To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Heather Monique Whaley entitled "Gender Differences in the Preferred Methods of Training, Needs and Interests, and Hindrances and Motivators for Sexual Harassment Training." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Business Administration.

Michael Lane Morris
Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

__Sharon Jeffcoat Bartley_____

__Priscilla Blanton_____

__Robert T. Ladd_____

Accepted for the Council:

_Anne Mayhew_____
Vice Chancellor and Dean of
Graduate Studies

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE PREFERRED METHODS OF TRAINING, NEEDS AND INTERESTS, AND HINDRANCES AND MOTIVATORS FOR SEXUAL HARASSMENT TRAINING

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

.

Heather Monique Whaley
December 2006

Copyright © 2006 by Heather Monique Whaley
All rights reserved.

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my biggest supporters in all things, my parents, Monroe and Claudeane Whaley, without whom nothing achieved would have meaning. To my sister, Tracee Whaley Knisley: thank you for being one of the first teachers I ever had. And to my brother-in-law, Marc Knisley: thank you for supporting me and rejoicing with me every step of the way.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to the many people who made completion of this degree possible. Thanks to Dr. Bartley for encouraging me to apply to the program in the beginning and sticking with me through everything. Her listening ear and patience are invaluable. Through the loss of three precious fur babies, many extended family members, and countless work hours professionally and academically, she helped me keep my sanity. Thanks to Dr. Blanton, the best student advocate I've ever known and one of the most passionate professors I had in undergrad. Thanks to Dr. Ladd for agreeing to work on my committee in the midst of big changes in his professional life. To Dr. Morris: thank you for your guidance through the transitions of changing colleges and programs and sticking with my crazy schedule. You continued to believe in me through all the transitions and the drops in energy. Thanks to Ann Reed for her invaluable statistical support and guidance. Even when coherent statements were rare, she was able to figure out what I was saying and put together the tests I needed for successful completion of this project.

To all my committee members: thank you for your support and your willingness to give up summer vacation on more than one occasion to help me meet the requirements along the way and to get this document in its final form.

Finally, thanks to all my family and friends who have supported the completion of this degree and encouraged me to push forward, even when the end seemed too far to measure.

ABSTRACT

Gender Differences in the Preferred Methods of Training, Needs and Interests, and Hindrances and Motivators for Sexual Harassment Training

The purpose of this descriptive study was to assess employees' preferences regarding sexual harassment prevention training (SHPT), compared by gender. A convenience sample of city/county governmental employees from a mid-size metropolitan city in the southeast representing multiple occupational groups consisted of 1387 employees. A response rate of 12% represented 169 respondents.

A modified Sexual Experiences Questionnaire - Department of Defense (SEQ-DoD) and the SHPT Preferences Climate Survey were completed. Frequency counts, descriptive statistics, principal component analysis, factor analysis, MANOVA tests, ANOVA tests, and a Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel (CMH) test allowed for hypotheses testing.

No statistical differences between genders exist in SHPT interests, design and intent, perceived usefulness of approaches of learning, or training attendance hindrances. Gender differences do exist in SHPT attendance motivators, identification of behaviors as sexual harassment compared between coworkers and supervisors, and factor scores of knowledge level and interest level of topics related to SHPT.

Gender is irrelevant in SHPT design. Training should focus on reducing gender-difference of attendance motivators and identification of behaviors as sexual harassment. Areas of future research include: (a) a longitudinal study to investigate the incidence rate to reveal whether reports decreased once more people were familiar with specific behaviors that constitute sexual harassment; (b) differences related to race; and (c) outcomes of training programs focused on needed areas of training, as indicated by employees.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I. **INTRODUCTION**.....1
Rationale.....2
Statement of the Problem.....3
Purpose.....3
Nominal Definitions.....4
Research Questions.....5
Research Objectives.....6
Assumptions.....6
Summary.....7

II. **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**.....8
Defining Sexual Harassment.....8
Sexual Harassment.....11
Natural/Biological Models.....11
Organizational Models.....13
Sociocultural Models.....14
Attempts at Integrating Models.....15
The Four-Factor Model.....16
Researcher's Prescribed Model.....17
Sexual Harassment Typologies.....18
Sexual Exploitation.....18
Sexual Attraction/Miscommunication.....19
Misogyny.....20
Homo-anathema.....20
Effects of Sexual Harassment.....21
Victim Effects.....21
Organizational Effects.....23
Prevention of Sexual Harassment.....24
Primary Prevention.....26
Overview of Current Prevention Programs.....27
Prevention Strategies.....28
Sexual Harassment Policy.....29
Affirmative Defense.....29
Policy Components.....30
Sexual Harassment Procedures.....32
Sexual Harassment Training.....34
Voluntary Training versus Mandatory Training.....34
Training Design.....35
Delivery Method.....38

Training Intervals 39
Training Objectives and Topics 39
Training Transfer 41
Needs and Interests 44
Hindrances and Motivators 44
Research Implications 46
Theoretical Perspectives 47
Hypotheses 48
Anticipated Contributions of Study 49
Theory 49
Research 49
Practice 49

III. **METHODS** 50
Sample Selection 51
Sample Characteristics 52
Education, Supervisor Gender, and Personal Salary Range 53
Age, Length of Employment, and Weekly Hours Worked 54
Job Titles 54
Demographic Relationship to Community 54
Research Design. 58
Weaknesses of Descriptive Surveys 59
Ethical Issues 59
Procedures 60
Advantages of Electronic Surveys 60
Disadvantages of Electronic Surveys 61
Data Collection 62
Data Management 63
Instrumentation 65
Sexual Experiences Questionnaire 65
Sexual Harassment Training Preferences Climate Survey 66
Knowledge 67
Preferred delivery methods 68
Professional development and job responsibilities 69
Preferred approaches to enhance learning 69
Training hindrances and motivators 70
Operational Definitions 71
Analytic Strategy 75
Frequency Counts and Descriptive Statistics 75
Principal Component Analysis/Factor Analysis 76
Cronbach's Alphas 76
MANOVA 76
ANOVA 78
Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel Test 78

IV. **RESULTS** 79
Descriptive Statistics 79
Previous Training Experiences 79
Satisfaction with Previous Training Experiences 81
Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Interests 82
Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Design and Intent.....85
Perceived Usefulness of Approaches of Learning 87
Voluntary Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Attendance.....87
Identification of Behaviors as Sexual Harassment.....89
Sexual Harassment Knowledge and Interest Level of Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Topics 92

V. **DISCUSSION** 97
Sexual Harassment Prevention Training 97
Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Interests 98
Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Design and Intent 99
Approaches of Learning Related to Sexual Harassment Prevention Training 99
Voluntary Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Attendance 100
Identification of Behaviors as Sexual Harassment. 101
Knowledge of Sexual Harassment and Interest Level of Topics Related to Sexual Harassment.....102
Limitations 103
Implications for Research 104
Defining Sexual Harassment.....104
Response Rate Factors 104
Future Research 106
Implications for Practice 107
Previous Sexual Harassment Prevention Training.....107
Training Content 108
Summary 109

REFERENCES.....110

APPENDICES 120
Appendix A 121
Appendix B 125
Appendix C 133
Appendix D 151
Appendix E.....154
Appendix F 161

VITA.....171

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Socio-Demographic Analyses Summary 55
2. Statistical Analysis of Instruments.....80
3. Knowledge Factor: Prevention Subscale Top Three Item Means by Gender.....83
4. Knowledge Factor: Victim Impact Subscale Top Three Item Means by Gender.....84
5. Group Training Subscale Top Three Item Means by Gender.....86
6. Preferred Approaches of Learning Subscale Top Three Item Means by Gender.....88
7. Training Hindrances Subscale Top Three Item Means by Gender.....89
8. Training Motivators Subscale Top Two Item Means by Gender 90
9. Frequency and Expected Results Reference Group by Response for Females.....92
10. Training Interest Factor: Prevention Subscale Top Three Item Means by Gender.....94
11. Training Interest Factor: Victim Impact Subscale Top Two Item Means by Gender 94
12. Training Interest Factor: Acceptable Behaviors Subscale Top Item Mean by Gender.....95

E1. Knowledge Factor One: Prevention Efforts 154
E2. Knowledge Factor Two: Victim Impact.....155
E3. Knowledge Factor Three: Acceptable Behaviors.....155
E4. Preferred Approaches Factor One: Group Training 156
E5. Preferred Approaches Factor Two: Individual Training 156
E6. Preferred Approaches Factor Three: Professional Development 157
E7. Preferred Approaches Factor Four: Job Responsibilities 157
E8. Preferred Approaches for Learning Factor Analysis.....158
E9. Training Hindrances Factor Analysis.....159

E10. Training Motivators Factor Analysis.....160
F1. Means: Knowledge Factor One - Prevention Efforts 161
F2. Means: Knowledge Factor Two - Victim Impact.....162
F3. Means: Knowledge Factor Three - Acceptable Behaviors.....162
F4. Means: Training Settings Factor One - Group Training.....163
F5. Means: Training Settings Factor Two – Individual Training.....163
F6. Means: Prevention Training Factor One – Professional Development.....164
F7. Means: Prevention Training Factor Two – Job Responsibilities.....164
F8. Means: Preferred Approaches for Learning Factor Analysis.....165
F9. Means: Training Hindrances Factor Analysis 166
F10. Means: Training Motivators Factor Analysis.....167
F11. Means: Training Interest Factor One – Prevention.....168
F12. Means: Training Interest Factor Two - Victim Impact.....169
F13. Means: Training Interest Factor Three - Acceptable Behaviors.....169
F14. Means: Program Emphasis Factor One - Program Focus.....170
F15. Means: Program Emphasis Factor Two - Program Rewards.....170

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Sexual harassment represents a cost of $6.7 million per year per company for Fortune 500 companies (Lambert, 2004). Comparatively, according to Lambert, efforts aimed at "meaningful preventative steps" (p. 2) would only cost $200,000 per year for the average company. While many companies offer sexual harassment prevention training, relatively few offer an explanation or rationale for including selected components in the training, including the grouping of employees for such training. Additionally, few, if any, climate and preference surveys are conducted prior to the training program development and implementation. While often a fast method for completing training initiatives and for complying with legal regulations, this approach is not an advantageous use of time or financial resources for this type of training. Because company liabilities (e.g., legal, financial, reputation) are on the line, the training segments within companies must include a more responsible and detailed examination into what type of sexual harassment prevention training employees want to receive, and in what forms or methods that training is preferred.

Companies today have much more responsibility beyond the daily requirements of conducting business. They must also deal in competitive financial return, matters of communication, public image, and interpersonal relationships among employees and customers. In the current litigious climate of America, it is essential that policies, programs, protocols, and procedures be in place, and worded in such a way as to provide an acceptable defense if the company faces a lawsuit. Beyond having policies, procedures, and protocols in place, training programs must also exist in order to share this

information with employees. Currently, one of the most widely offered training programs in companies, according to Galvin (2002), is sexual harassment prevention training. In Galvin's study, 83% of the respondents offered sexual harassment prevention training. Sexual harassment is against the law, which identifies sexual harassment as a different area of training need, as compared with customer service. Sexual harassment complaints are responsible for many lawsuits brought against companies on a regular basis with 13,566 cases reported in 2003 (O'Reiley, 2004). Therefore, training is essential to protect the interests of both the company and the employee.

Rationale

Limited training dollars are available to companies. *Training* magazine's analysis of employer-sponsored training (Dolezalek, 2004) found the overall amount spent on training in 2004 equaled $51.4 billion compared with $51.3 billion spent in 2003. Businesses must provide useful training that contributes to improving the work environment, more so than simply being able to have a paper trail that shows employees received the sexual harassment policy. Currently, little is in place to indicate (a) whether training resources are allocated most effectively, (b) whether the type of training offered meets the training objectives, or (c) if the type of training is the most advantageous design for the intended audience.

Views of sexuality and harassment issues are changing as the face of the workforce changes. As more women continue to participate in the workforce full time for extended periods and as those who began their careers during the sexual liberation movement are in positions of leadership in corporations, issues of sexual harassment today may be quite different from 30 years ago. Additionally, the increased presence of

sexuality in media, including television and magazines, in addition to the musical lyrics prominently aired on the radio, changes the face of sexuality for today's workforce. Training programs designed even five years ago may not be the best option for today's varied workforce.

Statement of the Problem

Although 62% of companies offer training programs focused on sexual harassment prevention, 15,000 reported occurrences are filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) each year (Katz, 2004). The most common type of sexual harassment prevention training offered today is a focus on the broad, general definitions of sexual harassment provided by the EEOC. This definition is, at best, ambiguous and offers little more than a "band-aid" approach at reducing the incidence of such behaviors in the workplace. Only through an assessment of employees' interest in the training program format and design, as well as hindrances of voluntary attendance, can sexual harassment prevention training evolve into a clear, efficient, customized, and effective prevention impact.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to assess employees' preferences regarding sexual harassment prevention training. More specifically, this comprises the prevention training interests, including the prevention of sexual harassment, the victim impact of sexual harassment, and topics related to sexually harassing behaviors. The preferred delivery method of sexual harassment prevention training including areas of interest related to both professional development and to job responsibilities will be explored. The perceived usefulness of approaches of learning related to sexual harassment prevention training will

be studied. Hindrances and motivators of workers related to voluntary attendance in sexual harassment prevention training will be measured. Additionally, it will serve as a needs assessment for sexual harassment prevention training programs. The study will explore the interest level of certain sexual harassment topics compared with self-assessed knowledge of the same topics. Each area will be evaluated to determine what gender differences exist within each area.

Nominal Definitions

Previous sexual harassment prevention training: Previous experiences with sexual harassment prevention training refer to formal training designed to educate people on the prevention of sexual harassment.

Identification of sexually harassing behaviors by a coworker: Considering a description of a particular behavior, such as "made offensive sexual remarks," identify whether this behavior was sexual harassment if a coworker committed it.

Identification of sexually harassing behaviors by a supervisor: Considering a description of a particular behavior, such as "made offensive sexual remarks," identify whether this behavior was sexual harassment if a supervisor committed it.

Knowledge: Knowledge is defined as "cognition: the psychological result of perception and learning and reasoning" (wordnet.princeton.edu/perl/webwn, 2005).

Prevention training interest: Given a list of sexual harassment prevention training topics, which items do people have interest in learning more about?

Victim impact training interest: Given a list of sexual harassment prevention training topics related to victim impact, which items do people have interest in learning more about?

Behaviors training interest: Given a list of sexual harassment prevention training topics related to sexually harassing behaviors, which items do people have interest in learning more about?

Preferred delivery methods: Delivery methods are those strategies used to convey the training content. This includes: (a) components related to learning designed to enhance professional skill sets; (b) completion of tasks related to job requirements and job description; and (c) preferred approaches to learning.

Training hindrances: Those things that would discourage a person from participation in sexual harassment prevention training, whether internal, external, or both.

Training motivators: Those things that would encourage a person to participate in training, whether internal, external, or both.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study include the following:

1. Do gender differences exist in sexual harassment prevention training interests?
2. Do gender differences exist in the design and intent of sexual harassment prevention training?
3. Do gender differences exist in the perceived usefulness of approaches of learning related to sexual harassment prevention training?
4. Do gender differences exist in the voluntary choice to attend sexual harassment prevention training?
5. Do gender differences exist in whether identification of behaviors committed by coworkers as sexual harassment is identified as sexual harassment when supervisors committed the same act?

6. Do gender differences exist in self-assessed knowledge of sexual harassment and interest level of training topics related to the prevention of sexual harassment?

Research Objectives

The research objectives are as follows:

1. To determine whether differences in gender exist in sexual harassment prevention training interests;
2. To determine whether gender differences exist in the design and intent of sexual harassment prevention training;
3. To determine whether gender differences exist in the perceived usefulness of approaches of learning related to sexual harassment prevention training;
4. To determine whether gender differences exist in voluntary choice to attend sexual harassment prevention training;
5. To determine whether gender differences exist in whether identification of behaviors committed by coworkers as sexual harassment are also identified as sexual harassment when supervisors committed the same act;
6. To determine whether gender differences exist in self-assessed knowledge of sexual harassment and interest level of training topics related to the prevention of sexual harassment.

Assumptions

To increase the ease of conducting research, assumptions are necessary. The addition of assumptions allow the researcher to work with the subjects more easily. Assumptions for this study include: (a) respondents answered truthfully for all assessed areas; (b)

respondents are representative of the sample population; and (c) respondents responded correctly to the items, resulting in standardized responses.

Summary

Research in the area of sexual harassment is not very comprehensive. Due to the controversial nature of the subject, the difficulty in identifying sexual harassment, and the reliance on the victim to report the incidents, the research is wide and the questions are many. Examining the preferred methods for sexual harassment prevention training, as well as needs, interests, motivators and hindrances to participating in such training programs will enable training developers to offer more comprehensive, and potentially more effective, programs.

CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

The issue of sexual harassment is more complex than many imagine. To serve the organization well requires that the employees, the Human Resources (HR) directors, and the management know what constitutes harassment and methods for preventing its occurrence. According to Van Detta, Jones, Hahn, Taylor, and Dougherty (2001):

> When supervisors and employees are made aware of the legal aspects of sexual harassment, offensive conduct often done in an unthinking manner is often eliminated. Harassment is recognized early and may be dealt with rationally before incidents are blown out of proportion. Inappropriate behavior and relations can be identified and discouraged. (p. 66)

The sooner issues like this are dealt with, and the more the type of behavior that constitutes sexual harassment is understood, the fewer the number of incidences of sexual harassment. In turn, the workplace environment is more positive and healthier for all involved. Prevention of sexual harassment begins with defining sexual harassment and the behaviors it comprises.

Defining Sexual Harassment

Although the EEOC definition of sexual harassment provides parameters within which to operate, its vagueness can lead to issues of ambiguity with regard to certain behaviors, particularly those behaviors that constitute less overt types of harassment. According to Fitzgerald, Swan, and Magley (1997), "[much] of the confusion surrounding definition can be traced to a failure to distinguish sexual harassment as a *legal concept* from the *psychological experience* of workplace victimization…" (p. 6). This contributes to the

definitional quandary that currently exists. Regardless of the definition used, sexual harassment brings negative effects to all involved.

Because whether sexual harassment has occurred often relies on the perception of the victim, there is no absolute exists under which to define harassment from person to person. The first time sexual harassment was recognized as a type of sex discrimination occurred in 1976 (Fitzgerald, Swan, et al., 1997). Quid pro quo harassment and hostile environment are two elements of legally recognized sexual harassment. Quid pro quo harassment involves "this for that" behavior, whereas hostile environment does not pose a reciprocal relationship. Rather, hostile environment leads to an uncomfortable workplace because of derisive behavior. Both types of harassment occur in many organizations, although hostile environment is the most prevalent type of harassment (O'Hare & O'Donohue, 1998).

Behavioral definitions of sexual harassment propose the categorization of sexually harassing behaviors (Fitzgerald, Swan, et al., 1997). One of the first categorizations was Till's system developed in 1980. Till (in Fitzgerald, Swan, et al.) classified five general categories of behavior to which he believed all harassing behaviors could be attributed: (a) generalized sexist remarks and behaviors; (b) inappropriate and offensive, but essentially sanction-free, sexual advances; (c) solicitation of sexual activity or other sex-related behavior by promise of reward; (d) coercion of sexual activity by threat of punishment; and (e) sexual crimes and misdemeanors.

Gruber (in Fitzgerald, Swan, et al., 1997) later developed a "typology of personal and environmental harassment" (p. 10). Gruber's typology evolved in 1992 and included three general categories, as opposed to the five categories proposed by Till. The

categories include: (a) verbal requests, (b) verbal remarks, and (c) nonverbal displays. While only three main categories exist, Gruber did include subcategories within each group.

Fitzgerald's tripartite model (Fitzgerald, Swan, et al., 1997) followed Gruber's work and is generally considered the most common model of sexual harassment. Fitzgerald's model is a "parsimonious classification of harassing behaviors consisting of three related but conceptually distinct dimensions: gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion" (p 10). The tripartite model includes a combination of the earlier work of Till and Gruber. Fitzgerald's model, based on several studies, rather than a single body of work, adds strength to the paradigm. The framework provided by this model assists in creating content-valid surveys and its use in multiple settings, including organizations, academia, and the military, adds strength (Williams, Fitzgerald, & Drascow, 1999). Through a system that allows for similar definitions and models of harassment, the body of research in this area receives strength. Barak, Pitterman, and Yitzhaki (1995) cite the major contributions of the tripartite model as its comprehensiveness and the addition of moderator variables that establish sexual harassment. The moderator variables include the victim's individual vulnerability and the victim's response approach, and are believed to have a noteworthy impact on encounters of sexual harassment.

While various models exist to define harassment and to determine its categorization, the courts currently use the reasonable person standard to assess whether a situation constitutes sexual harassment (Kaser, 1995). The reasonable person standard judges the alleged harassment in light of whether a "reasonable person" would view the

behavior as harassment. However, this does not add the clarity and straightforwardness that the severity of sexual harassment warrants. Again, the lack of definitional clarity prohibits simple, resolute categories.

Sexual harassment is an area of research that is still in its infancy, as evidenced by the absence of an agreed-upon definition. Nevertheless, sexual harassment is an issue that must be defined by companies and explained to employees in order to protect individuals and organizations from harm or liability. Development of theories related to the cause of sexual harassment is useful in beginning to clarify the issue.

Sexual Harassment

The models of sexual harassment are best understood and organized as a layered approach, due to the complexity and inner-relatedness of the components that contribute to sexually harassing behaviors. The core layer represents evolutionary behavioral adaptations. The next layer symbolizes the socio-cultural norms, values, and institutions, followed by the organizational structures and arrangements. Finally, the outside layer represents distinctive individual and dyadic characteristics, which are the most externally observable constructs. Terpstra and Baker (1986) organize these factors into the following classifications: (a) environmental-level variables, (b) organizational-level variables, and (c) individual-level variables. Each layer of theory is further outlined below.

Natural/Biological Models

The natural/biological model of sexual harassment is linked to evolutionary characteristics of behavior and to hormonal forces. The hormonal model purports that sexual harassment is a “normal expression of men’s stronger sex drive” (Tangri & Hayes,

1997, p. 114). Further, this model asserts that treating women as sex objects is natural and will not be ameliorated. The inherent flaw of the natural/biological model is that if hormones were actually to blame for sexual harassment, then the most likely harassers would be older women and younger men. Yet, the reverse is actually true with younger women and older men more often guilty of committing acts of sexual harassment (Petrocelli & Repa, 1999).

The evolutionary adaptation model of harassment attributes such behaviors to the goal of reproduction. Therefore, men are more likely to pursue low commitment, high-return relationships in order to reproduce as many times as possible (Tangri & Hayes, 1997). This theory hypothesizes that the basic biological nature of reproduction creates a psychosexual structure of reproduction that innately results in a conflict of interest between men and women due to differing reproductive goals. The evolutionary adaptation model further details that the inability to reproduce does not suppress the basic drive to participate in behaviors that lead to reproduction, despite the likely outcome.

The assertion of the model developers to presume that sexual advances are not related to power, but rather are sexually motivated, is in conflict with the purpose of developing a model of sexual harassment: to determine the behaviors that constitute sexual harassment (Tangri & Hayes, 1997). The abase assertion of power appears to drive sexual harassment in certain situations and therefore negates the underlying assumptions of the natural/biological model of sexual harassment. Furthermore, the conjecture that the evolutionary process of thinking of all relationships in terms of the goal of reproducing does not give credence to the possibility of behavior modification.

Organizational Models

Organizational models of sexual harassment examine the organizational structure to find the causes of harassment, or at least to examine the structures in place that make committing acts of harassment an easier process. There are two theories of organizational power. The first of these is the sex-role spillover theory.

The sex-role spillover theory is explained "as the carryover into the workplace of gender-based expectations for behaviors that are irrelevant or inappropriate to work" (Tangri & Hayes, 1997, p. 116), attributed to the tendency to rely on gender roles when in situations of uncertainty or inexperience. This manifestation is most likely to occur in work settings where the employees are mostly male or mostly female. Several predictions of this theory have been tested and supported, lending credence to its hypotheses. Theories that highlight structural features above gender are supported by studies that find symmetrical outcomes. Gutek (in Tangri & Hayes) added an element to strengthen the theory by including a "gender hypothesis" that asserts men are more likely than women to sexualize the work environment and therefore are more likely to commit acts of harassment when all other things are equal.

