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ABSTRACT

Sexual Harassment: A Pilot Study
in The Hotel Industry

by

Wen-Yi Tera Chung

Several studies have documented the existence of sexual harassment in workplaces in society-at-large. This pilot study seeks to determine whether sexual harassment is higher within the hotel industry than in workplaces in society-at-large, whether men and women react differently to sexual behaviors in the workplace, and whether those differences vary by department. In addition, the study seeks to determine hotel employees knowledge of the existence of policies and procedures on sexual harassment within one hotel property, to identify the initiators of sexually harassing behaviors, to suggest implications for management, and to provide a data base for future research.

Sixty-nine employees of one hotel property were telephone interviewed by using a 30 question survey designed for hotels that was based on the 1985 Gutek questionnaire. The responses were numerically coded and compiled by the Ci2 program. The data was transferred to Lotus 123, and then into Minitab for statistical analysis. The results were compared with the findings of the 1985 Gutek study of society-at-large.

The results of this study indicated sexual harassment is a widespread and deeply felt problem in the surveyed property. The findings confirm (1) that a higher proportion of hotel industry employees than of individuals in society-at-large experience sexually harassing behaviors in their workplace, and (2) that there exists a gender difference in reactions to sexual behaviors from the opposite sex in the workplace. This study found male respondents in food preparation appear to have a
higher tolerance for sexual behaviors in the workplace than do their counterparts in other departments. Among women respondents, there is very little variation by department in their reaction to sexual behaviors in the workplace. This study also found 100% of male and female respondents have knowledge of the existence of policies and procedures on sexual harassment in the hotel property. Further, co-workers are the initiators of most sexually harassing behaviors.

The study recommends the commitment of upper management must be scrupulously adhered to and exemplified by every manager and made known publicly to all employees both in writing and in practice. It is management's responsibility to observe, to listen, to reassure the employee, and to act. This study also recommends the traditional approach of training only managers is no longer sufficient. The results of this study point to the need for direct training of non-supervisory employees regarding sexual harassment. Furthermore, more research in this sensitive topic needs to be done. A problem of access to and cooperation from the hospitality industry need to be addressed before more research can be conducted.
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INTRODUCTION

The Clarence Thomas confirmation hearing brought national attention to sexual harassment in the workplace. The extent of sexual harassment in American workplaces has been called a pandemic problem often indicated in decreased productivity, increased absenteeism, lowered morale, employee turnover, and sometimes resulting in costly legal suits (Safran, 1976).

While the dollar loss within the hotel industry due to sexual harassment is unknown, the annual cost of the problem to the average Fortune 500 company is estimated to be $6.7 million in decreased productivity, absenteeism, and turnover (Sandroff, 1988). This figure does not include the personal cost and anguish to the victims themselves or the legal expenses involved in defending the organization against sexual harassment suits in the murky legal waters of employer liability. Moreover, the problem is not limited to the private sector: the federal government estimates that sexual harassment among its employees cost U.S. taxpayers $267 million between May 1985 and May 1987 (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1988, p.40). Employers are frequently advised to avoid liability and the related legal expenses for sexual harassment in their workplace by having a written policy against such behavior and a process for filing complaints. But such limited advice fails to recognize the vulnerability of workers in hotel industry and the complexity and uncertainty of the law on sexual harassment and employers' liability even with policies and procedures in place. Although the extent of this problem within the hotel industry is not known, research should be done regarding this sensitive issue to determine if hotel industry employees experience sexual harassment similar to other workplaces.
Previous articles about sexual harassment in the hotel industry have focused on how managers can avoid lawsuits. A more pragmatic approach for management would be to examine the characteristics of the hotel workplace that may be conducive to such behavior, to recognize the uncertainty of legal decisions determining employers' liability, and to redirect organizational efforts to prevent hurtful, disruptive, and costly occurrences.

**Background**

The phrase sexual harassment has been called a "term of art, that holds different meanings for different people" (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1988, p. 2). Since the phrase was introduced in the 1960's, various definitions have been decreed, legislated, and promulgated. It is now generally agreed that specific unwelcome verbal comments, gestures, or physical contact of a sexual nature and/or such conduct that creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment constitutes sexual harassment. There remains, however, much confusion and contradiction over the identification, prevention, and elimination of and responsibility for sexual harassment in the workplace.

In 1980, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) addressed the problem of sexual harassment and the inconsistency of court decisions being made regarding this issue. The EEOC wrote guidelines which state:

"An employer should take all steps necessary to prevent sexual harassment from occurring, such as affirmatively raising the subject, expressing strong disapproval, developing appropriate sanctions, informing employees of their right to raise and how to raise the issue of harassment under Title VII, and developing methods to sensitize all concerned" (EEOC, 1980).
Despite that 1980 dictum, sexual harassment continues to exist today as a psychologically damaging, financially costly, and pervasive problem in American society.

**Problem Statement**

It is often alleged that sexual harassment cannot be specifically defined. Debates throughout the country have revealed a widespread misunderstanding of what constitutes sexual harassment and an ignorance of the steps that employers can take to minimize the risk of liability for sexual harassment.

Hotels may be particularly susceptible given certain characteristics of the industry environment. Many hotel employees work unusual hours and experience peak and slack periods, in an environment of much social interaction. Further, there is an inherent sexual implication to the concept of hospitality service. The "pseudo bedroom" (Bellucci, 1984) environment has been emphasized by scantily-clad waitresses, suggestive advertising, and appeal to temporal pleasures; the fine line between offering service and entertainment can be easily blurred. Thus, the main question that needs to be answered: Is sexual behavior in the workplace perceived differently by men and women in hotel industry as compared to other industries?

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this pilot study is to identify and measure the sexual harassment problem in a hotel property, and to compare the results with a study done by Gutek in 1985. As part of this study the following specific objectives will be addressed: (1) to identify a gender difference in reactions to sexual behaviors in the hotel workplace, as compared to the workplaces in society-at-large, (2) to identify initiators of sexual behaviors in the hotel industry, (3) to determine hotel employees knowledge of the existence of policies and procedures on sexual harassment in the hotel property, and (4) to provide a data base for future research.

**Significance**
Many hotels are aware that sexual harassment is a form of sex discrimination that could be occurring at the front desk, in the back-of-the-restaurant, and in the guest rooms. Even though there are corporate policies and guidelines against it, they still would "rather not talk about it" because, somehow, talking it out might be construed as an admission of guilt. Precise evidence of the extent of sexual harassment in the hotel industry has not been available because previous studies have varied significantly in their definition of the problem, the sample populations, the time frames, and the measurement of incidence. Because of these inconsistencies, comparison of results has been statistically impossible.

The significance of this study is to pilot test a survey instrument and to find out if the problem in hotels is different from other industries because of the uniqueness of the hospitality work environment. The current study may provide a data base of information about the problem within the hotel industry. It is hoped that this will help both individuals and organizations in the industry deal with and eliminate all of sexual harassment.

**Scope and Limitation**

This is a pilot study on sexual harassment in one hotel property that agreed to participate with the strictest confidence assured for the hotel. The data was collected by telephone interviewing a limited number of the hotel's employees who had agreed to participate and who were only identified by first name and phone number. The current study only seeks to identify the nature and extent of sexual harassment in one hotel property and to inspire more precise future research into this sensitive issue in the hotel industry at large.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Sexual harassment literature falls into four categories: feminist writings, legal analyses, strategies for management, and theoretical research. "The usefulness of .... (each) in understanding sexual harassment varies a great deal depending on the purpose of the piece and the frame of reference of the writer" (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1981, p. G-1). "It is worth nothing that these perspectives are neither independent nor mutually exclusive. Some lawyers are feminists, many feminists are managers, and some lawyers are managers" (Gutek, 1985, p.8). Each groups' perspective has contributed to the theoretical research.

