

JOURNAL OF OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY AT 20

Sexual Harassment: Have We Made Any Progress?

James Campbell Quick
The University of Texas at Arlington and The University
of Manchester

M. Ann McFadyen
The University of Texas at Arlington

Sexual harassment (SH) is a continuing, chronic occupational health problem in organizations and work environments. First addressed in the *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology* through a 1998 Special Section on Sexual Harassment, we return to this consequential issue. If the goal is to reduce SH in organizations, and we believe that it should be, then a key question is whether we have made progress in 2 decades. The answer is mixed. Yes, there is a 28% decline in SH complaints. No, there is an increase in complaints by males. No, there has been an increase in the percentage of merit resolutions and monetary benefits. Maybe, because how do we explain the complexity of SH with emergent gay, lesbian, and transgender workforce members. One persistent problematic aspect of SH lack of agreement on definition. We address 2 of the 3 definitional approaches. We consider the broad, negative consequences for organizations and for individual victims. Harassers and aggressors destroy lives, leaving long legacies of suffering. In addition, we offer some suggestions for moving forward in science and practice, with emphasis on the role of the bystander. We conclude that SH is a preventable, if not always predictable, occupational health problem.

Keywords: sexual harassment (SH), violence, prevention, bystander, abuse of power

Sexual harassment (SH) is a chronic occupational health problem that first emerged in *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology (JOHP)* during the inaugural editorship. Back then, women authors and reviewers wanted SH articles published. Male reviewers were much more critical. There appeared to be gender bias across many reviews, though certainly not within each review. Male reviewers frequently recommended rejection based on research design problems whereas female reviewers could see the same flaws but recommend publication because of the significance of the issue, which they deemed overrode the flaws. Associate Editor Chaya Piotrkowski encouraged Quick (1998) to select the best and spotlight the issue. Have we made progress since then? Clearly SH continues as an occupational health problem but a closer look reveals a more complicated picture.

We revisit the *JOHP* special section articles as a historical benchmark. As we moved forward from there, we found much controversy still remains regarding the definition of SH. There is not a single, broadly accepted definition. So, for the present purpose, we accepted McDonald's (2012, p. 2)¹ relatively recent

definition: "conduct as unwanted or unwelcome, and which has the purpose or effect of being intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive." In addition, we highlight Fitzgerald's key work on the construct of SH. Her contribution is a central element in the review, but is surrounded by a complimentary body of work. This article is more than an update on what we know about SH.

In addition to what we know about SH, we focus attention on what we do not know and need to learn. We consider possible directions for future research on SH and organizational contextual factors that may influence the probability of SH occurring. SH is typically not an accidental occupational problem, but rather involves intentionality. Clearly an incident of workplace rape is no accident (Quick, McFadyen, & Nelson, 2014) and aggression in the workplace is destructive (cf., O Leary-Kelly, Griffin, & Glew, 1996). The burden of suffering is borne primarily by women in the workplace but not exclusively (Macik-Frey, Quick, & Nelson, 2007). SH may well be a problem that extends from sex discrimination in the workplace, a problem that has generated some landmark litigation from Berkman et al. v. City of New York et al. (1981–1982) to Beck v. Boeing (2004; Cascio, 2007).

Back Then . . . Two Decades Ago . . . A *JOHP* Special Section on SH

In introducing the special section, Quick (1998) placed SH in the context of occupational health psychology. He noted several

This article was published Online First October 10, 2016.

James Campbell Quick, Department of Management, The University of Texas at Arlington and Department of Organisational Psychology, The University of Manchester; M. Ann McFadyen, Department of Management, The University of Texas at Arlington.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to James Campbell Quick, Goolsby Leadership Academy, PO Box 19377, The University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington, Texas 76019-0377. E-mail: jquick@uta.edu

¹ In a subsequent section below, we discuss the controversies and complexities of research associated with the definition of SH.

problems associated with achieving high quality research on SH at that time. These included social stigma, the bias that it was a “woman’s problem,” and stereotype bias. In the Introduction, he also noted methodological alternatives that may overcome the subjective bias problem and social stigma. For example, archival research reviewing federal court SH case outcomes is one such alternative method. These comments set the stage for three empirical articles on SH by Dekker and Barling (1998); Goldenhar, Swanson, Hurrell, Ruder, and Deddens (1998), and Piotrkowski (1998) that we now review.

The university context is an interesting feature of the first competitive article in the special section (Dekker & Barling, 1998). This strikes us so given the recent national attention being brought to violence against women on university campuses and the problem of SA, with the federal government using Title IX as a way to leverage university responses on the issue. Therefore, Dekker and Barling (1998) may have been on the leading wave of this issue and note that the 10 to 15 years leading up to 1998 saw SH become a major issue because of several converging factors, including media attention and the commonality of victim symptoms to symptoms displayed by those experiencing other major workplace stressors. The authors did report a low response rate (18%) among all male university faculty ($N = 278$, M age = 45). The low response rate is not an uncommon problem for a socially sensitive research topic such as SH. We should note too that the focus was on SH of women by men, which is the stereotypic view of the problem. Despite the challenges and the limitations of their study, Dekker and Barling (1998) make two important, consequential points. First, the problem of SH is not a “woman’s problem.” They conclude that accumulating data suggest that workplace SH has widespread negative consequences for employees and organizations alike. Second, a fair and firm policy with consequential sanctions serves as a useful, importance preventive deterrent.

The lead article does raise a number of unanswered questions to consider. What were the attitudes and points of view of the nonrespondent male university faculty? What about the attitudes and perspectives of the female university faculty? These two questions have broader implications when considering research samples and designs. Specifically, what about the within group variance of attitudes and points of view? Not all men nor all women think, feel, and act in the same way. We may have stereotypic profiles but these break down when it comes to person-with-person interactions at the individual level. Second, what about the between group variance? The mean differences between any two groups, in this case men and women, may exist along some dimensions of concern while no mean group differences are found along other dimensions (cf., Taylor et al., 2000). Neither of these questions, however, negate the macrolevel outcomes of Dekker and Barling’s (1998) article: SH has widespread negative consequences and a firm, firm policy with consequential sanctions serves to prevent incidences of SH.

Goldenhar et al. (1998) took a very different approach in their study of SH and gender discrimination for female construction workers. At the time, while work-related injury rates in the construction industry were on the decline, they were still 50% higher than the average for all private industry. Hence, the construction industry was risky business. While women were not well represented in the skilled trades of the industry, such as carpenters, electricians, and plumbers, they were much better represented in

the laborer category within the industry. The research benefited from assistance from the Laborers’ Health and Safety Fund as well as local officials in two sites of the Laborers’ International Union of North America. The combined efforts yielded a sample of 211 female laborers. Rather than choosing a narrow research model with a limited number of stressors, the research team chose a more comprehensive model that considered three categories of stressors for these women: classic job stressors, such as job demands and control; gender-specific stressors, such as SH and gender discrimination; and construction industry specific stressors, such as safety climate and physical/chemical exposures.

This research design allowed the research team to consider the comparative risk associated with SH and gender-based discrimination for the women. These women reported that some supervisors and male coworkers were sources of SH and gender-based discrimination while other supervisors and male coworkers were sources of support, the latter contributing to greater job satisfaction. The results did indicate that SH and gender discrimination was positively related to reports of increased nausea and headaches. Hence, these are not just psychological concerns or issues but they do have somatic, physical consequences for women subject to this category of abuse in the workplace. However, the research team did find the work environment generally more favorable for the women construction workers in the study than both earlier focus group data and data from similar, predominately male occupations might have suggested. While the research model was robust, the researchers do note the self-report data limitation of the study along with the geographical constraint of the US Pacific Northwest.

Piotrkowski (1998) authored the third article in the special section on sexual harassment, or gender harassment, and distress among employed women. She aimed to use a more methodologically sound approach beyond the typical method of the era that relied primarily on women’s self-reports, or even checklist formats. While she had only a single item measure of frequency of offensive acts, she benchmarked against contextual variables in the data, such as gender composition in the work group, sex of supervisor, as well as perceived supervisor hostility toward women, frequency of unwanted sexual attention, and background characteristics. Piotrkowski (1998) had in addition within group sample variance among women, including White women and minority women. The total sample was composed of a relatively large number of women office workers ($N = 385$), with racial or ethnic minority (Black, Hispanic) women ($N = 225$) and White women ($N = 152$). There were 8 women who self-identified as “Other” in the sample.

Of the sample, a very large percentage (72%) reported exposure to gender harassment at work. This clearly suggested that SH was a problem of considerable magnitude for women, who we have noted are the primary victims, if not the exclusive victims. Piotrkowski (1998) found no significant difference in exposure to SH between the White women and the racial/ethnic minority women. She did find a negative relationship between SH and job satisfaction as well as a positive relationship between SH and distress. While she is cautious in her interpretation of the data recognizing the limitations of the research method, she does conclude like Dekker and Barling (1998) that there are both individual and organizational costs associated with gender harassment.