Organizational power theories support the belief that sexual harassment is the result of people in power abusing their positions. Therefore, it is possible that either gender can harass, although it is more likely that men are the harassers because they are disproportionately in positions of power as compared to women. According to Wilson and Thompson (2001):

> It is widely recognized that, while harassment might appear to be about sexual attraction, it is primarily about men exercising power over women. It is seen as an

> inappropriate use of power that undermines, isolates, and degrades women…Harassment is inexplicably lined with women's disadvantaged status at work and subordinate position in society. (p. 61-62)

Yet, the theory of organizational power is challenged by the fact that peers are more commonly the harassers, rather than supervisors (Tangri & Hayes, 1997). This leads to the question of whether formal organizational power is the only type of power that can be used in situations of coercive harassment. Systems of power related to the ability to bring about change in an organization and situations of informal power are disproportionately skewed toward men. Sociocultural models of harassment make an effort to resolve this conflict.

Sociocultural Models

Sociocultural models of harassment credit harassing behaviors to gender roles, sex-role stereotypes, and male dominance within society. Harassment functions as a means for harassers "to maintain their position of power" (Tangri & Hayes, 1997, p. 120). The socio-cultural model attributes harassment to a desire to maintain status quo in society.

> …the sociocultural model [has] the advantage over the organizational model of explaining not only why sexual harassment is endemic in social life, occurring outside as well as inside organizations, but also how it is linked to other kinds of sexual coercion. (Tangri & Hayes, p. 121)

The relatedness of power, gender, and harassment, however, does lead to the questions of why all people in positions of power or all men do not harass. The sociocultural model has yet to address this concern. While most often victims of sexual harassment are

believed to be women, the Merit System research (in Fitzgerald, Swan, et al., 1997) concluded that 17% of men had been sexually harassed. However, Berdahl, Magley, and Waldo (in Fitzgerald, Swan, et al.) purport that the loss of control and security defines the experience of sexual harassment, regardless of gender. More research regarding men's experiences with sexual harassment is needed. The person in the subordinate role in academic settings is more likely to be the harasser, which further clouds the issue. However, "[evidence] shows that women who enter male preserves are the most likely to be sexually harassed" (Wilson & Thompson, 2001, p. 64).

The issue of power brings to light differences in types and bases of power for genders. Gender role stereotypes, respect, communication, and socialization also factor into the different experience by genders related to sexual harassment. Men are more likely to underreported, often for fear of retaliation or name calling, rather than for fear of loss of employment or of retaliation by the perpetrator (Fitzgerald, Swan, et al., 1997).

Attempts at Integrating Models

As of yet, no one theory explains the complex relationship of sexual harassment, its behaviors, its victims, and its perpetrators. However, two attempts have been made at integrating the aforementioned models. Both utilize the strongest elements of each of the individual theories to create a strong, if not all-inclusive, model of harassment. The earliest integration of theories was by Brewer in 1982 (in Tangri & Hayes, 1997). He supported use of the three models to explain various types of harassment. According to Brewer, the strength of the organizational model relates to coercive types of harassment. The sociocultural model is the best explanation of gender-driven harassment, while the biological model best explains harassment that is similar in nature to courtship behaviors.

Following Brewer's work, Fitzgerald and Shullman (in Tangri & Hayes, 1997) continued toward the creation of an inclusive model of harassment and expanded on Brewer's early example by including a smaller model created by Pryor. The integration model focused on theoretical behaviors and "on the incidence, context, and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations" (Tangri & Hayes, p. 124). The model begins with the variables of the organizational context and the job context. The organizational context includes elements related to the tolerance for harassing behaviors within the organization, and the organization's policies and procedures for dealing with harassment. The job context includes elements related to the sex ratio of the labor force in a particular job and the level to which the job requirements bear a resemblance to traditional sex-role expectations. These two variables predict the incidence and type of sexual harassment.

Tangri and Hayes (1997) cite three issues not addressed by the Fitzgerald Shullman integration: (a) Fitzgerald and Shullman do not include theories regarding why sexual harassment occurs; (b) the model does not speak to the question of why some but not all men or women in the same organization participate in sexually harassing behaviors; and (c) the model does not examine sexual harassment in contexts other than the workplace. Whether these elements are critical to the model is debatable, but it does confirm that theories regarding sexual harassment remain incomplete.

The Four-Factor Model

The four-factor model was developed by Grundmann and O'Donohue (Grundmann, O'Donohue, & Peterson, 1997). This model merges pertinent facets of each of the previous models and additionally highlights the multidimensional characteristics of sexual harassment and the multidimensional method that would appear to be suitable for

prevention. The model necessitates four prerequisites be met for harassment to occur. They are as follows:

> …motivation of the harasser, the ability to overcome internal inhibitions that act to prevent the offender from acting on his motivation, opportunity to overcome inhibitors in the external environment, and the opportunity or ability to overcome resistance by the potential victim. (Grundmann et al., p. 179)

Unless all four conditions are met, sexual harassment cannot occur. O'Hare and O'Donohue (1998) tested the four-factor model and found the four-factor model to be a superior description of sexual harassment over the other models.

Researcher's Prescribed Theory

While several models on the occurrence of sexual harassment have been developed, none is flawless, although some models are stronger than others. The researcher most closely prescribes to the four-factor model, which meshes together elements from each model. The four-factor model considers the environment in which a person operates and the external and internal forces related to the behavior. Although no system is perfect, the four-factor model examines harassment as a multi-faceted issue with several layers of cause and effect. Sexual harassment can be related to an issue of power, but it does not always have to be related to power. The organizational culture must also be considered; a lax environment without enforced consequence for perpetrators will continue to breed poor behaviors. Issues of organizational climate are paramount to the occurrence of sexual harassment, or the lack of such behaviors, in an organization. It is on this point the researcher deviates slightly from the four-factor model

in the attribution of higher credence placed on the organization with respect to the other elements. Even so, personal responsibility must be realized in each case of harassment.

Sexual Harassment Typologies

Several types of sexual harassment manifest themselves in a variety of ways. Acts of sexual harassment are most often committed by males toward females (Pryor & Whalen, 1997), though it is not exclusively a case of men harassing women. Pryor and Whalen assume that sexual harassment serves one of two psychological functions: (a) sexual harassment as an expression of sexual feelings; or (b) sexual harassment as an expression of hostility toward a member of an outgroup. Furthermore, Pryor and Whalen include two subtypes of sexual harassment within each of the psychological functions. Sexual expression includes the subtypes of sexual exploitation and sexual attraction/miscommunication. Expression of hostility includes the subtypes of misogyny (hatred of women) and homo-anathema (attitudes or behaviors of hostility aimed at homosexuals). As well, harassers must have the penchant for committing sexually harassing behaviors and the necessary conditions, or an environment that does not discourage this type of behavior from occurring.

Sexual Exploitation

Sexual exploitation examines the multiple types of power bases that are germane to understanding sexual harassment. The power bases include: (a) organizational power, (b) status power, (c) physical power, and (d) situational power (Pryor & Whalen, 1997). Organizational power is associated with power someone has because of his position or standing within the organization. Status power relates to the societal status a person holds, i.e., men typically have higher societal status as compared to women. Physical

power relates to the tendency of men to be physically stronger than women. This difference of physical power can make the actions of the stronger individual seem more threatening to the person of weaker physical power. Situational power is "created by the interdependence that people sometimes develop in work situations" (Pryor & Whalen, 1997, p. 131). It can also occur related to advantaged knowledge in particular social situations. For example, a coworker may threaten to reveal knowledge of another's indiscretion with regard to use of company resources in exchange for certain actions. Any or all of the power bases involved to impose one person's will on another involving sexual ends is sexual exploitation.

Sexual Attraction/Miscommunication

Not all sexual harassment is motivated by a need to sexually take advantage of a person. Pryor (in Pryor & Whalen, 1997) conducted a study in 1994 and found that 75% of the reported incidences of sexual harassment did not involve an attempt to exert power over the individual. Rather, the behaviors were seen as harassing for one of three reasons:

(1) The behaviors I observed were unprofessional (75%)

(2) The individual(s) involved was insensitive to my feelings (61%), and

(3) I was not attracted to the person (55%). (Pryor & Whalen, p. 134)

The first reason cited suggests that the victims of harassment, which in this survey were women, expect certain behaviors to occur at work. The expected work behaviors do not necessarily include the pursuit of a sexual relationship among coworkers. The remaining two reasons indicate miscommunication occurred between the perpetrator and the victim. It appears that the perpetrator fails to see the lack of interest from the victim or that the behavior may be welcomed by the victim from another individual, but not from the

perpetrator. According to Pryor and Whalen, men may perceive friendliness as sexual intent. Indeed, men tend to view many behaviors as having more sexual intent than do women, which may result in numerous incidences of miscommunication and potential situations of unwelcome sexual advances. However, this tendency should not excuse the behavior. Pryor and Whalen state: "…sexual harassment is more likely to occur in highly sexualized work environments….[In] environments where other nonharassing sexual behaviors are more common, sexual harassment is more common, too" (p. 136). The organization has a responsibility to protect the environment from becoming highly sexualized and to discourage nonharassing sexual behaviors.

Misogyny

Misogyny harassment may be strongly prejudiced by work group climate or local social norms. A 1994 study by Zickar (in Pryor & Whalen, 1997) established "the incidence of gender harassment was higher in work groups in which there was a general perception of organizational tolerance toward sexual harassment" (p. 137). When a group of people is viewed as an outgroup, the likelihood of misogynistic harassment increases. Whether hostility exists due to stereotypes or other types of prejudice, or due to competition for limited resources, hostile environment harassment is recognized by the Supreme Court as a type of harassment protected under Title VII (Kaser, 1995). Misogyny is more likely to manifest itself in men who maintain sexist stereotypes.

Homo-anathema

Homo-anathema is "the reaction to homosexuals as a hated and feared outgroup" (Pryor & Whalen, 1997, p. 140). The scope of this problem as it relates to sexual harassment has been documented as a social problem. Homo-anathema supports the

contention that sexual harassment is not only men harassing women. Men or women can commit harassment and direct the harassment toward women or men. Some people may be more likely to commit acts of sexual harassment aimed at homosexuals than others.

Effects of Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment affects all employees, whether they are the victim, the perpetrator, or those vicariously involved in the incident. The organization experiences harsh effects related to the fallout of claims of sexual harassment. However, the most severe effects of harassment are those experienced by the victim.

Victim Effects

People who report harassment experience a worsening of the situation and appear to be at higher risk for physical and mental health-related consequences (Dansky & Kilpatrick, 1997). Dansky and Kilpatrick state, "[negative] job ramifications for individual victims include decreased job satisfaction, decline in job performance, decreased motivation, interrupted careers, decreased morale, increased absenteeism, lowered productivity, and impaired relationships between coworkers" (p. 160). Other research reported these factors as well (Avina & O'Donohue, 2002; Bell, Quick, & Cycyoto, 2002; Dansky & Kilpatrick, 1997; Magley, Waldo, Drasgow, & Fitzgerald, 1999). In addition, victims of harassment reported lower levels of commitment to their employers. Fitzgerald, Hulin, and Drasgow (in Magley et al., 2000) distinguished three groups of outcomes related to victim effects: (a) work-related effects, (b) psychological effects, and (c) physical or somatic effects. Magley et al. further detailed the possible impact of sexual harassment:

[Women] exposed to sexual harassment experience negative psychological

> outcomes, including higher incidence of psychological distress, increased symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder, lowered general life satisfaction, and lowered self-esteem. Work-related outcomes of sexual harassment range from lowered satisfaction with one's job, organizational withdrawal, declines in general job performance, to loss of one's job after filing a formal complaint. Finally, health-related outcomes such as decreased satisfaction with one's health and increased health problems are related to increased sexual harassment as mediated by the relationship between harassment and psychological effects. (p. 285)

The victim effects are real and potentially severe. The consequences of these effects result in employees who are less satisfied with their jobs, less supportive of their companies, and more likely to perform poorer on the regular duties of their jobs. Avina and O'Donohue (2002) agree with classifying sexual harassment as a diagnosable trauma related to post traumatic stress disorder (PSTD). Nearly 30% of sexual harassment victims report PTSD symptoms (Avina & O'Donohue, 2002; Dansky & Kilpatrick, 1997). Sexual harassment poses a threat to its victims and can result in a feeling of little control over their own situation and circumstance.

To add clarity to the issue of victim effects, Fitzgerald, Hulin, and Drasgow (in Fitzgerald, Drasgow, & Magley, 1999) proposed a model. The model integrates "sexual harassment with its antecedents and consequences as well as specifying moderating influences" (p. 330) and purports that harassment influences three key sets of outcomes: (a) psychological, (b) job-related, and (c) health-related status. The submodel of job outcomes considers both job withdrawal (cognitions regarding leaving the job) and work withdrawal (efforts to psychologically withdraw from the organization even as they retain

the job). The results of the model proposed by Fitzgerald are generalizable to both males and females who experience sexual harassment. This further supports the seriousness of victim effects as it is attributable to all victims of harassment, regardless of gender. In addition, a collectiveness to the experience exists: the form and relative occurrence of harassment are comparable, as are victims' ways of responding to or handling harassment (Gruber, 1997). These factors are important considerations for organizations.

Organizational Effects

Organizations involved in sexual harassment complaints face consequences, too. Among the consequences is a damaged reputation and lower productivity (Bell, Quick, et al., 2002; Bravo & Cassedy, in Dansky & Kilpatrick, 1997). Increased tardiness and absenteeism are likely to occur in a sexually harassing environment. Additionally, the occurrence of job turnover and early retirement increases, which increases the organizations' costs of recruitment and training.

"Understanding the impact of sexual harassment at an organizational level can lead to improved public/organizational policy regarding filing and processing sexual harassment complaints and help shape prevention programs" (Dansky & Kilpatrick, p. 161). The effects on the organization comprise additional monetary costs, including litigation costs. Excluding litigation costs, companies experience a monetary cost that averages $6.7 million annually and the federal government experiences a cost of approximately $250 million (Wagner, in Dansky & Kilpatrick). These costs are attributed to "declines in morale and productivity, increased medical claims for missed work, and job turnover" (p. 162). Prevention efforts may reduce this significant cost. The hidden costs experienced by organizations include: (a) decreased efficiency, (b) reduced morale,

(c) turnover and replacement actions, and (d) damaged public relations and image resulting from trouble associated with sexual harassment (Terpstra & Baker, 1986). These effects necessitate preventative measures be taken. Gruber (1997) states:

> [Organizations] (and organizational leaders) that do not take sexual harassment seriously create problems for women. Work units that have leaders who do not actively discourage sexual harassment have more problems with harassment than those that take a stand. Organizations that have a variety of policies on sexual harassment encourage more assertive responses to harassment from women and, overall, have a lower incidence of harassment. (p. 95)

Implementation of prevention programs is imperative to protect employees and organizations from the negative effects of sexual harassment both through direct involvement and through vicarious involvement.

Prevention of Sexual Harassment

Prevention of sexual harassment can assist organizations in reducing financial costs associated with such behaviors. As well, prevention measures decrease the negative effects experienced by the victim of harassment and the organization itself. Grundmann et al. (1997) suggest prevention interventions at three levels:

(1) *Primary prevention* efforts would be aimed at preventing new cases of harassment by targeting causal and risk factors;

(2) *Secondary prevention* would be aimed at identifying existing problems that might lead to sexual harassment and correcting them at the earliest possible stage to prevent further negative consequences; and

(3) *Tertiary prevention* would focus on providing service to perpetrators to

minimize occurrence of further harassment. (p. 175)

However, sexual harassment is often not viewed as a true problem by management, others in the organization, nor the perpetrators; Rather, it is often seen as a case of a minor incident being blown out of proportion (Grundmann et al., 1997). Truly, people are often more likely to believe the victim has an ulterior motive rather than recognize that the victim may be telling the truth and seeking a resolution. This further highlights the need for prevention measures at the primary level to assist others with identification of sexually harassing behaviors in the workplace and the removal of such behaviors from the workplace.

Lack of research clouds prevention efforts. The key elements related to the occurrence of sexual harassment are unclear. For example, McKinney and Maroules believe "…status differences between victims and offenders are the root of the problem of sexual harassment" (in Tangri & Hayes, 1997, p. 126). However, other theories or models cite different elements as "the root of the problem." Further research is needed to clear up issues such as these. Needed prevention methods aim at meeting the needs of the audience and do not solely aim at satisfying a legal obligation. Prevention strategies must be thoughtfully developed and enacted.

Knowledge of the typologies of sexual harassment is useful in sexual harassment prevention strategies. Pryor and Whalen (1997) support this assertion: "[Successful] attempts to ameliorate sexual harassment problems in the workplace are best guided by a recognition that there are different types of sexual harassment with potentially different causes" (p. 145). O'Donohue and Dubois (in Grundmann et al., 1997) consider that training on topics including victim empathy, explanation of the moral wrong of the act,

and aging harassment myths and end result expectancies may amplify internal inhibitions. In turn, removal of one of the preconditions of the four-factor approach theoretically prevents the occurrence of sexual harassment.

Primary Prevention

Primary prevention seeks to deal with the origin of organizational health problems, therefore averting the development of a problem (Bell, Quick, et al., 2002). The primary prevention of sexual harassment necessitates knowledge of certain causal or risk factors (Grundmann et al., 1997). Understanding the models of sexual harassment can aid in prevention design, allowing designers to consider the potential causes of sexual harassment and the best way to present information to change or eliminate the behaviors. However, due to the limited amount of research in this area, this task is not always easy. Without definitive research on the causes of sexual harassment, the design and implementation of prevention strategies must continue as a system of trial and error. Fortunately, a limited body of research does provide suggestions for primary prevention related to sexual harassment prevention training.

Williams et al. (1999) suggest preventative measures that include the following elements: (a) the encouragement of a professional work environment; (b) assimilation of women into nontraditional positions; (c) exploring the effectiveness of sexual harassment prevention training currently in place; and (d) evaluating managerial work performance partially related to the enforcement of the sexual harassment policy, procedures, and programming. Prevention measures that include managerial responsibility for enforcement and modeling of acceptable behaviors by supervisors strengthen the prevention efforts. Sexual harassment prevention requires all parties be involved in

eliminating harassing behaviors from the workplace. Furthermore, Bell, Quick, et al. (2002) propose the use of primary prevention methods as a proactive approach, which can optimistically influence organizational characteristics and the managerial harassment culture by means of preventive organizational actions. Use of primary prevention assists organizations in recognizing antecedents and early warning signs of sexual harassment.

Sexual harassment prevention training cannot be offered in isolation. Rather, the prevention program must be encompassed as part of a whole effort aimed at eliminating the behavior and creating organizational change. A look at current prevention programs provides direction into future paths for prevention.

Overview of Current Prevention Programs

Current training programs include educating managers and employees on "the company policies as well as workshops that give individuals direction on how to confront a harasser and how to report sexual harassment" (Flynn, 1997, p. 176). Regrettably, little empirical evidence exists to date that shows these programs reduce the occurrence of sexual harassment or decrease the probability that persons will sexually harass. Many sexual harassment prevention training programs are aimed at limiting organizational liability, but they may include little else to decrease the occurrence of sexual harassment.

Currently, sexual harassment prevention training often involves sensitivity training, empathy, and/or role-playing (Keyton, Ferguson, & Rhodes, 2001). Empathy is frequently viewed as a key element in addressing problems within an organization. "Like diversity training, sexual harassment training often relies on feelings and emotions to direct employees' behavior change" (p. 161). As well, it is believed that individuals with the ability to adopt another person's point-of-view are more likely to avoid harmful or

inappropriate behaviors. How does this relate to the organizational system for sexual harassment prevention?

Prevention Strategies

Many prevention strategies share three common components: "policies, procedures, and training (PPT) constitute the major components of many organizations' system for handling sexual harassment" (Gutek, 1997, p. 185). As well, Tangri and Hayes (1997) uphold "…the two most opportune points of intervention are in the policies, procedures, and commitment to change in organizations and in the educational system" (p. 125). A policy must be established, including grievance procedures, and all employees must be made aware of the policy. Employees who are aware of the organizational policy and the grievance procedures are less likely to perpetuate harassment (Grundmann et al., 1997). Furthermore, interventions aimed at any or all of the preconditions of the four-factor model would be helpful in decreasing the likelihood of sexual harassment. These are all considerations for creating effective prevention programs.

Effective prevention programs have effective results. In turn, ineffective prevention programs may cause harm by meeting an obligation without doing anything to eliminate sexual harassment, which should be the focus of the prevention program.

> Indeed, the negative effects of sexual harassment may be heightened when individuals working in a hostile or harassing environment are placed in a more difficult position because there are sexual harassment prevention programs in place (albeit ineffective) that putatively address their problem. The issue is not simply having a program that ostensibly decreased the rate of sexual harassment;

> rather, it is to have a demonstrably effective program. (Grundmann et al., 1997, p. 182)

Prevention efforts must focus on needed areas of training in order to increase the effectiveness programs or training. Indeed, preventative organizational actions that assist in prevention efforts include: (a) commitment to prevention from the top management; (b) zero tolerance included in the sexual harassment policy; (c) harassment-free notice provided to applicants and to new hires; (d) regular organizational appraisal; and (e) regular, directed training (Bell, Quick, et al., 2002). A comprehensive prevention strategy must include a comprehensive sexual harassment policy.

Sexual Harassment Policy

Affirmative Defense

The Faragher and Ellerth cases removed the distinction in courts of quid pro quo harassment and hostile environment (Van Detta, 2001). The new distinction was "whether or not the plaintiff suffered a tangible employment action, such as discharge, demotion, or transfer with significant change in responsibilities" (Van Detta et al., 2001, p. 65). Therefore, while sexual harassment policies may differentiate between the types of harassment that occur in the workplace, the courts use a different measure: the Affirmative defense. "The new Affirmative defense is two-fold: (1) the employer exercised responsible care to prevent and correct promptly any sexual harassing behavior, and (2) the employee unreasonably failed to take advantage of any preventative or corrective opportunities to avoid harm otherwise" (Van Detta et al., 2001, p. 65). Affirmative defense places the burden of proof on the employer, requiring the employer to show they took reasonable action regarding any charge of sexual harassment. The

accusing employee, in turn, must prove that he or she used the remedies established by the employer in such a case. One piece of evidence toward the Affirmative defense is to have a sexual harassment policy in place.

A general policy on harassment, however, is not enough, as evidenced in *Walker v. Thompson* in 2000 (Van Detta, 2001). This case dealt with the validity of using an anti-harassment policy to address any type of harassment, specifically racial harassment in this case. The Court determined the employer did not meet the Affirmative defense because they did not have specific policies for addressing or reporting racial harassment. In turn, the gender-based harassment suit, *Smith v. First Union National Bank* (Van Detta, 2001) was decided in favor of the plaintiff because the anti-harassment policy designed to prevent sexual advances was too narrow in scope. Smith claimed that the policy made it appear that in order to be sexually harassed a sexual advance must occur. As a result, Smith claimed, the policy of First Union prohibited her from recognizing her supervisor's behavior as sexual harassment. Both cases demonstrate the necessity of a good sexual harassment policy and the need to inform employees of the designated chain of complaint. One way to ensure employees know and understand the policy and its components, including prevention, is through sexual harassment prevention training.

Policy Components

Orlov and Roumell (1999) offer ten elements for inclusion in a good policy. They include: (a) a zero tolerance statement, (b) clear definition of what constitutes sexual harassment, (c) examples of what defines prohibited conduct, (d) duties and responsibilities for all employees, (e) emphasis that there will be no retaliation for reporters of sexual harassment, (f) the complaint procedure, (g) the investigation

procedure, (h) any corrective action, (i) confidentiality statement, and finally, (j) the training requirements necessary regarding the policy. These elements work together to protect employees and employers from the negative effects of sexual harassment. "Additionally, an employer should include a copy of the policy in all pre-employment 'paper work' and verbally inform applicants of its existence" (Van Detta et al., 2001, p. 65). Furthermore, the policy should provide disciplinary action for anyone that breaks confidentiality of those who report sexual harassment.

Decision makers in the realm of sexual harassment have a tough job. The laws regarding sexual harassment as outlined by the EEOC make even defining the incidences difficult. Enforcing sexual harassment policies is also difficult, because training employees regarding every aspect of sexual harassment may be impossible. Through further research and investigation, all involved will experience beneficial changes.

