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INTRODUCTION

The idea that men have more sexual freedom than women, and society accepts and tolerates certain sexual behaviors from men and not from women, is part of the concept of sexual double standard (Gentry, 1998). Sexual double standard, in this context, means there is one standard for men and another for women in terms of sexual behavior. Specifically, sexual double standard refers to a “greater intolerance of intercourse between a female and ‘a great many males’ than between a male and ‘a great many females’ ” (Robinson, Zeiss, Ganja, Katz, & Robinson, 1991).

The sexual double standard has been the focus of research since the 1960s. Ira Reiss defined the idea that it is more acceptable for men to engage in premarital sex than for women (Herold & Milhausen, 1999). Historically, women have had to subscribe to traditional gender roles. While the pressure to accept traditional gender roles has changed over time, gender role expectations of women continue to influence young women’s behavior in sexual interactions (Lucke, 1998). College women and men are not immune to the influence of sexual double standards. According to literature, there has been increased use of sexually provocative and suggestive content in advertisements among consumers and practitioners since the mid-sixties (Soley & Kurzbard, 1986). Perhaps, it is because of their youth, lack of experience, ignorance, or heavy dependence on the media (e.g., films, movies, music, magazines) that many females continue to subscribe to traditional gender roles. Research has suggested that age affects gender roles. As young boys and girls grow up, they learn that boys are allowed to do certain things, whereas such actions may not be permitted of girls (Herbert, 1989).
Herold and Milhausen (1999) define sexual double standard as a condition in which men are allowed to behave more sexually promiscuous, whereas women are only permitted to engage and lead a monogamous lifestyle. Gentry (1998) further elaborates by explaining that men have experienced more sexual freedom than women throughout the ages, and that society accepts and tolerates certain sexual behaviors from men and not from women. There are two main issues concerning sexual double standard: sexual behavior and evaluations of men and women who engage in certain sexual behaviors (Herold & Milhausen, 1999). First, sexual behavior consists of actions and behaviors of both men and women. Historically, women have had to subscribe to traditional gender roles (Gentry, 1998). While the pressure to accept traditional gender roles has changed over time, gender role expectations of women continue to influence young women’s behavior in sexual interactions (Lucke, 1998). Sexual double standards tend to give people distorted images of both men and women. According to the double standard, women are all supposedly in monogamous relationships, but in fact this is changing (Herold & Milhausen, 1999). Not all women are monogamous, but traditional gender roles mask the problem by perpetuating the double standard. That is, women hide their actions from society for fear of the social stigma of being labeled as promiscuous.

Second, sexual double standard involves evaluations of men and women who engage in certain sexual behaviors. Traditionally, men have reported having more sexual partners and less intimate relationships (Lucke, 1998). Women on the other hand, tend to follow traditional gender roles of monogamy. Differences in sexual behavior between men and women may be linked to an evolutionary process, where men and women have
adopted sexual behavior patterns that will maximize their chance of reproducing successfully (Lucke, 1998). For example, women tend to choose the best partner in order to survive and thrive in a healthy family. This evolutionary process of socialization may have been the genesis of sexual double standards.

The cultural expectation that men are initiators and women are gatekeepers of sexuality is embedded within the larger stereotype that men are sexually aggressive and women are sexually passive. Men not only initiate sexual encounters, but also are expected to dictate the choice, timing, and sequence of sexual positions and techniques. Women who express their sexual preferences openly may be deemed "unladylike" or "promiscuous." The stereotype that women are undersexed also supports the traditional double standard that it is natural for men to "sow their wild oats," while women who are sexually active outside of committed relationships are considered "sluts and whores."

Fortunately, more flexible sexual attitudes are emerging. Women are becoming more sexually assertive and men are becoming more receptive to expressing tenderness. Still, the roots of traditional gender roles run deep even on college campuses. About 47.5% of college students agree with the statement that a woman having sex with a great many men is immoral or sinful, while 34.5% agree with the statement that many a man having sex with a great many women is immoral or sinful (Robinson, Ziss, Ganza, & Katz, 1991). Almost 20% of college women versus 0.7% of college men agreed with the double standard, which allows men more sexual partners (Holcomb, Holcomb, Sondag, & Williams, 1991).
Various theories have been used to explain the widespread acceptance of sexual double standard. For instance, according to the social learning theory (Bandura, 1977), observing the behaviors of others influence men and women to model their own behaviors after such observations. Therefore, men are socialized to desire and engage in sexual activity readily, but women are encouraged to limit their sexual activity in a monogamous relationship (Herold & Milhausen, 1999). Herold and Milhausen (1999) confirmed that women are consequently punished for having more sexual permissive behaviors, whereas men are rewarded with popularity and admiration for being sexually permissive.

Despite the trend toward gender equality, there is still evidence of a double standard in sexuality. Conforming to gender roles and sexual double standards can affect how we behave toward others as well as how we perceive our own actions. This acceptance of the sexual double standard can result in misunderstandings that lead to sexual harassment in college settings. Sexual harassment in this context refers to the deliberate or repeated pattern of sexual advances that are unwelcome or sexually related behaviors that are hostile, offensive, or degrading. Because of the different ways men and women behave, misunderstandings and allegations of sexual harassments can sometimes arise. For instance, some women may regard hugging a male friend as a gesture of friendship, whereas the young man may misinterpret the actions as overtly sexual and arousing. Men tend to categorize certain behaviors as sexual, whereas women may view the behavior as a social act rather than displaying sexual interest (Haworth-Hoeppner, 1998). Consequently, women are more likely to define certain acts from men
as sexual harassment, whereas these men merely think of the gestures as acts of friendliness (Haworth-Hoeppner, 1998).

Although the topic of sexual harassment has been around for a while, it was not until October 1991, when the country was held spellbound by the Senate confirmation hearing on Judge Clarence Thomas’s nomination to the Supreme Court, during which a former assistant, Anita Hill, charged that Thomas had sexually harassed her. According to the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), sexual harassment is defined as,

“Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of sexual nature all constitute sexual harassment when (1) submission to such a conduct is made explicitly or implicitly as a term of an individual’s employment, (2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions affecting such individual, or (3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual’s work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment.”

This definition clearly defines what constitutes sexual harassment in the workplace. There are two forms of sexual harassment: quid pro quo sexual harassment and hostile environment sexual harassment (Rosman & McDonald, 1999). Quid pro quo sexual harassment is explicitly connected to job issues, such as pay, promotion, working conditions, hiring, and firing (Rosman & McDonald, 1999).

Sexual harassment is not only limited to the workplace, but also occurs in academic settings. Students sometimes find themselves exposed to unwanted sexual advances or sexually demeaning remarks from peers, faculty, and staff on campus. Recent studies indicate that the problem of sexual harassment on campus is a
commonplace. A 1993 study of over 2,000 students found that over half of the women surveyed had been harassed by their instructors (Fitzgerald, 1993). Some researchers have estimated that 27% of male and 65% of female students have experienced sexual harassment (McKinney & Maroules, 1991). Fitzgerald, Wertzman, Gold, and Ormerod (1988) reported that 11% of male faculty admitted they had attempted to touch, stroke, or caress a student.

