

SEXUAL HARASSMENT EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR WORKPLACES OF PAKISTAN: DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION[#]

Anila Kamal & Naeem Tariq

National Institute of Psychology

Centre of Excellence

Quaid-i-Azam University

Islamabad, Pakistan

The article describes the development of an indigenous Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (SHEQ) which measures the women's experiences of sexual harassment at the workplaces of Pakistan. Its 35 items are divided into Gelfand, Fitzgerald, and Drasgow's (1995) three dimensions of harassment: Gender Harassment, Unwanted Sexual Attention, and Sexual Coercion which are the reformulation of Till's (1986) five types of sexual harassment. The procedure followed for the development of SHEQ is same as that of Fitzgerald et al.'s (1988) Sexual Experience Questionnaire (SEQ). The results of the several studies suggest that SHEQ possesses sufficient reliability and validity for research use. SHEQ may be useful for increasing understanding of the experiences of sexual harassment faced by women at workplaces. It may also have a role in the development and evaluation of programs designed to prevent or alleviate harassing behaviours.

The topic of sexual harassment in the workplace was virtually unstudied until past two decades. According to Gutek and Dunwoody (1987) the focus on sexual harassment has led to research on two questions: (1) How do people define sexual harassment? (2) How common is sexual harassment? These questions are important for doing research, and for making laws and regulations for sexual harassment, and for the establishment of procedures to remedy the problem, which are ought to reflect public consensus. Further, it deserves study because it has negative consequences for women workers and organizations.

Perhaps one of the complicating factor that has delayed both awareness of and response to sexual harassment has been the difficulty in defining and measuring sexual harassing behaviours. Lee (as cited in Lee & Heppner, 1991) traced the historical, legal, and research

[#] This article is based on the Ph.D. research of Anila under the supervision of Naeem Tariq.

The authors wishes to thanks Fizza Sabir, Farah Naz Khan, Somia Pervaiz and Saima Pervaiz who helped in data collection at various stages of the research.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Anila Kamal, National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, P.O. Box 1511, Islamabad, Pakistan.

definitions of sexual harassment and found multiple definitions that have evolved over time. Lee also noted a growing recognition by researchers and lawmakers that sexual harassment is a complex phenomenon that must be evaluated with attention to the context within which the behaviour occurs. Nonetheless, sexual harassment continues to occupy an ambiguous arena extending from flirtatious behaviour to assault. The difficulty in defining and measuring sexual harassment has most likely hampered research in this area.

One of the most difficult problems for researchers investigating this phenomenon has been the lack of agreement concerning what behaviours actually constitute harassment, and the circumstances under which they are seen to do so. One of the consequences of the confusion surrounding the concept of harassment is the consistent finding that although a large number of women report that at their workplaces they experience obviously harassing behaviours, such as, touching, fondling, and propositions, only a small percentage of these same women indicate that they believe they have been sexually harassed (Fitzgerald, et al., 1988; Fitzgerald & Shullman, 1985).

In general, such contextual variables are seen to influence perceptions most powerfully when the behaviour in question is less explicitly coercive. Individuals overwhelmingly agree that requests for sex that are linked to threats of retaliation for noncompliance constitute sexual harassment, whatever the prior relationship or the nature of the woman's behaviour (Reilly, Carpenter, Dull, & Bartlett, 1982); to a somewhat lesser degree, the same is true of behaviours that link sex to promises of reward (Adams, Kottke, & Padgitt, 1983; Konrad & Gutek, 1986). The most important factor determining judgement of sexual harassment is the behaviour involved. Sexually explicit behaviour and behaviour involving threats or warnings is more likely than other less threatening behaviour, to be judged as sexual harassment (Gutek, Nakamura, Gahart, Handschumacher, & Russell, 1980; Reilly et al., 1982; Weber-Burdin & Rossi, 1982). Touching is also more likely to be rated as sexual harassment than comments, looks, or gestures (Dunwoody-Miller & Gutek, 1985; Gutek, Morasch, & Cohen, 1983; Reilly et al., 1982; Weber-Burdin & Rossi, 1982).

In addition to stimulus variables, perceptions of harassment are also influenced by various subject or "person" variables, the most powerful of which is gender. Women are consistently more likely to view such behaviours as harassment (Kenig & Ryan, 1986; Padgitt & Padgitt, 1986). Most of the studies reported that usually the younger ones experience more harassment as compared to the older ones (e.g.,

Coles, 1986; Gutek, 1985; Gutek et al., 1980; Schneider, 1982; Tangri, Burt, & Johnson, 1982; U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981, 1987). Brooks and Perot (1991) on the other hand, report that older women experience a higher frequency of sexual harassment than younger women. According to Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1992), women of all age groups report experiencing harassment (see also Farley, 1978).