Research in the area of sexual harassment is not very comprehensive. The lack of comprehensiveness of the body of research relates to several factors, including: (a) the recent categorization of sexual harassment as against the law according to Title VII; (b) the controversial nature of the subject; (c) the difficulty in identifying sexual harassment; and (d) the reliance on the victim to report the incidents. Assessment of current policies used in companies and assessment of perceptions of those charged with enforcing the policies assists in identification of areas where current policy and ideal policy do not align. In turn, by identifying areas of potential weakness within the policy, particularly as it deals with harassment reporting, increased knowledge of current mismatch related to corporate responsibilities in cases of alleged sexual harassment will encourage a decrease in the occurrence of harassment by the design of a better policy. Beyond having a good

policy in place, organizations must also develop appropriate and effective procedures related to sexual harassment.

Sexual Harassment Procedures

Organizations must have a set of procedures for handling complaints of harassment. Williams et al. (1999) define procedures as the informal or formal methods for filing grievances, examining complaints, and implementing prescribed penalties. While not always part of the policy, best practice suggests procedures be included within the policy. Enforcement of the policy includes ensuring the procedures are carried out accordingly. Examples of enforcements include (a) investigating complaints of harassment, (b) reducing the potential for retaliatory action against the victim, and (c) applying the sanctions to perpetrators. Howard (1991) emphasizes the importance of accessible, nonthreatening channels for victims to report sexual harassment.

While the anonymity of a sexual harassment complaint is not possible (*Casiano v. AT&T Corp*, Van Detta, 2001) those filing complaints should be guaranteed a thorough investigation that is quickly initiated. The person filing the complaint should remain apprised of the investigation and of any action taken following the conclusion of the investigation (Howard, 1991). In order to accurately assess whether harassment actually occurred, reporting must take place close to the incident. Though many of these elements may seem to work against the complainant, they are useful in gathering facts regarding the complaint in an acceptable period. A small lapse of time between the action, the complaint, and the investigation lessens complications associated with poor memory.

A direct supervisor may be one person who may receive a complaint, but this should not be the only person, as upheld in the *Madray v. Publix* case, (Orlov & Roumell,

1999). In *Coates v. Sundor Brands*, 1999, the Court upheld that a policy that directs employees who have been sexually harassed to "immediately contact their line manager, Personnel Contact, or other manager with whom they feel comfortable" was a reasonable policy (Van Detta, 2001, page 36). This must be included in the policy and acted upon in the event of a complaint of harassment.

After receiving a complaint, the organization should investigate all claims, present the alleged harasser with the charges, and conduct an interview with him or her. Questions or probes should be direct. Documentation of the complaint and actions taken to follow-up on the complaint are necessary. The investigator should attempt to compile a listing of all dates, times, and places where harassment occurred. An established procedure for discipline of the harasser will contribute to a smoother process as well.

The EEOC advises employers to be proactive in dealing with sexual harassment by encouraging employers to: (a) raise the subject of harassment; (b) ensure that employers understand such behaviors will not be tolerated; (c) develop appropriate consequences for behaviors of harassment; and (d) develop a chain of complaint to protect employees and to allow them to be aware of the appropriate course of action to take in cases of harassment. Additionally, the EEOC encourages employers to develop "methods to sensitize all concerned" (Van Detta et al., 2001, p 88). This includes providing sexual harassment prevention training. Training designed with the employees in mind will enable employers to develop prevention programs that meet their needs, which may result in a more successful outcome.

Sexual Harassment Training

Training, the third prong of defense to deal with sexual harassment in most organizations, is defined as a premeditated learning experience planned to produce lasting change in a person's knowledge, attitudes, or skills (Noe, 1986). Training, essential to the holistic approach necessary to deal with sexual harassment prevention, is the single determinate to help employees learn to alter behaviors and to develop the necessary skills to manage work group interactions (Licata & Popovich, 1987). But does this mean training should be mandatory rather than voluntary?

Voluntary Training versus Mandatory Training

Should training participants be given a choice whether to attend sexual harassment training? According to Orlov and Roumell (1999): "Implementing a mandatory sexual harassment training program for all employees is the only way to convince a judge, a jury, or your employees that the issue of sexual harassment is being addressed seriously" (p. 189). One issue with mandatory prevention training, however, is that it produces resentment and very little learning may occur as a result. Conversely, voluntary training may not reach those most in need because they often choose not to participate in the prevention program (Gutek, 1997). Furthermore, Baldwin, Magjuka, and Loher (1991) reported that when given a choice regarding training session topics, trainees were more motivated to learn if they were granted their choice. However, when allowed to choose training topics but not able to receive the training of their choice, trainees were less motivated to learn than trainees who were granted no choice in training topics. Ideally, the presence of an active training program and the commitment to prevent sexual harassment would lead to a decrease in the occurrence of harassment to begin

with, and therefore decrease the likelihood that a company would end up facing a complaint of an improperly handled allegation of sexual harassment. Knowing the types of programs trainees are interested in, and allowing choice to be granted and honored, may increase trainee motivation.

Training Design

The design of the training program is often as important as the training content (Silliman, 2004). Unfortunately, little empirical research exists that details training design as it relates to sexual harassment prevention (Keyton & Rhodes, 1999). Diversity training is different in purpose than is sexual harassment training. Diversity training attempts to reduce prejudicial behavior (Paluck, 2006). Additionally, diversity training strives to build on personal experiences, but good sexual harassment training should not rely on participants to share personal experiences. Sexual harassment training can, however, be likened to diversity training. Most diversity training begins with awareness training for employees (Wiethoff, 2004). Just as sexual harassment prevention training programs must strive to increase empathy and awareness, diversity training programs attempt to affect acceptance of differences. Diversity training was developed initially in response to federal legislation (i.e., Affirmative Action) and to reduce future litigation (Paluck). Diversity training shares a common goal with sexual harassment prevention training: eliminate problematic behavior and improve the work environment. This makes the case for the use of diversity training design in relation to ideal design for sexual harassment prevention training.

Good training design dictates that training must fit the learning styles of multiple learners and be designed in such a way as to encourage learners to find things within the

training program that are beneficial to them. As well, good training design considers motivation to learn and the implication of learning transfer. According to Mathieu, Tannenbaum, and Salas (1992) many trainers "suggested that developing a better understanding of participants' training-related motivation would provide useful insights into a neglected area related to training effectiveness" (p. 828). Guthrie and Schwoerer (1994) support this position: "An accurate understanding of the training needs of employees is essential to ensure an efficient and effective use of the heavy investment organizations make in the delivery of training programs" (p. 406). A needs assessment is one way to ascertain an accurate understanding of employees' training needs.

By determining trainee preferences, interests, and hindrances and motivators for participation, the training material may be designed in a way to be best received by the target audience. The use of a needs assessment is not always conducted prior to training development, however. Some training developers find the time to conduct a needs assessment for training programs is prohibitive, although it has utility across a variety of elements within training design.

Another factor in training design is cost of development and delivery. A needs assessment is also useful in these areas. According to Moore and Dutton (1978) the most effective utilization of training money and resources includes the determination of the exact "location, scope, and magnitude of the training need" (p. 532). Developing training programs without regard to trainee preferences is a practice in futility and a poor use of resources.

Training design related to sexual harassment prevention also often meets with conflicting forces: the organization has a legal responsibility and liability to provide the

training, yet the legal wrongness of sexual harassment is not enough to bring change to organizations. Unfortunately, legal and fiduciary obligations often prevail as the sole focus of prevention programs.

Bell and Putman (1979) offer a list of 16 items for inclusion in an effective training program. They include:

> establishing learning objectives for programs; designing programs to satisfy specific needs; determining program content; applying concepts of human development in designing training; applying adult-learning theory and instructional principles in developing programs; evaluating alternative instructional methods (e.g., videotape, role-play, etc.); developing training materials (e.g., workbooks, exercises); preparing scripts for films, videotapes, etc.; developing programmed learning or computer-manager instructional materials; determining program structure (length, number of participants, choice of techniques, etc.); determining appropriate sequence of programs (e.g., prerequisites, curricula); developing criteria for selecting participants; developing exercises and tests for measurements of learning; developing self-assessment tools (e.g., checklists, exercises); deciding whether to use an existing program, purchase an external program, or create a new one to satisfy needs; and revising materials/programs based on evaluation feedback. (p. 26)

Each of the above subjects should be considered when designing training. However, these topics are not always known regarding the training topic before the program is delivered. This is potentially true in regard to sexual harassment prevention training.

Delivery Method

Orlov and Roumell (1999) suggest asking these basic questions to assess the most effective method of delivery:

- What is the right amount of training?
- What key points should be included?
- How many people should be trained at once?
- How often should the training be scheduled?
- Who should conduct the training?
- Who should be trained first?
- Should you start training in an area where you have had problems?
- Should different programs be offered for different segments of the workforce?
- Is there such a thing as training for a single "problem" employee? (p. 191)

Posing and answering these questions assists in prevention training design with the intent of increasing the success of the training. Answers to these questions may dictate preference of one method over another. Choosing the best method of delivery involves considering effective methods and trainee preferences. "The most effective and ideal learning situation is live, interactive, and skill-based training with examples and situations relevant to your organization" (Orlov & Roumell, 1999, p. 196). However, this method is not always possible. Alternative methods necessitate exploration. For example, if a large group of people are to be trained at one time, a video presentation may be the best method. If, however, the large group can be trained at different times, a computer

module may be preferred. Whenever possible, preferred delivery methods of the participants should also be considered.

Training Intervals

Providing sexual harassment prevention training during new hire training or orientation immediately communicates the organization's zero-tolerance stance on harassment and encourages immediate accountability (Baker, Terpstra, & Cutler, 1990; Bell, Quick, et al., 2002). Regular training, or "booster" training, should be offered in regular intervals, much the same way many health and safety training programs are offered. Revisiting the topic of sexual harassment prevention makes sure certain employees are reminded from time to time of the organization's anti-harassment policy and further underscores the importance the organization places on this issue. No research was found regarding employee views on training intervals, however, nor on its likelihood to increase anti-harassment compliance within an organization.

Training Objectives and Topics

Training objectives for a successful sexual harassment prevention program should include: (a) "total workforce awareness, (b) eradication of sexual harassment, (c) morale improvement, (d) defense of lawsuits, and (e) behavioral changes" (Orlov & Roumell, 1999, p. 189-190). Everyone in an organization is a stakeholder. The design, objectives, and organization of the prevention program should outline the personal and global responsibility to make the work environment a positive place for all employees.

Prevention training topics must include a definition of sexual harassment, how to report incidences of harassment, and any new or ongoing legal concerns related to sexual harassment. Trainers should emphasize positive behaviors, point out negative behaviors,

and offer suggestions to eradicate these behaviors (Bell, Quick, et al., 2002). The totality of these suggestions, however, appears to be lacking. What do employees need and want to know about harassment?

Licata and Popovich (1987) offer training design as a four-part model. Phase I includes definitional issues surrounding sexual harassment and facts and myths related to sexual harassment. Phase II focuses on the responsibility of the organization and the supervisor related to the detection and prevention of harassment. The organization's policy and procedures are also included in this phase. Phase III includes an activity with opportunity to assess situations involving sexual harassment in a low-threat environment, such as the use of videotaped scenarios. Finally, phase IV evaluates the program's effectiveness, a component that many times is omitted in sexual harassment prevention training.

One study that did evaluate sexual harassment prevention training found the training "associated with an increased probability…of considering unwanted sexual gestures, remarks, touching, and pressure for dates to be a form of sexual harassment" (Antecol & Cobb-Clark, 2003, p. 826). Additionally, the proportion of employees receiving prevention training is "positively related to the propensity that an individual employee has a definition of sexual harassment that includes these forms of unwanted behaviors" (p. 826), promising for sexual harassment prevention. Even so, the evaluation component is missing from many current sexual harassment prevention programs and is an area in need of further research.

Training Transfer

Beyond just good training design, the training or learning must be transferred to the workplace. "[Research] suggests that the failure of learned skills to transfer to the workplace is because of the failure of systems to support the transfer of learning" (Baldwin & Ford, in Leimbach & Baldwin, 1997, p. 34). Noe (1986) explained the proclivity to training transfer this way: "Trainees' perceptions of the favorability of the work environment influence the motivation to learn, the results criteria, and the transfer of skills from the training situation to the work situation" (p. 744). Training transfer is a measure of training effectiveness and is particularly critical with regard to sexual harassment training. The training environment must be a supportive environment conducive to the assimilation of new behaviors. Egan, Yang, and Bartlett (2004) found organizational learning culture to be a legitimate construct in forecasting job satisfaction, the outcome variables of motivation to transfer learning, and turnover intention. Furthermore, their study revealed "organizational learning culture had significant influences on both job satisfaction and motivation to transfer learning" (p. 295). Organizations must therefore consider matters of organizational climate as it relates to sexual harassment prevention. Only in a supportive organizational climate can sexual harassment prevention training programs be truly successful.

Transfer environment or climates fit into one of two general categories: (a) situational cues and (b) consequences. Situational cues are comprised of peer support, manager goals, and opportunity for practice (Leimbach & Baldwin, 1997). In a study conducted by Rouillier and Goldstein (in Leimbach & Baldwin), trainees who worked in a more positive transfer climate exhibited more trained behaviors on the job. Therefore,

the training climate must be supportive of non-harassing behaviors to increase training transfer. Moreover, Leimbach and Baldwin contend:

> Rather than generating additional ways to exclude these questions from study, HRD researchers need to explore how these context factors interact with training design elements to help or hinder program success. Practitioners, in collaboration with researchers, can identify the contextual constraints and barriers they face in applying learning in the workplace, and their insights can shape research designs that produce knowledge useful to theory and practice. (p. 35)

It is necessary to determine the elements of organizations with conducive environments for learning transfer and to consider such elements within the design process as it relates to areas of future research.

Two key variables in learning transfer are supervisor support and organizational climate (Tracey, Tannenbaum, & Kavanaugh, 1995; Noe, 1986; Williams et al., 1999). As well, peer support is linked to higher levels of training transfer. Williams et al. note that organizational practices, as they relate to sexual harassment, "directly and substantially affect both harassment incidence and individual outcomes…" (p. 322). A supportive environment does as much to encourage training transfer as an environment devoid of support does to sabotage training application. When designing prevention training, determine the organizational culture regarding sexual harassment. It must be established whether trainees "are generally uninterested, if they have any awareness of the problem, or if most believe it is 'no big deal'" (Orlov & Roumell, 1999, p. 192). The organizational culture must be understood as well as the anticipated reaction of the

organization's personnel to sexual harassment in order to offer training with the appropriate focus.

Before offering training, the employee group to whom the training targets warrants examination. All employee groups should be included in the prevention training. If there is a small group that works some distance from the corporate office, the company should consider offering an alternative training method, such as "video and computer-based training" (Orlov & Roumell,1999, p. 194). The training may require multiple offerings at varying times and in multiple locations. Regardless of the method selected, the training should be suited to fit the employees' needs.

Determining the training format includes consideration of who will deliver the training and the most suitable method to reach the prevention training program goals. Choosing the best trainer involves consideration of two options: a trainer from within the organization or a training consultant from outside the company. Consideration of the information the employee would need or want to know regarding trainer characteristics is also important. Determining the information a trainee would prefer to know before attending training assists in the overall training design and in selecting the most effective trainer.

Other items requiring evaluation in the design stage include "the size of the group to be trained and the time frame for training" (Orlov & Roumell, 1999, p. 197). The more time you can offer for training, the increased opportunity that the message supporting sexual harassment prevention will be communicated and received.

Needs and Interests

While certain elements are necessary to include in sexual harassment prevention training, other elements may be included based on the audience. Training needs include: (a) the behaviors that constitute sexual harassment, (b) the organization's policy on sexual harassment, (c) the procedures for filing a grievance, and (d) the elements necessary for a respectful workplace. Other topics may be of interest to trainees. Determining trainees' views on the primary focus of training will enable trainers to design an effective program that meet both the trainees' needs and interests.

Keeling, Jones, and Botteril (1998) determined that employees have more confidence in training programs when they feel their personal needs have been considered. "Furthermore, employees were encouraged by those organizations that were flexible in their approach to work-based learning, could identify and incorporate individual needs and extended their work-based learning policies to all employees…" (p. 284). Using a flexible and holistic approach resulted in increased morale and loyalty to the organization.

Hindrances and Motivators

Hindrances or deterrents to training often exist, creating a lack of full transfer into the work place. According to Ballard (2000), deterrents to training "can be organized into three categories of participation in educational programs" (p. 34). The three categories include: (a) situational barriers, (e.g., cost); (b) institutional barriers, (e.g., inconvenient scheduling of classes); and (c) dispositional barriers, (e.g., lack of interest). Other researchers have found that the biggest hindrances to transfer of training in sexual harassment prevention programs may be attributed to the beliefs held by employees

within an organization (Foxon, 1993). Foxon's model of training transfer includes the following hindrances to the transfer: (a) organizational climate factors, (b) training design factors, (c) individual learner characteristics, and (d) training delivery factors. Lack of supervisor and peer support create barriers, too. Additionally, belief that there is inadequate job coverage to attend training hinders openness to training opportunities.

Sue (1991) identified three major barriers related to diversity training; two of these barriers are related to sexual harassment prevention training: (a) "interpersonal-attitudinal discrimination and prejudice; and (b) systemic barriers" (p. 101). Interpersonal-attitudinal discrimination and prejudice can foster sexual harassment within an organization. Indeed, the discrimination and prejudice can serve to perpetuate further the false belief that men are more suitable for positions of power than are women. While this discrimination may be conscious or unconscious, the latter is the most dangerous; belief that one is acting in the best interest of all involved can create further problems. "Training at this level focuses on interpersonal interaction and attitude and behavior change…" (Sue, p. 102). Systemic barriers, the reality that genders may be disproportionately represented in certain job categories and career fields, also evidences a need for sexual harassment prevention training that includes an attempt to change organizational culture from a climate that supports harassing behaviors to a climate that does not support harassing behaviors.

Motivation to learn is also an important characteristic for training reflection, although often neglected in training research (Clark, Dobbins, & Ladd, 1993). Noe's (1986) work on motivation to learn is often cited, most notably with regard to his model of the motivational influences on training effectiveness. Within the model, Noe states:

> The extent to which the individual is apt to make internal or external attributions regarding work outcomes (locus of control) directly influences his or her reaction to: (a) skill assessment feedback; (b) expectancies concerning the link between effort and mastery of training program content…and rewards resulting from successful completion of the program; and (c) career and job attitudes. (p. 738)

Noe hypothesizes that those individuals who are enthusiastic about attending the training program are "likely to acquire more knowledge and skills and demonstrate greater behavior change and performance improvement than trainees not motivated to learn" (p. 743). Furthermore, trainees are more motivated to transfer learning to the job when they feel it will improve the job situation or work environment. This bodes well for sexual harassment training with regard to the intent of trainees to transfer learning.

Clark et al. (1993) posit that motivation to learn is a critical component in training effectiveness. In order for training to be effective, the trainee must view the training as related to (a) job performance or (b) an increase in career opportunities. The transfer of training after a sexual harassment prevention training program is critical. Organizational climate factors, including the support of supervisors and peers, can increase the motivation to learn.

Research Implications

All these considerations must be contemplated for ideal training design and delivery. What are the preferred methods of participants? What are their needs and interests? What are the hindrances to training? What contributes to training motivation? What is the best method of delivery? What is the appropriate format for training delivery? This research attempts to answer these questions.

Theoretical Perspectives

The theoretical perspective of the researcher, based on the post-positivist ontology, posits that truth has roots in reality (Fischer, 1998). The truth of the policy's effectiveness rests in the reality in which policy dissemination occurs, as well as the unspoken policies in place. According to Creswell (2003), this type of ontology recognizes "that we cannot be 'positive' about our claims of knowledge when studying the behavior and actions of humans" (p. 7). Post-positivistic thought believes in an objective, scientific reality. Phillips and Burbules, as cited in Creswell (2003), outline the following assumptions of this position.

1. Knowledge is conjectural (and anti-foundational) - absolute truth can never be found. Thus, evidence established in research is always imperfect and fallible. (p. 7)
2. Research is the process of making claims and then refining or abandoning some of them for other claims more strongly warranted. (p. 7)
3. Data, evidence, and rational considerations shape knowledge. In practice, the researcher collects information on instruments based on measures completed by the participants or by observations recorded by the researcher. (p. 7)
4. Research seeks to develop relevant true statements, ones that can serve to explain the situation that is of concern or that describes the casual relationships of interest. (p. 8)
5. Being objective is an essential aspect of competent inquiry, and for this reason, researchers must examine methods and conclusions for bias. (p. 8)

This ontology, prevalent in much social science research, most closely aligns with the researcher's beliefs on scientific knowledge and inquiry.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses of this study, stated as null hypotheses, are as follows:

1. No differnces in gender exist in sexual harassment prevention training interests, including interests of training topics related to the following: prevention of sexual harassment, victim impact of sexual harassment, and sexually harassing behaviors.
2. No differences in gender exist in the design or intent of sexual harassment prevention, including group training, individual training, professional development, and job responsibilities.
3. No differences in gender exist in the perceived usefulness of approaches of learning related to sexual harassment prevention training.
4. No differences in gender exist in voluntary sexual harassment prevention training attendance related to hindrances or motivators.
5. No differences in gender exist in whether identification of behaviors committed by coworkers as sexual harassment is identified as sexual harassment when supervisors committed the same act.
6. Gender is independent as related to factor score of the knowledge of sexual harassment subscale and the factor score of the interest level of topics subscale related to sexual harassment prevention training.

Anticipated Contributions of Study

Theory

Sexual harassment prevention training theory is in its infancy. Testing current theoretical foundations is important for understanding sexual harassment and eventually ending it. Theory development and testing is important to guide future research.

Research

There is little public-domain research to further study the topic. The research results are useful to design meaningful training sessions that meet the burden of legal liability and that transfers to the workplace. The results provide information for conducting needs assessments within individual organizations. Adding to the body of research for any topic assists in more understanding of the topic.

Practice

This research allows for further development of hypotheses about appropriate training design, including proper intervals, retraining, and content. The use of a needs assessment to determine items for inclusion in training improves content and design. Additionally, trainee motivation to attend prevention training increases.

CHAPTER III

Methods

This study utilized a quantitative method of research. According to Gay and Airasian (2000), "quantitative approaches are used to describe current conditions, investigate relationships, and study cause-effect phenomena" (p. 11). The researcher used a non-experimental design, with closed-ended measures to evaluate the following null hypotheses:

1. No differences in gender exist in sexual harassment prevention training interests, including interests of training topics related to the following: prevention of sexual harassment, victim impact of sexual harassment, and sexually harassing behaviors.
2. No differences in gender exist in the design or intent of sexual harassment prevention, including group training, individual training, professional development, and job responsibilities.
3. No differences in gender exist in the perceived usefulness of approaches of learning related to sexual harassment prevention training.
4. No differences in gender exist in voluntary sexual harassment prevention training attendance related to hindrances or motivators.
5. No differences in gender exist in whether identification of behaviors committed by coworkers as sexual harassment is identified as sexual harassment when supervisors committed the same act.
6. Males and females do not differ when comparing the factor score of the knowledge of sexual harassment subscale and the factor score of the interest level

of topics subscale related to sexual harassment prevention training.

The survey required respondents to answer general demographic information, which the researcher used for statistical comparisons between and among respondents, with particular emphasis on gender differences. Use of a Web accessible instrument allowed respondents with Web access to link to a Website in order to complete the questionnaire. The use of statistical computer software aided with the numeric data analysis. Additionally, the aide of a team of master researchers was helpful throughout the research study.

Sample Selection

The researcher used a convenience sample of city/county governmental employees from a mid-size metropolitan city in the southeast. The employees represented multiple occupational groups. Sampling allows a researcher to study a portion of the population, rather than the entire population. While convenience sampling, or accidental sampling (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000), is the weakest type of sampling, it is also the most often utilized type of sampling. Through discussions with multiple human resource directors and senior management officers at prospective sites, the researcher learned that research involving the sexual harassment topic would be challenging due to the sensitivity of the topic. The researcher contacted no less than 35 organizations and invited the organizations to participate in this study. Of those contacted, the researcher obtained permission only from the organization involved in this study. Because of the sensitive nature of the sexual harassment topic, and the considerable difficulty experienced by the researcher in securing a population to study, the researcher elected to use accidental sampling once the sample in this study was obtained. Although accidental sampling as a sampling method is

not as representative of the population-at-large as a random sample, Kerlinger and Lee attest that accidental sampling "probably does not deserve the bad reputation it has" (p. 179).