Sexual Harassment

Feminist Writers

Before any attention was paid to the larger issue of sexual behaviors at work, sexual harassment was addressed in order to reveal it as a severe problem for many women. Feminist writers brought the issue to the public's attention, focusing on the frequency and range of offensive behavior, documenting its existence with early data collection, and providing counseling for victims. Most of this literature is descriptive, with generalizations drawn from individual case studies. The overwhelming majority of victims were believed to be women. These writers focused on who victims were, how they were affected, and how they responded. There was no examination of men, nor of the organizations or the workplaces themselves.

Following a few journalistic reports of sexual intimidation of women at work, Sexual Shakedown: The Sexual Harassment of Women on the Job (Farley, 1978) was the first large scale report of the problem. Lin Farley coined the phrase "sexual
harassment" and brought it to the public's attention. She argued that sexual harassment was the result of the convergence of capitalism and patriarchy mutually reinforcing women's inferior position in the labor force. Attesting to little faith in legal remedies, she advocated that women organize to protect themselves.

Among the effects of sexual harassment on women which these feminist writers identify are as follows:

* discomfort from violation of physical privacy
* reduced self-confidence
* loss of motivation
* lower productivity
* less job satisfaction
* reduced commitment to work
* reduced commitment to employer
* fear of retaliation
* interrupted careers
* high stress levels
* loss of friendships, mentorships, and other work alliances with male workers
* coercion out of nontraditional jobs
* physical and emotional illness
* disruption of marriage and/or other relationships with men

Feminist writers have also concentrated on exposing sexual harassment as an expression of hostility and an abuse of power, having little to do with sexuality.

Legal Analysis

In *Sexual Harassment of Working Women: A Case of Sex Discrimination* (MacKinnon, 1979), the author argues against two then-prevailing thoughts: that sexual harassment is an expression of individual urge and not gender-based, and that
sexual interaction between men and women is a biological reality and, therefore, natural and inevitable whenever men and women come together. She contends that sexual harassment differently injures one gender group and that it affects women in an already unequal context where women are systematically disadvantaged. She maintains that sexual harassment of women at work is sex discrimination in employment, actionable under the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Guidelines of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, enacted in 1980, support MacKinnon's contention.

Literature on sexual harassment has lacked a common definition of the problem. Can it happen only to women? Must it occur more than once? Must it be deliberate? Must it be tied to a job consequence or can it only be objectionable? Can it only happen in situations of unequal power? Is it only forced sexual relations? Can it be comments, touching, cornering, jokes, posters, leering, obscene gestures? The EEOC Guidelines define sexual harassment to include not only sexually offensive interpersonal behavior but also the climate of the workplace. The definition of what constitutes sexual harassment has broadened with increasing examination of the problem.

Strategies for Management

Management's first reaction to charges of sexual harassment in the workplace has been to dismiss it as the personal inclinations of individual people, women's modesty about sexuality, the result of romances gone sour, evidence that women cannot handle themselves in a group, or the natural result of women inviting attention by trying to use sex to their advantage at work. Employer concern has lay more with male supervisory personnel and their careers than with lower level, more easily replaceable, female employees.
Increasingly, organizations have been forced to deal with the reality of sexual harassment:

"The negative consequences reported by individuals become organizational consequences when they happen to many employees of the same firm. For example, the interrupted careers at a personal level translate into turnover and absenteeism at the organization level. Likewise, lowered job satisfaction of individuals translates into lower morale at the organizational level. Less frequently acknowledged is the 'cost' of misusing the organization's human resources and the waste of other organizational resources that are expended in employees' attempts to attract sexual partners by non-harassing or harassing means" (Gutek, 1986, p. 259).

Although unevenly upheld, employers' legal responsibility for such behavior in the workplace has been established.

In addition, the increased numbers of women entering the workforce, taking non-traditional jobs, and assuming supervisory and managerial responsibilities has altered the workplace and the traditional role-balance of the sexes.

A spate of articles has suggested strategies for management; however, the majority of them focus on how to avoid liability rather than how to improve the working environment. This is especially true of the articles written for and about the hospitality industry—Rankin, 1981; Goldman, 1986; Jeffries and Fellinger, 1986; Plummer, 1987.

Theoretical Research

In the relatively short history of research on sexual harassment, four distinct theoretical frameworks have been identified. In an attempt to explain their own findings on sexual harassment, Tangri, Burt and Johnson identified three models: (1)
the natural, biological model; (2) the socio-cultural model; and (3) the organizational model (Tangri/Burt/Johnson, 1982, p.55–74).

The natural/biological model holds that both sexes participate in natural, sexually-oriented behavior in the workplace, and that both like it, but that men's sex drive is stronger resulting in men more often initiating sexual approaches. Sexual harassment is attributed to the "idiosyncratic ('sick') proclivities of a minority of men" (Ibid., p. 36). It is this model that Margaret Mead must have had in mind when she called for a general taboo against sex at work (Mead, 1978, p. 31–33; 38).

It has been observed that men perceive the world in sexual terms more so than do women:

"... men are more likely than women to mistake friendliness for seduction and find the office is a little too exciting with women around. .... Reports from men, however, suggest that sex is present in male-dominated workplaces, whether or not women are actually present. This 'floating sex' takes the forms of posters, jokes, sexual metaphors for work, comments, obscene language, and the like. The relationship seems to be quite straightforward: the more men, the more sexualized the workplace" (Gutek/Dunwoody, p.256).

The natural/biological model is compatible with one identified by Nieva and Gutek (Nieva/Gutek, 1977). Their "individual deficit" model holds that "either the woman is incapable of handling an overture or she is overly sensitive ... (or) a man may be too assertive or unable to properly control his sex drive" (Gutek, p. 13).

Such a "sex is a natural urge" theory is what the early feminist writers had to confront and what underlies the early management perspective. However, Tangri, Burt and Johnson (1982) found little evidence to support this model—only that most victims were young and unattached.
The socio-cultural model holds that sexual harassment reflects the larger society's differential distribution of power and status between the sexes:

".... wherein men rule and social beliefs legitimize their rule. .... Therefore, sexual harassment's function is to manage on-going male-female interactions according to accepted sex status norms, and to maintain male dominance occupational and, therefore economically, by intimidating, discouraging or precipitating removal of women from work" (Tangri/Burt/Johnson, 1982, p. 34).

Sexual harassment, as explained by this power model, is analogous to rape, in that power, rather than sexual drive, is the dominant motivation.

Others appear to have written about this same model. Gutek and Dunwoody: Harassment is a mechanism for maintaining male control over women, in work and in society. "Male dominance is maintained by patterns of male-female interaction as well as by male domination of economic and political matters" (Gutek/Dunwoody, p. 260). Silverman: Sexual harassment is seen as a form of prostitution, the paradigm for all male-female relationships (Silverman, 1976–77). Bularzik: Sexual harassment is a form of violence, a "means of social control arising at the turn of the century out of men's hostility to women entering a domain once exclusively their own (Bularzik, 1978, p. 29).

Tangri, Burt and Johnson found that this model held up well, but was not consistent with findings about attitudes in the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board 1981 study.

The organizational model assumes that organizational characteristics set the stage for sexual harassment. It points to certain aspects of the workplace's infrastructure that are conducive to sexual aggression; among them are hierarchies, the differential of power, visibility and contact in sex-integrated jobs, sex ratios, occupational norms, and job alternatives.
Under this model, certain individuals appear more vulnerable to sexual harassment than others; they are younger people, those earning low salaries, minorities, those economically tied to their jobs, and women working in traditionally male jobs. This model appears to underlie much of the newer management perspective described above.

Tangri, Burt and Johnson found some support for this model, but concluded that it is useful only when used in conjunction with the others. Indeed, Tangri, Burt and Johnson concluded that none of the three models could by itself offer an adequate explanation of their data on sexual harassment.

Nieva and Gutek (1981) subsequently proposed another model, based on role theory, emphasizing the effects of sex role expectations in the workplace, which they named "sex role spillover." It includes the concepts of both work role (shared expectations about what is appropriate behavior in a particular job) and sex role (shared expectations about behavior of men and women).

Sex roles carry over into the workplace for four reasons:

1. Gender identity is the most noticeable social characteristic. Our society perceives sex as making a difference in virtually every aspect of human life.

