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ABSTRACT

Sexual harassment is a form of oppression that prevails in the workplace and negatively affects the victims as well as the organizations. In order to prevent sexual harassment, both the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Supreme Court have provided legal definitions of the construct for the past three decades. The interest in sexual harassment is also contemporary in the research arena. However, the literature shows a lack of cross-cultural data on the phenomenon.

This study evaluates the influence of individualism, feminism, and extroversion on sexual harassment experiences, as well as the differences of these variables across cultures. We collected data from 495 female employees located in the United States, Puerto Rico, and Japan. The hypothesized model was analyzed using structural equation modeling. T-tests and ANOVA were performed to assess the cross-cultural differences of the observed variables.

The hypothesized path model was partially supported. The results revealed that extroversion and feminism predict sexual harassment experiences. However, individualism did not predict sexual harassment.
Additionally, individualism, feminism, and extroversion resulted in significant differences across cultures. On the other hand, sexual harassment did not present significant cross-cultural differences.
DEDICATION

To my family

Mame, Pape, Javy, y Abuela

with love.

Bebe

En Paz

Muy cerca de mi ocaso, yo te bendigo, Vida, porque nunca me diste ni esperanza fallida, ni trabajos injustos, ni pena inmerecida;

Porque veo al final de mi rudo camino que yo fui el arquitecto de mi propio destino; que si extraje la mieles o la hiel de las cosas, fue porque en ellas puse hiel o mieles sabrosas: cuando planté rosales coseché siempre rosas.

...Cierto, a mis lozanías va a seguir el invierno: ¡mas tú no me dijiste que mayo fuese eterno!

Hallé sin duda largas las noches de mis penas; mas no me prometiste tan sólo noches buenas; y en cambio tuve algunas santamente serenas...

Amé, fui amado, el sol acarició mi faz. ¡Vida, nada me debes! ¡Vida, estamos en paz!

Amado Nervo (1870-1919)
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Three decades ago the concept of sexual harassment was unspeakable, but today the term is commonly used in our society (Uggen & Blackstone, 2004). In the workplace sexual harassment is a problem that may affect both men and women, but females have been the classic harassment victims and men have played the classic perpetrator roles. The United States legal system recognizes two types of sexual harassment, the first one is quid pro quo which is the request of sexual relations or sexual favors in exchange of promotions and other rewards that the harasser can control. The second type of sexual harassment is a hostile work environment. This type of harassment is very broad; it refers to unwelcome sexual advances or symbols that interfere with a person’s job performance, or it creates an offensive work environment. Examples of a hostile work environment could be posting of sexually suggestive pictures in employee’s work areas, consistently telling dirty jokes or stories where employees in the work area can hear them, the use of derogative terms with a sexual connotation to be used to describe co-workers, and frequent physical contact. In general, it is difficult and
complex to define sexual harassment because it involves the victims’ experiences and perceptions, and the legal aspect. Although our study is going to focus on the victims sexual harassment experiences we want to introduce how the legal definitions of sexual harassment have evolved to have a better understanding of the construct.

Sexual harassment is a relatively new issue in the courts. The Supreme Court did not deal with sexual harassment cases until 1986 (Bennet-Alexander & Hartman, 2004). Once a case is determined in the United States Supreme Court the local Court Circuits follow these determinations. Laws are like a skeleton that gives a structure, a foundation to the justice system. The case outcomes are the flesh and every time that a sexual harassment case is determined in courts a small piece of flesh ads to the skeleton (Bennett-Alexander, personal communication, February 27, 2006). Several cases have helped define sexual harassment for the legal system. In order to understand the legal definitions we are going to briefly discuss three key legal cases before moving forward to the introduction of the research studies.

In Rabidue v. Osceola Refining Co. (1986) Rabidue accused Osceola of sexual harassment after being fired. In her complaint she expresses discomfort with the derogatory
and sexist language of Henry, one of her male coworkers, and the posting of nudity posters in work areas by other employees. The court rejected her harassment claim arguing that Henry's behavior and the nudity postings did not cause psychological distress to Rabidue. The court manifested that nudity exposures are generally accepted in society as seen commonly in public settings and the media.

However, since Harris v. Forklift Systems (1993) the decision taken in Rabidue's does not prevail in courts anymore. Harris' case was very similar to Rabidue's. Harris, a female manager was constantly exposed to sexual jokes, sexist and derogatory comments from her male supervisor. She confronted him and asked him to stop. He agreed to stop but soon he continued his unpleasant behavior. In this case the Supreme Court established that psychological harm is not a requirement for a sexual harassment claim. If the environment is perceived as hostile by the plaintiff there is good reason to take legal action against the organization. Since the decision in Harris' case took place in the U.S. Supreme Court this decision has become normative in courts.

Right after Rabidue's case in the same year Meritor Savings Bank, FSB v. Vinson (1986) was determined in the U.S. Supreme Court. Vinson, a female employee was
requested to have sexual relationships with her male supervisor. This proposition was unwelcome by her, but she acceded because of fear of loosing her job. In this case Vinson did not loose any job benefits nor was threatened with loosing any job benefits which characterizes quid pro quo harassment. She proved to the Court that her supervisors’ sexual requests were unwelcome to her and created a tense and abusive environment even if she voluntarily submitted to his sexual requests. For the first time the Court determined that quid pro quo is not the only kind of sexual harassment and recognized hostile work environment as a category of harassment. It was also determined that “voluntarily submission” could be “unwanted”. Unfortunately the 6th Circuit Court in Rabidue’s case did not have the guidance of Vinson’s (Bennett-Alexander, personal communication, February 27, 2006).

While we have legal definitions we still do not have a clear definition of the construct that may help the victims to clearly identify sexual harassment. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) in an attempt to guide us toward a possible definition of the construct states that “unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a
sexual nature constitutes sexual harassment when
(1) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly
or implicitly a term or condition of an individual’s
employment, (2) submission to or rejection of such conduct
by an individual is used as the basis for employment
decisions affecting such individual, or (3) such conduct
has the purpose or effect of substantially interfering
with an individual’s work performance or creating an
intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment”
(Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1980, p. 25025;
as cited in Nielsen, 1996).

As described in the cases mentioned above, there have
been a lot of efforts invested on determining what is
sexual harassment from a legal perspective. However, fewer
efforts have been devoted to understand what predicts
sexual harassment experiences in the workplace and how
these experiences differ based on the perceptions and
differences of the victims, which is the purpose of this
study. We specifically want to consider the relationship
between sexual harassment experiences and cultural related
variables: individualism, feminism, and extroversion. It
is important to study sexual harassment and its
relationships with other variables because sexual
harassment has many negative outcomes for the victims and for organizations.

Sexual harassment goes beyond the liability cost of a legal issue. Jayaratne, Vinokur-Kaplan, Nagda, and Chess (1995); and Solomon and Williams (1997) have found that individuals who are victims of sexual harassment may experience a decrease in work motivation and performance, feelings of disgust, nervousness, anger, and intimidation. Even more, the harassment situation can contribute to the loss of the victim’s job or promotions. Additionally, Cortina, Fitzgerald and Drasgow (2002) found that sexual harassment is negatively related to job satisfaction and positively related to psychosomatic symptoms in a Latina sample. In the same study job satisfaction is negatively related to job withdrawal behaviors and psychosomatic symptoms are negatively related to life satisfaction. In a study developed in the U.S. Army by Faley, Knapp, Kustis, and DuBois (1999) to estimate the cost of sexual harassment the researchers identified that sexual harassment has a negative impact on productivity, absenteeism, employees’ transfer, incident process, replacement of employees, legal, medical, and counseling costs. In 1994 the U.S. Army spent over 250 million dollars as a consequence of sexual harassment. These
findings highlight the critical importance of eliminating sexual harassment in the workplace. However identifying sexual harassment is complicated by differences in how individuals define sexual harassment despite definitions provided by the courts.

Defining sexual harassment is further complicated by individual perceptions and sensitivity to the harassment experience. For example, some individuals may not tolerate sexual jokes in the workplace while others may enjoy engaging in conversations that involves sexual content. In this case, the interpretation of the behavior is going to depend on the values of the perceiver. Ilies, Hauserman, Schwochau, and Stibal (2003) have found that previous studies in the area have consistently shown a low percentage of participants identifying themselves as suffering sexual harassments as defined by what the researchers believe constitute sexual harassment. This fact supports the notion that sexual harassment is not a concrete set of behaviors, but individuals’ interpretations of such behaviors. This lack of consistency in the definition of the construct across participants makes it very difficult to draw conclusions across the literature. In the following section we will elaborate on how people report on experiences and
perceptions of sexual harassment. This will help us have an understanding on how people define sexual harassment.

Experience, Perception, and Definition of Sexual Harassment

Given the negative impact that sexual harassment can have on employees and organizations it is important to understand what is experienced and perceived as sexual harassment. These experiences and perceptions not only vary within a culture, but they may vary across cultures. Finding, knowing and understanding these cross-cultural differences will help us prevent sexual harassment and its negative consequences. The purpose of this study is to explore the systematic differences of cross-cultural experiences of sexual harassment. In this study we define sexual harassment experiences and perceptions based on Fitzgerald, Shullman, Baailey, Richards, Swecker, Gold, Ormerod, and Weitzman (1988) Sexual Harassment Questionnaire. A sexual harassment experience according to this measurement instrument is a harassing behavior (e.g., being touched) that the victim experience from the harasser. On the other hand, perceptions of sexual harassment are defined as the evaluative judgment that the victim makes of such experience. For example, if the person is asked how many times someone has touched their
body parts (experience), and perception is how much the person was bothered by such behavioral experience. The sexual harassment studies in this review are based on this definition. Whereas some studies will emphasize on experiences, others on perceptions, and others on both experiences and perceptions.