What Constitutes SH?

While this period research evidence addressed sexual harassment in an occupational health context, Quick (1998) failed to explicitly define sexual harassment (SH). This issue of defining the term “Sexual Harassment” has become one of the more researched topics in the SH literature. So much so that some suggest researchers have spent more time researching the definition than the phenomena itself (McDonald, 2012). Clearly the body of work on SH has increased over the last 30 years as has the list of definitions and understandings of the construct. Yet, one of the main difficulties in studying SH is lack of a clear definition (Fitzgerald et al., 1988). Cortina and Berdahl (2008) performed a 30 year review of the SH literature from 1988 through 2008 and offer that SH can be viewed from three perspectives—legal, social-psychological, and the public/law. We briefly define and discuss each below.

Legal

The legal definition of SH from EEOC, created in 1980, defines SH as

Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when this conduct explicitly or implicitly affects an individual’s employment, unreasonably interferes with an individual’s work performance, or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work environment. (p. 74677)

Recently, the EEOC updated the legal definition to include same sex SH. In addition the EEOC now stipulates that the harasser does not have to be employed by the victim’s organization and that the victim can be anyone affected by the conduct, not necessarily the individual directly targeted (Cortina & Berdahl, 2008). The definition was amended again to provide direction on discrimination against gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender individuals as well as men (https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/newsroom/wysk/lgbt_examples_decisions.cfm).

Other countries have also fine-tuned their legal definitions of SH. Notably, definitions of SH differ by country. This is important to note as we become a more global society. For example, McDonald (2012) writes that SH has been addressed by the International Labor Organization, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the European Union, and the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women. McDonald (2012) offers that there is no universal definition of SH, yet most definitions contain similar descriptions of unwanted or unwelcome conduct for the purpose of being intimidating, hostile, degrading humiliating or offense. Almost 50 countries prohibit SH.

Of interest to the authors, Australian courts take a broader interpretation of SH to include social functions, at work conferences, work related trips, and external premises (see also Eastale & Saunders, 2008; Hely, 2008; McDonald, Backstrom, & Dear, 2008). In France, SH is considered a criminal offense, narrowly defined as coercion to obtain sexual favors. Moreover, SH incidences appear to be highest in Austria and Germany, with the U.S. reporting slightly less. SH incidences are much lower in European nations, with low rates also in Sweden, Denmark, and Luxembourg. Clearly, culture places a large part in what constitutes SH. A study conducted in Spain found that many SH victims did not

see the incident as unpleasant, but rather as inevitable (see Valente, 1998 as cited by McDonald, 2012).

Finally, according to McDonald (2012, p. 12) ownership of liability for SH “frequently refer to vicarious liability, whereby organizations may be held liable unless they can establish that they took all reasonable steps to prevent the acts or that they promptly corrected the conduct after it became evident.” This last statement is important as in the United States, it is the employer who is held responsible for SH behaviors, whereas in other countries, individuals are held responsible for their actions.

Sociopsychological

The sociopsychological definition continues to be viewed as much broader than the legal definition, further it does not require negative work outcomes for claiming SH. The definition focuses on the victim’s subjective interpretation of the experience and is defined as “unwanted sex-related behavior at work that is appraised by the recipient as offensive, exceeding her resources, or threatening her well-being” (Fitzgerald, Drasgow, Hulin, Gelfand, & Magley, 1997, p. 15). This view relies upon the women’s subjective view of the experience. Fitzgerald et al. (1997) base their work on the premise that SH is a function of organizational and job characteristics. Broadly, SH behavior, based on the social psychological definition, generally fits into one of five categories: general sexist remarks and or behavior, inappropriate sexual advances, solicitation of sexual activity, or rewarded sexual favors, coerced sexual activity that include threat of punishment or sexual assault (Till, 1980).

Fitzgerald and Hesson-McInnis (1989) provided evidence that SH is multidimensional and that two dimensions—type and severity, are needed to represent the phenomena. Fitzgerald, Gelfand, and Drasgow (1995) developed the widely used Sexual Experience Questionnaire primarily based on Till’s (1980) five categories, designed to assess the level of SH in the workplace. General sexist remarks and or behavior (gender harassment) and inappropriate sexual advances (seductive behaviors) were by far the most commonly reported situations (Fitzgerald et al., 1997). Fitzgerald et al. (1997) conducted a factor analysis of the Till’s five constructs, which indicated the five constructs loaded on three factors: gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion. Gender harassment, the most commonly occurring form of SH, “consists of crude verbal, physical, and symbolic behaviors that convey hostile, offensive and misogynist behaviors” (Fitzgerald et al., 1997, p. 580, see also Berdahl, 2007b). More important, Fitzgerald and Hesson-McInnis (1989) found gender harassment to be distinct from other aspects of SH and recommended that researchers treat gender harassment separately from SH to increase the clarity and utility of both constructs. Unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion while more severe were reported less often. From a legal perspective, sexual coercion equates to quid pro quo and gender harassment and unwanted sexual attention make for a hostile work environment. Fitzgerald et al. (1997), first to explore outcomes of SH, suggest that SH is a function of organizational and job gender context and that other job stressors need to be accounted for when studying SH.

Drawing from Fitzgerald and colleagues, Sojo, Wood, and Genat (2016) conducted a meta-analysis of harmful workplace experiences and women’s occupational well-being finding that

“more intense yet less frequent harmful experiences (e.g., sexual coercion and unwanted sexual attention) and less intense but more frequent harmful experiences (e.g., sexist organizational climate and gender harassment) had similar negative effects on women’s well-being.” An interesting find was that the evidence indicated that power imbalance explained the impact of harmful work experiences on women’s well-being. Wright and Fitzgerald (2009) also explored workplace factors that influence SH, finding five variables as significant correlates: organizational climate, turnover, financial dependence, posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and primary appraisal, with contextual factors as the most important.

Public/Lay

Finally the lay perspective influences management policy and how employees view what constitutes SH, the most researched of the three definitions (Cortina & Berdahl, 2008). The lay definition evolved as the views of the general public of how SH change over time, and is also based on the woman’s subjective recount of the incidence. More research has been conducted based on the lay definition than the other definitions. Further, it is this definition of SH that influences management’s and employees’ views of SH in the workplace (Cortina & Berdahl, 2008). Further, studies examining lay perceptions of SH indicate women tend to include a broader range of behaviors as sexually harassing than do men (Cortina & Berdahl, 2008; Rotundo, Nguyen, & Sackett, 2001). More important, men and women differed most when perceiving behaviors to be SH when it comes to hostile work environment harassment, derogatory attitudes toward women, dating pressure, and physical sexual contact (Rotundo, Nguyen, & Sackett, 2001).

Notably, while all three definitions provide guidance and insights, each is restrictive for use in research and in further developing our understanding of SH in the workplace. For example, academic researchers argue that because the legal definition changes over time, the ability to compare studies and progress across time is difficult. In addition, the legal definition is considered narrow. Further, given that the legal definition came about in 1980, some state that SH cannot be examined before 1980. Academic researchers offer that the sociopsychological definition is broader; however, the downside to the measure is that not all behaviors in the sociopsychological definition are covered by the law (Cortina & Berdahl, 2008). Issues with the lay perceptions revolve around changing perceptions of SH behaviors. Behaviors that are now considered inappropriate were justified, tolerated, accepted, and even condoned in the past (Cortina & Berdahl, 2008).

Others have also offered new definitions in an effort to reconcile concerns with the existing definitions. Berdahl (2007a) offered an alternative definition, “behavior that derogates, demeans, or humiliates an individual based on that individual’s sex.” Berdahl’s (2007a) definition was drawn from “the notion that sexual harassment may be based on sex but not necessarily sexual.” Thus, researchers suggest rather than discuss “sexual harassment” as had been done traditionally, that the term “sex-based harassment” be used instead (Berdahl, 2007a). The reasoning is that the term sexual harassment is associated with sexual desire and not all incidents are a derived from sexual desire, many incidents are

driven by power or identify based concerns (Berdahl & Raver, 2010; Leskinen, Cortina, & Kabat, 2011).

More recently, a group of legal scholars (e.g., Leskinen et al., 2011) suggest the term “gender harassment” adds to the legal understanding of Berdahl’s (2007a, p. 425) definition of harassment being “a form of hostile environment harassment that appears to be motivated by hostility toward individuals who violate gender ideals rather than by desire for those who meet them.” This recent work is of importance as it sheds new light on the root cause of the harassment. SH was once thought of as primarily unwanted sexual attention or coercion, yet, evidence indicates that individuals are experiencing gender harassment, with no unwanted sexual attention or coercion. Put differently, the harassment is related to gender and not sexuality (Leskinen et al., 2011). More important, recent definitions go beyond focusing simply on the woman’s point of view, to offer a broader recognition of various forms of gender based harassment.

