

2019

The Impact of Perspective in Identifying and Responding to Potential Sexual Misconduct: A Study of University Students

Nichole Maki Weller
Indiana University Kokomo

Kathy Parkison
Indiana University Kokomo

Steven R. Cox
Indiana University Kokomo

Michael Plummer
Indiana University Kokomo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.valpo.edu/mssj>



Part of the [Anthropology Commons](#), [Business Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), [Economics Commons](#), [Environmental Studies Commons](#), [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#), [Geography Commons](#), [History Commons](#), [International and Area Studies Commons](#), [Political Science Commons](#), [Psychology Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Weller, Nichole Maki; Parkison, Kathy; Cox, Steven R.; and Plummer, Michael (2019) "The Impact of Perspective in Identifying and Responding to Potential Sexual Misconduct: A Study of University Students," *Midwest Social Sciences Journal*. Vol. 22: Iss. 1, Article 13.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22543/2766-0796.1012>

Available at: <https://scholar.valpo.edu/mssj/vol22/iss1/13>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by ValpoScholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Midwest Social Sciences Journal by an authorized administrator of ValpoScholar. For more information, please contact a ValpoScholar staff member at scholar@valpo.edu.

***The Impact of Perspective in Identifying and Responding to
Potential Sexual Misconduct: A Study of University Students****

NICHOLE MAKI WELLER
Indiana University Kokomo

KATHY PARKISON
Indiana University Kokomo

STEVEN R. COX
Indiana University Kokomo

MICHEAL PLUMMER
Indiana University Kokomo

ABSTRACT

Recent events have demonstrated a divergent understanding of sexual harassment and other forms of sexual misconduct. Although sociocultural standards regarding sexual misconduct have changed over time, including improved social and workplace standards and protections, it is clear that not everyone views these events through the same lens. The lens is even less clear when potential misconduct is viewed from the distinct perspectives of a “victim” and a “perpetrator.” We surveyed 424 undergraduate and graduate students at Indiana University Kokomo to identify the impact of perspective and various sociodemographic characteristics that may influence perceptions of what is, and is not, sexual misconduct. In addition, we examined if these factors also influence opinions on the severity of response toward this misconduct. Students completed a gender-neutral survey that presented eight potential sexual-misconduct scenarios in a first-person narrative. In each scenario, the fact pattern was identical, but some surveys were in the perspective of the “victim” and some were in the perspective of the “perpetrator.” We find that perspective matters, as do reported preconceived attitudes toward sexual misconduct. We also find preliminary evidence that the impact of

* Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Kathy Parkison, Professor of Economics, School of Business, Indiana University Kokomo, 2300 South Washington Street, Kokomo, IN 46904; kparkiso@iuk.edu; (765) 455-9462.

perspective and the severity of the response may depend on whether the misconduct occurs in an organizational setting, in a date setting, or without a distinct victim.

KEY WORDS Sexual; Misconduct; Harassment; Perspective

The evolution of sexual harassment from socially condemnable to illegal has transpired because of campaigns and efforts led by feminist activists, scholars, and lawyers, who collectively advanced the idea that sexual harassment was a form of sex discrimination as outlined in the Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Brownmiller 1999). During the 1960s and 1970s, these groups brought into public view what many professionals already knew but very rarely discussed—that the American workplace was a hostile work environment plagued by sexual harassment, where women were subjected to unwanted sexual comments, actions, and behaviors with no legal protection from these events (Blackstone, Houle, and Uggen 2014). Since the 1970s, social mores and legal protections have been enacted to protect all individuals from quid pro quo harassment and/or hostile work environments (Bursik and Geftner 2011; Page, Pina, and Giner-Sorolla 2016). Even as society has become more informed about these laws and protections, however, sexual harassment remains a widespread social phenomenon, with more than half of college-aged women experiencing some form of sexual harassment during their college careers and at least 50 percent of women being subject to sexually harassing circumstances at some point in their professional careers (Blackstone et al. 2014; U.S. EEOC 2013). Evidence suggests that actual rates of sexual harassment are much higher than reported incidence because many victims never report the crimes (Blackstone et al. 2014; U.S. EEOC 2013).

A variety of theoretical foundations are useful in understanding how and why sexual harassment remains a pervasive social plight, even in light of legal protections from these harassing behaviors. From a sociological perspective, institutional and structural inequalities that naturally exist in the workplace create unequal power dynamics and provide opportunities for quid pro quo harassment and/or hostile work environments, especially within a hierarchical leadership configuration (Bourgeois and Perkins 2003; Kimble et al. 2016; Lonsway, Cortina, and Magley 2008). Furthermore, gender segregation remains salient among certain occupations in which a disproportionate number of men dominate positions of authority within specific industries (Bourgeois and Perkins 2003; Kimble et al. 2016; Lonsway et al.). From a feminist perspective, this type of gender segregation results in marginalized social roles and norms that are deemed acceptable for men and women, and as such, positions of authority allow for hypersexualized masculinity and the consequential sexual harassment of subordinate female employees (Bourgeois and Perkins 2003; Kimble et al. 2016; Lonsway et al. 2008). Any time there is a gendered structural hierarchy, either in the workplace or on a college campus, there are opportunities for sexual harassment. Identifying social structures that present the potential for sexually harassing circumstances is only one step toward resolving the issue; a more challenging need is identifying how the subjective

perceptions of sexual harassment influence our response to victims and perpetrators of sexual harassment.

Shifting Social Trends

The recent #metoo social movement has brought the topic of sexual harassment and sexual assault to the forefront of the public's attention. This social movement, driven largely by social media and overwhelmingly comprising women, has created a global platform for victims of sexual harassment and assault to share their experiences and simultaneously show support and solidarity with other victims. More than this, the #metoo movement has created a shift in how men and women think about and respond to sexual harassment and sexual assault.

It is difficult to fully assess the impact of an ongoing social movement, but preliminary studies examining the effects of the #metoo movement indicate that there is increased awareness of sexual harassment and sexual assault (Fawcett Society 2018). For example, both men and women report that the #metoo movement has challenged their opinions regarding appropriate and inappropriate behaviors (Fawcett Society 2018). Women report that the #metoo movement has increased their own proactive responses to overcoming issues of sexual harassment, including confronting behaviors, comments, or stereotypes that they deem to be unacceptable (Fawcett Society 2018; Weinberg and Nielson 2017). Although early evidence suggests the #metoo movement has been more influential on the beliefs and actions of women, both men and women report that the movement has resulted in a cultural and social shift regarding sexual harassment and assault. This is most noticeable among older men who report increased awareness that certain behaviors or comments once considered socially acceptable now represent present-day definitions of sexual harassment (Fawcett Society 2018; Weinberg and Nielson 2017).

Perceptions of Sexual Harassment

The #metoo movement brought incredible awareness to the number of women and men who have been victimized by sexual harassment or sexual violence. More than this, the #metoo movement demonstrated that society's ability to define the criteria for sexual harassment is based on subjective perceptions of what behaviors constitute sexual harassment (Fawcett Society 2018; Weinberg and Nielson 2017). These perceptions are informed by a variety of sociodemographic factors, including age, race/ethnicity, and socioeconomic status; however, studies consistently identify gender and the type or severity of the harassment as leading factors influencing our perceptions of what constitutes sexual harassment (Fawcett Society 2018; Weinberg and Nielson 2017). To fully recognize the behaviors that constitute sexual harassment, it is imperative to discuss how individual differences affect our perceptions of harassing, and potentially harassing, behaviors.

