

A TARGET'S REACTION TO SEXUAL HARASSMENT: AN EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT OF LOCUS OF CONTROL, GENDER, AND TYPE OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Sean Walker

Lecturer

University of Tennessee at Martin

Abstract

Research suggests that the propensity of sexual harassment is linked to the association of power the initiator derives from it. The current research analyzes individual's reactions to ten sexual harassment scenarios to assess if reactions to sexual harassment are shaped by gender of the initiator, type of sexual harassment, and locus of control. Results show that reactions and their magnitude to sexually harassing behavior were impacted by the respondent's gender, sex of the harasser, same sex versus opposite sex harassment, and whether or not the harassment was quid pro quo or hostile work environment. Research and applied implications are discussed.

1. Introduction

Sexual harassment is one of the most harmful and impacting forms of counterproductive behaviors in the workplace. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (2007) defines it as “Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when this conduct explicitly or implicitly affects an individual's employment, unreasonably interferes with an individual's work performance, or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work environment (1).” Informally, or perhaps prototypically, it is thought of as an unwelcome physical or verbal act made by an aggressor (man) against a target (woman) that interferes with the target's work.

Sexual harassment should no longer be thought of solely as an act made by men against women rather as Stockdale (2004) discusses, sexual harassment can also be woman vs. man or same-sex. In fact, 16% of sexual harassment charges with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission were filed by men in 2007, whereas the number was 11.6% in 1997 (2007). Prior research has discussed the distinction between men and women in their perceptions of sexual harassment (Gruber, 1992; O'Connor, Gutek, Stockdale, & Geer, 2004; Williams & Cyr, 1992). Perhaps men are being harassed more as women assert their role in the workplace or maybe these acts have been occurring for some time but the same social norms that fuel men's sexual harassment of women have shifted to become more accepting of men admitting they are targets themselves. Berdahl (2007) found that women experienced more sexual harassment than men, not because of the frequency of the behaviors toward women, but because women evaluated the behaviors more negatively. Furthermore, Stockdale, O'Connor, Gutek, and Geer (2002) showed that women had higher prior sexual harassment and sexual abuse scores, which subsequently correlated with higher ratings of currently being sexually harassed.

The research conducted here is positioned to measure ones reaction to sexual harassment. Specifically, I look to see if ones reactions to sexual harassment are shaped by the gender of the initiator, the type of sexual harassment, and ones locus of control. As such the paper is broken up into the following four sections. The first section reviews the sexual harassment literature, specifically, person/situation factors. The second section reviews the locus of control literature and begins to piece together its relevance with sexual harassment. The third section introduces the theoretical framework and subsequent empirical examination of the abovementioned variables. The last section discusses the practical and empirical implications in the future.

2. Person & situation factors

Bandura's social learning theory of aggression (1978) states that aggressive behavior builds from multiple factors including the social norms that endorse the act (Situation), the proclivities of the individual (Person), and the presence of the target (Situation). Pryor (1995) also concluded that there are two factors affecting the frequency and severity of sexual harassment in the workplace: person and situation factors. The

first factor, person, has received a lot of attention over the past 15 years as social psychologists try to profile sexual initiators. What are their behaviors and personality traits? Pryor (1987) developed a scale to measure the likelihood an individual will sexually harass. The Likelihood to Sexually Harass (LSH) scale contains 10 hypothetical scenarios describing different interactions between men and women where the man has power over an attractive female. The male respondent is asked to rate the likelihood they would engage in acts of sexual harassment (e.g., granting a female subordinate's request in return for a sexual favor). For example, one scenario has the respondent imagine they are a Hollywood director casting a minor role, which calls for a stunning actress with a lot of sex appeal. The questions ask the respondent to rate the likelihood they would give the role to the actress they found sexiest, would give the role for sexual favors, or would ask the actress to dinner in order to discuss it.

Previous research (Pryor & Meyers, 2000; Lee, Gizzarone, & Ashton, 2003) has utilized the Big Five measures of conscientiousness, agreeableness, openness to experience, extraversion, and neuroticism to develop a link between personality and the aggressive behavior. Lee, Gizzarone, and Ashton (2003) found that Honesty-Humility, defined by adjectives that distinguish sincerity and trustworthiness from deceit, greed, and conceit, have a stronger relation with LSH than any of the Big Five measures. Since this new trait can be viewed as the tendency to take advantage or exploit others, and sexual harassment could be viewed as an egregious act of exploitation, the practical importance of this finding is significant. This does not mean a questionnaire should be developed to assess this measure and those low in Honesty-Humility should be immediately discarded. Doing so would be foolish on the part of the organization since there is a second factor that may influence sexual harassment more than the proclivity of man which will be discussed in the next section. Rather the organization may use this as a tool to identify potential problems and implement intensive sexual harassment training.

The situational factor seems to be the catalyst behind the act of sexual harassment. A study from Pryor (1987) found that men high in LSH exploited an excuse provided by the task environment of teaching a confederate how to putt a golf ball in order to touch a woman in a sexual way, whereas in a condition in which the male participant was to teach a female confederate how to play poker, which had no norms for touching, no touching, sexual or otherwise, took place. Those men with a low LSH did not utilize the opportunity in either situation to touch the female confederates in a sexual way. This supports the assertion of the Person X Situation model (Pryor, LaVite, & Stoller, 1993) that certain dispositions may create the potential for sexually harassing behavior to occur in some men, but men are still unlikely to follow through unless the norms of the situation endorses or condones the behavior. In other words, he will control his proclivity if he feels the cost of sexually harassing a co-worker is too extreme (i.e. getting caught and disciplined). Social norms in the workplace foster this behavior when management does not enforce sexual harassment policies. This indicates to the initiator that it is socially permissible to sexually harass a co-worker.

