EVALUATION OF A WORKSHOP METHOD FOR INCREASING AWARENESS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT ON RHODES UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

Loren Michelle Edelman

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Psychology in Clinical Psychology

RHODES UNIVERSITY

1995

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was twofold: 1) to educate and inform the student population about sexual harassment, and 2) to evaluate which one of two different training programs would be more effective in increasing awareness of sexual harassment on campus. A pre-test post-test group design was implemented. A sample of students (N=132) living in 14 different Rhodes university residences participated in the study on a voluntary basis. Subjects were divided into two groups. Group 1, participated in a workshop based upon a video entitled One man's meat is another man's poison, produced by the University of Cape Town. Group 2, was subjected to a more passive educational method where the video was played from beginning to end without any interruption. Awareness of sexual harassment was operationalised in terms of the subjects' attitudes towards sexual harassment, their perceptions of sexual harassment, and their sexual harassment myths. Results suggested a significant relationship between participation in the training programs and a change in awareness of sexual harassment, as measured by the changes in the pre-test and post-test scores. Results also suggested that males benefit most by simply viewing the video, while females benefit most by workshopping the same video.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I especially wish to thank Michelle Crowley for her supervision of this research and Sarah Radloff for her advice with the statistical analysis of the data.

The financial assistance of the Centre for Science Development towards this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed and conclusions arrived at, are those of the author and are not necessarily to be attributed to the Centre for Science Development.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES

CHAPTER ONE: LITERATURE SURVEY

1.1 Introduction

Over the past few years sexual harassment has enjoyed increasing prominence in the media. The American Psychological association has released a statement describing sexual harassment as a "destructive behaviour that can cause profound psychiatric problems for its victims," who "commonly keep quiet about the offense" (Charney & Russel, 1994, p.10).

While a plethora of information exists regarding sexual harassment, a lack of cohesiveness between investigated areas tends to fragment understanding of the phenomenon. Part of the challenge was thus that of trying to synthesize the literature in order to provide a comprehensive overview of research around the topic.

A literature search revealed a paucity of literature directly related to the topic under investigation, namely, only one article directly addressed and evaluated the effectiveness of an intervention programme over time (Beauvais 1986).

A thematic analysis of existing literature revealed the following foci, the history of sexual harassment, models of sexual harassment, sexual harassment myths, definitions, incidence, effects of sexual harassment, perceptions and attitudes towards

sexual harassment, sexual harassment education, policies and procedures.

1.2 Aims of the study

The Anti-Harassment Panel at Rhodes University has established a task force to develop a multi-faceted approach to combat sexual harassment on campus. Moreover, with the new constitution's emphasis on gender discrimination, it is expected that victims of sexual harassment may be less apprehensive about seeking assistance from mental health professionals, who may increasingly be called upon to assist in developing programmes to combat sexual harassment. It is therefore imperative that mental health service providers have some understanding of the attitudes, perceptions and myths that continue to perpetuate this problem.

The aim of this study was twofold: 1) to educate and inform the student population about sexual harassment, through the use of a video and 2) to evaluate which one of two different training programs would be more effective in increasing awareness of sexual harassment on campus. While the measurement of the long term effects of this workshop was beyond the scope of this research, it was hoped that by increasing the awareness and understanding of what constitutes sexual harassment, Rhodes students would be more sensitive to such behaviours. Hopefully this would ultimately decrease the incidence of sexual harassment on campus.

1.3 History of sexual harassment

Sexual harassment was first recognised as a legal issue in the United States of America in 1976. Prior to this, incidents of sexual harassment were typically met with a "boys will be boys attitude" from the courts and the organisations affected. The behaviour was viewed as private, not based upon sex and not the responsibility of the respective organisation. Often the complaining women were seen to be "asking for it" and men were viewed as behaving like men should behave. Harassment of this nature was not considered a form of sexual discrimination (Friedman, Boumil & Taylor, 1992).

Since its inclusion in the legal statutes in the United States of America in 1976, documented accounts of sexual harassment in the workplace have received wide media publicity. In 1980, the Equal Opportunity Commission (EEOC) issued guidelines which made explicit the liability of sexual harassment (Benson & Thomson, 1982). However, sexual harassment is not confined to the workplace and occurs on university campuses as well.

Universities are, in many ways, a microcosm of the larger society. The formal academy was instituted to educate men for the betterment of society. Women were intruders and their presence strongly resisted (Paludi, 1990). Most positions of power and influence in South African universities are occupied by men. This means that the culture or ethos of the university employment

environment is a male dominated one (Unpublished paper UCT, 1992).

However, sexual harassment has not enjoyed the interest of only organisations, the media and the legal profession; social scientists too have sought to explain and understand this problem.

1.4 Theoretical frameworks for understanding sexual harassment

Tangri, Burt and Johnson (1982), generated three models for explaining sexual harassment, namely the natural biological model, the organisational model and the socio-cultural model. The natural biological model posits that sexual harassment is "simply natural sexual attraction between people" (p.35). This model views harassing behaviour as a natural expression of men's stronger sex drive, and proposes that any person may be attracted to another individual and pursue that attraction, without intent to harass (Paludi, 1990). This model is unsatisfactory as it fails to take into account: the intra-personal level of analysis and the power differential that exists between the harasser and their victim. Moreover, it implies that all men are animals, ruled by their desires.

The organisational model views sexual harassment as arising as a consequence of the imbalance of power and authority inherent in the hierarchical structure of organisations. This model

asserts that sexual harassment is an issue of power, since academic institutions and work organisations are defined by vertical stratification. This model, however, does not take into account the role of gender socialisation. More specifically, it suggests that women in positions of power over men in an organisational structure are as likely to harass as their male counterparts, a hypothesis refuted by Paludi (1990).

Finally, the socio-cultural model postulated by these authors views sexual harassment as only one manifestation of the larger patriarchal system in which men are the dominant group. Although this is the most complete model currently available, it too fails to do justice to attempts to explain sexual harassment since it largely ignores the interpersonal level of analysis in favour of a systemic approach.

To this end Buber's (1970) interpersonal philosophy may provide a broader basis for the understanding of sexual harassment. This view would include feminist arguments in so much as sexual harassment can still be seen as a power relationship. At the same time, however, it provides an opportunity for a more expansive understanding of the dynamics involved in interpersonal relationships without viewing all interactions as a direct consequence of biological sex.

In Buber's (1970) view, people relate to each other in two different ways, each with specific consequences: "the other person can be met as a 'Thou,' as the unique person that he or

she is, or as an 'It,' as a 'thing' to be used" (Brice, 1984 p.111). Relating to a person as 'Thou' allows for a mutual relationship in which the other person is regarded as a separate and exclusive person: reality is co-constituted by two persons within their meeting. The current study proposed that when a person sexually harasses another individual, he/she is treating him/her as an 'It', and thus denies the harassed person the right to choose whether he/she feels comfortable with the reality that is being co-created, since he/she is regarded as an object.

Yet another explanation that has been sought in trying to understand the issue under investigation has been proposed by Gutek & Dunwoody (1987) who view sexual harassment as a consequence of socialised sex-role expectations. This theory has been termed sex-role spill-over, which is said to "occur when women, more than men in the same work roles, are expected to be sex objects or are expected to project sexuality through their behaviour, appearance, or dress" (p.19). Evidence suggests that sexual harassment experiences may parallel societal sex-role behaviour expectations. Men in our society are expected to be dominant, powerful, strong and aggressive. Women are expected to be powerless, submissive and weak. Thus, it may be argued from this perspective that socialisation impacts greatly on interpersonal relationships and the way in which others are treated.

Men are trained from childhood to separate sexual desire from caring, respecting, liking or loving. One of the consequences of

this training is that men tend to view women as sexual objects rather than human beings. Female sexual socialisation on the other hand encourages women to be sensitive to their partners' needs and to integrate sex, affection and love (Paludi, 1990).

Paludi and Barickman (1991) indicate that differences in the perceptions of the same behaviour seem well established by adolescence, with female adolescents tending to have a less sexualized view of the world than their male peers. Among adults this pattern may continue with men possibly mistaking friendliness for seduction. McCormick, Bohey, Peterson and Gaeddert (1989) posits that generally women tend to be more sensitive to sexual harassment. Men and those who hold traditional attitudes about sex roles, including women, tend not to be as sensitive to sexual harassment (Powell, 1986).

In a patriarchal society myths which reinforce male dominance still prevail, and the misinformation and stereotyping continues to inform an understanding of sexual harassment. These cultural beliefs consistently blame the victim for sexual abuse and act to keep women in their place (Mackinnon, 1979).

1.5 Sexual harassment myths

Sandler (1990) argues that the misconceptions surrounding sexual harassment rest on four myths. The first of these, the "beauty" and "clothing" myths suggest that a woman's beauty can be so overpowering as to "cause" sexual harassment. This myth arises

from a flaw in Tangri, et al's. (1982) natural biological model which implies that all men are animals ruled by their desires and therefore unable to resist harassing a woman to whom they feel attracted.

A second myth is that of the consenting adult which suggests that the victim allows the advances. True consent can only occur between two equals, however, and a relationship where one party has some power over the other is not equal. This myth may arise when a person adopts Buber's 'I-It' way of relating as opposed to an 'I-Thou' way of relating.

The third important myth is that all women secretly want to, need to, and or love to be forced to engage in sexual behaviour. Gutek (1985) has noted that males are more likely than females to believe that women are flattered by sexual attention but are too scared to ask for it. This may result in a man projecting his fantasies about what women want instead of listening to what women are saying.

Finally, there is a commonly held belief that women will falsify charges as a way of getting back at men. While Sandler (1990) believes that this certainly is possible, it is quite unlikely as most women (90%) don't want to file charges because they know of the risks involved. The outcome of this myth is that women who report sexual harassment are viewed with suspicion and their motives questioned.

A further reason why people may not report sexual harassment is that they are not sure what constitutes sexual harassment. The lack of understanding of what exactly can be termed sexual harassment reflects one of the most persistent and troubling dilemmas in the literature pertaining to this problem.

1.6 Definitions

Crocker (1983) argues that it is important to offer definitions of academic sexual harassment within an academic context since "they can educate the community and promote discussion and conscious evaluation of behaviour and experience. Students learn that certain experiences are officially recognised as wrong and punishable...."(p.697)

Unlike other problems which may be defined easily, no widely agreed upon definition of sexual harassment exists that is broad enough to comprehend the variety of experiences to which the construct refers, and yet specific enough to be of use (Fitzgerald, 1990). In the absence of such a definition Mackinnon (1979) notes "It is not surprising ... that women would not complain of an experience for which there has been no name" (p.27).

Two major types of definitions of sexual harassment have appeared in the legal, psychological and educational literature (Paludi & Barickman, 1991).

The first type includes legal and regulatory constructions and theoretical statements. Fitzgerald (1990) refers to these definitions as *a priori* definitions. They are theoretical in nature, and consist of a general statement describing the nature of the behaviour. According to Paludi (1990) the most influential non-regulatory *a priori* definition of sexual harassment has been offered by Mackinnon (1979):

> Sexual harassment ..... refers to the unwanted imposition of sexual requirements in the context of a relationship of unequal power. Central to the concept is the use of power derived from one social sphere to lever benefits or impose deprivations in another... When one is sexual, the other material, the cumulative sanction is particularly potent (MacKinnon, 1979 p.3).