Gender

The effect of gender on how we perceive sexual harassment has received a great deal of attention. Research consistently finds that gender influences how we identify and define sexual harassment. In this regard, gender serves a dual role in the broader identification and definition of sexual harassment, and the gender of the perpetrator will influence our perceptions of sexual harassment. For example, compared to their male counterparts, women are more likely to identify ambiguously harassing encounters as sexual harassment (Bhattacharya and Stockdale 2016; Cummings and Armenta 2002; Rotundo, Nguyen, and Sackett 2001; Smith and Gayles 2018). This research consistently finds that men's perceptions of sexual harassment tend to be more tolerant compared to women's perceptions (Bhattacharya and Stockdale 2016; Cummings and Armenta 2002; Rotundo et al. 2001; Smith and Gayles 2018). In a study by Dillon, Adair, and Brase (2015), women were also more likely to identify and define social behaviors as sexually harassing, and to rate these situations as more threatening and unwelcoming, compared to their male counterparts, who were more tolerant and accepting of these behaviors and frequently identified these behaviors as innocuous flirtations (Bhattacharya and Stockdale 2016; Cummings and Armenta 2002; Rotundo et al. 2001; Smith and Gayles 2018). The evidence indicates that women are more inclusive in their identification, interpretations, and definitions of sexual harassment compared to men (Bhattacharya and Stockdale 2016; Cummings and Armenta 2002; Rotundo et al. 2001; Smith and Gayles 2018).

Where men and women do present shared reactions toward sexual harassment is in their perception of guilt for a perpetrator. For example, accusations against male perpetrators are more likely to be perceived as accurate and more threatening or severe (Bhattacharya and Stockdale 2016; Cummings and Armenta 2002; Rotundo et al. 2001; Smith and Gayles 2018). Comparatively, accusations against female perpetrators are less likely to be considered factual, and if they are factual, the harassment is perceived as less severe (Bhattacharya and Stockdale 2016; Cummings and Armenta 2002; Rotundo et al. 2001; Smith and Gayles 2018). The actions and comments from female harassers are deemed more forgivable compared to similar actions and comments of their male counterparts (Bhattacharya and Stockdale 2016; Cummings and Armenta 2002; Rotundo et al. 2001; Smith and Gayles 2018). The differentials are dependent on the type of sexual harassment that has occurred, however. When sexual harassment constitutes a hostile work environment, including comments about someone's physical appearance, sexual jokes, or teasing, the actions of female perpetrators are more tolerated versus these same behaviors or comments committed by male perpetrators (Bhattacharya and Stockdale 2016; Cummings and Armenta 2002; Rotundo et al. 2001; Smith and Gayles 2018). When sexual harassment is perceived to be more severe, such as sexual coercion, both female and male perpetrators are evaluated at the same level (Bhattacharya and Stockdale 2016; Cummings and Armenta 2002; Rotundo et al. 2001; Smith and Gayles 2018). These studies suggest that our subjective perceptions of sexual harassment determine how we identify and define situations, behaviors, or comments as harassing, but they may also influence our perceptions of how to respond to and penalize these actions.

Young Adults

In spite of the attention that the #metoo movement has shed on rates of sexual harassment and assault, many students and young professionals still believe that sexual harassment is very rare and that, if it does occur, it will never happen to them (Carstenson 2016; Sipe, Johnson, and Fisher 2009; Thompson and Cracco 2008). Recent studies suggest that young adults and college-aged students possess core values, such as confidence and achievement, and believe the skills and abilities that encompass these attributes will protect them from sexual harassment or assault (Carstenson 2016; Sipe et al. 2009; Thompson and Cracco 2008). Young adults in today's modern society are less likely than older adults to identify and define behaviors or events as sexual harassment (Cummings and Armenta 2002). In mock trials and investigative proceedings, students reported skepticism about the existence of sexual harassment in today's academic and workforce organizations (Carstenson 2016; Sipe et al. 2009; Thompson and Cracco 2008). In similar studies, students had a higher tolerance for sexually harassing behaviors and comments, self-reporting that the hypersexualized atmosphere of college, combined with the omnipresence of social media, creates situations in which students are constantly exposed to potentially sexually harassing behaviors and makes it difficult to distinguish between harmless flirtation and sexual harassment (Cummings and Armenta 2002).

Motivation and Contribution

The influence of sociodemographic characteristics such as age, gender, student and or worker status, along with the recent #metoo movement, has shifted our present understandings of what delimits sexual harassment and assault, but it has not fully bridged the gap on defining and responding to sexually harassing events. To fully understand how movements like #metoo are transforming our perception of sexual harassment, it is necessary that we ascertain how we label situations that are sexually harassing. In particular, recognizing the risks of sexual harassment or assault during their college years, suspicion about the actual rates of sexual harassment, and the sense of invincibility that is so profoundly unique to millennials, an examination of college-aged millennials warrants further examination. The purpose of this study is to explore how students at a regional midwestern university identify potentially sexually harassing scenarios; more importantly, however, this study is an examination of how these perceptions are influenced by whether the scenarios represent the perspective of the victim or the perpetrator. The overarching contribution of this research to the existing literature on perceptions of sexual harassment is a comparative assessment of the responses to victims compared to perpetrators.

SURVEY

Survey Development

We administered two versions (A and B) of our survey (see description of the differences below). Surveys A and B can be found in Appendix 1; line spaces useful for ease of survey reading and response have been removed for brevity.

Both survey versions consist of an introduction and three parts. The versions are identical except for part three. The introduction thanks the students for their potential participation and states the number of questions and estimated completion time. There is also a statement of confidentiality. The first part of the survey (questions 1–6 on both versions) asks the student respondents typical questions about demographics, including age, gender, status in school, and work experience. The intent of questions 1–6 is to determine whether demographic characteristics are related to students' responses to scenarios of possible sexual misconduct.

The surveys did not ask about race/ethnicity. On our campus, about 90 percent of the students are white, and the 10 percent minority student population is split approximately evenly between Hispanic, black, and Asian students. As a result, our sample size does not allow for statistical tests for differences based on race/ethnicity. In addition, although we did not aggregate our completed surveys by classrooms, within a given classroom, minority students might have been concerned that revealing their race/ethnicity would reveal their identities.

The second part of our survey (questions 7–11 on both versions) measures students' attitudes toward and perceptions of sexual misconduct. Throughout this paper and the surveys, we use the term "sexual misconduct" rather than more specific terms such as "sexual harassment" and "sexual assault" that might influence student responses. This broader definition may allow survey respondents more flexibility in identifying bad behavior. Indiana University (home of our student respondents) defines sexual misconduct as "sex or gender-based discrimination, sexual harassment, sexual violence including sexual assault, dating and domestic violence, sexual exploitation, and stalking." In this section, the survey asks the students about their perception of the magnitude of the sexual-misconduct problem and the corresponding societal concern. It also asks why incidents of sexual misconduct might go unreported. Later, we test whether the students' responses to specific potential misconduct incidents are related to these premeasured attitudes and beliefs.

The third part of our survey differs between versions A and B. Each survey presents eight scenarios of possible sexual misconduct. The eight scenarios include interactions between boss and subordinate, work peers, professor and student, student and student, and dating participants. The scenarios were designed to range from subjectively minor or with zero misconduct to more overt situations (some based on recent news events) that are more likely to be judged misconduct. Each scenario is presented twice; the essential fact pattern remains the same, but one version is presented from the viewpoint of the "perpetrator" and the second is presented from the viewpoint of the "victim." All versions of all scenarios were written to be gender-neutral so students can potentially see themselves in the role of the potential victim or the potential perpetrator. Each survey includes four scenarios from each perspective (victim and perpetrator). The scenarios alternate in perspective on both versions.