Ilies, Hauserman, Schwochau, and Stibal (2003) performed a meta-analysis of the incidence of sexual harassment in the U.S. in which 58% of the women reported experiencing potentially harassing behaviors and 24% reported experiencing sexual harassment at the workplace. These two different estimates reflect differences between researchers and respondents’ definitions of sexual harassment, where women demonstrate reluctance to classify sexually offensive experiences as sexual harassment. This is what the authors call the differences between the behavioral experience surveys and the query surveys. In the first one the respondent has to answer if he/she has experienced behaviors that are sexually offensive. In the second one the respondent is directly questioned if he/she has been sexually harassed. Gutek, Murphy, and Douma (2004) explain that this difference is common when using the Sexual Experience Questionnaire, where more participants report some sort of behavioral experience.
related to sexual harassment and less participants report being sexually harassed when they are asked directly if they have been victims of sexual harassment in their workplace.

Icenogle, Eagle, Ahmad, and Hanks (2002) wanted to identify how accurately employees would identify behaviors that may constitute sexual harassment according to the U.S. federal guidelines. In their study they found that the majority of the participants accurately perceived that the behaviors associated with quid pro quo harassment are in fact harassment. Results demonstrate that 81 to 86% of the participants recognized five supervisory behaviors (asks you to have sex with the promise that it will help you on the job, asks you to have sex with the threat that refusing to have sex will hurt you on the job, asks you to go out on a date with the promise that it will help you on the job, asks you to go out on a date with the threat that it will hurt you if you do not go, touches you on the private parts of the body; for example, breast and buttocks) associated with quid pro quo harassment as "always" sexual harassment. Two supervisory behaviors (making gestures of a sexual nature and making sexually offensive comments) associated with quid pro quo harassment were identified as "always" sexual harassment.
by 55% of the participants, but 18% classified them as "never" harassment.

Participants were less likely to recognize supervisory behaviors associated with a hostile work environment. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents did not consider supervisors who make comments about someone’s dress or appearance as sexual harassment. Most of the respondents agree that touching on non-private parts of the body (e.g., shoulder, hand), looking at someone in a flattering way, making comments about appearance that are meant to be insulting, and telling sexually oriented jokes are “never” sexual harassment. Fewer respondents classify these behaviors as "sometimes” harassment. To avoid promoting legal actions against the organization, participants were not asked if they have ever experienced sexual harassment at work, what type of harassment they have experienced and if they perceive harassment as a problem in their workplace. Tang, Yik, Cheung, Choi, and Au (1995) found a similar pattern among Chinese students, who consider explicit request for sex (e.g., touching, kissing) from faculty members and peers more sexually harassing than implicit approaches (e.g., pressure for dates, gender jokes).
Similar findings were found by Solomon and Williams (1997) in a sexual harassment perceptions study. Their sexual harassment study was developed with college students between the ages of 19 to 33. It was hypothesized that messages that transmit sexual interest with greater explicitness are perceived as more harassing than messages that transmit sexual interest with less explicitness. The researchers found a significant main effect for this hypothesis; messages that communicate sexual interest with explicitness were rated as more harassing than implicit sexual interest. Twenty-six percent of the variance in observer’s harassment judgments was explained by the explicitness of the sexual interest messages. The authors explained that an indirect harassing message provides to the perceiver the opportunity to create more desirable interpretations of implicit harassing messages. People give space to other alternatives, like “may be its just my imagination, he/she is just trying to be nice, he/she is not like that”. On the other hand, an explicit harassing message does not provide that space, the receiver does not have the ability to reinterpret a sender’s intentions.

Exploring the possible relationship between sexual harassment and age, Welsh (1999) explained that young women may be seen by the harasser as more available and
desirable for sexual interaction than older women. For this reason young women may report higher experience levels of sexual harassment than older women. However, in a sexual harassment perceptions study developed with 886 female office professionals Nielsen (1996) found that older employees do perceive potentially harassing behaviors (a visual or verbal reference to sex or sexual behavior) as more severe than younger workers. Women ages 50 and over perceive the harassing behaviors significantly more severe than employees 40-49 years old. Taking into consideration the perpetrator age perspective Wayne (2000) found that sexual harassment behaviors were more positively perceived by the victim when the harasser was an older man or a younger woman than a younger man or an older woman. Based on these findings the author concluded that when a violation of social norms regarding age and gender occur the behavior is more likely to be perceived as harassment.

Summarizing findings from the research reviewed we find that reports of sexual harassment are inconsistent with the actual behaviors that women experience. Many of the experiences that are defined as harassing do not lead to a report of sexual harassment. In addition we find that individual differences of the women receiving the
behaviors affects how they interpret and experience the situations. It is important to understand the differences that affect a woman's experiences of the situation and her interpretation of the experience. Culture is one variable that has not been fully explored in the sexual harassment literature. A culture provides a basic orientation to create and understand the world around us, and to function effectively in it (Gone, Miller, and Rappaport, 1999; Ratner, 2000). Cultural differences lead to different values and societal norms.

Ratner (2000) considers that the development of a culture is an on-going historical process. Since every cultural group has different needs, cultural norms and values are continuously adapted to fulfill these needs. For example, cultural groups have different needs of belongingness or identity. Hence, culture has a self-making purpose (Gone, Miller, and Rappaport, 1999; Ratner, 2000; Tamminen, 2006). Also, the history and geography of every single societal group contributes to its culture. Every group has been through different life experiences and historical events that determine their values and norms. Cultural norms and values provide meaning to interpersonal relations that we can see reflected in societies' politics, work, education, medical
care, and religion (Ratner, 2000). Based on the different histories of countries across the world we often see cultural differences between countries. Three variables that have been identified in the cross cultural literature include individualism, extroversion, and feminism. These variables reflect the different cultural values that have developed between countries. Individualism, extroversion, and feminism may help us understand how women from different ethnicities may vary in how they experience behaviors that have been defined as harassing.

**Individualism/Collectivism**

The relationship between individualism and sexual harassment has not been directly studied. We believe that individualistic people may be more vulnerable to experience sexual harassment since researchers indicate that individualistic people are more likely to protect their own interests compared to less individualistic people who look forward to protect their group interests. “In high individualistic cultures, individuals tend to look out after their own interests; in highly collectivist cultures, emphasis is on social ties and the development of cohesive groups” (Shaffer, Joplin, Bell, Lau, & Oguz, 2000). There is little research on sexual harassment that
provides us with direction on how this factor can influence experiences and perceptions of sexual harassment. One of the reasons for the lack of direction on how individualism can affect experiences and perceptions of harassment is that most of the empirical research on sexual harassment has been developed in the United States where there may not be substantial individualism variations. It is important to study this phenomenon in different cultural contexts where we can find different degrees of individualism to compare and reach a broader understanding (Matsui, Kakuyama, Onglantco, & Ogutu, 1995). Within a culture or a society we can find individuals with either individualistic or collectivistic tendencies. But since individualism is a socialization factor embedded in the culture it is hard to find significant differences. It is more appropriate to look across different cultures.

Triandis (2001) argues that people in collectivistic societies compared to people in individualistic societies are more likely to identify themselves as part of a group. Oyserman, Sakamoto, and Lauffer (1998) have found that collectivistic people are more socially committed while individualism reduces social commitment in the individual. Yamagishi, Jin, and Miller (1998) provide evidence that
shows that collectivistics prefer to give favor to in-group members rather than out-group members because they expect that the favor is more likely to be returned when it is given to an in-group member than to an out-group member.

According to Triandis and Suh (2002) idiocentrism and allocentrism are personality attributes that should be mentioned when talking about individualism/collectivism. Idiocentrism involves self-reliance, competition, uniqueness, hedonism, and emotional distance from in-groups. Allocentrism involves interdependence, sociability, and family integrity. Idiocentric people are more common in individualistic and allocentristics are more common in collectivistic societies.

Individualism and collectivism can affect individual factors. For example, Klassen (2004) has found that self-efficacy, which is the belief that you are capable to perform certain tasks use to be higher in individualistic societies than in collectivistic societies. Also, Triandis and Suh (2002) argue that people in individualistic societies have more positive self-esteem and are more optimistic than people in collectivistic cultures.

Hofstede (1980) conducted one of the most comprehensive studies in the workplace across-cultures. In
His study Hofstede measured national differences in four dimensions named individualism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance and masculinity. He developed indexes for each one of these dimensions. All the indexes range from 0 to 100 where higher scores indicate higher levels of the dimension. The author measured these indexes from 13,958 employees (10,722 males, and 3,236 females) from 40 different countries. Below we discuss all dimensions except masculinity which will be discussed in a further section of this paper.

The Individualism Index (IDV) is based on what Hofstede considers the “intrinsic-extrinsic” factor. This factor indicates individualism orientation based on work goals named personal time, freedom, challenge at work, use of skills, working conditions, and training. The first three goals have positive loadings and are associated with the extrinsic dimension of the factor or the participants’ independence from their organization. The last three have negative loadings and are associated with the intrinsic dimension of the factor or the participants’ dependency of their organization. The United States scored the highest IDV (91) for this category and Japan showed a moderately collectivistic score (46) and was ranked number 22 in the list of 40 countries.
Nine-teen years after Hofstede’s study there is still evidence of differences in individualism and collectivism between Japanese and Americans. Ken-ichi, Shizuka, and Tedeschi (1999) found higher collectivism rates among Japanese students than American students. Japanese were more concerned about maintaining relationships with others and preferred confrontation avoidance to managing conflict. Americans were more concerned about fairness in a conflict situation and preferred assertive approaches (e.g., insisting on a position, anger at the other).

The Power Distance Index (PDI) describes the inequality in authority in the relationship between superiors and subordinates. Japan scored 46 (PDI) and was ranked number 22, and the United States scored 40 and was ranked number 38. Uncertainty avoidance is the degree to which the participants tolerate the future’s uncertainty. Japan scored 92 in the Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI) and was ranked number one. The United States scored 46 and was ranked 43.

