Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, Vol. 8, No. 4, 1995

The Relationship Between Gender, Personal Experience, and Perceptions of Sexual Harassment in the Workplace[1]

Gerald L. Blakely,[2] Eleanor H. Blakely,[3] and, Robert H. Moorman[2]

In this study 352 working men and women responded to a questionnaire about their perceptions of what constituted sexual harassment. It was hypothesized that females, compared to males, would view ambiguous sexually oriented work behavior as more harassing. It was also hypothesized that those who had been a target of sexual harassment, compared to those who had not been a target, would view ambiguous sexually oriented work behavior as more harassing. Both hypotheses were supported. Additionally, after taking into account the effect of having been a target of sexual harassment, the effect of gender on perceptions of sexual harassment was found to be spurious. Implications for management and future research are discussed.

KEY WORDS: sexual harassment; human sex differences; working women; gender versus target of sexual harassment.

INTRODUCTION

Recently, in large part because of the Anita Hill-Clarence Thomas controversy, considerable attention has been directed toward sexual harassment in the work place. According to the 1980 EEOC guidelines and the Supreme Court, sexually oriented verbal or physical conduct is considered harassment when (1) submission to the advances is required for pay, promotion, or other employment opportunity, or (2) the conduct has the purpose or effect of interfering with the individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile or offensive work environment (Federal Register, 1980: 25025; Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson, 477 U. S. 57 (1986)).

Because of the vagueness of the preceding definition and because perceptions of sexual harassment are often based on highly subjective assessments of other's

[1]An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 1993 Southern Management Association meeting in New Orleans.

[2]Department of Management, College of Business and Economics, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia 26506.
[3]West Virginia University, School of Social Work, Morgantown, West Virginia 26506.

0892-7545/95/1200-0263$07.50/0

behavior, there is disagreement about exactly what constitutes sexual harassment (Gruber, 1992). Furthermore, empirical tests of this topic frequently have provided inconsistent results (e.g., Baker, Terpstra, & Cutler, 1990; Konrad & Gutek, 1986; Powell, 1986; Terpstra & Baker, 1986). Accordingly, the purpose of this study was to examine those factors that may account for differences in perceptions about what is or is not sexual harassment and to examine potential explanations for the inconsistent results of previous research.

A number of factors have been found to be related to perceptions of what constitutes sexual harassment. For example, employed individuals have been found more likely than college students to rate some sexually oriented behavior as sexual harassment (Terpstra & Baker, 1987). Also, individuals consider sexually oriented behavior as more harassing when it is attributed to a supervisor rather than to a co-worker (Popovich, Licata, Nokovich, Martelli, & Zoloty, 1986). However, research examining gender differences in perceptions of what constitutes sexual harassment has been mixed. In some studies, females tended to rate sexually oriented behavior as sexual harassment to a greater degree than their male counterparts (Gutek, Nakamura, Gahart, Handschumacher, & Russell, 1980; Gutek, Morasch, & Cohen, 1983; Popovich *et al.*, 1986; Powell, 1983, 1986). Other studies have found no differences between women and men in their perceptions of what constitutes sexual harassment (Baker, Terpstra, & Cutler, 1990; Terpstra & Baker, 1987; Pryor, 1985).

As noted by Baker *et al.* (1990), one potential explanation for the inconsistent effects of respondent gender on perceptions of what constitutes sexual harassment may be the degree of ambiguity in the behavioral examples of the sexually oriented items being judged. Behavior that is extremely offensive and onerous may be so unambiguous that disagreement about its interpretation is highly unlikely. Behavior at the other extreme, which are relatively innocuous, may also allow for considerable agreement. It may seem reasonable to argue that seemingly innocuous behaviors should not even be included in a measure of sexual harassment. For example, Fitzgerald and Hesson-McInnis (1989) found that individuals perceive behaviors of this kind as conceptually distinct from other forms of sexual harassment and therefore argued that this innocuous form of harassment should be kept separate from the other forms. However, innocuous sexually oriented behaviors are a part of the legal definition of sexual harassment (EEOC, 1980) and we believe that even socially accepted behaviors may be perceived as sexual harassment because these behaviors may reflect a power disparity between a superior and a subordinate. As noted by Thacker and Ferris (1991), the power relationship between the sexual harasser and the target is related to sexual harassment in the workplace, and even behavior that many may characterize as courtesy, may convey power differences between males and females (Harris, 1992). For example, an extreme view might suggest that a male supervisor holding a door open for a female subordinate may constitute sexual harassment because the act implies that the female subordinate is less powerful than the male supervisor. Thus, even though innocuous, these behaviors may potentially be construed, to some degree, as sexual harassment. On the other hand, behaviors between the extremes may be much more ambiguous and allow for greater differences in interpretation.

