Chapter 10

Sexual Harassment, Gender, and the Workplace

Heather McLaughlin, Christopher Uggen, and Amy Blackstone

[textbox]

Key Terms and Cases

- Me Too
- Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)
- Quid pro quo
- Hostile work environment
- *Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson* (1986)
- *Ellison v. Brady* (1991)
- Reasonable person standard
- *EEOC v. Domino's Pizza, Inc.* (1995)
- *Oncale v. Sundowner Offshore Services* (1998)
- *Faragher v. City of Boca Raton* (1998)
- Liability/liable
- Youth Development Study
- Intersectionality

[/textbox]

On October 5, 2017, the *New York Times* published a Pulitzer Prize–winning article written by Jodi Kantor and Megan Twohey chronicling decades of sexual abuse by media mogul Harvey Weinstein. This was not the first story of its kind. Just one year prior, Gretchen Carlson, Megyn Kelly, and other Fox News employees similarly accused network exec Roger Ailes of sexual harassment (Talbot 2016). These allegations would become the basis for the 2019 film *Bombshell*. Workplace sexual harassment and abuse of power was also a hot button topic a couple decades prior. In 1991, Anita Hill testified during Clarence Thomas' Supreme Court confirmation hearing that he had sexually harassed her on multiple occasions when she worked as his assistant. Then, in the mid-1990s, Paula Jones sued President Bill Clinton for sexual harassment. Yet it took another 25 years before the more recent accusations against Weinstein would set off a firestorm and spark a worldwide social movement.

<Insert Figure 10.1>

Figure 10.1. ***New York Times* Mentions of "Sexual Harassment," 1975–2022**

In the months following the Weinstein revelation, articles about sexual harassment and assault dominated headlines around the globe. By late 2019, hundreds of rich and powerful men had been accused of wrongdoing. People of all genders, but especially women, took to social media to add their own stories. In solidarity, some shared experiences that they had kept secret for years or even decades. Activist Tarana Burke had coined the phrase **Me Too** over a decade prior, but the hashtag #MeToo was quickly associated with the social movement sparked by the Weinstein revelation. As the name suggests, sexual harassment is not just limited to Hollywood or politics but is a problem at Ford factories in Chicago (Chira & Einhorn, 2017), in the Silicon Valley tech world (Benner, 2017), in Florida farms, especially among undocumented workers (Ramchandani, 2018), and in fast food chains around the country (Abrams, 2018). In this chapter, we use a sociological lens to examine how gender is connected to sexual harassment for everyday workers, from hairdressers, to pediatricians, to electrical engineers. We organize this discussion around two central questions: What is sexual harassment, and how is it gendered?

What Is Sexual Harassment?

Workplace sexual harassment is considered an illegal form of sex discrimination under **Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964**. The **Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)** is the governmental agency responsible for investigating sexual harassment claims. This federal agency clarifies:

> Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature constitute sexual harassment when this conduct explicitly or implicitly affects an individual's employment, unreasonably interferes with an individual's work performance, or creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work environment. (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2020)

The EEOC definition includes two types of sexual harassment: quid pro quo and hostile work environment. Many of Harvey Weinstein's accusers allege he committed **quid pro quo** sexual harassment by linking unwanted sexual advances with employment outcomes, both positive (e.g., offering movie roles) and negative (e.g., firing women who declined or complained about his advances). In contrast, **hostile work environment** refers to those behaviors that interfere with a person's ability to work or create an offensive work environment. Scholars like Catharine MacKinnon wrote about both forms of sexual harassment in the 1970s, but it wasn't until 1986, in the case of ***Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson***, that the U.S. Supreme Court recognized hostile work environment sexual harassment as a form of sex discrimination (and thus is covered under Title VII).

Whether a single incident (or pattern of repeated behaviors) is "unreasonable" or "offensive" enough to constitute hostile work environment sexual harassment can be difficult to assess. Over the past 40 years, courts have ruled on what workers can and cannot do and who can be held accountable. Initially, courts applied the **"reasonable person" standard** when making their decisions, positing whether a sensible and objective hypothetical person would find the comment or behavior offensive and thus label it as sexual harassment.

In the 1991 case of ***Ellison v. Brady***, however, a "reasonable woman" standard was adopted. While working for the Internal Revenue Service, Kerry Ellison was repeatedly asked out by a coworker, who also wrote her several notes confessing that he had "enjoyed you so much over these past few months. Watching you. Experiencing you from O so far away" (*Ellison v. Brady*, 1991). The IRS responded by transferring the coworker to a different location, but Ellison sued when her harasser was allowed to return a few months later. The first judge to hear the case ruled that the coworker's conduct was "isolated and genuinely trivial" and issued a summary judgment in favor of the IRS. Ellison then appealed this decision to the ninth circuit, which overturned the lower court's ruling. The court's opinion explicitly applied the reasonable woman standard for the very first time, noting that the behavior was sufficiently severe and pervasive to be considered sexual harassment. The lower court was directed to listen to all of the evidence in the case before making their decision, but the parties instead reached an out-of-court settlement.