The two survey documents (A and B) were randomly distributed to students for completion. Students were unaware there were two versions. On Survey A, questions 12, 14, 16, and 18 (relating to scenarios 1, 3, 5, and 7) are presented from the perspective of the "perpetrator," and questions 13, 15, 17, and 19 (scenarios 2, 4, 6, and 8) are presented

from the perspective of the “victim.” On Survey B, the reverse is true: Questions 12, 14, 16, and 18 (scenarios 1, 3, 5, and 7) are presented from the perspective of the “victim,” and questions 13, 15, 17, and 19 (scenarios 2, 4, 6, and 8) are presented from the perspective of the “perpetrator.” From both perspectives, students were asked whether each scenario portrayed sexual misconduct and what level of response they would likely have if they were the victim or what level of response they would expect the victim to have if they were the perpetrator.

Institutional Approval of the Surveys and Procedures for Administration

The survey instrument and process were approved by the Indiana University Human Subjects Committee that approved our survey questionnaire and methodology. Faculty members were recruited from across campus from multiple academic units, and the survey was administered during the last 15–20 minutes of class. The Human Subjects Committee required a standard script to be read to the various classes so every student received the same set of instructions. All student participants were assured anonymity, and students were allowed to leave the classroom if they did not care to participate in the survey.

RESULTS

Descriptive Data

Our sample included 424 completed surveys. Approximately 20 surveys were not fully completed and were not included in the study. Table 1 presents the demographic statistics of our sample. Consistent with the demographics on our campus, women comprised 60 percent of the sample, and the mean age was 23. The respondents were primarily undergraduates (88 percent), and the remainder were master-level graduate students. The respondents studied a variety of disciplines, with 14 percent in Allied Health, 36 percent Business, 28 percent Humanities and Social Sciences, 12 percent Math and Science, and 10 percent other majors. Consistent with our primarily commuter-based campus, 54 percent of the student respondents reported that they lived at home with their parents. In terms of work experience, 29 percent reported that they had worked full-time earning at least \$35,000 per year. This potentially surprisingly high percentage likely reflects that (1) most of the graduate students in the sample were MBA students who were working full time, (2) some of our undergraduate students were of nontraditional age and had work history, and (3) some of our traditional-aged undergraduate students also worked full time.

Table 1. Sample Descriptive Demographic Statistics (*n* = 424)

<i>Age</i>	
Mean	23
Minimum	18
Maximum	60
<i>Gender</i>	
Men	40%
Women	60%
<i>Living Arrangement</i>	
Live with parents	54%
Live with roommates	13%
Live alone	9%
Live with significant other/child	24%
<i>Work Status</i>	
Have worked full time (\$35,000+)	29%
Have not worked full time	71%
<i>Class Status</i>	
Undergraduate	88%
Graduate	12%
<i>Area of Study</i>	
Allied Health	14%
Business	36%
Education	2%
Humanities/Social Sciences	28%
Math/Sciences	12%
Nursing	5%
Undecided	3%

Student Respondents' Premeasured Attitudes and Beliefs Regarding Sexual Misconduct

Table 2 summarizes the survey results relating to attitudes and perceptions of sexual misconduct. When students were asked about sexual misconduct in the United States, 71 percent of respondents indicated it was a “very serious” problem, 26 percent said it was a “somewhat serious” problem, and 3 percent said it was “not a serious” problem. With regard to society’s sensitivity to the problem, 48 percent responded “not sensitive enough,” 36 percent responded “about right,” and 16 percent responded “too sensitive.”

Table 2. Sample Attitudes Regarding Sexual Misconduct (n = 424)

<i>How Serious Is Sexual Misconduct in United States</i>	
Very Serious	71%
Somewhat Serious	26%
Not Serious	3%
<i>Society's Sensitivity to Sexual Misconduct Problem</i>	
Not Sensitive Enough	48%
About Right	36%
Too Sensitive	16%
<i>Estimated Percentage of Sexual-Harassment Victims</i>	
Women	59.3%
Men	33.8%
<i>Why No Report of Sexual Misconduct</i>	
Fear about Reputation	17%
Lack of Confidence in the System	18%
Fear of Not Being Believed	31%
Fear of Retaliation by the Offender	21%
Not Sure if It Qualifies as Sexual Misconduct	15%

The student respondents estimated that 59 percent of women and 34 percent of men have been subjected to sexual harassment. An online study by the not-for-profit Stop Street Harassment found that 81 percent of women and 43 percent of men report having been sexually harassed (Chatterjee 2018). That survey features a large national sample of men and women respondents above age 18.

When students were asked to select the most important reason for possibly not reporting sexual misconduct, their answers were split relatively evenly. Fear about reputation garnered 17 percent of the votes, lack of confidence in the system received 18 percent, fear of not being believed was most popular at 31 percent, fear of retaliation received 21 percent, and not sure if it qualifies as sexual harassment had 15 percent. The importance of multiple concerns may indicate that underreporting of sexual harassment is likely a complex issue. More than half of the student respondents indicated they might not report possible sexual misconduct because of uncertainty about whether an event even qualifies as misconduct or fear that their complaint wouldn't be believed. The rest of the respondents were concerned about the ramifications after an event had been identified. Concerns about retaliation from the perpetrator or an organization, fear of loss of reputation, and general concern that the "system" won't work make reporting questionable even if the victim is sure that the action is misconduct and can be proved; thus, the study of which scenarios students believe are sexual misconduct and the likely responses (each measured from the perspectives of victims and perpetrators) is an important preliminary step in understanding how society might agree on appropriate behavior and on appropriate responses to breaches of appropriate behavior.

Mean Tests of Perceptions and Reactions to Nine Scenarios Based on Perspective

One difficulty in working to reduce sexual misconduct is “knowing it when you see it”—that is, identifying it when it might be happening. The perception of whether an action is sexual misconduct is potentially influenced by age, gender, work and/or school experience, and preconceived ideas about the prevalence and importance of sexual misconduct. In addition, the perception of whether an action is inappropriate might depend on the lens that the action is viewed through. For example, a potential victim might view an action as threatening or uncomfortable, while a potential perpetrator might act without any awareness of the victim’s concerns. Optimistically, this might be because the potential perpetrator has no negative intentions. Alternatively, the perpetrator may have negative intentions but, because of lack of social awareness, believe his or her behavior is normal and acceptable, justified, or simply humorous.

In our surveys, students read eight scenarios of potential misconduct. Four scenarios were presented from the perspective of the potential victim, and four were presented from the perspective of the potential perpetrator. With two different surveys, we ultimately had 220 responses to each scenario from the victim perspective and 204 responses to each scenario from the perpetrator perspective.

After reading each scenario, students were asked two questions. First, students were asked “Is this sexual misconduct?” Then, students reading a scenario from the victim perspective were asked to choose their likely response (from four reactions ranging from almost no response, to severe responses with significant ramifications), and students reading a scenario from the perpetrator perspective were asked to predict the likely response by the potential victim in the scenario (from the same four potential reactions). The study was designed to test whether the identification of misconduct and/or the response to the possible misconduct differs depending on the perspective. If “perpetrators” are less likely to think they are doing anything wrong and “victims” are more likely to think they have been treated inappropriately, then “misconduct” is likely to persist until there is greater consensus about what behavior is inappropriate.