Researches also report that marital status is related to the experience of sexual harassment with unmarried often experiencing more harassment than married women (Coles, 1986; Gutek et al., 1980; Ryan & Kenig, 1991; Schneider, 1982; Tangri, et al. 1982). According to Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1992) as in case with the variable of age, it is easy to over interpret such data. Marital status is more likely a dummy variable representing lack of protected status of a wife, or most likely age itself. Farley (1978) has also cited instances of sexual harassment among women of all ages, races, occupations, income levels, and marital statuses; and she contends that sexual harassment can happen to any woman, and not only to just specific kind of women. Researches have also found that women with higher levels of education are more likely to report sexual harassment than women with lower levels of education (Coles, 1986; Fain & Anderton, 1987; Martin, 1984). Lach and Gwartney-Gibbs (1993) suggest that this may be a function of awareness and sensitization to the problem among more educated women. Gutek (1985) report that highly educated women tended to hold more liberal attitudes about social behaviour at work. These women were more likely to report being insulted by sexual propositions at work, and to indicate that both men and women contributed equally to sexual overtures.

The study of sexual harassment in organizations has been hampered by the lack of standard operational definition or measurement strategy. Early studies (e.g., Benson & Thomson, 1982; Gutek, 1985; U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981) typically presented respondents with a checklist of behaviours and asked whether they had experienced them within a particular time frame (generally, two years). Examples include U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board's (1981, 1987) seven behaviours (unwelcome sexual remarks, suggestive looks, deliberate touching, pressure for dates, pressure for sexual favours, unwelcome letters and telephone calls, and attempted or completed rape). Other researchers also used almost similar type of lists (see Gutek, 1985; Saunders, 1992). Gruber (1990) criticized this methodology as a theoretical, because little if any, rationale is offered in

these studies for the particular behaviours chosen and there has been little agreement among studies, as the target behaviours often vary from study to study, making cross-sample comparisons virtually impossible. In addition, no reliability data have been offered for such lists. In the mid-1990s the researches at West have started taking sexual harassment as a standard measureable construct (Arvey & Cavanaugh, 1995; Frazier, Cochran, & Olson, 1995), and they have also started differentiating clearly between sexual harassment as a legal concept and as a psychological construct (e.g., Fitzgerald, Swan, & Fischer, 1995).

Arguing that a theoretical and psychometrically sound measurement strategy is prerequisite to theoretical work, Fitzgerald et al. (1988) developed the Sexual Experience Questionnaire (SEQ), a self-report instrument designed to assess the five general types of offensive workplace behaviours proposed by Till (1980): Gender harassment, seductive behaviour, sexual bribery, sexual threats, and sexual imposition or assault. The SEQ assesses each area via a series of behavioural-based items. These offensive workplace behaviours can be classified as instances of *quid pro quo* (sexual bribery; sexual threats) or "hostile environment" (gender harassment, seductive behaviour, sexual imposition or assault). Later, Gelfand, Fitzgerald, and Drasgow (1995) has conclusively shown that Till's five types of harassment can be accounted for by a three factor solution which are the reformulation of Till's original system into three dimensions: (i) Gender Harassment (same as Till's gender harassment); (ii) Unwanted Sexual Attention (It includes Till's seductive behaviour and sexual imposition or assault; and (iii) Sexual Coercion (It includes Till's sexual bribery and sexual coercion).

Although sexual harassment is referred to as a hidden issue but like the other countries, in Pakistan it has also started receiving attention and awareness among women (Anila, 1992, 1994, 1995; Anila, Ansari, & Tariq, 1991). The research in the area of sexual harassment is still in a very earlier stage. At present in Pakistan it is not considered as an illegal act. No laws for the protection against sexual harassment are available (Anila, 1994). So far, the researches have only taken it as a psychological construct. The goal of the present research is to develop an instrument, namely Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (SHEQ), that would measure the women's experiences of sexual harassment at the workplaces in Pakistan. The concept of sexual harassment is taken as a behavioural construct only. The specific purpose of this article is to discuss the construction of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire. The following sections will

detail the instrument's development, results of psychometric analyses undertaken (including reliability and validity), and the results of the application of the instrument to a sample of working women in which the relationships of different demographic variables with women's experiences of sexual harassment have been studied.

METHOD

STUDY I

Development of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (SHEQ)

The procedure followed in the development of SHEQ is same as that of the development of Fitzgerald et al.'s (1988) Sexual Experience Questionnaire (SEQ), except (i) the process of item generation, and (ii) Fitzgerald et al.'s have used the term "sexual harassment" as a criterion item in SEQ, while in SHEQ, the criterion item has not been included, rather the subjects were instructed in the "instruction section", that SHEQ deals with the incidents of sexual harassment.