The population consisted of employees with work-provided Internet access and email address. The total population contained 1387 employees. Of those employees, 169 chose to respond, yielding a response rate of 12%. While the response rate was low, the researcher was unable to find other research of a very similar nature for benchmarking the response rate, possibly due to the proprietary nature of similar research and to the topic sensitivity.

Sample Characteristics

The survey responses represented n=169. Men represented 52.4% (n =89) of the overall respondents, with 47.6% female (n = 80), and 5 missing values. Percentages reflect removal of missing values from analysis. Due to the near 50/50 split, no stratification of the respondents was necessary. Single respondents equaled 12.2% of the sample, with (a) 69.5% of respondents married, (b) 2.4% of respondents separated, (c) 11.6% divorced, (d) 3.7% remarried, and (e) 0.6% widowed. There were five missing values removed from the analysis. More men were married than were females (73% vs. 65%, respectively) while more women than men were divorced (15.4% vs. 8.1%, respectively). Percentages of the remaining marital status categories were common between genders with less than a 4% difference per category remaining. Racial breakdown of the population was as follows: (a) 8% African-American, (b) 90.7% Caucasian, (c) 0.6% Hispanic, and (d) 0.6% Native American. Seven values were missing, resulting in removal of those seven responses from the analysis.

Education, Supervisor Gender, and Personal Salary Range

The educational breakdown of respondents indicated 17.2% had a high school education (males=19% and females=15%). Nineteen percent of male respondents reported completion of technical training, while only 9% of females completed technical training, representing 14.1% of the overall sample. Of the 8.4% who completed an Associates Degree, 25% were male and only 12% were female. Twenty-four percent of respondents earned a Bachelors Degree and represented a nearly equal percentage between males and females, i.e., 25% and 23% respectively. While more men than women in the sample reported completing technical training and receiving an Associates Degree, more females (33%) than males (12%) earned a Masters Degree, accounting for 22% of educational attainment reporting of the sample. The Educational Specialist Degree was earned by 3% of the population (males=1% and females=5%), and 1.2% earned a Doctoral Degree (males=0% and females=3%). Percentage computations were adjusted for the six missing values.

More respondents had male supervisors (82.7%) than female supervisors (17.3%). The largest position level represented by survey respondents was entry-level (34.6%), followed by team leader (24.8%), supervisor (20.3%), manager (17%) and finally executive (3.3%). Sixteen missing values were not factored into the analysis. Respondents reported personal salary ranges as follows: (a) below $15,000 = 1.9%, (b) $15,000–$29,999 = 17%, (c) $30,000-$44,999 = 47.8%, (d) $45,000-$59,999 = 22.6%, (e) $60,000-$74,999 = 7.5%, and (f) $75,000 or more = 3.1%. Forty-six percent of respondents indicated they were able to earn overtime, with 54% of respondents unable to earn overtime in their current positions.

Age, Length of Employment, and Weekly Hours Worked

To standardize responses, all responses related to months were changed to portions of a year. The respondents' ages ranged from age 20 to age 62 and the mean was 43.19 years. The number of position changes by respondents since their last degree ranged from zero to 25, with a mean of 1.9. The length of employment with current employer ranged from less than one-year to 34 years and the mean length of employment was 11.86 years. The minimum number of hours worked per week was 20 and the maximum number of hours was 108 with a mean of 45.79 hours. The high number of hours worked per week is due to the inclusion of firefighters in the sample and their job requirement to work multi-day shifts. Table 1 summarizes the socio-demographic narrative.

Job Titles

Respondents designated job titles by entering the title into a text box on the survey. After collapsing items separated into different categories by SPSS because of different spellings and spaces, the sample comprised 55 different job titles. The frequencies for various titles are in Appendix D.

Demographic Relationship to Community

Although there was a small response rate, the sample is representative of the county in which the research was conducted. The 2000 census results (http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/47/47093.html) confirmed the county's population consisted of 48.7% male and 51.3% female. The median age was 35.9 years of age, with 15.9% of the population aged 35 to 44 years. Caucasians comprised 88.1% of the population, with 8.6% African American, 1.3% Hispanic, 1.3% Asian, and 0.3%

Table 1.

Socio-Demographic Analyses Summary

	Male Frequency	**Male Percentage***	**Female Frequency**	**Female Percentage***	**Total Frequency**	**Total Percentage***
Gender						
Male	86	52.4			164	97
Female			78	47.6		
Missing					5	3
Marital Status						
Single	12	14	8	10.3	20	12.2
Married	63	73.3	51	65.4	114	69.5
Separated	1	1.2	3	3.8	4	2.4
Divorced	7	8.1	12	15.4	19	11.6
Remarried	3	3.5	3	3.8	6	3.7
Widowed	0	0	1	1.3	1	0.6
Race						
African-American	10	11.8	3	3.9	13	8
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caucasian	74	87.1	73	94.8	147	90.7
Hispanic	1	1.2	0	0	1	0.6
Native American	0	0	1	1.3	1	0.6

Table 1

Continued

	Male Frequency	Male Percentage*	Female Frequency	Female Percentage*	Total Frequency	Total Percentage*
Highest level of education completed						
High school	16	18.8	12	15.4	28	17.2
Tech Training	16	18.8	7	9.0	23	14.1
Associates	21	24.7	9	11.5	30	18.4
Bachelors	21	24.7	18	23.1	39	23.9
Masters	10	11.8	26	33.3	36	22.1
EdS	1	1.2	4	5.1	5	3.1
Doctorate	0	0	2	2.6	2	1.2
Number of job changes since last						
degree	2	2.3	20	25.6	22	13.5
0	16	18.8	46	59	62	38
1-5	21	24.7	1	1.2	22	13.5
6-10	12	14.1	11	14.1	23	14.1
11-15	17	20	0	0	17	10.4
16-20	17	20	0	0	17	10.4
21 or more	6		0		6	
Missing						

Table 1

Continued

	Male Frequency	Male Percentage*	Female Frequency	Female Percentage*	Total Frequency	Total Percentage*
Length of employment in current position						
1-5 years	79	95	49	69	128	83.1
6-10 years	4	4.8	10	14	14	9.1
11-15 years	0	0	4	6	4	3
16-20 years	0	0	2	3	2	1.3
21 years or more	0	0	6	8.4	6	3.9
Missing	8		7	9.9		

*adjusted for missing values

Native American. Married couples represented 52.6% of the population during the last census, with 30.7% of the population reporting as single.

Research Design

The best method for answering the research questions and for presenting the data was as a descriptive study. According to Gay and Airasian (2000), "[quantitative] descriptive studies are carried out to obtain information about the preferences, attitudes, practices, concerns, or interests of some group of people" (p. 11). In order to capture data, the respondents completed the *Sexual Experiences Questionnaire-Department of Defense* (SEQ-DoD) and the *Sexual Harassment Training Preferences Climate Survey*. The intent of surveys is to "generalize from a sample to a population" (Babbie, 1990, as cited in Creswell, 2003). Analysis of the responses focused on the intent to generalize the findings to the workforce. The responses proved helpful in describing the methods of sexual harassment prevention training dissemination from the employee perspective. The results of the training preferences survey were descriptive in nature. A needs assessment is necessary for designing effective training programs (Ballard & Morris, 2003) and often represents the first step in preparing training programs (Murk & Petrini, 1994). Murk and Petrini outline five essential questions to ask before designing a training program: (a) "who needs training," (b) "why are the participants attending the training session," (c) "when and where will the training take place," (d) "what is to be learned from the training session," and (e) "how much will the training cost" (p. 16). Cline and Seibert (1993) advocate needs assessments before developing training programs because "[you] can't design training without knowing the requirements of the trainees and the organization" (p. 99).

Weaknesses of Descriptive Surveys

Some weaknesses in descriptive studies include (a) the skill required to develop an instrument, and (b) "participant's failure to return questionnaires" (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 11). However, all chosen methods of research have inherent weaknesses. The goal is to select the method most appropriate for the research questions. Given limitations of the survey participant groups and the sensitive nature of the topic, the descriptive electronic survey was chosen as the preferred method of data collection.

Ethical Issues

The subject of sexual harassment is in itself a sensitive matter. When you begin to probe into employee training preferences and awareness of such behaviors, the matter becomes even more sensitive. Therefore, confidentiality was critical. The anonymity of specific responses was protected. In order to receive candid and useful responses, the researcher, in both the email notification and in the instrument instructions (Creswell, 2003), addressed the issue of disclosure of confidential information. The researcher provided contact information for further information or direct questions.

Additionally, the researcher provided the option of sharing the research results with the participants. Creswell (2003) advocates, "reciprocating between the researcher and the participants" (p. 65). The results may prove helpful for the HR department in designing and redesigning sexual harassment prevention training, and for redesigning other training programs currently in place. The final research findings from this study will be provided to the participating government organization in its published form and any further publications utilizing the data set will be offered to the groups.

The civil service director and the director of research and evaluation granted permission to use the group for study (see Appendix A). Additionally, it was necessary to secure permission from a building level principal (see Appendix A). A "Form A: For Certification for Exemption from the IRB review for Research Involving Human Subjects" was submitted and approved by appropriate personnel at The University of Tennessee (see Appendix B).

Procedures

The researcher prepared a survey for electronic distribution. The survey could be either paper-pen distributed, or electronically distributed, although the participating group preferred electronic dissemination. Advantages of electronic surveys include: (a) a faster response time when compared with mailed surveys, (b) lowered expense, (c) more frank responses, and (d) few, if any, data entry errors (Crowley, 1995; Porter, 2004; Shannon & Bradshaw, 2002).

Advantages of Electronic Surveys

Shannon and Bradshaw (2002) reported the return of electronic surveys was almost 5 days faster than the mailed responses. When corporate culture supports the use of email in daily business, the use of Web surveys is a natural progression (Crowley, 1995). Additionally, Crowley notes that people feel freer with electronic responses and therefore lower potential exists for socially acceptable responses and higher potential for more accurate responses. Email surveys are also more likely to reach respondents when they are in a frame of mind to respond to a survey. "When people open their email, they are ready to interact" (Raz, as stated in Crowley, 1995). The cost of developing and

sending a Web survey is less than the development and printing cost of paper-pencil surveys (Porter, 2004). Porter further explains:

> With paper surveys, transmission costs include the costs of printing copies of the survey, copies of the cover letter, and copies of additional communications such as a prenotification letter and a reminder letter or postcard. In addition, the surveys and reminder letter require envelopes for mailing to the participants. Each survey mailing will also require a return envelope for the completed survey. (p. 94)

Data entry is completed by the respondents and is virtually error free (Porter). This is a major timesaving benefit and reduces human error in the data set. As well, the cost to the respondent is less with Web surveys, where the user generates responses in a short amount of time with little effort for submitting that response.

Disadvantages of Electronic Surveys

Disadvantages of electronic surveys include: (a) the need for access to email and the Internet, (b) need for user comfort with such technology, (c) lowered response rate as compared to traditional mailed surveys, and (d) instability of email addresses (Shannon & Bradshaw, 2002). Those who intend to respond to the email survey had an almost immediate response, resulting in lowered possibility of the survey being returned after the initial contact. Email addresses are not as stable as postal addresses and very seldom have forwarding information attached when changed, as compared to mailing addresses. However, the use of the government group for the survey ensured that the email addresses were current and active.

Data Collection

The survey was prepared for electronic dissemination by using SPSS Data Entry 4.0. The researcher created the scale formats using the software package, which allowed the creation of various scales with multiple response formats. The researcher used: (a) open-ended responses where respondents provided their answer in a text box; (b) categorical responses (e.g., yes and no); (c) forced choice, multiple option responses (e.g., Likert-type scales); and (d) side-by-side forced choice, multiple option responses (e.g., items for coworker and supervisor behaviors). The software automatically created variables as the data for the scales was added. The variables were automatically created by number and signified within the database the type of data (i.e. ordinal or numerical).

To improve visibility, the researcher chose a 10% gray background. White backgrounds are too harsh for Web surveys and make the survey hard to read (Cary Springer, personal communication, October 2004). Within the scales, the text background utilized 25% gray and white on an alternating basis. This made it easier to differentiate between item response areas. With the exception of three screens, the scales were divided so no scrolling was required before moving onto the next survey page. The bottom of each screen prompted respondents to move to the "next" page or to return to the "previous" page. The use of Arial 10-point font was consistent with APA 5th edition recommendations for tables (American Psychological Association [APA], 2001). The Statistical Consulting Center uploaded the survey and managed the data results, including email addresses provided for the incentive drawing.

Due to the difficulty in finding companies willing to allow their employees to participate in this study by completing the *SEQ-DoD* and the *Sexual Harassment*

Training Preferences Climate Survey, the researcher determined the most appropriate method for distribution was to allow a governmental designee to disseminate the Web link to the employees. The link distribution was sent via email by a governmental representative and by the researcher. The governmental contact personnel expressed preference for this method of distribution over researcher disseminated email contact in order to continue to preserve the integrity of the workforce email system. The use of government personnel was believed to increase the response rate as compared to the supposed response rate if the solicitation was received from an outside source.

The researcher wrote the emails and sent them to the appropriate personnel at predetermined intervals. The email solicited selected participants to respond to an online survey. The survey link provided employees access to a secure Website where the answers were electronically submitted, with complete anonymity for the respondent. The first wave of the data collection consisted of an email letter sent to the employees of the company. The letter described the purpose of the research. The second wave included a hot link to the survey, with directions for accessing the site. The third and fourth waves were utilized as reminders in only one portion of the population, due to permission difficulties with a second portion of the population. Dillman (2000) notes: "Multiple contacts have been shown to be more effective than any other technique for increasing response to surveys by mail" (p. 149). More research is needed to determine the nuances for increased return rate for Web surveys versus mail surveys.

Data Management

The survey responses automatically submitted into an SPSS 13.0 file based on the selected response. Responses were delineated by variable number and label according to

cases received. The researcher utilized statistical software and the aid of master researchers to analyze the responses and to determine the statistical significance of responses. The researcher utilized several statistical techniques. The responses were maintained as complete cases and numbered by order of receipt.

An incentive drawing was offered as an option to all respondents. The use of incentives increases survey response rate, regardless of the size of the token (Dillman, 2000). The researcher chose to offer the opportunity to win one of four $25 gift certificates to Amazon.com to all respondents. Inclusion required submission of an email address at the conclusion of the survey. Email addresses were provided by 24% of respondents (n=41).

The researcher utilized a separate data collection file to maintain the email addresses of those respondents who wished to be included in the incentive drawing. After the last page of the survey content, respondents were directed to another page and asked if they wished to be included in the incentive drawing. If the respondent wanted to be included, the email address was entered in a text box. If not, then the respondent clicked to submit the responses without providing an email address. Statistical Consulting Center staff managed the file. The researcher used a random numbers table to select four respondents to receive a $25 gift certificate from Amazon.com. The researcher sent an email to the winning addresses provided by the selected respondents. The email contained an e-gift card and instructions for redemption. Supplying the email address in a separate data file made it impossible to attach the responses to the individual.

Instrumentation

To explore the research questions in this study, the researcher included the *Sexual Experiences Questionnaire* (SEQ) and the *Sexual Harassment Training Preferences Climate Survey*, found in Appendix C. The *Sexual Harassment Training Preferences Climate Survey* included the following subscales: (a) knowledge of sexual harassment and prevention topics; (b) preferred delivery methods; (c) professional development and job responsibilities; (d) preferred approaches to enhance learning; and (e) training hindrances and motivators. A series of demographic items were included. Removal of missing values was the chosen method for the data because the missing values were randomly distributed. According to Howell (1998), when missing values are random, it is appropriate to ignore those missing values. This concurs with the recommendation from the statistical consultant for the preferred method to handle the missing data for this study.

Sexual Experiences Questionnaire

The *Sexual Experiences Questionnaire – Department of Defense* (SEQ-DoD) survey (Fitzgerald, Magley, et al., 1999) is a 25-item, 5-point Likert-type scale used for assessing military personnel's experiences with sexual harassment in the past twelve months. In this study, the SEQ-DoD was modified with a 5-point, Likert-type scale ranging from "not sure = 0" to "strongly agree =4" to examine and compare respondents' identification of sexual harassment behaviors using two hypothetical scenarios of identical behavior: (a) if the coworker committed the behavior and (b) if a supervisor committed the behavior. "Not sure" was chosen as a response less than 1% of the time and was treated as a missing value. In previous studies, the SEQ-DOD has demonstrated

good psychometric properties of reliability and validity (Donovan & Drasgow, 1999; Fitzgerald, Drasgow, et al., 1999; Magley et al., 1999; Stark, Chernyshenko, Lancaster, Drasgow, & Fitzgerald, 2002). The SEQ-DoD was very closely modeled after the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ) developed by Fitzgerald, Magley, et al. (1999), with two changes (Donovan & Drasgow): (a) the time frame for consideration of sexual harassment experience was shortened from 24-months to 12-months; and (b) the modification from a 3-point Likert-type scale in the SEQ to the 5-point Likert-type scale used in the SEQ-DoD. The reliability of the SEQ-DoD is high, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.94 (Stark et al., 2002).

Magley et al. (1999) used the SEQ-DoD to compare the experiences of sexual harassment between men and women. More specifically, Magley et al. reviewed the effects of sexual harassment on military personnel. Twenty-three items were used from the SEQ-DoD to compare responses of males and females. They found no difference in the effects of sexual harassment on men and women, but women were more often the victims of sexual harassment. The authors attest that the use of multi-item subscales increased the reliability of the measures (Magley et al., 1999). In the current study, the modified SEQ-DoD scale used a 5-point Likert-type scale and the scale had a Cronbach's alpha of 0.986.

Sexual Harassment Training Preferences Climate Survey

The *Sexual Harassment Training Preferences Climate Survey* was comprised of 156 statements compiled from various public domain works (Ballard, 2000; Ballard & Morris, 2003; Ballard & Morris, 2005; O'Donohue, 1997; Paludi & Barickman, 1998). Based upon an extensive literature review, the researcher and her dissertation chair

created many of the items in order to test the hypotheses in this study. Because few descriptive sexual harassment studies exist, items for subscale creation were necessary. To determine the validity of the subscales used in this study, Principal Components Analyses (PCA) was used. The PCA enabled the researcher to look at data sections in large pieces and to determine the number of factors that would best explain the variance among items. A criteria of a minimum factor loading score of 0.4 was used to determine item placement within factors. The use of subscales allowed the division of statements into smaller, relevant combinations. The subscales utilized Likert-type scales, which varied in number of options and anchor points, outlined below. Reliability for each of the subscales was determined through Cronbach's alpha analyses. Statistical analyses confirmed the reliability and validity for each subscale used in this study. Appendix E contains each subscale with all items ranked by overall means and includes the mean scores by gender.

Knowledge.

To assess participants' current knowledge and participants' interest in sexual harassment and prevention topics, a list of 24 topic items was created from a literature review prepared by O'Donohue (1997) and is enumerated in Appendix E. All 24 items were created to utilize a 3-point Likert-type scale response ranging from "not at all knowledgeable =1" to "very knowledgeable =3". Additionally, the same 24 items were used at a later point in the survey to assess which topics respondents would like to learn more about in a training setting utilizing a 3-point, Likert-type scale with responses ranging from " not at all interested = 1" to " extremely interested = 3 ."

All 24 items in the knowledge scale were submitted for a PCA using a varimax rotation method with a 0.4 criterion, which indicated the best solution for these items yielded three factors (see Appendix E, Tables E1, E2, and E3). The three factors explained 74.4% of the variance. The factor analysis of these items indicated the following three factors: (a) prevention, (b) victim impact, and (c) acceptable behaviors. Of the 24 items, twelve items comprised the prevention factor, which had a Cronbach's alpha of 0.955. The victim impact factor possessed six items and had a Cronbach's alpha of 0.938. The behaviors factor included two items and had a Cronbach's alpha of 0.833.

Preferred delivery methods.

To assess the preferred delivery methods, the researcher adapted 10 items from Ballard's (2000) research, Ballard and Morris (2003; 2005), and from writings of Paludi and Barickman (1998). The 4-point Likert-type scale ranged from "uninterested=1" to "interested=4". There were 10 total items with 6 items comprising the group training factor and 3 items comprising the individual training setting factor (See Appendix E, Tables E4 and E5). The researcher removed one item, "group of same sex people as you", because there was no conclusive relationship to either scale. The factor loading score for this item was below 0.4 on both factors, which indicated it did not fit well into either scale. The Cronbach's alpha for the group training factor was 0.931 and the Cronbach's alpha for the individual training factor was 0.733.

Research conducted by Ballard and Morris (2005) used similar items to the preferred delivery methods section of the current study, but did not report a factor analysis of the information collected. However, the researchers did purport face validity of the survey instrument was ensured using a pretest with an advisory panel. Ballard and

Morris (2005) utilized an explanatory factor analysis on 22 possible deterrents to training attendance, which resulted in four factors: (a) programmatic deterrents with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.77, (b) personal deterrents with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.86, (c) time deterrent with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.71, and (d) attendance deterrents with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.71. Not all items used by Ballard and Morris (2005) were included in the current study and therefore different scales were formed.

In another study utilizing similar items, Ballard and Morris (2003) used PCA with a varimax rotation to measure participants' interest in selected family life education topics, which yielded six factors. Although the topics included for the current study were different from the topics included in Ballard's and Morris' (2003) research, the researcher modeled the needs assessment from their study.

Professional development and job responsibilities.

To assess professional development and job responsibilities, ten items were created and factor analysis supported a two-factor solution using a criteria for inclusion of a factor loading score of 0.4 or greater (See Appendix E, Tables E6 and E7). One item, "paid for by your employer," was removed from the analysis because it did not meet the criteria for inclusion. A 4-point Likert-type scale was used with anchor points ranging from "uninterested=1" to "interested=4". The professional development factor included five items and had a Cronbach's alpha of 0.858. The job responsibilities factor had a Cronbach's alpha of 0.832. This subscale included four items.

Preferred approaches to enhance learning.

To assess preferred approaches to enhance learning 15 items were included and factor analysis using a criteria for inclusion of a factor loading score of 0.4 or greater (see

Appendix E, Table E8). Two items were removed from the factor analysis because they did not meet criteria for inclusion. Those items were (a) “group discussion” and (b) “lecture from subject matter expert”. A 3-point Likert-type scale ranged from “not at all useful=1” to “extremely useful=3”. The factor included 13 items and had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.917.

Training hindrances and motivators.

To assess training program hindrances and motivators, the researcher adapted items from a survey created by Roberts and Morris (in Roberts & Morris, 1998). The original survey used a 5-point Likert-type scale, but for the researcher’s purposes, a 4-point Likert-type scale was used, ranging from “strongly disagree=1” to “strongly agree=4”. There were 22 items included in this scale. Factor analyses identified two separate scales: (a) training hindrances and (b) training motivators. It was necessary to remove five items from the scales because of failure to meet the criteria for inclusion within a factor (i.e., factor loading score of 0.4 or greater). Those items removed from the scales were: (a) “the amount of time required to attend;” (b) “the amount of money required to attend;” (c) “I like to attend training programs on this topic;” (d) “I prefer to learn on my own;” and (e) “the topic is too painful.”

The training hindrances scale included eleven items (e.g., “the topic discussed could invade my sense of privacy”) and had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.902. The training motivators scale included six items (e.g., “encouragement from supervisor”) and had a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.807. The subscales are in Appendix E.

Operational Definitions

Previous sexual harassment prevention training: Three items assessed previous sexual harassment prevention training. The first item asked respondents to indicate the number of training experiences s/he had for sexual harassment prevention. The second item asked respondents to characterize previous training experience(s). The response options included: (a) "extremely dissatisfying," (b) "more dissatisfying than satisfying," (c) "more satisfying than dissatisfying," (d) "extremely dissatisfying," and (e) "not applicable – I have never participated in this type of training." The third item measured the overall experience with previous sexual harassment prevention training experiences. Response options included: (a) extremely negative, (b) more negative than positive, (c) more positive than negative, (d) extremely positive, and (e) not applicable – I have never participated in this type of training before.

Identification of sexually harassing behaviors by a coworker: The modified SEQ-DoD measured respondents' identification of certain coworker behaviors as sexual harassment. Responses utilized a 5-point Likert-type scale including: (a) not sure, (b) strongly disagree, (c) disagree, (d) agree, and (e) strongly agree.

Identification of sexually harassing behaviors by a supervisor: The modified SEQ-DoD measured respondents' identification of certain supervisor behaviors as sexual harassment. The 5-point Likert-type scale used for responses included: (a) not sure, (b) strongly disagree, (c) disagree, (d) agree, and (e) strongly agree.