The top half of Table 3 shows the differences in mean responses based on perspective. In seven of the eight scenarios, the “victims” were significantly more likely to say that yes, it was sexual misconduct. In the other case (#6, relating to viewing pornography at work), the “perpetrators” were significantly more likely to say that yes, it was sexual misconduct. This result may be because pornography is sometimes viewed as a victimless crime and in our sample, the victim was a boss who may not want to fire the perpetrator because the boss was not personally victimized. In addition, students who viewed the scenario as a perpetrator were likely to know that viewing pornography at work is a clear mistake with no gray area and that some sort of ramification should be expected.

Table 3. Mean Tests Based on Perspective of Perceptions and Reactions to Nine Scenarios

	Scenario							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Is it misconduct? (yes)								
“Victim” (n = 220)	78%	93%	60%	74%	34%	69%	95%	97%
“Perpetrator” (n = 204)	59%	63%	44%	37%	12%	79%	82%	88%
t-value for difference (significance)	4.24 (.000)	7.88 (.000)	3.31 (.001)	8.19 (.000)	5.54 (.000)	-2.34 (-.020)	4.27 (.000)	3.46 (.001)
Magnitude of response (1-4, with 4 most severe)								
“Victim” (n = 220)	2.11	2.40	2.12	2.11	2.07	2.34	2.54	3.42
“Perpetrator” (n = 204)	1.66	2.00	1.92	2.16	1.67	2.51	2.15	2.76
t-value for difference (significance)	4.70 (.000)	5.26 (.000)	2.37 (.018)	0.60 (.547)	5.73 (.000)	-1.83 (.068)	4.56 (.000)	7.19 (.000)

Scenarios: 1=Possible Inappropriate Professor Attention; 2=Possible Inappropriate Coworker Comments; 3=Possible Inappropriate Mentor Attention; 4=Possible Inappropriate Date Behavior; 5=Possible Inappropriate Romantic Interest; 6=Possible Inappropriate Computer Use at Work; 7=Possible Inappropriate Physical Contact from Boss at Work; 8=Possible Inappropriate After-Hours Behavior from Boss

See survey in Appendix 1 for complete scenarios.

In the bottom half of Table 3, we look at mean responses to the scenarios. In six of the eight scenarios, the responses are harsher from the “victim” perspective. In one scenario (#6, depicting viewing pornography at work), respondents from the “perpetrator” perspective advocated a harsher response. Perhaps most interesting, in scenario 4, with a possible date-rape scenario, there was no difference in response based on perspective despite the fact that respondents from a “victim” perspective were twice as likely to classify the encounter as sexual misconduct. This suggests that sexual misconduct in a date setting might be less reported than misconduct in an organizational setting.

Logistic Tests to Explain Student Perceptions of Sexual-Misconduct Scenarios

Table 4 shows LOGIT regressions explaining the yes/no decision relating to the question “Is it sexual misconduct?” for each of the eight scenarios. The binary nature of the dependent variable (*Misconduct*) calls for the LOGIT specification of the regression. The

independent variables include age, gender, school status (undergraduate or graduate student), perception of the magnitude of the societal sexual-misconduct problem, and perspective (victim/perpetrator) of the survey participant. All eight regressions are significant, and simulated adjusted R^2 values range from 4 percent to 24 percent (using the Nagelkerke approximation).

$$\text{Misconduct} = a + B_1\text{Age}_i + B_2\text{Gender}_i + B_3\text{Graduate}_i + B_4\text{Perception}_i + B_5\text{Perspective}_i + e$$

Table 4. LOGIT Regressions Explaining Perception of Each Scenario (“Is it sexual misconduct?”)

	Scenario							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Constant	-2.956 (.001)	1.229 (.000)	-2.378 (.006)	2.292 (.010)	-3.216 (.003)	-1.393 (.179)	-1.719 (.199)	6.060 (.000)
Age	-.008 (.653)	.083 (.016)	.029 (.104)	-.023 (.206)	-.019 (.402)	.046 (.060)	.017 (.562)	-.036 (.135)
Gender	-.469 (.036)	-.093 (.720)	-.276 (.174)	-.498 (.022)	.039 (.871)	-.368 (.105)	-.073 (.819)	.066 (.861)
Graduate	-.321 (.379)	-.965 (.036)	-.349 (.313)	-.220 (.544)	-.787 (.110)	-.633 (.109)	-.410 (.433)	.609 (.359)
Perception	.896 (.000)	.602 (.009)	.213 (.265)	.341 (.097)	-.137 (.540)	.064 (.765)	.388 (.171)	.016 (.963)
Perspective	.991 (.000)	2.014 (.000)	.668 (.001)	1.608 (.000)	1.315 (.000)	-.541 (.016)	1.470 (.000)	1.385 (.002)
Observations	424	424	424	424	424	424	424	424
Chi-square (significance)	44.288 (.000)	73.327 (.000)	16.875 (.005)	70.900 (.000)	34.909 (.000)	12.745 (.026)	21.610 (.001)	14.277 (.014)
Cox & Snell R^2	.099	.159	.039	.154	.079	.030	.050	.033
Nagelkerke R^2	.139	.242	.052	.206	.119	.043	.098	.077

Notes: Age=age of the survey respondent; Gender=1 if male, 0 if female; Perception=How serious is the sexual misconduct problem in the U.S.? (3 = very serious, 2 = somewhat serious, 1 = not serious); Perspective=1 if from the viewpoint of the “victim”, 0 if from the viewpoint of the “perpetrator”; School Status=1 if graduate, 0 if undergraduate.

p -values from Wald values are shown in parentheses.

Scenarios: 1=Possible Inappropriate Professor Attention; 2=Possible Inappropriate Coworker Comments; 3=Possible Inappropriate Mentor Attention; 4=Possible Inappropriate Date Behavior; 5=Possible Inappropriate Romantic Interest; 6=Possible Inappropriate Computer Use at Work; 7=Possible Inappropriate Physical Contact from Boss at Work; 8=Possible Inappropriate After-Hours Behavior from Boss.

See survey in Appendix 1 for complete scenarios.

As shown in Table 4, Age is significant in two of the eight scenarios (#2 and #6). Those scenarios present possible misconduct at work, and in both cases, older

respondents were more likely to label the activity as misconduct. *Gender* is significant in two scenarios (#1 and #4), with men less likely to see the scenario as misconduct. In scenario 1, men were less likely to identify infatuation of a faculty member toward a student as misconduct, and in scenario 4, men were less likely to call a date situation misconduct.

Graduate was defined as a dummy variable equal to 1 if a graduate student and 0 if an undergraduate. This variable was generally not significant; however, the coefficient for seven of the eight scenarios is negative, and in scenario 2, relating to suggestive comments by a coworker, graduates were less likely to call that action sexual misconduct. In results not reported in tables, when living arrangement and work experience are included in the regression, those variables are generally not significant. Graduate status, living arrangement, and work experience are all positively correlated with age and each other. Graduate status was selected for the final reported results because it is likely to be a good proxy for living arrangement and work status, and the positive correlation with age was only about 30 percent. Area of study was not related to responses in any specification (results not shown).

The *Perception* variable is designed to measure whether respondents' preconceptions of sexual misconduct as a serious societal problem are related to whether a scenario is perceived to be sexual misconduct. In part two of the survey, respondents were asked "How serious do you think sexual misconduct is in the United States?" (with "very serious" = 3, "somewhat serious" = 2, and "not serious" = 1). In scenarios 1, 2, and 4, the perception of the magnitude of the sexual-misconduct problem in the United States is positively related to thinking that a scenario is misconduct.

