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ABSTRACT

The problem of peer sexual harassment among students in schools and universities has increasingly become the focus of research efforts. Surveys indicate that large numbers of students experience peer harassment. A majority of students at the secondary level report both being sexually harassed by peers and sexually harassing peers. Most research has been directed at documenting the prevalence of the problem, and as yet, very little is known as to why students harass their peers. The present study used survey methods and a correlational research design to investigate peer sexual harassment perpetration among students in late adolescence.

Participants were recruited from a medium-sized university to participate in a study on "harassment." The final sample consisted of 199 males ages 18 to 21. Peer sexual harassment perpetration was assessed with a self-report instrument developed for this study. This instrument samples broadly from all peer sexual harassment domains experienced by students, including gender harassment, a domain often overlooked or under-sampled in previous research.

Results revealed that almost all participants reported committing sexual harassment against peers and receiving gender harassment from peers in the current school year. Results of a series of multiple regression analyses indicated that 48% of the variance in the sexual harassment of female peers could be accounted for by a set of variables suggested by previous sexual harassment and sexual assault research. The most important of these factors was self-reported sexual harassment victimization, which was operationalized as gender harassment received from other students. Being a target of gender harassment from peers was the most significant predictor across sexual harassment domains for harassment directed at both females and males. Other important predictors included adherence to beliefs about traditional masculinity, having peers with a hypersexual orientation, and tolerant attitudes toward sexual harassment.

The results of the study were interpreted as supporting a feminist explanation of sexual harassment. Implications for harassment prevention and intervention programs were made that center around the intertwined roles that gender harassment and masculinity ideology play in the sexual harassment dynamic. Recommendations for research focus on the inclusion of gender harassment and other variables in future investigations of peer sexual harassment.
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CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

Research Problem

Research interest in the problem of sexual harassment of students by their peers has grown considerably in recent years. Sexual harassment among students has been called “gendered terrorism” because of the serious effects it often has on its female targets (Stein, 1992). The sometimes devastating impact of sexual harassment is conveyed in the following story by a sixteen-year-old female student who was harassed by male peers:

It came to the point where I was skipping almost all of my classes, therefore getting kicked out of the honors program. It was very painful for me. I dreaded school each morning, I started to wear clothes that wouldn’t flatter my figure, and I kept to myself. I never had a boyfriend that year. I’d cry every night I got home, and I thought I was a total loser. . . . They took away my self-esteem, my social life, and kept me from getting a good education (Stein, 1993, p. 313).

Such stories are not uncommon, according to studies in both Canada and the United States. For example, an 11th-grade female student changed schools as the result of harassment, stating that “I felt like something was taken away from me. I felt dirty and responsible” (Trigg & Wittenstrom, 1996, p. 58).

Peer sexual harassment may even increase in frequency when adolescents move from high school to college and university (Bogart, Simmons, Stein, & Tomaszewski, 1992). University students endure frustrations and indignities, including the following incidents reported by a female undergraduate:

College males are sexually insulting female peers. They rank them 1-10 on sex attributes and call out the ranks as girls pass. They go under the window of the women’s dorms and chant, “We want tits.” Up to 450 [students] may mass together (Bogart et al., 1992, p.207).
The largest study of adolescent sexual harassment, *Hostile Hallways*, was commissioned by the American Association of University Women [AAUW] (1993). The results of this large-scale (n = 1,632) study suggest that sexual harassment is a common experience for a majority of US students: 81% of secondary students reported experiencing some form of sexual harassment, with the vast majority of the harassment (83%) coming from other students. Canadian results are unfortunately similar. The Ontario Secondary School Teacher’s Federation (OSSTF, 1994) found that 81% of the female students in their study had experienced sexual harassment from peers. In general, more women than men in sexual harassment studies report sexual harassment experiences; however, a surprisingly large number (76%) of male secondary students in the AAUW study also reported being victimized by sexual harassment.

Students of both sexes in the AAUW (1993) study both reported being bothered by their experiences, but girls especially so, with 33% of girls reporting that they did not want to attend school because of the harassment, 28% finding it difficult to pay attention in class because of the harassment, and 17% having given up sports or other school activities to avoid harassment. These disturbing educational consequences for female students are also reported in other studies on peer sexual harassment in schools in the United States, Great Britain, and Canada (Halson, 1989; Larkin, 1994; Linn, Stein, Young, & Davis, 1992; OSSTF, 1994; Stein, Marshall, & Tropp, 1993). Fear is a common reaction to even minor peer sexual harassment because young women are aware that the possibility of escalation to more serious sexual offenses always exists (Halson, 1989; Larkin, 1994). A recent Canadian study investigated the mental health consequences of sexual harassment for early adolescents. McMaster, Connolly, Pepler, and Craig (1998) found that youth who experienced sexual harassment from peers were more likely to suffer clinically significant levels of internalizing and externalizing mental health symptoms.
Sexual harassment experiences in adolescence may also be contributing to sexual and physical abuse in later years. Several feminist theorists and researchers have argued that unchecked sexual harassment in adolescence may create a behavior pattern of male dominance and female submissiveness that may continue into later years, leading to physical and sexual abuse in dating and marital relationships (Fineran & Bennett, 1999; Jones, 1985; Stein, 1993; Strauss, 1992).

In addition to individual consequences of adolescent peer sexual harassment, there are consequences that affect entire schools and universities. After observing the effects of sexual harassment in schools, Stein (1993) concluded that “the school environment becomes poisoned for everyone – innocent witnesses and bystanders alike – in addition to the intended subject/victim of the sexual harassment” (p. 314). Another result of peer sexual harassment for educational institutions as a whole stems from the threat of law suits for schools which do not attempt to prevent sexual harassment and/or actively respond to its occurrence. In 1999, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in Davis v. Monroe County Board of Education that schools, colleges, and universities can be held legally and financially accountable for unchecked peer sexual harassment.

Researchers are beginning to present a picture of the severity and scope of peer sexual harassment among younger and older adolescents; however, almost all studies to date have focused on the problem from the perspective of the victim of sexual harassment, with little attention given to the perpetrator. As a result, we know very little about what motivates adolescents to sexually harass their peers. This lack of research limits our theoretical understanding of the sexual harassment process. It also may restrict the effectiveness of any sexual harassment prevention programs that schools or universities develop (Jackson & Salisbury, 1996). We do not know enough about what motivates harassers in order to create effective prevention programs aimed at stopping harassment before it occurs.
Evidence from the few studies on adolescent and adult sexual harassment perpetrators suggests that a number of factors may be involved, including institutional environment, peer encouragement, prior victimization, misunderstandings about the victim's response to the harassment, a sex/dominance linking in some men, hostility toward the opposite sex, a lack of empathy for victims, and acceptance of stereotypic beliefs about gender roles (AAUW, 1993; Fineman & Bennett, 1999; Fitzgerald & Weitzman, 1990; Lee, Croninger, Linn, & Chen, 1996; Pryor, 1987; Pryor, La Vite, & Stoller, 1993; Roscoe, Strouse, & Goodwin, 1994). This latter factor – stereotypic attitudes and beliefs about gender roles – is given strong theoretical support by feminist theorists and investigators who have influenced and led the research of sexual harassment. Feminist theory posits sexual harassment as one point on a continuum of violence against women, a continuum supported by the tenets and practices of traditional masculinity, by the structures of male dominance in society, and by the devaluation of women (e.g., Burt, 1980; Hyde, 1996; Linn et al, 1992; Jones, 1985; Russell, 1984). Several feminist researchers and theorists argue that stereotypic masculinity, with its accompanying misogyny, restricted emotionality, retarded development of empathy, and tendency to dominate in relationships is causally connected to sexual harassment (Beneke, 1997; Kaufman, 1993; Russell, 1984; Thomas, 1997).

Support for the feminist position that stereotypic masculinity is involved in problem male behaviors comes from clinical evidence and research studies on sexual assault, crime, and bullying (Koss, Leonard, Beezley, & Oros, 1985; Lisak, Hopper, & Song, 1996; Miedzian, 1991; Muehlenhard & Falcon, 1990; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987; Pleck et al., 1994; M. B. Strauss, 1994). However, although the conceptual links between stereotypic masculinity and sexual harassment have been clearly stated, only three empirical studies have explored these links, and two of them focused only on the more severe type of sexual harassment, the quid pro quo type in
which a person in a position of power coerces a subordinate into engaging in unwanted sex (Pryor, 1987; Pryor et al. 1993).

The literature base on educational interventions directed toward stopping and preventing sexual harassment and sexual assault is quite small. Most interventions in the research literature have described and/or evaluated acquaintance rape prevention workshops on university campuses. Most of these interventions have been aimed at changing participants' erroneous beliefs about sexual assault (Lonsway, 1996; Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994). The few articles and books that have addressed educational interventions for sexual harassment in educational settings have targeted student attitudes and beliefs about sexual harassment, without involving the students in activities aimed at challenging traditional gender roles (e.g., Higginson, 1993; Strauss, 1992). Two school-based interventions aimed at involving adolescent male students in deconstructing traditional masculinity have been described in the literature (Landis-Schiff, 1996; Novogrodsky, Kaufman, Holland, & Wells, 1992), but the theoretical rationale behind the interventions has not yet been empirically tested.

Sexual harassment research has been criticized for methodological weaknesses, especially in the lack of attention paid to the development and use of valid and reliable instruments and comprehensive definitions of the construct (Arvey & Cavanaugh, 1995; Fitzgerald, 1990; Fitzgerald, Swan & Magley, 1997; O'Donohue, Downs, & Yeater, 1998). A thorough look at the results of investigations of sexual harassment among adolescents indicates that the range of sexual harassment experiences is wide and multidimensional; however, most survey-type studies in schools, universities, and the workplace have under sampled from some domains, with gender harassment items being noticeably missing from many (Fitzgerald, 1990). Therefore, an exploration of the relationship between stereotypic masculinity and a broad range of sexual harassment behaviors is needed using a valid and reliable instrument. Also needed is a
comparison between the identified factors (i.e., stereotypic masculinity, peer encouragement, acceptance of sexual harassment, hypersexual socialization, previous victimization, attraction to power) to determine which are most important for harassers.

Most of the research in the area of sexual harassment has been aimed at documenting incidence and prevalence rates, investigating how participants define sexual harassment, and the experiences of victims (O’Donohue et al., 1998). In addition, most research to date has been directed at female victims of male harassment. This is understandable, given that most studies show that women experience sexual harassment in greater numbers than men in school, university, and work place settings, and that the effects on female victims seem to be more severe (AAUW, 1993; Fineran & Bennett, 1999; Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Malovich & Stake, 1990; McMaster et al., 1998; Roscoe et al., 1994; Koss et al., 1994). However, sexual harassment research has been criticized for assuming a male perpetrator and female victim model (Vaux, 1993), and recent research suggests that men can also be victims and that women can also be perpetrators (Fineran & Bennett, 1999; Lee et al., 1996; Mazer & Percival, 1989; McMaster et al., 1998; Murrell & Dietz-Uhler, 1993; Roscoe et al., 1994). Some of the same research has documented large amounts of same-gender harassment as well. As a result, possible motivating factors for both cross-gender and same-gender harassment perpetrators needs to be explored.

It is now known that sexual harassment is experienced by large numbers of students throughout secondary school years (AAUW, 1993; Fineran & Bennett, 1999; McMaster et al., 1998; OSSTF, 1994), but very little is known about developmental trends in sexual harassment perpetration. Recently, an effort aimed at documenting the developmental trajectories of students exhibiting harassing behaviors over the periods of early and middle adolescence was begun (McMaster et al., 2000). Much more research is needed in order to understand sexual harassment perpetration at all levels of adolescent development, including peer sexual harassment in late
adolescence. Few studies have examined the amounts and types of peer sexual harassment experienced by older adolescents in university settings, and even fewer have attempted to understand motivations for perpetration.

**Summary of Research Problem**

The field of sexual harassment research is still relatively new, especially in educational settings. Data exist that suggest that sexual harassment among adolescents is a widespread and pernicious problem, and that large numbers of male and female adolescents are both victims and perpetrators. However, most research has only tried to understand sexual harassment from the viewpoint of female victims, and no peer sexual harassment perpetration surveys of university students have been reported in the literature. Very few research efforts have been aimed at uncovering the motivations of harassers of any age. Although theoreticians and researchers operating out of a feminist framework have argued that one of the key causes of sexual harassment is adherence by some men to traditional beliefs about masculinity, the relationship between sexual harassment among adolescents and stereotypic masculinity has not been tested in a full and empirical way.

**Research Purpose**

This study was designed to identify correlates of sexual harassment among older adolescents in university in order to increase our understanding of the causes of peer harassment. The results should facilitate the development of effective intervention and prevention programs in schools and universities. The potential correlates of sexual harassment were selected from literature dealing with sexual harassment, sexual assault, and other problematic male behaviors. The suspected links between these factors and sexual harassment among adolescent male students have not yet been established through empirical means. Although the study was primarily aimed at young men who harass young women, it also searched for correlates for same-
gender harassers. Much of the sexual harassment literature has adopted a feminist perspective, and the present study can also be seen as a way of contributing to, and clarifying, feminist theory. Specifically, this study gathered empirical data to explore the theoretical link between stereotypic masculinity and sexual harassment among older male adolescents.

Significance of the Study

This study is important because it (1) further explores and clarifies the theoretical underpinnings of sexual harassment; (2) provides needed data on male harassment of female students, and also provides data on male harassment of other male students; (3) fills in a gap in the knowledge base about the amounts and types of peer sexual harassment being perpetrated among young people between the ages of 18 and 21; and, most importantly, (4) provides educators with critical information needed for program planning for sexual harassment prevention.

The study focused on variables related to sexual harassment that have the most utility as targets for practical, effective school-based interventions. Although prevention efforts in educational settings often only target attitudes about sexual harassment and victim empathy (e.g., O’Donohue, 1995), some feminist educators and researchers advocate more in-depth programs that challenge beliefs and attitudes about gender roles (e.g., Koss et al., 1994; Landis-Schiff, 1996; Novogrodsky, Kaufman, Holland, & Wells, 1992). Thus, this study was also a test of the feminist argument that traditional gender socialization patterns and relationships underlie sexual harassment. The study used a valid and reliable instrument designed to sample broadly from the entire range of sexual harassment behaviors experienced by adolescents.
CHAPTER TWO – REVIEW OF BACKGROUND LITERATURE

Introduction

This study was aimed at investigating peer sexual harassment among older adolescents. For the purposes of this study, late adolescence was defined as beginning at age 18 and ending at age 21. This literature review takes as its primary source of material the literature dealing with sexual harassment among adolescents in secondary school and university settings. However, the literature base in this area is minimal, so relevant aspects of the literature dealing with sexual harassment among adults in the workplace are also included. In addition, because of the conceptual similarity between sexual harassment and sexual assault, relevant sexual assault literature is also covered.

The purpose of the literature review is threefold: (a) to examine sexual harassment behaviors and definitions identified in the research literature and law to ensure that the conceptualization and operational definition of adolescent sexual harassment used in the present research is valid, (b) to describe the current state of the field of sexual harassment research, and (c) to assemble a list of factors that are likely to be associated with peer sexual harassment among adolescents.

I will argue that a broad definition of sexual harassment is required for research purposes, one that encompasses the full range of harassment experienced by adolescents. In particular, I will argue for a definition of sexual harassment that includes gender harassment – the common, everyday, gender-related put downs of male and female students – that has been overlooked by some researchers.
Definitions of Sexual Harassment

Early attention to sexual harassment focused on the most pernicious workplace kinds in which male employers, supervisors, and professors coerced women in subordinate positions into submitting to unwanted sexual acts. The type of sexual harassment in these hierarchies was incorporated into a feminist framework that critiqued the structural inequalities between men and women. Feminist theorists, such as MacKinnon (1979), described sexual harassment as one facet of the overall subjugation of women in a patriarchal culture. Sexual harassment was not about sex; it was an abuse of “hierarchical economic (or institutional) authority, not sexuality” (MacKinnon, p. 218).

Some feminist theorists have focused on the overall effect of sexual harassment on women. Superson (1993) offers a conceptualization of sexual harassment that is based on the group harm that women suffer from harassment. What matters is the effect of all the individual acts of harassment upon women as a group. Superson argues that women cannot harass men because “when a woman engages in apparently ‘harassive’ behavior, the social impact and underlying message implicit in male-to-female harassment are missing” (p. 55). Because men are not a disadvantaged class, “women cannot harm men as a group for it is impossible to send the message that one dominates (and so causes group harm if one does not dominate)” (p. 55).

Fitzgerald et al. (1997) accept that harassment of men does occur, but they argue that “sexual attention directed by a woman toward a man – even when unwanted – generally does not carry the same meaning as the reverse, given women’s lesser organizational, social, and physical power” (p. 24). Support for their assertion is found in studies in which both adolescent and adult men tend to report experiencing far less personal distress due to harassment from the opposite sex than do women (e.g., AAUW, 1993).
The notion of power or status is central to most feminist conceptualizations of harassment. As McKinney and Maroules (1991) put it, “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” (p. 35). McKinney and Maroules acknowledge that sexual harassment can occur even when status differences between perpetrator and victim are not apparent, such as the harassment that occurs between co-workers of the same rank. Other feminist theoreticians have tended to focus their analyses of sexual harassment on sex role patterns involving subtle male and female perceptions and communication patterns. Hotelling and Zuber (1997) agree that sexual harassment is a symptom of the unequal distributions of power in society, but they also assert that harassment stems from the dysfunctional communication patterns that men and women practice because of sex role socialization patterning. As they put it, “from a feminist perspective, sexual harassment both emanates from and reinforces the traditional sex roles of men and women” (Hotelling & Zuber, 1997, p. 103).

There is no single feminist definition of sexual harassment, and multiple definitions of sexual harassment exist in the research literature, courts, workplace, and educational institutions. The result is that there is no universally held consensus among academics or governmental bodies as to the exact meaning of sexual harassment. In general, though, sexual harassment is seen to consist of unwanted sexual behavior or hostile gender-related behavior. Perhaps the simplest (albeit broad) definition is offered by Strauss (1992) who says that “today it is generally accepted that any type of unwelcome conduct directed toward and employee or student because of his or her gender may constitute sexual harassment” (p. 5). Almost all definitions have a subjective component built in; that is, the recipient is the one who decides whether or not the behavior was unwanted.
The present analysis of sexual harassment begins by looking in the literature for legal definitions in order to inform our search for clarity on the construct. Following that, behaviors that have been identified by participants in empirical studies are examined.

**Legal Definitions**

Sexual harassment that results in decreased educational opportunities for female students is discrimination based on sex, and as such is prohibited by federal laws in both the United States (Title IX of the *Civil Rights Act*) and Canada (Section 15 of *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*). The number of court cases involving harassment in schools is growing rapidly, especially in the United States (for reviews, see Karpenko, 1997; Kopels & Dupper, 1999; and Watkinson, 1995). Court rulings in sexual harassment cases can have serious implications for educational institutions, and because of this, legal definitions and rulings offer a sort of “bottom line” interpretation of sexual harassment where schools and other institutions are concerned (Arvey & Cavanaugh, 1995). Although legal definitions of sexual harassment have been criticized for being overly narrow (O’Donohue et al., 1998), they can be useful in informing efforts aimed at developing conceptual and operational definitions of harassment.

In both Canada and the United States there has been a trend over time from a narrow focus on sexual extortion as a condition of employment — “quid pro quo” harassment — to a broader understanding that includes any sexual or gender-related behaviors that create a “hostile environment” (Koss et al., 1994). Wise and Stanley (1987) call these two types of sexual harassment “sledgehammer” harassment (the extreme cases of abuse of power involving sexual coercion) and “dripping tap” harassment (the everyday comments, looks, and taunts that are so common as to have become normalized). Statistics on court cases indicate that quid pro quo (or sledgehammer) harassment is far less common than hostile environment harassment, with only
five percent of sexual harassment legal cases being of the quid pro quo type (Thomas & Kitzinger, 1997).

The trend toward a broadening interpretation is apparent in the major law covering sexual harassment in the workplace in the United States, the well-known guidelines of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). The original 1980 guidelines defined sexual harassment as “unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature.” These guidelines were updated in 1993 when the EEOC issued a supplement clarifying that sexual harassment is not limited to sex-related behaviors but also includes gender-related behaviors. The EEOC update states that sexual harassment includes “verbal or physical conduct that denigrates or shows hostility or aversion” because of someone’s gender, and that these behaviors can include “epithets, slurs, negative stereotyping . . . that relate to gender” (p. 51269). Many researchers now refer to this type of harassment as gender harassment.

A federal law specifically forbidding sexual harassment in the schools was promulgated in the United States in Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972, and Supreme Court decisions have confirmed that peer sexual harassment in school settings is outlawed by Title IX (Karpenko, 1997). Canadian law also governs sexual harassment in educational institutions, with both federal and provincial Human Rights Acts having jurisdiction (Watkinson, 1995). The Canadian Human Rights Commission, in charge of enforcing the Canadian Human Rights Act, states that sexual harassment is a form of discrimination based on sex, and that harassment consists of “any unwelcome physical, visual, or verbal conduct” including “any behavior that insults or intimidates” (1991, p. 1). Canadian court decisions have indicated that sexual harassment can consist of sexist remarks and negative comments about a woman’s body. For example, in *Bell v. Ladas* (1980) an Ontario court ruled that sexual harassment includes “subtle
conduct such as gender based insult and taunting.” The legal definition of sexual harassment in the United States was recently broadened to include harassment by a member of the same sex in a Supreme Court decision in *Oncale v. Sundowner Offshore Service, Inc.*, 1998 (as cited in DuBois, Knapp, Faley, & Kustis, 1998).

Legal rulings such as these in the United States and Canada have also had an impact on institutional harassment policies. Universities, hospitals, and other institutions are increasingly including gender harassment in their definitions of sexual harassment. For example, the University of New Brunswick’s (1997) information pamphlet for students and staff asserts that sexual harassment “can also include sexist remarks or verbal abuse directed towards a person or a gender.” Another example of an inclusive definition of sexual harassment in an institutional context is found in the harassment policy of the British Columbia Children’s Hospital (1995) which lists “gender-based insults or sexist remarks” as examples of sexual harassment.

*Summary of legal definitions.* To summarize, a broad range of behaviors are included under American and Canadian legal definitions of sexual harassment, ranging from gender-based harassment to sexual assault. Same-gender harassment is also increasingly recognized as a type of sexual harassment in judicial rulings. The broadened legal definitions have had an impact in academia and in the workplace, where policies on sexual harassment now routinely include gender harassment. These legal definitions can be viewed as a “bottom line”; that is, operationalized definitions for research purposes should be at least as broad (Arvey & Cavanaugh, 1995).
Behaviors and Domains Generated by Qualitative Research with Adolescents

One way of gathering exploratory information about a construct is to elicit relevant information from those who have experience with the construct, and then to analyze the results for categories or domains, a process that Crocker and Algina (1986) call content analysis. Several research studies (e.g., Cairns, 1994; Halson, 1989; Jones, 1985; Larkin, 1994; Shakeshaft et al., 1995; Strauss, 1988) in recent years have queried adolescent victims about their experiences with sexual harassment and reported their findings.

It is often difficult for participants in studies to know which behaviors to call sexual harassment. Young women may not label offensive male behaviors as sexual harassment because they are so used to seeing males act in these ways; they seem like just “normal” male behavior (Halson, 1989; Herbert, 1989). As Larkin (1994) observes, it can be difficult “disentangling harassing incidents from what have come to be accepted as typical male-female interactions” (p. 264).

Although some feminist and pro-feminist researchers have begun including boys and men in their studies, Larkin (1994), like many researchers coming from a feminist framework, studied only female students. Although approximately 60 female students, ages 16 and up, from four Canadian high schools participated in her research in some fashion (mostly in discussion groups), Larkin derived her examples of sexual harassment from statements made in interviews with 25 students. Qualitative studies are designed to explore an issue in depth; therefore, generalizability of findings is not usually a goal. Although Larkin makes no explicit claims about the generalizability of her results, she does state that the participating students represented “a variety of racial, cultural and economic populations,” and that the schools were located in “urban, rural, and small-town settings” (p. 265). These descriptions of her participants and their schools suggest that the participants are at least somewhat representative of the Canadian school
population. In addition, Larkin's Canadian descriptions of sexual harassment are very similar to those reported by American and British researchers, suggesting that the described sexual harassment experiences are generalizable across borders of Western countries.

Larkin's (1994) content analysis generated three categories of sexual harassment: verbal, physical, visual. Although Larkin was able to code all reported incidents into one of the three categories, she points out that a variety of behaviors typically occurred simultaneously. In the verbal category, Larkin includes sexual propositions, put downs (such as "bimbo" and "bitch"), comments about body parts, rating of females ("Not bad, I'll give her an 8 out of 10"), sexual joking, telling stories about females that could damage their reputations, and threats of rape. Within this category Larkin also includes sexist comments (such as "women can't play basketball" and "women should be barefoot and pregnant") and sexist names (such as "chick" and "baby"). Larkin decries these sexist comments because they convey negative messages about women. Physical harassment, the second category, includes grabbing, touching, rubbing, being followed around school, nonsexual physical assaults (such as pushing, pinching, kicking, slapping, choking), and rape. Visual harassment, Larkin's third category, includes leering, sexual gesturing (such as pretending to masturbate), pornography, and sexually explicit graffiti. Larkin's visual category seems to cover offensive actions that can be seen, but not necessarily heard.

Larkin (1994) has collected useful descriptions of the sexual harassment the high school females in her study face, and she presents an intelligent feminist perspective. Unfortunately though, her three categories are not very helpful in analyzing and defining the dimensions of the construct, although the wide variety of examples of sexual harassment she found does inform us that the researcher must be aware that sexual harassment can take a variety of forms. Especially noteworthy are the sexist – rather than sexual – remarks, which were also found in other qualitative studies.
Halson (1989) studied 14-year-old British “working and lower-middle-class” female secondary students. Halson does not relate how the participants in her study were selected. Halson discovered behaviors similar to Larkin, but she categorized them slightly differently, placing all behaviors within only two categories. Halson’s *physical* category includes most of the same physical behaviors as Larkin (1994), but she excluded following someone around school and standing too close for comfort. Halson situated these two physical behaviors in her other category, a broad category that she labels *verbal/psychological*. Halson’s *verbal/psychological* category combines the behaviors described in Larkin’s verbal and visual categories. While Halson offers good description of sexually harassing behaviors, her two categories are too broad to be helpful in a comprehensive analysis of the construct. Halson’s study is similar to another study describing the male sexual harassment occurring in one British secondary school. Jones’ (1985) study also offers good description and a feminist analysis, but because the behaviors it reports overlap with those described in the other studies, it does not add anything original to the present undertaking. However, the Jones study does provide confirmation of the findings in the other studies in yet one more school setting.

Unlike the other studies, Shakeshaft et al. (1995) did include boys in their large-scale naturalistic study of peer harassment in eight middle and high schools. By observing and interviewing nearly 1,000 students over a period of 10 months, the study authors were able to discern patterns in harassment. They found that most students – male and female – were victims of peer harassment, and that consequently, school was a “harassing and unkind place for most students” (Shakeshaft et al., 1995, p. 35). Verbal harassment was the type most often experienced, and most comments had to do with the degree to which the girls and boys conformed to gender stereotypes. Thus, girls were called sluts, whores, and bitches, and boys were called faggots and queers. According to Shakeshaft et al., girls were most often harassed
because of how they looked, and boys were most often harassed for how they acted. Three types of students were observed to be harassed most frequently: girls who were physically unattractive or who did not dress in a stylish manner; girls who were physically more developed, and boys who did not fit the stereotypic masculine image. For example, boys who were not coordinated in sports were often verbally attacked with homophobic putdowns, as described by one middle school boy: "Yesterday in gym we played soccer. Whenever someone didn’t play well, they called them a faggot. The person being made fun of looked like he was about to cry" (p. 39).

**Behaviors and Domains Used in Quantitative Research with Secondary School Students**

Quantitative studies of adolescent experiences of sexual harassment can also inform our attempt to understand and define the construct. Very few studies have looked at peer sexual harassment at the high school or university levels, and most have been victimization studies aimed at discovering incidence and prevalence estimates. The victimization studies are useful to examine because they can help illuminate the types and amounts of harassment adolescents experience. But the few perpetration studies that exist are probably the studies that can tell us the most about perpetrator characteristics.

**Female-Only Studies**

It appears that the first survey of peer sexual harassment in secondary education was conducted by the Massachusetts Department of Education in 1980-1981 (as reported in Bogart et al., 1992). This study found that the majority of harassment experienced by students came from other students.¹

Strauss (1988) reported on survey data and discussion information gathered from a

---

¹ The study also found that both sexes experienced peer sexual harassment, but that females experienced more harassment, especially the more severe types.
sample of 133 female high school students, ages 16 to 18. At the time of the study, these students were attending a vocational center that drew its students from both urban and rural, but mostly middle class, areas. Unfortunately, Strauss does not explain how the students were selected for the study. The sample originally included an equal number of male students, but only one of the 130 male students reported that he had experienced sexual harassment, so males subjects were dropped from further data analyses. Given the much higher number of male students in other high school studies who have identified themselves as recipients of sexual harassment behaviors, (AAUW, 1993; Finernan & Bennet, 1999; McMaster et al., 1998; Roscoe et al., 1994), Strauss' methodology when collecting data from male participants is suspect. Unfortunately, Strauss does not report details of her data gathering techniques. Nor does she give an explanation for how the items were developed. Strauss does describe numerous examples of the behaviors that the participants in her study considered sexual harassment. These behaviors were categorized by Strauss into six types, and the percentages of students reporting each type are shown in Table 1.2

In 1992, Seventeen Magazine reported the results of a nation-wide survey on sexual harassment that was sponsored by the Center for Research on Women at Wellesley College and the National Organization for Women Legal Defense and Education Fund (Stein et al., 1993). Over 4,200 female readers of the magazine ranging in ages 9 to 19 years responded to the survey. The respondents were disproportionately Caucasian (89%), which likely reflected the readership of the magazine. The girls who responded were from all geographical regions of the United States, and 90% of them attended public schools. A sub-sample of 2,002 was randomly drawn, although the reason for doing so was not stated. The goal may have been to make the

2 In discussing peer sexual harassment among teens in a later book, Strauss and Espeland (1992) indicated that they believed that males can indeed be victims of sexual harassment. They also provided some detail for the remarks category from their survey, indicating that it includes the sexist name calling, gender put-downs, and sexual rating-type comments that were described by Larkin (1994).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females %</th>
<th>Males %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strauss (1988)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staring</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touch</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestures</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propositions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roscoe, Strouse, and Goodwin (1994)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual comments</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical contact</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone calls</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters/Notes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure for dates</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual advances</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (responses to open ended question)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seventeen Magazine Survey (Stein et al. 1993)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touched, pinched or grabbed</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaned over or cornered</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given sexual notes or pictures</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received suggestive or sexual gestures, looks, comments, or jokes</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressured to do something sexual</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced to do something sexual</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (written responses)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AAUW (1993)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual comments, jokes, gestures, or looks</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touched, grabbed, or pinched in a sexual way</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentionally brushed up against in a sexual way</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had sexual messages/graffiti written about them on bathroom walls, in locker rooms, etc.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flashed or mooned.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had sexual rumors spread about them.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had clothing pulled at in a sexual way.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shown, given, or left sexual pictures, photographs, illustrations, messages, or notes.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had their way blocked in a sexual way.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced to kiss someone.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called gay or lesbian.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had clothing pulled off or down.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced to do something sexual other than kissing.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spied on while dressing or showering.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *N = 133   †N = 2002    ‡N = 561    ††N = 1632
research results more generalizable; however, a random sub-sample of a self-selected initial sample should not necessarily result in greater generalizability. One can assume that the readership of *Seventeen Magazine* is well over the 4,200 responses received; therefore, the response rate cannot be known without first learning the readership of the magazine. Low response rates characterize many sexual harassment studies, jeopardizing the generalizability of their results (Gillespie & Leffler, 1987). For example, Trigg and Wittenstrom (1996) approached 30 New Jersey secondary schools in their study of sexual harassment, but only nine schools agreed to participate, for a response rate of 30%.