Knowledge: The survey measured items to assess current knowledge of topics related to sexual harassment. The level of knowledge was self-reported. Each item was

evaluated using a 3-point forced choice Likert-type-type scale. The responses included: (a) not at all knowledgeable, (b) knowledgeable, and (c) very knowledgeable.

Prevention training interest: Twelve items assessed respondents' interest level regarding training on the prevention of sexual harassment. The 3-point Likert-type scale options included (a) not at all interested, (b) somewhat interested, and (c) extremely interested.

Victim impact training interest: Six items were included to measure respondents' level of training interest in victim impact topics. The 3-point Likert-type scale options included (a) not at all interested, (b) somewhat interested, and (c) extremely interested.

Acceptable Behaviors training interest: Two items were included to measure respondents' level of interest regarding training interest in acceptable behaviors related to sexual harassment and its prevention. The 3-point Likert-type scale options included (a) not at all interested, (b) somewhat interested, and (c) extremely interested.

Preferred delivery methods: Respondents were asked to indicate their preferences for a range of six group training delivery methods and three individual training delivery methods. Each item was evaluated using a 4-point forced choice Likert-type-type scale. The responses included: (a) uninterested, (b) somewhat uninterested, (c) somewhat interested, and (d) interested.

Professional development: Respondents indicated their level of agreement with five statements related to their interest in sexual harassment prevention training related to professional development. A four-point Likert-type scale offered the following options: (a) uninterested, (b) somewhat uninterested, (c) somewhat interested, and (d) interested.

Job responsibilities: Four items assessed respondents' interest in sexual harassment prevention training related to job responsibilities. A four-point Likert-type scale assessed interest levels. The options were: (a) uninterested, (b) somewhat uninterested, (c) somewhat interested, and (d) interested.

Preferred approaches to learning: Respondents indicated the degree of usefulness of 15 learning approaches. The 3-point Likert-type scale included the following response options: (a) not at all useful, (b) somewhat useful, and (c) extremely useful.

Training hindrances: Respondents signified their level of agreement with nine items detailing possible hindrances to participation in non-mandatory sexual harassment prevention training programs. The response options followed a 4-point forced choice Likert-type scale. The responses included: (a) strongly disagree, (b) disagree, (c) agree, and (d) strongly agree.

Training motivators: Respondents signified their level of agreement with seven items detailing possible motivators of participation in non-mandatory sexual harassment prevention training programs. The response options followed a 4-point forced choice Likert-type scale. The responses included: (a) strongly disagree, (b) disagree, (c) agree, and (d) strongly agree.

Gender: Respondents identified themselves as either male or female. The descriptive statistics for this item are reported in *Sample Characteristics*.

Age: Respondents identified their age. The descriptive statistics for this item are reported in *Sample Characteristics*.

Marital status: Respondents indicated their martial status as one of the following: (a) single, (b) widowed, (c) separated, (d) divorced, or (e) married. The descriptive statistics for this item are reported in *Sample Characteristics*.

Race: Respondents identified their race according to the following categories: (a) Caucasian, (b) African American, (c) Hispanic, (d) Native American, or (e) Asian. The descriptive statistics for this item are reported in *Sample Characteristics*.

Educational attainment: Respondents provided information regarding the highest level of education attained to date. The categories offered were: (a) high school education, (b) technical training, (c) associates degree, (d) bachelors degree, (e) masters degree, (f) educational specialist degree, and (g) doctoral degree. The descriptive statistics for this item are reported in *Sample Characteristics*.

Number of job changes: Respondents reported the number of times they had changed jobs since earning their last degree. The descriptive statistics for this item are reported in *Sample Characteristics.*

Gender of supervisor: Respondents identified their supervisor as either male or female. The descriptive statistics for this item are reported in *Sample Characteristics*.

Position level: Respondents indicated which of the following terms best describes their current position level at work: (a) entry-level, (b) team leader, (c) supervisor, (d) manager, or (e) executive. The descriptive statistics for this item are reported in *Sample Characteristics*.

Length of employment in current position in years: Respondents entered the length of employment in their current position. The length of employment was entered

according to nearest whole year. The descriptive statistics for this item are reported in *Sample Characteristics*.

Average number of hours worked per week: Respondents entered the average number of hours worked per week. No categorization of the average number of hours worked was used. The descriptive statistics for this item are reported in *Sample Characteristics*.

Personal salary range: Respondents indicated their salary range. The salary ranges were: (a) below $15,000, (b) $15,000–$29,999, (c) $30,000-$44,999, (d) $45,000-$59,999, (e) $60,000-$74,999, and (f) $75,000 or more. Descriptive statistics for this item are reported in *Sample Characteristics*.

Ability to earn overtime: Respondents identified whether they were able to earn overtime pay in their current positions. The categorical variable offered two options: yes and no. Descriptive statistics for this item are reported in *Sample Characteristics*.

Occupation: Respondents provided their occupation title using an open-ended format. Descriptive statistics for this item are reported in *Sample Characteristics*. As well, the categories are reported by title in Appendix D.

Analytic Strategy

The researcher chose several statistical analyses to test the null hypotheses of her study. The rationale and purpose for each test is as follows.

Frequency Counts and Descriptive Statistics

The use of frequency counts and descriptive statistics provided for basic reporting of data. The demographic items were analyzed using frequency counts to provide a quick picture of the respondents. Frequency counts enabled the researcher to describe the

population in a concise manner, based on demographic characteristics. Frequency counts also allowed analysis of items requiring respondents' to fill in the answer, e.g., the number of training sessions attended previously. Descriptive statistics enabled the researcher to report basic statistical components of various subscale analyses.

Principal Component Analysis/Factor Analysis

As previously noted, because several subscales within the *Sexual Harassment Training Preferences Climate Survey* were used for the first time, and to support validity of the instruments used, PCA was employed. The PCA enabled the researcher to look at data sections in large pieces and to determine the number of factors that would best explain the variance among items. This exploratory method allowed the researcher to examine several potential factor solutions while not limiting the factors created. The scree plot and the percent of variance explained were used to determine the appropriate number of factors for each scale. A criterion of a minimum factor loading score of 0.4 was used to determine item placement within factors.

Cronbach's Alphas

The use of Cronbach's alphas allowed for assessment of scale internal consistency. The Cronbach's alphas for each of the subscales are reported in each subscale section. All the subscales had favorable scores, indicating the instrument subscales are reliable.

MANOVA

The MANOVA tested the means for differences in the following: (a) sexual harassment prevention training interests, including the following subscales: prevention, victim impact, and acceptable behaviors (null Hypothesis 1); (b) sexual harassment

prevention training design and intent, including group training, individual training, professional development, and job responsibilities (null Hypothesis 2); (c) voluntary sexual harassment prevention training attendance hindrances and motivators (null Hypothesis 4); and (d) current knowledge and interest in further training, gathered from the modified SEQ-DoD (null Hypothesis 6). The means were compared by gender. The MANOVA helped decrease Type I errors, i.e., finding significance when it does not exist. Because the more tests that are used, the higher the chances of finding spurious significance, an alpha equal to 0.1 was used for the initial multivariate F-tests, then a Bonferroni correction for follow-up tests utilized a significance score equal to 0.1 divided by the number of dependent variables tested. The data met all assumptions for normality of distribution. The researcher rejected any *p*-value less than .05, resulting in a good covariance structure.

One assumption of MANOVA tests is equality of variance. To assume equal variance, a significance score of 0.05 or greater is necessary, judged by the Box's M test, to assume equal variance. The test of between-subjects effects determines whether statistically significant difference exists. If no statistically significant difference exists, the Bonferroni adjustment is not necessary.

The second assumption of MANOVA tests is normal distribution. If the Shapiro-Wilks statistic is 0.9 or greater, then assumption of normality is okay. If the Shapiro-Wilks statistic is less than 0.9, a histogram assists in determining whether the subscale follows a normal curve. Even when the histogram shows that the subscale does not follow a normal curve, the procedure is robust enough to assume normal distribution, given N=157.

ANOVA

The ANOVA tested the means for gender difference in the perceived usefulness of approaches of learning related to sexual harassment prevention training (null Hypothesis 3). The ANOVA test was also used to further develop testing of null Hypotheses 1, 4, and 6.

Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel Test

The Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel (CMH) test was used to test agreement or disagreement matches between identification of behaviors when committed by a coworker compared to the same behavior committed by a supervisor (null Hypothesis 5). The CMH test allows for comparison of groups stratified by gender. A table of relative risk is also created and is used to assess the probability of agreement.

The null hypothesis of the CMH test is there is no association between reference groups (co-worker and supervisor) and response group (agreement or disagreement) while controlling for gender. If the row (reference group) and column (response group) variables are nominal, the General Association statistic and p-value are used, with a significance score greater than or equal to .05.

Within the CMH test, the Breslow-Day test is used to assess the null hypothesis that the male and female Odds Ratios for the reference group by response contingency tables are equal. If no significant difference exists, the case-control results are used. If a significant difference does exist, the reference groups by response tables are considered separately by gender.

CHAPTER IV

Results

The results of this study are reported in seven sections: (a) descriptive statistics; (b) sexual harassment prevention training interests; (c) sexual harassment prevention training design and intent; (d) approaches of learning related to sexual harassment prevention training; (e) voluntary sexual harassment prevention training attendance; (f) identification of behaviors as sexual harassment; and (g) knowledge of sexual harassment and interest level of topics related to sexual harassment prevention training. The Mean, Median, Mode, Standard Deviation (SD), Range, and Cronbach's alphas of each of the Instruments are noted in Table 2.

Descriptive Statistics

Previous Training Experiences

The number of respondents who reported never attending a sexual harassment prevention training program was 23.7% (n=40), the highest–represented response. The second-highest response was those attending only one training program, representing 16.6% (n=28). One person estimated attendance in sexual harassment prevention training programs as 2-3 times (0.6%), while 11.2% of respondents had attended 2 training programs (n=19). Three training programs were attended by 7.7% of respondents (n=13) and 2.4% (n=4) respondents attended four training programs. Attendance at five training programs was reported by 8.3% of respondents (n=14). One person reported attending "6 or more" programs, representing 0.6% of the sample. Two respondents attended eight training programs (1.2%) and two respondents attended 10 programs (1.2%). One respondent reported attending 20 training programs (0.6%). There were 44 missing

Table 2

Statistical Analysis of Instruments

Instrument	Mean	Mode	Median	Standard Deviation	Range	Cronbach's Alpha
Prevention	1.94	2.00	1.93	0.53	1.00-3.00	0.961
Victim Impact	1.94	2.00	2.00	0.55	1.00-3.00	0.938
Acceptable behaviors	2.22	2.00	2.00	0.45	1.00-3.00	0.833
Professional Development	2.43	2.80	2.60	0.73	1.00-4.00	0.858
Job Responsibilities	2.78	3.00	3.00	0.74	1.00-4.00	0.832
Group Training	2.49	1.00	2.67	0.92	1.00-4.00	0.931
Individual Training	2.25	2.33	2.33	0.86	1.00-4.00	0.733
Preferred Approaches to Learning	1.79	2.00	1.85	0.45	1.00-3.00	0.917
Training Hindrances	1.89	2.00	2.00	0.51	1.00-4.00	0.902
Training Motivators	2.66	3.00	2.71	0.53	1.00-4.00	0.807

values. Twelve percent of males had received no training, as compared with 37% of females, when responses were analyzed by gender. Attendance in one or two sexual harassment prevention training programs by gender revealed 26.4% of males had attended one or two training sessions, with 29.5% of females reporting attendance at one or two sessions. Thirty-five percent of male responses were missing and 18% of female responses were missing. Attendance at more than two sexual harassment prevention training programs represented 25.6% of males and 15.5% of females.

Satisfaction with Previous Training Experiences

Of those previously attending sexual harassment prevention training programs, the majority (43.2%) characterized their experience(s) as "more satisfying than dissatisfying=3" (n=73). Twenty-one respondents felt their experience(s) to be "more dissatisfying than satisfying=2," representing 12.4% of responses. Thirteen respondents indicated their experience(s) as "extremely satisfying=4," representing 7.7% of respondents. The fewest respondents found training to be "extremely dissatisfying=1," representing 4.1% (n=7).

Respondents most often ranked their experience(s) with previous sexual harassment prevention programs as "more satisfying than dissatisfying=3," representing 42.6% (n=72). The next highest response was "more dissatisfying than satisfying," representing 16% (n=27). Nine respondents rated their previous experiences as "extremely satisfying=4," with six respondents reporting the experience(s) as "extremely dissatisfying=1" (3.6%).

Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Interests

Hypothesis 1 explored the Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Interests of participants in this study.

Hypothesis 1: *No differences in gender exist in sexual harassment prevention training interests, including the following subscales: prevention, victim impact, and acceptable behaviors.*

In order to test Hypothesis 1, a MANOVA test was performed on prevention, victim impact, and acceptable behaviors subscales as related to gender. The factors met the assumption of equal variances and normality. The null hypothesis is the means are equal for all subscales for both males and females. The multivariate F-score indicated statistically significant differences between males and females may exist on at least one subscale, using a significance score $p \geq .033$.

Univariate ANOVA tests were performed on each of the three subscales to determine which subscales were statistically significant based on gender. The analysis of each subscale included rank ordering by overall mean. The rank order for the entire prevention subscale is delineated in Table F1 (see Appendix F, p. 159). Table 3 reflects the rank order of the top three items for both males and females related to the prevention subscale. The rank order for the entire victim impact subscale is delineated in Table F2 (see Appendix F, p. 160). Table 4 outlines the rank order of the top three items for both males and females related to the victim impact subscale. The rank order for the entire acceptable behaviors subscale contained only two items, which are delineated in Table

Table 3

Knowledge Factor: Prevention Subscale Top Three Item Means by Gender

Item Rank	Male	Female
1	The manager's duty to prevent harassment (μ = 2.21)	The manager's duty to prevent harassment (μ = 1.95)
2	The employee's duty to prevent harassment (μ =2.12)	What to do if you believe you are being harassed (μ = 1.95)
3	What to do if you believe you are being harassed (μ = 2.10)	Understanding the organization's harassment policy and procedure (μ = 1.93)

Table 4

Knowledge Factor: Victim Impact Subscale Top Three Item Means by Gender

Item Rank	Male	Female
1	How sexual harassment affects victims' performance on the job (μ = 2.01)	How sexual harassment affects victims emotionally (μ =2.08)
2	What causes harassment? (μ = 2.01)	How sexual harassment affects victims' performance on the job (μ =1.96)
3	Why sexual harassment victims get blamed? (μ =1.95)	Why sexual harassment victims get blamed? (μ =1.97)

F3 (see Appendix F, p. 160). Males and females completely agreed on these items, resulting in identical rank ordering of items for both genders.

The follow-up tests indicated that while the acceptable behaviors subscale approached significant difference, it was not of enough magnitude to be statistically significant. The behavior subscale appears to have a pattern of difference, but it did not qualify as statistically significant at the Bonferroni adjustment p-value. Therefore, the researcher fails to reject null Hypothesis 1: *No differences in gender exist in sexual harassment prevention training interests, including the following subscales: prevention, victim impact, and acceptable behaviors.*

Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Design and Intent

Hypothesis 2 explored the preferred Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Design and Intent of participants in this study.

Hypothesis 2: *No differences in gender exist in the design or intent of sexual harassment prevention, including group training, individual training, professional development, and job responsibilities.*

In order to test Hypothesis 2, a MANOVA test was performed on the group training, individual training, professional development, and job responsibilities subscales as related to gender. The factors met the assumption of equal variances and normality. A test of between-subjects effects indicated no statistically significant difference, and therefore no Bonferroni adjustment was necessary.

Analysis of each of the four subscales included rank ordering by overall mean. The rank order for the entire group training subscale is delineated in Table F4 (seeAppendix F, p. 161). Table 5 details the top three items for the group training

Table 5

Group Training Subscale Top Three Item Means by Gender

Item Rank	Male	Female
1	Mixed group of both males and females (μ = 2.01)	Small group training (μ =2.59)
2	Group training? (μ = 2.70)	Group training (μ =2.46)
3	Small group training (μ =2.63)	Large group training (μ =1.97)

subscale for both males and females. Males and females agreed on the top item in the individual training subscale, "On site training using an electronic delivery format," and reversed preference for the remaining two items of the subscale (see Table F5, Appendix F, p. 161). The rank order for the entire professional development subscale is delineated in Table F6 (see Appendix F, p. 162) and was identical for both males and females. Table F7 (see Appendix F, p. 162) outlines the rank order by means for the entire job responsibilities subscale, which was rank ordered identically for both males and females. The null hypothesis is the means are equal for all subscales for both males and females. The multivariate F-score indicated no statistically significant differences between males and females exists on any subscale, using a significance score $\geq$.025. Therefore, the researcher failed to reject null Hypothesis 2: No differences in gender exist in the design or *intent of sexual harassment prevention, including group training, individual training, professional development, and job responsibilities.*

Perceived Usefulness of Approaches of Learning

Hypothesis 3 explored the perceived usefulness of approaches of learning related to sexual harassment prevention training.

Hypothesis 3: *No differences in gender exist in the perceived usefulness of approaches of learning related to sexual harassment prevention training.*

In order to test Hypothesis 3: *No differences in gender exist in the perceived usefulness of approaches of learning related to sexual harassment prevention training*, an ANOVA test was used. There was no statistically significant difference between males and females, using significance score $\geq$.05. However, differences in the rank order of means for males and females are shown in Table 6. Table F8 (see Appendix F, p. 163) includes a rank order by means of the entire preferred approaches of learning subscale. Due to lack of statistically significant difference, the researcher failed to reject null Hypothesis 3: *No differences in gender exist in the perceived usefulness of approaches of learning related to sexual harassment prevention training*.

Voluntary Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Attendance

Hypothesis 4 explored the gender differences in voluntary sexual harassment prevention training.

Hypothesis 4: *No differences in gender exist in voluntary sexual harassment prevention training attendance related to hindrances or motivators*.

In order to test Hypothesis 4, a MANOVA test was performed on the hindrances and motivators subscales as related to gender. The factors met the assumption of equal variances and normality.

The null hypothesis is the means are equal for both subscales for males and

Table 6

Preferred Approaches of Learning Subscale Top Three Item Means by Gender

Item Rank	Male	Female
1	Movie Clips (μ = 2.00)	Television documentary (μ = 2.05)
2	Instructional videos (μ = 2.00)	Self-paced/self-guided computer program at work (μ = 2.00)
3	Television documentary (μ = 1.91)	Internet/web site program (μ = 1.96)

females. The multivariate F-score (0.912) indicated no statistically significant differences between males and females exists on the hindrance subscale, using a significance score ≥.05. The univariate ANOVA test reported an F-score of 0.006 between genders on the hindrance subscale, with a significance score of 0.941, indicating no significant difference. The mean score for males was 1.89 and the mean score for females was 1.90. Table F9 (see Appendix F, p. 164) delineates the rank order for the entire hindrance subscale. The top three items for both males and females for the hindrance subscale are detailed in Table 7.

However, there was a statistically significant difference between males and females on the motivators subscale, using a significance score ≥.05. The multivariate F-score (0.008) indicated a statistically significant difference between males and females exists on the motivators subscale, using a significance score ≥.05. The univariate ANOVA test reported an F-score of 7.68 between genders on the motivators subscale, with a significance score of 0.006, indicating a significant difference. The mean score for

Table 7

Training Hindrances Subscale Top Three Item Means by Gender

Item Rank	Male	Female
1	The activities done during the training could invade the privacy of my working relationships (μ = 2.12)	The activities done during the training could invade the privacy of my working relationships (μ = 2.20)
2	I could be asked to do things that would embarrass me (μ = 1.98)	I could be asked to do things that would embarrass me (μ = 2.00)
3	I could say something dumb (μ = 1.96)	The topics discussed could invade my sense of privacy (μ = 2.07)

males was 2.55 and the mean score for females was 2.78, indicating females were more motivated than males to attend training. The rank order for the entire motivators subscale is delinated in Table F10 (see Appendix F, p. 165). The top two items for both males and females are detailed in Table 8.

Therefore, the researcher partially rejected null Hypothesis 4: *No differences in gender exist in voluntary sexual harassment prevention training attendance related to hindrances or motivators*.

Identification of Behaviors as Sexual Harassment

Hypothesis 5 explores the gender differences in whether identification of behaviors committed by coworkers as sexual harassment is also identified as sexual harassment

Table 8

Training Motivators Subscale Top Two Item Means by Gender

Item Rank	Male	Female
1	The topic is interesting (μ = 2.77)	The amount of time required to attend (μ = 3.12)
2	The amount of time required to attend (μ = 2.71)	The topic is interesting (μ = 2.92)

when supervisors committed the same act.

Hypothesis 5: *No differences in gender exist in whether identification of behaviors committed by coworkers as sexual harassment is also identified as sexual harassment when supervisors committed the same act*.

As previously described, the SEQ-DoD was modified for this study. The results of the statistical analysis of this hypothesis follow.

The Cochran-Mantel-Haenszel (CMH) test tests the hypothesis of no association between reference groups (coworker and supervisor) and response (agreement or disagreement) while controlling for gender. Because the $p<.001$, the null hypothesis was rejected: there is an association between the response level and the group to which it refers across the items of interest when controlling for gender. The Breslow-Day test null hypothesis is that the male and female Odds Ratios for the reference group by response contingency tables are equal. Since $p<.001$, the null hypothesis was rejected and it was thus concluded that the Odds Ratios differ between males and females.

All respondents, regardless of gender, were more likely to indicate the behavior was sexual harassment when committed by a supervisor than when a coworker committed the behavior. However, The CMH value indicates that the probability of agreement with an item when the reference group was supervisor is 2.39 times the probability of agreement when the reference group was a coworker for females. Stated differently, when a female respondent defined a given behavior as sexual harassment, the respondent was almost 2.5 times more likely to define the behavior as harassment when the supervisor committed the behavior versus when the same behavior was committed by a coworker. This follows logically from quid pro quo; supervisors have more avenues or opportunities to commit sexual harassment and should be held to a higher standard as a result.

When considered separately by gender, a significant association between reference group and response group for females exists (Pearson Chi-Square $p<.001$). Table 9 provides the frequencies and expected counts for supervisor and coworker by agreement and disagreement. This means that far more often than expected, females agree rather than disagree that a behavior is sexual harassment when committed by a supervisor. This finding has implications for supervisors because females hold supervisors to a higher standard of behavior than coworkers. No significant association exists between reference group and response for males ($p=0.38$): the type of response (agree or disagree) is independent of the group to which the reference is made (supervisor or coworker).

In conclusion, the researcher rejected null Hypothesis 5: *No differences in gender exist in whether identification of behaviors committed by coworkers as sexual*

Table 9

Frequency and Expected Results Reference Group by Response for Females

Supervisor	*Type of Count*	*Agree*	*Disagree*
	Frequency	32	4
	Expected	18	18
Coworker			
	Frequency	4	32
	Expected	18	18

harassment is also identified as sexual harassment when supervisors committed the same act.

Sexual Harassment Knowledge and Interest Level of Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Topics

Hypothesis 6 explored the differences between genders when comparing knowledge of sexual harassment and interest level of topics related to sexual harassment prevention training.

Hypothesis 6: *Males and females do not differ when comparing the factor score of the knowledge of sexual harassment subscale and the factor score of the interest level of topics related to sexual harassment prevention training*.

As previously described, the PCA of the knowledge items resulted in three factors: (1) prevention, (2) victim impact, and (3) acceptable behaviors. Although not examined

individually for hypothesis testing, the training interest topics are depicted by rank order for each of the three subscales. The rank order for the entire training interest prevention subscale is delineated in Table F11 (see Appendix F, p. 166). Table 10 indicates the top three item means for both males and females for training interest prevention topics. The rank order for the entire training interest victim impact subscale is delineated in Table F12 (see Appendix F, p. 167). The top two items for both males and females are detailed in Table 11. The rank order for the entire training interest acceptable behaviors subscale is delineated in Table F13 (see Appendix F, p. 167). Table 12 outlines the top response item for both males and females. The subscales were compared with interest level in receiving training on these topics. Subtracting the response for each interest level item from the response for each knowledge item resulted in a difference score for each subscale (knowledge score–interest score=difference score). A positive number indicated the respondent had more knowledge than interest related to the given topic, whereas a negative score indicated the respondent had more interest than knowledge related to the given topic. The results of the analysis of this hypothesis follow.