Perspective is a dummy variable defined as 1 if a scenario is read from the viewpoint of the "victim" or 0 if from the viewpoint of the "perpetrator." Consistent with our means analysis, *perspective* is significant in seven of eight cases, with the victim more likely to classify an event as sexual misconduct. In scenario 6, portraying the use of company resources to view explicit sexual images on the internet, the survey respondents who read from the "victim" perspective were less likely to say it was misconduct.

OLS Regressions Explaining the Magnitude of Student Responses to Sexual Misconduct Scenarios

Table 5 presents OLS regressions of the responses to the scenarios (ranging from 1–4, with 4 most severe).

$$Response = \alpha + B_1 Age_i + B_2 Gender_i + B_3 Graduate_i + B_4 Sensitive_i + B_5 Perspective_i + e$$

Age is generally not related to the severity of the responses anticipated following the potential misconduct scenarios. *Gender* is marginally related to responses, with men predicting a more severe response in scenarios 1 and 2 and a less severe response to scenario 4, relating to possible misconduct in a date. *Graduate* is not significant.

Table 5. Ordinary Least Squares Regressions Explaining the Magnitude of Responses to Each of the Scenarios

	Scenario							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Constant	.426 (1.22)	2.297 (8.30)***	1.278 (4.17)***	2.131 (7.60)***	.894 (3.46)***	1.925 (5.46)***	1.745 (5.57)***	3.803 (11.41)***
Age	.014 (1.71)*	.002 (0.32)	.009 (1.33)	-.004 (-0.63)	.007 (1.17)	.000 (0.03)	-.007 (-0.99)	-.003 (-0.37)
Gender	.189 (1.87)*	.150 (1.88)*	.018 (0.21)	-.146 (-1.81)*	.095 (1.27)	-.150 (-1.48)	.108 (1.19)	.064 (0.67)
School Status	-.022 (0.13)	.016 (-0.12)	-.053 (0.37)	-.018 (0.14)	-.081 (0.66)	-.111 (0.66)	.044 (-0.29)	-.052 (0.33)
Perception	.171 (2.50)**	.187 (3.45)***	.079 (1.32)	.033 (0.61)	.046 (0.91)	.089 (1.30)	.080 (1.31)	.120 (1.84)*
Perspective	.434 (4.54)***	.419 (5.52)***	.191 (2.28)**	-.043 (-0.55)	.398 (5.62)***	-.167 (-1.73)*	.380 (4.42)***	.665 (7.28)***
F Value	6.59***	8.27***	1.81	1.10	7.14***	1.86*	4.84***	11.12***
Adjusted R ²	.062	.079	.009	.001	.068	.010	.043	.107
Observations	424	424	424	424	424	424	424	424

Notes: Age=age of the survey respondent; Gender=1 if male, 0 if female; Perception=How serious is the sexual misconduct problem in the U.S.? (3 = very serious, 2 = somewhat serious, 1 = not serious); Perspective=1 if from the viewpoint of the “victim”, 0 if from the viewpoint of the “perpetrator”; School Status=1 if graduate, 0 if undergraduate.

Unstandardized coefficients with *t*-values are shown in parentheses.

* significant at .10 ** significant at .05 *** significant at .01

Scenarios: 1=Possible Inappropriate Professor Attention; 2=Possible Inappropriate Coworker Comments; 3=Possible Inappropriate Mentor Attention; 4=Possible Inappropriate Date Behavior; 5=Possible Inappropriate Romantic Interest; 6=Possible Inappropriate Computer Use at Work; 7=Possible Inappropriate Physical Contact from Boss at Work; 8=Possible Inappropriate After-Hours Behavior from Boss.

See survey in Appendix 1 for complete scenarios.

In this regression, rather than the *Perception* variable being defined as the respondents’ preconceived level of the sexual-misconduct problem, it is defined as the respondents’ preconceived level of how appropriately society responds to potential sexual misconduct. In part two of the survey, respondents were asked “Are people too sensitive to sexual misconduct, or not sensitive enough?” (with 3 = not sensitive enough, 2 = about right, and 1 = too sensitive.) In scenarios 1, 2, and 4, the perception of the magnitude of the sexual-misconduct problem in the United States is positively related to thinking that a scenario is misconduct. We use the “How sensitive are we to sexual misconduct?” responses as a variable to represent the respondents’ preconceptions about how appropriately society responds to potential sexual harassment. Perception of whether society is not sensitive enough to sexual misconduct was significant in scenarios 1, 2, and 8.

The *Perspective* variable was again significant in seven of the eight cases. Viewing a scenario from the perspective of the victim is related to a stronger response to the potential sexual misconduct. The exception is scenario 6, in which the “victim” perspective is less severe. Recall that scenario 6 related to viewing internet pornography on a company computer. The “victim” in this case is the employee’s boss. Consistent with our means test results, in scenario 4, depicting possible lack of consent in a dating scenario, there was no difference in predicted responses to the action despite the fact that victims are significantly more likely than perpetrators to call this scenario sexual misconduct.

The adjusted R^2 s in Table 5 are relatively low, but not necessarily unusual in cross-sectional survey data, ranging from 11 percent to less than 1 percent (the regression relating to scenario 4 was not significant). The impact of perspective on the predicted responses to potential sexual harassment is thus only part of the story.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Recent events have demonstrated a divergent understanding of sexual harassment and other forms of sexual misconduct. Although the sociocultural standards regarding sexual misconduct have changed over time, including improved social and workplace standards and protections, not everyone views these events through the same lens. The difference in the view may depend on whether activities are viewed from the lens of a victim or a perpetrator. If perpetrators are less likely to think they are doing anything wrong and victims are more likely to think they have been treated inappropriately, then “misconduct” is likely to persist until there is greater consensus about what behavior is inappropriate.

We find that perspective matters, as do reported preconceived attitudes toward sexual misconduct. We also find preliminary evidence that the impact of perspective and the severity of the response may depend on whether the misconduct occurs in an organizational setting, in a date setting, or without a distinct victim.

In seven of eight scenarios, students who read from the perspective of the victim were significantly more likely to label activities as sexual misconduct. In the other scenario (#6), relating to viewing explicit images on a company computer, students who read from the “victim’s” perspective (the employee’s boss who needs to clean up the problem) were less likely to call it sexual misconduct. Thus, it is possible that activities without a clear or nearby victim are more likely to be considered a “rules problem” more than sexual misconduct.

The projected harshness of responses to the scenarios also differed significantly based on perspective; however, in scenario 4, relating to potential lack of consent in a date, victims were three times more likely to deem the behavior as sexual misconduct, though their suggested response was statistically no different from the perpetrator’s projection of the victim’s response. This may predict that sexual misconduct in a dating/romantic setting may be less likely to be reported compared to misconduct within an organization.

We also find that the perception of the magnitude of the sexual misconduct problem in the United States is positively related to thinking that a scenario is misconduct. Similarly, we find that students who think that society is not sensitive enough to sexual misconduct are more likely to prescribe harsher responses to potential sexual misconduct. This is another reason that people may have differing views on whether a specific action should be classified as sexual misconduct.

We did not find pervasive differences in responses based on gender or age; however, in scenarios of potential misconduct at work, older respondents are more likely to see certain behaviors as sexual misconduct. Men are less likely to identify scenarios relating to infatuation and dating behavior as misconduct. Specifically, in the potential-lack-of-consent scenario, men were less likely to call it sexual misconduct and predicted less strong responses to the event compared to women.