The basic sexual harassment items in the *Seventeen Magazine* survey (Stein et al., 1993) and the percentages of respondents endorsing each are presented in Table 1. The survey asked the following question: “Did anyone do any of the following to you when you didn’t want them to in the last school year?”

The survey included an open-ended “other” item which allowed the respondents to identify types of sexual harassment not specified by the researchers. Unfortunately, the researchers do not state whether the responses to the “other” item resulted in any new categories of sexual harassment. Two of the items have ambiguous word choices. The items ask about being “pressured” or “forced” to do something sexual. The word “pressured” presumably means verbal pressure, but it does not specify this; and the word “force” may connote only physical force to some readers.

Stein and colleagues (1993) do not give a rationale for their item selection for their survey, nor do they describe the item selection process, except to say that experts in the field were involved. Nonetheless, the fact that over 4,000 female students found these items meaningful enough to respond to does suggest something about face validity. Moreover, the almost complete overlap between these items and the behaviors described in the previous studies
lends support to the contention that these items are valid examples of sexual harassment in the schools.

**Mixed-Gender Studies**

None of the studies described so far examined male experiences of sexual harassment. In Strauss' (1988) study, only one male could be found who had been or was willing to admit that he was sexually harassed. Roscoe et al. (1994) included males in their survey of students attending a mostly Caucasian intermediate school in the American upper Midwest. A total of 281 females and 280 males with an age range of 11 to 16 years, and a mean age of 13, were asked about their experiences with peer sexual harassment. Fifty percent of females and 37 percent of males reported being victimized by sexual harassment from other students.

Roscoe et al. (1994) indicated that they developed their survey after reviewing studies of university students. No other comments about construct validity or reliability were offered. The actual items were not presented in the journal article, but the behaviors sampled were described as including sexual comments, teasing, sexual gossip/rumors, phone calls, pressure for dates, touching, rubbing, pinching, grabbing, pushing, sexual advances, pressure for sexual activity, sexual assault. These behaviors were broken down into six broader categories for the purposes of data analysis. These six categories and the percentages of males and females endorsing them are also presented in Table 1.

The *Hostile Hallways* study (AAUW, 1993), commissioned by the American Association of University Women and conducted by Louis Harris and Associates, was a nation-wide survey of 1,632 students in grades 8 through 11 from 79 public schools. Of importance, the AAUW survey asked students of both sexes about their experiences with sexual harassment. Schools and classes within schools were randomly selected, and the researchers followed a two-stage sampling design that resulted in a well stratified final sample. These procedures helped to insure
that the results are generalizable to the entire United States. Although the AAUW researchers did not reveal the response rate from the schools or teachers, this study provides the best estimate of the prevalence of sexual harassment among American adolescents.

The AAUW (1993) study used the following definition of sexual harassment in their survey: “Sexual harassment is unwanted and unwelcome sexual behavior which interferes with your life. Sexual harassment is not behaviors that you like or want (for example: wanted kissing, touching, or flirting).” The authors conceptualized sexual harassment as existing in two dimensions: physical and non-physical, and seven items of each type were used in the survey. The report on the study says only that the items were written by a team of “experts in the field who ... worked with the AAUW Educational Foundation and Harris/Scholastic” (AAUW, 1993, p. 6). Other information about validity, reliability, item specifications, or selection procedures has not been published.

The AAUW (1993) survey was fairly comprehensive, asking about numbers and types of experiences of sexual harassment, where the harassment occurred, who the perpetrators were, the grade level in which it was first experienced, how students responded to the situation, who they told, and how students felt about their experiences. Importantly, this study also asked whether the students had ever committed sexual harassment themselves, and, if they had, why they thought they had done it.

Overall, 85% of girls and 76% of boys said that they had received unwanted sexual attention from other students. The victimization item endorsed by the most students (62%) was one asking if they had experienced “sexual comments, jokes, gestures or looks.” The item endorsed by the least number of students was one asking if they had been “forced to do something sexual other than kissing” (11%). The AAUW (1993) survey items and the percentages of male and female respondents endorsing each one are also presented in Table 1.
Five subsequent studies have used slightly modified versions of the AAUW (1993) harassment instrument to further explore sexual harassment in secondary settings in the United States and Canada (Fineran & Bennett, 1995; McMaster et al., 2000; OSSTF, 1994; PCSW, 1995; Trigg & Wittenstrom, 1996). In general, the victimization rates in these other studies parallel the findings in the AAUW study, with high rates of both males and females reporting at least one sexual harassment experience. For example, 87% of females and 79% of males had experienced peer sexual harassment in a study looking at harassment in a large, urban high school located in the American Midwest (Fineran & Bennett, 1999). The Ontario-based OSSTF (1994) study found somewhat smaller percentages, with 83% of females and 50% of males reporting harassment in a school setting.

**Behaviors and Domains Used in Quantitative Research with University Students**

If the literature on peer harassment in secondary schools is limited; the literature on peer harassment at the post-secondary level is even smaller. Peer sexual harassment among university students was first noted as a problem in the 1980's, although early studies focused exclusively on females (e.g., Cammaert, 1985; Hughes & Sandler, 1988).

Although a number of researchers have undertaken investigations into sexual harassment of students by faculty, very few studies have methodically investigated the prevalence and scope of peer harassment. The first report in the literature of a formal study of sexual harassment in a university setting that included peer harassment was a Canadian study at the University of Calgary (Cammaert, 1985). Only females were surveyed, and the results showed that 44% of female undergraduate students had received sexual harassment from staff and other students. The majority of the harassment (53%) came from male students. The author of the study categorized the harassment behaviors as verbal, nonverbal, and physical, but does not give any information about the process of identifying these domains. The actual items used in the questionnaire and the
percentages of students reporting the behaviors are also not included in the research write-up. Cammaert does report that “verbal harassment (e.g., joking, vulgar comments) and nonverbal harassment (e.g., catcall, leers, and whistles)” were the most common types of harassment experienced by students (p. 394).

In another Canadian study, Mazer and Percival (1989) asked students at the University of Prince Edward Island about harassment experienced from university staff, instructors, and classmates. The majority of harassment reported by the students came from peers, with 73% of students reporting harassment from peers and 25% reporting harassment from faculty. Students were asked about harassment experienced at any time during their years at university. Unlike the present study which included only students 21 and younger, Mazer and Percival’s sample included students older than 21, although half of their sample consisted of younger, first- and second-year students. The percentages of students experiencing the harassment behaviors included in the PEI study are presented in Table 2. Sexually suggestive looks/gestures and sexual teasing, jokes, comments, and questions were the items reported by the highest numbers of both male and female students. More than half of the male students also reported experiencing unwanted pressure to engage in social activities with female students. This study, like many other sexual harassment studies, had a low response rate (36%), which should generate some degree of caution about the generalizability of the results.

An American study at a Philadelphia university (Bremer, Moore, & Bildersee, 1991) also found that verbal behaviors such as sexually suggestive language and sexual jokes were the most commonly experienced. And, as in the other studies, the majority of the harassment students experienced came from peers rather than from instructors, staff, or professors. Unlike some of the other studies, Bremer et al. do provide some details about the construction of their questionnaire. The researchers gathered a list of 66 behaviors from the literature that was
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Survey Items and Percentages Endorsed by Participants</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mazer &amp; Percival, 1989 (N = 210)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually suggestive looks or gestures.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual teasing, jokes, comments, or questions.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberate touching or physical closeness.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure for social contact, e.g., coffee, drinks, dates.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts to kiss or fondle.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure for sexual activities.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure for sex with implied negative consequences (e.g., rumors about reputation, physical harm) if doesn't participate.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in sexual activities because of fear of reprisal or due to psychological or physical pressure or threat.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arm around your shoulder.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shepela &amp; Levesque, 1998 (N = 369)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive, sexually suggestive stories, jokes or humor.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing, shoving or physical intimidation by opposite sex.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate body language such as staring, leering or sexual advances.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive, seductive remarks, including attempts to establish a sexual relationship despite discouragement.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Requests for sexual favors with hint of consequences.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate sexual remarks including discussion of personal or sexual matters.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>&quot;Accidental&quot; brushing or bumping in sensitive areas (e.g., breast).</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted sexually explicit phone calls or notes.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Forced kissing and/or touching.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted or inappropriate physical or sexual contact.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Forced sexual activity.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced sexual intercourse.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
narrowed down to the 16 behaviors that were included on the survey. The final item selection was done through pretesting with students who were asked to indicate whether or not the items were examples of sexual harassment. This selection procedure can be praised for letting members of the research target population decide on the relevancy of the behaviors. However, the procedure raises serious validity questions. Other studies have found that students can identify quid pro quo behaviors as sexual harassment, but have great difficulty recognizing non-sexually coercive behaviors as forms of sexual harassment (Fitzgerald & Hesson-McInnis, 1989; Loredo, Reid, & Deaux, 1995; Powell, 1986; Padgitt & Padgitt, 1986; Shepela & Levesque, 1998).

Ironically, even within Bremer et al.'s. own study, students had difficulty labeling many behaviors as sexual harassment. Students were given a list of situations and asked to rate the degree of severity of sexual harassment, and 34% of the students did not recognize "repeated requests for a date from a person you don’t care for, but have consistently refused to go out with" as a form of sexual harassment.

A unique study was conducted by Ivy and Hamlet (1996) with a large ($N = 824$) sample of undergraduates at an American university. Ivy and Hamlet's questionnaire defined peer sexual harassment with the following:

Don’t limit your thinking about harassment to overt instances, such as someone trying to secure a date with a classmate by threatening to spread rumors across campus about him/her. This is clearly an example of peer sexual harassment, but the range of harassing behaviors is more extensive than this. Any behavior that a target/victim deems unwelcome and inappropriate may constitute harassment - including excessive compliments about personal appearance and dress; sexual jokes, questions, comments, and innuendo; invasions of personal space; and inappropriate touch (p. 153).

Thus, Ivy and Hamlet allowed their participants to define sexual harassment for themselves. This method can be praised for allowing the victims of harassment to decide, rather than making a
priori researcher judgments about what constitutes harassment. However, only self-identified harassment victims were allowed to participate beyond the first page of the questionnaire. Recipients were first asked if they had ever “been a target/victim of peer sexual harassment,” and only those who responded affirmatively were asked to describe their harassment experiences. By not asking all participants to indicate whether or not they had experienced specific harassment behaviors, the study most likely resulted in an underestimate of the numbers of students who have been harassed by peers. Participant confusion over which incidents to report may be responsible for the extremely low percentage (1%) of same-sex harassment found in this study. Considerable evidence exists to indicate that the majority of people have difficulty knowing what is and what is not harassment. This confusion among students was also noted by Ivy and Hamlet in a follow-up study that explored student perceptions of harassing behaviors.

The participants in Ivy and Hamlet’s (1996) study ranged in age from 18 to 31, with a mean of 21 years. Thus, approximately half of their sample does not fall within the age range of interest to this study. The behaviors reported by the students were categorized as verbal or nonverbal. Verbal harassment was most common, and the nonverbal harassment usually included verbal communication as well. The behaviors reported in this study mirror those described in other studies. The most common types of harassment reported by female students were sexual comments and comments about body parts or physical appearance. Male students reported the same two types as the most common, but in the reverse order.

Another study of sexual harassment among university students was carried out by Shepela and Levesque (1998). The researchers first conducted a qualitative study to find out the types of harassment experienced by students; they then constructed a survey to gather quantitative data about those behaviors. The items were selected from Fitzgerald et al.’s (1988) Sexual Experiences Questionnaire which was designed originally to measure workplace sexual
harassment. The items selected represent the first two of the three sexual harassment categories recognized by Fitzgerald and her colleagues: *gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention,* and *sexual coercion* (for a complete description, see Gelfand, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1995). As shown in Table 2, offensive, sexually suggestive stories, jokes, and humor were the most commonly experienced behaviors from peers for both women and men. Interestingly, although the students reported that sexist language, humor, and comments were the most commonly experienced behaviors coming from teachers, the researchers did not ask the students about sexist behaviors coming from other students. Roughly equal numbers of male and female students reported experiencing the various harassment types from peers.

The only other study of peer sexual harassment at the university level was one that included sexist put downs in a questionnaire asking about generalized harassment based on gender, religion, and academic ability. Sands (1998) included an item that asked if students had ever experienced “demeaning, intimidating or hostile behavior related to your gender” in a study on a private university campus in the eastern United States. Thirty-one percent of female students and 10% of male students reported experiencing such gender-based harassment. The majority of the harassment experienced by both women and men came from other students.

**Commonalties and Comparisons Among the Studies**

Comparisons about sexual harassment studies described above are difficult because of differing definitions and operationalizations of sexual harassment. Some studies did not define sexual harassment for the participants, opting to just describe the behavior and ask the students to report on the number of times they had experienced it. On the other hand, the studies that used the AAUW (1993) items generally also gave participants a definition that said that sexual harassment is “*unwanted and unwelcome* behavior that interferes with your life.” Bremer et al.
(1991) did not define sexual harassment, but they did ask students to report on events for which they had “been made to feel uncomfortable, embarrassed, insulted or afraid.”

Item content varied from study to study. Bremer et al. (1991) excluded the inappropriate body language (e.g., sexually suggestive looks or gestures) that were endorsed by high percentages of respondents in the other two university survey studies. Another difference is that some of the sexual harassment examples in the research questionnaires were presented as discrete behaviors, but others were combined. For example, one item in the AAUW (1993) study asked about sexual rumors alone, whereas another item covered four behaviors (sexual comments, jokes, gestures, or looks) that may not necessarily be related. Similarly, Shepela and Levesque (1998) combined “inappropriate body language such as staring, leering” with “sexual advances” in one item.

Even when the same items were used across studies, the types of data collected and/or reported varied. For example, Mazer and Percival (1989) reported rates of harassment from peers along with rates of harassment from instructors and staff, but a replication study by Saperstein, Triolo, and Heinzen (1995) failed to report rates harassment from peers. Shepela and Levesque (1998) reportedly used the same items to asked about harassment from faculty and students, but failed to ask about sexist comments from students.

The studies also differed in the length of reporting time. For example, the AAUW (1993) and Ivy and Hamlet (1996) studies asked about harassment received or committed throughout the student’s entire school experience; whereas McMaster et al. (2000) asked about only the previous six weeks. As a result, the perpetration and victimization rates reported by McMaster et al. may be lower than those reported in the other studies.

Differences in response categories also vary from study to study. The AAUW respondents were given the following response options: often, occasionally, rarely, never, not
sure; the Fineran and Bennett (1999) and McMaster et al. (2000) respondents were given more precise options: never, once or twice, a few times per month, every few days, daily. The lack of uniformity in response categories should not make a difference for prevalence rates (i.e., the percentage of students who have ever experienced at least one incident of harassment), but they could make a difference when attempting to make finer comparisons.

Despite the differences between the studies, some useful comparisons and generalizations can be made. Victimization rates from the quantitative studies that included both males and females are presented in Table 3. Female’s self-reported victimization rates of sexual harassment from peers ranged from a low of 52% (Bremer et al., 1991) to a high of 92% (PCSW, 1995), but was generally around 80%. Male’s self-reported victimization rates ranged from 25% (Ivy & Hamlet, 1996) to 79% (Fineran & Bennett, 1995). However, as previously mentioned, Ivy and Hamlet’s rate is most likely an underestimate because it is based on the number of students who responded affirmatively to a question asking whether or not they have ever been “a target/victim of peer sexual harassment.” The other three university studies found higher rates of peer harassment for males students that ranged from 36% to 75%.

The majority of the sexual harassment experienced by students in the studies came from other students. Fully 80% of the sexual harassment incidents reported in the AAUW (1993) survey involved peers. In addition, most of the harassers were not strangers; for example, 70% of perpetrators were known casually by the victims in the Fineran and Bennett (1999) study. Most of the harassment of male students in the AAUW (1993), Mazer and Percival (1989), and Ivy and Hamlet (1996) studies came from female students, but more male than female students were found to experience same-sex harassment. Twenty-two percent of the male students in the
Table 3

Peer Harassment Victimization Rates Reported in North American High School and University Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Female %</th>
<th>Male %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAUW (1993)</td>
<td>U.S. nation wide</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roscoe, Strouse, &amp; Goodwin (1994)</td>
<td>U.S. Midwest</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trigg &amp; Wittenstrom (1996)$^a$</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCSW (1995)$^a$</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fineran &amp; Bennett (1995)$^a$</td>
<td>U.S. Midwest</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSSTF (1994)$^a$</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster et al. (2000)$^{ab}$</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percival &amp; Mazer (1989)</td>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremer, Moore, &amp; Bildersee (1991)</td>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy &amp; Hamlet (1996)</td>
<td>U.S. South</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepela &amp; Levesque (1998)</td>
<td>U.S. East Coast</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $^a$ Slightly modified versions of AAUW instrument used. $^{ab}$6-week reporting period.

Roscoe et al. (1994) study experienced unwanted pressure for dates from females, although all of the physical harassment and most of the unwanted sexual comments came from other males. Verbal behaviors were the most common forms of harassment experienced across the studies. Behaviors with the highest frequency counts in most studies were as follows: sexual comments, jokes, gestures, or looks; homophobic name calling; being touched, pinched, or grabbed; comments about bodies or body parts; and negative comments about your gender. Homophobic name calling was experienced more often by male than female students.
The commonality of homophobic name calling among male adolescents appears to be related to norms about masculinity. Shakeshaft et al. (1995) found that “conformity to gender stereotypes is central” to peer harassment (p. 36). And “normal” masculinity translates to heterosexuality in most settings. Frank (1994) describes the average secondary school as being permeated by a “heterosexual masculine hegemony.” He cites a male high school student who reports that at his school “sex is all about image ... and a big part of that is making sure that others know you're not queer” (p. 49).

Most of the physical harassment reported by male students in Roscoe et al. (1994) consisted of such juvenile behavior as grabbing other boys’ genitals, pulling their pants down, or giving “wedgies.” The authors concluded that it probably was not appropriate to label these behaviors as sexual harassment because this male victimization “did not appear to result in a hostile or offensive environment which interfered with their ability to learn” (Roscoe et al., 1994, p. 520). However, the authors did not explain how they came to the conclusion. Certainly the male students in their study found the behaviors to be offensive, as all of these behaviors received a mean rating higher than 3 on the authors’ 4-point Acceptability of Sexual Harassment scale, with 1 being very accepting and 4 being very unaccepting.

Although Roscoe et al. (1994) reject the sexual harassment label for the “developmentally immature” behaviors the young adolescent males visited on one another, they do not offer an alternative label. However, there is research evidence to suggest that male-to-male harassment exists, is offensive to the victims, and should be considered sexual harassment. Sexual harassment from other males was reported by 25% of boys in the AAUW (1993) survey and 31% of boys in the Trigg and Wittenstrom (1996) study. Male-only settings were the stage for much of the harassment experienced by the boys in the AAUW study: 24% report being sexually harassed in locker rooms, and 14% were harassed in school bathrooms. Trigg and Wittenstrom’s study of
New Jersey adolescents found that male harassment victims were most bothered by harassing behaviors "that threatened their masculinity, such as being called homosexual or being sexually harassed by other boys" (p. 59).

In lengthy observations and interviews with the victims of boy-on-boy harassment, Shakeshaft et al. (1995) observed that same-gender harassment frequently had a devastating impact on adolescent males. Boys were emotionally upset by their experiences, and they took pains to alter their behavior and dress so that they conformed more to gender role norms in order to avoid getting more harassment. Other researchers looking at the lives of young men have also vividly described male-on-male harassment related to gender role fulfillment (Frank, 1994; Mac an Ghaill, 1994).

Examples of public pressure to conform to stereotypic behavior patterns is also found in Cairn's (1994) study of university students. A number of undergraduate male students reported being publicly taunted by female students after turning down sexual advances from the women. Other men joined in the taunting, and several of the men report giving in and having unwanted sex with the women. Such public taunting and pressure by women and other men "were much more likely to result in the man developing negative feelings about ... himself," with one man saying the experience made him feel violated and humiliated (p. 199).

While acknowledging that boys and men can also be victims of sexual harassment, it is important not to trivialize girls' and women's experiences and complaints. Studies exploring the physical and mental health consequences of harassment are few and limited (for a review, see Dahinten, 1999), and nothing can be stated conclusively; but the research to date suggests that women as a group suffer greater negative consequences of sexual harassment than do men. For example, in the AAUW (1993) study, girls experiencing sexual harassment were five times as likely as boys to report fear and were three times as likely to report feeling less confident about
themselves. Girls were also far more likely than boys to report dropping school-related activities or sports and having difficulty concentrating or speaking out in class as a result of harassment. Similar results were found in Trigg and Wittenstrom's (1996) study of New Jersey teens. In a recent study looking specifically at mental health outcomes associated with peer sexual harassment, McMaster et al. (1998) found that girls were more likely than boys to experience clinically significant levels of both externalizing and internalizing mental health symptoms as a result of cross-gender harassment. However, the authors found that boys and girls were alike in the severity of internalizing symptoms associated with same-gender peer sexual harassment. In a study of university staff of both sexes, Richman et al. (1999) found that women and men were found to have negative mental health consequences associated with sexual harassment (most of which came from peers).

**Criticisms of Sexual Harassment Research**

**Gender Harassment**

There is considerable overlap in item content and in findings among all of the above studies of adolescent harassment. However, not all of the actions identified as offensive by the participants in the qualitative studies appeared in the survey studies. One type of harassment in particular was missing — the sexist comments and put downs described in the qualitative studies (Larkin, 1994; Halson, 1989; Jones, 1985; Shakeshaft et al., 1995). The "gay or lesbian" and "spreading sexual rumors" items in the AAUW (1993) study fit in this category, but it is not clear if any of the other AAUW items do. Perhaps the AAUW researchers conceptualized the item "sexual comments, gestures, jokes, and looks" to include these sexist comments, but they did not specify this. The *Seventeen Magazine* survey (Stein et al., 1993) did not include gender harassment even though the principal author of the study indicated later (in Stein & Sjostrom, 1994) that she believes that sexual harassment in school can also consist of comments that
“offend, stigmatize, demean, frighten, or threaten you because of your sex” (p. 37). The lack of sexist – as opposed to overtly sexual – items threatens the content validity in the surveys, for the evidence collected by Larkin (1994) and the other qualitative researchers suggests that comments of this type are both bothersome and pervasive. The limited survey-type data obtained to date also support this conclusion; being called gay or lesbian was viewed as the most offensive type of sexual harassment by the adolescents in the AAUW (1993) study. Another reason for taking sexist harassment seriously is that it may be connected to more serious harassment; among male university students, engaging in sexist jokes has been found to be associated with perpetrating sexual, physical, and psychological aggression toward women (Ryan & Kanjorski, 1998).

Many researchers and theorists label the sexist type of comments gender harassment, and research in the workplace, universities, military, and schools consistently shows that it is the most common form of sexual harassment experienced for both women and men (Barak, Pittman, & Yitzhaki, 1995; Canadian Human Rights Commission, 1983; Cleary, Schmieler, Parascenzo, & Ambrosio, 1994; DuBois, Knapp, Faley, & Kutis, 1998; Fitzgerald & Shullman, 1993; Fitzgerald et al. 1988; Gutek, 1985; Mazer & Percival, 1989; O'Connell & Korabik, 2000; O'Hare & O'Donohue, 1998; Richman et al., 1999; Strauss, 1992; Tang, Yik, Cheung, Choi, & Au, 1996). Nonetheless, gender-based harassment behaviors that are not explicitly sexual are sometimes omitted from harassment research questionnaires (e.g., Cammaert, 1985; Malovich & Stake, 1990; Reilly, Lott, & Gallogly, 1986; Roscoe et al. 1994; Stein, Marshall, & Tropp, 1993). Shepela and Levesque (1998) attempted to include gender harassment behaviors in their survey of university students, and so included an item covering “sexist language, humor or comments” in the section of their questionnaire asking about harassment experienced from faculty. However, the researchers inexplicably left the item out of the questionnaire section asking about harassment from peers.
Leaving gender harassment out of sexual harassment survey instruments may cause an underestimation of the prevalence of this type of harassment and of harassment in general. It may also cause a distortion in our understanding of who is victimized by sexual harassment. Gender harassment emerged as a common occurrence for men in a study that asked university students about professors' sexist remarks and differential treatment based on gender (Fitzgerald et al., 1988). Gender harassment was also found to be common in studies of younger adolescent boys (Shakeshaft et al., 1995) and of men in academic and non-academic workplaces (DuBois et al., 1998; Gerrity, 2000; Richman et al., 1999; Waldo, Berdahl, & Fitzgerald, 1998). In two workplace study, negative stereotyping of men and harassment for deviating from the male gender role was identified as coming from co-workers of both sexes, but especially from other men (Berdahl et al., 1996; Gerrity, 2000). Same-sex gender harassment was reported by 35% of men and 1% of women in a study of American military personnel (DuBois et al., 1998). Same-sex harassment was found to have "a more far-reaching impact on the professional and personal lives of male targets" (DuBois et al., p. 742). Thus, leaving gender harassment behaviors out of research efforts may seriously underestimate the amount and severity of sexual harassment experienced by males, especially male-on-male harassment.

The practice of under-sampling from the gender harassment domain may exist because many lay people — and perhaps some researchers as well — have a difficult time accepting gender harassment as sexual harassment. Several studies have shown that the general population is more likely to label distinctly sexual behaviors rather than non-sexual behaviors as sexual harassment (Fitzgerald & Hennon-McInnis, 1989; Ivy & Hamlet, 1996; Loredo et al., 1995; Padgitt & Padgitt, 1986; Powell, 1986). High school students have been found not to attach the label of sexual harassment to offensive teacher behaviors unless the behaviors were of the more severe (sexual coercion and assault) forms of harassment (Corbett, Gentry, & Pearson, 1993;
Houston & Hwang, 1996). Even though high school students report being disturbed by homophobic putdowns (AAUW, 1993; Trigg & Wittenstrom, 1996), they do not necessarily label those behaviors as sexual harassment. Studies examining the perceptions of “sexual harassment” among secondary students found that adolescents rated gender harassment and verbal harassment as the least serious forms of harassment (Loredo et al., 1995; Trigg & Wittenstrom, 1996). Nonetheless, gender harassment is a form of sexual harassment, and Paludi et al. (1990) offer an explanation for why gender harassment comments are so offensive: “They are directed at individuals whom the initiator deems inferior. Therefore, gender harassment resembles racial and ethnic slurs and epithets” (p. 3).

Several researchers have noted the lack of gender harassment items in the AAUW (1993) survey, and have added additional items to tap this domain when using the AAUW instrument. The OSSTF (1994) study added an item asking about “negative comments made about your gender.” Fineran & Bennett (1999) added an item covering “negative comments about body/weight/clothing.” Similarly, McMaster et al. (2000) added the following item: “made negative comments about or rated the parts of your body that make you a boy/girl.”

Additional criticisms. The following criticisms of sexual harassment research have been made by Fitzgerald and her associates (e.g., Fitzgerald, 1990; Fitzgerald, Swan, & Magley, 1997; Gelfand, et al., 1995), who have done the most work on the psychometrics of sexual harassment research instruments. First, reliability and validity issues have not been addressed by most sexual harassment instrument developers. Second, instruments have failed to sample fully from all sexual harassment domains. Third, instruments have not been theory based. Fourth, many items have been written in ambiguous terms, leading to the possibility of multiple interpretations by respondents. Fifth, some items contain multiple behaviors that have not been empirically shown to be related to one another.
Arvey and Cavanaugh (1995) criticized are critical of many studies for having a possible selection bias resulting from non-random, self-selected, or convenience samples. They also criticized the lengthy recall periods on which many surveys ask respondents to recall and report. The University of Calgary study (Cammaert, 1985), for example, asked students about harassment experienced at any time in their university careers. However, Arvey and Cavanaugh do not deal with the problem of sampling infrequent events. Some sexual harassment behaviors (such as the more extreme, coercive forms of sexual harassment) occur relatively infrequently for individuals, and longer reporting periods are needed to gather enough frequencies to provide the variance necessary for statistical analysis purposes. In looking at research investigating infrequent events, Hulin and Rousseau (1980) argue for the importance of balancing the need to increase frequency counts with the need to avoid fluctuations in relations between variables. Even with a two-year reporting period, O'Connell and Korabik (2000) found that the low frequency counts for the most severe types of harassment did not allow them to examine relationships between those behaviors and the other variables of interest. Gelfand et al. (1995) opted to drop several of the more severe, low frequency items from their harassment surveys because data analysis with such items was problematic.