2. "Men may feel more comfortable reacting to women at work in the same manner in which they react to other women in their lives; and, unless a woman is too young, too old, or too unattractive, that includes viewing her as a potential sexual partner (Gutek/Dunwoody, p. 262)."

3. Women may feel more comfortable with stereotypical female roles. Kanter identifies three basic ones: pet, mother, and/or seductress (Kanter, 1977, p. 233–236).

4. Characteristics of work and sex roles may facilitate the expression of sexuality.

According to Gutek (1982, p. 15), sex role spillover occurs
"... when women's, more than men in the same work roles, are expected to be sex objects or are expected to project sexuality through their behavior, appearance or dress. What is equally important is the fact that there is no strongly held comparable belief about men. While it is generally assumed that men are more sexually active than women and men are the initiators in sexual encounters, the cluster of characteristics that are usually associated with the male personality do not include a sexual component. Sex role spillover, thus, introduces the view of women as sexual beings in the workplace, but it simply reinforces the view of men as organizational beings—active, work-oriented".

Kanter (1977) observes that a woman's perceived sexuality "blots out" all other characteristics. Gutek holds that women at work are treated as women rather than as workers—valued for their femininity rather than for their skills and/or training; and it is not they who make that choice.

Dunwoody and Gutek (1986, p. 264) looked at the larger issue of sexuality at work. They identify an interesting paradox:

"At work, women are perceived as using sex to their advantage; but, in practice, they are hurt by sex at work. On the other hand, men, who are perceived as concerned with business, display more sexual behavior than women at work and may benefit from it".

Just as the legal consideration of sexual harassment continues to evolve, so too does a theoretical understanding. Nevertheless, this research has brought the problem to society's attention.

"Indeed, many researchers have served as both scholars and advocates on this issue. The contribution of their research—exploratory, descriptive, and/or theoretical—toward understanding and explaining
sexual harassment at work has been invaluable. A domain of human behavior that was largely invisible a decade ago is now visible, numerous misconceptions have been uncovered, and some alleged facts have been exposed as myths" (Ibid., p. 265).

The Legislative and Judicial History of Sexual Harassment

Although mention of sexual harassment can be found in the Bible, its legal history in this country is very recent. Sex discrimination was first legislatively addressed in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. "Sex" was not included among the protected categories until the debate on the House floor. It is generally believed that most members of Congress were interested in including the designation of "sex" not to eliminate sex discrimination, but in an attempt to insure defeat of the bill which was already unpalatable to Southerners (19 Duquesne Law Review 453, 1981). There was virtually no discussion of its addition. Actually, there is no legislative history of Congress' intent concerning the scope of sex discrimination; and, particularly, there is no mention of harassment (67 Boston University Law Review 445, 1987, p.449).

The Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 was directed at this void. It states that "Discrimination against women is no less serious than other prohibited forms of discrimination.... it is to be accorded the same degree of concern given to any type of similarly unlawful conduct" (S. Rep No. 92–415, 92nd Congr. 1st Sess. 7, 1971).

Even so, most courts continued to hold that sexual harassment was not within the definition of sex discrimination and, therefore, not a violation of Title VII. A Federal District Court in Arizona, in 1975, rather bluntly stated the prevailing view: "Title VVI does not contemplate imposing liability for satisfying a personal urge" (Corne v. Bausch & Lomb, Inc., 1975).
Eventually, with Williams v. Saxbe, in 1976, the first successful claim of sexual harassment was made (Levine, 1987, p.254). Since there was no consistency in subsequent court decisions, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission issued "Final Guidelines on Sexual Harassment in the Workplace" in 1980 in an attempt to codify the law. According to the Guidelines:

"Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when (1) such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment, (2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions affecting such individual, or (3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile or offensive work environment" (EEOC, 1980).

**Quid Pro Quo or Hostile Environment?**

The Guidelines make a critical distinction between types of sexual harassment. Situations (1) and (2) above constitute *quid pro quo* harassment, while situation (3) is hostile environment harassment. *Quid pro quo* sexual harassment occurs when sexual favors are demanded as a condition of employment or when a tangible job consequence follows as a result of the employee's response. Under current law, it is presumed that only supervisors have sufficient delegated power or leverage in the workplace to make such a demand; and, therefore, only they can be guilty of *quid pro quo* sexual harassment. "Although it is conceivable that a co-worker (or non-employee) could attempt *quid pro quo* harassment, perhaps by threatening to sabotage an employee's work product if his sexual demands are not met, Title VII provides no remedy for this situation" (Anderson, 1987).
A hostile environment situation exists, according to the Guidelines, not when the solicitation of sexual favors is directly linked to job-related consequences, but, rather, when the employee is continually subjected to sexual innuendoes and propositions, making the workplace environment hostile and discriminatory. Such a situation may be created by a co-worker, supervisor, or a non-employee.

The other critical contribution of the Guidelines is the theory of strict liability in all cases of sexual harassment by supervisory personnel. Specifically, the Guidelines state that the employer is responsible for its actions and those of its agents and supervisory employees" .... "regardless of whether the specific acts complained of were authorized or even forbidden by the employer and regardless of whether the employer knew or should have known of their occurrence" (EEOC, 1980).

In cases of sexual harassment by a co-worker or a non-employee, however, the Commission imposed an actual or constructive knowledge requirement. Employers are liable only if they knew or should have known of the conduct and failed to take immediate and appropriate corrective action.

In addition, the Commission identified another offense—that of giving a job—related benefit to an employee who acquiesces to sexual pressures instead of to a more job-worthy person who refuses. However, the Commission did not indicate whether sexually harassing action between an employee and a supervisor, co-employee, or non-employee of the same sex would constitute a violation.

The legal status of the Guidelines has often been debated; but, as Chief Justice Burger wrote of another EEOC issuance:

"The administrative interpretation of the Act by the enforcing agency is entitled to great deference. Since the Act and its legislative history support the Commission's construction, this affords good reason to treat the Guidelines as expressing the will of Congress" (Griggs, 1971).
Empirical Research

The earliest reported study on sexual harassment was conducted by Working Women United (WWU), a grass-roots organization at Cornell University in 1975. The prevailing assumption was that sexual attention to a woman was flattering. WWU argued that the perception of a woman on-the-job as a sexual being rather than as a worker was in direct conflict with the demands of her job (Evans, 1978, p. 204). A "Speak-out" on the subject was held in Ithaca, New York; and 275 attendees and women members of a civil service union were surveyed. Sexual harassment was defined as "any repeated and unwanted sexual comments, looks, suggestions or physical contact that you find objectionable or offensive and that causes you discomfort on your job" (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, p. G-2). Seventy percent of the women said they had experienced such behavior at least once during their careers.

As the first public rallying cry against sexual harassment, the work of WWU was profoundly important. However, its study demonstrates the weaknesses and inconsistencies that are characteristic of most sexual harassment research. The absence of a common definition of sexual harassment is a major problem. While there is general agreement that sexually harassing behaviors cover a wide range of verbal, visual and physical behaviors and that mutually satisfactory relationships are not included, many questions remain. Does sexual harassment happen only to women? Must the behavior be deliberate? Must the offensive behavior occur more than once to be sexual harassment? Can the behavior merely be offensive or must it be tied to the threat of job consequences? If offensive behavior is harassment only when tied to job consequences, can persons other than supervisory personnel be guilty of harassment (Ibid., p. G3-4)?

A second major problem lies in the selection of the sample. Often, as in the case of the women attendee at the Speak-Out, respondents have been self-selected,
resulting in higher rates based on over-reporting. A third problem has been the inconsistency regarding time and workplace. Some studies have inquired about respondents' experiences over their entire working career, others specify a restricted time frame or workplace, while others are ambiguous. Finally, there is the problem of the identification of sexually harassing behavior. In most studies, self-reporting is accepted at face value, but should there be some other verification? Because of these complications, comparison of results is of little use; and generalization to the population-at-large is difficult to defend.

Nevertheless, the WWU survey and five subsequent studies have contributed to our knowledge of the extent of sexual harassment in the public and private sectors, the significance of the problem, and the gaps in perception between men and women and among employees of different levels. Therefore, examination of those studies is warranted.