3. *Hypotheses development*

3.1 Same Sex Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment has commonly been thought of as an opposite gender targeted behavior. As noted by Stockdale (2004) sexual harassment must also be considered from the perspective of men being harassed, and genders being harassed by a same gendered initiator. In other words, scholars and practitioners must move beyond the narrow definition of sexual harassment where a man harasses a female and acknowledge that women can and do harass men and that both men and women are targeted by their same gender. Research has found that when harassed, men are more frequently harassed by other men, not women (e.g., Dubois, Knapp, Faley, & Kustis, 1998; Magley, Waldo, Drasgow, & Fitzgerald, 1999; Mazer & Percival, 1989; Pellegrini, 2001). Dubois et al., (1998) found that men are more likely to be sexually harassed by a same sexed individual than women. Specifically they found that 35% of male respondents experienced same sex sexual harassment whereas only 1% of women faced same sex sexual harassment. Scholars on the subject argue that men experience it more often because it is used as a method for ridiculing those individuals not perceived to fit to the societal expectations of individuals within the firm (Berdahl, Magley, & Waldo, 1996; Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Stockdale, Gandolfo, & Schneider, 2001). Because these traditional male expectations or gender norms are commonly linked with homophobia (Herek, 1986; Herek, 1988; Sinn, 1997; Stark, 1991) they generally feel a strong pressure to assert themselves in a more forceful manner (Goldberg & Zhang, 2004; Herek, 1988) in order to halt the assumptions that they may be a homosexual and, at the same time, reinforce their “manhood”. In other words, “being harassed by other men may be particularly threatening to the masculine identity (Stockdale, 1999: 634).”

Hypothesis 1: Men will be more likely than women to respond more assertively (protest more) when harassed by a same sex initiator than women.

4. *Locus of control*

The concept of locus of control was developed by Rotter (1966) stemming from his social learning theory (1954). Locus of control refers to the “generalized expectancy” of an individual to be able to control the outcomes in one’s life (Rotter, 1966). To the extent that an individual feels that the outcomes are within one’s own control, they are termed an internal. On the other hand, if an individual feels that the outcomes of life are controlled by fate, luck, and chance; they are termed an external.

Locus of control can be measured through the use of several scales. “The most widely used instrument” is Rotter’s (1966) Internal-External scale (Spector, 1982: 482). The scale consists of 29 paired items, six of which are filler items, in a forced-choice format. Although originally scored by summing the total number of externally oriented responses from each pair, the scale is now also being scored by internally

oriented responses. Based on the 23 valid items on the scale, scores range from 0-23. If the scale is assessed externally, then the higher the score on the scale, the more external the individual is.

The application of locus of control to an organizational context has drawn much attention in the past 33 years (Giles, 1977; Phares, 1976; Muhonen & Torkelson, 2004; O'Brien, 1983; and Spector, 1982; Spector, 1988). Giles (1977) found that locus of control moderated the relation between need satisfaction and volunteering among female factory workers that were administered several questionnaires, including a shortened Rotter I-E Scale and a measure of satisfaction with higher order needs. Phares (1976) notes that individuals with an internal locus of control performed better in learning and problem-solving situations. Specifically, he cites the findings of Seeman and Evans (1962) that internal patients suffering from tuberculosis sought greater information about their condition. Because of this increased level of information seeking, they knew more about their own condition, and exhibited less satisfaction with the information they hospital was relaying to them about their condition than external patients. This higher level of performance by internals is reflected in the notion that internals try to control their work settings, especially the flow of information. This allows the individual to perform at a higher level because they control relevant information in the decision making and problem-solving processes.

Rotter's I-E scale serves as a global measure for the assessment of locus of control. In order to more accurately assess locus of control in environments that tailor to an organizational context, Spector (1988) developed the work locus of control scale. The work locus of control scale, also referred to as the WLCS, is a domain-specific measure of locus of control that focuses on organizational settings. Domain-specific measures such as the work locus of control are often considered to be more accurate predictors than the global measure of locus of control (Blau, 1993; Orpen, 1992) including Phares (1976) who recommended the development of domain-specific measures because they would enhance the predictiveness of locus of control when compared with Rotter's (1966) global I-E scale. Specifically, Phares states that "a general measure of locus of control allows us to describe each individual's 'average' locus of control attributes over many situations. The wider the range of the situations, the less predictive the concept will be (1976: 46)." Essentially, the premise is that the I-E scale may adequately assess generalized scenarios but when utilizing the scale to assess specific, unique, and individualized scenarios, the reliability of the scale becomes suspect. Some organizational outcomes or rewards assessed by the scale are promotions, raises and career progress (Spector, 1988). When analyzing the effects of locus of control in an organizational context Muhonen & Torkelson (2004) found that those employees with an external work locus of control had higher levels of work related stress, lower levels of job satisfaction and were more prone to symptoms of ill-health.

The next important step in relating locus of control to an organizational context is the identification of situations in which locus of control negatively impacts behaviors. Specifically, it is important to diagnose counterproductive behaviors that may be exhibited by employees or supervisors to someone that they hold power over. For instance, Mitchell, Smyser, and Weed (1975) found that supervisors considered to be external

according to Rotter's I-E scale were more likely to view coercion and formal position as the most effective ways to make subordinates perform their job. On the other hand, internal supervisors were more likely to view rewards, expertise, and respect as the proper means for motivating employees. Furthermore, Perlow and Latham (1993) administered the Rotter (1966) Locus of Control Scale to 312 employees at five state-supported mental retardation facilities. They found that client abusers, those workers that commit inappropriate physical action toward a person with mental retardation, had higher external locus of control scores than those employees that did not commit client abuse. This finding supported the hypothesis posited by the author that those with an internal locus of control are less likely to commit client abuse than those individuals with an external locus of control.