Sexual harassment cases among college students relate primarily to hostile environment sexual harassment. This would include behaviors such as unwelcome sexually oriented kidding, teasing, or joking; unwelcome display of sexual depictions or objects; unwelcome propositioning or touching; and repeated sexual flirtation or suggestive gestures (Rosman & McDonald, 1999). The practice of sexual harassment on college campuses is prevalent today, although college women tend to be less perceptive of sexual harassment. Women tend to ignore sexual remarks or advances as forms of sexual harassment, but rather view them as flattery (Herold & Milhausen, 1999). College men tend to be more domineering and aggressive in relationships (Gentry, 1998). Sometimes college men act this way because of peer pressure expectations of dominance (Herold & Milhausen, 1999). Differences in sexual behavior may lead to occasions when misunderstandings can occur, which can result in allegations of sexual harassment. Both men and women can commit, and be victimized by sexual harassment, although male offenders and female victims make up the majority of cases. Others often trivialize charges of sexual harassment, although evidence shows that victims of sexual harassment do suffer from it. Dziech and Weiner (1984) reported that college women who are
sexually harassed on campus are often forced to switch majors or even colleges because they were unable to stop persistent sexual harassment on campus.

Estimates of the frequency of sexual harassment among college settings vary widely across studies. On the average, research has indicated that about 70% of university women have reported some form of sexual harassment and the majority of the incidences were unreported (Larocca, 1999). Sexual harassment on campus usually involves the less severe forms of harassment such as sexist comments and sexual remarks, as well as suggestive looks and touching. Few acts involve the use of direct pressure of sexual intercourse. In 1992, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the federal law prohibiting sex discrimination in academic institutions permits students to sue their schools for monetary damages for sexual harassment (Greenhouse, 1992).

Attitudes about sexual harassment on college campuses are different from those found in the work environment. Consequently, college students (males and females) are particularly susceptible to being sexually harassed. About 12% of young women believe they have no right to avoid sexual abuse, and more than half of the young women interviewed believe that forcing sex on someone you know does not constitute sexual violence (Dietz-Uhler & Murrell, 1992). This could be due to their lack of experience in addition to the ample opportunities to explore their developing sexual identities. Research has shown that male and female college students differ in attitudes about sexual harassment. College women are usually more passive when it comes to certain sexual behaviors, such as sexual remarks and propositions (Dietz-Uhler & Murrell, 1992). College men on the other hand are more assertive concerning sexual behaviors.
According to the literature, there are three models that conceptualize sexual harassment: the Natural/Biological model, the Organizational model, and the Sociocultural model (O’Donohue, Downs, & Yeater, 1998). The first model is the Natural/Biological model. This model suggests that sexual harassment is not really sexual harassment, but rather the natural sex drive that men have over women. This implies that men have stronger sex drives and that men and women naturally have normal attractions to each other.

The second model is the Organizational model. This model holds that there is an organizational sex hierarchy, where those in higher rankings have authority to secure sexual gratification through sexual harassment. According to this model, women or men with lower organizational ranks tend to be the victims. Those with higher rankings tend to be the harassers. To the degree in our society that men are more powerful socially and politically, women will be victims of sexual harassment (O’Donohue, Downs, & Yeater, 1998).

The third model is the Sociocultural model. This model assumes that sexual harassment is a reflection of a patriarchal system in which social beliefs legitimize men’s role. This model utilizes traditional gender roles. According to this model, women are expected and trained to be passive and sexually attractive, whereas men are expected to be domineering and authoritative in relationships. This last model may have more relevance to the issue of sexual double standards.

Previous research (Charney & Russell, 1994; Perry, Schmidtke, & Kulik, 1998) has suggested that a greater acceptance of sexual double standards may influence
perceptions of sexual harassment in the college setting. According to Charney and Russell (1994), males, who are usually perpetrators of sexual harassment, often display aggressive sexual behaviors toward females; such behaviors are consistent with their male gender role, which may perpetuate the sexual double standard. Social conditioning reinforces this acceptance of the sexual double standard, where males, who embody a greater acceptance of sexual double standards, may enjoy social and sexual dominance over females (Pryor, Lavite, & Stroller, 1993). Under this perspective, conceivably, males may view some behavior as sexual in nature (such as a female smiling warmly or touching their hand in conversation), whereas females, viewing the same behavior, may believe they are only being friendly or sociable. If the male persists in his attention toward her, he may be accused of sexual harassment by her (Foulis & McCabe, 1997). This point is made clearer by Terpstra and Baker (1986) who noted that, “Sexual harassment is simply the exhibition of conditioned behaviors that are in accord with societal sex-role stereotypes.” In other words, males are more tolerant of sexual harassment actions than females because they view their actions as appropriate according to sex-role stereotypes or the acceptance of the sexual double standard.

The value in examining the relationship between these two variables (gender and sexual double standard) and how it might change the way we understand both concepts may go a long way in helping to reduce the incidence of sexual harassment on campus. Perhaps, we need to identify ways to mitigate the acceptance of sexual double standards among both men and women, since acceptance of the sexual double standard could significantly impact healthy interactions between the two genders, which, in turn, could
reduce the incidence of sexual harassment on campus. Of course, this premise assumes there is a relationship between acceptance of sexual double standard and attitudes toward sexual harassment. This study addresses the relationship between sexual double standard and sexual harassment among college men and women. Hence, foci of the current research are the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Gender affects attitudes toward sexual harassment among college students.

Hypothesis 2: Sexual double standard affects attitude toward sexual harassment among college students.

Hypothesis 3: There is an interaction effect of gender and sexual double standard on attitude toward sexual harassment among college students, where males, more than females, will score higher under the low sexual double standard condition, than under the high sexual double standard condition, on sexual harassment.

The review of literature has highlighted the salient features of sexual double standards in American society, as well as address the different aspects of sexual harassment, particularly as it pertains to the college populations. There is suggestive evidence that the more individuals subscribe to traditional gender roles, the more likely they are to believe in and practice sexual double standards in their lives. Also, literature confirms that the problem of sexual harassment is quite common in American universities, with most victims being female students. According to the theoretical models reviewed, the more individuals reflect the sociocultural model of behavior, the
more likely they expect men to be domineering and women submissive. Consequently, there are research findings to suggest a correlational relationship between the concepts of sexual double standard and sexual harassment, particularly among college men and women.

**METHODOLOGY**

**Design**

The design is cross-sectional and assesses the relationship between the acceptance of sexual double standard and sexual harassment attitude among a sample of college male and female students attending the University of North Texas in the spring semester, 2001.

