی یا دوستانہ مراسم نہیں بڑھانا چاہتیں۔ اگر آپ کے ساتھ ایسا واقعہ کبھی نہیں پیش آیا تو "کبھی نہیں" والے خانے میں / کا نشان لگادیں۔ اگر آپ کے ساتھ ایسا واقعہ صرف ایک مرتبہ پیش آیا ہو تو "ایک مرتبہ" والے خانے میں / کا نشان لگادیں۔ اگر ایسا واقعہ ایک سے زیادہ مرتبہ پیش آیا تو "چند مرتبہ" والے خانے میں نشان لگادیں اور اگر ایسا واقعہ اکثر اوقات پیش آتا ہے تو "اکثر" والے خانے میں / کا نشان لگادیں۔

سوالات پر کرتے وقت اس بات کا خیال رکھیں کہ میں صرف دفاتر میں خواتین کو ہراساں کرنے والے واقعات کے بارے میں جاننا چاہتی ہوں۔ ایسے واقعات کسی بھی وقت کسی بھی خاتون کے ساتھ پیش آسکتے ہیں اس لیے جواب پوری دیانتداری سے دیں اور اس بات کا یقین رکھیں کہ آپ کے جوابات کا کسی کو علم نہیں ہوگا۔ بلکہ یہ صرف ریسرچ کے سلسلے میں استعمال ہوگے۔

شکریہ!

نوٹ: ہر واقعہ کے لیے صرف ایک ہی خانے میں نشان لگانا ہے۔

کبھی نہیں	ایک مرتبہ	چند مرتبہ	اکثر
—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—

۱- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکو بیہودہ لطیفہ سنایا ہو۔

۲- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکے جسم کی تعریف کی ہو۔

۳- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکو سر سے پاؤں تک گندی نظروں سے گھورا ہو۔

۴- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکو بہانے بہانے سے اپنے پاس بیٹھانے کی کوشش کی ہو۔

۵- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکے لباس یا میک اپ کی تعریف کی ہو۔

۶- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکو ان کے ساتھ گھومنے یا ہوٹل میں کھانا کھانے کی دعوت دی ہو۔

۷- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکو بیہودہ تصویروں والا رسالہ دکھانے کی کوشش کی ہو۔

اکثر	چند مرتبہ	ایک مرتبہ	کبھی نہیں	
—	—	—	—	۸- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکے ساتھ فلرٹ کرنے کی کوشش کی ہو۔
—	—	—	—	۹- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکو گاڑی میں لفٹ دینے کی پیشکش کی ہو۔
—	—	—	—	۱۰- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکی موجودگی میں بیہودہ گانے گنگنائے ہوں۔
—	—	—	—	۱۱- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکو کارڈ دینے کی کوشش کی ہو۔
—	—	—	—	۱۲- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکا کام روکا ہو تاکہ آپ اپنے کام کی وجہ سے بار بار اسکے پاس جائیں۔
—	—	—	—	۱۳- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکے ساتھ فون پر بیہودہ گفتگو کی ہو۔
—	—	—	—	۱۴- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکی گھریلو زندگی میں دلچسپی لی ہو اس نیت سے کہ اس بہانے آپ اسکو لفٹ کرنا شروع کر دیں۔
—	—	—	—	۱۵- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکی یا اپنی جنسی زندگی کے بارے میں گفتگو کرنے کی کوشش کی ہو۔
—	—	—	—	۱۶- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپ کی جنسی زندگی کی محرومیوں کو کریدنے کی اور اپنے آپکو ہمدرد ظاہر کرنے کی کوشش کی ہو۔