4.1. The Target of Sexual Harassment

Now that a foundation has been laid to illustrate the severity of the issue, it is important to continue the process of better understanding what causes sexual harassment in the workplace or perhaps what makes it so prevalent. In the following sections, I will propose that the reaction of the target of sexual harassment is determined by their locus of control.

The target of sexual harassment has two options once they have been harassed: ignore it or fight it. Most targets decide to ignore what has been done to them. Why? Do they fear retaliation? Is there precedent established in the social norms that it will go unpunished? Perhaps management has a "don't bother me attitude." Or it could be because the initiator stripped the target of their dignity and control in their own life. All but the latter will be discussed in the next section when we look at the behaviors of management. For now, the focus is on the loss of control by the target. The target may lose their will to fight because of experiencing the harassing behavior. Even if they had an internal locus of control before the heinous act, they may have shifted toward an external locus after this. Perhaps, since they could not protect themselves while it happened, they do not feel they can protect themselves now. Essentially, the target perceives that they are incapable of processing the required information to predict, avoid, and defend against sexually harassing behavior. In fact, Phares (1976) found that internals are more likely to perform better in such situations where the control of information is pertinent to problem-solving. If the target believes that the act is likely to occur again, the target may experience fear and anxiety, resulting in a sense of helplessness (Klein & Seligman, 1976) and a resulting withdrawal from the situation or company.

The target might also ignore what happened because they strive to be accepted. For instance, many cases of sexual harassment go unreported in the military (O'Leary-Kelly, Paetzold, & Griffin, 2000), police departments, and manufacturing jobs because the women want to assert their place with "the men". They feel they must put up with these acts in order to be accepted. Essentially, they will "tough it out", allow the harassment to continue for now, and eventually the men will either get bored or the women will prove themselves resulting in the harassment ceasing. This decision reflects a distorted view of control over the

influences or outcomes in one's life. Essentially, the targets in these situations are taking control of their outcomes by not doing anything. Their inaction is what will finally gain them acceptance in the workplace by their male counterparts.

Hypothesis 2: Targets with an internal locus of control will tolerate more sexually harassing behavior when it is perceived as a requirement to being accepted in the workplace.

Another option the target has is to fight it. This does not necessarily mean physically assaulting the assailant, although some may say the initiator has it coming, but instead fighting simply refers to protesting the treatment the target has been subjected to. This may be done by reporting the act to the initiator, a co-worker, management, human resources, the police, or even an outsider of the company (friend/family member, pastor/priest, or government agency like the EEOC). This indicates a willingness to seize control after it was stripped from the target. This signifies an internal locus of control because there is an assumption that the target is able to affect the outcomes they experience by taking action. This important step of rising up and taking back control can be seen by the internal female employee who files a complaint to management about sexually harassing behavior that she has been subjected to and lets the initiator know that the act will not be tolerated.

Hypothesis 3: A target with an internal locus of control will be more likely to protest against initiators of sexual harassment.

Lucero, Allen, & Middleton (2006) showed that most initiators' behavior tends to decrease in severity once they have been disciplined. This illustrates the importance of, for no matter what reason, allowing this act to go uncontested. The result of fighting the harassment will vary from case to case, but the result is not as important as the act of fighting when compared to the alternative (e.g. ignoring the situation and letting it go unchecked).

The two choices that a target has after she has experienced sexual harassment can do a lot toward preventing or, at least, lessening the frequency and severity of sexual harassment in the future. It can call the attention of management or outside agencies that will curb the act or it may have an effect on the initiator. O'Leary-Kelly, Paetzold, and Griffin (2000) proposed that the targets' responses following sexual harassment will be interpreted by the initiator as supportive of the initiators' goal attainment or as efforts to block goal attainment. The authors go on to further state that if the target ignores the act, thus supporting goal attainment for the initiator, the initiator will merely continue their current behavior; however if the target fights back and blocks the goal attainment, the initiator will either lessen the severity and frequency or pursue sexually harassing behaviors that are even more severe and frequent than before. Thus, if the target ignores it, they have no chance of stopping it; while if they choose to fight, it may get worse or better, but at least by fighting they have a chance of making it better.

5. Methodology

5.1. Data and Sample

Participants. Upper level undergraduate business students (N=137) participated in exchange for extra credit. Of these, 87 were male and 50 were female with a mean age of 21.8 years. 76 participants (55.5%) are currently employed, 61 (44.5%) previous managerial experience, and 16 (26.23%) of those had previously terminated an employee.