**Sample Selection**

Convenience sampling was used to recruit self-selected subjects from undergraduate and graduate classes (mostly from the Colleges of Education and Arts and Science), organized student groups, as well as students congregating at the student union. A power evaluation based on a power level of 0.85, a small effect size of 0.35, and an alpha of 0.05 suggests a sample size of at least 300 students (150 males, 150 females). Data collection followed the approval of the Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects. All subjects received a consent form, a letter outlining the purpose and benefits of participation, prior to completing an anonymous questionnaire. Five hundred (500) questionnaires were distributed and 426 were returned producing a return rate of 85.2%.
Measures and Procedures

Independent Variables

There are two independent variables: acceptance of sexual double standard and gender. First, the Double Standard Scale (DSS), designed by Caron, Davis, Halterman, and Stickle (1993), measures acceptance of sexual double standard. The DSS is a 10-item scale arranged in a 5-point Likert-type format with response options labeled from (1) strongly agrees to (5) strongly disagree. The purpose of this scale was to measure acceptance of the traditional sexual double standard. A total score was obtained by summing the scores for each item. The scores can range from 10 to 50. The lower score indicates a greater acceptance of the traditional double standard (Caron, Davis, Halteman, & Stickle, 1993). To establish internal reliability, Cronbach's coefficient alpha for summed scores of the 10 items of the DSS was .77, as established by this study. Second, the gender variable was binary: male or female.

Dependent Variable

The Sexual Harassment Attitudes Questionnaire (SHAQ), as designed by Malovich and Stake (1990), measured the dependent variable, sexual harassment. This instrument measures respondents’ attitudes or tolerance regarding (a) responsibility for harassment behaviors by the student, (b) responsibility for harassment behavior by the professor, (c) reaction about appropriate responses to sexual harassment, and (d) victim's feelings about the effects of sexual harassment (Malovich & Stake, 1990). SHAQ (18 items) is scored by totaling the sum of scores for all items, where a higher score indicates
less sensitivity to sexual harassment actions. After reading a scenario of sexual harassment in a college setting, respondents indicated to whom they attributed responsibility for the incident. Six questions pertained to delegation of blame (3 to student and 3 to professor), six questions measured reactions about appropriate responses to sexual harassment, and six questions measured feelings about the sexual harassment. All questions were measured by a 6-point Likert-type scale, except questions about feelings, which used a 7-point Likert-type scale. To establish construct validity for the current research, a principal components analysis, with varimax rotation, was performed on the SHAQ, which yielded four factors: student blame (Cronbach’s coefficient alpha = .61), professor blame (Cronbach’s coefficient alpha = .71), reaction about appropriate responses to sexual harassment (Cronbach’s coefficient alpha = .72), and feelings of the victim of the effects of the sexual harassment (Cronbach’s coefficient alpha = .85). These four factors were treated as separate dependent variables. Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for the entire SHAQ was .86, as established by this study.

Control Variables

The control variables in the study were included to remove any biases that could moderate the relationship between the independent variables and the dependant variables. For this study the control variables were age, race (African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, Caucasian/White, Hispanic/Latino, Native American, and other), marital status (single, married, divorced, widowed, and other). Sexual double standard and gender (male, female) were also used as control variables in specific models. By controlling for race, marital status, age, and sexual double standard, hypothesis 1 can be addressed by
testing the effect of the independent variable of gender on the dependent variable of sexual harassment attitude independent of the control variables. By controlling for race, marital status, age, and gender, hypothesis 2 can be addressed by testing the effect of the independent variable of acceptance of sexual double standard on the dependent variable of sexual harassment attitude independent of the control variables. By controlling for race, marital status, and age, hypothesis 3 can be addressed by testing only the effect of the independent variables of acceptance of sexual double standard and gender on the dependent variable of sexual harassment attitude independent of the control variables. Data concerning the control variables were collected via the demographics section of the questionnaire.

**Data Analysis**

To investigate the first hypothesis, 1-way ANOVA, with Type III sums of squares, controlling for the effects of race, marital status, age, and acceptance of sexual double standard, was used to assess the effect of gender on attitude toward sexual harassment. Four separate univariate tests were performed assessing the effect of gender on each dependent variable (*student blame, professor blame, reaction about appropriate responses to sexual harassment, and feelings of the victim of the effects of the sexual harassment*) separately. To investigate the second hypothesis, multiple regression controlling for the effects of age, gender, race, and marital status was used to determine if the acceptance of sexual double standard affects attitude toward sexual harassment. To investigate the third hypothesis, 2-way ANOVA, controlling for the effects of age, race, and marital status, was used to determine the interaction effect of gender and acceptance
of sexual double standard on attitude toward sexual harassment. A median split criterion was used to dichotomize the independent variable of sexual double standard into two levels – high and low. For this study, low equals less than or equal to the median value ($\leq 3.90$) and high equals greater than the median value ($>3.90$). The goal of using 2-way ANOVA was to assess the interaction effect of the independent variables, gender and sexual double standard, on each dependent variable of sexual harassment – student, professor, reaction, and feeling – of sexual harassment, controlling for age, race, and marital status. The SAS (Statistical Analysis Software) was used for all necessary computations and a significance level of 0.5 was used for all analyses.

**RESULTS**

**Demographic Data of Subjects**

The sample consisted of 141 (33.1%) male and 285 (66.9%) female subjects aged 18 to 62 years. The average age of the subjects was 21.90 (SD 5.36) years of age. The racial distribution of the study sample included 294 (69.01%) Caucasians, 54 (12.68%) African Americans, 36 (8.45%) Asians, 31 (7.28%) Hispanics, 1 (0.23%) Native Americans, and 10 (2.35%) were classified as “other.” The marital status of the subjects was 375 (88.03%) single, 38 (8.92%) married, 6 (1.41%) divorced, 1 (0.23%) widowed, and 5 (1.41%) classified as other. The academic classification of the subjects was 375 (88.03%) undergraduate students and 51 (11.97%) graduate students. Almost a quarter (n=104, 24.5%) of the sample reported a history of sexual harassment (n=16 males, 3.7%; n=88 females, 20.6%), while 56.6% (n=241) reported knowing a victim of sexual harassment (n=81 males, 19%; n=160 females, 37.5%). In addition, 14 males (3.2%) and
76 females (17.8%) have been harassed themselves as well as knowing other victims. In summary, almost 60% (n=255) of the sample had been affected personally by sexual harassment on campus. Table 1 represents descriptive statistics and a frequency analysis for the demographics of the sample.

**Hypothesis 1 results:**

*Student blame*

One-way ANOVA results revealed a significant difference between gender and student blame when the effects of marital status, age, race, and sexual double standard were statistically controlled, $F(1, 413) = 4.10$, $p = .04$. The student blame subscale was scored so that a higher score indicates less sensitivity to sexual harassment actions. The pattern of the student blame least squares means (Table 2) showed that males (least squares mean 1.88, SEM 0.30) had a higher student blame score than females (least square mean 1.66, SEM 0.31). Thus, hypothesis 1 was supported.