Survey by Redbook: November 1976

In its January 1976 issue, Redbook magazine published a two-page questionnaire, which was completed and returned by 9,000 women readers. It was the largest study to date and provided the first nationwide statistics on the extent of sexual harassment in the workplace. The definition used was

"leering and ogling, sexual remarks and teasing, subtle sexual hints and pressures, touching, brushing up against, grabbing and pinching, and invitations to a date, sexual propositions and sexual relations with the implication that refusing may count against you" (Redbook, 1976 p.75).

The survey population was all female and self-selected, and no time frame was specified (Redbook, 1976, p. 217). Redbook reported that 90 percent of the respondents said they had been subjected to some form of the described behaviors at work. Of them, 75 percent found this unwelcome attention embarrassing, demeaning
and/or intimidating, while 15 percent termed it flattering. Forty-five percent had, or knew someone who had, quit or been fired over sexual harassment. Ninety-two percent of the respondents said sexual harassment was a serious problem. Redbook concluded, "Our survey tells us that the problem is not epidemic; it is pandemic—an everyday, everywhere occurrence" (Ibid.).

**Survey by U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board: March 1981**

In 1979, the federal government, in the person of James M. Haney, chairperson of the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the United States House of Representatives, conducted a preliminary study of 100 complaints. On the basis of those findings, the Subcommittee asked the Merit Systems Protection Board to conduct a major scientific survey of sexual harassment in the federal workplace.

A questionnaire was prepared using the Office of Personnel Management's definition of sexual harassment: "deliberate or repeated unsolicited verbal comments, gestures or physical contact of a sexual nature that is considered to be unwelcome by the recipient" (U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, p. 2). Respondents were questioned about six specific behaviors. A disproportionately stratified, random sample was taken from the O.P.M.'s Central Personnel Data File and the questionnaire was mailed to 23,000 men and women in May 1980. Both reminder post-cards and a follow-up questionnaire were sent to non-respondents; the final rate of return was 85 percent. Forty-two percent of the women and 15 percent of the men reported being sexually harassed within the preceding 24—month period.

There was substantial agreement among male and female respondents in the way they defined sexual harassment. A higher percentage of women than men identified as sexual harassment each of six specific behaviors initiated either by a supervisor or by a co-worker. In each case, a majority of the male respondents regarded the behavior as sexual harassment when initiated by a supervisor. However,
less than half the men responding considered sexually suggestive looks, gestures, remarks, joking, teasing, or questioning to be harassment when coming from a co-worker.

It was concluded that "sexual harassment is widespread, is costly, deeply felt by many of the victims, and that the 1979 Congressional investigation was indicative of a significant problem.... " (Ibid., p.4).


Again in 1980, a second study was undertaken by Redbook magazine—this time, in cooperation with the Harvard Business Review (HBR) (Collins/Blodgett, 1976). A questionnaire was mailed to 7,408 HBR subscribers in the United States. Eighteen hundred and forty-six replies were tabulated, a response rate of 25 percent. As with the Merit Systems Protection Board study, a disproportionately stratified, random sample was used which excluded all non-U.S. subscribers (22 percent of HBR's total) to ensure an American perspective and which included virtually every female subscriber (seven percent of HBR's total) to ensure a representative response from women. The resulting response rate was 52 percent male, 44 percent female, and four percent with no indication of gender (Ibid., p.77).

Unlike the previous Redbook survey which sought information on the extent of the problem, this study attempted to measure opinions on and awareness of sexual harassment in the workplace. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's definition of sexual harassment, as written in its interpretive Guidelines, was quoted in the survey. Results showed that sexual harassment is perceived as an issue of power, that men and women generally agree on what sexual harassment is, but that they disagree on how frequently it occurs. Only 32 percent of the women respondents compared to 66 percent of the men agreed with the statement that "The amount of sexual harassment at work is greatly exaggerated". The authors concluded
that "the gap in perception between different levels of management and between men and women poses a serious problem for policy makers" (Collins/Blodgett, p. 82).

Most respondents rated a supervisor's behavior as substantially more serious and threatening than that of a co-worker. Seventy-three percent of the respondents favored policies against sexual harassment in their workplace, but only 29 percent worked in companies with such policies.

While this study's respondents were self-selected, "it nevertheless represents a major step toward recognition of the importance of employee perceptions in significant employment discrimination research" (Wesman, 1984, p. 4).

**Survey by Gutek: August 1985**

Her study was based on telephone interviews with a random sample of 827 women and 405 men who work in Los Angeles County, California. Eight specific sexual behaviors were identified and respondents were asked whether they had experienced any of those particular behaviors in their work career and also how they would label each class of behaviors. Other questions focused on respondents' attitudes about sexuality at work and the role of physical attractiveness. This study was developed by Barbara A. Gutek, Professor of Psychology, Claremont College, Claremont, California, and is included in her book, *Sex and the Workplace*.

Gutek's model for measuring sexual harassment should be noted. First, she assumed that all eight behaviors have the potential of being considered sexual harassment and, therefore, anyone reporting one of them could be considered a victim. This, Gutek, observes, undoubtedly overstates the amount of actual harassment. Her second measurement was to count as sexually harassed those persons who had experienced a behavior and who considered that class of behavior to be sexual harassment. Finally, on the theory that a person may either over-react or be harassed and not know it, an outside ratter reviewed each respondent's description of
his/her experience and determined, on a five-point scale, whether the given experience was believably sexual harassment.

Fifty-three percent of the women and 37 percent of the men reported experiencing some form of harassing sexual behavior. However, only nine percent of the men reported an incident that was categorized as harassment by the independent ratter, and most of these "victims" were flattered. None reported suffering negative consequences. Twenty-one percent of the women's experiences, on the other hand, were rated as sexual harassment. However, this is believed to be an extremely conservative estimate of the occurrence of sexual harassment "since it only includes people who gave fairly extensive answers about a limited set of behaviors" (Ibid., p. 49).

Gutek theorizes that sexual harassment in the workplace is a function of sex-role spillover. She believes that the traditional valuing of women for their attractiveness and compliance and the existence of sex-segregated occupations and work groups sexualize the workplace. Men relate to their female co-workers more as potential lovers than as professional colleagues. Further, most men consider their sexual behavior at work as a normal part of the behavior that society expects of them. Gutek sees a dual effect of sex in the workplace:

1. sex as a problem for workers, managers, human resources specialists, lawyers, feminists, counselors, consultants and perhaps others, and
2. sex as a pervasive influence that affects people's experiences at work, their reactions to others, and their view of themselves (Gutek, p.3).

She suggests that it is not impossible to effect change in this area and suggests strategies for management.

Survey by U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board: June 1988

On its own initiative, the Board undertook a follow-up to it 1981 study of sexual harassment in the federal government. In 1988, a similar questionnaire was
sent to some 13,000 federal employees; the response rate was approximately 65 percent. It was found that, compared with seven years earlier, federal workers in 1988 were more prone to label as sexual harassment the same six types of behavior. There was no significant change in the rate of self-reported incidents: 42 percent of the women and 19 percent of the men responding had experienced persistent unwanted and uninvited sexual attention. However, the actual number of women experiencing sexual harassment had increased, because the number of federally employed women had risen by approximately 100,000 in the intervening years (USMSPB, An Update, p. 1).

Sixty-nine percent of the women respondents and 77 percent of the men reported harassment by a co-worker. Curiously, the 1987 survey omitted the question about sex of harasser, so there is no information on homosexual harassment. It is estimated that, from May 1985 until May 1987, sexual harassment cost the federal government $267 million.

"This conservative estimate is derived from calculating the cost of replacing employees who leave their jobs as a result of sexual harassment, of paying sick leave to employees who miss work as a consequence, and of reduced individual and work group productivity. .... It is in addition to the personal cost and anguish many of the victims had to bear" (Ibid., p.4).

The Board found some relief in the fact that a higher percentage of respondents in 1987, than in 1981, felt that there is less sexual harassment in the federal workplace than in the non-federal sector.