Consistent with this assertion, Adams, Kottke, and Padgitt (1983) found, in an academic setting, that male-female perceptions of sexual harassment in student-teacher relationships varied according to the ambiguity of the situation depicted. When the items were highly explicit, there was consensus between males and females; however, when the items were ambiguous, females were more likely than males to perceive the behavior as sexually harassing. Similar results, again in an academic setting, were also reported by Kenig and Ryan (1986) and Benson and Thompson (1982).

Although the preceding behaviors were described in terms of ambiguity, they can also be described in terms of their degree of severity. Sexual behavior at work may be viewed on a continuum from harmless to harmful behaviors (Gutek *et al.*, 1980). Similarly, Till's (1980) classification system of sexual harassment, for which there is mixed support (see Fitzgerald *et al.*, 1988; Fitzgerald & Hesson-McInnis, 1989), can be loosely ordered in terms of the severity of the behavior.

Based on Till's (1980) study of college women, there are five categories of sexual harassment. They are (1) remarks and behavior that are sexist but not intended as to gain sexual favors, (2) offensive and improper seductive behavior but with no quid pro quo involved, (3) required sexual activity or behavior with the promise of reward, (4) required sexual activity or behavior under the threat of punishment, and (5) sexual imposition or assault. It should be noted that categories three and four, which require sexual activity or behavior either with the promise of reward or the threat of punishment, can logically be combined into one category which is consistent with the legal quid pro quo definition of sexual harassment. Consistent with this assertion, a factor analytic study by Fitzgerald *et al.* (1988) found that these two categories of behavior loaded on the same factor.

Thus, sexually oriented behavior that is at an extreme, either particularly abhorrent or particularly innocent, may allow little leeway for disagreement about its interpretation. On the other hand, sexually oriented behavior that is between the extremes is likely more ambiguous, thereby resulting in greater disagreement over its interpretation. Based on the preceding discussion, the following was hypothesized:

> H1: Differences between males and females in their judgements about what behaviors are sexual harassment are more pronounced when the behavior is not at an extreme and thereby more ambiguous.

Although the individual's gender may be a major determinant of the differences that exist in perceptions of what constitutes sexual harassment, undoubtedly numerous other potential causes of differences exist. One particularly relevant cause, given the public discussion of the topic in light of the Hill-Thomas hearings, is one's sensitivity to the issue. Following Konrad and Gutek (1986) and consistent with classical conditioning theory, having been sexually harassed may influence one's attitudes toward sexually oriented work behaviors. For example, the issue of sexual harassment is likely to be far more salient for individuals who have been victims or targets of sexual harassment than for individuals who have not been harassed. Consistent with this assertion, Konrad and Gutek (1986) found that individuals who experienced negative work outcomes (e.g., being fired, quitting, asking for a transfer, discussing problem with a co-worker, experiencing diminished

motivation to work) as a result of negative sexual experiences at work, were more likely than those who had not had such experiences to report certain sexual behaviors as sexual harassment. The results did vary by respondent gender. Compared with other males, males who had experienced negative outcomes due to sexual harassment viewed serious sexual behaviors as more harassing, whereas females, compared with other females, who had experienced negative outcomes due to sexual harassment viewed less serious sexual behaviors as more harassing (Konrad & Gutek, 1986).

It seems likely, however, that to become sensitized to the issue one does not need to experience such severe negative outcomes as those presented above. Simply having been sexually harassed, regardless of severity, may be sufficient to cause one to more likely view a particular sexual behavior as harassment. Consequently, in the present study the second hypothesis was as follows:

> H2: Individuals who have been the target of sexual harassment are more likely to view ambiguous sexual behavior as sexual harassment than individuals who have not been targets of sexual harassment.