Luthar and Luthar (2002) believe that it is more difficult for individuals in collectivistic societies to distance themselves from the group norms. They proposed several women sexual harassment hypotheses based on Hofstede’s cross-cultural dimensions. They proposed that
sexual harassment experiences would be more accepted (positively perceived) by females in countries with lower individualism levels. They also proposed that women in countries with higher power distance will perceive sexual harassment experiences as more acceptable than women in lower power distance countries. This proposal comes from the belief that females that occupy lower status in their societies may see sexual harassment behaviors as part of males' legitimate exercise of power. A third proposition was that women in countries with high uncertainty avoidance levels would be less likely to make sexual harassment accusations than women in countries with low uncertainty levels. This proposition comes from the assumption that questioning the behaviors and decisions of others is not respectful, even if these are harassing behaviors. Considering these hypotheses Japanese women should be more likely to tolerate and accept sexual harassment behaviors than American women, and less likely to accuse the harasser than American women. However, the authors limited themselves to proposed hypotheses but did not test them empirically. By using a standardized individualism scale like the one developed by Triandis (1995) we could directly measure individualism and test its relationship to sexual harassment experiences. This
approach could help us move from the hypothesis
development to the hypothesis testing research phase.
Indeed if we find a relationship between individualism and
sexual harassment experiences we will be opening doors to
a new perspective in sexual harassment research.

Differences in Communication Styles in
Individualism and Collectivism

Another aspect to be considered within individualism
is communication. Sexual harassment is a communication
process in which the perpetrator is communicating its
intentions to the victim, in turn; the victim experiences
the behaviors and perceives them as a threat. Further,
differences in communication styles, which are a
characteristic of individualistic and collectivistic
societies, could determine sexual harassment behavioral
experiences and perceptions. When we think about Western
and Asian cultures' communication styles we can easily
identify the dissimilarity. Western societies value direct
communication in tension contexts and are more tolerant of
physical contact and body language than Asian societies
whom are more likely to use indirect communications styles
(Kirkbride, Tang, & Westwood, 1991). Based on this
statement we should consider that sexual harassment can
involve tense interaction, physical contact and/or body language.

Chinese as well as most collectivistic societies differ from Western societies in the way they perceive and approach conflict. These societies are more likely to avoid confrontation of sexual harassment experiences, and may deny the experiences to avoid conflict and keep harmony with in-group members (Chan, Tang, & Chan, 1999; Kirkbride, Tang, & Westwood, 1991). In conflict situations they are more likely to assume compromising and avoiding styles than the classical westerns' assertive and aggressive styles. Even more, Chinese elevated respect for power figures may lead them to yield to authority figures' requests (Kirkbride, Tang, & Westwood, 1991).

Dsilva and Whyte (1997) agree that collectivistic and individualistic cultures use different communications styles. They comment that collectivistic societies are more likely to use high context and individualistic societies low context communication patterns. High context communication is more intuitive and less verbal. The information is internalized by the individual and the information is implicitly communicated through the physical context while the verbal expression lacks explicit message. Low context communication is the
opposite; the individual use an explicit verbal message to communicate. The high context assumption has been confirmed in an empirical study that revealed that Indians, who are characterized by a collectivistic culture, prefer indirect communication and have more positive perceptions of silence than Americans (Kapoor, Hughes, Baldwin, & Blue, 2003).

According to Triandis (2001) collectivistics give priority to in-group matters and focus on context (which is how something is said) more than content (which is what was said) when communicating. External processes are more relevant than internal processes to determine their behavior. In conflict situations collectivistics are more interested in keeping the relationship with the other party and individualistics are more concern about achieving justice.

In a study evaluating negative feelings related to peer criticism Niikura (1999) developed scenarios where the participants experienced criticism of a personal idea. The purpose of the scenario was to induce the participants to express their negative feelings to a work peer. A factor analysis revealed that the American, Malaysian, and Filipino samples shared common response patterns. The participants from these three countries were more likely
to feel bad about the opposition to their ideas but keep silent, accept only the part of their colleague’s argument that sound reasonable, and/or openly reject their peer’s argument. On the other hand Japanese participants were more likely to give full support or accept their peer’s argument. Also, Japanese, Malaysians and Filipinos were less likely than Americans to decline a favor request from a senior colleague.

Gao (1998) used a rural Chinese TV series to collect and analyze interpersonal communication data present in the series. He found that “face” and “other” concerns are factors that play important roles in Chinese interpersonal communication. “Face (lian) represents the confidence of society in the integrity of one’s ego’s moral character, the loss of which makes it impossible for him/her to function properly within the community” (Hu, 1944; as cited in Gao, 1998). Loosing face was related to situations in which personal integrity was at risk. The loss of face brings shame to the person and his/her in-group members; therefore a person without face and his/her in-group is viewed as a person or group without integrity by other community members. That is why there may be a restriction to communicate negative information that may harm the face of the person and his/her in-group.
Also, "other" consideration plays an important role in Chinese interpersonal communication. It is important for Chinese not to let others down; Chinese people use persuasion on individuals to enhance close community support. Similar to what Niikura (1999) found in the Japanese sample this study shows that Chinese people try not to disappoint others by accepting their requests. Individualism/Collectivism has been identified as a key variable in the face concept which has a direct effect on avoiding conflict style (Oetzel & Ting-Toomey, 2003).

Gudykunst, Yoon, and Nishida (1987) studied personalized communication (which involves intimacy), synchronized communication (which involves smooth flow), and difficult communication (which involves communication barriers) among American, Japanese and Korean students. The American participants show the lowest personalization and synchronization in in-group relationships, followed by Japanese, and Koreans with the highest level. Korean participants show the lowest levels of difficulty, followed by Japanese and Americans with the highest difficulty level.

Ambady, Koo, Lee, and Rosenthal (1996) developed a communication study with a sample of Korean stockbrokers and American students. Korean participants oriented their
politeness based on relational circumstances. The Koreans also demonstrated more other oriented strategies (e.g. attentive, approving, and empathic) toward supervisors than to subordinates and coworkers. These differences were not found in the American sample. Americans based their politeness strategies on the content of their communications. Americans were more other oriented when communicating good news and more circumspect (e.g. uncertain, indirect, avoidant) when communicating bad news. Unfortunately, we could not find studies with a direct relationship between individualism and sexual harassment, which in fact motivated us to explore the relationship between these two variables.

Personality Trait: Extroversion

Sexual harassment has been broadly studied in terms of age differences and gender differences, but researchers have not been curious enough about one of the most attractive and interesting topics of social psychology: personality traits. Although the five-factor model offers us much more than extroversion, we consider this trait quite relevant to sexual harassment experiences research. We believe that extroverted people may report more sexual harassment experiences than introverted people. It is
widely known that extroverters are perceived by others different compared to introverters, even more, extroverters could experience and perceive the world different compared to introverters, which make us believe that there will be sexual harassment differences based on levels of extroversion.

An individual’s personality depends not only on genetic factors but also on environmental factors, including culture (Triandis & Suh, 2002). This implies that extroversion as a personality trait could be affected by culture. In addition we could find differences of extroversion across culture. Extroversion is highly related to individual’s communication patterns, which make this section overlap with the previous one. As a matter of fact shyness has been identified and included in measurement instruments as an extroversion component (Saucier, 1994). In an interesting personality study Zimbardo (1977) collected shyness data from different ethnic groups. He found the highest shyness rating among Japanese. Seventy five percent of the Japanese participants considered shyness a problem. However, more Japanese (20%) than any other participants in this study reported that they liked being shy. The author concluded that Japanese are socialized from early childhood to be
shy. Twenty-seven years after Zimbardo’s shyness study Sakuragi (2004) also found higher shyness rates among Japanese students compared to American students.

Shame plays a key role in the development of shyness in Japan. Japanese have a tendency to be concerned about avoiding shame and recur to shyness to avoid situations that could turn into shame for them (Zimbardo, 1977). This proposition suggests that face concerns as studied by Gao (1998) in China could be applied to Japan.

Matsumoto, Takeuchi, Andayani, Kouznetsova, and Krupp (1998) assessed the display of emotions (anger, contempt, disgust, fear, happiness, sadness, and surprise) in different contexts of social relationships (with family, close friends, colleagues, and strangers) among Americans and Japanese. Overall, they found that Japanese display more control over their emotional expressions than their American counterparts. Since extroversion/introversion is characterized by differences in emotional expression these findings could be associated to our idea that there may be differences in extroversion levels between Japanese and Americans.

Linking extroversion to sexual harassment perceptions Lester, Banta, Barton, Elian, Mackiewicz, and Winkelried (1986) performed a study where they presented several
sexual harassment situational experiences to female college students and asked them to rate the degree of sexual harassment that they perceived in the situation. They found that extroverted students perceived less sexual harassment in the situations. Even though these findings are the opposite of our proposition, this study revealed a significant association between extraversion and sexual harassment attitudes. Although there is a limited amount of literature on this topic our intention is to expand the scientific knowledge in this area in order to highlight the importance of extroversion in the sexual harassment research.

Feminism

Feminism is another variable that has been included in sexual harassment research. Sexual harassment is a form of oppression and feminists are more likely to resist oppression. Thus, we believe that women with higher feminism characteristics will have different sexual harassment experiences than women with less feminism levels. They could be more likely to be targeted by sexual harassers that may want to humiliate them or put them down. Hence, they may be more likely to report sexual harassment experiences.
Matsui, Kakuyama, Onglantco, and Ogutu (1995) used a sample of 258 female freshmen Japanese college students enrolled in a university located in Tokyo to develop a perceptual study of sexual harassment. They manipulated three contextual variables: harasser status (co-worker vs. supervisor), harasser-victim closeness of relationship (friendly vs. distant), and sexual harassment experience: body area touched (back vs. fanny), and presented a common situation were the harasser says "Hurry up, you'll never get everything done today". The authors found that women who hold liberal sex-role attitudes perceived the sexual behavior as more inappropriate than women with conservative attitudes. Body touching was the only variable that influenced women to perceive the situation more inappropriate and intimidating. Touching the buttocks always had a higher mean score than touching the back. However, the buttocks mean scores run from mild to somewhat inappropriate. Subjects did not perceive the behavior very sexual even if the touched area was the buttocks. They also found that 53% of the women in this study would do nothing or ignore the sexual behavior even if it involved touching their buttocks. Even liberal women did not expect the victim to make the incident public. A
direct complaint to the harasser or the harasser’s supervisor was not expected either.