In order to test Hypothesis 6, a MANOVA test was performed on the subscales as related to gender. The difference scores met the assumptions of equal variance and normality. A test of between-subjects effects indicated no statistically significant difference, and therefore no Bonferroni adjustment was necessary. The difference scores met all assumptions for use of MANOVA.

The null hypothesis is the difference score means are not significantly different from zero and the means are equal for all subscales for both males and females. The multivariate F-score indicated (a) at least one mean difference score was significantly

Table 10

Training Interest Factor: Prevention Subscale Top Three Item Means by Gender

Item Rank	Male	Female
1	Understanding the law relevant to sexual harassment (μ =2.17)	Ways to prevent workplace harassment (μ = 2.26)
2	The manager's duty to prevent harassment (μ = 2.16)	The employee's duty to prevent harassment (μ = 2.19)
3	The employee's duty to prevent harassment (μ = 2.15)	Understanding the organization's harassment policy and procedure (μ = 2.18)

Table 11

Training Interest Factor: Victim Impact Subscale Top Two Item Means by Gender

Item Rank	Male	Female
1	What kind of people are more likely to harass (μ =2.14)	What kind of people are more likely to harass (μ = 2.17)
2	How sexual harassment affects victims' performance on the job (μ = 2.07)	What causes harassment (μ = 2.01)

Table 12

Training Interest Factor: Acceptable Behaviors Subscale Top Item Mean by Gender

Item Rank	Male	Female
1	Specific guidelines of appropriate behavior at work (μ =2.14)	How to listen to others with respect (μ = 2.07)

different from zero ($p < .001$) and (b) males and females have significantly different means on at least one difference score (p=.004).

Further investigation using the ANOVA test revealed that, for the test on intercepts, mean difference scores were significantly different from zero for two subscales: prevention (p=.012) and behaviors (p=.016). The mean score for the victim impact difference score indicated no statistically significant difference (p=.142). Additionally, the ANOVA test indicated none of the mean difference scores differ between males and females.

For prevention, the interest level was, on average, greater than self-assessed knowledge. The mean difference score equaled -0.1629. However, the reverse was true for behaviors: the interest level on average was less than self-assessed knowledge, with a mean difference score of .1533. Each score was averaged over males and females.

Further investigation of the means of difference scores for males and females revealed no statistically significant mean difference between males and females related to the difference score for behaviors. However, large differences exist between genders on the prevention difference score and on the victim impact difference score, but not

between genders on the acceptable behaviors difference score. Follow-up tests on the prevention difference score and the victim impact difference score do not show varying means in difference scores, but a lot of variability is present within males and within females, which makes it difficult to find the means different when follow up paired tests were calculated.

Therefore, the researcher rejected null Hypothesis 6: *Males and females do not differ when comparing the factor score of the knowledge of sexual harassment subscale and the factor score of the interest level of topics related to sexual harassment prevention training*.

CHAPTER V

Discussion

Results of the survey provided insight into current needs regarding sexual harassment prevention training, as well as employees' desires for training topics. It also provided good news for training developers and training delivery sectors: the lack of differentiation between male and female responses supports one training design for both genders. There is no need to develop separate training components based on gender, as no statistically significant difference exists among delivery and content preferences. This saves money and time, while also allowing for joint prevention and design efforts among genders. Many of the suggested topics hold interest for employees, despite current knowledge levels of the topic.

Sexual Harassment Prevention Training

Among the survey respondents, 18.9% had received no sexual harassment training. Those attending only one training session represented 16.6% of respondents, while 11.8% had only attended two sexual harassment prevention training sessions. This means that over 35% of the respondents had attended no more than one sexual harassment prevention training session, an indefensible position. Orlov and Roumell (1999) state: "implementing a mandatory sexual harassment training program for all employees is the only way to convince a judge, a jury, or your employees that the issue of sexual harassment is being addressed seriously" (p. 189). Lack of sexual harassment prevention training increases organizational liability and demonstrates irresponsibility.

Primary prevention efforts are critical to begin to ameliorate the occurrence of sexual harassment in the workforce (Paludi & Barickman, 1998). According to Bell,

Quick, et al. (2002), sexual harassment affects approximately 15% of males and almost 50% of females during their years of employment. Furthermore, the costs involved in efforts aimed at the prevention of sexual harassment in the workplace may actually result in monetary savings by reducing absenteeism, turnover, and litigation costs (Bell, Quick, et al., 2002). Future research is needed to determine the true return on investment from a comprehensive training prevention program.

Additionally, the lack of exposure to sexual harassment prevention training is startling because the mean age of employees was 43 years of age and the average length of employment with the current organization was over 11 years, 8 months. Petrocelli and Repa (1999) reported the American Management Association discovered 65% of companies surveyed offered anti-harassment training, findings not supported by this study. Sexual harassment prevention training is necessary, at the very least, during employee orientation (Grundmann et al., 1997), with the best interval for retraining within the organization yet to be determined. Measuring training evaluations, training transfer, and return on investment for training equates with a successful training program.

Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Interests

No differences in gender existed in sexual harassment prevention training interests, including prevention, victim impact, and acceptable behaviors. However, a pattern appears to be related to acceptable behaviors. The lack of gender difference in training interests means that prevention training design can focus on good content rather than creating programs for different genders. A needs assessment will ensure topics of interest are included in the prevention program (Morrison, Ross, & Kemp, 2004).

Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Design and Intent

No differences in gender exist in relation to preferences for training design or intent. Group training and individual training were desirable by both males and females, with the majority of respondents showing more interest for group training. Morrison et al. (2004) suggest self-paced training learners "work harder, learn more, and retain more of what is learned than do learners in conventional classes" (p. 186). However, with a topic as important as sexual harassment prevention, learning is too important to leave solely to each individual's discretion. Morrison et al. further explain: "[lack] of self-discipline combined with procrastination can result in delaying the completion of required study by some learners" (p. 187). Group training is more familiar to learners (Morrison et al.) and it is possible to design the training to be interactive, with opportunity to check for understanding throughout the training program. Regardless of the type of training selected, the quality of training is paramount.

While there were no statistically significant gender differences related to the intent of the training, more respondents would attend training related to job responsibilities than for professional development. Exploring opportunities to both satisfy job responsibilities and professional development interests is important. Conducting a needs assessment assists training designers in determining the best training intent for the audience.

Approaches of Learning Related to Sexual Harassment Prevention Training

Males and females did not differ on the perceived usefulness of approaches of learning related to sexual harassment. Brochures or pamphlets were most useful according to respondents. Books were least useful, with nearly 50% reporting books as

"not at all useful" as an approach for sexual harassment prevention training. Ballard (2000) reported brochures or pamphlets as the second-most highly rated approach to learning among older adults, with books ranking third. Perhaps the lack of job responsibilities for retired individuals contributes to the difference in preference for reading books to gain knowledge. Further research is necessary to discover the variables involved in the difference among preferred methods for workforce-aged adults and older adults.

While both the most useful and the least useful approaches for learning involve reading, perhaps brochures are more desirable because they take the most pertinent components of the training and condense the information into a "snap shot." This may also be rated highly because brochures are easy to read and do not take long to check off as completed. However, this study did not measure the efficacy of brochures for learning and for training transfer. Future research should examine the effectiveness of brochures or pamphlets as a training tool.

Voluntary Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Attendance

Hindrances for attending sexual harassment prevention programs did not differ significantly by gender. However, females were more highly motivated to attend prevention training, perhaps because females are more often the victims of sexual harassment (Paludi & Barickman, 1998). Coworker support and supervisor support for training attendance is the biggest motivator as well as the biggest hindrance. Additionally, having an organizational culture that supports learning is important (Egan et al., 2004). Environmental support must be in place for training transfer to occur.

Identification of Behaviors as Sexual Harassment

Rating behaviors as sexual harassment, whether committed by coworker or supervisor, revealed females are more likely to agree that a given behavior constitutes sexual harassment, regardless of who committed the act, and almost 2.5 times more likely to rate the behavior as harassment when committed by a supervisor. Alternately, males are more likely to vary their opinion of the behavior based on whether a coworker or supervisor is responsible for the action, with a higher standard enforced for the supervisor. Indeed, Kaser (1995) emphasizes the key to perceived acceptable behaviors within an organization is linked to the behavior of key personnel, including supervisors.

This reinforces the need to define sexual harassment within the organization. For example, if males believe it is acceptable to tell a dirty joke among coworkers, but not with a supervisor, the organization is vulnerable to sexual harassment complaints. However, this study did not separate response by gender of coworker or supervisor. More research is needed to exhaust the implications of work behaviors and working relationships.

A clear definition is a critical first step in sexual harassment prevention (Paludi & Barickman, 1998). Supervisors need additional training related to the implications of their behavior in a position of power. Supervisors are held to a higher expectation of behavior: employees expect the supervisor to behave differently toward them than they a coworker behaves toward them.

Knowledge of Sexual Harassment and Interest Level of Topics Related to Sexual Harassment

Respondents felt they were knowledgeable about many sexual harassment topics. However, knowledge of sexual harassment is not enough. The respondents realized this, as indicated by their responses indicating training prevention topics they would like to know more about. Trainers must go beyond the basic level of knowledge and move into conceptual content and into higher order thinking levels in order for training transfer to occur. According to Bloom's taxonomy (Morrison et al., 2004), in the highest level, evaluation, judgments can be made. Unfortunately, many training programs do not get beyond the knowledge and comprehension levels.

Respondents were most interested in determining ways to prevent workplace harassment. They were also interested in learning the duty of employees, managers, and their own personal responsibility in preventing workplace harassment. The survey portion listing the possible content topics is a usable tool for use at various organizations to get a better idea of the direction for training design. Conversely, the topic respondents had the least desire for further training was how to investigate a sexual harassment complaint. However, this topic is necessary for certain job titles and positions.

Training must focus on the ability to learn material and to synthesize the learning, resulting in the ability of learners to perform in the context in which the training occurred, and even more so to perform outside of the previously learned context (van Merriënboer, 1997). Developing sexual harassment prevention training that defines sexual harassment (Petrocelli & Repa, 1999) and calls on participants to use cognitive

skills in order to connect concepts to real experiences may create a more positive work environment and lead to decreased incidence of sexual harassment.

Limitations

A limitation of the survey was that there was no designation of whether behaviors were considered harassment if committed by a male or female coworker or supervisor. However, due to the identification of behaviors as sexual harassment, whether committed by a coworker or by a supervisor, the researcher believes a statistical difference may not exist even when differentiating behaviors by gender based on the number of behaviors that were identified as harassment by both genders. Further research is necessary in order to determine whether this is true, however. This is of particular interest as it relates to male respondents answering about male coworkers.

Another limitation is the small sample size. Due to the sensitive nature of the subject, the researcher was unable to secure multiple locations for survey dissemination. The survey should be repeated using a larger population to increase the generalizability of survey results. As well, research using a private sector organization may provide more insight regarding sexual harassment prevention training needs.

Using an online survey was a possible limitation. While the use of computers continues to grow, comfort with technology may still be an issue for many. The use of Web surveys is still a new concept. As Porter (2004) notes, the use of Web surveys for sensitive subject matters may result in a decreased response rate due to the non-respondents fear that responses are not truly anonymous. However, there is no way to tell if a paper-pencil survey would yield a higher response rate with this population.

Finally, the lack of other sexual harassment prevention training needs assessments is a limitation of the study. Research in this area is limited and needs to increase. O'Donohue (1997) calls for more research in many areas related to sexual harassment. The publication of more studies will strengthen the body of research.

Implications for Research

Defining Sexual Harassment

Despite efforts to standardize the definition of sexual harassment, this study reveals differences in how men and women view behaviors. This difference is important to include in presentations aimed at sexual harassment prevention. The training topic of most interest to respondents was behavioral examples of sexual harassment. As well, a statistical difference exists between males and females when asked to determine whether certain behaviors constituted sexual harassment, whether committed by a coworker or by a supervisor. Females agreed more often that behaviors constituted sexual harassment regardless of the perpetrator's role in the organization; males did not. This divide must be conquered and education is the best route.

Trainers must emphasize what behaviors constitute sexual harassment and emphasize the issue of perception in defining whether sexual harassment occurred (Petrocelli & Repa, 1999). Even though gender discrepancy exists, the survey does indicate no need for gender diverse training; males and females did not differ in preferred method of training delivery.

Response Rate Factors

Several factors may explain the low response rate. They are as follows:

1. Little research on training and training design is available. Perhaps

because sexual harassment prevention training is mandatory, few studies focused on training design based on employee need. No conducted training needs assessments are currently in the at-large research community.

2. Most sexual harassment research populations consist of students, university faculty, or other “hostage” populations. Due to the nature of sexual harassment and the legal implications, many companies do not want to bring attention to the situation. Universities provide an outlet for research, but participation may relate to a professional courtesy or to a point-award in a class. While this research is still necessary and telling, it does help inflate the response rate to levels not often possible in private or public sectors outside of the university environment.
3. Proprietary research, either by consultants or within an institution, may exist but is not available to the at-large community. Much research occurs within companies on a regular basis. However, due to the sensitive nature of research and the possibility that profiles of the company tie into the research, it does not always become part of the at-large community.
4. The research instrument was long and its completion percentage represents over 85 hours of work, which equates to over 2 weeks of work. One respondent indicated that completing the survey took her twice as long as indicated in the instructions. The time of year affected the survey response as well, because one of the institutions was working

to get things in order before a 10-week hiatus.

5. Having the instrument on-line posed a problem for some respondents. Despite a hot-link connected to the email, at least one respondent indicated he was unable to figure out how to respond to the survey. The use of email at the public entities did not ensure employees were able to utilize other computer and Internet applications.

6. Low response rate was indicated as "typical" of the survey population. One of the managers suggested the number of responses to the survey were right in line with her experience in collecting research from the group. As well, further research collection in the second setting is proving in line with the response rates received for the researcher's survey.

Future Research

Prevention of sexual harassment may be related to defining behaviors. A longitudinal study would be necessary to research this phenomenon due to an initial increase in sexual harassment claims directly following in-depth training on the subject. However, once the initial reports were made, the incidence rate should be studied to reveal whether reports decreased once more people were familiar with specific behaviors that constitute sexual harassment. This effort is either primary or secondary prevention, depending on the other elements included in the training program.

Focusing on needed areas of training, as indicated by employees, results in improved training outcomes. As well, focus on employees' training needs can alleviate many of the problems associated with mandatory training efforts. Identifying behaviors

defined as sexual harassment opens the door to providing more in-depth training efforts in the future. Development of training program content following best practices models increases training transfer by providing relevance to training participants (Morrison et al., 2004).

Future research should investigate differences related to race. According to Adams (1997), "the extent to which ethnic minority women experience different rates of sexual harassment and report this harassment at different levels than white women is unclear" (p. 214). A racially diverse sample is necessary. Until research includes racially diverse populations, determining what differences exist among attitudes, experiences, and coping patterns among different races is difficult. Specifically, black females may be more susceptible to victimization, including sexual harassment, and the perception of harassment varies based on cultural values and beliefs (Adams). Future research modeled to determine the extent of cultural values and beliefs on the experience of sexual harassment is necessary. Additionally, attention to other nationally underrepresented demographic areas of the study could reveal statistically significant differences that were not discernible within the limited sample size.

Implications for Practice

Previous Sexual Harassment Prevention Training

Employees surveyed do not have many experiences with sexual harassment prevention training. Good training programs are needed. The design must incorporate items employees want to know more about. While many respondents reported they were somewhat knowledgeable or very knowledgeable in many areas, respondents also reported an interest in receiving training in these areas. This indicates a climate of

learning among the respondents and provides a great opportunity for training program implementation success within these organizations.

Training Content

Orlov and Roumell (1999) suggested basic question to assess effectiveness for method of delivery. Based on the content of this study, good content would include: A (a) information pertaining to the duty of both the manager and the employee to prevent harassment; (b) information of ways to prevent workplace harassment, and (c) an explanation of the organization's harassment policy and procedure.

When training includes content related to victim impact, inform trainees of the following: (a) what type of person is more likely to harass, (b) the causes of sexual harassment, and (c) how sexual harassment affects victims' performance on the job. The physical and emotional affects for sexual harassment strengthens the victim impact training content. Additionally, inclusion of examples of acceptable behaviors, such as how to listen to one another with respect and specific guidelines of appropriate behavior at work is beneficial.

When designing sexual harassment prevention training, provide a workshop where people have plenty of time to attend. Make things shared during training confidential and avoid asking people questions that might embarrass them. If group training is offered, have a mixed group of both males and females in a small group. Use an electronic delivery format rather than a traditional format, whether on-site or off-site. Best practice suggests a blended approach, but be sure to include the following: (a) movie clips, (b) television documentaries, (c) instructional videos, (d) self-paced/self-guided

computer program for at-work use, and (e) internet/web site programming. Technology use is easily included within the electronic delivery format.

Employees indicated that making SHPT part of an incentive plan or offer continuing education or professional development credit was of interest for participants. Use of an outside consultant may alleviate potential barriers. Good training design necessitates making the topic interesting and include relevant information that participants can transfer to the workplace.

Several items, including sexual harassment effects, prevention, policy, and procedures may be included in secondary and tertiary prevention measures. Until employees feel confident in the behaviors that constitute sexual harassment, training transfer of the other components related to sexual harassment prevention efforts will not exist.

Summary

This study provides a springboard for future sexual harassment prevention training needs assessments and provides important insights into training design and delivery that meets employees' needs while at the same time providing necessary information. More training needs assessments are desirable, particularly in private sector organizations. Research into the appropriate frequency of training is needed as well. Finally, further research into training outcomes and training transfer will improve the training delivery that is available and utilized.

References

References

Adams, J. H. (1997). Sexual harassment and black women: A historical perspective. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp. 213-224). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

American Psychological Association. (2001). Publication manual of the American Psychological Association (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Antecol, H., & Cobb-Clark, D. (2001). Men, women, and sexual harassment in the U.S. military. *Gender Issues, 4,* 3–18.

Avina, C., & O'Donohue, W. (2002). Sexual harassment and PTSD: Is sexual harassment diagnosable trauma? *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, *15,* 69-75.

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

Baldwin, T. T., Magjuka, R. J., & Loher, B. T. (1991). The perils of participation: Effects of choice of training on trainee motivation and learning. *Personnel Psychology*, *44*, 51-65.

Ballard, S. M. (2000). *Family Life Education for mid-life and older adults*. (UMI No. 9973431).

Ballard, S. M., & Morris, M. L. (2005). Factors influencing midlife and older adults' attendance in family life education programs. *Family Relations*, *54* (3), 461-472.

Ballard, S. M., & Morris, M. L. (2003). The family life education needs of midlife and older adults. *Family Relations*, *52* (2), 129-156.

Barak, A., Pitterman, Y., & Yitzhaki, R. (1995). An empirical test of the role of power differential in originating sexual harassment. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 17*, 497-517.

Bell, C., & Putman, T. (1979). Mastering the art of training design. *Training and Development Journal, 33 (5)*, 24-27.

Bell, M. P., Quick, J. C., & Cycyota, C. S. (2002). Assessment and prevention of sexual harassment of employees: An applied guide to creating health organizations. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *10*, 160- 167.

Clark, C. S., Dobbins, G. H., & Ladd, R. T. (1993). Exploratory field study of training motivation: Influence of involvement, credibility, and transfer climate. *Group and Organization Management, 18,* 292-307.

Cline, E. B., & Seibert, P. S. (1993). Help for first-time needs assessors. *Training & Development*, *47*(5), 99-101.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crowley, A. (1995). Email surveys elicit fast response, cut costs. *PC Week*, *12*(4), 65. Retrieved June 9, 2004 from EBSCOhost Database.

Dansky, B. S., & Kilpatrick, D. G. (1997). Effects of sexual harassment. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp. 152-174). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and electronic surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Dolezalek, H. (2004). Training magazine's annual comprehensive analysis of employer-sponsored training in the united states. *Training*, 10, 20-36.

Donovan, M. A., & Drasgow, F. (1999). Do men's and women's experiences of sexual harassment differ: An examination of the differential test functioning of the sexual experiences questionnaire. *Military Psychology*, *11*(3), 265-282.

Egan, T. M., Yang, B., & Bartlett, K. R. (2004). The effects of organizational learning culture and job satisfaction on motivation to transfer learning and turnover intent. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *15*, 279-301.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) (1980). Guidelines and discrimination because of sex. (Sex. 1604.ii). *Federal Register*, *45*, 74676-74677.

Fischer, F. (1998). Beyond empiricism: Policy inquiry in postpositivist perspective. *Policy Studies Journal*, *26*, 129-146. Retrieved April 28, 2003 from http://www.cddc.vt.edu/tps/e-print/PETER.htm

Fitzgerald, L. F., Drasgow, F., & Magley, V. J. (1999). Sexual harassment in the armed forces: A test of an integrated model. *Military Psychology*, *11,* 329-343.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Magley, V J., Drasgow, F., & Waldo, C. R. (1999). Measuring sexual harassment in the military: The sexual experiences questionnaire (seq-dod). *Military Psychology*, *11*, 243-263.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Swan, S., & Magley, V. J. (1997). But was it really sexual harassment? Legal, behavioral, and psychological definitions of the workplace victimization of women. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp. 5-28). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Flynn, G. (1997). A pioneer program nurtures a harassment free workplace. *Workforce*, *78 (10)*, 38-43.

Foxon, M. (1993). A process approach to the transfer of training: Part I: The impact of motivation and supervisor support on transfer maintenance. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*, 9 (2), 130-143.

Galvin, T. (2002). 2002 Industry report. *Training*, *39* (10), 24-73.

Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. (2000). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application.* Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Gruber, J. (1997). An epidemiology of sexual harassment: Evidence from north america and europe. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp. 84-98). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Grundmann, E., O'Donohue, W., & Peterson, S. H. (1997). The prevention of sexual harassment. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp. 175-184). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Gutek, B. A. (1997). Sexual harassment policy initiatives. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp. 185-198). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Guthrie, J. P., & Schwoerer, C. E. (1994). Individual and contextual influences on self-assessed training needs. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15,* 405-422. Retrieved Oct. 3, 2004 from JSTOR database.

Howard, S. (1991). Organizational resources for addressing sexual harassment. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *69*, 507-511.

Howell, D. C. (1998). *Treatment of missing data*. Retrieved December 2, 2005 from http://www.uvm.edu/~dhowell/StatPages/More_Stuff/Missing_Data/Missing.html

Kaser, J. (1995). *Honoring boundaries: Preventing sexual harassment in the workplace*. Amherst, MA: Human Resource Development.

Katz, N. (2004). *Sexual harassment statistics*. Retrieved Oct. 3, 2004 from http://womensissues.about.com/cs/governornews/a/sexharassstats.htm

Keeling, D., Jones, E., & Botterill, D. (1998). Work-based learning, motivation and employer-employee interaction: Implications for lifelong learning. *Innovations in Education and Training International, 35,* 282-291.

Kerlinger, F. N., & Lee, H. B. (2000). *Foundations of behavioral research* (4th ed.). United States: Wadsworth.

Keyton, J., Ferguson, P., & Rhodes, S. C. (2001). Cultural indicators of sexual harassment. *Southern Communication Journal, 67* (1), 33 – 50.

Keyton, J., & Rhodes, S. C. (1999). Organizational sexual harassment: Translating research into application. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *27*, 158-173.

Lambert, A. (2004). Steer your clients away from risk of sexual harassment claims. *Insurance Journal*. Retrieved Oct. 3, 2004 from http:www.insurancejournal.com/magazines/southeast/2004/04/05/features/40854.htm

Leimbach, M. P., & Baldwin, T. T. (1997). How research contributes to the HRD value chain. In R. A. Swanson & E. F. Holton (Eds.), *Human resource development research handbook: Linking research and practice* (pp. 21-46). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Licata, B. J., & Popovich, P. M. (1987). Preventing sexual harassment: A proactive approach. *Training and Development Journal, 47 (5)* , 34-38.

Magley, V.J., Waldo, C. R., Drasgow, F., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1999). The impact of sexual harassment on military personnel: Is it the same for men and women? *Military Psychology, 11*, 283-302.

Mathieu, J. E., Tannenbaum, S. I., & Salas, E. (1992). Influences of individual and situational characteristics on measures of training effectiveness. *The Academy of Management Journal, 35*, 828-847. Retrieved Oct. 3, 2004 from JSTOR database.

Moore, M. L., & Dutton, P. (1978). Training needs analysis: Review and critique. The *Academy of Management Review, 3*, 532-545. Retrieved Oct. 3, 2004 from JSTOR database.