*Professor blame*

One-way ANOVA results revealed a significant difference between gender and professor blame when the effects of marital status, age, race, and sexual double standard were statistically controlled, $F(1, 413) = 7.03$, $p = .01$. The professor blame subscale was scored so that a higher score reflected less sensitivity to sexual harassment actions. The pattern of the professor blame least squares means (Table 2) showed that males (least squares mean 1.05, SEM 0.31) had a higher professor blame score than females (least square mean 0.75, SEM 0.32). Therefore, males more than females were less sensitive to sexual harassment. Thus, hypothesis 1 was supported.
Reaction

One-way ANOVA results revealed a significant difference between gender and reaction of sexual harassment action when the effects of marital status, age, race, and sexual double standard were statistically controlled, $F (1, 413) = 19.85, p = .0001$. The reaction of sexual harassment action subscale was scored so that a higher score indicated less sensitivity to sexual harassment actions. The pattern of the reaction of sexual harassment action least squares means (Table 2) showed that males (least squares mean 1.51, SEM 0.25) had a higher reaction of sexual harassment action score than females (least square mean 1.11, SEM 0.25). Therefore, a higher score for males suggests that males were less sensitive to the sexual harassment actions than females. Thus, hypothesis 1 was supported.

Feelings

One-way ANOVA results revealed a significant difference between gender and feeling of the victim of the effects of the sexual harassment when the effects of marital status, age, race, and sexual double standard were statistically controlled, $F (1, 413) = 57.93, p = .0001$. The victim’s feelings about the effects of the sexual harassment were scored so that a higher score reflects less sensitivity to sexual harassment actions. The pattern of the victim’s feelings least squares means (Table 2) showed that males (least squares mean 2.29, SEM 0.30) had a higher reaction of sexual harassment action score than females (least square mean 1.45, SEM 0.31). This means that males were less sensitive to the sexual harassment actions than females. Thus, hypothesis 1 was supported.
**Hypothesis 2 results:**

*Student blame*

To test hypothesis 2, multiple regression was conducted to assess the relationship between acceptance of sexual double standard and attitude toward sexual harassment. The multiple regression results revealed that sexual double standard had a significantly negative relation to student blame when the effects of marital status, age, race, and gender were statistically controlled, $b = -0.51$, $F (1, 420) = 39.86$, $p = .0001$. Therefore, the results suggest that as acceptance of sexual double standard increases, sensitivity to sexual harassment actions decreases. Thus, hypothesis 2 was supported.

*Professor blame*

Sexual double standard had a significantly negative relation to professor blame when the effects of marital status, age, race, and gender were statistically controlled, $b = -0.27$, $F (1, 420) = 10.23$, $p = .0015$. Therefore, the results suggest that as acceptance of sexual double standard increases, sensitivity to sexual harassment actions decreases. Thus, hypothesis 2 was supported.

*Reaction*

Sexual double standard had a significantly negative relation to the reaction of sexual harassment action when the effects of marital status, age, race, and gender were statistically controlled, $b = -0.35$, $F (1, 420) = 27.06$, $p = .0001$. As acceptance of sexual double standard increases, sensitivity to sexual harassment actions decreases. Thus, hypothesis 2 was supported.
Feelings

Sexual double standard had a significantly negative relation to the victim’s feelings about sexual harassment when the effects of marital status, age, race, and gender were statistically controlled, $b = -0.33$, $F(1, 420) = 16.28$, $p = .0001$. The results suggest that as acceptance of sexual double standard increases, sensitivity to sexual harassment actions decreases. Thus, hypothesis 2 is supported.

Hypothesis 3 results:

Student blame

To test hypothesis 3, a two-way ANOVA was conducted to assess the interaction effect of gender and sexual double standard on attitude toward sexual harassment among college students, where males, more than females, will score higher under the low sexual double standard condition on sexual harassment. The 2 x 2 ANOVA revealed a significant interaction between gender and sexual double standard, $F(3, 412) = 11.02$, $p = .0001$, when age, race, and marital status were statistically controlled. The cell means tests revealed that the difference between males (least squares mean = 1.51, SEM = 0.33) and females (least squares mean = 1.32, SEM = 0.31) on student blame was not significant, $t(190) = 1.15$, $p = .25$, under the high sexual double standard condition. However, under the low sexual double standard condition, males (least squares mean = 2.11, SEM = 0.31) reported a significantly higher level of student blame than females (least squares mean = 1.79, SEM = 0.31), $t(214) = 2.23$, $p = .025$. Thus, the pattern of the means for student blame (Table 3) supported hypothesis 3.
Professor blame

The 2 x 2 ANOVA revealed a significant interaction between gender and sexual double standard, \( F(3, 412) = 4.43, p = .0044 \), when age, race, and marital status were statistically controlled. The cell means tests revealed that the difference between males (least squares mean = 0.93, SEM = 0.35) and females (least squares mean = 0.62, SEM = 0.33) on professor blame was not significant, \( t(190) = 1.80, p = .07 \), under the high sexual double standard condition. However, under the low sexual double standard condition, males (least squares mean = 1.15, SEM = 0.32) reported a significantly higher level of professor blame than females (least squares mean = 0.81, SEM = 0.33), \( t(214) = 2.28, p = .023 \). Thus, the pattern of the means for professor blame (Table 3) supported hypothesis 3.

Reaction

The 2 x 2 ANOVA revealed a significant interaction between gender and sexual double standard, \( F(3, 412) = 12.62, p = .0001 \), when age, race, and marital status were statistically controlled. The cell means tests revealed that males consistently scored higher than females under both the high sexual double standard and the low sexual double standard conditions. Under high sexual double standard condition, males (least squares mean = 1.33, SEM = 0.28) scored significantly higher than females (least squares mean = 0.92, SEM = 0.26) on the reaction subscale, \( t(190) = 2.96, p = .003 \). Under the low sexual double standard condition, males (least squares mean = 1.64, SEM = 0.26) again reported a significantly higher level of reaction than females (least squares mean =
0.17, SEM = 0.26), t (214) = 3.90, p = .0001. Thus, this pattern of the means for the reaction subscale (Table 3) does not support hypothesis 3.

*Feelings*

The 2 x 2 ANOVA revealed a significant interaction between gender and sexual double standard, F (3, 412) = 24.08, p = .0001, when age, race, and marital status were statistically controlled. The cell means tests revealed that males scored significantly higher (least squares mean = 2.20, SEM = 0.34) than females (least squares mean = 1.30, SEM = 0.32) on feelings, t (190) = 5.33, p = .0001, under the high sexual double standard condition. Under the low sexual double standard condition, males (least squares mean = 2.39, SEM = 0.31) also scored significantly higher on the feelings subscale than females (least squares mean = 1.52, SEM = 0.32), t (214) = 5.92, p = .0001. Thus, this pattern of the means for the feelings subscale (Table 3) does not support hypothesis 3.