Although the above criticisms were directed toward research using adult subjects in workplace settings, the criticisms are applicable to many of the adolescent studies reviewed in this chapter. Many of the items used in the survey studies were not written in behaviorally explicit language, leading to concern over a lack of consistency in item interpretation among participants. As mentioned previously, none of the instruments used in the adolescent studies sampled fully from all domains of sexual harassment. Also, some survey researchers made a priori decisions to combine multiple behaviors and list them within individual harassment items. For example, one item on the AAUW (1993) scale asks about "sexual pictures, photographs,
illustrations, messages, or notes.” Another AAUW item asks about being “flashed or mooned,” yet it has not been established that the two behaviors are perceived to be equivalent by recipients or are underlain by the same motivations for perpetrators. The recall period respondents were asked to report on varied considerably in the adolescent studies, from six weeks to the student’s entire school or university life. Not all studies (e.g., Roscoe et al., 1994; Trigg & Wittenstrom, 1996) provide details about the reporting period. The Seventeen Magazine survey (Stein et al., 1993) asked readers to report events that had occurred in the last year, the length of time recommended by Arvey and Cavanaugh (1995). However, the AAUW (1993) study asked about harassment students had experienced at any time in the respondents’ school years. Strauss (1988) did not specify a time period in her questionnaire.

Lengnick-Hall (1995) is critical of much workplace sexual harassment research because the researchers exhibit confusion over the construct of sexual harassment. He insists that construct validity issues need to be addressed by all researchers, who must be more precise about what is being measured. Discussions of validity and reliability issues are almost completely lacking in the articles describing the studies of harassment among adolescents. Most of the studies failed to describe the item development and selection process for the instruments used. An exception is the university-based study by Shepela and Levesque (1998) in which the survey items were selected to represent behaviors uncovered in their previously conducted qualitative study. Most studies used convenience samples, with only the AAUW (1993) study detailing the steps taken to ensure a sample representative enough to inspire confidence in the generalizability of the results. However, despite the methodological flaws and variations among the studies, there is considerable convergence of findings regarding the prevalence and types of sexual harassment experienced by adolescents. In terms of validity, there is considerable overlap between the
behaviors respondents were asked about on the quantitative studies and those described in the 
qualitative studies.

In order to correct the psychometric weaknesses of previous harassment research, 
Fitzgerald and colleagues created a survey instrument that has become the most widely used 
instrument in workplace sexual harassment research (described in detail in Gelfand et al., 1995). 
After using variations of the instrument in many studies, including a cross-cultural confirmatory 
factor analysis study, Gelfand et al. concluded that "sexual harassment is a behavioral construct 
composed of three related, but conceptually distinct and nonoverlapping dimensions: gender 
harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion" (p. 167). Gender harassment 
consists of displays of insulting, hostile, and degrading attitudes toward women. Unwanted 
sexual attention ranges from repeated verbal requests for dates to grabbing, cornering, and 
fondling. Sexual coercion consists of the quid pro quo type behaviors in which bribery or threats 
are used in an attempt to gain sexual compliance. The authors argued that these three domains 
encompass all of the types of harassment that are experienced by women, and are invariant across 
settings. The behaviors tapped by individual items will likely vary from setting to setting, though. 
As a result, they created both workplace and student versions of the Sexual Experiences 
Questionnaire.

Fitzgerald and her colleagues (e.g., Fitzgerald & Hesson-McInnis, 1989; Gelfand et al., 
1995) have done the most methodologically sound work in developing their instrument by 
grounding their definition of sexual harassment and the items developed to operationalize it in 
empirical studies. Nevertheless, their Sexual Experiences Questionnaire is not necessarily 
applicable for peer sexual harassment among adolescents. Although Gelfand et al. (1995, p. 174) 
claimed that their conceptualization "provides a comprehensive description of the nature of 
sexual harassment as a behavioral construct," their instrument is not necessarily appropriate for
measuring adolescent peer harassment. The Sexual Experiences Questionnaire was developed for the workplace, and the formal power structures that exist in most workplaces do not exist in adolescent peer groups. Although there is a student version of the instrument, it measures only harassment that is received from professors.

**Operational Definition for the Present Study**

Much sexual harassment research has been flawed by the use of narrow definitions of sexual harassment that have resulted in restrictions on the quality and quantity of data collected (Gruber, 1990; Vaux, 1993). Fitzgerald (1990) argues that content validity is the most relevant form of validity in sexual harassment survey research. Content validity requires specifying the domains of interest and selecting a set of items that adequately samples from the domains. Fitzgerald points out that many workplace sexual harassment survey instruments have under sampled from the gender harassment domain, as was found in the adolescent harassment studies reviewed above.

A definition of peer sexual harassment is needed for research purposes that is sufficiently broad to include the behaviors described in court cases and in the qualitative and quantitative research literature. For the purposes of data collection in the present study, the following definition is used: *Peer sexual harassment among adolescents is unwanted behavior or comments that are of a sexual nature or that are directed toward someone because of their gender.* Harassment among adolescents is further conceptualized as being comprised of three domains, the first of which is *gender harassment*, which is defined as sexist remarks and behaviors that demean a person on the basis of his or her gender and are used to enforce traditional gender roles, or in response to the violation of those roles. The second domain, *unwelcome sexual advances*, is defined as inappropriate or unwanted references to sexuality or
romance. The third domain, *sexual imposition and assault*, is defined as unwelcome physical intrusions and forced sexual acts.

These three domains encompass the behaviors described in the research literature. They also cover the harassment behaviors observed by me, and reported to me, in my own extensive work with high school and university student populations. The domains are roughly equivalent to the three dimensions specified by Gelfand et al. (1995), but they represent more closely the unique experiences of students who receive harassment from their peers. For example, it is unlikely that the quid pro quo behaviors included in Gelfand et al.'s sexual coercion dimension are found among adolescent peers whose relationships do not have the hierarchical structures found in the workplace.

**Characteristics of Sexual Harassers**

Very little research has been conducted with adolescent or adult harassers, and as a result, the following review is brief. This regrettable brevity alone supports the need for the present study on adolescent sexual harassers.

**Younger Adolescent Sexual Harassers**

Few studies have investigated sexual harassers in secondary school, with the result being a very small literature base. In seeking to explore gender and power issues among students in an urban high school in the American Midwest, Fineran and Bennett (1999) found that roughly equal numbers of male (72%) and female (77%) students admitted to having harassed other students. Perpetrators of both sexes reported that their most common harassing behaviors were making negative comments about body/weight/clothing and calling someone gay or lesbian. Perpetrators of both sexes were found to be more likely to endorse beliefs that men should be dominant, although the correlation for male harassers ($r = .49$) was stronger than that for female harassers ($r = .28$). A measure of self-confidence/sense of personal power was also included, and
perpetrators of both sexes were more likely to report having more personal power. The correlation for female harassers was somewhat weaker than that for male harassers ($r = .23$ and $r = .29$, respectively), and the authors conclude that, personal power, like sexist beliefs, is a more potent factor for young men than for young women.

The largest examination of adolescent harassers occurred as part of the AAUW (1993) study, which, in addition to collecting data on victimization, also asked respondents if they had ever sexually harassed another student in a school setting. The perpetration items were repeats of the victimization items, although frequency data was not obtained. In this study, 66% of boys and 52% of girls acknowledged committing one or more acts of sexual harassment in a school setting. Harassers were asked which sex they targeted, and most said they targeted the opposite sex rather than the same sex, with males (15%) more likely than females (5%) to target same sex students.

Participants in the AAUW (1993) study were presented with a list of possible reasons for harassing other students, and the results, in descending order of endorsement, are as follows. They did it because: (a) it was a normal part of school life; (b) they thought the other person liked it; (c) they wanted a date with the person; (d) of peer pressure or encouragement; (e) they wanted something from that person; and (f) they wanted the person to think the harasser had some sort of power over them.

A key finding in the AAUW (1993) study was that self-reported harassers were more likely to also claim to have been harassed. In fact, 94% of harassers claimed that they were sexual harassment victims. In a follow-up study on the AAUW data, Lee et al. (1996) found that students who harassed other students were not only more likely to have been harassed, they were more likely to have been more severely harassed. Severity in this case was operationalized as a combination of three elements: the degree of upset reported by the victim, the frequency of
victimization, and the number of different types of harassment experienced. Sexual harassment victimization and gender were the only variables found to be related to being a peer harasser in the schools; none of the demographic variables were related to harassment. From these findings the authors concluded that the dualistic victim/perpetrator model that is assumed in much harassment research may be more applicable in workplace settings than in school settings in which the majority of all students both harass and are harassed. They speculate that involvement in harassing peer groups may help explain the large overlap between perpetration and victimization. As with other studies, considerable sexual harassment was found to emanate from other students. Sexual harassment therefore does not need formal power or status hierarchies in order to occur.

The OSSTF (1994) also used the AAUW (1993) items. The sample was designed to be representative of the linguistic, ethnic, and geographic diversity within Ontario. The sample consisted of 264 students from ages 14 to 20 years attending nine secondary schools. This study asked about victimization in school settings but only asked about perpetration for community settings. The researchers also added a gender harassment item asking if the students had ever “made negative comments about someone’s gender,” to which 26% of males responded in the affirmative. This study did not report victimization and perpetration overlap, but it did ask about reasons for committing the harassing behaviors. As in the AAUW study, the most common reason given by males for harassing was that “it’s just a part of school life” (41%). Another 35% of the males indicated that they “thought the person liked it.” Peer pressure was cited as a reason by 20% of the youth.

Canadian researchers McMaster et al. (1998) defined sexual harassment as “unwanted sexual attention” in a relatively large-scale (N = 1213) study of early adolescents’ experiences with peer sexual harassment in grades six through eight. This study is one of the only studies to
be aimed primarily at perpetrators of harassment. The questionnaire limited the reporting period to the last six weeks, so the rates of victimization and perpetration would be expected to be lower than in the AAUW (1993) study which asked about harassment experienced throughout the school years. To operationalize their definition, the authors used a shortened form of the AAUW survey, with an added gender harassment item covering comments and ratings about sexual body parts. The three most common behaviors that perpetrators reported engaging in were homophobic name calling, making sexual comments/jokes/gestures/looks, and making comments or rating sexual body parts.

Consistent with the AAUW (1993) findings, a large overlap between perpetration and victimization was found by McMaster et al. (2000): 78% of perpetrators reported that they were also recipients of sexual harassment from peers. A larger percentage of boys reported perpetration (36%) than girls (21%), but the sexes were equal in their reported victimization rates (girls, 38%; boys, 42%). The large overlap between perpetration and victimization caused the authors of the study to speculate that “it may be appropriate to consider victimization and perpetration as two aspects of a single phenomenon of harassment involvement” (McMaster et al., p.21).

Unlike the high school youth in the AAUW (1993) study, the younger adolescent males in the McMaster et al. (2000) study were more likely to commit same-gender harassment than cross-gender harassment. However, cross-gender harassment increased for both boys and girls as the younger adolescents moved through puberty. The authors also found that same-gender and cross-gender harassment were not completely overlapping phenomena, and so should be analyzed separately. The authors concluded that cross-gender and same-gender harassers may not necessarily be the same people. Although not stated, an implication of this conclusion is that the motivations underlying the two harassment forms may be different.
In a related research study, the same group of researchers conceptualized adolescent sexual harassment as a sexualized form of bullying (McMaster et al., 1997). They found an overlap between bullying and sexual harassment behaviors: 55% of male bullies and 48% of female bullies were also sexual harassers. This led the authors to speculate that the bullies who also do sexual harassment in early adolescence may be the ones who will do the more severe types of sexual harassment as they grow into adulthood.

Roscoe et al. (1994) asked groups of early adolescents (ages 11 - 16 years) why they engaged in sexual harassment. The authors' interpretations of the responses received from the adolescents were as follows: “peer pressure; it is fun; to get the victim’s attention; everyone does it; have seen others do it; do not recognize the behavior as unwelcome and/or illegal; do not know other ways to show people of the opposite sex that they are interested in them; the entire area of sexuality is new and unfamiliar to them” (p. 521).

Sexual harassment may be just an ordinary part of being an adolescent male. When asked about male sexuality, one boy in Frank’s (1994) study of adolescent males said that “male sexuality means doing things to females: calling them names, the catcalls, making them do your homework, getting them to lie to the teachers for you, fucking them” (p. 54). If a boy does not act in stereotypically masculine ways, he risks being harassed himself. According to another boy in Frank’s study, if you don’t conform, “you will suffer the consequences, which can be pretty bad, depending on how far you stepped out of line. You can get called names, or isolated, but you also take the chance of getting the shit beaten out of you” (p. 51).

The only other findings on adolescent sexual harassers are reported by Shakeshaft et al. (1995) who also observed that male students repeatedly targeted students for harassment who did not meet standards about masculine and feminine dress and comportment. Boys who failed to conform to stereotypic male role norms were harassed with homophobic put downs or were
verbally equated with girls. For example, boys who did not appear to engage in appropriate risk-taking behavior (e.g., drinking alcohol) were verbally harassed: “You’d call a person a pussy if they were afraid to do something. Like if we were drinking and they were afraid to drink.” (Shakeshaft, 1995, p. 39).

These studies offer limited, but still valuable, insight into adolescent harassment, and they each have their methodological strengths and weaknesses. The AAUW (1993) study was anonymous, randomly structured, and national in scope, and steps were taken to ensure that the sample was representative of American secondary students. These features increase confidence in the trustworthiness and generalizability of findings. The Roscoe et al. (1994) study had a relatively large sample size (N = 561), but was conducted in only one school, so the results may not be as generalizable. The Ontario study involved students in nine secondary schools. An especially laudable feature of the AAUW questionnaire was that it asked about homophobic put downs, a common form of adolescent harassment that can have a serious emotional impact on male and female targets (Savin-Williams, 1994). However, the authors asked only about a small number of possible motivating factors, all of which were generated by the researchers. In contrast, Roscoe et al. allowed the students to generate their own reasons for sexually harassing other students. The questionnaire items from both studies failed to sample fully from all sexual harassment domains. Although most sexual harassment behaviors were well sampled, the gender harassment domain was seriously under sampled. McMaster et al. (2000) did add one additional gender harassment item.

**Older Adolescent and Adult Sexual Harassers**

As is the case with younger adolescents, most sexual harassment research with university students and adults has focused on victimization rates, and as a result, there is a similar paucity of research with older adolescent harassers. In fact, no peer sexual harassment perpetration surveys
at the university level have been reported in the literature. Victimization studies in American and
Canadian universities present findings similar to the younger adolescent studies; that is, both male
and female university students report being sexually harassed (although female students are
apparently harassed in larger numbers), peers are the most common perpetrator, and gender
harassment is the most common type (Fitzgerald et al. 1988; Malovich & Stake, 1990; Mazer &
Percival, 1989; Murrell & Dietz-Uhler, 1993; Reilly et al., 1986).

In order to investigate harassers, Fitzgerald and Weitzman (1990) queried male university
professors about their relationships with students. They concluded that sexual harassers in the
academy are virtually indistinguishable from non-harassers. However, the authors collected data
only on experience with harassment and demographic variables, without attempting to determine
if there were any attitudinal variables that may have divided the groups. One difference between
the two groups was noted, and it parallels the adolescent findings: the men who admitted to
having engaged in harassing behaviors were more likely to also report that they themselves had
been subject to previous harassment (from students, in this case).

Sundt (1996) investigated attitudes and beliefs among male and female faculty members
at six randomly selected post-secondary institutions in California. Approximately one quarter of
the 669 respondents reported having engaged in behaviors that constituted sexual harassment. A
number of attitudinal variables were explored in this study, and significant correlations with self-
reported harassment were found for the following beliefs: that women provoke sexual
harassment through their behavior or dress; that sexually harassing behaviors are normal; and that
interpersonal relationships are to be exploited. However, as argued elsewhere in the present
study, many of the items on the latter scale actually measured hostility toward women.

Qualitative data on the causes of sexual harassment were obtained by Gardner (1995)
who interviewed over 200 men about their reasons for participating in public harassment of
women. A number of the men stated the view that such behaviors were an expected part of masculine heterosexuality. Even some gay informants reported that they participated in the public harassment of women in order to appear to fit in with what they perceived to be the heterosexual masculine norm. This view that sexual harassment of women is a public demonstration of normal masculinity is echoed in the research of Thomas (1997) who interviewed a group of mostly professional men about their experience committing harassment of the everyday, ‘dripping tap’ variety. The interviews left Thomas with the impression that the men considered their actions to be part of a normal, masculine repertoire of behaviors that are performed for the benefit of other males. As one interviewee put it, “I think it’s just sort of proving like - ‘I’m one of the lads’, I suppose” (p. 144).

Male bonding as a factor in sexual harassment was also noted in a study of male professors. Dzeich and Weiner (1984) described the purpose of one professor’s harassing behaviors as “his way of declaring to the male community his place in the order of things” (p. 137). Dzeich and Weiner believe that at least some harassers were still trying to prove themselves as men because they suffered from what the authors called “arrested adolescent development” (p. 136) stemming from not being successful in the more traditionally masculine arenas such as sports when they were in high school. As university professors, they chose harassment of women as a way of dealing with their insecurities over male bonding because “whistles, insistence on eye contact, nonreciprocal touching, jokes, and off-color remarks are standard tactics that unsophisticated men suppose to be masculine behaviors” (137). Thus, these men choose to harass because they believed that that is what real men were supposed to do.

Pryor (1987) and Pryor et al. (1993) report on a number of laboratory studies that found similarities between sexual harassers and sexual assaulteders. Specifically, the authors found that among university students, sexual harassers were likely to cognitively link dominance and
sexuality, were likely to view male-female relationships as adversarial in nature, were likely to believe rape myths, and were likely to hold stereotypic attitudes about gender. One limitation of these studies is that they did not query men about actual behaviors, but instead asked them about their likelihood of committing sexual harassment if they could be assured of not getting caught. Another limitation is that participants were only asked about severe (quid pro quo) harassment. Nonetheless, these studies underscore the need to take the sexual assault literature into account when attempting to understand sexual harassment.

Another study of university students looking at likelihood to commit harassment was conducted by Bingham and Burleson (1996). They found that undergraduate male students who scored highly on the authors' sexual harassment “proclivity index” were more likely to be accepting of sexual harassment, believe rape myths, and believe that women were out to take advantage of men in romantic relationships. Participants with a proclivity to commit quid pro quo harassment were also more likely to hold stereotypic attitudes about sex roles.

**Typologies of harassers.** A typology of sexual harassers has been proposed by Pryor and Whalen (1997), who base their work on studies of harassment in workplace and university settings. They posit four categories of harassers in a person-by-situation model of sexual harassment perpetration. The authors believe that membership in these categories reflects both commonalities about the type of harassment committed and about the underlying motivations for engaging in the harassment. Irrespective of the motivation for the harasser, social norms within the institutional setting can foster, support, and reinforce the occurrence of sexual harassment. Their first category, *sexual exploiters*, described men who use power to coerce females into granting sex. The power they described does not have to be formal, institutional power. Instead, it can be power based on status, as in a sexist society in which men have more power than women solely by virtue of being male. The second category, *sexual*
attraction/miscommunication, covered men who committed harassment, not because they were sexist or wanted to exploit women, but because they had poor social skills and/or deficits in decoding women's affective cues. The third category, misogyny, referred to sexist men who held hostile attitudes toward women. Women who enter nontraditional occupations may encounter harassers from this category who view women as an outgroup. The fourth category, homo-anathema, referred to harassers of men and women who are motivated by antipathy toward gays and lesbians. Pryor and Whalen noted, however, that heterosexuals could also be the victims of this type of harassment.

Another typology of harassers was offered by Lengnick-Hall (1995), who suggested that there are three identifiable workplace harasser types. The first, the insensitive harasser, commits his harassment behaviors out of ignorance about the impact of his behavior on others. The second, the opportunist, does not normally harass, but does so if the opportunity arises. The third type, the hard core harasser, actively seeks out opportunities to harass. He likely has dysfunctional personality traits that distinguish him from the general population and from the other two types of harassers.

Social desirability as a possible characteristic of harassers. Sexual harassment is a controversial and sensitive issue in today's world, and some sexual harassment researchers have included measures of social desirability among their other self-report instruments to help control for a possible social desirability response bias. However, Fineran and Bennett (1999) found that secondary student responses were not affected by social desirability. Among university students, only a small correlation \( r = .17 \) between likelihood of committing sexual harassment and a measure of social desirable response bias was found by Pryor (1987). A non-significant correlation between social desirability and a proclivity to engage in sexual harassment among university students was found by Bingham and Burleson (1996). In another study of university
students, those who reported a likelihood of committing sexual harassment were actually less likely to be concerned about social desirability, although the correlation was small (Driscoll, Kelly, & Henderson, 1998). Thus, a tendency towards social desirable responding does not appear to be a characteristic of sexual harassers.

Conclusions About Sexual Harassers

Investigations of sexual harassers are few in number and limited in scope; nonetheless, some tentative conclusions about possible harasser characteristics and motivating factors can be drawn from the reported studies. Both adolescent and adult sexual harassers were found to be indistinguishable from their cohort on demographic variables. Sexual harassment in schools and universities may be affected by the institutional climate, as evidenced by students reporting that they did it because “others did it, too.” Indeed, peer harassment may be so common in educational settings that it has become normalized behavior. Some harassers seemed to be unaware that at least some of their harassment is offensive (“it was no big deal”). Indeed, behaviors viewed as harassing by the investigators were perceived by both adolescents and adults as being expected behaviors of normal males in our society. Sexual harassment may be a part of a public performance of masculinity for some men, for whom peer influences/pressure may be involved. Much verbal harassment may be motivated by a desire to put down the victim for not conforming to male and female role norms concerning behavior and dress. Prior victimization may also be involved for both adolescents and adults, although not the relationship between receiving and perpetrating unwanted sexual attention is not clear. Involvement in harassing peer networks may be responsible for the high overlap between harassment and perpetration. Evidence also suggests that adolescent and adult harassers tend to hold stereotypic beliefs about gender. In addition, a desire for power over others may be a factor. Finally, social desirability
does not appear to be a relevant factor for young people responding to questions about sexual harassment perpetration or victimization.

The results of the studies investigating adult sexual harassers suggest that at least some male harassers have characteristics in common with male sexual assaulters. Because of the overlap between sexual harassment and sexual assault and because of the theoretical links between the two constructs, the sexual assault literature can also inform our search for understanding sexual harassment.

**Theoretical Links Between Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault**

Although research data on sexual harassers is scarce, there is a sizable amount of data on sexual assaulters, a group involved in an analogous activity. Sexual harassment and sexual assault are related constructs that overlap in places (most harassment surveys include questions on behaviors that would be considered sexual assault by legal definition). In addition, there is considerable theoretical linking of the two constructs in the literature.

Many feminist theorists, whose work has inspired most of the research in the areas of sexual assault and sexual harassment, maintain that socialization and socially constructed gender roles serve to maintain a patriarchal system and are the primary determinants of behaviors such as sexual harassment and sexual coercion. As Hotelling and Zuber (1997) state, “from a feminist perspective, sexual harassment both emanates from and reinforces the traditional sex roles of men and women” (p. 103).

The feminist emphasis on socialization is in contrast to other perspectives that place greater weight on biological, evolutionary, organizational, or individual pathology causes. However, a reading of contemporary feminist literature indicates that there is a wide range of feminist thought. Some feminism-inspired models of sexual harassment or sexual assault involve an interactive mixture of personal, situational, and societal factors. Other contemporary feminists
and pro-feminists coming from a post-structuralist perspective (e.g., Connell, 1995) argue against including the construct of sex roles in discussions of gender relations. Nonetheless, most feminist analyses of sexual harassment and coercion incorporate a common body of assumptions. First, sexual harassment and sexual coercion are both an expression of, and a way of maintaining, the disparate power and status relationships among men and women in our society (Duffy, 1995; Kelly, 1987; Russell, 1984; Stock, 1991; Superson, 1993). Second, as previously stated, sexual harassment and coercion stem from socialization and gender roles (Burt, 1980; Hotelling & Zuber, 1997; Hyde, 1996; Koss et al. 1994; Lisak, 1991; Miedzian, 1993; Thomas, 1997). Third, ours is a misogynistic culture (Burkhardt & Fromuth, 1991; Cieriello, 1993; Lisak, 1991; Stock, 1991). Fourth, many feminist theorists and researchers view sexual harassment and sexual assault as two linked points on a continuum of sexual violence directed by men toward women.

According to the feminist analysis, the same societal features that cause sexual assault are also suspected to underlie sexual harassment and other points on the continuum of violence against women (Funk, 1993; Kelly, 1987; Larkin, 1994; Medea & Thompson, 1974; Russell, 1984; Strauss, 1992). Some amount of empirical support for the continuum notion has been demonstrated (Briere & Malamuth, 1983; Malamuth et al. 1991; Pryor, 1987; Reilly et al. 1992).

Because of the suspected links between sexual assaulters and sexual harassers, research findings from the assault literature can also inform and offer direction for harassment studies.

Characteristics of Sexual Assaulters

Clinical findings and research data have found links between a number of factors and sexual assault, many of which mirror those identified with sexual harassment. In general, these research findings tend to support a feminist (or sociocultural, as it is sometimes called) model rather than a psychological model. Central to the feminist analysis is the contention that sexual harassment and sexual assault cannot be explained by a model of individual pathology simply
because of the huge numbers of men involved in sexual coercion and harassment. Instead, feminists argue that the traditional male role that most men have been socialized to accept is a key problem. As Russell (1984) bluntly states, "The truth that must be faced is that this culture's notion of masculinity — particularly as it is applied to male sexuality — predisposes men to violence, to rape, to sexually harass, and to sexually abuse children" (p. 260). Thomas (1997) points out that much of the common, everyday sexual harassment that women experience are for men acts of conformity to 'normal' male behavior patterns. In particular, it is believed to be the need to publicly demonstrate masculinity in front of other males that pushes many men to commit sexual assault and harassment (Beneke, 1997; Gardiner, 1995; Hills, 1995; Miedzien, 1993; Sanday, 1996; Thomas, 1997).

Traditional male role norms. A useful way of looking at masculinity is offered by Levant (1995) who observes that the traditional male role in Western society has some positive aspects (including initiative, leadership, and strength) as well as some more dysfunctional aspects. Many of the dysfunctional aspects of the male role — a lack of empathy, a desire for social and sexual dominance, a tendency to turn from anger to rage and violence, homophobia, rejection of femininity — seem to be connected to sexual coercion and sexual harassment.

Joseph Pleck (1981), in the Myth of Masculinity, points out that early psychological conceptualizations of gender held that healthy human personality development was dependent on successful gender identity formation. Pleck labels this early conceptualization the gender role identity paradigm. Within this paradigm masculinity and femininity were seen as bipolar and mutually exclusive. Pleck proposed a new way of thinking about sex roles that he called the gender role strain paradigm. The gender role strain paradigm asserts that the male gender role contains dysfunctional aspects, that gender roles are inconsistent and contradictory, that many
people violate gender roles, and that violation of gender roles leads to condemnation (especially for men), which in turn results in many men overconforming to traditional gender roles.

There are two basic approaches taken by researchers when attempting to measure gender: trait and normative ideology (Thompson et al., 1992). The trait-based approach to measuring masculinity assumes that respondents hold varying amounts of personality traits and behaviors that are more characteristic of men than of women in our society. This approach stems from the gender role identity paradigm. The normative ideology approach stems from Pleck’s (1981) gender role strain paradigm. This approach assumes that respondents vary in their acceptance of beliefs about what men should be like. Thus, it is a predictive approach. The normative ideology approach to measuring masculinity is perhaps more useful from an educational perspective because it identifies beliefs and attitudes than can be targeted by interventions.

Traditional masculinity ideology is assumed to be multidimensional, and various conceptualizations of the components making up the construct exist among researchers. For example, Levant et al. (1992) identified the following seven components of masculinity ideology: anti-femininity, emotional inexpressiveness, an emphasis on toughness and aggression, self-reliance, striving for status, homophobia, and objectifying sexual attitudes.

Masculinity is a highly complex subject, however, as noted by Connell (1989) and other pro-feminist theorists operating from a post-structuralist perspective. Connell pointed out that it is a mistake to assume that there is only one masculinity in our culture. Instead multiple, competing masculinities exist within society as a whole and within individual educational institutions. Connell asserted that the notion of sex roles limits our thinking because young men do not just passively receive a male sex role from society; instead, they are involved in the creation of their own forms of masculinity. In fact, these forms that are often created in opposition to the dominant version of masculinity within the subculture in which the young men
live. Nonetheless, Connell (1995) also described a dominant, hegemonic form of masculinity that serves to give men power and authority over others. As described by Pleck (1995) "there is a particular constellation of standards and expectations that individually and jointly have various kinds of negative concomitants" (p. 20). It is these standards and expectations that are identified and measured with instruments using the normative ideology approach.

Traditional masculinity has been implicated in problem behaviors such as crime, bullying, violence, and homophobia (Miedzian, 1991; M. B. Strauss, 1994; Messerschmidt, 1993; Patel, Long, McCammon & Wuensch, 1995; Thompson et al., 1985). Among adolescent males, traditional beliefs about masculinity have been linked to numerous delinquent behaviors and to low condom use and other problems in intimate relationships (Mosher & Sirkin, 1984; Pleck, Sonenstein, & Ku, 1991, 1994). Acceptance of traditionally prescriptive statements about masculinity has been linked to non-sexual aggression in a laboratory study (Weisbuch, Beal, & O’Neal, 1999). Endorsement of stereotypic gender roles by male and female university students has also been linked to tolerance for sexual harassing behaviors (Malovich & Stake, 1990).