Matsui, Kakuyama, Onglantco, and Ogutu (1995) explained these reactions arguing that the fact that Japanese women occupy lower status in the hierarchical power structure may promote submission to those who occupy higher status, which are usually men. They also emphasize that an explicit complaint may harm the public esteem, which is highly valued among Japanese. Saving herself and her family esteem may be considered more important for the victim than fighting for her rights. This reaction is also prevalent in the United States, but may be more likely to happen in Japan because women’s submission is expected in Japanese society.

Brooks and Perot (1991) performed a study on the incidence of sexual harassment using the Sexual Experience Questionnaire (SEQ) and the Attitudes Towards Sex-Role Inventory (ATFS) with a sample of students and faculty members in an American university. They found that feminism significantly predicted sexual harassment perceived offensiveness. However, there was no relationship between feminism and frequency of experienced harassing behaviors.
Wasti and Cortina (2002) report that Hispanic American women respond with more avoidance and denial and less advocacy seeking than Anglo American women when they are sexually harassed. The authors argue that these results may be related to "machista" values that dominate Latin American cultures. "Machista" values encourage men to have an early initiation in sexual life, promiscuity, and infidelity. On the other hand, women are devaluated for the same behavior. The authors conclude that Hispanic women may be more likely to accept men sexual harassment behaviors as normal and less worthy of reporting. However, "machista" values are not limited to Hispanic societies, Chinese men have reported to believe that sexual harassment is not prevalent in China, and it is exclusively found in Western societies (Choi, Au, Cheung, Tang, & Yik, 1993; as cited in Bowes-Sperry & Tata, 1999).

Hofstede (1980) used the term masculinity to refer to men assertiveness and femininity to women nurturance tendency or traditionally perceived societal roles. Hofstede (1980) found a factor that opposes masculine and feminine work goals which he identifies as the "social-ego" factor. Men show to be more oriented to ego work goals (e.g. advancement, training, and earnings) and for women social work goals (interpersonal aspects,
service orientation, job security, and the environment) were more important. Based on this factor they created the Masculinity Index (MAS). Like the Individualism Index (IDV) mentioned in the individualism section of this paper this index ranges from 0 to 100, where higher masculine goals in a country resulted in a higher MAS. Ideas of male dominance or "machismo" in social structures characterized high MAS countries. Among the 40 countries Japan scored the highest (95) MAS. The United States ranked 13 with a 62 MAS score. It is important to consider that most of the participants of Hofstede's study were men. Specifically, for Japan, they used the minimum required number of female participants (n = 20). Also, it should be mentioned that MAS show a significant positive association with the percentage of working women in professional and technical jobs. Even though there are just a handful of studies in the literature linking feminism and sexual harassment, we have enough evidence to believe that feminism is a relevant variable in the sexual harassment research.

Taking into account the importance of culture and its differences in sexual harassment research, we consider three cultural variables in our study: individualism, feminism, and extroversion. We believe that these variables will differ across three cultural groups.
(Ameicans, Puerto Ricans, and Japanese) and that they will positively predict sexual harassment. The reason for choosing these variables is that we consider that women higher in individualism, feminism, and extroversion will be more likely to report sexual harassment experiences. For example, we believe that individualistics are more likely than collectivistics to protect personal interests over group or organizational interests. We also believe that feminists are more likely than machistas to reject oppression and speak out for their rights. In the same way we believe that extroverters are more likely than introverters to externalize their thoughts and feelings. The mentioned characteristics for each variable should lead women to report higher sexual harassment experiences.

It is important to highlight that when we refer to “country” in this paper we are referring to the geographical areas (Unites States, Puerto Rico, and Japan) where we expect to find cultural differences.

Ethnicity and Sexual Harassment

Giuffre and Williams (1994) found that people’s ethnicity can influence their perceptions of sexual harassment experiences. They studied the behavior of waiters and waitresses in their workplace and found that
the participants flirted constantly with peers of their same ethnicity. This behavioral experience was acceptable, but when the same harassing behavior was coming from peers of different ethnicities it was more likely to be perceived as sexual harassment.

Recognizing that most of the research in the sexual harassment area has been developed with samples of White-Caucasian, Shelton, and Chavous (1999) developed a study composed of eighty-nine White female and forty-six black female, college students. The participants received a package of harassment situations (experiences) in which the woman was always black and the man (harasser) was either white or black. Also, the harasser was either the woman’s supervisor or co-worker.

They found a relationship between how appropriate the participants perceived the harasser’s behavior and how humorous the incident was perceived. As predicted, black women perceived black men harassing behavior more appropriate and humorous than from white men. Black women consider their co-worker’s behavior as more appropriate and humorous when he was black than from white co-workers. However, there was no significant difference in black women ratings for her supervisors, regardless of race. On
the other hand, White females' did not show significant mean differences in any one of these measures.

Based on these findings the authors suggest that race and the power level of the harasser promoted different perceptions of sexual harassment experiences on White and Black women regarding Black women's sexual harassment experiences. White women's perceptions do not show to be affected by these variables. But Black women seem to be more lenient to accept (positive perception) same race sexual harassment, than interracial sexual harassment.

Cortina et al. (2002) examined the contribution of several cultural and universal factors that may affect sexual harassment experiences and perceptions. Since most of the research of sexual harassment has been developed with White/European samples it is not reasonable at this point to generalize the result of that research to minorities' sexual harassment. They developed a study with 184 Latina victims of sexual harassment experiences. Most of the participants were young, low educated Mexican women from San Diego and Chicago metropolitan areas.

They argued that the "power of the harasser" cultural factor is important when studying sexual harassment among Latinas because their culture has high respect for power figures in social structures. Cortina et al. (2002) think
that there are two rival hypotheses that can explain the influence of this factor on the perception of Latinas' sexual harassment experiences. Their first hypothesis argues that sexual harassment coming from a power figure is more threatening and intimidating for Latinas, further it may be perceived as more severe. The second one argues that since a power figure is expected to exercise its power, harassment is expected from this source, further harassment is perceived as less severe from a power figure.

Under contextual factors, the authors hypothesized that Latinas may perceive sexual harassment behavioral experiences as more severe in organizational climates where racial harassment is tolerated. The researchers found support for this hypothesis; racial harassment was related to the severity of sexual harassment perceptions. Latinas perceived sexual harassment experiences as more severe in organizations that tolerate racial harassment. Also, data analysis reflects that the more power the harasser has in the organization the more severe the harassment experience is perceived by the participants. When they compared this finding to similar White sample studies they found that the correlation between power of the harasser and perceived severity of the harassment
experience is much higher for this study using a Latina sample. The authors commented that the nature of this high correlation may reflect Latinas’ strong sense of respect for authority figures.

Finally, acculturation is a cultural individual factor that can determine Latinas’ perception of a harassment experience. Acculturation is the change in Latin values, norms and attitudes as a result of the exposure to the mainstream United States culture. Another finding of the Cortina et al. (2002) study is that the more acculturated Latinas are the more they perceive the harassment experience as more severe. A possible explanation for this according to Rogler, Cortes, and Malgady (1991) is that acculturated Latinas have adopted feminist standpoints that make them perceive harassment experiences more negatively when they arise.

As we can see perceptions of sexual harassment experiences is a subjective process individually defined and judged by the perceiver. However, societies’ cultural norms and values could play a crucial role in the harassment experience and the individual’s judgments of such experiences. Countries’ laws and regulations are driven by society’s cultural norms and values. Considering the possible differences of countries’ laws and
regulations regarding sexual harassment Napier and Taylor (2002) developed an exploratory study of foreign women working in different countries including China and Japan. In China the government has supported women’s equality through policies; but this is not Japan’s case, where power remains unequally with men. Not surprisingly most of the women working in Japan had a sexual harassment experience. On the other hand, women in China were less likely to experience harassment experiences than woman in Japan. These differences in sexual harassment experience between Japan and China may reflect the effectiveness of equality laws and organizational policies in China. However, Napier and Taylor’s (2002) study cannot generalize to the whole Chinese population. Having equality laws and organizational policies does not necessarily mean that they are being effectively implemented. Shaffer, Joplin, Bell, Lau, and Oguenz, (2000) argue that China has had “women equality” laws and policies since 1954, but regardless of the relative long period of time the equal opportunity legislation has been ineffective in this country.

Matsuda, Harsel, Furusawa, Kim, and Quarles (2001) asked participants from Australia, United States, Japan, and South Korea to evaluate each of these countries
commitment to human rights violations, including women’s rights. Japan and South Korea were more negatively evaluated than Australia and the United States. These findings are relevant considering that sexual harassment is a human rights issue that mainly affects women.

There is empirical evidence and theoretical assumptions indicating that culturally related variables could influence experiences and perceptions of sexual harassment. Individualism, feminism, and extroversion are culturally related variables that could have an effect on experiences and perceptions of sexual harassment. However, the relationship between these variables and sexual harassment has not been studied in depth. As a matter of fact we did not find associations between these three variables and sexual harassment in the ethnical studies mentioned in this section. There is no empirical evidence in the literature on how these three variables combined affect sexual harassment. This study seeks to understand how individualism, feminism, and extroversion influence sexual harassment among women.
Hypotheses

Based on the literature review we expect to find differences in individualism, feminism, and extroversion across cultures. These differences should lead to differences in sexual harassment experiences. Additionally, individualism, feminism, and extroversion should predict sexual harassment.

H1: There will be significant mean differences in individualism across cultures. Americans will report higher individualism, followed by Puerto Ricans, followed by Japanese.

H2: There will be significant mean differences in feminism across cultures. Americans will report higher feminism, followed by Puerto Ricans, followed by Japanese.

H3: There will be significant mean differences in extroversion across cultures. Americans will report higher extroversion followed by Puerto Ricans, followed by Japanese.