اکثر	چند مرتبہ	ایک مرتبہ	کبھی نہیں	
—	—	—	—	۱۷- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکو نوکری میں ترقی یا کسی اور قسم کے فائدے کا یقین دلایا ہو اگر آپ اسکے غیر اخلاقی مطالبات پورے کرنے کو تیار ہو جائیں۔
—	—	—	—	۱۸- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکے پاس سے گذرتے ہوئے آپ کو نکل ماری ہو۔
—	—	—	—	۱۹- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے کوئی چیز مثلاً فائل وغیرہ پکڑتے ہوئے آپکا ہاتھ چھونے کی کوشش کی ہو۔
—	—	—	—	۲۰- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکو "ڈارلنگ" "میری جان" وغیرہ جیسے ناموں سے پکارا ہو۔
—	—	—	—	۲۱- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے کام کے دوران آپکے کندھے یا کمر پر ہاتھ رکھا ہو۔
—	—	—	—	۲۲- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکو رومانی خط (Love Letter) دینے کی کوشش کی ہو۔
—	—	—	—	۲۳- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکے چہرے یا بالوں کی تعریف کی ہو۔
—	—	—	—	۲۴- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے کام کے بہانے آپ کے ساتھ لگ کر بیٹھنے کی کوشش کی ہو۔
—	—	—	—	۲۵- آپکے پاس / ساتھی ورکر / ماتحت نے آپکے ساتھ کسی بیہودہ فلم یا ٹی وی پروگرام کے بارے میں گفتگو کرنے کی کوشش کی ہو۔

۲۵-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ (Rape) کر کے کرپشن کی ہو۔	—	—	—	—
۲۴-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ جوئے (Kiss) کی کرپشن کی ہو۔	—	—	—	—
۲۳-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ تھانے تھانے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۲۲-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۲۱-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۲۰-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۱۹-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۱۸-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۱۷-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۱۶-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۱۵-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۱۴-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۱۳-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۱۲-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۱۱-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۱۰-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۹-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۸-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۷-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۶-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۵-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۴-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۳-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۲-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—
۱-	آٹھ ماہی ۱۶ یومی روکر اچھت جے آٹھ بڑے بڑے ہلے ہلے کرے۔	—	—	—	—

پورا غیر مستحق غیر مستحق غیر مستحق

SEXUAL HARASSMENT EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE
(35 items, English Version)*

No.	Items
	<i>Your boss/coworker/subordinate</i>
1.	...told a dirty joke to you.
2.	...appreciated your figure.
3.	...stared at you from head to toe with dirty looks.
4.	...tried to make you sit with him on some lame excuses.
5.	...admired your dress or make-up.
6.	...invited you for outing or going to a restaurant with him to eat.
7.	...tried to show you a magazine containing pornographic material.
8.	...tried to flirt with you.
9.	...offered you lift in his car.
10.	...hummed filthy songs in your presence.
11.	...tried to give you a card.
12.	...withheld (delayed) your work so that you might go to him again and again regarding that work.
13.	...made obnoxious calls to you on the telephone.
14.	...took interest in your personal life with the intention that you might start responding favourably to him.
15.	...tried to talk about your or his own sexual life.
16.	...tried to probe your sexual frustration and deprivations, and pretended to be a sympathizer.
17.	...assured you of promotion in the job or of some other benefits if you could fulfil his immoral (bad) demands.
18.	...collided with you while passing by.
19.	...tried to touch your hand while giving you something.
20.	...called you "darling", "sweet heart", etc.
21.	...put his hand on your shoulder or back while working.
22.	...tried to give you a love letter.
23.	...admired your face or hair.
24.	...tried to have body touch with you while sitting for some work.
25.	...tried to talk with you about some vulgar movie or a television programme.
26.	...threatened you to be fired (turn out of the job) if you did not develop romantic ties with him.
27.	...have made you face some loss in your job for not meeting his immoral (bad) demands.
28.	...tried to defame you for not fulfilling his immoral (bad) demands.
29.	...tried to have an immoral (bad) talk with you.
30.	...forced you to fulfil his immoral (bad) demands by exploiting hardships of your personal life at your work.
31.	...tried to pat on your shoulders or back while praising your work.
32.	...threatened you to put you out of job if you did not have physical/sexual relations with him.
33.	...put his hand on your hand while posing to teach you something, e.g., how to work on a computer, or any other such task.
34.	...tried to kiss you.
35.	...tried to rape you.