Item Generation

The first step in the instrument development is to generate an initial item pool. Unlike Fitzgerald et al., who identified the items from the relevant literature or wrote them on their own, in the present study all the items were empirically determined. For this purpose indepth interviews have been carried out with 54 women working with males (bosses, colleagues, and subordinates) in different fields and at various job levels. They were from Hospitals ($n = 11$); Banks ($n = 7$); Research Organizations and NGOs ($n = 5$); Ministries ($n = 7$); Semi-government Offices/Corporations i.e., WAPDA, Pakistan Television Corporation ($n = 16$); and Private Offices ($n = 8$). The job levels of women were equivalent to the government grades which ranges from 2 to 20 with majority of them falling into grades 11 to 15 ($n = 33$), and grades 17 to 18 ($n = 14$). Rest ($n = 7$) were divided into other grades. Different field of jobs were taken so that a vast variety of experiences can be explored.

During the interviews all the women were asked to tell about the incidence of sexual harassment that they themselves or their female colleagues have experienced at their respective workplaces. They were also asked to report whether the harassers were their bosses, colleagues, or subordinates. Only those women were taken who voluntarily participated in the study. On the whole 78 women were contacted but

24 refused to participate. Most of the women who refused were from the higher job grades.

In result of these interviews an item pool of 46 items was generated. Then these items were categorized on the three types of sexual harassment identified by Gelfand et al. (1995) by three psychologists (one Ph.D. and two M.Phil. degree holders) who have experience of research related to women issues. These types are:

- I. *Gender Harassment*: This category encompasses a range of verbal and nonverbal behaviours generally not aimed at sexual cooperation; rather they convey insulting, hostile, degrading, and sexist attitudes about women (10 items).
- II. *Unwanted Sexual Attention*: It include both verbal and nonverbal behaviour which ranges from repeated, nonreciprocal requests for dates; intrusive letters and phone calls; touching, grabbing, and cornering; and gross sexual imposition or assault. Although frequently experienced as intimidating or coercive, it can be distinguished from the third category (Sexual Coercion) by its lack of job related losses or benefits, either explicit or implied (27 items).
- III. *Sexual Coercion*: The classic instance of *quid pro quo* sexual harassment, behaviour of this type refers to bribes and threats, whether explicit or subtle, that condition some job related benefit on sexual cooperation. Although it is almost universally recognized and labeled as harassment, it is, perhaps not paradoxically, also the least common. According to Gelfand, et al. (1995) research studies routinely provide prevalence estimates in 5 to 10% range, compared to 20 to 25% for Unwanted Sexual Attention, and 50% and higher for Gender Harassment (9 items).

All items were written in behavioural terms, and the words "sexual harassment" did not appear in any item, rather the respondents were instructed that in the following, different incidents of sexual harassment have been written which women usually face at their workplaces in which either their bosses, colleagues, or subordinates are the initiators or harassers. These three job levels of males in the workplaces were taken because subjects during the interviews mentioned that they are harassed by all levels of males at their workplaces. The subjects were also instructed that while responding to each item it should be kept in mind that the experiences of sexual harassment can be differentiated by social interaction at work, which involves social relationship in which both persons, that is male and female, enter into or develop, with mutual understanding. While sexual harassment is the imposition of

unwelcome attention or action on one person (usually female) by another person (usually male). Thus every item of the item pool describes an incident in which a male (boss/colleague/subordinate), with whom the female respondent does not want to develop any social relationship, other than working relationship initiate any kind of offensive or sexually harassing behaviour.

Scoring

For each item, subjects were instructed to circle the responses most closely describing their own experiences. The response options included (1) Never, (2) Once, (3) A few times, and (4) Very frequent. The SHEQ is designed primarily to identify the frequency of various types of harassment and thus is scored simply by counting the number of subjects who endorsed the once, a few times, and very frequent response options for each item.

Final selection of items

The 46 items SHEQ was again administered on a sample of 60 working women who voluntarily participated. On the whole, 100 women were contacted but 40 refused to participate in the study. The item-total correlation yielded 35 items which were found significantly correlated at $p < .001$ and the r ranges from .42 to .71. These 35 items were included in the final form of SHEQ. The number of items and their sample item on each dimension are: (I) Gender Harassment, 7 items, e.g., staring, suggestive jokes or songs, use of pornographic material, etc.; (II) Unwanted Sexual Attention, 21 items, e.g., unwanted discussion of personal or sexual matters, requests for dates, attempt to establish a romantic sexual relation, unwanted and forceful attempts to touch or fondle, rape, etc.; and (III) Sexual Coercion, 7 items. e.g., subtle or direct bribery for sexual cooperation, subtle or direct threats for retaliation of sexual noncooperation, actually experienced negative consequences for sexual noncooperation, etc. According to Fitzgerald et al. (1988), "the original intent during the construction of SEQ had been to design an inventory with 50 items (10 on each scale) ...However, in practices it proved difficult to construct without considerable redundancy. In particular, levels of Bribery and Threat (Coercion) appeared to be completely covered by 4 items" (p. 158). The SEQ was originally developed with five scales according to Till's categorization. During the development of SHEQ, the same problem has been found in the present study, because an equal number of items for each scale can not be prepared.