Evidence-Based Preventive Interventions

Setting the definition challenge aside for the moment, if SH is an intentional and/or volitional problem in the workplace with known risk factors, then it would stand to reason that there are solutions for the problem. Gutek (1985) was among the first to identify two known risk factors, those being where men outnumber women in the workplace and where men are the supervisors over women. A key concern is whether enough was being done on the prevention side versus the remedial side of the problem. As Cascio (2007) displays in the case of sexual discrimination, remedial solutions are available through the courts but the process is long, laborious, uncertain, and costly for all parties involved. The alternative to remedying the problem after the fact is through preventive intervention. Dekker and Barling (1998) offer plausible actions through organizational policies that are fair, firm and carry consequential sanctions. McDonald (2012) points out the complications associated with organizational grievance systems for SH complaints. These complications include the conflicting interests of the organization, which are self-and-image protection, and of the aggrieved, who seek justice, fair treatment, and remediation. This conflict of interest at the core of the organization calls for individual protection to complement organizational prevention, as we see later in the article.

Bell, Quick, and Cycyota (2002), motivated by a California workplace rape case circa 1995, reviewed the evidence from the mid- to late-1990s and offer a guide based on applying the public health notions of prevention to the problem of SH. The two keys to good preventive interventions are (a) surveillance data that serves as the triggering mechanism for (b) preventive action. However, translating successful models from one domain (public health setting) to another domain (organizational context) for a somewhat different problem (chronic disease vs. chronic workplace disorder) requires subsequent evidence-based testing. Two questions left with us from the 1990s review are:

What is the relative risk associated with SH, both in terms of probability of occurrence and severity of impact, compared with other workplace risks, either accidental or nonaccidental?

Why are evidence-based preventive interventions not more widely implemented and embedded in organizational practice?

And Now . . . Current State of SH Literature

To develop an understanding of where we are on SH, and recent trends, we analyzed the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and Fair Employment Practices agencies (FEPA) reported complaints.² Overall, the combined reports indicate that the total number of SH complaints actually declined 28.5% from 1997 to 2011. An interesting find was that the percentage of charges filed by males increased 15.3%; yet, women continue to file the majority of complaints. *Cardinale (2013)* offers that more men might be filing complaints as a result of the *Oncale v. Sundowner Offshore Services* ruling where the Supreme Court held that Title VII could be applied to harassment among workers of the same sex. Notably, *Cardinale (2013)* contends the frequency of males in the workplace experiencing harassment has not likely increased, rather males in the workplace are simply more willing to file complaints given the reduced stigma surrounding males making complaints. This may be indeed because of increased awareness of what constitutes SH and how to report potential incidences.

All the same, even though overall number of complaints declined, the percentage of settlements for complaints increased by 60% (from 6.8 to 10.9%). Complaints ruled with “no reasonable cause” increased from 41.4 to 53% (28% increase). Notably, the percentage of merit resolutions³ increased 39% (from 18.8 to 26.1%) and monetary benefits from \$49.5 million to \$52.3 million, a 6% increase. In summary, fewer complaints were filed, and the percentage of complaints filed by men increased. In addition, more complaints were ruled without cause. More important, a higher percentage of recorded complaints were considered merit resolutions and over all monetary benefits increased.

We also examined the Department of Labor’s statistics and found that the percentage of women in the workforce increased by 28% from 1990 to 2012,⁴ and the percentage of college graduates increased significantly from 1970 to 2012, with 15.7% of men in 1970 having college degrees, to 34.6 in 2012. Women in the workforce holding college degrees increased from 11.2% in 1970 to 38% in 2012. In addition, younger women now make up a lower percentage of the workforce than they did in 1990. In 1990, 25–44 year younger women made up 54% of the workforce; yet by 2012, 25–44-year-old women accounted for 42% of the workforce. However, the percentage of women older than 45 increased from 28% in 1990 to 44% by 2012. Overall, more men and women held college degrees in 2012 than they did in 1970, and the largest segment of women were older than 45. The Department of Labor indicates that men over the age of 40 accounted for 44.8% of men in the workplace in 1996, and women over the age of 40 also accounted for 44.8% of women in the workplace in 1996. Women over the age of 40 made up 52% of female workers in 2006, while men over 40 made up 51.2%.⁵ Clearly, the workplace is comprised of an older more educated population, with more females making up the workforce, especially women over 40.

What do these statistics mean? As numbers and percentage of more educated and younger women grow in the workforce, what does this mean for SH? *Gutek (1985)* was first working at a time where most workplaces were male dominated, one way or the other. As women achieve parity, would this mean that SH should be expected to decline because of equality and balance? Or, does *Berdahl’s (2007a)* work suggest that men will feel more threatened

by the rise of women in the workplace; thus, leading to increasing SH? The declines support a *Gutek (1985)* implication while SH’s intractability supports *Berdahl (2007a)*.

These statistics indicate that even with the changing workforce and efforts to heighten the awareness of SH, SH continues to be a problem in the work place. And while the U.S. EEOCs and FEPAs reports are encouraging in terms of reduced complaints received, the popular press continues to report SH incidences in the workplace, and organizations are faced with increasing costs related to SH incidences. Several recent headlines from the Wall Street Journal (WSJ) include: “Colleges face legal backlash from men accused of sex crimes” (*Associated Press, 2016a*); Lawsuit sparks soul-searching on Madison Avenue over diversity: *Bloomingtondale’s* apologized for an ad, shown in an image from Twitter, that some critics viewed as promoting date rape (*Vranica & Tadana, 2016b*); J. Walter Thompson CEO Resigns: WPP replaces Gustavo Martinez with Tamara Ingram in wake of discrimination lawsuit (*Vranica & Tadana, 2016a*); UC Berkeley Law School Dean resigns amid sexual harassment complaint (*Gershman, 2016*); NY lawmaker accused of sexual harassment to seek reelection (*Associated Press, 2016c*); Lawsuit deplores sex abuse of women in NY state prisons (*Associated Press, 2016b*); Microsoft apologizes after Xbox party includes scantily clad women (*Needleman, 2016*); Parent company of Roscoe’s House of Chicken and Waffles files for bankruptcy: Owing more than \$3 million to an ex-employee who said he was a target of racial discrimination and sexual harassment (*Stech, 2016*). More important, these headlines are but the tip of the iceberg of SH occurrences and complaints in today’s workforce.

Our review of recent statistics indicates much more research is needed regarding SH in the workplace. Further, recent studies indicate that over 50% of women and over 30% of working men report experiencing SH (*McLaughlin, Uggen, & Blackstone, 2012*). Thus, we analyze the more recent research to determine: where are we today in understanding SH in the workplace, how is SH defined today, what do we know about SH in the workplace, what future issues must be examined?

What We Know

Who Is Effected

While understandable that many of the definitions for SH are based on women’s perspective of being harassed as women have traditionally reported most SH complaints, we find this research, while interesting, to be somewhat limited. Also surprising is that most work on women have primarily researched White/European women, with little to no diversity in ethnic or cultural backgrounds

² The compiled report of the EEOC and FEPA may be found at https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/statistics/enforcement/sexual_harassment.cfm.

³ According to the EEOC, “merit factor resolutions include mediation and other settlements and cause findings, which, if not successfully conciliated, are considered for litigation.” (<https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/enforcement/>)

⁴ Please see the Department of Labor’s website for facts over time (http://www.dol.gov/wb/stats/facts_over_time.htm#labor).

⁵ Please see the Department of Labor’s website for trends (<http://www.dol.gov/dol/aboutdol/history/herman/reports/futurework/conference/trendsI.htm>).

(Cortina & Berdahl, 2008). Researchers have primarily looked at subordinates being harassed by those higher up in the organization. Yet, evidence exists that not only superiors but also coworkers, subordinates, customers, clients have been known to harass others to exert power, gain favors, and control (Cortina & Berdahl, 2008). Berdahl (2007b) found that women who violate traditional feminine ideals are also targets of harassment.

Other studies continue to indicate that women tend to report more adverse effects after experiencing harassing situations than men. Evidence continues to suggest that women may experience negative mood, eating disorders, drug and alcohol abuse as well as work turnover intentions, long-term anxiety, job stress, and or burnout (Cortina & Berdahl, 2008). Further, most studies indicate that men who experience SH do not find SH experiences as anxiety provoking, nor do they see it as bothersome, stressful or upsetting as women (Berdahl, Magley, & Waldo, 1996; Cortina & Berdahl, 2008). Even if the gender gap closes in the workforce SH claims may continue to increase if men feel more threatened (Berdahl, 2007a).