Gender Harassment: Item Nos. 1,3,5,7,10,23, 25.

Unwanted Sexual Attention: Item Nos. 2,4,6,8,9,11,13,14,15,16,18,19,20,21,22,24,29,31,33,34,35.

Sexual Coercion: Item Nos. 12,17,26,27,28,30, 32.

*The original questionnaire is in Urdu, the national language of Pakistan (See Annexure D).

Annexure-E
COPING WITH HARASSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
(50 items, Urdu and English Versions)

COPING WITH HARASSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

(50 items, Urdu Version)

اپنے (Sexual Harassment) کے واقعہ / واقعات کی روشنی میں نیچے دیئے گئے ہر جملے کے بارے میں بتائیں کہ وہ کس حد تک آپ کے رویئے کی ترجمانی کرتا ہے۔ ایک (1) سے پانچ (5) تک کے نمبر میں سے جو نمبر آپ کے رویئے کو ظاہر کرے اس پر نشان لگادیں۔ نمبر 5 پر اسی صورت میں نشان لگائیں جب آپ کا رویہ اس سے بالکل ملتا ہوا ہو یعنی "مکمل متفق" اور نمبر 1 پر ایسی صورت میں نشان لگائیں جب آپ کا رویہ اس سے بالکل نہ ملتا ہو یعنی "مکمل غیر متفق" اور اسی طرح سے درمیانے نمبروں پر اپنے رویئے کی مناسبت سے نشان لگائیں۔ یہ خیال رہے کہ ان رویوں میں صحیح یا غلط کچھ نہیں ہے بلکہ ہم جاننا چاہتے ہیں کہ ایسے حالات میں آپ کا رویہ کیسا ہوتا ہے۔

شکریہ!

غیر متفق

مکمل متفق

۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵

۱- میں نے اسے مذاق کے طور پر لیا۔

۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵

۲- میں یہ ظاہر کیا جیسے کچھ ہوا ہی نہیں۔

۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵

۳- میں نے اس کو اپنی تعریف سمجھا۔

۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵

۴- مجھے احساس ہوا کہ یہ مسئلہ میرا اپنا پیدا کیا ہوا ہے۔

- ۵- میں نے اس شخص سے دوز رسنے کی ہر ممکن کوشش کی۔
- ۶- میں نے اس شخص کو بتا دیا کہ مجھے اسکی حرکتیں پسند نہیں ہیں۔
- ۷- میں نے اس واقعہ کی اطلاع ساتھ کام کرنے والوں کو دی۔
- ۸- میں نے کوشش کی کہ میرے رد عمل سے اس شخص کے جذبات مجروح نہ ہوں۔
- ۹- جو کچھ ہوا اسکے بارے میں میں نے دوسروں کو بتا دیا۔
- ۱۰- میں نے احتیاط برتی کہ کہیں وہ شخص میرے رویے سے دلبرداشتہ نہ ہو جائے۔
- ۱۱- میں نے خود کو سمجھایا کہ یہ کوئی اتنی اہم بات نہیں۔
- ۱۲- میں نے یوں ظاہر کیا جیسے مجھے پتا ہی نہیں چلا۔
- ۱۳- میں نے سوچا اس شخص کی نیت صاف ہے۔
- ۱۴- مجھے لگا کہ میں بہت بے وقوف ہوں جو اس واقعہ کا شکار ہوئی۔
- ۱۵- میں نے اس شخص کو اس حرکت پر سخت ڈانٹ دیا۔
- ۱۶- میں نے اس شخص کی شکایت کردی۔
- ۱۷- میں نے اس بات کو درگزر کر دیا۔