**DISCUSSION**

The data show that almost 60% (n=255) of the sample has been personally affected by the phenomenon of sexual harassment on campus, either as a victim or as a friend or family member of a victim. More specifically, the finding of 24.5% of students reporting a personal history of sexual harassment corresponds with the findings of others (Fitzgerald, 1993; Greenhouse, 1992; McKinney & Maroules, 1991), who reported that overall, 25% to 30% of students report at least one incident of sexual harassment in college. The overall pattern of the data shows that sexual harassment is higher for females (20.6%) than for males (3.7%) on the UNT campus.
This study established that gender significantly affects attitude toward sexual harassment. Males, more than females, accept sexual harassment actions. The gender difference in tolerance and attribution of blame in this study concurs with the research findings of Fitzgerald (1993), Haworth-Hoeppner (1998), and Powell (1996) who found that women are more likely to define certain acts from men as sexual harassment, whereas these men merely think of the gestures as acts of friendliness. Obviously, there is a significant difference in the cultural interpretation of what constitutes acts of sexual harassment between men and women. According to Strong, DeVault, and Sayad (1999), it is a “time-honored” practice for boys to “tease” girls: flipping up their skirts, calling them names, touching their breasts, spreading sexual gossip. If such behavior is defined as merely “teasing,” its impact is discounted; it is just “fun.” Herbert (1989) in her research concluded that such intimidating behaviors from boys leads girls to become more subordinated, less autonomous, and less capable of resisting. The behavior controls the girls through intimidation, embarrassment, or humiliation. Such harassments in young people are usually ignored by adults or regarded as normal or typical behavior among boys – “Boys will be boys” (Chira, 1992; Henneberger & Marriot, 1993). Girls are frequently blamed for the harassment because they did not “stand up for themselves” or they took the incidents “too seriously” (Herbert, 1989). Such early conditioning of boys can eventually lead to adult men who blame women for not taking a “compliment” and for provoking unwanted sexual attention by what they wear or how they look (Henneberger & Marriot, 1993; Chira, 1992). According to Powell (1991), "women are damned if they assert themselves and victimized if they don't."
Sexual harassment is considered generally an abuse of power or an attempt to establish power rather than an expression of sexual desire (Maccoby, 1998). The prevailing viewpoint among researchers (Goleman, 1991; Haworth-Hoeppner, 1998; Herbert, 1989; Maccoby, 1998; Powell, 1991; Tedeschi & Felson, 1994) is that harassers (typically males) use sexual harassment as a power tactic, to control or frighten victims (typically females). In this context, sexual harassment could be conceived as a way to keep women "in their place" and out of settings that have traditionally been male dominated (Goleman, 1991). It has been suggested that sexual harassment is a reflection of the low status of females in society (Studd, 1996). Since males typically have greater power and authority (political, financial, social, and economic) within the workplace and on most colleges, they are often able to coerce females into sexual activities. In some cases, as reported in this study, they justify this harassment by blaming the women.

The finding of the positive relationship between acceptance of sexual double standard and attitude toward sexual harassment supports the results of the study conducted by Perry, Schmitke, and Kulik (1998), who found that men who accept the sexual double standard are more likely than women to regard aggressive sexual actions as normal and expected; women are typically uncomfortable with such actions. Sexual harassment is thought to be related to the gender roles that are central to society. Our culture has traditionally placed tighter restrictions on women’s sexuality than it has on the sexuality of men. One of the clearest reflections of the differences in restrictions on male and female sexuality is the double standard. The double standard posits that the same behavior is evaluated differently, depending on whether a male or a female engages
The sexual double standard which gives men more sexual freedom than women (Muehlenhard & McCoy, 1991), suggests sexual scripts where men should be sexually aggressive and women should be ready and willing sex objects. This study revealed that as acceptance of sexual double standard increases, sensitivity to sexual harassment actions decreases, among both men and women. Young college students often bring into their campus life personal biases and prejudices that create unfairness, disrespect, and resentment towards other students. Early childhood learning, and experiences, is where bias and prejudice ideas and thinking begin to develop, all of which help to form an individual’s beliefs and behavior and create personality traits (Hyde & DeLamater, 1997; Holcomb, Holcomb, Sondag, & Williams, 1991; Robinson, Ziss, Ganza, & Katz, 1991), particularly as it relates to gender roles in society. Gender roles dictate proper behavior for females and males in sexual interactions – that is, they specify the script. For example, there is a stereotype of the male as the initiator and the female as the passive object of his advances; surely this does not encourage the woman to take active steps to protect herself against unwanted sexual attention, or the man to consider the sexual needs of the woman? Harassment is thought to occur when these gender-role expectations and sexual scripts are brought to colleges and the workplace (Hyde & DeLamater, 1997; Maccoby, 1998; Muehlenhard & McCoy, 1991).

The interaction effect between gender and sexual double standard on sexual harassment is worthy of comment. Results revealed that being male and accepting sexual double standard can significantly affect a man’s attitude toward sexual harassment, particularly on the student blame and professor blame subscales. This interaction effect
is in agreement with those of Perry, Schmidtke, and Kulik (1998). Holcomb, Holcomb, Sondag, and Williams, (1991), and Robinson, Ziss, Ganza, and Katz (1991) contend that as men are more sexually aggressive and women are sexually passive, they tend to be more direct with potential partners and initiate sexual encounters more readily than women. The sexual double standard gives men more sexual freedom than women (Muehlenhard & McCoy, 1991). As men believe more in sexual double standards, they tend to accept a wider range of sexual overtures toward women without believing that such acts are necessarily inappropriate and illegal. Women on the other hand, are more likely to reject sexual double standards, expecting to be treated as an equal. As such, they are typically more likely to reject any sexually harassing attention from others (Haworth-Hoeppner, 1998; Holcomb et al., 1991; Robinson et al., 1991).

This study also found an unexpected pattern in the interaction between gender and sexual double standard on the reaction and feelings subscales of sexual harassment. Contrary to expectation, these findings revealed that males scored higher than females under both the low and high conditions of sexual double standard. This unexpected pattern may be the result of ambiguous instructions used by these two subscales (reaction and feelings), which might have confused or challenged the respondent. For instance, in the feelings subscale, the respondent is asked to describe, “how you or a close woman friend might feel about this experience.” This instruction is different from that used in the previous subscales (student blame, professor blame), which merely asked students to agree or disagree with statements about sexual harassment. They did not ask students to locate themselves in the situation of being harassed by a male professor. The confusion
arises if the respondent were male, and he is now required by the feelings subscale to think of himself as a victim of a male professor; it might confuse him, particularly if he were heterosexual. Although a male homosexual might have less problem thinking of himself as a victim by a male professor, there is still too much room for personal interpretation. Depending on how many males respond from their own perspective or those of their “close woman friend,” it might significantly confound the results of the study, producing findings that are open to multiple interpretations. The same could be said about the reactions subscale of reactions to the incident. Again the student respondent is required to agree or disagree with statements describing how “you could deal with the situation” of being sexually harassed. If he were heterosexual and now is required to contemplate his own reactions to being sexually harassed by a male professor, it could again confound the results as discussed above.