The second type of definition summarized by Fitzgerald (1990) is developed empirically through investigating what various groups of individuals perceive sexual harassment to be under different circumstances. Paludi (1990) suggests that the most useful definition is that of Fitzgerald and McInnis (1988). They view sexual harassment along a continuum, with gender harassment at the one end and sexual imposition on the other. These levels correlate with legal definitions of sexual harassment.

> Gender harassment - consists of generalized sexist remarks and behaviour not designed to elicit sexual cooperation,

but rather to convey insulting, degrading or sexist attitudes about women or about lesbians and gays.

Seductive behaviour - unwanted, inappropriate, and offensive sexual advances.

Sexual bribery - the solicitation of sexual activity or other sex-linked behaviour by threat of punishment.

Sexual coercion - the coercion of sexual activity by threat of punishment.

Sexual imposition - includes gross sexual imposition, assault and rape.

Sexual harassment can also be divided into two main categories: *quid pro quo* and hostile-environment, each of which in turn can be seen on a continuum. These distinctions were first made by MacKinnon (1979).

Quid pro quo is "a form of sexual harassment in which sexual compliance is exchanged, or proposed to be exchanged, for an employment or academic opportunity" (Mackinnon, 1979 p.11). In *quid pro quo* behaviour, the coercion behind the advance is brought to light by the reprisals that follow a refusal to comply (MacKinnon, 1979). Thus this is a form of sexual bribery.

Hostile-environment sexual harassment occurs when sexual behaviour interferes with an individual's performance and creates an intimidating, hostile or offensive environment. A power differential between the harasser and the victim is not required

for this type of harassment to exist (Paludi and Barickman, 1991).

Thus, a definition can set the tone for a university community's response to sexual harassment, and thus the recognition of its presence on campus.

1.7 Incidence of sexual harassment in university settings

Here the literature has focused on the sexual harassment of women. Findings reveal that sexual harassment "affects seven out of every ten women at some point in their work lives, and that women at colleges and universities are among those who confront the problems caused by sexual harassment" (Beauvais, 1986 p.132).

Dziech and Weiner (1984) have reported that 30% of all undergraduate women suffer sexual harassment from at least one of their instructors during their university careers. When definitions of sexual harassment include sexist remarks, the incidence rate in undergraduate populations approaches 70% (Lott, Reilly and Howard 1982).

Studies conducted at the University of California, Berkeley (Benson & Thomson, 1982), Arizona State University (Metha & Nigg, 1983), Michigan State University (Maihoff & Forrest, 1983), Harvard University (McCain, 1983) and Rhode Island University (Lott, Reilly & Howard, 1982), revealed that sexual harassment is present on university campuses with figures ranging between

20% at the University of Arizona and 95% percent at the University of Berkeley .

Adams, Kottke and Padgitt (1983) found that 13% of women surveyed, reported that they had avoided taking a class or working with certain professors because of the risk of being subjected to sexual advances. Reportedly 17% received verbal sexual advances, 13.6% received sexual invitations, 6.4% had been subjected to physical advances and 2% received direct physical assault.

However, the findings of these studies must be interpreted with caution given that each study defines sexual harassment differently. The Arizona State University defined sexual harassment more narrowly than most surveys and the University of Berkeley included a wide range of behaviours in their definition. The differences in the definitions employed may account for the significantly different incidence rates found on their campuses. Thus, in research of this kind it must be noted that comparisons of findings of investigations are complicated by differences in scope, methodology and most importantly, in the definition of key concepts (Lott, Reilly & Howard, 1982).

1.8 Do women harass?

Although these studies indicate that in most reported sexual harassment cases men are the offenders and women are the victims (Beauvais, 1986), the organisational model suggests that women

in senior positions too may harass male subordinates.

Hite (1990) reports incidents of men harassing women, as well as incidents of homosexual harassment, sometimes involving two men and less often involving two women. However, it is noted that these incidents are relatively rare and do not seem to affect the overwhelming apprehension that sexual harassment is something that men do to women.

Findings by McCormick et al. (1989) conclude that sexual harassment is a form of sexual discrimination in which the typical perpetrator is a male authority figure and the typical victim is a female subordinate. They add that while sexual harassment may happen to men they are less likely to see themselves as victims than are females.

Paludi (1990) found that women professors are highly unlikely to date or initiate sexual relationships with male and female students. As in the workplace, women in the academic environment are less likely to hold organisational power and positions that would permit them to offer sexual rewards or punishment. They conclude:

> Although it is theoretically possible for women to harass men, it is, in practice, an extremely rare event. This is due both to the women's relative lack of formal power, and the socialisation that stigmatizes the sexually aggressive woman. Reports by male subjects of sexual overtures by

women co-workers not only do not constitute harassment in any formal sense, but must also be evaluated in light of data suggesting that men are likely to interpret innocuous behaviour as invitations to sexual contact (p.138).

1.9 Effects of sexual harassment on students

In academic settings, harassment can adversely affect students' learning and therefore their academic standing. A desire to avoid threatening situations may deprive students of educational and career opportunities. Students who have been harassed adopt various strategies when confronted with the harasser: they avoid taking a class from or working with a particular faculty member, they change their major, or leave a threatening situation and they experience decreased feelings of competence (Schneider, 1987).

These manifestations of the trauma attached to sexual harassment are commensurate with surveys which indicate that over 90 percent of victims of sexual harassment suffer from a significant degree of emotional distress (Charney et al., 1994). This data was collected from self report surveys of victims. They report a wide array of symptoms, including anger, fear, depression, crying spells, anxiety, irritability, loss of self-esteem, feelings of humiliation and alienation, and a sense of helplessness and vulnerability. Research describes not only psychological effects but also physiological sequelae, such as headaches, decreased appetite, weight loss, decreased sleep, and an increased

frequency of respiratory or urinary tract infections. Moreover, the more severe the behaviour in question the greater the likelihood of such symptomology.

Salisbury, Ginorio, Remick, & Stringer, (1986) suggest that symptoms progress in predictable stages with initial reactions to sexual harassment being typified by self doubt and confusion, with victims often feeling guilty and wondering whether they might have caused or encouraged the behaviour. Later, their anxiety tends to shift to depression. A turning point occurs when they realise that they are not to blame for the harassment and anger follows as they realise that the harasser is violating their rights.

Arguably the lack of a clear definition of what constitutes sexual harassment will colour an individual's response to and ability to tolerate such an act. Clearly, sexually suggestive behaviour cannot be deemed harassment if the recipient does not perceive it as such (Charney & Russel 1994).

1.10 Perceptions of sexual harassment

As already cited, definitions of sexual harassment are socially constructed, and vary not only with characteristics of the perceiver but also with the situational context and the participants involved. Studies reveal that situational factors are the most important factors in determining the way in which harassment behaviour is perceived (Baker, Terpstra & Larnz, 1990;

Pryor, 1985). A second difference is the discrepancy in power between perpetrator and victim. Behaviour is more likely to be labelled harassment when it is done by someone with greater power than the victim (Gutek, Morasch & Cohen, 1983). Individuals overwhelmingly agree that requests for sex that are linked to threats of retaliation for noncompliance, constitute sexual harassment, whatever the prior relationship or the nature of the woman's behaviour (Reilly, Carpenter, Dull & Bartlett, 1982).

Studies by Gutek (1985), Kenig and Ryan (1986), Lott, Reilly and Howard (1982), and Popovitch, Licata, Nokovitch, Martelli and Zoloty (1986) found significant sex differences in the perceptions of sexual harassment behaviour, with more women labelling various behaviours as sexual harassment than men.

A similar trend arose in a study by Gutek, Morasch and Cohen (1983) who found that women more often than men tend to interpret ambiguous but potentially sexual interactions as instances of sexual harassment. This resulted in them concluding that when studying sexual behaviour, female students more than male students would consider the behaviours to be sexually harassing.

This finding appears to be supported by Fitzgerald and Omerad (1991) who studied the effects of various individual and situational variables on perceptions. They found that women were more likely than men to view less explicitly coercive situations as harassing behaviour. However, they did not find that the level of education (undergraduate or graduate) or the degree of power

that a faculty member held influenced individuals ratings of perceived scenarios.

Not all researchers agree that women's perceptions of sexual harassment differ significantly from men. Terpstra and Baker's (1987) study did not find gender differences in the perceptions of sexual harassment when they investigated how both students and working individuals of both sexes perceived sexual harassment. Their findings showed that both groups ranked the severity of the incidents similarly and that there were few gender differences between women and men student perceptions of the individual scenarios. The scenarios posed were very specific, providing information on the actor's gender, age and the type of behaviour that occurred. Such scenarios may have decreased the ambiguity, resulting in a more reliable measurement of perceptual differences between women and men.

Baker, Terpstra and Cutler (1989), in an attempt to help clarify these contradictory findings, examined the perceptions of 409 state government employees. They initiated research in order to: 1) clarify the conflicting evidence of the effects of gender on perceptions of sexual harassment and 2) compare the sexual harassment perceptions of students and workers. Terpstra and Baker's (1987) questionnaire was given to a sample of working women and men and compared to those of the earlier study. Results revealed that the perceptions of working women and men were very highly correlated. However, 40% of women and only 30% of men judged a man staring at a woman to be sexual harassment. Further,

it was found that a higher percentage of working women and men, perceived the scenarios to constitute sexual harassment.

Riger (1991) concluded that men and women perceive and define sexual harassment differently. To women, the behaviour in question is offensive and they are likely to see themselves as the victims of male actions. To many men, the behaviour is not offensive, but acceptable. In their eyes no crime has been committed and there is no problem to be solved. Both Riger (1991) and Lott et al. (1982) have found that young women are more tolerant of sexually harassing behaviours than men are. They also found that women report higher rates when asked if they have been the target of specific harassing behaviours than when asked a general question about whether they have been harassed. Thus, specific questions need to be posed to victims of harassment to facilitate a more accurate reporting of incidents of sexual harassment.

Clearly, differences in perceptions may be influenced by factors other than gender. Popovich, Licata, Nokovitch, Martelli, and Zoloty (1986) also found a difference in the way individuals from different backgrounds perceive behaviours that constitute sexual harassment. Their sample consisted of 209 undergraduate students enrolled in psychology and business courses. Participants were tested in groups of 15 to 25, and asked to fill out a questionnaire. They developed a nine item scale of sexual harassment to test behaviours in a two study sequence. In the first study male and female college students with job experience

rated the frequency with which they experienced certain behaviours from both supervisors and co-workers to be sexual harassment. Subsequently revisions were made on the basis of these results and the revised scale administered to a different, yet similar sample in order to measure the perceptions of each behaviour. Results of both studies showed a significant difference between the ratings of supervisor and co-worker perceptions of various behaviours with supervisor harassment considered more to be *quid pro quo* harassment or sexual bribery, than co-worker harassment. Participants considered these behaviours more definitely sexual harassment when attributed to a supervisor as opposed to a co-worker.

In summary, various research findings support significant sex differences in the perceptions of sexual harassment behaviour, with more women labelling various behaviours as sexual harassment than men (Baker et al., 1989; Fitzgerald et al., 1991; Gutek 1985; Gutek et al., 1983; Lott et al., 1986; Reilly et al., 1982; Popovitch et al., 1986). Terpestra and Baker's 1987 study is one of the only studies that has not found differences in the way males and females perceive sexual harassment. A difference between this study and other studies was that it posed less ambiguous sexual harassment scenarios. The differences in the way males and females perceive sexual harassment have been attributed to differences in gender (Gutek et al., 1983), background (Popovitch et al., 1986) the situational context in which the harassment occurs (Baker et al., 1990) and the differences in

power between the perpetrator and the victim (Gutek et al., 1983).