- ۱۸۔ میں نے کسی دوسرے سے اس بارے میں بات کر کے دل ہانکا کر لیا۔
- ۱۹۔ میں نے اس شخص سے پیچھا چھڑانے کے لیے بہانا بنایا۔
- ۲۰۔ میں نے واقعے کی شدت کو کم کرنے کی کوشش کی۔
- ۲۱۔ میں نے سارے واقعے کو نظر انداز کر دیا۔
- ۲۲۔ میں نے سوچا کہ اس شخص نے بے دھیانی میں یہ سب کچھ کیا ہے۔
- ۲۳۔ جو کچھ ہوا اسکے لیے میں نے خود کو قصور وار سمجھا۔
- ۲۴۔ میں نے کوشش کی کہ اس شخص کے ساتھ تنہا نہ رہا کروں۔
- ۲۵۔ میں نے اس شخص کو بتا دیا کہ اسکی اس حرکت پر میں نے کیسا محسوس کیا۔
- ۲۶۔ میں نے اس شخص کے خلاف باقاعدہ شکایت درج کرا دی۔
- ۲۷۔ میں نے اس واقعے کو اپنے تک رکھا اور کسی سے ذکر نہیں کیا۔
- ۲۸۔ میں نے یہ واقعہ بتا کر دوسرے ساتھیوں سے مشورہ مانگا۔
- ۲۹۔ میں نے اس شخص کو مذاق میں ٹالنے کی کوشش کی کہ اس طرح وہ میری جان چھوڑ دے۔
- ۳۰۔ میں نے کوشش کی کہ بات حد سے نہ بڑھ جائے۔

- ۲۱۔ میں نے سارے واقعے کو فراموش کرنے کی کوشش کی۔
۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵
- ۲۲۔ میں نے سوچا کہ اس شخص کے ایسے رویے کی کوئی وجہ ضرور ہوگی جو میں نہیں سمجھ سکی۔
۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵
- ۲۳۔ میں نے اندازہ لگایا کہ اگر میرا رویہ مختلف ہوتا تو یہ واقعہ نہ پیش آتا۔
۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵
- ۲۴۔ میں نے اپنے سارے کاموں کو اس طرح ترتیب دیا کہ میرا اس شخص سے واسطہ نہ پڑے۔
۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵
- ۲۵۔ میں نے اس شخص کے ہاتھوں کھلونا بننے سے انکار کیا۔
۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵
- ۲۶۔ میں نے اپنے نگران افسر یا محکمہ کے بڑے افسران کو بتا دیا۔
۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵
- ۲۷۔ میں نے حالات سے سمجھوتا کر لیا۔
۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵
- ۲۸۔ میں نے اس واقعے کا ذکر اپنے قابل اعتماد ساتھی سے کیا۔
۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵
- ۲۹۔ میں نے اس واقعے کو بلکے پھلکے انداز میں لیا۔
۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵
- ۳۰۔ میں نے سوچا کہ وہ صرف مذاق کر رہا تھا۔
۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵
- ۳۱۔ میں نے سمجھ لیا کہ وہ واقعی مجھے پسند کرتا ہے۔
۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵
- ۳۲۔ مجھے احساس ہوا کہ وہ شخص یہ حرکت کبھی نہ کرتا اگر میرا حلیہ (لباس وغیرہ) مختلف ہوتا۔
۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵
- ۳۳۔ میں نے احتیاط کی کہ میں اس شخص سے بچوں۔
۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵

- ۴۴۔ میں نے اس شخص پر واضح کر دیا کہ وہ حد سے بڑھ رہا ہے۔
 ۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵
- ۴۵۔ میں نے پتا چلایا کہ میں اس شخص کے خلاف کہاں شکایت کر سکتی ہوں اور پھر وہاں شکایت کر بھی دی۔
 ۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵
- ۴۶۔ میں نے کچھ نہیں کیا۔
 ۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵
- ۴۷۔ میں نے اپنے دوستوں سے بات کی تاکہ وہ میری بات سمجھ سکیں اور میری مدد کر سکیں۔
 ۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵
- ۴۸۔ میں نے اس شخص کو احساس دلایا کہ مجھ پر اسکی باتوں کا کوئی اثر نہیں ہوا۔
 ۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵
- ۴۹۔ میں نے سوچا کہ وہ مذاق کے موڈ میں تھا۔
 ۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵
- ۵۰۔ اگر مجھے اس شخص سے ملنا پڑے تو میں کسی کو اپنے ساتھ لے لیتی ہوں۔
 ۱ ۲ ۳ ۴ ۵