The inconsistencies among these surveys in terms of the definition, sample population, measurement of incidence, and time frame are evident and have made comparison of results virtually impossible. Nevertheless, each study in its own way reinforces the fact that sexual behavior exists in the workplace. While most sexual
behavior is not harassment, each study provides further evidence that sexual harassment in the workplace is an endemic problem which merits attention and change.

Survey by Working Women: December 1988

Noting that more than 38,500 sexual harassment cases had been filed with the federal government since the EEOC Guidelines were published in 1980, the editors of Working Women magazine determined to find out how corporations were responding to the changing legal and social climate. A 49-question survey was mailed to the directors of personnel, human resources, and equal opportunity offices of 160 Fortune 500 manufacturing and service companies, representing 3.3 million employees. Results were published in the December 1988 issue of Working Women, but no rate of return was given (Sandroff, p. 69-82).

Eight scenarios were given to describe the dimensions of sexual harassment, and a 24-month time frame was specified. The report observes that many corporations now ascribe to a broad ("If it makes you uncomfortable, it could be harassment" (Scott-Buczak, 1988, p. 70).) definition. Ninety percent of the responding corporations had received complaints of sexual harassment. More than 33 percent had been sued; and approximately 25 percent had been sued repeatedly. Sixty-eight percent of the complaints involved supervisors and 32 percent, co-workers. Sixty-four percent of the corporate executives surveyed said that most of the complaints they received were valid. Corporations with the lowest percentage of women employees reported the highest rate of formal sexual harassment complaints.

This study focused also on the cost of sexual harassment to employers. It calculated a per year cost of $6.7 million for a typical Fortune 500 corporation with approximately 23,750 employees. This includes the expense of absenteeism, low productivity, and turnover, but not the possible additional expenses of court costs, executive time, and bad publicity associated with law suits. The survey suggested
that "sexual harassment, once a feminist issue, has become a financial one; and substantial numbers of companies are reacting accordingly, treating the issue with seriousness and a significant investment of time and money" (Ibid., p.70). Seventy-six percent of the corporations surveyed have specific policies against sexual harassment, while another 16 percent include it in their policies against discrimination.
Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

The Sample Population

Access to and cooperation from employees can present a problem when the research subject is as sensitive as sexual harassment. It is not uncommon for hotels to be unwilling to participate in this kind of research, rationalizing that to mention the subject is to raise the problem or admit to guilt. Three hotels were contacted to participate in this pilot study. One resort hotel property agreed to do it, but only if the strictest confidentiality was guaranteed. This hotel is a resort property with 1,889 guest rooms, 20 meeting rooms, 4 restaurants, 2 bars, and 2 swimming pools. It is located in a metropolitan area of 850,000 population. It has 1,000 full-time and part-time employees. Sixty-five percent of the employees are female, 70% are people of color whose first language is not English, and most are immigrants.

A convenience sample of lower level managers and supervisors and hourly employees from several hotel departments was provided by a middle manager of the hotel property. The sample consisted of 69 individuals, 47 female and 22 male, listed by first name only and their phone number. Telephone interviews were completed in July 1992.

The Survey Instrument

The survey instrument was designed based on the Gutek study questionnaire. It consisted of thirty questions or statements that represented a range of social-sexual behaviors including some most likely to be called sexual harassment and other not likely to be called sexual harassment. Each of question or statement appeared on a separate screen of a Ci2 program, the computer software package, Ci2, an interactive
interviewing program, was used in the construction and execution of the questionnaire. (See Appendix A for questionnaire)

The first section (questions 1–3) solicited information about the respondent's sex, department, and length of employment. The second section (questions 4–11) ascertained the frequency of sexual behavior experienced by the respondent while employed at the present hotel. The Gutek's eight types of social-sexual behaviors described were:

- sexual comments intended to be complimentary,
- sexual comments intended to be insulting,
- sexual looks and/or gestures intended to be complimentary,
- sexual looks and/or gestures intended to be insulting,
- non-sexual touching,
- sexual touching,
- dating as a requirement of the job and
- sexual relations as a requirement of the job.

The third section (questions 12–15) focused on the more serious forms of social-sexual behavior: sexual touching, dating as a job requirement, and sexual relations as a requirement of the job. The questions concerned the individual's assignment of responsibility for the sexual incident and characteristics of the initiating person. Respondents who had not experienced one of these more serious forms of sexual behavior were not asked these questions.

The fourth section (question 16) ascertained respondents' awareness of policies and procedures regarding sexual harassment in their present hotel.

The term sexual harassment was used for the first time in section five (questions 17–25). Respondents were asked whether or not they considered each of the eight types of sexual behavior previously asked to be sexual harassment.
The sixth and last section (questions 26–30) asked respondents who had experienced a serious type of sexual behavior whether or not they had filed a grievance; if so, what had happened and, if not, why not? All respondents were asked whether they had ever been troubled enough by sexual behavior in their present job to talk to someone about it and, if so, who? All respondents were also asked whether they had ever had a similar homosexual experience in their present hotel.

**Survey Methods**

To ascertain interviewee's personal experience with and reaction to sexual behavior in the workplace, telephone interviews were used to obtain more reliable responses according to Barbara A. Gutek's survey method. Confidentiality and anonymity would be maintained by using telephone interview, and just the employees' first name and phone number. Questions and language would be as unbiased as possible. Further, questions about experiences would be limited to the respondent's current job and would address heterosexual conduct, although one question about homosexual behavior was included to provide a small window on that issue.

**Data Analysis**

Responses from the 69 completed interviews were numerically coded and compiled by the Ci2 program. The data was transferred to Lotus 123, and then into Minitab for statistical analysis. Frequencies and percents of responses were tabulated for each question, and cross-tabulations of the eight types of social-sexual behaviors were used to make comparisons with Gutek's study.

The Gutek study is used as benchmark data for this study of sexual harassment in the hotel. Data on the existence of and reaction to certain specific sexual behaviors and the effect of specific aspects of the work environment and of employees themselves on sexuality in this study are compared with Gutek's study.
Chapter IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The results of this pilot study are presented and discussed in this chapter. In measuring the frequency of sexual harassment, the question of definition is critical. In this study, two definitions were measured: the number of self-reported experiences of sexual behaviors, and the number of incidents of behaviors that the respondent independently labeled sexual harassment.

In response to question one, the survey sample consisted of 47 women and 22 men. In response to question two, of the female respondents, thirty-two (68%) worked in food service as waitresses, bartenders, expediters, buspersons, or cashiers. Another seven (15%) worked in housekeeping, three (6%) in food preparation, three (6%) in telephone service, and two (4%) in front office. Of the male respondents, ten (46%) worked in food service, seven (32%) in food preparation, three (14%) in front office, and two (9%) in housekeeping.

In response to question three that asked for the length of employment, all sixty-nine interviewees have worked in the hotel for at least 9 months. The longest one is seven years.

In response to question four to eleven, Table 1 presents the rates of self-reported incidents for men and women in this study as compared with the Gutek study. In all categories, a higher percentage of women reported having experienced the specific behavior. In contrast, men reported a higher frequency only in the categories of insulting sexual comments and both complimentary and insulting sexual looks and gestures. The low percentages of both sexes reporting expected socialization and expected sexual activity with job consequences is not surprising. It
may be that persons who have experienced such extreme harassment have already left that workplace.

Table 1 shows that a higher percentage of women in this study reported experiences in every category than did women in the Gutek study. Men reported a slightly lower incidence of sexual behaviors in the workplace than did men in the Gutek study.
### TABLE 1.

**Comparison of Men's and Women's Experiences of Social-Sexual Behaviors with the Gutek Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This Study, 1992 (N=22)</td>
<td>Gutek, 1985 * (N=405)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I have experienced:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complimentary sexual comments</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulting sexual comments</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complimentary sexual looks/gestures</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulting sexual looks/gestures</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-sexual touching</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual touching</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected socialization outside of work with job consequences</td>
<td>0.0 %</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected sexual activity with job consequences</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to question twelve, forty-two percent of the male respondents reported that the sexual harassment had occurred a few times, while thirty-two percent reported a single incident. Of women, twenty-four percent reported the harassment had occurred repeatedly, twenty-eight percent a few times, and thirty-nine percent only once.