In making their decision, the ninth circuit court argued that severity and harm must be assessed from the *victim's* perspective. In his majority opinion, Judge Beezer explained, "If we only examined whether a reasonable person would engage in allegedly harassing conduct, we would run the risk of reinforcing the prevailing level of discrimination. Harassers could continue to harass merely because a particular discriminatory practice was common, and victims of harassment would have no remedy" (*Ellison v. Brady*, 1991).

Social science research confirms that women are more likely to experience unwanted sexual behaviors and to label these interactions as sexual harassment (Gutek, 1985; O'Leary-Kelly et al., 2009; Rotundo et al., 2001). Women are also much more likely than men to experience rape (Black et al., 2011), stalking (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2012), and intimate partner violence (Caldwell et al., 2012). Therefore, they are more likely to experience potentially harassing behaviors as threatening, even if the average man might dismiss the same behaviors as humorous, flattering, or trivial. Since workplace interactions cannot be stripped of gender, the reasonable woman standard takes into consideration the social and historical context of women's lived experiences.

This is not to say that men cannot be harassed. Although courts had previously applied other forms of sex discrimination to men, the first ruling in favor of a male victim of sexual harassment did not occur until 1995. In this landmark case, Domino's Pizza was ordered to pay over $200,000 in damages after a woman supervisor in Florida sexually harassed an employee named David Papa and then fired him when he threatened to report her (**EEOC v. Domino's Pizza, Inc.**). Another significant ruling came in 1998, when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in favor of a male oil rig worker and established that sexual harassment can occur among members of the same sex (**Oncale v. Sundowner Offshore Services**).

Given that sexual harassment occurs among people of all genders, the reasonable woman standard, which takes into consideration victim's perspectives, has come to be known as the "reasonable worker standard." Sociolegal scholars continue to debate whether the "reasonable person standard" or "reasonable woman/worker standard" is more appropriate. Kenealy (1992), for example, expressed concern that the reasonable woman standard could be deployed to argue that women require special treatment, antithetical to the goal of antidiscrimination law. From this perspective, "reasonableness" is not in the eye of the beholder, and all workers or jurors, regardless of gender, should be able to recognize intimidating, offensive, and hostile behavior. From either perspective, however, it is important to recognize how gender influences workers' understandings and experiences of sexual harassment, a point we return to in the following section.

In addition to establishing precedent on what sexual harassment is and who can experience this form of sex discrimination, courts have also addressed culpability. Organizations have a legal responsibility to protect workers from sexual harassment, and the EEOC stipulates that employers' responses to sexual harassment should be "immediate and appropriate." In the case of *Ellison v. Brady* (1991), discussed above, the ninth circuit wrote that allowing Ellison's harasser to transfer back after a brief "cooling-off period" was an insufficient response. There was no evidence provided that the IRS had explicitly expressed their disapproval, reprimanded the harasser, or even informed him that subsequent harassment would result in disciplinary action.

A few years later, in **Faragher v. City of Boca Raton**, the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals found that Beth Ann Faragher had indeed experienced hostile work environment sexual harassment while working as a municipal lifeguard during college but dismissed the case after determining that her employer, the city of Boca Raton, Florida, was not **liable** because City Hall was never made aware of the problem. The case went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, which ruled in 1998 that the city *should* have known but made no attempt to establish an antiharassment policy or monitor employees' behavior. This ruling led to the widespread adoption of workplace policies and complaint procedures. Although such procedures provide some protections to harassment targets, they have been criticized as window dressing designed to protect employers from legal **liability** rather than meaningful efforts to improve problematic workplace cultures (Kalev et al., 2006; Nelson et al., 2008). Next, we turn to our second question: How is sexual harassment gendered?

How Is Sexual Harassment Gendered?

In her pioneering work on sexual harassment, Catharine MacKinnon (1979) argued that sexual harassment is used as a tactic to assert and maintain patriarchal power arrangements. Beth Quinn's (2002) research on one particular form of sexual harassment, referred to as *girl watching*, illustrates this point. Quinn uses this expression to describe when men, often in groups, make comments about women's bodies, detail imagined sexual acts, or boast about their sexual prowess. Because these behaviors are directed at each other and not openly to the women being objectified, men are often surprised or confused when women take offense; however, the most egregious forms of girl watching operate

> as a targeted tactic of power. The men seem to want everyone—the targeted woman as well as coworkers, clients, and superiors—to know they are looking. The gaze demonstrates their right, as men, to sexually evaluate women. Through the gaze, the targeted woman is reduced to a sexual object, contradicting her other identities, such as that of competent worker or leader. (Quinn, 2002, p. 392)

We found similar stories in our own research on sexual harassment. For example, Holly, an upper-level manager we interviewed who worked in manufacturing, was sexually harassed by a client at a company dinner. She described how she resisted when he put his arm around her and placed his hand on her thigh, how he told her coworkers, "Oh, I love her. She's beautiful," and how she trembled with fear after he placed his arm on her shoulders and commanded she stay when she tried to leave the table. In her own words, Holly explained how "he just kept going on and touching me and put his hand on [my] leg very forcefully and then he was playing the game of trying to unhook the bra with two fingers, which he did after I tried to get up and get away." Throughout the meal, Holly's colleagues noticed the harassment, but rather than address the behavior directly, they pulled her aside and urged her to go home while they stayed behind and continued business with the client over drinks.