Materials & Procedure. The questionnaire packet was disseminated to the students within their classroom setting. Participants first filled out information pertaining to certain demographic data (e.g. age, work experience) and consent was obtained to proceed. The next part of the packet contained Rotter's (1966) I-E scale that measures the extent in which an individual attributes specific outcomes to be controlled by the self or by external forces (i.e. luck, fate). After completing Rotter's scale the subjects were presented with an amended version of the Pryor (1987) Likelihood to Sexually Harass scale. The Likelihood to Sexually Harass (LSH) scale has consistently had high reliabilities and support (Dall'Ara & Maass, 1999; Lee et al., 2003; Perry, Schmidtke, & Kulik, 1998; Pryor, 1987) and as such was deemed a suitable model to base this study off of. The LSH scale was amended in two ways. First, as it is the purpose of the scales to measure ones proclivity to sexually harass others, the scenarios are worded as if you were the initiator of the sexual harassing behavior. The wording of the scenarios was thus changed in order to position you as the target of the sexually harassing behavior. Second, the LSH scale is generally provided to male participants (Dall'Ara & Maass, 1999; Lee et al., 2003; Pryor, 1987; Pryor et al., 1995) and as such is usually not positioned to be directed towards female respondents or for same sex sexual harassment. As it was important to this study to assess not only the typical male-female sexual harassment interaction but also same sex interactions, the gender of the initiator was manipulated into two conditions in which some participants were sexually harassed by the opposite sex throughout the ten scenarios while others were harassed by someone of the same sex. This led to changes such as the title of some of the individuals, i.e. from secretary to personal assistant, in an attempt to make the position less gender specific and remove any potential bias as a result of the gender specific nature of that title.

6. Results

6.1. Scale Reliability

The four questions accompanying each of the ten scenarios underwent reliability analysis to assess the internal consistency of the items. The first question assessed ones tendency to ignore the sexually harassing behavior and proceed with what they were doing (e.g. scenario 1 asked if you would ignore an interviewers sexually harassing comment and proceed with the interview). The 10 item ignore scale for the ten scenarios had good internal consistency of .79.

The next set of questions assessed ones likelihood of being complicit with the sexually harassing behavior. In other words, would you go along with whatever the individual was proposing if it meant you could get ahead (e.g. scenario 2 – would you consider exchanging sexual favors if it meant you could keep your job). This scale only consisted of 7 items as 3 of the scenarios measured hostile work environment harassment and did not assess complicit behavior. The 7 item complicit scale had exceptional consistency of .93

The next two sets of questions both assess ones likelihood of protesting against being sexually harassed. Two sets of questions were derived to measure two different magnitudes of protestation. In other words, the third set of questions assessed ones likelihood to protest to the individual or to the company in which you are currently employed (e.g. scenario 4 – would you walk out of the meeting and file a complaint with an executive producer of the film or executive of the studio in which the director is employed), while the fourth set of questions assessed ones likelihood to protest to a state or federal agency (e.g. scenario 5 - would you file a complaint with a state/federal human resource agency). The 13 item protest1 scale had good internal consistency of .86 while the 10 item protest2 scale had good internal consistency of .88.

Table 1.

	Complicit		Protest 1		Protest 2		Ignore	
	Gender***	Sex***	Gender***	Sex***	Gender***	Sex***	Gender	Sex
Male	2.0509	1.4348	2.7975	3.2698	2.5586	3.0420	3.1414	3.1174
Female	1.3086	2.1303	3.3138	2.6980	3.0520	2.4309	3.1660	3.1838

* indicates significant at $p < .10$
 ** indicates significant at $p < .05$
 *** indicates significant at $p < .01$

Table 2.

Gender	Sex							
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
	Complicit***		Protest 1		Protest 2		Ignore	
Male	1.432	2.6286	3.3158	2.4650	2.9548	2.1889	3.1738	3.1111
Female	1.4392	1.1553	3.4501	3.1538	3.1778	2.9043	3.0296	3.3261

* indicates significant at $p < .10$
 ** indicates significant at $p < .05$
 *** indicates significant at $p < .01$

Ignore. The means of the scales (see table 1) generated by the respondents were analyzed by a 2 (gender) X 2 (sex of initiator) between-subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA). There were no significant main effects or interaction effects.

Complicit. There was a Gender main effect for the seven item measure assessing an individual's likelihood to be complicit $F(1, 133) = 24.49, p < .001$ such that men were more likely to be complicit (2.05) than women (1.21). There was also a main effect for the sex of the initiator of the sexually harassing act, $F(1, 133) = 9.623, (p < .01)$ such that respondents were willing to be more complicit when the sex of the initiator was female (2.13) compared to male (1.43). Furthermore, there was an interaction effect for gender x sex, $F(1,133) = 25.33, p < .001$ such that men were more likely to be complicit when the initiator was female (2.63) than male (1.43) whereas women were more likely to be complicit when the initiator was male (1.44) compared to when the initiator was female (1.16). These findings suggest that when individuals are sexually harassed by a member of the same sex, they are less likely to be complicit with the act even if it means it may allow them to advance in their career.

Protest1. There was a Gender main effect for the thirteen item measure assessing an individual's likelihood to protest against the individual or to the organization $F(1, 133) = 16.24, p < .001$ such that women were more likely to protest (3.31) than men (2.80). There was also a main effect for the sex of the initiator of the sexually harassing act, $F(1, 133) = 16.24, p < .001$ such that respondents were more likely to protest when the sex of the initiator was male (3.27) compared to female (2.70). There was no interaction effect for gender x sex, $F(1,133) = 2.58, p = .111$.

Protest2. There was a Gender main effect for the ten item measure assessing an individual's likelihood to protest by filing a complaint to a state or federal agency $F(1, 133) = 9.39, p < .01$ such that women were more likely to protest (3.05) than men (2.56). There was also a main effect for the sex of the initiator of the sexually harassing act, $F(1, 133) = 11.52, p < .01$ such that respondents were more likely to protest when the sex of the initiator was male (3.04) compared to female (2.43). Furthermore, there was no interaction effect for gender x sex, $F(1,133) = 2.58, p = .11$. Based on these findings, there is no support for **Hypothesis 1** that men will protest more when harassed by a same sexed individual than women as it was that men did protest more in both cases, but this difference did not reach statistical significance.