COPING WITH HARASSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

(50 items, English Version)

	Not At All Descriptive			Extremely Descriptive	
	1	2	3	4	5
1. I treated it like a joke.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I pretended that nothing was happening.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I considered it flattering.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I realized that I had probably brought it on myself.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I stayed away from him as much as possible.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I let him know I didn't like what he was doing.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I reported him.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I tried not to hurt his feelings by my reaction.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I talked to someone about what happened.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I was careful not to make him mad.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I told myself it wasn't really important.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I acted like I didn't notice.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I assumed he meant well.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I felt stupid for letting myself get into the situation.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I stood up to him.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I filed a grievance.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I just let it go.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I talked it over with somebody.	1	2	3	4	5

	Not At All Descriptive			Extremely Descriptive	
	1	2	3	4	5
19. I made up some story so he'd leave me alone.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I tried to minimize the situation.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I just ignored the whole thing.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I assumed he didn't know better.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I blamed myself for what happened.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I avoided being alone with him.	1	2	3	4	5
25. I let him know how I felt about what he was doing.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I made a formal complaint.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I just kept it to myself and didn't say anything.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I asked someone for advice.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I just joked around with him and hoped he'd leave me alone.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I tried not to blow things out of proportion.	1	2	3	4	5
31. I tried to forget the whole thing.	1	2	3	4	5
32. I assumed there was some explanation for his behavior that I didn't understand.	1	2	3	4	5
33. I figured it wouldn't have happened if I had behaved differently.	1	2	3	4	5
34. I arranged things so that I wouldn't have to deal with him.	1	2	3	4	5
35. I refused to play along with him.	1	2	3	4	5
36. I told a supervisor or department head.	1	2	3	4	5
37. I just put up with it.	1	2	3	4	5
38. I talked about it with someone I trusted.	1	2	3	4	5

	Not At All Descriptive			Extremely Descriptive	
39. I made light of the situation.	1	2	3	4	5
40. I assumed he was only joking.	1	2	3	4	5
41. I figured he must really like me.	1	2	3	4	5
42. I realized he probably wouldn't have done it if I had looked or dressed differently.	1	2	3	4	5
43. I was careful to stay out of his way.	1	2	3	4	5
44. I made clear to him that he was out of line.	1	2	3	4	5
45. I found out where to report him and did it.	1	2	3	4	5
46. I didn't do anything.	1	2	3	4	5
47. I talked to my friends for understanding and support.	1	2	3	4	5
48. I just "blew it off" and acted like I didn't care.	1	2	3	4	5
49. I assumed he was trying to be funny.	1	2	3	4	5
50. I took somebody with me if I had to see him.	1	2	3	4	5

Annexure-F
**DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE OF MAIN
STUDY**

DEMOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE OF MAIN STUDY

Table A
Ages of the sample with frequencies and percentages

Age (in years)	Frequencies	%
18	1	0.5
19	4	2.0
20	5	2.4
21	8	3.9
22	10	4.9
23	11	5.4
24	11	5.4
25	14	6.8
26	16	7.8
27	11	5.4
28	15	7.3
29	11	5.4
30	19	9.2
31	2	1.0
32	9	4.4
33	7	3.4
34	6	2.9
35	12	5.8
36	5	2.4
37	5	2.4
38	5	2.4
39	1	0.5
40	4	2.0
41	1	0.5
42	4	2.0
43	1	0.5
44	1	0.5
45	2	1.0
46	2	1.0
55	2	1.0
Total	205	100.0