An interesting find was that one study indicated that SH experiences resulted in high levels of depression and anxiety for men (Vogt, Pless, King, & King, 2005). This study was somewhat unique, and provided critical insights and implications for the research field. Vogt et al. (2005) studied military men and women and the impact of being the target of SH when deployed. Their findings indicated that the higher the level of SH experiences, the higher the levels of depression, for both men and women. However, the increase in the level of depression rose more sharply for men, with less change for women. Vogt et al. (2005) interpreted this finding as experiencing SH presented a stronger risk factor for depression for men and a stronger negative impact on men's mental health in general. Further, they concluded that,

... when a man is sexually harassed, it may be more unexpected, have a more stigmatizing effect, and consequently, be more detrimental to mental health. On a related note, it is likely that there is generally more social support available to women compared with men who experience sexual harassment. Thus, the present findings contribute to the growing recognition that military SH is an important issue for men as well as for women. (Vogt et al., 2005, p. 126)

More important, not reporting SH incidences continues to be higher than anticipated; few men reported sexual harassment, and consistent with previous literature, women are more likely to report SH (McDonald, 2012). Holland, Rabelo, Gustafson, Seabrook, and Cortina (2016), one of the few studies that explore SH of men, found that men who engaged in feminist activism were more likely to experience SH in the workplace. Further, SH was more likely to occur in a workplace that tolerated SH, and these men who experienced SH were more likely to report negative job satisfaction. In a broader sense, studies indicate that men may be at a higher risk of mental health issues and depression is concerning, especially for military personnel (McDonald, 2012). Evidence exists that men in the military are 10 times more likely to experience SH than civilian men. Both men and women in the military experience unwanted sexual contact. To be sure, 5% of active military women and 1% of active military men report having experienced SH (Kime, 2014). And it is estimated that 81% of males experiencing SH in the military do not report the incidences (Penn, 2014). Further concerning is the overall general stigma felt

by many men in reporting SH incidences. Men who have experienced SH are less likely to seek treatment for depression, are more likely to experience self-harm and drug or alcohol abuse, and especially for veterans, have a higher potential of coming home homeless (Kime, 2014).

Researchers have broadened their work to include the lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer, and transgender (LGBTQ) individuals. Rabelo and Cortina (2014) studied gender and sexuality based harassment on the LGBTQ workforce. The scholars found evidence that the LGBTQ workforce is more likely to face both gender and sexual orientation SH than simply gender SH alone. The study provided evidence that Title VII could be broadened to include not only protection against SH based on gender, sex, and sex stereotyping, but also sexual orientation.

Antecedents

Many have extended our understanding of antecedents to SH in the workplace. While many continue to agree that gender underrepresentation is a prime antecedent for increased workplace SH risk, and the importance of examining context, not simply the individual as most SH incidents occurred at the group level. Fitzgerald et al. (1997) and Fitzgerald et al. (1995) works have served as the foundations for much of the recent work on SH today. An integrated model of antecedents and consequences developed by Fitzgerald et al. (1997) provided evidence of the importance of including both the organizational and job gender (ratio of women to men in the workplace) context as being instrumental in determining the prevalence of the occurrence of SH in an organization. Organizational climate refers to the organization's tolerance for SH; job gender context refers to the balance of genders in the work environment. Organizational climate was a strong of SH, indicating when employees do not believe the organization will take complaints seriously. And SH occurs more frequently when men outnumber women in the work group and when supervisors are predominantly male (Gutek, 1985). To be sure, organizational context and job gender context are perhaps two of the most researched SH constructs (Willness, Steel, & Lee, 2007).

Schneider, Swan, and Fitzgerald (1997) also found that when SH did occur, the incident impacted the victims' job satisfaction, health conditions, and psychological conditions. The scholars emphasized the moderating roles that personal vulnerability and response styles have on SH situations. The authors concluded that while job stressors also impacted the victims' job satisfaction, health conditions, and psychological conditions, incidences of SH had separate independent effects on each above and beyond.

Recent work from McCabe and Hardman (2005) found that employee's attitudes and experiences of SH were derived from both organizational and individual factors. Individual factors included the employee's perception of management's tolerance for SH, their age, gender, gender role, past experiences of SH. Other factors that impacted the perception of SH included the employees' attitude, the context of the behavior, the victim, and perpetrators genders (McCabe & Hardman, 2005). Power continues to be studied, with new insights indicating that individuals are more likely to sexually harass another when they had a previous positive power discrepancy experience (Walker, 2014).

“Incivility,” defined as rude and discourteous behavior that lacks intent to harm, has been recognized as an antecedent of and contributor toward the occurrence of SH (Cortina, Kabat-Farr, Leskinen, Huerta, & Magley, 2013; Leskinen et al., 2011). Incivility, even if expressed without any discriminatory intent, tends to alienate women and people of color in the workplace (Brief, 2008; Cortina et al., 2013; Leskinen et al., 2011).

What Are the Ramifications?

The majority of the research on SH has studied outcomes of SH incidences (Gutek & Koss, 1993, p. 43). This research has primarily examined individual outcomes and experiences, and focused mostly on women as victims. To be sure, “Sexual harassment (SH) has been identified as one of the most damaging barriers to career success and satisfaction for women” (Fitzgerald et al., 1988 as cited by Willness et al., 2007, p. 127). In general much of the literature reports that victims of SH report more depression, general stress and anxiety as well as posttraumatic stress (Cortina & Berdahl, 2008). Larsen and Fitzgerald (2011) found that SH leads to post traumatic stress (PTS), and that when the victims’ perceived control over their recovery and that future harassments was unlikely, PTS symptoms lessened. In another study, Vaile Wright, Collinsworth, and Fitzgerald (2010) found that victims of sexual trauma (i.e., rape) may be the largest group of women suffering from PTS, and that cognitive processing therapy is effective in treating trauma related difficulties (Vaile Wright et al., 2010). Palmieri and Fitzgerald (2005) also examined women who had experienced a wide range of SH and PTS, and concluded that the women experienced re-experiencing, effortful avoidance, emotional numbing, and hyperarousal factors associated with PTS. Additionally, victims report an impaired psychological well-being, negative moods and have an increased likelihood of using prescription drugs, expressing anger and disgust resulting in a lower level of overall happiness (Cortina & Berdahl, 2008).

Undeniably, SH has been associated with many negative outcomes such as reduced job satisfaction and work productivity, and even increased withdrawal behaviors (see Fitzgerald et al., 1997; Langhout et al., 2005; Leskinen et al., 2011). Others have examined the impact of SH in conjunction with job fit literature. Findings from this line of research indicate that the more pervasive the sexist and or sexual hostility toward an individual, the more stress the individual experiences. Notably, the more stressful the experience, the less personal and professional well-being was reported by the individual, resulting in less organizational commitment and work productivity (Langhout et al., 2005). Still others have examined the impact of SH in regards to those who work in individual’s homes. Barling, Rogers, and Kelloway (2001) found that SH in the workplace when studying health care professionals in individual clients homes resulted in fear, negative mood, and perceived injustice that lead to lower affective commitment and enhanced withdrawal intentions, poor interpersonal job performance, greater neglect, and cognitive difficulties. Their work provided evidence that work place violence and sexual harassment co-occur.

While the majority of research on SH has been at the individual level, clearly the ramifications of SH incidences are experienced not just by the victims and harassers, but also by others in the workplace such as managers, compliance officers, coworkers, and

confidants among others (Buckner, Hindman, Huelsman, & Bergman, 2014). Further, a recent study indicated that the negative ramifications of workplace SH also extend to the victim’s person life, particularly their romantic relationships, in that anger mediated the effects of SH on romantic relationships (Dionisi & Barling, 2015). Yet, little work has been done on other levels of analysis such as teams, groups or the overall firm (Raver & Gelfand, 2005). This despite the fact that Fitzgerald et al. (1995) identified that even though individual differences exist regarding the propensity to harass, the vast majority of SH is a function of both organizational climate and gender balance. Critical to the advancement of our understanding of SH and the workplace is to further examine these units of analysis.

SH impacts not just the individual but also the organization, as Dekker and Barling (1998) pointed out. Further, SH has been found to be costly to organizations, in terms of psychological problems, and higher absenteeism and turnover intention levels as victims are less likely to fully engage at work (Fitzgerald et al., 1997; Jiang et al., 2015). And, researchers found that SH produced higher negative impacts on employees, much more so than other job related stressors (Fitzgerald et al., 1997). Moreover, when examining the lagged effects of SH on self-reported illness, injury, or assault, SH and general workplace harassment increased the incidence of illness, injury, and assault (Rospenda, Richman, Ehmke, & Zlatoper, 2005). Bottom line, SH occurrences create a hostile work environment. Organizational costs of SH entail losing quality employees, lost business because of tarnished organizational reputations, and lost productivity as victims of SH are less likely fully engages at work (Orlitzky, Schmidt, & Rynes, 2003).