Morrison, G. R., Ross, S. M., & Kemp, J. E. (2004). *Designing effective instruction*, (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Murk, P. J., & Petrini, C. M. (1994). Training 101. *Training & Development*, *48* (7), 15-18. Retrieved August 17, 2004 from EBSCOHost research databases.

Noe, R. A. (1986). Trainees' attributes and attitudes: Neglected influences on training effectiveness. *Academy of Management Review*, *11*, 736-749.

O'Donohue, W. (Ed.). (1997). Sexual harassment: Theory, research, and treatment. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

O'Hare, E. A., & O'Donohue, W. (1998). Sexual harassment: Identifying risk factors. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *27*, 561-579.

O'Reiley, T. (2004). Sexual harassment falls. *Daily Record.com*. Retrieved Oct. 3, 2004 from http://www.dailyrecord.com/business/business1-Sexharass.htm.

Orlov, D., & Roumell, M. T. (1999). *What every manager should know about sexual harassment.* New York: AMACOM.

Paluck, E. L. (2006). Diversity training and intergroup contact: A call to action research. *Journal of Social Issues, 62 (3)*, 577-595.

Paludi, M. A., & Barickman, R. B. (1998). *Sexual harassment, work, and education: A resource manual for prevention*, (2nd ed.). NY: State University of New York.

Petrocelli, W., & Repa, B. K. (1999). Sexual harassment on the job: What it is & how to stop it (4th ed.). Berkeley, CA: Nolo.

Porter, S. R. (2004). Pros and cons of paper and electronic surveys. *New Directions for Institutional Research*. *121,* 91-97. Retrieved June 9, 2004 from EBSCOhost Research Database.

Pryor, J. B., & Whalen, N. J. (1997). A typology of sexual harassment: Characteristics of harassers and the social circumstances under which sexual harassment occurs. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp. 129-151). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Quickfacts Census. (2000). Retrieved December 7, 2005 from http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTable?_bm=n&_lang=en&qr_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U_DP1&ds_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U&geo_id=04000US47 http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/47/47093.html

Roberts, L. C., & Morris, M. L. (1998). An evaluation of marketing factors in marriage enrichment program promotion. *Family Relations*, *47*(1), 37-44.

Shannon, D. M., & Bradshaw, C. C. (2002). A comparison of response rate, response time, and costs of electronic and mail surveys. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *70*(*2*), 179-192. Retrieved June 9, 2004, from EBSCOhost Research Databases.

Silliman, B. (2004). Building healthy marriages through early and extended outreach with youth. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 31,* 270-282. Retrieved October 8, 2004 from *Academic Premier Search*.

Stark, S., Chernyshenko, O. S., Lancaster, A. R., Drasgow, F., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (2002). Toward standardized measurement of sexual harassment: Shortening the seq-dod using item response theory. *Military Psychology*, *14*(1), 49-72.

Sue, D. W. (1991). A model for cultural diversity training. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70 (6)*, 99-105.

Tangri, S. S., & Hayes, S. M. (1997). Theories of sexual harassment. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp.112-128). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Terpstra, D. E., & Baker, D. D. (1986). A framework for the study of sexual harassment. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *7*, 17-34.

Tracey, J. B., Tannenbaum, S. I., & Kavanaugh, M. J. (1995). Applying trained skills on the job: The importance of the work environment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80 (2), 239-252.

Van Detta, K. J. (2001). Only fools rush in: How to ensure that your harassment policy and investigation provide a strong defense in a sexual harassment action. *Wimberly and lawson annual labor relations and employment law update conference*, USA.

Van Detta, K. J., Jones, J. G., Hahn, R. S., Taylor, J. C., & Doherty, J. J. (2001). What's love got to do with it? Harassment investigation do's and don'ts. *Wimberly and lawson annual labor relations and employment law update conference*, USA.

van Merriënboer, J. J. G. (1997). *Training complex cognitive skills: A four-component instructional design model for technical training*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology.

Wiethoff, C. (2004). Motivation to learn and diversify training: Application of the theory of planned behavior. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *15*, 263-278.

Williams, J. H., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Drasgow, F. (1999). The effects of organizational practices on sexual harassment and individual outcomes in the military. *Military Psychology, 11*, 303-328.

Wilson, F., & Thompson, P. (2001). Sexual harassment as an exercise of power. *Gender, Work, and Organization, 8* (1), 61-83.

WordNet 2.1. (2005). Lexical database for the english language. Retrieved December 3, 2005 from wordnet.princeton.edu/perl/webwn.

Appendices

Appendix A

Permission Letters

BILL HASLAM, MAYOR

City of Knoxville

CIVIL SERVICE DEPARTMENT
KAREN R. DAY, DIRECTOR

Heather Whaley
9213 Countryway Drive
Knoxville, TN 37922-5857

October 5, 2004

Dear Ms. Whaley,

I have received your request regarding the City of Knoxville's participation in data collection for your online survey on Sexual Harassment Training. Our office has reviewed the survey and would be happy to assist.

The City of Knoxville has approximately 1600 employees. When the survey is ready, we will distribute an email to City Employees that includes the link to your survey. We will explain to them that this survey is voluntary and that their participation is not mandatory, so we are unable to estimate how many surveys will actually be completed. However, we will assist as we are able.

We look forward to working with you on this project and look forward to seeing your results.

Sincerely,

Karen R. Day
Civil Service Director
City of Knoxville

CITY COUNTY BUILDING • SUITE 569 • 400 MAIN STREET • P.O. BOX 1631 • KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE 37901
OFFICE: 865-215-2106 • JOB LINE: 215-2JOB (215-2562) • TDD: 215-2900 • FAX: 865-215-4270
www.cityofknoxville.org

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

Knox County Schools
Andrew Johnson Building

Dr. Charles Q. Lindsey, Superintendent

July 1, 2004

Dear Ms. Whaley:

You are granted permission to contact appropriate building-level administrators concerning the conduct of your proposed research study on sexual harassment training. In the Knox County schools final approval of any research study is contingent upon acceptance by the principal(s) at the site(s) where the study will be conducted. Include a copy of this permission form when seeking approval from the principal(s).

In all research studies names of individuals, groups, or schools may not appear in the text of the study unless *specific* permission has been granted through this office. The principal researcher is required to furnish this office with one copy of the completed research document.

Good luck with your study. Do not hesitate to contact me if you need further assistance or clarification.

Yours truly,

Mike S. Winstead, Ph.D.
Director of Research and Evaluation
Phone: (865) 594-1740
Fax: (865) 594-1709

Project No. 4004

P.O. Box 2188 • 912 South Gay Street • Knoxville, Tennessee 37901-2188 • Telephone (865) 594-1740

Karns High School

"Excellence in Education"

2710 BYINGTON SOLWAY ROAD
KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE 37931
TELEPHONE (865) 539-8670
FAX (865) 539-8679
http://www.korrnet.org/khs

CLIFFORD DAVIS, JR.
PRINCIPAL

DAVID B. BELL
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL

DARYL CHANDLER
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL

MILLICENT B. SMITH
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL

AMY C. WALKER
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL

Heather M. Whaley
9213 Countryway Drive
Knoxville, TN 37922-5857

February 28, 2005

Dear Ms. Whaley:

You are granted permission to solicit participation in your online survey related to sexual harassment training from the staff of Karns High School. It is my understanding that survey participation is completely voluntary and that staff will be provided with an online link to the survey via email. In addition, no identifying information will be coupled with the collected data.

As per instructions received from Dr. Mike Winstead, Director of Research and Evaluation, names of individuals, groups, or schools will not appear in the text of the study, unless prior permission has been granted. The completed research document will be made available through Knox County Schools Office of Research and Evaluation.

Good luck with your study.

Sincerely,

Clifford Davis, Jr.
Principal
Karns High School

Appendix B

FORM A

IRB #_____

Certification for Exemption from IRB Review for Research Involving Human Subjects

---

A. PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(s) and/or CO-PI(s): (For student projects, list both the student and the advisor.)

Heather M. Whaley, Principal Investigator

Michael Lane Morris, Ph.D., Dissertation Chairperson

B. DEPARTMENT:

Human Resource Development/Management

C. COMPLETE MAILING ADDRESS AND PHONE NUMBER OF PI(s) and CO-PI(s):

Heather M. Whaley: 9213 Countryway Drive, Knoxville, TN 37922-5857

Michael Lane Morris: 410 Stokely Management Center, Knoxville, TN 37996

D. TITLE OF PROJECT:

Gender Differences in and Sexual Harassment Prevention Training Preferences

E. EXTERNAL FUNDING AGENCY AND ID NUMBER (if applicable):

F. GRANT SUBMISSION DEADLINE (if applicable):

G. STARTING DATE: (NO RESEARCH MAY BE INITIATED UNTIL CERTIFICATION IS GRANTED.)

February 4, 2005

H. ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE (Include all aspects of research and final write-up.):

December 31, 2005

I. RESEARCH PROJECT:

1. **Objective(s) of Project** (Use additional page, if needed.):

To determine the existing gender differences in

- current knowledge of sexual harassing behaviors
- the preferred method of sexual harassment prevention training delivery.
- hindrances to attending sexual harassment prevention training.
- motivators to attending sexual harassment prevention training.
- the characteristics that contribute to the credibility of sexual harassment prevention trainers.

2. **Subjects** (Use additional page, if needed.):

Knoxville City Government employees (1600 employees). The permission letter is attached.

Knox County Schools employees (200 employees). The permission letter is attached from Knox County Schools. Verbal permission to provide the survey address to the employees has been granted from two building level administrators; Clifford Davis and Diane Pshiogios. Approval letters are expected from the specific administrators no later than February 21, 2005.

A convenience sample will be used, allowing all employees an equal opportunity for inclusion in the survey. All employees will be given the web address. The choice to respond is left to the individual. Exclusion from the survey is by self-selection.

Anonymity is granted for participants by the design of the web survey. The web address does not reveal the participants in any way. There is no tracking of IP addresses and no request for identifying information within the survey form. Respondents will be given the option to enter a drawing for Amazon gift certificates. However, the email addresses will be collected on a separate form and managed by The University of Tennessee Statistical Consulting staff. The researchers will have no access to these addresses. Confidentiality and anonymity will be maintained throughout the process.

Completion of the survey will require approximately 20 minutes. Once participants have submitted their answers electronically, no further time commitment is required.

3. **Methods or Procedures** (Use additional page, if needed.):

This research will utilize a quantitative method of research. The researcher will use non-experimental design. Closed-ended measures will be used to evaluate: (a) the methods employees prefer when participating in sexual harassment prevention training, (b) hindrances to participation in such training, (c) motivators to participation in such training, and (d) and trainer characteristics important to know before training. The survey will ask respondents to answer general demographic information, which the researcher will use for statistical comparisons between and among respondents, with particular emphasis on gender differences. The use of statistical computer software will aid with the numeric data analysis.

The research will be a descriptive study. In order to capture data, the respondents will complete the *Training Preferences Climate* Survey (attached). Analysis of the

responses will focus on the intent to generalize the findings to employee groups working for large corporations. The responses are helpful in describing the methods of sexual harassment prevention training dissemination from the employee perspective. The results of training preferences will be descriptive in nature.

Because the research will examine gender differences, a stratification of the sample may be necessary, depending on the number of responses received from each gender. The use of school employees will most likely increase the number of females responding to the survey to a level higher than that represented by the general population. Therefore, stratification of the sample may be used. Depending on the ability to attain a sample with high power, a random sampling of the strata may be utilized.

The contact between the respondents and the researcher will occur in a minimum of four waves. The four waves are: (a) a pre-notification email to let the sample know they have been selected for participation, (b) the initial survey email notice, (c) a reminder email, with thanks to participants for their assistance, and finally, (d) a second email with another link to the survey. The researcher will use email communication means with a US mail option for survey distribution and for return of the completed survey.

The selected participants will be asked to respond to an online survey. The survey link will take employees to a secure website where the answers are electronically submitted, with complete anonymity for the respondent. The first wave of the research will consist of an email letter sent to the employees of the company. The letter will describe the purpose of the research. The second wave will include a hot link to the

survey, with directions for accessing the site. The third and fourth waves will be utilized as reminders.

The survey responses will be entered directly into an SPSS file by the respondent based on the selected response. The researcher will utilize statistical software and the aid of master researchers to analyze the responses and to determine the statistical significance of responses. Several statistical techniques will be utilized.

Descriptive statistics will be used to describe the data collected. Particular focus will be given to the demographic information collected. The respondents will be described based on the demographic characteristics included in the survey.

The research questions require gender comparison. This is best assessed by use of *t*-tests. The differences in mean of responses between men and women will be analyzed. The researcher will be looking for significant differences between the respondents based on gender.

The one-way ANOVA will be used to test the means for (a) training preferences, (b) training needs and interests, (c) hindrances and motivators to training, and (d) trainer characteristics. These means will be compared by gender. Additionally a factor analysis will be conducted to categorize hindrances, motivators, and methods, respectively and to determine if any further relationship or grouping possibilities exist.

A separate data collection file will be utilized to maintain the email addresses of those respondents who wish to be included in the incentive drawing. The file will be managed by the statistical consulting staff. Statistical computation will be used to randomly select respondents to receive one of four $25 gift certificates to Amazon.com.

Because the email addresses are supplied in a separate data file from the responses to the survey, there will be no way to attach the responses to the individual.

Those persons with access to the raw data include Statistical Consulting Department employees, Mike O'Neil and Ann Reed; principal investigators, Heather M. Whaley and Michael Lane Morris.

CATEGORY(s) FOR EXEMPT RESEARCH PER 45 CFR 46 (see reverse side for categories): _____

and confidentiality of materials with names and/or data will be obtained and maintained. List the names of individuals who will have access to names and/or data.

I.4. CATEGORY(s) FOR EXEMPT RESEARCH PER 45 CFR 46: Referring to the extracts below from Federal regulations, cite the paragraph(s) which you deem entitle this research project to certification as exempt from review by the Institutional Review Board. **45 CFR 46.101(b): Research activities in which the only involvement of human subjects will be in one or more of the following categories are exempt from IRB review:**

(1) Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as: (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.

(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, **unless**: (i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; **and** (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

PLEASE NOTE: *An exemption cannot be used when children are involved for research involving survey or interview procedures or observations of public behavior, except for research involving observation of public behavior when the investigator(s) do not participate in the activities being observed. [45 CFR 46.401(b)]*

(3) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under paragraph (2) above, if: (i) the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or (ii) Federal

statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.

(4) Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

(5) Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of Federal Department or Agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine: (i) Public benefit or service programs; (ii) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs; (iii) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or (iv) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs.

(6) Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, if wholesome foods without additives are consumed or if a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminants at or below the level found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the US Department of Agriculture.

Rev. 01/97

For additional information on Form A, contact Brenda Lawson by e-mail at blawson@tennessee.edu or by phone at (865) 974-7697.

J. CERTIFICATION: The research described herein is in compliance with 45 CFR 46.101(b) and presents subjects with no more than minimal risk as defined by applicable regulations.

Principal Investigator	Heather M. Whaley Name	Signature	3/8/05 Date
Faculty Reviewer	Doo H. Lim		Nov 4 05
Student Advisor	Michael Lane Morris Name	Signature	3/10/05 Date
Program Review Comm.Chair	Michael Lane Morris Name	Signature	3/7/05 Date
APPROVED: Program Head	Michael Lane Morris Name	Signature	3/8/05 Date

COPY OF THIS COMPLETED FORM MUST BE SENT TO COMPLIANCE OFFICE IMMEDIATELY UPON COMPLETION.

Rev. 01/97

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING FORM A
PLEASE TYPE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED ON THE FRONT OF THIS FORM

Provide the required information in the space available if at all possible. If additional space is necessary, attach a separate sheet. Submit one copy of this form to the Chair of your Departmental Review Committee for review and approval. [PLEASE NOTE: This form may be reproduced on a personal computer and printed on a high quality printer (*e.g.*, LaserJet, DeskJet). Form A was originally created under WordPerfect 6.1 and printed on a HP LaserJet III printer using a 9-point CG Times font.]

ALL SIGNATURES MUST BE ORIGINAL on this form. When certified by your department or unit head, a copy of the signed Form A will be returned to the Principal Investigator and a copy will be returned to the Research Compliance Services Section, Office of Research.

I.1. OBJECTIVES: Briefly state, in non-technical language, the purpose of the research, with special reference to human subjects involved.

I.2. SUBJECTS: Briefly describe the subjects by number to be used, criteria of selection or exclusion, the population from which they will be selected, duration of involvement, and any special characteristics necessary to the research.

I.3. METHODS OR PROCEDURES: Briefly enumerate, in non-technical language, the research methods which directly involve use of human subjects. List any potential risks, or lack of such, to subjects and any protection measures. Explain how anonymity of names

Appendix C

Survey Instrument

The purpose of this survey is to assess the preferred methods to receive sexual harassment prevention training. In addition, the psychometric properties of the Training Preferences Climate Survey will be investigated (e.g., reliability, etc.).

Projected benefits for you may entail an enhanced understanding of your learning preferences and items that may effect your participation in training programs. At the end of the research process, a report detailing the findings will be available to you upon request. I would like to emphasize my commitment to the following safeguards in your interest:

1. Before you complete the survey, please print this consent form for future reference.

2. Because there is no request for you to provide your name on this survey, the confidentiality of your individual responses can and will be maintained.

3. The data gathered will be entered automatically into an SPSS spreadsheet and will be reported in summary form. Individual data will not be shared with anyone. The confidentiality of the data will be maintained through a password protected file.

4. I do not anticipate that participation in this survey will involve risks for anyone, but if responding to the questionnaire creates concern for you, I will be happy to refer you to a trained professional.

Next Page

Answers to any questions you may have about the procedures of this study are available from:

Heather M. Whaley, Doctoral Candidate The University of Tennessee, Knoxville College of Business Administration

Department of Human Resource Development 410 Stokely Management Center

Knoxville, TN 37996

hwhaley@utk.edu (865) 693-8657

6. The time needed to complete the survey is approximately 10 minutes.

THE SUBMISSION OF YOUR SURVEY INDICATES THAT YOU HAVE READ THIS FORM AND AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY.

Thank you for your help!

Previous Page Next Page

Indicate the total number of sexual harassment prevention training programs you have participated in during your career. Insert the number into the space and enter 0 if you have never attended a sexual harassment prevention training program.

Overall, how would you characterize your previous sexual harassment prevention training experience(s)?

- Extremely dissatisfying
- More dissatisfying than satisfying
- More satisfying than dissatisfying
- Extremely satisfying
- Not applicable - I have never participated in this type of training before

Overall, how would you characterize your previous sexual harassment prevention training experience(s)?

- Extremely dissatisfying
- More dissatisfying than satisfying
- More satisfying than dissatisfying
- Extremely satisfying
- Not applicable - I have never participated in this type of training before

Overall, my experience(s) with previous sexual harassment prevention programs has been:

- Extremely dissatisfying
- More dissatisfying than satisfying
- More satisfying than dissatisfying
- Extremely satisfying
- Not applicable - I have never participated in this type of training before

Previous Page | Next Page

Think about the behavior of two types of colleagues: (1) coworkers and (2) supervisors. Using the following scale, please indicate your level of agreement that you would consider the following behaviors as sexual harassment. Please respond to each item if a coworker was responsible and if a supervisor was responsible for the behavior.

Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you

If a coworker... If a supervisor...

Whistling, calling, or hooting at you in a sexual way

If a coworker... If a supervisor...

Making unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters

If a coworker... If a supervisor...

Making crude and offensive sexual remarks, either publicly or to you privately

If a coworker... If a supervisor...

Previous Page Next Page

Think about the behavior of two types of colleagues: (1) coworkers and (2) supervisors. Using the following scale, please indicate your level of agreement that you would consider the following behaviors as sexual harassment. Please respond to each item if a coworker was responsible and if a supervisor was responsible for the behavior.

Treated you "differently" because of your sex

If a coworker... If a supervisor...

Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities?

If a coworker... If a supervisor...

Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed you

If a coworker... If a supervisor...

Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials

If a coworker... If a supervisor...

Made offensive sexual remarks

If a coworker... If a supervisor...

Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it

If a coworker... If a supervisor...

Previous Page Next Page

Think about the behavior of two types of colleagues: (1) coworkers and (2) supervisors. Using the following scale, please indicate your level of agreement that you would consider the following behaviors as sexual harassment. Please respond to each item if a coworker was responsible and if a supervisor was responsible for the behavior.

Put you down or related to you in a condescending manner because of your sex

If a coworker... [ ] If a supervisor... [ ]

Stared, leered, or ogled you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable

If a coworker... [ ] If a supervisor... [ ]

Exposed themselves physically in a way that made you feel uncomfortable

If a coworker... [ ] If a supervisor... [ ]

Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said no

If a coworker... [ ] If a supervisor... [ ]

Made you feel you were being bribed with some sort of reward or special treatment to engage in sexual behavior

If a coworker... [ ] If a supervisor... [ ]

Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative

If a coworker... [ ] If a supervisor... [ ]

Previous Page | Next Page

Think about the behavior of two types of colleagues: (1) coworkers and (2) supervisors. Using the following scale, please indicate your level of agreement that you would consider the following behaviors as sexual harassment. Please respond to each item if a coworker was responsible and if a supervisor was responsible for the behavior.

Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable

If a coworker... [ ] If a supervisor... [ ]

Made unwanted attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss you

If a coworker... [ ] If a supervisor... [ ]

Treated you badly for refusing to have sex

If a coworker... [ ] If a supervisor... [ ]

Implied faster promotions or better treatment if you were sexually cooperative

If a coworker... [ ] If a supervisor... [ ]

Made you afraid you would be treated poorly if you didn't cooperate sexually

If a coworker... [ ] If a supervisor... [ ]

Offered to be sexually cooperative to you in exchange for a favor from you

If a coworker... [ ] If a supervisor... [ ]

Previous Page | Next Page

Think about the behavior of two types of colleagues: (1) coworkers and (2) supervisors. Using the following scale, please indicate your level of agreement that you would consider the following behaviors as sexual harassment. Please respond to each item if a coworker was responsible and if a supervisor was responsible for the behavior.

Unsuccessfully attempted to have sex with you without your consent or against your will

If a coworker... [ ] If a supervisor... [ ]

Had sex with you without your consent or against your will

If a coworker... [ ] If a supervisor... [ ]

Other sex related behaviors not listed

If a coworker... [ ] If a supervisor... [ ]

Indicate your level of knowledge about each of the following topics.

	Not at all knowledgeable	Knowledgeable	Very knowledgeable
The legal definition of sexual harassment	○	○	○
Behavioral examples of sexual harassment	○	○	○
Understanding your rights regarding sexual harassment	○	○	○
Understanding your responsibilities regarding sexual harassment	○	○	○

Previous Page | Next Page

Indicate your level of knowledge about each of the following topics.

	Not at all knowledgeable	Knowledgeable	Very knowledgeable
Understanding the organization's harassment policy and procedure	○	○	○
What causes harassment	○	○	○
How sexual harassment affects victims physically	○	○	○
How sexual harassment affects victims emotionally	○	○	○
How sexual harassment affects victims' performance on the job	○	○	○
Why sexual harassment victims get blamed	○	○	○
What kind of people are more likely to harass	○	○	○
The manager's duty to prevent harassment	○	○	○
The employee's duty to prevent harassment	○	○	○
Ways to prevent workplace harassment	○	○	○
How to communicate healthy boundaries	○	○	○
How to file a sexual harassment complaint	○	○	○
How to listen to others with respect	○	○	○

Previous Page Next Page

Indicate your level of knowledge about each of the following topics.

	Not at all knowledgeable	Knowledgeable	Very knowledgeable
Specific guidelines of appropriate behavior at work	○	○	○
What to do if you believe you are being harassed	○	○	○
Employer liability for sexual harassment	○	○	○
Individual liability for sexual harassment	○	○	○
Understanding the law relevant to sexual harassment	○	○	○
How to investigate a sexual harassment complaint	○	○	○
How to know whether your environment is hostile, with regard to sexual harassment	○	○	○

How interested would you be in receiving sexual harassment prevention training in the following settings?

	Uninterested	Somewhat uninterested	Somewhat interested	Interested
On site training using a traditional delivery format	○	○	○	○
On site training using an electronic delivery format	○	○	○	○
Off site training using a traditional delivery format	○	○	○	○
Off site training using an electronic delivery format	○	○	○	○

Previous Page | Next Page

How interested would you be in receiving sexual harassment prevention training in the following settings?