1.11 Attitudes towards sexual harassment

Swecker (1985) has identified three constellations of attitudes and beliefs which foster acceptance and thereby prevent the elimination of sexual harassment. First is a belief upon which the natural biological model is based. It states that men and women are naturally attracted to each other and that it is natural for men to pursue their attractions, and for both men and women to enjoy this pursuit. This belief leads to an unstated denial of sexual harassment as a problem. The second belief rises from the organisational model and recognises a power differential by which superiors gain sexual favours from subordinates. Although this view acknowledges sexual harassment as a power issue, it narrowly defines harassers as superiors. The third barrier put forward by Swecker involves the unquestioning acceptance of sex-role norms which maintain male dominance and female powerlessness.

Abbey (1982) conducted a laboratory experiment to assess whether friendliness from a member of the opposite sex might be mis-perceived as a sign of sexual interest. Males and females participated in a five minute conversation while a hidden male and female observed their interaction. Results indicated that there were sex differences in the subject's rating of the actors. Male actors and observers rated the female actor as being more

promiscuous and seductive than female actors and observers. Males were also more sexually attracted to the opposite sex actor than females were. Finally, males also rated the male actor in a more sexualized fashion than females did. The results were interpreted as indicating that men were more likely to perceive the world in sexual terms and make more sexual judgments than do women, and that males perceived friendliness from females as seduction. This research lends support to theories which state that socialisation has impacted on sex-role beliefs and the emerging attitudes and perceptions that people hold towards the members of the opposite sex.

Lott, Reilly and Howard (1982) surveyed the Rhode Island University campus community regarding student and lecturer personal experiences of sexual harassment on campus. Part of their objective was to obtain information on attitudes towards sexual harassment. A nine page questionnaire which took thirty minutes to complete was mailed to 1944 people. 927 questionnaires or 47.7% were returned. Attitudes were assessed by analysing responses to 11 statements that dealt with sexually harassing behaviours. The mean responses to each statement made by women and men revealed that the two groups had divergent attitudes regarding behaviour associated with sexual harassment. Findings revealed that: men consider sexually related behaviour more natural, more to be expected and less serious and problematic than do women; men believe that women who have been sexually harassed are likely to have provoked this behaviour by the way they walk, dress, act and talk; and that men were more accepting

of sexually harassing behaviour than women, with younger respondents (i.e., undergraduates) being more tolerant of sexual harassment than were older persons (i.e., faculty). The problem with this study was that it did not assess changes of attitudes over time.

Carrol and Ellis (1989) undertook a study to provide greater awareness of the attitudes and perceptions of faculty concerning sexual harassment. A survey was mailed to part time and full time faculty members (N=372). A comparison of mean scores for men and women on the Tolerance of Sexual Harassment Inventory was carried out. Findings suggested a trend towards greater acceptance and tolerance by male faculty of sexual harassment. The total sample was also less tolerant of same sex sexual harassment than opposite sex sexual harassment, and were also fairly sophisticated in their recognition of incidents of sexual harassment. This study also neglected to measure the change due to their intervention programme over time.

The only study found in the literature which measured a change in attitudes over time, as a result of a training workshop, was conducted by Beauvais (1986). She established a sexual harassment task force to develop a multifaceted attempt to combat sexual harassment on campus as a method of changing attitudes towards sexual harassment. The task force assumed that the attitudes of participants involved in the training would be changed by the combination of exposure to factual information on the harmful effects of sexual harassment, and by exploring and challenging

personal opinions on the issue. The workshop consisted of 12 scenes of videotaped dramas, six of which focused on student settings and six of which focused on employment settings. The participants (N = male 23, female 30) completed an initial survey immediately preceding a two hour training session on sexual harassment and then completed the post training test two weeks later. The results of the study indicated that the training program was successful, in so much as the total attitude scores of the subjects in the treatment group changed in the desired direction. The variable with the largest impact was the sex of the participant. More specifically, the workshop effected a far greater change on males. The problem with this research was however, its small sample size and the lack of a control group. This limited its interpretative and comparative value.

1.12 Education

Numerous authors have highlighted the need for education in addressing sexual harassment. Barak (1992) posited that education must be at the forefront of combatting sexual harassment, "for it is only education that can effectively modify the discriminatory attitudes in general and lenient sexual harassment norms in particular" (p.818).

Also Robertson, Dryer and Cambell, (1988) found that educational efforts concerning sexual harassment, especially for male faculty and male students, are needed. They felt that this would help to

eliminate what might be called "naive" harassment caused partly by ignorance.

Supporting the call for education Cyril and Engelman (1988) have suggested various strategies for addressing sexual harassment on campus, this includes conducting information sessions for faculty, staff, and students on campus policy; holding seminars; using peer education among students, and giving courses on human sexuality.

Paludi (1990) on the other hand, argues that men need to be educated regarding their perceptions of the misuse of power, their perceptions about women who have been harassed and their attitudes towards sexual interactions. Further she advocated that educational programmes are needed to deal with both men and women's understanding of the concept of harassment and the social meanings attributed to the behaviours that legally constitute harassment.

Biaggio, Watts, and Brownell (1990), on the other hand, offered the following interventions in order to challenge attitudes that perpetuate sexual harassment: placing items relating to sexist comments or sexual invitations on teaching evaluations; publishing articles on sexual harassment in student newspapers; and disseminating information about institutional policies that prohibit sexual harassment at new student orientation and in residences.

Recognising the need for universities to take a stand on the issue, Wagner (1990) proposed that one of the best means of preventing sexual harassment is to ensure the creative, and wide dissemination of information about the university policy towards sexual harassment, as well as how to report incidents of sexual harassment.

Riger (1991) acknowledges that education is necessary in the fight to combat sexual harassment, but argues that "education alone is not sufficient. Sexual harassment is the product not only of individual attitudes and beliefs, but also of organisational practices" (p.503). Thus, the organisational climate needs to change through the elimination of gender discrimination from grievance procedures. Barak (1992) disagrees with Riger's shunting of education to a secondary position, arguing that it is education that must be at the forefront of combatting sexual harassment. "For it is only education that can effectively modify the discriminatory attitudes in general and lenient sexual harassment norms in particular" (p.818). Barak proposes small workshops for women and female students. He promotes a cognitive-behavioural approach to personal change because of its proven effectiveness in programmes emphasising skill acquisition and to avoid the negative emotional consequences that could result from personal dynamics. He divides the workshop into two phases. The first phase would be to develop the individuals awareness of the sexual harassment phenomenon, including its process, causes and typical consequences. The second phase would then teach practical coping skills.

Clearly, the negative effects that sexual harassment has on students is sufficient motivation as to why colleges and universities should accept responsibility for developing training programs and workshops on sexual harassment. At the same time the literature reveals very few actual sexual harassment training programmes in operation in educational institutions, and thus little evaluation of efforts to increase students awareness of sexual harassment and efficacy with respect to dealing with sexual harassment incidents.

1.13 Sexual harassment at South African Universities

A sexual harassment workshop was held at the University of Cape Town in 1992 and was attended by 17 representatives of different South African Universities. An unpublished report on the workshop stated that participants felt that the general culture on campuses in South Africa was tolerant of sexual harassment, and in some cases actually encouraged it. These workshop participants advocated that this tolerance in campus culture stemmed, in part, from widespread sexual discrimination and sexual harassment in South African society in general. Some students argued that sexual harassment has not been viewed as a problem on campus and that such behaviour is condoned in their communities.

The report posits that sexual abuse and harassment in residences at South African Universities is a serious problem and is bigger than most institutions or residences would care to admit. Acts of violence such as gang rape, date and acquaintance rape, as

well as battery, were reported at the workshop. On the strength of this information, it appears that sexual harassment not only occurs frequently at South African Universities, but is also of a more severe nature than that reported at similar institutions elsewhere (Benson & Thomson, 1982; Metha & Nigg, 1983 Maihoff & Forrest, 1983; McCain, 1983; Lott, Reilly & Howard, 1982).

One university which has taken on this responsibility in South Africa is the University of Cape Town which has produced a video based on a sexual harassment workshop conducted on its campus and then made available to other universities for educational purposes. This video formed an integral part in the creation of the sexual harassment workshop conducted in this study.

Although the literature on sexual harassment is fragmented, it is apparent that sexual harassment is a reality on many campuses, and as such it is the responsibility of universities to provide educational workshops as a means for combatting sexual harassment and the adverse affects that it may have on its students. One of the inherent weaknesses of the work done in this field to date is that although research proposes education programmes there has been a failure to measure the effectiveness of these programmes over time.

CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY

A video titled One mans' meat is another man's poison was obtained from the University of Cape Town. It consisted of various more and less ambiguous scenes depicting different types of sexual harassment. In order to assess the video as a means of educating students about sexual harassment subjects were divided into two groups. The first group, viewed the video, which was stopped at various critical moments to engage the group in discussion. The second group viewed the same video, however it was played from beginning to end without interruption.

As it was the aim of this study to measure which of the two interventions would be more effective in increasing awareness of sexual harassment on campus, the following formed the central hypotheses of this study.

2.1 Hypotheses

1. Ho: There is no significant difference between the workshop and the video post-test scores.
   H1: There is a significant difference between the workshop and video post-test scores.
2. Ho: There is no significant difference between the male and female pre-test and post-test scores.
   H1: There is a significant difference between the male and female pre-test and post-test scores.
3. Ho: There is no significant difference between the male

and female post-test scores for the workshop and video groups.

H1: There is a significant difference between the male and female post-test scores for the workshop and video.

4. Ho: There is no significant change in the attitudes, perceptions and sexual harassment myths for males and females in the workshop and video groups.

H1: There is a significant change in the attitudes, perceptions and sexual harassment myths for males and females in the workshop and video groups.

5. Ho: There is no significant difference in the number of people who find that the intervention helps them increase their awareness of sexual harassment.

H1: There is a significant difference in the number of people who find that the intervention helps them increase their awareness of sexual harassment.

6. Ho: There will no significant difference in the number of people who find that the intervention helps them clarify their understanding of sexual harassment.

H1: There is a significant difference in the number of people who find that the intervention helps them clarify their understanding of sexual harassment.

7. Ho: There is no significant difference in the number of people who find that the intervention help them recognise sexual harassment.

H1: There is a significant difference in the number of people who find that the intervention helped them recognise sexual harassment.

8. Ho: There will no significant difference in the number of people who find that the intervention helps them deal with sexual harassment.

H1: There is a significant difference in the number of people who find that the intervention helps them deal with sexual harassment.

In this chapter the selection of subjects, the instruments for the study, the experimental procedure, research design and statistical analysis will be discussed.

2.2 Selection of subjects and residences

A campus wide selection of Rhodes University residences was conducted using convenience sampling. Residences were identified on the basis of the hall to which they belonged. The halls, in turn, were selected on the Panel's subjective opinion as to which hall wardens would be most receptive to the aims of the study. This type of sampling was necessary in order to ensure access to the residences. The residences were then matched in order to ensure an equal number of male and female participants in the workshop (n=72, males=36, females=36) and video (n=60, males=28, females=32) interventions. Subjects participated on a voluntary basis after having been informed about the video at dinner the evening prior to the screening of the video. Where insufficient subjects were obtained in the identified residences, sampling continued until an adequate sample was obtained for the study.