Locus of Control. A correlation analysis was conducted to see if ones locus of control related to their tendency to exhibit any of these behaviors. The individual's locus of control score was summated so that each individual was scored a 1 when they provided an answer that was internal and a 0 when the answer was externally oriented thus resulting in a potential range of scores from 0-23 with higher scores meaning one is more internally oriented. The only significant correlation between ones locus of control was with the ignore scale, $r(135) = -.183, p < .05$, such that internals are more likely to ignore sexual harassment. This finding provides partial support for **Hypothesis 3**.

7. Further analysis

As it is possible that the different types of sexual harassment one is subjected to may engender different reactions, subsequent analysis was conducted to flesh this out. As such, the scales were separated out to assess differences between quid pro quo and hostile work environment reactions to the original 4 scales (of the ten scenarios, three were hostile work environment while 7 were quid pro quo). Due to page constraints, only significant results are reported. Scale means for main effects are shown in table 3 and interaction effects are shown in table 4.

Table 3

	Protest 1				Protest 2				Ignore			
	QPQ		H		QPQ		H		QPQ		H	
	Gender ***	Sex* **	Gender ***	Sex* *	Gender ***	Sex* **	Gender **	Sex	Gender **	Sex* *	Gender r*	Sex
M	3.1117	3.683 2	3.4444	2.41 06	2.7356	3.312 6	2.4310	2.78 74	3.000	3.17 81	2.145 6	3.25 60
F	3.6543	2.930 7	3.1333	2.14 22	3.2857	2.554 6	2.9167	2.42 65	3.3114	3.04 83	2.506 7	3.40 69

* indicates significant at $p < .10$

** indicates significant at $p < .05$

*** indicates significant at $p < .01$

Table 4

	Sex											
	Quid Pro Quo						Hostile					
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
	Ignore*		Protest 1***		Protest 2**		Ignore		Protest 1		Protest 2	
Male	3.531 0	2.857 1	3.625 9	2.631 7	3.244 9	2.260 3	3.396 8	3.488 9	2.603 2	2.270 4	2.277 8	2.022 2
Female	3.216 9	3.422 4	3.772 5	3.515 5	3.418 0	3.130 4	3.037 0	3.246 4	3.074 1	2.731 9	2.617 3	2.376 8

* indicates significant at $p < .10$

** indicates significant at $p < .05$

*** indicates significant at $p < .01$

7.1 Quid Pro Quo

Ignore. There was a Gender main effect for the seven item measure assessing an individual's likelihood to ignore quid pro quo sexual harassment $F(1, 133) = 5.54, p < .05$ such that women were more likely to ignore (3.31) than men (3.00). Furthermore, there was a moderate interaction effect for gender x sex, $F(1,133) = 3.52, p < .07$ such that men were more likely to ignore the harassment when the initiator was male (3.15) than female (2.86) whereas women were more likely to ignore when the initiator was female (3.42) than male (3.22). These findings suggest that when individuals are sexually harassed by a member of the same sex, they are more likely to ignore the act.

Protest1. There was a Gender main effect for the seven item measure assessing an individual's likelihood to protest to the individual or the organization when exposed to quid pro quo sexual harassment $F(1, 133) = 13.82, p < .001$ such that women were more likely to protest (3.65) than men (3.11). There was also a main effect for the sex of the initiator of the sexually harassing act, $F(1, 133) = 20.37, p < .001$ such that respondents were more likely to protest when the sex of the initiator was male (3.68) compared to female (2.93). Furthermore, there was an interaction effect for gender x sex, $F(1,133) = 7.07, p < .001$ such that men were more likely to be protest when the initiator was male (3.63) than female (2.63) whereas women were more likely to protest when the initiator was female (3.77) compared to when the initiator was male (3.52). Again, these findings provide more support for the notion that when individuals are sexually harassed by a member of the same sex, they are more likely to react negatively toward it, in this instance protest to the individual or to a member of the organization.

Protest2. There was a Gender main effect for the seven item measure assessing an individual's likelihood to protest to a state or federal agency after being exposed to quid pro quo sexual harassment $F(1, 133) = 9.13 p < .01$ such that women were more likely to protest (3.29) than men (2.74). There was also a main effect for the sex of the initiator of the sexually harassing act, $F(1, 133) = 14.76, p < .001$ such that respondents were more likely to protest when the sex of the initiator was male (3.31) compared to female (2.55). Furthermore, there was an interaction effect for gender x sex, $F(1,133) = 4.43, p < .05$ such that men were more likely to protest when the initiator was male (3.24) than female (2.26) and women were also more likely to protest when the initiator was male (3.42) compared to when the initiator was female (3.13). Contrary to the previous findings, this suggests that when exhibited to the most heinous and direct of sexual harassment forms, both genders are more likely to file a complaint with a state or federal agency when the initiator is male. This shows the seriousness that men seem to take away from this when harassed by a member of the same sex whereas, perhaps because of the communal nature of women, they are less likely to report such acts to a state or federal agency. When coupled with the first protest scale, these findings suggest that women are more likely to act against another woman in terms of complaining to the initiator of filing a complaint with the organization, but are less willing to file a complaint against them with a state or federal agency.

7.2 Hostile Work Environment

Ignore. There was a moderate Gender main effect for the three item measure assessing an individual's likelihood to ignore hostile work environment sexual harassment $F(1, 133) = 9.13, p < .07$ such that men were more likely to ignore (3.44) than women (3.13). This finding suggests, common sensically, that men are more likely to tolerate hostile work environment sexual harassment (e.g. nude pin-ups), perhaps as they view it as a necessity to fitting into a male dominated work environment.