H4: There will be significant mean differences in sexual harassment across cultures. Americans will report higher sexual harassment experiences, followed by Puerto Ricans, followed by Japanese.
H5: In the following figure, the rectangles are representing measured variables. The arrows connecting the rectangles represent the direction of hypothesized relationships. If there is no arrow connecting the rectangles there is no hypothesized relationship. We hypothesize that individualism, extroversion, and feminism will positively predict sexual harassment experience.

Figure 1. Hypothesized Path Model
CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Participants

Although we acknowledge that men experience sexual harassment that runs from dating requests to sexual intercourse requests (Fiebert & Tucci, 1998), just as women do, we limited the participation in this study to female participants, the classical sexual harassment victim. This decision was made on the fact that gender has consistently predicted definitions of sexual harassment in self reports (Gutek, 1995). Overall, men are more tolerant of sexual harassment than woman (Ford & Donis, 1996).

The sample was limited to only one Latin-American country (Puerto Rico) and one Asian country (Japan) because language differences could cause confounds and constrained resources to collect data abroad. We collected data from a total of 503 employed females: 183 from the United States, 164 from Puerto Rico, and 156 from Japan. Their participation in this study was voluntary. Participants received a summary of the study and a consent form to sign; however, for the computer based survey participants did not sign, instead they clicked “continue” to the surveys if they agreed to participate in the study.
The sample was composed of Latin Americans (36.8%), Japanese (30.9%), White/Caucasians (20.0%), Blacks/African-Americans (5.1%), other ethnicities (4.0%), and Native Americans (0.8%). Participants’ age range in this study was 18 to 66 years, and the mean age was 35 years. Most of the participants were between 18 and 32 years old (50.7%), followed by participants between 33 and 52 years old (40.0%), followed by participants between 53 and 66 years old (9.3%). Most of the participants were married (42.0%), or single (41.4%). All others were divorced (5.7%), cohabitating (4.6%), widowed (4.4%), and separated (1.8%).

Measures

Sexual harassment perceptions were measured using the Sexual Experience Questionnaire (SEQ) (Fitzgerald, Shullman, Bailey, Richards, Swecker, Gold, Ormerod, & Weitzman, 1988). We used the behavioral experience items of the measure and excluded a subjective perceptions (query) item that was not part of any sexual harassment dimension specified by the author. Since we focused this study on sexual harassment experiences we also excluded the perceptions portion of the scale where the participants indicate how much the behaviors bothered
them. A behavioral experience sample item would be “DURING THE PAST 24 MONTHS at this organization, have you been in a situation where any of your MALE supervisors or co-workers: habitually told suggestive stories or offensive jokes?” Participants responded on a 5 point Likert scale anchored with 1 = Never to 5 = Many Times. The Cronbach alpha reliability for the SEQ in this study was .84.

Individualism was measured with The Individualism/Collectivism Scale developed by Triandis (1995). This scale has four dimensions named Horizontal Individualism (HI): where people want to be unique and do their own thing, Vertical Individualism (VI): where people want to do their own thing and also to be the best, Horizontal Collectivism (HC): where people merge themselves with the in-group, and Vertical Collectivism (VC): where people submit to the authorities of the in-group (Triandis 2001; Triandis & Suh 2002). “In both individualist and collectivist cultures, the vertical dimension accepts inequality, and rank has its privileges. In contrast, the horizontal dimension emphasizes that people should be similar on most attributes, especially status” (Triandis, 1995).
Participants responded on a 9 point Likert scale anchored with 1 = Strongly Disagree to 9 = Strongly Agree. A Horizontal Individualism sample item would be "Being a unique individual is important to me". A Vertical Collectivism sample item would be "I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group". Unfortunately we had to exclude the Vertical Individualism items from this study since we find that this dimension was decreasing the Cronbach alpha reliability of the whole scale to .52. The Cronbach alpha reliability for this scale after removing the Vertical Individualism dimension was .74.

Feminism was measured with The Attitudes Towards Feminism Scale (FEM) (Smith, Ferree, & Miller, 1975). Participants responded on a 5 point Likert scale anchored with 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree. The Cronbach alpha reliability of this instrument for this study was .75.

We used Saucier’s (1994) Big-Five Mini-Marker Set to measure extroversion. Before each trait participants wrote a number indicating how accurately that trait described them. Participants responded on a 9 point Likert scale anchored with 1 = Extremely Inaccurate to 9 = Extremely
Accurate. A sample item would be "Talkative". This scale shows a Cronbach alpha reliability of .78 in this study.

Procedures

These measures were translated to Spanish and Japanese and translated back into English to verify the accuracy of the meaning. Two Subject Matter Expert (SME) panels were used for the translation of these measures, one was composed of three Spanish speakers from Puerto Rico and the other one was composed of three native Japanese speakers. The members of these two panels were at least moderately fluent in English. The purpose of using these SME panels was to ensure that the actual meaning of the instruments was maintained in the translated surveys.

The data was collected both electronically and on a paper and pencil basis. Electronic surveys were distributed via e-mail using a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) web-link. Every participant received an invitation letter via e-mail asking them to voluntarily participate in the study. Participants where asked to click on the surveys' electronic link that was attached in this letter. When the participants clicked on the link they where directed to the electronic survey where they could read the informed consent and start answering the questions by
pointing with their computer mouse on the desired answer and clicking it. Participants were able to change their answers and move back and forward through the survey if desired. However, once they selected the submit button at the end of the survey they were not able to change any answer. After they submitted their completed survey the data was automatically sent to an electronic database which eliminated the data entry process.

Most of the data collected from this source was from unknown participants. In the United States the URL web-link was mainly distributed to a government agency e-mail address database provided by a government official. In Puerto Rico it was mainly distributed to public e-mail addresses from employees of a university system. In Japan it was mostly distributed by a collaborator as “bulk mail” through an electronic database of e-mail addresses that are usually used for marketing purposes. Participants where asked to forward the URL web-link to other potential participants. From this source we collected 153 from the United States, 109 from Japan, and 40 from Puerto Rico.

For the paper and pencil version participants did not receive an invitation letter like the electronic version participants did. Instead we verbally ask them for their collaboration in this study. Those interested in the study
received the survey in an enveloped and where asked to return the completed survey sealed in the same envelop. The survey package for this version included the same informed consent, surveys and debriefing statement included in the electronic version. After participants returned the completed survey the data was entered in an SPSS file. We did not targeted male participants, but some males decided to voluntarily participate either in the electronic or paper and pencil version. Their participation was not denied but their information was deleted from the database.

In the United States the paper and pencil survey was distributed to employees in a public school in Southern California. In Puerto Rico it was distributed in the west and north-east regions of the island. Most of the participants were public school and food services employees. In Japan the paper and pencil surveys was distributed among employees in a public agency. From this source we collected 30 from the United States, 47 from Japan, and 124 from Puerto Rico.
CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Assumptions

Before evaluating assumptions individual scores were computed for sexual harassment (gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion), feminism (general social roles, family roles, and authority roles), and individualism (vertical collectivism, horizontal collectivism, vertical individualism, and horizontal individualism), and extroversion (bold, extraverted, talkative, energetic, bashful, quiet, shy, and withdrawn). A missing value analysis was done using SPSS on a sample of 503 participants. Forty (8.0%) individuals were missing data on sexual harassment, twenty-five (5.0%) individuals were missing data on individualism, twenty (4.0%) individuals were missing data on feminism, and twenty-seven (5.4%) individuals were missing data on extroversion. Little’s MCAR test was examined; it was found to be non-significant ($\chi^2 = 47.109$, df = 25, $p > .001$). A t test reflected that missing data on extroversion was significantly related to both individualism and feminism. However, we did not consider these relationships meaningful for several reasons. First,
the questions of these variables do not have a sensitive content that could raise a missing pattern among them. Second, the percentage (5.4%) of missing data for extroversion is marginal. As a result, the missing data was imputed using EM algorithm. Although the missing data for sexual harassment was high Tabachnick and Fidell (2000) indicate that the pattern of missing data is more important than the amount of missing data. The fact that our data is MCAR and that we have a fairly robust data set allowed us to impute the data. This decision prevented from loosing participants across variables.

The data was then examined for outliers and normality using SPSS. Using a Mahalanobis distance (p < .001) 3 multivariate outliers were found. To describe the outliers a new variable was created with 2 values (1 = outlier, 0 = not an outlier) and was used as dependent variables with sexual harassment, individualism, feminism, and extroversion as the independent variables in a standard regression analysis. It was found that we could significantly predict multivariate outlier #1 from horizontal collectivism (score 2.25), authority (4.00), energetic (8.00), extraverted (1.00), bashful (9.00), and withdrawn (1.00). It was also found that we could significantly predict the multivariate outlier #2 from
horizontal individualism (1.00), and the withdrawn (9.00) item. Finally, we can significantly predict outlier #3 from horizontal collectivism (2.00), vertical individualism (2.13), and horizontal individualism (9.00). After deleting the 3 multivariate outliers the data was examined for univariate outliers using a sample size of 500 participants, and a criteria z score of 3.3 and -3.3. Five univariate outliers were found and eliminated from the database. Sexual harassment was found to be significantly positively skewed and kurtotic; however its skewness and kurtosis is natural since most participants did not experience or experience low sexual harassment (See table 1). Since we were expecting sexual harassment to be naturally skewed we will interpret the Satorra-Bentler Chi Square, and fit indices for the path analysis.