2.3 Measuring instruments

In this study the effect of two independent variables, namely, the psycho-educational sexual harassment workshop and the video intervention, conducted in a group format were implemented. Subjects were required to complete a pre-intervention and a post-intervention questionnaire to measure any change in the dependant variables due to the independent variables. The dependant variable was the awareness of sexual harassment. Awareness was operationalised in terms of the subjects' attitudes towards sexual harassment, their perceptions of sexual harassment, and myths associated with sexual harassment.

2.3.1 Sexual harassment Questionnaire (Appendix 1)

A two part questionnaire was used to gather data in this study. The first part served as a pre-intervention questionnaire which was designed to assess the samples' spontaneous awareness of sexual harassment. The other half, the post-intervention questionnaire, was designed to assess the quality and quantity of change in each sample's awareness of sexual harassment following the intervention.

Pre-intervention Questionnaire

Respondents were asked to fill in their biographical details (section A), and to write down a definition of sexual harassment (section B). In terms of this definition subjects were requested

to describe any incident in which they felt they were sexually harassed. Section C aimed to gather data which would allow for a quantitative analysis of possible sexual harassment experiences. Subjects were presented with a list of statements borrowed from the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire, developed by Fitzgerald and Shullman (1985), which reflected sexual harassment scenarios. They were asked to indicate, by marking the choice 'yes', 'no' or 'never', whether they had ever had similar experiences. Section D formed the pre-intervention test in which subjects were required to rate 29 statements on a six point Likert scale. The statements tapped three different aspects of sexual harassment referred to in the literature. These three aspects, namely attitudes, perceptions and myths, were incorporated into the questionnaire as an index of awareness of sexual harassment.

Statements 1-15 of Section D were selected from the Sexual Harassment Attitudes Survey, which was developed by Kathleen Beauvais (1986). They were statements of opinion and were selected for their relevance to the student population. Statements 17-19 were commonly believed sexual harassment myths which Paludi (1993) presented at a workshop. Statements 20-29 tapped perceptions of sexually harassing behaviours. Behaviours considered to be sexual harassment by Baker et. al. (1989), Popovitch et. al. (1986), and the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire were posed. Subjects were asked to indicate whether or not they perceived the incidents to be sexual harassment.

Post-intervention

Section E was a replication of section D. The statements, however were presented in a different order so that subjects would not simply copy their previous answers. Section F required that subjects respond to 4 statements designed to evaluate the workshop. A 6 point Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" was used. This allowed individuals to express to what degree they felt that the workshop was helpful.

2.4 Procedure

Hall wardens were notified of the research approximately one month prior to the commencement of the study on the eighth day of May 1995. They in turn notified the residence wardens who in turn notified the head students. The latter invited students to participate in the video and workshop interventions on a voluntary basis.

The workshops and videos were conducted by a team of five honours students and the researcher. The team had discussed the format that the workshops and videos were to take under the supervision of an Anti-Harassment Panel supervisor. While it was intended that the data would be collected over a one week period to eliminate the effects of contamination, this proved impossible. Data collection therefore took place over three weeks.

2.5 Research design

According to Kaplan (1987), a research design is a programme or procedure that is followed when collecting, analysing or interpreting phenomena. This study employed an experimental research design.

A pre-test post-test group design was implemented. The subjects were divided into two groups. Group 1 participated in a workshop and group 2 participated in a video.

Group 1: A 90 minute sexual harassment workshop was designed, using as its basis a video entitled One man's meat is another man's poison, produced by the University of Cape Town. The video was designed to demonstrate the variety, complexity and uncertainty surrounding incidents of sexual harassment. This was achieved by the actors role playing various forms of sexual harassment in which the students may find themselves. The video was used interactively, with facilitators stopping it from time to time in order to engage the group in discussion of critical issues. The workshop participants were asked to propose solutions to the dilemmas posed by the video. These workshops were facilitated by trained psychology honours students and by the researcher.

Group 2: This Group viewed the same video as Group 1. The video was played from the beginning to the end without interruption, however there was no discussion afterwards and participants were

simply asked to complete the questionnaire. In comparison to Group 1, this group was subjected to a more passive educational method.

Data was collected from each group by means of a questionnaire which consisted of a pre-intervention and a post-intervention section. Both pre-intervention and post-intervention questions were incorporated in the same survey in order to simplify application thereof. The questionnaire was handed out at the beginning of the intervention. Subjects were requested to fill in the first half of the questionnaire prior to the workshop/video and the second half was completed after the respective interventions.

2.6 Statistical data analysis

The BMDP Statistical Software Incorporated Programme (1990) was used to compute all the statistics for this study. Matched t-tests were used for the analysis of within group change due to each intervention. Group t-tests were used to compare changes between the groups and to assess if one intervention was more effective than the other.

Two way and multi-way frequency tables were computed as measures of association between age, biological sex and race groups for the entire sample.

CHAPTER THREE: RESULTS

3.1 Introduction

The literature has focused on establishing policy and grievance procedures as ways of dealing with sexual harassment (Riger, 1991; Wagner, 1990). Beauvais (1986) however, argues that the literature overlooks the potential importance of training programmes for the resolution to the problem. Subsequent researchers have proposed training strategies (Cyril and Engelman, 1988; Biaggio, Watts, Brownell, 1990; Riger, 1991; and Barak, 1992), but few have done anything about evaluating the effectiveness of their proposals. This study has endeavoured to assess the effects of a training programme for increasing the awareness of sexual harassment on campus among university students.

3.2 Characteristics of the sample group

A total of 132 (male n=64 female n=68) students living in 14 different Rhodes university residences (women n=7, men n=6 and mixed n=1) participated in the study on a voluntary basis. The sample consisted of two matched sex groups. Group 1, consisted of 72 subjects (males n=36 females n=36) and formed the workshop group. Group 2, consisted of 60 subjects (males n=28 females n=32) and formed the video group. Participants in both groups were between the ages of 17 and 31 with the mean age being 19.94 years.

Of the 132 participants, 92% (n=122) indicated that they preferred partners of the opposite sex. The remaining 3% (n=5) indicated that they preferred partners of the same sex, and another 3% (n=5) stated that they found both sexes attractive as sexual partners. The total sample consisted of 92 white, 28 black, 8 indian and 4 coloured subjects. (As the term 'coloured' is gaining recognition as an authentic subculture, it will be adopted in this study.)

All subjects were registered at Rhodes with the average length of registration as a student being 1.5 years. The shortest registration was 4 months and the longest registration was 6 years 4 months. Subjects were registered for 19 different degrees: 25% Bachelor of Arts, 20% Bachelor of Commerce, 18% Bachelor of Science, 14% Bachelor of Pharmaceutics, 9% Bachelor of Journalism, 6% Bachelor of social science, 4% Bachelor of Human Movement Studies, 4% LLB.

A total of 34% (n=22) of the male participants reported that they had been guilty of sexual harassment, of which 78% claimed to have been unaware that their behaviour would be regarded as such at the time. This figure represents what Robertson et al. (1988) termed "naive" harassers. A lower percentage (10%, n=7) of women reported that they felt that they have been guilty of sexual harassment, of which 23% reported that they were unaware that their behaviour constituted sexual harassment. It is interesting to note that more women than men were aware that their behaviour constituted sexual harassment even though a smaller portion of

women than men admitted to being guilty of sexual harassment behaviour. In spite of this knowledge, womens' harassing behaviour continued which may suggest that some women need to exert power over men, and thus use their sexuality as a weapon.

During their years as a student at Rhodes, 22% (n=29) of the participants felt that they had been sexually harassed while 8.33% (n=11) said they were not sure. A judgement was made in terms of the subjects own definition of what they believed to constitute sexual harassment. Of the 40 students who answered 'yes' or 'unsure' to being sexually harassed, 30% had reported the harassment, while the majority (70%) had not.

The demographic data on all subjects with respect to age, biological sex, race, preferred partner, guilty of sexual harassment and awareness of harassing behaviour at the time, appears in table 1 over the page.

Table 1: Demographic data

	Total group	Group 1 Workshop	Group 2 Video
Age Mean Min-Max (Range)	19.94 17-31		
Biological sex Male Female	64 68	36 36	28 32
Race White Black Indian Coloured	92 28 8 4		
Preferred partner Opposite sex Same sex Both sexes	122 5 5		
Guilty of sexual harassment Male Female	22 7		
Aware of harassing behaviour at time Male Female	5 5		

3.3 Reporting of sexual harassment incidents

Table 2: Individuals to whom a sexual harassment incident was reported and to whom an incident would be reported if harassed again.

	Reported to	Report to next time
Hallwarden	5	13
Friend	6	7
Parent	1	3
Psychologist	0	2
Harassment panel	0	7
Girl/boy friend	0	3
Campus security	0	2

The above table indicates that there was an increase in the number of participants who would report a sexual harassment incident after participating in the interventions. Of significance is the increase in the number of subjects who said they would report a harassment incident to a hall warden or to the Anti-Harassment panel.

3.4 Test Data

The full results of the study are reported in appendix 2. The following table includes only those statements in which a significant change was noted.

Table 3: T-scores for 11 significant statements from appendix 2 concerning sexual harassment behaviours.

Statement	Male workshop	Female workshop	Male video	Female video
1 Sexual harassment rarely occurs in a university setting	3.06**	2.49*	2.07*	3.06*
7 Women who are wearing provocative clothing are inviting a sexual response	0.66	1.90	2.81**	0.66
11 People who are sexually harassed feel a great deal of shame and guilt	1.58	2.11*	1.11	1.58
14 Lecturers should refrain from dating their students	1.71	2.50*	2.17*	1.71
19 Sexual harassment is harmless and similar to flirtation	0.76	0.77	2.25*	0.76
22 Telling sexual jokes is considered sexual harassment	1.66	1.05	2.60*	1.66
23 Requests for sex by someone you are not in relationship with is sexual harassment	1.99	2.28*	0.85	1.99
24 Yelling and whistling at women who walk by residences is sexual harassment	0.54	2.46*	0.78	0.54
25 Constant comments about ones' physical appearance is considered sexual harassment	1.75	1.94	2.88**	1.75
26 Continuous requests, by the same person, for dates even after the date has been refused, is sexual harassment	0.11	1.94	2.12*	0.11
28 Constant physical touching, which is not invited, is considered sexual harassment	0.93	3.27**	0.37	0.93

* Significance level $p < 0.05$
** Significance level $p < 0.01$

A significant change in a positive direction across all four groups was noted for Statement 1. Where initially subjects did not think that sexual harassment occurred on campus, after the various interventions they realised that it does occur. This is an important observation, since it was only once subjects had recognised sexual harassment, that they could begin to become aware of their attitudes towards it. Thus, the video allowed

subjects to recognise that sexual harassment occurs on campus. Further, it is interesting to note that all significant responses changed in a positive direction, indicating that the interventions did not cloud subjects awareness or understanding of sexual harassment. Although, one could, on the strength of table 3, conclude that the education campaign was generally effective, further analysis of the results is necessary in order to establish which of the interventions were more effective.