Protest1. There was a Gender main effect for the six item measure assessing an individual's likelihood to protest to the initiator or the organization after being exposed to a hostile work environment $F(1, 133) = 9.88, p < .01$ such that women were more likely to protest (2.92) than men (2.43). There was also a main effect for the sex of the initiator of the sexually harassing act, $F(1, 133) = 5.18, p < .03$ such that respondents were more likely to protest when the sex of the initiator was male (2.79) compared to female (2.43).

Protest2. There was a Gender main effect for the three item measure assessing an individual's likelihood to protest to a state or federal agency after being exposed to a hostile work environment $F(1, 133) = 4.10, p < .05$ such that women were more likely to protest (2.51) than men (2.15). When taken holistically, these findings suggest that the type of sexual harassment one is exposed to interacts with the findings on reactions to same sex sexual harassment. In other words, men are more likely to react assertively (i.e. protest) than women when exposed to same sex sexual harassment thus providing partial support to **Hypothesis 1**.

Locus of Control. To better assess the distinction between internals and externals, two additional conditions were created (internal or external) for ones locus of control. Each of the conditions was created by taking scores more extreme than one standard deviation from the mean for respondents' locus of control scores. In other words, scores more extreme than one standard deviation above the mean were scored as internal ($N = 34$) whereas scores more extreme than one standard deviation lower than the mean were scored as external ($N = 28$).

Ignore. There was a moderate main effect for locus of control for the ones likelihood to ignore the sexually harassing act $F(1,133) = 3.40, p=.07$ such that externals were more likely to ignore (3.38) the sexual harassment than internals (3.06). This finding provides moderate support for **Hypothesis 2**.

Protest2. There was a moderate main effect for locus of control for ones likelihood to protest to a state or federal agency after being sexually harassed $F(1,133) = 3.87, p < .06$ such that internals are more likely to protest (2.89) than externals (2.54), thus providing moderate support for **Hypothesis 3**. To further flesh out this linkage between locus of control and ones likelihood to react to sexual harassment, the above conditions were reanalyzed based on the two types of sexual harassment.

7.3 Quid pro quo

Protest2. There was a moderate main effect for locus of control $F(1,133) = 3.35, p = .07$ such that internals were more likely to protest (3.11) to a state or federal agency than externals (2.79).

Hostile Work Environment

Protest2. There was a moderate main effect for locus of control $F(1,133) = 3.27, p < .08$ such that internals were more likely to protest (2.38) to a state or federal agency than externals (1.96).

When coupled together, these findings suggest moderate support for **Hypothesis 3** such that those with an internal locus of control are more likely to protest to being sexually harassed than those individuals with an external locus of control. Although the hypothesized directionality of **Hypothesis 2** was experienced (i.e. internals were more likely to ignore and be complicit in order to fit in), this did not reach statistical significance, therefore failing to support **Hypothesis 2**.

7.4 Final Analysis

A consistent finding throughout the analysis was that respondent's reactions were much more intense for the quid pro quo sexual harassment than hostile work environment. As such, further analysis was conducted to see if the responses for the two types of sexual harassment were in fact significantly different. A paired samples t-test for type of sexual harassment was significant for ignore $t(136) = -2.60, p < .01$ such that respondents were more likely to ignore hostile work environment sexual harassment (3.33) than quid pro quo (3.11). A paired samples t-test for type of sexual harassment was significant for protest1 $t(136) = 9.40, p < .001$ such that respondents were more likely to protest when exposed to quid pro quo sexual harassment (3.31) than hostile work environment (2.61). Finally, a paired samples t-test for type of sexual harassment was significant for protest2 $t(136) = 8.834, p < .001$ such that respondents were more likely to protest to a state or federal agency when exposed to quid pro quo sexual harassment (2.94) than a hostile work environment (2.28). These findings are supported by discussion and findings in the literature that the type of sexual harassment will engender different reactions (e.g., Hogler, Frame, & Thornton, 2002; Icenogle, Eagle, Ahmad, & Hanks, 2002; Loreda, Reid, & Deaux, 1995; Stockdale et al., 2002). Specifically, the perception that quid pro quo is a more heinous and severe form of sexual harassment is supported here, while the necessity to undergo certain treatment to fit into an organization is expected when exposed to hostile work environment sexual harassment compared to quid pro quo sexual harassment.

8. General discussion and conclusion

Sexual harassment most likely will never be eliminated. It seems as much a part of the workplace as an individual's heartbeat. Several findings are worth noting. First, current findings provide further support for the notion that women have more negative reactions to being sexually harassed than men. Second, the type

of sexual harassment influenced the magnitude of the reaction to being sexually harassed, and this finding was not contingent on gender. In other words, both men and women had stronger reactions to being sexually harassed when it was in the form of quid pro quo as opposed to hostile work environment. This finding may stem from the fact that both sexes feel that sexual harassment, to a certain degree, is a requirement of the workplace. Certain levels of sexual harassment (i.e. naked pin-ups and/or sexually explicit jokes) may serve as a sort of quasi-initiation process for newcomers into the organization. Put differently, employees may utilize this type of sexual harassment to acculturate and/or weed out the desirable versus less desirable workers. This type of harassment is typically aimed at more feminine workers, whether one's sex is female or not. Third, the sex of the harasser was significant. Men were less likely to be complicit and more likely to protest when the harasser was male which is consistent with findings from other scholars within the field (Goldberg & Zhang, 2004; Herek, 1988; Waldo, Berdahl, & Fitzgerald, 1998). On the other hand, women were less likely to be complicit and less likely to protest when the harasser was female. This finding suggests that men react to same sex sexual harassment more seriously (i.e. respond more negatively) than women. Finally, one's locus of control amended how they would react to being sexually harassed. Internals were less likely to ignore sexual harassment and more likely to protest. This is consistent with the locus of control literature as it suggests that those individuals who believe they can control their own fate are more likely to try to control it, i.e. in this instance by protesting to the state or federal agency.