Beyond the preceding main effect hypotheses concerning the effects of gender and having been a target on one's perceptions of what constitutes sexual harassment, the interrelationship between these two factors may have an effect as well. For example, since most harassment is perpetrated by males toward females (Merit System Protection Board, 1981; Backhouse & Cohen, 1978; Baldridge & McLean, 1980; Benson & Thomson, 1982; Bureau of National Affairs, 1981; Gutek *et al.*, 1980), the relationship between gender and harassment perceptions may be spurious. It may be the effect of having been sexually harassed rather than being female that causes one to view ambiguous sexual behaviors as sexual harassment. Thus, if one takes into account previous personal experience, in terms of having been a target of sexual harassment, there may be no independent effect of gender in influencing perceptions of what constitutes sexual harassment.

Alternatively, the interrelationship between gender and target may influence harassment perceptions in that target may moderate the relationship between gender and harassment perceptions. It is possible that for females, being a target of sexual harassment causes a pronounced response regarding their view of what constitutes sexual harassment, whereas with males there may be less of an effect. Following this logic, there may be an interactive effect between gender and having been the target of sexual harassment on harassment perceptions. Since there was no basis on which to choose one of these competing hypotheses rather than the other, it was decided to examine both possibilities but to not formally develop a hypothesis concerning these two variables in combination.

Finally, there are two methodological issues that the present study sought to address. First, much of the previous research on sexual harassment has used measures in which the respondents indicated that the particular behavior was either sexual harassment or not sexual harassment (Terpstra & Baker, 1987; York, 1989; Padgitt & Padgitt, 1986; Gutek, 1985; Powell, 1983; Konrad & Gutek, 1986). Since there are both theoretical and empirical grounds for viewing sexual harassment on a continuum, in terms of severity, studies with this kind of "yes or no" response

categories may fail to capture the richness and subtle differences in perceptions of what constitutes sexual harassment. Accordingly, in the present study, a measure (described in the "methods" section) was utilized that allowed respondents to report the degree to which they perceived a given behavior as sexually harassing. The measure, while not all inclusive, included a broad range of behaviors that may be regarded as sexually harassing, yet were lacking in much of the previous research on this topic (Gruber, 1992).

Second, much of the previous research has been devoted to the professor-student relationship in which the professor, typically male, is presented as the perpetrator of the behavior being examined, toward a student, typically female (Reilly, Carpenter, & Dull, 1982; Adams, Kottke, & Padgitt, 1983; Rossi & Weber-Burdin, 1983; Kenig & Ryan, 1986; Terpstra & Baker, 1987; Fitzgerald & Hesson-McInnis, 1989). Although an examination of this topic in an academic setting is useful, results of such studies may not be generalizable to nonacademic work settings. For example, Terpstra and Baker (1987) found that employed individuals and college students differed in what they consider as sexually harassing behavior. While a number of previous studies have addressed perceptions of working men and working women about what constitutes sexual harassment, the extent to which ambiguity of the situation causes differences between male and female perceptions has not been examined, in a nonacademic setting, with a measure sufficiently sensitive to find such differences.

In sum, although a number of studies have been conducted regarding this topic, the present study differs from previous research by (1) sampling working men and women, (2) using a measure sufficiently sensitive to capture the range and complexity of the behavior, and (3) taking into consideration individual respondents' personal experiences with sexual harassment. While much of the previous research addresses one of these issues, an extensive review of the literature failed to produce a study that takes into account all three.

METHODS

Sample

As part of a requirement for a part-time MBA business research class at a large mid-Atlantic university, those students who were working were to enlist ten volunteers, among their co-workers, to anonymously complete and forward directly to the researchers a questionnaire about their perceptions of the extent to which certain behaviors constituted sexual harassment. Out of 410 potential responses, 374 questionnaires were actually returned with 352 of those being usable (86%). The sample consisted of 62% females and 38% males. The average age of the respondents was 38.9 years, with a standard deviation of 10.7. The respondents reported an average of 17 years of work experience, with a standard deviation of 9.9 years.