Believing in the traditional role for men and/or women has been linked to actual peer sexual harassment with secondary school-age adolescents (Fineran & Bennett, 1999) and with actual sexual coercion in numerous studies with university male students (Byers & Eno, 1991; Garrett-Gooding, & Senter, 1987; Koralewski, & Conger, 1992; Koss et al. 1985; Lackie & de Man, 1997; Lisak, Hopper, & Song, 1996; Mosher & Anderson, 1986; Muehlenhard & Falcon, 1990; Smeaton & Byrne, 1987; Snell, Hawkins, & Belk, 1988; Truman, Tokar & Fischer, 1996). For example, Lisak et al. found that gender rigidity differentiated sexually/physically abusive and non-abusive male university students. In another study, Mosher and Anderson found that self-reported sexual aggression against women was related to belief in stereotypic masculinity among university undergraduate males. Additional studies have found a link between traditional sex roles
and the attitudes and beliefs (such as rape myth beliefs and acceptance of the use of force in
sexual situations) that seem to foster sexual aggression (Bell et al. 1992; Bernard, Bernard, &
Bernard, 1985; Boxley, Lawrance, & Gruchow, 1995; Bunting & Reeves, 1983; Burt, 1980;
For example, Good et al. found that belief in traditional male role norms was significantly related
to belief in rape myths.

Although the preponderance of evidence suggests that sex role stereotyping is involved in
sexual aggression, not all studies have found the same link (e.g., Murphy, Coleman & Haynes,
1986). In fact, exactly the opposite relationship was found in one study. Burke, Stets, and Pirog-
Good (1989) found that male perpetrators of sexual and/or physical aggression in university
dating relationships scored in the traditionally feminine direction on a measure of gender identity.
However, their study took a trait-based approach and did not look at the masculinity ideology of
the participants.

Interestingly, there is evidence to suggest that traditional masculinity may be a factor for
female sexual and physical aggressors as well. Masculinity scores correlated with sexual coercion
in dating relationships for both male and female aggressors in a study of New Zealand medical
students (McConaghy & Zamir, 1995). The more sexually coercive the student, regardless of sex,
the more he or she embraced a masculine personality orientation. In another study, a masculine
gender style predicted involvement in courtship physical aggression for both males and females
(Thompson, 1991). Several other studies have found disturbingly high rates of female physical
and psychological aggression among adolescents (Artz, 1996; Hird, 2000), with university
students in a laboratory setting (Lightdale & Prentice, 1994), and in spousal abuse among adults
(Straus & Gelles, 1990), but unfortunately have not addressed the issue of gender beliefs and
attitudes. There is some indication that girls may be as aggressive as boys, but in different ways
(Crick & Grotpeter, 1995). All of this points to the need to learn more about why some females act in aggressive ways.

In general, a connection between traditional masculinity and sexual aggression has been found in several studies. There are specific aspects of the male role that appear to be especially problematic, especially for those boys and men who over conform to those aspects.

**Hostility toward women.** Hostility toward women is viewed as a key component of modern heterosexual masculinity (Cieriello, 1993; Levant et al. 1992; Thomas, 1997; Thompson & Pleck, 1986). Anti-femininity items are included on many scales used in research investigating masculinity (Thompson, Pleck, & Ferrera, 1992). Not surprisingly, hostility toward women has been found to be related to sexual aggression for some men. Several studies have found that hostility toward women is associated with self-reported sexual aggression among male university students (Koss & Gaines, 1993; Malamuth, 1986; Malamuth, Sockloskie, Koss, & Tanaka, 1991). A scale measuring hostility towards women was found to be the most strongly related to a tendency to sexually harass among all of the attitudinal measures employed in Pryor's (1987) study that looked at the more severe type of sexual harassment.

**Dominance and power.** One component of stereotypic masculinity that has received special attention in the literature is a desire for dominance or power in relationships. Power is equated with masculinity in our society, according to Kaufman (1994). Having a sense of self-confidence or personal power was found to be related to sexual harassment perpetration among adolescent males and females by Fineran and Bennett (1999). A desire for dominance has been found in studies of both incarcerated rapists (Scully & Marolla, 1985) and in self-reported sexual aggressors (Lisak & Roth, 1988; Muehlenhard & Falcon, 1990; Petty, & Dawson, 1989; Snell et al. 1988). A desire to regain or exercise power has also been found with school-yard bullies (Ross, 1996; Miedzian, 1991) and adolescent sex offenders (Lane, 1991; Margolin, 1984;
Messerschmidt, 2000; Strauss, 1994). In addition, as previously mentioned, an underlying power factor has been linked to quid pro quo-type sexual harassment proclivities.

Formal power has been investigated many times in harassment studies because sexual harassment was first conceptualized as an abuse of authority by men in positions of power. However, the existence of formal employment or status hierarchies is not a necessary precondition to harassment. For example, sexual harassment was found to occur with equal frequency in hierarchical and non-hierarchical workplaces in a study that compared harassment rates between Israeli women working in kibbutzim and those working in regular, urban jobs (Barak et al., 1995). However, harassment from peers in workplace settings may also be related to power imbalances in the workforce. In attempting to explain workplace peer harassment of women in nontraditional occupations, LaFontaine and Tredeau (1986) observed that male co-workers of equal status do not have the same formal institutional power to harass women that supervisors and employers have. The authors concluded that because the male peers “lack an institutional basis for dominating their female colleagues, ... sexual harassment may be one of the few means available for realizing this end” (p. 439).

**Hypersexualization.** Another component of stereotypic masculinity that has received special attention is an exaggerated emphasis on sexuality. In his analysis of the social construction of male sexuality, Kimmel (1993) points out that “men are supposed to be ever ready for sex, constantly seeking sex, and constantly seeking to escalate every encounter so that intercourse will result” (p. 123). Thus, sexual behavior often confirms a man’s sense of his own masculinity. As Hill (1995) notes, “‘scoring’ with a sexually attractive woman — the more frequently the better — may become a kind of ritualistic test of their manhood” (p. 451). Messner (1992) found that university student athletes used sexual exploits with women to
impress their male peers. As one young man described it, he and his friends would “tell a lot of stories about girls. I guess it was a way to show our masculinity” (p. 97).

One of the first research studies in this area was done by Kanin (1985), who found that date rapists reported a higher emphasis on the importance of sex and sexual conquest, a characteristic that Kanin called “hypersexual socialization.” Additional support for a hypersexual component in sexual aggression has been found among adolescents (Nathanson, 1988) and adults (Bell et al. 1992; Briere & Malamuth, 1983; Lisak & Roth, 1988). Finally, the model of sexual aggression developed and successfully tested by Malamuth et al. (1991) involves a combination of sexual promiscuity (an outcome of hypersexual socialization) and hostile masculinity.

**Restrictive emotionality.** Men who act in traditionally masculine ways tend to hide their emotions, existing in a sort of “emotional straight jacket” in which anger is perceived to be the only socially acceptable emotion (Kaufman, 1993; Mosher & Tomkins, 1988). As Beneke (1997) states, men learn that to be a man means following certain rules about emotions: “don’t feel fear, don’t feel grief, don’t feel sad, remain cool under stress” (p. 66). Men who physically or sexually abuse others have been found to manifest more emotional restriction than non-abusers (Lisak et al., 1996). The route from emotional restriction to sexual assault may lie in one of two ways: by encouraging men to flash quickly to anger or by discouraging the development of empathy (Lisak et al.).

**Additional Factors Found to be Related to Sexual Aggression**

**Peer support for sexual aggression.** The hypersexual socialization process described by Kanin (1985) involves the learning and reinforcement of problematic attitudes about sexuality from other people. Modeling appears to be a key mechanism in peer influence on adolescent behaviors in general (Biddle, Bank, & Marlin, 1980). Peer approval and expectations are important factors in sexual assault and sexual harassment among older and younger adolescents.
(Ageton, 1983; Alder, 1985; Nathanson, 1988; Parrot, 1989; Roscoe et al., 1994). The importance of peer support as a factor for sexual and physical abuse in university and adult populations has also been found (DeKeseredy, 1988; Lisak & Roth, 1988; Sanday, 1990; Schwartz, M. D. & Nogrady, C. A., 1996; Smith, 1991). Finally, involvement in peer networks in which harassment is common may help explain why so many self-reported adolescent harassers are also self-reported victims (Lee et al., 1996).

**Prior victimization.** Young people who sexually harass their peers have been found to be more likely to report having been harassed themselves (AAUW, 1993; Fineman & Bennett, 1999; Lee et al., 1996; McMaster et al., 2000). Prior sexual harassment victimization also appears to be related to attitudes about sexual harassment, which may, in turn, contribute to sexual harassment perpetration. Two studies have found that an attitude of tolerance of sexual harassment is related to previous sexual harassment victimization among university students (Murrell & Dietz-Uhler, 1993; Reilly, Lott, Caldwell, & DeLuca, 1992). In addition, prior experience as an unwilling participant in sexual activity is related to increased acceptance of forced sex among adolescents (Feltey, Ainslie, & Geibb, 1991). Similarly, prior victimization involving sexual and/or physical abuse or witnessing of family violence has been shown to be a relevant factor among adolescents and adults who physically and/or sexually abuse others (Awad & Saunders, 1991; Bagley & Shewchuk-Dann, 1991; Gwartney-Gibbs, Stockard, & Bohmer, 1987; Messerschmidt, 2000; Parrot, 1989).

Although no studies have examined gender harassment victimization as a possible precursor or companion to sexual harassment perpetration, there is a strong rationale for doing so. Several feminist or “pro-feminist” theorists have argued that one of the reasons males sexually harass and assault females is in order to demonstrate their masculinity to other males, thus staving off ridicule for not being “man” enough (Beneke, 1997; Hill, 1995; Miedzian, 1993;
Thomas, 1997). Frank’s (1994) and Mac an Ghaill’s (1994) descriptions of their time spent with adolescent males show how gender harassment is sometimes used by males to punish other males who do not exhibit traditionally masculine behaviors. Messerschmidt (2000) studied two adolescent male sex offenders, and found that the boys had received considerable gender harassment at school and so were attempting to establish themselves as “real men” by sexually aggressing against females. Thus, researchers need to assess gender harassment victimization among adolescents, for harassers may have learned their harassment from receiving or witnessing previous verbal abuse related to their gender. Harassers may also be attempting to build their own masculine self-esteem that has been previously damaged by previous harassment from other men.
Summary of the Literature

Research shows that peer sexual harassment is a serious problem affecting large numbers of youths. Members of both sexes are targets of sexual harassment, although female students appear to experience it more frequently, more severely, and suffer greater consequences from it. Men outnumber women as perpetrators in most studies. Most of the literature on sexual harassment has assumed a male perpetrator and a female victim, but recent research suggests that this model is not necessarily applicable to secondary or university settings. Male and female adolescents appear to be involved in large numbers in sexual harassment as both targets and harassers. The types of sexual harassment experienced by men and women vary considerably. In the present study, an operational definition of sexual harassment is proposed that attempts to incorporate all of the examples of sexual harassment identified in research studies and court cases.

Very little research has been carried out on sexual harassers, so much of what is “known” at this point is untested speculation. The research studies reviewed above offer a number of suggestions for possible causes of peer sexual harassment among adolescents, especially for male harassers. Feminist theorists have offered a sociocultural explanation of violence against women that gives a rationale for looking at certain factors, chief among which is a constellation of behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs associated with traditional masculinity. These are as follows: (a) dominance in sexual and social arenas, (2) misogyny, (c) aggression, (d) homophobia (which can contribute to sexual harassment of gays and lesbians as well as heterosexuals who depart in manner or dress from the norm), and (e) restricted emotionality (which may restrict empathic responses). Endorsement of traditional masculinity and stereotypic gender roles has been implicated in quid pro quo sexual harassment, sexual assault, relationship violence, and bullying.
Additional factors that may relate to sexual harassment include peer support for harassment and prior victimization.

The suspected links between the factors identified above and sexual harassment among adolescents have not yet been established. It is vital to do so, because in order to prevent sexual harassment, we must understand its antecedents and reinforcement mechanisms.

**Target Population for the Present Study**

The target population for this study consists of older male adolescents. This population was selected for both theoretical and practical reasons.

*Male Students*

Men were selected because, first, research suggests that men commit more sexual harassment than females. Men are also more likely to commit the more severe forms of harassment (i.e., sexual assault). Second, the suspected correlates of sexual harassment that are examined in this study were gleaned from sexual harassment and sexual assault research studies that primarily looked at male perpetrators only. Third, next to nothing is known about female harassers. Although the list of suspected correlates for male harassers could also be used in analyses with female harassers, it is likely that men’s and women’s motivations for harassing differ. Consequently, initial exploratory studies – likely involving qualitative research methods – first need to be undertaken in order to develop a list of suspected correlates of harassment perpetration for female harassers. After the initial exploratory research, a model of female sexual harassment perpetration could be tested on a larger scale. Fourth, the theoretical work that has been done in the area of sexual harassment has been largely based on a male perpetrator model. Since many of the theoretical correlates of sexual harassment suggested by feminist theorists are related to stereotypic masculinity, it is logical to investigate male harassers when working within a feminist or pro-feminist framework.
Older Adolescents

Older adolescents were selected because of the lack of knowledge about peer sexual harassment perpetration for this population. Peer harassment may increase as students move from secondary to post-secondary schooling (Bogart et al., 1992), yet previous perpetration studies have only targeted adolescents at the secondary level. No studies have investigated peer harassment perpetration rates nor have attempted to identify correlates of peer harassment perpetration among older adolescents attending university. The present study, therefore, both provides basic perpetration prevalence data and also extends research efforts aimed at understanding peer harassment. By doing so, the present study makes a unique contribution to knowledge about adolescent peer harassers.

The older adolescent population is also of interest because this group appears to engage in greater levels of some risk behaviors that are popularly assumed to characterize younger adolescents in their teens, according to Arnett (2000). For example, binge drinking peaks at ages 21 to 22, and unprotected sex, and driving at high speeds while intoxicated reach their peak in the 18 to 25 years group. Arnett also points out that although many researchers have investigated problematic behaviors among adolescents in their teens, fewer researchers have investigated these behaviors among older adolescents.

There is an additional reason of a more practical nature for carrying out this study among university students. Permission for participation in research by adolescents under the age of 18 must be obtained from parents and schools. Because the items on sexual harassment instruments must be written in behavioral terms in order to be valid, many school administrators are hesitant about allowing researchers to pass out questionnaires for fear of antagonizing sexually conservative parents. I found this to be true in British Columbia. Although support for this
research was found among individual counsellors and teachers at several secondary schools in the Lower Mainland, permission from principals and school boards was extremely difficult to obtain.

*Defining late adolescence.* Deciding where to set the upper limit of adolescence is a somewhat difficult matter. Arnett and Taber (1994) attempted to tackle the problem of defining the end of adolescence in an article appropriately titled: *Adolescence Terminable and Interminable: When Does Adolescence End?* After a thorough review of the problem, Arnett and Taber concluded that there is no precise answer to their question because in Western culture the transition to adulthood is subjectively and individually defined. They argued that late adolescence is a long, gradual process of getting to adulthood that takes place for most people over many years.

Others who have examined adolescent development have also found that there is no easily identifiable end to adolescence. Hopkins (1983) pointed out that some people consider adulthood to start when a person becomes married. However, the median ages for women to marry in Canada and the United States in 1996 were 26.0 and 25.2, respectively (Noble, Cover, & Yanagishita, as cited in Arnett, 2000). Fuhrman (1986) observed that adolescence ends with the assumption of full adult responsibilities, and that this varies from age 18 to the early thirties. However, he did state that for most people, adolescence ends at approximately age 21. Newman and Newman (1986) stated that the period of later adolescence consists of "about ages 18 to 22" (p. 4). However, Arnett (2000) introduces a new conception of development covering ages 18 to 25 that he calls *emerging adulthood.* Arnett argues that young people in the emerging adulthood group have moved beyond adolescence to a certain degree, but are far from being full-fledged adults. For example, he found that it is only when young people reach their late twenties and early thirties that a clear majority label themselves as adults.
As shown, there is no consensus in the human development literature as to the upper or lower bounds of late adolescence. It is reasonable to assume that younger university students still have many things in common with high school students, just as it is equally reasonable to assume that older university students may share more characteristics with adults. Certainly many graduate students have more in common with working adults than with younger undergraduates. Because of the lack of an agreed upon ending for adolescence, a conservative approach was taken for this study. For the purposes of this study, late adolescence was defined as beginning at age 18 and ending at age 21; therefore, only participants between the ages of 18 and 21, inclusive, were included in the data analysis.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

Five research questions were asked in this study, as follows:

1. Is there a relationship between cross-gender peer sexual harassment perpetration among older adolescents in university and the following factors: masculinity ideology, hostility toward women, attitudes towards sexual harassment, prior gender harassment victimization, peer sexual attitudes, and attraction to power. Because previous sexual harassment/sexual assault research and feminist theory suggest that such relationships exist, it was hypothesized that substantial positive correlations would be found between peer sexual harassment perpetration and each of the above variables.

2. Which variables, singly or in combination, best explain variance in sexual harassment perpetration among university students? This question is important because the answer to it will point toward the attitudinal variables that should be targeted in educational interventions aimed at preventing peer sexual harassment. Currently no theoretical rationale exists for making a hypothesis in relation to this question. However, given that stereotypic masculinity is hypothesized by feminist theory to be deeply implicated in sexual harassment, it was
expected that the traditional masculinity variable would be a key element in the regression equation.

3. Does the same pattern of predictors for cross-gender harassment also characterize same-gender harassment? Very little is known about sexual harassers in general, and even less is known about males who harass other males. This study, then, must be considered exploratory in regards to this question. Because of the suspected link between gender harassment perpetration and stereotypic masculinity, it was hypothesized that a positive relationship would be found between scores on the sexual harassment perpetration measure and the stereotypic masculinity measure.

4. Does the inclusion of masculinity ideology contribute to explanation of variance in harassment perpetration above and beyond the contribution made by attitudes about sexual harassment and hostility toward women? It was hypothesized that masculinity ideology would make a unique contribution in explaining peer sexual harassment. The answer to this question can inform educators about the relative merits of these variables. Some researcher/educators have proposed that beliefs and attitudes about traditional masculinity should be central features of educational interventions aimed at preventing sexual harassment and sexual assault (e.g., Landis-Schiff, 1996; Novogrodsky, Kaufman, Holland, & Wells, 1992).

5. What aspects of masculinity ideology contribute the most to harassment perpetration? This research question must be considered exploratory because so little is known about the differential effects of the various dimensions of masculinity ideology. However, the Tough Image subscale of the Male Role Norms Survey (MRNS) was the only subscale found to account for unique variance in self-reported sexual aggression in a study by Truman, Tokar,
and Fischer (1996). Therefore, it was hypothesized that the Tough Image subscale of the MRNS would be the strongest predictor of variance in sexual harassment perpetration scores.
CHAPTER 3 - METHOD

Introduction

This research examined relationships between sexual harassment perpetration and the following predictors: stereotypical masculinity, gender harassment victimization, hostility to women, attitudes toward sexual harassment, peer sexual attitudes, and desire for power. The study targeted male students in late adolescence.

Participants

Students were recruited from residences in a medium-sized (10,000 students) co-educational university in a small city in Atlantic Canada. Approximately 15% of the students live in university residences. Most of the students come from Atlantic Canada, although a small minority of students come from other regions of Canada and from other countries. The university has sports teams, but it does not have fraternities or sororities. The university has somewhat of a reputation of being a “party” school where a lot of alcohol is consumed by students.

Of the 1450 students living in residence, 429 were recruited for the study. Of those filling out questionnaires, 249 were men and 180 were women.\(^1\) Only data from the male respondents were analyzed in the present study. Twenty-one questionnaires were excluded because the students were older than 21. Six participants were dropped because of extensive missing data, and three were dropped because of spoiled questionnaires.\(^2\) The final sample consisted of 199 male students.

Participants ranged in age from 18 to 21, with a mean age of 19.2 years \((SD = .97)\). Most

---

\(^1\) Data was collected from both sexes in order to prevent male students from feeling singled out and defensive. Feelings of defensiveness could deter some men from participating and could lead to social desirability problems.

\(^2\) Two participants spoiled their questionnaires by giving the same response to every question, and one participant marked his responses so as to create a geometrical design.
participants (94.5%) had lived in Canada their entire lives, and only one participant had lived in Canada for less than three years. Only fourteen participants grew up in households where a language other than English was primarily spoken (French, $n = 12$, Spanish, $n = 1$, Urdu, $n = 1$). Students were asked about ethnicity, and 95% described themselves as white. Most participants were in either their first (60%) or second (27%) year in residence. Finally, 97% of participants characterized themselves as heterosexual, 1.5% ($n = 3$) as gay, and 1.5% ($n = 3$) as bisexual.

**Representativeness of the Sample**

The study targeted male university students below age 22, and the sample was drawn from students living in residence, most of whom were first and second year students. The original sample is fairly representative of the students living in residence at the university. Of the original sample 58% were men and 42% were women, which is very similar to the 56% to 44% ratio of men to women in the residence community as a whole. The mean age (19.76) of the initial sample was also very close to the mean age (19.88) of all students living in residence, according to statistics obtained from university housing staff. Of the final sample of 199 men, 26% were 18, 40% were 19, 21% were 20, and 13% were 21. These percentages are fairly close to the percentages of students in the four age groups living in residence over all (18 years = 29, 19 years = 25, 20 years = 15, 21 years = 11). The ethnic makeup of the student body at the university is unknown, as the administration does not keep statistics on ethnicity. However, the student body gives the appearance of being overwhelmingly white, as was the sample.

**Data Collection Procedure**

Permission to gather data at university residences was obtained from residence administration. Approval for the study was also received from the ethics review committees at both the University of British Columbia and the university where the sample was taken. A letter
of permission to use the Hostile Hallways sexual harassment survey items was obtained from the American Association of University Women.

Participants were recruited during the month of March. A table was set up in residence dining hall foyers during the supper hour, and students were invited to fill out a questionnaire on “harassment” in exchange for a can of pop and a chance to win one of two $50 gift certificates to a local music store. The purpose of the study was described in a cover sheet (see Appendix A). Participants were handed a pencil and a questionnaire that consisted of a page giving directions (see Appendix B), a series of demographic questions, and the attitudinal and behavioral measures. Filling out the questionnaire took between 12 to 25 minutes for most participants.

In order to protect confidentiality, participants filled out the questionnaire in an anonymous manner and were offered an envelope to place it in before returning it to the researcher. Most students did not opt for the envelope. Upon returning the questionnaire, students were given a contest form to enter their name in the draw. They were also given a debriefing handout (see Appendix C) that explained sexual harassment and listed local resources and telephone numbers. The debriefing handout contained a statement encouraging any participants who experienced distress to contact one of the local resource numbers for counselling assistance. No distress among participants was detected by residence staff in the days and weeks after the data was gathered, according to a senior residence official.

A field test of the data collection method had been previously carried out in the residence dining halls at the University of British Columbia (White, 1997), and the experience convinced the researcher of the necessity of pointedly asking participants not to talk with anyone else while filling out the questionnaire. Participants were given this instruction orally as they were handed the questionnaire. Because participants filled out the questionnaire within view of the researcher, the degree of compliance with this instruction could be judged. The great majority of participants
did not talk at all as they filled out the questionnaire, and the small number who did were compliant after receiving a verbal reminder from the researcher.

To thank the university for allowing the study to take place, a written report on the findings was prepared for the head of residences. In addition, the researcher gave three training workshops on sexual harassment prevention to residence staff.

Measures

A questionnaire was compiled by the researcher which included the scales listed in Table 4. The scales were selected because they were the best measures available of the constructs being investigated. All except one had been used previously in studies of sexual harassment or sexual assault with university populations. The exception was a short scale measuring beliefs about power that was developed for the present study. Sexual harassment perpetration and victimization scales were also developed for this study because no instruments with demonstrated validity and reliability existed for measuring peer sexual harassment among older adolescents. Each scale is described in detail below. Demographic information on age, years in Canada, years in residence, ethnicity, language in the home, and sexual orientation was also requested.

Table 4
Instruments Used in Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Name of Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Adolescent Sexual Harassment – Perpetration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Adolescent Sexual Harassment - Gender Harassment Victimization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Male Role Norms Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Peer Sexual Socialization Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Tolerance for Sexual Harassment Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Adversarial Sexual Beliefs (hostility toward women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Attraction to Power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sexual Harassment Perpetration

The dependent variable in this study was sexual harassment perpetration, and a new self-report instrument – the Adolescent Sexual Harassment Perpetration (ASHP) – was developed for the present study. Summary information about the creation of the ASHP is provided here, and a fuller description of the instrument development process is provided in Appendix K.

The ASHP-Same assesses sexual harassment committed by males against males, and the ASHP-Cross assesses harassment by males against females (see Appendix D). Items for both scales are essentially the same, with only minor wording modifications to make them more appropriate to the gender of the target. The ASHP items ask participants about harassment they may have committed during the present year. Because participants were queried in March, the reporting period covered the previous six months, a time length under the maximum recommended by Arvey and Cavanaugh (1995) for minimizing recall problems on sexual harassment instruments. The following wording is used in the ASHP-Cross: “During this school year, how many times, if at all, did you do any of the following things to a female student, EVEN IF YOU WERE ONLY JOKING?” Participants indicate frequency of harassing behaviors by marking their answer on a 4-point scale ranging from “never” to “often”.

The ASHP is one-half of the Adolescent Sexual Harassment (ASH) scale that measures both perpetration and victimization. The ASH was constructed to sample broadly from the types of peer sexual harassment reported in studies among adolescents and/or recognized by legal definitions and court rulings in the United States and Canada. Items representing each of the modalities of peer sexual harassment (verbal, physical, and visual) reported in the literature were also included. Development of the ASH was also guided by my own extensive experience working with adolescents in high schools and universities in the field of sexual harassment and sexual assault prevention. The ASH does not include the kind of quid pro quo-type harassment
found in work situations because adolescent peer groups typically do not have hierarchical relationships characterized by formal power imbalances. The domains tapped by the ASH were roughly equivalent to the three dimensions specified by Gelfand et al. (1995), but they represented more closely the unique experiences of students who received harassment from their peers.

The original pool of 32 ASH items consisted of the AAUW (1993) items supplemented by items measuring gender harassment and other harassment behaviors reported in the literature. Item reviews by academics, professionals (school counsellors, teachers, harassment prevention officers), and groups of university and high school students helped ensure face validity. For the purposes of developing this instrument, sexual harassment was defined as unwanted behavior or comments that are of a sexual nature or that are directed toward someone because of their gender. All ASH items were written in behaviorally descriptive terms so that participants could clearly understand the behavior being assessed. Following the suggestion of other researchers using self-report instruments (Fitzgerald & Shullman, 1993), the words “sexual harassment” did not appear on the questionnaire. Instead, the instrument asked about “harassment” and the sexual harassment items were preceded by several distracter items that ask about harassment in general (e.g., calling someone a “nerd” or “brown noser”).

The factor structure of the ASH was investigated by the author of the present study in a field test involving 376 mostly first-year undergraduates at the University of British Columbia (White, 1997). For the field test, the ASH questionnaire asked students about their harassment experiences in their last year in high school. In the present study, undergraduates were asked about their harassment experiences in the current school year in university.

Exploratory factor analysis is a way to reduce the number of items in instrument development, but of more importance, it is a process of uncovering and labeling latent variables
(factors) that account for the intercorrelations among the items (Loehlin, 1992). Because men's and women's experiences with sexual harassment and their motivations for committing harassment are likely to differ, the latent variables underlying male and female responses may also differ. Therefore, in the original field study, separate exploratory factor analyses were conducted on victimization and perpetration both for men and women. As expected, somewhat different factor structures were found. A large reason for this was because of the existence of relatively low frequency counts for same-gender behaviors of a more sexual nature. Nonetheless, the analyses did produce clear evidence of a strongly defined gender harassment factor containing common item content across genders. Two other factors were also found, but their item content varied somewhat depending on the gender of the victim and perpetrator. These factors were tentatively labeled Unwelcome Sexual References/Advances and Sexual Imposition/Assault.

Changes to Instrument for Present Study

Several changes were made to the initial field test instrument for use in the present study. An important change was made to the sexual harassment target specified in the items. Although the original instrument used single items to ask about behaviors done to boys or girls, it was decided that perpetration motivations would likely be different depending on the sex of the target. Therefore, the perpetration instrument was divided into two parts in order to distinguish between same- and cross-gender harassment.

The original instrument asked university students about their last year in high school, and the wording was changed for the present study to ask about harassment behaviors in the current school year. The response format was changed to be consistent with the studies that used the AAUW (1993) instrument so that comparisons between perpetration rates could be made. The original instrument contained a prompt: "Remember, these questions ask about behaviors during
your last year of high school with someone who was not your girlfriend or boyfriend.” This prompt was deleted for the present study in order to avoid excluding forced sex behaviors that might occur within the context of a boyfriend/girlfriend relationship. Several items were dropped because of cross loadings, low item-to-total correlations, or low variance. Wording changes were made to several items following feedback from field study participants to make the items more understandable. These changes resulted in the 19-item version of the scale that was used in the present study.

**Factor analysis of ASHP-Cross.** Exploratory factor analysis of cross-gender perpetration by male students was conducted in the present study, and the results are presented in Table 5. This process yielded four factors with eigenvalues over one that together accounted for 59% of the variance. However, one of the eigenvalues was only slightly above one (1.03), and Loehl (1992) points out that eigenvalues such as this should be treated with caution because random measurement error can push them over or under the cut line. Catell’s (1966) scree test suggested the presence of either three or four factors, so both three and four factor solutions were examined. Because factor intercorrelations were substantial (over .40) for one of the factor pairs, oblique rotation was employed.

Following the recommendation of Tabachnik and Fidell (1996), the pattern matrix was used for factor interpretation after oblique rotation. After specifying rotation and extraction of four factors, two of the resulting factors consisted of only two items each and were largely uninterpretable. A three factor solution yielded three interpretable factors with only one item that had to be dropped because of cross loadings above .30 (“flashed or mooned a girl”). All retained items had factor loadings greater than .40, and the three factors accounted for 53% of the total variance (see Table 5).