The current research was not without its limitations. First, the sample set was derived from undergraduate students. As such, it can be argued that they may not fully appreciate the behavior of being sexually harassed. Future research should be conducted by providing the same scenarios to individuals within an employment context which could provide some support for the utilization of such convenience samples. Second, it may be argued that the utilization of scenarios lacks a degree of realism. The scenarios were adapted from the Pryor (1987) Likelihood to Sexually Harassed scenarios which are a commonly accepted measurement of proclivity to sexually harass. Third, there is a degree of skepticism as the results are based on self-report. Finally, although there are multiple types of reactions that could have been assessed, this research only focuses on the three main types (ignore, complicit, and protest). As such, there are multiple potential relationships between the current and future variables that were not assessed because of the narrow focus of types of reactions.

There are several areas for future research that would prove useful and additive to the current findings. First, assessing one's sexual orientation and other demographic characteristics (i.e. ethnicity, age) such as ethnicity are needed. In other words, does one's sexual orientation or the sexual orientation of the harasser change one's reaction or magnitude of reactions? As women were more likely to let the harassing acts slide if they were harassed by women, does this finding change if the harasser is a lesbian? In other words, sexual orientation may serve as a meaningful moderating variable. Furthermore, we know that men are more likely to protest and women are less likely with same sex harassment, how does this relationship change when

we add in the factor of ethnicity? Are women more likely to be upset if harassed by an individual of a different ethnicity? Are men less likely to protest if harassed by an individual of a similar ethnicity? Second, does ones tenure or position within an organization impact ones reactions? Are individuals who have been within an organization more likely to protest? Conversely, if the individual conducting the harassment have been with the firm a long time, are targets less likely to protest? Third, a more descriptive picture of ones personality needs to be mapped out. In other words, which types of personalities are more likely to protest and which ones are more likely to go along? It may be fruitful in future research to utilize the big five personality dimensions to illuminate this issue. Finally, as I found significance in terms of the type of harassment and sex of the harasser, it would behoove researchers in the future to assess other reactions to same sex sexual harassment such as physical responses. In other words, when harassed by another male, do males tend to become more physically altercative?

There are several practical implications stemming from these findings. First, it is important that organizations foster an environment of understanding and standing up for what one believes in. In other words, organizations should try to foster an environment that is conducive with an internal locus of control mindset (i.e. where individuals believe they can stop sexually harassing acts when they occur thus fostering the utilization of the targets voice). On a similar note, it is important to identify those individuals that are external in nature and provide them with sexual harassment training, as these are the individuals that will likely be targeted. Second, organizations must keep their finger on the pulse of the organization and monitor these issues. In order for targets to be able to protest being sexually harassed, policies and guidelines must be in place that allows for the reporting, investigation, and if required, punishment of sexually harassing behaviors. Management's action against potential and current initiators may be able to rehabilitate initiators or at least reduce the frequency and severity of their actions. Bandura's (1978) social learning theory of aggression emphasizes the need for management to actively pursue this problem and eliminate it because the severity, duration, and frequency will only get worse as the act goes unchecked. Finally, organizations must pay more attention to a different type of sexual harassment, or at least different than what we are used to hearing about, same sex. In other words, although it is of no business of the organization or the employees what each individual employees sexual orientation is, it is important to understand this when sexual harassment is occurring. It is important because as these findings suggest, male reactions to being sexually harassed by another male are significantly stronger, and as such, are more likely to become more physical in response.

References

1. Bandura, A. (1978). Social Learning theory of aggression. *Journal of Communication*, 3, 12-19.
2. Berdahl, J.L. (2007). The Sexual Harassment of Uppity Women. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 425-437.
3. Berdahl, J. L., Magley, V. J., & Waldo, C. R. (1996). The sexual harassment of men? Exploring the concept with theory and data. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 20, 527-547.
4. Burgess, D., & Borgida, E. (1999). Who women are, who women should be: Descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotyping in sex discrimination. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 5, 630-664.
5. Blau, G. (1993). Testing the relationship of locus of control to different performance dimensions. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 66, 125-138
6. Dall'Ara, E., & Maass, A. (1999). Studying sexual harassment in the laboratory: Are egalitarian women at higher risk? *Sex Roles*, 41, 681-704.
7. Dubois, C.L.Z., Knapp, D.E., Faley, R.H., Kustis, G.A. (1998). An empirical examination of same- and other-gender sexual harassment in the workplace. *Sex Roles*, 10, 731-749
8. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2007). Sexual Harassment Charges EEOC & FEPA's Combined: FY 1997-2007. Retrieved September 14, 2008, from <http://www.eeoc.gov/stats/harass.html>
9. Giles, W.F. (1977). Volunteering for job enrichment: A test of expectancy theory predictions. *Personnel Psychology*, 30, 427-435
10. Goldberg, C., & Zhang, L. (2004). Simple and joint effects of gender and self-esteem on responses to same-sex sexual harassment. *Sex Roles*, 50, 823-833
11. Gruber, J.E. (1992). A typology of personal and environmental sexual harassment: Research and policy implications for the 1990's. *Sex Roles*, 26, 447-464
12. Herek, G. (1986). On heterosexual masculinity: Some psychological consequences of the social construction of gender and sexuality. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 29, 563-577.
13. Herek, G.M. (1988). Heterosexuals' attitudes toward lesbians and gay men: Correlates and gender differences. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 25, 451-477
14. Hogler, R.L., Frame, J.H., & Thornton, G. (2002). Workplace sexual harassment law: An empirical analysis of organizational justice and legal policy. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 14, 234-250
15. Icenogle, M.L., Eagle, B.W., Ahmad, S., & Hanks, L.A. (2002). Assessing perceptions of sexual harassment behaviors in a manufacturing environment. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 16, 601-616
16. Klein, D.C., & Seligman, M.E.P. (1976). Reversal of Performance Deficits and Perceptual Deficits in Learned Helplessness and Depression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 85, 11-26.