Measures

The measure of perceptions of what constituted sexual harassment consisted of 13 items, which were developed to cover the range of the severity continuum, from innocent and innocuous to extremely severe behaviors. Many of the items were similar to those used by Fitzgerald *et al.* (1988), except that the items used in the present study depicted a male supervisor's actions toward a female subordinate, rather than a male professor's actions toward a female student. Although sexual harassment may be directed toward those of the same gender or directed from females toward male targets, the 13 items depicted male behaviors directed toward female targets because the preponderance of sexual harassment is of this form (Merit System Protection Board, 1981; Backhouse & Cohen, 1978; Baldridge & McLean, 1980; Benson & Thomson, 1982; Bureau of National Affairs, 1981; Gutek *et al.*, 1980). It should be noted that the measure used in the present study was not all inclusive. While Gruber's (1992) categorization of sexual harassment included 11 types of harassment, the purpose of the present study was to examine the potential causes of gender differences in perceptions of what constitutes sexual harassment rather than empirically test a comprehensive typology of sexual harassment.

Rather than a yes or no response about whether an item was or was not sexual harassment, the respondents were asked to what degree they felt the incident constituted sexual harassment. Their responses were measured on a five-point scale, anchored from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." Respondents were also asked if they had ever been the target of sexual harassment. A definition of sexual harassment was not provided so the responses, either yes or no, were based on the respondents' own interpretations of what constituted sexual harassment. Respondents were also asked to provide demographic information (e.g., age, gender, years of work experience).

RESULTS

Rather than ordering the 13-item scale along a severity continuum, the items were factored using a principal factor analysis. Because there was no basis on which to expect the factors to be orthogonal, the matrix was rotated with an oblique rotation. Based on the eigenvalue greater than one criterion and an inspection of the scree plot, a solution with three factors was retained. The item means, standard deviations, and factor loadings are reported in Table I. An inspection of Table I reveals that the three factors are ordered on the basis of severity. The initial factor, which consisted of items particularly offensive and onerous, was labeled as severe sexually oriented work behavior (Cronbach's alpha = .58). Although the alpha level is low, it was decided to retain this factor with the three items because it was quite robust even though a number of factor analytic strategies were employed. The second factor, which contained items depicting the hostile work environment definition of sexual harassment and which may allow for greater subjectivity in interpretation, was labeled ambiguous sexually oriented work behavior (Cronbach's alpha = .83).

Table I. Means, Standard Deviations, and Rotated Factor Loadings for Sexually Oriented Work Behavior Items

Item	Mean (s.d.)	Severe	Ambiguous	Innocuous
A male supervisor requiring sexual favors from a female subordinate in order for her to obtain organizational rewards (e.g., promotion, keeping her job).	4.91(.54)	0.62	−0.08	−0.10
A male supervisor touching or patting a female subordinate on a private part of the body (e.g., breast, buttocks).	4.94(.33)	0.60	−0.09	−0.02
A male supervisor repeatedly asking out a female subordinate who is not interested.	4.34(1.04)	0.52	−0.03	0.29
A male supervisor telling sexually oriented jokes to a female subordinate.	3.32(1.22)	−0.08	0.89	−0.07
A male supervisor telling sexually oriented jokes in the presence of a female subordinate.	3.18(1.19)	−0.06	0.87	0.03
A male supervisor making sexually suggestive remarks or gestures around a female subordinate.	4.32(.95)	0.30	0.53	−0.04
A male supervisor displaying sexually suggestive visuals (e.g., pin-up calendars).	3.69(1.27)	0.13	0.49	0.11
A male supervisor paying for a female subordinate's meal.	1.95(1.09)	0.01	−0.08	0.74
A male supervisor helping a female subordinate with physically demanding work.	1.66(.97)	−0.12	−0.08	0.63
A male supervisor touching or patting a female subordinate on nonsexual places on the body (e.g., arm, shoulder).	2.57(1.26)	0.04	0.02	0.62
A male supervisor asking a female subordinate for a date.	2.27(1.23)	0.05	0.13	0.53
A male supervisor holding a door open for a female subordinate.	1.30(.74)	−0.41	0.02	0.47
A male supervisor asking a female subordinate to run a personal errand (e.g., picking up laundry).	3.19(1.37)	0.29	0.06	0.43

Finally, the third factor consisted of relatively innocuous and innocent sexually oriented work behavior and consequently was labeled innocuous sexually oriented work behavior (Cronbach's alpha = .74). These three factors served as the dependent variables for the following analysis.