Linearity was assessed by examining pair-wise scatter plots between sexual harassment and extroversion, feminism and individualism, and extroversion and feminism. Since the scatter plots were not oval shaped linearity was not assumed. The assumptions of multivariate normality, multicollinearity, singularity and homoscedasticity were examined using EQS. Multivariate normality was violated since the normalized estimate is 7.75 which is greater
than $\pm 3.3$. The determinant of input matrix is $1.4309D+00$, this is greater than 0, indicating that we do not have multicollinearity or singularity. The distribution of the residuals was largely centered around 0, indicating that we have normality of residuals.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Measured Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measured Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>21.00*</td>
<td>27.92*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>-2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminism</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>-2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroversion</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $z > 3.3$

A series of t-tests were conducted on all the four variables between the paper-and-pencil method and the online method. There were no statistically significant mean differences found in the sexual harassment and extroversion scores between the two types of methods, $t(493) = -.59, p > .05$ and $t(493) = -.31, p > .05$, respectively. However, for the feminism and individualism scores, there were statistically significant mean differences found between the methods, $t(493) = 2.46, p < .05$ and $t(493) = 6.53, p < .05$, respectively. On the feminism scores, participants with the paper-and-pencil
method \((M = 2.17\) and \(SD = .49\)) scored significantly higher (higher scores means lower feminism) than those with the online method \((M = 2.05\) and \(SD = .60\)). For the individualism scores, participants with the paper-and-pencil method \((M = 6.98\) and \(SD = .98\)) scored significantly higher than those with the online method \((M = 6.40\) and \(SD = .95\)).

In order to explore the significant differences in depth we decided to conduct a series of t-tests on all the four variables between the paper-and-pencil method and the online method by country. For the United States there were not statistically significant mean differences found in the sexual harassment, individualism, and extroversion scores between the two types of methods, \(t(177) = -.81, p > .05; t(177) = .91, p > .05; t(177) = -.58, p > .05\), respectively. However, for feminism there were statistically significant mean differences found between the methods, \(t(177) = 2.34, p < .05\). On the feminism scores participants with the paper-and-pencil method \((M = 2.10\) and \(SD = .53\)) scored significantly higher (higher scores means lower feminism) than those with the online method \((M = 1.82\) and \(SD = .57\)).

For Puerto Rico there were not statistically significant mean differences found in the sexual
harassment and individualism scores between the two types of methods, \( t(159) = .16, p > .05; \) \( t(159) = .55, p > .05. \) Although for the feminism and extroversion scores there were statistically significant mean differences found between the methods, \( t(159) = 5.10, p < .05; \) \( t(159) = -2.10, p < .05, \) respectively. On the feminism scores participants with the paper-and-pencil method \( (M = 2.20 \text{ and } SD = .49) \) scored significantly higher (higher scores means lower feminism) than those with the online method \( (M = 1.76 \text{ and } SD = .43). \) For the extroversion scores, participants with the online method \( (M = 6.00 \text{ and } SD = 1.25) \) scored significantly higher than those with the paper-and-pencil method \( (M = 5.53 \text{ and } SD = 1.08). \)

Finally, for Japan there were not statistically significant mean differences found in extroversion scores between the two types of methods, \( t(153) = .97, p > .05. \) However, for sexual harassment, individualism, and feminism scores there were statistically significant mean differences found between the methods, \( t(153) = -2.61, p < .05; \) \( t(153) = 3.77, p < .05; \) \( t(153) = -3.85, p < .05, \) respectively. On the sexual harassment scores participants with the online method \( (M = 1.40 \text{ and } SD = .48) \) scored significantly higher than those with the paper-and-pencil
method ($M = 1.21$ and $SD = .24$). For the individualism scores, participants with the paper-and-pencil method ($M = 6.13$ and $SD = .59$) scored significantly higher than those with the online method ($M = 5.80$ and $SD = .55$). Finally, for the feminism scores, participants with the online method ($M = 2.46$ and $SD = .44$) scored significantly higher (higher scores means lower feminism) than those with the paper-and-pencil method ($M = 2.16$ and $SD = .46$).

We can conclude from these analyses that feminism mean scores show statistically significant differences depending on the method used (online vs. paper-and-pencil) across the three cultural groups. However, for the paper-and-pencil method the means were lower in the United States and Puerto Rico, and higher in Japan when compared to the online method. On the other hand, individualism and sexual harassment show significance mean differences between the two methods in Japan only. Differences in paper-and-pencil compared to online data collection methods are commonly reported in the literature (Chang, 2005; Fouladi, McCarthy, and Moller, 2002; Sethuraman, Kerin, and Cron, 2005; Smither, Walker, and Yap, 2004; Wood, Nosko, Desmarais, Ross, and Irvine, 2006). Although we cannot determine what cause these significant differences in our study characteristics of the methods...
may account for these differences. For example, Salgado and Moscoso (2003) have found that participants perceive online surveys more enjoyable than paper-and-pencil surveys.

Using SPSS version 13 planned comparisons were conducted on individualism across countries. The United States’ scores were compared against scores of Japan and Puerto Rico combined. Then, Puerto Rico’s scores were compared against Japan’s scores.

The first comparison was not found to have a statistically significant mean difference in individualism between participants from the United States and participants from Japan and Puerto Rico combined, \( t(494) = .72, p > .05 \). The second comparison was found to have a statistically significant mean difference between participants from Japan and Puerto Rico, \( t(494) = -15.7, p < .05 \). This result indicates that participants from Puerto Rico scored significantly higher in individualism than did participants from Japan. Therefore, the first hypothesis was partially supported.

Planned comparisons were conducted on feminism across the countries. The first comparison was made between the United States’ scores and Puerto Rico and Japan scores combined. The second comparison was made between Puerto
Rico’s and Japan’s scores. Both of the comparisons were found to have statistically significant mean differences in feminism as a function of the countries, $t(494) = -7.44, p < .05$ for the first comparison and $t(494) = 4.81, p < .05$ for the second comparison. The United States participants scored significantly higher in feminism than the participants from Puerto Rico and Japan combined. Participants from Puerto Rico scored significantly higher than did participants from Japan. Thus, the hypothesis was confirmed.

Planned comparisons were conducted on extroversion scores across the countries. The United States’ scores were compared against Puerto Rico’s and Japan’s scores combined. Then, Puerto Rico’s scores were compared against Japan’s scores.

Both of the comparisons were found to have statistically significant mean differences in extroversion scores $t(494) = 4.16, p < .05$ for the first comparison, and $t(494) = -4.91, p < .05$ for the second comparison. Participants from the United States scored significantly higher on extroversion than participants from Puerto Rico and Japan combined. The result of the second comparison indicates that participants from Puerto Rico scored significantly higher on extroversion than participants
from Japan. Therefore, this third hypothesis was supported (See Table 2 for Means and Standard Deviations on all planned comparisons).

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted sexual harassment across three countries (the United States, Puerto Rico, and Japan) to examine whether there are significant differences in sexual harassment among participants of these countries. Unfortunately, there were no statistical significance found in sexual harassment across countries, $F(2, 492) = 1.19, p > .05$. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis was not supported.

Table 2. Means ($M$) and Standard Deviations ($SD$) for Measured Variables by Country for Planned Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measured Variable</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Planned Comparison 1</th>
<th>Planned Comparison 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Puerto Rico and Japan combined</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualism</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminism</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extroversion</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The higher the score the lower the feminism; the higher the score the higher the individualism; and the higher the score the higher the extroversion.
Previous to the hypothesized path model (H5) we considered a structural model where feminism, extroversion, individualism, and sexual harassment were all factors (represented by circles). Each one of these factors had their respective indicators (represented by rectangles). However, the indicators were correlated across factors (e.g., indicators of feminism were correlated with indicators of extroversion). Because of this statistical clustering we could not perform an analysis based on the initial model. Thus, we decided to reduce the model to measured variables (See figure I) to perform a path analysis. We should also mention that the individual indicators of each factor were correlated with each other which indicates reliable measurement of the factors.

Model Estimation

Structural equation modeling was use to examine the hypothesized relationships. Since normality was violated we use maximum likelihood (ML) estimation and Satorra-Bentler scaled chi-square (Ullman, 2000). Model fit was assessed with the comparative fit index (CFI) and root mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA). Models
with a CFI greater than .95 and RMSEA smaller than .06 are considered good fitting models.

Because of normality violations we estimated the model with maximum likelihood (ML) robust and Satorra-Bentler chi-square. The Comparative fit index (CFI) and root mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA) indicated that the model did not fit the data, \( \chi^2(3, N = 495) = 44.14, \ p = <.05, \ CFI = .29 < .95, \) RMSEA = .17 > .06. The Multivariate Lagrange Multiplier test indicated that covariances between individualism and extroversion, individualism and feminism, and extroversion and feminism needed to be added in order for the model to fit the data. These model modifications were performed in a post hoc analysis. After the modifications we estimated a saturated model which show fitness, \( \chi^2(0, N = 495) = 00.00., \ CFI = 1.00 > .95. \) The Multivariate Wald test indicated that the hypothesized relationship between individualism and sexual harassment was not significant, suggesting it should be deleted. This modification was performed in a post hoc analysis. After this modification the CFI and RMSEA indicated a good model fit \( \chi^2(1, N = 495) = 1.31, \ p = .25, \ CFI = .99 > .95, \) RMSEA = .02 < .06. Four per cent of the total variance in sexual harassment is accounted for by the model that
contains extroversion and feminism ($R^2 = .037$). The participants' sexual harassment experiences could be significantly predicted by their feminism level. For every one-unit increase in their feminism level we can predict a .13 unit increase in their sexual harassment experiences. The participants' sexual harassment experiences could be significantly predicted by their extroversion level. For every one-unit increase in their extroversion level we can predict a .16 unit increase in their sexual harassment experiences. The alpha reliability analysis reflected that vertical individualism dimension of the individualism measure needed to be eliminated to increase the Cronbach alpha reliability of the measure form .54 to .74. Although the Cronbach alpha reliability of this measure was improved the participants' sexual harassment experiences could not be significantly predicted by their individualism level. Correlations among individual variables were examined; there were three significant correlations (See Table 4). The correlation between feminism and extroversion indicates a small, positive relationship between them. It indicates that as participants' feminism scores increase, their extroversion scores tend to increase as well. The correlation between feminism and individualism indicates a small, positive
relationship. It indicates that as participants' feminism scores increases, their individualism scores tend to increase. The last correlation between extroversion and individualism shows a small, positive relationship. It indicates that as participants' extroversion increases, their individualism scores tend to increase.