Reliability

Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient

Initial psychometric analysis, using Cronbach's alpha coefficient yielded an internal consistency coefficient of .94 for the entire 35-item SHEQ and for every scale it ranges from .70 to .92 (Table 1).

Table 1

Alpha coefficients of the scales of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaires (N = 60)

| | Scales | No. of items | Alpha Coefficients |
|------|---------------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| I. | Gender Harassment | 7 | .70 |
| II. | Unwanted Sexual Attention | 21 | .92 |
| III. | Sexual Coercion | 7 | .80 |
| | Total SHEQ | 35 | .94 |

Intercorrelations

The internal consistency was further determined by intercorrelation of every scale as well as with that of the total score on SHEQ. All the correlations are highly significant as shown in Table 2.

Table 2

Intercorrelations among the scales of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaires (N = 60)

| | Scales | I | II | III |
|------|---------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| I. | Gender Harassment | - | | |
| II. | Unwanted Sexual Attention | .76** | - | |
| III. | Sexual Coercion | .52** | .67** | - |
| | Total SHEQ | .84** | .98** | .76** |

** $p < .000$

Split-half Reliability

For calculating the split-half reliability coefficient SHEQ was divided into two parts, with 18 items in part I and 17 items in part II. The reliability coefficient was found as .91 with alpha of 18 items part is .90 and 17 items part is .88.

Validity

All the items of the SHEQ are determined empirically and they are judged by the experts as well. Therefore, it has sufficient content validity.

For the determination of the convergent and discriminant validities a study was carried out. The 35-item SHEQ and the Urdu translated version of Coping with Harassment Questionnaire (CHQ, Fitzgerald, 1990) were administered on the sample of 60 working women. Their age ranges from 21 to 43 years with mean age of 29.02 years. CHQ is a 50 items inventory yielding scores for 10 coping strategies which are classified into two general categories. The first category is of Externally focussed strategies: Avoidance, Assertion/ Confrontation, Seeking Institutional/Organizational Relief, Social Support, and Appeasement. The second category is of Internally focussed strategies: Detachment, Denial, Relabeling, Illusory Control, and Endurance. Fitzgerald, Hulin, and Drasgow (1994) reported that more assertive and severe external responding is associated with more severe sexual harassment experience (see also, Baker, Terpstra, & Larntz, 1991; Dunwoody-Miller & Gutek, 1985; Gruber, 1989; Gruber & Bjorn, 1982; Livingston, 1982; Loy & Stewart, 1984). Typically, the CHQ is used to describe an individual's responses to a particular incident of harassing behaviour, but in the present study the respondents were asked to describe how they usually respond to their sexually harassing incidents indicated in SHEQ. It was assumed that the respondents who experienced more frequent and thus severe harassment will employ more assertive and externally focussed strategies.

The correlations found for SHEQ with each scale of CHQ are as follows: Total Externally focussed strategies ($r = .26, p < .05$), Avoidance ($r = .10, p > .05$), Assertion/Confrontation ($r = .07, p > .05$), Seeking Institutional/Organizational Relief ($r = .07, p > .05$), Social Support ($r = .26, p < .05$), and Appeasement ($r = .05, p > .05$); Total Internally focussed strategies ($r = -.25, p < .05$), Detachment ($r = -.26, p < .05$), Denial ($r = -.18, p > .05$), Relabeling ($r = -.09, p > .05$), Illusory Control ($r = -.05, p > .05$), and Endurance ($r = -.10, p > .05$).

Although only four correlations are found significant but their directions showed that the subjects who report severe experiences of sexual harassment usually react by adopting externally focused strategies, which can be seen in the positive correlation of externally focused strategies with SHEQ. Thus the SHEQ have convergent validity. On the other hand, the subjects who report severe harassment experiences do not employ internally focused strategies as can be seen

by the negative correlations between the SHEQ and internally focused strategies. This shows the discriminant validity of SHEQ.

For further validation of the SHEQ, a study was carried out to determine the relationship of different demographic variables of women with their experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces.

STUDY II

Demographic Variables and Women's Sexual Harassment Experiences at Workplaces

The study was carried out to explore the effect of age, education, marital status, and reasons for doing job on the working women's experiences of sexual harassment.

Sample

A sample of 60 working women who showed their willingness to participate were selected. Their age ranged from 19 to 50 years ($M = 28.78$, $SD = 6.55$). Their education ranges from Matric/Intermediate ($n = 22$); Bachelors and higher degree including the Professional degrees ($n = 38$). Out of 60 women, 43 were unmarried and 17 were married. Most of the women were doing job because of financial problems ($n = 48$); only 12 were working just to pass their time.