Victims of SH face negative consequences because of their experiences. Wright and Fitzgerald (2007) extended our understanding of the victim’s cognitive evaluation of SH experiences by identifying four emotion clusters: demoralization, anxious arousal, fear, and self-blame, which were differentially related to the intensity of the stimulus and individual (self-esteem, previous victimization, feminist attitudes, and attributions) factors. Sims, Drasgow, and Fitzgerald (2005) found that working women who have experienced SH experience changes in their attitudes about work and tend to see an increase in work withdrawal. SH is linked to the intent to leave, even after controlling for job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and marital status. Jiang et al. (2015) found that perceived anti SH practices and SH incidences were linked to commitment and intent to stay as well as to psychological distress and employee engagement. Still others found a link between SH and eating disorders for female victims (Harned & Fitzgerald, 2002).

Drawing from Fitzgerald and colleagues, Sojo et al. (2016) conducted a meta-analysis and confirmed the link between SH and women’s overall wellbeing. They found that the more intense yet less frequent experiences (sexual coercion and unwanted sexual attention) and less intense but more frequent experiences (sexist organizational climate and gender harassment) had similar negative effects on women’s well-being. Put differently, they found that high frequency yet low intensity SH experiences were as detrimental to the woman’s overall wellbeing as the low frequent high intensity forms of SH.

What Tools Have Been Shown to Be Effective at Reducing SH

Primary tools used to combat occurrence of SH in the workplace have been laws and company policies, coupled with training on the laws and policies. Some researchers have provided insights into the importance of intervention activities. Of note, the EEOC, formed in 1965, recently celebrated its 50th year. The purpose of the agency was to enforce Title VII, specifically to enforce prohibiting employment discrimination and retaliation based on race, color, religion, national origin, and sex. The EEOC's initiatives emphasize corporate training and policies directed toward EEOC compliance (Dwoskin, Squire, Patullo, & Kessler, 2016).

Popovich (1988) called for organizations to act proactively by establishing policies prohibiting SH, raising employee awareness of SH as well as of reporting procedures, providing education to employees about problems with SH as well as making sure the organization supported the victims. Organizations have created policies and training, and implemented hot lines toward reducing the incidence of SH in the workplace. Most implement training on SH as a way to inform and educate employees on appropriate workplace behaviors. Cortina and Berdahl (2008) contend that many important advances have result regarding SH in the workplace. First, training results in better educated employees and aid in identifying better ways to approach SH. Training should include SH scenarios, experiences, and motivation, in addition to understanding what constitutes SH (Cortina & Berdahl, 2008). Further training must also provide insights into why many SH victims remain passive and do not report incidences. The purpose is to provide employees with a clearer understanding of SH from various viewpoints.

Training should also provide insights into how individuals are likely to incorrectly predict how they would react in a SH situation. The purpose is to raise overall awareness (see also Cortina & Berdahl, 2008). Cortina and Berdahl (2008) cite research conducted by Patricia Devine in which she examines the notion that all individuals have an implicit bias. The more cognitive individuals are of their own biases, the better able they are to alter their own behavior and understand the consequences of their biases. (Perry, Kulik, & Field, 2009) report that skill based training is ideal for behavior changes especially when dealing with issues as sexual harassment. Training that includes role playing as both the harasser and victim is beneficial.

However, while many are optimistic about the power of training employees on SH, evidence exists that training may actually do more harm than good. Interestingly, research indicates that while we have much research in theory about training and the potential good it may do, we have little empirical research to support positive outcomes of training (Buckner et al., 2014). What we do know is that training may have an oversensitizing effect that could lead to more positive identifications of SH occurrences. Furthermore an EEOC survey reported that most SH training was worthless (www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/task_force/harassment/upload/report.pdf). To be effective SH training it must "be part of a holistic, committed effort to combat harassment, focused on the specific culture and needs of a particular workplace . . . live, in-person and customized to your workplace." (Lipnic, 2016).

Buckner et al. (2014) set out to examine elements of SH training program design and administration (quantity, variety, and recency)

to determine the relationship with manager's ability to accurately identify SH and follow up with an appropriate recommended response. They contend that we know very little empirically on how to design, implement and respond to a SH training program. Indeed they asked for a call to action for future research to provide better understanding of identifying antecedents that predict manager's ability to accurately identify and respond with appropriate action to incidences of SH. And for HR professionals as well as scholars to examine training, intervention initiatives to stop SH from occurring in the workplace (Buckner et al., 2014). Still others advocate for new HR practices to reduce SH occurrences. For example, Nishii and Wright (2008) call for anti-SH practices to be directed at reducing psychological stress and enhancing employee engagement, in an effort to increase commitment and intentions to stay.

Nevertheless, researchers have found that it is not the employee's perception of the practices as much as it is the perception of manager's intentions that impact the employee's reaction to the practices (Aryee, Walumbwa, Seidu, & Otake, 2012). Jiang et al. (2015) also found that employee's perception of antisexual harassment policies as well as SH occurrences both directly and indirectly impact the employee's psychological stress. Further, psychological distress and engagement mediated the relationships of perceived antisexual harassment policies and SH occurrences and commitment and intention to stay (Jiang et al., 2015).

Claybourn (2011) recommends that because work characteristics, satisfaction and moral disengagement are related to SH in the work place, interventions such as modification of organizational characteristics (e.g., structure, policies, education on what constitutes SH and on how SH affects employees as well as employee programs) that contribute to the occurrence of SH should be addressed to reduce the occurrence of SH. More important, Claybourn (2011) notes that because each organization is unique, interventions must be custom designed, rather than taking a "one-size fits all" approach.

Bowes-Sperry and O'Leary-Kelly (2005) provided new insights by developing a typology of intervention behaviors and an intervention process model in which they characterized interventions in terms of immediacy and level of involvement that resulted in four types of recommended interventions. The authors proposed interventions based on the notion that many SH victims may be hesitant to report harassment incidences and often deny the harassment took place, avoid the harasser and may even joke about the incident. Bowes-Sperry and O'Leary-Kelly (2005) suggested instead that observers also play an active role in intervention by reporting of potential observed SH, stepping in to stop SH as it is occurring, and/or provide negative feedback to the harassers. Raver and Gelfand (2005) found that at the team level, ambient SH negatively affected team cohesion, financial performance. Third party intervention has the potential to be both powerful and effective.

Lawson, Wright, and Fitzgerald (2013) examined the impact of engaging in litigation related to SH experiences and posttraumatic stress, finding that using multiple validated measures and diagnostic interviews helped reduce the bias and improved the accuracy of understanding SH experiences and reduce the bias in evaluations. Still others have the impact on victims who reported SH. Bergman, Langhout, Palmieri, Cortina, and Fitzgerald (2002) found that

contrary to expectations, female military personnel who reported SH did not experience improved job, psychological or health outcomes. The authors suggest that the organizations response to the reports and procedural satisfaction were the source of the negative effects rather than reporting itself.

What We Need to Find Out

As evidence from the literature, much more work is needed to better understand SH in the workplace and ways in which to decrease its occurrence. First, much work has been done on the most frequently occurring forms of SH; general sexist remarks and or behavior (gender harassment). Yet, while occurring less frequently sexual coercion has been shown to be as detrimental and requires more study.

The EEOC recognizes the importance of emerging issues such as transgender discrimination and needed laws to protect this group of individuals. The EEOC expanded their scope beyond the existing laws (Dwoskin et al., 2016, p. 4) to include three additional areas: "1. Transgender protections under Title VII; 2. Religious discrimination and accommodation; and 3. The EEOC's efforts regarding background checks."

Undeniably, the vast majority of SH research has been conducted on White/European women in traditional work environments and academia (Cortina & Berdahl, 2008). More research is needed the military (Fitzgerald et al., 1997) additional ethnic backgrounds (e.g., Cortina, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 2002; Wasti, Bergman, Glomb, & Drasgow, 2000) and men (Berdahl & Moore, 2006).

Much more work is also needed on properly specifying SH models. Nye, Brummel, and Drasgow (2014) argue that many of the SH constructs are complex and to better understand SH the constructs need to be aggregated. Fitzgerald (2003) called for additional protections for victims of SH, suggesting that the current litigation process frequently results in harm to the victim. Fitzgerald calls for removing the caps on Title VII damages, minimum rewards, and ways to educate juries on the damages caused by SH to its victims.

In addition, researchers are asked to focus on emerging forms of SH. More work is needed regarding the impact of SH on observers, the organization as a whole as well as on men and the LGBT community. Historically, SH has been defined from the women's subjective experience. Yet, new evidence exists that SH may come from customers, clients, and other members of the general public; and nonsexual forms are increasingly being recognized, such as jokes on intelligence, comments related to not belonging in certain jobs (Cortina & Berdahl, 2008). A recent article in the WSJ provided evidence of an increasingly sensitive society and ramifications on perceptions of SH. Recently, a tenured LSU faculty member was terminated as a result of her use of a crude term, a joke about lesbianism and a joke about sex after marriage. While no student charged the professor with SH, the professor was fired for violating LSUs SH policy which prohibits "unwelcome verbal, visual, or physical behavior of a sexual nature" and that "harassment does not have to include intent to harm, be directed at a specific target, or involve repeated incidents" (Crealey, 2016).