---

3 Research suggests that sexual coercion within high school and university student dating relationships is
Table 5

*Factor Loadings for ASHP – Cross*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item content</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Spread a sexual rumor, passed a sexual not, or wrote sexual graffiti about a girl.</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Called a girl a lesbian or gay or something similar.</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Made negative comments about a girl’s body or body parts suggesting she didn’t look feminine enough.</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Made fun of a girl or called her names for having too much sex.</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teased a girl about her hormones (e.g., PMS).</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Called a girl a name like butch, etc., suggesting that she was not feminine enough.</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Put down females in general.</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gave a girl an unwelcome or crude compliment about her body or parts of her body.</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Showed a girl a sexual cartoon or picture or told a sexual joke that she didn’t want to see or hear.</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Flashed or “mooned” a girl.</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Made a sexual gesture or stared at a girl’s body in a sexual way.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Followed a girl around or pestered her for a date after she said she wasn’t interested.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Yelled something sexual or whistled or howled at a girl as she walked by.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Touched, grabbed, or pinched a girl in a sexual way.</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Stood too close or brushed up against a girl in a sexual way.</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Pulled at a girl’s clothing in a sexual way or pulled her clothing down or off.</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Blocked a girl’s way or cornered her in a sexual way.</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Kissed or hugged a girl when she didn’t want you to.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Forced a girl to do something sexual other than kissing or hugging.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of item variance</td>
<td>35.43</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Loadings < 0.30 have not been presented. Total N = 199.*
Factor 1 accounted for 35% of the variance and was composed of verbal behaviors including all seven gender harassment items plus two others. The gender harassment items had the highest factor loadings, so this factor is interpreted and labeled as a gender harassment factor. The highest loading (.80) was for an item stating “Made negative comments about a girl’s body or body parts suggesting she didn’t look feminine enough.” The two additional items consisted of telling unwanted sexual jokes and giving crude compliments about bodies or body parts. Fitzgerald et al. (1997) also found that similar items loaded on their gender harassment factor, and they speculate that the behaviors serve to remind women that they are seen primarily as sexual objects. This factor was found to have adequate internal consistency (α = .85).

The second factor accounted for an additional 11% of the variance and consisted of mostly physical behaviors that can be considered more serious harassment. The items with the highest loadings were as follows: “Touched, grabbed, or pinched a girl in a sexual way” (.88) and “Stood too close or brushed up against a girl in a sexual way” (.76). This factor was labeled Sexual Advances/Imposition. This factor was also found to have adequate internal consistency (α = .84).

The third factor accounted for an additional 7% of the variance and includes three items covering forced sex, forced kissing, and stalking. These forced sex and stalking items were the least frequently endorsed items, and thus may have been considered to be the most serious infractions. This factor has been labeled Sexual Assault/Stalking. Internal consistency for this subscale was considerably lower (α = .67), which is not surprising given that the subscale has only three items. Although these items can perhaps be viewed as the most serious types of harassment on the instrument, they also have low frequency of endorsement in common. Because there was so little variation in these items, it is certainly possible that the factor is merely a statistical artifact, and that a better name for the factor might be Least Endorsed Items. As
Fitzgerald (1990) put it when faced with a similar problem, factor solutions "must be considered tentative due to the unstable nature of the correlations computed on the items showing very little variance" (p. 36).

Gelfand et al. (1995) opted to drop several of their more severe, low frequency items from their harassment surveys because data analysis with such items was so problematic. However, deleting conceptually important items can threaten content validity. Therefore, efforts were made to retain the three sexual assault/stalking items. Factors two and three were conceptually similar in that both covered the more physical and sexual types of sexual harassment behaviors (as opposed to the more verbal, gender-related behaviors in the gender harassment factor). A moderately high correlation (.68) found for factors two and three supports this view. Because factors two and three were conceptually similar, because the third factor had very little variance, and because of the possibility that the third factor is a statistical artifact, factors two and three were combined for all data analyses in the present study. This combined factor is labeled Sexual Advances/Imposition.

Collapsing the second and third factors into one subscale made sense conceptually, as the items loading on these two factors all described behaviors that were more physical and overtly sexual when compared with the more verbal gender harassment items. Combining these two sets of items into a Sexual Advances/Imposition subscale also keeps the ASHP more in line with Fitzgerald et al.'s. (1997) widely used sexual harassment instrument which was consistently found to have three factors, one of which, Sexual Coercion (or quid pro quo), was not represented in the items in the ASHP.

In sum, the final version of the ASHP-Cross used in the data analyses in the present study consisted of 18 items. The instrument as a whole had good internal consistency (α = .90). Total scores on the ASHP-Cross were obtained by totaling the responses for the 18 items. Total scores
could range from 0 to 54, with higher scores indicating greater frequency of sexual harassment perpetration.

The Gender Harassment subscale had nine items and had adequate reliability ($\alpha = .85$). The Sexual Advances/Imposition subscale also had nine items and had adequate reliability ($\alpha = .84$). Subscale total scores for both were obtained by adding up the scores on the individual nine items. Total scores could range from 0 to 27, with higher scores indicating greater frequency of sexual harassment perpetration.

**Factor analysis of the ASHP-Same.** Exploratory factor analysis of the ASHP-Same revealed four eigenvalues over one. However, the eigenvalues for the third and fourth factors were only marginally over one (1.153 & 1.025, respectively). In addition, the scree plot suggested only two, or at most, three factors. Therefore two and three-factor solutions were sought. An oblique rotation provided the cleanest factor separation when three factors were requested (see Table 6). As with the ASHP-Cross, a clear gender harassment factor emerged as the first factor with almost exactly the same items. A third factor was found with the same three sexual assault/stalking items, but it shared several other items with the second factor. The fact that 97% of the males in this sample characterized themselves as heterosexual leads to uncertainty about the meaning of factor two and three behaviors, all of which fall on the more sexual side of sexual harassment. And, as with the ASHP-Cross, the existence of the third factor could be a statistical artifact.

Specifying a two-factor solution resulted in a very clean separation (i.e., no cross loadings over .30) between all of the mostly verbal gender harassment behaviors and the other, more physical and overtly sexual, behaviors. Because of this, a decision was made to follow the pattern set with the ASHP-Cross and use only two subscales in data analysis for this study: Gender Harassment and Sexual Advances/Imposition. The "put down males in general" item from the
Table 6

Factor Loadings for ASHP – Same

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item content</th>
<th>Factor 1*</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Spread a sexual rumor, passed a sexual note, or wrote sexual graffiti about a boy.</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Called a guy gay or something similar.</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Made negative comments about a guy’s body or body parts suggesting he didn’t look masculine enough.</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Made fun of a guy or called him names for not having much sex.</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teased a guy about his hormones (e.g., his testosterone level).</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Called a guy a name like wimp, sissy, cry baby, girl, bitch, or loser, suggesting that he was not masculine enough.</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Put down males in general.</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gave a guy an unwelcome or crude compliment about his body or parts of his body.</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Showed a guy a sexual cartoon or picture or told a sexual joke that he didn’t want to see or hear.</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Flashed or “mooned” a guy.</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Made a sexual gesture or stared at a guy’s body in a sexual way.</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Followed a guy around or pestered him for a date after he said he wasn’t interested.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Yelled something sexual or whistled or howled at a guy as he walked by.</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Touched, grabbed, or pinched a guy in a sexual way.</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Stood too close or brushed up against a guy in a sexual way.</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Pulled at a guy’s clothing in a sexual way or pulled his clothing down or off.</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Blocked a guy’s way or cornered him in a sexual way.</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Kissed or hugged a guy when he didn’t want you to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Forced a guy to do something sexual other than kissing or hugging.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of item variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>33.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of item variance</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>18.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Loadings < 0.30 have not been presented. Total N = 199. ** These items were not included in the data analyses.
gender harassment subscale was deleted because conceptually men could not harass other men by putting down their own sex. Internal consistency estimates were all acceptably high for the 17-item ASHP-Same as a whole ($\alpha = .87$), the 8-item gender harassment subscale ($\alpha = .87$), and the 9-item sexual advances/imposition subscale ($\alpha = .89$).

Total scores on the ASHP-Same were obtained by totaling the responses for the 17 items. Total scores could range from 0 to 51, with higher scores indicating greater frequency of sexual harassment perpetration. Subscale total scores for both were obtained by adding up the scores on the individual nine items. Total scores could range from 0 to 27, with higher scores indicating greater frequency of sexual harassment perpetration.

**Sexual Harassment Victimization**

Sexual harassment victimization was measured with the 7-item ASH gender harassment victimization subscale (GHV, see Appendix E). For each item, participants were asked about harassment received from both sexes. Item content and wording closely parallel the gender harassment perpetration items found on the ASHP, except that the sexual jokes and crude compliments items were not included. Like the ASHP, the GHV measures frequency with a four-point scale ranging from “Never” to “Often.” The stem for each of the GHV-Same items is as follows: “During this school year, how often, if at all, did a male student do any of the following things to you WHEN YOU DID NOT WANT HIM TO, EVEN IF HE WAS ONLY JOKING?”

Exploratory factor analysis of GHV-Same uncovered only one factor with an eigenvalue over one (3.22), and it accounted for 54% of the variance. The same pattern emerged from exploratory factor analysis of GHV-Cross, with only one factor found (eigenvalue = 2.65) that accounted for 44% of the variance. Because these two scales have considerable conceptual overlap and have a moderately high correlation with one another ($r = .55$), they were combined for data analysis purposes in the present study. It is the effect of receiving the gender harassment
rather than the source that is of interest in the present study. Whether coming from male or female students, gender harassment most likely has the same effect of making the male targets feel the need to conform to perceived norms of masculinity.

Although participants were asked how often other males had "put down males in general," this item was not included in the score total because conceptually, males cannot harass other males by putting down their own sex. Internal consistency for the 13-item victimization scale was adequate for this sample (\( \alpha = .85 \)).

Total scores on the GHV were obtained by totaling the responses for the 13 items. Total scores could range from 0 to 39, with higher scores indicating greater frequency of gender harassment victimization.

**Masculinity Ideology**

To assess adherence to beliefs about traditional masculinity, Thompson and Pleck's (1986) Male Role Norms Scale (MRNS) was used (see Appendix F). The MRNS was derived from the Brannon Masculinity Scale (Brannon & Juni, 1984), which measures ideological beliefs about masculinity. Masculinity ideology refers to "degree of endorsement and internalization of cultural belief systems about masculinity and the masculine gender role" (Good et al., 1994, p. 5). Evidence for the validity of the MRNS is reported in Thompson et al. (1992). As predicted by the normative ideology theoretical approach, the MRNS was found to be only minimally related to measures of trait masculinity, and strongly related to two measures of male gender role strain. In addition, MRNS subscales have been found to correlate with other scales measuring the same constructs. Scores on the MRNS have been found to vary in meaningful ways in a number of studies looking at gender, age, culture, and sexual orientation. For example, gay men scored in a less traditional direction than predominantly heterosexual university students. The MRNS has been used in research with male students in both high
school and university settings using both global scores and dimensional subscale scores (e.g., Good, et al., 1995; Lackie & de Man, 1997; Pleck et al., 1994; Truman et al., 1996). Exploratory factor analysis of the MRNS by Thompson and Pleck (1986) suggested a three-factor model. However, Fischer, Tokar, Good, and Snell (1998) conducted an exploratory factor analysis that resulted in a four-factor model that fit the data better. Testing of both models through confirmatory factor analysis across three separate samples of undergraduates supported Fischer et al.’s multidimensional, four-factor model. Because Fischer et al.’s version of the MRNS was tested and found adequate across multiple samples, it was the one selected for inclusion in the present study.

The MRNS as used in this study asked respondents to indicate their degree of agreement with 21 statements about masculinity on a four-point scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." The original MRNS used a 7-point scale, but it was changed to a four-point scale for this study in order to be consistent with the other measures. Some items were reverse scored. The first MRNS factor, labeled Status/Rationality, consisted of six items emphasizing gaining respect through career success (e.g., "The best way for a young man to get the respect of other people is to get a job, take it seriously, and do it well") and by being rational (e.g., "A man should always think everything out coolly and logically and have rational reasons for everything he does"). The second factor, labeled Tough Image, consisted of five items emphasizing hiding pain (e.g., "When a man is feeling a little pain, he should try not to let it show very much"), being highly independent (e.g., "A man must stand on his own two feet and never depend on other people to help him do things"), and projecting an air of confidence. The seven-item Antifemininity factor consisted of items critical of males who act in a stereotypically female manner (e.g., "I might find it a little silly or embarrassing if a male friend of mine cried over a sad love scene in a movie"). The last factor, Physical Violence, emphasized a willingness to use
fisticuffs (e.g., “In some kinds of situations a man should be ready to use his fists, even if his wife or his girlfriend would object”). The Physical Violence factor consisted of three items.

Internal consistency for the MRNS as a whole with the sample in the present study was found to be adequate ($\alpha = .84$), but subscale reliability coefficients were less than those reported by Fischer, et al. (1998). For this sample, subscale alphas were as follows: status/rationality ($\alpha = .65$), tough image ($\alpha = .69$), anti-femininity ($\alpha = .74$), physical violence ($\alpha = .58$). Although these reliability estimates are considerably less than desirable, they were deemed adequate for research purposes.

Total scores on the MRNS were obtained by totaling the responses for the 21 items. Total scores could range from 0 to 63, with higher scores indicating greater agreement with stereotypic masculinity ideology. Subscale scores were obtained by totaling the responses to the individual subscale items. Scores could range from 0 to 18 for the six-item status/rationality subscale, from 0 to 15 for the five-item tough image subscale, from 0 to 21 for the seven-item anti-femininity subscale, and from 0 to 9 for the three-item physical violence subscale.

**Hostility Toward Women**

Hostility toward women was measured with a three-item abbreviated version of the Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale (ASB), which was developed by Burt (1980) as one of a set of scales measuring attitudes contributing to sexual violence (see Appendix F). The ASB as a whole is one of the most widely used scales in research investigating correlates of sexual aggression. The ASB has fairly consistently been found to correlate with self-reported sexual assault, sexual harassment, and rape myth acceptance. The ASB was used as a key component of a “hostile masculinity” construct in a series of studies by Malamuth and associates, and as such was found to contribute substantially to self-reported sexual aggression (Malamuth & Brown, 1994; Malamuth et al., 1991, 1995).
Although the original nine-item ASB purportedly measures beliefs that sexual relationships are exploitative, all but two of the items involve the misogynous beliefs that women are manipulative and not to be trusted and that male dominance of women is justified. Because only two of the nine items relate to the untrustworthiness of men, it is perhaps more legitimate to view the ASB scale as a measure of hostility toward women. Other researchers have also viewed the ASB in this manner (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995; Ryan & Kanjorski, 1998).

A factor analysis by Briere, Malamuth, and Check (1985) found that the original scale was multidimensional. A subsequent study by Bell et al. (1992) used only the four items loading above .50 on a factor that they labeled “male dominance.” However, the latent construct behind these four items can also be interpreted to be hostility toward women. Bell et al. found that their “male dominance” scale was the strongest predictor of rape callous attitudes in a study with undergraduate males. Bell et al. report an alpha of .71 for their scale, but in the present study reliability for the four items was found to be .68. The scale consisted of four statements about women to which respondents indicate degree of agreement on a four-point response format ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” Bell et al. used a five-point response format, but it was changed to a four-point format in the present study to match the other instruments. The four items were as follows: “Women are usually sweet until they’ve caught a man, but then they let their true selves show;” “A man’s got to show the woman who’s boss right from the start or he’ll end up henpecked;” “A woman will only respect a man who will lay the law down to her;” and, “Most women are sly and manipulating when they are out to attract a man.”

Total scores on the hostility to women measure were obtained by totaling the responses for the three items. Total scores could range from 0 to 12, with higher scores indicating greater hostility toward women.
**Attitudes About Sexual Harassment**

Accepting attitudes about sexual harassment may contribute to sexually harassing behaviors, and to measure this the Tolerance for Sexual Harassment Inventory (TSH) developed by Lott, Reilly, and Howard (1982) was used (see Appendix G). The TSH consists of ten statements of belief about sexual advances and sexual harassment at school and at work. Research using the TSH has consistently found that men score in a predictably higher direction than women on every item among university student samples (Reilly et al., 1986; Reilly et al., 1992). Studies have found that the TSH correlates moderately with university men’s self-reports of experience with sexual harassment (Reilly et al., 1992) and self-reports of abusive sexual practices (Murrell & Dietz-Uhler, 1993).

Although the authors found that the TSH has adequate internal consistency ($\alpha = .78$) when used with undergraduates, the overall reliability coefficient found for the instrument in the present study ($\alpha = .48$) was unacceptably low. Because of the theoretically important relationship between attitudes and behaviors, efforts were undertaken to increase the reliability of the instrument so that it would not have to be excluded from the study. A reliability analysis revealed that a five-item version would produce the highest reliability estimate ($\alpha = .51$). Although this resulted in a truncated version of the scale, the resulting alpha – while still indicating a rather serious lack of consistency among the items – was deemed acceptable for research purposes. However, the low reliability of the instrument suggests that the results of analyses using it should be interpreted with caution.

Respondents indicated degree of agreement with the statements on a 4-point scale ranging from “*strongly disagree*” to “*strongly agree*”. Examples of items from this scale are as follows: “Most women who are sexually insulted by a man provoke his behavior by the way they
talk, act, or dress”, and “It is only natural for a man to make sexual advances to a woman he finds attractive.”

Total scores on the attitudes toward sexual harassment measure were obtained by totaling the responses for the five items. Total scores could range from 0 to 15, with higher scores indicating greater acceptance of sexual harassment.

**Peer sexuality attitudes**

Lottes and Kuriloff’s (1994) Peer Sexual Socialization Scale (PSS) was used to tap involvement with peers who have a hypersexual orientation, have sexually calloused attitudes, and approve of the sexual exploitation of women (see Appendix I). The authors found good reliability ($\alpha = .85$) for this 12-item instrument in a university undergraduate sample, and internal consistency in the present study was also adequate ($\alpha = .78$). Evidence for validity was provided by the authors’ expected finding that membership in a male fraternity (which has been found to be associated with sexual coercion) was associated with a more permissive sexual socialization.

Respondents indicated degree of agreement with the items on a four-point scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. Some items are reverse scored. Examples of items from this scale are as follows: (1) Among my friends, men who have the most sexual experience are the most highly regarded; and (2) My friends brag about their sexual exploits. Total scores on the peer sexual socialization scale were obtained by totaling the responses for the 12 items. Total scores could range from 0 to 36, with higher scores indicating greater hostility toward women.

**Attraction to Power**

A set of six items to measure attraction to power was developed for this study (see Appendix I). Attraction to power was conceptualized as subscribing to a prescriptive set of beliefs about the importance of being powerful, feeling powerful, and being perceived as
powerful by others. Although no validity evidence was available prior to using the instrument in the present study, the instrument did perform in expected directions. A desire for power is viewed in the sex role literature as being an integral characteristic of masculinity; and, as could be predicted, the power measure was found to have a moderately high correlation ($r = .61$) with the MRNS in the current study. In addition, the power measure was found to have the highest correlation ($r = .62$) with the tough image subscale of the MRNS. Part of maintaining a tough image is portraying confidence and power.

An internal consistency analysis revealed that one of the six power items did not seem to have been interpreted along the same lines as the other items. This item was the only reverse scored item, and as a result it was likely misinterpreted by many participants. Dropping the problematic item resulted in an adequate level of internal consistency ($\alpha = .76$) for the remaining five attraction to power items. Ideally, refining an instrument in this way is carried out during an instrument development process before the instrument is ever used for research. However, because this instrument was developed for the present study, it had not been previously field tested. A factor analysis of the remaining items found only one eigenvalue over one, accounting for 51% of the variance. The scree plot also indicated only one factor, suggesting that the instrument is unidimensional.

Examples of attraction to power items are as follows: “You need to be a powerful person in order to be successful”; “A person should feel strong and powerful”; “You need to be seen as strong by others to get respect.” Total scores on the attraction to power measure were obtained by totaling the responses for the five items. Total scores could range from 0 to 15, with higher scores indicating a greater belief in the necessity of being and feeling powerful and being perceived by others as powerful.
Summary of Measures

Table 7 displays the measures used in the study. All instruments share a four-point response format. Included in Table 7 is the construct being measured and the reliability (alpha) coefficient for each instrument.

### Table 7
**Summary of Instruments Used in Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct Being Measured</th>
<th>Name of Instrument and/or Subscale</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment committed against female peers</td>
<td>Adolescent Sexual Harassment Perpetration – Cross (ASHP-Cross)</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender harassment</td>
<td>Gender Harassment subscale (GHP-Cross)</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More sexual &amp; physical harassment behaviors</td>
<td>Sexual Advances/Imposition subscale (SA/IP-Cross)</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment committed against male peers</td>
<td>Adolescent Sexual Harassment Perpetration – Same (ASHP-Same)</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender harassment</td>
<td>Gender Harassment subscale (GHP-Same)</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More sexual &amp; physical harassment behaviors</td>
<td>Sexual Advances/Imposition subscale (SA/IP-Same)</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender harassment received from peers</td>
<td>Adolescent Sexual Harassment Victimization – Gender Harassment (GHV)</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity ideology</td>
<td>Male Role Norms Scale (MRNS)</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MRNS Status/Rationality subscale</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MRNS Tough Image subscale</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MRNS Anti-femininity subscale</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MRNS Physical Violence subscale</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement with peers with a hypersexual orientation</td>
<td>Peer Sexual Socialization Scale (PSS)</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward sexual harassment</td>
<td>Tolerance for Sexual Harassment Inventory (TSHI)</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile attitudes toward women</td>
<td>Hostility Toward Women (HTW) [subset of items from Adversarial Sexual Beliefs]</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward personal power</td>
<td>Attraction to Power (Power)</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4 – RESULTS

Data Analysis Overview

This study used correlational research methods in order to investigate the relations between peer sexual harassment perpetration and several variables suggested by the sexual harassment and sexual assault literature and by feminist theory. A series of simultaneous and hierarchical multiple regression analyses were used in order to investigate the predictive power of the variables of interest and sexual harassment perpetration. Sexual harassment against female peers was of primary interest, and perpetration against other male peers was of secondary interest. The primary dependent variable in these analyses was an overall sexual harassment perpetration score. Additional regression analyses were conducted that used perpetration subscale scores as the dependent variables in order to examine relations among the variables at a deeper level.

Scale and subscale total scores were used for all variables in the data analyses. By summing the items in the scales, the assumption for multiple regression that interval level data is used was not violated. It is generally accepted that summing rating scale data allows the data to be treated as interval level unless the data distribution is severely skewed (Streiner & Norman, 1995).

In order to further analyze the relations among the variables in the study, scores on the harassment and attitudinal measures were collapsed into high and low categories by recoding the top 50% of each distribution as high, and the bottom 50% as low. The selection of these values is somewhat of an arbitrary decision, as no consensus exists in the literature as to what

\[1\] Little variation was found on the demographic variables collected in this study. Therefore, it was expected that the demographic variables (age, years living in residence, years living in Canada, sexual orientation, ethnicity, language spoken in childhood home) would not have significant relationships with the dependent variables. Multiple regression runs with and without controlling for demographic variables indicated no changes in results. Therefore, subsequent analyses did not control for demographic variables.
constitutes high or low levels of harassment. Relations between the recoded variables were analyzed using the chi-square test of independence, a nonparametric method that is used to analyze the relations between categorical variables.

**Significance Criteria and Statistical Power**

The significance criterion was set at $\alpha = .05$ prior to conducting analyses. A power analysis was conducted following the guidelines of Cohen and Cohen (1983). With degrees of freedom equaling 7, alpha set at .05, and a desired power of .90, 172 participants would be needed to ensure a reasonably good likelihood of finding a small (.10) effect size. Thus, the number of subjects in the sample ($n = 199$) provided an adequate level of statistical power for the multiple regression analyses. The sample size was also adequate to conduct factor analyses on the sexual harassment instrument used in the study (which had 18 items), according to recommendations by Munro and Page (1993), who suggest 10 participants for every item.

**Data Conditioning**

**Missing Data**

The data set was screened for missing data. Cases with missing data for more than ten percent of a scale were dropped, following the recommendation of Knapp (1998). Six such cases were found and removed. The group mean was used to calculate a prorated score for participants missing less than ten percent of their responses on a scale. Prorated substitutions were made for same-gender Adolescent Sexual Harassment Perpetration, Gender Harassment Victimization, Peer Sexual Socialization, Male Role Norms Scale, Hostility Toward Women, and Tolerance of Sexual Harassment.²

² The number of cases for which prorated substitutions were made ranged from one for TSH to eight for MRNS.
Normality, Linearity, and Homoscedasticity

Frequency histograms were examined to screen all scales and subscales for normality, and two subscales were found to be substantially skewed. Following the advice of Tabachnick and Fidell (1996), square root transformations were made for the Sexual Advances/Imposition subscales of the ASHP-Cross Gender and ASHP-Same Gender. These transformations resulted in somewhat more normal looking distributions, so the transformed variables were used in all subsequent data analyses. Scatterplots for all independent and dependent variable bivariate relations were examined to screen for linearity and homoscedasticity. Scatterplots for multiple regression residuals were also checked. All scatterplots were deemed to be satisfactorily linear after the two transformations described above. True homoscedasticity is usually found only in very large data sets (Hopkins, Glass, & Hopkins, 1987), and therefore was not expected to be a characteristic of variables from a sample of this size. Nonetheless, most predictor variables were found to have roughly equal variability at all levels of the relations with the dependent variable. The few suspect variables did not show signs of serious heteroscedasticity, which Tabachnick and Fidell describe as greater than a one to three difference between the narrowest part of the residual plot to the widest part.

Univariate and Multivariate Outliers

Data were screened for univariate outliers by examining histograms of standardized scores. Two univariate outliers (i.e., scores > ± 3 standard deviations from the mean and discontinuous from the distribution) were found on the Sexual Advances/Imposition subscales of ASHP-Same and ASHP-Cross, one outlier on GHV, and one on Male Role Norms. Following the recommendation of Tabachnick and Fidell (1996), the participants were retained by recoding the univariate outliers so that the scores remained extreme (one point beyond the next most extreme score) and stayed within the data distribution.
Multivariate outliers were screened through an examination of Mahalanobis distances following each regression run, and one to three multivariate outliers were identified for each regression analysis. Analyses were conducted with and without the multivariate outliers included, and the results were similar. Therefore, all multivariate outliers were retained in the data set.

**Multicollinearity**

Zero-order correlations were used to screen for multicollinearity (see Table 8). Tabachnick and Fidell (1996) recommend a cut-off criteria of .70, and examination of the correlation matrix for all predictor variables indicated that multicollinearity was not a problem with any of the variables.

**Characteristics of the Sample**

Frequencies, means, and standard deviations for the instruments in the study were examined in order to characterize the sample. The means and standard deviations for total scores for ASHP-Cross, GHP-Cross, SIP-Cross, ASHP-Same, GHP-Same, SIP-Same, GHV, MRNS, MRNS subscales, Peer Sexual Socialization, Tolerance for Sexual Harassment, Hostility Toward Women, and Power are presented in Table 9. Also included in Table 9 are means and standard deviations in the metric of the original 0 to 3 response formats (0 = Never, 1 = Rarely, 2 = Occasionally, & 3 = Often) used on all of the instruments, which provide a more meaningful portrayal of mean scores. These latter statistics were obtained by first dividing scale total scores by the number of items in the scale.

In general, the participants reported committing higher levels of sexual harassment against women ($M = .74$, $SD = .51$) than against men, ($M = .58$, $SD = .43$), $t (198) = 5.92, p < .001$. When the overall harassment score is broken down into subscale mean scores, the results reveal that participants reported committing higher levels of sexual advances/imposition against
### Table 8

**Correlations Among Measures Used in Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ASHP-Cross</td>
<td></td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. GHP-Cross</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SA/IP-Cross</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ASHP-Same</td>
<td></td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. GHP-Same</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SA/IP-Same</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. GHV</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. MRNS</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Status</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Tough</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Anti-Fem</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Violence</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. PSS</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. TSH</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. HTW</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Power</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** N = 199. *p < .01** **p < .001. ASHP-Cross = Adolescent Sexual Harassment Perpetration-Cross Gender; GHP-Cross = ASHP Gender Harassment Cross-gender subscale; SA/IP-Cross = ASHP Sexual Advances/Imposition Cross-Gender subscale; AHSP-Same = Adolescent Sexual Harassment Perpetration-Same Gender; GHP-Same = ASHP Gender Harassment Same-Gender subscale; SA/IP-Same = ASHP Sexual Advances/Imposition Same-Gender subscale; GHV = ASHP Gender Harassment Victimization; MRNS = Male Role Norms Scale - global score; Status = MRNS Status/Rationality subscale; Tough = MRNS Tough Image subscale; AntiFem = MRNS Anti-Femininity subscale; Violence = MRNS Physical Violence subscale; PSS = Peer Sexual Socialization; TSH = Tolerance for Sexual Harassment Inventory; HTW = Hostility Toward Women; Power = Attraction to Power.
Table 9

Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges of Measures Used in Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th># of Items</th>
<th>Means for Scale Totals</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Means Based on Response Metric*</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>Max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHP-Cross</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHP-Cross</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA/IP-Cross</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASHP-Same</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHP-Same</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA/IP-Same</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHV</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRNS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.06</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRNS Status</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRNS Tough</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRNS Anti-Fem</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRNS Violence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.55</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 199. * All instruments used same response scale format of 0 – 3. ASHP-Cross = Adolescent Sexual Harassment Perpetration-Cross Gender; GHP-Cross = ASHP Gender Harassment Cross-Gender subscale; SA/IP-Cross = ASHP Sexual Advances/Imposition Cross-Gender subscale; ASHP-Same = Adolescent Sexual Harassment Perpetration-Same Gender; GHP-Same = ASHP Gender Harassment Same-Gender subscale; SA/IP-Same = ASHP Sexual Advances/Imposition Same-Gender subscale; GHV = ASH Gender Harassment Victimization; MRNS = Male Role Norms Scale - global score; Status = MRNS Status/Rationality subscale; Tough = MRNS Tough Image subscale; AntiFem = MRNS Anti-Femininity subscale; Violent = MRNS Physical Violence subscale; PSS = Peer Sexual Socialization; TSH = Tolerance for Sexual Harassment Inventory; HTW = Hostility Toward Women; Power = Attraction to Power.
women ($M = .61, SD = .55$) than against men ($M = .15, SD = .36$), $t = 11.63, p < .001$, but did not differ significantly on the levels of gender harassment reported against women ($M = .86, SD = .60$) and men ($M = .92, SD = .64$), $t (198) = -1.76, p = .08$. The participants reported receiving more gender harassment from men ($M = 1.11, SD = .75$) than from women ($M = .84, SD = .60$), $t = 5.87, p < .001$.