The first hypothesis, that there are differences between the perceptions of males and females about what constitutes sexual harassment in ambiguous situations but not in extreme situations, was examined initially with a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The overall effect of gender on perceptions of sexual harassment was not significant (Wilks' lambda = .99, $F(3, 348) = 1.71, p = .16$). How-

Table II. Analysis of Variance Tables for Perceptions of Sexual Harassment

Source	SS	*df*	*F*
Dependent variable: Severe sexually oriented work behavior			
Gender	0.03	1	0.74
Error	84.84	350	
Dependent variable: Ambiguous sexually oriented work behavior			
Gender	4.36	1	4.95[a]
Error	308.26	350	
Dependent variable: Innocuous sexually oriented work behavior			
Gender	0.46	1	0.85
Error	190.13	350	

[a] $p < 0.05$.

ever, since it was hypothesized that there would be an effect of gender only on ambiguous sexually oriented work behavior, it was deemed appropriate to further examine this hypothesis with univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA). The results of these univariate ANOVAs for the dependent variables are presented in Table II. As predicted under the hypothesis, there were no differences between males and females in their ratings of the extent to which the severe sexually oriented work behavior constituted sexual harassment ($M = 4.71$ vs. $M = 4.73$). There were also no differences between males and females in their ratings of the extent to which the innocuous sexually oriented work behavior constituted sexual harassment ($M = 2.11$ vs. $M = 2.19$). However, as predicted, there was a difference between males and females in their ratings of the extent to which ambiguous sexually oriented work behavior constituted sexual harassment. Males rated this factor significantly less harassing than did females ($M = 3.48$ vs. $M = 3.71$).

The second hypothesis pertained to the effects of having been the target of sexual harassment. The overall effect of target on perceptions of sexual harassment was not significant (Wilks' lambda = .99, $F(3, 363) = 1.74$, $p = .16$). However, similar to the analysis of the main effect of gender on harassment perceptions, it was deemed appropriate to examine this hypothesis with univariate ANOVAs. The results of these ANOVAs are presented in Table III.

As predicted under the hypothesis, there were no differences between those who were and were not targets in their ratings of the extent to which the severe sexually oriented work behavior constituted sexual harassment ($M = 4.72$ vs. $M = 4.74$). There were also no differences between those who were and were not targets in their ratings of the extent to which the innocuous sexually oriented work behavior constituted sexual harassment ($M = 2.12$ vs. $M = 2.21$). However, as predicted, there was a difference between those who were and were not targets in their ratings of the extent to which ambiguous sexually oriented work behavior constituted sexual harassment. Those who had been targets rated this factor significantly higher than did those who had not been targets ($M = 3.77$ vs. $M = 3.54$).

Our final analyses examined the competing hypotheses regarding the spurious versus interactive effects of gender and having been a target of sexual harassment

Table III. Analysis of Variance Tables for Perceptions of Sexual Harassment

Source	SS	*df*	*F*
Dependent variable: Severe sexually oriented work behavior			
Target	0.05	1	0.70
Error	86.04	365	
Dependent variable: Ambiguous sexually oriented work behavior			
Target	4.45	1	5.13[a]
Error	317.48	365	
Dependent variable: Innocuous sexually oriented work behavior			
Target	0.68	1	1.25
Error	199.37	365	

[a] $p < 0.05$.

Table IV. Analysis of Variance Table for Perceptions of Sexual Harassment

Source	SS	*df*	*F*
Target	5.18	1	5.95[a]
Gender	1.64	1	1.88
Target × Gender	2.62	1	3.01
Error	303.18	348	

[a] $p < 0.05$.

on harassment perceptions. The first possibility was that the main effect of gender may be spurious when the effect of target is measured since more women than men report that they have been targets of sexual harassment. In the present study, approximately 50% of the females and 12% of the males reported that they had been the target of sexual harassment. Also the intercorrelation between gender and target was .39.

The results, reported in Table IV, indicate that when the effects of target are accounted for, the main effect of gender on the perceptions of ambiguous sexually oriented work behavior was no longer significant ($F = 1.88$, ns). This result lends support to the idea that the relationship between gender and perceptions of sexual harassment may be due to personal experience.

Finally, an interactive model was tested as an alternative to the spuriousness model. This possibility was examined with an ANOVA in which in addition to the main effect terms for gender and target an interactive term for the two factors was included. As with the spuriousness model, ambiguous sexually oriented work behavior was used as the dependent variable. The results of this ANOVA, reported in Table IV, indicate that the interaction term was not significant ($F = 3.01$, ns), thus suggesting that personal experience does not moderate the relationship between gender and perceptions.