This research provides preliminary insight into why sexual misconduct seems to persist even as society theoretically becomes more enlightened regarding appropriate behavior. Future research into the difference in responses to misconduct in organizations versus dating/romantic settings seems promising. Of course, the typical cautions relating to this survey-based research apply. Our sample is limited to (mostly) traditional-age college students in a relatively small, nonurban, demographically homogenous, regional public university. The results may not extend to the greater population.

REFERENCES

- Bhattacharya, Gargi, and Margaret S. Stockdale. 2016. "Perceptions of Sexual Harassment by Evidence Quality, Perceiver Gender, Feminism, and Right-Wing Authoritarianism: Debunking Popular Myths." *Law and Human Behavior* 40(5):594–609.
- Blackstone, Amy, Jason Houle, and Christopher Uggen. 2014. "I Didn't Recognize It as a Bad Experience until I Was Much Older": Age, Experience and Workers' Perceptions of Sexual Harassment." *Sociological Spectrum* 34(4):314–37.
- Bourgeois, Martin J., and James Perkins, J. 2003. "A Test of Evolutionary and Sociocultural Explanations of Reactions to Sexual Harassment." *Sex Roles* 49(7):343–51.
- Brownmiller, Susan. 1999. *In Our Time: Memoir of a Revolution*. New York: Dell.
- Bursik, Krisanne, and Julia Geftner. 2011. "Still Stable After All These Years: Perceptions of Sexual Harassment in Academic Contexts." *Journal of Social Psychology* 151(3):331–49.
- Carstensen, Gunilla. 2016. "Sexual Harassment Reconsidered: The Forgotten Grey Zone." *NORA: Nordic Journal of Women's Studies* 24(4):267–280.
- Chatterjee, Rihit. 2018. "A New Survey Finds 81 Percent of Women Have Experienced Sexual Harassment." NPR, February 21. Retrieved (<https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2018/02/21/587671849/a-new-survey-finds-eighty-percent-of-women-have-experienced-sexual-harassment>).
- Cummings, Kimberly M., and Madeline Armenta. 2002. "Penalties for Peer Sexual Harassment in an Academic Context: The Influence of Harasser Gender, Participant

- Gender, Severity of Harassment, and the Presence of Bystanders.” *Sex Roles* 47(5):273–80.
- Dillon, Haley M., Lora E. Adair, and Gary L. Brase. 2015. “A Threatening Exchange: Gender and Life History Strategy Predict Perceptions and Reasoning about Sexual Harassment.” *Personality and Individual Differences* 72:195–99.
- Fawcett Society. 2018. “#METOO One Year On—What’s Changed?” Retrieved March 12, 2019 (<https://www.fawcettsociety.org.uk/metoo-one-year>).
- Kimble, Katherine, Katlyn F. Farnum, Richard L. Weiner, Jill Allen, Gwenith D. Nuss, and Sarah J. Gervais. 2016. “Differences in the Eyes of the Beholders: The Roles of Subjective and Objective Judgements in Sexual Harassment Claims.” *Law and Human Behavior* 40(3):319–336.
- Lonsway, Kimberly A., Lilia M. Cortina, and Vicki J. Magley. 2008. “Sexual Harassment Mythology: Definition, Conceptualization, and Measurement.” *Sex Roles* 58(9–10):599–615.
- Page, Thomas, E., Afroditi Pina, and Roger Giner-Sorolla. 2016. “‘It Was Only Harmless Banter!’ The Development and Preliminary Validation of the Moral Disengagement in Sexual Harassment Scale.” *Aggressive Behavior* 42(3):254–73.
- Rotundo, Maria, Dung-Hanh Nguyen, and Paul R. Sackett. 2001. “A Meta-Analytic Review of Gender Differences in Perceptions of Sexual Harassment.” *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86(5):914–22.
- Sipe, Stephanie R., C. Douglas Johnson, and Donna K. Fisher. 2009. “University Students’ Perceptions of Sexual Harassment in the Workplace: A View through Rose-Colored Lenses.” *Equal Opportunities International* 28(4):336–50.
- Smith, Kathleen N., and Joy Gaston Gayles. 2018. “‘Girl Power’: Gendered Academic and Workplace Experiences of College Women in Engineering.” *Social Sciences* 7(1):11.
- Thompson, Jr., Edward H., and Elizabeth J. Cracco. 2008. “Sexual Aggression in Bars: What College Men Can Normalize.” *The Journal of Men’s Studies* 16(1):82–96.
- U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. 2013. “Sexual Harassment.” Retrieved March 12, 2019 (http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/types/sexual_harassment.cfm).
- Weinberg, Jill D., and Laura Beth Nielson. 2017. “What Is Sexual Harassment: An Empirical Study of Perceptions of Ordinary People and Judges.” *Saint Louis University Public Law Review* 36(1):39–58.

APPENDIX 1. SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

Two survey documents were randomly distributed to students for completion. Students were unaware there were two versions. The introduction and questions 1–11 were identical on both surveys. After that, on Survey A, questions 12, 14, 16, and 18 (scenarios 1, 3, 5, and 7) are written from the perspective of the “perpetrator” and questions 13, 15, 17, and 19 (scenarios 2, 4, 6, and 8) are written from the perspective of the “victim.” On survey B, the reverse is true: Questions 12, 14, 16, and 18 (scenarios 1, 3, 5, and 7) are written from the perspective of the “victim,” and questions 13, 15, 17, and 19 (scenarios 2, 4, 6, and 8) are written from the perspective of the “perpetrator.”

Common to SURVEYS A and B

(For brevity, line spaces useful for ease of reading and response have been removed.)

INTRODUCTION

We appreciate you completing this questionnaire to help us in a research project used to develop a better understanding of how students perceive and react to sexual harassment.

Number of Questions: 19

Estimated Time: 15 – 20 minutes

CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT

You are invited to participate in this research study (survey) about students' interpretations and hypothetical responses to potential sexual misconduct. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to take the short survey below. Your participation in this research study is voluntary; you are under no obligation to participate. You have the right to withdraw at any time and there will be no penalties for non-participation. Your name is not asked in the survey, so your identity cannot be revealed.

THIS SET OF QUESTIONS ASKS ABOUT YOUR PERSONAL DEMOGRAPHICS

Please write your answer or select the best response to each question.

1. What is your age?
2. What is your gender?
 1. Male
 2. Female
3. What is your current living arrangement? (circle just one answer)
 1. Live with parents
 2. Live with roommates
 3. Live by yourself
 4. Live with significant other/child
4. What is your student class status?
 1. Undergraduate Student
 2. Graduate Student
5. Have you ever worked full-time (35+ hours a week) in a job that paid more than \$15/hour (\$30,000/year)?
 1. Yes
 2. No
6. What is your primary area of study? (circle just one answer)
 1. Allied Health
 2. Business
 3. Education
 4. Humanities and/or Social Sciences

5. Math and/or Sciences
6. Nursing
7. Undecided

THIS SET OF QUESTIONS ASKS YOUR GENERAL OPINION ABOUT SEXUAL MISCONDUCT IN THE UNITED STATES.