Mean scores on the attitudinal and belief measures indicate that, on average, participants scored in the neutral range (between mild agreement and mild disagreement) on almost all measures. The only variable to break this pattern was hostility towards women, the mean for which indicates that most participants do not have hostile attitudes. In looking at the masculinity ideology subscales, participants showed the greatest agreement with the status/rationality items, and the least agreement with the anti-femininity and physical violence items.

Means and standard deviations for individual harassment items are presented in Table 10. The data for harassment of both male and female targets are presented together in Table 10 for convenience sake, and not for purposes of making comparisons between groups. The behaviors most commonly reported to have been perpetrated against female students were “made a sexual gesture or stared in a sexual way,” “put down females in general,” and “teased about hormones (e.g., PMS).” The behaviors most commonly reported to have been perpetrated against male students were gender harassment put-downs concerning a peer’s degree of masculinity: “called a guy a wimp suggesting he is not masculine enough,” “called a guy gay,” and “made negative comments about a guy’s body suggesting he did not look masculine.”

In order to assess the proportions of students who reported committing the different types of harassment, a dichotomous sexual harassment variable was created, in which participants who reported no harassment in the current school year were recoded as a “0” and participants who reported at least one incident of harassment were recoded as a “1.” Table 11 presents the proportions of participants who reported committing at least one act of harassment
Table 10
Means and Standard Deviations for Perpetration and Victimization Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item content</th>
<th>Against Females Mean (SD)</th>
<th>Against Males Mean (SD)</th>
<th>From Females Mean (SD)</th>
<th>From Males Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender Harassment Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spread a sexual rumor etc.</td>
<td>.47 (.74)</td>
<td>.65 (.95)</td>
<td>.59 (.86)</td>
<td>.81 (.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called someone gay/lesbian.</td>
<td>.90 (.91)</td>
<td>1.61 (1.04)</td>
<td>.54 (.90)</td>
<td>1.39 (1.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made negative comments about body suggesting not masculine/feminine.</td>
<td>.95 (.96)</td>
<td>1.12 (1.01)</td>
<td>.73 (.89)</td>
<td>1.20 (1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made fun for too little/too much sex.</td>
<td>.97 (1.00)</td>
<td>.92 (1.05)</td>
<td>.75 (.94)</td>
<td>1.25 (1.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teased about hormones.</td>
<td>.99 (.88)</td>
<td>.78 (.93)</td>
<td>.69 (.91)</td>
<td>.71 (.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called a name like wimp/butch.</td>
<td>.90 (.90)</td>
<td>1.65 (1.03)</td>
<td>.79 (.86)</td>
<td>1.29 (1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put down females/males in general.a</td>
<td>1.07 (.89)</td>
<td>.43 (.73)</td>
<td>1.67 (1.01)</td>
<td>.72 (.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave a crude compliment about body.</td>
<td>.72 (.85)</td>
<td>.85 (.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showed sexual cartoon, etc.</td>
<td>.78 (.91)</td>
<td>.73 (.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flashed or “mooned” someone. b</td>
<td>.55 (.86)</td>
<td>.70 (.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Advances/Imposition Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual gesture or stared in sexual way.</td>
<td>1.54 (1.09)</td>
<td>.18 (.58)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yelled something sexual.</td>
<td>.87 (.97)</td>
<td>.21 (.53)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touched, grabbed, etc. in sexual way.</td>
<td>.76 (.99)</td>
<td>.24 (.59)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stood too close or brushed against.</td>
<td>.85 (.93)</td>
<td>.15 (.51)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulled at clothing in sexual way.</td>
<td>.53 (.86)</td>
<td>.21 (.61)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocked/cornered in sexual way.</td>
<td>.31 (.71)</td>
<td>.11 (.43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed around or pestered for a date.</td>
<td>.28 (.55)</td>
<td>.09 (.39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissed or hugged when not wanted.</td>
<td>.23 (.41)</td>
<td>.07 (.29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced to do something sexual.</td>
<td>.10 (.62)</td>
<td>.06 (.30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Total $N = 199$ aFor the perpetration scale, this item was scored for female targets only. For gender harassment victimization scale, this item was scored only for harassment received from women. b This item was not included in subsequent data analyses.
### Table 11
Percentage Reporting Sexual Harassment Perpetration* and Victimization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item content</th>
<th>Against Females %</th>
<th>Against Males %</th>
<th>From Females %</th>
<th>From Males %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spread a sexual rumor, passed a sexual note, or wrote sexual graffiti about a boy/girl.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called someone gay/lesbian or something similar.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made negative comments about a boy/girl’s body or body parts suggesting he/she didn’t look masculine/feminine.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made fun of a boy/girl or called him/her names for having too little/too much sex.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teased a boy/girl about his/her hormones (e.g., PMS).</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Called a name like wimp/butch, etc., suggesting that he/she was not masculine/feminine enough.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put down females/males in general b</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave a an unwelcome or crude compliment about body or parts of body.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showed a sexual cartoon or picture or told a sexual joke that someone didn’t want to see or hear.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flashed or “mooned” someone.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made a sexual gesture or stared at someone’s body in a sexual way.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed someone around or pestered them for a date after they said they weren’t interested.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yelled something sexual or whistled or howled at someone as they walked by.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touched, grabbed, or pinched someone in a sexual way.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stood too close or brushed up against someone in a sexual way.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulled at someone’s clothing in a sexual way or pulled their clothing down or off.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blocked someone’s way or cornered them in a sexual way.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissed or hugged a girl when she didn’t want you to.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced someone to do something sexual other than kissing or hugging.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Total $N = 199$  *Percentage of males who reported committing at least one instance of behavior in current school year.  b For the perpetration scale, this item was scored for female targets only. For gender harassment victimization scale, this item was scored only for harassment received from women.
against a peer in the current school year. Again, the data for male and female targets are presented together in this table for display purposes only. Table 11 reveals that only 3.5% of students reported never harassing a female peer in the current school year. Large majorities of participants reported committing at least one act of gender harassment (96%) and at least one act of the more physical – and therefore, perhaps, more serious – sexual advances/imposition behaviors (86%) against a female peer. Fewer participants reported committing any of the stalking (20%), forced kissing (18%), or forced sex (7%) behaviors. Almost all participants (96.5%) reported committing at least one harassing behavior against another male.

The percentages of participants who reported that they had harassed a peer at least once in the current school year were very high. Perhaps more important though, are the percentages of participants who reported having harassed their peers either “occasionally” or “often.” New variables were created so that participants who reported committing peer harassment “rarely” were recoded as a “0” and only those who reported harassment “occasionally” or “often” were recoded as a “1.” A majority of participants (78%) reported that they occasionally or often had committed a harassing behavior of some kind against a female peer. More than half (65%) reported committing at least one gender harassment behavior occasionally or often, although under half of the sample (46%) reported committing a sexual advances/imposition behavior occasionally or often.

A large percentage (73%) of participants reported committing at least one type of harassment behavior against another male occasionally or often. Most of these behaviors were in the form of gender harassment, of which 72% of the sample had done one occasionally or often. In contrast, only 12% reported committing a sexual advances/imposition behavior against another male occasionally or often.
Participants reported experiencing gender harassment in large numbers. Almost all (98%) had experienced at least one incident of gender harassment in the current school year, and 87% had experienced at least one behavior occasionally or often. For individual harassment behaviors coming from female students, the most frequently occurring behavior—and the behavior experienced by the most participants—was "put down males in general." For harassment from other male students, the behavior experienced the most frequently, and by the greatest numbers of participants, was "called you gay."

In order to determine the relations between perpetration and victimization, crosstabulations between harassment scores recoded as 0 or 1 were examined. This method allowed for an examination of the overlap between reporting committing at least one incident of sexual harassment and receiving at least one incident of gender harassment. Very high overlaps between perpetration and victimization were found, with 98% of self-reported cross-gender sexual harassment perpetrators reporting also being targets of gender harassment. The overlap is similar with same-gender perpetration: 99% of self-reported same-gender harassers also reported being targets of gender harassment.

*Relations Between Cross-Gender Peer Sexual Harassment Perpetration and Predictor Variables (Research Questions 1 and 2)*

Research question one asked about relations between each of the predictor variables and sexual harassment perpetration against females. Examination of the correlation matrix presented in Table 8 showed that all predictor variables had significant bivariate relations with cross-gender sexual harassment overall and with both of the subscales. A series of multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine the contributions of gender harassment victimization, masculinity ideology, peer sexuality attitudes, hostility toward women, acceptance of sexual harassment, and attraction to power to the prediction of sexual harassment perpetration against females. Table 12 shows the results of all three regression analyses.
Predicting overall sexual harassment of females. A standard multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the relative contributions of all of the independent variables in predicting overall sexual harassment perpetration against females. Specifically, this analysis examined the degree to which sexual harassment of female students could be predicted by gender harassment victimization, masculinity ideology, peer sexuality attitudes, hostility toward women, acceptance of sexual harassment, and attraction to power. Simultaneous entry was chosen because there was no known a priori reason for assuming that any of the predictors should be entered before the others. Standard regression is preferable in this case because it allows all of the variables to enter together in order to reveal any unique variance that is explained after accounting for the explanatory power of all other variables. The results of the regression are displayed in Table 12. Bivariate correlations are displayed again for comparison purposes.

The set of six independent variables significantly predicted cross-gender sexual harassment, accounting for 48% (adjusted $R^2$) of the variance, $F(6,192) = 30.92, p < .001$. Although significant zero-order correlations were found between cross-gender sexual harassment and all six independent variables, the semi-partial correlations indicate that only four of the predictors – gender harassment victimization, masculinity ideology, peer sexuality attitudes, and acceptance of sexual harassment – contributed uniquely to prediction of cross-gender harassment. Hostility toward women and attraction to power may be associated with cross-gender perpetration, but these two variables have overlapping variance with the other predictors. Examination of the semi-partial correlation coefficients indicates that gender harassment victimization is by far the strongest predictor, followed by peer sexual attitudes, and masculinity ideology. As hypothesized, traditional masculinity was found to explain a significant amount of variance in sexual harassment. Thus, male students who reported being targets of gender harassment from peers, who had peers with a hypersexual orientation,
Table 12

**Regression Analyses Predicting Overall Sexual Harassment, Gender Harassment, and Sexual Advances/Imposition Perpetration Against Females from Gender Harassment Victimization and Attitudinal Variables.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>ASHP-Cross&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>GHP-Cross&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>SAIP-Cross&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>$sr^d$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Harassment Victimization</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.37***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Role Norms Scale</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Sexual Socialization</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility Toward Women</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance for Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N = 199. * ASH Perpetration-Same scale total.  
<sup>a</sup> ASHP-Same Gender Harassment subscale.  
<sup>b</sup> ASHP-Same Sexual Advances/Imposition subscale.  
<sup>c</sup> ASHP-Same Sexual Advances/Imposition subscale.  
<sup>d</sup> Semi-partial correlations.

* $p \leq .05$  ** $p < .01$  *** $p < .001$.  
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who adhered to a more traditional masculinity ideology, and who held tolerant attitudes toward sexual harassment were more likely to commit sexual harassment against their female peers.

*Predicting gender harassment of females.* Another regression analysis was conducted to examine the relative contributions of all of the independent variables in predicting gender harassment perpetration against females. Regression results for this analysis are also presented in Table 12. Because gender harassment makes up the bulk of the perpetration done by participants, it is not surprising that the pattern found in the previous regression analysis for total perpetration was repeated in the results of this analysis. Together, the independent variables accounted for 47% of the variance in gender harassment of females, $F(6, 192) = 30.73, p < .001$. Gender harassment victimization, masculinity ideology, peer sexuality attitudes, and acceptance of sexual harassment each accounted for unique variance above and beyond the others. Inspection of the semi-partial correlations indicated that gender harassment victimization was the strongest predictor.

*Predicting sexual advances/imposition harassment of females.* A final simultaneous multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the predictive power of the independent variables with more serious sexual harassment. Results of this regression analysis are presented in Table 12 as well. Together, the six independent variables explained 29% of the variability in sexual advances/imposition, $F(6, 192) = 14.48, p < .001$. All predictors had significant zero-order correlations with sexual advances/imposition, but only gender harassment victimization and peer sexual attitudes accounted for unique variance above and beyond the others. Inspection of the semi-partial correlations indicated that gender harassment victimization was again the strongest predictor. Thus, older adolescent males who were a target of gender harassment from peers and had friends with a hypersexual focus were more likely to commit more serious sexual harassment against women.
Same-Gender Sexual Harassment Perpetration (Research Question 3)

In order to determine if the same pattern of predictors that was found for harassment of females also holds for males who sexually harass males, another series of standard multiple regression analyses were run. Specifically, these analyses examined the degree to which sexual harassment of male peers could be predicted by being a target of gender harassment, masculinity ideology, peer sexuality attitudes, hostility toward women, acceptance of sexual harassment, and attraction to power. Table 13 shows the results of all three regression runs.

Predicting overall sexual harassment of males. Together the predictor variables accounted for 47% of overall sexual harassment perpetration against males, $F(6, 192) = 31.19$, $p < .001$. Although all zero-order correlations were significant, only gender harassment victimization, masculinity ideology, and hostility toward women added unique variance when the other predictors were held constant. As with the other multiple regression runs, examination of semi-partial correlations indicated that gender harassment victimization made the strongest individual contribution to the regression equation.

Predicting gender harassment of males. With gender harassment perpetration against males as the criterion variable, the predictor variables as a group accounted for 51% of the variance, $F (6, 192) = 35.43, p < .001$. Again, all predictors were found to have significant bivariate relationships with gender harassment. Unique variance explanation was added by gender harassment victimization, masculinity ideology, peer sexual attitudes, and tolerance for sexual harassment. Examination of the semi-partial correlations indicated that gender harassment victimization was again the strongest individual predictor.

Predicting sexual advances/imposition harassment of males. A third regression analysis was conducted in order to examine the relations between the predictor variables and same-gender sexual advances/imposition harassment. The predictor variables accounted for much less overall variance ($R^2 = .12$) in this analysis, $F (6, 192) = 5.49, p < .001$. Only gender
Table 13
Regression Analyses Predicting Overall Sexual Harassment, Gender Harassment, and Sexual Advances/Imposition Harassment Perpetration Against Males from Gender Harassment Victimization and Attitudinal Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>ASHP-Same(^a)</th>
<th>GHP-Same(^b)</th>
<th>SAIP-Same(^c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(r)</td>
<td>(\beta)</td>
<td>(sr^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Harassment Victimization</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Role Norms Scale</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Sexual Socialization</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility Toward Women</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance for Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted \(R^2\) 

\(r\) = Correlation coefficient. \(\beta\) = Standardized regression coefficient. \(sr\) = Semi-partial correlation.

Note: \(N = 199\). \(^a\) ASH Perpetration-Same scale total. \(^b\) ASHP-Same Gender Harassment subscale. \(^c\) ASHP-Same Sexual Advances/Imposition subscale. \(^d\) Semi-partial correlations.

* \(p \leq .05\) ** \(p < .01\) *** \(p < .001\).
harassment victimization and hostility toward women were found to have significant relations with same-gender sexual advances/imposition by themselves ($r = .33$ & $.27$, respectively), and they were the only two variables to explain additional variance in criterion scores above and beyond that explained by the other predictors. Gender harassment victimization was again the strongest predictor in the regression equation. Thus, male students who are a target of gender harassment from their peers are more likely to commit sexual harassment not only against female students, but also against other males students. Being a target of gender harassment also predicted both subtypes of sexual harassment.

The Contribution of Stereotypical Masculinity to Explanation of Variance in Harassment (Research Question 4)

Research question 4 asked whether or not masculinity ideology explains unique variance in sexual harassment perpetration beyond that explained by attitudes about sexual harassment and hostility toward women. To answer this question, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was run, the results of which are presented in Table 14. For this analysis, tolerance for sexual harassment and hostility toward women were entered first, and together they explained 21% of the variance in sexual harassment of females, $F(2, 196) = 26.75$, $p < .001$. Entering these two variables first allowed for an examination of the power of masculinity attitudes to explain additional variance with the other two variables held constant. With the addition of stereotypical masculinity in step two, a small but significant additional 3% of the variance was explained, $F(3, 195) = 21.30$, $p < .001$. All three predictors had significant bivariate relationships with sexual harassment, and all three also had significant semi-partial correlations in the multivariate analysis. When holding tolerance for sexual harassment and hostility toward women constant, masculinity ideology explains a significant amount of additional variance in sexual harassment, as predicted. Examination of the semi-partial correlations reveals that masculinity ideology was the second largest contributor to the regression equation. Thus, adhering to traditional ideas
Table 14

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Cross-Gender Sexual Harassment Perpetration from Hostility Toward Women and Attitudes Toward Sexual Harassment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>sr</td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility Toward Women</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance for Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted $R^2$ = .21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility Toward Women</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance for Sexual Harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Role Norms Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2$ change = .03

Note: $N = 199$. a ASH Perpetration-Same scale total. b Semi-partial correlations. *$p < .05$ **$p < .01$ ***$p < .001$.

about masculinity predicted sexual harassment against female peers above and beyond the amount predicted by attitudes toward women and attitudes toward sexual harassment.

Does Any Particular Dimension of Masculinity Ideology Better Predict Sexual Harassment Perpetration? (Question 5)

All four of the MRNS subscales were given simultaneous entry in a multiple regression analysis to investigate whether any of the subscales were more powerful than the others in predicting cross-gender and same-gender sexual harassment. The results of the two regression analyses are displayed in Table 15. The four masculinity subscales together accounted for 16% (adjusted $R^2$) of the variance in sexual harassment of female students, $F(4, 198) = 10.56$, $p < .001$. All zero-order correlations with sexual harassment were significant, and anti-femininity and physical violence accounted for additional variance above and beyond the others.
### Table 15

**Regression Analyses Predicting Cross-Gender and Same-Gender Sexual Harassment from Masculinity Ideology Dimensions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>ASHP-Cross&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>ASHP-Same&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status/Rationality</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tough Image</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Femininity</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Violence</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N = 199. <sup>a</sup> ASHP Cross-Gender Sexual Harassment <sup>b</sup> ASHP Same-Gender Sexual Harassment <sup>c</sup> All predictor variables are Male Role Norms Scale subscales. <sup>d</sup>Semi-partial correlations. *p < .05 **p < .01.

Comparison of the sizes of the semi-partial correlations indicates that physical violence is the strongest predictor, followed by anti-femininity.

In predicting sexual harassment of male peers, the four dimensions of the MRNS together explained 16% (adjusted $R^2$) of the variance, $F (4, 198) = 10.16, p < .001$. All four MRNS dimensions again were found to have significant zero-order correlations with the sexual harassment variable. However, in the results of this analysis only anti-femininity accounted for variation on top of that accounted for by the other dimensions. In other words, male students who believed that men should never act like women were more likely to sexually harass their female and male peers. In addition, male students who believed that men should be physically tough and be willing to get into fights were also more likely to sexually harass female peers.
High-Level and Low-Level Harassers

An analysis of the crosstabulations between overall cross-gender harassment and the predictor variables for this sample was conducted in order to get a clearer understanding of the relationships between the variables, and the results are presented in Table 16. Scores on all measures in the study were dichotomized into high and low categories by recoding the top 50% of each distribution as high, and the bottom 50% as low. A cut-off point for separating participants into high and low groups would ideally reflect a criterion-based judgement about the meaning of high and low scores. However, no studies have been conducted with adolescents or adults to determine meaningful high and low levels of harassment. Nor do expert opinions on such criterions exist in the literature.

A problem with using the top and bottom 50 percent of a distribution is that there is very little difference between a score at the 47th percentile and a score at the 53rd percentile, yet they are treated as distinctly different levels of scores. In contrast, someone who scored at the 10th percentile on a measure is clearly different from someone who scored at the 90th percentile. Although it would have been preferable to use the top and bottom 25 percent of the distributions, an attempt to do so resulted in too few cases in several of the cross-tabulation cells. Therefore, a very rough division between high and low scorers was accomplished by selecting the 50th percentile as the dividing point. This is admittedly an arbitrary division point, however, so the analysis results based on this cut-off point probably should be treated as rough estimates only.

A large majority (79%) of those in the sample who commit high levels of harassment against women also report receiving high levels of gender harassment. Majorities of the sample who scored highly on harassment of women also scored highly on the predictor variables. In looking at traditional male role norms, 68% of high harassers of females also scored highly on the MRNS.
Table 16

Percent of High-Level and Low-Level Sexual Harassers with High Scores on Victimization and Attitudinal Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sexual Harassers of Women</th>
<th>Sexual Harassers of Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>High&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Gender Harassment Victimization from Men and Women</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Gender Harassment Victimization from Men</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Gender Harassment Victimization from Women</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Traditional Masculinity</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Peer Sexual Socialization</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Hostility Toward Women</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Tolerance of Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Power</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *High and Low = top and bottom 50% of distributions. <sup>b</sup> n = 93  <sup>c</sup> n = 106  <sup>d</sup> n = 97  <sup>e</sup> n = 102
* p < .05  ** p < .01  *** p < .001.

Cross-gender and same-gender sexual harassment overlap. As shown in the cross-tabulations for perpetration against males and females in Table 17, of the participants who reported committing high levels of gender harassment against female students, 79% also reported committing high levels of gender harassment against male students. And 72% of high sexual advances/imposition harassers of female students are also high gender harassers of male students. As could be expected, the opposite pattern was found when comparing cross-sex gender harassment and same-sex sexual advances/imposition rates. Less than half of high gender harassers of female students (40%) were also found to be high-level sexual advances/imposition harassers of male students. Not shown in the table is the finding that 79% of high gender harassers of women were also high sexual advances/imposition harassers of men.
Table 17

Percent of High-Level and Low-Level Sexual Harassers of Female Students Who Are Also High Harassers of Male Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Harassers of</th>
<th>Sexual Advances/Imposition Harassers of Women</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low $^b$</td>
<td>High $^c$</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Gender Harassers of Men</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Sexual Advances/Imposition Harassers of Men</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $^a$ High and Low = top and bottom 50% of distributions. $^b$ 114 $^c$ 114 $^d$ 92 $^e$ 107

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

**Recognition of sexual harassment.** An item asking participants how many times they had “sexually harassed a girl” was included in the questionnaire after the ASH-Cross items were presented in order to determine whether harassers recognized that they had committed harassment. A similar item asking if they had “sexually harassed a boy” was placed after the ASH-Same items were presented. Harassers were divided into high and low harasser groups in order to see if high harassers were correctly identifying themselves as such. As Table 18 shows, only 26% of high harassers of women said that they had ever sexually harassed a woman. And only 11% of high harassers of men said that they had ever sexually harassed a man.
Table 18

Percent of High-Level\(^a\) and Low-Level Sexual Harassers Who Answered “Yes” to the Question “Have You Ever Sexually Harassed a Female/Male?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Harassers of Women</th>
<th>Sexual Harassers of Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question answered in affirmative</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \(^a\)High & Low = top and bottom 50% of distribution. \(^b\)\(n = 93\) \(^c\)\(n = 106\) \(^d\)\(n = 97\) \(^e\)\(n = 102\)

\(^*p < .05\) \(^**p < .01\) \(^***p < .001\).
CHAPTER 5 – DISCUSSION

This study investigated sexual harassment in late adolescence in order to better understand factors that are related to perpetration. Male undergraduates between the ages of 18 and 21 living in residence at a small Atlantic Canadian university were questioned about their experiences with peer sexual harassment during the current school year. A primary aim of the study was to explore the relation between stereotypical masculinity and sexual harassment perpetration against female peers. A major feature of the study was the use of a new sexual harassment scale that is both a reliable and valid measure of the construct of peer sexual harassment. By sampling broadly from all domains of peer sexual harassment reported in the literature – including gender harassment – the use of this scale addresses a key criticism of past research.

Sexual Harassment Frequency

Victimization Frequency

In order to find out about the gender harassment that participants have received from peers, this study asked participants to report on the frequency of a list of harassment behaviors. Participants were asked to report only on behaviors that were unwanted. Large numbers of participants in this study reported experiencing sexual harassment from their peers. Almost the entire sample in the present study (98%) reported experiencing at least one incident of gender harassment in the previous six months. More than half of the students in this sample had committed a majority of the gender harassment behaviors against both female and other male students.

The overwhelmingly large percentage (98%) of students reporting being the target of peer sexual harassment found in the present study is higher than the percentages
reported elsewhere in the literature. Victimization prevalence estimates for male students reported in the high school studies (Roscoe, Strouse, & Goodwin, 1994; Fineran & Bennett, 1995) range from 37% to 79% and are at about 75% in the university studies (Percival & Mazer, 1989; Shepela & Levesque, 1998) that have asked male students about victimization. When looking at just those students who reported receiving harassment often or occasionally, the present study found a rate of 79%. In contrast, 49% of the younger adolescent male students in the AAUW (1993) study reported receiving harassment often or occasionally. The AAUW study was the only one to group responses in this manner, so comparisons with other studies are not possible.

Examination of victimization rates for individual items shows that the present study had somewhat higher rates as well. However, comparisons must be treated with caution since the only type of sexual harassment victimization asked about in the present study was gender harassment. This study found that 75% of male students had been called “gay” by other male students, and 73% had been called “a name like girl, wimp, sissy, cry baby, bitch, or loser” by other male students in the current school year. The highest rate for being called gay for other studies was OSSTF (1994), in which 45% of the male high school students reported having the experience. Few of the other studies included gender harassment items, although some contained verbal harassment items that might include gender harassment. For example, in the other studies, receiving unwanted comments, jokes, teasing, etc. was reported by percentages of male students ranging from 56% to 75%. Thus, the verbal harassment rates found in the present study were consistent with at least some previous studies.
A plausible explanation for the difference in victimization rates between this and previous studies lies in the characteristics of the samples. The present sample included only students living in residence, whereas Mazer and Percival (1989) queried both full- and part-time university students living in a variety of on- and off-campus accommodations. It is likely that male students living in residence would have more harassment experiences than those living off campus simply because of the increased opportunities living in residence affords for interacting with peers. By living in residence, the students in the present sample have 24-hour access to their peers. Students in high school settings in particular would have fewer opportunities for peer interactions.

Another likely explanation for the larger percentages of harassed students in the present study lies in the broader definition of sexual harassment used in the present study. The domain of gender harassment has been under-sampled in previous studies, and the present study used an instrument that sampled broadly from this domain. There are other possible explanations for the difference in victimization rates as well. Peer sexual harassment may increase as youth move from high school to university, as has been suggested by Bogart et al. (1992). No longitudinal or cross-sectional studies have investigated this issue, although sexual harassment experiences have been found to increase across the high school years (Lee et al., 1996).

The age range of students sampled in the studies varies as well. For example, Mazer and Percival’s sample ranged from ages 18 to “25+”, and it may be that sexual harassment is not as prevalent among older university students. However, no trends in harassment perpetration or victimization were evident with the sample in this study. Age was found to have a significant relationship with only sexual advances/imposition.
perpetration, but the small (.15) correlation indicates that only two percent of the variance in sexual harassment is explained by age.

_The meaning of “victimization.”_ This study asked about behaviors that were unwanted, but most legal and institutional definitions of sexual harassment require that the behavior not only be unwelcomed, but cause distress and interfere with the recipient's academic or work life. Consequently, several studies that have focused on victimization have also asked participants to report on the degree of upset that they experienced from the behaviors. In this way, the researchers could differentiate between true sexual harassment and other behaviors that may be annoying but do not cause distress to the recipient. Because this study did not ask about the amount of distress that resulted from the received behaviors, it is perhaps unwise to label the recipients as “victims.” However, the goal of this study was not to document rates of harassment victimization. Instead, the goal was to explore relationships between harassment perpetration and factors that previous research indicate may be implicated. Gender harassment victimization experiences were investigated in this study because such harassment has the effect of enforcing conformity to stereotypical patterns of masculinity.

_Perpetration Frequency_

Large numbers of students reported committing sexual harassment toward their peers in the present study. Almost all respondents admitted to committing at least one incident of harassment against a female or male peer. No previous studies with university students have asked about sexual harassment perpetration, but the high school studies that asked about self-reported perpetration found lower perpetration rates. Studies with high school samples found perpetration prevalence rates ranging from 60% (OSSTF, 1994) to
72% (Fineran & Bennett, 1999). These percentages were much lower than the 96% rate found in the present study.

Perpetration rates against female students for individual items in the present study ranged from 78% (made a sexual gesture or stared at a girl's body in a sexual way) to 7% (forced a girl to do something sexual other than kissing or hugging). The highest reported percentage for a single item in any of the other studies was 60% for calling a peer a gay or lesbian. In the present study, 71% of students had called another student gay or lesbian.

The percentages of males who reported committing the most severe behavior is roughly equal across studies. In the present study, 7% of participants reported forcing a girl to do something sexual other than kissing or hugging. The Ontario study (OSSTF, 1995) used the same sexual assault item and found that 6% of males had committed the behavior. Fineran and Bennett (1999) found that 8% of high school males reported committing a somewhat similarly worded item. However, both of those studies had much longer reporting periods than the six month period in the present study.

In sum, perpetration rates were somewhat higher in the present study than in previous studies. One plausible explanation for the higher rates is that the students in this study have more opportunities to commit harassment because they live in residence where they have 24-hour access to their peers. Because previous perpetration studies involved only high school students, they did not ask about peer harassment among students living in residence. For example, the largest study – AAUW (1993) – asked about victimization and perpetration committed on school grounds only.
Another likely reason for the greater rate of self-reported perpetration seen in the present study is that the present study incorporated more gender harassment items than were included in the previous studies. Indeed, if the gender harassment items in the present study are excluded, the frequency percentages found in the present study are in keeping with those found in previous studies with adolescents.

If the high rate of perpetration found in the present study is accurate, it supports Thomas' (1997) view that sexual harassment of the ordinary, dripping tap variety is a practice in which most men engage. Thomas argued that "normal" heterosexual masculinity involves a certain degree of misogyny and attempts to dominate women. For men, ordinary, dripping tap sexual harassment is "an act of conformity, rather than one of deviance" (p. 148). It is likely that the instrument used in the present study was more sensitive in detecting the ordinary, dripping tap harassment.