Respondents were asked question thirteen how responsible they felt for the incident they experienced. Seventy-eight percent of the women said they felt they were not at all responsible, while 19 percent felt they were somewhat responsible, and one (3%) woman said she was very responsible.

Thirty-six percent of the men said they felt they were somewhat responsible for the reported incident, while another 64 percent said they were not at all responsible.

In response to question fourteen, respondents were asked to identify the harasser as a co-worker, supervisor, or customer or any combination of the three. Table 2 gives the incidence rates presented in Table 1 above with the identification of the initiator of the sexual behavior.

In the case of male respondents, it appears that sexual behavior in the workplace originates primarily with co-workers and second with customers. In the categories of the most informal, non-threatening social behavior (complimentary sexual comments and looks/gestures), harassment is perpetrated by all sources. This appears to indicate an informal environment with much social-sexual interaction.

Women report co-workers as the major source of sexual harassment. Customers are responsible for all types of sexual harassment including sexual touching, but are not involved in the coercion to have sexual relations with threatened job consequences. In one instance, a customer was cited for harassing to socialize with the threat of job consequence. Supervisors were cited by women as initiators of
all types of harassment, including the most serious forms. In cases of harassment to have sex, the majority of the harassers were supervisors.
TABLE 2.

Rates of Social-Sexual Behaviors by the Initiators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=22)</td>
<td>(N=47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complimentary sexual comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker, supervisor and customer</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker only</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor only</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer only</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker and supervisor</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker and customer</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer and supervisor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulting sexual comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker, supervisor and customer</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker only</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor only</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer only</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker and supervisor</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker and customer</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer and supervisor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complimentary sexual looks/gestures:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker, supervisor and customer</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker only</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor only</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer only</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker and supervisor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker and customer</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer and supervisor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulting sexual looks/gestures:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker, supervisor and customer</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker only</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor only</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer only</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker and supervisor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker and customer</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer and supervisor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-sexual touching:</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker, supervisor and customer</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker only</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor only</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer only</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker and supervisor</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker and customer</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer and supervisor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual touching:</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker, supervisor and customer</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker only</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor only</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer only</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker and supervisor</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker and customer</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer and supervisor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socialization with job consequences:</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker, supervisor and customer</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker only</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor only</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer only</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker and supervisor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker and customer</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer and supervisor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual activity with job consequences:</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker, supervisor and customer</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker only</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor only</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer only</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker and supervisor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-worker and customer</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer and supervisor</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To the question fifteen, "To your knowledge, has this person behaved in the same way toward other people at work?" 45% of the women victims reported that their harasser was also harassing other women. Thirty-three percent said there was no other person being victimized by the same harasser; and twenty-two percent said they didn't know whether they were alone or not. Of the men, 37 percent responded positively; 40 percent said there was no other person being victimized by the same harasser; and 23 percent reported they didn't know.

In response to question sixteen, 100 percent of men and women aware that their employer hotel has policies and procedures regarding sexual harassment.

In response to question seventeen, 97% of male respondents and ninety-eight percent of female respondents reported that they are familiar with the term "sexual harassment".

In response to question eighteen to twenty-five, respondents were also asked whether they considered specific behaviors to be sexual harassment. Table 3 presents those results, compared to the results of the Gutek study. In all categories, female hotel workers had higher rate than the Gutek study.

Over 60 percent of the male respondents identified insulting sexual comments, sexual touching and expected socialization and expected sexual activity as sexual harassment. Overall, there was even more consensus among the women respondents. More than 85 percent of them agreed that insulting sexual comments, insulting sexual looks/gestures, sexual touching, expected socialization and expected sexual activity are sexual harassment.

The evidence presented that a higher percentage of women identify sexual behaviors by the opposite sex in the workplace as sexual harassment than do men. Women's descriptions of behaviors and of their reactions to them imply that sexual intimidation is used for dominance in the workplace and that often women are viewed merely as sex objects.
TABLE 3.

Comparison of Men's and Women's Responses to: What Is Sexual Harassment? with the Gutek Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This Study (N=22)</td>
<td>Gutek * (N=405)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, sexual harassment is:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complimentary sexual comments</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulting sexual comments</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complimentary sexual looks/gestures</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulting sexual looks/gestures</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-sexual touching</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual touching</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected socialization outside of work with job consequences</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected sexual activity with job consequences</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results (See Table 3) were then cross-tabulated with the incidents self-reported (See Table 1) to yield only those experiences which were considered by the respondents to be sexual harassment. Gutek correctly points out that "this does not necessarily mean that their own experience is sexual harassment. Rather it means that they experienced something they would generally label sexual harassment" (Ibid., P.48). These results are reported in Table 4.

Unfortunately, in this analysis, the Gutek results are based on reported experiences over respondents' work careers, rather than on only the current job. The reported incidents over the longer period of time were substantially higher than for the shorter period. Therefore, it can be assumed that there would be a greater difference between the rates reported for the hotel industry and those for the population at large when considering only respondent's current employment.
TABLE 4.

Comparison of Men's and Women's Reported Experiences and Labeled It as Sexual Harassment with the Gutek Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEN This Study (N=22)</th>
<th>MEN Gutek * (N=405)</th>
<th>WOMEN This Study (N=47)</th>
<th>WOMEN Gutek * (N=827)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complimentary sexual comments</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulting sexual comments</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complimentary sexual looks/gestures</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulting sexual looks/gestures</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-sexual touching</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual touching</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected socialization outside of work with job consequences</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected sexual activity with job consequences</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To ascertain how victims of sexual harassment dealt with their situation, question 26, 27a, and 27b were posed about the existence and utilization of hotel policies and procedures regarding sexual harassment, what happened or why a grievance was not filed, and how the situation changed as a result of the victim's response.

Victims, defined as those persons who self-reported experiencing one or more of the three most serious sexual behaviors, were asked whether they filed a grievance. Of the women who were thus identified as victims, 29 percent did not file a complaint. In most instances, these women who did not file grievances chose to handle the situation themselves. Their comments include "There was no real need", "Nothing would be done", and "It was too much trouble".

To the question twenty-eight, "Has being sexually harassed at work ever upset you enough to talk to a friend, co-worker, supervisor, family member, or someone else about the experience?" twenty percent of the male respondents replied positively. Thirty-six percent of the women responded positively. In most instances, both men (74%) and women (81%) turned to a co-worker as identified from responses to question twenty-nine.

In response to question thirty, twenty-three percent of the male respondents reported having homosexual experience with another man. Only six percent of the women respondents reported having homosexual experience with another woman.

According to this survey, the most of men in the hotel industry are not troubled by heterosexual behaviors. This research did reveal that some male hotel workers are concerned about homosexual behavior. However, because this study focused on heterosexual behavior, it does not purport to provide an accurate or thorough measurement of the other.

As stated above, to measure reaction to sexual behaviors, respondents were asked whether or not they considered certain sexual behaviors to be sexual
harassment. These questions were not limited to heterosexual behaviors. Table 5 presents the cross tabulation of question two by question four to eleven to show the percentage of employees within each department who answered positively.

In view of the respondents, the relatively low rates among the men in food preparation (7) and food service (10) are more apparent than the higher rates among the very few respondents in front office (3) and housekeeping (2). These rates suggest a fairly high tolerance for sexual behaviors among men in both food-related departments. There were 32 women respondents in food service, 7 in housekeeping, 3 in food preparation, 3 in telephone service, and two in front office. Women in food service, food preparation, telephone service, and front office indicated a low tolerance for sexual behavior, with considerably higher rates for the identification of sexual behaviors as sexual harassment than did the men. The inconsistent results among both men and women within the housekeeping department may reflect the cultural diversity of the persons working there and the cultural sensitivity of the topic. For both men and women, there was consistently a lesser reaction to non-sexual touching than to any other behavior.