Table B
Education of the sample with frequencies and percentages

Education	Frequencies	%
Matric & less	14	6.8
F.A./F.Sc.	40	19.5
B.A./B.Sc.	63	30.7
M.A./M.Sc./M.Phil.	54	26.3
Professional degree	34	16.7
Total	205	100.0

Table G

Job Experience of the sample with frequencies and percentages

Job Experience (in years)	Frequencies	%
1	35	17.0
2	28	13.7
3	25	12.2
4	16	7.8
5	16	7.8
6	12	5.9
7	5	2.4
8	8	3.9
9	8	3.9
10	13	6.3
11	3	1.5
12	8	3.9
13	2	1.0
14	6	2.9
15	6	2.9
16	2	1.0
17	2	1.0
18	5	2.4
20	2	1.0
21	1	0.5
23	1	0.5
29	1	0.5
Total	205	100.0

Table H

Sample's Own Income with frequencies and percentages

Income (in Rupees)	Frequencies	%
2500 & less	32	15.6
2501 to 5000	71	34.6
5001 to 7500	36	17.6
7501 to 10,000	41	20.0
10,001 & above	25	12.2
Total	205	100.0

Table I

Sample's Family Income with frequencies and percentages

Income (in Rupees)	Frequencies	%
Less than 5000	87	42.4
5001 to 9999	23	11.2
10,000 to 14999	34	16.6
15,000 to 19999	23	11.2
20,000 & above	38	18.6
Total	205	100.0

Table C

Marital Status of the sample with frequencies and percentages

Marital Status	Frequencies	%
Single	136	66.3
Married	69	33.7
Total	205	100.0

Table D

Professions of the sample with frequencies and percentages

Professions	Frequencies	%
Telephone Operator	15	7.3
Stenotypist, Assistant, Secretary	49	23.9
Receptionist	9	4.3
Government Gazetted Officer	23	11.2
Researcher/NGOs	16	7.8
Banking	7	3.4
Air Hostess	7	3.4
Nurse	11	5.4
Lawyer	5	2.4
Doctor	24	11.7
Engineer	5	2.4
Teaching	8	3.9
Private Office Worker	16	7.8
Librarian	2	1.0
Economist	2	1.0
Computer Analyst	3	1.5
Pharmacist	2	1.0
T.V. Producer	1	0.5
Total	205	100.0

Table E

Job Status of the sample with frequencies and percentages

Job Status	Frequencies	%
Officer	101	49.3
Nonofficer	104	50.7
Total	205	100.0

Table F

Organizations of the sample with frequencies and percentages

Organizations	Frequencies	%
Hospital	37	18.0
Bank	12	5.9
Educational Institution	8	3.9
Private Office	64	31.2
Government Office	74	36.1
Airport	10	4.9
Total	205	100.0

Annexure-G
PERSONAL STRAIN QUESTIONNAIRE
(40 items, Urdu and English Versions)

PERSONAL STRAIN QUESTIONNAIRE

(40 items, Urdu Version)

جنہیں سے ایک ہے اسکا sexual harassment

دفتر میں کام کرنے والی خواتین کو مختلف قسم کے مسائل کا سامنا کرنا پڑتا ہے۔۔۔ اثر انکے کام، ذہن، صحت اور لوگوں سے تعلقات پر بھی پڑتا ہے۔ مندرجہ ذیل جملوں میں ان ہی اثرات کو دیکھنے کی کوشش کی گئی ہے۔ آپ ان جملوں کو غور سے پڑھیں اور اپنے تجربہ کی بنیاد پر ایک (۱) تا پانچ (۵) تک کے نمبروں میں سے جو نمبر آپکے اپنے تجربے اور کیفیت کو ظاہر کرتا ہے اس پر نشان لگادیں۔ نمبر (۱) پر ایسی صورت میں نشان لگائیں جب آپکے تجربے میں ایسا "کبھی نہیں" ہوا۔ نمبر (۲) پر ایسی صورت میں نشان لگائیں جب آپکے تجربے میں ایسا "کبھی کبھار" ہوتا ہے۔ (۳) پر ایسی صورت میں نشان لگائیں جب آپکے تجربے میں ایسا "اکثر" ہوتا ہے۔ (۴) پر ایسی صورت میں نشان لگائیں جب آپکے تجربے میں ایسا "زیادہ تر" ہوتا ہے اور نمبر (۵) پر ایسی صورت میں نشان لگائیں جب آپکے تجربے میں ایسا "ہمیشہ" ہوتا ہے۔