It should be noted that the potential effects of target and gender and their interaction on the severe and innocuous sexually oriented work behaviors were examined with ANOVAs and were not significant.

DISCUSSION

This study examined the extent to which gender differences in perceptions of sexual harassment are moderated by the ambiguity of the situation. Three sexually oriented work behavior factors were identified and ordered along a continuum of severity. These factors were labeled severe, ambiguous, and innocuous sexually oriented work behavior.

The study's first hypothesis that a main effect for gender would exist but only for ambiguous sexually oriented work behavior was supported. No gender differences were found in perceptions of severe sexually oriented work behavior or innocuous sexually oriented work behavior. However, for situations that were between these extremes and consequently more ambiguous, females tended to rate them as more sexually harassing than did males. These findings are consistent with those of previous research, which focused on the student-teacher relationship (Adams, Kottke, & Padgitt, 1983; Kenig & Ryan, 1986).

The second hypothesis, that whether a person has or has not been a target of sexual harassment has a main effect on harassment perceptions, was also supported. Those who indicated that they had been the target of sexual harassment were more likely to rate ambiguous sexually oriented work behavior as sexual harassment than were those who had not been a target. Thus, it appears that the personal experience of having been harassed may increase sensitivity to the issue and cause those individuals to view ambiguous sexually oriented work behavior as sexual harassment. Alternatively, it is also possible that since the power/dependence relationship underlies sexual harassment (Thacker & Ferris, 1991), those who have been harassed may be more sensitive to the coercive aspects of the supervisor-subordinate relationship and consequently more likely to rate ambiguous sexually oriented work behavior as more harassing.

The next issue examined in this study dealt with the combined effects of both gender and target on harassment perceptions. The results indicated that when target was accounted for, the effect of gender on harassment perceptions was no longer significant. Finally, tests to determine if there was an interactive effect of gender and target on harassment perceptions yielded results that indicated that there was no interactive effect, thus lending more support for the spuriousness model.

Based on these results, an important finding of this study was that when the effect of having been the target of sexual harassment was controlled, the effect of gender on perceptions of the extent to which ambiguous sexually oriented work behavior was sexual harassment was no longer significant. Both male and female respondents who reported having been the target of sexual harassment were more likely to perceive ambiguous sexually oriented work behavior as sexual harassment than male and female respondents who had not been the target of sexual harassment. Thus, it appears from these results that sensitivity to the issue of sexual har-

assment (i.e., having been a target) more strongly influences perceptions of sexual harassment than does gender. The apparent gender effect is understandable since women are targets of the vast majority of sexual harassment incidences. Although Konrad and Gutek (1986) did not directly examine the spuriousness hypothesis, their conclusion that gender differences in what is considered sexual harassment are, in part, due to "women's more frequent negative experiences with sex at work" is consistent with the results of the present study.

However, one of the limitations of the present research is that when respondents were asked if they had been the target of sexual harassment, no definition of the term was provided. Consequently, gender differences may actually exist, in terms of what individuals consider sexual harassment when directed toward them, as opposed to when responding to nonpersonalized items included on a scale. The gender effect, while found here to be subordinate to the effect of personal experience, may still exist in the degree to which respondents perceive that they have been sexually harassed. Thus, in making this determination, there may have been gender differences that are not reflected in the results of the data analysis. Males, for example, may have responded affirmatively if they had been the target of extreme sexually oriented work behavior, but negatively if they had been the target of less extreme or ambiguous sexually oriented work behavior. To resolve this, future research on the effect of personal experience on perceptions of sexual harassment should try to include more objective measures of personal experience, to the degree this is possible.

Although the present study does have limitations, there are several possible implications for organizations. The results of the study suggest that for organizations that are seeking to deal effectively with the problem of sexual harassment in the workplace, an important component of any effort directed to this end would be to obtain agreement between men and women about what constitutes sexual harassment. Since this study found that it was experience and not gender per se that accounts for these differences in perceptions, it seems imperative that any effort to foster agreement must include mechanisms that would allow common experiences. Such mechanisms might include role-playing and other experiential exercises.

Second, the commonly held assumption that women are more sensitive to the issue of sexual harassment and that men "just don't get it" may be a false one. Results of this study indicate that individual perceptions of sexual harassment are more influenced by having been a target of harassment than by gender. Thus, training programs that seek to sensitize employees to the problem of sexual harassment in the workplace must include all employees, rather than focusing only on males within the organization. Sexual harassment should not be considered only a "womens' issue" since, according to this study, males perceive sexual harassment similarly when they have been a target.