17. Lee, K., Gizzarone, M., & Ashton, M. C. (2003). Personality and the likelihood to sexually harass. *Sex Roles, 49*, 59-69.
18. Loreda, C., Reid, A., & Deaux, K. (1995). Judgments and definitions of sexual harassment by high school students. *Sex Roles, 32*, 29-45
19. Lucero, M. A., Allen, R. E., & Middleton, K. (2006). Sexual initiators: Behaviors, motives, and change over time. *Sex Roles, 55*, 331-343.
20. Magley, V.J., Waldo, C.R., Drasgow, F., & Fitzgerald, L.F. (1999). The impact of sexual harassment on military personnel: Is it the same for men and women? *Military Psychology, 11*, 283-302
21. Mazer, D.B., & Percival, E.F. (1989). Students' experiences of sexual harassment at a small university. *Sex Roles, 20*, 1-22
22. Mitchell, T.R., Smyser, C.M., and Weed, S.E. (1975). Locus of Control, supervision, and work satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal, 18*, 623-630.
23. Muhonen, T. & Torkelson, E. (2004). Work locus of control and its relationship to health and job satisfaction from a gender perspective, *Stress and Health, 20*, 21-28
24. O'Brien, G. E. (1983). Locus of control, work, and retirement, In H. M. Lefcourt (Ed.), *Research with the Locus of Control Construct*, vol. 3. New York: Academic Press
25. O'Connor, M.O., Gutek, B.A., Stockdale, M.S., Geer, T.M., & Melancon, J.D.R. (2004). Explaining sexual harassment judgments: Looking beyond gender of the rater. *Law and Human Behavior, 28*, 69-95
26. O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Paetzold, R. L., & Griffin, R. W. (2000). Sexual harassment as aggressive behavior: An actor-based perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 25*, 372-388.
27. Orpen, C. (1992). The work locus of control scale as a predictor of employees attitudes and behaviour: a validity study. *Psychology, A Journal of Human Behavior, 2*, 35-37
28. Perry, E.L., Schmidtke, J.M., & Kulik, C.T. (1998). Propensity to sexually harass: An exploration of gender differences. *Sex Roles, 38*, 443-460
29. Pellegrini, A.D. (2001). A longitudinal study of heterosexual relationships, aggression, and sexual harassment during the transition from primary school through middle school. *Applied Developmental Psychology, 22*, 119-133
30. Phares, E.J. (1976). *Locus of Control in Personality*. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press
31. Pryor, J. B. (1987). Sexual harassment proclivities in men. *Sex Roles, 17*, 269-290.
32. Pryor, J. B., Giedd, J. L., & Williams, K. B. (1995). A social psychological model for predicting sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues, 51*, 69-84.
33. Pryor, J.B., LaVite, C.M., Stoller, L.M. (1993). A Social Psychological Analysis of Sexual Harassment: The Person/Situation Interaction. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42*, 68-83.

34. Pryor, J. B., & Meyers, A. B. (2000). Men who sexually harass women. In L. B. Schlesinger (Ed.), *Serial offenders: Current thought, recent findings, unusual syndromes* (pp. 207-228). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
35. Rotter, J.B. (1954) *Social Learning and Clinical Psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall
36. Seeman, M. & Evans, J.W. (1962). Alienation and learning in a hospital setting. *American Sociological Review*, 27, 772-783
37. Sinn, J. (1997). The predictive and discriminant validity of masculinity ideology. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31, 117-135.
38. Spector, P.E. (1982). Behavior in Organizations as a Function of Employee's Locus of Control. *Psychological Bulletin*, 91, 482-497
39. Spector, P.E. (1988). Development of the Work Locus of Control Scale. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 61, 335-340
40. Stark, L. (1991). Traditional gender role beliefs and individual outcomes: An exploratory analysis. *Sex Roles*, 24, 639-650.
41. Stockdale, M.S., Berry, C.G., Schneider, R.W., & Cao, F. (2004). Perceptions of the sexual harassment of men: Evidence for a broader theory of sexual harassment and sexual discrimination. *Psychology, Public Policy, and the Law*, 5, 630-664.
42. Stockdale, M. S., Gandolfo, C., & Schneider, R. W. (2001, April). Perceptions of sexual harassment of men. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychologists, San Diego, CA
43. Stockdale, M.S., O'Connor, M., Gutek, B.A., & Geer, T. (2002). The relationship between prior sexual abuse and reactions to sexual harassment: Literature review and empirical study. *Psychology Public Policy and Law*, 8, 64-95
44. Stockdale, M.S., Visio, M., & Batra, L. (1999). The sexual harassment of men: Evidence for a broader theory of sexual harassment and sex discrimination. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 5, 630-664
45. Waldo, C.R., Berdahl, J.L., & Fitzgerald, L.F. (1998). Are men sexually harassed? If so, by whom? *Law and Human Behavior*, 22, 59-79
46. Williams, K.B., & Cyr, R.R. (1992). Escalating commitment to a relationship: The sexual harassment trap. *Sex Roles*, 27, 47-72