Table 3. Correlations Between Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (N = 495)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Feminism</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Extroversion</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Individualism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The higher the score the lower the feminism; the higher the score the higher the individualism; and the higher the score the higher the extroversion.
*p<.05
Although we did not find significant differences of sexual harassment experiences across cultures, individualism, feminism and extroversion were significantly different in our sample. Also, our results indicate that extroversion and feminism are significant and low predictors of women's sexual harassment experiences. However, contrary to our proposition individualism did not predict women's sexual harassment. Additionally, we found significant associations between feminism and extroversion, feminism and individualism, and extroversion and individualism.

Most of the participants did not experience or experienced low sexual harassment ($M = 1.33$ and $SD = .48$ in the United States, $M = 1.35$ and $SD = .43$ in Japan, $M = 1.41$ and $SD = .61$ in Puerto Rico) and there were no significant differences in sexual harassment across cultures. We have to consider that even though we found direct and significant effects of the predictors (extroversion and feminism) on sexual harassment experiences, the effects were small. This implies that the influence of extroversion and feminism were not big enough
to induce differences of sexual harassment across the observed cultures. Another possible reason for the lack of sexual harassment experiences differences, specifically between Puerto Rico and the United States is the fact that Puerto Rican culture has been highly influenced by American culture for over a hundred years. Puerto Rico became a United States territory in year 1898, ever since Puerto Ricans have been more exposed than any other Hispanic country to the United States political structure and cultural values. Hence, this cultural interaction could have the capacity of buffering the sexual harassment differences that we were expecting between the Hispanic and the American culture. On the other hand, people from Puerto Rico and Japan, who are identified in the literature by lower levels of individualism and higher "machismo", may try to avoid confronting the harassment and deny the experience (Chan et al., 1999; Kirkbride et al., 1991; Wasti & Cortina, 2002). Since experiencing sexual harassment could be considered an embarrassing situation these groups may want to deny the experience to protect the "face" or integrity of their community (Oetzel & Ting-Toomey, 2003). Therefore, the combination of their face concern and the denial of the harassment experience could be reflected as an under report of sexual harassment.
experiences that contributed to a lack of significant differences across the cultural groups in this study. Additionally, we should consider that women that score low in feminism are less likely to report their sexual harassment experiences (Berdahl, 2007). Moreover, some researchers focus their studies on sexual harassment experience, and some others on both, experiences and perceptions of such experiences. The perceptions element considers the participants’ level of acceptance of the experience. Even though there could be differences in perceptions of the experiences we only considered sexual harassment experiences to make the study parsimonious.

As predicted we did find significant differences in individualism between participants from Puerto Rico and Japan. These findings show that Puerto Rican culture, which was predominately collectivistic in the early beginnings of its history, represented individualistic values in our sample. In contrast Japanese participants show moderate levels of individualism. This is consistent with the literature that indicates that Asian cultures show lower individualism levels than Western cultures (Hofstede, 1980; Ken-ichi, Shizuka, & Tedeschi, 1999). On the other hand participants from the United States did not show significant mean differences in individualism when
compared to the participants from Puerto Rico and Japan combined. Even more, the participants from the United States scored lower than the participants from Puerto Rico in individualism. As we stated earlier, Puerto Rican culture has been highly influenced by the American culture for a long period of time which could explain the higher means in this measure and the lack of significant differences. Also, the United States sample was integrated from members of different ethnic groups including White-Caucasians, African-Americans, Latin-Americans, and participants from other ethnic groups. It is possible that some Latin-Americans and participants from other ethnic groups in the United States sample may be immigrants or early generations of immigrants that have not been fully acculturated to the main stream American culture. Thus, the level of acculturation of some participants may have affected the prediction. In addition we have to consider that we dropped the "vertical individualism" dimension from the individualism scale to improve the Cronbach alpha reliability of the measurement instrument. For this reason we were not able to have a comprehensive measure of individualism which possibly affected our prediction.

The third hypothesis was fully supported. The participants from the United States scored significantly
higher in feminism than Puerto Ricans and Japanese combined, and Puerto Ricans scored significantly higher than Japanese. These findings show that the participants from the United States are less likely to accept men's oppression, and more likely to strive for gender roles equality. This was expected since historically women in the United States have fought for their human rights and social justice. As a result of the social pressure of feminists and other oppressed groups The United States Congress adopted the Title VII of the Civil Rights Act (CRA) in year 1964. This Act enforces equal employment opportunities for minority groups (including women), protecting them from discrimination in the workplace.

The lower feminism mean in Puerto Rico was expected since women in this culture have been subjected to “machista” values, the antagonist of feminism values. Lower mean scores were expected in Japan as well. Japan similarly to Puerto Rico holds traditional gender roles values (Ashikari, 2003; Hofstede, 1980). However, higher means were expected in Puerto Rico than in Japan because the previously mentioned exposition of Puerto Ricans to the American culture and public policies. An example of this is that Puerto Rico, as well as the United States, adopted the CRA Title VII in year 1964 while Japan adopted
and Equal Employment Opportunities Law (EEOL) for the first time on year 1986 (Nowaza, 1995).

Although we found significant differences they were small, and participants from the three countries show high levels of feminism, which is expected from female participants. This indicates that women across countries reject oppression and inequality. However, being immersed in cultures that are dominated by males and characterized by higher oppression could make women slightly less feminist than their counterparts in cultures where women equality is more accepted or encouraged. As a matter of fact, Hofstede (1980) found higher “machismo” (low feminism) among Japanese using a predominantly male sample. Not surprisingly Japanese women scored the lowest in feminism in this study.

Extroversion was also significantly different across cultures. As predicted the United States participants scored the highest on this variable showing a moderate level of extroversion. Puerto Rico and Japan had lower mean scores. Participants from Puerto Rico show a moderate level of extroversion, and Japanese participants a low-moderate level. These findings demonstrate that extroversion could be influenced by the participants’
culture. Therefore our results provide support to the findings of Sakuragi (2004) and Zimbardo (1977).

Extroversion is a highly valuable trait in Western cultures like the American and Puerto Rican. Being extroverted is associated with leadership, confidence, and success in these cultures. The lower mean scores among Puerto Ricans were expected since the "machista" values of this society could encourage women to be less extroverted. This gender oppression could also be one reason for Japanese lower mean scores. But we should also consider that extroversion is not highly regarded in Asian cultures as it is in Western cultures. Japanese are more likely to be socialized to communicate in a passive, non-direct, and non-verbal style, which lead them to be less extroverted than their Western counterparts.
The hypothesized model was partially supported. We found that both feminism and extroversion have a small effect on sexual harassment experiences. However, individualism did not predict sexual harassment experiences.

In agreement with our findings Berdahl (2007) recently reported that feminist women are more likely to report sexual harassment than less feminist women. The author commented that woman who violates traditional
gender roles norms are more likely to be targeted by men's sexual harassment, which is use as a mean of social control, or to "put them back where they belong to". Hence, women who strive for gender equality are in higher risk of sexual harassment.

The extroversion findings are similar to the feminism findings in terms of the gender equality issue. There is evidence of higher means of extroversion among males across cultures (Lynn & Martin, 1997; Sahoo, Sahoo, Harichandan, 2005). In addition, extroversion is associated with leadership (Bono & Judge, 2004; Campbell, Simpson, Stewart, & Manning, 2003; Harms, Roberts, & Wood, 2007; Johnson, Vernon, Harris, & Jang, 2004; Judge, Bono, Llies, & Gerhardt, 2002; Kognor & Nordvik, 2004; Leung & Bozionelos, 2004; Riggio, Riggio, Salinas, & Cole, 2003; Stevens & Ash, 2001), a role that organizations have traditionally assigned to men.

Considering these findings, higher levels of extroversion among women could be perceived by men as a challenge to their authority roles and a women's attempt for gender equality. In response men use sexual harassment as a mean to oppress women and control power positions in organizations. Hence, we agree with Cortina et al. (2002); Luthar and Luthar (2002); and Matsui, Kakuyama, Onglantco,
and Ogutu (1995) that power is a key variable in sexual harassment. As a matter of fact, we consider that our findings are contributing to the power literature on sexual harassment. However, our structural model considered a limited portion (feminism and extroversion) of the power related variables. Consequently, our predictors had a small effect on sexual harassment.

Expanding research on the effect of power and power related variables, emphasizing on gender equality, could reveal the unexplained variance that our model did not capture.

We did not find that individualism predicts sexual harassment experiences. This could be due to the fact that we lost a dimension of individualism called "vertical individualism". The fact that we lost a dimension of the individualism variable could be a reason for the lack of the prediction since the scale is not measuring the construct as a whole. Also, the individualism scale that we use does not include a communication style component, which has been identified in the literature as an important dimension that differentiates between individualistic and collectivistic societies (Kapoor, Hughes, Baldwin, & Blue, 2003; Triandis, 2001). This could
also be a function of the lack of cultural differences on the SEQ measure.

We found small but significant positive associations between feminism and extroversion, feminism and individualism, and extroversion and individualism. Although there is scarce literature supporting these associations they make sense theoretically. Women who hold feminist standpoints are more likely to be bold, independent, self-starters, and to speak out for their own interests. At the same time an extroverted person is more likely to be self-reliant. We did not find literature associating feminism and extroversion. But in agreement with the relationship found between feminism and individualism Cukur, De Guzman, and Carlo (2004) found significant positive relationship between conservative values (traditionalism and conformity) and collectivism across cultures, including the United States, Turkey, and the Philippines. In addition the literature shows that societies that are characterized by low individualism tend to be low in extroversion (Sakuragı, 2004; Zimbardo, 1977). Considering previous discussions our findings are not surprising. Being low in feminism, individualism, and extroversion will lead women to be more dependent on men and being immerse in gender inequality positions.
Limitations

One of the limitations of this study was that we lost a dimension of the individualism measure. The fact that we use a translation-back-translation method may contribute to this limitation. We recognize that a validation process of the instruments that we use was more appropriate to make the measurement instruments more sensitive to the cultural realities of the participants. Both Western and Asian cultures differ in how they communicate, which could affect the way they define a psychological construct. Even more, the individualism variable by itself should include a dimension that could differentiate low individualism from high individualism based on communication styles. Hence, a validation process that could adapt the psychological measures to the culture of the participants should substitute a translation-back-translation process.