**Overlapping Perpetration/Victimization**

Previous studies of adolescents have made the remarkable discovery that harassers report that they, too, were harassment victims (Fineran & Bennett, 1999; Lee et al., 1996; McMaster et al., 2000). Among high school harassers, 94% claimed that they, too, were sexual harassment victims. The results of the present study follow this same pattern, with virtually all harassers claiming that they were also victims of harassment. In addition, 75% of the participants in the present study who reported committing high levels of harassment reported that they were also the recipients of high levels of gender harassment from peers.

The persistent overlap found in perpetration studies across the adolescent age spectrum is difficult to explain. McMaster et al. (2000) state that victimization and
perpetration may be “two aspects of a single phenomenon of harassment involvement” (p. 21). The authors speculate that the overlap may exist because students who do peer harassment are immersed in peer groups consisting of other harassers.

Support for the interpretation offered by McMaster et al. (2000) is found in the results of the present study. A moderately high positive correlation (.51) between committing gender harassment against female students and having sexually callous peers was found. Other support is reported by Pryor and Whalen (1997) who described a series of studies with university men that found that sexual harassment of the more severe, coercive sexuality type is more likely to occur when local norms allow it and when a harassing role model is present.

The influence of all-male peer groups on men’s relationships with women has been explored in depth by Michael Messner in his (1992) book *Power at Play: Sports and the Problem of Masculinity*. In interviewing university student athletes, Messner found that the “use of women as objects of sexual conquest is important for gaining status in the male peer group” (p. 97). He observed that perceived male peer group expectations and attitudes shaped and limited the way the young men related to women, resulting in stilted relationships. Messner concluded that “In a very real sense, these young males’ relationships with females – whether sexual or not – were constructed through (indeed, were often distorted by and subordinated to) their relationships with their male teammates” (p. 97). For the young men in the present study, it appeared that perceived peer attitudes may also be linked to sexual harassment of women.
Relations Among Variables

As hypothesized, each of the predictor variables was found to have a significant positive relationship with sexual harassment perpetration, regardless of whether the target is a man or woman. Gender harassment victimization had the largest zero-order correlation coefficients, followed by peer sexual socialization, masculinity ideology, and hostility toward women. The predictor variables were each significantly correlated with the harassment subscales as well, with the exception of same-gender sexual advances/imposition. Only gender harassment victimization and hostility toward women had significant correlations with this subscale. Thus, on the face of it, men who committed gender harassment of men of both men and women and more severe harassment of women were more likely to be harassed themselves, had hypersexual and sexually callous peers, believed that men should act in stereotypically masculine ways, were hostile toward women, were accepting of sexual harassment, and had a strong desire for power.

Zero-order correlations reveal simple, bivariate relationships between variables, but of more interest are the relationships between the predictor variables and the harassment types when overlapping variance was taken into account. The results of regression analyses revealed the relative merits of the variables in predicting harassment. The results also indicated which factors make unique contributions to explaining variance in the target variables when the others were held constant.

Predicting cross-gender harassment. For sexual harassment against females as a whole, gender harassment victimization contributed the most to prediction of cross-gender harassment in this sample. Next in order of importance were peer sexual
socialization and masculinity ideology. This same pattern of predictor variables held true for the two cross-gender harassment subscales: gender harassment and sexual advances/imposition. Only attraction to power failed to be a significant predictor. Despite having a significant zero-order correlation with each of the harassment criterion variables, belief in the need to be powerful was a redundant predictor in each of the regression equations. It is likely that the variance in harassment perpetration explained by this scale overlapped with the variance explained by the masculinity ideology scale. Part of maintaining a tough, masculine image is portraying confidence and power. Attraction to power and the Tough Image subscale of the MRNS had a moderately high correlation with one another.

**Predicting same-gender harassment.** Hypothesis number three predicted that the pattern of predictors for cross-gender harassment would be repeated for same-gender harassment. The hypothesis was only partially confirmed. As with harassment of female peers, gender harassment made a significant contribution to the prediction equations even after the contributions of the other variables had been taken into account. This was true for sexual harassment overall and for each of the two subscales. Although masculinity ideology and peer sexual socialization were both significant predictors of gender harassment, neither was a significant predictor for sexual advances/imposition harassment of male peers. Inexplicably, only hostility toward *women* explained significant additional variation in more serious sexual harassment of men. This suggests that much more research is needed in order to understand male-on-male harassment of the sexual advances/imposition type.
The same pattern of bivariate and multivariate relationships that was found for male-on-female harassment was not found for male-on-male harassment of the sexual advances/imposition type. This is perhaps to be expected in a largely heterosexual sample. Nonetheless, the results suggest that cross- and same-gender harassment may be distinct behaviors. McMaster et al. (2000) reached this same conclusion after testing models of harassment among young adolescents. McMaster et al. interpreted their results as suggesting that perpetrators of same-gender harassment are not necessarily the same perpetrators of cross-gender harassment. The results of the present study support this, but only in regard to the more serious sexual advances/imposition type of harassment. That is, male students who were targets of gender harassment from peers, who believed that men should be masculine in the traditional sense, and who had peers who place high importance on sex and sexual conquest were more likely to commit both gender harassment and sexual advances/imposition harassment of women and were also more likely to commit gender harassment of other men. However, the men who committed the more serious type of harassment against men were more likely to have hostility toward women and to be targets of gender harassment from peers.

Gender harassment was found to be significantly related to sexual harassment in this study. Men who scored as high perpetrators of sexual harassment of either type against women were more likely to be high gender harassers of men; that is, roughly three-fourths of men who committed high levels of harassment against women were also high gender harassers of other men.
Masculinity Ideology

Hypothesis number four predicted that masculinity ideology would explain additional variance in sexual harassment perpetration against women beyond the variance explained by attitudes toward harassment and hostility toward women. Masculinity ideology explain a significant amount of variance even after the other two variables had been taken into account. This suggests that masculinity ideology must be considered in attempting to understand men’s sexual harassment of women. Harasser attitudes toward women and harassment are important, but the harassers’ beliefs about what it means to be a man may be equally as important. This can be seen in two of the studies looking at male harassment of women in which the harassment seemed to be not so much about the women as about the harasser’s relationship with other men (Dzeich & Weiner, 1984; Thomas, 1997). As Thomas observed, the men doing whistling and cat-calling behaviors did so when other men were around to see it, and thus seemed to be “performing to an audience of one’s peers” (p. 144).

Masculinity ideology as a multidimensional construct. Research question number five asked about the relative strengths of the four subscales of masculinity ideology in explaining sexual harassment, and it was hypothesized that the Tough Image subscale would explain variance above and beyond the others. The data analysis did not support the hypothesis. The Tough Image subscale did not account for unique variance in harassment perpetration; instead, the Violent Toughness and Anti-Femininity subscales were found to offer unique explanatory power in predicting harassment against women. Understanding the relative importance of the Violent Youghness subscale is difficult. It may be that men who believe that men should be willing to get into physical fights are
more likely to be aggressive in other ways as well. However, the Violent Toughness scale had marginal reliability in the present sample ($\alpha = .58$), so these results must be treated with caution.

The Anti-Femininity subscale was found to explain unique variance in perpetration against both female and male peers. Thus, it appeared that believing that men should not act in “feminine” ways was an important predictor of both cross- and same-gender sexual harassment. In the case of male-on-male harassment, this is logical given that most of the harassment that male adolescents experience is in the form of gender harassment in which men are called “girls,” “sissies,” “wimps,” etc. With male-on-female harassment it may be that the antipathy toward femininity in men may have at its core an underlying antipathy toward femaleness in general, as has been suggested by Kaufman (1993) and other pro-feminist and feminist writers and researchers. Truman et al. (1996) have speculated that “men who strongly endorse the component of traditional masculinity that devalues the ‘feminine’ as ‘unmasculine’ may more easily be able to feel justified in aggressing against women” (p. 560). Similarly, Thomas (1997) argues that the sexual harassment of women is a way for men to act out the desire to “differentiate the male self from all things female” (p. 137).

In sum, gender harassment victimization, involvement with peers with a callous, hypersexual orientation, and believing in the tenets of traditional masculinity were the most potent predictors of sexual harassment perpetration of all types against females and of gender harassment against males. Gender harassment victimization was the strongest predictor for all targets and types of harassment. Therefore, special attention is given it in the next section.
Gender Harassment

Gender harassment victimization was found to be the most important predictor for sexual harassment perpetration in this study. A good definition of gender harassment comes from Miller (1997) who studied the harassment that many women in the military receive from male soldiers: "gender harassment refers to harassment that is not sexual, and is used to enforce traditional gender roles, or in response to the violation of those roles" (p.35). Thus, female soldiers may hear comments questioning the ability of women to drive trucks.

Gender harassment of girls and women can serve to enforce stereotypically feminine roles in other ways as well. For example, the verbal bantering about "sluts" and "nymphos" that is sometimes heard among young people may let female adolescents know about the importance of not being perceived to be having sex too frequently or enjoying sex too much. Spreading sexual rumors can possibly serve the same function. Comments about bodies and body parts – both positive and negative – can serve to remind girls and women of the need to meet stereotypical standards of beauty. Frequent comments and references to sexuality can remind women that their worth in a patriarchal culture is equated with their sexuality (Miller, 1997).

Gender harassment of women may be tied to gender harassment of men. Schacht (1996) describes university rugby players who gender harass both women and men with misogynistic comments. "While most of these practices are applied to women, they also are used in a homophobic fashion on males who do not measure up to rugby players' images of being a 'man'" (Schacht, 1996, p. 558). Fagot (1985) found that such gender harassment among boys starts at a very early age. In watching two-year-olds play, she
observed a pattern of verbal enforcement of norms concerning what are acceptable toys for boys and girls. As Fagot observes:

> We see that the male peer group starts defining what is not male very early and that the behaviors that are defined as not male drop out of the boy’s repertoire. . . . We can see in these young children what might be called the tyranny of the male group (p. 1102).

Thus, boys learn what it means to be a man from other males. In general, being a man means a rigid rejection of things considered feminine. Gender harassment can be seen as part of the verbal reminding process by which males ensure that other males relinquish such “feminine” traits as empathy, compassion, and being emotionally expressive.

Campbell (1993) describes the process thusly:

> As a boy moves toward adulthood, he attains masculinity by following a narrow path beset on either side by the dangers of effeminacy. The price of failure is high. The taunt of “Mama’s boy,” for example, is a stinging accusation, and he will learn to steer clear of it.

> Boys may select female targets in order to prove their masculinity to their peers.

Fear of not being seen as masculine enough by other men may be a key to understanding the sexual harassment of women. As Thomas notes in her sexual harassment study,

> What impels men to behave in this way towards women may actually be fear as much as anything else. For as we have seen . . . there is an openly acknowledged fear of failing to conform to the rules of masculinity – a fear of not being accepted as one of the lads (Thomas, 1997, p. 149).

Thus, perceived expectations of other men about the importance of meeting rigid standards of masculinity are likely an important factor in men’s harassment of
women. And these expectations are often delivered in the form of gender harassment.

Studies that have included gender harassment indicate that it is an odious experience for both female and male recipients (e.g., Dahinten, 2000; DuBois et al., 1998; Gerrity, 2000; Miller, 1997; Shakeshaft et al., 1995). The degree of distress it causes men and women is enough to suggest that gender harassment should be taken seriously. The results of the present study offer additional compelling reasons for doing so. Among the students in this sample, the large majority of high gender harassers of other males were also high gender harassers of females. In addition, those who committed gender harassment against women and other men were more likely to commit more serious sexual advances/imposition harassment against women as well. Almost 80% of high cross-sex gender harassers in this study were also high cross-sex sexual advances/imposition harassers. The same pattern held true for same-sex gender harassers: 70% of gender harassers of males were also high sexual advances/imposition harassers of females. Thus, the young men who frequently voiced sexist jokes and comments and other verbal putdowns of women were generally the ones who committed the more serious types of sexual harassment as well. This was also noted in another study with undergraduates in which a relation between sexist humor and self-reported sexual, physical, and psychological aggression against women was found (Ryan & Kanjorski, 1998).

Gender harassment has been left out or under-sampled in many – if not most – sexual harassment studies. But the results of the present study provide evidence of the widespread occurrence of gender harassment and of the link between gender harassment
and other, more serious, harassment behaviors. Researchers have consistently found that the majority of adolescents, whether in university or high school, have difficulty labeling gender harassment and other types of verbal harassment as sexual harassment (Fitzgerald & Hesson-McInnis, 1989; Loredo et al., 1995; Padgitt & Padgitt, 1986; Powell, 1986). This may be because gender harassment is often considered less severe. However, the more important reason may lie in the ubiquity of gender harassment behaviors. Stockdale and Vaux (1993) found that university students seemed to make determinations as to which behaviors constituted sexual harassment based not so much on the perceived severity of the behavior as on the prevalence of the behavior. Thus, the more widespread a behavior, the less likely it is to be labeled as harassment. An implication for this is that such normalized behaviors are less likely to be taken seriously by victims, perpetrators, and, perhaps, educational administrators.

For Hotelling and Zuber (1997) “sexual harassment both emanates from and reinforces the traditional sex roles of men and women” (p. 103). The gender harassment that the male students in the present study reported receiving appears to function in the way described by Hotelling and Zuber: it is based in and serves to uphold traditional sex roles. Indeed, gender harassers can almost be considered sex role police in that the gender-based comments and put downs they display are aimed at peers who are perceived to deviate from socially sanctioned roles.

Interestingly, the male students in the present study reported receiving large amounts of gender harassment from women as well as from men. It is not known why women engage in this type of behavior. It may be that the women who do so are only reacting in kind to harassment they have received from men. In the present study, the
most frequently occurring behavior coming from women – and the behavior experienced by the most participants – was "put down males in general." It is easy to imagine that the reason so many men hear comments like "all men are pigs" from women is because so many men act in harassing ways toward women. It also likely, though, that some women also participate in the gender policing process by gender harassing men.

Evidence from DuBois et al. (1998) suggests that same-gender harassment bothers men the most, and nothing in the present study disputes this. However, when a multiple regression was run that included separate variables for gender harassment received from male and female students, female gender harassment victimization was found to explain additional variance in male sexual harassment perpetration above and beyond that explained by gender harassment victimization from men. Future studies should perhaps explore the gender harassment of men by women in order to understand these reported behaviors.

Support for Feminist Analysis of Harassment

The present study was conceived and carried out under a feminist framework. This is in keeping with my own pro-feminist perspective. My prevention work with male secondary and post-secondary students has also been strongly influenced by feminist theory. For example, in the many sexual assault/harassment prevention workshops that I have led, I have encouraged male participants to critically examine the messages they receive from the media about masculinity. One reason for carrying out the present study was to test my own pro-feminist assumptions about sexual harassment.

The results of this study generally support a feminist analysis of harassment. Most feminist analyses of sexual harassment argue that patterns of gender relations and
traditional sex roles are implicated in the perpetuation of sexual harassment, a position supported by the finding in the present study of the importance of masculinity ideology. Men whose scores on the MRNS indicate that they oversubscribe to the tenets of traditional masculinity are also more likely to harass women. When harassers were divided into high and low groups, it was found that 68% of men who scored highly on masculinity ideology were high harassers of women.

Much previous feminist-inspired research has tended to focus on men's attitudes toward women because sexual harassment has been rightly seen as behavior that is related to sexist attitudes and the lower status of women in society. In the present study, hostility toward women was found to be positively associated with harassment perpetration against women. However, men's attitudes and beliefs about men were found to explain additional variance above and beyond that explained by attitudes toward women. These results suggest that men's beliefs about masculinity should be incorporated into analyses of sexual harassment.

This study assumed that men can be the victims of gender harassment from women, an assumption not shared by all feminist theoreticians, some of whom argue that only men have the societal power to commit sexual harassment (e.g., Superson, 1993). However, this study found that the gender harassment men received from men and women appears to be implicated in men's harassment of women. Men who received frequent messages from their peers — regardless of the gender of the source — about the importance of being "manly" were much more likely to sexually harass women. Previous findings by some feminist researchers employing qualitative methods (e.g., Thomas, 1997) also support this conclusion.
The results of this study also lend support to the notion proposed by some feminist theorists of a continuum of violence against women, in which the different behavioral points are connected by common underlying causes. Gender harassers and more serious harassers were found to share similar attitudes and beliefs. In addition, the factors associated with sexual harassment in this study also have been found to be associated with sexual assault in previous studies.

**Implications for Educational Intervention and Prevention Efforts**

The results from this study have important implications for efforts by educational administrators to combat peer sexual harassment. The large amount of harassment reported by the male students in this study suggests that peer harassment is a common experience for university students. Therefore, universities and schools should recognize that peer harassment exists, and should put peer harassment policies in place.

Gender harassment has been ignored in some institutional definitions of sexual harassment, but most legal authorities now recognize that it is indeed a form of sexual harassment. Gender harassment should be included in institutional policies because of the links between gender harassment and more severe harassment found in the present study. Gender harassment victimization was found to be the largest predictor by far of all types of harassment perpetration. To not target gender harassment would be to ignore the large amount of verbal harassment that students suffer in university and secondary school settings.

Prevention and intervention efforts in universities and schools can be informed by the results in this study, which found that the following factors are all related to sexual harassment perpetration: gender harassment victimization, peer sexual attitudes,
masculinity ideology, hostility toward women, attitudes toward sexual harassment, and desire for power. Ideally, all of these variables would be included in educational programs, but since this may be impractical, a more parsimonious grouping of variables is offered by the results of the multiple regression analyses. The most potent predictors across harassment types of perpetration against female victims are gender harassment victimization, peer sexual attitudes, and masculinity ideology. That is, men who experience gender harassment from peers, have friends who place an overly high emphasis on the importance of having sex, and who overconform to stereotypic beliefs about what it means to be a man are more likely to commit both the more verbal gender harassment and the more sexual and physical sexual advances/imposition types of harassment against women. This pattern held true for gender harassment perpetration against male victims as well. Therefore, each of these three variables should be given special attention when designing interventions.

Stereotypic masculinity has been recommended as a focus for sexual harassment prevention programs by some feminist and pro-feminist theorists and educators (e.g., Koss et al., 1994; Landis-Schiff, 1996; Novogrodsky, Kaufman, Holland, & Wells, 1992). As Koss et al. (1994) argue, preventing sexual harassment and sexual assault “requires directly focusing interventions on cultural conceptions of the masculine gender role” (p. 14). Support for this perspective was found in the present study.

Masculinity ideology was tested as a predictor and was found to explain unique variance in perpetration against women over and above attitudes toward harassment and attitudes toward women. Two of the masculinity subscales (Anti-Femininity and Violent Toughness) were found to contribute uniquely to explaining harassment perpetration, so
perhaps special attention should be paid to them. Hostility toward “feminine” men was found to predict harassment of both women and men. This type of masculinity would be automatically included if gender harassment was targeted for an educational program because much gender harassment consists of anti-feminine, misogynistic, and homophobic remarks. It would seem to be especially important to provide young males with the opportunity to explore alternate ways of being a man that do not include being dominant in relationships and putting down women.

Efforts to stop peer sexual harassment should also include basic education about what constitutes sexual harassment. Previous studies with university and high school students have found that most have difficulty recognizing sexual harassment as such, even when they experience it themselves. For example, Shepela and Levesque (1998) found that half to three-quarters of the students in their sample who reported experiencing specific sexual harassment behaviors from peers failed to recognize and label their experience as harassment. In the present study, only 26% of students who reported committing high levels of sexual harassment against women said that they had ever sexually harassed a female peer. It is important to note that it was not only the gender harassers who failed to recognize that they were harassers. Only 25% of the high sexual advances/imposition harassers knew that they had committed harassment. Thus, students are in need of basic education so that they can recognize harassing behaviors. Education of this sort should reduce the numbers of Lengnick-Hall’s (1995) “insensitive” harassers who do not intend to harass and are unaware that their behavior is a problem.
CHAPTER 6 – CONCLUSION

Summary

This study investigated the phenomenon of peer sexual harassment in late adolescence, a pervasive problem about which little previously was known. Previous university studies have mainly been aimed at documenting rates of sexual harassment from professors, and no previous university studies have investigated peer sexual harassment perpetration. Thus, this study adds needed information about the extent of student-to-student sexual harassment victimization and perpetration. More importantly, it provides needed information to aid the process of understanding why peer harassment occurs.

This study sought to identify and compare the relative importance of correlates of peer sexual harassment among older male adolescents. After a thorough literature review, peer sexual harassment among adolescents was defined as unwanted behavior or comments that are of a sexual nature or that are directed toward someone because of their gender. To measure peer harassment, a comprehensive, valid, and reliable instrument was developed for this study. The instrument is unique in that it samples broadly from the gender harassment domain by including many of the behaviors that have been reported in qualitative studies but that have been left out of many survey instruments.

The selection of independent variables was guided by feminist theory and previous investigations of sexual harassment and sexual assault, a related construct. Most of the independent variables are connected to the dominant traditional form of masculinity. These consisted of masculinity ideology, hostile attitudes toward women, having an attraction to power, and being involved with a sexually calloused and hypersexual peer group. Attitudes toward sexual harassment were also included, as was previous gender harassment victimization.
High rates of sexual harassment victimization and perpetration were reported by the participants, especially for gender harassment. In general, the young men in this study committed more sexual harassment against their female peers than against their male peers. When type of harassment was examined, the young men were found to have committed more sexual advances/imposition harassment against female students, but more gender harassment against male students. More gender harassment was also received from other male peers than was received from female peers.

Gender harassment victimization was found to be the strongest single predictor of perpetration against women for both gender harassment and sexual advances/imposition harassment. Gender harassment victimization, along with masculinity ideology, peer sexual attitudes, and acceptance of sexual harassment, explained 48% of the variance in sexual harassment perpetration against female peers. Being a target of gender harassment was also the largest predictor for gender harassment perpetration against men. Gender harassment victimization was selected because the research literature suggests that gender harassment serves to enforce stereotypically masculine behaviors. The perceived need to publicly demonstrate masculinity may be a contributing factor in the high rates of peer sexual harassment of women.

The results of this study suggest that many of the characteristics associated with hegemonic masculinity are implicated in sexual harassment. These results lend support to feminist explanations of sexual harassment which contend that sexual harassment is a by-product of the gender socialization process in which boys and men are taught to be aggressive and dominant and to consider girls and women as acceptable targets of abuse. Support was also found for the feminist notion of a continuum of violence against women. Factors that previous research have shown to be associated with sexual assault were found to be associated with sexual harassment in this study.
Implications for sexual harassment prevention programs in universities and schools were described. Educational programs need to go beyond targeting only attitudes about harassment to include the other variables included in this study. Educational programs that offer young men opportunities for exploring alternatives to stereotypic masculinity and misogyny seem especially appropriate.

Limitations of the Present Study

This study provides important information about the nature of peer sexual harassment perpetration in late adolescence, but the study is limited in a number of ways. First, because this was a correlational rather than experimental study, the correlational patterns found in this study, while in accordance with theoretical explanations of sexual harassment, do not provide evidence of causality. Second, the data from this study were obtained through self-report methodology, and the use of self-report methods for measuring both dependent and independent variables can inflate the strength of relationships (Lengnick-Hall, 1995). As well, self-reports are subject to respondent biases and memory problems (Foddy, 1995), and thus, the findings must be viewed with some degree of caution. However, self-reports have been used extensively in sexual assault research, and the validity and reliability of self-reports in that related area have generally been found to be adequate (Koss & Gidycz, 1985; Lisak et al., 1996; Lisak & Roth, 1988).

Adolescents have been found to vary in their perceptions and conceptualizations of sexual harassment. To overcome the problem of perceptual bias, this study did not ask about “sexual harassment;” instead, it asked about experiences of discrete behaviors that were written in clear, behavioral language. Despite these efforts to create a more objective data collection instrument, problems still remain when measuring perpetration. If sexual harassment is “in the eye of the beholder”, then asking the perpetrator to report on sexual harassment behaviors may not result in completely valid results. Ideally, a separate validity check using a different measurement method would be used to make sure that the incidents being measured really were
bothersome and unwanted to the recipient. For example, if male harassers identified their female targets by name, the researcher could interview the targets to discover the women’s perceptions of the men’s behaviors.

Participants in this study were recruited from university residences, and by doing so a wide variety of academic disciplines were represented. This sampling method may have resulted in a sample with greater diversity than those obtained by the oft-used method in other university studies in which students are recruited from large classes in one discipline. Nonetheless, the participants in this study were not randomly selected, which suggests some degree of caution in making assumptions about the generalizability of the results. In addition, the sample was relatively homogenous in terms of ethnicity, age, and other demographic variables. As well, the sample did not include older adolescents who did not go on to post-secondary education, a limitation that could lead to a restricted range of scores on some measures. For example, research by Pleck et al. (1994) suggests that male teens who do not expect to complete high school hold more traditional beliefs about masculinity; thus, the restricted range in this study may have attenuated the relationship found between stereotypical masculinity and sexual harassment behaviors.

Although the instruments used in this study were all selected because of their validity and reliability in measuring their respective constructs, a few of them were found to have less than ideal psychometric qualities when used with the sample in this study. The scale measuring attitudes toward sexual harassment had particularly low reliability, and this could have affected the results. The reliability coefficients for the four MRNS subscales were also less than ideal. Although Fischer et al. (1998) found that masculinity is not a global construct and that it is composed of related-but-distinct components, it may be wisest to place the most emphasis on the results of the regression analyses that used the global MRNS score.
Directions for Future Research

Research Methods

In order to overcome many of the limitations noted above, replication studies are needed with larger and more diverse samples of adolescent males. Additional studies using more diverse research instruments and methodologies are also needed. In order to fully investigate peer harassment, both quantitative and qualitative research studies are probably required. Qualitative methodology could be useful for in-depth explorations of harassers' perceptions about their motivations. The conclusions from such a study could then be tested through survey methodology with larger samples more representative of the target population.

Qualitative interview techniques might be particularly useful in exploring participants' perceptions and interpretations about gender harassment. There may be differences between gender harassment received from men and that received from women that could be explored in this way. Interviews could also be a useful tool for exploring the concept of power. This study found that a belief in the importance of being powerful was related to harassment perpetration, whereas other researchers have conceptualized power differently. For example, Fineran and Bennett's (1999) conceptualization of power was centered around the perpetrator's self-confidence and perceptions of their own personal power. Interviews could also provide in-depth data about the meaning of power to harassment perpetrators and victims. Such interviews could help to tease out the differences between the subtle status and power variations that exist in peer relationships.

Naturalistic observation could be a useful tool for getting first hand views of peer sexual harassment, especially in university residence settings. Lengnick-Hall (1992) suggests that observational methods could be used to supplement self-report instruments in order to increase faith in the validity of self-report findings.
Relation Between Victimization and Perpetration

Future research should investigate further the relationship between sexual harassment victimization and sexual harassment perpetration. This study was not designed to make causal determinations, so the temporal order remains unclear. Future studies could explore possible mediating variables as well. For example, if the assumption is made that previous experience as a victim of gender harassment is a cause of perpetration, it would be useful to know what mediating factors keep some male adolescents from becoming perpetrators.

This study investigated only one type of harassment victimization as a factor related to perpetration (gender harassment), and it is possible that other types of harassment victimization experiences are also involved. Future studies might ask about sexual advances/imposition and sexual coercion victimization as well.

The high overlap between victimization and perpetration found in this study leads to the tentative conclusion that peer harassers are involved in harassing friendship groups. The present study asked about peers' sexually callous attitudes, and future studies might ask about peers' actual harassment behaviors.

Younger Adolescent Population

Future studies should investigate relationships among the same variables used in this study with a younger adolescent target population. Research shows that sexual harassment is experienced throughout the secondary years (AAUW, 1993; McMaster et al., 2000), and it may be that harassing behaviors are associated with different factors at different ages. For example, traditional beliefs in masculinity have been found to be associated with being younger for male adolescents (Pleck et al., 1994).

As has been previously noted, permission to conduct harassment research in secondary school settings can be quite difficult to obtain because of reluctance on the part of some school administrators to allow students to fill out questionnaires that ask about sexual behaviors.
However, some researchers (e.g., Dahinten, 2000) have found that it is somewhat easier getting permission if the study can be portrayed as having a focus on victimization and health outcomes. Therefore, in order to obtain data about perpetrators at the secondary level, it may be necessary to package perpetration items with victimization items. Another method of overcoming the reluctance of administrators may be to convince them that the school will directly benefit from participation in the study. The researcher could offer to give presentations on sexual harassment information and prevention to school staff. Researchers could also offer to conduct group intervention work with identified harassers.

**Sexual Harassment Behaviors Sampled in Research**

This study used a harassment instrument that was designed to be comprehensive, not all peer sexual harassment behaviors may have been included. Additional harassment behaviors will undoubtedly arise as new communication technologies enter our lives. For example, sexual rumors can now be spread via e-mail or by postings on web sites. Surveys of sexual harassment should perhaps include telephone harassment as well, as research suggests that large numbers of women receive upsetting obscene, threatening, or silent phone calls (Smith & Morra, 1994).

**Investigating Masculinity**

The conceptualization of traditional masculinity that was used in this study was based on theoretical work looking at gender role socialization by Brannon (1976) and Thompson and Pleck (1986). This is not the only conceptualization and operationalization of masculinity ideology, however, and instruments with a greater focus on gender role stress (Eisler & Blalock, 1991) and gender role conflict (O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, & Wrightsman, 1986) could also be useful in future studies. Some of these instruments include restrictive emotionality, a characteristic of traditional masculinity that is associated with sexual aggression (e.g., Levant et al, 1992; Lisak, Hopper, & Song, 1996) and that was not included in the present study.
The young men in this study were asked about their prescriptive beliefs about masculinity; that is, they were asked to indicate how they believe men should act and feel. Masculinity ideology was included because it is assumed that a man’s own beliefs about masculinity will have an influence on his behaviors as a man. However, it might also be useful to look at young men’s perceptions of other people’s expectations about what it means to be a man. It is possible that a young man’s own beliefs, his perceptions of those of his peer group, and his perceptions of society’s expectations about masculine behavior all have an impact on his behavior as a man and on sexual harassment perpetration. Denton (as cited in Pryor and Whalen, 1997) found that self-reported sexual coercion was related to men’s perceptions of their peers’ attitudes. Thus, the accuracy of the harasser’s perceptions of his peers’ attitudes and behaviors may not be as important as the perceptions themselves.