3.5 Results of hypothesis tested

When an independent t-test was administered between the video and workshop groups it was found that neither the workshop group nor the video group differed significantly from each other with regards to their pre-intervention and post-intervention test scores. However, when the pre-intervention and post-intervention test scores within each group was explored, it was found that a significant increase had occurred between the pre-intervention and post-intervention scores in each of the respective groups' level of awareness.

As the data revealed that there was no significant difference between the post-intervention scores of the workshop or video groups, it is suggested that both interventions were equally effective in increasing the awareness of sexual harassment of students on campus.

Table 4: Matched t-tests statistics and probability values calculated on change in awareness of sexual harassment in the workshop and video groups

WORKSHOP	Workshop	Male workshop	Female workshop
Pre-test mean	120.8088	115.8125	125.2500
Post-test mean	126.0735	118.1250	133.1300
Hypothesis test for Ho			
Mean pre = mean post	t=3.92	t=1.36	t=4.15
vs Alt: NE	p=0.0002**	p=0.2025	p=0.0002**
at Alpha = 0.05	Reject Ho	Accept Ho	Reject Ho

VIDEO	Video	Male video	Female video
Pre-test mean	119.7857	112.0833	115.8125
Post-test mean	125.4643	118.8333	118.1250
Hypothesis test for Ho			
Mean pre = mean post	t=4.82	t=3.08	t=1.30
vs Alt: NE	p=0.0000**	p=0.0050*	p=0.2025
at Alpha = 0.05	Reject Ho	Reject Ho	Accept Ho

* Significance level $p<0.05$
** Significance level $p<0.01$

The finding that both interventions were equally effective in increasing awareness of sexual harassment was surprising. This result led to further investigation and an analysis of the scores in terms of biological sex. Results indicated that there was a significant change between the pre-intervention and post-intervention test score of the female workshop group but not the male workshop group. The opposite held true for the video group, where there was a significant change in the male video group but not the female video group. This may be due to womens' need to connect to their issues and discuss how to draw boundaries in order to avoid being sexually harassed. Men who tend to be the

perpetrators, however, may not have the same need as women and therefore do not need to discuss their anxieties. This significant change in the female group may account for the significant change in the overall workshop group.

Table 5: Group t-test statistics and probability values calculated for male and female pre-test and post-test scores.

	Pre-test	Post-test
Male	113.4286	118.4286
Female	125.3920	131.8670
T-score	4.04	4.64
p-value	0.0001**	0.0000**

* Significance level $p<0.05$
** Significance level $p<0.01$

It should be noted that while there was an increase in the awareness of sexual harassment for both the male and female groups, a group t-test indicated that females were significantly more aware of sexual harassment both before and after the respective interventions. This result suggested that male students in general are less aware of sexual harassment than are female students. This finding may be the result of females being more sensitive to the issue since they are more likely to be sexually harassed than men, who tend to be the perpetrators.

The overall increase in awareness of sexual harassment was further analysed in terms of changes in attitudes, perceptions and sexual harassment myths.

Table 6: T-test statistics and probability values calculated on the workshop group attitudes, perceptions and myths

	Wrksp Male	Wrksp Female	Attit Male	Attit Female	Perc Male	Perc Female	Myth Male	Myth Female
T-score	1.36	4.15	1.97	4.02	0.40	2.67	0.52	0.65
p-value	0.2025	0.0002 **	0.0576	0.0003 **	0.6892	0.0114	0.6033	0.5193
Ho:	Acc Ho	Rej Ho	Acc Ho	Rej Ho	Acc Ho	Rej Ho	Acc Ho	Acc Ho

** Significance level p<0.01

Table 6 indicates that the workshop intervention was associated with a significant increase in the overall awareness of attitudes towards sexual harassment and perceptions of sexual harassment among the female group. The change of male attitudes towards sexual harassment approached significance.

Table 7: T-test statistics and probability values calculated on the video group for attitudes, perceptions and myths

	Vid Male	Vid Female	Attit Male	Attit Female	Perc Male	Perc Female	Myth Male	Myth Female
T-score	3.08	1.30	2.08	4.21	2.94	1.02	1.55	0.57
p-value	0.0050 **	0.2025	0.0486 *	0.0002 **	0.0071 **	0.3160	0.1344	0.5698
Ho:	Rej Ho	Acc Ho	Rej Ho	Rej Ho	Rej Ho	Acc Ho	Acc Ho	Acc Ho

* Significance level p<0.05
** Significance level p<0.01

Table 7 indicates that the video intervention caused a significant increase in the overall awareness of attitudes towards sexual harassment and perceptions of sexual harassment among the male group. A change in female attitudes towards sexual harassment was also noted.

From table 6 and 7 it was concluded that females benefitted more from the workshop, while males on the other hand benefitted more from the video.

3.6 Participants' evaluation of the workshop

Participants' subjective evaluation of the study indicated that 58.8% of subjects felt that the interventions helped increase their awareness of sexual harassment and 58% felt better able to deal with sexual harassment behaviour after the interventions. While 56.6% believed that their understanding of sexual harassment was clarified by the intervention, only 33.6% believed the interventions had helped them to recognise sexual harassment behaviour.

3.6.1 Group evaluation of video and workshop

Table 8: Data and analysis of variance by sex and race concerning increases in the awareness of sexual harassment

	Group	Males	Female	White	Black	Coloured
Increased awareness (IncA)	58.8%	54%	63.2%	53.9%	71.5%	62.5%
No change in understanding (No IncA)	41.2%	46%	36.8%	46.1%	28.6%	37.5%
Hypothesis test for Ho						
IncA=No IncA	Chi =	6.792			21.328	
vs Alt: NE	Prob =	0.2366			0.1276	
at Alpha = 0.05		Accept			Accept	
95% significance level		11.1			25.0	

The above table illustrates that there was no significant difference between male and female groups or race group in terms of whether or not they felt the intervention had increased their awareness of sexual harassment.

Table 9: Data and analysis of variance by sex and race group concerning clarification of understanding of sexual harassment

	Group	Male	Female	White	Black	Coloured
Clarify understanding (CU)	56.5%	52.3%	60.3%	49.5%	75.1%	75%
No change in understanding (NCU)	43.5%	47.6%	39.7%	50.5%	24.9%	25%
Hypothesis test for Ho						
CU=NCU	Chi =	8.205		34.868		
vs Alt: NE	Prob =	0.1453		0.0026 **		
at Alpha 0.05		Accept		Reject		
95% significance level		11.1		25		

** Significance level p<0.01

A significant difference among members of different race groups was found, with the black and coloured groups claiming that the intervention helped clarify their understanding of sexual harassment significantly more than did the white group. It could be hypothesised that the reason for this difference was the way in which the various race groups have been socialised, with different boundaries being set in the white culture and thus creating a different understanding of what constitutes sexual harassment. Therefore black and coloured subjects benefitted from the intervention as they may have become aware of the manner of sexual communication in western culture, which in turn helped

them clarify their understanding of sexual harassment. No significant differences between the sexes was noted.

Table 10: Data and analysis of variance by sex and race group concerning recognition of sexual harassment

	Group	Male	Female	White	Black	Coloured
Recognise sexual harassment (RSH)	33.6%	31.7%	68.3%	29.7%	50%	31.3%
No change in recognition of sexual harassment (NCRSH)	66.4%	35.3%	64.7%	70.3%	50%	68.7%
Hypothesis test for Ho						
RSH=NCRSH	Chi =	12.907		23.450		
vs Alt: NE	Prob =	0.8813		0.0750		
at Alpha = 0.05		Accept		Accept		
95% significance level		31.4		25.0		

The above table indicates that there was no significant difference in the two groups ability to recognise sexual harassment after the training programme. Less than half of the subjects (33.6%) felt that they were better able to recognise sexual harassment after training. This indicates that the intervention programs were not helpful in educating subjects how to recognise sexual harassment.

Table 11: Data and analysis of variance by sex and race group concerning ability to deal with sexual harassment

	Group	Male	Female	White	Black	Coloured
Deal with sexual harassment (DSH)	58%	52.3%	63.2%	53.9%	64.3%	81.25%
No change in dealing with SH (NCD)	42%	47.7%	36.8%	46.1%	35.7%	18.75%
Hypothesis test for Ho						
DSH=NCD	Chi =	16.91		3.054		
vs Alt: NE	Prob =	0.0047 **		0.0117 *		
at Alpha = 0.05		Reject		Reject		
95% significance level		11.1		25.0		

* Significance level $p<0.05$
** Significance level $p<0.01$

The above table illustrates that both the coloured and black groups found that the training programs helped them to deal with sexual harassment better when compared to the white group. The female group also felt better equipped to deal with sexual harassment than did the male group.

3.7 Conclusion

From the above results it can be concluded that the workshop was more effective as a means for increasing female's awareness, attitudes and perceptions of sexual harassment. The video on the other hand, was more effective for increasing male awareness of attitudes and perceptions of sexual harassment. Neither the workshop nor the video format, however, led to a significant change in the myths around sexual harassment for either males or females.

Participants' subjective evaluation of the workshop indicated that 58.8% of subjects felt that the interventions had changed their awareness of sexual harassment. More blacks and coloureds stated that the intervention had helped them to know how to deal with sexual harassment, and to clarify their understanding of sexual harassment. Female participants, more than male participants, felt that the interventions had helped them to deal with sexual harassment. Only one third of the subjects (33.6%) felt that the intervention had assisted them in recognising sexual harassment.

CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION, EVALUATION OF THIS STUDY, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Discussion

It could be argued that one can only educate a campus about sexual harassment once they have acknowledged that it exists. In this respect, statement 1 of the pre-intervention questionnaire, which states that "sexual harassment rarely occurs on university settings", revealed the most significant results. More specifically this was the only statement that increased significantly for both sexes in both intervention groups. The interventions therefore appear to have made subjects aware that sexual harassment is not merely a theoretical concept to be debated but a real issue on campus, and is supported by Beauvais (1986) who also found a significant increase in positive responses to this statement. This indicates that the relative lack of awareness that sexual harassment occurs on university settings was not unique to this study.

4.1.1 Effect of an intervention program

While various studies promote education as the way to increase awareness of sexual harassment, only one study by Beauvais (1986) was found which measured the change in awareness levels due to an intervention. Results in this study are similar to those found in the later study and indicated an increase in the overall

awareness of sexual harassment owing to an educational intervention program.

4.1.2 Male and female responses to the intervention programs

The variable, biological sex, seemed to be correlated strongly with change in both intervention groups. The workshop intervention was associated with a significant increase in the awareness of sexual harassment among female subjects, whereas the video intervention was associated with a significant increase in male subjects' awareness. No research literature has directly investigated how the different sexes respond to different training programmes, and in this respect this finding is thought to be new.

That males and females respond differently to different intervention can be understood in terms of research conducted by Gutek (1985) and Gutek, Morasch and Cohen (1983) who found that women, more often than men, interpret ambiguous but potentially sexually harassing interactions as instances of sexual harassment. It can be argued that workshopping the video provided little clarification in the perceptions and attitudes held towards sexual harassment for males since it alerted male students to the ambiguity of the incidents discussed. This in turn resulted in no significant change in the number of situations they deemed to constitute sexual harassment. This does not seem to have been the case for women who benefitted more by workshopping the video than by merely watching it. Thus it could

also be argued that women are more sensitised to the issues involved in sexual harassment, and are therefore more sensitive to potentially harassing behaviours.