7. How serious do you think sexual misconduct is in the United States? (circle just one answer)
 1. Very serious
 2. Somewhat serious
 3. Not serious
8. Do you think that people are too sensitive or not sensitive enough to the problem of sexual misconduct? (circle just one answer)
 1. Too sensitive
 2. About right
 3. Not sensitive enough
9. Please write the percent of women in the U.S. that you estimate have been sexually harassed?
10. Please write the percent of men in the U.S. that you estimate have been sexually harassed?
11. What do you think is the most important reason why people do not report sexual misconduct? (circle just one answer)
 1. Fear about reputation
 2. Lack of confidence in the system
 3. Fear of not being believed
 4. Fear of retaliation by the offender
 5. Not sure if it qualifies as sexual misconduct

SURVEY A QUESTIONS 12–19

THIS SET OF QUESTIONS ASKS FOR YOUR RESPONSES TO HYPOTHETICAL SITUATIONS.

12. (Scenario #1) You are a professor with a very attractive student who has proved to be quite a distraction for you. Despite your best efforts, you find yourself staring, and not just at their face. You don't have any bad intentions, but you have failed to look the student in the eye and have "checked them out" more frequently than you would like to admit (in your office, the classroom, and maybe even the hallway).
 - A. Is this sexual misconduct?
 1. Yes
 2. No
 - B. Which one of the following responses would you expect if the student is noticing your staring?

1. No formal complaint although they might tell a few friends.
 2. They would tell you that you are making them uncomfortable during your interactions and the staring must stop.
 3. They would inform your boss (the Dean) or another professor or another campus official about the interactions so that you must take some sort of training and so that there is a formal record of these interactions in your personnel file.
 4. Inform your Dean or another professor or campus official about the interactions so that action can be taken to potentially fire you.
13. (Scenario #2) Your coworker has twenty years at the company and is considered a “superstar employee”. Now, for reasons that are unclear, this coworker (who is not your boss) is regularly making lewd jokes and suggestive comments about your appearance.
- A. Is this sexual misconduct?
1. Yes
 2. No
- B. Which one of the following best reflects how you would likely respond to this situation?
1. No formal complaint although you might tell a few friends or coworkers.
 2. Risk hard feelings and potential retaliation and tell the coworker to “cool it” or deal with the potential reaction of Human Resources.
 3. Contact your boss or Human Resources and ask that the behavior be entered into the coworker’s personnel file. Also insist that the coworker be reassigned away from you and be given appropriate training.
 4. Inform your boss or Human Resources of the behavior so that action can be taken to potentially fire the coworker.
14. (Scenario #3) One of your favorite perks as an upper-level manager has been serving as a mentor to younger but high performing managers. Recently, your favorite mentee got a significant promotion and raise based in part on your recommendation. You have been single for some time and you have never considered becoming romantically involved with a subordinate or someone you are mentoring. However, this person is amazing, mature, and they feel like your soulmate. You are not sure if they feel the same way, but you have talked about how happy you were to help with their promotion. You have started hinting about a possible “relationship” and how great the two of you would be “together” including future bonuses, promotions, and other benefits.
- A. Is this sexual misconduct?
1. Yes
 2. No
- B. Which one of the following responses would you expect if your mentee does not share your hope for a romantic relationship?
1. No formal complaint although they might tell a few friends or coworkers.
 2. Risk embarrassing, alienating, or angering you and telling you that the behavior is unprofessional, and they only want a business relationship.

3. Inform your boss or their boss or Human Resources about the behavior and ask that your mentor/mentee relationship be ended, and request that you be kept away from them.
 4. Inform your boss or Human Resources about the behavior so that action can be taken to potentially fire you.
15. (Scenario #4) Last night you went on a first date with a person you already knew from your circle of friends. As the night progressed a sexual encounter occurred. You were hesitant, but your date kept pressuring you and it happened. Now, the morning after, you regret what happened and feel you were pressured into the behavior and didn't give 100% consent.
- A. Is this sexual misconduct?
1. Yes
 2. No
- B. Which one of the following best reflects how you would likely respond to this situation?
1. You wouldn't tell anyone, and you wouldn't date that person again.
 2. You would confront your date and tell them how you feel and that there would be no further interaction between the two of you.
 3. You would not talk again with your date and you would tell people in your circle of friends how they behaved.
 4. You would pursue legal/police action against your date.
16. (Scenario #5) Last semester you met a classmate in one of your classes that you like a lot. You had friendly conversations and there seemed to be some chance that you might be able to ask them out. The semester ended before you had a chance to ask for the date. This semester the student is not in any of your classes. Fortunately, they are taking a class at the same time as you, in a nearby classroom. You don't want to lose your momentum in getting to know this person, so you try to "run into them" in the hallway as frequently as possible after class. You also know that both of you typically leave campus after that class period and you try to park near their car so there is an opportunity to interact with them.
- A. Is this sexual misconduct?
1. Yes
 2. No
- B. Which one of the following responses would you expect if this classmate is not interested in a relationship and they are becoming concerned about your "coincidental" encounters?
1. They would just be friendly and treat you like any other student.
 2. They would tell you that your presence is making them uncomfortable and a relationship isn't going to happen.
 3. They would inform a campus official about your interactions, so you can be instructed not to follow them around.
 4. They would inform a campus official about your interactions, so the school can begin the process of expelling you from school.

17. (Scenario #6) Your subordinate, who is an excellent worker, has a private office with a company assigned computer. Your IT staff informs you that the company's network management software has detected your subordinate's computer has been used to visit sexually explicit web sites. Your subordinate admits that he has visited these sites during personal time but not during formal work hours.
- A. Is this sexual misconduct?
1. Yes
 2. No
- B. Which one of the following best reflects how you would likely respond to this situation?
1. Because your subordinate is a good worker, and no one was harmed by these actions, you send an email to all of your employees reminding them not to visit inappropriate web sites and that IT is watching us.
 2. Because your subordinate is a good worker, and no one was harmed by these actions, you tell your worker to stop the behavior or the IT Department might initiate a dismissal request.
 3. Work with Human Resources and IT to develop a plan for discipline and prevention going forward.
 4. Work with Human Resources and IT to initiate termination of your employee.
18. (Scenario #7) As president of your company, you are proud of its success and of its employees. Within the company you are known as a friend of the workers. You love to give "full" hug greetings. You have been advised to tone down the touching as some employees are uncomfortable with them. Recently, as you greeted one of your younger employees, your hug accidentally included grabbing on to their lower back and perhaps buttock. The employee seemed a little shocked and perhaps stunned by your enthusiastic hug.
- A. Is this sexual misconduct?
1. Yes
 2. No
- B. Which one of the following responses would you expect if the employee did not appreciate the hug and the accidental grabbing of their lower back and perhaps buttock?
1. No formal complaint although they might tell a few friends or coworkers.
 2. Directly tell you not to touch them again.
 3. They will contact Human Resources, the board of directors, or media members to try to embarrass you and stop the uncomfortable touching.
 4. They will contact Human Resources, or the board of directors, or media members to try to force your dismissal/resignation.
19. (Scenario #8) You're recently hired to your dream job (high salary, work you enjoy, possibility for further advancement and raises) by a charismatic powerful owner of a tech start-up firm. Before you were hired, your new boss/owner explained you would have to work long and unpredictable hours. A month into your job you receive a call late on a Friday night to come to your boss's penthouse apartment to discuss an exciting new business idea. You are told to let yourself in. As you enter the apartment you soon hear your boss's voice

behind you. Your boss is wearing only a bath towel and looks like they just came out of the shower. They are blocking the door and say “it’s about time we have some fun together”. You escape around them and out the door but not before the towel is dropped and they lunged to grab you as you ran by.