The present study focused on traditional masculinity ideology. However, Connell (1995) and other post-structuralist pro-feminist theorists point out that boys and men are not simple passive recipients of sex roles. Instead, men are actively engaged in creating their own versions of masculinity, leading to the existence of multiple, competing masculinities within individual schools or universities. Thus, the relationship between masculinity and sexual harassment may be far more complex than can be measured by the operationalization of masculinity used in the present study. Further refinements in efforts to understand the depth and complexity of masculinity as a factor in sexual harassment could result from research operating out of a post-structuralist framework. It is likely that such a perspective would require the use of qualitative research methods as described above in order to more fully understand conceptualizations of masculinity among adolescent males.

Female Harassers

Finally, this study looked only at male harassers. Although it is known that female students also sexually harass their female and male peers, no correlates of female harassment
have been identified. Attempts to identify such correlates should probably first be made through the use of qualitative research methods. Once a list of suspected correlates is developed, quantitative methods such as those employed in the present study could be used with a larger sample to further explore the relationships among the variables.

Conclusion

Research into peer sexual harassment is a relatively new field, and little is known about the causes of student-on-student harassment. Previous research has documented the extent of the problem with adolescents in universities and secondary schools. However, the present study is the first to examine peer harassment perpetration among older adolescents at university. By doing so, this study makes a unique contribution to knowledge in this area.

Extensive research with teenagers led Shakeshaft (1995) to conclude that “school is a harassing and unkind place for most students” (p. 35). The results of the present study suggest that this is also be true for many university students. The large amounts of harassment behaviors reported by the participants in this study show how pervasive and frequent peer harassment behaviors are among older adolescents in university settings. The results show that being a target of gender harassment from peers is a key variable in explaining harassment of all types against both women and men. The large overlap found between perpetration and victimization indicates that sexual harassment perpetration is enmeshed with gender harassment victimization.

Despite the limitations of this study, the results provide critical information that will aid in our efforts to understand the phenomenon of peer harassment among older adolescents. The present study provides critical information to help build our knowledge about the problem of harassment. The results also provide guidance for future investigations. Even more importantly, the results of this study have implications for educational efforts to prevent the occurrence of what Stein (1992) calls “gendered terrorism.”
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APPENDICES
Appendix B
Directions for Participants

UNDERSTANDING HARASSMENT

MALE VERSION

DIRECTIONS: DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE OR THE ENVELOPE. It is very important that you do not discuss or share your responses with anyone else. Please answer each item as thoughtfully and honestly as possible. Please circle your response.
Appendix C  
Debriefing Handout

Harassment Information

All of the behaviors described in the questionnaire you have just completed are examples of harassment. Harassment is any kind of behavior that makes someone uncomfortable and interferes with their life. Almost all of the behaviors described in the questionnaire were examples of sexual harassment.

Sexual harassment can be someone in authority coercing a subordinate into having a sexual relationship; it can also be another student creating an offensive environment. Sexual harassment includes a wide range of behaviors — from unwelcome jokes and comments about gender to sexual assault. Under Canadian and New Brunswick human rights legislation, sexual harassment is a type of discrimination based on gender, and as such is illegal. Sexual harassment, whether from another student, a professor, or a staff member is forbidden at UNB and STU. Sexual harassment can come from a member of the opposite sex or from your own sex.

There are many types of harassment, each of which can have serious emotional consequences. Sexual harassment and sexual assault are serious matters, and if you would like to talk with anyone about any experiences you may have had the following resources can be useful. Anyone experiencing emotional distress as a result of filling out this questionnaire is encouraged to talk with a counsellor. Usually, a good person to talk with first is your residence proctor or don.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Harassment</th>
<th>Sexual Assault</th>
<th>Counselling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNB Sexual Harassment Advisors</td>
<td>Fredericton Sexual Assault Crisis Centre</td>
<td>UNB/STU Counselling Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see UNB harassment pamphlet)</td>
<td>454-0437</td>
<td>453-4820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STU Sexual Harassment Advisors</td>
<td>Campus Security</td>
<td>Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452-0486 (Deborah van den Hoonard)</td>
<td>453-4830</td>
<td>453-2132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452-0507 (John McKendy)</td>
<td>Fredericton Police Force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>460-2300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D
Adolescent Sexual Harassment Perpetration – Cross Gender

Gender Harassment
1. Spread a sexual rumor, passed a sexual not, or wrote sexual graffiti about a girl.
2. Called a girl a lesbian or gay or something similar.
3. Made negative comments about a girl’s body or body parts suggesting she didn’t look feminine enough.
4. Made fun of a girl or called her names for having too much sex.
5. Teased a girl about her hormones (e.g., PMS).
6. Called a girl a name like butch, etc., suggesting that she was not feminine enough.
7. Put down females in general.
8. Gave a girl an unwelcome or crude compliment about her body or parts of her body.
9. Showed a girl a sexual cartoon or picture or told a sexual joke that she didn’t want to see or hear.

Sexual Advances/Imposition
10. Made a sexual gesture or stared at a girl’s body in a sexual way.
11. Yelled something sexual or whistled or howled at a girl as she walked by.
12. Touched, grabbed, or pinched a girl in a sexual way.
13. Stood too close or brushed up against a girl in a sexual way.
14. Pulled at a girl’s clothing in a sexual way or pulled her clothing down or off.
15. Blocked a girl’s way or cornered her in a sexual way.
16. Followed a girl around or pestered her for a date after she said she wasn’t interested.
17. Kissed or hugged a girl when she didn’t want you to.
18. Forced a girl to do something sexual other than kissing or hugging.

Participants were asked: “During this school year, how many times, if at all, did you do any of the following things to a female student, EVEN IF YOU WERE ONLY JOKING?”

Response Format: 0 = Never; 1 = Rarely; 2 = Occasionally; 3 = Often
19. Appendix D (cont.)
Adolescent Sexual Harassment Perpetration – Same Gender

Gender Harassment
1. Spread a sexual rumor, passed a sexual note, or wrote sexual graffiti about a boy.
2. Called a guy gay or something similar.
3. Made negative comments about a guy’s body or body parts suggesting he didn’t look masculine enough.
4. Made fun of a guy or called him names for not having much sex.
5. Teased a guy about his hormones (e.g., his testosterone level).
6. Called a guy a name like wimp, sissy, cry baby, girl, bitch, or loser, suggesting that he was not masculine enough.
7. Gave a guy an unwelcome or crude compliment about his body or parts of his body.
8. Showed a guy a sexual cartoon or picture or told a sexual joke that he didn’t want to see or hear.

Sexual Advances/Imposition
9. Made a sexual gesture or stared at a guy’s body in a sexual way.
10. Yelled something sexual or whistled or howled at a guy as he walked by.
11. Touched, grabbed, or pinched a guy in a sexual way.
12. Stood too close or brushed up against a guy in a sexual way.
13. Pulled at a guy’s clothing in a sexual way or pulled his clothing down or off.
14. Blocked a guy’s way or cornered him in a sexual way.
15. Followed a guy around or pestered him for a date after he said he wasn’t interested.
16. Kissed or hugged a guy when he didn’t want you to.
17. Forced a guy to do something sexual other than kissing or hugging.

Participants were asked: “During this school year, how many times, if at all, did you do any of the following things to a male student, EVEN IF YOU WERE ONLY JOKING?”

Response Format: 0 = Never; 1 = Rarely; 2 = Occasionally; 3 = Often
Appendix E
Adolescent Sexual Harassment - Gender Harassment Victimization

1. Spread a sexual rumor about you, passed a sexual note, or wrote sexual graffiti about you on bathroom walls, etc.
2. Called you gay or something similar.
3. Made negative comments about your body or parts of your body or your weight, height, or build, suggesting that you didn't look masculine enough.
4. Made fun of you or called you names for having too little or too much sex.
5. Teased you about your hormones (e.g., your testosterone level).
6. Called you a name like girl, wimp, sissy, cry baby, bitch, or loser, suggesting that you were not manly enough.
7. Put down males in general (e.g., said all men are pigs).

Participants were asked: “During this school year, how often, if at all, did a male student do any of the following things to you WHEN YOU DID NOT WANT HIM TO, EVEN IF HE WAS ONLY JOKING?”

Response Format: 0 = Never; 1 = Rarely; 2 = Occasionally; 3 = Often
Appendix F
Male Role Norms Scale
(Revision by Fischer et al., 1998)

Status/Rationality
1. A man owes it to his family to work at the best-paying job he can get.
2. A man should always think everything out coolly and logically, and have rational reasons for everything he does.
3. I always like a man who’s totally sure of himself.
4. A man always deserves the respect of his wife and children.
5. It is essential for a man to always have the respect and admiration of everyone who knows him.
6. The best way for a young man to get the respect of other people is to get a job, take it seriously, and do it well.

Tough Image
7. A man should always try to project an air of confidence even if he really doesn’t feel confident inside.
8. I think a young man should try to become physically tough, even if he’s not big.
9. A good motto for a man would be “When the going gets tough, the tough get going.”
10. When a man is feeling a little pain he should try not to let it show very much.
11. A man must stand on his own two feet and never depend on other people to help him do things.

Anti-femininity
12. If I heard about a man who was a hairdresser and a gourmet cook, I might wonder how masculine he was.
13. A man whose hobbies are cooking, sewing, and going to the ballet wouldn’t appeal to me.
14. I might find it a little silly or embarrassing if a male friend of mine cried over a sad love scene in a movie.
15. Unless he was really desperate, I would probably advise a man to keep looking rather than accept a job as a secretary.
16. It bothers me when a man does something that I consider “feminine.”
17. It is a bit embarrassing for a man to have a job that is usually filled by a woman.
18. I think it's extremely good for a boy to be taught to cook, sew, clean the house, and take care of younger children.\textsuperscript{a}

Violent Toughness

19. A man should always refuse to get into a fight, even if there seems to be no way to avoid it.\textsuperscript{a}
20. Fists are sometimes the only way to get out of a bad situation.
21. In some kinds of situations a man should be ready to use his fists, even if his wife or his girlfriend would object.

\textsuperscript{a} Reverse-scored items

Response Format: 0 = Strongly Disagree; 1 = Disagree; 2 = Agree; 3 = Strongly Disagree.
Appendix G
Peer Sexual Socialization Scale
(Lottes & Kuriloff, 1994)

1. Among my friends, men who have the most sexual experience are the most highly regarded.
2. Among my friends, women who have the most sexual experiences are the most highly regarded.
3. I am uncomfortable around people who spend much of their time talking about their sexual experiences. *a*
4. My friends disapprove of being involved with someone who is known to be sexually easy. *a*
5. My friends suggest dates to each other who are known to be sexually easy.
6. My friends and I enjoy telling each other about our sexual experiences.
7. Most of my friends believe that you should only have sex in a serious relationship. *a*
8. My friends brag about their sexual exploits.
9. Most of my friends don’t approve of having multiple sexual partners. *a*
10. Among my friends, people seldom discuss their sexuality. *a*
11. My friends approve of being involved with someone just for sex.
12. Among my friends alcohol is used to get someone to sleep with you.

*a* Reverse-scored items.

Response Format: 0 = Strongly Disagree; 1 = Disagree; 2 = Agree; 3 = Strongly Disagree.
Appendix H
Tolerance for Sexual Harassment Inventory
(Lott, Reilly, & Howard, 1982)

1. Most women who are sexually insulted by a man provoke his behavior by the way they talk, act, or dress.
2. It is only natural for a woman to use her sexuality as a way of getting ahead in school or at work.
3. An attractive man has to expect sexual advances and should learn how to handle them.
4. It is only natural for a man to make sexual advances to a woman he finds attractive.
5. Innocent flirtations make the workday or school day interesting.
6. A man must learn to understand that a woman’s “no” to his sexual advances really means “no.”
7. An attractive woman has to expect sexual advances and should learn how to handle them.
8. Most men are sexually teased by many of the women with whom they interact on the job or at school.
9. I believe that sexual intimidation is a serious social problem.
10. Encouraging a professor’s or a supervisor’s sexual interest is frequently used by women to get better grades or to improve their work situation.

*a Item not included in data analyses in order to increase reliability.  
b Reverse-scored items.

Response Format: 0 = Strongly Disagree; 1 = Disagree; 2 = Agree; 3 = Strongly Disagree.
Appendix I
Hostility Toward Women
(Adapted from Burt’s [1980] Adversarial Sexual Beliefs)

1. A woman will only respect a man who will lay down the law to her.
2. A man’s got to show a woman who’s boss right from the start or he’ll end up henpecked.
3. Women are usually sweet until they’ve caught a man, but then they let their true self show.
4. Most women are sly and manipulating when they are out to attract a man.

Response Format: 0 = Strongly Disagree; 1 = Disagree; 2 = Agree; 3 = Strongly Disagree.
Appendix J
Attraction to Power

1. A man should feel strong and powerful.
2. A man needs to be a powerful person in order to be successful.
3. You need to be seen as strong by others to get respect.
4. A man should be in control of all aspects of his life.
5. Men who act decisively and take charge of situations are more successful in life.

Response Format: 0 = Strongly Disagree; 1 = Disagree; 2 = Agree; 3 = Strongly Disagree.
Appendix K
Development of the Adolescent Sexual Harassment (ASH)

Sexual Harassment Perpetration Item Development

Three broad domains of peer sexual harassment among adolescents were identified in the review and analysis of the sexual harassment literature: Gender Harassment, Sexual Imposition, and Sexual Assault. This conceptualization of these domains allows for the sampling of the full range of peer-on-peer sexual harassment behaviors reported in the literature. The domains encompass all of the behaviors found in the survey instruments used in the studies of adolescent students. They also encompass the other behaviors described in the qualitative studies which were not as well represented on the survey studies, especially gender harassment behaviors. The domains also cover the range of sexual harassment behaviors that I have learned about in my work in secondary schools and universities. Item specifications were written to guide the writing items for each of these domains (see Table 19).

Multiple items were generated to sample fully from each domain, with a larger number of items developed for the gender harassment domain because it was the most common and varied type of sexual harassment described in most studies reported in the research literature. Several items were borrowed from the AAUW (1993) survey instrument because it samples broadly from the sexual imposition domain and it includes several items that sample from the gender harassment and sexual assault domains. However, the AAUW instrument is not sufficient by itself because it does not sample fully from all sexual harassment domains; it is particularly weak in the gender harassment domain. The AAUW
Table 19

**Item Specifications for Sexual Harassment Perpetration Instrument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description:</th>
<th>This will be a self-report instrument for measuring the commission of sexual harassment by male and female adolescents.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domains:</td>
<td>Items will represent the three domains of peer harassment: Gender Harassment, Sexual Imposition, and Sexual Assault.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex:</td>
<td>Because research suggests that males and females are both targets and sources of sexual harassment, items should be applicable to respondents of either sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intent:</td>
<td>Intent does not matter in sexual harassment, so the items will not ask about intent. However, because perpetrators may not know whether or not a past action was offensive to the recipient, the items should describe actions in specific, behavioral terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Form:</td>
<td>Item stems will read as follows: In your last year in high school, how many times, if at all, have you done any of the following when the other student may not have wanted you to?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Format</td>
<td>Item responses will be on a frequency scale from 0 to 4 as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 = Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Once or twice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = One or a few times per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = One or a few times per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 = Daily or almost daily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instrument also does not use very explicit language on some items, making these items somewhat ambiguous and thus open to different interpretations by respondents. Nonetheless, some items were selected for inclusion in the present study because they were written in clear, unambiguous, behavioral terms. The content of these items was similar to those found in other studies, including the qualitative studies. In addition, the AAUW instrument was successful at getting adolescents to admit to committing sexual harassment, which makes another argument for using AAUW items. Written permission was obtained from the authors to use these items. Other items were written in order to sample from areas not covered well by the AAUW instrument.

The initial set of items was reviewed by persons knowledgeable about adolescents and sexual harassment (persons working in sexual harassment prevention at the secondary
and post-secondary levels, school counsellors, teachers, and other professionals with extensive clinical experience with secondary and university students) as a check to see if the items adequately represented the types of sexual harassment they knew about in the schools and whether the item wordings were clear and understandable. An additional item review with students from a grade 12 psychology class was undertaken to check for readability and clarity of the items and instructions. The items were also reviewed by two groups of university students, one group from language education that consisted mostly of teachers, and one group of educational psychology students consisting of students involved in research with school children. These item reviews confirmed that the initial pool of items did indeed represent the bulk of sexual harassment behaviors in the schools. Only two behaviors (stalking and obscene phone calls) were identified as missing, and items were written to represent these behaviors. Several items were identified as being confusing or that could be interpreted in multiple ways, and these items were dropped or rewritten. This item review process also resulted in changes to the directions and instrument format in order to improve clarity and readability.

The above process resulted in an instrument with clear and concise wording for directions, and items and with content validity. The item review process included discussions among secondary and post-secondary students as to whether or not the instrument should include gender harassment items. Consistent with previous research, some of the students reviewing the items had not yet embraced the broader conceptualization of sexual harassment that has been enlarged by the courts and other governmental regulatory bodies. If some respondents were reluctant to consider gender harassment as a subtype of sexual harassment, they might perceive the instrument to be flawed. This could result in some respondents not
taking their participation in research activities seriously, and thus not giving accurate responses. To get around this possible threat to the face validity of the instrument, a decision was made to identify the instrument as being a measure of harassment in general rather than a measure of "sexual harassment." Distracter items covering other types of harassment (e.g., calling someone a "nerd," putting someone down because of their age, racial epithets) were written to give credibility to this claim. It was hoped that this would avoid the gender harassment problem while at the same time also helping to defuse any possible tendencies toward social desirable responding due to possible sensitivities about admitting to sexual harassing behaviors.

Because of the possible unreliability of responses to queries about events that happened in the distant past, it is preferable to ask respondents about more recent events. Foddy’s (1993) review of the literature on memory suggests that people can reliably remember salient events for up to a year. In order to get the most reliable responses, the instrument asked only about sexual harassment behaviors that had been committed in the past school year.

**Construction of Parallel Victimization Instrument**

Based on the above item development and review process, a second instrument was also developed in order to measure sexual harassment victimization. The content and wording of the victimization items were kept as parallel as possible to the perpetration items in order to capitalize on the content validity and item readability and clarity of the first instrument.
Measures Used in Study

The item-construction procedures outlined above resulted in a questionnaire that was comprised of three sections: (A) a demographics section (B) a 40-item measure of harassment experienced from others, and, (C) a 32 item measure of harassment participants had done to others. The demographics section consisted of items asking about sex, age, languages spoken in the home, country in which they went to high school, size of high school, sexual makeup of high school (co-ed or single sex), and size of town in which the high school was located.

Participants

A serious problem emerges when attempting to gather data of a sexual nature in the schools. Conversations with numerous school district officials and secondary school staff have made it apparent that some parents and school board members would object to secondary students responding to a survey about sexual harassment. This means that it is very difficult finding a district that will allow such research to take place. It also means that an unknown number of students would not participate in the research because of parental objections. Both of these problems can bias a sample. An additional problem involves the wording of items that would be acceptable to parents and school boards. It is likely that only generally-worded items would be allowed into the schools, but generally-worded items are not likely to be sensitive enough to detect some sexual harassment. Because sexual harassers may not know that they are doing anything objectionable, items must be worded in explicit behavioral terms in order to be clearly understood.

The problems accompanying research of a sexual nature effectively prohibit carrying out such research in the schools. As an alternative, it was decided that adolescents who have
recently completed high school and are now attending university would be queried about their high school experiences. Because these students are no longer minors and are no longer under the supervision of public school boards, the problems of parental consent and school board acceptance are removed. This also means that the items can be written in less ambiguous wording, which should enhance the reliability and validity of the instrument.

Data were collected from 163 male and 210 female undergraduates. Although this is a large number of participants for a relatively simple pilot study, a sample of this size was needed for two important reasons. First, a factor analysis of the results was planned, and recommendations for such an analysis are that at least 300 cases are needed (Tabachnik & Fidell, 1996), although other authorities say that 100 cases are adequate (Kline, 1994). Second, this was also a field test of the procedure to be used in subsequent research with the sexual harassment instrument, for which a large sample size would also be necessary. Although equal numbers of male and female participants may have been the ideal, the increased participation rate by females is understandable given the nature of the research topic.

Procedure

Participants were recruited in one of the large residences at the University of British Columbia. Permission to solicit participants in this dorm was obtained from university residence staff. University staff were willing to allow the research because of their own concerns about sexual harassment in the dorms and because the researcher agreed to provide two workshops on sexual harassment to residence advisors in exchange for the opportunity to collect data.
It was originally hoped that a random sample of the dorm residents would receive questionnaire packets in their mail boxes, but this was precluded by a policy allowing only official university and Canada Post mail to be placed in the boxes. Because of this restriction, the decision was made to utilize any and all students that could be solicited in person. A table was set up near the cafeteria in the commons area of the dormitory, and passersby were offered a free can of pop if they would fill out a survey about their harassment experiences in high school.

Participants were given a handout describing the study goals, the questionnaire, and a statement that informed consent would be assumed if they agreed to fill out the questionnaire. Students were then given a questionnaire, a pencil, and an envelope in which to place the questionnaire when finished. The questionnaires were filled out by participants sitting and standing at tables, on benches, and on the floor in the commons area. Upon the return of the questionnaire, participants were given a can of pop and a debriefing handout about sexual harassment that included suggestions for where to go to talk about experiences with harassment or about any emotional reactions they might have had as a result of participating in the study.

Envelopes were provided to the participants in order to increase validity of responding; it was hoped that participants would be more inclined to answer honestly if they knew that they could place their filled-out questionnaires in sealed envelopes. However, almost all participants indicated that they did not want the envelopes. Other procedures for maximizing the validity of the responding included instructions that the questionnaire was to be filled out anonymously and that participants avoid talking with others while filling out the questionnaire. No questionnaires were returned with names attached, and the vast majority of
participants filled out the questionnaires without talking to neighbors. As an effort to minimize any tendencies toward social desirable responding that might arise when answering questions about sexual harassment, a highly sensitive topic in the 90's, the words “sexual harassment” did not appear anywhere on the questionnaire. Instead, students were told that the study was about harassment in general. In order to make a “general harassment” questionnaire have face validity, distracter items asking about other types of harassment (e.g., general name calling and racial epithets) were included. A final procedure for minimizing biased responding consisted of querying participants about their own experiences as the recipient of unwanted sexual attention before querying them about harassment they had done to others. It was hoped that participants might feel more willing to respond honestly to the perpetration items if they were first given the opportunity to show that others had done the same behaviors to them. The AAUW (1993) survey followed this procedure and was able to elicit reports of sexual harassment perpetration from 59 percent of their respondents.

RESULTS

Sample characteristics

Half of the total sample (49.9 %) graduated from high school the previous year, and the bulk of the rest (36.5 %) graduated two years previously. 97 percent of all participants attended co-ed high schools. As measures of familiarity with the English language, participants were asked if they had attended a Canadian high school (94 percent “yes”) and if English was the primary language spoken in the home (91% “yes”).
Table 20

Demographic Characteristics of Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Male Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>19.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years out of high school</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school in Canada (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of high school (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ed</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single sex</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of high school (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 250</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-499</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 +</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of town (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1,000</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-24,999</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000-74,999</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75,000-249,999</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000 +</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as first language (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: n = 163

Psychometric Issues

The primary objective of this study was to develop a reliable and valid measure of adolescent peer sexual harassment perpetration among adolescents for research purposes. A secondary objective was to develop a reliable and valid measure of peer sexual harassment victimization among adolescents because scores on it may be of use in predicting scores on the perpetration measure. This paper reports the data analysis results for the perpetration measure; the results of the victimization measure will be discussed in a separate paper.
Validity. All measurement instruments should be valid. There are three basic types of validity that a questionnaire should have: content, criterion, and construct. If an instrument has content validity, it should sample all of the content or domains under consideration (Streiner & Norman, 1995). Content validity for the sexual harassment instrument was ensured by basing the items on behaviors identified in the research literature. The analysis of this literature indicated that three broad domains would cover the harassment experiences reported in the studies. A number of items were written to sample fully from these three domains. The item review process indicated that the initial pool of items sampled well from all types of peer sexual harassment experienced by adolescents.

Of the three basic types of validity, content validity is the most relevant for a sexual harassment instrument, according to Fitzgerald (1990), the researcher who has done the most to bring test psychometric issues to the forefront in the sexual harassment research literature. Fitzgerald argues that sexual harassment measurement research is at such a rudimentary theoretical and practical level that attention should be focused on ensuring that the construct of sexual harassment is reasonably defined and on ensuring that a scale samples broadly from all sexual harassment domains. In addition, Fitzgerald points out that there presently exists no established gold (or even bronze) standard for comparison purposes in order to demonstrate criterion validity. When criterion validity cannot be assessed for a new instrument, validity can still be established with construct validity studies (Streiner & Norman, 1995). Construct validation is the process by which an instrument is shown to perform meaningfully in expected ways by the testing of hypotheses about relationships between theoretically related and unrelated variables. However, the process of establishing
construct validity is an ongoing one that usually involves a number of studies taking place over a number of years (Litwin, 1995), and therefore is beyond the scope of this initial study. One procedure that is sometimes used to investigate the construct validity of a new instrument is the contrasted groups method, a procedure in which groups known to possess very low and very high degrees of the construct are assessed with the instrument to make sure that their scores differentiate the groups as predicted (Waltz, Strickland, & Lenz, 1991). This approach cannot be taken at the present time because no groups of sexual harassers have been identified. The number of sexual harassers reported and identified at schools and universities is very small, and no counselling or remediation groups comprised of sexual harassers are known to exist. It is possible that the teachers in a school could be asked to identify sexual harassers, but using persons who are not directly involved in the harassment presents problems of reliability and validity. It is possible that a peer nomination process could be used in which female students nominate male students who are sexual harassers. However, such a peer nomination process is problematic given the likely difficulties that would be encountered in getting consent from all of the participants and school or university staff.

Another procedure frequently used to investigate the construct validity of a new instrument is to analyze the factor structure of the instrument to determine if the expected factors emerge from the analysis. Factor analysis also aids in scale refinement by clarifying factor structure and reducing the number of items.

*Factor analysis of male perpetration scores.* A principal components analysis of the initial 32 item version of the instrument produced eight factors with eigenvalues greater than one that together accounted for 69.2 percent of the variance in scores. The eigenvalues for
these factors were 12.23, 2.91, 1.90, 1.54, 1.49, 1.26, 1.11, and 1.02. A scree test indicated that a three-factor solution best accounted for the data, and these three factors accounted for the bulk (50%) of the variance for male scores.

The three retained factors were rotated with a Varimax procedure in order to further clarify the factor structure. An examination of the items comprising the three factors indicated that these factors could probably be labeled Gender Harassment, Unwelcome Sexual References/Advances, and Sexual Imposition/Assault. Items that loaded at or above .30 on a factor were retained. Items that loaded higher on a factor other than the one it should were discarded. Items that cross loaded (loaded at or above .30) on more than one factor were also discarded, except in the case of items needed conceptually to ensure the content validity of the instrument. Items that detracted from the internal consistency or that had item-to-subscale-total correlations of less than .20 were also discarded. These procedures follow the recommendations for scale construction given by Streiner and Norman (1995). The final version of the instrument for males was comprised of 22 items. The factors with their corresponding items and factor loadings are displayed in Table 21.
Table 21

Factor Analysis Results for Males on the Sexual Harassment Perpetration Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 1 (Gender Harassment)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Make negative comments to a girl about her body, weight, height,</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>looks, muscles, or athletic ability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Make negative comments to a boy about his body, weight, height,</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>looks, muscles, or athletic ability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tell a boy he was a “homosexual”, “fag”, “gay”, or something</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tell a girl she was a “lesbian”, “gay”, “dyke”, “butch” or</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>something similar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Make fun of a boy or girl for how sexually active they were</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., called a girl a “slut” or laughed at a boy for not getting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enough sex).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Put down females or males in general (for example, said “women</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can’t drive” or “all men are pigs”).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tease a girl about having PMS or her period or a boy about his</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>testosterone level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tease a girl about the size of her breasts or a boy about the size</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of his penis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Tell a girl she was a “dog,” “cow,” “pig,” “bitch,” or something</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Tell a boy he was a “wimp,” “sissy,” “girl,” “cry baby,” or</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>something similar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 2 (Unwelcome Sexual References and Advances)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Pat a boy or girl on the rear (not in a sports situation).</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Yell something sexual, whistle, or howl at someone walking by.</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Stare at someone’s body in a sexual way or give them a sexual</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Tell someone that you wanted to have sex with her or him when it</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was not appropriate to do so, even if you were only joking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Stand too close, lean against, or brush up against someone in a</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Pull at a girl’s clothing (her bra strap, for example) or lift her</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skirt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Touch or grab a girl’s breasts or grab a boy’s penis.</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 3 (Sexual Imposition/Assault)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Ask someone to go out with you after they said they weren’t</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interested.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Stalk someone (e.g., follow them around).</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Kiss or hug someone who did not want you to.</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Physically force someone to do something sexual other than kissing.</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Use some other means to make someone do something sexual other</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than kissing (for example, by threatening to spread rumors about</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>them).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: n = 163. a Factor loadings above .30 are shown. b Reliability = .91 c Reliability = .81 d Reliability = .78
Reliability. There are two basic types of reliability that are of importance for a self-report instrument measuring sexual harassment: internal consistency and temporal stability. Measures of internal consistency estimate the degree the items in a scale assess the same underlying dimension. To measure internal consistency with the perpetration measure, coefficient alpha was employed, which essentially results in the average of the correlations among all of the items in the measure. Internal consistency for the entire instrument was found to be high for both males (.91) and females (.81). Internal consistency was also assessed at the subscale level. For males, internal consistency estimates of .91, .82, and .78 were obtained for the first, second, and third factors, respectively. For females, internal consistency estimates of .79 and .62 were obtained for the first and second factor, respectively.

Temporal stability is typically assessed through a test-retest procedure. Test-retest reliability was not investigated in the present study. Instead, attention was given to making sure that the participants were accurately recalling past behaviors and experiences. Accuracy of recall is an issue for all investigators of past behaviors. Although people may have vivid memories of salient events from many years ago, memories for non-salient events can be less reliable (Foddy, 1993). Because harassers may not have paid much attention to their own behaviors, the present study followed Foddy (1993) and Fink's (1995) recommendation of limiting the time period covered by a questionnaire to one year in order to ensure a reasonable degree of accurate recall of non-salient events.