During the ensuing sexual harassment investigation, Holly's interview with lawyers and human resources representatives focused on "why I was there. You know, totally drilling … like, 'you shouldn't have been there.' And I'm like, 'I'm in charge of purchasing for our company and you are one of our major suppliers and when we're talking about a new program or putting something into play, I need to know.'" The companies were anxious to "get back to business as usual" after formally apologizing, but Holly was unsatisfied, especially after hearing a rumor that the company had "paid out money because of him before. And I'm like, and he's still employed?" Still, Holly was not surprised to learn of his past behavior, because "He knew what he was doing. I mean, to unhook somebody's bra with two fingers between their clothes … He knew what he was doing. He knew exactly what he was doing." Holly's boss and her harasser had known each other for many years, and she speculated that their relationship may have led him to think he could "get away with it." As one of her colleagues remarked, "He's just horrible. He's grandfathered in with the good old boys."

Sometimes sexual harassment is an isolated incident, committed by a "bad apple" employee. Often, however, it is rooted in a workplace culture that promotes or, at best, ignores sexism and misogyny (Baigent, 2005; Yount, 2005), in line with the situation that Holly described. Sexual harassment goes beyond a misguided or awkward expression of romantic interest but is instead motivated by power and domination. In one of our first studies on the topic (Uggen and Blackstone, 2004), we used data from the **Youth Development Study (YDS)** to show how sexual harassment is a gendered expression of power. This longitudinal survey followed a group of St. Paul, Minnesota, students for over 20 years, beginning when they were high school freshmen in the late 1980s. By their mid-20s, at least one third of women and 14% of men had a workplace experience that they considered to be sexual harassment (Uggen & Blackstone, 2004; Blackstone et al., 2014). By their early 30s, the number harassed grew to at least 45% of women and 23% of men. Women were also more likely than men to experience the most serious forms of sexual harassment, such as unwanted touching. Across every type of sexual harassment we asked about, it was rare for harassed women to report that it happened only once, and they typically endured multiple forms throughout the year (McLaughlin, 2018). These findings are consistent with annual U.S. EEOC (2020) data showing that females file the vast majority of sexual harassment charges (around 84% each year for the past decade).

Our research has also explored why some women (and some men) are more likely to be harassed than others (Uggen & Blackstone, 2004; McLaughlin et al., 2017). After reviewing work on the intersections of gender, sexuality, and power, we theorized that women in management positions were actually *more* likely to experience sexual harassment than other working women. This may seem like a surprising hypothesis, but it is based on a theory known as the "power threat" perspective.[1] Research shows that challenges to men's dominance can lead to violence and other forms of backlash against women (Bailey, 1999; Berdahl, 2007; Faludi, 1991; Whaley, 2001). In one computer simulation experiment, for example, men were more likely to send offensive pornographic images to (fictitious) women who aspired to be bank managers and supporters of women's rights as compared to aspiring elementary school teachers (Maass et al., 2003). Moreover, they also reported a greater willingness to sexually exploit women in a hypothetical hiring scenario after interacting with the first woman.

In a separate study by Willer et al. (2013), masculine threat was even linked to men's car preferences. After completing a "gender identity survey," participants received randomly assigned feedback—regardless of their actual answers—indicating that their score was either "feminine" or "masculine." While women's subsequent answers did not significantly differ between the two conditions, men who were told they had scored in the "feminine" range relative to other study participants reacted to this perceived threat by expressing more support for war, more homophobic attitudes, and greater interest in purchasing an SUV.

Consistent with this literature, we found that women supervisors indeed experience the highest rates of harassment. In our most conservative statistical models, women supervisors were 138% more likely to have been the victim of least one harassing behavior in the past year, the number of harassing behaviors they reported was 73% greater, and they were nearly 3.5 times more likely than nonsupervisors to label their experiences as sexual harassment (McLaughlin et al., 2012). We also interviewed a subset of YDS respondents to learn more about the relationship between supervisory authority and harassment. Several women, including Holly whose harassment we described above, told us how they felt isolated as one of only a handful of women managers at their company. It is well documented that women are underrepresented in the highest rungs of management and corporate leadership positions (Elliott & Smith, 2004; Gorman, 2005; Kalev, 2009; Reskin & McBrier, 2000), which, as Cohen and Huffman (2007) have shown, contributes to the gender wage gap. Although we find that women supervisors experience high rates of harassment today, our research also suggests that promoting more women into positions of authority could ultimately reduce such harassment in the future.