**Delimitations**

1. The study is limited to college students at the University of North Texas in Denton, Texas.

2. The study is limited to the collection of data in the spring, 2001 semester.

**Limitations**

1. The responses of participants were self-reported and there was no way of verifying the accuracy of statements. External validation of such responses is warranted.
2. There were a larger number of females (n=285, 66.9%) in the sample than males (n=141, 33.1%). To minimize its effect, where appropriate, gender was entered as a control variable in data analysis.

3. Since sexual harassment and sexual double standards are politically inappropriate concepts to support, participants may feel the need to hide their true beliefs and attitudes. This study is subject to possible response bias because subjects may respond in a manner that is socially acceptable. To minimize this bias and to encourage more candor in responses, no name or personal information that could be traced to individual respondents was collected, and at data collection, both written and verbal assurances about anonymity were given.

4. This study was a cross-sectional investigation in which all information about sexual double standard and sexual harassment was collected at the same time. Therefore, it is difficult to infer causal relationships between sexual double standard and harassment. Sexual double standard attitudes could precede or be the result of sexual harassment. A longitudinal study could better assess cause and effect.

5. The SHAQ defines sexual harassment on campus as only between a harassing male professor and a female student victim. This restrictive definition may limit the generalizability of study findings to other configurations such as a harassing female and a male victim. As such, male respondents to the study may experience difficulty in responding to role-play scenarios where they are asked to respond as “victims” being harassed by a male professor. There is no attempt to verify how
this subtext of homosexual conduct in the harassment scenario may have affected the responses of male students.

6. Although the overall response rate was high (85.2%), it is unclear whether students who did not respond differed systematically in their views and behaviors from those who completed the surveys.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Four important results emerged from the current study. First, the phenomenon of sexual harassment is common among students, with at least 60% of them reporting being touched by the problem. Second, gender affects attitude toward sexual harassment. Males are less sensitive to sexual harassment actions than females. Third, as acceptance of sexual double standard increases, sensitivity to sexual harassment actions decreases. Fourth, the interaction effect between gender and acceptance of sexual double standard applies to all the subscales of sexual harassment. However, only the subscales of student blame and professor blame supported the hypothesis, where males, more than females, have a higher acceptance of the sexual double standard and are less sensitive to sexual harassment actions, particularly when it relates to assigning blame for the incident.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Recommendations for Programming**

1. As the DSS is found to be valid among university students, the University Health Center as well as the University Counseling and Testing Center could start using this scale to design intervention programs for populations who are more likely to
sexually harass others on campus. For instance, if a particular group of individuals has a significant history of being accused of sexual harassment, in addition to highlighting legal and administrative consequences, it may be helpful to identify their beliefs in sexual double standard, which may contribute to their sexual harassment actions. Intervention programs could be designed to help such at risk individuals reduce their belief in the sexual double standard as a prevention of sexual harassment on campus.

2. As male students are more likely to believe in sexual double standard, and to sexually harass others, it would be appropriate to highlight the negative effects of a belief in sexual double standard in student orientation programs on campus.

3. Prevention is the best tool to eliminate sexual harassment on campus. College administrators are encouraged to take steps necessary to prevent sexual harassment from occurring. They should clearly communicate to students, staff and faculty that sexual harassment would not be tolerated. While a policy may exist on campus, it should be more widely and regularly publicized to all members of the university community. This can be done by establishing an effective complaint and grievance process and taking immediate steps and appropriate action when a student, staff or faculty complaints.

4. Formal workshops or academic programs addressing sexual harassment and sexual double standard issues could be developed to assist and help all students become knowledgeable about sexual double standard and sexual harassment issues on campus.
**Recommendations for Future Study**

1. Because the majority of the subjects were Caucasians, it would be interesting to design a study involving a larger sample from other ethnicities. Because ethnic and cultural groups may have different beliefs about sexual double standard, it would be prudent to investigate the phenomenon with a diversity of cultural and ethnic groups in the country. For instance, would the same findings be found among African American, Native American, Latino or Asian-Pacific Islander students? Obviously cultural conditioning affects a person’s perspective on what constitutes sexual harassment as well as the different roles and functions of men and women in society. The aspect of ethnic and cultural background warrants further study.

2. It would be interesting to design a study involving a more diverse sample of subjects with an evenly distributed age range. Could age or marital status have an effect on sexual double standard and sexual harassment? Would older students have different responses than younger ones? Would married students respond differently than single subjects? These important variables merit further investigation.
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APPROVAL LETTER FOR HUMAN SUBJECTS
December 6, 2000

Asaya Pisesaakornkit
2840 Sandy Lane
Fort Worth, Texas 76112

Re: Human Subjects Application No. 00-250

Dear Ms. Pisesaakornkit,

As permitted by federal law and regulations governing the use of human subjects in research projects (45 CFR 46), the UNT Institutional Review Board has reviewed your proposed project titled "Relationship Between Attitude Toward Sexual Harassment Involving Instructor and Student, and Acceptance of Sexual Double Standard Among Male and Female Students at the University of North Texas." Your application is approved for use of human subjects on this project.

Enclosed is the consent document with stamped IRB approval. Please copy and use this form only for your study subjects.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services regulations require that you submit annual and terminal progress reports to the UNT Institutional Review Board. The Board must review this project annually and/or prior to any modifications you make in the approved project. Federal policy 21 CFR 56.109(e) stipulates that IRB approval is for one year only.

Please contact me if you wish to make changes or need additional information.

Sincerely,

Reata Busby
Chair
Institutional Review Board

RB:sb
APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT COVER LETTER
Consent to Participate in Double Standard and Sexual Harassment Study

INVESTIGATOR:
Asaya Pisesnakornkit
Department of Kinesiology and Health Promotion
University of North Texas
Denton, Texas 76203

DESCRIPTION: This study will examine the beliefs of double standards and the relationship with sexual harassment attitudes among college students. The attached survey is designed to measure the extent of your acceptance of double standards and your attitude toward sexual harassment. Participation in this study would involve a pencil/pen in completing the questionnaire. It should take approximately 20-30 minutes to complete this questionnaire. You must be at least 18 years old to participate in this study.

BENEFITS: The benefits of participation in this study may be an increase in awareness of the issues of sexual double standard and sexual harassment. Those who do not participate in this survey will also not receive any benefit. Results from this study could help extend your knowledge about the relationship between sexual double standards and sexual harassment among college students. It could help provide guidance in designing and implementing programs to reduce incidence of sexual harassment at UNT.