Still other questions remain unanswered. For example, why are some SH victims traumatized and others not? How will the changing workplace which will increasingly be made up of more mil-

lennials and fewer baby boomers impact not only the definition of SH, but also reporting, training and intervention strategies? Changes such as an increasing workforce who work from home, social media, a more casual work environment including slackened more casual dress codes. And millennials themselves bring unique challenges to the work place environment (Mainiero & Jones, 2013, see also Council of Economic Advisors, 2014). Millennials, individuals born between 1980 and 2000, have been shown to be less career oriented, less loyal to organizations, more sensitive than other generations, and more likely to leave an organization if adversity strikes (Alexander & Sysko, 2013). More work is needed to understand the unique perspectives of this growing segment of the workforce and their perceptions of SH.

Of note, is that while millennials are more open minded and tolerant of sexual behavior than previous generations, they may also lack a clear understanding of acceptable work place behavior, and may not have a clear understanding of legal ramifications of certain behaviors (Dozier, 2015). In addition, the use of social media for texting and sexting are likely to blur the lines and challenge the organization in terms of the organization's responsibilities and boundaries, especially in the United States as the organization is still held accountable for SH incidences (Landers, 2013). More work is also needed to address the increasing LGBT community. Evidence exists that this group experiences SH at the same rate if not higher than the heterosexual community, however, has significantly fewer reports. This community tends to experience heterosexism, homophobia, transphobia, as well as hate crimes (Staff, 2016). Clearly much more work is needed to fully understand these new generation of workers and their understanding of SH.

Organizational Context: Prevention of Sexual Harassment

We have seen that the evidence is equivocal concerning the question of whether we have made progress in addressing SH in the workplace. Despite the chronic nature of these pernicious organizational problems, there is work that can be done in the organizational context to prevent SH. Thus, there is a continuing role for organizational prevention as the first line of defense.

Here we look briefly at what has been done to reduce workplace violence more broadly and then consider three ideas for future work. We agree with McDonald's (2012) that the hierarchical power dynamic as at the root of sexual harassment and addressing that power dynamics in hierarchical relationships is an avenue that has not been fully explored.

One condition that sets the stage for preventing SH is more broadly reducing violence in the workplace. The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH, 2004) brought significant attention to research on workplace violence as a source of morbidity and mortality for nearly two million Americans annually. SH falls into the scope of abusive, even violent behaviors, whether the violence is verbal, interpersonal in nature or physical in nature. The creation of a safe, secure workplace is typically a priority for organizations, especially healthy ones that place priority on their human resources. While NIOSH's mission is focused on research and it's translation into practice, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) is an enforcement arm of the Department of Labor that aims to insure the safety

and security of workplaces. OSHA (2015) has brought particular attention to the burden of suffering from violence for health care and social service workers. Some organizational contexts are at higher risk of violent and abusive behavior, including SH and SA. Once organizations have done what they can to prevent SH, SA, and workplace violence in policy and procedure, then there is a need to focus attention on leadership and prospective victims.

The Hierarchical Power Dynamic

SH in the workplace is an issue of interpersonal as well as physical safety and of felt security. McDonald (2012) places SH in the range of abusive or counterproductive behaviors which has hierarchical power relations at their core. Considering how power plays in as a causal factor in SH may be fruitful. This could be approached through David McClelland's concept of imperial power in future research (McClelland & Burnham, 1995). Imperial power motivation leads to impulsive and erratic actions, rude and overbearing behavior, and the exploitation of others (Quick & Quick, 2013). Imperial power should be considered as a foundation for abuse of power and for the abusive or counterproductive behavior to which McDonald (2012) refers. Imperial power is toxic in relationships and in the workplace. Hence, the research question is whether leaders who engage in the use of imperial power are more prone to abusive behaviors, to include SH. By way of explanation, we are not suggesting that leaders or bosses are the primary culprits in SH cases but we are suggesting that the tone and nature of the leader-follower dynamic in the workplace is one important organizational culture cornerstone (Schein, 2010).

Leadership: Preventing the Abuse of Power

McDonald (2012) suggests that, while there is comparatively limited research on the characteristics of the harassers (e.g., lack social conscience, engage in immature, irresponsible, manipulative, and exploitative behaviors), what does exist leads toward understanding the harasser's motives as aggression, not seduction. Aggressive, overbearing, and exploitive behaviors would fall into the domain of the abuse of power. Preventing the abuse of power might again be considered through McClelland's concept of socialized or interactive power, which is self-controlled, relies on appropriate inhibition of feelings and actions, is respectful of others' rights to include those of followers, and is concerned with fairness and organizational justice (McClelland & Burnham, 1995). This approach to the use of power aims to shrink the hierarchical distinction in leader-follower relations and is often labeled servant leadership (McRaven, 2016). The research question here is whether socialized power and servant leadership lead to reduction in the abuse of power and, in turn, reductions in SH.

Secure Interpersonal Relationships

While we can envision roles for leaders and organizations in addressing the problem of SH, we also can envision a role for secure, interpersonal relationships as guards against unwanted aggression and harassment. Political skills may be one key element of building a strong, secure interpersonal network. Perrewé et al. (2005) have shown how political skill can be effective in dealing with job stress, work overload, and strain at work. Turning polit-

ical skill to managing a difficult or challenging relationship to avert SH is an avenue for future research.

In addition to political skills, psychological intimacy is another path to secure interpersonal relationships. Are those with such relationships less likely to be victims of SH? Lobel, Quinn, St Clair, and Warfield (1994) found that psychological intimacy between men and women at work was a real possibility without engaging romance or sex. The caution for both women and men in forming strong, intimate psychological bonds in the workplace is that some individuals may prove untrustworthy, ultimately being a danger rather than a support. de Becker (1997) shows through case analyses that attention to intuition can serve a powerful protective role in sensing persons and situations fraught with danger, to include risk of SH. Navigating the power dynamics of most work environments requires more political skills and human understanding than it does management skills and scientific knowledge.

Bystander Approach

Most prevention programs focus on prevention by reducing risk of occurrence for potential victims (Burn, 2009). Recently, the focus of prevention has shifted to the role of bystanders and addresses bystander intervention before, during, and after assault (McMahon & Banyard, 2012). Bystander interventions involve individuals who see or hear about SH incidences and how they might intervene to protect or reduce harm to the victim (Powell, 2011). Bowes-Sperry and O'Leary-Kelly (2005) devised a typology and 2×2 model of bystander interventions based on the immediacy (low/high) and level of involvement (low/high). Further they note that nonintervention of bystanders as the status quo may actually encourage more SH in the workplace. McDonald, Charlesworth, and Graham (2016) empirically examined Bowes-Sperry and O'Leary-Kelly's (2005) work and found four contextual features which influenced bystander intervention: identification with and similarity to target, experience and anticipation of sanctions, workplace norms, and inaction or coparticipation of others. Bystander involvement is thought to be driven by workplace culture and level of SH tolerance (McMahon & Banyard, 2012). An interesting find was that the EEOC now encourages bystander training in terms of how to recognize and report the problem so as to make SH a "sense of collective responsibility" (Lipnic, 2016). Bystander intervention continues to be an important emerging area of prevention and more work is needed to fully understand its impact on SH.

Conclusion

JOHP embraced SH as an occupational health psychology problem in 1998 when three competitive research articles were published in a special section. Our current examination of the evidence suggests that SH is a continuing occupational problem. Have we made progress? Yes, there has been progress on some fronts but not on others and the problem has morphed, becoming more complicated for a variety of reasons found in the current data. First, we continue to struggle with the very definition of SH which limits our ability to develop effective strategies to address the phenomena in the workplace (McDonald, 2012). Next, we know that the majority of women and men are not victimized in the workplace by SH. McDonald (2012) noted that there is limited

research on the characteristics of the harassers, while she also noted more research on the characteristics of the complainants. Further, we know that the makeup of the workforce is changing. We have just begun to see research on SH implications to the gay, lesbian, and transgendered employees. We also know little about millennials view of what constitutes SH in the workplace, important as this generation is larger than the baby-boomer generation, and have a much different attitude toward work, sexual behavior, and responsibility. Further little if any research has been conducted on why some people become subjects of SH while others do not. Finally, we know that training efforts have been less successful than had been hoped, yet new insights have been made and new training elements are being encouraged. From a public health perspective, there is a real need to know more about harassers, aggressors, abuses, and the role power dynamics play in causing SH. Why? Because with this new information and evidence about risks factors, then surveillance indicators and systems can be put in place to address this preventable, if not always predictable, occupational health problem.