Regardless of women's hierarchical rank, isolation due to the nature of the occupations or industries in which they work may also increase their risk of harassment. Jenna, for example, told us how she was subjected to sexual innuendos and inappropriate comments about her body while working at a gas station, which she attributed to being "the only female there. … They work on the buddy system, you know? So the more you say, the more you get yourself in trouble." Although sexual harassment has been documented across a range of jobs, especially within the service industry (Giuffre & Williams 1994; Hughes & Tadic, 1998), sexual and gender-based harassment is most common in male-dominated professions (Fitzgerald et al., 1997; Hersch, 2011; Mansfield et al., 1991; McLaughlin et al., 2012), such as policing (de Haas & Timmerman, 2010; Texeira 2002), firefighting (Baigent, 2005; Yoder & Aniakudo, 1996), mining (Tallichet, 1995; Yount, 2005), and military service (Antecol & Cobb-Clark, 2001; Bonnes, 2017). Similarly, as a recent National Academies (2018) report documents, gender-based harassment is especially common in male-dominated STEM fields, such as engineering and in medical education.

In our own research, we heard eerily similar stories from women across a range of masculine professions who felt they were constantly trying to prove that they were just as capable or qualified as the men they worked with. So when it came to sexual harassment, many said they tolerated inappropriate comments or other harassment to avoid alienating their coworkers. Marie, for example, told us how the few women who work in construction often experience catcalling, leering, and sexual advances. She ignored these behaviors, however, explaining,

---

[1] This theory parallels Blalock's (1967) racial threat theory, which has been used to explain how changes in the size of racial and ethnic minority groups are associated with different forms of social control, most notably incarceration and other disparate sentencing outcomes (e.g., Caravelis et al., 2011; Jacobs et al., 2005; Johnson et al., 2008).

> You still need to keep a working relationship with these people. … If you wanted to leave, sure you could file a claim or do whatever, but if you want to stay at the job … I guess to a certain extent you kind of feel like you have to put up with. …That was just the way things were, and I guess I just accepted that.

Denissen and Saguy (2014) conducted 63 interviews with women in construction and the larger building trades industry (e.g., electricians, surveyors, carpenters, and metal workers), where women account for less than 2% of workers. The authors argue that tradeswomen threaten conceptions of this work as inherently masculine, and tradesmen neutralize this threat through homophobia and sexualization. For example, assumptions that all tradeswomen are lesbians prevents many women, regardless of their sexual orientation, from networking and seeking support from other women in the industry, perpetuating isolation.

Denissen and Saguy (2014) further show how sexual orientation, race, and body size—in addition to gender—shape women's experiences of harassment. Gender nonconforming women described how their looks often shielded them from sexual advances but also led to more crass language and behavior from men who felt they were "not really a chick." Tradeswomen resist harassment by strategically manipulating the rules of gender, a process called "gender maneuvering," in varied ways based on their intersecting identities. For example, White women often emphasized their femininity as part of their gender maneuvering, while "black, butch, and large tradeswomen were more likely to emphasize their ability to 'hold their own' with the heaviest, dirtiest, and most dangerous tasks" (Denissen & Saguy, 2014, p. 394). Similarly, workers who are undocumented or marginalized in other ways are at increased risk, particularly when they cannot come forward when harassed (Blackstone et al., 2009; Fitzgerald, 2019; Ramchandani, 2018). In their analysis of Filipinas working as live-in caregivers in Canada, Welsh and colleagues (2006), for example, find that racism and lack of citizenship limit women's options when they are harassed by the employers who sponsor their temporary work visas. U.S. antidiscrimination laws have lagged behind those of other countries that have taken steps to recognize and address multiple dimensions of inequality (Kantola & Nousiainen, 2009). This remains true today, despite the intersectional goals of the #MeToo movement, which Tarana Burke initiated in 2006 to help sexual violence survivors, particularly Black and other women of color.[2]

Lastly, it is also important to consider the ways that complete physical isolation from others can increase victimization. In a story published in *Outside*, Langlois (2018) described the prevalence of sexual harassment in outdoor workplaces, such as national parks and ski resorts. The magazine posted an anonymous survey on Facebook and found that approximately 70% of the 4,176 respondents said they had been harassed while working or playing in the outdoors industry.[3] Jessie was one of those people. A few nights into a whitewater river trip in the Grand Canyon, another guide she had never worked with before crawled into her raft and tried to sleep with her (clients typically sleep on land while the guides stay with their boats). Without bystanders nearby to intervene, this scenario can become especially dangerous. She considered reporting his behavior to the owner but was advised against it by a superior who implied that she might be seen as a problem and assigned fewer trips in the future. Other guides reported similar stories, like Bridget who explained that, along with her ability to read maps, "harassment-coping skills were necessary for my survival" (Langlois, 2018, para. 7). Many women end up leaving the industry entirely (Langlois, 2018; McLaughlin et al., 2017).

Although much more has been written about the sexual harassment of cisgender women, there is some research related to cisgender men (Berdahl et al., 1996; Lee, 2010) and, to a lesser degree, transgender and nonbinary workers (Rabelo & Cortina, 2014). Gender-based harassment and discrimination are extremely pervasive among the latter (Grant et al., 2011), but most sexual harassment surveys have relatively low representation of queer workers and/or have only recently introduced more inclusive gender questions (e.g., the General Social Survey).