شکریہ!

نوٹ: ہر جملے کے لیے صرف ایک ہی خانے میں نشان لگانا ہے۔

کبھی نہیں	کبھی کبھار	اکثر	زیادہ تر	ہمیشہ
۱	۲	۳	۴	۵
۱	۲	۳	۴	۵
۱	۲	۳	۴	۵
۱	۲	۳	۴	۵
۱	۲	۳	۴	۵
۱	۲	۳	۴	۵
۱	۲	۳	۴	۵
۱	۲	۳	۴	۵
۱	۲	۳	۴	۵
۱	۲	۳	۴	۵

- ۱- میرے خیال میں، میں دفتر میں زیادہ کام نہیں کر پاتی ہوں۔
- ۲- آجکل مجھے دفتر کام پر جاتے ہوئے وحشت ہوتی ہے۔
- ۳- میں اپنے دفتر کے کام میں یوریت محسوس کرنے لگی ہوں۔
- ۴- ان دنوں میں محسوس کرتی ہوں کہ میں اپنا کام مکمل نہیں کر پا رہی ہوں۔
- ۵- حال ہی میں دوران ملازمت میرے ساتھ کئی حادثات پیش آئے۔
- ۶- میرے کام کرنے کی کوالٹی اچھی ہے۔
- ۷- آجکل میں اپنے آفس سے غائب رہتی ہوں۔
- ۸- مجھے اپنا کام دلچسپ اور مزے کا لگتا ہے۔
- ۹- میں امور ملازمت پر حسب ضرورت توجہ مرکوز کر سکتی ہوں۔
- ۱۰- میں اپنے کام کے دوران بہت غلطیاں کرتی ہوں۔

۱۱-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	میں آجکل بہت جلد جھنجھلا جاتی ہوں۔
۱۲-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	ان دنوں میں بہت ڈپریشن میں ہوں۔
۱۳-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	ان دنوں میں بہت بے چینی محسوس کرتی ہوں۔
۱۴-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	ان دنوں میں بہت خوش ہوں۔
۱۵-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	رات کو سونے سے قبل بہت سے خیالات میرے ذہن میں آتے ہیں جو کہ مجھے سونے نہیں دیتے۔
۱۶-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	کچھ دنوں سے میں ایسے مضمونوں پر بہت بری طرح پیش آتی ہوں جن کا پہلے اثر نہیں لیتی تھی۔
۱۷-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	میرے خیال میں ان دنوں میں بہت چھوٹی چھوٹی باتوں کا ٹکاوہ کرنے لگی ہوں۔
۱۸-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	کچھ عرصے سے میں پریشان رہنے لگی ہوں۔
۱۹-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	مجھ میں اچھی حس مزاج موجود ہے۔
۲۰-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	حالات ویسے ہی ہیں جیسے کہ انہیں ہونا چاہیے۔
۲۱-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	میری خواہش ہے کہ میرے پاس دوستوں کے ساتھ گزارنے کے لیے زیادہ وقت ہوتا۔
۲۲-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	میں اپنے شوہر/کمر کے اہم فرد سے لڑتی جھگڑتی رہتی ہوں۔
۲۳-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	میں اپنے دوستوں سے لڑتی جھگڑتی ہوں۔
۲۴-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	ہم میاں بیوی آپس میں خوش ہیں یا گھر کے اہم فرد کے ساتھ میرے تعلقات اچھے ہیں۔
۲۵-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	کچھ عرصے آپس کوشش کرتی ہوں کہ ہر کام اکیلے ہی کروں بجائے اسکے کے دوسروں کے ساتھ مل کر کروں۔
۲۶-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	میں اپنے گھر والوں کے ساتھ لڑتی جھگڑتی ہوں۔
۲۷-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	ان دنوں لوگوں سے میرے تعلقات خوشگوار ہیں۔
۲۸-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	مجھے لگتا ہے کہ مجھے اپنی ذاتی مشکلات کو سلجھانے کے لیے وقت چاہیے۔
۲۹-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	میری خواہش ہے کہ میرے پاس اپنے آپکو دینے کے لیے اور وقت ہوتا۔
۳۰-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	کچھ دنوں سے میں لوگوں سے ہنسنی چلی جا رہی ہوں۔
۳۱-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	میری خواہش کے برعکس میرا وزن بڑھتا چلا جا رہا ہے۔
۳۲-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	میری کھانے پینے کی عادات بگڑی ہوئی ہیں۔
۳۳-	۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	ان دنوں میں نے چانے / کافی کا استعمال بہت زیادہ کر دیا ہے۔