REFERENCES

Adams, J. W., Kottke, J. L., & Padgitt, J. S. (1983). Sexual harassment of university students. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 24*, 484-490.

Backhouse, C., & Cohen, L. (1978). *The Secret Oppression: Sexual Harassment of Working Women.* Toronto: MacMillan.

Baldridge, K., & McLean, G. (1980). Sexual harassment: How much of a problem is it . . . really? *Journal of Business Education, 55,* 294-297.

Baker, D. D., Terpstra, D. E., & Cutler, B. D. (1990). Perceptions of sexual harassment: A reexamination of gender differences. *Journal of Psychology, 124,* 409-416.

Benson, D. J., & Thomson, G. E. (1982). Sexual harassment on a university campus: The confluence of authority relations, sexual interest, and gender stratification. *Social Problems, 29,* 236-251.

Bureau of National Affairs. (1981). *Sexual Harassment and Labor Relations: A Bureau of National Affairs Special Report.* Washington, DC: Bureau of National Affairs.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (1980). Guidelines on discrimination because of sex. *Federal Register, 65,* 74, 676-74, 677.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Shullman, S. L., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y., Ormerod, A. J., & Weitzman, L. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 32,* 152-175.

Fitzgerald, L. F., & Hesson-McInnis, M. (1989). The dimensions of sexual harassment: A structural analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 35,* 309-326.

Gruber, J. E. (1992). A typology of personal and environmental sexual harassment: Research and policy implications for the 1990s. *Sex Roles, 26,* 447-464.

Gutek, B. (1985). *Sex and the Workplace.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

Gutek, B. A., Nakamura, C. Y., Gahart, M., Handschumacher, I. W., & Russell, D. (1980). Sexuality and the workplace. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 1,* 255-265.

Harris, M. B. (1992). When courtesy falls: Gender roles and polite behaviors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22,* 1399-1416.

Kenig, S., & Ryan, J. (1986). Sex differences in levels of tolerance and attribution of blame for sexual harassment on a university campus. *Sex Roles, 15,* 535-549.

Konrad, A. M., & Gutek, B. A. (1986). Impact of work experiences on attitudes toward sexual harassment. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 31,* 422-438.

Merit Systems Protection Board. (1981). *Sexual Harassment in the Federal Workplace: Is it a Problem?* Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson. (1986). *40 Fair Employment Practices Cases,* 1428. Washington, DC: Bureau of National Affairs.

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

Popovich, P. M., Licata, B. J., Nokovich, D., Martelli, & Zoloty, S. (1986). Assessing the incidence and perceptions of sexual harassment behaviors among American undergraduates. *Journal of Psychology, 120,* 387-396.

Powell, G. N. (1983). Definition of sexual harassment and sexual attention experienced. *Journal of Psychology, 113,* 113-117.

Powell, G. N. (1986). Effects of sex role identity and sex on definitions of sexual harassment. *Sex Roles, 14,* 9-19.

Pryor, J. B. (1985). The lay person's understanding of sexual harassment. *Sex Roles, 13,* 273-286.

Reilly, T., Carpenter, S., & Dull, V. (1982). The factorial survey: An approach to defining sexual harassment on campus. *Journal of Social Issues, 38,* 99-109.

Rossi, P. H., & Weber-Burdin, E. (1983). Sexual harassment on the campus. *Social Sciences Research, 12,* 131-158,

Terpstra, D. E., & Baker, D. D. (1987). A hierarchy of sexual harassment. *Journal of Psychology, 121,* 599-605.

Terpstra, D. E., & Baker, D. D. (1986). Psychological and demographic correlates of perception of sexual harassment. *Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monographs, 112,* 459-478.

Thacker, R. A., & Ferris, G. R. (1991). Understanding sexual harassment in the workplace: The influence of power and politics within the dyadic interaction of the harasser and target. *Human Resource Management Review, 1,* 23-37.

Till, F. J. (1980). *Sexual Harassment: A Report on the Sexual Harassment of Students.* Washington, DC: National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs.

York, K. M. (1989). Defining sexual harassment in workplaces: A policy-capturing approach. *Academy of Management Journal, 32,* 830-850.