---

[2] Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989) coined the term **intersectionality** to critique the law's view of racism and sexism as separate issues, hindering Black women's ability to prove discrimination claims when targeted in ways that neither Black men nor White women experienced. For more recent work on this, we recommend Crenshaw's excellent TedTalk "The Urgency of Intersectionality."

[3] After sharing the link to their survey on social media, a disturbing number of followers, mostly men, contacted the magazine to cancel their subscription or complain that "someone should kick them in the nuts (if they had any)" due to their "leftist political agenda" (Berger, 2017, Facebook Comments section).

When cisgender men are targeted, it is often motivated by a desire to police gendered behavior. Gender scholars argue that, in the context of a specific time and place, a singular form of masculinity is privileged above others. Thus, the men most likely to be harassed are those who do not act like "real" men and do not conform to cultural expectations of what Raewyn Connell (1995) refers to as "hegemonic masculinity." In statistical models, we found that men who rated themselves as more feminine than their peers were more likely to be harassed, and our interviews support the notion that men are often targeted for not conforming to masculine expectations (McLaughlin et al., 2012). One straight White man we interviewed named Rick told us that his coworkers in a printing warehouse often made "really awful jokes—gay jokes, sex jokes" that worsened when they saw it offended him. He would wear headphones at work to tune them out, and he explained that he never confronted or reported the harassers because "they hassled me enough as it was and I think if I'd said something … they'd lay into it even more." Similarly, one of Cam's coworkers was subjected to gay slurs and spat on due to "the way that he moves [and] the way he dress[es]."

People are often dismissive of sexual harassment against men (Stockdale et al., 2004), perhaps because (straight) men are told they should welcome and enjoy sexual attention from women. This helps explain why, in 1 year of our analysis, over one third of men experienced at least one harassing behavior (recall that the legal definition of sexual harassment requires that the behavior must be repeated and unwanted), but only 1% labeled their experiences as sexual harassment (McLaughlin et al., 2012). Furthermore, our data show that men are very often harassed by other men. Figure 10.2 shows the gender of the target (blue vs. red bars) and harasser (solid vs. striped stacks) for three of the most common harassing behaviors: (1) exposure to offensive pictures, posters, or other materials; (2) uncomfortable staring or leering; and, (3) attempts to discuss sex, sharing of suggestive stories, and/or inappropriate comments. Men were more likely than women to be the harassers for each of these behaviors, although the gender of the harasser for some of the less common types of harassment that men experience, such as unwanted touching or repeated requests for dinner or drinks, was more varied.

<Insert Figure 10.2>

Figure 10.2. Gender of Harassers and Targets

Conclusion

Sexual harassment comes with considerable costs. These include costs to workers' health (Chan et al., 2008; Houle et al., 2011; Richman et al., 1999), their careers (Hart, 2019; McLaughlin et al., 2017), coworkers' well-being (Glomb et al., 1997; Richman-Hirsch & Glomb, 2002), and organizations' productivity and financial success (Merkin, 2008; U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, 1988). Sexual harassment is not a criminal offense, so harassers do not serve prison sentences unless their behavior rises to the level of sexual assault (as was the case with Harvey Weinstein). Some harassment targets have received millions of dollars in judgments or settlements after suing their harassers and employers (McCoy, 2017), although monetary awards for targets in many jurisdictions are capped at much lower amounts. Federal law limits damages to $50,000 for small companies[4] and $300,000 for those with 500 or more employees, and these limits have not changed since the early 1990s. Regardless of the potential legal remedies, however, it is clear that organizations must do more to eliminate sexual harassment and improve workplace cultures. Hart and colleagues (2018) find that employers can make a big difference. When organizational leaders emphasize that sexual harassment and assault are important issues, even with just a few sentences, their employees often listen and follow suit. But it is up to all of us to challenge the cultural norms that perpetuate sexual harassment.

---

[4] The maximum award of $50,000 applies to companies with 15–100 employees. Those who are harassed while working in smaller companies or as independent contractors are not considered "employees" under Title VII and cannot file a complaint with the EEOC; however, nontraditional workers may be covered by state or local antidiscrimination laws.