All of them belonged to a wide range of professions, e.g., Telephone Operator, Stenotypist, Receptionist, Airline Ticketing, Secretary, Diplomatic Counsellor, Research Assistant, Banking, Airhostess, Nurse, Doctor, and Government grade 17 officer, etc.

Instrument

The Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire (SHEQ) developed in Study I was used as an instrument. The procedure followed in the instructions and scoring is same as that of Study I. The total score of the 35 items can be ranged from 35 to 140. The high score indicate the more severe sexually harassing experiences.

Procedure

The women were approached by female researchers at their respective offices. Out of 100 women approached only 60 agreed to participate in the study after getting the assurance of confidentiality of their responses.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In order to get a clear picture of the experiences of sexual harassment for the present sample, frequencies and percentages on every item of SHEQ have been calculated. The frequencies as shown in Table 3 are calculated by adding the responses of subjects who endorsed the response alternatives of 'once', 'a few times', and 'very frequent'.

Table 3

Frequencies and percentages of the experiences of sexual harassment among working women (N = 60)

| Item No. | Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire* | f | % |
|----------|--|----|------|
| | <i>Your boss/coworker/subordinate</i> | | |
| 1. | ...told a dirty joke to you. | 32 | 53.3 |
| 2. | ...appreciated your figure. | 32 | 53.3 |
| 3. | ...stared at you from head to toe with dirty looks. | 31 | 51.7 |
| 4. | ...tried to make you sit with him on some lame excuses. | 41 | 68.3 |
| 5. | ...admired your dress or make-up. | 54 | 90.0 |
| 6. | ...invited you for outing or going to a restaurant with him to eat. | 42 | 70.0 |
| 7. | ...tried to show you a magazine containing pornographic material. | 8 | 13.3 |
| 8. | ...tried to flirt with you. | 36 | 60.0 |
| 9. | ...offered you lift in his car. | 45 | 75.0 |
| 10. | ...hummed filthy songs in your presence. | 28 | 46.7 |
| 11. | ...tried to give you a card. | 28 | 46.7 |
| 12. | ...withheld (delayed) your work so that you might go to him again and again regarding that work. | 34 | 56.7 |
| 13. | ...made obnoxious calls to you on the telephone. | 21 | 35.0 |
| 14. | ...took interest in your personal life with the intention that you might start responding favourably to him. | 37 | 61.7 |
| 15. | ...tried to talk about your or his own sexual life. | 12 | 20.0 |
| 16. | ...tried to probe your sexual frustration and deprivations, and pretended to be a sympathizer. | 18 | 30.0 |
| 17. | ...assured you of promotion in the job or of some other benefits if you could fulfill his immoral (bad) demands. | 13 | 21.7 |
| 18. | ...collided with you while passing by. | 17 | 28.3 |
| 19. | ...tried to touch your hand while giving you something. | 36 | 60.0 |
| 20. | ...called you "darling", "sweet heart", etc. | 17 | 28.3 |

| Item No. | Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire* | f | % |
|----------|--|----|------|
| 21. | ...put his hand on your shoulder or back while working. | 20 | 33.3 |
| 22. | ...tried to give you a love letter. | 14 | 23.3 |
| 23. | ...admired your face or hair. | 54 | 90.0 |
| 24. | ...tried to have body touch with you while sitting for some work. | 28 | 46.7 |
| 25. | ...tried to talk with you about some vulgar movie or a television programme. | 24 | 40.0 |
| 26. | ...threatened you to be fired (turn out of the job) if you did not develop romantic ties with him. | 9 | 15.0 |
| 27. | ...have made you face some loss in your job for not meeting his immoral (bad) demands. | 18 | 30.0 |
| 28. | ...tried to defame you for not fulfilling his immoral (bad) demands. | 20 | 33.3 |
| 29. | ...tried to have an immoral (bad) talk with you. | 29 | 48.3 |
| 30. | ...forced you to fulfill his immoral (bad) demands by exploiting hardships of your personal life at your work. | 13 | 21.7 |
| 31. | ...tried to pat on your shoulders or back while praising your work. | 29 | 48.3 |
| 32. | ...threatened you to put you out of job if you did not have physical/sexual relations with him. | 5 | 8.3 |
| 33. | ...put his hand on your hand while posing to teach you something, e.g., how to work on a computer, or any other such task. | 37 | 61.7 |
| 34. | ...tried to kiss you. | 15 | 25.0 |
| 35. | ...tried to rape you. | 5 | 8.3 |

Gender Harassment: Item Nos. 1,3,5,7,10,23, 25.

Unwanted Sexual Attention: Item Nos. 2,4,6,8,9,11,13,14,15,16,18,19,20,21,22,24, 29,31,33,34, 35.

Sexual Coercion: Item Nos. 12,17,26,27,28,30, 32.