RISKS: The risks are minimal to nonexistent to the participants. The questionnaire addresses beliefs of double standards and attitudes toward sexual harassment. The questionnaire uses questions that are non-threatening. No personal, potentially embarrassing sexual information will be collected in the survey. The questionnaire does not encourage any sexual actions or decisions. Participants should not feel threatened or pressured in any form after completing the questionnaire. The benefits of participating in this study are for educational and clinical practices.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION AND RIGHT TO WITHDRAW: Your participation in this study is strictly confidential and voluntary. You may refuse or withdraw from participating in this research study anytime without penalty, prejudice, or loss of benefits. There are no right or wrong answers. By completing and submitting this survey packet, you are giving consent to participate in this study. Participation in this study does not affect your grade. Please take some time to complete the attached survey. Your responses will be useful in determining the relationship between the acceptance of double standards and attitude toward sexual harassment. Please do not complete more than one survey.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Your responses to the questionnaire will be completely confidential. Please answer all of the questions completely. Your responses are important! To ensure anonymity, please do not write your name or any kind of identification on this survey. If you have any questions or comments about this questionnaire, please contact Asaya Pisesnakornkit at (817) 992-7744, Dr. Chwee Lye Ching, Program Coordinator and Professor at the University of North Texas (UNT) Kinesiology, Health Promotion, and recreation Department at (940) 565-2651 or the Institutional Review Board at (940) 565-3940. Thank you for your participation.

APPROVED BY THE UNT IRB
FROM 10/06/20 TO 10/05/21
APPENDIX C

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD REQUEST
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS
COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS
RESEARCH CONSENT FORM

Subject Name: Students Enrolled at The University of North Texas during Spring 2001

Date: 11/3/00

Title of Study: Relationship Between Attitude Toward Sexual Harassment Involving Instructor and Student, and Acceptance of Sexual Double Standard Among Male and Female Students at the University of North Texas

Principal Investigator: Asaya Pisesnakornkit

Co-Investigators: Dr. Chwee Lye Chng

Before agreeing to participate in this research study, it is important that you read and understand the following explanation of the proposed procedures. It describes the procedures, benefits, risks, and discomforts of the study. It also describes the alternative treatments that are available to you and your right to withdraw from the study at any time. It is important for you to understand that no guarantees or assurances can be made as to the results of the study. **You must be at least 18 years old to participate in this study.**

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY AND HOW LONG IT WILL LAST:

The purpose of this study is to explore the effect of acceptance of sexual double standards on sexual harassment attitudes amongst male and female students attending the University of North Texas. The sampling frame will consist of students enrolled in classes in the Spring semester, 2001 (January-May).

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY INCLUDING THE PROCEDURES TO BE USED:

The study attempts to access the relationship between acceptance of sexual double standard and sexual harassment attitude among a sample of college male and female students. The dependent variable of this study is sexual harassment attitude, as measured
by the Sexual Harassment Attitudes Questionnaire designed by Stake and Malovich (1990). There are two independent variables: sexual double standard (as measured by the Double Standard Scale (DSS), designed by Caron, Davis, Halterman, and Stickle (1993) and gender. Age will be entered as a covariate to address the effect of the independent nominal variables of sexual double standard and gender, (which are group membership variables) on the dependent variable of sexual harassment.

All volunteer subjects in this study will be currently enrolled students at UNT. To provide an adequate sample size of 300 students (150 males, 150 females), and to ensure an acceptable response rate, at least 600 questionnaires will be distributed. Questionnaires will be distributed to volunteer students recruited from college classes and student organizations at the University of North Texas in spring semester, 2001. Each participant will be presented with a questionnaire packet that contained a measurement of sexual harassment attitudes and a double standard scale. Each questionnaire packet will contain a cover letter, which outlines the purpose of the study, states participation is voluntary, and assures that all data collected is anonymous. Each participant will be asked to complete the survey individually and return the survey as soon as they have completed the packet.

Student volunteers will be asked to complete a questionnaire for a research project, which will examine the attitudes of college men and women concerning sexual harassment and the acceptance of sexual double standards. The investigators will explain the study and answer all questions from participants. All risks or discomforts and possible benefits of the study will be explained clearly. Participants will be told that they
I do not have to take part in this study, and their refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of rights to which they are entitled. They may withdraw at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which they are entitled. The investigators will stop their participation at any time if it appears to be harmful to students, if they fail to follow directions for participation in the study, if it is discovered that they do not meet the study requirements, or if the study is canceled. In case there are problems or questions, they have been provided the names and phone numbers of investigators. Participants will be provided a signed copy of the consent form approved by the IRB.

Also, the participants will be told that all of the information provided would be kept confidential. The names and telephone numbers of the investigators will be listed in the cover letter to enable participants to provide feedback as well as discuss problems arising from participation in the study. If students indicate the need to speak to health professionals, they will be referred to the Student Health Center and/or, the Psychology Clinic, or the UNT Counseling and Testing Center.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURES/ELEMENTS THAT MAY RESULT IN DISCOMFORT OR INCONVENIENCE:**

There should be no discomfort or inconvenience associated with this survey. Participants (UNT undergraduate student volunteers) will be recruited from college classes. The researcher, upon approval from the class instructor, will speak to the students during class time. The researcher will then explain the details and purpose of the study encouraging participation, before distributing the questionnaire packets. The investigators will emphasize the voluntariness of the process and the importance of
anonymity. Students do not write their names or provide any personal identification on the completed survey. The students who wish to participate in the study will complete the survey in the classroom after the class period has ended. Students who do not wish to participate could leave the room before data collection begins. Instructor of classes will provide extra course credit for students who participate in the study. Students will not be penalized for non-participation. (They merely will not receive extra course credit). At any point in the data collection process, a student can stop participation without penalty. The investigators will be present to answer questions from participants. A copy of the cover letter will also be attached to each questionnaire packet. All subjects will receive a copy of the informed consent.

In addition to visiting classes, the investigators will approach student organizations on campus to invite participation in the study. The same protocol for data collection explained above will be enforced in this setting as well.

**DESCRIPTION OF THE PROCEDURES/ELEMENTS THAT ARE ASSOCIATED WITH FORESEEABLE RISKS:**

The risks are minimal to nonexistent to the participants. The questionnaire addresses beliefs of double standards and attitudes toward sexual harassment. The questionnaire uses questions that are non-threatening. No personal, potentially embarrassing sexual information will be collected in the survey. The questionnaire does not encourage any sexual actions or decisions. Participants should not feel threatened or pressured in any form after completing the questionnaire. The benefits of participating in this study are for educational and clinical practices.
**BENEFITS TO THE SUBJECTS OR OTHERS:**

The participants will not receive any benefit from participating in this study. By completing the questionnaire, students may gain an awareness of the issues of sexual double standard and sexual harassment. Those who do not participate in this survey will also not receive any benefit. Results from this study could help extend our knowledge about the relationship between sexual double standards and sexual harassment among college students. It could help provide guidance in designing and implementing programs to reduce incidence of sexual harassment at UNT.

**CONFIDENTIALITY OF RESEARCH RECORDS:**

There will be no names or any form of identification on the questionnaires that could link responses to individual participants. Data analysis will only be made using group aggregates. The researcher will not release any information about anyone participating in the study. All data will be stored in a locked file cabinet in the department of Kinesiology, Health Promotion and Recreation.
APPENDIX D

DOUBLE STANDARD SCALE
Double Standard Scale Questionnaire

Double standard is defined as a set of principles permitting greater opportunity or liberty to one than to another, especially the granting of greater sexual freedom to men than to women. Double standard addresses a code of morals and the acceptance of standards of sexual behaviors of men and women.