4.1.3 Differences in male and female perceptions and attitudes of sexual harassment

While the variable, biological sex, was found to interact differently in the two intervention programs, it should be noted that there was a significant difference between the level of awareness of males and females prior to any intervention, with males labelling fewer incidents as sexual harassment than did females. This finding is strongly supported in the literature (Baker, Terpstra and Cutler, 1989; Beauvais 1986; Popovich, Licata, Nokovich 1986; Gutek 1985; Gutek, Nakamura, Gahart, Handschumaker & Russell, 1980; Kenig and Ryan 1986; Lott, Reilly & Howard 1982; and Martelli & Zoloty, 1986) which suggests that men and women differ in their attitudes and perceptions. More specifically males find sexually related behaviour more natural, more to be expected and less serious and problematic than do women. Consequently men tend to judge fewer behaviours as sexual harassment than do women.

Carrol and Ellis (1989) argue that men display greater acceptance and tolerance of sexual harassment than women. This may be attributed to the fact that men are less often on the receiving end of sexually harassing behaviours and thus do not view this as a problem. In this sense the natural biological model may be

viewed as a male model which condones sexual harassment since it does not place males on the receiving end of harassing behaviours.

The socio-cultural model posits sexual harassment as only one manifestation of the larger patriarchal system in which men are the dominant group. Buber (1970) might argue that the fundamental issue is that males tend not to see the 'other' as a 'thou' but rather as an 'it', and thus as an object for their own desires rather than as a separate and exclusive person.

4.1.4 Sexual harassment myths

While statistical analysis revealed that there was an increase in the awareness of, perceptions and attitudes of subjects in both interventions, no change was found to occur in either male or female subjects' awareness of the given sexual harassment myths irrespective of the interventions to which they were exposed. The inability of a single intervention programme to change sexual harassment myths is explored in the literature by Wagner (1990) and Biaggio, Watts, Brownell (1990). They argue that a single intervention is not sufficient to dislodge these myths, and that it is only possible to affect change and educate people through the wide spread dissemination of information using multiple strategies. Riger (1991) adds that while education is necessary in the fight against sexual harassment, education alone is not sufficient. Clearly people's modes of interacting need to be changed if we are to succeed in eliminating sexual harassment.

This could be accomplished by urging the media to desist from portraying women as sex objects, and by implementing an integrated education strategy at schools, universities and organisations. This would serve to encourage respect for the 'other' as a 'thou' rather than an 'it', in keeping with Buber's interpersonal philosophy.

4.1.5 Participants subjective evaluation of the study

An analysis of subjects' evaluation of the training demonstrates a belief in its efficacy. More specifically 58.8% felt the intervention increased their awareness of sexual harassment, 56.6% felt it helped them to clarify their understanding of sexual harassment and 58% felt better equipped to deal with sexual harassment in the future. The validity of these self-report claims must be questioned however, given that 33.6% of subjects did not feel that the training programme had helped them recognise situations which could be termed sexual harassment. This finding contradicts the significant increase in awareness of sexually harassing behaviours reflected in the statistical results. In trying to explain this difference it might be argued that the reason that subjects did not think the interventions helped them recognise sexual harassment was because the sexual harassment scenes posed were ambiguous. Possibly this finding needs to be understood in light of the fact that even social scientists have difficulty defining sexual harassment. It seems that that what constitutes sexual harassment differs in terms of each individual's subjective experience.

4.1.6 Follow up implications of research

Although it was not a primary aim of this study to investigate to whom subjects would report an incident of sexual harassment, table 2 suggests that prior to the intervention subjects had not considered to whom they would report such an incident. After the interventions, however, there was an increase in the number of subjects who claimed that they would report an incident to hallwardens and the Anti-Harassment panel. This result is significant in so much as it facilitates the Anti-Harassment Panel's efforts. More specifically, it suggests that students trust the existing structures, namely hallwardens and the Anti-Harassment panel. It also implies that the Anti-Harassment Panel needs to educate hallwardens about sexual harassment and how to deal with the psychological issues that may arise from such an incident, namely fear, depression, anxiety and anger. In addition wardens need to be familiar with the policies and procedures involved in a sexual harassment incident on campus.

4.2 Evaluation of this study

4.2.1 Evaluation of research methodology

A campus wide selection of residences was conducted using convenience sampling in order to ensure access to the students. This type of selection, together with the voluntary participation of subjects, meant that a population already receptive to new ideas were being reached. One may thus argue that the sample of

people who attended the training programs already had some interest in the issues involved in sexual harassment and were better informed about sexual harassment issues. In this respect, it could be argued that the training interventions were not reaching those students who most need to be educated about sexual harassment. Obtaining a more representative sample however would raise various ethical issues since it is not fair to choose and thereby force people to participate in the study. This might be seen as a limitation of the research as it brings the validity and generalisability of the training program into question. Thus, the research question may have to be changed from "what is the most effective means of increasing awareness of sexual harassment on campus" to "how do we gain access to those students who are unaware and resistant to being educated about sexual harassment issues".

The questionnaire was long and perhaps too ambitious in seeking to obtain a breadth of information. This may have resulted in subjects not paying full attention to their answers (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1987) and thus reduced the quality of information obtained.

The questionnaire also failed to ask women if they viewed themselves as feminists. In hindsight this may have weakened the study since it may be argued that women of strong feminist leanings are more sensitive to potentially sexually harassing behaviours than are non-feminists.

Items measuring awareness of sexual harassment were compiled from existing questionnaires and consisted of items which the researcher thought would tap the relevant construct. Thus, while the face validity of the questionnaire was assessed, there was no validation of the questionnaire's construct validity or internal consistency. A participatory research methodology would possibly have contributed towards the development of a more effective and clearly defined questionnaire. This questionnaire may have resonated more strongly with respondents, and thus improved the quality of information obtained.

By providing a Likert scale to analyse the specific responses of individuals, an arbitrary upper limit was imposed on the responses of subjects. This limited the degree of possible change from the pre-intervention to the post-intervention tests, especially where the pre-intervention and post-intervention test scores were at the upper end of the Likert scale.

The workshop and video interventions were conducted by different researchers. Personal researcher variables may have impacted on the subjects differently, resulting in more or less successful interventions, and thus affected the levels of increase in the awareness of sexual harassment.

While it was the intention of this research to collect all data over a one week period, poor attendance at training workshops required that the interventions continue until a suitable sample size was obtained. As the study extended over a three week

period, contamination effects could not be controlled and there is thus no way of objectively measuring how the contamination may have confounded the results.

4.2.2 Limitations of the research

The sample group consisted largely of undergraduate students who all were living in residences on Rhodes University campus. Thus the results of this study cannot be generalised to other populations, or students living off campus who are arguably more vulnerable to being sexually harassed.

The post-intervention questionnaire was administered immediately after the intervention to ensure confidentiality to subjects. The findings of this research therefore refer to immediate effects and the long term effects of the intervention strategies cannot be predicted. A study by Beauvais (1986) in which the post-test was conducted two weeks after the workshop intervention found that there was a significant increase in the awareness of attitudes towards sexual harassment. This suggests that long term effects of the interventions are possible.

4.2.3 Value of the study

The Anti-Harassment Panel at Rhodes University established a task force to develop a multi-faceted approach to combatting sexual harassment on campus. This research formed one component in their

attempt to combat sexual harassment on campus.

A report from the workshop held in Cape Town suggests that sexual harassment is a reality on many South African university campuses. However, little has been done to address the issue. The University of Cape Town was the first local university to explore a means of combatting sexual harassment on campus by producing an educational video. This study has attempted to evaluate whether the video produced by the University of Cape Town would be more effective if it was presented on its own or if it was presented in the form of a workshop. In this respect, the research is unique as it has evaluated the effectiveness of an intervention program. In sum, it is considered that this study partially succeeded in its aim to educate and inform the student population about sexual harassment. This was achieved by employing two different training programs and evaluating which would be more effective in increasing awareness of sexual harassment on campus.

The present research suggests a significant relationship between participation in the training programs and a change in awareness of sexual harassment, as measured by the changes in the pre-intervention and post-intervention test scores. Certain conclusions are indicated regarding the effect of different training programs on males and females.

Significant findings include the followings:

- Males benefited from simply watching the video while females benefited by workshopping the video.

- Blacks and coloured benefited more from the interventions than did whites. This suggests that they may have become more aware of the manner of sexual communication in western culture, which in turn helped them clarify their understanding of sexual harassment.

- Only one third of the subjects felt they were better able to recognise sexual harassment after the intervention. This indicated that the intervention programs were not helpful in educating subjects how to recognise sexual harassment.

- No change was noted in the subjects awareness of given sexual harassment myths. This suggests that a single intervention is not sufficient to dislodge the myths upon which harassment is based.

4.2.4 Recommendations

The findings support the use of the video training programs as interventions for the purposes of changing the awareness of sexual harassment on campus. Thus the following recommendations are made:

1. It would seem that if the university is going to use its time and energy prudently, it is recommended that the males only view the video One man's meat is another man's poison while the females workshop the same video. Further, it is suggested that these workshops be conducted during the orientation week attended by all first years so as to set the tone for first year students with respect to what behaviour is and is not acceptable on campus. This would also be the most time and energy efficient manner of reaching students.

2. Since it seems that hallwardens are trusted by students they should be brought into the initiative of combatting sexual harassment on campus. To achieve this they should receive training concerning the effects of sexual harassment, policies and procedures regarding sexual harassment and how to do basic counselling with sexual harassment victims and perpetrators.

3. Since the sexual harassment myths were not altered, the workshops should be altered in a manner that would encourage an 'I-Thou' way of relating rather than an 'I-It' way of relating. This would enable people to recognise the internal personhood of people and set the tone for acceptable behaviour on campus.

4. While the study has attempted to measure the change in awareness as a measure to combat sexual harassment at

Rhodes University, no statement can be made as to the effect that this study has had on campus. Therefore, it is further recommended that a follow up study be conducted to measure if there have been lasting effects of these training interventions. As this cannot be done without breaking confidentiality, perhaps future investigations should consider appropriate ways of obtaining follow-up data from the subjects involved.

REFERENCES

Abbey, A. (1982). Sex differences in attributions for friendly behaviour: Do males misperceive females friendliness? Journal of personality and social psychology, 42, 5, 830-838.

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

Baker, D.D., Terpstra, D.E., & Cutler, B.D. (1989). Perceptions of sexual harassment: A re-examination of gender differences. The Journal of Psychology, 124, 4, 409-416.

Baker, D.D., Terpstra, D.E., & Larntz, K. (1990). The influence of individual characteristics and severity of harassing behaviour reactions to sexual harassment. Sex Roles, 22, 305-325.

Barak, A. (1992). Combatting sexual harassment. American Psychologist, 47, 818-819.

Beauvias, K. (1986). Workshops to combat sexual harassment: A case study of changing attitudes. Signs, 12, 130-145.

Benson, D., & Thomson, G. (1982). Sexual harassment on a university campus: The confluence of authority relations, sexual interest and gender stratification. Social Problems, 3, 236-251.

Biaggio, M.K., Watts, D., & Brownell, A. (1990). Addressing sexual harassment: Strategies for prevention and change. In M.A. Paludi (Ed.), Ivory Power: Sexual harassment on campus, Albany: SUNY Press.