Additionally, limiting the study to experiences and not considering the perceptions of such experiences is another limitation of the study. The perceptions portion that we excluded has two components: a scale where the participants rated how much does the harassment experience bothered them, and a query item which asks the participants directly if they have experienced sexual harassment in the workplace. Researchers have found that
participants report higher sexual harassment behavioral experiences and lower perceived sexual harassment when they answer the query item (Ilies, Hauserman, Schwochau & Stibal, 2003). Examining the perceptions that the participants have of the behavioral experiences could reveal the cross-cultural differences that we did not find by looking at sexual harassment experiences alone.

Also, we consider that the cultural overlap or interaction between the United States and Puerto Rico affected our cross-cultural predictions. Puerto Ricans living in the island have been highly influenced by the American culture and politics for over a hundred years. We consider that other Hispanic cultural groups that have not been highly exposed to the American culture may have been more appropriate to assess differences in cultural sensitive variables like the ones that we study.

Since the sample size required for this study was fairly robust and located in three different countries we used two data collection methods (paper and pencil and online) to facilitate the process. However, we found significant mean differences within countries for all of the variables across the data collection methods. Differences between paper-and-pencil and online data collection methods are widely reported in the literature
(Chang, 2005; Fouladi, McCarthy, and Moller, 2002; Sethuraman, Kerin, and Cron, 2005; Smither, Walker, and Yap, 2004; Wood, Nosko, Desmarais, Ross, and Irvine, 2006). This could be related to how the participants perceive the method itself (Salgado and Moscoso, 2003).

Finally, we should consider that besides the influence of the observed cultural variables on sexual harassment, the organizational culture (norms and values) towards sexual harassment could influence the employees' harassment experiences. Some organizations adopt norms and values that are not tolerant to sexual harassment and some others may be lenient to sexual harassment in the workplace. In this study we did not considered how the organizational cultural norms and values for sexual harassment influenced the employees' experiences.

Future Directions

Future research should expand on variables related to power and gender equality and its relationship to sexual harassment. Such variables should be explored not only from the victims' perspective but from the harasser, and the organizational culture perspective. Also both sexual harassment experiences and the perceptions that the participants have about such experiences should be
considered in order to explore how the participants judge the experience. In addition, men should be included in future research. By including men we should expect gender differences. For example, if men were included in this study we expected, higher extroversion and individualism, and lower feminism and sexual harassment experiences compared to women. We recommend that the relationships that we found between feminism and extroversion, feminism and individualism, and extroversion and individualism should be confirmed in future studies since there is a lack of literature evidencing these relationships.

Finally, cross-cultural researchers should consider that in a globalized world there is a high cultural interaction across cultures like the one that we mentioned between Puerto Rico and the United States. The investigators should consider how such interactions could affect their predictions when doing cross-cultural research.
APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRES
Sexual Experiences Questionnaire

YOUR EXPERIENCES AT YOUR WORKPLACE

In this part of the questionnaire, we would like to know about your experiences AT YOUR WORKPLACE. For each item, please write in the blank space the number that most closely describes your own experience with MALE co-workers and supervisors DURING THE LAST 24 MONTHS. Please answer as frankly and completely as you can using the following key:

1 = Never
2 = Once or Twice
3 = Sometimes
4 = Often
5 = Many Times

Remember that YOUR ANSWERS ARE COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL.

DURING THE PAST 24 MONTHS AT YOUR WORKPLACE, have you been in a situation where any of your MALE supervisors or co-workers:

a) ...habitually told suggestive stories or offensive jokes? ____

b) ...made unwanted attempts to draw you into a discussion of personal or sexual matters (e.g., attempted to discuss or comment on your sex life)? ____

c) ...made crude and offensive sexual remarks, either publicly (for example, in the office), or to you privately? ____

d) ...made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities? ____

e) ...gave you unwanted sexual attention? ____

f) ...was staring, leering, or ogling you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable? ____

g) ...attempted to establish a romantic or sexual relationship despite your efforts to discourage him? ____

h) ...displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials (e.g., pictures, stories, or pornography)? ____

i) ...frequently make sexist remarks (e.g., suggesting that women are too emotional to be scientists or to assume leadership roles)? ____

j) ...has continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you have said "no"? ____

k) ...made you feel like you were being subtly bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behavior? ____
DURING THE PAST 24 MONTHS AT YOUR WORKPLACE, have you been in a situation where any of your MALE supervisors or co-workers:

l) ...made you feel subtly threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative (e.g., the mention of an upcoming evaluation, review, etc.)? _____

m) ...touched you (e.g., laid a hand on your bare arm, put an arm around your shoulders) in a way that made you feel uncomfortable? _____

n) ...made unwanted attempts to stroke or fondle you (e.g., stroking your leg or neck, touching your breast, etc)? _____

o) ...made unwanted attempts to have sex with you that resulted in you pleading, or physically struggling? _____

p) ...implied faster promotions or better treatment if you were sexually cooperative? _____

q) ...made it necessary for you to respond positively to sexual or social invitations in order to be well treated on the job? _____

r) ...made you afraid that you would be treated poorly if you didn't cooperate sexually? _____

s) ...treated you badly for refusing to have sex with a coworker or supervisor? _____
Individualism/Collectivism Questionnaire

This questionnaire is anonymous, and there are no right or wrong answers.
We want to know if you strongly agree or disagree with some statements. If you strongly agree enter a 9 in the blank space; if you strongly disagree, enter a 1 in that space; if you are unsure or think that the question does not apply to you, enter a 5 next to the statement.

In short, use this key:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me___
2. Winning is everything ___
3. I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group___
4. It annoys me when other people perform better than I do___
5. It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group___
6. It is important to me that I do my job better than others___
7. I like sharing little things with my neighbors___
8. I enjoy working in situations involving competition___
9. The well-being of my co-workers is important to me___
10. I often do "my own thing"___
11. If a relative were in financial difficulty, I would help within my means___
12. Competition is the law of nature___
13. If a co-worker gets a prize I would feel proud___
14. Being a unique individual is important to me___
15. To me, pleasure is spending time with others___
16. When another person does better than I do, I get tense and aroused___
17. Children should be taught to place duty before pleasure___
18. Without competition it is not possible to have a good society___
19. I feel good when I cooperate with others___
20. Some people emphasize winning; I am not one of them___
21. It is important to me that I respect decisions made by my groups
22. I rather depend on myself than on others
23. Family members should stick together, no matter what sacrifices are required
24. I rely on myself most of the time; I rarely rely on others
25. Parents and children must stay together, as much as possible
26. My personal identity independent from others is very important to me
27. It is my duty to take care of my family, even when I have to sacrifice what I want
28. My personal identity is very important to me
29. I am a unique person, separate from others
30. I respect the majority's wishes in groups of which I am a member
31. I enjoy being unique and different from others
32. It is important to consult close friends and get their ideas before making a decision
The Attitudes Towards Feminism Scale

Directions: For each statement, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement using the following guide and placing the appropriate number to the right of the statement.

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

1. Women have the right to compete with men in every sphere of activity. _____
2. As head of the household, the father should have final authority over his children. _____
3. The unmarried mother is morally a greater failure than the unmarried father. _____
4. A woman who refuses to give up her job to move with her husband would be to blame if the marriage broke up. _____
5. A woman who refuses to bear children has failed in her duty to her husband. _____
6. Women should not be permitted to hold political offices that involves great responsibility. _____
7. A woman should be expected to change her name when she marries. _____
8. Whether or not they realize it, most women are exploited by men. _____
9. Women who join the Women’s Movement are typically frustrated and unattractive people who feel they lose out by the current rules of society. _____
10. A working woman who sends her six month old baby to a daycare center is a bad mother. _____
11. A woman to be truly womanly should gracefully accept chivalrous attentions from men. _____
12. It is absurd to regard obedience as a wifely virtue. _____
13. The “clinging vine” wife is justified provided she clings sweetly enough to please her husband. _____
14. Realistically speaking, most progress so far has been made by men and we can expect it to continue that way. _____
15. One should never trust a woman’s account of another woman. _____
16. It is desirable that woman be appointed to police forces with the same duties as men. _____
17. Women are basically more unpredictable than men. _____
18. It is all right for women to work but men will always be the basic breadwinners. _____
19. A woman should not expect to go to the same places or have the same freedom of action as a man. _____
20. Profanity sounds worse generally coming from a woman. _____
**Big Five Mini-Markers**

**Instruction**
Please use this list of common human traits to describe yourself as accurately as possible. Describe yourself as you see yourself at the present time, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you are generally or typically, as compared with other persons you know of the same sex and of roughly your same age.

Before each trait, please write a number indicating how accurately that trait describes you, using the following rating scale:

**Inaccurate:**

1 = **Extremely**
2 = **Very**
3 = **Moderately**
4 = **Slightly**

5 = **Neither Inaccurate nor Accurate**

**Accurate:**

6 = **Slightly**
7 = **Moderately**
8 = **Very**
9 = **Extremely**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bashful</th>
<th>Energetic</th>
<th>Moody</th>
<th>Systematic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bold</td>
<td></td>
<td>Envious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careless</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extraverted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fretful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harsh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Imaginative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorganized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jealous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Talkative     | Organized | Philosophical | Temperamental |
|              |          |               |              |
| Practical     |           |               | Touchy       |
| Quiet         |           |               |              |
| Relaxed       |           |               | Uncreative   |
| Shy           |           |               | Unenvious    |
| Rude          |           |               | Unintellectual |
| Shy           |           |               | Unsympathetic |
| Sloppy        |           |               | War |
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