Each item below is an attitude or belief statement about the sex roles of men and women. There are no right or wrong answers. This is a measure of your personal attitudes. You may agree or disagree with each statement. Next to each statement is a scale that ranges from strongly agree (SA) to strongly disagree (SD). For each item, please circle the number corresponding to which you agree or disagree with that particular statement. Please make sure that you answer each item and that you choose only one answer per item. **You must be at least 18 years old to participate in this study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale definition: SA-Strongly agree</th>
<th>A-Agree</th>
<th>U-Undecided</th>
<th>D-Disagree</th>
<th>SD-Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes about the sex roles of men and women</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. It is expected that a woman be less sexually experienced than her partner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A woman who is sexually active is less likely to be considered a desirable partner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A woman should never appear to be prepared for a sexual encounter.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is important that the men be sexually experienced so as to teach the woman.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A “good” woman would never have a one-night stand, but it is expected of a man.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It’s important for a man to have multiple sexual experiences in order to gain experience.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In sex, the man should take the dominant role and the woman should assume the passive role.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It is acceptable for a woman to carry condoms.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It is worse for woman to sleep around than it is for a man.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. It is up to the man to initiate sex.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

SEXUAL HARASSMENT ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE (SHAQ)
Sexual Harassment Attitudes Questionnaire

Sexual harassment is defined as unwanted and offensive sexual advances or sexually derogatory or discriminatory remarks, as those made by a male or female. Sexual harassment addresses issues that concern actions or behaviors that a person perceives as against their own will or moral judgment.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to examine relationships between instructors and students. This is a measure of your personal attitudes. You will read one scenario involving instructor and student. The scenario will be followed by a set of questions consisting of statements about the scenario you have read. You will be asked to imagine that a close woman friend of yours is the student in the situation presented. There are no right or wrong answers. Please answer each question that best fits your opinion. **You must be at least 18 years old to participate in this study**

Scenario

Suppose that a close woman friend of yours is attending this campus. Through the course of the semester you notice that a professor in one of your classes frequently seems to be staring at your friend. When talking with him after class one day about an upcoming essay exam, he puts his arm around your woman friend and touches her hair. He then suggests that she comes to his office at the end of the day so that the exam can be discussed further. He adds that if she fails to do so, she will probably not do as well on the exam as expected.

The following are a number of statements about the situation that might help to explain why the above incident occurred. Rate you agreement with each of the following comments. Circle the corresponding number that represents your feeling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree (0)</th>
<th>Moderately disagree (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree (3)</td>
<td>Moderately agree (4)</td>
<td>Strongly agree (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statements about the situation that might help to explain why the incident above occurred.

1. The student is probably hoping that getting to know the professor personally will help her get a better grade in the course.

   0 1 2 3 4 5

2. The professor probably meant no harm so it should not be taken seriously.

   0 1 2 3 4 5

3. The professor is using his status unfairly to pressure the student into dating him.

   0 1 2 3 4 5
4. The professor is responding to normal sexual attraction and cannot really be blamed for his actions in the situation.

5. The professor’s actions were unethical and could be harmful to his students.

6. The students is most likely a flirtations type who enjoys getting special attention from her professors.

The following are a number of statements describing possible ways that you could deal with the situation. Rate your agreement with each of the following statements. Circle the corresponding number that represents your feeling. Use the following key:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree (0)</th>
<th>Moderately disagree (1)</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree (3)</td>
<td>Moderately agree (4)</td>
<td>Strongly agree (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Change the subject and try to forget about the conversation.

8. Go to dinner with the professor and talk over the problems you are having in class.

9. Continue to work hard in the class and avoid any individual conversations with the professor.

10. Tell the professor that you are not interested in a personal relationship and that this should have nothing to do with your grade in the course.

11. See the professor on a social basis if he is interested as it may help your grade.

12. Go to the department head and tell him/her about the professor’s actions.

Below is a set of word pairs that describe how you or a close woman friend might feel about this experience. The two feelings in each pair are separated by a 7-point scale, with one word on each side on the scale. For each word pair, circle the number that is closest to how you think you or your friend might feel.

13. Insulted 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Flattered
14. Pleased 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Angry
15. Comfortable 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Uncomfortable
16. Relaxed 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Nervous
17. Intimidated 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Powerful
18. Embarrassed 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Proud

**Demographics Information** (Circle your responses)

1. What is your gender?  a) Male  b) Female

2. What is your age? _______

3. What is your marital status?
   a) Single (never married)  b) Married  c) Divorced  d) Widowed
   e) Other __________

4. What is your ethnicity?
   a) African American  b) Asian/Pacific Islander  c) Caucasian/White
   d) Hispanic/Latino  e) Native American  f) other (specify) ______________

5. I am a (an):
   a) Undergraduate  b) Graduate

6. I have been personally sexually harassed
   a) Yes  b) No

7. I have known someone who has been sexually harassed
   a) Yes  b) No
APPENDIX F

TABLES
Table 1: Frequency and Percentage of Respondents for Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>141 (33.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>285 (66.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic classification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375 (88.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51 (11.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>375 (88.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38 (8.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personally sexually harassed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88 (20.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined (males and females)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104 (24.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have known someone who has been sexually harassed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81 (19.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160 (37.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined (males and females)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>241 (56.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personally sexually harassed and have known someone who has been harassed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76 (17.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined (males and females)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90 (21.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: The Relationship Between Gender and Sexual Harassment

| Sexual harassment | Gender |              |    |     |      |  
|-------------------|--------|--------------|----|-----|------|------|
|                   |        | Male         |    | Female     |     |      |      |  
|                   |        | Least squares mean # | SEM | Least squares mean # | SEM | F  |
| Student blame     |        | 1.88         | 0.3 | 1.66         | 0.31 | 4.1*|
| Professor blame   |        | 1.05         | 0.31 | 0.75         | 0.32 | 7.03**|
| Reaction          |        | 1.51         | 0.25 | 1.11         | 0.25 | 19.85***|
| Feelings          |        | 2.29         | 0.3 | 1.45         | 0.31 | 57.93***|

Note:
# Subscales of Sexual Harassment Questionnaire (SHAQ), higher score means less sensitivity to sexual harassment actions.
* Significance at p < .05
** Significance at p < .01
*** Significance at p < .001
Table 3: Interaction Effects of Gender and Sexual Double Standard on Sexual Harassment: 2-Way ANOVA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Harassment</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Least squares mean</th>
<th>Least squares mean</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student blame #</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor blame #</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction #</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings #</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.08*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
# Subscales of Sexual Harassment Attitude Questionnaire (SHAQ), where a higher score means less sensitivity to sexual harassment actions.
* Significance at p < .0044
** Significance at p < .0001
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