*The original questionnaire is in Urdu, the national language of Pakistan.

The highest frequency (90.0%) of the experiences of sexual harassment of the present sample is on the item nos. 5 and 23, which are the examples of Gender Harassment. 75.0% and 70.0% of the women experience item nos. 9 and 6, respectively, which belongs to Unwanted Sexual Attention. Among the items of Sexual Coercion the highest frequency is on the item no. 12, which was endorsed by 56.7% of the working women. Thus the prevalence estimate of the present sample is same as in West. For example, according to Gelfand, Fitzgerald, and Drasgow (1995) the highest prevalence is on the dimension of Gender Harassment, then comes Unwanted Sexual

Attention, and the lowest is on the dimension of Sexual Coercion. The same response trend is among the present sample, as can be seen in the Table 3.

t-test analysis was carried out to find the differences among women, if any, regarding age, education, marital status, and reasons for doing job (Tables 4 to 7).

Table 4

Differences among age groups on scales and total score of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire

| Scales | Age (in years) | | | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|
| | Less than 30 (<i>n</i> = 39) | | 30 & above (<i>n</i> = 21) | | | |
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | |
| I. Gender Harassment | 15.31 | 4.53 | 15.71 | 3.78 | .35 | .727 |
| II. Unwanted Sexual Attention | 38.90 | 13.74 | 40.20 | 12.62 | .36 | .722 |
| III. Sexual Coercion | 10.51 | 4.28 | 9.71 | 2.20 | .80 | .428 |
| Total SHEQ | 64.72 | 20.76 | 65.62 | 16.89 | .17 | .865 |

df = 58

The results shown in Table 4 indicate no significant difference among women with age group less than 30 years and age group of 30 and above years. These results are similar to some Western studies (e.g., Farley, 1978; Fitzgerald & Ormerod, 1992).

Table 5

Differences among educational levels on scales and total score of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire

| Scales | Education | | | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|----------------------------------|--|-----------|--------------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|
| | Matric & Intermediate (<i>n</i> = 22) | | B. A. & Above (<i>n</i> = 38) | | | |
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | |
| I. Gender Harassment | 15.05 | 4.36 | 15.68 | 4.23 | .56 | .579 |
| II. Unwanted Sexual Attention | 36.95 | 11.97 | 40.74 | 13.93 | 1.07 | .291 |
| III. Sexual Coercion | 9.32 | 2.90 | 10.76 | 4.01 | 1.48 | .145 |
| Total SHEQ | 61.32 | 17.91 | 67.18 | 20.05 | 1.13 | .261 |

df = 58

The results shown in Table 5 also indicate no significant difference among women with educational level of Matric/Intermediate and B.A. and above. Although the higher educated group showed slightly greater mean score on all the scales as well as the total SHEQ indicating more experiences of sexual harassment among this group as compared to the lesser educated group. The reason may be as reported by Lach and Gwartney-Gibbs (1993) that the women with higher level of education have more awareness and sensitization of the problem of sexual harassment as compared to the lesser educated women. Therefore, highly educated women are more likely to report their experiences. Thus, one can say that it is not necessary that more educated women have more experiences of sexual harassment as compared to less educated women.

Table 6

Differences among marital status on scales and total score of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire

| Scales | Marital Status | | | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------|----------|
| | Unmarried (<i>n</i> = 43) | | Married (<i>n</i> = 17) | | | |
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | |
| I. Gender Harassment | 15.30 | 4.22 | 15.82 | 4.43 | .42 | .673 |
| II. Unwanted Sexual Attention | 38.74 | 12.93 | 40.88 | 14.39 | .56 | .578 |
| III. Sexual Coercion | 10.65 | 4.10 | 9.18 | 2.20 | 1.41 | .164 |
| Total SHEQ | 64.69 | 19.60 | 65.88 | 19.26 | .21 | .833 |

d.f. = 58

The marital status also does not seem to have any effect on women's experiences of sexual harassment as indicated by nonsignificant differences between married and unmarried women (Table 6). These findings are similar to Farley (1978) and Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1992).

The reasons for doing job showed a significant difference (Table 7). The women who are doing job for just passing their time showed more experiences of sexual harassment as compared to the needy women, i.e., those women who are doing the job for financial reasons. The significant difference ($p < .05$) was found among these women on the total SHEQ and on the scale of Unwanted Sexual Attention. On the other scales although the difference is not significant

but the women who are doing job for passing their time showed more experiences as compared to the other group. The reason may be that the women who do not have any financial problems may feel confident to report as they have no liabilities and compulsions for job.