Brewer, M.B., & Berk, R.A. (1982). Beyond 9 to 5: Sexual harassment on the job. Journal of Social Issues, 38, 4, 1-6.

Brice, C.W. (1984). Pathological modes of human relating and therapeutic mutuality. Psychiatry, 47, 109-123.

Buber, M. Translated by Schribner, C. (1970). I and Thou, Morrison and Gibb Publishers, Great Britain.

Burt, M.R. (1980). Cultural myths and support for rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 217-230.

Carrol, L., & Ellis, L. (1989). Faculty attitudes towards sexual harassment: survey results, survey process. Journal of NAWDAC, 52, 3, 35-41.

Charney, A., & Russel, R.C. (1994). An overview of sexual harassment. American journal of psychiatry, 151, 1, 13-19.

Crocker, L.P. (1983). An analysis of university definitions of sexual harassment. Signs, 8, 4, 696-707.

Cyril, J., & Engelman, C. (1988). Educational strategies. In Paludi, M.A., (Ed.), Ivory Power; sexual harassment on campus, Albany: Sunny Press.

Dzeich, B., & Weiner, L. (1984). The lecherous professor: Sexual harassment on campus. Boston: Beacon Press.

Fitzgerald, L.F. (1990). Sexual harassment: The definition and measurement of a construct. In Paludi, M. (Ed.) Ivory Power: Sexual Harassment on Campus, (pp. 17-21) Albany: SUNY Press.

Fitzgerald, L.F., & Hesson-McInnis, M. (1988). The structure of sexual harassment. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 35, 309-326.

Fitzgerald, L.F., & Omerad, A.J. (1991). Perceptions of sexual harassment: the influence of gender and academic context. Psychology of Womens Quarterly, 15, 2, 281-294.

Fitzgerald, L.F., & Shullman, S. (1985). The development and validation of an objectively scored measure of sexual harassment. In Paludi, M.A. & Barickman, R.B. (1991). Academic and workplace sexual harassment. Albany: SUNY Press.

Fitzgerald, L.F., & Weitzman, L. (1990). Men who harass: Speculation and data. In Paludi, M. (Ed.), Ivory Power; sexual harassment on campus (pp.125-141) Albany: Sunny Press.

Friedman, J., Boumil, M.M., & Taylor, B.E. (1992). Sexual Harassment. Health Communications: Congress Press.

Gervasio, A.M. & Ruckdeschel, K. (1992). College students judgments of verbal harassment. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22, 3, 190-211.

Gutek, B.A. (1985). Sex and the workplace. San Fransisco:Josey-Bass.

Gutek, B.A. & Dunwoody, V. (1987). Understanding sex in the workplace. In McCormick, N., et al. (1989). Sexual harassment of students at a small college Journal of NAWDAC, 52, 3, 15-24.

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

Hite, M. (1990). Sexual harassment and the university community. Journal of NAWDAC, 52, 4, 11-17.

Jensen, I.W., & Gutek, B.A. (1982). Attributions and assignment of responsibility in sexual harassment. Journal of social issues 38, 4, 121-136.

Kaplan, R.M., (1987). Basic Statistics for the Behavioural Sciences. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc.

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.

LaFontaine, E., & Tredeau, L. (1986). The frequency, scores, and correlates of sexual harassment among women in traditional male occupations. Sex Roles, 15, 433-442.

Lott, B., Reilly, M.E., Howard, D.R. (1982). Sexual assault and harassment: A campus community case study. Signs, 8, 296-319.

MacKinnon, C.A. (1979). Sexual Harassment of Working Women. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

Maihiff,N. & Forrest, L. (1983). Sexual harassment in higher education: An assessment study. Journal of NAWDAC, 46, 2, 3-10.

McCain, N. (1983). Female faculty members and students at Harvard report sexual harassment. Chronicle of higher education. 10, 1, 1-10.

McCormick, N., Bohley. S.A., Peterson, S., & Gaeddert, W. (1989). Sexual harassment of students at a small college. Journal of NAWDAC, 52, 3, 15-24.

Metha, A., & Nigg, J. (1983). Sexual harassment on campus: An institutional response. Journal of NAWDAC, 46, 2, 9-15.

Nachmias, D., & Nachmias, C. (1987). Research Methods in the Social Sciences. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Paludi, M.A., (Ed.), (1990). Ivory Power: Sexual harassment on campus. Albany: SUNY Press.

Paludi, M.A. & Barickman, R.B. (1991). Academic and workplace sexual harassment. Albany: SUNY Press.

Popovitch, P.M., Licata, B.J., Nokovitch, D., Martelli, T. & Zoloty, S. (1986). Assessing the incidence and perceptions of sexual harassment behaviours among American undergraduates. The Journal of Psychology, 129, 4, 387-396.

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 persons' understanding of sexual harassment. Sex Roles, 13, 273-286.

Reilly, T., Carpenter, S., Dull, V., & Bartlett, K. (1982). The factorial survey: An approach to defining sexual harassment. Journal of Social Issues, 38, 4, 99-110.

Riger, S. (1991). Gender dilemmas in sexual harassment policies and procedures. American Psychologist, 46, 5, 497-505.

Robertson, C., Dryer, C.E., & Cambell, D.A. (1988). Campus harassment: Sexual harassment policies and procedures at institutions of higher learning. Signs, 13, 792-812.

Salisbury, J., Ginorio, A.B., Remick, H., & Stringer, D.M. (1986). Counselling victims of sexual harassment. Psychotherapy, 23, 3, 316-324.

Sandler B.R. (1990). Sexual Harassment: A New Issue for Institutions. Journal of NAWDAC, 52, 4.

Schneider,B.E. (1987). Graduate women, sexual harassment and university policy. Journal of Higher Education, 58, 46-65.

Swecker ,J. (1985). Straightening out the power curve. In Paludi, M.A., (Ed.), Ivory Power; sexual harassment on campus, (pp220-222) Albany: SUNY Press.

Tangri, S.S., Burt, M.R., & Johnson, L.B. (1982). Sexual harassment at work: Three explanatory models. Journal of social issues, 38, 33-54.

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

Thurstone, L.L. (1931). The measurement of social attitudes. Journal of Abnormal and social psychology, Vol 26, 249-69.

Wagner K.C. (1990). Prevention and intervention: Developing campus policy and procedures. Journal of NAWDAC, 52, 4, 37-46.

Wilson, K.R., & Kraus, L.A. (1983). Sexual harassment in the university. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24, 219-224.

Unpublished Reports

Report on the sexual harassment workshop held at the University of Cape Town (11-12 July 1992) under the auspices of the equal opportunities research.

Paludi, M. (1993). Sexual harassment myths. Paper presented at a sexual harassment conference held at the University of New York.

APPENDIX 1

SECTION A

Please fill in the following details as accurately as possible.

1. What is your age? (completed years) _____

2. To which race group do you belong? (Please circle the appropriate answer)

   a) White b) Black

   c) Indian d) Other (Please specify)

   _____

3. What is your biological sex? (Please circle the appropriate answer)

   a) Male b) Female

4. In terms of sexual partner, I prefer members of (Please circle the appropriate answer)

   a) The opposite sex b) My own sex

   c) Both my own and the opposite sex

5. Please indicate the degree for which you are currently registered.

   _____

6. How many years have you been at Rhodes in total?

   _____

7. In which subjects do you intend to major? (Please list)

   _____ _____

   _____

8. Did you study at any other university before attending Rhodes university? (Please circle the appropriate answer)

   a) Yes b) No

   IF YES please indicate which university or universities and the number of years spent there.

   _____ _____years

   _____ _____years

9. Where did you live before coming to Grahamstown?

_____

SECTION B

1. How would you define sexual harassment in terms of your present understanding?

_____

_____

_____

2. In terms of the definition that you have provided above, would you say that you have been sexually harassed during the past year? (Please circle the appropriate answer)

a) Yes b) No c) Unsure

If you answered YES or UNSURE, please describe what occurred. Pay particular attention to the context and circumstances in which the harassment arose, as well as to the feelings you experienced during and after the harassment incident.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Did you report the incident to anyone? (Please circle the appropriate answer)

a) Yes b) No

4. IF you answered YES to question 3, to whom did you report the incident and why that person?

_____

_____

5. IF you answered NO to question 3, why did you not report the incident?

_____

_____

6. If you were harassed again, to whom would you report the incident. Please explain why that person.

_____

SECTION C

For each item below, please circle the number which most clearly describes your own experience. If you circle 2 or 3 please say whether the person involved was a man (M) or a woman (W) or both (B) (if it happened more than once). In addition please indicate if the person involved was a lecturer (L) a fellow student (S) or both. Refer only to those incidents that have occurred while at this university.

1 = Never M = Male L = Lecturer O = Other
2 = Once F = Female S = Student
3 = More than once B = Both

1. Have you ever been in a situation where a lecturer or fellow student habitually told suggestive stories or offensive jokes about you?

1 2 3 M F B L S B O

2. Have you ever been in a situation where a lecturer or fellow student made seductive remarks about your appearance, body or sexual activities to you?

1 2 3 M F B L S B O

3. Have you ever been in a situation where a lecturer or fellow student was staring or leering at you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable?

1 2 3 M F B L S B O

4. Have you ever been in a situation where a lecturer or fellow student made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion of personal sexual matters (e.g. attempts to discuss or comment on your sex life)?

1 2 3 M F B L S B O

5. Have you ever been in a situation that you actually were rewarded by a lecturer or fellow student for being socially or sexually cooperative (e.g. going out to dinner, having drinks, establishing a sexual relationship)?

1 2 3 M F B L S B O

6. Have you ever been in a situation where you have received unwanted sexual attention from a lecturer or fellow student?

1 2 3 M F B L S B O

7. Have you ever been in a situation where a lecturer of fellow student directly offered you some sort of reward for being sexually cooperative?

1 2 3 M F B L S B O

8. Have you ever engaged in sexual behaviour WHEN you did not want to because of promises of rewards (in the case of a lecturer, good grades)?

1 2 3 M F B L S B O

9. Have you ever been in a situation where a lecturer or fellow student engaged in what you considered seductive behaviour toward you that was not invited (e.g. made flattering or suggestive remarks, asked you for a date, suggest that you "get together" for a drink, offered to give you a back rub)?

1 2 3 M F B L S B O

10. Have you ever felt that you were being subtly or directly threatened or pressured to engage in sexual activity by threats of punishment or retaliation?

1 2 3 M F B L S B O

11. Have you ever been in a situation where you actually experienced some negative consequences for refusing to engage in sexual activity with a lecturer or fellow student?

1 2 3 M F B L S B O

12. Have you ever been in a situation where a lecturer or fellow student made unwanted attempts to touch or fondle you (e.g. kissing you, stroking your leg or neck, touching your breasts and so forth)?

1 2 3 M F B L S B O

13. Have you ever been in a situation where a lecturer or fellow student forced you to touch their genitals against your will?

1 2 3 M F B L S B O

14. Has a lecturer or fellow student ever asked you to have sex with them?

1 2 3 M F B L S B O

15. Have you ever been in a situation where lecturer or fellow student sexually harassed you?

1 2 3 M F B L S B O

16. Have you ever been raped by a lecturer or fellow student?

1 2 3 M F B L S B O

17. Have you ever been date raped?

1 2 3 M F B L S B O

SECTION D

Rate the following statements where:
1 means "strongly disagree" and 6 means "strongly agree".