As shown in Table 5, male respondents in food preparation appear to have a higher tolerance for sexual behaviors in the workplace than do their counterparts in other departments. Male employees in food service are the next most tolerant departmental group, followed by those in housekeeping and front office. Among women respondents, there is very little variation by department in their reaction to sexual behaviors in the workplace.
### TABLE 5.

**Men's and Women's Responses to: What Is Sexual Harassment? by Department**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food Service (N=10)</td>
<td>Food Prep (N=7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complimentary sexual comments</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulting sexual comments</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complimentary sexual looks/gestures</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulting sexual looks/gestures</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-sexual touching</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual touching</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected socialization outside of work with job consequences</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected sexual activity with job consequences</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The frequency rate of sexual behaviors by department was examined. The number of reported experiences of sexual behaviors by department is presented in Table 6. The data represent the number of incidents by department of the respondent, not by department of the harasser nor by the location where the incident occurred.

Relative to their representation, men in food preparation report a disproportionately low incidence rate of sexual behaviors. It is also the lowest rate of any department. On the other hand, the rate for food service employees is disproportionately high. Among women, the frequency rate is proportionately highest among those respondents in food service and food preparation departments. The differences between men versus women in the food preparation department should be noted.
### TABLE 6.

**Men's and Women's Experiences of Social-Sexual Behaviors by Department**

**MEN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Food Service (N=10)</th>
<th>Food Prep (N=7)</th>
<th>Front Office (N=3)</th>
<th>Hskpg (N=2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complimentary sexual comments</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulting sexual comments</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complimentary sexual looks/gestures</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulting sexual looks/gestures</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-sexual touching</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual touching</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected socialization outside of work with job consequences</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected sexual activity with job consequences</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WOMEN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Food Service (N=32)</th>
<th>Food Prep (N=3)</th>
<th>Hskpg (N=7)</th>
<th>Tel (N=3)</th>
<th>Front Office (N=2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complimentary sexual comments</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulting sexual comments</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complimentary sexual look/gestures</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulting sexual looks/gestures</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-sexual touching</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual touching</td>
<td>84.6%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected socialization outside of work with job consequences</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected sexual activity with job consequences</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Sexual harassment is generally recognized as an abuse of power through sex. The results of this study indicated sexual harassment is a widespread and deeply felt problem in the surveyed property. From this pilot research, 76 percent of the women and 57 percent of the men reported experiencing some form of harassing sexual behavior. To compare with Gutek's study (53% female and 37% male have reported experiencing some form of harassing sexual behavior), this study shows that a higher percentage of female and male hotel employees experience sexual harassment in their workplace than do their counterparts in society at large. In addition, men and women differ considerably in their reactions to sexual behaviors in the workplace, with women much more likely to label as harassment each of the eight Gutek social-sexual behaviors.

This study also found co-workers to be the main source of sexual behaviors identified as sexually harassing. In fact, co-workers were the majority of initiators of all types of sexual harassment. However, pressure to have sexual relations with the threat of a job consequence was initiated primarily from supervisors.

Whereas the Working Women's study concluded that corporations with the lowest number of women employees had the highest rate of formal complaints of sexual harassment (Sandroff, 1988, P.72), no such pattern was found in this hotel. In fact, it appears that wherever men are present, sexual harassment occurs. Only when women work solely with other women is no such offensive behavior reported. This may be a result of the power differential that exists in most hotels, and particularly in food and beverage departments, where men hold most authority-endowed jobs. This
research confirmed with Gutek’s theory that, wherever both sexes are present, the workplace is sexualized. However, it is arguable that, where there is a balance of power and an emphasis on work performance, sexual interaction is more often within acceptable boundaries and sexually harassing behavior is not as likely to occur.

The hotel industry is already faced with increasing labor costs, high turnover, and a diminishing supply of workers. Maintaining a stable work force has become a critical success factor, and the elimination of sexual harassment may be one part of the solution. This study found 100% of male and female respondents have knowledge of the existence of policies and procedures on sexual harassment in the hotel property.

Recommendations

Recommendations to management regarding the handling and elimination of sexual harassment are (1) the response by management, (2) the training request, and (3) the need to do more research in this sensitive topic.

The social norms of a hotel evolve from the policies of the corporation and by standards set by management. The commitment of upper management is critical to have a workplace free of offensive sexual behavior. This commitment must be scrupulously adhered to and exemplified by every manager and made known publicly to all employees both in writing and in practice. The policy should make clear that normal social interaction does not constitute sexual harassment, since sexual harassment is behavior that is one-sided, intimidating, and offensive to the recipient. It should encourage victims to come forward, ensuring both confidentiality and protection against retaliation. It should also guarantee that each complaint will be investigated thoroughly and that appropriate remedial and disciplinary action will be taken against anyone in the company who harasses another employee. In addition, the policy should clearly state that any supervisory personnel who condone offensive behavior or fail to take corrective action pursuant to this policy will be disciplined.
It is management's responsibility to observe, to listen, to reassure the employee, and to act. Allegations of sexual harassment must be vigorously and promptly investigated. Corroboration must be sought by interviewing the alleged harasser and any witnesses. Every effort must be made to respect the privacy of the persons involved and to keep the investigation confidential. In addition, the investigator should research whether similar accusations have previously been made against that person or by the victim, and whether any change in the victim's performance has been noted.

If the complaint is substantiated, appropriate discipline must be administered. A minimal response might be to explain to the harasser that his or her behavior constitutes sexual harassment, to review guidelines for appropriate behavior, and to issue a stern warning. A more serious offense or a repeated one would be cause for more severe punitive action, including suspension, loss of wages, transfer, or termination. The victim must always be informed of the results of the investigation and encouraged to report any further problems. Removing the victim is no solution, for very often the harasser will continue the behavior with someone else.

Management must thoroughly document every complaint, the ensuing investigation, and the steps toward resolution. Such information should become a part of the personnel files of those involved. It should also be included in performance appraisals and regarded as relevant. In addition, positive behavior that supports the commitment to eliminating sexual harassment should be incorporated into the organization's reward structure. Therefore, the sex distribution and authority distribution within departments and work groups should be examined, and a policy of more equal distribution of men and women should be mandated to the human resources director and all department heads.

Given that most offensive behaviors originated with co-workers, the traditional approach of training only managers is no longer sufficient. The results of
this study point to the need for direct training of non-supervisory employees regarding sexual harassment. Among the recommendations of the Merit Systems Protection Board (1988, p.46) is the following statement:

"Aiming sexual harassment training at managers and personnel officials .... may have been appropriate initially, considering always-limited training resources, competing needs, and the imperative for initiating training focused on a problem newly recognized as serious.... However, in view of the continued high level of alleged sexual harassment .... and increasing attention to the possible existence of a 'hostile environment,' agency training programs should also be broadened to include the entire work force".

The training should include a discussion of various behaviors and the circumstances under which those behaviors may be considered sexual harassment.

The results of this pilot study support the need to do more research in this sensitive topic. A problem of access to and cooperation from the hospitality industry need to be addressed before more research can be conducted.


APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE WITH A SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Section I

1. Respondent's sex  
   M=22, F=47
2. What is your department?
   (M: 46% Food Service, 32% Food Preparation, 14% Front Office, and 9% Housekeeping.  
   F: 68% Food Service, 15% Housekeeping, 6% Food Preparation, 6% Telephone Service,  
   and 4% Front Office)
3. Length of employment ______________________

Section II

There are various ways a person can behave toward another person at work in a non-professional way. We think this is very important part of people's working conditions, and I would like to ask you some questions about it. If any question should make you too uncomfortable, please feel free to say you prefer not to answer it.