کبھی نہیں	کبھی کبھار	اکثر	زیادہ تر	ہمیشہ	
۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۲۴- کچھ دنوں سے میں بہت زیادہ تھکن محسوس کرنے لگی ہوں۔
۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۲۵- میں بہت ٹینشن محسوس کرتی ہوں۔
۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۲۶- مجھے نیند مشکل سے آتی ہے اور جب سو جاؤں تو بار بار آنکھ کھلتی ہے۔
۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۲۷- مجھے ایسی جسمانی دردیں اور تکلیفیں ہیں جو میری سمجھ میں نہیں آتیں۔
۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۲۸- میں غلط قسم کی چیزیں کھاتی رہتی ہوں۔
۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۲۹- میں اپنے آپکو بے حس و محسوس کر رہی ہوں۔
۱	۲	۳	۴	۵	۳۰- مجھ پر سستی کا غلبہ رہتا ہے۔

PERSONAL STRAIN QUESTIONNAIRE
(40 items, English Version)

1. I don't seem to be able to get much done at work.
2. I dread going to work, lately.
3. I am bored with my work.
4. I find myself getting behind in my work, lately.
5. I have accidents on the job of late.
6. The quality of my work is good.
7. Recently, I have been absent from work.
8. I find my work interesting and/or exciting.
9. I can concentrate on the things I need to at work.
10. I make errors or mistakes in my work.
11. Lately, I am easily irritated.
12. Lately, I have been depressed.
13. Lately, I have been feeling anxious.
14. I have been happy, lately.
15. So many thoughts run through my head at night that I have trouble falling asleep.
16. Lately, I respond badly in situations that normally wouldn't bother me.
17. I find myself complaining about little things.
18. Lately, I have been worrying.
19. I have a good sense of humor.
20. Things are going about as they should.
21. I wish I had more time to spend with close friends.
22. I quarrel with my spouse.
23. I quarrel with friends.
24. My spouse and I are happy together.
25. Lately, I do things by myself instead of with other people.
26. I quarrel with members of the family.
27. Lately, my relationships with people are good.
28. I find that I need time to myself to work out my problems.
29. I wish I had more time to spend by myself.
30. I have been withdrawing from people lately.
31. I have unplanned weight gains.
32. My eating habits are erratic.
33. I find myself drinking a lot lately.
34. Lately, I have been tired.
35. I have been feeling tense.
36. I have trouble falling and staying asleep.
37. I have aches and pains I can not explain.
38. I eat the wrong foods.
39. I feel apathetic.
40. I feel lethargic.

Annexure-H
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SHEET