Discussion Questions

1. What happened that led to a dramatic increase in sexual harassment being in the news?
2. What are the two types of sexual harassment? Explain and cite an example for each type.
3. Why is the *Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson* (1986) case important? To learn more, look up a summary of this famous case.
4. What is the reasonable person standard, and how is it used in sexual harassment cases?
5. Is a reasonable woman standard needed instead of a gender-neutral reasonable person standard when evaluating sexual harassment in the workplace? What are the arguments for and against this? Which do you favor?
6. According to the chapter, can a man be the victim of sexual harassment according to the law? If so, what case established this precedent? According to the law, can someone be sexually harassed by a member of their own sex?
7. Should employers be held liable if one of their employees engages in sexual harassment? If so, in what circumstances?
8. Although both men and women can be victims of sexual harassment, the chapter argues that sexual harassment is *gendered*. What does this mean? What evidence do the authors give for this claim?
9. What hypothesis is based on the "power threat" perspective?
10. The authors state that "sexual and gender-based harassment is most common in male-dominated professions, such as policing, firefighting, mining, military service" and STEM fields. Why do you think this is the case?
11. How do race, sexual orientation, gender identity, and body size interact with gender to affect women's experiences of sexual harassment, particularly in male-dominated occupations?
12. When men are harassed, what is the typical scenario they experience? Why do they often not label their experience as harassment even if it fits the definition?
13. What can be done to reduce sexual harassment in the workplace?

References

Abrams, R. (2018, September 18). McDonald's workers across the U.S. stage #MeToo protests. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2018/09/18/business/mcdonalds-strike-metoo.html

Antecol, H., & Cobb-Clark, D. (2001). Men, women and sexual harassment in the U.S. military. *Gender Issues*, *19*(1), 3–18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12147-001-0001-1

Baigent, D. (2005). Fitting in: The conflation of firefighting, male domination, and harassment. In J. Gruber & P. Morgan (Eds.), *In the company of men: Male dominance and sexual harassment* (pp. 45–64). Northeastern University Press.

Bailey, W. C. (1999). The socioeconomic status of women and patterns of forcible rape for major U.S. cities. *Sociological Focus*, *32*(1), 43–63. https://doi.org/10.1080/00380237.1999.10571123

Benner, K. (2017, June 30). Women in tech speak frankly on culture of harassment. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/30/technology/women-entrepreneurs-speak-out-sexual-harassment.html

Berdahl, J. L. (2007). The sexual harassment of uppity women. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(2), 425–437. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.425

Berdahl, J. L., Magley, V. J., & Waldo, C. R. (1996). The sexual harassment of men? Exploring the concept with theory and data. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *20*(4), 527–547. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1996.tb00320.x

Berger, E. (2017, November 29). Don't care about sexual harassment? Don't read *Outside*. *Outside*. https://www.outsideonline.com/culture/opinion/dont-care-about-sexual-harassment-dont-read-outside/

Black, M. C., Basile, K. C., Breiding, M. J., Smith, S. G., Walters, M. L., Merrick, M. T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M. R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 summary report*. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Blackstone, A., Houle, J. N., & Uggen, C. (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), 314–337. https://doi.org/10.1080/02732173.2014.917247

Blackstone, A., Uggen, C., & McLaughlin, H. (2009). Legal consciousness and responses to sexual harassment. *Law & Society Review*, *43*(3), 631–668. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5893.2009.00384.x

Blalock, H. M. (1967). *Toward a theory of minority-group relations*. John Wiley and Sons.

Bonnes, S. (2017). The bureaucratic harassment of U.S. servicewomen. *Gender & Society*, *31*(6), 804–829. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243217736006

Caldwell, J. E., Swan, S. C., & Woodbrown, V. D. (2012). Gender differences in intimate partner violence outcomes. *Psychology of Violence*, *2*(1), 42–57. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026296

Caravelis, C., Chiricos, T., & Bales, W. (2011). Static and dynamic indicators of minority threat in sentencing outcomes: A multi-level analysis. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *27*(4), 405–425. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-011-9130-1

Chan, D. K., Chow, S. Y., Lam, C. B., & Cheung, S. F. (2008). Examining the job-related, psychological, and physical outcomes of workplace sexual harassment: A meta-analytic review. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *32*(4), 362–376. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2008.00451.x

Chira, S., & Einhorn, C. (2017, December 19). How tough is it to change a culture of harassment? Ask women at Ford. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/12/19/us/ford-chicago-sexual-harassment.html

Cohen, P. N., & Huffman, M. L. (2007). Working for the woman? Female managers and the gender wage gap. *American Sociological Review*, *72*(5), 681–704. https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240707200502

Connell, R. (1995). *Masculinities*. Polity Press.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, *1*, 139–167.

de Haas, S., & Timmerman, G. (2010). Sexual harassment in the context of double male dominance. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *19*(6), 717–734. https://doi.org/10.1080/09541440903160492

Denissen, A. M., & Saguy, A. C. (2014). Gendered homophobia and the contradictions of workplace discrimination for women in the building trades. *Gender & Society*, *28*(3), 381–403. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243213510781

Elliott, J. R., & Smith, R. A. (2004). Race, gender, and workplace power. *American Sociological Review*, *69*(3), 365–386. https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240406900303

Ellison v. Brady, 924 F. 2d 872 (9th Cir. 1991).

Faludi, S. (1991). *Backlash: The undeclared war against American women.* Crown Publishing Group.