Table 7

Differences among different reasons for jobs on scales and total score of Sexual Harassment Experience Questionnaire

| Scales | Reasons for Job | | | | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------|--|-----------|----------|----------|
| | To Pass Time (<i>n</i> = 12) | | Financial Problems (<i>n</i> = 48) | | | |
| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | | |
| I. Gender Harassment | 16.08 | 4.72 | 15.29 | 4.17 | .57 | .568 |
| II. Unwanted Sexual Attention | 46.92 | 17.38 | 37.46 | 11.49 | 2.29 | .026 |
| III. Sexual Coercion | 11.92 | 4.89 | 9.81 | 3.25 | 1.80 | .077 |
| Total SHEQ | 74.92 | 24.98 | 62.56 | 17.11 | 2.03 | .047 |

df = 58

CONCLUSION

An examination of the available data suggests that SHEQ possesses sufficient reliability and validity for research purposes. All the items were empirically determined by the members of the relevant population. Convergent and discriminant validities also seem promising, although the correlations are not very high. The reason may be that the criterion scale (CHQ) was developed in U.S.A. and was translated into Urdu, the national language of Pakistan. Although SHEQ was carefully constructed and internal reliability seems to be good, further research is needed to examine test-retest reliability and to reconfirm internal reliability with data from additional samples. The SHEQ is in its initial development stage. Other validity studies have yet to be examined.

When the frequencies and percentages of the sexual harassment experiences of the working women of the present sample was calculated, it showed the same prevalence rate as in West (e.g., Gelfand, Fitzgerald, & Drasgow, 1995). When the relationship of different demographic variables with sexual harassment experiences were studied on SHEQ, the results found are consistent with some Western

studies which showed that SHEQ can be used as a measure of women's experiences of sexual harassment at workplaces.

One problem that persists throughout this research is the general unwillingness of women to participate in the study. Very few women agreed to participate when they were assured by the researchers that their identity would not be disclosed. Anila (1995) has also reported that sexual harassment has been proven very difficult to study as it is a least spoken issue in Pakistani society. Another reason for the unwillingness is may be that instead of asking indirectly, the respondents were simply told that the present research is meant to identify their experiences of sexual harassment.

The present study also suffers from the usual limitations on generalizability, although possibly less so because of a wide variety of professions were taken as compared to one profession study. In particular, the study is quite limited in drawing conclusions concerning employed women's sexual harassment experiences. Although it covered quite a vast variety of occupational groups but the sample is very small. Until the study can be replicated with a large number of employed women, the results should be generalized with caution.

In conclusion, SHEQ may be useful for increasing understanding of the women's experiences of sexual harassment at the workplaces of Pakistan. It may also have a role in the development and evaluation of programs designed to prevent or alleviate harassing behaviours.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. W., Kottke, J. L., & Padgitt, J. S. (1983). Sexual harassment of university students. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 23, 484-499.
- Anila. (1992). *Attribution of responsibility for sexual harassment as related to sex role attitudes*. M.Phil. Thesis, National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Anila. (1994, January). Sexual harassment in the university campus. *NIP Newsletter*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 2-3.
- Anila. (1995). Sexual harassment: Myths versus women's reality. *Personality Study and Group Behaviour*, 15, 47-54.
- Anila., Ansari, Z. A., & Tariq, N. (1991). Development of an indigenous Sexual Harassment Attribution Questionnaire for Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 6(1-2), 55-68.

- Arvey, R. D., & Cavanaugh, M. A. (1995). Using surveys to assess the prevalence of sexual harassment: Some methodological problems. *Journal of Social Issues, 51*(1), 39-52.
- Baker, D. D., Terpstra, D. E., & Larntz, K. (1991). The influence of individual characteristics and severity of harassing behaviours on reactions to sexual harassment. *Sex Roles, 22*, 305-323.
- Benson, D. J., & Thomson, G. (1982). Sexual harassment on a university campus: The confluence of authority relations, sexual interest, and gender gratification. *Social Problems, 29*(3), 236-251.
- Brooks, L., & Perot, A. R. (1991). Reporting sexual harassment: Exploring a predictive model. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15*, 31-47.
- Coles, F. S. (1986). Forced to quit: Sexual harassment complaints and agency response. *Sex Roles, 14*, 81-95.
- Dunwoody-Miller, V., & Gutek, B. A. (1985). *S.H.E. Project Report, Sexual harassment in the state workforce: Results of a survey*. Sacramento: Sexual Harassment in Employment Project of the California Commission on the Status of Women.
- Fain, T. C., & Anderton, D. L. (1987). Sexual harassment: Organizational context and diffuse status. *Sex Roles, 17*, 291-311.
- Farley, L. (1978). *Sexual shakedown: The sexual harassment of women in the working world*. London: Melbourne House.
- Fitzgerald, L. F. (1990, March). *Assessing strategies for coping with harassment: A theoretical/empirical approach*. Paper presented at the Midwinter conference of the Association for Women in Psychology, Tempe, AZ.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Hulin, C. L., Drasgow, F. (1994). The antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations: An integrated model. In G. P. Keita & J. J. Jr. Hurrell (Eds.), *Job stress in changing workforce: Investigating gender, diversity, and family issues*, (pp. 55-73). Washington, DC: American Psychological Organization.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., & Ormerod, A. J. (1992). Breaking silence: The sexual harassment of women in academia and the workplace. In F. Denmark & M. Paludi (Eds.), *Handbook of the psychology of women*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., & Shullman, S. L. (1985, August). *The development and validation of an objective inventory to assess sexual harassment in academia and the workplace*. Paper presented at the

- annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Shullman, S. L., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y., Ormerod, M., & Weitzman, L. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 32, 152-175.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Swan, S., & Fischer, K. (1995). Why didn't she just report him? The psychological and legal implications of women's responses to sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51(1), 117-138.
- Frazier, P. A., Cochran, C. C., & Olson, A. M. (1995). Social science research on lay definitions of sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51(1), 21-37.
- Gelfand, M. J., Fitzgerald, L. F., & Drasgow, F. (1995). The structure of sexual harassment: A confirmatory analysis across cultures and settings. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 47, 164-177.
- Gruber, J. E. (1989). How women handle sexual harassment: A literature review. *Social Science Research*, 74, 3-9.
- Gruber, J. E. (1990). Methodological problems and policy implications in sexual harassment research. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 9, 235-254.
- Gruber, J. E., & Bjorn, L. (1982). Blue-collar blues: The sexual harassment of women autoworkers. *Work and Occupation*, 9, 271-298.
- Gutek, B. A. (1985). *Sex and the workplace*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gutek, B. A., & Dunwoody, V. (1987). Understanding sex in the workplace. In A. H. Stromberg, L. Larwood, & B. A. Gutek (Eds.), *Women and work: An annual review* (pp. 249-269). London: Sage Publications.
- Gutek, B. A., Morasch, B., & Cohen, A. G. (1983). Interpreting social-sexual behaviour in a work setting. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 22, 30-48.
- Gutek, B. A., Nakamura, C. Y., Gahart, M., Handschumacher, I., & Russell, D. (1980). Sexuality and the workplace. *Basic and Applied Psychology*, 1, 255-265.

- Kenig, S., & Ryan, J. (1986). Sex differences in the levels of tolerance and attribution of blame for sexual harassment on a university campus. *Sex Roles, 15*, 535-549.
- Konrad, A. M., & Gutek, B. A. (1986). Impact of work experiences on attitudes toward sexual harassment. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 31*, 422-438.
- Lach, D. H., & Gwartney-Gibbs, P. A. (1993). Sociological perspective on sexual harassment and workplace dispute resolution. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 42*, 102-115.
- Lee, L. A., & Heppner, P. P. (1991). The development and evaluation of a sexual harassment inventory. *Journal of Counselling and Development, 69*, 512-517.
- Livingston, J. A. (1982). Responses to sexual harassment on the job: Legal, organizational, and individual actions. *Journal of Social Issues, 38*(4), 5-22.
- Loy, P. H., & Stewart, L. P. (1984). The extent and effects of sexual harassment of working women. *Sociological Focus, 17*, 31-43.
- Martin, S. E. (1984). Sexual harassment: The link between gender stratification, sexuality, and women's economic status. In J. Freeman (Ed.), *Women: A feminist perspective* (pp. 54-69). Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Padgitt, S. L., & Padgitt, J. S. (1986). Cognitive structure of sexual harassment: Implications of university policy. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 27*, 34-39.
- Reilly, T., Carpenter, S., Dull, V., & Bartlett, K. (1982). The factorial survey: An approach to defining sexual harassment on campus. *Journal of Social Issues, 38*(4), 99-110.
- Ryan, J., & Kenig, S. (1991). Risk and ideology in sexual harassment. *Sociological Inquiry, 61*, 231-241.
- Saunders, B. E. (1992). *Sexual harassment of women in the workplace: Results from national women's study*. 8th Annual North Carolina/South Carolina Labor Law Seminar, Asheville, NC.
- Schneider, B. E. (1982). Consciousness about sexual harassment among heterosexual and lesbian women workers. *Journal of Social Issues, 38*(4), 75-98.
- Tangri, S. S., Burt, M. R., & Johnson, L. B. (1982). Sexual harassment at work: Three explanatory models. *Journal of Social Issues, 38*(4), 33-54.

- Till, F. J. (1980). *Sexual harassment: A report on the sexual harassment of students*. Washington DC: National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs.
- U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board. (1981). *Sexual harassment of federal workers: Is it a problem?* Washington DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Merit Systems Protection Board. (1987). *Sexual harassment in the federal workplace: An update*. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Weber-Burdin, E., & Rossi, P. H. (1982). Defining sexual harassment on campus: A replication and extension. *Journal of Social Issues*, 38, 111-120.

Received: July 30, 1996.