A. Is this sexual misconduct?

1. Yes
2. No

B. Which one of the following best reflects how you would likely respond to this situation?

1. Since this is the ultimate job, you do nothing and hope that it was a one-time incident.
2. You want to keep your job, and wait until Monday to talk to your boss to explain that you meant no disrespect Friday night but aren’t interested in that kind of “fun” and it can’t happen again.
3. Even though this is the ultimate job, this incident disturbed you enough to resign. You don’t tell anybody about the incident.
4. You resign and try to help future employees by publicizing (through the media if necessary) the type of behavior your boss expects from employees.

SURVEY B QUESTIONS 12–19

THIS SET OF QUESTIONS ASKS FOR YOUR RESPONSES TO HYPOTHETICAL SITUATIONS.

12. (Scenario #1) You visit one of your professors during office hours and the professor doesn’t look you in the eye but instead seems to be staring at your body. In future conversations (during class, after class, and in hallways) the same pattern continues; your teacher seems to be more interested in staring at your body than looking you in the eye.

A. Is this sexual misconduct?

1. Yes
2. No

B. Which one of the following best reflects how you would likely respond to this situation?

1. No formal complaint although you might tell a few friends.
2. Risk embarrassing, alienating, or angering your professor and tell them that they are making you uncomfortable during your interactions.
3. Inform the Dean (the professor’s boss) or another professor or another campus official about the interactions so that the professor must take some sort of training and so that there is a formal record of these interactions in the professor’s personnel file.
4. Inform the Dean or another professor or campus official about the interactions so that action can be taken to potentially file the professor.

13. (Scenario #2) You are a “superstar” with twenty years of experience at the company. You have always been a rule follower at work but lately you have felt like having a little more fun and not being so rule oriented. A coworker (who you did not notice much over the last few years) now has a cubical near yours. This coworker has been on your mind more and you

have been talking with them and joking around, including making some lewd jokes and a few suggestive comments about their appearance.

A. Is this sexual misconduct?

1. Yes
2. No

B. Which one of the following responses would you expect from your shocked coworker?

1. No formal complaint although they might tell a few friends or co-workers.
2. They would tell you to “cool it” or deal with the potential reaction of Human Resources.
3. They would contact your boss or Human Resources and ask that the behavior be entered into your personnel file. They would also insist that you be reassigned and given appropriate training.
4. Inform your boss or Human Resources of your behavior so that action can be taken to potentially fire you.

14. (Scenario #3) A mentor at work has always seemed to like you and your work. In fact, recently the mentor helped you get a promotion and a significant raise. Now the mentor has been talking about how much they like you and how happy they were to help you get your promotion. They also have started hinting about a possible “relationship” and how great the two of you would be “together” including future bonuses, promotions, and other benefits.

A. Is this sexual misconduct?

1. Yes
2. No

B. Which one of the following best reflects how you would likely respond to this situation?

1. No formal complaint although you might tell a few friends or coworkers.
2. Risk embarrassing, alienating, or angering your mentor and tell them that the behavior is unprofessional, and you only want a business relationship.
3. Inform your boss or your mentor’s boss or Human Resources about the behavior and ask that your mentor/mentee relationship be ended, and request that the mentor be kept away from you.
4. Inform your boss or Human Resources about the behavior so that action can be taken to potentially fire the coworker.

15. (Scenario #4) Last night you went on a first date with a person you already knew from your circle of friends. As the night progressed a sexual encounter occurred. You were very attracted to your date and, as the night progressed, and after a few drinks, and some persuasion, a sexual encounter occurred. Now, the morning after, you are happy the date went so well but you sense your date doesn’t share your feelings.

A. Is this sexual misconduct?

1. Yes
2. No

B. Which one of the following responses would you expect if your date feels like you took advantage of them?

1. They wouldn't tell anyone, and they wouldn't date you again.
 2. They would confront you and tell you how they feel and there would be no further interaction between the two of you.
 3. They would not talk to you again and they would tell people in your circle of friends how you behaved.
 4. They would pursue legal/police action against you.
16. (Scenario #5) A classmate from a course last semester seemed romantically interested in you. You remained friendly but neutral. This semester the student seems to "coincidentally" be in the hallway after one of your classes ends, and near your car in the parking lot when you leave campus. Each time they seem eager to start up a conversation. Initially you were polite but now you are getting concerned.
- A. Is this sexual misconduct?
1. Yes
 2. No
- B. Which one of the following best reflects how you would likely respond to this situation?
1. No formal complaint although you might tell a few friends or coworkers.
 2. Risk embarrassing, alienating, or angering your classmate and tell them that they need to stop following you because it is making you uncomfortable.
 3. Inform a campus official about the student's interactions with you so that they can instruct the student not to follow you around.
 4. Inform a campus official about the student's interactions with you so that they can consider expelling the student.
17. (Scenario #6) You are an excellent worker and have a private office with a company assigned computer. You are a top performer who always gets your work done. Some days during your lunch break you get bored and instead of looking at Facebook like some of your coworkers, you log onto sexually explicit web sites that you previously used to visit at home. The web sites are not illegal and there are no minor-age actors.
- A. Is this sexual misconduct?
1. Yes
 2. No
- B. Which one of the following responses would you expect if your lunch activities were discovered by your boss?
1. To avoid embarrassing you, and because you are a good worker, and no one was harmed by your actions, your boss would just send an email to all employees reminding them not to visit inappropriate web sites and that IT will monitor web activity.
 2. Because you are a good worker, and no one was harmed by these actions, your boss would just stop by your office and tell you to stop the behavior or the IT Department might initiate a dismissal request.
 3. Your boss would work with Human Resources and IT so that you could keep your job but to develop a plan for discipline and prevention going forward.

4. Your boss would work with Human Resources and IT to initiate your termination.
18. (Scenario #7) Your company president is known to be warm and friendly with the employees. The president is also known to be a hugger. Some of the hugs include hands subtly lingering on areas not normally hugged. Recently the president greeted you with a hug that you believed lingered too long on your lower back and buttock.
- A. Is this sexual misconduct?
1. Yes
 2. No
- B. Which one of the following best reflects how you would likely respond to this situation?
1. No formal complaint although you might tell a few friends or coworkers.
 2. Risk embarrassing, alienating, or angering the president and directly tell them that they are not allowed to touch you.
 3. Contact Human Resources, or the board of directors, or media members to try to force the president to stop the uncomfortable touching.
 4. Contact Human Resources, or the board of directors, or media members to try to force the dismissal/resignation of the president.
19. (Scenario #8) You are a charismatic powerful owner of a tech start-up firm. You recently hired an impressive and attractive young applicant to a dream job (crazy high pay, challenging work, and possibility for further advancement and even more money). The applicant was told that the expectation was long and unpredictable hours (like the owner works). A month later you were working late at home Friday night when you decided to summon the new employee to your penthouse apartment to talk about a great new idea (and perhaps have a fun weekend night). You told the employee to let themselves in the unlocked front door. Meanwhile, you take a quick shower, so you can look your best. By the time they arrived you have forgotten about the good idea and hope for some fun. As the new employee entered, you arrived from your shower wearing only a towel. You tried to discourage the startled employee from leaving but they rushed past you in a panic as your towel fell off.
- A. Is this sexual misconduct?
1. Yes
 2. No
- B. Which one of the following responses would you expect from your new employee?
1. Since this is the ultimate job, they won't do anything.
 2. They will wait until Monday to talk to you at work and apologize for rushing out Friday night and explain that they meant no disrespect, but they aren't interested in that kind of "fun" and it can't happen again.
 3. Even though this is the ultimate job, they will resign on Monday but not tell anybody about the incident.
 4. They will resign on Monday and try to help future employees by publicizing (through the media if necessary) the type of behavior you are capable of.