Fitzgerald, L. F. (2019). Unseen: The sexual harassment of low-income women in America. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion*, *39*(1), 5–16. https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-08-2019-0232

Fitzgerald, L. F., Drasgow, F., Hulin, C. L., Gefland, M. J., & Magley, V. J. (1997). Antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations: A test of an integrated model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*(4), 578–589. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.82.4.578

Giuffre, P. A., & Williams, C. L. (1994). Boundary lines: Labeling sexual harassment in restaurants. *Gender & Society*, *8*(3), 378–401. https://doi.org/10.1177/089124394008003006

Glomb, T. M., Richman, W. L., Hulin, C. L., Drasgow, F., Schneider, K. T., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1997). Ambient sexual harassment: An integrated model of antecedents and consequences. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *71*(3), 309–328. https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.1997.2728

Gorman, E. H. (2005). Gender stereotypes, same-gender preferences, and organizational variation in the hiring of women: Evidence from law firms. *American Sociological Review*, *70*(4), 702–728. https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240507000408

Grant, J. A., Mottet, L. A., Tanis, J., Harrison, J., Herman, J. L., & Kiesling, M. (2011). *Injustice at every turn: A report of the National Transgender Discrimination Survey*. https://transequality.org/sites/default/files/docs/resources/NTDS_Exec_Summary.pdf

Gutek, B. A. (1985). *Sex and the workplace: The impact of sexual behavior and harassment on women, men, and organizations*. Jossey-Bass.

Hart, C. G. (2019). The penalties for self-reporting sexual harassment. *Gender & Society*, *33*(4), 534–559. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243219842147

Hart, C. G., Crossley, A. D., & Correll, S. J. (2018). Leader messaging and attitudes towards sexual violence. *Socius*, *4*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023118808617

Hersch, J. (2011). Compensating differentials for sexual harassment. *American Economic Review*, *101*(3), 630–634. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.101.3.630

Houle, J. N., Staff, J., Mortimer, J. T., Uggen, C., & Blackstone, A. (2011). The impact of sexual harassment on depressive symptoms during the early occupational career. *Society and Mental Health*, *1*(2), 89–105. https://doi.org/10.1177/2156869311416827

Hughes, K. D., & Tadic, V. (1998). 'Something to deal with': Customer sexual harassment and women's retail service work in Canada. *Gender, Work and Organization*, *5*(4), 207–219. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0432.00058

Jacobs, D., Carmichael, J. T., & Kent, S. L. (2005). Vigilantism, current racial threat, and death sentences. *American Sociological Review*, *70*(4), 656–677. https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240507000406

Johnson, B. D., Ulmer, J. T., & Kramer, J. H. (2008). The social context of guidelines circumvention: The case of federal district courts. *Criminology*, *46*(3), 737–783. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2008.00125.x

Kalev, A. (2009). Cracking the glass cages? Restructuring and ascriptive inequality at work. *American Journal of Sociology*, *114*(6), 1591–1643. https://doi.org/10.1086/597175

Kalev, A., Dobbin, F., & Kelly, E. (2006). Best practices or best guesses? Assessing the efficacy of corporate affirmative action policies. *American Sociological Review*, *71*(4), 589–617. https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240607100404

Kantola, J., & Nousiainen, K. (2009). Institutionalizing intersectionality in Europe. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, *11*(4), 459–477. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616740903237426

Kantor, J., & Twohey, M. (2017, October 5). Harvey Weinstein paid off sexual harassment accusers for decades. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/05/us/harvey-weinstein-harassment-allegations.html

Kenealy, K. A. (1992). Sexual harassment and the reasonable woman standard. *The Labor Lawyer*, *8*(2), 203–210.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (2012). Gender and stalking: Current intersections and future directions. *Sex Roles*, *66*(5–6), 418–426. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-011-0093-3

Langlois, K. (2018, January 31). Hostile environment. *Outside*. https://www.outsideonline.com/2277166/hostile-environment

Lee, D. (2010). Hegemonic masculinity and male feminization: The sexual harassment of men at work. *Journal of Gender Studies*, *9*(2), 141–155. https://doi.org/10.1080/713677986

Maass, A., Cadinu, M., Guarnieri, G., & Grasselli, A. (2003). Sexual harassment under social identity threat: The computer harassment paradigm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *85*(5), 853–870. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.5.853

MacKinnon, C. A. (1979). *Sexual harassment of working women: A case of sex discrimination*. Yale University Press.

Mansfield, P. K., Koch, P. B., Henderson, J., Vicary, J. R., Cohn, M., & Young, E. W. (1991). The job climate for women in traditionally male blue-collar occupations. *Sex Roles*, *25*(1–2), 63–79. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00289317

McCoy, K. (2017, October 25). Sexual harassment: Here are some of the biggest cases. *USA Today*. https://www.usatoday.com/story/money/2017/10/25/sexual-harassment-here-some-biggest-cases/791439001/

McLaughlin, H. (2018, January 31). Who's harassed, and how? *Harvard Business Review*. https://hbr.org/2018/01/whos-harassed-and-how

McLaughlin, H, Uggen, C., & Blackstone, A. (2012). Sexual harassment, workplace authority, and the paradox of power. *American Sociological Review*, *77*(4), 625–647. https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122412451728

McLaughlin, H, Uggen, C., & Blackstone, A. (2017). The economic and career effects of sexual harassment on working women. *Gender & Society*, *31*(3), 333–358. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243217704631

Merkin, R. S. (2008). The impact of sexual harassment on turnover intentions, absenteeism, and job satisfaction: Findings from Argentina, Brazil, and Chile. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, *10*(2), 73–91.