References

- Alexander, C. S., & Sysko, J. M. (2013). I'm GenY, I love feeling entitled, and it shows. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 17, 127–131.
- Aryee, S., Walumbwa, F. O., Seidu, E. Y. M., & Otaye, L. E. (2012). Impact of high-performance work systems on individual- and branch-level performance: Test of a multilevel model of intermediate linkages. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97, 287–300. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0025739>
- Associated Press. (2016a, March 23). Colleges face legal backlash from men accused of sex crimes. *Wall Street Journal*.
- Associated Press. (2016b, February 26). Lawsuit deplores sex abuse of women in NY state prisons. *Wall Street Journal*.
- Associated Press. (2016c, March 10). NY lawmaker accused of sexual harassment to seek re-election. *Wall Street Journal*.
- Barling, J., Rogers, A. G., & Kelloway, E. K. (2001). Behind closed doors: In-home workers' experience of sexual harassment and workplace violence. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 6, 255–269. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.6.3.255>
- Bell, M. P., Quick, J. C., & Cycyota, C. S. (2002). Assessment and prevention of sexual harassment of employees: An applied guide to creating healthy organizations. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 10, 160–167. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00203>
- Berdahl, J. L. (2007a). Harassment based on sex: Protecting social status in the context of gender hierarchy. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 641–658. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2007.24351879>
- Berdahl, J. L. (2007b). The sexual harassment of uppity women. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, 425–437. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.425>
- Berdahl, J. L., Magley, V. J., & Waldo, C. R. (1996). The sexual harassment of men? Exploring the concept with theory and data. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 20, 527–547. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1996.tb00320.x>
- Berdahl, J. L., & Moore, C. (2006). Workplace harassment: Double jeopardy for minority women. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 426–436. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.2.426>
- Berdahl, J. L., & Raver, J. L. (2010). Sexual harassment. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial/organizational psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 641–669). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Bergman, M. E., Langhout, R. D., Palmieri, P. A., Cortina, L. M., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2002). The (un)reasonableness of reporting: Antecedents and consequences of reporting sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 230–242. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.87.2.230>
- Bowes-Sperry, L., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (2005). To act or not to act: The dilemma faced by sexual harassment observers. *Academy of Management Review*, 30, 288–306. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2005.16387886>
- Brief, A. P. (2008). *Diversity at work*. New York, NY: Cambridge Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511753725>
- Buckner, G., Hindman, H., Huelsman, T., & Bergman, J. (2014). Managing workplace sexual harassment: The role of manager training. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 26, 257–278. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10672-014-9248-z>
- Burn, S. M. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. *Sex Roles*, 60, 779–792. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9581-5>
- Cardinale, J. (2013, April). Sexual harassment complaints by males on the rise: 2012 EEOC enforcement and litigation statistics. *Sexual Harassment & Gender Discrimination*. Retrieved from <http://www.employmentlawblog.info/2013/04/sexual-harassment-complaints-by-males-on-the-rise-2012-eeoc-enforcement-and-litigation-statistics.shtml>
- Cascio, W. F. (2007). Sex discrimination in the workplace: Lessons from two high-profile cases. In F. J. Crosby, M. S. Stockdale, & S. A. Ropp (Eds.), *Sex discrimination in the workplace: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 143–152). Oxford, United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Claybourn, M. (2011). Relationships between moral disengagement, work characteristics and workplace harassment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100, 283–301. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0680-1>
- Cortina, L. M., & Berdahl, J. L. (2008). Sexual harassment in organizations: A decade of research in review. In J. Barling & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational behavior: Vol. I. Micro Approaches* (pp. 469–497). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781849200448.n26>
- Cortina, L. M., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Drasgow, F. (2002). Contextualizing Latina experiences of sexual harassment: Preliminary tests of a structural model. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 24, 295–311. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15324834BASP2404_5
- Cortina, L. M., Kabat-Farr, D., Leskinen, E. A., Huerta, M., & Magley, V. J. (2013). Selective incivility as modern discrimination in organizations: Evidence and impact. *Journal of Management*, 39, 1579–1605. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206311418835>
- Council of Economic Advisors. (2014). *15 economic facts about millennials*. Washington, DC: Executive Office of the President of the United States.
- Creeley, W. (2016, February 19). How the Sex-Harassment cops became speech police. *Wall Street Journal*.
- de Becker, G. (1997). *The gift of fear: Survival signals that protect us from violence*. New York, NY: Dell Publishing.
- Dekker, I., & Barling, J. (1998). Personal and organizational predictors of workplace sexual harassment of women by men. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3, 7–18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.3.1.7>
- Dionisi, A. M., & Barling, J. (2015). Spillover and crossover of sex-based harassment from work to home: Supervisor gender harassment affects romantic relationship functioning via targets' anger. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36, 196–215. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/job.1969>
- Dozier, C. (2015). *How do millennials view sexual harassment?* Retrieved from <http://www.workplaceanswers.com/resources/blog/millennials-and-sexual-harassment/>
- Dwoskin, L. B., Squire, M. B., Patullo, J. E., & Kessler, L. (2016). The EEOC at 50. *Employee Relations Law Journal*, 41, 3–34.
- Easteal, P., & Saunders, S. (2008). Interpreting vicarious liability with a broad brush in sexual harassments cases. *Alternative Law Journal*, 33, 75–79.

- Fitzgerald, L. F. (2003). Sexual harassment and social justice: Reflections on the distance yet to go. *American Psychologist*, 58, 915–924. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.58.11.915>
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Drasgow, F., Hulin, C. L., Gelfand, M. J., & Magley, V. J. (1997). Antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations: A test of an integrated model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 578–589. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.4.578>
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Gelfand, M. J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment: Theoretical and psychometric advances. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17, 425–445. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15324834baspl704_2
- Fitzgerald, L. F., & Hesson-McInnis, M. (1989). The dimensions of sexual harassment: A structural analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 35, 309–326. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(89\)90032-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(89)90032-8)
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Shulman, S. L., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y., . . . Weitzman, L. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 32, 152–175. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(88\)90012-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(88)90012-7)
- Gershman, J. (2016, March 10). UC Berkeley Law School Dean resigns amid sexual harassment complaint. *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://blogs.wsj.com/law/2016/03/10/uc-berkeley-dean-resigns-amid-sexual-harassment-complaint/>
- Goldenhar, L. M., Swanson, N. G., Hurrell, J. J., Jr., Ruder, A., & Deddens, J. (1998). Stressors and adverse outcomes for female construction workers. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3, 19–32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.3.1.19>
- Gutek, B. A. (1985). *Sex and the workplace*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gutek, B. A., & Koss, M. (1993). Changed women and changed organizations: Consequences of and coping with sexual harassment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 42, 28–48. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1993.1003>
- Harned, M. S., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2002). Understanding a link between sexual harassment and eating disorder symptoms: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 70, 1170–1181. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-006x.70.5.1170>
- Hely, B. (2008). Open all hours: The reach of vicarious liability in 'off-duty' sexual harassment complaints. *Federal Law Review*, 36, 173–207.
- Holland, K. J., Rabelo, V. C., Gustafson, A. M., Seabrook, R. C., & Cortina, L. M. (2016). Sexual harassment against men: Examining the roles of feminist activism, sexuality, and organizational context. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 17, 17–29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0039151>
- Jiang, K., Hong, Y., McKay, P. F., Avery, D. R., Wilson, D. C., & Volpone, S. D. (2015). Retaining employees through anti-sexual harassment practices: Exploring the mediating role of psychological distress and employee engagement. *Human Resource Management*, 54, 1–21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21585>
- Kime, P. (2014). *Incidents of rape in military much higher than previously reported*. Vienna, VA: Military Times.
- Landers, R. N. (2013). *Textual harassment at work: Romance and sexual harassment on social media*. Retrieved from <http://neoacademic.com/2013/03/20/textual-harassment-at-work-romance-and-sexual-harassment-on-social-media/>
- Langhout, R. D., Bergman, M. E., Cortina, L. M., Fitzgerald, L. F., Drasgow, F., & Williams, J. H. (2005). Sexual harassment severity: Assessing situational and personal determinants and outcomes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 35, 975–1007. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2005.tb02156.x>
- Larsen, S. E., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2011). PTSD symptoms and sexual harassment: The role of attributions and perceived control. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26, 2555–2567. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0886260510388284>
- Lawson, A. K., Wright, C. V., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2013). The evaluation of sexual harassment litigants: Reducing discrepancies in the diagnosis of posttraumatic stress disorder. *Law and Human Behavior*, 37, 337–347. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000024>
- Leskinen, E., Cortina, L., & Kabat, D. (2011). Gender harassment: Broadening our understanding of sex-based harassment at work. *Law & Human Behavior*, 35, 25–39. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10979-010-9241-5>
- Lipnic, V. (2016). EEOC: Most harassment training is worthless. *HR Specialist: Employment Law*, 46, 1–2.
- Lobel, S. A., Quinn, R. E., St Clair, L., & Warfield, A. (1994). Love without sex: The impact of psychological intimacy between men and women at work. *Organizational Dynamics*, 23, 4–16. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(94\)90084-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(94)90084-1)
- Macik-Frey, M., Quick, J. C., & Nelson, D. L. (2007). Advances in occupational health: From a stressful beginning to a positive future. *Journal of Management*, 33, 809–840. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206307307634>
- Mainiero, L. A., & Jones, K. J. (2013). Sexual harassment versus workplace romance: Social media spillover and textual harassment in the workplace. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 27, 187–203. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amp.2012.0031>
- McCabe, M. P., & Hardman, L. (2005). Attitudes and perceptions of workers to sexual harassment. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 145, 719–740. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.145.6.719-740>
- McClelland, D. C., & Burnham, D. H. (1995). Power is the great motivator. *Harvard Business Review*, 73, 126–139. (Republished in January 2003)
- McDonald, P. (2012). Workplace sexual harassment 30 years on: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 14, 1–17. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00300.x>
- McDonald, P., Backstrom, S., & Dear, K. (2008). Reporting sexual harassment: Claims and remedies. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 46, 173–195. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1038411108091757>
- McDonald, P., Charlesworth, S., & Graham, T. (2016). Action or inaction: Bystander intervention in workplace sexual harassment. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 27, 548–566. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1023331>
- McLaughlin, H., Uggen, C., & Blackstone, A. (2012). Sexual harassment, workplace authority, and the paradox of power. *American Sociological Review*, 77, 625–647. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0003122412451728>
- McMahon, S., & Banyard, V. L. (2012). When can I help? A conceptual framework for the prevention of sexual violence through bystander intervention. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 13, 3–14. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1524838011426015>
- McRaven, W. H. (2016, May). *State of the system*. Chancellor's address at The 49th chasncellor's council annual meetings & symposium, Austin, Texas.
- Needleman, S. (2016, March 21). Microsoft apologizes after Xbox party includes scantily clad women. *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://blogs.wsj.com/digits/2016/03/21/microsoft-apologizes-after-xbox-party-includes-scantily-clad-women/>
- NIOSH. (2004). *Workplace violence prevention strategies and research needs*. Cincinnati, OH: Author.
- Nishii, L. H., & Wright, P. M. (2008). Variability within organizations: Implications for strategic human resources management. In D. B. Smith (Ed.), *The people make the place: Dynamic linkages between individuals and organizations* (pp. 225–248). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Nye, C. D., Brummel, B. J., & Drasgow, F. (2014). Understanding sexual harassment using aggregate construct models. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99, 1204–1221. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0037965>
- O'Leary-Kelly, A. M., Griffin, R. W., & Glew, D. J. (1996). Organization-motivated aggression: A research framework. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 225–253.