4. Sometimes on the job, some people make comments of a sexual nature that are meant to be compliments.  
   On your present job, have you ever received sexual remarks from somebody that they meant to be complimentary?  
   Yes (M=43%, F=77%)  No (M=57%, F=23%)
5. Sometimes on the job, some people make sexual comments that are meant to be an insult or a "put-down." On your present job, have you ever received sexual comments from somebody that they meant to be insulting?
   Yes (M=21%, F=40%)  No (M=79%, F=60%)

6. Sometimes on the job, though they don't say anything, people make looks or gestures of a sexual nature that are meant to be a compliment. On your present job, have you ever received sexual looks or gestures from somebody that they meant to be complimentary?
   Yes (M=52%, F=65%)  No (M=48%, F=35%)

7. Sometimes on the job, even though they don't say anything, people make looks or gestures of a sexual nature that are meant to be an insult or a "put-down." On your present job, have you ever received sexual looks or gestures from somebody that they meant to be insulting?
   Yes (M=15%, F=30%)  No (M=85%, F=70%)

8. Sometimes on the job, a man/woman might touch a woman/man in a way that is not meant to be sexual. On your present job, have you ever been touched by a man/woman in a non sexual way?
   Yes (M=56%, F=75%)  No (M=44%, F=25%)
9. Sometimes on the job, a man/woman might touch a woman/man in a way that is meant to be sexual. On your present job, have you ever been touched by a man/woman in a sexual way?
   Yes (M=19%, F=30%)  No (M=81%, F=70%)

10. Sometimes on the job, a man/woman expects a woman/man to go out with him/her with the understanding that it would hurt her/his job situation if she/he refused or would help if she/he accepted. On your present job, have you ever been asked by a man/woman to go out with him/her as part of your job?
   Yes (M=0%, F=7%)  No (M=100%, F=93%)

11. Sometimes a woman/man is expected to engage in sexual relations with a man/woman with the understanding that it would hurt her/his job situation if she/he refused or help if she/he accepted. On your present job, have you ever been asked by a man/woman to engage in sexual relations as part of your job?
   Yes (M=0%, F=7%)  No (M=100%, F=93%)

Section III
(Interviewer: determine which one of the following experiences questions 13–16 refer to. Circle number below:)

(Q.11) 1. being asked by a man/woman to engage in sexual relations as part of your present job
(Q.10) 2. being asked by a man/woman to go out with him/her as part of your present job

(Q.9) 3. being touched by a man/woman in a sexual way on your present job

Now I'd like to ask you about:

12. How frequently has this happened to you? Would you say only once, a few times, or many times?
   - Only once (M=32%, F=39%)
   - A few times (M=42%, F=28%)
   - Many times (M=20%, F=24%)
   - Decline to answer (M=6%, F=9%)

13. Overall, how responsible would you say you were for this happening? Would you say you were very responsible, somewhat responsible, not at all responsible?
   - Very responsible (M=0%, F=3%)
   - Somewhat responsible (M=36%, F=19%)
   - Not at all responsible (M=64%, F=78%)

14. Is the person your supervisor, co-worker, customer, or combination of the three?
   - Supervisor
   - Co-worker
   - Customer
   (See Table 2)

15. To your knowledge, has this person behaved in the same way toward other people at work?
   - Yes (M=37%, F=45%)
   - No (M=40%, F=33%)
   - Don't know (M=23%, F=22%)
Section IV

16. Do you aware your hotel has policies and procedures regarding sexual harassment?
Yes  (M=100%, F=100%)  No

Section V

17. Are you familiar with the term "sexual harassment"?
Yes  (M=97%, F=98%)  No  (M=3%, F=2%)

Well, recently there has been some interest in what has been called sexual harassment at work. This usually refers to harassment of women by male supervisor, workers, clients, or customers, but may also include female harassment of male workers.

We'd like to find out just what the term sexual harassment means to you. Going back to the questions I asked earlier, I want your opinion of whether or not you consider each type of incident we mentioned as sexual harassment. For each one I read, please tell me whether yes, you do consider it sexual harassment; no, you do not; or you don't know or aren't sure.

18. Being asked to have sexual relations with the understanding that it would hurt your job situation if you refused or help if you accepted?
Yes  (M=80%, F=99%)

19. Being asked to go out with someone with the understanding that it would hurt your job situation if you refused or help if you accepted?
Yes  (M=60%, F=97%)

20. Touching at work that was meant to be sexual?
Yes  (M=63%, F=93%)
21. Touching at work that was not meant to be sexual?
Yes (M=7%, F=24%)

22. Looks or gestures of a sexual nature that were meant to be insulting?
Yes (M=44%, F=85%)

23. Looks or gestures of a sexual nature that were meant to be complimentary?
Yes (M=16%, F=47%)

24. Comments of a sexual nature that were meant to be insulting?
Yes (M=63%, F=93%)

25. Comments of a sexual nature that were meant to be complimentary?
Yes (M=16%, F=50%)

Section VI

26. Have you ever fill a grievance because you were sexually harassed?
Yes (skip to Q. 36a) (M=45%, F=71%)
No (skip to Q. 36b) (M=55%, F=29%)

27a. What had happened? ________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

27b. Why not? ________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________
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28. Has being sexually harassed at work ever upset you enough to talk to a co-worker, friend, supervisor, family member, or someone else about the experience?
   Yes (skip to Q.38)  \( (M=20\%, \, F=36\%) \)
   No  \( (M=80\%, \, F=60\%) \)  Decline to answer  \( (F=4\%) \)

29. Who did you talk to? Co-worker  \( (M=74\%, \, F=81\%) \).

30. Have you ever had a similar homosexual experience at work?
   Yes  \( (M=23\%, \, F=6\%) \)  No  \( (M=69\%, \, F=94\%) \)
   Decline to answer  \( (M=8\%) \)
APPENDIX B
EEOC GUIDELINES ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT

On April 11, 1980, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission published the interim Guidelines on sexual harassment as an amendment to the Guidelines on Discrimination because of Sex, 29 CFR Part 1604.11, 45 FR 25024. This amendment will re-affirm that sexual harassment is an unlawful employment practice. The EEOC received public comments for 60 days subsequent to the date of the publication of the interim Guidelines. As a result of the comments and the analysis of them these Final Guidelines were drafted.

PART 1604—GUIDELINES ON DISCRIMINATION BECAUSE OF SEX

1604.11 Sexual Harassment

(a) Harassment on the basis of sex is a violation of Sec. 703 of Title VII. Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when (1) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment, (2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions affecting such individual, or (3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment.

(b) In determining whether alleged conduct constitutes sexual harassment, the Commission will look at the record as a whole and at the totality of the circumstances, such as the nature of the sexual advances and the context in which the alleged incidents occurred. The determination of the legality of a particular action will be made from the facts, on a case by case basis.

(c) Applying general Title VII principles, an employer, employment agency, joint apprenticeship committee or labor organization (hereinafter collectively
referred to as "employer") is responsible for its acts and those of its supervisory employees with respect to sexual harassment regardless of whether the specific acts complained of were authorized or even forbidden by the employer and regardless of whether the employer knew or should have known of their occurrence. The Commission will examine the circumstances of the particular employment relationship and the job functions performed by the individual in determining whether an individual acts in either a supervisory or agency capacity.

(d) With respect to conduct between fellow employees, an employer is responsible for acts of sexual harassment in the workplace where the employer (or its agents or supervisory employees) knows or should have known of the conduct, unless it can show that it took immediate and appropriate corrective action.

(e) An employer may also be responsible for the acts of non-employees, with respect to sexual harassment of employees in the workplace, where the employer (or its agents or supervisory employees) knows or should have known of the conduct and fails to take immediate and appropriate corrective action. In reviewing these cases the Commission will consider the extent of the employer's control and any other legal responsibility which the employer may have with respect to the conduct of such non-employees.

(f) Prevention is the best tool for the elimination of sexual harassment. An employer should take all steps necessary to prevent sexual harassment from occurring, such as affirmatively raising the subject, expressing strong disapproval, developing appropriate sanctions, informing employees of their right to raise and how to raise the issue of harassment under Title VII, and developing methods to sensitize all concerned.

(g) Other related practices: Where employment opportunities or benefits are granted because of an individual's submission to the employer's sexual advances or requests for sexual favors, the employer may be held liable for unlawful sex
discrimination against other persons who were qualified for but denied that employment opportunity or benefit.