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2018). *Sexual harassment of women: Climate, culture, and consequences in academic sciences, engineering, and medicine*. https://www.nap.edu

Nelson, R. L., Berrey, E., & Nielsen, L. B. (2008). Divergent paths: Conflicting conceptions of employment discrimination in law and social sciences. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, *4*, 103–122. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.1.041604.115934

O'Leary-Kelly, A. M, Bowes-Sperry L., Bates, C. A., & Lean, E. R. (2009). Sexual harassment at work: A decade (plus) of progress. *Journal of Management*, *35*(3), 503–536. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308330555

Quinn, B. A. (2002). Sexual harassment and masculinity: The power and meaning of "girl watching." *Gender and Society*, *16*(3), 386–402. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243202016003007

Rabelo, V. C., & Cortina, L. M. (2014). Two sides of the same coin: Gender harassment and heterosexist harassment in LGBQ work lives. *Law and Human Behavior*, *38*(4), 378–391. https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000087

Ramchandani, A. (2018, January 29). There's a sexual-harassment epidemic on America's farms. *The Atlantic*. https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2018/01/agriculture-sexual-harassment/550109/

Reskin, B. F., & McBrier, D. B. (2003). Why not ascription? Organizations' employment of male and female managers. *American Sociological Review*, *65*(2), 210–233. https://doi.org/10.2307/2657438

Richman, J. A., Rospenda, K. M., Nawyn, S. J., Flaherty, J. A., Fendrich, M., Drum, M. L., & Johnson, T. P. (1999). Sexual harassment and generalized workplace abuse among university employees: prevalence and mental health correlates. *American Journal of Public Health*, *89*(3), 358–363. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.89.3.358

Richman-Hirsch, W. L., & Glomb, T. M. (2002). Are men affected by the sexual harassment of women? Effects of ambient sexual harassment on men. In J. M. Brett & F. Drasgow (Eds.), *The psychology of work: Theoretically based empirical research* (pp. 121–140). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Rotundo, M., Nguyen, D., & Sackett, P. R. (2001). A meta-analytic review of gender differences in perceptions of sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(5), 914–922. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.914

Shoenfelt, E. L., Maue, A. E., & Nelson, J. (2002). Reasonable person versus reasonable woman: Does it matter? *Journal of Gender, Social Policy & the Law*, *10*(3), 633–672.

Stockdale, M. S., Gandolfo Berry, C., Schneider, R. W., & Cao, F. (2004). Perceptions of the sexual harassment of men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *5*(2), 158–167. https://doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.5.2.158

Talbot, M. (2016, August 19). Fox News and the repercussions of sexual harassment. *The New Yorker*. https://www.newyorker.com/news/daily-comment/fox-news-and-the-repercussions-of-sexual-harassment.

Tallichet, S. E. (1995). Gendered relations in the mines and the division of labor underground. *Gender & Society*, *9*(6), 697–711. https://doi.org/10.1177/089124395009006004

Texeira, M. T. (2002). “Who protects and serves me?”: A case study of sexual harassment of African American women in one U.S. law enforcement agency. *Gender & Society*, *16*(4), 524–545. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243202016004007

Uggen, C., & Blackstone, A. (2004). Sexual harassment as a gendered expression of power. *American Sociological Review*, *69*(1), 64–92. https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240406900105

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2020). *Sexual harassment*. https://www.eeoc.gov

U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board. (1988). *Sexual harassment in the federal government: An update*. U.S. Government Printing Office.

Welsh, S., Carr, J., MacQuarrie, B., & Huntley, A. (2006). “I’m not thinking of it as sexual harassment”: Understanding harassment across race and citizenship. *Gender & Society*, *20*(1), 87–107. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243205282785

Whaley, R. B. (2001). The paradoxical relationship between gender inequality and rape: Toward a refined theory. *Gender and Society*, *15*(4), 531–555. https://doi.org/10.1177/089124301015004003

Willer, R., Rogalin, C. L., Conlon, B., & Wojnowicz, M. T. (2013). Overdoing gender: A test of the masculine overcompensation thesis. *American Journal of Sociology*, *118*(4), 980–1022. https://doi.org/10.1086/668417

Yoder, J. D., & Aniakudo, P. 1996. When pranks become harassment: The case of African American women firefighters. *Sex Roles*, *35*(5–6), 253–270. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01664768

Yount, K. (2005). Sexualization of work roles among men miners: structural and gender-based origins of “harazzment.” In J. Gruber & P. Morgan (Eds.), *In the company of men: Male dominance and sexual harassment* (pp. 65–91). Northeastern University Press.