	Uninterested	Somewhat uninterested	Somewhat interested	Interested
Group training	○	○	○	○
Individual training	○	○	○	○
Small group training	○	○	○	○
Large group training	○	○	○	○
Group of same sex people as you	○	○	○	○
Mixed group of both males and females	○	○	○	○

How interested would you be in receiving sexual harassment prevention training if participation in the program was...

	Uninterested	Somewhat uninterested	Somewhat interested	Interested
required by your employer	○	○	○	○
recommended by your employer	○	○	○	○
made optional by your employer	○	○	○	○

Previous Page | Next Page

How interested would you be in receiving sexual harassment prevention training if participation in the program was...

	Very uninterested	Uninterested	Interested	Very interested
paid for by your employer	○	○	○	○
paid for by you	○	○	○	○
part of your performance review	○	○	○	○
part of an incentive plan	○	○	○	○
continuing education or professional development credit	○	○	○	○
presented by a trainer within your organization	○	○	○	○
presented by an outside consultant	○	○	○	○

How much would you be willing to pay for a sexual harassment prevention program?

Previous Page | Next Page

How interested would you be in receiving sexual harassment prevention training if the program emphasis was:

	Uninterested	Somewhat uninterested	Somewhat interested	Interested
primarily knowledge building	○	○	○	○
primarily awareness building	○	○	○	○
primarily skill building	○	○	○	○
primarily attitude changing	○	○	○	○
a part of your performance review	○	○	○	○
a part of an incentive plan	○	○	○	○
a continuing education or professional development credit(s)	○	○	○	○

Previous Page | Next Page

Done

Please indicate how useful the following approaches would be for you in learning about the subject of sexual harassment.

	Not at all useful	Somewhat useful	Extremely useful
Brochures/pamphlets	○	○	○
Self-paced/self-guided computer program (at home)	○	○	○
Self-paced/self-guided computer program (at work)	○	○	○
Independent study with manuals	○	○	○
Group discussion	○	○	○
Internet/web site program	○	○	○
Lecture from subject matter expert	○	○	○
Newsletter	○	○	○
PowerPoint presentation	○	○	○
Movie clips	○	○	○
Instructional videos	○	○	○
Television documentary	○	○	○
Books	○	○	○
Newspaper articles	○	○	○
Magazine articles	○	○	○

Previous Page | Next Page

Please indicate how the following issues influence your decision to attend sexual harassment prevention training.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The topics discussed could invade my sense of privacy	○	○	○	○
The activities done during the training could invade the privacy of working relationships	○	○	○	○
People could think I was a victim if I attended	○	○	○	○
People could think I was a perpetrator if I attended	○	○	○	○
My working relationships could become more complicated if I attended	○	○	○	○
Attendance could indicate that I lack social skills	○	○	○	○
I could be asked to do things that would embarrass me	○	○	○	○
Others attending the training could not accept me	○	○	○	○
I could say something dumb	○	○	○	○

Previous Page Next Page

Please indicate how the following issues influence your decision to attend sexual harassment prevention training.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The amount of time required to attend	○	○	○	○
The amount of money required to attend	○	○	○	○
The topic is interesting	○	○	○	○
Adequate job coverage	○	○	○	○
Receiving enough information about the training	○	○	○	○
I like to attend training programs on this topic	○	○	○	○
I prefer to learn on my own	○	○	○	○
The topic is too painful	○	○	○	○
There is a lack of accountability for sexual harassment in my department	○	○	○	○
Encouragement from co-workers	○	○	○	○
Encouragement from supervisors	○	○	○	○
Training does not improve the situation	○	○	○	○
Attendance would be considered as part of my next performance review	○	○	○	○

Previous Page Next Page

Indicate your level of interest in learning more about each of the following topics.

	Not at all interested	Somewhat interested	Extremely interested
The legal definition of sexual harassment	○	○	○
Behavioral examples of sexual harassment	○	○	○
Understanding your rights regarding sexual harassment	○	○	○
Understanding your responsibilities regarding sexual harassment	○	○	○
Understanding the organization's harassment policy and procedure	○	○	○
What causes harassment	○	○	○
How sexual harassment affects victims physically	○	○	○
How sexual harassment affects victims emotionally	○	○	○
How sexual harassment affects victims' performance on the job	○	○	○
Why sexual harassment victims get blamed	○	○	○
What kind of people are more likely to harass	○	○	○
The manager's duty to prevent harassment	○	○	○
The employee's duty to prevent harassment	○	○	○
Ways to prevent workplace harassment	○	○	○

Previous Page Next Page

Indicate your level of interest in learning more about each of the following topics.

	Not at all interested	Somewhat interested	Extremely interested
How to communicate healthy boundaries	○	○	○
How to file a sexual harassment complaint	○	○	○
How to listen to others with respect	○	○	○
Specific guidelines of appropriate behavior at work	○	○	○
What to do if you believe you are being harassed	○	○	○
Employer liability for sexual harassment	○	○	○
Individual liability for sexual harassment	○	○	○
Understanding the law relevant to sexual harassment	○	○	○
How to investigate a sexual harassment complaint	○	○	○
How to know whether your environment is hostile, with regard to sexual harassment	○	○	○

If a comprehensive training program was offered that included all the training topics listed above, what price would be reasonable for participants to pay?

If a comprehensive training program was offered that included all the training topics listed above, what price would you be willing to pay?

Estimate the percent difference a comprehensive training program that included all the training topics listed above would make in your ability to do your job.

Previous Page | Next Page

Respond to the following items.

Gender

- Male
- Female

Age (in years)

Martial Status

- Single
- Married
- Separated
- Divorced
- Remarried
- Widowed

Race

- African-American
- Asian
- Caucasian
- Hispanic
- Native American

Previous Page | Next Page

Respond to the following items.

Highest level of education completed

- Elementary school (grades K-5)
- Middle school (grades 6-8)
- High school (grades 9-12)
- Technical training
- Associates
- Bachelors
- Masters
- EdS
- Doctorate

Indicate the number of times you have changed jobs since your last degree

Length of employment with current company

Gender of supervisor

- Male
- Female

Previous Page | Next Page

Respond to each of the following items

Which term most closely resembles your position level?

- Entry-level
- Team leader
- Supervisor
- Manager
- Executive

Length of employment in current position, rounded to the nearest year

Average number of hours worked per week, rounded to the nearest whole number

Personal salary range

- Below $15,000
- $15,000-$29,999
- $30,000-$44,999
- $45,000-$59,999
- $60,000-$74,999
- $75,000 or more

In your job, are you able to earn overtime?

- Yes
- No

Job title

Previous Page | Next Page

If you would like to be entered in a drawing for one of four $25 gift certificates from amazon.com please enter your e-mail address below.

Thank you for your time. Please use the SEND ANSWERS button to submit your responses.

Previous Page | Send Answers

Thank you,
your response has been sent.

Appendix D

Job Titles Frequencies

Job Title	Male Frequency	*Male Percentage	Female Frequency	*Female Percentage	Total Frequency	*Total Percentage
Accounting Clerk, Senior	0	0	1	1.3	1	0.6
Analyst	0	0	1	1.3	1	0.6
Assistant Fire Chief	1	1.2	0	0	1	0.6
Booking Services	1	1.2	0	0	1	0.6
Captain	1	1.2	0	0	1	0.6
CE Technician	1	1.2	0	0	1	0.6
Chaplain	1	1.2	0	0	1	0.6
CID	1	1.2	0	0	1	0.6
Clerk	0	0	1	1.3	0	0
Codes Enforcement Officer	0	0	1	1.3	1	0.6
Collections Officer, Senior	0	0	1	1.3	1	0.6
Commander	1	1.2	0	0	1	0.6
Crime Analyst	1	1.2	0	0	1	0.6
Data Entry	0	0	1	1.3	1	0.6
Deputy Chief	1	1.2	0	0	1	0.6
Educator	5	5.8	23	29.5	28	17.1
EMT	2	2.3	0	0	2	1.2
Engineering Tech	1	1.2	0	0	1	0.6
Executive	1	1.2	0	0	1	0.6
Executive Assistant	1	1.2	2	2.6	3	1.8
Financial Analyst	1	1.2	0	0	1	0.6
Fire Fighter	15	17.4	0	0	15	9.1
Greenways Coordinator	0	0	1	1.3	1	0.6

Job Title	Male Frequency	*Male Percentage	Female Frequency	*Female Percentage	Total Frequency	*Total Percentage
HR Technician, Senior	0	0	1	1.3	1	0.6
HR Analyst	1	1.2	0	0	1	0.6
Investigator	1	1.2	0	0	1	0.6
Lieutenant	2	2.4	1	1.3	3	1.9
Manager	1	1.2	0	0	1	0.6
Master Firefighter	1	1.2	0	0	1	0.6
Office Assistant I	0	0	2	2.6	2	1.2
Office Assistant II	0	0	6	7.7	6	3.7
Police Officer	3	3.5	0	0	3	1.9
Police Officer IV	1	1.2	1	1.3	2	1.2
Police Sergeant	2	2.4	0	0	2	1.2
Principal Secretary	0	0	1	1.3	1	0.6
Project Manager	1	1.2	0	0	1	0.6
Rep	0	0	1	1.3	1	0.6
Safety City Aide	0	0	1	1.3	1	0.6
School Counselor	0	0	2	1.3	2	1.2
Secretary	0	0	2	1.3	2	1.2
Shop Chief	1	1.2	0	0	1	0.6
Supervisor	6	7.0	0	0	5	3.0
Technical Writer	0	0	1	1.3	1	0.6
Technician	0	0	1	1.3	1	0.6
Traffic Engineer II	1	1.2	0	0	1	0.6
Traffic Engineer III	1	1.2	0	0	1	0.6

Appendix E

Principal Components Analyses by Factors

Table E1

Knowledge Factor One: Prevention Efforts

Item	Eigenvalue/Factor Loading Score
Understanding the organization's harassment policy and procedure	0.63
The manager's duty to prevent harassment	0.67
The employee's duty to prevent harassment	0.60
Ways to prevent workplace harassment	0.59
How to communicate healthy boundaries	0.58
How to file a sexual harassment complaint	0.77
What to do if you believe you are being harassed	0.66
Employer liability for sexual harassment	0.89
Individual liability for sexual harassment	0.88
Understanding the law relevant to sexual harassment	0.79
How to investigate a sexual harassment complaint	0.78
How to know whether your environment is hostile, with regard to sexual harassment	0.61
Cronbach's Alpha = 0.955	

Table E2

Knowledge Factor Two: Victim Impact

Item	**Eigenvalue/Factor Loading Score**
What causes harassment	0.63
How sexual harassment affects victims physically	0.81
How sexual harassment affects victims emotionally	0.87
How sexual harassment affects victims' performance on the job	0.82
Why sexual harassment victims get blamed	0.80
What kind of people are more likely to harass	0.70
Cronbach's Alpha = 0.938	

Table E3

Knowledge Factor Three: Acceptable Behaviors

Item	**Eigenvalue/Factor Loading Score**
How to listen to others with respect	0.82
Specific guidelines of appropriate behavior at work	0.83
Cronbach's Alpha = 0.833	

Table E4

Preferred Approaches Factor One: Group Training

Item	**Eigenvalue/Factor Loading Score**
On site training using a traditional delivery format	0.77
Off site training using a traditional delivery forma	0.66
Group training	0.93
Small group training	0.83
Large group training	0.84
Mixed group of both males and females	0.84
Cronbach's Alpha = 0.931	

Table E5

Preferred Approaches Factor Two: Individual Training

Item	**Eigenvalue/Factor Loading Score**
On site training using a traditional delivery format	0.81
Off site training using an electronic delivery format	0.82
Individual training	0.65
Cronbach's Alpha = 0.733	

Table E6

Preferred Approaches Factor Three: Professional Development

Item	Eigenvalue/Factor Loading Scores
Required by your employer	0.789
Recommended by your employer	0.880
Made optional by your employer	0.898
Paid for by you	0.505
Presented by a trainer within your organization	0.564
Cronbach's Alpha = 0.858	

Table E7

Preferred Approaches Factor Four: Job Responsibilities

Item	Eigenvalue/Factor Loading Scores
Part of your performance review	0.835
Part of an incentive plan	0.895
Continuing education or professional development credit	0.684
Presented by an outside consultant	0.597
Cronbach's Alpha = 0.832	

Table E8

Preferred Approaches for Learning Factor Analysis

Item	**Eigenvalue/Factor Loading Score**
Brochures/Pamphlets	0.69
Self-paced/self-guided computer program (at home)	0.69
Self-paced/self-guided computer program (at work)	0.59
Independent study with manuals	0.75
Internet/web site program	0.63
Newsletter	0.74
PowerPoint presentation	0.68
Movie clips	0.66
Instructional videos	0.62
Television documentary	0.62
Books	0.71
Newspaper articles	0.77
Cronbach's Alpha=0.917	

Table E9

Training Hindrances Factor Analysis

Item	**Eigenvalue/Factor Loading Scores**
The topics discussed could invade my sense of privacy	0.69
The activities done during the training could invade the privacy of working relationships	0.62
People could think I was a victim if I attended	0.81
People could think I was a perpetrator if I attended	0.76
My working relationships could become more complicated if I attended	0.80
Attendance could indicate that I lack social skills	0.75
I could be asked to do things that would embarrass me	0.75
Others attending the training could not accept me	0.73
I could say something dumb	0.67
Cronbach's Alpha=0.902	

Table E10

Training Motivators Factor Analysis

Item	**Eigenvalue/Factor Loading Scores**
The amount of time required to attend	0.50
The topic is interesting	0.68
Adequate job coverage	0.61
Receiving enough information about the training	0.65
Encouragement from co-workers	0.61
Encouragement from supervisors	0.67
Attendance would considered as part of my next performance review	0.61
Cronbach's Alpha=0.807	

Appendix F
Subscale Overall Means and Means by Gender of Individual Items

Table F1

Means: Knowledge Factor One - Prevention Efforts

Item	Overall Mean	Male Mean	Female Mean
The manager's duty to prevent harassment	2.08	2.21 (1)	1.95 (1)
What to do if you believe you are being harassed	2.03	2.10 (3)	1.95 (2)
The employee's duty to prevent harassment	2.02	2.12 (2)	1.90 (4)
Understanding the organization's harassment policy and procedure	2.00	2.06 (5)	1.93 (3)
Ways to prevent workplace harassment	1.95	2.07 (4)	1.82 (7)
How to communicate healthy boundaries	1.91	1.98 (8)	1.84 (6)
How to know whether your environment is hostile, with regard to sexual harassment	1.89	1.90 (11)	1.89 (5)
Understanding the law relevant to sexual harassment	1.86	1.94 (10)	1.76 (8)
How to file a sexual harassment complaint	1.83	2.04 (6)	1.59 (11)
Individual liability for sexual harassment	1.83	2.00 (7)	1.64(10)
Employer liability for sexual harassment	1.83	1.98 (9)	1.68 (9)
How to investigate a sexual harassment complaint	1.65	1.77 (12)	1.51 (12)

Cronbach's Alpha = 0.955

Table F2

Means: Knowledge Factor Two - Victim Impact

Item	Overall Mean	Male Mean	Female Mean
How sexual harassment affects victims emotionally	2.01	1.95 (4)	2.08 (1)
How sexual harassment affects victims' performance on the job	1.99	2.01 (1)	1.96 (2)
Why sexual harassment victims get blamed	1.96	1.95 (3)	1.97 (3)
What causes harassment	1.95	2.01 (2)	1.89 (5)
How sexual harassment affects victims physically	1.93	1.94 (5)	1.92 (4)
What kind of people are more likely to harass	1.76	1.78 (6)	1.74 (6)
Cronbach's Alpha = 0.938			

Table F3

Means: Knowledge Factor Three - Acceptable Behaviors

Item	Overall Mean	Male Mean	Female Mean
How to listen to others with respect	2.27	2.30 (1)	2.25 (1)
Specific guidelines of appropriate behavior at work	2.24	2.27 (2)	2.20 (2)
Cronbach's Alpha = 0.833			

Table F4

Means: Training Settings Factor One - Group Training

Item	Overall Mean	Male Mean	Female Mean
Small group training	2.60	2.62 (3)	2.59 (1)
Group training	2.59	2.70 (2)	2.46 (2)
Mixed group of both males and females	2.57	2.78 (1)	2.34 (4)
Large group training	2.47	2.48 (5)	2.46 (3)
On site training using a traditional delivery format	2.44	2.54 (4)	2.32 (5)
Off site training using a traditional delivery format	2.21	2.34 (6)	2.08 (6)
Cronbach's Alpha = 0.931			

Table F5

Means: Training Settings Factor Two - Individual Training

Item	**Overall Mean**	**Male Mean**	**Female Mean**
On site training using an electronic delivery format	2.54	2.53 (1)	2.55 (1)
Off site training using an electronic delivery format	2.12	2.15 (3)	2.08 (2)
Individual training	2.09	2.35 (2)	1.81 (3)
Cronbach's Alpha = 0.733			

Table F6

Means: Prevention Training Factor One - Professional Development

Item	Overall Mean	Male Mean	Female Mean
Required by your employer	2.88	2.88 (1)	2.89 (1)
Recommended by your employer	2.74	2.76 (2)	2.73 (2)
Made optional by your employer	2.61	2.62 (3)	2.60 (3)
Presented by a trainer within your organization	2.44	2.56 (4)	2.31 (4)
Paid for by you	1.48	1.63 (5)	1.32 (5)
Cronbach's Alpha = 0.858			

Table F7

Means: Prevention Training Factor Two - Job Responsibilities

Item	Overall Mean	Male Mean	Female Mean
Part of an incentive plan	2.92	2.87 (1)	2.97 (1)
Continuing education or professional development credit	2.84	2.84 (2)	2.85 (2)
Presented by an outside consultant	2.70	2.62 (3)	2.78 (3)
Part of your performance review	2.61	2.53 (4)	2.71 (4)
Cronbach's Alpha = 0.832			

Table F8

Means: Preferred Approaches for Learning Factor Analysis

Item	Overall Mean	Male Mean	Female Mean
Television documentary	1.98	1.91 (3)	2.05 (1)
Movie clips	1.97	2.00 (1)	1.95 (4)
Instructional videos	1.97	2.00 (2)	1.93 (5)
Self-paced/self-guided computer program (at work)	1.94	1.88 (4)	2.00 (2)
Internet/web site program	1.89	1.83 (6)	1.96 (3)
Brochures/Pamphlets	1.84	1.81 (7)	1.86 (6)
PowerPoint presentation	1.81	1.86 (5)	1.76 (7)
Self-paced/self-guided computer program (at home)	1.70	1.67 (9)	1.73 (8)
Newspaper article	1.67	1.69 (8)	1.65 (9)
Newsletter	1.61	1.61 (11)	1.60 (10)
Independent study with manuals	1.58	1.64 (10)	1.53 (12)
Books	1.57	1.55 (12)	1.58 (11)
Cronbach's Alpha=0.917			

Table F9

Means: Training Hindrances Factor Analysis

Item	Overall Mean	Male Mean	Female Mean
The activities done during the training could invade the privacy of working relationships	2.12	2.04 (1)	2.20 (1)
I could be asked to do things that would embarrass me	2.03	1.98(2)	2.09 (2)
The topics discussed could invade my sense of privacy	1.99	1.91 (4)	2.07 (3)
I could say something dumb	1.91	1.96 (3)	1.85 (5)
My working relationships could become more complicated if I attended	1.87	1.85 (6)	1.89 (4)
People could think I was a victim if I attended	1.79	1.78 (9)	1.81 (6)
People could think I was a perpetrator if I attended	1.78	1.87 (5)	1.69 (7)
Attendance could indicate that I lack social skills	1.74	1.80 (8)	1.68 (8)
Others attending the training could not accept me	1.74	1.82 (7)	1.66 (9)

Cronbach's Alpha=0.902

Table F10

Means: Training Motivators Factor Analysis

Item	Overall Mean	Male Mean	Female Mean
The amount of time required to attend	2.91	2.71 (2)	3.12 (1)
The topic is interesting	2.84	2.77 (1)	2.92 (2)
Receiving enough information about the training	2.78	2.72 (3)	2.84 (3)
Adequate job coverage	2.72	2.62 (4)	2.82 (4)
Attendance would considered as part of my next performance review	2.63	2.45 (5)	2.82 (5)
Encouragement from supervisors	2.45	2.35 (6)	2.57 (6)
Encouragement from co-workers	2.28	2.23 (7)	2.33 (7)
Cronbach's Alpha=0.807			

Table F11

Means: Training Interest Factor One - Prevention

Item	Overall Mean	Male Mean	Female Mean
Ways to prevent workplace harassment	2.19	2.13 (5)	2.26 (1)
The employee's duty to prevent harassment	2.17	2.15 (3)	2.19 (2)
The manager's duty to prevent harassment	2.15	2.16 (2)	2.13 (6)
Understanding the organization's harassment policy and procedure	2.13	2.09 (8)	2.18 (3)
Understanding the law relevant to sexual harassment	2.12	2.17 (1)	2.07 (9)
What to do if you believe you are being Harassed	2.11	2.04 (12)	2.18 (4)
Employer liability for sexual harassment	2.10	2.15 (4)	2.05(11)
Individual liability for sexual harassment	2.10	2.12 (6)	2.08 (8)
How to communicate healthy boundaries	2.09	2.04 (11)	2.14 (5)
How to know whether your environment is hostile, with regard to sexual harassment	2.09	2.07 (9)	2.11 (7)
How to investigate a sexual harassment complaint	2.02	2.11 (7)	1.92 (12)
How to file a sexual harassment complaint	1.97	1.98 (6)	1.97 (10)

Cronbach's Alpha = 0.964

Table F12

Means: Training Interest Factor Two - Victim Impact

Item	Overall Mean	Male Mean	Female Mean
What kind of people are more likely to harass	2.15	2.14 (1)	2.17 (1)
What causes harassment	2.03	2.04 (4)	2.01 (2)
How sexual harassment affects victims physically	2.03	2.04 (5)	2.01 (3)
How sexual harassment affects victims emotionally	1.99	2.06 (3)	1.91 (5)
How sexual harassment affects victims' performance on the job	1.99	2.07 (2)	1.91 (6)
Why sexual harassment victims get blamed	1.99	2.01 (6)	1.96 (4)
Cronbach's Alpha = 0.950			

Table F13

Means: Training Interest Factor Three - Acceptable Behaviors

Item	Overall Mean	Male Mean	Female Mean
Specific guidelines of appropriate behavior at work	2.10	2.14 (1)	2.05 (2)
How to listen to others with respect	2.08	2.10 (2)	2.07 (1)
Cronbach's Alpha = 0..885			

Table F14

Means: Program Emphasis Factor One - Program Focus

Item	Overall Mean	Male Mean	Female Mean
Primarily knowledge building	2.80	2.91 (1)	2.68 (1)
Primarily skill building	2.76	2.85 (2)	2.66 (2)
Primarily awareness building	2.75	2.85 (3)	2.65 (4)
Primarily attitude changing	2.73	2.80 (4)	2.66 (3)
Cronbach's Alpha = 0.945			

Table F15

Means: Program Emphasis Factor Two - Program Rewards

Item	Overall Mean	Male Mean	Female Mean
Part of an incentive plan	2.95	2.93 (2)	2.99 (1)
Continuing education or professional development credit(s)	2.95	2.99 (1)	2.92 (2)
Part of your performance plan	2.73	2.65 (3)	2.81 (3)
Cronbach's Alpha = 0.817			

Vita

Heather Monique Whaley was born in Knoxville, TN and lived in Knoxville, Mt. Juliet, and Hixson, TN and Provo, UT, where she graduated from Timpview High School in 1992. She attended Carson-Newman College immediately after high school. After her first year of college, she transferred to The University of Tennessee, Knoxville and received a B.S. in Human Ecology in 1996 and an M.S. in Human Resource Development in 1998.

After completing a one-year teaching internship in Family and Consumer Sciences in Knox County, Tennessee, Heather taught middle school and high school Work and Family Studies in Montgomery County, Virginia for two years. She returned to Knox County, Tennessee in 1999 and continued to teach high school Family and Consumer Sciences for an additional six years, during which time she supervised four field experience students and three teaching interns.

Heather is currently pursing her doctorate in business administration at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. During her Ph.D. program, Heather was the graduate teaching assistant and summer instructor for *Human Resource Development Training Systems: Strategies and Techniques*.

Heather began an assistant professorship at Carson-Newman College August 2006 in Jefferson City, Tennessee.