- Orlitzky, M., Schmidt, F. L., & Rynes, S. L. (2003). Corporate social and financial performance: A meta-analysis. *Organization Studies*, 24, 403–441.
- OSHA. (2015). *Guidelines for preventing workplace violence for health-care and social service workers*. Washington DC: Author.
- Palmieri, P. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2005). Confirmatory factor analysis of posttraumatic stress symptoms in sexually harassed women. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 18, 657–666.
- Penn, N. (2014). Son, men don't get raped. *Gentlemen's Quarterly*. Retrieved from <http://www.gq.com/long-form/male-military-rape>
- Perrewé, P. L., Zellars, K. L., Rossi, A. M., Ferris, G. R., Kacmar, C. J., Liu, Y., . . . Hochwarter, W. A. (2005). Political skill: An antidote in the role overload-strain relationship. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10, 239–250. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.10.3.239>
- Perry, E. L., Kulik, C. T., & Field, M. P. (2009). Sexual harassment training: Recommendations to address gaps between the practitioner and research literatures. *Human Resource Management*, 48, 817–837. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20316>
- Piotrowski, C. S. (1998). Gender harassment, job satisfaction, and distress among employed white and minority women. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3, 33–43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.3.1.33>
- Popovich, P. M. (1988). Sexual Harassment in Organizations. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 1, 273–282. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01556936>
- Powell, A. (2011). *Review of bystander approaches in support of preventing violence against women*. Melbourne, Victoria, Australia: Victorian Health Promotion Foundation.
- Quick, J. C. (1998). Sexual harassment at work. Introduction. [special section on sexual harassment]. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3, 3–6. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0092743>
- Quick, J. C., McFadyen, M. A., & Nelson, D. L. (2014). No accident: Health, well-being, performance . . . and danger. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 1, 98–119. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JOEPP-01-2014-0006>
- Quick, J. C., & Quick, J. D. (2013). Executive well-being. In A. Caza & K. S. Cameron (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Happiness* (pp. 798–813). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Rabelo, V. C., & Cortina, L. M. (2014). Two sides of the same coin: Gender harassment and heterosexist harassment in LGBQ work lives. *Law and Human Behavior*, 38, 378–391. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000087>
- Raver, J. L., & Gelfand, M. J. (2005). Beyond the individual victim: Linking sexual harassment, team processes, and team performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 387–400. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2005.17407904>
- Rospenda, K. M., Richman, J. A., Ehmke, J. L. Z., & Zlatoper, K. W. (2005). Is Workplace harassment hazardous to your health? *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 20, 95–110. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10869-005-6992-y>
- Rotundo, M., Nguyen, D.-H., & Sackett, P. R. (2001). A meta-analytic review of gender differences in perceptions of sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 914–922. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.914>
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Wiley.
- Schneider, K. T., Swan, S., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1997). Job-related and psychological effects of sexual harassment in the workplace: Empirical evidence from two organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 401–415. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.3.401>
- Sims, C. S., Drasgow, F., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2005). The effects of sexual harassment on turnover in the military: Time-dependent modeling. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1141–1152. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1141>
- Sojo, V. E., Wood, R. E., & Genat, A. E. (2016). Harmful workplace experiences and women's occupational well-being: A meta-analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 40, 10–40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0361684315599346>
- Staff. (2016). *Sexual assault/abuse*. Retrieved from <http://www.goodtherapy.org/learn-about-therapy/issues/sexual-abuse>
- Stech, K. (2016, March 29). Parent company of Roscoe's House of Chicken and Waffles files for bankruptcy. *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://blogs.wsj.com/bankruptcy/2016/03/29/parent-company-of-roscoes-house-of-chicken-and-waffles-files-for-bankruptcy/>
- Taylor, S. E., Klein, L. C., Lewis, B. P., Gruenewald, T. L., Gurung, R. A. R., & Updegraff, J. A. (2000). Biobehavioral responses to stress in females: Tend-and-befriend, not fight-or-flight. *Psychological Review*, 107, 411–429. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.107.3.411>
- Till, F. (1980). *Sexual harassment: A report on the sexual harassment of students*. Washington, DC: National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs.
- Vaile Wright, C., Collinsworth, L. L., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2010). Why did this happen to me? Cognitive schema disruption and posttraumatic stress disorder in victims of sexual trauma. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25, 1801–1814. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0886260509354500>
- Valiente, C. (1998). Sexual harassment in the workplace. Equality policies in post-authoritarian Spain. In T. Carver & V. Mottier (Eds.), *Politics of sexuality. Identity, gender, citizenship* (pp. 169–179). London, UK: Routledge.
- Vogt, D. S., Pless, A. P., King, L. A., & King, D. W. (2005). Deployment stressors, gender, and mental health outcomes among Gulf War I veterans. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 18, 115–127. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jts.20018>
- Vranica, S., & Tadana, N. (2016a, March 17). J. Walter Thompson CEO Resigns: WPP replaces Gustavo Martinez with Tamara Ingram in wake of discrimination lawsuit. *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.wsj.com/articles/j-walter-thompson-company-ceo-resigns-1458232560>
- Vranica, S., & Tadana, N. (2016b, March 13). Lawsuit sparks soul-searching on Madison Avenue over diversity: Bloomingdale's apologized for an ad, shown in an image from Twitter, that some critics viewed as promoting date rape. *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.wsj.com/articles/madison-avenue-grapples-with-a-lack-of-diversity-1457914997>
- Walker, S. (2014). The automatic activation of sexually harassing beliefs: Past experiences and traits of power. *Academy of Business Journal*, 1, 90–104.
- Wasti, S. A., Bergman, M. E., Glomb, T. M., & Drasgow, F. (2000). Test of the cross-cultural generalizability of a model of sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 766–778. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.766>
- Willness, C. R., Steel, P., & Lee, K. (2007). A meta-analysis of the antecedents and consequences of workplace sexual harassment. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 127–162. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00067.x>
- Wright, C. V., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2007). Angry and afraid: Women's appraisal of sexual harassment during litigation. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31, 73–84. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00332.x>
- Wright, C., & Fitzgerald, L. (2009). Correlates of joining a sexual harassment class action. *Law & Human Behavior*, 33, 265–282. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10979-008-9156-6>

Received May 23, 2016

Revision received August 12, 2016

Accepted August 16, 2016 ■