1. Sexual harassment rarely occurs in a university setting.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 **Strongly Agree**

2. One of the problems of sexual harassment is that some people can not take a joke.

1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Sexual harassment may happen to men.

1 2 3 4 5 6

4. People who are sexually harassed usually invite it.

1 2 3 4 5 6

5. Once a person becomes sexually involved in a relationship, they cannot claim to be sexually harassed by that partner.

1 2 3 4 5 6

6. Homosexuals/Lesbians are sometimes sexually harassed by persons of either sex.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 **Strongly Agree**

7. Women who are wearing provocative clothing are inviting a sexual response.

1 2 3 4 5 6

8. Many charges of sexual harassment are vindictive and frivolous.

1 2 3 4 5 6

9. Most incidents of sexual harassment are reported.

1 2 3 4 5 6

10. The victim who complains of sexual harassment is more often more punished than the person who harassed them.

1 2 3 4 5 6

11. People who are sexually harassed feel a great deal of shame and guilt.

1 2 3 4 5 6

12. Issues of sexual harassment make it difficult for people to ask other people for dates.

1 2 3 4 5 6

13. Sexual harassment has little to do with issues of power.

1 2 3 4 5 6

14. Lecturers should refrain from dating their students.

1 2 3 4 5 6

15. I have witnessed sexual harassment in my life.

1 2 3 4 5 6

16. I have a friend who has been sexually harassed.

1 2 3 4 5 6

17. You have been sexually harassed only when you have been sexually assaulted.

1 2 3 4 5 6

18. Sexual harassment only affects a very small number of persons.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 **Strongly Agree**

19. Sexual harassment is harmless and is similar to flirtation.

1 2 3 4 5 6

20. Only men sexually harass.

1 2 3 4 5 6

21. Staring at a person in a sexually seductive manner is not considered to be sexual harassment.

1 2 3 4 5 6

22. Telling sexual jokes is considered sexual harassment.

1 2 3 4 5 6

23. Requests for sex by someone you are not in a relationship with is sexual harassment.

1 2 3 4 5 6

24. Yelling and whistling at women who walk by residences or digs is sexual harassment.

1 2 3 4 5 6

25. Constant comments about ones' physical appearance/attractiveness is considered sexual harassment.

1 2 3 4 5 6

26. Continuous requests, by the same person, for dates even after the date has been refused, is sexual harassment.

1 2 3 4 5 6

27. Rating women's attractiveness is sexual harassment.

1 2 3 4 5 6

28. Constant physical touching, which is not invited, is considered sexual harassment.

1 2 3 4 5 6

29. I find shouting obscenities at women who walk by residences or digs to be sexual harassment.

1 2 3 4 5 6

PLEASE DO NOT TURN OVER

SECTION E

Rate the following statements where"
1 means "strongly disagree" and 6 means "strongly agree".

1. Sexual harassment only affects a very small number of persons.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 **Strongly Agree**

2. Sexual harassment may happen to men.

1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Women who are wearing provocative clothing are inviting a sexual response.

1 2 3 4 5 6

4. Once a person becomes sexually involved in a relationship, they cannot claim to be sexually harassed by that partner.

1 2 3 4 5 6

5. Sexual harassment rarely occurs in a university setting.

1 2 3 4 5 6

6. Many charges of sexual harassment are vindictive and frivolous.

1 2 3 4 5 6

7. Staring at a person in a sexually seductive manner is not considered to be sexual harassment.

1 2 3 4 5 6

8. Most incidents of sexual harassment are reported.

1 2 3 4 5 6

9. Telling sexual jokes is considered sexual harassment.

1 2 3 4 5 6

10. The victim who complains of sexual harassment is more often more punished than the person who harassed them.

1 2 3 4 5 6

11. Homosexuals/Lesbians are sometimes sexually harassed by persons of either sex.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 **Strongly Agree**

12. Issues of sexual harassment make it difficult for people to ask other people for dates.

1 2 3 4 5 6

13. Constant comments about ones' physical appearance/attractiveness is considered sexual harassment.

1 2 3 4 5 6

14. Sexual harassment has little to do with issues of power.

1 2 3 4 5 6

15. Yelling and whistling at women who walk by residences or digs is sexual harassment.

1 2 3 4 5 6

16. Lecturers should refrain from dating their students.

1 2 3 4 5 6

17. People who are sexually harassed usually invite it.

1 2 3 4 5 6

18. I have a friend who has been sexually harassed.

1 2 3 4 5 6

19. Only men sexually harass.

1 2 3 4 5 6

20. Requests for sex by someone you are not in a relationship with is sexual harassment.

1 2 3 4 5 6

21. I have witnessed sexual harassment in my life.

1 2 3 4 5 6

22. Constant physical touching which is not invited is considered sexual harassment.

1 2 3 4 5 6

23. Sexual harassment is harmless and is similar to flirtation.

Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 **Strongly Agree**

24. One of the problems of sexual harassment is that some people can not take a joke.

1 2 3 4 5 6

25. Continuous requests, by the same person, for dates even after the date has been refused is sexual harassment.

1 2 3 4 5 6

26. Rating women's attractiveness is sexual harassment.

1 2 3 4 5 6

27. People who are sexually harassed feel a great deal of shame and guilt.

1 2 3 4 5 6

28. You have been sexually harassed only when you have been sexually assaulted.

1 2 3 4 5 6

29. I find shouting obscenities at women who walk past residences or digs to be sexual harassment.

1 2 3 4 5 6

SECTION F

1. Having viewed the video/participated in the workshop, how would you now define sexual harassment?

_____

_____

Rate the following FOUR statements where **1 means 'not at all' and 6 means 'a great deal'.**

2. The video/workshop increased my awareness of sexual harassment.

1 2 3 4 5 6

Why do say this?

_____

_____

3. The video/workshop helped me clarify my understanding of sexual harassment.

1 2 3 4 5 6

Why do you say this?

_____

4. The workshop/video enabled me to recognise incidents in which I have been sexually harassed.

1 2 3 4 5 6

Why do you say this?

_____

5. The workshop/video has enabled me to deal with sexual harassment.

1 2 3 4 5 6

Why do you say this?

_____

_____

6. Please indicate if you felt that scenarios posed in the video/workshop were realistic where 1 means 'not at all realistic' and 6 means 'very realistic' (please circle the most appropriate answer)

1 2 3 4 5 6

Why do you say this?

_____

_____

7. Please list those aspects of the video/workshop that you have found most useful.

_____

_____

8. Please list those aspects of the video/workshop you considered a waste of time.

_____

_____

9. Do you think you have ever been guilty of sexual harassment? Please <u>circle</u> the appropriate answer.

a) yes b) no c) unsure

If YES were you aware of it at the time?

a) yes b) no

10. Please feel free to add additional comments if you have ideas about how the workshop may be improved.

_____

_____

11. Please feel free to add any comments about how you feel having participated in such a workshop/video.

_____

_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION

APPENDIX 2

Matched t-test: Mean pre-test and post-test scores of individual's responses to statements.

WORKSHOP						
Statement	Pre MM	Post MM	t-score	Pre FM	Post FM	t-score
1	4.1111	4.7778	3.06**	4.4722	5.3056	2.49*
2	3.3333	3.6944	1.28	4.8611	4.9722	0.66
3	5.2222	5.3056	0.42	4.5556	4.8056	0.87
4	4.8333	4.5000	1.28	5.4722	5.4722	0.00
5	4.4167	4.6389	0.98	5.1111	5.2778	0.67
6	3.8182	3.7576	0.25	4.4722	4.5833	0.60
7	3.1111	3.2778	0.66	4.0278	4.4167	1.90
8	3.5833	3.7222	0.53	4.5833	4.3611	0.93
9	5.0556	4.8611	0.74	5.3056	5.6667	1.60
10	3.9706	4.0588	0.43	4.6389	4.6944	0.20
11	4.6944	5.0833	1.58	5.1389	5.6667	2.11*
12	4.5556	4.2500	1.77	3.9444	4.0000	0.28
13	4.1944	4.5556	1.40	4.8333	5.2778	1.19
14	3.5000	3.9167	1.71	4.3333	4.9722	2.50*
15	3.1944	3.2500	0.19	3.3056	3.1944	0.44
17	5.0857	5.2000	0.38	5.5833	5.4167	0.62
18	4.6857	4.5429	0.66	5.2778	5.3889	0.55
19	5.9722	5.1389	0.76	5.5556	5.7222	0.77
20	5.2500	5.3333	0.23	4.8889	5.1944	1.38
21	3.5560	3.7500	0.72	4.6667	4.3611	1.54
22	2.7500	3.2500	1.66	2.8333	3.1667	1.05
23	3.5000	2.8889	1.99	3.8333	4.6111	2.28*
24	3.8889	3.7500	0.54	3.6111	4.1944	2.46*
25	3.0278	3.6111	1.75	3.3611	4.0833	1.94
26	3.8889	3.8611	0.11	3.8611	3.9444	0.29
27	2.4167	2.8611	1.87	3.6111	3.9444	1.48
28	5.3143	5.0857	0.93	4.7222	5.6389	3.27**
29	4.5556	4.2778	1.54	4.3889	4.8056	1.54
VIDEO						
1	4.1852	4.7407	2.07*	4.1111	4.7778	3.06*
2	3.7037	3.8889	0.62	3.3333	3.6944	1.28
3	5.0370	4.9259	0.38	5.2222	5.3056	0.42
4	4.8929	4.7500	0.63	4.8333	4.5000	1.28
5	4.6071	4.6071	0.00	4.4167	4.6389	0.98
6	4.2500	4.3571	0.62	3.8182	3.7576	0.25
7	2.9286	3.6071	2.81**	3.1111	3.2778	0.66

8	3.6429	3.7857	0.54	3.5833	3.7222	0.53
9	5.0714	4.8929	1.54	5.0556	4.8611	0.74
10	4.0370	4.0000	0.16	3.9706	4.0588	0.43
11	4.7778	4.4815	1.11	4.6944	5.0833	1.58
12	4.1111	4.1852	0.36	4.5556	4.2500	1.77
13	4.4074	4.3333	0.39	4.1944	4.556	1.40
14	3.3214	4.0357	2.17	3.5000	3.9167	1.71
15	3.4231	3.5000	0.23	3.9144	3.2500	0.19
17	4.8889	5.0000	0.31	5.0857	5.2000	0.38
18	4.3704	4.6667	0.87	4.6857	4.5429	0.66
19	4.8519	5.4444	2.25*	4.9722	5.1389	0.76
20	5.4286	5.5357	0.36	5.2500	5.3333	0.23
21	3.6296	3.5185	0.32	3.556	3.7500	0.72
22	2.2222	3.0741	2.60*	2.7500	3.2500	1.66
23	3.1481	3.4074	0.85	3.5000	2.889	1.99
24	2.9643	3.1429	0.78	3.8889	3.7500	0.54
25	2.9259	3.4444	2.88**	3.0278	3.6111	1.75
26	2.8571	3.4286	2.12*	3.8889	3.8611	0.11
27	2.4286	2.8929	1.23	2.4167	2.8611	1.87
28	4.8148	4.9630	0.37	5.3143	5.0857	0.93
29	3.6538	4.1923	1.83	4.556	4.2778	1.54

Note: The higher the score the more desirable the response

* Significance level $p<0.05$
** Significance level $p<0.01$

KEY: MM = Male mean
FM = Female mean